IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA
NO. 1:15-CV-00399

SANDRA LITTLE COVINGTON, *et al.*,	)
	)
Plaintiffs,	)
	)
v.	)
	)
STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA, *et al.*	)
	)
Defendants.	)
	)

NOTICE OF FILING

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that, pursuant to the Court's Order of July 31, 2017 (Doc. 180), the North Carolina General Assembly enacted new House and Senate districting plans as of Thursday, August 31, 2017, and hereby provide notice of such enactment and the other information requested in the Court's Order of July 31, 2017 (Doc. 180, pp. 8-9).

I. The 2017 House Redistricting Plan

The new House districting plan was identified as House Bill 927 ("H927") during consideration by the General Assembly and is now identified as Session Law 2017-208 and titled "2017 House Redistricting Plan A2" (hereinafter the "2017 House Redistricting Plan") after final enactment on August 31, 2017.[1] The following documents requested by the Court related to this plan are attached:

[1] A link to the complete history of H927, including all amendments proposed, may be found at the link below:

- A map of the 2017 House Redistricting Plan. (Attached as Ex. 1).[2]

- The Block Assignment File for the 2017 House Redistricting Plan is available at: http://www.ncleg.net/Sessions/2017/h927maps/h927maps.html

- The Shapefile for the 2017 House Redistricting Plan is available at: http://www.ncleg.net/Sessions/2017/h927maps/h927maps.html

- The "stat pack" for the 2017 House Redistricting Plan. (Attached as Ex. 2).

- Additional statistical information requested by members of the General Assembly but not considered by the House Select Committee on Redistricting in drawing the 2017 House Redistricting Plan. (Attached as Ex. 3).

II. The 2017 Senate Redistricting Plan

The new Senate districting plan was identified as Senate Bill 691 ("S691") during consideration by the General Assembly and is now identified as Session Law 2017-207 and titled "2017 Senate Floor Redistricting Plan -4th Ed." (hereinafter the "2017 Senate Redistricting Plan") after final enactment on August 31, 2017.[3] The following documents requested by the Court related to this plan are attached:

- A map of the 2017 Senate Redistricting Plan. (Attached as Ex. 4).[4]

---

http://www.ncleg.net/gascripts/BillLookUp/BillLookUp.pl?Session=2017&BillID=H927&submitButton=Go

[2] Maps of previous editions of the adopted 2017 House Redistricting Plan may be found here: http://www.ncleg.net/Sessions/2017/h927maps/h927maps.html

[3] A link to the complete history of S691, including all amendments proposed, may be found at the link below :
http://www.ncleg.net/gascripts/BillLookUp/BillLookUp.pl?Session=2017&BillID=S691&submitButton=Go

[4] Maps of previous editions of the adopted 2017 Senate Redistricting Plan may be found here: http://www.ncleg.net/Sessions/2017/s691maps/s691maps.html

- The Block Assignment File for the 2017 Senate Redistricting Plan is available at: http://www.ncleg.net/Sessions/2017/s691maps/s691maps.html

- The Shapefile for the 2017 Senate Redistricting Plan is available at: http://www.ncleg.net/Sessions/2017/s691maps/s691maps.html

- The "stat pack" for the 2017 Senate Redistricting Plan. (Attached as Ex. 5).

- Additional statistical information requested by members of the General Assembly but not considered by the Senate Redistricting Committee on Redistricting in drawing the 2017 House Redistricting Plan. (Attached as Ex. 6).

III. Transcripts of Committee Hearings and Floor Debates

Transcripts of all committee hearings and floor debates related to the enactment of these plans are attached and identified as:

- Exhibit 7: 7/26/17 – Joint Redistricting Committee meeting
- Exhibit 8: 8/4/17 – Joint Redistricting Committee meeting
- Exhibit 9: 8/10/17 – Joint Redistricting Committee meeting
- Exhibit 10: 8/22/17 – Public Hearing – Raleigh site
- Exhibit 11: 8/22/17 – Public Hearing – Beaufort site
- Exhibit 12: 8/22/17 – Public Hearing - Charlotte site
- Exhibit 13: 8/22/17 - Public Hearing – Fayetteville site
- Exhibit 14: 8/22/17 – Public Hearing – Hudson site
- Exhibit 15: 8/22/17 – Public Hearing – Jamestown site
- Exhibit 16: 8/22/17 – Public Hearing – Weldon site
- Exhibit: 17: 8/24/17 – Senate Redistricting Committee meeting
- Exhibit: 18: 8/25/17 – House Select Committee on Redistricting meeting
- Exhibit: 19: 8/25/17 – Senate Floor Session
- Exhibit: 20: 8/28/17 – House Floor Session
- Exhibit: 21: 8/28/17 – Senate Floor Session
- Exhibit: 22: 8/29/17 – Senate Redistricting Committee meeting
- Exhibit: 23: 8/29/17 – House Select Committee on Redistricting meeting
- Exhibit: 24: 8/30/17 – Senate Floor Session
- Exhibit: 25: 8/30/17 – House Floor Session

IV. Description of the 2017 Redistricting Process and Identification of Participants Involved

On June 27, 2017, Senate President Pro Tempore Phil Berger and House Speaker Tim Moore approved a contract with Dr. Tom Hofeller as a mapdrawing consultant for Rep. David Lewis and Sen. Ralph Hise, the forthcoming chairs of the 2017 redistricting committees in the House and the Senate. On June 30, 2017, the Senate Redistricting Committee was appointed by Sen. Berger with the following members:

- Sen. Ralph Hise, Chairman
- Sen. Dan Bishop
- Sen. Dan Blue
- Sen. Harry Brown
- Sen. Ben Clark
- Sen. Warren Daniel
- Sen. Kathy Harrington
- Sen. Brent Jackson
- Sen. Michael V. Lee
- Sen. Paul A. Lowe, Jr.
- Sen. Paul Newton
- Sen. Bill Rabon
- Sen. Erica Smith-Ingram
- Sen. Terry Van Duyn
- Sen. Trudy Wade

On June 30, 2017, the House Select Committee on Redistricting was appointed by Rep. Moore with the following members:

- Rep. David Lewis, Senior Chairman
- Rep. Nelson Dollar, Chairman
- Rep. John Bell, Vice Chairman
- Rep. Darren Jackson, Vice Chairman
- Rep. Sarah Stevens, Vice Chairman
- Rep. John Szoka, Vice Chairman
- Rep. Jon Torbett, Vice Chairman
- Rep. Bill Brawley
- Rep. Cecil Brockman

- Rep. Justin Burr
- Rep. Ted Davis
- Rep. Jimmy Dixon
- Rep. Josh Dobson
- Rep. Andy Dulin
- Rep. Jean Farmer-Butterfield
- Rep. Elmer Floyd
- Rep. Terry Garrison
- Rep. Rosa Gill
- Rep. Holly Grange
- Rep. Destin Hall
- Rep. Ed Hanes
- Rep. Jon Hardister
- Rep. Pricey Harrison
- Rep. Kelly Hastings
- Rep. Julia Howard
- Rep. Howard Hunter
- Rep. Pat Hurley
- Rep. Linda Johnson
- Rep. Bert Jones
- Rep. Jonathan Jordan
- Rep. Chris Malone
- Rep. Mickey Michaux
- Rep. Rodney Moore
- Rep. Garland Pierce
- Rep. Robert Reives
- Rep. David Rogers
- Rep. Jason Saine
- Rep. Michael Speciale
- Rep. Shelly Willingham
- Rep. Michael Wray
- Rep. Larry Yarborough

On July 26, 2017, the Senate Redistricting Committee and the House Select Committee on Redistricting met jointly for organizational and informational purposes. At that meeting, committee chairs made available to committee members information regarding 2010 Census population by county, the method of calculating ideal House and

Senate districts for population purposes, maps submitted by Common Cause for House and Senate plans, maps that reflected the county grouping formula that Common Cause used, and the opportunities that would be available for public comment on proposed redistricting plans to be considered by the committee. No votes were taken at the meeting.

On August 4, 2017, the Senate Redistricting Committee and the House Select Committee on Redistricting met jointly to discuss potential criteria to be used by the committees in drawing new House and Senate districts. The meeting included a period of public comment. Sen. Smith-Ingram proposed a list of criteria for the committees to consider. Additionally, information regarding ideal county groupings for House and Senate maps were made available to committee members as well as comparisons of the groupings used in 2011 with those proposed in 2017 for both House and Senate plans. Finally, the committees approved a policy for sharing and posting information on the General Assembly website as well as policies for access to General Assembly staff and computer terminals for the purpose of drawing districts.

On August 10, 2017, the Senate Redistricting Committee and the House Select Committee on Redistricting met jointly to adopt criteria to be used when drawing legislative districts in their respective maps. The committees separately adopted an identical set of nine criteria that would be used to draw new districts in the 2017 House and Senate Redistricting plans. Rep. Jackson, Sen. Blue, and Sen. Clark suggested criteria to be considered by the committee.

On August 11, 2017, Rep. Lewis and Sen. Hise notified Dr. Hofeller of the criteria adopted by the redistricting committees and directed him to utilize those criteria when drawing districts in the 2017 plans.

On August 19, 2017, the proposed 2017 House Redistricting map was released on the General Assembly website. On August 20, 2017, the proposed 2017 Senate Redistricting map was released on the General Assembly website. On August 21, 2017, a series of statistical information and reports were released for the proposed House and Senate Redistricting plans.

On August 22, 2017, public hearings were held in Raleigh, Beaufort, Charlotte, Fayetteville, Hudson, Jamestown, and Weldon to discuss the proposed 2017 House and Senate Redistricting plans.

On August 24, 2017, the Senate Redistricting Committee met and approved the proposed 2017 Senate Redistricting plan. Two amendments were adopted by the committee, one offered by Sen. Clark and one offered by Sen. Blue.

On August 25, 2017, the House Select Committee on Redistricting met and approved the proposed 2017 House Redistricting plan. Four amendments were offered, two by Rep. Jackson, one by Rep. Speciale, and one Rep. Hunter. One of the two amendments from Rep. Jackson, which renumbered districts 25 and 7, was accepted. The other three amendments were defeated by a vote of the committee.

On August 25, 2017, the Senate met to consider S691, the 2017 Senate Redistricting Plan. One amendment offered by Sen. Blue was adopted by the Senate. Additional amendments offered by Sen. Jeff Jackson and Sen. Blue were defeated on the

floor. Sen. Gladys Robinson offered an amendment on the floor but it was withdrawn before a vote was taken. S691 passed second reading. Third reading was objected to by Sen. Hise and the bill was held over to the next legislative day.

On August 28, 2017, the House met to consider H927, the 2017 House Redistricting Plan. An amendment offered by Rep. Larry Pittman was defeated on the floor. An amendment offered by Rep. Lewis passed related to the House districts within Wake County. The bill passed second and third reading and was sent to the Senate.

On August 28, 2017, the Senate met to consider S691 on third reading. Amendments offered by Sen. Clark and Sen. Robinson were defeated on the floor. An amendment offered by Sen. Hise to trade the numbers of Senate District 29 and Senate District 32 passed. During debate on third reading, Sen. McKissick asked for additional statistical reports including racial demographics to be added to the General Assembly website. The bill passed third reading in the Senate and was sent to the House.

On August 29, 2017, Representative Lewis asked for additional statistical information for the House plan, which members of the Democratic Party had apparently already requested and received. The information was posted on the House Select Committee on Redistricting's website. That morning the Senate Redistricting Committee met to consider H927. The committee approved the 2017 House Redistricting Plan.

On August 29, 2017, the House Select Committee on Redistricting met to consider S691. The committee approved the 2017 Senate Redistricting Plan.

On August 30, 2017, the Senate met to consider H927. No amendments were offered to the bill. The bill passed second and third readings and was ordered enrolled.

On August 30, 2017, the House met to consider S691. No amendments were offered to the bill. The bill passed second and third readings and was ordered enrolled.

On August 31, 2017, H927 was ratified in the House and became law. The same day, S691 was ratified in the Senate and became law.

V. Alternative Districting Plans Considered

Information regarding alternative districts or districting plans considered by the House Select Committee on Redistricting or on the floor of the House are attached:

- Rep. Jackson Proposed Map and Reports Considered by House Select Committee on Redistricting (Failed) (Attached as Ex. 28).[5]
- Rep. Speciale Proposed Map and Reports Considered by House Select Committee on Redistricting (Failed) (Attached as Ex. 38).
- Rep. Hunter Proposed Map and Reports Considered by House Select Committee on Redistricting (Failed) (Attached as Ex. 39).
- Amendment 1: Representative Pittman Proposed Map and Reports (Failed) (Attached as Ex. 26).
- Amendment 2: Representative Lewis Proposed Map and Reports (Passed) (Attached as Ex. 27).

Information regarding alternative districts or districting plans considered by the Senate Redistricting Committee or on the floor of the Senate are attached:

- Sen. Clark Proposed Map and Reports Considered by Senate Redistricting Committee (Passed) (Attached as Ex. 29)
- Sen. Blue Proposed Map and Reports Considered by Senate Redistricting Committee (Passed) (Attached as Ex. 30)

[5] In introducing this proposed map, Rep. Jackson stated it was drawn by the Plaintiffs in this matter.

- Amendment 2: Sen. Blue Proposed Map and Reports Considered on Senate Floor (Passed) (Attached as Ex. 31).
- Amendment 3: Sen. Robinson Proposed Map and Reports Considered on Senate Floor (Withdrawn) (Attached as Ex. 32).
- Amendment 4: Sen. Jeff Jackson Proposed Map and Reports Considered on Senate Floor (Failed) (Attached as Ex. 33).
- Amendment 5: Sen. Blue Proposed Map and Reports Considered on Senate Floor (Failed) (Attached as Ex. 34).[6]
- Amendment 8: Sen. Robinson Proposed Map and Reports Considered on Senate Floor (Failed) (Attached as Ex. 35).
- Amendment 9: Sen. Clark Proposed Map and Reports Considered on Senate Floor (Failed) (Attached as Ex. 36).

VI. Criteria Applied in Drawing the 2017 House and Senate Districts

The set of nine criteria for drawing the new districts in the 2017 House and Senate Redistricting plans adopted by both the Senate Redistricting Committee and the House Select Committee on Redistricting on August 10, 2017 are attached as Exhibit 37. Data regarding race was not used in the drawing of districts for the 2017 House and Senate redistricting plans. No information regarding legally sufficient racially polarized voting was provided to the redistricting committees to justify the use of race in drawing districts. To the extent that any district in the 2017 House and Senate redistricting plans exceed

[6] In introducing this proposed map, Sen. Blue stated it was drawn by the Plaintiffs in this matter.

50% BVAP, such a result was naturally occurring and the General Assembly did not conclude that the Voting Rights Act obligated it to draw any such district.

This the 7th day of September, 2017.

OGLETREE, DEAKINS, NASH
SMOAK & STEWART, P.C.

/s/ Phillip J. Strach
Phillip J. Strach
N.C. State Bar No. 29456
Michael D. McKnight
N.C. State Bar No. 36932
Thomas A. Farr
N.C. State Bar No. 10871
phil.strach@ogletreedeakins.com
michael.mcknight@ogletreedeakins.com
4208 Six Forks Road, Suite 1100
Raleigh, North Carolina 27609
Telephone: (919) 787-9700
Facsimile: (919) 783-9412

Counsel for Legislative Defendants

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I, Phillip J. Strach, have served the foregoing **NOTICE OF FILING** with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system which will send notification of such filing to the following:

Edwin M. Speas, Jr.
John W. O'Hale
Carolina P. Mackie
Poyner Spruill LLP
P.O. Box 1801 (27602-1801)
301 Fayetteville St., Suite 1900
Raleigh, NC 27601
espeas@poynerspruill.com
johale@poynerspruill.com
cmackie@poymerspruill.com
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

Anita S. Earls
Allison J. Riggs
Southern Coalition for Social Justice
1415 Highway 54, Suite 101
Durham, NC 27707
anita@southerncoalition.org
allisonriggs@southerncoalition.org
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

Adam Stein
Tin Fulton Walker & Owen, PLLC
312 West Franklin Street
Chapel Hill, NC 27516
astein@tinfulton.com
Attorney for Plaintiffs

Alexander McC. Peters
Senior Deputy Attorney General
N.C. Department of Justice
Apeters@ncdoj.gov
P.O. Box 629
Raleigh, NC 27602
Attorneys for Defendants

This the 7th day of September, 2017.

OGLETREE, DEAKINS, NASH
SMOAK & STEWART, P.C.

/s/ Phillip J. Strach

31102097.1

EX. 1

2017 House Redistricting Plan A2



Legend

Groupings	Member by Party
Districts	Democratic
Counties	Republican

N W E S

0 25 50 100 150 200 Miles

HBK-25

Printed by the NC General Assembly, August 28, 2017.

EX. 2

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: Population Deviation

District	2010 Pop	Ideal Pop	Deviation	Deviation %
1	77,143	79,462	-2,319	-2.92%
2	82,634	79,462	3,172	3.99%
3	75,726	79,462	-3,736	-4.70%
4	81,905	79,462	2,443	3.07%
5	77,527	79,462	-1,935	-2.44%
6	76,421	79,462	-3,041	-3.83%
7	78,432	79,462	-1,030	-1.30%
8	75,926	79,462	-3,536	-4.45%
9	75,794	79,462	-3,668	-4.62%
10	83,434	79,462	3,972	5.00%
11	83,266	79,462	3,804	4.79%
12	75,923	79,462	-3,539	-4.45%
13	76,622	79,462	-2,840	-3.57%
14	77,065	79,462	-2,397	-3.02%
15	77,307	79,462	-2,155	-2.71%
16	81,425	79,462	1,963	2.47%
17	77,263	79,462	-2,199	-2.77%
18	77,681	79,462	-1,781	-2.24%
19	76,666	79,462	-2,796	-3.52%
20	78,488	79,462	-974	-1.23%
21	83,434	79,462	3,972	5.00%
22	83,434	79,462	3,972	5.00%
23	81,057	79,462	1,595	2.01%
24	81,234	79,462	1,772	2.23%
25	78,027	79,462	-1,435	-1.81%
26	83,432	79,462	3,970	5.00%
27	76,790	79,462	-2,672	-3.36%
28	83,431	79,462	3,969	4.99%
29	82,735	79,462	3,273	4.12%
30	83,272	79,462	3,810	4.79%
31	82,773	79,462	3,311	4.17%
32	83,140	79,462	3,678	4.63%
33	82,644	79,462	3,182	4.00%
34	77,948	79,462	-1,514	-1.91%
35	82,728	79,462	3,266	4.11%
36	81,926	79,462	2,464	3.10%
37	81,952	79,462	2,490	3.13%
38	83,061	79,462	3,599	4.53%
39	83,055	79,462	3,593	4.52%
40	80,675	79,462	1,213	1.53%
41	80,739	79,462	1,277	1.61%
42	81,439	79,462	1,977	2.49%
43	77,725	79,462	-1,737	-2.19%
44	80,973	79,462	1,511	1.90%
45	79,294	79,462	-168	-0.21%
46	80,440	79,462	978	1.23%
47	82,618	79,462	3,156	3.97%
48	83,109	79,462	3,647	4.59%
49	82,999	79,462	3,537	4.45%
50	80,866	79,462	1,404	1.77%
51	83,434	79,462	3,972	5.00%
52	76,894	79,462	-2,568	-3.23%
53	83,429	79,462	3,967	4.99%
54	82,312	79,462	2,850	3.59%
55	75,792	79,462	-3,670	-4.62%
56	76,654	79,462	-2,808	-3.53%
57	82,755	79,462	3,293	4.14%
58	82,137	79,462	2,675	3.37%
59	79,907	79,462	445	0.56%
60	81,856	79,462	2,394	3.01%
61	81,019	79,462	1,557	1.96%
62	80,732	79,462	1,270	1.60%
63	75,550	79,462	-3,912	-4.92%
64	75,581	79,462	-3,881	-4.88%
65	83,430	79,462	3,968	4.99%
66	83,032	79,462	3,570	4.49%
67	82,583	79,462	3,121	3.93%
68	76,067	79,462	-3,395	-4.27%
69	76,381	79,462	-3,081	-3.88%
70	76,125	79,462	-3,337	-4.20%
71	75,793	79,462	-3,669	-4.62%
72	76,245	79,462	-3,217	-4.05%
73	78,189	79,462	-1,273	-1.60%
74	79,963	79,462	501	0.63%
75	78,886	79,462	-576	-0.72%
76	81,908	79,462	2,446	3.08%
77	82,918	79,462	3,456	4.35%
78	76,980	79,462	-2,482	-3.12%
79	75,538	79,462	-3,924	-4.94%
80	81,522	79,462	2,060	2.59%
81	81,356	79,462	1,894	2.38%
82	81,088	79,462	1,626	2.05%

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: Population Deviation

District	2010 Pop	Ideal Pop	Deviation	Deviation %
83	81,172	79,462	1,710	2.15%
84	77,282	79,462	-2,180	-2.74%
85	78,372	79,462	-1,090	-1.37%
86	79,175	79,462	-287	-0.36%
87	83,029	79,462	3,567	4.49%
88	76,022	79,462	-3,440	-4.33%
89	77,838	79,462	-1,624	-2.04%
90	82,779	79,462	3,317	4.17%
91	82,843	79,462	3,381	4.25%
92	77,172	79,462	-2,290	-2.88%
93	78,360	79,462	-1,102	-1.39%
94	83,358	79,462	3,896	4.90%
95	82,155	79,462	2,693	3.39%
96	76,520	79,462	-2,942	-3.70%
97	78,265	79,462	-1,197	-1.51%
98	75,602	79,462	-3,860	-4.86%
99	77,141	79,462	-2,321	-2.92%
100	75,589	79,462	-3,873	-4.87%
101	79,876	79,462	414	0.52%
102	77,391	79,462	-2,071	-2.61%
103	76,381	79,462	-3,081	-3.88%
104	76,869	79,462	-2,593	-3.26%
105	75,967	79,462	-3,495	-4.40%
106	75,762	79,462	-3,700	-4.66%
107	75,856	79,462	-3,606	-4.54%
108	76,926	79,462	-2,536	-3.19%
109	75,517	79,462	-3,945	-4.96%
110	75,573	79,462	-3,889	-4.89%
111	76,148	79,462	-3,314	-4.17%
112	79,547	79,462	85	0.11%
113	81,089	79,462	1,627	2.05%
114	82,902	79,462	3,440	4.33%
115	79,883	79,462	421	0.53%
116	75,533	79,462	-3,929	-4.94%
117	79,251	79,462	-211	-0.27%
118	76,322	79,462	-3,140	-3.95%
119	75,548	79,462	-3,914	-4.93%
120	80,814	79,462	1,352	1.70%
Total:	**9,535,483**			

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: Population 2010, US Senate 2010, President 2012

	2010 Census		US Senate 2010: Marshall-Burr-Beitler								US President 2012: Obama-Romney-Johnson							
District	Total Pop	18+ Pop	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %
1	77,143	60,226	11,572	46.71%	12,798	51.66%	398	1.61%	6	0.02%	19,188	51.49%	17,761	47.66%	255	0.68%	62	0.17%
2	82,634	64,057	9,138	42.84%	11,711	54.90%	479	2.25%	4	0.02%	16,284	44.54%	19,862	54.33%	322	0.88%	89	0.24%
3	75,726	57,749	6,926	34.46%	12,772	63.55%	390	1.94%	11	0.05%	13,877	41.67%	19,044	57.18%	308	0.92%	77	0.23%
4	81,905	60,243	6,889	39.27%	10,357	59.03%	292	1.66%	6	0.03%	11,345	38.94%	17,541	60.21%	200	0.69%	45	0.15%
5	77,527	60,228	10,791	55.68%	8,307	42.86%	273	1.41%	11	0.06%	20,871	60.75%	13,179	38.36%	249	0.72%	57	0.17%
6	76,421	60,608	8,872	34.50%	16,174	62.90%	661	2.57%	7	0.03%	14,765	38.52%	22,988	59.97%	532	1.39%	50	0.13%
7	78,432	58,921	9,576	42.69%	12,410	55.32%	440	1.96%	8	0.04%	15,958	44.13%	19,772	54.68%	331	0.92%	98	0.27%
8	75,926	58,873	10,135	61.68%	6,095	37.09%	195	1.19%	7	0.04%	22,626	66.47%	11,119	32.66%	254	0.75%	42	0.12%
9	75,794	59,235	7,527	37.19%	12,496	61.74%	210	1.04%	7	0.03%	15,362	42.01%	20,876	57.09%	280	0.77%	50	0.14%
10	83,434	62,414	6,595	29.90%	15,171	68.78%	287	1.30%	3	0.01%	11,116	32.12%	23,262	67.22%	212	0.61%	17	0.05%
11	83,266	67,330	11,833	53.19%	9,697	43.59%	704	3.16%	13	0.06%	25,329	60.49%	15,536	37.10%	905	2.16%	106	0.25%
12	75,923	57,405	10,406	46.00%	11,921	52.70%	282	1.25%	13	0.06%	17,724	49.08%	18,140	50.23%	210	0.58%	40	0.11%
13	76,622	61,839	7,638	28.48%	18,590	69.32%	538	2.01%	52	0.19%	12,458	31.09%	27,181	67.84%	359	0.90%	68	0.17%
14	77,065	56,588	4,167	33.67%	7,902	63.84%	301	2.43%	7	0.06%	9,736	39.75%	14,437	58.94%	253	1.03%	70	0.29%
15	77,307	59,638	3,006	31.19%	6,343	65.81%	284	2.95%	5	0.05%	6,424	34.97%	11,670	63.53%	225	1.22%	50	0.27%
16	81,425	62,717	10,108	39.84%	14,778	58.24%	474	1.87%	14	0.06%	16,124	42.93%	21,036	56.00%	314	0.84%	88	0.23%
17	77,263	64,270	9,560	31.61%	20,050	66.30%	624	2.06%	8	0.03%	15,595	36.15%	27,141	62.91%	333	0.77%	74	0.17%
18	77,681	61,478	11,041	55.09%	8,555	42.68%	437	2.18%	10	0.05%	22,442	61.89%	13,304	36.69%	413	1.14%	100	0.28%
19	76,666	60,681	8,459	32.87%	16,677	64.80%	587	2.28%	14	0.05%	16,301	40.73%	23,121	57.77%	483	1.21%	119	0.30%
20	78,488	63,095	9,000	33.59%	17,209	64.23%	570	2.13%	12	0.04%	16,368	39.38%	24,562	59.09%	499	1.20%	135	0.32%
21	83,434	62,990	11,059	53.59%	9,325	45.19%	248	1.20%	4	0.02%	20,461	59.78%	13,589	39.70%	173	0.51%	5	0.01%
22	83,434	63,053	11,647	44.71%	14,036	53.88%	357	1.37%	9	0.03%	15,826	44.07%	19,774	55.06%	257	0.72%	56	0.16%
23	81,057	61,743	14,653	59.95%	9,513	38.92%	269	1.10%	8	0.03%	24,825	62.80%	14,515	36.72%	147	0.37%	43	0.11%
24	81,234	61,182	13,631	51.47%	12,420	46.90%	428	1.62%	3	0.01%	20,875	53.38%	17,954	45.91%	242	0.62%	38	0.10%
25	78,027	59,741	12,874	49.23%	12,965	49.58%	303	1.16%	8	0.03%	21,791	53.51%	18,673	45.85%	191	0.47%	67	0.16%
26	83,432	58,967	8,134	33.11%	15,900	64.72%	520	2.12%	12	0.05%	15,202	36.94%	25,391	61.70%	445	1.08%	113	0.27%
27	76,790	59,572	13,603	61.65%	8,196	37.14%	261	1.18%	6	0.03%	24,188	66.17%	12,189	33.34%	143	0.39%	35	0.10%
28	83,431	61,419	6,884	32.21%	14,114	66.03%	369	1.73%	8	0.04%	11,854	34.87%	21,776	64.05%	289	0.85%	80	0.24%
29	82,735	67,058	18,865	79.26%	4,545	19.10%	373	1.57%	17	0.07%	38,148	82.20%	7,753	16.71%	435	0.94%	70	0.15%
30	83,272	64,089	17,881	60.80%	11,040	37.54%	478	1.63%	11	0.04%	31,862	67.06%	15,158	31.90%	424	0.89%	70	0.15%
31	82,773	61,422	16,672	78.56%	4,267	20.11%	275	1.30%	8	0.04%	33,340	80.93%	7,466	18.12%	349	0.85%	43	0.10%
32	83,140	63,471	15,476	60.71%	9,595	37.64%	411	1.61%	8	0.03%	26,033	65.34%	13,608	34.16%	154	0.39%	45	0.11%
33	82,644	63,669	14,296	71.29%	5,421	27.03%	325	1.62%	10	0.05%	28,994	74.78%	9,266	23.90%	455	1.17%	58	0.15%
34	77,948	62,394	14,385	50.35%	13,551	47.43%	618	2.16%	18	0.06%	26,190	56.56%	19,408	41.91%	632	1.36%	75	0.16%
35	82,728	57,787	9,664	37.37%	15,571	60.21%	605	2.34%	20	0.08%	19,801	42.91%	25,771	55.84%	492	1.07%	86	0.19%
36	81,926	59,799	10,864	35.93%	18,694	61.83%	668	2.21%	8	0.03%	19,655	41.26%	27,387	57.49%	537	1.13%	58	0.12%
37	81,952	56,082	8,939	37.49%	14,256	59.79%	639	2.68%	11	0.05%	19,519	44.02%	24,145	54.46%	594	1.34%	80	0.18%
38	83,061	60,242	14,768	75.10%	4,569	23.23%	314	1.60%	14	0.07%	31,122	80.50%	7,137	18.46%	347	0.90%	56	0.14%
39	83,055	59,229	13,679	57.96%	9,434	39.98%	475	2.01%	11	0.05%	26,426	63.26%	14,861	35.58%	401	0.96%	83	0.20%
40	80,675	60,028	12,633	37.17%	20,533	60.41%	804	2.37%	20	0.06%	22,067	42.83%	28,781	55.86%	591	1.15%	83	0.16%
41	80,739	54,288	9,329	43.46%	11,499	53.57%	636	2.96%	3	0.01%	21,835	52.16%	19,425	46.40%	534	1.28%	66	0.16%
42	81,439	57,374	8,476	69.63%	3,542	29.10%	150	1.23%	5	0.04%	18,934	73.86%	6,486	25.30%	161	0.63%	55	0.21%
43	77,725	59,350	11,403	65.17%	5,813	33.22%	270	1.54%	11	0.06%	23,644	72.26%	8,782	26.84%	225	0.69%	69	0.21%
44	80,973	59,789	8,858	46.26%	9,916	51.78%	366	1.91%	9	0.05%	17,939	53.66%	15,149	45.31%	292	0.87%	52	0.16%
45	79,294	57,377	7,955	39.32%	11,934	58.98%	335	1.66%	10	0.05%	15,275	42.60%	20,249	56.48%	249	0.69%	80	0.22%
46	80,440	59,587	6,977	43.94%	8,611	54.23%	284	1.79%	7	0.04%	12,303	45.76%	14,327	53.29%	203	0.76%	51	0.19%
47	82,618	60,831	8,315	57.29%	6,015	41.44%	173	1.19%	11	0.08%	17,243	63.29%	9,705	35.62%	221	0.81%	77	0.28%
48	83,109	59,851	9,247	55.26%	7,197	43.01%	281	1.68%	9	0.05%	18,291	58.54%	12,650	40.49%	258	0.83%	46	0.15%
49	82,999	65,532	12,934	48.71%	12,907	48.61%	699	2.63%	11	0.04%	26,324	56.03%	19,879	42.31%	683	1.45%	93	0.20%
50	80,866	62,232	15,177	53.97%	12,277	43.66%	657	2.34%	11	0.04%	24,313	55.84%	18,630	42.79%	471	1.08%	123	0.28%
51	83,434	59,547	7,714	41.44%	10,529	56.56%	364	1.96%	8	0.04%	14,314	44.67%	17,331	54.08%	328	1.02%	72	0.22%
52	76,894	60,407	8,130	31.91%	16,852	66.14%	491	1.93%	7	0.03%	14,828	36.08%	25,925	63.08%	289	0.70%	58	0.14%
53	83,429	62,151	8,067	38.56%	12,447	59.50%	400	1.91%	6	0.03%	13,061	39.03%	20,001	59.78%	325	0.97%	73	0.22%

Populations values derive from the 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File. Election results were provided by the NC State Board of Elections. Votes that could not be associated with a specific precinct were excluded. Reported statewide totals may therefore be marginally lower than official contest results.

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: Population 2010, US Senate 2010, President 2012

	2010 Census		US Senate 2010: Marshall-Burr-Beitler								US President 2012: Obama-Romney-Johnson							
District	Total Pop	18+ Pop	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %
54	82,312	64,361	16,920	53.96%	13,730	43.79%	695	2.22%	10	0.03%	26,235	55.99%	20,057	42.81%	473	1.01%	89	0.19%
55	75,792	57,260	7,418	36.90%	12,345	61.41%	326	1.62%	12	0.06%	13,756	39.49%	20,716	59.48%	275	0.79%	84	0.24%
56	76,654	62,430	19,313	77.49%	5,073	20.35%	522	2.09%	15	0.06%	34,936	78.94%	8,503	19.21%	669	1.51%	151	0.34%
57	82,755	64,200	14,697	81.20%	3,148	17.39%	243	1.34%	11	0.06%	36,447	86.99%	5,069	12.10%	296	0.71%	84	0.20%
58	82,137	62,753	12,047	63.92%	6,487	34.42%	288	1.53%	25	0.13%	27,946	73.09%	9,912	25.92%	286	0.75%	93	0.24%
59	79,907	61,233	9,808	38.24%	15,356	59.87%	480	1.87%	7	0.03%	18,869	42.66%	24,892	56.27%	368	0.83%	106	0.24%
60	81,856	61,808	9,568	57.73%	6,682	40.31%	309	1.86%	16	0.10%	23,485	67.53%	10,974	31.55%	253	0.73%	67	0.19%
61	81,019	63,506	9,721	33.66%	18,550	64.22%	586	2.03%	27	0.09%	19,567	41.33%	27,191	57.44%	446	0.94%	136	0.29%
62	80,732	60,423	9,300	34.11%	17,363	63.68%	595	2.18%	10	0.04%	19,556	41.92%	26,542	56.89%	449	0.96%	107	0.23%
63	75,550	57,278	8,482	38.39%	13,031	58.99%	571	2.58%	8	0.04%	15,509	43.71%	19,573	55.17%	330	0.93%	68	0.19%
64	75,581	58,410	6,964	35.86%	11,981	61.69%	458	2.36%	17	0.09%	13,366	41.39%	18,597	57.58%	267	0.83%	66	0.20%
65	83,430	64,719	7,496	33.32%	14,282	63.48%	706	3.14%	16	0.07%	14,675	39.12%	22,455	59.86%	299	0.80%	84	0.22%
66	83,032	63,266	10,774	47.23%	11,598	50.84%	428	1.88%	11	0.05%	16,209	46.56%	18,293	52.54%	287	0.82%	26	0.07%
67	82,583	62,630	6,659	26.05%	18,384	71.93%	506	1.98%	10	0.04%	11,108	27.80%	28,389	71.05%	412	1.03%	47	0.12%
68	76,067	49,871	5,344	28.78%	12,791	68.88%	426	2.29%	9	0.05%	13,160	35.92%	23,097	63.04%	316	0.86%	66	0.18%
69	76,381	54,263	5,446	30.22%	12,148	67.40%	419	2.32%	11	0.06%	12,576	36.44%	21,460	62.18%	368	1.07%	110	0.32%
70	76,125	57,325	3,558	21.14%	12,749	75.74%	513	3.05%	13	0.08%	8,189	25.84%	23,113	72.94%	343	1.08%	44	0.14%
71	75,793	57,481	9,798	58.11%	6,782	40.22%	275	1.63%	7	0.04%	23,956	69.74%	10,090	29.38%	302	0.88%	0	0.00%
72	76,245	58,071	11,678	66.54%	5,620	32.02%	248	1.41%	5	0.03%	27,128	76.55%	8,076	22.79%	235	0.66%	0	0.00%
73	78,189	59,318	6,106	25.80%	17,032	71.95%	529	2.23%	4	0.02%	12,278	32.31%	25,229	66.40%	441	1.16%	47	0.12%
74	79,963	60,453	8,675	32.94%	17,137	65.07%	516	1.96%	8	0.03%	16,896	39.09%	25,912	59.95%	415	0.96%	0	0.00%
75	78,886	59,414	7,130	32.40%	14,427	65.57%	435	1.98%	11	0.05%	16,022	40.59%	23,039	58.37%	407	1.03%	0	0.00%
76	81,908	62,585	7,822	37.03%	12,787	60.53%	502	2.38%	13	0.06%	15,191	41.45%	20,960	57.20%	360	0.98%	135	0.37%
77	82,918	63,076	6,663	26.24%	18,105	71.29%	617	2.43%	11	0.04%	11,587	28.89%	28,014	69.84%	394	0.98%	117	0.29%
78	76,980	58,404	4,029	21.41%	14,213	75.51%	567	3.01%	13	0.07%	8,233	24.08%	25,560	74.77%	335	0.98%	58	0.17%
79	75,538	58,785	8,646	35.68%	15,108	62.35%	466	1.92%	12	0.05%	14,321	39.25%	21,861	59.92%	236	0.65%	66	0.18%
80	81,522	61,819	4,779	23.10%	15,452	74.68%	458	2.21%	3	0.01%	9,557	26.44%	26,120	72.27%	383	1.06%	81	0.22%
81	81,356	62,187	6,468	30.99%	13,884	66.51%	508	2.43%	14	0.07%	11,067	31.81%	23,263	66.86%	393	1.13%	71	0.20%
82	81,088	58,038	7,291	33.20%	14,207	64.70%	460	2.09%	0	0.00%	15,974	39.95%	23,599	59.03%	408	1.02%	0	0.00%
83	81,172	59,773	6,999	36.00%	11,962	61.52%	478	2.46%	4	0.02%	14,172	41.75%	19,323	56.92%	423	1.25%	29	0.09%
84	77,282	58,924	7,244	32.03%	14,736	65.16%	617	2.73%	18	0.08%	12,673	34.35%	23,733	64.33%	356	0.96%	131	0.36%
85	78,372	62,493	6,014	26.73%	15,873	70.54%	595	2.64%	20	0.09%	9,740	29.02%	23,328	69.50%	389	1.16%	110	0.33%
86	79,175	61,639	7,764	37.95%	12,242	59.83%	450	2.20%	5	0.02%	12,429	38.01%	19,756	60.42%	393	1.20%	119	0.36%
87	83,029	64,243	6,908	31.41%	14,382	65.39%	690	3.14%	15	0.07%	10,898	31.49%	23,229	67.12%	479	1.38%	0	0.00%
88	76,022	57,630	10,228	65.20%	5,122	32.65%	325	2.07%	12	0.08%	24,610	71.63%	9,328	27.15%	337	0.98%	84	0.24%
89	77,838	59,483	6,177	29.81%	13,998	67.55%	532	2.57%	15	0.07%	11,364	32.70%	22,869	65.82%	392	1.13%	122	0.35%
90	82,779	64,448	7,116	31.71%	14,796	65.92%	526	2.34%	6	0.03%	10,337	30.79%	22,726	67.68%	406	1.21%	109	0.32%
91	82,843	63,967	6,435	27.34%	16,505	70.13%	587	2.49%	9	0.04%	10,448	28.75%	25,325	69.69%	459	1.26%	107	0.29%
92	77,172	58,012	8,592	56.26%	6,372	41.72%	302	1.98%	7	0.05%	21,244	64.97%	11,011	33.68%	342	1.05%	100	0.31%
93	78,360	65,985	10,383	39.34%	15,262	57.83%	729	2.76%	18	0.07%	17,118	42.54%	22,103	54.93%	803	2.00%	213	0.53%
94	83,358	64,525	7,672	29.90%	17,245	67.21%	729	2.84%	11	0.04%	10,263	27.92%	25,882	70.40%	503	1.37%	117	0.32%
95	82,155	59,928	5,680	27.90%	14,174	69.63%	496	2.44%	6	0.03%	13,403	33.96%	25,566	64.77%	391	0.99%	112	0.28%
96	76,520	58,080	6,470	31.28%	13,705	66.27%	495	2.39%	11	0.05%	12,700	36.45%	21,665	62.18%	378	1.08%	102	0.29%
97	78,265	59,784	6,958	30.01%	15,653	67.51%	564	2.43%	11	0.05%	11,021	29.97%	25,266	68.71%	369	1.00%	115	0.31%
98	75,602	56,018	6,849	32.00%	14,098	65.88%	445	2.08%	8	0.04%	16,276	39.21%	24,750	59.62%	402	0.97%	83	0.20%
99	77,141	55,130	12,757	73.89%	4,259	24.67%	232	1.34%	16	0.09%	26,889	79.03%	6,836	20.09%	215	0.63%	83	0.24%
100	75,589	56,173	9,157	57.35%	6,485	40.62%	314	1.97%	10	0.06%	21,275	67.14%	10,017	31.61%	329	1.04%	67	0.21%
101	79,876	58,931	12,051	68.58%	5,219	29.70%	291	1.66%	11	0.06%	28,250	74.39%	9,386	24.72%	257	0.68%	82	0.22%
102	77,391	59,231	10,729	74.35%	3,424	23.73%	269	1.86%	8	0.06%	25,970	80.44%	5,905	18.29%	324	1.00%	84	0.26%
103	76,381	56,360	7,849	32.02%	16,157	65.92%	488	1.99%	16	0.07%	16,067	38.44%	25,182	60.25%	416	1.00%	132	0.32%
104	76,869	59,384	9,634	33.26%	18,842	65.05%	476	1.64%	13	0.04%	18,349	39.25%	27,916	59.71%	393	0.84%	95	0.20%
105	75,967	56,011	7,111	32.05%	14,618	65.88%	454	2.05%	5	0.02%	16,507	40.61%	23,709	58.33%	356	0.88%	73	0.18%
106	75,762	57,932	9,986	67.03%	4,694	31.51%	214	1.44%	3	0.02%	23,892	73.26%	8,334	25.55%	299	0.92%	89	0.27%

Populations values derive from the 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File. Election results were provided by the NC State Board of Elections. Votes that could not be associated with a specific precinct were excluded. Reported statewide totals may therefore be marginally lower than official contest results.

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: Population 2010, US Senate 2010, President 2012

	2010 Census		US Senate 2010: Marshall-Burr-Beitler								US President 2012: Obama-Romney-Johnson							
District	Total Pop	18+ Pop	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %
107	75,856	55,478	12,601	72.88%	4,477	25.89%	207	1.20%	6	0.03%	27,803	76.86%	8,081	22.34%	222	0.61%	67	0.19%
108	76,926	59,400	5,880	32.51%	11,794	65.21%	413	2.28%	0	0.00%	12,869	38.42%	20,266	60.50%	362	1.08%	0	0.00%
109	75,517	56,493	6,277	33.20%	12,209	64.58%	419	2.22%	0	0.00%	14,138	40.79%	20,201	58.28%	321	0.93%	0	0.00%
110	75,573	57,987	6,366	33.61%	12,134	64.06%	439	2.32%	2	0.01%	11,593	35.29%	20,921	63.69%	314	0.96%	20	0.06%
111	76,148	58,045	7,206	36.13%	12,341	61.87%	390	1.96%	9	0.05%	11,633	35.72%	20,543	63.07%	306	0.94%	89	0.27%
112	79,547	61,671	6,370	30.24%	14,175	67.30%	509	2.42%	9	0.04%	10,646	32.71%	21,465	65.95%	351	1.08%	87	0.27%
113	81,089	66,177	11,159	36.07%	19,015	61.47%	754	2.44%	8	0.03%	15,774	37.46%	25,726	61.09%	477	1.13%	132	0.31%
114	82,902	67,453	17,655	66.88%	8,010	30.34%	725	2.75%	8	0.03%	33,044	72.54%	11,524	25.30%	682	1.50%	300	0.66%
115	79,883	63,911	12,292	44.29%	14,665	52.84%	766	2.76%	31	0.11%	20,831	47.82%	21,945	50.38%	592	1.36%	195	0.45%
116	75,533	58,114	9,048	38.38%	13,930	59.09%	585	2.48%	12	0.05%	16,743	43.40%	21,230	55.04%	447	1.16%	154	0.40%
117	79,251	62,434	8,152	32.28%	16,500	65.33%	596	2.36%	9	0.04%	13,707	36.65%	23,138	61.86%	435	1.16%	123	0.33%
118	76,322	60,837	12,403	42.23%	16,191	55.12%	767	2.61%	12	0.04%	15,098	41.30%	20,729	56.71%	548	1.50%	180	0.49%
119	75,548	61,452	10,591	46.03%	11,788	51.23%	619	2.69%	12	0.05%	15,557	47.80%	16,410	50.42%	543	1.67%	39	0.12%
120	80,814	65,097	9,909	32.86%	19,081	63.28%	1,143	3.79%	18	0.06%	11,787	30.01%	26,800	68.23%	517	1.32%	176	0.45%
Totals:	**9,535,483**	**7,253,848**	**1,141,700**	**43.04%**	**1,454,082**	**54.82%**	**55,554**	**2.09%**	**1,263**	**0.05%**	**2,171,293**	**48.33%**	**2,267,353**	**50.47%**	**44,448**	**0.99%**	**9,519**	**0.21%**

Populations values derive from the 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File. Election results were provided by the NC State Board of Elections. Votes that could not be associated with a specific precinct were excluded. Reported statewide totals may therefore be marginally lower than official contest results.

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: Governor 2012, Lt Governor 2012, US Senate 2014

	Governor 2012: Dalton-McCrory-Howe								Lieutenant Governor 2012: Coleman-Forest				US Senate 2014: Tillis-Hagan-Haugh							
District	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %
1	19,104	52.09%	16,908	46.10%	653	1.78%	8	0.02%	20,570	57.32%	15,314	42.68%	11,858	47.79%	12,208	49.20%	729	2.94%	17	0.07%
2	14,964	41.36%	20,485	56.62%	721	1.99%	11	0.03%	16,970	48.44%	18,065	51.56%	12,193	52.00%	10,289	43.88%	921	3.93%	44	0.19%
3	12,556	38.05%	19,773	59.92%	658	1.99%	12	0.04%	14,086	43.44%	18,342	56.56%	12,612	56.92%	8,699	39.26%	804	3.63%	43	0.19%
4	11,015	38.19%	17,336	60.11%	481	1.67%	9	0.03%	12,235	43.31%	16,012	56.69%	10,607	58.61%	6,770	37.41%	701	3.87%	20	0.11%
5	20,700	61.40%	12,290	36.45%	721	2.14%	3	0.01%	21,685	65.17%	11,591	34.83%	7,987	40.13%	11,521	57.88%	382	1.92%	15	0.08%
6	13,800	36.70%	22,340	59.41%	1,446	3.85%	14	0.04%	15,559	42.25%	21,269	57.75%	16,135	58.33%	10,543	38.11%	962	3.48%	22	0.08%
7	14,682	40.75%	20,622	57.24%	713	1.98%	13	0.04%	16,471	46.60%	18,875	53.40%	13,313	52.56%	10,823	42.73%	1,140	4.50%	53	0.21%
8	21,272	62.86%	11,935	35.27%	624	1.84%	7	0.02%	22,701	68.07%	10,649	31.93%	6,095	33.50%	11,528	63.36%	540	2.97%	32	0.18%
9	13,954	38.44%	21,716	59.83%	624	1.72%	4	0.01%	15,785	44.22%	19,914	55.78%	12,511	56.57%	8,912	40.30%	654	2.96%	38	0.17%
10	10,584	30.70%	23,479	68.10%	406	1.18%	6	0.02%	11,878	35.06%	21,998	64.94%	15,412	64.62%	7,489	31.40%	918	3.85%	30	0.13%
11	21,999	53.26%	17,500	42.37%	1,792	4.34%	12	0.03%	24,648	61.28%	15,576	38.72%	8,940	34.77%	15,640	60.82%	1,079	4.20%	55	0.21%
12	17,079	47.65%	18,313	51.09%	441	1.23%	12	0.03%	18,554	52.55%	16,752	47.45%	11,373	48.26%	11,355	48.19%	820	3.48%	17	0.07%
13	11,186	27.90%	28,180	70.30%	711	1.77%	10	0.02%	13,096	33.28%	26,250	66.72%	18,332	63.57%	9,180	31.83%	1,201	4.16%	126	0.44%
14	8,602	35.58%	14,927	61.74%	643	2.66%	5	0.02%	10,111	42.64%	13,602	57.36%	8,982	59.61%	5,359	35.57%	704	4.67%	22	0.15%
15	5,745	31.82%	11,786	65.27%	520	2.88%	5	0.03%	6,792	38.70%	10,759	61.30%	7,085	63.75%	3,460	31.13%	548	4.93%	20	0.18%
16	15,315	41.05%	21,295	57.08%	692	1.85%	6	0.02%	17,254	47.21%	19,293	52.79%	12,611	51.55%	10,386	42.45%	1,421	5.81%	48	0.20%
17	13,028	30.49%	28,818	67.45%	874	2.05%	4	0.01%	16,102	38.50%	25,725	61.50%	18,597	58.14%	11,618	36.32%	1,730	5.41%	39	0.12%
18	19,993	56.18%	14,447	40.60%	1,136	3.19%	12	0.03%	21,986	63.19%	12,809	36.81%	6,879	33.33%	12,754	61.79%	968	4.69%	39	0.19%
19	13,581	34.41%	24,684	62.54%	1,193	3.02%	10	0.03%	16,131	42.05%	22,234	57.95%	14,029	52.05%	11,412	42.34%	1,465	5.44%	48	0.18%
20	13,683	33.44%	26,066	63.71%	1,152	2.82%	12	0.03%	16,044	40.45%	23,624	59.55%	14,896	53.87%	11,396	41.22%	1,311	4.74%	47	0.17%
21	19,613	57.51%	14,045	41.18%	434	1.27%	11	0.03%	20,805	61.90%	12,803	38.10%	8,557	40.29%	12,041	56.70%	612	2.88%	26	0.12%
22	15,714	43.90%	19,638	54.87%	434	1.21%	5	0.01%	17,535	49.93%	17,581	50.07%	12,817	51.78%	10,726	43.34%	1,158	4.68%	50	0.20%
23	24,490	62.22%	14,521	36.89%	350	0.89%	1	0.00%	25,919	66.94%	12,801	33.06%	8,825	34.89%	15,731	62.19%	722	2.85%	17	0.07%
24	20,058	51.71%	18,288	47.15%	436	1.12%	8	0.02%	21,144	55.44%	16,994	44.56%	11,750	45.62%	13,325	51.74%	657	2.55%	24	0.09%
25	21,049	51.78%	19,219	47.28%	375	0.92%	5	0.01%	22,227	55.32%	17,950	44.68%	13,321	46.35%	14,633	50.91%	764	2.66%	25	0.09%
26	13,521	33.02%	26,508	64.73%	910	2.22%	10	0.02%	15,493	38.60%	24,641	61.40%	16,047	59.39%	9,887	36.59%	1,036	3.83%	49	0.18%
27	23,878	65.27%	12,369	33.81%	331	0.90%	4	0.01%	25,041	69.33%	11,076	30.67%	8,198	34.09%	15,190	63.16%	647	2.69%	16	0.07%
28	10,971	32.32%	22,423	66.05%	544	1.60%	10	0.03%	12,723	38.23%	20,560	61.77%	13,561	62.04%	7,307	33.43%	943	4.31%	48	0.22%
29	35,463	77.32%	9,134	19.92%	1,242	2.71%	25	0.05%	37,229	82.66%	7,812	17.34%	4,020	14.49%	23,189	83.60%	503	1.81%	27	0.10%
30	29,080	61.95%	16,637	35.44%	1,215	2.59%	11	0.02%	31,249	67.84%	14,812	32.16%	9,863	30.23%	21,982	67.37%	753	2.31%	30	0.09%
31	31,088	76.24%	8,713	21.37%	943	2.31%	30	0.07%	32,663	81.05%	7,639	18.95%	4,068	16.31%	20,384	81.72%	452	1.81%	39	0.16%
32	24,908	63.00%	14,186	35.88%	438	1.11%	4	0.01%	26,603	68.44%	12,266	31.56%	8,903	33.82%	16,633	63.19%	755	2.87%	32	0.12%
33	26,671	69.27%	10,833	28.14%	996	2.59%	3	0.01%	28,733	75.79%	9,178	24.21%	5,274	22.15%	17,806	74.77%	693	2.91%	42	0.18%
34	23,053	50.18%	21,562	46.94%	1,318	2.87%	7	0.02%	25,739	57.30%	19,181	42.70%	12,441	38.80%	18,646	58.16%	917	2.86%	57	0.18%
35	16,938	36.94%	27,839	60.72%	1,057	2.31%	14	0.03%	19,155	42.56%	25,850	57.44%	16,824	52.58%	14,184	44.33%	926	2.89%	66	0.21%
36	16,512	34.84%	29,686	62.64%	1,187	2.50%	8	0.02%	19,356	41.76%	26,991	58.24%	18,484	54.29%	14,562	42.77%	934	2.74%	67	0.20%
37	16,581	37.68%	26,133	59.38%	1,280	2.91%	14	0.03%	18,944	44.10%	24,017	55.90%	16,120	52.84%	13,273	43.50%	1,049	3.44%	68	0.22%
38	28,927	75.25%	8,620	22.42%	883	2.30%	11	0.03%	30,685	80.78%	7,300	19.22%	4,250	18.20%	18,478	79.11%	594	2.54%	35	0.15%
39	24,094	57.85%	16,578	39.81%	963	2.31%	13	0.03%	26,404	64.35%	14,629	35.65%	9,143	33.82%	17,083	63.20%	766	2.83%	40	0.15%
40	18,258	35.73%	31,594	61.83%	1,235	2.42%	15	0.03%	21,010	41.98%	29,040	58.02%	20,016	52.51%	17,135	44.95%	923	2.42%	46	0.12%
41	18,240	44.11%	21,871	52.89%	1,228	2.97%	12	0.03%	20,681	51.40%	19,552	48.60%	12,238	43.63%	14,958	53.33%	802	2.86%	52	0.19%
42	17,657	70.31%	6,879	27.39%	570	2.27%	7	0.03%	18,581	74.83%	6,251	25.17%	3,360	24.76%	9,838	72.50%	356	2.62%	15	0.11%
43	22,155	68.80%	9,319	28.94%	716	2.22%	13	0.04%	23,447	73.52%	8,447	26.48%	5,177	28.30%	12,578	68.77%	504	2.76%	32	0.17%
44	16,575	50.29%	15,604	47.34%	777	2.36%	4	0.01%	18,236	56.47%	14,058	43.53%	9,371	46.34%	10,098	49.94%	724	3.58%	28	0.14%
45	14,293	40.30%	20,508	57.83%	654	1.84%	10	0.03%	16,061	46.10%	18,779	53.90%	12,902	55.12%	9,613	41.07%	862	3.68%	28	0.12%
46	13,148	49.59%	12,865	48.52%	494	1.86%	9	0.03%	14,692	56.79%	11,178	43.21%	8,263	51.41%	6,912	43.00%	864	5.38%	34	0.21%
47	17,474	65.03%	8,923	33.21%	463	1.72%	10	0.04%	19,029	72.21%	7,325	27.79%	6,020	38.81%	8,990	57.95%	483	3.11%	20	0.13%
48	17,506	57.00%	12,512	40.74%	683	2.22%	11	0.04%	18,833	62.60%	11,253	37.40%	8,168	39.86%	11,599	56.60%	702	3.43%	25	0.12%
49	22,549	48.54%	22,368	48.15%	1,520	3.27%	18	0.04%	25,418	56.16%	19,843	43.84%	12,506	39.43%	18,268	57.59%	905	2.85%	41	0.13%
50	22,427	51.96%	19,641	45.50%	1,079	2.50%	17	0.04%	24,273	57.34%	18,057	42.66%	11,936	39.20%	17,598	57.80%	884	2.90%	31	0.10%
51	13,347	41.90%	17,802	55.89%	695	2.18%	9	0.03%	14,890	47.81%	16,254	52.19%	10,309	51.33%	8,824	43.94%	912	4.54%	37	0.18%
52	13,223	32.47%	26,842	65.91%	647	1.59%	13	0.03%	14,727	36.95%	25,133	63.05%	18,117	61.71%	10,299	35.08%	918	3.13%	25	0.09%
53	12,066	36.20%	20,590	61.78%	654	1.96%	18	0.05%	13,884	42.31%	18,933	57.69%	12,290	57.33%	8,229	38.39%	881	4.11%	37	0.17%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-25.asc', modified 08/28/2017 04:08:41 PM

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptS03|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections. Votes that could not be associated with a specific precinct were excluded. Reported statewide totals may therefore be marginally lower than official contest results.

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: Governor 2012, Lt Governor 2012, US Senate 2014

	Governor 2012: Dalton-McCrory-Howe								Lieutenant Governor 2012: Coleman-Forest				US Senate 2014: Tillis-Hagan-Haugh							
District	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %
54	23,822	51.27%	21,500	46.27%	1,129	2.43%	13	0.03%	25,713	56.54%	19,767	43.46%	13,798	38.55%	20,947	58.53%	1,010	2.82%	33	0.09%
55	11,895	34.27%	22,352	64.40%	451	1.30%	9	0.03%	14,409	42.63%	19,392	57.37%	12,564	58.22%	8,132	37.68%	825	3.82%	59	0.27%
56	31,425	72.59%	10,387	23.99%	1,442	3.33%	35	0.08%	33,453	79.36%	8,702	20.64%	4,328	14.66%	24,548	83.15%	623	2.11%	25	0.08%
57	33,864	82.21%	6,380	15.49%	935	2.27%	15	0.04%	35,587	87.36%	5,148	12.64%	2,908	12.79%	19,345	85.07%	461	2.03%	27	0.12%
58	25,470	67.33%	11,477	30.34%	871	2.30%	12	0.03%	27,374	73.49%	9,877	26.51%	6,056	26.29%	16,414	71.26%	541	2.35%	23	0.10%
59	16,881	38.35%	26,270	59.68%	842	1.91%	22	0.05%	18,902	43.85%	24,202	56.15%	16,481	54.26%	13,076	43.05%	781	2.57%	38	0.13%
60	21,229	61.82%	12,382	36.06%	716	2.08%	14	0.04%	22,798	67.67%	10,893	32.33%	6,627	32.59%	13,173	64.78%	511	2.51%	23	0.11%
61	16,477	35.08%	29,436	62.67%	1,042	2.22%	13	0.03%	18,890	41.30%	26,843	58.70%	18,586	54.92%	14,369	42.46%	833	2.46%	54	0.16%
62	16,439	35.57%	28,715	62.13%	1,049	2.27%	16	0.03%	18,766	41.64%	26,301	58.36%	17,940	54.18%	14,342	43.32%	788	2.38%	39	0.12%
63	13,645	38.81%	20,703	58.88%	806	2.29%	8	0.02%	15,271	44.34%	19,170	55.66%	12,602	53.40%	9,988	42.32%	965	4.09%	44	0.19%
64	11,979	37.49%	19,341	60.53%	627	1.96%	4	0.01%	13,229	42.12%	18,180	57.88%	11,778	56.82%	8,157	39.35%	765	3.69%	29	0.14%
65	13,513	36.26%	23,056	61.87%	688	1.85%	8	0.02%	15,423	42.41%	20,945	57.59%	14,329	56.93%	9,480	37.67%	1,299	5.16%	61	0.24%
66	14,745	42.53%	19,327	55.75%	573	1.65%	22	0.06%	17,639	52.60%	15,896	47.40%	11,634	48.65%	10,906	45.60%	1,307	5.46%	69	0.29%
67	8,403	21.02%	30,987	77.50%	589	1.47%	3	0.01%	11,566	29.86%	27,172	70.14%	17,657	66.58%	7,224	27.24%	1,552	5.85%	88	0.33%
68	9,603	26.44%	26,124	71.94%	580	1.60%	8	0.02%	12,272	34.62%	23,173	65.38%	14,825	62.65%	8,035	33.95%	726	3.07%	78	0.33%
69	9,500	27.69%	24,180	70.48%	618	1.80%	12	0.03%	12,086	36.26%	21,244	63.74%	12,586	61.65%	7,039	34.48%	713	3.49%	76	0.37%
70	7,067	22.31%	23,955	75.61%	659	2.08%	2	0.01%	8,422	27.16%	22,587	72.84%	13,549	72.21%	4,376	23.32%	811	4.32%	27	0.14%
71	21,632	63.47%	11,608	34.06%	833	2.44%	11	0.03%	23,344	69.85%	10,074	30.15%	5,937	29.94%	13,286	67.01%	564	2.84%	41	0.21%
72	25,032	71.44%	9,442	26.95%	561	1.60%	4	0.01%	26,408	76.70%	8,021	23.30%	4,846	22.84%	15,910	75.00%	431	2.03%	27	0.13%
73	10,246	26.97%	26,893	70.79%	836	2.20%	13	0.03%	12,226	33.12%	24,693	66.88%	16,341	65.28%	7,672	30.65%	958	3.83%	60	0.24%
74	14,574	33.71%	27,740	64.17%	903	2.09%	14	0.03%	16,738	39.66%	25,462	60.34%	16,626	57.24%	11,474	39.50%	896	3.08%	52	0.18%
75	13,727	34.78%	24,886	63.06%	843	2.14%	8	0.02%	15,812	40.97%	22,784	59.03%	14,120	56.55%	10,022	40.14%	765	3.06%	60	0.24%
76	12,284	33.69%	23,538	64.56%	628	1.72%	9	0.02%	14,731	41.42%	20,837	58.58%	12,611	55.12%	8,946	39.10%	1,270	5.55%	51	0.22%
77	9,369	23.42%	29,955	74.88%	668	1.67%	11	0.03%	11,524	29.40%	27,678	70.60%	17,850	66.81%	7,521	28.15%	1,287	4.82%	59	0.22%
78	7,417	21.69%	26,189	76.58%	589	1.72%	2	0.01%	8,545	25.56%	24,890	74.44%	15,703	72.92%	4,853	22.54%	935	4.34%	44	0.20%
79	13,554	37.32%	22,193	61.10%	570	1.57%	4	0.01%	15,469	43.41%	20,162	56.59%	14,708	55.81%	10,339	39.23%	1,201	4.56%	104	0.39%
80	8,280	22.99%	27,024	75.04%	703	1.95%	6	0.02%	10,026	28.42%	25,253	71.58%	15,663	71.58%	5,384	24.61%	804	3.67%	30	0.14%
81	9,478	27.29%	24,476	70.48%	769	2.21%	5	0.01%	11,626	34.16%	22,403	65.84%	13,608	64.41%	6,478	30.66%	994	4.70%	48	0.23%
82	11,819	29.62%	27,372	68.60%	709	1.78%	0	0.00%	15,675	40.46%	23,071	59.54%	13,965	56.43%	9,795	39.58%	921	3.72%	66	0.27%
83	11,196	32.99%	22,088	65.08%	657	1.94%	0	0.00%	14,396	43.66%	18,580	56.34%	10,827	53.84%	8,173	40.65%	1,043	5.19%	65	0.32%
84	10,369	28.17%	25,834	70.19%	594	1.61%	8	0.02%	12,890	35.90%	23,016	64.10%	15,527	61.64%	8,043	31.93%	1,547	6.14%	72	0.29%
85	8,720	26.19%	23,735	71.30%	830	2.49%	4	0.01%	10,049	31.44%	21,909	68.56%	14,353	67.23%	5,803	27.18%	1,155	5.41%	37	0.17%
86	9,894	30.27%	22,179	67.86%	597	1.83%	14	0.04%	12,957	40.71%	18,868	59.29%	12,566	56.86%	8,134	36.81%	1,359	6.15%	39	0.18%
87	8,402	24.08%	25,771	73.84%	726	2.08%	0	0.00%	11,079	32.73%	22,771	67.27%	13,309	63.30%	6,258	29.76%	1,381	6.57%	78	0.37%
88	20,018	59.29%	13,068	38.71%	670	1.98%	6	0.02%	23,272	70.93%	9,539	29.07%	5,082	26.73%	13,373	70.35%	525	2.76%	30	0.16%
89	8,637	25.00%	25,338	73.34%	567	1.64%	8	0.02%	11,035	32.69%	22,717	67.31%	13,875	64.20%	6,526	30.20%	1,153	5.33%	58	0.27%
90	9,098	27.20%	23,610	70.57%	737	2.20%	9	0.03%	11,015	34.03%	21,358	65.97%	14,202	63.15%	6,909	30.72%	1,333	5.93%	45	0.20%
91	9,542	26.27%	25,983	71.53%	788	2.17%	12	0.03%	11,497	32.45%	23,938	67.55%	15,807	65.85%	6,654	27.72%	1,463	6.09%	82	0.34%
92	17,313	53.39%	14,448	44.55%	661	2.04%	6	0.02%	20,458	64.53%	11,246	35.47%	5,661	32.76%	10,988	63.60%	586	3.39%	43	0.25%
93	14,589	36.70%	23,616	59.41%	1,532	3.85%	11	0.03%	17,050	44.54%	21,230	55.46%	13,890	52.47%	11,056	41.76%	1,481	5.59%	47	0.18%
94	8,654	23.53%	27,494	74.76%	619	1.68%	7	0.02%	10,736	30.05%	24,993	69.95%	16,393	66.83%	6,491	26.46%	1,552	6.33%	92	0.38%
95	9,674	24.71%	28,753	73.44%	710	1.81%	15	0.04%	12,828	33.76%	25,174	66.24%	15,725	62.10%	8,257	32.61%	1,255	4.96%	84	0.33%
96	9,710	27.99%	24,383	70.28%	596	1.72%	7	0.02%	12,265	36.11%	21,704	63.89%	13,550	60.40%	7,757	34.58%	1,060	4.73%	65	0.29%
97	8,226	22.44%	27,842	75.96%	582	1.59%	5	0.01%	10,866	30.52%	24,732	69.48%	15,844	66.50%	6,685	28.06%	1,232	5.17%	66	0.28%
98	11,028	26.83%	29,295	71.27%	774	1.88%	7	0.02%	15,043	37.92%	24,623	62.08%	14,436	56.42%	10,325	40.35%	736	2.88%	89	0.35%
99	23,478	69.59%	9,686	28.71%	565	1.67%	7	0.02%	26,192	78.87%	7,017	21.13%	3,532	18.57%	15,086	79.31%	374	1.97%	29	0.15%
100	17,333	55.16%	13,474	42.88%	605	1.93%	12	0.04%	20,399	66.57%	10,245	33.43%	5,518	31.92%	11,202	64.79%	533	3.08%	36	0.21%
101	24,485	65.40%	12,341	32.96%	605	1.62%	7	0.02%	27,310	74.45%	9,370	25.55%	4,873	23.57%	15,262	73.83%	512	2.48%	25	0.12%
102	21,669	68.30%	9,269	29.22%	768	2.42%	18	0.06%	24,802	80.30%	6,085	19.70%	2,896	16.75%	13,858	80.17%	508	2.94%	23	0.13%
103	10,654	25.61%	30,288	72.80%	655	1.57%	9	0.02%	14,826	36.80%	25,459	63.20%	14,931	57.20%	10,396	39.82%	727	2.78%	51	0.20%
104	11,360	24.40%	34,544	74.20%	641	1.38%	13	0.03%	16,834	37.48%	28,079	62.52%	16,733	55.41%	12,697	42.04%	731	2.42%	39	0.13%
105	10,762	26.63%	29,029	71.84%	610	1.51%	6	0.01%	14,930	38.00%	24,356	62.00%	13,516	56.71%	9,683	40.63%	589	2.47%	44	0.18%
106	20,129	62.28%	11,537	35.70%	637	1.97%	17	0.05%	23,095	72.96%	8,561	27.04%	4,035	23.69%	12,601	73.99%	384	2.25%	10	0.06%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-25.asc', modified 08/28/2017 04:08:41 PM

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptS03|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections. Votes that could not be associated with a specific precinct were excluded. Reported statewide totals may therefore be marginally lower than official contest results.

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: Governor 2012, Lt Governor 2012, US Senate 2014

	Governor 2012: Dalton-McCrory-Howe								Lieutenant Governor 2012: Coleman-Forest				US Senate 2014: Tillis-Hagan-Haugh							
District	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Write-In**	**Write-In %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Write-In**	**Write-In %**
107	24,066	67.23%	11,223	31.35%	499	1.39%	11	0.03%	26,973	76.68%	8,203	23.32%	4,072	20.43%	15,400	77.28%	420	2.11%	35	0.18%
108	10,229	30.60%	22,641	67.73%	553	1.65%	6	0.02%	12,577	38.66%	19,954	61.34%	11,798	58.37%	7,436	36.79%	940	4.65%	37	0.18%
109	11,675	33.74%	22,419	64.79%	501	1.45%	9	0.03%	13,855	41.00%	19,937	59.00%	12,274	57.67%	8,147	38.28%	804	3.78%	59	0.28%
110	10,188	31.08%	22,150	67.56%	443	1.35%	4	0.01%	11,944	37.40%	19,996	62.60%	12,381	60.75%	6,988	34.29%	961	4.72%	49	0.24%
111	10,978	33.85%	21,002	64.75%	447	1.38%	9	0.03%	12,345	39.08%	19,245	60.92%	12,248	58.87%	7,466	35.89%	1,040	5.00%	50	0.24%
112	13,175	40.49%	18,798	57.78%	552	1.70%	10	0.03%	11,934	37.96%	19,505	62.04%	13,356	60.75%	7,327	33.33%	1,273	5.79%	30	0.14%
113	14,513	34.86%	26,056	62.58%	1,053	2.53%	14	0.03%	15,965	39.13%	24,832	60.87%	17,951	56.94%	12,220	38.76%	1,317	4.18%	39	0.12%
114	30,335	67.66%	12,627	28.17%	1,853	4.13%	17	0.04%	32,363	73.64%	11,584	26.36%	6,689	22.11%	22,389	74.02%	1,142	3.78%	29	0.10%
115	18,992	44.03%	22,839	52.94%	1,300	3.01%	8	0.02%	20,704	48.97%	21,574	51.03%	14,095	45.76%	15,408	50.02%	1,262	4.10%	39	0.13%
116	15,055	39.40%	22,073	57.77%	1,069	2.80%	10	0.03%	16,787	44.87%	20,623	55.13%	13,088	50.68%	11,658	45.14%	1,042	4.03%	38	0.15%
117	12,236	33.12%	23,695	64.13%	1,002	2.71%	14	0.04%	13,677	37.80%	22,505	62.20%	14,898	58.54%	9,518	37.40%	995	3.91%	37	0.15%
118	14,554	39.85%	21,033	57.59%	922	2.52%	13	0.04%	15,851	44.59%	19,698	55.41%	14,379	52.35%	11,489	41.83%	1,537	5.60%	61	0.22%
119	14,498	44.69%	16,886	52.05%	1,054	3.25%	2	0.01%	15,958	50.57%	15,600	49.43%	10,500	46.76%	10,697	47.64%	1,217	5.42%	40	0.18%
120	12,098	31.33%	25,139	65.11%	1,357	3.51%	18	0.05%	13,273	35.22%	24,408	64.78%	18,212	62.59%	9,371	32.21%	1,474	5.07%	40	0.14%
Totals:	**1,925,270**	**43.18%**	**2,437,224**	**54.67%**	**94,512**	**2.12%**	**1,191**	**0.03%**	**2,174,021**	**49.88%**	**2,184,891**	**50.12%**	**1,416,834**	**48.84%**	**1,370,303**	**47.23%**	**108,779**	**3.75%**	**5,251**	**0.18%**

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: President 2016, US Senate 2016, Governor 2016

	US President 2016: Trump-Clinton-Johnson								US Senate 2016: Burr-Ross-Haugh						Governor 2016: Cooper-McCrory-Cecil					
District	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %
1	18,589	51.78%	16,455	45.83%	630	1.75%	229	0.64%	18,358	52.14%	16,040	45.56%	811	2.30%	16,170	45.62%	18,855	53.20%	418	1.18%
2	21,687	56.45%	15,453	40.22%	893	2.32%	385	1.00%	21,503	56.54%	15,299	40.22%	1,232	3.24%	16,542	43.27%	21,035	55.02%	656	1.72%
3	19,500	57.51%	13,102	38.64%	958	2.83%	350	1.03%	19,722	58.75%	12,526	37.32%	1,320	3.93%	13,284	39.49%	19,645	58.40%	709	2.11%
4	19,316	63.27%	10,515	34.44%	536	1.76%	163	0.53%	18,844	62.77%	10,197	33.97%	978	3.26%	10,515	34.80%	19,240	63.67%	463	1.53%
5	14,071	42.89%	17,840	54.38%	677	2.06%	221	0.67%	13,942	43.33%	17,542	54.52%	690	2.14%	17,723	54.83%	14,115	43.67%	483	1.49%
6	26,166	63.13%	13,548	32.69%	1,322	3.19%	413	1.00%	25,754	63.45%	13,548	33.38%	1,290	3.18%	14,719	36.08%	25,069	61.45%	1,010	2.48%
7	21,956	56.91%	15,273	39.59%	939	2.43%	411	1.07%	21,764	56.74%	15,352	40.02%	1,242	3.24%	16,618	43.12%	21,215	55.05%	707	1.83%
8	11,251	32.48%	22,166	63.99%	878	2.53%	346	1.00%	11,920	34.87%	21,238	62.12%	1,030	3.01%	21,791	63.50%	11,949	34.82%	577	1.68%
9	20,103	53.26%	16,101	42.66%	1,112	2.95%	426	1.13%	20,913	55.89%	15,376	41.09%	1,129	3.02%	16,546	44.07%	20,375	54.27%	626	1.67%
10	24,292	66.90%	11,079	30.51%	680	1.87%	258	0.71%	24,011	66.82%	10,937	30.44%	984	2.74%	11,524	31.87%	24,183	66.89%	449	1.24%
11	12,772	30.14%	26,766	63.16%	1,949	4.60%	890	2.10%	14,335	34.09%	26,030	61.90%	1,690	4.02%	28,163	66.70%	12,781	30.27%	1,278	3.03%
12	17,784	51.92%	15,657	45.71%	569	1.66%	241	0.70%	17,668	52.25%	15,240	45.07%	906	2.68%	15,523	45.65%	18,084	53.18%	397	1.17%
13	29,527	68.85%	11,999	27.98%	967	2.25%	396	0.92%	29,080	68.53%	11,666	27.49%	1,685	3.97%	12,730	29.84%	29,076	68.17%	849	1.99%
14	16,391	60.55%	9,442	34.88%	949	3.51%	289	1.07%	16,089	60.41%	9,134	34.30%	1,410	5.29%	9,540	35.73%	16,350	61.23%	813	3.04%
15	13,635	66.87%	5,838	28.63%	701	3.44%	217	1.06%	13,255	66.19%	5,709	28.51%	1,061	5.30%	6,115	30.44%	13,366	66.54%	606	3.02%
16	24,723	60.82%	14,793	36.39%	868	2.14%	267	0.66%	24,021	60.12%	14,359	35.94%	1,578	3.95%	15,806	39.44%	23,414	58.42%	858	2.14%
17	33,539	64.40%	16,832	32.32%	1,227	2.36%	480	0.92%	32,987	64.27%	16,223	31.61%	2,112	4.12%	18,326	35.57%	32,038	62.18%	1,162	2.26%
18	14,960	39.11%	21,515	56.25%	1,247	3.26%	530	1.39%	15,065	40.15%	20,714	55.20%	1,747	4.66%	22,540	59.77%	14,028	37.20%	1,146	3.04%
19	24,349	55.45%	17,494	39.84%	1,461	3.33%	604	1.38%	24,444	56.44%	16,799	38.79%	2,068	4.77%	19,932	45.80%	22,351	51.36%	1,232	2.83%
20	25,197	54.81%	18,393	40.01%	1,731	3.77%	651	1.42%	25,753	56.83%	17,604	38.84%	1,962	4.33%	20,831	45.79%	23,400	51.43%	1,266	2.78%
21	12,919	40.43%	18,303	57.28%	495	1.55%	237	0.74%	13,027	41.30%	17,815	56.47%	703	2.23%	17,980	56.77%	13,288	41.96%	404	1.28%
22	20,939	58.30%	14,256	39.69%	523	1.46%	201	0.56%	20,588	58.10%	14,025	39.58%	820	2.31%	14,561	40.81%	20,720	58.07%	400	1.12%
23	14,143	38.43%	22,040	59.88%	449	1.22%	173	0.47%	14,165	38.89%	21,496	59.02%	760	2.09%	21,917	59.87%	14,389	39.30%	303	0.83%
24	17,531	45.97%	19,663	51.56%	667	1.75%	274	0.72%	17,641	46.58%	19,435	51.32%	794	2.10%	20,471	53.84%	17,161	45.13%	391	1.03%
25	17,731	44.94%	20,836	52.81%	588	1.49%	299	0.76%	17,965	45.70%	20,621	52.45%	729	1.85%	21,877	55.47%	17,171	43.54%	389	0.99%
26	28,405	59.94%	16,944	35.76%	1,499	3.16%	539	1.14%	28,505	60.58%	16,778	35.66%	1,767	3.76%	18,608	39.37%	27,716	58.63%	946	2.00%
27	12,504	36.17%	21,573	62.40%	373	1.08%	123	0.36%	12,390	36.15%	21,326	62.22%	557	1.63%	21,783	63.37%	12,336	35.89%	256	0.74%
28	24,454	65.87%	11,524	31.04%	860	2.32%	288	0.78%	24,026	65.28%	11,577	31.45%	1,202	3.27%	12,613	34.09%	23,768	64.24%	617	1.67%
29	5,172	10.88%	40,386	84.99%	1,171	2.46%	787	1.66%	7,072	15.00%	39,112	82.96%	964	2.04%	40,387	85.64%	6,009	12.74%	761	1.61%
30	13,282	26.62%	34,511	69.18%	1,265	2.54%	829	1.66%	14,956	30.09%	33,506	67.41%	1,242	2.50%	35,040	70.35%	13,947	28.00%	818	1.64%
31	7,429	16.37%	36,169	79.69%	1,136	2.50%	654	1.44%	8,466	18.76%	35,558	78.81%	1,092	2.42%	36,387	80.47%	8,063	17.83%	770	1.70%
32	13,636	35.53%	23,937	62.37%	563	1.47%	241	0.63%	13,731	36.10%	23,622	62.10%	683	1.80%	24,127	63.21%	13,643	35.74%	401	1.05%
33	8,767	21.69%	29,855	73.85%	1,231	3.05%	571	1.41%	9,581	23.88%	29,362	73.19%	1,176	2.93%	30,383	75.49%	9,009	22.38%	856	2.13%
34	15,899	33.19%	29,193	60.93%	1,853	3.87%	964	2.01%	18,725	39.20%	27,648	57.88%	1,394	2.92%	30,754	64.19%	16,172	33.75%	985	2.06%
35	25,820	48.23%	24,741	46.22%	1,856	3.47%	1,114	2.08%	27,825	52.32%	23,667	44.50%	1,691	3.18%	26,206	49.05%	26,119	48.89%	1,103	2.06%
36	25,495	49.78%	22,974	44.86%	1,903	3.72%	846	1.65%	27,500	53.89%	21,900	42.91%	1,632	3.20%	24,574	47.98%	25,611	50.00%	1,036	2.02%
37	26,551	49.29%	24,034	44.61%	2,353	4.37%	933	1.73%	28,537	53.33%	22,998	42.98%	1,977	3.69%	25,914	48.21%	26,430	49.17%	1,407	2.62%
38	6,506	16.91%	30,462	79.16%	973	2.53%	542	1.41%	7,268	19.02%	29,875	78.17%	1,077	2.82%	30,642	79.97%	6,895	17.99%	782	2.04%
39	14,772	32.83%	28,309	62.91%	1,293	2.87%	625	1.39%	15,518	34.68%	27,895	62.33%	1,339	2.99%	29,019	64.61%	15,061	33.53%	837	1.86%
40	25,292	46.24%	26,285	48.05%	2,113	3.86%	1,008	1.84%	28,467	52.13%	24,667	45.17%	1,474	2.70%	27,948	51.03%	25,775	47.06%	1,042	1.90%
41	17,243	35.39%	28,670	58.85%	1,924	3.95%	879	1.80%	20,149	41.74%	26,623	55.15%	1,504	3.12%	29,266	60.36%	18,040	37.21%	1,180	2.43%
42	6,364	25.50%	17,674	70.81%	647	2.59%	274	1.10%	6,643	26.97%	17,141	69.60%	845	3.43%	17,092	69.47%	6,886	27.99%	627	2.55%
43	8,099	26.20%	21,704	70.20%	798	2.58%	317	1.03%	8,364	27.40%	21,127	69.21%	1,035	3.39%	21,109	69.10%	8,700	28.48%	740	2.42%
44	14,477	44.27%	16,935	51.79%	961	2.94%	329	1.01%	14,728	45.60%	16,387	50.74%	1,184	3.67%	16,797	51.88%	14,827	45.80%	750	2.32%
45	22,325	57.35%	15,292	39.28%	967	2.48%	343	0.88%	22,167	57.66%	15,078	39.22%	1,202	3.13%	15,451	40.04%	22,349	57.91%	792	2.05%
46	16,046	61.47%	9,544	36.56%	396	1.52%	116	0.44%	15,195	59.76%	9,522	37.45%	708	2.78%	9,625	37.45%	15,778	61.39%	300	1.17%
47	11,779	46.41%	12,896	50.81%	520	2.05%	186	0.73%	11,277	45.82%	12,909	52.46%	423	1.72%	12,419	49.71%	12,346	49.42%	216	0.86%
48	14,016	43.58%	17,045	53.00%	831	2.58%	266	0.83%	13,782	43.73%	16,722	53.06%	1,010	3.20%	17,039	53.91%	13,890	43.94%	679	2.15%
49	16,965	33.01%	31,447	61.18%	2,012	3.91%	974	1.90%	19,884	38.92%	29,621	57.98%	1,580	3.09%	32,686	63.71%	17,463	34.04%	1,158	2.26%
50	18,683	40.92%	25,213	55.22%	1,226	2.69%	539	1.18%	19,535	43.06%	24,526	54.06%	1,309	2.89%	26,259	57.73%	18,414	40.49%	810	1.78%
51	18,556	54.99%	13,829	40.98%	1,027	3.04%	332	0.98%	18,319	54.87%	13,803	41.34%	1,264	3.79%	14,919	44.49%	17,772	53.00%	840	2.51%
52	26,508	61.46%	14,902	34.55%	1,240	2.87%	482	1.12%	26,850	62.67%	14,595	34.07%	1,396	3.26%	16,149	37.60%	25,907	60.32%	893	2.08%

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: President 2016, US Senate 2016, Governor 2016

	US President 2016: Trump-Clinton-Johnson								US Senate 2016: Burr-Ross-Haugh						Governor 2016: Cooper-McCrory-Cecil					
District	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %
53	21,436	60.85%	12,611	35.80%	852	2.42%	328	0.93%	21,212	60.60%	12,628	36.08%	1,164	3.33%	13,300	37.93%	21,064	60.08%	697	1.99%
54	19,492	37.13%	30,645	58.38%	1,545	2.94%	809	1.54%	21,169	40.48%	29,679	56.76%	1,444	2.76%	31,838	60.66%	19,672	37.48%	979	1.87%
55	22,840	63.50%	12,002	33.37%	788	2.19%	336	0.93%	22,508	63.37%	11,758	33.10%	1,252	3.52%	12,330	34.49%	22,863	63.95%	559	1.56%
56	5,901	12.36%	39,502	82.73%	1,392	2.92%	955	2.00%	8,341	17.60%	38,022	80.24%	1,021	2.15%	40,120	84.53%	6,502	13.70%	838	1.77%
57	4,869	12.13%	33,975	84.62%	785	1.96%	523	1.30%	5,571	14.07%	33,051	83.48%	968	2.45%	33,866	85.39%	5,062	12.76%	733	1.85%
58	8,963	23.57%	27,663	72.74%	918	2.41%	485	1.28%	9,437	25.12%	26,960	71.78%	1,164	3.10%	28,097	74.57%	8,759	23.25%	823	2.18%
59	25,507	54.53%	19,758	42.24%	1,056	2.26%	457	0.98%	25,592	55.15%	19,403	41.81%	1,411	3.04%	21,420	45.98%	24,237	52.03%	926	1.99%
60	10,484	30.27%	22,918	66.17%	880	2.54%	353	1.02%	10,935	32.03%	22,058	64.61%	1,148	3.36%	23,295	68.08%	10,105	29.53%	819	2.39%
61	24,185	49.68%	22,193	45.59%	1,552	3.19%	752	1.54%	25,701	53.16%	21,118	43.68%	1,528	3.16%	24,221	49.98%	23,168	47.80%	1,075	2.22%
62	23,811	49.23%	22,262	46.02%	1,540	3.18%	757	1.57%	25,865	53.72%	20,867	43.34%	1,417	2.94%	24,295	50.38%	22,926	47.54%	1,000	2.07%
63	19,745	52.91%	16,215	43.45%	964	2.58%	397	1.06%	20,099	54.24%	15,711	42.39%	1,249	3.37%	17,448	46.93%	19,042	51.22%	687	1.85%
64	19,070	56.36%	13,618	40.25%	831	2.46%	317	0.94%	19,281	57.45%	13,162	39.22%	1,119	3.33%	14,584	43.35%	18,459	54.87%	596	1.77%
65	23,874	63.29%	12,795	33.92%	751	1.99%	301	0.80%	23,327	62.41%	12,731	34.06%	1,321	3.53%	14,611	38.98%	22,135	59.06%	733	1.96%
66	20,232	57.61%	14,075	40.08%	619	1.76%	192	0.55%	19,128	55.40%	14,083	40.79%	1,316	3.81%	15,183	43.59%	19,075	54.76%	577	1.66%
67	31,950	73.24%	10,240	23.47%	1,051	2.41%	381	0.87%	30,799	71.22%	10,291	23.80%	2,154	4.98%	11,709	26.92%	30,872	70.99%	907	2.09%
68	25,357	58.90%	15,581	36.19%	1,519	3.53%	593	1.38%	26,537	62.36%	14,300	33.60%	1,717	4.03%	16,268	38.02%	25,525	59.65%	1,000	2.34%
69	23,008	61.78%	12,620	33.89%	1,151	3.09%	461	1.24%	23,224	63.20%	11,858	32.27%	1,667	4.54%	13,180	35.64%	22,857	61.81%	941	2.54%
70	25,245	74.51%	7,544	22.27%	779	2.30%	312	0.92%	24,601	73.23%	7,505	22.34%	1,490	4.44%	9,245	27.45%	23,609	70.11%	821	2.44%
71	9,228	26.65%	23,827	68.81%	1,064	3.07%	510	1.47%	10,380	30.23%	22,857	66.56%	1,102	3.21%	24,376	70.96%	9,143	26.62%	831	2.42%
72	6,795	19.73%	26,406	76.67%	805	2.34%	436	1.27%	8,321	24.36%	25,110	73.50%	730	2.14%	26,382	77.32%	7,107	20.83%	631	1.85%
73	25,744	64.55%	12,400	31.09%	1,183	2.97%	558	1.40%	26,690	67.24%	11,644	29.33%	1,362	3.43%	14,295	35.92%	24,646	61.93%	854	2.15%
74	25,112	56.02%	17,682	39.45%	1,399	3.12%	630	1.41%	26,414	59.14%	16,750	37.50%	1,499	3.36%	19,607	43.87%	24,064	53.84%	1,022	2.29%
75	22,992	54.52%	17,297	41.02%	1,322	3.13%	559	1.33%	23,918	57.09%	16,460	39.29%	1,518	3.62%	19,049	45.40%	21,902	52.20%	1,008	2.40%
76	23,064	61.73%	13,031	34.87%	877	2.35%	393	1.05%	22,286	60.33%	12,833	34.74%	1,819	4.92%	14,249	38.34%	21,950	59.07%	961	2.59%
77	30,333	72.00%	10,259	24.35%	1,103	2.62%	434	1.03%	29,715	71.11%	10,106	24.19%	1,965	4.70%	12,186	29.04%	28,782	68.58%	1,000	2.38%
78	28,166	77.69%	7,076	19.52%	739	2.04%	272	0.75%	27,319	76.13%	7,166	19.97%	1,402	3.91%	8,771	24.33%	26,543	73.63%	737	2.04%
79	22,774	61.50%	13,292	35.90%	678	1.83%	285	0.77%	22,332	61.14%	12,865	35.22%	1,328	3.64%	13,385	36.39%	22,891	62.23%	509	1.38%
80	28,033	74.04%	8,623	22.78%	918	2.42%	287	0.76%	27,677	73.76%	8,454	22.53%	1,394	3.71%	10,385	27.55%	26,519	70.35%	793	2.10%
81	26,284	71.05%	9,486	25.64%	941	2.54%	284	0.77%	25,858	70.60%	9,299	25.39%	1,469	4.01%	11,560	31.43%	24,341	66.17%	883	2.40%
82	25,226	55.52%	18,186	40.03%	1,438	3.16%	585	1.29%	25,508	56.72%	17,410	38.71%	2,053	4.57%	19,329	42.73%	24,713	54.63%	1,191	2.63%
83	20,902	57.22%	14,146	38.72%	1,046	2.86%	436	1.19%	20,485	56.66%	13,780	38.12%	1,887	5.22%	15,101	41.54%	20,226	55.63%	1,030	2.83%
84	25,864	67.41%	11,302	29.46%	842	2.19%	358	0.93%	24,946	65.81%	11,099	29.28%	1,862	4.91%	12,373	32.46%	24,857	65.22%	885	2.32%
85	27,148	74.95%	7,952	21.95%	700	1.93%	421	1.16%	25,691	72.23%	8,320	23.39%	1,555	4.37%	9,999	27.89%	24,896	69.44%	959	2.67%
86	23,049	66.31%	10,412	29.95%	895	2.57%	404	1.16%	22,151	64.58%	10,580	30.84%	1,571	4.58%	12,309	35.59%	21,505	62.18%	773	2.23%
87	26,621	73.29%	8,427	23.20%	849	2.34%	425	1.17%	25,537	71.08%	8,542	23.78%	1,847	5.14%	10,059	27.82%	25,176	69.62%	927	2.56%
88	8,920	23.83%	26,524	70.85%	1,470	3.93%	521	1.39%	10,746	29.20%	24,677	67.05%	1,383	3.76%	26,564	71.76%	9,507	25.68%	947	2.56%
89	25,622	70.69%	9,396	25.92%	904	2.49%	322	0.89%	24,664	68.94%	9,348	26.13%	1,762	4.93%	10,714	29.78%	24,387	67.78%	880	2.45%
90	26,756	73.64%	8,414	23.16%	812	2.23%	352	0.97%	25,983	72.41%	8,481	23.64%	1,418	3.95%	10,714	29.67%	24,677	68.34%	717	1.99%
91	28,820	75.03%	8,334	21.70%	925	2.41%	332	0.86%	28,090	73.57%	8,518	22.31%	1,573	4.12%	10,858	28.38%	26,538	69.37%	859	2.25%
92	11,487	31.37%	23,378	63.84%	1,245	3.40%	512	1.40%	12,363	34.22%	22,148	61.30%	1,621	4.49%	23,338	64.34%	11,852	32.67%	1,085	2.99%
93	23,108	53.24%	17,638	40.63%	1,667	3.84%	994	2.29%	23,511	54.86%	17,413	40.63%	1,936	4.52%	19,952	46.21%	21,906	50.74%	1,316	3.05%
94	29,477	75.08%	8,525	21.71%	899	2.29%	359	0.91%	28,311	72.90%	8,699	22.40%	1,828	4.71%	10,479	26.75%	27,879	71.16%	818	2.09%
95	28,890	65.36%	13,432	30.39%	1,343	3.04%	536	1.21%	28,179	64.55%	13,088	29.98%	2,386	5.47%	16,212	37.00%	26,066	59.50%	1,534	3.50%
96	22,685	62.88%	11,805	32.72%	1,069	2.96%	516	1.43%	22,549	63.28%	11,383	31.95%	1,699	4.77%	13,036	36.38%	21,866	61.02%	935	2.61%
97	28,804	71.97%	9,897	24.73%	971	2.43%	349	0.87%	27,868	70.41%	9,798	24.76%	1,913	4.83%	11,331	28.44%	27,557	69.16%	959	2.41%
98	24,388	51.54%	20,350	43.01%	1,862	3.94%	714	1.51%	26,049	55.74%	18,824	40.28%	1,864	3.99%	22,765	48.54%	22,553	48.09%	1,578	3.36%
99	6,628	19.07%	26,877	77.31%	830	2.39%	430	1.24%	7,073	20.60%	26,097	76.00%	1,169	3.40%	26,426	76.70%	7,280	21.13%	749	2.17%
100	9,065	29.00%	20,731	66.33%	994	3.18%	465	1.49%	9,754	31.61%	19,803	64.18%	1,297	4.20%	20,677	66.67%	9,505	30.65%	830	2.68%
101	8,930	22.86%	28,642	73.33%	994	2.54%	491	1.26%	9,615	24.91%	27,574	71.43%	1,414	3.66%	28,397	73.33%	9,359	24.17%	969	2.50%
102	5,292	16.06%	25,980	78.86%	1,162	3.53%	511	1.55%	6,327	19.52%	24,761	76.39%	1,328	4.10%	26,109	80.03%	5,584	17.12%	931	2.85%
103	22,701	52.01%	18,642	42.71%	1,539	3.53%	769	1.76%	24,458	56.51%	17,208	39.76%	1,617	3.74%	19,220	44.13%	23,328	53.56%	1,003	2.30%
104	20,925	43.85%	23,772	49.82%	1,932	4.05%	1,089	2.28%	25,905	54.36%	20,414	42.84%	1,332	2.80%	24,093	50.36%	22,791	47.64%	955	2.00%
105	20,052	47.27%	20,155	47.52%	1,504	3.55%	705	1.66%	22,414	53.33%	18,049	42.94%	1,569	3.73%	20,512	48.58%	20,692	49.00%	1,021	2.42%

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: President 2016, US Senate 2016, Governor 2016

	US President 2016: Trump-Clinton-Johnson								US Senate 2016: Burr-Ross-Haugh						Governor 2016: Cooper-McCrory-Cecil					
District	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Write-In**	**Write-In %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**
106	7,622	22.42%	24,886	73.20%	952	2.80%	539	1.59%	8,421	25.05%	24,052	71.55%	1,145	3.41%	24,815	73.54%	8,084	23.96%	846	2.51%
107	7,868	21.04%	28,142	75.25%	886	2.37%	500	1.34%	8,416	22.77%	27,293	73.84%	1,251	3.38%	27,988	75.41%	8,221	22.15%	903	2.43%
108	21,977	61.91%	12,155	34.24%	963	2.71%	405	1.14%	21,400	61.05%	11,934	34.04%	1,722	4.91%	13,133	37.22%	21,326	60.44%	824	2.34%
109	21,849	58.81%	13,856	37.29%	1,026	2.76%	424	1.14%	21,752	59.21%	13,385	36.43%	1,600	4.36%	14,614	39.57%	21,473	58.14%	845	2.29%
110	23,363	67.95%	10,064	29.27%	685	1.99%	272	0.79%	22,465	66.14%	10,103	29.74%	1,399	4.12%	11,006	32.21%	22,520	65.90%	648	1.90%
111	23,088	67.78%	10,066	29.55%	621	1.82%	290	0.85%	22,172	65.93%	10,185	30.29%	1,272	3.78%	11,069	32.68%	22,235	65.64%	569	1.68%
112	25,060	72.71%	8,351	24.23%	717	2.08%	339	0.98%	23,380	69.04%	9,131	26.96%	1,353	4.00%	10,575	31.07%	22,633	66.49%	831	2.44%
113	27,846	61.60%	15,495	34.27%	1,152	2.55%	715	1.58%	27,107	60.73%	15,907	35.64%	1,619	3.63%	17,776	39.74%	25,806	57.69%	1,150	2.57%
114	10,675	21.88%	35,226	72.20%	1,424	2.92%	1,464	3.00%	10,943	22.71%	35,335	73.32%	1,918	3.98%	36,921	76.30%	9,880	20.42%	1,589	3.28%
115	22,578	48.02%	21,856	46.49%	1,453	3.09%	1,127	2.40%	22,563	48.39%	22,221	47.66%	1,839	3.94%	24,377	52.10%	21,034	44.95%	1,382	2.95%
116	22,462	52.07%	18,367	42.57%	1,409	3.27%	903	2.09%	22,583	52.90%	18,335	42.95%	1,776	4.16%	20,574	48.00%	20,962	48.91%	1,323	3.09%
117	25,251	60.45%	14,625	35.01%	1,235	2.96%	660	1.58%	24,962	60.51%	14,605	35.40%	1,688	4.09%	16,583	40.08%	23,567	56.96%	1,227	2.97%
118	25,826	63.62%	13,002	32.03%	1,152	2.84%	616	1.52%	24,143	60.30%	14,050	35.09%	1,845	4.61%	16,169	40.08%	22,971	56.94%	1,202	2.98%
119	19,623	54.48%	14,434	40.08%	1,323	3.67%	637	1.77%	18,853	53.03%	15,016	42.24%	1,683	4.73%	17,194	48.15%	17,362	48.62%	1,156	3.24%
120	30,691	72.91%	9,871	23.45%	1,030	2.45%	501	1.19%	28,591	69.53%	10,931	26.58%	1,600	3.89%	12,825	31.06%	27,221	65.92%	1,249	3.02%
Totals:	**2,359,749**	**49.90%**	**2,180,316**	**46.10%**	**129,929**	**2.75%**	**59,397**	**1.26%**	**2,392,439**	**51.13%**	**2,119,696**	**45.30%**	**167,190**	**3.57%**	**2,300,381**	**48.95%**	**2,296,039**	**48.86%**	**102,729**	**2.19%**

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: Lieutenant Governor 2016, Attorney General 2016

	Lieutenant Governor 2016: Forest-Coleman-Cole						Attorney General 2016: Stein-Newton			
District	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %
1	17,778	51.12%	16,328	46.95%	671	1.93%	17,047	49.85%	17,149	50.15%
2	21,550	57.60%	15,020	40.15%	840	2.25%	17,015	46.07%	19,917	53.93%
3	19,362	58.56%	12,769	38.62%	932	2.82%	13,595	41.50%	19,163	58.50%
4	18,524	62.83%	10,278	34.86%	683	2.32%	11,259	38.68%	17,851	61.32%
5	13,598	42.70%	17,580	55.21%	665	2.09%	18,195	57.96%	13,195	42.04%
6	24,969	62.46%	13,748	34.39%	1,261	3.15%	14,523	36.89%	24,849	63.11%
7	21,930	57.78%	15,216	40.09%	806	2.12%	16,847	44.72%	20,823	55.28%
8	11,543	34.32%	21,250	63.17%	844	2.51%	22,114	66.21%	11,285	33.79%
9	20,567	55.82%	15,300	41.53%	978	2.65%	16,594	45.44%	19,925	54.56%
10	24,002	67.76%	10,809	30.52%	609	1.72%	12,118	34.50%	23,009	65.50%
11	14,274	34.59%	25,118	60.87%	1,876	4.55%	27,570	67.41%	13,329	32.59%
12	17,425	52.08%	15,430	46.12%	602	1.80%	16,317	49.26%	16,804	50.74%
13	28,811	68.95%	11,868	28.40%	1,107	2.65%	12,793	30.86%	28,667	69.14%
14	15,667	60.14%	9,239	35.46%	1,146	4.40%	10,094	39.18%	15,668	60.82%
15	13,102	66.99%	5,648	28.88%	809	4.14%	6,333	32.79%	12,978	67.21%
16	24,001	61.02%	14,369	36.53%	963	2.45%	16,456	42.25%	22,490	57.75%
17	33,147	65.60%	16,131	31.92%	1,254	2.48%	19,137	38.21%	30,944	61.79%
18	15,040	40.84%	20,340	55.23%	1,451	3.94%	22,453	61.46%	14,080	38.54%
19	24,414	57.61%	16,318	38.51%	1,644	3.88%	19,234	45.77%	22,791	54.23%
20	25,574	57.77%	17,001	38.41%	1,690	3.82%	19,782	45.08%	24,099	54.92%
21	12,799	41.18%	17,731	57.04%	553	1.78%	18,620	60.43%	12,192	39.57%
22	19,955	57.34%	14,263	40.98%	584	1.68%	15,485	44.90%	19,006	55.10%
23	13,735	38.22%	21,664	60.28%	537	1.49%	22,629	63.31%	13,112	36.69%
24	17,614	46.94%	19,307	51.45%	603	1.61%	20,220	53.88%	17,311	46.12%
25	17,898	45.87%	20,551	52.67%	567	1.45%	21,475	55.06%	17,527	44.94%
26	28,921	62.29%	16,198	34.89%	1,310	2.82%	18,501	40.21%	27,514	59.79%
27	12,111	35.73%	21,357	63.01%	427	1.26%	22,185	65.86%	11,500	34.14%
28	24,390	66.96%	11,178	30.69%	856	2.35%	13,012	36.07%	23,064	63.93%
29	6,887	14.85%	38,300	82.61%	1,175	2.53%	39,832	86.28%	6,334	13.72%
30	14,967	30.49%	32,969	67.17%	1,147	2.34%	34,972	71.69%	13,809	28.31%
31	8,325	18.63%	35,107	78.57%	1,251	2.80%	36,433	81.98%	8,009	18.02%
32	13,338	35.53%	23,613	62.89%	594	1.58%	24,809	66.54%	12,475	33.46%
33	9,598	24.23%	28,755	72.60%	1,252	3.16%	30,236	77.08%	8,990	22.92%
34	18,573	39.50%	26,912	57.23%	1,539	3.27%	30,038	64.36%	16,637	35.64%
35	28,435	54.03%	22,760	43.25%	1,431	2.72%	25,432	48.94%	26,536	51.06%
36	27,546	54.81%	21,270	42.32%	1,440	2.87%	23,809	47.79%	26,015	52.21%
37	28,417	54.03%	22,394	42.58%	1,780	3.38%	24,840	47.69%	27,241	52.31%
38	7,278	19.26%	29,353	77.68%	1,157	3.06%	30,708	82.05%	6,718	17.95%
39	15,526	35.03%	27,659	62.40%	1,137	2.57%	29,063	66.23%	14,821	33.77%
40	28,705	53.32%	23,652	43.93%	1,479	2.75%	26,879	50.45%	26,397	49.55%
41	19,765	41.83%	25,900	54.81%	1,591	3.37%	28,166	60.12%	18,685	39.88%
42	6,383	26.30%	16,996	70.03%	891	3.67%	17,644	73.09%	6,497	26.91%
43	8,192	27.18%	20,960	69.55%	985	3.27%	21,834	72.91%	8,112	27.09%
44	14,388	45.35%	16,265	51.27%	1,074	3.39%	17,572	55.64%	14,009	44.36%
45	21,770	57.53%	14,903	39.38%	1,170	3.09%	16,323	43.39%	21,299	56.61%
46	14,441	57.97%	9,982	40.07%	487	1.96%	11,292	45.85%	13,335	54.15%
47	9,967	41.61%	13,476	56.25%	513	2.14%	14,324	60.47%	9,364	39.53%
48	13,005	42.20%	16,855	54.69%	958	3.11%	17,475	57.21%	13,069	42.79%
49	19,658	39.17%	28,779	57.35%	1,747	3.48%	31,874	63.90%	18,007	36.10%
50	19,497	43.57%	24,182	54.04%	1,066	2.38%	26,089	58.72%	18,339	41.28%
51	18,400	55.76%	13,619	41.27%	982	2.98%	15,312	46.95%	17,303	53.05%
52	26,962	63.92%	14,147	33.54%	1,075	2.55%	15,745	37.70%	26,021	62.30%

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: Lieutenant Governor 2016, Attorney General 2016

	Lieutenant Governor 2016: Forest-Coleman-Cole						Attorney General 2016: Stein-Newton			
District	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %
53	21,328	61.54%	12,493	36.05%	835	2.41%	13,900	40.45%	20,460	59.55%
54	21,038	40.77%	29,281	56.74%	1,285	2.49%	31,512	61.45%	19,770	38.55%
55	22,921	65.35%	11,444	32.63%	707	2.02%	13,375	38.47%	21,391	61.53%
56	8,019	17.31%	36,854	79.55%	1,455	3.14%	38,609	83.76%	7,487	16.24%
57	5,185	13.28%	32,626	83.59%	1,221	3.13%	33,561	86.54%	5,219	13.46%
58	9,287	25.04%	26,651	71.86%	1,150	3.10%	27,954	75.69%	8,977	24.31%
59	25,437	55.49%	19,257	42.01%	1,150	2.51%	21,109	46.33%	24,449	53.67%
60	10,658	31.74%	21,827	65.01%	1,092	3.25%	23,010	68.91%	10,383	31.09%
61	25,459	53.65%	20,630	43.47%	1,366	2.88%	22,996	48.67%	24,252	51.33%
62	25,436	53.83%	20,543	43.48%	1,270	2.69%	22,809	48.55%	24,175	51.45%
63	20,032	54.75%	15,433	42.18%	1,125	3.07%	17,264	47.50%	19,085	52.50%
64	19,368	58.48%	12,814	38.69%	936	2.83%	14,428	43.87%	18,457	56.13%
65	22,925	62.41%	12,935	35.21%	874	2.38%	14,435	39.54%	22,070	60.46%
66	18,853	55.74%	14,153	41.85%	816	2.41%	15,907	47.40%	17,650	52.60%
67	31,697	74.44%	9,793	23.00%	1,092	2.56%	12,410	29.40%	29,801	70.60%
68	27,015	64.52%	13,606	32.49%	1,252	2.99%	15,674	37.79%	25,803	62.21%
69	23,744	65.63%	11,331	31.32%	1,104	3.05%	13,327	37.18%	22,517	62.82%
70	24,712	74.71%	7,488	22.64%	879	2.66%	8,822	26.83%	24,059	73.17%
71	9,831	29.19%	22,738	67.51%	1,114	3.31%	24,171	72.07%	9,367	27.93%
72	7,738	23.10%	24,959	74.51%	800	2.39%	26,121	78.27%	7,254	21.73%
73	26,437	67.76%	11,626	29.80%	951	2.44%	13,736	35.45%	25,011	64.55%
74	26,030	59.30%	16,599	37.82%	1,263	2.88%	19,028	43.58%	24,635	56.42%
75	23,675	57.44%	16,356	39.68%	1,189	2.88%	18,577	45.30%	22,428	54.70%
76	22,655	62.28%	12,646	34.76%	1,076	2.96%	14,921	41.29%	21,213	58.71%
77	30,027	73.04%	9,965	24.24%	1,120	2.72%	12,267	30.01%	28,609	69.99%
78	27,573	77.81%	7,048	19.89%	814	2.30%	8,576	24.38%	26,597	75.62%
79	22,124	61.39%	13,157	36.51%	760	2.11%	14,148	39.62%	21,559	60.38%
80	27,461	74.39%	8,544	23.14%	912	2.47%	9,959	27.05%	26,856	72.95%
81	25,744	71.35%	9,365	25.95%	974	2.70%	11,232	31.27%	24,684	68.73%
82	26,046	58.83%	16,802	37.95%	1,428	3.23%	19,140	43.65%	24,713	56.35%
83	20,975	58.79%	13,482	37.79%	1,221	3.42%	15,585	44.02%	19,820	55.98%
84	25,615	68.55%	10,772	28.83%	981	2.63%	12,983	35.05%	24,055	64.95%
85	25,753	73.78%	8,159	23.37%	995	2.85%	9,757	28.36%	24,643	71.64%
86	22,615	66.72%	10,457	30.85%	824	2.43%	12,699	37.72%	20,964	62.28%
87	26,540	74.72%	8,133	22.90%	848	2.39%	11,035	31.39%	24,120	68.61%
88	10,717	29.69%	23,935	66.30%	1,447	4.01%	25,771	71.73%	10,156	28.27%
89	25,345	71.91%	8,879	25.19%	1,023	2.90%	11,207	31.97%	23,846	68.03%
90	25,448	72.45%	8,865	25.24%	810	2.31%	10,667	30.51%	24,300	69.49%
91	27,570	73.67%	8,869	23.70%	983	2.63%	10,703	28.73%	26,555	71.27%
92	12,587	35.41%	21,535	60.57%	1,429	4.02%	23,404	66.33%	11,881	33.67%
93	23,009	55.17%	16,926	40.58%	1,774	4.25%	19,469	47.25%	21,733	52.75%
94	28,780	75.23%	8,557	22.37%	919	2.40%	11,073	29.23%	26,803	70.77%
95	28,982	67.70%	12,360	28.87%	1,470	3.43%	14,947	35.22%	27,490	64.78%
96	23,121	65.77%	10,946	31.14%	1,089	3.10%	13,281	38.01%	21,662	61.99%
97	28,690	73.47%	9,283	23.77%	1,078	2.76%	11,903	30.76%	26,797	69.24%
98	26,644	58.05%	17,734	38.63%	1,524	3.32%	20,452	45.00%	24,992	55.00%
99	7,163	21.09%	25,734	75.76%	1,073	3.16%	26,872	79.60%	6,888	20.40%
100	10,063	33.08%	19,181	63.06%	1,172	3.85%	20,835	69.05%	9,337	30.95%
101	9,666	25.39%	27,134	71.26%	1,276	3.35%	28,611	75.49%	9,289	24.51%
102	6,255	19.64%	24,161	75.87%	1,429	4.49%	25,604	80.91%	6,042	19.09%
103	25,117	58.86%	16,313	38.23%	1,242	2.91%	18,820	44.51%	23,460	55.49%
104	25,845	55.28%	19,567	41.85%	1,340	2.87%	22,699	48.98%	23,646	51.02%

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: Lieutenant Governor 2016, Attorney General 2016

	Lieutenant Governor 2016: Forest-Coleman-Cole						Attorney General 2016: Stein-Newton			
District	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**
105	22,913	55.44%	17,133	41.45%	1,287	3.11%	19,598	47.84%	21,369	52.16%
106	8,550	25.79%	23,420	70.66%	1,176	3.55%	24,690	75.03%	8,218	24.97%
107	8,546	23.39%	26,870	73.54%	1,124	3.08%	28,191	77.62%	8,126	22.38%
108	22,310	64.29%	11,377	32.79%	1,013	2.92%	13,450	39.21%	20,851	60.79%
109	22,545	62.11%	12,803	35.27%	950	2.62%	14,882	41.40%	21,065	58.60%
110	23,200	68.91%	9,752	28.97%	715	2.12%	11,596	34.80%	21,723	65.20%
111	22,768	68.36%	9,875	29.65%	661	1.98%	11,856	36.00%	21,073	64.00%
112	23,864	71.32%	8,660	25.88%	937	2.80%	9,906	29.88%	23,248	70.12%
113	27,273	61.90%	15,470	35.11%	1,314	2.98%	16,730	38.29%	26,962	61.71%
114	10,534	22.22%	34,662	73.10%	2,218	4.68%	36,615	77.84%	10,425	22.16%
115	22,047	48.06%	22,007	47.98%	1,816	3.96%	23,858	52.43%	21,647	47.57%
116	21,972	52.39%	18,326	43.70%	1,641	3.91%	19,951	47.93%	21,673	52.07%
117	25,457	62.47%	14,037	34.45%	1,255	3.08%	15,539	38.46%	24,861	61.54%
118	23,864	60.56%	14,093	35.76%	1,451	3.68%	15,949	40.83%	23,111	59.17%
119	18,801	53.70%	14,824	42.34%	1,385	3.96%	16,595	47.85%	18,084	52.15%
120	28,296	69.92%	10,903	26.94%	1,271	3.14%	11,790	29.51%	28,166	70.49%
Totals:	**2,390,619**	**51.88%**	**2,084,975**	**45.25%**	**132,360**	**2.87%**	**2,294,855**	**50.20%**	**2,276,276**	**49.80%**

EX. 3

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: County - District

County	District	Total County Pop	Total District Pop	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Alamance	63	151,131	75,550	75,550	49.99%	100.00%
	64	151,131	75,581	75,581	50.01%	100.00%
Alexander	94	37,198	83,358	37,198	100.00%	44.62%
Alleghany	90	11,155	82,779	11,155	100.00%	13.48%
Anson	55	26,948	75,792	26,948	100.00%	35.56%
Ashe	93	27,281	78,360	27,281	100.00%	34.81%
Avery	85	17,797	78,372	17,797	100.00%	22.71%
Beaufort	79	47,759	75,538	47,759	100.00%	63.23%
Bertie	1	21,282	77,143	21,282	100.00%	27.59%
Bladen	22	35,190	83,434	35,190	100.00%	42.18%
Brunswick	17	107,431	77,263	77,263	71.92%	100.00%
	18	107,431	77,681	30,168	28.08%	38.84%
Buncombe	114	238,318	82,902	82,902	34.79%	100.00%
	115	238,318	79,883	79,883	33.52%	100.00%
	116	238,318	75,533	75,533	31.69%	100.00%
Burke	86	90,912	79,175	79,175	87.09%	100.00%
	112	90,912	79,547	11,737	12.91%	14.75%
Cabarrus	67	178,011	82,583	30,593	17.19%	37.05%
	82	178,011	81,088	81,088	45.55%	100.00%
	83	178,011	81,172	66,330	37.26%	81.72%
Caldwell	87	83,029	83,029	83,029	100.00%	100.00%
Camden	1	9,980	77,143	9,980	100.00%	12.94%
Carteret	13	66,469	76,622	66,469	100.00%	86.75%
Caswell	50	23,719	80,866	23,719	100.00%	29.33%
Catawba	89	154,358	77,838	77,838	50.43%	100.00%
	96	154,358	76,520	76,520	49.57%	100.00%
Chatham	54	63,505	82,312	63,505	100.00%	77.15%
Cherokee	120	27,444	80,814	27,444	100.00%	33.96%
Chowan	1	14,793	77,143	14,793	100.00%	19.18%
Clay	120	10,587	80,814	10,587	100.00%	13.10%
Cleveland	110	98,078	75,573	21,930	22.36%	29.02%
	111	98,078	76,148	76,148	77.64%	100.00%
Columbus	16	58,098	81,425	29,208	50.27%	35.87%
	46	58,098	80,440	28,890	49.73%	35.91%
Craven	3	103,505	75,726	75,726	73.16%	100.00%
	79	103,505	75,538	27,779	26.84%	36.77%
Cumberland	42	319,431	81,439	81,439	25.50%	100.00%
	43	319,431	77,725	77,725	24.33%	100.00%
	44	319,431	80,973	80,973	25.35%	100.00%
	45	319,431	79,294	79,294	24.82%	100.00%
Currituck	6	23,547	76,421	23,547	100.00%	30.81%
Dare	6	33,920	76,421	33,920	100.00%	44.39%
Davidson	80	162,878	81,522	81,522	50.05%	100.00%
	81	162,878	81,356	81,356	49.95%	100.00%
Davie	77	41,240	82,918	41,240	100.00%	49.74%
Duplin	4	58,505	81,905	58,505	100.00%	71.43%
Durham	29	267,587	82,735	82,735	30.92%	100.00%
	30	267,587	83,272	83,272	31.12%	100.00%

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: County - District

County	District	Total County Pop	Total District Pop	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Durham	31	267,587	82,773	82,773	30.93%	100.00%
	54	267,587	82,312	18,807	7.03%	22.85%
Edgecombe	23	56,552	81,057	56,552	100.00%	69.77%
Forsyth	71	350,670	75,793	75,793	21.61%	100.00%
	72	350,670	76,245	76,245	21.74%	100.00%
	73	350,670	78,189	39,783	11.34%	50.88%
	74	350,670	79,963	79,963	22.80%	100.00%
	75	350,670	78,886	78,886	22.50%	100.00%
Franklin	7	60,619	78,432	60,619	100.00%	77.29%
Gaston	108	206,086	76,926	76,926	37.33%	100.00%
	109	206,086	75,517	75,517	36.64%	100.00%
	110	206,086	75,573	53,643	26.03%	70.98%
Gates	5	12,197	77,527	12,197	100.00%	15.73%
Graham	120	8,861	80,814	8,861	100.00%	10.96%
Granville	2	59,916	82,634	43,170	72.05%	52.24%
	32	59,916	83,140	16,746	27.95%	20.14%
Greene	10	21,362	83,434	21,362	100.00%	25.60%
Guilford	57	488,406	82,755	82,755	16.94%	100.00%
	58	488,406	82,137	82,137	16.82%	100.00%
	59	488,406	79,907	79,907	16.36%	100.00%
	60	488,406	81,856	81,856	16.76%	100.00%
	61	488,406	81,019	81,019	16.59%	100.00%
	62	488,406	80,732	80,732	16.53%	100.00%
Halifax	27	54,691	76,790	54,691	100.00%	71.22%
Harnett	28	114,678	83,431	5,681	4.95%	6.81%
	51	114,678	83,434	25,568	22.30%	30.64%
	53	114,678	83,429	83,429	72.75%	100.00%
Haywood	118	59,036	76,322	37,740	63.93%	49.45%
	119	59,036	75,548	21,296	36.07%	28.19%
Henderson	113	106,740	81,089	27,489	25.75%	33.90%
	117	106,740	79,251	79,251	74.25%	100.00%
Hertford	5	24,669	77,527	24,669	100.00%	31.82%
Hoke	48	46,952	83,109	46,952	100.00%	56.49%
Hyde	6	5,810	76,421	5,810	100.00%	7.60%
Iredell	84	159,437	77,282	77,282	48.47%	100.00%
	95	159,437	82,155	82,155	51.53%	100.00%
Jackson	119	40,271	75,548	40,271	100.00%	53.31%
Johnston	10	168,878	83,434	7,696	4.56%	9.22%
	26	168,878	83,432	83,432	49.40%	100.00%
	28	168,878	83,431	77,750	46.04%	93.19%
Jones	13	10,153	76,622	10,153	100.00%	13.25%
Lee	51	57,866	83,434	57,866	100.00%	69.36%
Lenoir	12	59,495	75,923	59,495	100.00%	78.36%
Lincoln	97	78,265	78,265	78,265	100.00%	100.00%
Macon	120	33,922	80,814	33,922	100.00%	41.98%
Madison	118	20,764	76,322	20,764	100.00%	27.21%
Martin	23	24,505	81,057	24,505	100.00%	30.23%
McDowell	85	44,996	78,372	44,996	100.00%	57.41%
Mecklenburg	88	919,628	76,022	76,022	8.27%	100.00%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-25.asc', modified 08/28/2017 04:08:41 PM

Data Source: 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File - North Carolina

Printed 08/29/2017 {rptG01|dc2016GE|re1.4.0}

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: County - District

County	District	Total County Pop	Total District Pop	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Mecklenburg	92	919,628	77,172	77,172	8.39%	100.00%
	98	919,628	75,602	75,602	8.22%	100.00%
	99	919,628	77,141	77,141	8.39%	100.00%
	100	919,628	75,589	75,589	8.22%	100.00%
	101	919,628	79,876	79,876	8.69%	100.00%
	102	919,628	77,391	77,391	8.42%	100.00%
	103	919,628	76,381	76,381	8.31%	100.00%
	104	919,628	76,869	76,869	8.36%	100.00%
	105	919,628	75,967	75,967	8.26%	100.00%
	106	919,628	75,762	75,762	8.24%	100.00%
	107	919,628	75,856	75,856	8.25%	100.00%
Mitchell	85	15,579	78,372	15,579	100.00%	19.88%
Montgomery	66	27,798	83,032	27,798	100.00%	33.48%
Moore	52	88,247	76,894	76,894	87.13%	100.00%
	78	88,247	76,980	11,353	12.87%	14.75%
Nash	7	95,840	78,432	17,813	18.59%	22.71%
	25	95,840	78,027	78,027	81.41%	100.00%
New Hanover	18	202,667	77,681	47,513	23.44%	61.16%
	19	202,667	76,666	76,666	37.83%	100.00%
	20	202,667	78,488	78,488	38.73%	100.00%
Northampton	27	22,099	76,790	22,099	100.00%	28.78%
Onslow	4	177,772	81,905	23,400	13.16%	28.57%
	14	177,772	77,065	77,065	43.35%	100.00%
	15	177,772	77,307	77,307	43.49%	100.00%
Orange	50	133,801	80,866	57,147	42.71%	70.67%
	56	133,801	76,654	76,654	57.29%	100.00%
Pamlico	6	13,144	76,421	13,144	100.00%	17.20%
Pasquotank	5	40,661	77,527	40,661	100.00%	52.45%
Pender	16	52,217	81,425	52,217	100.00%	64.13%
Perquimans	1	13,453	77,143	13,453	100.00%	17.44%
Person	2	39,464	82,634	39,464	100.00%	47.76%
Pitt	8	168,148	75,926	75,926	45.15%	100.00%
	9	168,148	75,794	75,794	45.08%	100.00%
	12	168,148	75,923	16,428	9.77%	21.64%
Polk	113	20,510	81,089	20,510	100.00%	25.29%
Randolph	70	141,752	76,125	76,125	53.70%	100.00%
	78	141,752	76,980	65,627	46.30%	85.25%
Richmond	66	46,639	83,032	46,639	100.00%	56.17%
Robeson	46	134,168	80,440	51,550	38.42%	64.09%
	47	134,168	82,618	82,618	61.58%	100.00%
Rockingham	65	93,643	83,430	83,430	89.09%	100.00%
	91	93,643	82,843	10,213	10.91%	12.33%
Rowan	76	138,428	81,908	81,908	59.17%	100.00%
	77	138,428	82,918	41,678	30.11%	50.26%
	83	138,428	81,172	14,842	10.72%	18.28%
Rutherford	112	67,810	79,547	67,810	100.00%	85.25%
Sampson	21	63,431	83,434	15,187	23.94%	18.20%
	22	63,431	83,434	48,244	76.06%	57.82%
Scotland	48	36,157	83,109	36,157	100.00%	43.51%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-25.asc', modified 08/28/2017 04:08:41 PM

Data Source: 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File - North Carolina

Printed 08/29/2017 {rptG01|dc2016GE|re1.4.0}

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: County - District

County	District	Total County Pop	Total District Pop	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Stanly	66	60,585	83,032	8,595	14.19%	10.35%
	67	60,585	82,583	51,990	85.81%	62.95%
Stokes	91	47,401	82,843	47,401	100.00%	57.22%
Surry	90	73,673	82,779	48,444	65.76%	58.52%
	91	73,673	82,843	25,229	34.24%	30.45%
Swain	119	13,981	75,548	13,981	100.00%	18.51%
Transylvania	113	33,090	81,089	33,090	100.00%	40.81%
Tyrrell	1	4,407	77,143	4,407	100.00%	5.71%
Union	55	201,292	75,792	48,844	24.27%	64.44%
	68	201,292	76,067	76,067	37.79%	100.00%
	69	201,292	76,381	76,381	37.95%	100.00%
Vance	32	45,422	83,140	45,422	100.00%	54.63%
Wake	11	900,993	83,266	83,266	9.24%	100.00%
	33	900,993	82,644	82,644	9.17%	100.00%
	34	900,993	77,948	77,948	8.65%	100.00%
	35	900,993	82,728	82,728	9.18%	100.00%
	36	900,993	81,926	81,926	9.09%	100.00%
	37	900,993	81,952	81,952	9.10%	100.00%
	38	900,993	83,061	83,061	9.22%	100.00%
	39	900,993	83,055	83,055	9.22%	100.00%
	40	900,993	80,675	80,675	8.95%	100.00%
	41	900,993	80,739	80,739	8.96%	100.00%
	49	900,993	82,999	82,999	9.21%	100.00%
Warren	32	20,972	83,140	20,972	100.00%	25.22%
Washington	1	13,228	77,143	13,228	100.00%	17.15%
Watauga	93	51,079	78,360	51,079	100.00%	65.19%
Wayne	10	122,623	83,434	54,376	44.34%	65.17%
	21	122,623	83,434	68,247	55.66%	81.80%
Wilkes	90	69,340	82,779	23,180	33.43%	28.00%
	94	69,340	83,358	46,160	66.57%	55.38%
Wilson	24	81,234	81,234	81,234	100.00%	100.00%
Yadkin	73	38,406	78,189	38,406	100.00%	49.12%
Yancey	118	17,818	76,322	17,818	100.00%	23.35%
			Total:	**9,535,483**		

District plan definition file: 'HBK-25.asc', modified 08/28/2017 04:08:41 PM
Data Source: 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File - North Carolina
Printed 08/29/2017 {rptG01|dc2016GE|re1.4.0}

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Aberdeen	52	6,350	76,894	6,350	100.00%	8.26%
Ahoskie	5	5,039	77,527	5,039	100.00%	6.50%
Alamance	64	951	75,581	951	100.00%	1.26%
Albemarle	66	15,903	83,032	2,814	17.69%	3.39%
	67	15,903	82,583	13,089	82.31%	15.85%
Alliance	6	776	76,421	776	100.00%	1.02%
Andrews	120	1,781	80,814	1,781	100.00%	2.20%
Angier (Harnett)	28	4,247	83,431	4,242	99.88%	5.08%
	53	4,247	83,429	5	0.12%	0.01%
Angier (Wake)	37	103	81,952	103	100.00%	0.13%
Ansonville	55	631	75,792	631	100.00%	0.83%
Apex	11	37,476	83,266	2	0.01%	0.00%
	36	37,476	81,926	7,166	19.12%	8.75%
	37	37,476	81,952	9,982	26.64%	12.18%
	41	37,476	80,739	20,326	54.24%	25.17%
Arapahoe	6	556	76,421	556	100.00%	0.73%
Archdale (Guilford)	59	333	79,907	217	65.17%	0.27%
	60	333	81,856	116	34.83%	0.14%
Archdale (Randolph)	70	11,082	76,125	11,082	100.00%	14.56%
Archer Lodge	26	4,292	83,432	4,292	100.00%	5.14%
Asheboro	70	25,012	76,125	21,327	85.27%	28.02%
	78	25,012	76,980	3,685	14.73%	4.79%
Asheville	114	83,393	82,902	66,182	79.36%	79.83%
	115	83,393	79,883	5,409	6.49%	6.77%
	116	83,393	75,533	11,802	14.15%	15.62%
Askewville	1	241	77,143	241	100.00%	0.31%
Atkinson	16	299	81,425	299	100.00%	0.37%
Atlantic Beach	13	1,495	76,622	1,495	100.00%	1.95%
Aulander	1	895	77,143	895	100.00%	1.16%
Aurora	79	520	75,538	520	100.00%	0.69%
Autryville	22	196	83,434	196	100.00%	0.23%
Ayden	12	4,932	75,923	4,932	100.00%	6.50%
Badin	66	1,974	83,032	1,974	100.00%	2.38%
Bailey	7	569	78,432	569	100.00%	0.73%
Bakersville	85	464	78,372	464	100.00%	0.59%
Bald Head Island	17	158	77,263	158	100.00%	0.20%
Banner Elk	85	1,028	78,372	1,028	100.00%	1.31%
Bath	79	249	75,538	249	100.00%	0.33%
Bayboro	6	1,263	76,421	1,263	100.00%	1.65%
Bear Grass	23	73	81,057	73	100.00%	0.09%
Beaufort	13	4,039	76,622	4,039	100.00%	5.27%
Beech Mountain (Avery)	85	24	78,372	24	100.00%	0.03%
Beech Mountain (Watauga)	93	296	78,360	296	100.00%	0.38%
Belhaven	79	1,688	75,538	1,688	100.00%	2.23%
Belmont	108	10,076	76,926	4,622	45.87%	6.01%
	109	10,076	75,517	5,454	54.13%	7.22%
Belville	18	1,936	77,681	1,936	100.00%	2.49%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-25.asc', modified 08/28/2017 04:08:41 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/29/2017 {rptG03|dc2016GE|re1.4.0}

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Belwood	111	950	76,148	950	100.00%	1.25%
Benson (Harnett)	53	0	83,429	0	0.00%	0.00%
Benson (Johnston)	28	3,311	83,431	3,311	100.00%	3.97%
Bermuda Run	77	1,725	82,918	1,725	100.00%	2.08%
Bessemer City	110	5,340	75,573	5,340	100.00%	7.07%
Bethania	74	328	79,963	328	100.00%	0.41%
Bethel	8	1,577	75,926	1,577	100.00%	2.08%
Beulaville	4	1,296	81,905	1,296	100.00%	1.58%
Biltmore Forest	116	1,343	75,533	1,343	100.00%	1.78%
Biscoe	66	1,700	83,032	1,700	100.00%	2.05%
Black Creek	24	769	81,234	769	100.00%	0.95%
Black Mountain	115	7,848	79,883	7,848	100.00%	9.82%
Bladenboro	22	1,750	83,434	1,750	100.00%	2.10%
Blowing Rock (Caldwell)	87	49	83,029	49	100.00%	0.06%
Blowing Rock (Watauga)	93	1,192	78,360	1,192	100.00%	1.52%
Boardman	46	157	80,440	157	100.00%	0.20%
Bogue	13	684	76,622	684	100.00%	0.89%
Boiling Spring Lakes	17	5,372	77,263	5,370	99.96%	6.95%
	18	5,372	77,681	2	0.04%	0.00%
Boiling Springs	111	4,647	76,148	4,647	100.00%	6.10%
Bolivia	18	143	77,681	143	100.00%	0.18%
Bolton	16	691	81,425	691	100.00%	0.85%
Boone	93	17,122	78,360	17,122	100.00%	21.85%
Boonville	73	1,222	78,189	1,222	100.00%	1.56%
Bostic	112	386	79,547	386	100.00%	0.49%
Brevard	113	7,609	81,089	7,609	100.00%	9.38%
Bridgeton	79	454	75,538	454	100.00%	0.60%
Broadway (Harnett)	53	25	83,429	25	100.00%	0.03%
Broadway (Lee)	51	1,204	83,434	1,204	100.00%	1.44%
Brookford	89	382	77,838	321	84.03%	0.41%
	96	382	76,520	61	15.97%	0.08%
Brunswick	16	1,119	81,425	1,119	100.00%	1.37%
Bryson City	119	1,424	75,548	1,424	100.00%	1.88%
Bunn	7	344	78,432	344	100.00%	0.44%
Burgaw	16	3,872	81,425	3,872	100.00%	4.76%
Burlington (Alamance)	63	49,308	75,550	23,248	47.15%	30.77%
	64	49,308	75,581	26,060	52.85%	34.48%
Burlington (Guilford)	59	655	79,907	655	100.00%	0.82%
Burnsville	118	1,693	76,322	1,693	100.00%	2.22%
Butner	2	7,591	82,634	7,591	100.00%	9.19%
Cajah's Mountain	87	2,823	83,029	2,823	100.00%	3.40%
Calabash	17	1,786	77,263	1,786	100.00%	2.31%
Calypso	4	538	81,905	538	100.00%	0.66%
Cameron	52	285	76,894	285	100.00%	0.37%
Candor	66	840	83,032	840	100.00%	1.01%
Canton	118	4,227	76,322	4,227	100.00%	5.54%
Cape Carteret	13	1,917	76,622	1,917	100.00%	2.50%

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Carolina Beach	19	5,706	76,666	5,706	100.00%	7.44%
Carolina Shores	17	3,048	77,263	3,048	100.00%	3.94%
Carrboro	50	19,582	80,866	81	0.41%	0.10%
	56	19,582	76,654	19,501	99.59%	25.44%
Carthage	52	2,205	76,894	6	0.27%	0.01%
	78	2,205	76,980	2,199	99.73%	2.86%
Cary (Chatham)	54	1,422	82,312	1,422	100.00%	1.73%
Cary (Wake)	11	133,812	83,266	44,038	32.91%	52.89%
	36	133,812	81,926	19,380	14.48%	23.66%
	37	133,812	81,952	2,024	1.51%	2.47%
	41	133,812	80,739	46,234	34.55%	57.26%
	49	133,812	82,999	22,136	16.54%	26.67%
Casar	111	297	76,148	297	100.00%	0.39%
Castalia	25	268	78,027	268	100.00%	0.34%
Caswell Beach	17	398	77,263	398	100.00%	0.52%
Catawba	89	603	77,838	603	100.00%	0.77%
Cedar Point	13	1,279	76,622	1,279	100.00%	1.67%
Cedar Rock	87	300	83,029	300	100.00%	0.36%
Centerville	7	89	78,432	89	100.00%	0.11%
Cerro Gordo	46	207	80,440	207	100.00%	0.26%
Chadbourn	46	1,856	80,440	1,856	100.00%	2.31%
Chapel Hill (Durham)	29	2,836	82,735	2,234	78.77%	2.70%
	54	2,836	82,312	602	21.23%	0.73%
Chapel Hill (Orange)	50	54,397	80,866	2,280	4.19%	2.82%
	56	54,397	76,654	52,117	95.81%	67.99%
Charlotte	88	731,424	76,022	72,044	9.85%	94.77%
	92	731,424	77,172	57,603	7.88%	74.64%
	98	731,424	75,602	0	0.00%	0.00%
	99	731,424	77,141	67,000	9.16%	86.85%
	100	731,424	75,589	64,757	8.85%	85.67%
	101	731,424	79,876	71,339	9.75%	89.31%
	102	731,424	77,391	77,391	10.58%	100.00%
	103	731,424	76,381	30,850	4.22%	40.39%
	104	731,424	76,869	76,869	10.51%	100.00%
	105	731,424	75,967	75,967	10.39%	100.00%
	106	731,424	75,762	74,391	10.17%	98.19%
	107	731,424	75,856	63,213	8.64%	83.33%
Cherryville	110	5,760	75,573	5,760	100.00%	7.62%
Chimney Rock Village	112	113	79,547	113	100.00%	0.14%
China Grove	83	3,563	81,172	3,563	100.00%	4.39%
Chocowinity	79	820	75,538	820	100.00%	1.09%
Claremont	89	1,352	77,838	1,352	100.00%	1.74%
Clarkton	22	837	83,434	837	100.00%	1.00%
Clayton (Johnston)	26	16,116	83,432	16,116	100.00%	19.32%
Clayton (Wake)	39	0	83,055	0	0.00%	0.00%
Clemmons	73	18,627	78,189	6,625	35.57%	8.47%
	75	18,627	78,886	12,002	64.43%	15.21%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-25.asc', modified 08/28/2017 04:08:41 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/29/2017 {rptG03|dc2016GE|re1.4.0}

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Cleveland	77	871	82,918	871	100.00%	1.05%
Clinton	21	8,639	83,434	4,242	49.10%	5.08%
	22	8,639	83,434	4,397	50.90%	5.27%
Clyde	118	1,223	76,322	1,223	100.00%	1.60%
Coats	53	2,112	83,429	2,112	100.00%	2.53%
Cofield	5	413	77,527	413	100.00%	0.53%
Colerain	1	204	77,143	204	100.00%	0.26%
Columbia	1	891	77,143	891	100.00%	1.15%
Columbus	113	999	81,089	999	100.00%	1.23%
Como	5	91	77,527	91	100.00%	0.12%
Concord	67	79,066	82,583	0	0.00%	0.00%
	82	79,066	81,088	40,818	51.63%	50.34%
	83	79,066	81,172	38,248	48.37%	47.12%
Conetoe	23	294	81,057	294	100.00%	0.36%
Connelly Springs	86	1,669	79,175	1,669	100.00%	2.11%
Conover	89	8,165	77,838	384	4.70%	0.49%
	96	8,165	76,520	7,781	95.30%	10.17%
Conway	27	836	76,790	836	100.00%	1.09%
Cooleemee	77	960	82,918	960	100.00%	1.16%
Cornelius	98	24,866	75,602	24,866	100.00%	32.89%
Cove City	79	399	75,538	399	100.00%	0.53%
Cramerton	108	4,165	76,926	1	0.02%	0.00%
	109	4,165	75,517	4,164	99.98%	5.51%
Creedmoor	2	4,124	82,634	4,124	100.00%	4.99%
Creswell	1	276	77,143	276	100.00%	0.36%
Crossnore	85	192	78,372	192	100.00%	0.24%
Dallas	110	4,488	75,573	4,488	100.00%	5.94%
Danbury	91	189	82,843	189	100.00%	0.23%
Davidson (Iredell)	95	294	82,155	294	100.00%	0.36%
Davidson (Mecklenburg)	98	10,650	75,602	10,650	100.00%	14.09%
Dellview	110	13	75,573	13	100.00%	0.02%
Denton	80	1,636	81,522	1,636	100.00%	2.01%
Dillsboro	119	232	75,548	232	100.00%	0.31%
Dobbins Heights	66	866	83,032	866	100.00%	1.04%
Dobson	90	1,586	82,779	1,436	90.54%	1.73%
	91	1,586	82,843	150	9.46%	0.18%
Dortches	25	935	78,027	935	100.00%	1.20%
Dover	79	401	75,538	401	100.00%	0.53%
Drexel	86	1,858	79,175	1,858	100.00%	2.35%
Dublin	22	338	83,434	338	100.00%	0.41%
Duck	6	369	76,421	369	100.00%	0.48%
Dunn	53	9,263	83,429	9,263	100.00%	11.10%
Durham (Durham)	29	228,300	82,735	79,803	34.96%	96.46%
	30	228,300	83,272	60,805	26.63%	73.02%
	31	228,300	82,773	71,653	31.39%	86.57%
	54	228,300	82,312	16,039	7.03%	19.49%
Durham (Orange)	50	30	80,866	30	100.00%	0.04%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-25.asc', modified 08/28/2017 04:08:41 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/29/2017 {rptG03|dc2016GE|re1.4.0}

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Durham (Wake)	41	0	80,739	0	0.00%	0.00%
Earl	111	260	76,148	260	100.00%	0.34%
East Arcadia	22	487	83,434	487	100.00%	0.58%
East Bend	73	612	78,189	612	100.00%	0.78%
East Laurinburg	48	300	83,109	300	100.00%	0.36%
East Spencer	76	1,534	81,908	1,534	100.00%	1.87%
Eastover	45	3,628	79,294	3,628	100.00%	4.58%
Eden	65	15,527	83,430	15,527	100.00%	18.61%
Edenton	1	5,004	77,143	5,004	100.00%	6.49%
Elizabeth City (Camden)	1	45	77,143	45	100.00%	0.06%
Elizabeth City (Pasquotank)	5	18,638	77,527	18,638	100.00%	24.04%
Elizabethtown	22	3,583	83,434	3,583	100.00%	4.29%
Elk Park	85	452	78,372	452	100.00%	0.58%
Elkin (Surry)	90	3,921	82,779	3,921	100.00%	4.74%
Elkin (Wilkes)	94	80	83,358	80	100.00%	0.10%
Ellenboro	112	873	79,547	873	100.00%	1.10%
Ellerbe	66	1,054	83,032	1,054	100.00%	1.27%
Elm City	24	1,298	81,234	1,298	100.00%	1.60%
Elon	64	9,419	75,581	9,419	100.00%	12.46%
Emerald Isle	13	3,655	76,622	3,655	100.00%	4.77%
Enfield	27	2,532	76,790	2,532	100.00%	3.30%
Erwin	53	4,405	83,429	4,405	100.00%	5.28%
Eureka	10	197	83,434	197	100.00%	0.24%
Everetts	23	164	81,057	164	100.00%	0.20%
Fair Bluff	46	951	80,440	951	100.00%	1.18%
Fairmont	47	2,663	82,618	2,663	100.00%	3.22%
Fairview	55	3,324	75,792	3,324	100.00%	4.39%
Faison (Duplin)	4	961	81,905	961	100.00%	1.17%
Faison (Sampson)	21	0	83,434	0	0.00%	0.00%
Faith	76	807	81,908	807	100.00%	0.99%
Falcon (Cumberland)	45	258	79,294	258	100.00%	0.33%
Falcon (Sampson)	22	0	83,434	0	0.00%	0.00%
Falkland	8	96	75,926	96	100.00%	0.13%
Fallston	111	607	76,148	607	100.00%	0.80%
Farmville	8	4,654	75,926	4,654	100.00%	6.13%
Fayetteville	42	200,564	81,439	67,394	33.60%	82.75%
	43	200,564	77,725	74,393	37.09%	95.71%
	44	200,564	80,973	51,354	25.60%	63.42%
	45	200,564	79,294	7,423	3.70%	9.36%
Flat Rock	113	3,114	81,089	3,114	100.00%	3.84%
Fletcher	117	7,187	79,251	7,187	100.00%	9.07%
Forest City	112	7,476	79,547	7,476	100.00%	9.40%
Forest Hills	119	365	75,548	365	100.00%	0.48%
Fountain	8	427	75,926	427	100.00%	0.56%
Four Oaks	28	1,921	83,431	1,921	100.00%	2.30%
Foxfire	52	902	76,894	902	100.00%	1.17%
Franklin	120	3,845	80,814	3,845	100.00%	4.76%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-25.asc', modified 08/28/2017 04:08:41 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/29/2017 {rptG03|dc2016GE|re1.4.0}

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Franklinton	7	2,023	78,432	2,023	100.00%	2.58%
Franklinville	78	1,164	76,980	1,164	100.00%	1.51%
Fremont	10	1,255	83,434	1,255	100.00%	1.50%
Fuquay-Varina	36	17,937	81,926	228	1.27%	0.28%
	37	17,937	81,952	17,709	98.73%	21.61%
Gamewell	87	4,051	83,029	4,051	100.00%	4.88%
Garland	22	625	83,434	625	100.00%	0.75%
Garner	33	25,745	82,644	21,922	85.15%	26.53%
	36	25,745	81,926	3,823	14.85%	4.67%
Garysburg	27	1,057	76,790	1,057	100.00%	1.38%
Gaston	27	1,152	76,790	1,152	100.00%	1.50%
Gastonia	108	71,741	76,926	26,870	37.45%	34.93%
	109	71,741	75,517	41,847	58.33%	55.41%
	110	71,741	75,573	3,024	4.22%	4.00%
Gatesville	5	321	77,527	321	100.00%	0.41%
Gibson	48	540	83,109	540	100.00%	0.65%
Gibsonville (Alamance)	64	3,148	75,581	3,148	100.00%	4.17%
Gibsonville (Guilford)	59	3,262	79,907	3,262	100.00%	4.08%
Glen Alpine	86	1,517	79,175	1,517	100.00%	1.92%
Godwin	45	139	79,294	139	100.00%	0.18%
Goldsboro	10	36,437	83,434	2,531	6.95%	3.03%
	21	36,437	83,434	33,906	93.05%	40.64%
Goldston	54	268	82,312	268	100.00%	0.33%
Graham	63	14,153	75,550	14,153	100.00%	18.73%
Grandfather	85	25	78,372	25	100.00%	0.03%
Granite Falls	87	4,722	83,029	4,722	100.00%	5.69%
Granite Quarry	76	2,930	81,908	2,930	100.00%	3.58%
Grantsboro	6	688	76,421	688	100.00%	0.90%
Green Level	63	2,100	75,550	2,100	100.00%	2.78%
Greenevers	4	634	81,905	634	100.00%	0.77%
Greensboro	57	269,666	82,755	80,164	29.73%	96.87%
	58	269,666	82,137	76,171	28.25%	92.74%
	59	269,666	79,907	11,283	4.18%	14.12%
	60	269,666	81,856	14,170	5.25%	17.31%
	61	269,666	81,019	36,131	13.40%	44.60%
	62	269,666	80,732	51,747	19.19%	64.10%
Greenville	8	84,554	75,926	48,780	57.69%	64.25%
	9	84,554	75,794	34,649	40.98%	45.71%
	12	84,554	75,923	1,125	1.33%	1.48%
Grifton (Lenoir)	12	186	75,923	186	100.00%	0.24%
Grifton (Pitt)	12	2,431	75,923	2,431	100.00%	3.20%
Grimesland	9	441	75,794	441	100.00%	0.58%
Grover	111	708	76,148	708	100.00%	0.93%
Halifax	27	234	76,790	234	100.00%	0.30%
Hamilton	23	408	81,057	408	100.00%	0.50%
Hamlet	66	6,495	83,032	6,495	100.00%	7.82%
Harmony	84	531	77,282	531	100.00%	0.69%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-25.asc', modified 08/28/2017 04:08:41 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/29/2017 {rptG03|dc2016GE|re1.4.0}

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Harrells (Duplin)	4	23	81,905	23	100.00%	0.03%
Harrells (Sampson)	22	179	83,434	179	100.00%	0.21%
Harrellsville	5	106	77,527	106	100.00%	0.14%
Harrisburg	67	11,526	82,583	3,156	27.38%	3.82%
	82	11,526	81,088	8,335	72.31%	10.28%
	83	11,526	81,172	35	0.30%	0.04%
Hassell	23	84	81,057	84	100.00%	0.10%
Havelock	3	20,735	75,726	20,735	100.00%	27.38%
Haw River	63	2,298	75,550	2,254	98.09%	2.98%
	64	2,298	75,581	44	1.91%	0.06%
Hayesville	120	311	80,814	311	100.00%	0.38%
Hemby Bridge	69	1,520	76,381	1,520	100.00%	1.99%
Henderson	32	15,368	83,140	15,368	100.00%	18.48%
Hendersonville	113	13,137	81,089	514	3.91%	0.63%
	117	13,137	79,251	12,623	96.09%	15.93%
Hertford	1	2,143	77,143	2,143	100.00%	2.78%
Hickory (Burke)	86	66	79,175	66	100.00%	0.08%
Hickory (Caldwell)	87	18	83,029	18	100.00%	0.02%
Hickory (Catawba)	89	39,926	77,838	5,448	13.65%	7.00%
	96	39,926	76,520	34,478	86.35%	45.06%
High Point (Davidson)	80	5,310	81,522	5,310	100.00%	6.51%
High Point (Forsyth)	75	8	78,886	8	100.00%	0.01%
High Point (Guilford)	59	99,042	79,907	33	0.03%	0.04%
	60	99,042	81,856	59,653	60.23%	72.88%
	61	99,042	81,019	39,356	39.74%	48.58%
High Point (Randolph)	70	11	76,125	11	100.00%	0.01%
High Shoals	110	696	75,573	696	100.00%	0.92%
Highlands (Jackson)	119	4	75,548	4	100.00%	0.01%
Highlands (Macon)	120	920	80,814	920	100.00%	1.14%
Hildebran	86	2,023	79,175	2,023	100.00%	2.56%
Hillsborough	50	6,087	80,866	6,087	100.00%	7.53%
Hobgood	27	348	76,790	348	100.00%	0.45%
Hoffman	66	588	83,032	588	100.00%	0.71%
Holden Beach	17	575	77,263	575	100.00%	0.74%
Holly Ridge	15	1,268	77,307	1,268	100.00%	1.64%
Holly Springs	37	24,661	81,952	24,661	100.00%	30.09%
Hookerton	10	409	83,434	409	100.00%	0.49%
Hope Mills	44	15,176	80,973	5,976	39.38%	7.38%
	45	15,176	79,294	9,200	60.62%	11.60%
Hot Springs	118	560	76,322	560	100.00%	0.73%
Hudson	87	3,776	83,029	3,776	100.00%	4.55%
Huntersville	98	46,773	75,602	36,997	79.10%	48.94%
	107	46,773	75,856	9,776	20.90%	12.89%
Indian Beach	13	112	76,622	112	100.00%	0.15%
Indian Trail	55	33,518	75,792	51	0.15%	0.07%
	68	33,518	76,067	7,845	23.41%	10.31%
	69	33,518	76,381	25,622	76.44%	33.54%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-25.asc', modified 08/28/2017 04:08:41 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/29/2017 {rptG03|dc2016GE|re1.4.0}

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Jackson	27	513	76,790	513	100.00%	0.67%
Jacksonville	14	70,145	77,065	27,897	39.77%	36.20%
	15	70,145	77,307	42,248	60.23%	54.65%
Jamestown	58	3,382	82,137	0	0.00%	0.00%
	59	3,382	79,907	4	0.12%	0.01%
	60	3,382	81,856	3,378	99.88%	4.13%
Jamesville	23	491	81,057	491	100.00%	0.61%
Jefferson	93	1,611	78,360	1,611	100.00%	2.06%
Jonesville	73	2,285	78,189	2,285	100.00%	2.92%
Kannapolis (Cabarrus)	82	33,194	81,088	20,175	60.78%	24.88%
	83	33,194	81,172	13,019	39.22%	16.04%
Kannapolis (Rowan)	77	9,431	82,918	5,529	58.63%	6.67%
	83	9,431	81,172	3,902	41.37%	4.81%
Kelford	1	251	77,143	251	100.00%	0.33%
Kenansville	4	855	81,905	855	100.00%	1.04%
Kenly (Johnston)	28	1,176	83,431	1,176	100.00%	1.41%
Kenly (Wilson)	24	163	81,234	163	100.00%	0.20%
Kernersville (Forsyth)	74	23,071	79,963	5,280	22.89%	6.60%
	75	23,071	78,886	17,791	77.11%	22.55%
Kernersville (Guilford)	61	52	81,019	52	100.00%	0.06%
Kill Devil Hills	6	6,683	76,421	6,683	100.00%	8.74%
King (Forsyth)	74	619	79,963	619	100.00%	0.77%
King (Stokes)	91	6,285	82,843	6,285	100.00%	7.59%
Kings Mountain (Cleveland)	110	9,242	75,573	0	0.00%	0.00%
	111	9,242	76,148	9,242	100.00%	12.14%
Kings Mountain (Gaston)	110	1,054	75,573	1,054	100.00%	1.39%
Kingstown	111	681	76,148	681	100.00%	0.89%
Kinston	12	21,677	75,923	21,677	100.00%	28.55%
Kittrell	32	467	83,140	467	100.00%	0.56%
Kitty Hawk	6	3,272	76,421	3,272	100.00%	4.28%
Knightdale	39	11,401	83,055	11,401	100.00%	13.73%
Kure Beach	19	2,012	76,666	2,012	100.00%	2.62%
La Grange	12	2,873	75,923	2,873	100.00%	3.78%
Lake Lure	112	1,192	79,547	1,192	100.00%	1.50%
Lake Park	69	3,422	76,381	3,422	100.00%	4.48%
Lake Santeetlah	120	45	80,814	45	100.00%	0.06%
Lake Waccamaw	16	1,480	81,425	1,480	100.00%	1.82%
Landis	77	3,109	82,918	1,773	57.03%	2.14%
	83	3,109	81,172	1,336	42.97%	1.65%
Lansing	93	158	78,360	158	100.00%	0.20%
Lasker	27	122	76,790	122	100.00%	0.16%
Lattimore	111	488	76,148	488	100.00%	0.64%
Laurel Park	113	2,180	81,089	2	0.09%	0.00%
	117	2,180	79,251	2,178	99.91%	2.75%
Laurinburg	48	15,962	83,109	15,962	100.00%	19.21%
Lawndale	111	606	76,148	606	100.00%	0.80%
Leggett	23	60	81,057	60	100.00%	0.07%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-25.asc', modified 08/28/2017 04:08:41 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/29/2017 {rptG03|dc2016GE|re1.4.0}

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Leland	17	13,527	77,263	2,631	19.45%	3.41%
	18	13,527	77,681	10,896	80.55%	14.03%
Lenoir	87	18,228	83,029	18,228	100.00%	21.95%
Lewiston Woodville	1	549	77,143	549	100.00%	0.71%
Lewisville	73	12,639	78,189	10,883	86.11%	13.92%
	74	12,639	79,963	1,756	13.89%	2.20%
Lexington	80	18,931	81,522	0	0.00%	0.00%
	81	18,931	81,356	18,931	100.00%	23.27%
Liberty	78	2,656	76,980	2,656	100.00%	3.45%
Lilesville	55	536	75,792	536	100.00%	0.71%
Lillington	53	3,194	83,429	3,194	100.00%	3.83%
Lincolnton	97	10,486	78,265	10,486	100.00%	13.40%
Linden	45	130	79,294	130	100.00%	0.16%
Littleton	27	674	76,790	674	100.00%	0.88%
Locust (Cabarrus)	67	215	82,583	215	100.00%	0.26%
Locust (Stanly)	67	2,715	82,583	2,715	100.00%	3.29%
Long View (Burke)	86	752	79,175	752	100.00%	0.95%
Long View (Catawba)	96	4,119	76,520	4,119	100.00%	5.38%
Louisburg	7	3,359	78,432	3,359	100.00%	4.28%
Love Valley	84	90	77,282	90	100.00%	0.12%
Lowell	108	3,526	76,926	3,526	100.00%	4.58%
Lucama	24	1,108	81,234	1,108	100.00%	1.36%
Lumber Bridge	46	94	80,440	94	100.00%	0.12%
Lumberton	46	21,542	80,440	5,785	26.85%	7.19%
	47	21,542	82,618	15,757	73.15%	19.07%
Macclesfield	23	471	81,057	471	100.00%	0.58%
Macon	32	119	83,140	119	100.00%	0.14%
Madison	91	2,246	82,843	2,246	100.00%	2.71%
Maggie Valley	118	1,150	76,322	1,039	90.35%	1.36%
	119	1,150	75,548	111	9.65%	0.15%
Magnolia	4	939	81,905	939	100.00%	1.15%
Maiden (Catawba)	89	3,308	77,838	3,308	100.00%	4.25%
Maiden (Lincoln)	97	2	78,265	2	100.00%	0.00%
Manteo	6	1,434	76,421	1,434	100.00%	1.88%
Marietta	46	175	80,440	175	100.00%	0.22%
Marion	85	7,838	78,372	7,838	100.00%	10.00%
Mars Hill	118	1,869	76,322	1,869	100.00%	2.45%
Marshall	118	872	76,322	872	100.00%	1.14%
Marshville	55	2,402	75,792	2,402	100.00%	3.17%
Marvin	68	5,579	76,067	5,579	100.00%	7.33%
Matthews	103	27,198	76,381	27,198	100.00%	35.61%
Maxton (Robeson)	47	2,230	82,618	2,230	100.00%	2.70%
Maxton (Scotland)	48	196	83,109	196	100.00%	0.24%
Mayodan	91	2,478	82,843	2,478	100.00%	2.99%
Maysville	13	1,019	76,622	1,019	100.00%	1.33%
McAdenville	108	651	76,926	651	100.00%	0.85%
McDonald	47	113	82,618	113	100.00%	0.14%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-25.asc', modified 08/28/2017 04:08:41 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/29/2017 {rptG03|dc2016GE|re1.4.0}

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
McFarlan	55	117	75,792	117	100.00%	0.15%
Mebane (Alamance)	63	9,600	75,550	9,600	100.00%	12.71%
Mebane (Orange)	50	1,793	80,866	1,793	100.00%	2.22%
Mesic	6	220	76,421	220	100.00%	0.29%
Micro	28	441	83,431	441	100.00%	0.53%
Middleburg	32	133	83,140	133	100.00%	0.16%
Middlesex	7	822	78,432	822	100.00%	1.05%
Midland (Cabarrus)	67	3,073	82,583	3,073	100.00%	3.72%
Midland (Mecklenburg)	103	0	76,381	0	0.00%	0.00%
Midway	80	4,679	81,522	3,504	74.89%	4.30%
	81	4,679	81,356	1,175	25.11%	1.44%
Mills River	113	6,802	81,089	300	4.41%	0.37%
	117	6,802	79,251	6,502	95.59%	8.20%
Milton	50	166	80,866	166	100.00%	0.21%
Mineral Springs	55	2,639	75,792	688	26.07%	0.91%
	68	2,639	76,067	1,951	73.93%	2.56%
Minnesott Beach	6	440	76,421	440	100.00%	0.58%
Mint Hill (Mecklenburg)	100	22,669	75,589	7,784	34.34%	10.30%
	103	22,669	76,381	14,885	65.66%	19.49%
Mint Hill (Union)	69	53	76,381	53	100.00%	0.07%
Misenheimer	67	728	82,583	728	100.00%	0.88%
Mocksville	77	5,051	82,918	5,051	100.00%	6.09%
Momeyer	25	224	78,027	224	100.00%	0.29%
Monroe	55	32,797	75,792	3,133	9.55%	4.13%
	68	32,797	76,067	13,278	40.49%	17.46%
	69	32,797	76,381	16,386	49.96%	21.45%
Montreat	115	723	79,883	723	100.00%	0.91%
Mooresboro	111	311	76,148	311	100.00%	0.41%
Mooresville	95	32,711	82,155	32,711	100.00%	39.82%
Morehead City	13	8,661	76,622	8,661	100.00%	11.30%
Morganton	86	16,918	79,175	16,918	100.00%	21.37%
Morrisville (Durham)	31	0	82,773	0	0.00%	0.00%
Morrisville (Wake)	41	18,576	80,739	11,226	60.43%	13.90%
	49	18,576	82,999	7,350	39.57%	8.86%
Morven	55	511	75,792	511	100.00%	0.67%
Mount Airy	90	10,388	82,779	10,388	100.00%	12.55%
Mount Gilead	66	1,181	83,032	1,181	100.00%	1.42%
Mount Holly	108	13,656	76,926	13,656	100.00%	17.75%
Mount Olive (Duplin)	4	51	81,905	51	100.00%	0.06%
Mount Olive (Wayne)	21	4,538	83,434	4,538	100.00%	5.44%
Mount Pleasant	67	1,652	82,583	1,652	100.00%	2.00%
Murfreesboro	5	2,835	77,527	2,835	100.00%	3.66%
Murphy	120	1,627	80,814	1,627	100.00%	2.01%
Nags Head	6	2,757	76,421	2,757	100.00%	3.61%
Nashville	25	5,352	78,027	5,352	100.00%	6.86%
Navassa	18	1,505	77,681	1,505	100.00%	1.94%
New Bern	3	29,524	75,726	27,063	91.66%	35.74%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-25.asc', modified 08/28/2017 04:08:41 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
New Bern	79	29,524	75,538	2,461	8.34%	3.26%
New London	67	600	82,583	600	100.00%	0.73%
Newland	85	698	78,372	698	100.00%	0.89%
Newport	13	4,150	76,622	4,150	100.00%	5.42%
Newton	89	12,968	77,838	12,968	100.00%	16.66%
	96	12,968	76,520	0	0.00%	0.00%
Newton Grove	22	569	83,434	569	100.00%	0.68%
Norlina	32	1,118	83,140	1,118	100.00%	1.34%
Norman	66	138	83,032	138	100.00%	0.17%
North Topsail Beach	15	743	77,307	743	100.00%	0.96%
North Wilkesboro	90	4,245	82,779	5	0.12%	0.01%
	94	4,245	83,358	4,240	99.88%	5.09%
Northwest	18	735	77,681	735	100.00%	0.95%
Norwood	67	2,379	82,583	2,379	100.00%	2.88%
Oak City	23	317	81,057	317	100.00%	0.39%
Oak Island	17	6,783	77,263	6,783	100.00%	8.78%
Oak Ridge	62	6,185	80,732	6,185	100.00%	7.66%
Oakboro	67	1,859	82,583	1,859	100.00%	2.25%
Ocean Isle Beach	17	550	77,263	550	100.00%	0.71%
Old Fort	85	908	78,372	908	100.00%	1.16%
Oriental	6	900	76,421	900	100.00%	1.18%
Orrum	46	91	80,440	91	100.00%	0.11%
Ossipee	64	543	75,581	543	100.00%	0.72%
Oxford	2	8,461	82,634	239	2.82%	0.29%
	32	8,461	83,140	8,222	97.18%	9.89%
Pantego	79	179	75,538	179	100.00%	0.24%
Parkton	46	436	80,440	436	100.00%	0.54%
Parmele	23	278	81,057	278	100.00%	0.34%
Patterson Springs	111	622	76,148	622	100.00%	0.82%
Peachland	55	437	75,792	437	100.00%	0.58%
Peletier	13	644	76,622	644	100.00%	0.84%
Pembroke	47	2,973	82,618	2,973	100.00%	3.60%
Pikeville	10	678	83,434	678	100.00%	0.81%
Pilot Mountain	91	1,477	82,843	1,477	100.00%	1.78%
Pine Knoll Shores	13	1,339	76,622	1,339	100.00%	1.75%
Pine Level	28	1,700	83,431	1,700	100.00%	2.04%
Pinebluff	52	1,337	76,894	1,337	100.00%	1.74%
Pinehurst	52	13,124	76,894	13,124	100.00%	17.07%
Pinetops	23	1,374	81,057	1,374	100.00%	1.70%
Pineville	92	7,479	77,172	7,479	100.00%	9.69%
	104	7,479	76,869	0	0.00%	0.00%
Pink Hill	12	552	75,923	552	100.00%	0.73%
Pittsboro	54	3,743	82,312	3,743	100.00%	4.55%
Pleasant Garden	59	4,489	79,907	4,489	100.00%	5.62%
Plymouth	1	3,878	77,143	3,878	100.00%	5.03%
Polkton	55	3,375	75,792	3,375	100.00%	4.45%
Polkville	111	545	76,148	545	100.00%	0.72%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-25.asc', modified 08/28/2017 04:08:41 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/29/2017 {rptG03|dc2016GE|re1.4.0}

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Pollocksville	13	311	76,622	311	100.00%	0.41%
Powellsville	1	276	77,143	276	100.00%	0.36%
Princeton	10	1,194	83,434	1,194	100.00%	1.43%
Princeville	23	2,082	81,057	2,082	100.00%	2.57%
Proctorville	46	117	80,440	117	100.00%	0.15%
Raeford	48	4,611	83,109	4,611	100.00%	5.55%
Raleigh (Durham)	31	1,067	82,773	1,067	100.00%	1.29%
Raleigh (Wake)	11	402,825	83,266	37,217	9.24%	44.70%
	33	402,825	82,644	54,577	13.55%	66.04%
	34	402,825	77,948	77,331	19.20%	99.21%
	35	402,825	82,728	27,414	6.81%	33.14%
	36	402,825	81,926	6	0.00%	0.01%
	38	402,825	83,061	81,167	20.15%	97.72%
	39	402,825	83,055	31,384	7.79%	37.79%
	40	402,825	80,675	42,647	10.59%	52.86%
	49	402,825	82,999	51,082	12.68%	61.55%
Ramseur	78	1,692	76,980	1,692	100.00%	2.20%
Randleman	70	4,113	76,125	4,113	100.00%	5.40%
Ranlo	108	3,434	76,926	3,434	100.00%	4.46%
	110	3,434	75,573	0	0.00%	0.00%
Raynham	47	72	82,618	72	100.00%	0.09%
Red Cross	67	742	82,583	742	100.00%	0.90%
Red Oak	25	3,430	78,027	3,430	100.00%	4.40%
Red Springs (Hoke)	48	0	83,109	0	0.00%	0.00%
Red Springs (Robeson)	47	3,428	82,618	3,428	100.00%	4.15%
Reidsville	65	14,520	83,430	14,520	100.00%	17.40%
Rennert	46	383	80,440	383	100.00%	0.48%
Rhodhiss (Burke)	86	700	79,175	700	100.00%	0.88%
Rhodhiss (Caldwell)	87	370	83,029	370	100.00%	0.45%
Rich Square	27	958	76,790	958	100.00%	1.25%
Richfield	67	613	82,583	613	100.00%	0.74%
Richlands	4	1,520	81,905	1,520	100.00%	1.86%
River Bend	3	3,119	75,726	3,119	100.00%	4.12%
Roanoke Rapids	27	15,754	76,790	15,754	100.00%	20.52%
Robbins	52	1,097	76,894	1,097	100.00%	1.43%
	78	1,097	76,980	0	0.00%	0.00%
Robbinsville	120	620	80,814	620	100.00%	0.77%
Robersonville	23	1,488	81,057	1,488	100.00%	1.84%
Rockingham	66	9,558	83,032	9,558	100.00%	11.51%
Rockwell	76	2,108	81,908	2,108	100.00%	2.57%
Rocky Mount (Edgecombe)	23	17,524	81,057	17,524	100.00%	21.62%
Rocky Mount (Nash)	25	39,953	78,027	39,953	100.00%	51.20%
Rolesville	35	3,786	82,728	3,786	100.00%	4.58%
Ronda	90	417	82,779	417	100.00%	0.50%
Roper	1	611	77,143	611	100.00%	0.79%
Rose Hill	4	1,626	81,905	1,626	100.00%	1.99%
Roseboro	22	1,191	83,434	1,191	100.00%	1.43%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-25.asc', modified 08/28/2017 04:08:41 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/29/2017 {rptG03|dc2016GE|re1.4.0}

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Rosman	113	576	81,089	576	100.00%	0.71%
Rowland	47	1,037	82,618	1,037	100.00%	1.26%
Roxboro	2	8,362	82,634	8,362	100.00%	10.12%
Roxobel	1	240	77,143	240	100.00%	0.31%
Rural Hall	74	2,937	79,963	2,937	100.00%	3.67%
Ruth	112	440	79,547	440	100.00%	0.55%
Rutherford College	86	1,341	79,175	1,341	100.00%	1.69%
Rutherfordton	112	4,213	79,547	4,213	100.00%	5.30%
Salemburg	22	435	83,434	435	100.00%	0.52%
Salisbury	76	33,662	81,908	31,445	93.41%	38.39%
	77	33,662	82,918	2,217	6.59%	2.67%
Saluda (Henderson)	113	12	81,089	12	100.00%	0.01%
Saluda (Polk)	113	701	81,089	701	100.00%	0.86%
Sandy Creek	18	260	77,681	260	100.00%	0.33%
Sandyfield	16	447	81,425	447	100.00%	0.55%
Sanford	51	28,094	83,434	28,094	100.00%	33.67%
Saratoga	24	408	81,234	408	100.00%	0.50%
Sawmills	87	5,240	83,029	5,240	100.00%	6.31%
Scotland Neck	27	2,059	76,790	2,059	100.00%	2.68%
Seaboard	27	632	76,790	632	100.00%	0.82%
Seagrove	78	228	76,980	228	100.00%	0.30%
Sedalia	59	623	79,907	623	100.00%	0.78%
Selma	28	6,073	83,431	6,073	100.00%	7.28%
Seven Devils (Avery)	85	28	78,372	28	100.00%	0.04%
Seven Devils (Watauga)	93	164	78,360	164	100.00%	0.21%
Seven Springs	10	110	83,434	110	100.00%	0.13%
Severn	27	276	76,790	276	100.00%	0.36%
Shallotte	17	3,675	77,263	3,675	100.00%	4.76%
Sharpsburg (Edgecombe)	23	209	81,057	209	100.00%	0.26%
Sharpsburg (Nash)	25	1,252	78,027	1,252	100.00%	1.60%
Sharpsburg (Wilson)	24	563	81,234	563	100.00%	0.69%
Shelby	110	20,323	75,573	11,240	55.31%	14.87%
	111	20,323	76,148	9,083	44.69%	11.93%
Siler City	54	7,887	82,312	7,887	100.00%	9.58%
Simpson	9	416	75,794	416	100.00%	0.55%
Sims	24	282	81,234	282	100.00%	0.35%
Smithfield	26	10,966	83,432	2,993	27.29%	3.59%
	28	10,966	83,431	7,973	72.71%	9.56%
Snow Hill	10	1,595	83,434	1,595	100.00%	1.91%
Southern Pines	52	12,334	76,894	12,334	100.00%	16.04%
Southern Shores	6	2,714	76,421	2,714	100.00%	3.55%
Southport	17	2,833	77,263	2,833	100.00%	3.67%
Sparta	90	1,770	82,779	1,770	100.00%	2.14%
Speed	23	80	81,057	80	100.00%	0.10%
Spencer	76	3,267	81,908	3,267	100.00%	3.99%
Spencer Mountain	108	37	76,926	37	100.00%	0.05%
Spindale	112	4,321	79,547	4,321	100.00%	5.43%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-25.asc', modified 08/28/2017 04:08:41 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Spring Hope	25	1,320	78,027	1,320	100.00%	1.69%
Spring Lake	42	11,964	81,439	11,964	100.00%	14.69%
Spruce Pine	85	2,175	78,372	2,175	100.00%	2.78%
St. Helena	16	389	81,425	389	100.00%	0.48%
St. James	17	3,165	77,263	3,165	100.00%	4.10%
St. Pauls	46	2,035	80,440	2,035	100.00%	2.53%
Staley	78	393	76,980	393	100.00%	0.51%
Stallings (Mecklenburg)	103	399	76,381	399	100.00%	0.52%
Stallings (Union)	68	13,432	76,067	0	0.00%	0.00%
	69	13,432	76,381	13,432	100.00%	17.59%
Stanfield	67	1,486	82,583	1,486	100.00%	1.80%
Stanley	108	3,556	76,926	3,550	99.83%	4.61%
	110	3,556	75,573	6	0.17%	0.01%
Stantonsburg	24	784	81,234	784	100.00%	0.97%
Star	66	876	83,032	876	100.00%	1.06%
Statesville	84	24,532	77,282	20,541	83.73%	26.58%
	95	24,532	82,155	3,991	16.27%	4.86%
Stedman	45	1,028	79,294	1,028	100.00%	1.30%
Stem	2	463	82,634	463	100.00%	0.56%
Stokesdale	62	5,047	80,732	5,047	100.00%	6.25%
Stoneville	65	1,056	83,430	1,056	100.00%	1.27%
Stonewall	6	281	76,421	281	100.00%	0.37%
Stovall	32	418	83,140	418	100.00%	0.50%
Sugar Mountain	85	198	78,372	198	100.00%	0.25%
Summerfield	62	10,232	80,732	10,232	100.00%	12.67%
Sunset Beach	17	3,572	77,263	3,572	100.00%	4.62%
Surf City (Onslow)	15	292	77,307	292	100.00%	0.38%
Surf City (Pender)	16	1,561	81,425	1,561	100.00%	1.92%
Swansboro	14	2,663	77,065	2,663	100.00%	3.46%
Swepsonville	63	1,154	75,550	1,154	100.00%	1.53%
Sylva	119	2,588	75,548	2,588	100.00%	3.43%
Tabor City	46	2,511	80,440	2,511	100.00%	3.12%
Tar Heel	22	117	83,434	117	100.00%	0.14%
Tarboro	23	11,415	81,057	11,415	100.00%	14.08%
Taylorsville	94	2,098	83,358	2,098	100.00%	2.52%
Taylortown	52	722	76,894	722	100.00%	0.94%
Teachey	4	376	81,905	376	100.00%	0.46%
Thomasville (Davidson)	80	26,493	81,522	25,474	96.15%	31.25%
	81	26,493	81,356	1,019	3.85%	1.25%
Thomasville (Randolph)	70	264	76,125	264	100.00%	0.35%
Tobaccoville (Forsyth)	74	2,441	79,963	2,441	100.00%	3.05%
Tobaccoville (Stokes)	91	0	82,843	0	0.00%	0.00%
Topsail Beach	16	368	81,425	368	100.00%	0.45%
Trent Woods	3	4,155	75,726	4,155	100.00%	5.49%
Trenton	13	287	76,622	287	100.00%	0.37%
Trinity	70	6,614	76,125	6,614	100.00%	8.69%
Troutman	84	2,383	77,282	2,169	91.02%	2.81%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-25.asc', modified 08/28/2017 04:08:41 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/29/2017 {rptG03|dc2016GE|re1.4.0}

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Troutman	95	2,383	82,155	214	8.98%	0.26%
Troy	66	3,189	83,032	3,189	100.00%	3.84%
Tryon	113	1,646	81,089	1,646	100.00%	2.03%
Turkey	21	292	83,434	292	100.00%	0.35%
Unionville	55	5,929	75,792	337	5.68%	0.44%
	69	5,929	76,381	5,592	94.32%	7.32%
Valdese	86	4,490	79,175	4,490	100.00%	5.67%
Vanceboro	79	1,005	75,538	1,005	100.00%	1.33%
Vandemere	6	254	76,421	254	100.00%	0.33%
Varnamtown	17	541	77,263	541	100.00%	0.70%
Vass	52	720	76,894	720	100.00%	0.94%
Waco	110	321	75,573	321	100.00%	0.42%
Wade	45	556	79,294	556	100.00%	0.70%
Wadesboro	55	5,813	75,792	5,813	100.00%	7.67%
Wagram	48	840	83,109	840	100.00%	1.01%
Wake Forest (Franklin)	7	899	78,432	899	100.00%	1.15%
Wake Forest (Wake)	35	29,218	82,728	29,218	100.00%	35.32%
Walkertown	72	4,675	76,245	1,018	21.78%	1.34%
	74	4,675	79,963	3,657	78.22%	4.57%
Wallace (Duplin)	4	3,880	81,905	3,880	100.00%	4.74%
Wallace (Pender)	16	0	81,425	0	0.00%	0.00%
Wallburg	80	3,047	81,522	3,047	100.00%	3.74%
Walnut Cove	91	1,425	82,843	1,425	100.00%	1.72%
Walnut Creek	10	835	83,434	835	100.00%	1.00%
Walstonburg	10	219	83,434	219	100.00%	0.26%
Warrenton	32	862	83,140	862	100.00%	1.04%
Warsaw	4	3,054	81,905	3,054	100.00%	3.73%
Washington	79	9,744	75,538	9,744	100.00%	12.90%
Washington Park	79	451	75,538	451	100.00%	0.60%
Watha	16	190	81,425	190	100.00%	0.23%
Waxhaw	55	9,859	75,792	1,604	16.27%	2.12%
	68	9,859	76,067	8,255	83.73%	10.85%
Waynesville	119	9,869	75,548	9,869	100.00%	13.06%
Weaverville	115	3,120	79,883	3,120	100.00%	3.91%
Webster	119	363	75,548	363	100.00%	0.48%
Weddington (Mecklenburg)	103	7	76,381	7	100.00%	0.01%
Weddington (Union)	68	9,452	76,067	8,933	94.51%	11.74%
	69	9,452	76,381	519	5.49%	0.68%
Weldon	27	1,655	76,790	1,655	100.00%	2.16%
Wendell	39	5,845	83,055	5,845	100.00%	7.04%
Wentworth	65	2,807	83,430	2,807	100.00%	3.36%
Wesley Chapel	68	7,463	76,067	6,877	92.15%	9.04%
	69	7,463	76,381	586	7.85%	0.77%
West Jefferson	93	1,299	78,360	1,299	100.00%	1.66%
Whispering Pines	52	2,928	76,894	2,928	100.00%	3.81%
Whitakers (Edgecombe)	23	402	81,057	402	100.00%	0.50%
Whitakers (Nash)	25	342	78,027	342	100.00%	0.44%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-25.asc', modified 08/28/2017 04:08:41 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/29/2017 {rptG03|dc2016GE|re1.4.0}

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
White Lake	22	802	83,434	802	100.00%	0.96%
Whiteville	16	5,394	81,425	5,394	100.00%	6.62%
Whitsett	59	590	79,907	590	100.00%	0.74%
Wilkesboro	90	3,413	82,779	3	0.09%	0.00%
	94	3,413	83,358	3,410	99.91%	4.09%
Williamston	23	5,511	81,057	5,511	100.00%	6.80%
Wilmington	18	106,476	77,681	41,563	39.04%	53.50%
	19	106,476	76,666	33,947	31.88%	44.28%
	20	106,476	78,488	30,966	29.08%	39.45%
Wilson	24	49,167	81,234	49,167	100.00%	60.53%
Wilson's Mills	26	2,277	83,432	0	0.00%	0.00%
	28	2,277	83,431	2,277	100.00%	2.73%
Windsor	1	3,630	77,143	3,630	100.00%	4.71%
Winfall	1	594	77,143	594	100.00%	0.77%
Wingate	55	3,491	75,792	349	10.00%	0.46%
	69	3,491	76,381	3,142	90.00%	4.11%
Winston-Salem	71	229,617	75,793	75,779	33.00%	99.98%
	72	229,617	76,245	73,464	31.99%	96.35%
	73	229,617	78,189	17,422	7.59%	22.28%
	74	229,617	79,963	30,077	13.10%	37.61%
	75	229,617	78,886	32,875	14.32%	41.67%
Winterville	8	9,269	75,926	0	0.00%	0.00%
	9	9,269	75,794	8,391	90.53%	11.07%
	12	9,269	75,923	878	9.47%	1.16%
Winton	5	769	77,527	769	100.00%	0.99%
Woodfin	114	6,123	82,902	2,563	41.86%	3.09%
	115	6,123	79,883	2,717	44.37%	3.40%
	116	6,123	75,533	843	13.77%	1.12%
Woodland	27	809	76,790	809	100.00%	1.05%
Wrightsville Beach	19	2,477	76,666	2,477	100.00%	3.23%
	20	2,477	78,488	0	0.00%	0.00%
Yadkinville	73	2,959	78,189	2,959	100.00%	3.78%
Yanceyville	50	2,039	80,866	2,039	100.00%	2.52%
Youngsville	7	1,157	78,432	1,157	100.00%	1.48%
Zebulon (Johnston)	26	0	83,432	0	0.00%	0.00%
Zebulon (Wake)	35	4,433	82,728	381	8.59%	0.46%
	39	4,433	83,055	4,052	91.41%	4.88%
			Total:	**5,250,071**		

District plan definition file: 'HBK-25.asc', modified 08/28/2017 04:08:41 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/29/2017 {rptG03|dc2016GE|re1.4.0}

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: Split VTD Detail

County	VTD	District	Total VTD Pop	VTD Pop in District	Percent of VTD Pop in District
Alamance	03C	63	2,814	2,491	88.52%
		64	2,814	323	11.48%
	063	63	4,940	4,090	82.79%
		64	4,940	850	17.21%
	06W	63	1,973	1,617	81.96%
		64	1,973	356	18.04%
Brunswick	04	17	13,819	3,644	26.37%
		18	13,819	10,175	73.63%
Buncombe	05.1	114	2,748	1,691	61.54%
		115	2,748	1,057	38.46%
	100.1	114	9,126	8,524	93.40%
		115	9,126	602	6.60%
	102.1	114	5,975	1,385	23.18%
		116	5,975	4,590	76.82%
	104.1	114	3,081	2,345	76.11%
		115	3,081	736	23.89%
	19.1	114	2,159	1,843	85.36%
		116	2,159	316	14.64%
	24.1	114	3,211	1,964	61.16%
		116	3,211	1,247	38.84%
	52.1	115	5,279	3,762	71.26%
		116	5,279	1,517	28.74%
	57.1	114	3,534	315	8.91%
		115	3,534	1,149	32.51%
		116	3,534	2,070	58.57%
	60.2	114	1,300	164	12.62%
		115	1,300	1,136	87.38%
	64.1	114	2,671	820	30.70%
		115	2,671	1,851	69.30%
	70.1	114	3,508	2,418	68.93%
		115	3,508	1,090	31.07%
Craven	N4	3	6,831	5,069	74.21%
		79	6,831	1,762	25.79%
Cumberland	G2	43	34,282	29,272	85.39%
		45	34,282	5,010	14.61%
Durham	34	29	11,492	9,457	82.29%
		31	11,492	2,035	17.71%
Gaston	05	109	4,767	4,132	86.68%
		110	4,767	635	13.32%
Harnett	PR07	51	17,943	14,553	81.11%
		53	17,943	3,390	18.89%
	PR08	28	10,373	5,681	54.77%
		53	10,373	4,692	45.23%
Haywood	IH	118	3,815	3,256	85.35%
		119	3,815	559	14.65%
Johnston	PR04	10	1,929	413	21.41%
		28	1,929	1,516	78.59%
	PR26	26	4,445	297	6.68%
		28	4,445	4,148	93.32%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-25.asc', modified 08/28/2017 04:08:41 PM

VTDs ('Voting Districts') derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Printed 08/29/2017 {rptG05|dc2016GE|re1.4.0}

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: Split VTD Detail

County	VTD	District	Total VTD Pop	VTD Pop in District	Percent of VTD Pop in District
Mecklenburg	001	102	1,950	102	5.23%
		104	1,950	1,848	94.77%
	069	104	5,121	3,240	63.27%
		105	5,121	1,881	36.73%
	134	98	8,939	4,410	49.33%
		107	8,939	4,529	50.67%
Moore	RBN	52	2,923	2,593	88.71%
		78	2,923	330	11.29%
	WEM	52	2,982	1,806	60.56%
		78	2,982	1,176	39.44%
New Hanover	CF03	18	8,711	828	9.51%
		20	8,711	7,883	90.49%
	W24	18	7,784	3,543	45.52%
		20	7,784	4,241	54.48%
	WB	19	2,473	2,473	100.00%
		20	2,473	0	0.00%
Onslow	GB12	4	6,284	5,776	91.92%
		14	6,284	508	8.08%
	HM05	14	8,258	5,303	64.22%
		15	8,258	2,955	35.78%
Pitt	1403A	9	7,871	3,868	49.14%
		12	7,871	4,003	50.86%
	1507	8	6,628	5,623	84.84%
		9	6,628	1,005	15.16%
Rockingham	HU	65	6,052	5,815	96.08%
		91	6,052	237	3.92%
Sampson	ROWA	21	3,210	1,577	49.13%
		22	3,210	1,633	50.87%
Union	017A	68	4,593	1,595	34.73%
		69	4,593	2,998	65.27%
	019	55	5,806	1,105	19.03%
		68	5,806	4,701	80.97%
	029A	68	5,935	5,079	85.58%
		69	5,935	856	14.42%
	029C	68	2,942	1,576	53.57%
		69	2,942	1,366	46.43%
	032	55	4,095	1,820	44.44%
		69	4,095	2,275	55.56%
	040	68	4,926	1,122	22.78%
		69	4,926	3,804	77.22%
Wake	10-02	35	6,441	898	13.94%
		39	6,441	5,543	86.06%
	12-05	36	9,236	5,460	59.12%
		37	9,236	3,776	40.88%
	16-09	33	4,924	3,027	61.47%
		36	4,924	1,897	38.53%
	18-08	11	5,677	2,521	44.41%
		36	5,677	3,156	55.59%
Wayne	09	10	5,273	3,733	70.79%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-25.asc', modified 08/28/2017 04:08:41 PM

VTDs ('Voting Districts') derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Printed 08/29/2017 {rptG05|dc2016GE|re1.4.0}

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: Split VTD Detail

County	VTD	District	Total VTD Pop	VTD Pop in District	Percent of VTD Pop in District
Wayne	09	21	5,273	1,540	29.21%

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: Population Deviation

District	2010 Pop	Ideal Pop	Deviation	Deviation %
1	77,143	79,462	-2,319	-2.92%
2	82,634	79,462	3,172	3.99%
3	75,726	79,462	-3,736	-4.70%
4	81,905	79,462	2,443	3.07%
5	77,527	79,462	-1,935	-2.44%
6	76,421	79,462	-3,041	-3.83%
7	78,432	79,462	-1,030	-1.30%
8	75,926	79,462	-3,536	-4.45%
9	75,794	79,462	-3,668	-4.62%
10	83,434	79,462	3,972	5.00%
11	83,266	79,462	3,804	4.79%
12	75,923	79,462	-3,539	-4.45%
13	76,622	79,462	-2,840	-3.57%
14	77,065	79,462	-2,397	-3.02%
15	77,307	79,462	-2,155	-2.71%
16	81,425	79,462	1,963	2.47%
17	77,263	79,462	-2,199	-2.77%
18	77,681	79,462	-1,781	-2.24%
19	76,666	79,462	-2,796	-3.52%
20	78,488	79,462	-974	-1.23%
21	83,434	79,462	3,972	5.00%
22	83,434	79,462	3,972	5.00%
23	81,057	79,462	1,595	2.01%
24	81,234	79,462	1,772	2.23%
25	78,027	79,462	-1,435	-1.81%
26	83,432	79,462	3,970	5.00%
27	76,790	79,462	-2,672	-3.36%
28	83,431	79,462	3,969	4.99%
29	82,735	79,462	3,273	4.12%
30	83,272	79,462	3,810	4.79%
31	82,773	79,462	3,311	4.17%
32	83,140	79,462	3,678	4.63%
33	82,644	79,462	3,182	4.00%
34	77,948	79,462	-1,514	-1.91%
35	82,728	79,462	3,266	4.11%
36	81,926	79,462	2,464	3.10%
37	81,952	79,462	2,490	3.13%
38	83,061	79,462	3,599	4.53%
39	83,055	79,462	3,593	4.52%
40	80,675	79,462	1,213	1.53%
41	80,739	79,462	1,277	1.61%
42	81,439	79,462	1,977	2.49%
43	77,725	79,462	-1,737	-2.19%
44	80,973	79,462	1,511	1.90%
45	79,294	79,462	-168	-0.21%
46	80,440	79,462	978	1.23%
47	82,618	79,462	3,156	3.97%
48	83,109	79,462	3,647	4.59%
49	82,999	79,462	3,537	4.45%
50	80,866	79,462	1,404	1.77%
51	83,434	79,462	3,972	5.00%
52	76,894	79,462	-2,568	-3.23%
53	83,429	79,462	3,967	4.99%
54	82,312	79,462	2,850	3.59%
55	75,792	79,462	-3,670	-4.62%
56	76,654	79,462	-2,808	-3.53%
57	82,755	79,462	3,293	4.14%
58	82,137	79,462	2,675	3.37%
59	79,907	79,462	445	0.56%
60	81,856	79,462	2,394	3.01%
61	81,019	79,462	1,557	1.96%
62	80,732	79,462	1,270	1.60%
63	75,550	79,462	-3,912	-4.92%
64	75,581	79,462	-3,881	-4.88%
65	83,430	79,462	3,968	4.99%
66	83,032	79,462	3,570	4.49%
67	82,583	79,462	3,121	3.93%
68	76,067	79,462	-3,395	-4.27%
69	76,381	79,462	-3,081	-3.88%
70	76,125	79,462	-3,337	-4.20%
71	75,793	79,462	-3,669	-4.62%
72	76,245	79,462	-3,217	-4.05%
73	78,189	79,462	-1,273	-1.60%
74	79,963	79,462	501	0.63%
75	78,886	79,462	-576	-0.72%
76	81,908	79,462	2,446	3.08%
77	82,918	79,462	3,456	4.35%
78	76,980	79,462	-2,482	-3.12%
79	75,538	79,462	-3,924	-4.94%
80	81,522	79,462	2,060	2.59%
81	81,356	79,462	1,894	2.38%
82	81,088	79,462	1,626	2.05%

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: Population Deviation

District	2010 Pop	Ideal Pop	Deviation	Deviation %
83	81,172	79,462	1,710	2.15%
84	77,282	79,462	-2,180	-2.74%
85	78,372	79,462	-1,090	-1.37%
86	79,175	79,462	-287	-0.36%
87	83,029	79,462	3,567	4.49%
88	76,022	79,462	-3,440	-4.33%
89	77,838	79,462	-1,624	-2.04%
90	82,779	79,462	3,317	4.17%
91	82,843	79,462	3,381	4.25%
92	77,172	79,462	-2,290	-2.88%
93	78,360	79,462	-1,102	-1.39%
94	83,358	79,462	3,896	4.90%
95	82,155	79,462	2,693	3.39%
96	76,520	79,462	-2,942	-3.70%
97	78,265	79,462	-1,197	-1.51%
98	75,602	79,462	-3,860	-4.86%
99	77,141	79,462	-2,321	-2.92%
100	75,589	79,462	-3,873	-4.87%
101	79,876	79,462	414	0.52%
102	77,391	79,462	-2,071	-2.61%
103	76,381	79,462	-3,081	-3.88%
104	76,869	79,462	-2,593	-3.26%
105	75,967	79,462	-3,495	-4.40%
106	75,762	79,462	-3,700	-4.66%
107	75,856	79,462	-3,606	-4.54%
108	76,926	79,462	-2,536	-3.19%
109	75,517	79,462	-3,945	-4.96%
110	75,573	79,462	-3,889	-4.89%
111	76,148	79,462	-3,314	-4.17%
112	79,547	79,462	85	0.11%
113	81,089	79,462	1,627	2.05%
114	82,902	79,462	3,440	4.33%
115	79,883	79,462	421	0.53%
116	75,533	79,462	-3,929	-4.94%
117	79,251	79,462	-211	-0.27%
118	76,322	79,462	-3,140	-3.95%
119	75,548	79,462	-3,914	-4.93%
120	80,814	79,462	1,352	1.70%
Total:	**9,535,483**			

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: Total Population by Race and Ethnicity

		Total Population by Race															Total Population by Ethnicity					
District	Total	White	% White	Black	% Black	NA	% NA	A/PI	% A/PI	Other	% Other	MR	% MR	MR Black	% MR Black	Total Black	% Total Black	Hisp	% Hisp	Non Hisp	% Non Hisp	White Non Hisp	% White Non Hisp
1	77,143	43,036	55.79%	31,299	40.57%	254	0.33%	479	0.62%	1,094	1.42%	981	1.27%	548	0.71%	31,847	41.28%	1,941	2.52%	75,202	97.48%	42,492	55.08%
2	82,634	55,267	66.88%	22,323	27.01%	560	0.68%	372	0.45%	2,741	3.32%	1,371	1.66%	797	0.96%	23,120	27.98%	5,304	6.42%	77,330	93.58%	53,219	64.40%
3	75,726	52,955	69.93%	16,429	21.70%	366	0.48%	2,089	2.76%	1,650	2.18%	2,237	2.95%	1,103	1.46%	17,532	23.15%	4,825	6.37%	70,901	93.63%	50,501	66.69%
4	81,905	52,149	63.67%	17,615	21.51%	399	0.49%	450	0.55%	9,499	11.60%	1,793	2.19%	754	0.92%	18,369	22.43%	13,952	17.03%	67,953	82.97%	48,754	59.53%
5	77,527	39,613	51.10%	34,332	44.28%	480	0.62%	636	0.82%	1,045	1.35%	1,421	1.83%	882	1.14%	35,214	45.42%	2,459	3.17%	75,068	96.83%	38,532	49.70%
6	76,421	66,331	86.80%	6,663	8.72%	337	0.44%	462	0.60%	1,338	1.75%	1,290	1.69%	546	0.71%	7,209	9.43%	3,737	4.89%	72,684	95.11%	64,201	84.01%
7	78,432	52,317	66.70%	19,324	24.64%	433	0.55%	335	0.43%	4,603	5.87%	1,420	1.81%	707	0.90%	20,031	25.54%	7,739	9.87%	70,693	90.13%	49,951	63.69%
8	75,926	34,384	45.29%	36,008	47.43%	243	0.32%	1,244	1.64%	2,436	3.21%	1,611	2.12%	968	1.27%	36,976	48.70%	4,331	5.70%	71,595	94.30%	33,062	43.55%
9	75,794	54,466	71.86%	16,126	21.28%	254	0.34%	1,382	1.82%	2,115	2.79%	1,451	1.91%	781	1.03%	16,907	22.31%	3,822	5.04%	71,972	94.96%	53,086	70.04%
10	83,434	57,841	69.33%	17,575	21.06%	382	0.46%	733	0.88%	5,233	6.27%	1,670	2.00%	773	0.93%	18,348	21.99%	8,447	10.12%	74,987	89.88%	55,240	66.21%
11	83,266	57,348	68.87%	12,384	14.87%	551	0.66%	5,869	7.05%	4,733	5.68%	2,381	2.86%	1,005	1.21%	13,389	16.08%	9,925	11.92%	73,341	88.08%	53,238	63.94%
12	75,923	41,983	55.30%	29,244	38.52%	307	0.40%	394	0.52%	2,884	3.80%	1,111	1.46%	655	0.86%	29,899	39.38%	4,966	6.54%	70,957	93.46%	40,382	53.19%
13	76,622	65,741	85.80%	7,330	9.57%	373	0.49%	681	0.89%	1,002	1.31%	1,495	1.95%	677	0.88%	8,007	10.45%	2,639	3.44%	73,983	96.56%	64,318	83.94%
14	77,065	54,800	71.11%	13,211	17.14%	521	0.68%	2,108	2.74%	2,627	3.41%	3,798	4.93%	1,887	2.45%	15,098	19.59%	7,986	10.36%	69,079	89.64%	50,900	66.05%
15	77,307	58,090	75.14%	11,619	15.03%	585	0.76%	1,504	1.95%	2,409	3.12%	3,100	4.01%	1,474	1.91%	13,093	16.94%	8,017	10.37%	69,290	89.63%	53,863	69.67%
16	81,425	56,495	69.38%	18,680	22.94%	1,826	2.24%	355	0.44%	2,596	3.19%	1,473	1.81%	717	0.88%	19,397	23.82%	4,563	5.60%	76,862	94.40%	54,943	67.48%
17	77,263	66,925	86.62%	6,701	8.67%	471	0.61%	381	0.49%	1,612	2.09%	1,173	1.52%	477	0.62%	7,178	9.29%	3,456	4.47%	73,807	95.53%	65,432	84.69%
18	77,681	48,174	62.02%	23,982	30.87%	595	0.77%	645	0.83%	2,315	2.98%	1,970	2.54%	1,125	1.45%	25,107	32.32%	5,001	6.44%	72,680	93.56%	46,124	59.38%
19	76,666	66,806	87.14%	4,941	6.44%	382	0.50%	961	1.25%	2,114	2.76%	1,462	1.91%	566	0.74%	5,507	7.18%	4,279	5.58%	72,387	94.42%	65,009	84.80%
20	78,488	67,586	86.11%	6,574	8.38%	318	0.41%	1,170	1.49%	1,445	1.84%	1,395	1.78%	558	0.71%	7,132	9.09%	3,529	4.50%	74,959	95.50%	65,884	83.94%
21	83,434	37,752	45.25%	35,654	42.73%	671	0.80%	943	1.13%	6,478	7.76%	1,936	2.32%	1,018	1.22%	36,672	43.95%	10,356	12.41%	73,078	87.59%	34,864	41.79%
22	83,434	49,601	59.45%	23,316	27.95%	1,662	1.99%	316	0.38%	7,086	8.49%	1,453	1.74%	719	0.86%	24,035	28.81%	9,987	11.97%	73,447	88.03%	47,386	56.79%
23	81,057	34,942	43.11%	43,086	53.16%	242	0.30%	209	0.26%	1,760	2.17%	818	1.01%	523	0.65%	43,609	53.80%	2,873	3.54%	78,184	96.46%	34,150	42.13%
24	81,234	42,222	51.98%	31,686	39.01%	238	0.29%	693	0.85%	5,122	6.31%	1,273	1.57%	701	0.86%	32,387	39.87%	7,724	9.51%	73,510	90.49%	40,157	49.43%
25	78,027	41,217	52.82%	32,538	41.70%	553	0.71%	731	0.94%	1,740	2.23%	1,248	1.60%	820	1.05%	33,358	42.75%	3,052	3.91%	74,975	96.09%	40,297	51.64%
26	83,432	63,986	76.69%	12,131	14.54%	401	0.48%	679	0.81%	4,537	5.44%	1,698	2.04%	794	0.95%	12,925	15.49%	8,708	10.44%	74,724	89.56%	60,529	72.55%
27	76,790	30,558	39.79%	42,004	54.70%	2,172	2.83%	422	0.55%	762	0.99%	872	1.14%	576	0.75%	42,580	55.45%	1,457	1.90%	75,333	98.10%	30,165	39.28%
28	83,431	58,605	70.24%	13,809	16.55%	558	0.67%	396	0.47%	8,446	10.12%	1,617	1.94%	703	0.84%	14,512	17.39%	13,649	16.36%	69,782	83.64%	54,413	65.22%
29	82,735	37,009	44.73%	30,817	37.25%	408	0.49%	5,543	6.70%	6,751	8.16%	2,207	2.67%	1,079	1.30%	31,896	38.55%	12,052	14.57%	70,683	85.43%	32,825	39.67%
30	83,272	48,201	57.88%	24,800	29.78%	331	0.40%	2,798	3.36%	5,149	6.18%	1,993	2.39%	1,011	1.21%	25,811	31.00%	8,493	10.20%	74,779	89.80%	45,691	54.87%
31	82,773	27,086	32.72%	41,732	50.42%	514	0.62%	2,526	3.05%	8,791	10.62%	2,124	2.57%	1,252	1.51%	42,984	51.93%	14,465	17.48%	68,308	82.52%	22,765	27.50%
32	83,140	36,092	43.41%	41,590	50.02%	1,241	1.49%	371	0.45%	2,632	3.17%	1,214	1.46%	809	0.97%	42,399	51.00%	4,514	5.43%	78,626	94.57%	34,757	41.81%
33	82,644	34,154	41.33%	37,928	45.89%	487	0.59%	1,847	2.23%	6,195	7.50%	2,033	2.46%	1,199	1.45%	39,127	47.34%	11,480	13.89%	71,164	86.11%	30,248	36.60%
34	77,948	57,335	73.56%	12,566	16.12%	283	0.36%	1,951	2.50%	4,022	5.16%	1,791	2.30%	847	1.09%	13,413	17.21%	7,884	10.11%	70,064	89.89%	54,346	69.72%
35	82,728	63,703	77.00%	12,524	15.14%	300	0.36%	2,583	3.12%	1,737	2.10%	1,881	2.27%	869	1.05%	13,393	16.19%	4,928	5.96%	77,800	94.04%	61,015	73.75%
36	81,926	67,252	82.09%	7,354	8.98%	556	0.68%	2,373	2.90%	2,746	3.35%	1,645	2.01%	619	0.76%	7,973	9.73%	6,529	7.97%	75,397	92.03%	64,125	78.27%
37	81,952	63,571	77.57%	11,066	13.50%	446	0.54%	2,348	2.87%	2,527	3.08%	1,994	2.43%	874	1.07%	11,940	14.57%	6,741	8.23%	75,211	91.77%	60,053	73.28%
38	83,061	28,345	34.13%	40,174	48.37%	604	0.73%	3,159	3.80%	8,218	9.89%	2,561	3.08%	1,593	1.92%	41,767	50.28%	15,524	18.69%	67,537	81.31%	23,007	27.70%
39	83,055	41,263	49.68%	29,938	36.05%	542	0.65%	2,070	2.49%	6,577	7.92%	2,665	3.21%	1,460	1.76%	31,398	37.80%	12,259	14.76%	70,796	85.24%	37,214	44.81%
40	80,675	69,465	86.10%	5,956	7.38%	201	0.25%	2,659	3.30%	961	1.19%	1,433	1.78%	543	0.67%	6,499	8.06%	3,185	3.95%	77,490	96.05%	67,561	83.74%
41	80,739	54,778	67.85%	5,965	7.39%	193	0.24%	16,382	20.29%	1,250	1.55%	2,171	2.69%	692	0.86%	6,657	8.25%	4,108	5.09%	76,631	94.91%	52,218	64.68%
42	81,439	36,372	44.66%	33,080	40.62%	812	1.00%	2,648	3.25%	3,578	4.39%	4,949	6.08%	2,957	3.63%	36,037	44.25%	11,084	13.61%	70,355	86.39%	31,600	38.80%
43	77,725	30,362	39.06%	38,791	49.91%	613	0.79%	2,141	2.75%	2,283	2.94%	3,535	4.55%	2,208	2.84%	40,999	52.75%	6,916	8.90%	70,809	91.10%	27,411	35.27%
44	80,973	44,904	55.46%	26,165	32.31%	1,530	1.89%	2,254	2.78%	2,571	3.18%	3,549	4.38%	2,000	2.47%	28,165	34.78%	7,379	9.11%	73,594	90.89%	41,620	51.40%
45	79,294	52,426	66.12%	19,081	24.06%	2,185	2.76%	1,272	1.60%	1,511	1.91%	2,819	3.56%	1,338	1.69%	20,419	25.75%	4,811	6.07%	74,483	93.93%	50,118	63.21%
46	80,440	41,240	51.27%	20,157	25.06%	12,231	15.21%	281	0.35%	4,813	5.98%	1,718	2.14%	642	0.80%	20,799	25.86%	7,668	9.53%	72,772	90.47%	39,214	48.75%
47	82,618	16,633	20.13%	20,782	25.15%	39,581	47.91%	849	1.03%	2,755	3.33%	2,018	2.44%	869	1.05%	21,651	26.21%	4,557	5.52%	78,061	94.48%	15,639	18.93%
48	83,109	38,094	45.84%	29,659	35.69%	8,446	10.16%	885	1.06%	3,128	3.76%	2,897	3.49%	1,425	1.71%	31,084	37.40%	6,577	7.91%	76,532	92.09%	35,747	43.01%
49	82,999	60,332	72.69%	10,655	12.84%	340	0.41%	7,699	9.28%	1,962	2.36%	2,011	2.42%	867	1.04%	11,522	13.88%	5,359	6.46%	77,640	93.54%	57,511	69.29%
50	80,866	58,216	71.99%	16,296	20.15%	388	0.48%	1,626	2.01%	2,655	3.28%	1,685	2.08%	741	0.92%	17,037	21.07%	5,250	6.49%	75,616	93.51%	56,158	69.45%
51	83,434	55,735	66.80%	17,117	20.52%	651	0.78%	938	1.12%	6,324	7.58%	2,669	3.20%	1,299	1.56%	18,416	22.07%	13,301	15.94%	70,133	84.06%	50,146	60.10%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-25.asc', modified 08/28/2017 04:08:41 PM

Printed 08/29/2017 {rptS02|dc2016GE|re1.4.0}

Data Source: 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File. A = Asian, NA = American Indian and Alaskan Native, PI = Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander, MR = Multi-Race, Hisp = Hispanic or Latino (of any race)

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: Total Population by Race and Ethnicity

		Total Population by Race															Total Population by Ethnicity					
District	Total	White	% White	Black	% Black	NA	% NA	A/PI	% A/PI	Other	% Other	MR	% MR	MR Black	% MR Black	Total Black	% Total Black	Hisp	% Hisp	Non Hisp	% Non Hisp	White Non Hisp	% White Non Hisp
52	76,894	61,594	80.10%	10,399	13.52%	654	0.85%	746	0.97%	2,154	2.80%	1,347	1.75%	599	0.78%	10,998	14.30%	4,633	6.03%	72,261	93.97%	59,461	77.33%
53	83,429	57,593	69.03%	17,341	20.79%	1,094	1.31%	706	0.85%	4,502	5.40%	2,193	2.63%	1,085	1.30%	18,426	22.09%	8,459	10.14%	74,970	89.86%	54,569	65.41%
54	82,312	60,215	73.15%	12,620	15.33%	430	0.52%	2,310	2.81%	5,022	6.10%	1,715	2.08%	756	0.92%	13,376	16.25%	9,295	11.29%	73,017	88.71%	56,601	68.76%
55	75,792	53,470	70.55%	18,433	24.32%	337	0.44%	545	0.72%	1,923	2.54%	1,084	1.43%	549	0.72%	18,982	25.04%	3,724	4.91%	72,068	95.09%	51,969	68.57%
56	76,654	56,098	73.18%	7,652	9.98%	267	0.35%	7,502	9.79%	3,036	3.96%	2,099	2.74%	709	0.92%	8,361	10.91%	6,511	8.49%	70,143	91.51%	53,026	69.18%
57	82,755	23,484	28.38%	50,636	61.19%	487	0.59%	2,574	3.11%	3,436	4.15%	2,138	2.58%	1,493	1.80%	52,129	62.99%	6,278	7.59%	76,477	92.41%	21,651	26.16%
58	82,137	33,725	41.06%	35,085	42.72%	644	0.78%	4,700	5.72%	5,524	6.73%	2,459	2.99%	1,631	1.99%	36,716	44.70%	9,979	12.15%	72,158	87.85%	30,241	36.82%
59	79,907	56,422	70.61%	18,422	23.05%	457	0.57%	1,001	1.25%	2,121	2.65%	1,484	1.86%	834	1.04%	19,256	24.10%	4,102	5.13%	75,805	94.87%	54,807	68.59%
60	81,856	36,304	44.35%	33,863	41.37%	463	0.57%	5,052	6.17%	3,991	4.88%	2,183	2.67%	1,331	1.63%	35,194	43.00%	7,419	9.06%	74,437	90.94%	33,713	41.19%
61	81,019	64,810	79.99%	9,522	11.75%	295	0.36%	3,398	4.19%	1,509	1.86%	1,485	1.83%	665	0.82%	10,187	12.57%	3,952	4.88%	77,067	95.12%	62,732	77.43%
62	80,732	63,780	79.00%	11,371	14.08%	248	0.31%	2,686	3.33%	1,094	1.36%	1,553	1.92%	824	1.02%	12,195	15.11%	3,096	3.83%	77,636	96.17%	62,084	76.90%
63	75,550	52,887	70.00%	14,405	19.07%	636	0.84%	878	1.16%	5,109	6.76%	1,635	2.16%	878	1.16%	15,283	20.23%	9,081	12.02%	66,469	87.98%	49,886	66.03%
64	75,581	54,533	72.15%	13,964	18.48%	384	0.51%	1,017	1.35%	4,182	5.53%	1,501	1.99%	780	1.03%	14,744	19.51%	7,558	10.00%	68,023	90.00%	51,832	68.58%
65	83,430	62,485	74.90%	16,311	19.55%	302	0.36%	453	0.54%	2,394	2.87%	1,485	1.78%	815	0.98%	17,126	20.53%	4,731	5.67%	78,699	94.33%	60,543	72.57%
66	83,032	53,801	64.80%	21,088	25.40%	1,326	1.60%	1,052	1.27%	4,285	5.16%	1,480	1.78%	706	0.85%	21,794	26.25%	6,921	8.34%	76,111	91.66%	51,712	62.28%
67	82,583	71,233	86.26%	7,221	8.74%	286	0.35%	1,448	1.75%	1,424	1.72%	971	1.18%	456	0.55%	7,677	9.30%	2,765	3.35%	79,818	96.65%	70,124	84.91%
68	76,067	59,525	78.25%	8,635	11.35%	236	0.31%	1,858	2.44%	4,236	5.57%	1,577	2.07%	677	0.89%	9,312	12.24%	8,495	11.17%	67,572	88.83%	55,810	73.37%
69	76,381	58,666	76.81%	9,580	12.54%	407	0.53%	1,223	1.60%	4,958	6.49%	1,547	2.03%	665	0.87%	10,245	13.41%	9,560	12.52%	66,821	87.48%	54,663	71.57%
70	76,125	63,479	83.39%	4,827	6.34%	503	0.66%	1,140	1.50%	4,761	6.25%	1,415	1.86%	560	0.74%	5,387	7.08%	9,117	11.98%	67,008	88.02%	59,853	78.62%
71	75,793	35,803	47.24%	27,474	36.25%	359	0.47%	1,236	1.63%	8,785	11.59%	2,136	2.82%	1,284	1.69%	28,758	37.94%	13,643	18.00%	62,150	82.00%	32,386	42.73%
72	76,245	29,252	38.37%	36,563	47.95%	356	0.47%	1,091	1.43%	7,207	9.45%	1,776	2.33%	1,176	1.54%	37,739	49.50%	11,080	14.53%	65,165	85.47%	26,503	34.76%
73	78,189	65,541	83.82%	5,520	7.06%	194	0.25%	1,689	2.16%	3,983	5.09%	1,262	1.61%	576	0.74%	6,096	7.80%	6,629	8.48%	71,560	91.52%	63,356	81.03%
74	79,963	63,541	79.46%	11,004	13.76%	311	0.39%	899	1.12%	2,918	3.65%	1,290	1.61%	630	0.79%	11,634	14.55%	5,408	6.76%	74,555	93.24%	61,476	76.88%
75	78,886	58,387	74.01%	11,858	15.03%	316	0.40%	1,893	2.40%	4,834	6.13%	1,598	2.03%	742	0.94%	12,600	15.97%	8,764	11.11%	70,122	88.89%	55,235	70.02%
76	81,908	59,289	72.38%	16,804	20.52%	277	0.34%	967	1.18%	3,212	3.92%	1,359	1.66%	688	0.84%	17,492	21.36%	5,725	6.99%	76,183	93.01%	57,161	69.79%
77	82,918	70,153	84.61%	7,185	8.67%	276	0.33%	545	0.66%	3,433	4.14%	1,326	1.60%	649	0.78%	7,834	9.45%	5,997	7.23%	76,921	92.77%	68,033	82.05%
78	76,980	67,009	87.05%	4,789	6.22%	527	0.68%	396	0.51%	3,072	3.99%	1,187	1.54%	507	0.66%	5,296	6.88%	6,209	8.07%	70,771	91.93%	64,378	83.63%
79	75,538	52,037	68.89%	18,987	25.14%	346	0.46%	329	0.44%	2,697	3.57%	1,142	1.51%	631	0.84%	19,618	25.97%	4,613	6.11%	70,925	93.89%	50,629	67.02%
80	81,522	69,381	85.11%	7,009	8.60%	402	0.49%	689	0.85%	2,859	3.51%	1,182	1.45%	484	0.59%	7,493	9.19%	5,369	6.59%	76,153	93.41%	67,274	82.52%
81	81,356	67,978	83.56%	7,412	9.11%	392	0.48%	1,332	1.64%	3,012	3.70%	1,230	1.51%	551	0.68%	7,963	9.79%	5,039	6.19%	76,317	93.81%	66,212	81.39%
82	81,088	61,714	76.11%	11,740	14.48%	276	0.34%	2,532	3.12%	3,119	3.85%	1,707	2.11%	868	1.07%	12,608	15.55%	6,708	8.27%	74,380	91.73%	58,658	72.34%
83	81,172	57,839	71.25%	14,296	17.61%	325	0.40%	775	0.95%	6,052	7.46%	1,885	2.32%	1,057	1.30%	15,353	18.91%	10,624	13.09%	70,548	86.91%	54,202	66.77%
84	77,282	60,431	78.20%	10,990	14.22%	226	0.29%	1,091	1.41%	3,229	4.18%	1,315	1.70%	678	0.88%	11,668	15.10%	5,886	7.62%	71,396	92.38%	58,312	75.45%
85	78,372	71,962	91.82%	2,475	3.16%	329	0.42%	467	0.60%	2,274	2.90%	865	1.10%	264	0.34%	2,739	3.49%	3,820	4.87%	74,552	95.13%	70,667	90.17%
86	79,175	66,893	84.49%	4,814	6.08%	298	0.38%	3,099	3.91%	2,640	3.33%	1,431	1.81%	665	0.84%	5,479	6.92%	4,411	5.57%	74,764	94.43%	65,712	83.00%
87	83,029	74,925	90.24%	4,086	4.92%	257	0.31%	455	0.55%	2,048	2.47%	1,258	1.52%	637	0.77%	4,723	5.69%	3,796	4.57%	79,233	95.43%	73,565	88.60%
88	76,022	32,713	43.03%	30,244	39.78%	427	0.56%	3,576	4.70%	7,079	9.31%	1,983	2.61%	1,003	1.32%	31,247	41.10%	13,088	17.22%	62,934	82.78%	28,026	36.87%
89	77,838	64,718	83.14%	6,608	8.49%	237	0.30%	2,483	3.19%	2,543	3.27%	1,249	1.60%	604	0.78%	7,212	9.27%	5,436	6.98%	72,402	93.02%	62,229	79.95%
90	82,779	74,694	90.23%	2,727	3.29%	199	0.24%	413	0.50%	3,670	4.43%	1,076	1.30%	433	0.52%	3,160	3.82%	6,156	7.44%	76,623	92.56%	72,594	87.70%
91	82,843	74,957	90.48%	3,868	4.67%	295	0.36%	234	0.28%	2,431	2.93%	1,058	1.28%	445	0.54%	4,313	5.21%	4,349	5.25%	78,494	94.75%	73,314	88.50%
92	77,172	39,181	50.77%	23,400	30.32%	393	0.51%	4,258	5.52%	7,469	9.68%	2,471	3.20%	1,221	1.58%	24,621	31.90%	15,637	20.26%	61,535	79.74%	32,516	42.13%
93	78,360	74,322	94.85%	1,038	1.32%	194	0.25%	601	0.77%	1,210	1.54%	995	1.27%	283	0.36%	1,321	1.69%	3,024	3.86%	75,336	96.14%	72,688	92.76%
94	83,358	74,122	88.92%	4,427	5.31%	182	0.22%	632	0.76%	2,777	3.33%	1,218	1.46%	585	0.70%	5,012	6.01%	4,709	5.65%	78,649	94.35%	72,471	86.94%
95	82,155	68,215	83.03%	8,057	9.81%	321	0.39%	1,874	2.28%	2,119	2.58%	1,569	1.91%	715	0.87%	8,772	10.68%	4,958	6.03%	77,197	93.97%	65,795	80.09%
96	76,520	61,433	80.28%	6,433	8.41%	252	0.33%	2,922	3.82%	3,852	5.03%	1,628	2.13%	932	1.22%	7,365	9.62%	7,596	9.93%	68,924	90.07%	58,159	76.00%
97	78,265	69,940	89.36%	4,340	5.55%	250	0.32%	438	0.56%	2,078	2.66%	1,219	1.56%	493	0.63%	4,833	6.18%	5,238	6.69%	73,027	93.31%	67,139	85.78%
98	75,602	64,869	85.80%	5,626	7.44%	217	0.29%	2,068	2.74%	1,473	1.95%	1,349	1.78%	529	0.70%	6,155	8.14%	4,501	5.95%	71,101	94.05%	62,204	82.28%
99	77,141	25,224	32.70%	38,224	49.55%	446	0.58%	2,760	3.58%	7,848	10.17%	2,639	3.42%	1,602	2.08%	39,826	51.63%	13,947	18.08%	63,194	81.92%	20,750	26.90%
100	75,589	37,215	49.23%	24,869	32.90%	526	0.70%	2,391	3.16%	8,101	10.72%	2,487	3.29%	1,416	1.87%	26,285	34.77%	14,651	19.38%	60,938	80.62%	31,907	42.21%
101	79,876	28,966	36.26%	42,189	52.82%	424	0.53%	3,018	3.78%	3,143	3.93%	2,136	2.67%	1,354	1.70%	43,543	54.51%	6,400	8.01%	73,476	91.99%	26,741	33.48%
102	77,391	28,313	36.58%	35,171	45.45%	444	0.57%	3,003	3.88%	8,482	10.96%	1,978	2.56%	1,090	1.41%	36,261	46.85%	13,616	17.59%	63,775	82.41%	24,486	31.64%

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: Total Population by Race and Ethnicity

		Total Population by Race															Total Population by Ethnicity					
District	Total	White	% White	Black	% Black	NA	% NA	A/PI	% A/PI	Other	% Other	MR	% MR	MR Black	% MR Black	Total Black	% Total Black	Hisp	% Hisp	Non Hisp	% Non Hisp	White Non Hisp	% White Non Hisp
103	76,381	64,032	83.83%	5,771	7.56%	290	0.38%	3,484	4.56%	1,437	1.88%	1,367	1.79%	569	0.74%	6,340	8.30%	4,242	5.55%	72,139	94.45%	61,473	80.48%
104	76,869	67,511	87.83%	4,708	6.12%	149	0.19%	2,092	2.72%	1,229	1.60%	1,180	1.54%	503	0.65%	5,211	6.78%	3,311	4.31%	73,558	95.69%	65,683	85.45%
105	75,967	59,831	78.76%	6,157	8.10%	200	0.26%	6,575	8.66%	1,565	2.06%	1,639	2.16%	681	0.90%	6,838	9.00%	5,044	6.64%	70,923	93.36%	56,724	74.67%
106	75,762	32,644	43.09%	29,006	38.29%	379	0.50%	6,060	8.00%	5,464	7.21%	2,209	2.92%	1,220	1.61%	30,226	39.90%	9,825	12.97%	65,937	87.03%	29,267	38.63%
107	75,856	28,447	37.50%	37,439	49.36%	366	0.48%	3,735	4.92%	3,823	5.04%	2,046	2.70%	1,324	1.75%	38,763	51.10%	7,682	10.13%	68,174	89.87%	25,595	33.74%
108	76,926	59,716	77.63%	11,495	14.94%	343	0.45%	1,208	1.57%	2,751	3.58%	1,413	1.84%	690	0.90%	12,185	15.84%	5,072	6.59%	71,854	93.41%	57,763	75.09%
109	75,517	54,878	72.67%	15,145	20.06%	293	0.39%	1,096	1.45%	2,597	3.44%	1,508	2.00%	824	1.09%	15,969	21.15%	5,218	6.91%	70,299	93.09%	52,771	69.88%
110	75,573	60,428	79.96%	12,053	15.95%	276	0.37%	377	0.50%	1,270	1.68%	1,169	1.55%	590	0.78%	12,643	16.73%	2,615	3.46%	72,958	96.54%	59,312	78.48%
111	76,148	60,267	79.14%	13,070	17.16%	170	0.22%	640	0.84%	828	1.09%	1,173	1.54%	705	0.93%	13,775	18.09%	2,052	2.69%	74,096	97.31%	59,257	77.82%
112	79,547	68,044	85.54%	8,052	10.12%	198	0.25%	690	0.87%	1,168	1.47%	1,395	1.75%	759	0.95%	8,811	11.08%	2,620	3.29%	76,927	96.71%	66,814	83.99%
113	81,089	74,798	92.24%	2,584	3.19%	241	0.30%	390	0.48%	1,793	2.21%	1,283	1.58%	538	0.66%	3,122	3.85%	3,935	4.85%	77,154	95.15%	72,857	89.85%
114	82,902	65,627	79.16%	10,973	13.24%	335	0.40%	1,059	1.28%	2,690	3.24%	2,218	2.68%	1,144	1.38%	12,117	14.62%	5,927	7.15%	76,975	92.85%	62,851	75.81%
115	79,883	74,227	92.92%	1,960	2.45%	281	0.35%	651	0.81%	1,330	1.66%	1,434	1.80%	522	0.65%	2,482	3.11%	3,448	4.32%	76,435	95.68%	72,376	90.60%
116	75,533	68,338	90.47%	2,278	3.02%	332	0.44%	996	1.32%	2,246	2.97%	1,343	1.78%	568	0.75%	2,846	3.77%	4,879	6.46%	70,654	93.54%	66,014	87.40%
117	79,251	69,326	87.48%	2,850	3.60%	375	0.47%	1,032	1.30%	4,084	5.15%	1,584	2.00%	565	0.71%	3,415	4.31%	8,575	10.82%	70,676	89.18%	65,423	82.55%
118	76,322	73,197	95.91%	741	0.97%	289	0.38%	247	0.32%	980	1.28%	868	1.14%	213	0.28%	954	1.25%	2,397	3.14%	73,925	96.86%	71,971	94.30%
119	75,548	63,014	83.41%	1,089	1.44%	7,720	10.22%	535	0.71%	1,615	2.14%	1,575	2.08%	261	0.35%	1,350	1.79%	3,417	4.52%	72,131	95.48%	61,746	81.73%
120	80,814	75,746	93.73%	878	1.09%	1,126	1.39%	412	0.51%	1,292	1.60%	1,360	1.68%	300	0.37%	1,178	1.46%	3,370	4.17%	77,444	95.83%	73,962	91.52%
Totals:	**9,535,483**	**6,528,950**	**68.47%**	**2,048,628**	**21.48%**	**122,110**	**1.28%**	**215,566**	**2.26%**	**414,030**	**4.34%**	**206,199**	**2.16%**	**102,828**	**1.08%**	**2,151,456**	**22.56%**	**800,120**	**8.39%**	**8,735,363**	**91.61%**	**6,223,995**	**65.27%**

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: Voting Age Population by Race and Ethnicity

		Voting Age Population by Race																Voting Age Population by Ethnicity					
District	Total	White	% White	Black	% Black	NA	% NA	A/PI	% A/PI	Other	% Other	MR	% MR	MR Black	% MR Black	Total Black	% Total Black	Hisp	% Hisp	Non Hisp	% Non Hisp	White Non Hisp	% White Non Hisp
1	60,226	34,797	57.78%	23,705	39.36%	194	0.32%	365	0.61%	684	1.14%	481	0.80%	208	0.35%	23,913	39.71%	1,164	1.93%	59,062	98.07%	34,470	57.23%
2	64,057	43,435	67.81%	17,546	27.39%	427	0.67%	295	0.46%	1,747	2.73%	607	0.95%	254	0.40%	17,800	27.79%	3,380	5.28%	60,677	94.72%	42,123	65.76%
3	57,749	41,982	72.70%	11,870	20.55%	265	0.46%	1,505	2.61%	1,160	2.01%	967	1.67%	398	0.69%	12,268	21.24%	3,122	5.41%	54,627	94.59%	40,376	69.92%
4	60,243	39,866	66.18%	13,360	22.18%	294	0.49%	336	0.56%	5,616	9.32%	771	1.28%	248	0.41%	13,608	22.59%	8,064	13.39%	52,179	86.61%	37,938	62.97%
5	60,228	31,638	52.53%	26,329	43.72%	386	0.64%	485	0.81%	694	1.15%	696	1.16%	363	0.60%	26,692	44.32%	1,654	2.75%	58,574	97.25%	30,875	51.26%
6	60,608	53,038	87.51%	5,449	8.99%	284	0.47%	351	0.58%	876	1.45%	610	1.01%	127	0.21%	5,576	9.20%	2,436	4.02%	58,172	95.98%	51,639	85.20%
7	58,921	40,399	68.56%	14,575	24.74%	303	0.51%	258	0.44%	2,724	4.62%	662	1.12%	274	0.47%	14,849	25.20%	4,528	7.68%	54,393	92.32%	38,994	66.18%
8	58,873	29,279	49.73%	26,000	44.16%	199	0.34%	1,030	1.75%	1,543	2.62%	822	1.40%	404	0.69%	26,404	44.85%	2,731	4.64%	56,142	95.36%	28,405	48.25%
9	59,235	44,131	74.50%	11,804	19.93%	187	0.32%	1,047	1.77%	1,326	2.24%	740	1.25%	307	0.52%	12,111	20.45%	2,415	4.08%	56,820	95.92%	43,249	73.01%
10	62,414	44,608	71.47%	13,143	21.06%	285	0.46%	568	0.91%	3,100	4.97%	710	1.14%	237	0.38%	13,380	21.44%	4,965	7.95%	57,449	92.05%	43,054	68.98%
11	67,330	48,415	71.91%	9,132	13.56%	371	0.55%	4,909	7.29%	3,097	4.60%	1,406	2.09%	507	0.75%	9,639	14.32%	6,552	9.73%	60,778	90.27%	45,621	67.76%
12	57,405	33,395	58.17%	21,251	37.02%	232	0.40%	293	0.51%	1,767	3.08%	467	0.81%	220	0.38%	21,471	37.40%	2,975	5.18%	54,430	94.82%	32,443	56.52%
13	61,839	54,015	87.35%	5,619	9.09%	302	0.49%	529	0.86%	660	1.07%	714	1.15%	202	0.33%	5,821	9.41%	1,700	2.75%	60,139	97.25%	53,084	85.84%
14	56,588	41,730	73.74%	9,228	16.31%	400	0.71%	1,726	3.05%	1,890	3.34%	1,614	2.85%	611	1.08%	9,839	17.39%	5,094	9.00%	51,494	91.00%	39,197	69.27%
15	59,638	45,959	77.06%	8,610	14.44%	480	0.80%	1,269	2.13%	1,795	3.01%	1,525	2.56%	590	0.99%	9,200	15.43%	5,657	9.49%	53,981	90.51%	42,909	71.95%
16	62,717	44,650	71.19%	14,180	22.61%	1,314	2.10%	262	0.42%	1,578	2.52%	733	1.17%	282	0.45%	14,462	23.06%	2,767	4.41%	59,950	95.59%	43,674	69.64%
17	64,270	57,012	88.71%	4,985	7.76%	367	0.57%	310	0.48%	1,029	1.60%	567	0.88%	138	0.21%	5,123	7.97%	2,193	3.41%	62,077	96.59%	56,048	87.21%
18	61,478	40,411	65.73%	17,503	28.47%	461	0.75%	520	0.85%	1,533	2.49%	1,050	1.71%	471	0.77%	17,974	29.24%	3,290	5.35%	58,188	94.65%	39,040	63.50%
19	60,681	53,954	88.91%	3,618	5.96%	289	0.48%	712	1.17%	1,378	2.27%	730	1.20%	224	0.37%	3,842	6.33%	2,713	4.47%	57,968	95.53%	52,806	87.02%
20	63,095	55,283	87.62%	4,998	7.92%	238	0.38%	895	1.42%	971	1.54%	710	1.13%	200	0.32%	5,198	8.24%	2,363	3.75%	60,732	96.25%	54,131	85.79%
21	62,990	30,512	48.44%	26,231	41.64%	496	0.79%	768	1.22%	3,975	6.31%	1,008	1.60%	442	0.70%	26,673	42.34%	6,306	10.01%	56,684	89.99%	28,755	45.65%
22	63,053	39,163	62.11%	17,502	27.76%	1,228	1.95%	233	0.37%	4,303	6.82%	624	0.99%	249	0.39%	17,751	28.15%	5,905	9.37%	57,148	90.63%	37,870	60.06%
23	61,743	28,157	45.60%	31,756	51.43%	184	0.30%	153	0.25%	1,072	1.74%	421	0.68%	244	0.40%	32,000	51.83%	1,717	2.78%	60,026	97.22%	27,691	44.85%
24	61,182	33,784	55.22%	23,051	37.68%	170	0.28%	500	0.82%	3,078	5.03%	599	0.98%	267	0.44%	23,318	38.11%	4,652	7.60%	56,530	92.40%	32,523	53.16%
25	59,741	33,100	55.41%	23,998	40.17%	427	0.71%	545	0.91%	1,078	1.80%	593	0.99%	337	0.56%	24,335	40.73%	1,873	3.14%	57,868	96.86%	32,525	54.44%
26	58,967	46,305	78.53%	8,476	14.37%	275	0.47%	478	0.81%	2,737	4.64%	696	1.18%	244	0.41%	8,720	14.79%	5,115	8.67%	53,852	91.33%	44,316	75.15%
27	59,572	24,998	41.96%	31,725	53.25%	1,612	2.71%	309	0.52%	470	0.79%	458	0.77%	269	0.45%	31,994	53.71%	912	1.53%	58,660	98.47%	24,748	41.54%
28	61,419	44,981	73.24%	9,949	16.20%	390	0.63%	285	0.46%	5,106	8.31%	708	1.15%	196	0.32%	10,145	16.52%	8,082	13.16%	53,337	86.84%	42,553	69.28%
29	67,058	31,403	46.83%	24,512	36.55%	299	0.45%	4,928	7.35%	4,539	6.77%	1,377	2.05%	630	0.94%	25,142	37.49%	8,319	12.41%	58,739	87.59%	28,349	42.28%
30	64,089	39,510	61.65%	17,963	28.03%	221	0.34%	2,182	3.40%	3,172	4.95%	1,041	1.62%	458	0.71%	18,421	28.74%	5,281	8.24%	58,808	91.76%	37,873	59.09%
31	61,422	22,428	36.51%	29,823	48.55%	380	0.62%	2,079	3.38%	5,544	9.03%	1,168	1.90%	617	1.00%	30,440	49.56%	9,206	14.99%	52,216	85.01%	19,590	31.89%
32	63,471	29,296	46.16%	30,805	48.53%	912	1.44%	277	0.44%	1,555	2.45%	626	0.99%	375	0.59%	31,180	49.12%	2,622	4.13%	60,849	95.87%	28,545	44.97%
33	63,669	29,268	45.97%	27,538	43.25%	345	0.54%	1,608	2.53%	3,742	5.88%	1,168	1.83%	594	0.93%	28,132	44.18%	7,043	11.06%	56,626	88.94%	26,747	42.01%
34	62,394	47,432	76.02%	9,446	15.14%	217	0.35%	1,512	2.42%	2,715	4.35%	1,072	1.72%	430	0.69%	9,876	15.83%	5,394	8.65%	57,000	91.35%	45,313	72.62%
35	57,787	45,277	78.35%	8,700	15.06%	206	0.36%	1,783	3.09%	1,084	1.88%	737	1.28%	296	0.51%	8,996	15.57%	3,012	5.21%	54,775	94.79%	43,586	75.43%
36	59,799	50,030	83.66%	5,313	8.88%	370	0.62%	1,727	2.89%	1,644	2.75%	715	1.20%	218	0.36%	5,531	9.25%	3,815	6.38%	55,984	93.62%	48,207	80.62%
37	56,082	44,085	78.61%	7,746	13.81%	307	0.55%	1,638	2.92%	1,522	2.71%	784	1.40%	295	0.53%	8,041	14.34%	3,939	7.02%	52,143	92.98%	42,006	74.90%
38	60,242	22,586	37.49%	28,363	47.08%	386	0.64%	2,367	3.93%	5,251	8.72%	1,289	2.14%	731	1.21%	29,094	48.30%	9,786	16.24%	50,456	83.76%	19,170	31.82%
39	59,229	31,658	53.45%	20,432	34.50%	360	0.61%	1,531	2.58%	3,994	6.74%	1,254	2.12%	567	0.96%	20,999	35.45%	7,343	12.40%	51,886	87.60%	29,192	49.29%
40	60,028	52,112	86.81%	4,444	7.40%	141	0.23%	2,080	3.47%	612	1.02%	639	1.06%	203	0.34%	4,647	7.74%	2,038	3.40%	57,990	96.60%	50,867	84.74%
41	54,288	37,693	69.43%	4,115	7.58%	107	0.20%	10,730	19.76%	779	1.43%	864	1.59%	257	0.47%	4,372	8.05%	2,529	4.66%	51,759	95.34%	36,080	66.46%
42	57,374	26,984	47.03%	23,106	40.27%	594	1.04%	2,117	3.69%	2,402	4.19%	2,171	3.78%	1,122	1.96%	24,228	42.23%	6,805	11.86%	50,569	88.14%	23,910	41.67%
43	59,350	24,998	42.12%	28,657	48.28%	482	0.81%	1,808	3.05%	1,620	2.73%	1,785	3.01%	994	1.67%	29,651	49.96%	4,571	7.70%	54,779	92.30%	22,915	38.61%
44	59,789	35,338	59.10%	18,286	30.58%	1,165	1.95%	1,697	2.84%	1,735	2.90%	1,568	2.62%	715	1.20%	19,001	31.78%	4,619	7.73%	55,170	92.27%	33,209	55.54%
45	57,377	39,285	68.47%	13,450	23.44%	1,587	2.77%	959	1.67%	965	1.68%	1,131	1.97%	410	0.71%	13,860	24.16%	2,782	4.85%	54,595	95.15%	37,916	66.08%
46	59,587	32,459	54.47%	14,537	24.40%	8,629	14.48%	214	0.36%	2,960	4.97%	788	1.32%	186	0.31%	14,723	24.71%	4,606	7.73%	54,981	92.27%	31,254	52.45%
47	60,831	13,985	22.99%	15,406	25.33%	28,092	46.18%	664	1.09%	1,721	2.83%	963	1.58%	311	0.51%	15,717	25.84%	2,768	4.55%	58,063	95.45%	13,363	21.97%
48	59,851	29,168	48.73%	21,169	35.37%	5,671	9.48%	652	1.09%	1,944	3.25%	1,247	2.08%	454	0.76%	21,623	36.13%	3,844	6.42%	56,007	93.58%	27,765	46.39%
49	65,532	49,219	75.11%	7,967	12.16%	245	0.37%	5,629	8.59%	1,353	2.06%	1,119	1.71%	437	0.67%	8,404	12.82%	3,711	5.66%	61,821	94.34%	47,219	72.05%
50	62,232	45,590	73.26%	12,895	20.72%	276	0.44%	1,135	1.82%	1,568	2.52%	768	1.23%	267	0.43%	13,162	21.15%	3,087	4.96%	59,145	95.04%	44,356	71.28%
51	59,547	41,611	69.88%	11,836	19.88%	438	0.74%	697	1.17%	3,859	6.48%	1,106	1.86%	395	0.66%	12,231	20.54%	7,706	12.94%	51,841	87.06%	38,415	64.51%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-25.asc', modified 08/28/2017 04:08:41 PM

Printed 08/29/2017 {rptS03|dc2016GE|re1.4.0}

Data Source: 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File. A = Asian, NA = American Indian and Alaskan Native, PI = Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander, MR = Multi-Race, Hisp = Hispanic or Latino (of any race)

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: Voting Age Population by Race and Ethnicity

		Voting Age Population by Race															Voting Age Population by Ethnicity					
District	Total	White	% White	Black	% Black	NA	% NA	A/PI	% A/PI	Other	% Other	MR	% MR	MR Black	% MR Black	Total Black	% Total Black	Hisp	% Hisp	Non Hisp	% Non Hisp	White Non Hisp	% White Non Hisp
52	60,407	49,850	82.52%	7,619	12.61%	467	0.77%	581	0.96%	1,294	2.14%	596	0.99%	212	0.35%	7,831	12.96%	2,760	4.57%	57,647	95.43%	48,572	80.41%
53	62,151	44,700	71.92%	12,567	20.22%	739	1.19%	542	0.87%	2,657	4.28%	946	1.52%	354	0.57%	12,921	20.79%	4,956	7.97%	57,195	92.03%	42,861	68.96%
54	64,361	48,532	75.41%	9,855	15.31%	301	0.47%	1,811	2.81%	3,068	4.77%	794	1.23%	275	0.43%	10,130	15.74%	5,657	8.79%	58,704	91.21%	46,311	71.96%
55	57,260	41,389	72.28%	13,632	23.81%	265	0.46%	382	0.67%	1,130	1.97%	462	0.81%	178	0.31%	13,810	24.12%	2,231	3.90%	55,029	96.10%	40,450	70.64%
56	62,430	47,132	75.50%	6,044	9.68%	225	0.36%	5,709	9.14%	2,128	3.41%	1,192	1.91%	387	0.62%	6,431	10.30%	4,601	7.37%	57,829	92.63%	44,917	71.95%
57	64,200	20,466	31.88%	38,168	59.45%	363	0.57%	1,771	2.76%	2,162	3.37%	1,270	1.98%	836	1.30%	39,004	60.75%	3,955	6.16%	60,245	93.84%	19,268	30.01%
58	62,753	28,089	44.76%	26,061	41.53%	466	0.74%	3,450	5.50%	3,468	5.53%	1,219	1.94%	710	1.13%	26,771	42.66%	6,296	10.03%	56,457	89.97%	25,832	41.16%
59	61,233	44,991	73.48%	13,294	21.71%	333	0.54%	721	1.18%	1,203	1.96%	691	1.13%	313	0.51%	13,607	22.22%	2,353	3.84%	58,880	96.16%	44,046	71.93%
60	61,808	30,160	48.80%	24,215	39.18%	347	0.56%	3,552	5.75%	2,490	4.03%	1,044	1.69%	544	0.88%	24,759	40.06%	4,615	7.47%	57,193	92.53%	28,511	46.13%
61	63,506	52,201	82.20%	7,003	11.03%	220	0.35%	2,372	3.74%	992	1.56%	718	1.13%	279	0.44%	7,282	11.47%	2,547	4.01%	60,959	95.99%	50,848	80.07%
62	60,423	48,947	81.01%	8,107	13.42%	160	0.26%	1,832	3.03%	686	1.14%	691	1.14%	323	0.53%	8,430	13.95%	1,908	3.16%	58,515	96.84%	47,877	79.24%
63	57,278	41,803	72.98%	10,714	18.71%	412	0.72%	649	1.13%	3,004	5.24%	696	1.22%	273	0.48%	10,987	19.18%	5,215	9.10%	52,063	90.90%	40,080	69.97%
64	58,410	43,637	74.71%	10,535	18.04%	281	0.48%	753	1.29%	2,483	4.25%	721	1.23%	283	0.48%	10,818	18.52%	4,477	7.66%	53,933	92.34%	42,008	71.92%
65	64,719	49,574	76.60%	12,469	19.27%	227	0.35%	323	0.50%	1,493	2.31%	633	0.98%	235	0.36%	12,704	19.63%	2,775	4.29%	61,944	95.71%	48,492	74.93%
66	63,266	42,955	67.90%	15,501	24.50%	931	1.47%	765	1.21%	2,456	3.88%	658	1.04%	229	0.36%	15,730	24.86%	3,917	6.19%	59,349	93.81%	41,762	66.01%
67	62,630	55,139	88.04%	5,170	8.25%	221	0.35%	904	1.44%	804	1.28%	392	0.63%	102	0.16%	5,272	8.42%	1,574	2.51%	61,056	97.49%	54,502	87.02%
68	49,871	39,713	79.63%	5,613	11.26%	170	0.34%	1,205	2.42%	2,531	5.08%	639	1.28%	222	0.45%	5,835	11.70%	5,048	10.12%	44,823	89.88%	37,481	75.16%
69	54,263	42,697	78.69%	6,709	12.36%	280	0.52%	905	1.67%	2,990	5.51%	682	1.26%	205	0.38%	6,914	12.74%	5,719	10.54%	48,544	89.46%	40,303	74.27%
70	57,325	49,199	85.82%	3,465	6.04%	373	0.65%	804	1.40%	2,911	5.08%	573	1.00%	148	0.26%	3,613	6.30%	5,365	9.36%	51,960	90.64%	47,083	82.13%
71	57,481	29,844	51.92%	20,468	35.61%	249	0.43%	956	1.66%	4,926	8.57%	1,038	1.81%	549	0.96%	21,017	36.56%	7,877	13.70%	49,604	86.30%	27,709	48.21%
72	58,071	24,730	42.59%	27,020	46.53%	238	0.41%	899	1.55%	4,223	7.27%	961	1.65%	569	0.98%	27,589	47.51%	6,505	11.20%	51,566	88.80%	23,053	39.70%
73	59,318	51,131	86.20%	4,091	6.90%	138	0.23%	1,120	1.89%	2,290	3.86%	548	0.92%	182	0.31%	4,273	7.20%	3,829	6.46%	55,489	93.54%	49,810	83.97%
74	60,453	49,491	81.87%	7,888	13.05%	233	0.39%	625	1.03%	1,631	2.70%	585	0.97%	237	0.39%	8,125	13.44%	3,083	5.10%	57,370	94.90%	48,281	79.87%
75	59,414	46,037	77.49%	8,337	14.03%	224	0.38%	1,308	2.20%	2,780	4.68%	728	1.23%	262	0.44%	8,599	14.47%	5,203	8.76%	54,211	91.24%	44,060	74.16%
76	62,585	46,797	74.77%	12,309	19.67%	215	0.34%	687	1.10%	1,925	3.08%	652	1.04%	238	0.38%	12,547	20.05%	3,393	5.42%	59,192	94.58%	45,555	72.79%
77	63,076	54,656	86.65%	5,347	8.48%	192	0.30%	379	0.60%	1,977	3.13%	525	0.83%	154	0.24%	5,501	8.72%	3,446	5.46%	59,630	94.54%	53,435	84.72%
78	58,404	51,778	88.65%	3,669	6.28%	374	0.64%	277	0.47%	1,797	3.08%	509	0.87%	131	0.22%	3,800	6.51%	3,488	5.97%	54,916	94.03%	50,341	86.19%
79	58,785	42,089	71.60%	14,053	23.91%	252	0.43%	256	0.44%	1,610	2.74%	525	0.89%	208	0.35%	14,261	24.26%	2,730	4.64%	56,055	95.36%	41,250	70.17%
80	61,819	53,737	86.93%	5,072	8.20%	294	0.48%	479	0.77%	1,702	2.75%	535	0.87%	129	0.21%	5,201	8.41%	3,168	5.12%	58,651	94.88%	52,496	84.92%
81	62,187	53,084	85.36%	5,552	8.93%	285	0.46%	939	1.51%	1,805	2.90%	522	0.84%	134	0.22%	5,686	9.14%	2,954	4.75%	59,233	95.25%	52,067	83.73%
82	58,038	45,672	78.69%	7,959	13.71%	199	0.34%	1,719	2.96%	1,847	3.18%	642	1.11%	233	0.40%	8,192	14.11%	3,863	6.66%	54,175	93.34%	43,923	75.68%
83	59,773	44,944	75.19%	9,713	16.25%	238	0.40%	577	0.97%	3,527	5.90%	774	1.29%	337	0.56%	10,050	16.81%	6,161	10.31%	53,612	89.69%	42,812	71.62%
84	58,924	47,537	80.68%	7,987	13.55%	165	0.28%	696	1.18%	2,008	3.41%	531	0.90%	175	0.30%	8,162	13.85%	3,603	6.11%	55,321	93.89%	46,217	78.43%
85	62,493	57,936	92.71%	2,116	3.39%	239	0.38%	328	0.52%	1,409	2.25%	465	0.74%	70	0.11%	2,186	3.50%	2,311	3.70%	60,182	96.30%	57,157	91.46%
86	61,639	53,530	86.84%	3,680	5.97%	225	0.37%	1,936	3.14%	1,649	2.68%	619	1.00%	184	0.30%	3,864	6.27%	2,728	4.43%	58,911	95.57%	52,806	85.67%
87	64,243	58,950	91.76%	2,971	4.62%	186	0.29%	317	0.49%	1,275	1.98%	544	0.85%	155	0.24%	3,126	4.87%	2,215	3.45%	62,028	96.55%	58,194	90.58%
88	57,630	27,086	47.00%	21,674	37.61%	317	0.55%	2,742	4.76%	4,720	8.19%	1,091	1.89%	465	0.81%	22,139	38.42%	8,736	15.16%	48,894	84.84%	23,889	41.45%
89	59,483	50,730	85.28%	4,978	8.37%	185	0.31%	1,528	2.57%	1,536	2.58%	526	0.88%	143	0.24%	5,121	8.61%	3,253	5.47%	56,230	94.53%	49,254	82.80%
90	64,448	59,218	91.88%	2,081	3.23%	157	0.24%	291	0.45%	2,176	3.38%	525	0.81%	131	0.20%	2,212	3.43%	3,569	5.54%	60,879	94.46%	58,015	90.02%
91	63,967	58,581	91.58%	3,095	4.84%	208	0.33%	164	0.26%	1,417	2.22%	502	0.78%	147	0.23%	3,242	5.07%	2,479	3.88%	61,488	96.12%	57,637	90.10%
92	58,012	31,160	53.71%	16,964	29.24%	278	0.48%	3,294	5.68%	4,999	8.62%	1,317	2.27%	535	0.92%	17,499	30.16%	10,419	17.96%	47,593	82.04%	26,664	45.96%
93	65,985	62,913	95.34%	895	1.36%	151	0.23%	487	0.74%	861	1.30%	678	1.03%	152	0.23%	1,047	1.59%	2,158	3.27%	63,827	96.73%	61,727	93.55%
94	64,525	58,270	90.31%	3,568	5.53%	160	0.25%	444	0.69%	1,601	2.48%	482	0.75%	138	0.21%	3,706	5.74%	2,679	4.15%	61,846	95.85%	57,326	88.84%
95	59,928	50,749	84.68%	5,695	9.50%	220	0.37%	1,293	2.16%	1,307	2.18%	664	1.11%	209	0.35%	5,904	9.85%	2,979	4.97%	56,949	95.03%	49,272	82.22%
96	58,080	48,441	83.40%	4,647	8.00%	172	0.30%	1,848	3.18%	2,336	4.02%	636	1.10%	242	0.42%	4,889	8.42%	4,549	7.83%	53,531	92.17%	46,487	80.04%
97	59,784	54,140	90.56%	3,272	5.47%	182	0.30%	309	0.52%	1,343	2.25%	538	0.90%	116	0.19%	3,388	5.67%	3,289	5.50%	56,495	94.50%	52,415	87.67%
98	56,018	48,609	86.77%	4,117	7.35%	154	0.27%	1,518	2.71%	984	1.76%	636	1.14%	219	0.39%	4,336	7.74%	2,971	5.30%	53,047	94.70%	46,842	83.62%
99	55,130	20,052	36.37%	26,613	48.27%	297	0.54%	2,020	3.66%	4,850	8.80%	1,298	2.35%	696	1.26%	27,309	49.54%	8,725	15.83%	46,405	84.17%	17,117	31.05%
100	56,173	30,108	53.60%	17,444	31.05%	368	0.66%	1,803	3.21%	5,169	9.20%	1,281	2.28%	592	1.05%	18,036	32.11%	9,342	16.63%	46,831	83.37%	26,652	47.45%
101	58,931	24,080	40.86%	29,331	49.77%	311	0.53%	2,161	3.67%	1,920	3.26%	1,128	1.91%	617	1.05%	29,948	50.82%	3,928	6.67%	55,003	93.33%	22,661	38.45%
102	59,231	24,454	41.29%	25,405	42.89%	337	0.57%	2,230	3.76%	5,598	9.45%	1,207	2.04%	592	1.00%	25,997	43.89%	8,986	15.17%	50,245	84.83%	21,918	37.00%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-25.asc', modified 08/28/2017 04:08:41 PM

Printed 08/29/2017 {rptS03|dc2016GE|re1.4.0}

Data Source: 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File. A = Asian, NA = American Indian and Alaskan Native, PI = Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander, MR = Multi-Race, Hisp = Hispanic or Latino (of any race)

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: Voting Age Population by Race and Ethnicity

		Voting Age Population by Race															Voting Age Population by Ethnicity					
District	Total	White	% White	Black	% Black	NA	% NA	A/PI	% A/PI	Other	% Other	MR	% MR	MR Black	% MR Black	Total Black	% Total Black	Hisp	% Hisp	Non Hisp	% Non Hisp	White Non Hisp	% White Non Hisp
103	56,360	48,038	85.23%	4,154	7.37%	216	0.38%	2,382	4.23%	935	1.66%	635	1.13%	205	0.36%	4,359	7.73%	2,751	4.88%	53,609	95.12%	46,339	82.22%
104	59,384	52,714	88.77%	3,453	5.81%	111	0.19%	1,659	2.79%	808	1.36%	639	1.08%	242	0.41%	3,695	6.22%	2,246	3.78%	57,138	96.22%	51,440	86.62%
105	56,011	45,081	80.49%	4,348	7.76%	142	0.25%	4,595	8.20%	1,068	1.91%	777	1.39%	274	0.49%	4,622	8.25%	3,369	6.01%	52,642	93.99%	42,980	76.73%
106	57,932	26,611	45.93%	21,354	36.86%	262	0.45%	4,865	8.40%	3,543	6.12%	1,297	2.24%	658	1.14%	22,012	38.00%	6,409	11.06%	51,523	88.94%	24,352	42.04%
107	55,478	22,233	40.08%	26,820	48.34%	258	0.47%	2,816	5.08%	2,341	4.22%	1,010	1.82%	579	1.04%	27,399	49.39%	4,746	8.55%	50,732	91.45%	20,401	36.77%
108	59,400	47,484	79.94%	8,365	14.08%	263	0.44%	885	1.49%	1,763	2.97%	640	1.08%	206	0.35%	8,571	14.43%	3,259	5.49%	56,141	94.51%	46,195	77.77%
109	56,493	42,832	75.82%	10,442	18.48%	223	0.39%	784	1.39%	1,589	2.81%	623	1.10%	224	0.40%	10,666	18.88%	3,197	5.66%	53,296	94.34%	41,500	73.46%
110	57,987	47,490	81.90%	8,697	15.00%	218	0.38%	298	0.51%	767	1.32%	517	0.89%	176	0.30%	8,873	15.30%	1,552	2.68%	56,435	97.32%	46,845	80.79%
111	58,045	47,151	81.23%	9,291	16.01%	135	0.23%	490	0.84%	508	0.88%	470	0.81%	184	0.32%	9,475	16.32%	1,225	2.11%	56,820	97.89%	46,542	80.18%
112	61,671	53,632	86.96%	6,168	10.00%	157	0.25%	435	0.71%	741	1.20%	538	0.87%	140	0.23%	6,308	10.23%	1,593	2.58%	60,078	97.42%	52,887	85.76%
113	66,177	61,998	93.69%	1,953	2.95%	175	0.26%	290	0.44%	1,111	1.68%	650	0.98%	162	0.24%	2,115	3.20%	2,455	3.71%	63,722	96.29%	60,783	91.85%
114	67,453	55,428	82.17%	8,086	11.99%	269	0.40%	789	1.17%	1,761	2.61%	1,120	1.66%	396	0.59%	8,482	12.57%	3,893	5.77%	63,560	94.23%	53,575	79.43%
115	63,911	60,023	93.92%	1,529	2.39%	222	0.35%	484	0.76%	832	1.30%	821	1.28%	205	0.32%	1,734	2.71%	2,107	3.30%	61,804	96.70%	58,893	92.15%
116	58,114	53,593	92.22%	1,601	2.75%	266	0.46%	696	1.20%	1,349	2.32%	609	1.05%	161	0.28%	1,762	3.03%	2,908	5.00%	55,206	95.00%	52,184	89.80%
117	62,434	56,024	89.73%	2,104	3.37%	278	0.45%	753	1.21%	2,523	4.04%	752	1.20%	157	0.25%	2,261	3.62%	5,215	8.35%	57,219	91.65%	53,637	85.91%
118	60,837	58,718	96.52%	603	0.99%	194	0.32%	186	0.31%	610	1.00%	526	0.86%	81	0.13%	684	1.12%	1,419	2.33%	59,418	97.67%	58,015	95.36%
119	61,452	52,836	85.98%	982	1.60%	5,207	8.47%	409	0.67%	1,066	1.73%	952	1.55%	124	0.20%	1,106	1.80%	2,155	3.51%	59,297	96.49%	51,983	84.59%
120	65,097	61,750	94.86%	649	1.00%	801	1.23%	303	0.47%	799	1.23%	795	1.22%	82	0.13%	731	1.12%	2,092	3.21%	63,005	96.79%	60,624	93.13%
Totals:	**7,253,848**	**5,155,756**	**71.08%**	**1,497,453**	**20.64%**	**87,111**	**1.20%**	**158,730**	**2.19%**	**256,529**	**3.54%**	**98,269**	**1.35%**	**38,780**	**0.53%**	**1,536,233**	**21.18%**	**492,330**	**6.79%**	**6,761,518**	**93.21%**	**4,964,325**	**68.44%**

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: Voter Registration by Party and Race

		Registration by Party																Registration by Race Without Regard to Party			
		% D	Racial %s among D's				% R	Racial %s among R's				% U	Racial %s among U's				% L				
District	Total		White % of D	Black % of D	NA % of D	Other % of D		White % of R	Black % of R	NA % of R	Other % of R		White % of U	Black % of U	NA % of U	Other % of U		% White	% Black	% NA	% Other
1	53,172	55.10%	36.55%	61.18%	0.12%	2.15%	19.79%	92.52%	4.94%	0.20%	2.34%	24.83%	79.40%	13.71%	0.17%	6.71%	0.28%	58.40%	38.12%	0.15%	3.32%
2	52,645	44.54%	46.62%	49.93%	0.31%	3.14%	26.93%	95.20%	1.76%	0.32%	2.72%	28.14%	79.92%	11.30%	0.37%	8.40%	0.39%	69.23%	25.92%	0.33%	4.53%
3	52,348	34.06%	42.07%	52.18%	0.20%	5.54%	34.83%	92.98%	2.06%	0.23%	4.73%	30.58%	78.28%	12.19%	0.31%	9.21%	0.53%	71.07%	22.25%	0.24%	6.44%
4	46,175	40.32%	41.45%	52.47%	0.15%	5.93%	31.30%	93.37%	2.37%	0.25%	4.01%	27.95%	80.07%	10.20%	0.22%	9.52%	0.44%	68.64%	24.78%	0.20%	6.37%
5	52,146	56.25%	29.20%	67.44%	0.35%	3.00%	17.47%	90.38%	6.15%	0.25%	3.23%	25.89%	70.67%	20.48%	0.34%	8.51%	0.39%	50.82%	44.38%	0.33%	4.48%
6	60,196	31.60%	78.13%	18.74%	0.19%	2.94%	31.34%	97.13%	0.59%	0.18%	2.10%	36.47%	93.47%	2.10%	0.21%	4.23%	0.59%	89.77%	6.88%	0.19%	3.16%
7	53,803	41.58%	42.59%	52.76%	0.30%	4.35%	31.68%	94.85%	1.88%	0.18%	3.09%	26.33%	79.27%	9.95%	0.35%	10.43%	0.41%	68.97%	25.19%	0.28%	5.57%
8	51,613	56.26%	22.07%	73.39%	0.17%	4.37%	18.69%	89.06%	6.96%	0.13%	3.85%	24.54%	60.72%	26.38%	0.32%	12.58%	0.51%	44.30%	49.17%	0.20%	6.33%
9	53,215	38.94%	47.40%	47.10%	0.20%	5.29%	31.79%	95.29%	1.80%	0.13%	2.78%	28.70%	76.85%	12.70%	0.30%	10.15%	0.57%	71.25%	22.62%	0.21%	5.92%
10	51,189	38.08%	47.09%	47.98%	0.13%	4.80%	36.86%	94.68%	1.38%	0.15%	3.78%	24.70%	77.69%	12.11%	0.26%	9.94%	0.36%	72.30%	21.80%	0.17%	5.73%
11	59,987	37.20%	56.44%	29.36%	0.28%	13.92%	21.55%	89.74%	1.84%	0.13%	8.28%	40.38%	68.51%	9.03%	0.26%	22.20%	0.86%	68.70%	15.01%	0.24%	16.05%
12	50,318	53.20%	31.28%	66.03%	0.14%	2.55%	25.70%	93.89%	3.81%	0.16%	2.13%	20.83%	71.89%	20.03%	0.25%	7.83%	0.27%	55.96%	40.31%	0.17%	3.56%
13	60,110	27.64%	70.76%	25.80%	0.19%	3.25%	39.80%	96.46%	0.68%	0.17%	2.70%	32.14%	90.10%	3.80%	0.25%	5.85%	0.42%	87.28%	8.64%	0.20%	3.87%
14	50,265	29.02%	40.31%	48.69%	0.31%	10.69%	34.49%	87.91%	2.96%	0.35%	8.78%	35.76%	72.85%	13.94%	0.46%	12.76%	0.73%	68.64%	20.20%	0.38%	10.78%
15	36,099	27.32%	45.45%	45.90%	0.37%	8.28%	36.66%	91.31%	2.13%	0.33%	6.23%	35.28%	77.37%	11.21%	0.37%	11.05%	0.74%	73.79%	17.34%	0.35%	8.51%
16	58,342	41.39%	47.41%	46.43%	2.99%	3.18%	31.16%	95.24%	1.80%	0.51%	2.46%	27.02%	83.04%	9.10%	1.07%	6.79%	0.43%	72.12%	22.25%	1.69%	3.94%
17	70,894	26.60%	77.23%	19.15%	0.28%	3.35%	38.39%	95.92%	0.91%	0.20%	2.97%	34.68%	91.30%	3.42%	0.27%	5.02%	0.33%	89.33%	6.63%	0.25%	3.79%
18	63,099	42.69%	40.78%	53.23%	0.34%	5.65%	22.78%	92.12%	3.08%	0.38%	4.42%	33.83%	72.48%	14.07%	0.50%	12.95%	0.71%	63.50%	28.22%	0.41%	7.88%
19	64,214	28.08%	78.16%	15.93%	0.24%	5.67%	35.71%	95.75%	0.62%	0.14%	3.49%	35.62%	87.36%	3.59%	0.26%	8.79%	0.59%	87.79%	5.99%	0.21%	6.00%
20	64,964	27.29%	72.98%	20.90%	0.16%	5.96%	37.14%	95.99%	0.55%	0.16%	3.30%	34.95%	85.74%	3.97%	0.26%	10.04%	0.63%	86.09%	7.31%	0.19%	6.41%
21	49,825	54.44%	21.22%	71.80%	0.59%	6.38%	23.49%	89.02%	5.47%	0.37%	5.14%	21.76%	53.71%	29.71%	0.53%	16.05%	0.31%	44.36%	46.89%	0.52%	8.22%
22	51,671	48.77%	38.77%	55.41%	1.77%	4.05%	28.90%	94.15%	2.36%	0.92%	2.56%	22.11%	74.80%	13.89%	1.80%	9.51%	0.21%	62.82%	30.80%	1.53%	4.85%
23	55,818	67.94%	24.72%	73.46%	0.13%	1.69%	17.19%	90.20%	8.08%	0.11%	1.60%	14.67%	64.39%	28.11%	0.31%	7.19%	0.20%	41.88%	55.46%	0.16%	2.51%
24	55,364	53.59%	27.74%	67.51%	0.15%	4.60%	24.54%	92.53%	4.42%	0.07%	2.99%	21.63%	66.47%	21.32%	0.30%	11.91%	0.24%	52.12%	41.92%	0.16%	5.80%
25	55,424	54.00%	25.14%	70.86%	0.60%	3.39%	26.60%	93.98%	3.89%	0.24%	1.90%	19.15%	67.71%	22.55%	0.66%	9.08%	0.25%	51.72%	43.66%	0.52%	4.10%
26	64,833	30.03%	52.90%	39.97%	0.38%	6.74%	38.27%	95.18%	1.27%	0.20%	3.36%	31.13%	79.95%	8.99%	0.33%	10.73%	0.57%	77.67%	15.33%	0.29%	6.70%
27	51,993	68.61%	24.42%	70.47%	2.66%	2.46%	11.60%	86.41%	10.26%	0.90%	2.44%	19.61%	64.65%	27.12%	1.39%	6.84%	0.18%	39.55%	54.91%	2.21%	3.33%
28	53,678	34.86%	50.91%	42.14%	0.32%	6.63%	37.58%	95.23%	1.59%	0.22%	2.96%	27.15%	77.22%	10.14%	0.42%	12.22%	0.42%	74.85%	18.07%	0.31%	6.77%
29	70,145	58.46%	36.87%	53.77%	0.31%	9.05%	9.24%	85.85%	6.36%	0.19%	7.61%	31.84%	55.66%	20.41%	0.30%	23.63%	0.46%	47.51%	38.60%	0.31%	13.59%
30	70,270	52.78%	46.40%	46.08%	0.23%	7.28%	17.78%	92.43%	2.75%	0.11%	4.71%	29.03%	66.93%	14.35%	0.35%	18.37%	0.41%	60.65%	29.03%	0.25%	10.08%
31	66,614	60.88%	21.65%	70.00%	0.27%	8.09%	10.82%	83.11%	8.92%	0.28%	7.70%	27.85%	47.58%	28.44%	0.29%	23.69%	0.44%	35.70%	51.60%	0.27%	12.43%
32	54,510	67.43%	27.28%	68.55%	1.51%	2.66%	14.06%	89.06%	7.52%	0.39%	3.03%	18.30%	64.39%	26.12%	0.79%	8.70%	0.21%	42.83%	52.12%	1.22%	3.84%
33	57,266	56.12%	20.40%	69.89%	0.34%	9.37%	13.16%	83.88%	7.03%	0.31%	8.78%	30.21%	44.13%	28.74%	0.32%	26.81%	0.51%	36.13%	48.93%	0.33%	14.62%
34	62,215	39.96%	64.08%	26.29%	0.19%	9.44%	26.09%	93.16%	1.11%	0.16%	5.57%	33.28%	75.55%	8.53%	0.24%	15.67%	0.67%	75.58%	13.68%	0.20%	10.54%
35	68,501	31.34%	50.16%	39.15%	0.21%	10.48%	35.18%	91.87%	1.14%	0.13%	6.86%	32.94%	76.47%	8.78%	0.22%	14.53%	0.54%	73.67%	15.59%	0.19%	10.55%
36	65,255	28.87%	65.66%	24.12%	0.25%	9.96%	36.35%	94.00%	0.73%	0.17%	5.10%	34.26%	81.01%	4.90%	0.33%	13.76%	0.53%	81.31%	8.93%	0.25%	9.51%
37	68,780	28.83%	56.31%	32.92%	0.37%	10.39%	35.11%	93.32%	1.01%	0.19%	5.48%	35.43%	79.98%	6.48%	0.21%	13.34%	0.64%	77.89%	12.16%	0.25%	9.70%
38	57,803	58.04%	20.65%	67.68%	0.27%	11.40%	11.27%	78.51%	8.84%	0.35%	12.30%	30.21%	42.76%	29.51%	0.31%	27.42%	0.48%	34.05%	49.28%	0.29%	16.38%
39	61,241	49.50%	25.11%	63.97%	0.27%	10.65%	21.31%	88.44%	3.62%	0.20%	7.75%	28.74%	55.45%	23.28%	0.40%	20.87%	0.45%	47.51%	39.19%	0.29%	13.01%
40	67,044	28.80%	71.50%	19.00%	0.29%	9.21%	36.68%	94.13%	0.57%	0.09%	5.21%	33.96%	82.10%	4.63%	0.19%	13.08%	0.56%	83.49%	7.26%	0.18%	9.07%
41	62,161	28.93%	54.69%	19.81%	0.42%	25.08%	27.07%	89.10%	0.78%	0.17%	9.96%	43.37%	63.64%	4.46%	0.34%	31.57%	0.62%	68.04%	7.89%	0.31%	23.76%
42	44,287	51.70%	11.11%	77.66%	0.46%	10.77%	16.73%	73.79%	9.73%	0.85%	15.63%	31.03%	38.06%	34.39%	0.60%	26.95%	0.55%	30.25%	52.56%	0.57%	16.62%
43	52,995	54.48%	13.67%	77.99%	0.40%	7.94%	16.31%	78.34%	9.44%	0.64%	11.58%	28.76%	38.17%	36.83%	0.67%	24.33%	0.45%	31.49%	54.70%	0.52%	13.29%
44	53,439	44.97%	31.15%	58.93%	1.20%	8.71%	24.64%	85.93%	4.21%	1.22%	8.63%	29.91%	53.43%	23.45%	1.31%	21.80%	0.48%	51.50%	34.63%	1.24%	12.64%
45	58,775	38.21%	37.30%	53.94%	1.93%	6.82%	32.41%	89.65%	2.63%	1.44%	6.28%	28.97%	64.60%	17.44%	2.11%	15.84%	0.40%	62.30%	26.57%	1.83%	9.30%
46	44,558	59.60%	43.47%	38.84%	14.83%	2.85%	16.59%	84.27%	3.73%	8.57%	3.42%	23.58%	64.65%	15.22%	12.33%	7.79%	0.23%	55.29%	27.38%	13.19%	4.14%
47	47,311	70.55%	15.32%	36.68%	44.87%	3.12%	10.65%	52.32%	4.78%	38.55%	4.35%	18.60%	28.72%	18.47%	41.67%	11.13%	0.19%	21.81%	29.86%	43.57%	4.77%
48	54,356	52.04%	26.58%	61.97%	7.05%	4.39%	19.21%	82.01%	5.40%	5.57%	7.01%	28.34%	59.20%	21.19%	7.65%	11.97%	0.41%	46.64%	39.36%	6.94%	7.06%
49	67,409	34.93%	61.44%	23.87%	0.27%	14.42%	26.37%	90.79%	0.98%	0.23%	8.00%	38.02%	71.14%	6.93%	0.28%	21.65%	0.68%	73.01%	11.26%	0.26%	15.47%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-25.asc', modified 08/28/2017 04:08:41 PM

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections. Voter registration snapshot as of November 12, 2016. Note that voter records that could not be associated with a geographic location were excluded.

D = Democratic, R = Republican, L = Libertarian, NA = Native American. In this chart, the 'Other' race categories also include multi-race voters and those voters for whom a race indicator was not present in the source data.

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: Voter Registration by Party and Race

		Registration by Party																Registration by Race Without Regard to Party			
		% D	Racial %s among D's				% R	Racial %s among R's				% U	Racial %s among U's				% L				
District	Total		White % of D	Black % of D	NA % of D	Other % of D		White % of R	Black % of R	NA % of R	Other % of R		White % of U	Black % of U	NA % of U	Other % of U		% White	% Black	% NA	% Other
50	60,769	47.30%	58.54%	36.08%	0.20%	5.17%	22.29%	94.85%	1.60%	0.18%	3.37%	29.99%	80.17%	6.94%	0.27%	12.62%	0.42%	73.23%	19.52%	0.22%	7.03%
51	51,162	39.13%	45.47%	45.78%	0.41%	8.33%	29.83%	92.08%	1.72%	0.42%	5.78%	30.49%	72.36%	12.48%	0.40%	14.76%	0.54%	67.72%	22.28%	0.42%	9.57%
52	58,220	25.65%	56.08%	39.56%	0.70%	3.67%	40.49%	96.41%	0.86%	0.33%	2.40%	33.34%	87.16%	5.99%	0.59%	6.26%	0.51%	82.94%	12.51%	0.52%	4.03%
53	54,170	38.13%	45.35%	47.71%	0.88%	6.06%	35.64%	92.89%	1.95%	0.49%	4.67%	25.62%	73.53%	12.77%	0.89%	12.82%	0.60%	69.72%	22.21%	0.75%	7.33%
54	67,517	41.93%	62.42%	28.98%	0.26%	8.34%	23.34%	93.24%	1.17%	0.16%	5.43%	34.25%	79.02%	6.08%	0.21%	14.69%	0.48%	75.37%	14.53%	0.22%	9.88%
55	53,115	40.79%	43.46%	48.41%	0.19%	7.94%	34.38%	95.04%	1.34%	0.24%	3.38%	24.57%	82.44%	8.05%	0.28%	9.22%	0.26%	70.87%	22.19%	0.23%	6.70%
56	68,359	47.47%	72.28%	14.98%	0.26%	12.48%	10.37%	89.52%	1.52%	0.25%	8.70%	41.51%	66.46%	5.42%	0.28%	27.85%	0.66%	71.70%	9.55%	0.27%	18.48%
57	62,864	65.61%	15.48%	79.20%	0.25%	5.06%	8.21%	76.37%	14.99%	0.33%	8.31%	25.74%	36.54%	42.11%	0.38%	20.97%	0.43%	26.08%	64.17%	0.29%	9.46%
58	55,902	57.63%	22.04%	69.79%	0.45%	7.72%	16.24%	86.98%	5.66%	0.48%	6.87%	25.68%	48.46%	30.56%	0.48%	20.50%	0.46%	39.53%	49.11%	0.46%	10.90%
59	61,489	37.96%	38.90%	56.23%	0.35%	4.52%	36.25%	96.42%	1.54%	0.19%	1.85%	25.44%	75.50%	14.98%	0.40%	9.12%	0.35%	69.21%	25.75%	0.31%	4.73%
60	52,097	52.72%	21.17%	70.75%	0.28%	7.79%	20.48%	88.34%	5.39%	0.30%	5.97%	26.38%	54.62%	26.76%	0.28%	18.34%	0.42%	43.95%	45.55%	0.28%	10.22%
61	62,835	33.36%	63.60%	28.69%	0.22%	7.50%	37.78%	96.11%	0.83%	0.14%	2.91%	28.38%	79.11%	8.13%	0.26%	12.50%	0.49%	80.38%	12.22%	0.20%	7.20%
62	63,040	32.06%	60.18%	33.55%	0.21%	6.06%	37.86%	96.27%	0.90%	0.12%	2.72%	29.55%	80.77%	8.24%	0.26%	10.72%	0.53%	80.05%	13.58%	0.19%	6.18%
63	51,804	39.97%	48.80%	43.51%	0.33%	7.35%	31.85%	95.49%	1.36%	0.20%	2.95%	27.75%	77.22%	9.70%	0.29%	12.79%	0.43%	71.69%	20.55%	0.28%	7.48%
64	48,685	38.13%	46.42%	45.58%	0.26%	7.74%	33.84%	95.63%	1.34%	0.23%	2.80%	27.60%	77.11%	9.22%	0.29%	13.38%	0.44%	71.68%	20.41%	0.26%	7.65%
65	53,978	39.53%	51.96%	44.87%	0.16%	3.02%	34.04%	95.94%	1.66%	0.19%	2.21%	26.11%	83.60%	8.98%	0.25%	7.17%	0.32%	75.28%	20.68%	0.20%	3.84%
66	51,977	50.71%	48.83%	47.20%	0.64%	3.33%	24.11%	93.91%	2.35%	0.92%	2.82%	24.93%	78.67%	12.26%	1.46%	7.61%	0.25%	67.19%	27.59%	0.92%	4.30%
67	58,768	25.64%	66.66%	28.55%	0.19%	4.60%	45.46%	96.57%	0.52%	0.18%	2.72%	28.57%	87.04%	4.89%	0.29%	7.78%	0.34%	86.14%	8.98%	0.21%	4.67%
68	59,838	24.19%	51.11%	36.97%	0.36%	11.56%	42.48%	94.81%	0.90%	0.12%	4.16%	32.88%	80.46%	6.78%	0.27%	12.48%	0.45%	79.47%	11.58%	0.23%	8.72%
69	54,396	28.28%	51.68%	38.24%	0.34%	9.74%	40.24%	95.18%	1.19%	0.26%	3.37%	31.06%	80.62%	7.39%	0.34%	11.66%	0.42%	78.30%	13.61%	0.31%	7.78%
70	49,623	22.30%	66.69%	25.02%	0.28%	8.01%	48.66%	96.86%	0.63%	0.23%	2.28%	28.58%	86.57%	4.50%	0.51%	8.42%	0.47%	87.14%	7.20%	0.32%	5.35%
71	50,921	51.48%	33.46%	58.57%	0.18%	7.79%	19.47%	90.94%	4.13%	0.20%	4.73%	28.53%	62.72%	20.91%	0.29%	16.08%	0.53%	53.21%	36.98%	0.21%	9.60%
72	51,625	61.29%	19.65%	74.37%	0.20%	5.78%	15.22%	88.25%	7.19%	0.20%	4.35%	23.12%	49.53%	32.81%	0.28%	17.39%	0.37%	37.16%	54.33%	0.22%	8.29%
73	53,508	23.79%	68.30%	24.18%	0.16%	7.37%	47.31%	97.06%	0.46%	0.09%	2.40%	28.50%	85.80%	5.06%	0.25%	8.90%	0.40%	86.95%	7.42%	0.15%	5.48%
74	59,404	31.40%	56.94%	37.59%	0.17%	5.31%	40.54%	96.22%	0.83%	0.19%	2.76%	27.65%	82.25%	8.29%	0.23%	9.23%	0.41%	79.98%	14.46%	0.19%	5.38%
75	57,799	32.07%	51.34%	40.24%	0.20%	8.21%	38.03%	95.26%	1.12%	0.15%	3.47%	29.42%	77.62%	9.89%	0.33%	12.16%	0.48%	75.91%	16.28%	0.23%	7.59%
76	55,656	33.73%	42.31%	52.99%	0.26%	4.45%	37.41%	96.00%	1.75%	0.14%	2.10%	28.52%	80.24%	12.86%	0.24%	6.65%	0.34%	73.34%	22.23%	0.21%	4.22%
77	58,417	22.89%	62.23%	32.66%	0.14%	4.97%	47.79%	97.01%	0.53%	0.14%	2.32%	28.98%	88.31%	5.20%	0.18%	6.30%	0.34%	86.50%	9.25%	0.15%	4.10%
78	50,906	21.69%	70.17%	24.24%	0.47%	5.12%	50.02%	97.73%	0.49%	0.25%	1.53%	27.91%	90.61%	3.64%	0.34%	5.41%	0.39%	89.74%	6.53%	0.33%	3.41%
79	51,819	40.75%	45.07%	51.68%	0.15%	3.11%	32.64%	95.49%	1.95%	0.09%	2.47%	26.29%	81.02%	11.31%	0.25%	7.41%	0.32%	71.08%	24.70%	0.16%	4.05%
80	53,649	24.02%	62.36%	32.17%	0.28%	5.18%	49.28%	97.09%	0.61%	0.21%	2.09%	26.27%	88.18%	5.36%	0.30%	6.16%	0.44%	86.36%	9.47%	0.25%	3.92%
81	51,976	28.43%	67.25%	27.61%	0.28%	4.85%	43.92%	97.56%	0.65%	0.19%	1.60%	27.31%	89.03%	4.45%	0.32%	6.21%	0.34%	86.57%	9.36%	0.25%	3.81%
82	63,032	30.41%	46.71%	43.51%	0.28%	9.50%	37.51%	94.68%	1.23%	0.16%	3.93%	31.53%	75.85%	10.14%	0.37%	13.63%	0.54%	74.04%	16.96%	0.27%	8.73%
83	54,011	34.43%	44.82%	47.77%	0.22%	7.18%	35.02%	95.14%	1.79%	0.20%	2.87%	30.05%	76.80%	11.69%	0.28%	11.23%	0.49%	72.24%	20.63%	0.23%	6.90%
84	53,651	30.02%	54.24%	40.12%	0.17%	5.46%	40.93%	96.68%	1.07%	0.14%	2.11%	28.71%	84.90%	7.46%	0.28%	7.36%	0.35%	80.49%	14.66%	0.19%	4.67%
85	48,473	21.47%	90.34%	6.65%	0.16%	2.85%	47.58%	98.39%	0.18%	0.09%	1.34%	30.56%	95.36%	1.28%	0.13%	3.23%	0.38%	95.70%	1.91%	0.12%	2.27%
86	51,445	33.30%	78.88%	16.12%	0.18%	4.82%	35.36%	97.07%	0.58%	0.11%	2.24%	30.90%	89.40%	3.30%	0.18%	7.12%	0.44%	88.59%	6.61%	0.16%	4.64%
87	53,883	27.18%	79.93%	15.98%	0.12%	3.97%	44.93%	97.88%	0.39%	0.10%	1.63%	27.28%	93.43%	2.46%	0.15%	3.96%	0.60%	91.75%	5.20%	0.12%	2.93%
88	60,901	51.29%	26.99%	64.14%	0.33%	8.54%	18.35%	87.97%	5.42%	0.20%	6.42%	29.70%	62.26%	20.19%	0.42%	17.14%	0.66%	48.94%	40.00%	0.33%	10.73%
89	52,655	26.11%	64.43%	28.29%	0.16%	7.13%	43.34%	96.84%	0.65%	0.10%	2.41%	30.17%	86.75%	4.36%	0.20%	8.69%	0.37%	85.30%	9.00%	0.15%	5.55%
90	51,627	31.31%	87.33%	8.92%	0.14%	3.61%	42.58%	97.48%	0.29%	0.09%	2.14%	25.81%	92.23%	1.91%	0.23%	5.64%	0.30%	92.93%	3.41%	0.14%	3.52%
91	53,574	28.47%	81.15%	15.43%	0.23%	3.19%	45.51%	97.15%	0.27%	0.14%	2.44%	25.63%	91.81%	1.91%	0.23%	6.05%	0.40%	91.21%	5.01%	0.19%	3.60%
92	58,460	45.92%	27.42%	59.26%	0.31%	13.01%	21.82%	88.27%	4.16%	0.24%	7.32%	31.68%	60.19%	19.68%	0.30%	19.83%	0.58%	51.32%	34.44%	0.29%	13.95%
93	63,046	28.05%	91.96%	3.33%	0.15%	4.57%	34.31%	97.53%	0.21%	0.10%	2.16%	36.81%	92.18%	1.60%	0.17%	6.05%	0.82%	93.95%	1.60%	0.14%	4.31%
94	52,688	25.64%	81.89%	14.47%	0.08%	3.55%	47.67%	97.93%	0.42%	0.06%	1.58%	26.40%	92.31%	2.81%	0.18%	4.70%	0.30%	92.31%	4.66%	0.10%	2.93%
95	63,800	23.50%	62.16%	31.02%	0.21%	6.60%	41.97%	95.95%	0.78%	0.16%	3.11%	34.03%	86.70%	5.08%	0.23%	8.00%	0.49%	84.82%	9.37%	0.19%	5.62%
96	51,891	26.46%	63.61%	27.49%	0.14%	8.76%	42.40%	96.02%	0.80%	0.08%	3.10%	30.77%	84.06%	5.30%	0.14%	10.49%	0.37%	83.74%	9.26%	0.12%	6.89%
97	55,069	26.13%	77.43%	17.59%	0.17%	4.81%	43.40%	97.30%	0.35%	0.13%	2.22%	30.08%	90.44%	3.08%	0.21%	6.27%	0.38%	90.01%	5.69%	0.17%	4.14%
98	64,276	25.09%	68.17%	23.46%	0.18%	8.20%	38.21%	95.90%	0.65%	0.15%	3.31%	36.07%	84.39%	4.65%	0.18%	10.79%	0.63%	84.74%	7.82%	0.17%	7.27%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-25.asc', modified 08/28/2017 04:08:41 PM

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections. Voter registration snapshot as of November 12, 2016. Note that voter records that could not be associated with a geographic location were excluded.

D = Democratic, R = Republican, L = Libertarian, NA = Native American. In this chart, the 'Other' race categories also include multi-race voters and those voters for whom a race indicator was not present in the source data.

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: Voter Registration by Party and Race

		Registration by Party																Registration by Race Without Regard to Party			
		% D	Racial %s among D's				% R	Racial %s among R's				% U	Racial %s among U's				% L				
District	Total		White % of D	Black % of D	NA % of D	Other % of D		White % of R	Black % of R	NA % of R	Other % of R		White % of U	Black % of U	NA % of U	Other % of U		% White	% Black	% NA	% Other
99	55,566	60.75%	13.36%	75.97%	0.29%	10.38%	12.93%	81.40%	9.23%	0.35%	9.02%	25.89%	40.51%	35.18%	0.34%	23.97%	0.43%	29.33%	56.57%	0.31%	13.79%
100	50,526	50.03%	28.76%	59.97%	0.39%	10.88%	19.96%	88.81%	4.41%	0.27%	6.51%	29.52%	59.36%	21.97%	0.40%	18.27%	0.50%	49.98%	37.45%	0.37%	12.21%
101	64,652	58.71%	15.76%	76.74%	0.25%	7.25%	14.91%	86.42%	7.12%	0.18%	6.29%	25.86%	49.21%	32.07%	0.32%	18.40%	0.52%	35.18%	54.53%	0.26%	10.04%
102	56,395	57.44%	26.94%	65.25%	0.35%	7.47%	12.07%	84.29%	8.70%	0.32%	6.69%	29.75%	58.80%	22.56%	0.39%	18.26%	0.74%	43.66%	45.38%	0.36%	10.60%
103	60,081	26.90%	64.84%	25.12%	0.35%	9.70%	39.71%	95.18%	0.68%	0.19%	3.94%	32.94%	80.62%	5.46%	0.28%	13.64%	0.46%	82.17%	8.85%	0.26%	8.72%
104	64,218	26.34%	77.39%	15.74%	0.17%	6.70%	40.52%	96.76%	0.43%	0.12%	2.69%	32.68%	86.85%	3.66%	0.22%	9.27%	0.46%	88.38%	5.53%	0.17%	5.92%
105	59,875	26.06%	59.66%	24.79%	0.56%	14.99%	38.22%	93.86%	0.66%	0.20%	5.29%	35.25%	75.30%	6.04%	0.44%	18.22%	0.48%	78.35%	8.86%	0.38%	12.40%
106	55,729	52.49%	18.21%	71.17%	0.29%	10.33%	16.08%	87.23%	5.40%	0.21%	7.15%	30.78%	49.76%	26.51%	0.40%	23.33%	0.66%	39.29%	46.52%	0.31%	13.89%
107	58,873	58.91%	14.29%	77.88%	0.26%	7.57%	14.26%	86.87%	6.88%	0.27%	5.98%	26.38%	49.40%	31.56%	0.29%	18.75%	0.44%	34.12%	55.29%	0.27%	10.32%
108	53,081	32.61%	52.10%	40.79%	0.25%	6.85%	37.12%	95.58%	1.00%	0.22%	3.20%	29.78%	79.54%	9.39%	0.37%	10.69%	0.49%	76.57%	16.51%	0.28%	6.65%
109	54,288	34.64%	45.16%	48.31%	0.25%	6.27%	36.97%	95.81%	1.33%	0.15%	2.70%	28.02%	76.56%	12.03%	0.34%	11.07%	0.37%	72.81%	20.63%	0.24%	6.32%
110	49,991	35.00%	54.89%	41.33%	0.20%	3.58%	36.93%	96.74%	1.01%	0.19%	2.06%	27.70%	84.84%	7.50%	0.30%	7.37%	0.37%	78.76%	16.93%	0.23%	4.09%
111	48,335	39.65%	56.83%	40.44%	0.14%	2.60%	33.95%	96.06%	1.35%	0.12%	2.47%	26.06%	85.99%	7.29%	0.14%	6.57%	0.35%	77.85%	18.42%	0.14%	3.60%
112	51,533	34.65%	74.83%	21.34%	0.13%	3.69%	36.17%	95.73%	1.09%	0.12%	3.05%	28.78%	89.39%	4.44%	0.21%	5.95%	0.41%	86.64%	9.09%	0.15%	4.12%
113	62,182	25.15%	86.73%	9.43%	0.17%	3.68%	36.11%	97.54%	0.27%	0.11%	2.08%	38.31%	93.49%	1.65%	0.20%	4.67%	0.42%	93.24%	3.10%	0.16%	3.50%
114	70,877	47.93%	74.38%	18.61%	0.20%	6.81%	13.69%	92.81%	2.15%	0.22%	4.82%	37.57%	82.39%	5.08%	0.31%	12.22%	0.80%	80.02%	11.14%	0.25%	8.58%
115	64,179	36.12%	90.66%	4.31%	0.19%	4.84%	28.87%	96.18%	0.28%	0.13%	3.40%	34.45%	90.72%	1.40%	0.24%	7.63%	0.56%	92.26%	2.13%	0.19%	5.42%
116	60,457	32.85%	86.83%	7.42%	0.19%	5.56%	31.57%	95.50%	0.47%	0.16%	3.87%	35.03%	89.11%	2.13%	0.30%	8.46%	0.55%	90.37%	3.34%	0.22%	6.07%
117	59,643	23.09%	82.32%	10.92%	0.24%	6.52%	37.03%	96.78%	0.38%	0.12%	2.73%	39.37%	90.62%	2.09%	0.22%	7.07%	0.51%	90.97%	3.50%	0.19%	5.35%
118	58,270	38.15%	96.33%	1.64%	0.14%	1.88%	31.03%	97.94%	0.19%	0.18%	1.69%	30.39%	93.88%	0.85%	0.30%	4.97%	0.43%	96.07%	0.95%	0.20%	2.78%
119	53,612	39.22%	88.61%	2.96%	4.91%	3.52%	26.27%	93.28%	0.23%	3.51%	2.99%	34.00%	84.63%	1.27%	6.73%	7.37%	0.52%	88.49%	1.66%	5.15%	4.70%
120	62,750	27.23%	94.82%	1.81%	1.13%	2.24%	40.98%	97.79%	0.14%	0.52%	1.55%	31.38%	94.88%	0.65%	0.93%	3.55%	0.41%	96.05%	0.75%	0.82%	2.37%
Totals:	**6,822,218**	**39.52%**	**46.08%**	**46.13%**	**1.19%**	**6.60%**	**30.24%**	**94.05%**	**1.80%**	**0.40%**	**3.75%**	**29.77%**	**75.43%**	**11.39%**	**0.72%**	**12.47%**	**0.46%**	**69.48%**	**22.21%**	**0.81%**	**7.51%**

District plan definition file: 'HBK-25.asc', modified 08/28/2017 04:08:41 PM

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections. Voter registration snapshot as of November 12, 2016. Note that voter records that could not be associated with a geographic location were excluded.

D = Democratic, R = Republican, L = Libertarian, NA = Native American. In this chart, the 'Other' race categories also include multi-race voters and those voters for whom a race indicator was not present in the source data.

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: Voter Registration by Gender, Age, and Ethnicity

		Voter Registration by Gender						Voter Registration by Age								Voter Registration by Ethnicity					
District	Total	Male	% Male	Female	% Female	Undesig.	% Undesig.	18-25	% 18-25	26-40	% 26-40	41-65	% 41-65	66+	% 66+	Hispanic	% Hisp	Non-Hisp	% Non-Hisp	Undesig.	% Undesig.
1	53,172	24,016	45.17%	28,474	53.55%	682	1.28%	4,921	9.25%	10,893	20.49%	23,446	44.09%	13,912	26.16%	207	0.39%	37,512	70.55%	15,453	29.06%
2	52,645	23,631	44.89%	27,541	52.31%	1,473	2.80%	5,338	10.14%	11,256	21.38%	25,258	47.98%	10,793	20.50%	776	1.47%	41,031	77.94%	10,838	20.59%
3	52,348	23,253	44.42%	28,306	54.07%	789	1.51%	5,762	11.01%	13,188	25.19%	21,167	40.44%	12,231	23.36%	1,209	2.31%	42,756	81.68%	8,383	16.01%
4	46,175	20,478	44.35%	24,587	53.25%	1,110	2.40%	5,244	11.36%	11,824	25.61%	19,461	42.15%	9,646	20.89%	1,767	3.83%	36,429	78.89%	7,979	17.28%
5	52,146	22,969	44.05%	28,026	53.75%	1,151	2.21%	6,253	11.99%	12,394	23.77%	22,113	42.41%	11,386	21.83%	334	0.64%	30,866	59.19%	20,946	40.17%
6	60,196	28,447	47.26%	31,068	51.61%	681	1.13%	4,792	7.96%	12,202	20.27%	28,268	46.96%	14,934	24.81%	429	0.71%	34,065	56.59%	25,702	42.70%
7	53,803	24,727	45.96%	27,849	51.76%	1,227	2.28%	6,166	11.46%	12,056	22.41%	24,955	46.38%	10,626	19.75%	1,214	2.26%	42,239	78.51%	10,350	19.24%
8	51,613	21,706	42.06%	28,371	54.97%	1,536	2.98%	9,728	18.85%	16,078	31.15%	18,606	36.05%	7,201	13.95%	878	1.70%	45,213	87.60%	5,522	10.70%
9	53,215	23,596	44.34%	28,149	52.90%	1,470	2.76%	9,446	17.75%	14,779	27.77%	20,780	39.05%	8,210	15.43%	906	1.70%	47,191	88.68%	5,118	9.62%
10	51,189	23,407	45.73%	26,799	52.35%	983	1.92%	6,159	12.03%	11,615	22.69%	23,309	45.54%	10,106	19.74%	1,093	2.14%	40,706	79.52%	9,390	18.34%
11	59,987	27,068	45.12%	29,427	49.06%	3,492	5.82%	11,689	19.49%	20,047	33.42%	20,064	33.45%	8,187	13.65%	2,057	3.43%	40,509	67.53%	17,421	29.04%
12	50,318	22,039	43.80%	27,539	54.73%	740	1.47%	5,734	11.40%	11,389	22.63%	21,927	43.58%	11,268	22.39%	664	1.32%	41,141	81.76%	8,513	16.92%
13	60,110	27,587	45.89%	31,255	52.00%	1,268	2.11%	5,232	8.70%	11,961	19.90%	26,693	44.41%	16,224	26.99%	531	0.88%	49,485	82.32%	10,094	16.79%
14	50,265	22,026	43.82%	27,296	54.30%	943	1.88%	7,042	14.01%	16,762	33.35%	19,507	38.81%	6,954	13.83%	2,521	5.02%	40,000	79.58%	7,744	15.41%
15	36,099	15,866	43.95%	19,606	54.31%	627	1.74%	4,900	13.57%	11,663	32.31%	13,978	38.72%	5,558	15.40%	1,475	4.09%	29,127	80.69%	5,497	15.23%
16	58,342	26,884	46.08%	30,788	52.77%	670	1.15%	5,857	10.04%	12,280	21.05%	26,451	45.34%	13,754	23.57%	724	1.24%	46,608	79.89%	11,010	18.87%
17	70,894	32,382	45.68%	37,240	52.53%	1,272	1.79%	4,507	6.36%	9,814	13.84%	29,026	40.94%	27,547	38.86%	625	0.88%	49,701	70.11%	20,568	29.01%
18	63,099	27,537	43.64%	32,497	51.50%	3,065	4.86%	9,995	15.84%	18,860	29.89%	23,481	37.21%	10,763	17.06%	1,246	1.97%	41,920	66.44%	19,933	31.59%
19	64,214	28,555	44.47%	33,390	52.00%	2,269	3.53%	6,274	9.77%	15,893	24.75%	28,259	44.01%	13,788	21.47%	842	1.31%	47,139	73.41%	16,233	25.28%
20	64,964	28,558	43.96%	33,760	51.97%	2,646	4.07%	8,222	12.66%	16,401	25.25%	25,674	39.52%	14,667	22.58%	956	1.47%	51,310	78.98%	12,698	19.55%
21	49,825	21,290	42.73%	27,215	54.62%	1,320	2.65%	6,005	12.05%	12,071	24.23%	20,930	42.01%	10,819	21.71%	1,620	3.25%	36,657	73.57%	11,548	23.18%
22	51,671	23,418	45.32%	27,786	53.77%	467	0.90%	5,469	10.58%	11,118	21.52%	23,028	44.57%	12,056	23.33%	1,337	2.59%	42,674	82.59%	7,660	14.82%
23	55,818	24,573	44.02%	30,734	55.06%	511	0.92%	6,124	10.97%	12,544	22.47%	24,507	43.91%	12,643	22.65%	407	0.73%	45,059	80.72%	10,352	18.55%
24	55,364	24,344	43.97%	30,028	54.24%	992	1.79%	6,494	11.73%	12,877	23.26%	24,200	43.71%	11,793	21.30%	974	1.76%	44,507	80.39%	9,883	17.85%
25	55,424	24,653	44.48%	30,212	54.51%	559	1.01%	6,586	11.88%	12,366	22.31%	24,728	44.62%	11,744	21.19%	573	1.03%	46,524	83.94%	8,327	15.02%
26	64,833	29,910	46.13%	33,861	52.23%	1,062	1.64%	7,241	11.17%	16,205	24.99%	31,702	48.90%	9,685	14.94%	1,814	2.80%	49,378	76.16%	13,641	21.04%
27	51,993	22,836	43.92%	28,385	54.59%	772	1.48%	5,366	10.32%	11,379	21.89%	22,482	43.24%	12,766	24.55%	249	0.48%	42,765	82.25%	8,979	17.27%
28	53,678	24,145	44.98%	28,772	53.60%	761	1.42%	6,489	12.09%	12,666	23.60%	24,014	44.74%	10,509	19.58%	1,979	3.69%	41,069	76.51%	10,630	19.80%
29	70,145	29,759	42.42%	37,490	53.45%	2,896	4.13%	13,282	18.94%	25,430	36.25%	22,384	31.91%	9,049	12.90%	2,250	3.21%	46,718	66.60%	21,177	30.19%
30	70,270	30,129	42.88%	38,171	54.32%	1,970	2.80%	7,737	11.01%	20,268	28.84%	28,546	40.62%	13,719	19.52%	1,872	2.66%	51,471	73.25%	16,927	24.09%
31	66,614	28,185	42.31%	35,783	53.72%	2,646	3.97%	8,119	12.19%	23,876	35.84%	26,231	39.38%	8,388	12.59%	2,576	3.87%	43,116	64.73%	20,922	31.41%
32	54,510	24,024	44.07%	29,474	54.07%	1,012	1.86%	6,201	11.38%	11,663	21.40%	23,713	43.50%	12,933	23.73%	523	0.96%	43,388	79.60%	10,599	19.44%
33	57,266	24,591	42.94%	28,773	50.24%	3,902	6.81%	11,268	19.68%	17,637	30.80%	21,300	37.19%	7,061	12.33%	2,068	3.61%	35,574	62.12%	19,624	34.27%
34	62,215	27,312	43.90%	32,518	52.27%	2,385	3.83%	6,664	10.71%	21,026	33.80%	23,961	38.51%	10,564	16.98%	1,628	2.62%	46,954	75.47%	13,633	21.91%
35	68,501	30,688	44.80%	35,529	51.87%	2,284	3.33%	7,903	11.54%	16,920	24.70%	33,500	48.90%	10,178	14.86%	1,826	2.67%	52,752	77.01%	13,923	20.33%
36	65,255	30,581	46.86%	32,875	50.38%	1,799	2.76%	7,467	11.44%	14,342	21.98%	33,136	50.78%	10,310	15.80%	1,454	2.23%	49,232	75.45%	14,569	22.33%
37	68,780	31,721	46.12%	35,162	51.12%	1,897	2.76%	7,558	10.99%	19,380	28.18%	32,754	47.62%	9,088	13.21%	1,912	2.78%	48,738	70.86%	18,130	26.36%
38	57,803	24,180	41.83%	30,297	52.41%	3,326	5.75%	9,067	15.69%	19,484	33.71%	22,593	39.09%	6,659	11.52%	2,803	4.85%	36,386	62.95%	18,614	32.20%
39	61,241	26,450	43.19%	32,588	53.21%	2,203	3.60%	7,844	12.81%	18,419	30.08%	27,438	44.80%	7,540	12.31%	2,833	4.63%	42,910	70.07%	15,498	25.31%
40	67,044	31,004	46.24%	34,270	51.12%	1,770	2.64%	7,143	10.65%	14,954	22.30%	32,890	49.06%	12,057	17.98%	1,079	1.61%	53,891	80.38%	12,074	18.01%
41	62,161	28,449	45.77%	31,462	50.61%	2,250	3.62%	7,539	12.13%	16,013	25.76%	32,521	52.32%	6,088	9.79%	1,768	2.84%	41,865	67.35%	18,528	29.81%
42	44,287	18,567	41.92%	23,137	52.24%	2,583	5.83%	7,200	16.26%	15,128	34.16%	16,743	37.81%	5,216	11.78%	3,296	7.44%	28,653	64.70%	12,338	27.86%
43	52,995	21,710	40.97%	28,079	52.98%	3,206	6.05%	8,548	16.13%	15,748	29.72%	20,028	37.79%	8,671	16.36%	2,499	4.72%	35,451	66.89%	15,045	28.39%
44	53,439	22,377	41.87%	28,520	53.37%	2,542	4.76%	6,737	12.61%	15,111	28.28%	22,165	41.48%	9,426	17.64%	2,640	4.94%	36,494	68.29%	14,305	26.77%
45	58,775	26,311	44.77%	30,223	51.42%	2,241	3.81%	7,304	12.43%	14,376	24.46%	27,822	47.34%	9,273	15.78%	2,000	3.40%	42,229	71.85%	14,546	24.75%
46	44,558	19,824	44.49%	24,463	54.90%	271	0.61%	4,792	10.75%	10,613	23.82%	19,804	44.45%	9,349	20.98%	665	1.49%	39,850	89.43%	4,043	9.07%
47	47,311	20,514	43.36%	26,532	56.08%	265	0.56%	6,388	13.50%	11,763	24.86%	19,886	42.03%	9,274	19.60%	498	1.05%	44,506	94.07%	2,307	4.88%
48	54,356	23,970	44.10%	29,974	55.14%	412	0.76%	6,260	11.52%	15,473	28.47%	23,540	43.31%	9,083	16.71%	1,902	3.50%	43,263	79.59%	9,191	16.91%
49	67,409	29,950	44.43%	34,496	51.17%	2,963	4.40%	8,818	13.08%	22,076	32.75%	27,614	40.96%	8,901	13.20%	1,835	2.72%	47,687	70.74%	17,887	26.54%
50	60,769	27,486	45.23%	31,885	52.47%	1,398	2.30%	6,184	10.18%	12,926	21.27%	28,951	47.64%	12,708	20.91%	1,028	1.69%	48,371	79.60%	11,370	18.71%
51	51,162	22,913	44.79%	27,423	53.60%	826	1.61%	6,196	12.11%	13,607	26.60%	21,894	42.79%	9,465	18.50%	2,900	5.67%	38,782	75.80%	9,480	18.53%
52	58,220	26,479	45.48%	31,687	54.43%	54	0.09%	5,005	8.60%	11,728	20.14%	23,314	40.04%	18,173	31.21%	804	1.38%	53,829	92.46%	3,587	6.16%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-25.asc', modified 08/28/2017 04:08:41 PM

Printed 08/29/2017 {rptS05|dc2016GE|re1.4.0}

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections. Voter registration snapshot as of November 12, 2016. Note that voter records that could not be associated with a geographic location were excluded.

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: Voter Registration by Gender, Age, and Ethnicity

		Voter Registration by Gender						Voter Registration by Age								Voter Registration by Ethnicity					
District	Total	Male	% Male	Female	% Female	Undesig.	% Undesig.	18-25	% 18-25	26-40	% 26-40	41-65	% 41-65	66+	% 66+	Hispanic	% Hisp	Non-Hisp	% Non-Hisp	Undesig.	% Undesig.
53	54,170	24,180	44.64%	29,003	53.54%	987	1.82%	6,586	12.16%	13,907	25.67%	23,746	43.84%	9,931	18.33%	1,658	3.06%	40,746	75.22%	11,766	21.72%
54	67,517	29,569	43.79%	34,994	51.83%	2,954	4.38%	5,901	8.74%	15,644	23.17%	28,910	42.82%	17,062	25.27%	1,685	2.50%	50,290	74.48%	15,542	23.02%
55	53,115	23,863	44.93%	26,854	50.56%	2,398	4.51%	6,237	11.74%	11,604	21.85%	24,188	45.54%	11,086	20.87%	727	1.37%	44,506	83.79%	7,882	14.84%
56	68,359	28,716	42.01%	35,523	51.97%	4,120	6.03%	20,331	29.74%	21,347	31.23%	19,375	28.34%	7,306	10.69%	2,477	3.62%	49,881	72.97%	16,001	23.41%
57	62,864	26,282	41.81%	34,904	55.52%	1,678	2.67%	16,885	26.86%	17,365	27.62%	20,614	32.79%	8,000	12.73%	1,377	2.19%	48,273	76.79%	13,214	21.02%
58	55,902	24,033	42.99%	30,872	55.23%	997	1.78%	9,624	17.22%	16,217	29.01%	21,283	38.07%	8,778	15.70%	1,718	3.07%	44,615	79.81%	9,569	17.12%
59	61,489	28,147	45.78%	32,800	53.34%	542	0.88%	6,474	10.53%	14,189	23.08%	27,811	45.23%	13,015	21.17%	878	1.43%	53,209	86.53%	7,402	12.04%
60	52,097	22,481	43.15%	28,940	55.55%	676	1.30%	6,980	13.40%	14,828	28.46%	21,378	41.03%	8,911	17.10%	1,628	3.12%	41,459	79.58%	9,010	17.29%
61	62,835	28,639	45.58%	33,767	53.74%	429	0.68%	5,992	9.54%	13,589	21.63%	28,014	44.58%	15,240	24.25%	1,237	1.97%	55,194	87.84%	6,404	10.19%
62	63,040	28,495	45.20%	34,061	54.03%	484	0.77%	7,011	11.12%	14,194	22.52%	29,564	46.90%	12,271	19.47%	983	1.56%	55,677	88.32%	6,380	10.12%
63	51,804	22,519	43.47%	28,148	54.34%	1,137	2.19%	5,424	10.47%	11,679	22.54%	23,148	44.68%	11,553	22.30%	1,510	2.91%	39,655	76.55%	10,639	20.54%
64	48,685	21,343	43.84%	25,977	53.36%	1,365	2.80%	6,325	12.99%	10,931	22.45%	21,058	43.25%	10,371	21.30%	1,233	2.53%	36,850	75.69%	10,602	21.78%
65	53,978	24,781	45.91%	29,186	54.07%	11	0.02%	5,417	10.04%	10,887	20.17%	24,841	46.02%	12,833	23.77%	636	1.18%	45,502	84.30%	7,840	14.52%
66	51,977	23,632	45.47%	27,784	53.45%	561	1.08%	5,683	10.93%	11,250	21.64%	22,759	43.79%	12,285	23.64%	757	1.46%	42,982	82.69%	8,238	15.85%
67	58,768	27,441	46.69%	30,353	51.65%	974	1.66%	6,579	11.19%	12,708	21.62%	27,446	46.70%	12,035	20.48%	523	0.89%	50,098	85.25%	8,147	13.86%
68	59,838	28,292	47.28%	30,779	51.44%	767	1.28%	7,966	13.31%	12,248	20.47%	32,232	53.87%	7,392	12.35%	2,202	3.68%	48,996	81.88%	8,640	14.44%
69	54,396	25,057	46.06%	28,589	52.56%	750	1.38%	7,124	13.10%	13,307	24.46%	25,137	46.21%	8,828	16.23%	2,075	3.81%	44,916	82.57%	7,405	13.61%
70	49,623	22,924	46.20%	26,179	52.76%	520	1.05%	5,521	11.13%	11,074	22.32%	22,048	44.43%	10,980	22.13%	1,425	2.87%	40,111	80.83%	8,087	16.30%
71	50,921	21,447	42.12%	27,834	54.66%	1,640	3.22%	6,936	13.62%	15,167	29.79%	19,774	38.83%	9,044	17.76%	2,219	4.36%	36,208	71.11%	12,494	24.54%
72	51,625	22,000	42.62%	27,737	53.73%	1,888	3.66%	7,386	14.31%	13,802	26.74%	20,289	39.30%	10,148	19.66%	1,553	3.01%	35,188	68.16%	14,884	28.83%
73	53,508	24,310	45.43%	28,286	52.86%	912	1.70%	5,905	11.04%	11,396	21.30%	24,517	45.82%	11,690	21.85%	1,213	2.27%	43,903	82.05%	8,392	15.68%
74	59,404	27,098	45.62%	31,122	52.39%	1,184	1.99%	6,085	10.24%	12,281	20.67%	28,121	47.34%	12,917	21.74%	1,119	1.88%	46,898	78.95%	11,387	19.17%
75	57,799	25,443	44.02%	31,065	53.75%	1,291	2.23%	6,037	10.44%	13,967	24.16%	25,719	44.50%	12,076	20.89%	1,869	3.23%	44,651	77.25%	11,279	19.51%
76	55,656	25,540	45.89%	29,498	53.00%	618	1.11%	7,045	12.66%	12,737	22.89%	23,850	42.85%	12,024	21.60%	842	1.51%	47,081	84.59%	7,733	13.89%
77	58,417	27,234	46.62%	30,688	52.53%	495	0.85%	6,108	10.46%	11,786	20.18%	26,969	46.17%	13,554	23.20%	886	1.52%	49,302	84.40%	8,229	14.09%
78	50,906	23,926	47.00%	26,648	52.35%	332	0.65%	5,614	11.03%	10,705	21.03%	23,370	45.91%	11,217	22.03%	998	1.96%	41,996	82.50%	7,912	15.54%
79	51,819	23,313	44.99%	27,415	52.91%	1,091	2.11%	5,018	9.68%	10,367	20.01%	22,135	42.72%	14,299	27.59%	509	0.98%	40,550	78.25%	10,760	20.76%
80	53,649	24,887	46.39%	28,256	52.67%	506	0.94%	5,838	10.88%	11,323	21.11%	24,757	46.15%	11,731	21.87%	742	1.38%	43,762	81.57%	9,145	17.05%
81	51,976	24,043	46.26%	27,610	53.12%	323	0.62%	5,271	10.14%	10,753	20.69%	24,117	46.40%	11,835	22.77%	715	1.38%	43,054	82.83%	8,207	15.79%
82	63,032	28,262	44.84%	33,381	52.96%	1,389	2.20%	7,270	11.53%	16,050	25.46%	29,991	47.58%	9,721	15.42%	1,928	3.06%	47,673	75.63%	13,431	21.31%
83	54,011	23,904	44.26%	29,083	53.85%	1,024	1.90%	6,189	11.46%	14,264	26.41%	23,361	43.25%	10,197	18.88%	1,796	3.33%	41,676	77.16%	10,539	19.51%
84	53,651	24,993	46.58%	28,203	52.57%	455	0.85%	5,655	10.54%	11,694	21.80%	24,281	45.26%	12,021	22.41%	1,246	2.32%	46,659	86.97%	5,746	10.71%
85	48,473	22,744	46.92%	25,537	52.68%	192	0.40%	4,703	9.70%	9,652	19.91%	21,230	43.80%	12,888	26.59%	410	0.85%	41,912	86.46%	6,151	12.69%
86	51,445	23,957	46.57%	27,173	52.82%	315	0.61%	5,436	10.57%	10,557	20.52%	22,767	44.26%	12,685	24.66%	624	1.21%	45,289	88.03%	5,532	10.75%
87	53,883	25,478	47.28%	28,043	52.04%	362	0.67%	5,324	9.88%	11,065	20.54%	24,208	44.93%	13,286	24.66%	646	1.20%	46,552	86.39%	6,685	12.41%
88	60,901	27,035	44.39%	32,400	53.20%	1,466	2.41%	7,878	12.94%	23,291	38.24%	22,579	37.07%	7,153	11.75%	2,470	4.06%	45,650	74.96%	12,781	20.99%
89	52,655	24,569	46.66%	27,550	52.32%	536	1.02%	5,384	10.23%	11,104	21.09%	24,592	46.70%	11,575	21.98%	997	1.89%	43,978	83.52%	7,680	14.59%
90	51,627	23,578	45.67%	27,380	53.03%	669	1.30%	4,878	9.45%	9,759	18.90%	23,013	44.58%	13,977	27.07%	878	1.70%	43,781	84.80%	6,968	13.50%
91	53,574	25,050	46.76%	28,227	52.69%	297	0.55%	5,331	9.95%	10,302	19.23%	25,152	46.95%	12,789	23.87%	679	1.27%	45,038	84.07%	7,857	14.67%
92	58,460	25,742	44.03%	31,505	53.89%	1,213	2.07%	6,703	11.47%	20,293	34.71%	24,720	42.29%	6,744	11.54%	3,954	6.76%	43,894	75.08%	10,612	18.15%
93	63,046	29,592	46.94%	32,775	51.99%	679	1.08%	16,558	26.26%	13,850	21.97%	20,286	32.18%	12,352	19.59%	1,041	1.65%	51,960	82.42%	10,045	15.93%
94	52,688	24,687	46.86%	27,386	51.98%	615	1.17%	5,218	9.90%	10,253	19.46%	23,698	44.98%	13,519	25.66%	707	1.34%	46,187	87.66%	5,794	11.00%
95	63,800	29,910	46.88%	33,035	51.78%	855	1.34%	7,366	11.55%	14,825	23.24%	30,999	48.59%	10,610	16.63%	1,219	1.91%	53,880	84.45%	8,701	13.64%
96	51,891	23,510	45.31%	27,817	53.61%	564	1.09%	5,534	10.66%	11,523	22.21%	23,208	44.72%	11,626	22.40%	1,283	2.47%	42,967	82.80%	7,641	14.73%
97	55,069	25,791	46.83%	28,569	51.88%	709	1.29%	5,236	9.51%	11,389	20.68%	26,591	48.29%	11,853	21.52%	1,154	2.10%	45,801	83.17%	8,114	14.73%
98	64,276	29,505	45.90%	33,592	52.26%	1,179	1.83%	7,445	11.58%	16,549	25.75%	30,370	47.25%	9,912	15.42%	1,500	2.33%	53,230	82.81%	9,546	14.85%
99	55,566	23,633	42.53%	30,371	54.66%	1,562	2.81%	8,322	14.98%	17,375	31.27%	23,482	42.26%	6,387	11.49%	3,350	6.03%	40,012	72.01%	12,204	21.96%
100	50,526	21,718	42.98%	27,605	54.64%	1,203	2.38%	6,428	12.72%	16,016	31.70%	20,625	40.82%	7,457	14.76%	2,861	5.66%	37,942	75.09%	9,723	19.24%
101	64,652	28,290	43.76%	34,686	53.65%	1,676	2.59%	9,749	15.08%	22,210	34.35%	25,586	39.57%	7,107	10.99%	2,038	3.15%	46,370	71.72%	16,244	25.13%
102	56,395	25,176	44.64%	29,651	52.58%	1,568	2.78%	6,828	12.11%	22,555	39.99%	20,617	36.56%	6,395	11.34%	1,924	3.41%	41,317	73.26%	13,154	23.32%
103	60,081	27,582	45.91%	31,492	52.42%	1,007	1.68%	6,648	11.07%	13,092	21.79%	28,690	47.75%	11,651	19.39%	1,489	2.48%	50,475	84.01%	8,117	13.51%
104	64,218	28,730	44.74%	34,608	53.89%	880	1.37%	6,489	10.10%	17,039	26.53%	27,359	42.60%	13,331	20.76%	1,035	1.61%	55,176	85.92%	8,007	12.47%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-25.asc', modified 08/28/2017 04:08:41 PM

Printed 08/29/2017 {rptS05|dc2016GE|re1.4.0}

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections. Voter registration snapshot as of November 12, 2016. Note that voter records that could not be associated with a geographic location were excluded.

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: Voter Registration by Gender, Age, and Ethnicity

		Voter Registration by Gender						Voter Registration by Age								Voter Registration by Ethnicity					
District	**Total**	**Male**	**% Male**	**Female**	**% Female**	**Undesig.**	**% Undesig.**	**18-25**	**% 18-25**	**26-40**	**% 26-40**	**41-65**	**% 41-65**	**66+**	**% 66+**	**Hispanic**	**% Hisp**	**Non-Hisp**	**% Non-Hisp**	**Undesig.**	**% Undesig.**
105	59,875	27,143	45.33%	31,712	52.96%	1,020	1.70%	6,223	10.39%	15,133	25.27%	29,149	48.68%	9,370	15.65%	2,025	3.38%	49,511	82.69%	8,339	13.93%
106	55,729	24,459	43.89%	29,561	53.04%	1,709	3.07%	13,349	23.95%	16,417	29.46%	20,173	36.20%	5,790	10.39%	2,425	4.35%	40,510	72.69%	12,794	22.96%
107	58,873	25,076	42.59%	32,353	54.95%	1,444	2.45%	7,888	13.40%	19,123	32.48%	25,182	42.77%	6,680	11.35%	2,188	3.72%	44,061	74.84%	12,624	21.44%
108	53,081	23,550	44.37%	28,375	53.46%	1,156	2.18%	5,747	10.83%	13,085	24.65%	23,607	44.47%	10,642	20.05%	1,254	2.36%	42,636	80.32%	9,191	17.32%
109	54,288	23,977	44.17%	29,120	53.64%	1,191	2.19%	5,991	11.04%	13,065	24.07%	24,970	46.00%	10,262	18.90%	1,270	2.34%	43,075	79.35%	9,943	18.32%
110	49,991	22,449	44.91%	26,679	53.37%	863	1.73%	5,153	10.31%	10,836	21.68%	22,807	45.62%	11,195	22.39%	528	1.06%	41,083	82.18%	8,380	16.76%
111	48,335	21,874	45.25%	25,734	53.24%	727	1.50%	5,279	10.92%	10,240	21.19%	21,899	45.31%	10,917	22.59%	405	0.84%	40,841	84.50%	7,089	14.67%
112	51,533	23,585	45.77%	26,978	52.35%	970	1.88%	5,220	10.13%	10,757	20.87%	23,099	44.82%	12,457	24.17%	537	1.04%	43,546	84.50%	7,450	14.46%
113	62,182	28,591	45.98%	32,777	52.71%	814	1.31%	5,414	8.71%	10,873	17.49%	24,694	39.71%	21,201	34.10%	659	1.06%	49,650	79.85%	11,873	19.09%
114	70,877	31,085	43.86%	37,587	53.03%	2,205	3.11%	8,390	11.84%	23,478	33.12%	26,065	36.77%	12,944	18.26%	1,368	1.93%	48,071	67.82%	21,438	30.25%
115	64,179	29,132	45.39%	33,655	52.44%	1,392	2.17%	6,157	9.59%	14,207	22.14%	28,061	43.72%	15,754	24.55%	694	1.08%	46,633	72.66%	16,852	26.26%
116	60,457	27,354	45.25%	31,764	52.54%	1,339	2.21%	5,855	9.68%	14,647	24.23%	26,469	43.78%	13,486	22.31%	916	1.52%	44,783	74.07%	14,758	24.41%
117	59,643	26,729	44.81%	32,084	53.79%	830	1.39%	5,007	8.39%	12,136	20.35%	24,630	41.30%	17,870	29.96%	1,290	2.16%	44,466	74.55%	13,887	23.28%
118	58,270	27,317	46.88%	30,140	51.72%	813	1.40%	5,851	10.04%	11,623	19.95%	25,489	43.74%	15,307	26.27%	378	0.65%	46,049	79.03%	11,843	20.32%
119	53,612	24,147	45.04%	28,207	52.61%	1,258	2.35%	7,661	14.29%	11,121	20.74%	20,912	39.01%	13,918	25.96%	573	1.07%	45,491	84.85%	7,548	14.08%
120	62,750	29,253	46.62%	33,075	52.71%	422	0.67%	5,113	8.15%	11,571	18.44%	26,091	41.58%	19,975	31.83%	464	0.74%	54,372	86.65%	7,914	12.61%
Totals:	**6,822,218**	**3,055,867**	**44.79%**	**3,614,514**	**52.98%**	**151,837**	**2.23%**	**834,432**	**12.23%**	**1,704,813**	**24.99%**	**2,938,614**	**43.07%**	**1,344,359**	**19.71%**	**163,663**	**2.40%**	**5,323,441**	**78.03%**	**1,335,114**	**19.57%**

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: 2016 General Election - PR, USS, and GV

	US President: Trump-Clinton-Johnson-Write-in								US Senate: Burr-Ross-Haugh						Governor: Cooper-McCrory-Cecil					
District	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	WI	WI %	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %
1	18,589	51.78%	16,455	45.83%	630	1.75%	229	0.64%	18,358	52.14%	16,040	45.56%	811	2.30%	16,170	45.62%	18,855	53.20%	418	1.18%
2	21,687	56.45%	15,453	40.22%	893	2.32%	385	1.00%	21,503	56.54%	15,299	40.22%	1,232	3.24%	16,542	43.27%	21,035	55.02%	656	1.72%
3	19,500	57.51%	13,102	38.64%	958	2.83%	350	1.03%	19,722	58.75%	12,526	37.32%	1,320	3.93%	13,284	39.49%	19,645	58.40%	709	2.11%
4	19,316	63.27%	10,515	34.44%	536	1.76%	163	0.53%	18,844	62.77%	10,197	33.97%	978	3.26%	10,515	34.80%	19,240	63.67%	463	1.53%
5	14,071	42.89%	17,840	54.38%	677	2.06%	221	0.67%	13,942	43.33%	17,542	54.52%	690	2.14%	17,723	54.83%	14,115	43.67%	483	1.49%
6	26,166	63.13%	13,548	32.69%	1,322	3.19%	413	1.00%	25,754	63.45%	13,548	33.38%	1,290	3.18%	14,719	36.08%	25,069	61.45%	1,010	2.48%
7	21,956	56.91%	15,273	39.59%	939	2.43%	411	1.07%	21,764	56.74%	15,352	40.02%	1,242	3.24%	16,618	43.12%	21,215	55.05%	707	1.83%
8	11,251	32.48%	22,166	63.99%	878	2.53%	346	1.00%	11,920	34.87%	21,238	62.12%	1,030	3.01%	21,791	63.50%	11,949	34.82%	577	1.68%
9	20,103	53.26%	16,101	42.66%	1,112	2.95%	426	1.13%	20,913	55.89%	15,376	41.09%	1,129	3.02%	16,546	44.07%	20,375	54.27%	626	1.67%
10	24,292	66.90%	11,079	30.51%	680	1.87%	258	0.71%	24,011	66.82%	10,937	30.44%	984	2.74%	11,524	31.87%	24,183	66.89%	449	1.24%
11	12,772	30.14%	26,766	63.16%	1,949	4.60%	890	2.10%	14,335	34.09%	26,030	61.90%	1,690	4.02%	28,163	66.70%	12,781	30.27%	1,278	3.03%
12	17,784	51.92%	15,657	45.71%	569	1.66%	241	0.70%	17,668	52.25%	15,240	45.07%	906	2.68%	15,523	45.65%	18,084	53.18%	397	1.17%
13	29,527	68.85%	11,999	27.98%	967	2.25%	396	0.92%	29,080	68.53%	11,666	27.49%	1,685	3.97%	12,730	29.84%	29,076	68.17%	849	1.99%
14	16,391	60.55%	9,442	34.88%	949	3.51%	289	1.07%	16,089	60.41%	9,134	34.30%	1,410	5.29%	9,540	35.73%	16,350	61.23%	813	3.04%
15	13,635	66.87%	5,838	28.63%	701	3.44%	217	1.06%	13,255	66.19%	5,709	28.51%	1,061	5.30%	6,115	30.44%	13,366	66.54%	606	3.02%
16	24,723	60.82%	14,793	36.39%	868	2.14%	267	0.66%	24,021	60.12%	14,359	35.94%	1,578	3.95%	15,806	39.44%	23,414	58.42%	858	2.14%
17	33,539	64.40%	16,832	32.32%	1,227	2.36%	480	0.92%	32,987	64.27%	16,223	31.61%	2,112	4.12%	18,326	35.57%	32,038	62.18%	1,162	2.26%
18	14,960	39.11%	21,515	56.25%	1,247	3.26%	530	1.39%	15,065	40.15%	20,714	55.20%	1,747	4.66%	22,540	59.77%	14,028	37.20%	1,146	3.04%
19	24,349	55.45%	17,494	39.84%	1,461	3.33%	604	1.38%	24,444	56.44%	16,799	38.79%	2,068	4.77%	19,932	45.80%	22,351	51.36%	1,232	2.83%
20	25,197	54.81%	18,393	40.01%	1,731	3.77%	651	1.42%	25,753	56.83%	17,604	38.84%	1,962	4.33%	20,831	45.79%	23,400	51.43%	1,266	2.78%
21	12,919	40.43%	18,303	57.28%	495	1.55%	237	0.74%	13,027	41.30%	17,815	56.47%	703	2.23%	17,980	56.77%	13,288	41.96%	404	1.28%
22	20,939	58.30%	14,256	39.69%	523	1.46%	201	0.56%	20,588	58.10%	14,025	39.58%	820	2.31%	14,561	40.81%	20,720	58.07%	400	1.12%
23	14,143	38.43%	22,040	59.88%	449	1.22%	173	0.47%	14,165	38.89%	21,496	59.02%	760	2.09%	21,917	59.87%	14,389	39.30%	303	0.83%
24	17,531	45.97%	19,663	51.56%	667	1.75%	274	0.72%	17,641	46.58%	19,435	51.32%	794	2.10%	20,471	53.84%	17,161	45.13%	391	1.03%
25	17,731	44.94%	20,836	52.81%	588	1.49%	299	0.76%	17,965	45.70%	20,621	52.45%	729	1.85%	21,877	55.47%	17,171	43.54%	389	0.99%
26	28,405	59.94%	16,944	35.76%	1,499	3.16%	539	1.14%	28,505	60.58%	16,778	35.66%	1,767	3.76%	18,608	39.37%	27,716	58.63%	946	2.00%
27	12,504	36.17%	21,573	62.40%	373	1.08%	123	0.36%	12,390	36.15%	21,326	62.22%	557	1.63%	21,783	63.37%	12,336	35.89%	256	0.74%
28	24,454	65.87%	11,524	31.04%	860	2.32%	288	0.78%	24,026	65.28%	11,577	31.45%	1,202	3.27%	12,613	34.09%	23,768	64.24%	617	1.67%
29	5,172	10.88%	40,386	84.99%	1,171	2.46%	787	1.66%	7,072	15.00%	39,112	82.96%	964	2.04%	40,387	85.64%	6,009	12.74%	761	1.61%
30	13,282	26.62%	34,511	69.18%	1,265	2.54%	829	1.66%	14,956	30.09%	33,506	67.41%	1,242	2.50%	35,040	70.35%	13,947	28.00%	818	1.64%
31	7,429	16.37%	36,169	79.69%	1,136	2.50%	654	1.44%	8,466	18.76%	35,558	78.81%	1,092	2.42%	36,387	80.47%	8,063	17.83%	770	1.70%
32	13,636	35.53%	23,937	62.37%	563	1.47%	241	0.63%	13,731	36.10%	23,622	62.10%	683	1.80%	24,127	63.21%	13,643	35.74%	401	1.05%
33	8,767	21.69%	29,855	73.85%	1,231	3.05%	571	1.41%	9,581	23.88%	29,362	73.19%	1,176	2.93%	30,383	75.49%	9,009	22.38%	856	2.13%
34	15,899	33.19%	29,193	60.93%	1,853	3.87%	964	2.01%	18,725	39.20%	27,648	57.88%	1,394	2.92%	30,754	64.19%	16,172	33.75%	985	2.06%
35	25,820	48.23%	24,741	46.22%	1,856	3.47%	1,114	2.08%	27,825	52.32%	23,667	44.50%	1,691	3.18%	26,206	49.05%	26,119	48.89%	1,103	2.06%
36	25,495	49.78%	22,974	44.86%	1,903	3.72%	846	1.65%	27,500	53.89%	21,900	42.91%	1,632	3.20%	24,574	47.98%	25,611	50.00%	1,036	2.02%
37	26,551	49.29%	24,034	44.61%	2,353	4.37%	933	1.73%	28,537	53.33%	22,998	42.98%	1,977	3.69%	25,914	48.21%	26,430	49.17%	1,407	2.62%
38	6,506	16.91%	30,462	79.16%	973	2.53%	542	1.41%	7,268	19.02%	29,875	78.17%	1,077	2.82%	30,642	79.97%	6,895	17.99%	782	2.04%
39	14,772	32.83%	28,309	62.91%	1,293	2.87%	625	1.39%	15,518	34.68%	27,895	62.33%	1,339	2.99%	29,019	64.61%	15,061	33.53%	837	1.86%
40	25,292	46.24%	26,285	48.05%	2,113	3.86%	1,008	1.84%	28,467	52.13%	24,667	45.17%	1,474	2.70%	27,948	51.03%	25,775	47.06%	1,042	1.90%
41	17,243	35.39%	28,670	58.85%	1,924	3.95%	879	1.80%	20,149	41.74%	26,623	55.15%	1,504	3.12%	29,266	60.36%	18,040	37.21%	1,180	2.43%
42	6,364	25.50%	17,674	70.81%	647	2.59%	274	1.10%	6,643	26.97%	17,141	69.60%	845	3.43%	17,092	69.47%	6,886	27.99%	627	2.55%
43	8,099	26.20%	21,704	70.20%	798	2.58%	317	1.03%	8,364	27.40%	21,127	69.21%	1,035	3.39%	21,109	69.10%	8,700	28.48%	740	2.42%
44	14,477	44.27%	16,935	51.79%	961	2.94%	329	1.01%	14,728	45.60%	16,387	50.74%	1,184	3.67%	16,797	51.88%	14,827	45.80%	750	2.32%
45	22,325	57.35%	15,292	39.28%	967	2.48%	343	0.88%	22,167	57.66%	15,078	39.22%	1,202	3.13%	15,451	40.04%	22,349	57.91%	792	2.05%
46	16,046	61.47%	9,544	36.56%	396	1.52%	116	0.44%	15,195	59.76%	9,522	37.45%	708	2.78%	9,625	37.45%	15,778	61.39%	300	1.17%
47	11,779	46.41%	12,896	50.81%	520	2.05%	186	0.73%	11,277	45.82%	12,909	52.46%	423	1.72%	12,419	49.71%	12,346	49.42%	216	0.86%
48	14,016	43.58%	17,045	53.00%	831	2.58%	266	0.83%	13,782	43.73%	16,722	53.06%	1,010	3.20%	17,039	53.91%	13,890	43.94%	679	2.15%
49	16,965	33.01%	31,447	61.18%	2,012	3.91%	974	1.90%	19,884	38.92%	29,621	57.98%	1,580	3.09%	32,686	63.71%	17,463	34.04%	1,158	2.26%
50	18,683	40.92%	25,213	55.22%	1,226	2.69%	539	1.18%	19,535	43.06%	24,526	54.06%	1,309	2.89%	26,259	57.73%	18,414	40.49%	810	1.78%
51	18,556	54.99%	13,829	40.98%	1,027	3.04%	332	0.98%	18,319	54.87%	13,803	41.34%	1,264	3.79%	14,919	44.49%	17,772	53.00%	840	2.51%
52	26,508	61.46%	14,902	34.55%	1,240	2.87%	482	1.12%	26,850	62.67%	14,595	34.07%	1,396	3.26%	16,149	37.60%	25,907	60.32%	893	2.08%
53	21,436	60.85%	12,611	35.80%	852	2.42%	328	0.93%	21,212	60.60%	12,628	36.08%	1,164	3.33%	13,300	37.93%	21,064	60.08%	697	1.99%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-25.asc', modified 08/28/2017 04:08:41 PM

Printed 08/29/2017 {rptS06|dc2016GE|re1.4.0}

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections. Votes that could not be associated with a specific precinct were excluded. Reported statewide totals may therefore be marginally lower than official contest results.

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: 2016 General Election - PR, USS, and GV

	US President: Trump-Clinton-Johnson-Write-in								US Senate: Burr-Ross-Haugh						Governor: Cooper-McCrory-Cecil					
District	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	WI	WI %	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %
54	19,492	37.13%	30,645	58.38%	1,545	2.94%	809	1.54%	21,169	40.48%	29,679	56.76%	1,444	2.76%	31,838	60.66%	19,672	37.48%	979	1.87%
55	22,840	63.50%	12,002	33.37%	788	2.19%	336	0.93%	22,508	63.37%	11,758	33.10%	1,252	3.52%	12,330	34.49%	22,863	63.95%	559	1.56%
56	5,901	12.36%	39,502	82.73%	1,392	2.92%	955	2.00%	8,341	17.60%	38,022	80.24%	1,021	2.15%	40,120	84.53%	6,502	13.70%	838	1.77%
57	4,869	12.13%	33,975	84.62%	785	1.96%	523	1.30%	5,571	14.07%	33,051	83.48%	968	2.45%	33,866	85.39%	5,062	12.76%	733	1.85%
58	8,963	23.57%	27,663	72.74%	918	2.41%	485	1.28%	9,437	25.12%	26,960	71.78%	1,164	3.10%	28,097	74.57%	8,759	23.25%	823	2.18%
59	25,507	54.53%	19,758	42.24%	1,056	2.26%	457	0.98%	25,592	55.15%	19,403	41.81%	1,411	3.04%	21,420	45.98%	24,237	52.03%	926	1.99%
60	10,484	30.27%	22,918	66.17%	880	2.54%	353	1.02%	10,935	32.03%	22,058	64.61%	1,148	3.36%	23,295	68.08%	10,105	29.53%	819	2.39%
61	24,185	49.68%	22,193	45.59%	1,552	3.19%	752	1.54%	25,701	53.16%	21,118	43.68%	1,528	3.16%	24,221	49.98%	23,168	47.80%	1,075	2.22%
62	23,811	49.23%	22,262	46.02%	1,540	3.18%	757	1.57%	25,865	53.72%	20,867	43.34%	1,417	2.94%	24,295	50.38%	22,926	47.54%	1,000	2.07%
63	19,745	52.91%	16,215	43.45%	964	2.58%	397	1.06%	20,099	54.24%	15,711	42.39%	1,249	3.37%	17,448	46.93%	19,042	51.22%	687	1.85%
64	19,070	56.36%	13,618	40.25%	831	2.46%	317	0.94%	19,281	57.45%	13,162	39.22%	1,119	3.33%	14,584	43.35%	18,459	54.87%	596	1.77%
65	23,874	63.29%	12,795	33.92%	751	1.99%	301	0.80%	23,327	62.41%	12,731	34.06%	1,321	3.53%	14,611	38.98%	22,135	59.06%	733	1.96%
66	20,232	57.61%	14,075	40.08%	619	1.76%	192	0.55%	19,128	55.40%	14,083	40.79%	1,316	3.81%	15,183	43.59%	19,075	54.76%	577	1.66%
67	31,950	73.24%	10,240	23.47%	1,051	2.41%	381	0.87%	30,799	71.22%	10,291	23.80%	2,154	4.98%	11,709	26.92%	30,872	70.99%	907	2.09%
68	25,357	58.90%	15,581	36.19%	1,519	3.53%	593	1.38%	26,537	62.36%	14,300	33.60%	1,717	4.03%	16,268	38.02%	25,525	59.65%	1,000	2.34%
69	23,008	61.78%	12,620	33.89%	1,151	3.09%	461	1.24%	23,224	63.20%	11,858	32.27%	1,667	4.54%	13,180	35.64%	22,857	61.81%	941	2.54%
70	25,245	74.51%	7,544	22.27%	779	2.30%	312	0.92%	24,601	73.23%	7,505	22.34%	1,490	4.44%	9,245	27.45%	23,609	70.11%	821	2.44%
71	9,228	26.65%	23,827	68.81%	1,064	3.07%	510	1.47%	10,380	30.23%	22,857	66.56%	1,102	3.21%	24,376	70.96%	9,143	26.62%	831	2.42%
72	6,795	19.73%	26,406	76.67%	805	2.34%	436	1.27%	8,321	24.36%	25,110	73.50%	730	2.14%	26,382	77.32%	7,107	20.83%	631	1.85%
73	25,744	64.55%	12,400	31.09%	1,183	2.97%	558	1.40%	26,690	67.24%	11,644	29.33%	1,362	3.43%	14,295	35.92%	24,646	61.93%	854	2.15%
74	25,112	56.02%	17,682	39.45%	1,399	3.12%	630	1.41%	26,414	59.14%	16,750	37.50%	1,499	3.36%	19,607	43.87%	24,064	53.84%	1,022	2.29%
75	22,992	54.52%	17,297	41.02%	1,322	3.13%	559	1.33%	23,918	57.09%	16,460	39.29%	1,518	3.62%	19,049	45.40%	21,902	52.20%	1,008	2.40%
76	23,064	61.73%	13,031	34.87%	877	2.35%	393	1.05%	22,286	60.33%	12,833	34.74%	1,819	4.92%	14,249	38.34%	21,950	59.07%	961	2.59%
77	30,333	72.00%	10,259	24.35%	1,103	2.62%	434	1.03%	29,715	71.11%	10,106	24.19%	1,965	4.70%	12,186	29.04%	28,782	68.58%	1,000	2.38%
78	28,166	77.69%	7,076	19.52%	739	2.04%	272	0.75%	27,319	76.13%	7,166	19.97%	1,402	3.91%	8,771	24.33%	26,543	73.63%	737	2.04%
79	22,774	61.50%	13,292	35.90%	678	1.83%	285	0.77%	22,332	61.14%	12,865	35.22%	1,328	3.64%	13,385	36.39%	22,891	62.23%	509	1.38%
80	28,033	74.04%	8,623	22.78%	918	2.42%	287	0.76%	27,677	73.76%	8,454	22.53%	1,394	3.71%	10,385	27.55%	26,519	70.35%	793	2.10%
81	26,284	71.05%	9,486	25.64%	941	2.54%	284	0.77%	25,858	70.60%	9,299	25.39%	1,469	4.01%	11,560	31.43%	24,341	66.17%	883	2.40%
82	25,226	55.52%	18,186	40.03%	1,438	3.16%	585	1.29%	25,508	56.72%	17,410	38.71%	2,053	4.57%	19,329	42.73%	24,713	54.63%	1,191	2.63%
83	20,902	57.22%	14,146	38.72%	1,046	2.86%	436	1.19%	20,485	56.66%	13,780	38.12%	1,887	5.22%	15,101	41.54%	20,226	55.63%	1,030	2.83%
84	25,864	67.41%	11,302	29.46%	842	2.19%	358	0.93%	24,946	65.81%	11,099	29.28%	1,862	4.91%	12,373	32.46%	24,857	65.22%	885	2.32%
85	27,148	74.95%	7,952	21.95%	700	1.93%	421	1.16%	25,691	72.23%	8,320	23.39%	1,555	4.37%	9,999	27.89%	24,896	69.44%	959	2.67%
86	23,049	66.31%	10,412	29.95%	895	2.57%	404	1.16%	22,151	64.58%	10,580	30.84%	1,571	4.58%	12,309	35.59%	21,505	62.18%	773	2.23%
87	26,621	73.29%	8,427	23.20%	849	2.34%	425	1.17%	25,537	71.08%	8,542	23.78%	1,847	5.14%	10,059	27.82%	25,176	69.62%	927	2.56%
88	8,920	23.83%	26,524	70.85%	1,470	3.93%	521	1.39%	10,746	29.20%	24,677	67.05%	1,383	3.76%	26,564	71.76%	9,507	25.68%	947	2.56%
89	25,622	70.69%	9,396	25.92%	904	2.49%	322	0.89%	24,664	68.94%	9,348	26.13%	1,762	4.93%	10,714	29.78%	24,387	67.78%	880	2.45%
90	26,756	73.64%	8,414	23.16%	812	2.23%	352	0.97%	25,983	72.41%	8,481	23.64%	1,418	3.95%	10,714	29.67%	24,677	68.34%	717	1.99%
91	28,820	75.03%	8,334	21.70%	925	2.41%	332	0.86%	28,090	73.57%	8,518	22.31%	1,573	4.12%	10,858	28.38%	26,538	69.37%	859	2.25%
92	11,487	31.37%	23,378	63.84%	1,245	3.40%	512	1.40%	12,363	34.22%	22,148	61.30%	1,621	4.49%	23,338	64.34%	11,852	32.67%	1,085	2.99%
93	23,108	53.24%	17,638	40.63%	1,667	3.84%	994	2.29%	23,511	54.86%	17,413	40.63%	1,936	4.52%	19,952	46.21%	21,906	50.74%	1,316	3.05%
94	29,477	75.08%	8,525	21.71%	899	2.29%	359	0.91%	28,311	72.90%	8,699	22.40%	1,828	4.71%	10,479	26.75%	27,879	71.16%	818	2.09%
95	28,890	65.36%	13,432	30.39%	1,343	3.04%	536	1.21%	28,179	64.55%	13,088	29.98%	2,386	5.47%	16,212	37.00%	26,066	59.50%	1,534	3.50%
96	22,685	62.88%	11,805	32.72%	1,069	2.96%	516	1.43%	22,549	63.28%	11,383	31.95%	1,699	4.77%	13,036	36.38%	21,866	61.02%	935	2.61%
97	28,804	71.97%	9,897	24.73%	971	2.43%	349	0.87%	27,868	70.41%	9,798	24.76%	1,913	4.83%	11,331	28.44%	27,557	69.16%	959	2.41%
98	24,388	51.54%	20,350	43.01%	1,862	3.94%	714	1.51%	26,049	55.74%	18,824	40.28%	1,864	3.99%	22,765	48.54%	22,553	48.09%	1,578	3.36%
99	6,628	19.07%	26,877	77.31%	830	2.39%	430	1.24%	7,073	20.60%	26,097	76.00%	1,169	3.40%	26,426	76.70%	7,280	21.13%	749	2.17%
100	9,065	29.00%	20,731	66.33%	994	3.18%	465	1.49%	9,754	31.61%	19,803	64.18%	1,297	4.20%	20,677	66.67%	9,505	30.65%	830	2.68%
101	8,930	22.86%	28,642	73.33%	994	2.54%	491	1.26%	9,615	24.91%	27,574	71.43%	1,414	3.66%	28,397	73.33%	9,359	24.17%	969	2.50%
102	5,292	16.06%	25,980	78.86%	1,162	3.53%	511	1.55%	6,327	19.52%	24,761	76.39%	1,328	4.10%	26,109	80.03%	5,584	17.12%	931	2.85%
103	22,701	52.01%	18,642	42.71%	1,539	3.53%	769	1.76%	24,458	56.51%	17,208	39.76%	1,617	3.74%	19,220	44.13%	23,328	53.56%	1,003	2.30%
104	20,925	43.85%	23,772	49.82%	1,932	4.05%	1,089	2.28%	25,905	54.36%	20,414	42.84%	1,332	2.80%	24,093	50.36%	22,791	47.64%	955	2.00%
105	20,052	47.27%	20,155	47.52%	1,504	3.55%	705	1.66%	22,414	53.33%	18,049	42.94%	1,569	3.73%	20,512	48.58%	20,692	49.00%	1,021	2.42%
106	7,622	22.42%	24,886	73.20%	952	2.80%	539	1.59%	8,421	25.05%	24,052	71.55%	1,145	3.41%	24,815	73.54%	8,084	23.96%	846	2.51%

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: 2016 General Election - PR, USS, and GV

	US President: Trump-Clinton-Johnson-Write-in								US Senate: Burr-Ross-Haugh						Governor: Cooper-McCrory-Cecil					
District	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**WI**	**WI %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**
107	7,868	21.04%	28,142	75.25%	886	2.37%	500	1.34%	8,416	22.77%	27,293	73.84%	1,251	3.38%	27,988	75.41%	8,221	22.15%	903	2.43%
108	21,977	61.91%	12,155	34.24%	963	2.71%	405	1.14%	21,400	61.05%	11,934	34.04%	1,722	4.91%	13,133	37.22%	21,326	60.44%	824	2.34%
109	21,849	58.81%	13,856	37.29%	1,026	2.76%	424	1.14%	21,752	59.21%	13,385	36.43%	1,600	4.36%	14,614	39.57%	21,473	58.14%	845	2.29%
110	23,363	67.95%	10,064	29.27%	685	1.99%	272	0.79%	22,465	66.14%	10,103	29.74%	1,399	4.12%	11,006	32.21%	22,520	65.90%	648	1.90%
111	23,088	67.78%	10,066	29.55%	621	1.82%	290	0.85%	22,172	65.93%	10,185	30.29%	1,272	3.78%	11,069	32.68%	22,235	65.64%	569	1.68%
112	25,060	72.71%	8,351	24.23%	717	2.08%	339	0.98%	23,380	69.04%	9,131	26.96%	1,353	4.00%	10,575	31.07%	22,633	66.49%	831	2.44%
113	27,846	61.60%	15,495	34.27%	1,152	2.55%	715	1.58%	27,107	60.73%	15,907	35.64%	1,619	3.63%	17,776	39.74%	25,806	57.69%	1,150	2.57%
114	10,675	21.88%	35,226	72.20%	1,424	2.92%	1,464	3.00%	10,943	22.71%	35,335	73.32%	1,918	3.98%	36,921	76.30%	9,880	20.42%	1,589	3.28%
115	22,578	48.02%	21,856	46.49%	1,453	3.09%	1,127	2.40%	22,563	48.39%	22,221	47.66%	1,839	3.94%	24,377	52.10%	21,034	44.95%	1,382	2.95%
116	22,462	52.07%	18,367	42.57%	1,409	3.27%	903	2.09%	22,583	52.90%	18,335	42.95%	1,776	4.16%	20,574	48.00%	20,962	48.91%	1,323	3.09%
117	25,251	60.45%	14,625	35.01%	1,235	2.96%	660	1.58%	24,962	60.51%	14,605	35.40%	1,688	4.09%	16,583	40.08%	23,567	56.96%	1,227	2.97%
118	25,826	63.62%	13,002	32.03%	1,152	2.84%	616	1.52%	24,143	60.30%	14,050	35.09%	1,845	4.61%	16,169	40.08%	22,971	56.94%	1,202	2.98%
119	19,623	54.48%	14,434	40.08%	1,323	3.67%	637	1.77%	18,853	53.03%	15,016	42.24%	1,683	4.73%	17,194	48.15%	17,362	48.62%	1,156	3.24%
120	30,691	72.91%	9,871	23.45%	1,030	2.45%	501	1.19%	28,591	69.53%	10,931	26.58%	1,600	3.89%	12,825	31.06%	27,221	65.92%	1,249	3.02%
Totals:	**2,359,749**	**49.90%**	**2,180,316**	**46.10%**	**129,929**	**2.75%**	**59,397**	**1.26%**	**2,392,439**	**51.13%**	**2,119,696**	**45.30%**	**167,190**	**3.57%**	**2,300,381**	**48.95%**	**2,296,039**	**48.86%**	**102,729**	**2.19%**

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: 2016 General Election - LG, AG, AD, CA, and CI

	Lieutenant Governor: Forest-Coleman-Cole						Attorney General: Stein-Newton				Auditor: Wood-Stuber				Comm. of Agriculture: Troxler-Smith				Comm. of Insurance: Causey-Goodwin			
District	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %
1	17,778	51.12%	16,328	46.95%	671	1.93%	17,047	49.85%	17,149	50.15%	17,560	52.13%	16,125	47.87%	18,007	52.49%	16,301	47.51%	15,699	46.22%	18,265	53.78%
2	21,550	57.60%	15,020	40.15%	840	2.25%	17,015	46.07%	19,917	53.93%	17,522	48.30%	18,758	51.70%	22,729	61.40%	14,287	38.60%	19,412	53.39%	16,946	46.61%
3	19,362	58.56%	12,769	38.62%	932	2.82%	13,595	41.50%	19,163	58.50%	14,299	44.42%	17,895	55.58%	19,552	60.50%	12,764	39.50%	18,761	58.50%	13,307	41.50%
4	18,524	62.83%	10,278	34.86%	683	2.32%	11,259	38.68%	17,851	61.32%	11,629	40.68%	16,958	59.32%	18,436	63.44%	10,624	36.56%	17,715	61.62%	11,035	38.38%
5	13,598	42.70%	17,580	55.21%	665	2.09%	18,195	57.96%	13,195	42.04%	18,582	59.83%	12,478	40.17%	13,671	43.63%	17,662	56.37%	12,579	40.44%	18,524	59.56%
6	24,969	62.46%	13,748	34.39%	1,261	3.15%	14,523	36.89%	24,849	63.11%	15,098	38.91%	23,701	61.09%	25,170	64.45%	13,885	35.55%	24,161	62.22%	14,671	37.78%
7	21,930	57.78%	15,216	40.09%	806	2.12%	16,847	44.72%	20,823	55.28%	17,765	47.79%	19,410	52.21%	23,546	62.44%	14,162	37.56%	20,004	53.80%	17,177	46.20%
8	11,543	34.32%	21,250	63.17%	844	2.51%	22,114	66.21%	11,285	33.79%	22,403	67.93%	10,578	32.07%	12,017	36.30%	21,089	63.70%	11,116	33.76%	21,809	66.24%
9	20,567	55.82%	15,300	41.53%	978	2.65%	16,594	45.44%	19,925	54.56%	17,274	47.89%	18,798	52.11%	21,318	58.80%	14,937	41.20%	19,780	54.93%	16,228	45.07%
10	24,002	67.76%	10,809	30.52%	609	1.72%	12,118	34.50%	23,009	65.50%	12,919	37.34%	21,676	62.66%	24,296	69.24%	10,793	30.76%	22,074	63.75%	12,552	36.25%
11	14,274	34.59%	25,118	60.87%	1,876	4.55%	27,570	67.41%	13,329	32.59%	25,755	64.01%	14,483	35.99%	18,386	45.40%	22,115	54.60%	13,426	33.59%	26,543	66.41%
12	17,425	52.08%	15,430	46.12%	602	1.80%	16,317	49.26%	16,804	50.74%	17,019	51.70%	15,897	48.30%	17,565	52.94%	15,612	47.06%	16,452	50.12%	16,371	49.88%
13	28,811	68.95%	11,868	28.40%	1,107	2.65%	12,793	30.86%	28,667	69.14%	13,602	33.49%	27,011	66.51%	29,462	71.58%	11,700	28.42%	27,496	67.35%	13,328	32.65%
14	15,667	60.14%	9,239	35.46%	1,146	4.40%	10,094	39.18%	15,668	60.82%	10,253	40.52%	15,049	59.48%	15,637	61.47%	9,800	38.53%	15,427	60.91%	9,901	39.09%
15	13,102	66.99%	5,648	28.88%	809	4.14%	6,333	32.79%	12,978	67.21%	6,457	34.22%	12,414	65.78%	12,994	68.31%	6,028	31.69%	12,852	67.86%	6,087	32.14%
16	24,001	61.02%	14,369	36.53%	963	2.45%	16,456	42.25%	22,490	57.75%	16,032	41.74%	22,380	58.26%	23,829	61.66%	14,815	38.34%	23,195	60.22%	15,319	39.78%
17	33,147	65.60%	16,131	31.92%	1,254	2.48%	19,137	38.21%	30,944	61.79%	17,739	35.90%	31,667	64.10%	33,444	67.99%	15,743	32.01%	32,701	66.44%	16,516	33.56%
18	15,040	40.84%	20,340	55.23%	1,451	3.94%	22,453	61.46%	14,080	38.54%	21,525	59.74%	14,509	40.26%	15,450	42.96%	20,512	57.04%	14,980	41.67%	20,968	58.33%
19	24,414	57.61%	16,318	38.51%	1,644	3.88%	19,234	45.77%	22,791	54.23%	17,823	43.39%	23,256	56.61%	25,163	61.15%	15,985	38.85%	24,213	58.92%	16,884	41.08%
20	25,574	57.77%	17,001	38.41%	1,690	3.82%	19,782	45.08%	24,099	54.92%	18,506	43.12%	24,408	56.88%	26,408	61.52%	16,521	38.48%	25,358	59.28%	17,417	40.72%
21	12,799	41.18%	17,731	57.04%	553	1.78%	18,620	60.43%	12,192	39.57%	18,993	62.26%	11,511	37.74%	13,372	43.47%	17,392	56.53%	11,809	38.80%	18,624	61.20%
22	19,955	57.34%	14,263	40.98%	584	1.68%	15,485	44.90%	19,006	55.10%	15,871	46.86%	17,997	53.14%	20,435	59.08%	14,154	40.92%	18,599	54.55%	15,496	45.45%
23	13,735	38.22%	21,664	60.28%	537	1.49%	22,629	63.31%	13,112	36.69%	23,399	66.36%	11,860	33.64%	14,348	40.15%	21,390	59.85%	12,352	34.88%	23,062	65.12%
24	17,614	46.94%	19,307	51.45%	603	1.61%	20,220	53.88%	17,311	46.12%	21,252	57.73%	15,562	42.27%	18,394	49.42%	18,826	50.58%	16,304	44.20%	20,582	55.80%
25	17,898	45.87%	20,551	52.67%	567	1.45%	21,475	55.06%	17,527	44.94%	22,512	58.32%	16,092	41.68%	18,950	48.77%	19,902	51.23%	16,760	43.45%	21,814	56.55%
26	28,921	62.29%	16,198	34.89%	1,310	2.82%	18,501	40.21%	27,514	59.79%	19,109	42.21%	26,162	57.79%	31,195	68.01%	14,671	31.99%	26,821	59.42%	18,320	40.58%
27	12,111	35.73%	21,357	63.01%	427	1.26%	22,185	65.86%	11,500	34.14%	22,880	68.60%	10,475	31.40%	12,517	37.18%	21,145	62.82%	10,862	32.50%	22,559	67.50%
28	24,390	66.96%	11,178	30.69%	856	2.35%	13,012	36.07%	23,064	63.93%	14,216	40.02%	21,307	59.98%	25,756	71.31%	10,362	28.69%	22,177	62.22%	13,464	37.78%
29	6,887	14.85%	38,300	82.61%	1,175	2.53%	39,832	86.28%	6,334	13.72%	37,899	83.27%	7,615	16.73%	8,616	18.89%	37,003	81.11%	6,656	14.66%	38,737	85.34%
30	14,967	30.49%	32,969	67.17%	1,147	2.34%	34,972	71.69%	13,809	28.31%	33,628	70.01%	14,402	29.99%	17,097	35.32%	31,309	64.68%	13,691	28.55%	34,258	71.45%
31	8,325	18.63%	35,107	78.57%	1,251	2.80%	36,433	81.98%	8,009	18.02%	35,436	80.66%	8,494	19.34%	9,905	22.46%	34,191	77.54%	8,030	18.31%	35,815	81.69%
32	13,338	35.53%	23,613	62.89%	594	1.58%	24,809	66.54%	12,475	33.46%	25,347	68.68%	11,559	31.32%	14,318	38.41%	22,958	61.59%	11,893	32.22%	25,022	67.78%
33	9,598	24.23%	28,755	72.60%	1,252	3.16%	30,236	77.08%	8,990	22.92%	29,511	76.13%	9,252	23.87%	11,856	30.38%	27,169	69.62%	8,957	23.19%	29,675	76.81%
34	18,573	39.50%	26,912	57.23%	1,539	3.27%	30,038	64.36%	16,637	35.64%	27,947	60.90%	17,941	39.10%	23,552	50.95%	22,678	49.05%	16,806	36.80%	28,860	63.20%
35	28,435	54.03%	22,760	43.25%	1,431	2.72%	25,432	48.94%	26,536	51.06%	24,736	48.31%	26,467	51.69%	30,751	59.73%	20,729	40.27%	26,285	51.66%	24,595	48.34%
36	27,546	54.81%	21,270	42.32%	1,440	2.87%	23,809	47.79%	26,015	52.21%	22,890	46.63%	26,198	53.37%	31,442	63.52%	18,058	36.48%	25,800	52.87%	22,999	47.13%
37	28,417	54.03%	22,394	42.58%	1,780	3.38%	24,840	47.69%	27,241	52.31%	23,883	46.57%	27,398	53.43%	31,661	61.36%	19,936	38.64%	27,068	53.09%	23,916	46.91%
38	7,278	19.26%	29,353	77.68%	1,157	3.06%	30,708	82.05%	6,718	17.95%	29,667	80.26%	7,297	19.74%	9,239	24.86%	27,921	75.14%	6,756	18.34%	30,075	81.66%
39	15,526	35.03%	27,659	62.40%	1,137	2.57%	29,063	66.23%	14,821	33.77%	28,904	66.57%	14,515	33.43%	17,987	41.10%	25,780	58.90%	14,443	33.38%	28,830	66.62%
40	28,705	53.32%	23,652	43.93%	1,479	2.75%	26,879	50.45%	26,397	49.55%	25,329	48.21%	27,213	51.79%	33,206	62.85%	19,625	37.15%	26,212	50.23%	25,974	49.77%
41	19,765	41.83%	25,900	54.81%	1,591	3.37%	28,166	60.12%	18,685	39.88%	26,208	56.90%	19,853	43.10%	22,859	49.51%	23,309	50.49%	19,109	41.87%	26,532	58.13%
42	6,383	26.30%	16,996	70.03%	891	3.67%	17,644	73.09%	6,497	26.91%	17,694	73.65%	6,330	26.35%	6,823	28.43%	17,178	71.57%	6,377	26.63%	17,567	73.37%
43	8,192	27.18%	20,960	69.55%	985	3.27%	21,834	72.91%	8,112	27.09%	21,902	73.54%	7,881	26.46%	8,700	29.23%	21,064	70.77%	8,010	26.97%	21,691	73.03%
44	14,388	45.35%	16,265	51.27%	1,074	3.39%	17,572	55.64%	14,009	44.36%	17,713	56.69%	13,533	43.31%	15,059	48.09%	16,258	51.91%	13,735	44.10%	17,413	55.90%
45	21,770	57.53%	14,903	39.38%	1,170	3.09%	16,323	43.39%	21,299	56.61%	16,681	44.69%	20,648	55.31%	22,703	60.52%	14,810	39.48%	20,875	56.03%	16,381	43.97%
46	14,441	57.97%	9,982	40.07%	487	1.96%	11,292	45.85%	13,335	54.15%	11,346	46.90%	12,846	53.10%	13,462	54.79%	11,107	45.21%	13,264	54.43%	11,104	45.57%
47	9,967	41.61%	13,476	56.25%	513	2.14%	14,324	60.47%	9,364	39.53%	14,777	63.19%	8,607	36.81%	9,520	40.24%	14,139	59.76%	9,276	39.47%	14,225	60.53%
48	13,005	42.20%	16,855	54.69%	958	3.11%	17,475	57.21%	13,069	42.79%	18,052	60.07%	12,001	39.93%	13,831	45.47%	16,584	54.53%	12,138	40.10%	18,128	59.90%
49	19,658	39.17%	28,779	57.35%	1,747	3.48%	31,874	63.90%	18,007	36.10%	29,084	59.37%	19,906	40.63%	24,344	49.41%	24,926	50.59%	18,437	37.92%	30,189	62.08%
50	19,497	43.57%	24,182	54.04%	1,066	2.38%	26,089	58.72%	18,339	41.28%	25,020	57.22%	18,703	42.78%	21,839	49.19%	22,559	50.81%	18,220	41.64%	25,538	58.36%
51	18,400	55.76%	13,619	41.27%	982	2.98%	15,312	46.95%	17,303	53.05%	15,786	49.15%	16,331	50.85%	19,609	60.24%	12,940	39.76%	17,097	53.25%	15,009	46.75%
52	26,962	63.92%	14,147	33.54%	1,075	2.55%	15,745	37.70%	26,021	62.30%	15,594	38.16%	25,266	61.84%	28,615	69.48%	12,567	30.52%	25,470	62.35%	15,378	37.65%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-25.asc', modified 08/28/2017 04:08:41 PM

Printed 08/29/2017 {rptS07|dc2016GE|re1.4.0}

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections. Votes that could not be associated with a specific precinct were excluded. Reported statewide totals may therefore be marginally lower than official contest results.

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: 2016 General Election - LG, AG, AD, CA, and CI

	Lieutenant Governor: Forest-Coleman-Cole						Attorney General: Stein-Newton				Auditor: Wood-Stuber				Comm. of Agriculture: Troxler-Smith				Comm. of Insurance: Causey-Goodwin			
District	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %
53	21,328	61.54%	12,493	36.05%	835	2.41%	13,900	40.45%	20,460	59.55%	14,600	42.90%	19,434	57.10%	22,445	65.35%	11,899	34.65%	19,984	58.72%	14,046	41.28%
54	21,038	40.77%	29,281	56.74%	1,285	2.49%	31,512	61.45%	19,770	38.55%	30,326	59.98%	20,235	40.02%	23,886	46.83%	27,122	53.17%	19,955	39.58%	30,463	60.42%
55	22,921	65.35%	11,444	32.63%	707	2.02%	13,375	38.47%	21,391	61.53%	12,986	37.97%	21,216	62.03%	22,702	65.93%	11,733	34.07%	20,782	60.57%	13,530	39.43%
56	8,019	17.31%	36,854	79.55%	1,455	3.14%	38,609	83.76%	7,487	16.24%	35,713	79.07%	9,451	20.93%	10,291	22.74%	34,969	77.26%	8,106	18.02%	36,871	81.98%
57	5,185	13.28%	32,626	83.59%	1,221	3.13%	33,561	86.54%	5,219	13.46%	33,339	86.37%	5,260	13.63%	7,064	18.24%	31,655	81.76%	5,325	13.86%	33,095	86.14%
58	9,287	25.04%	26,651	71.86%	1,150	3.10%	27,954	75.69%	8,977	24.31%	27,544	75.20%	9,084	24.80%	11,218	30.45%	25,619	69.55%	9,177	25.12%	27,361	74.88%
59	25,437	55.49%	19,257	42.01%	1,150	2.51%	21,109	46.33%	24,449	53.67%	20,636	45.87%	24,352	54.13%	28,818	62.84%	17,043	37.16%	24,991	55.39%	20,126	44.61%
60	10,658	31.74%	21,827	65.01%	1,092	3.25%	23,010	68.91%	10,383	31.09%	22,610	68.34%	10,476	31.66%	12,118	36.45%	21,130	63.55%	10,603	32.10%	22,425	67.90%
61	25,459	53.65%	20,630	43.47%	1,366	2.88%	22,996	48.67%	24,252	51.33%	21,723	46.77%	24,727	53.23%	29,176	62.17%	17,757	37.83%	24,836	53.66%	21,452	46.34%
62	25,436	53.83%	20,543	43.48%	1,270	2.69%	22,809	48.55%	24,175	51.45%	21,360	46.24%	24,838	53.76%	29,428	63.02%	17,271	36.98%	24,958	54.30%	21,002	45.70%
63	20,032	54.75%	15,433	42.18%	1,125	3.07%	17,264	47.50%	19,085	52.50%	16,942	47.21%	18,947	52.79%	21,995	60.53%	14,342	39.47%	19,134	53.27%	16,782	46.73%
64	19,368	58.48%	12,814	38.69%	936	2.83%	14,428	43.87%	18,457	56.13%	14,200	43.74%	18,268	56.26%	20,998	63.78%	11,922	36.22%	18,661	57.42%	13,838	42.58%
65	22,925	62.41%	12,935	35.21%	874	2.38%	14,435	39.54%	22,070	60.46%	14,492	40.57%	21,230	59.43%	25,310	68.90%	11,423	31.10%	21,766	60.54%	14,187	39.46%
66	18,853	55.74%	14,153	41.85%	816	2.41%	15,907	47.40%	17,650	52.60%	16,108	49.17%	16,651	50.83%	19,534	58.52%	13,844	41.48%	13,942	41.20%	19,895	58.80%
67	31,697	74.44%	9,793	23.00%	1,092	2.56%	12,410	29.40%	29,801	70.60%	12,146	29.42%	29,134	70.58%	32,075	76.60%	9,801	23.40%	29,191	70.39%	12,281	29.61%
68	27,015	64.52%	13,606	32.49%	1,252	2.99%	15,674	37.79%	25,803	62.21%	14,765	36.10%	26,136	63.90%	27,101	66.61%	13,586	33.39%	26,016	64.11%	14,567	35.89%
69	23,744	65.63%	11,331	31.32%	1,104	3.05%	13,327	37.18%	22,517	62.82%	12,667	35.86%	22,653	64.14%	23,669	67.05%	11,633	32.95%	22,499	63.86%	12,734	36.14%
70	24,712	74.71%	7,488	22.64%	879	2.66%	8,822	26.83%	24,059	73.17%	8,735	27.19%	23,389	72.81%	25,807	78.79%	6,946	21.21%	24,113	74.42%	8,289	25.58%
71	9,831	29.19%	22,738	67.51%	1,114	3.31%	24,171	72.07%	9,367	27.93%	23,586	71.23%	9,528	28.77%	11,036	33.26%	22,142	66.74%	9,590	29.09%	23,379	70.91%
72	7,738	23.10%	24,959	74.51%	800	2.39%	26,121	78.27%	7,254	21.73%	25,584	77.61%	7,380	22.39%	8,654	26.21%	24,363	73.79%	7,418	22.59%	25,415	77.41%
73	26,437	67.76%	11,626	29.80%	951	2.44%	13,736	35.45%	25,011	64.55%	13,187	34.72%	24,791	65.28%	26,439	68.62%	12,092	31.38%	25,081	66.12%	12,851	33.88%
74	26,030	59.30%	16,599	37.82%	1,263	2.88%	19,028	43.58%	24,635	56.42%	18,119	42.13%	24,888	57.87%	27,812	64.20%	15,506	35.80%	25,140	58.69%	17,692	41.31%
75	23,675	57.44%	16,356	39.68%	1,189	2.88%	18,577	45.30%	22,428	54.70%	17,787	44.05%	22,590	55.95%	25,324	62.29%	15,329	37.71%	22,936	56.97%	17,324	43.03%
76	22,655	62.28%	12,646	34.76%	1,076	2.96%	14,921	41.29%	21,213	58.71%	14,347	40.43%	21,139	59.57%	23,582	65.83%	12,243	34.17%	21,910	61.46%	13,740	38.54%
77	30,027	73.04%	9,965	24.24%	1,120	2.72%	12,267	30.01%	28,609	69.99%	11,836	29.45%	28,356	70.55%	31,417	77.15%	9,307	22.85%	29,068	72.16%	11,212	27.84%
78	27,573	77.81%	7,048	19.89%	814	2.30%	8,576	24.38%	26,597	75.62%	8,654	25.16%	25,747	74.84%	28,677	81.58%	6,477	18.42%	26,492	76.39%	8,189	23.61%
79	22,124	61.39%	13,157	36.51%	760	2.11%	14,148	39.62%	21,559	60.38%	15,164	43.09%	20,024	56.91%	22,504	63.38%	13,005	36.62%	21,262	60.47%	13,899	39.53%
80	27,461	74.39%	8,544	23.14%	912	2.47%	9,959	27.05%	26,856	72.95%	9,929	27.30%	26,447	72.70%	29,186	79.38%	7,580	20.62%	26,959	74.18%	9,384	25.82%
81	25,744	71.35%	9,365	25.95%	974	2.70%	11,232	31.27%	24,684	68.73%	11,381	32.08%	24,099	67.92%	27,352	76.14%	8,571	23.86%	24,719	69.72%	10,734	30.28%
82	26,046	58.83%	16,802	37.95%	1,428	3.23%	19,140	43.65%	24,713	56.35%	18,510	43.08%	24,452	56.92%	26,675	61.76%	16,518	38.24%	24,778	57.69%	18,173	42.31%
83	20,975	58.79%	13,482	37.79%	1,221	3.42%	15,585	44.02%	19,820	55.98%	15,213	43.80%	19,520	56.20%	21,679	61.95%	13,315	38.05%	19,951	57.27%	14,885	42.73%
84	25,615	68.55%	10,772	28.83%	981	2.63%	12,983	35.05%	24,055	64.95%	12,646	34.81%	23,684	65.19%	25,630	69.83%	11,072	30.17%	23,964	65.80%	12,453	34.20%
85	25,753	73.78%	8,159	23.37%	995	2.85%	9,757	28.36%	24,643	71.64%	9,695	28.95%	23,796	71.05%	26,068	76.47%	8,021	23.53%	24,312	72.23%	9,346	27.77%
86	22,615	66.72%	10,457	30.85%	824	2.43%	12,699	37.72%	20,964	62.28%	12,373	37.16%	20,922	62.84%	22,201	66.44%	11,214	33.56%	20,842	62.70%	12,397	37.30%
87	26,540	74.72%	8,133	22.90%	848	2.39%	11,035	31.39%	24,120	68.61%	10,477	30.43%	23,956	69.57%	25,822	74.46%	8,859	25.54%	24,396	70.64%	10,141	29.36%
88	10,717	29.69%	23,935	66.30%	1,447	4.01%	25,771	71.73%	10,156	28.27%	24,700	69.62%	10,776	30.38%	11,936	33.80%	23,374	66.20%	10,666	30.35%	24,476	69.65%
89	25,345	71.91%	8,879	25.19%	1,023	2.90%	11,207	31.97%	23,846	68.03%	10,785	31.22%	23,755	68.78%	25,467	73.54%	9,161	26.46%	23,945	69.51%	10,504	30.49%
90	25,448	72.45%	8,865	25.24%	810	2.31%	10,667	30.51%	24,300	69.49%	10,728	31.36%	23,480	68.64%	26,274	75.70%	8,432	24.30%	23,881	69.83%	10,320	30.17%
91	27,570	73.67%	8,869	23.70%	983	2.63%	10,703	28.73%	26,555	71.27%	10,798	29.54%	25,755	70.46%	29,013	77.93%	8,218	22.07%	26,296	71.72%	10,367	28.28%
92	12,587	35.41%	21,535	60.57%	1,429	4.02%	23,404	66.33%	11,881	33.67%	22,819	65.24%	12,158	34.76%	13,018	37.44%	21,755	62.56%	12,218	35.24%	22,453	64.76%
93	23,009	55.17%	16,926	40.58%	1,774	4.25%	19,469	47.25%	21,733	52.75%	18,571	46.41%	21,443	53.59%	23,642	58.17%	16,999	41.83%	21,576	53.90%	18,454	46.10%
94	28,780	75.23%	8,557	22.37%	919	2.40%	11,073	29.23%	26,803	70.77%	10,764	29.19%	26,113	70.81%	28,663	76.43%	8,838	23.57%	26,506	71.39%	10,621	28.61%
95	28,982	67.70%	12,360	28.87%	1,470	3.43%	14,947	35.22%	27,490	64.78%	13,872	33.50%	27,542	66.50%	29,126	70.05%	12,454	29.95%	27,769	67.09%	13,621	32.91%
96	23,121	65.77%	10,946	31.14%	1,089	3.10%	13,281	38.01%	21,662	61.99%	12,630	36.72%	21,767	63.28%	23,473	68.26%	10,917	31.74%	22,008	64.33%	12,203	35.67%
97	28,690	73.47%	9,283	23.77%	1,078	2.76%	11,903	30.76%	26,797	69.24%	11,581	30.59%	26,281	69.41%	28,172	73.99%	9,902	26.01%	26,798	70.66%	11,126	29.34%
98	26,644	58.05%	17,734	38.63%	1,524	3.32%	20,452	45.00%	24,992	55.00%	18,829	42.14%	25,852	57.86%	27,315	61.81%	16,874	38.19%	25,888	58.83%	18,120	41.17%
99	7,163	21.09%	25,734	75.76%	1,073	3.16%	26,872	79.60%	6,888	20.40%	26,577	79.08%	7,030	20.92%	7,534	22.44%	26,044	77.56%	6,929	20.67%	26,594	79.33%
100	10,063	33.08%	19,181	63.06%	1,172	3.85%	20,835	69.05%	9,337	30.95%	20,214	67.64%	9,672	32.36%	10,576	35.54%	19,182	64.46%	9,600	32.30%	20,124	67.70%
101	9,666	25.39%	27,134	71.26%	1,276	3.35%	28,611	75.49%	9,289	24.51%	28,107	74.77%	9,484	25.23%	10,225	27.21%	27,352	72.79%	9,495	25.36%	27,949	74.64%
102	6,255	19.64%	24,161	75.87%	1,429	4.49%	25,604	80.91%	6,042	19.09%	24,873	79.35%	6,474	20.65%	7,402	23.73%	23,786	76.27%	6,318	20.34%	24,751	79.66%
103	25,117	58.86%	16,313	38.23%	1,242	2.91%	18,820	44.51%	23,460	55.49%	17,553	42.11%	24,127	57.89%	26,003	62.87%	15,355	37.13%	23,889	57.91%	17,362	42.09%
104	25,845	55.28%	19,567	41.85%	1,340	2.87%	22,699	48.98%	23,646	51.02%	20,300	44.63%	25,181	55.37%	28,536	63.31%	16,539	36.69%	24,724	55.09%	20,155	44.91%

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: 2016 General Election - LG, AG, AD, CA, and CI

	Lieutenant Governor: Forest-Coleman-Cole						Attorney General: Stein-Newton				Auditor: Wood-Stuber				Comm. of Agriculture: Troxler-Smith				Comm. of Insurance: Causey-Goodwin			
District	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**
105	22,913	55.44%	17,133	41.45%	1,287	3.11%	19,598	47.84%	21,369	52.16%	18,118	44.89%	22,242	55.11%	23,634	59.21%	16,279	40.79%	21,962	55.13%	17,872	44.87%
106	8,550	25.79%	23,420	70.66%	1,176	3.55%	24,690	75.03%	8,218	24.97%	24,265	74.20%	8,435	25.80%	9,076	27.93%	23,417	72.07%	8,360	25.80%	24,044	74.20%
107	8,546	23.39%	26,870	73.54%	1,124	3.08%	28,191	77.62%	8,126	22.38%	27,767	76.94%	8,320	23.06%	8,874	24.70%	27,051	75.30%	8,284	23.11%	27,560	76.89%
108	22,310	64.29%	11,377	32.79%	1,013	2.92%	13,450	39.21%	20,851	60.79%	12,933	38.54%	20,624	61.46%	21,697	64.47%	11,958	35.53%	20,761	61.84%	12,813	38.16%
109	22,545	62.11%	12,803	35.27%	950	2.62%	14,882	41.40%	21,065	58.60%	14,364	40.76%	20,878	59.24%	22,000	62.37%	13,274	37.63%	21,044	59.80%	14,149	40.20%
110	23,200	68.91%	9,752	28.97%	715	2.12%	11,596	34.80%	21,723	65.20%	11,256	34.48%	21,390	65.52%	22,448	68.39%	10,376	31.61%	21,495	65.65%	11,246	34.35%
111	22,768	68.36%	9,875	29.65%	661	1.98%	11,856	36.00%	21,073	64.00%	11,456	35.52%	20,798	64.48%	22,098	67.92%	10,436	32.08%	20,865	64.36%	11,552	35.64%
112	23,864	71.32%	8,660	25.88%	937	2.80%	9,906	29.88%	23,248	70.12%	10,101	30.74%	22,758	69.26%	23,583	71.50%	9,401	28.50%	22,686	69.18%	10,108	30.82%
113	27,273	61.90%	15,470	35.11%	1,314	2.98%	16,730	38.29%	26,962	61.71%	16,629	38.41%	26,666	61.59%	28,478	65.70%	14,865	34.30%	26,719	62.24%	16,211	37.76%
114	10,534	22.22%	34,662	73.10%	2,218	4.68%	36,615	77.84%	10,425	22.16%	35,482	76.57%	10,857	23.43%	12,396	26.71%	34,013	73.29%	10,742	23.33%	35,299	76.67%
115	22,047	48.06%	22,007	47.98%	1,816	3.96%	23,858	52.43%	21,647	47.57%	23,153	51.74%	21,592	48.26%	23,934	53.21%	21,047	46.79%	21,680	48.69%	22,851	51.31%
116	21,972	52.39%	18,326	43.70%	1,641	3.91%	19,951	47.93%	21,673	52.07%	19,318	47.22%	21,593	52.78%	24,227	58.81%	16,970	41.19%	21,756	53.31%	19,052	46.69%
117	25,457	62.47%	14,037	34.45%	1,255	3.08%	15,539	38.46%	24,861	61.54%	15,283	38.19%	24,739	61.81%	26,739	66.71%	13,343	33.29%	24,891	62.75%	14,778	37.25%
118	23,864	60.56%	14,093	35.76%	1,451	3.68%	15,949	40.83%	23,111	59.17%	15,787	41.05%	22,668	58.95%	25,298	64.96%	13,647	35.04%	22,645	59.04%	15,712	40.96%
119	18,801	53.70%	14,824	42.34%	1,385	3.96%	16,595	47.85%	18,084	52.15%	16,430	48.02%	17,786	51.98%	19,750	57.47%	14,617	42.53%	17,900	52.60%	16,132	47.40%
120	28,296	69.92%	10,903	26.94%	1,271	3.14%	11,790	29.51%	28,166	70.49%	12,213	31.16%	26,987	68.84%	28,136	71.36%	11,292	28.64%	27,299	69.68%	11,878	30.32%
Totals:	**2,390,619**	**51.88%**	**2,084,975**	**45.25%**	**132,360**	**2.87%**	**2,294,855**	**50.20%**	**2,276,276**	**49.80%**	**2,250,664**	**50.00%**	**2,250,696**	**50.00%**	**2,521,477**	**55.64%**	**2,010,452**	**44.36%**	**2,268,142**	**50.47%**	**2,226,295**	**49.53%**

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: 2016 General Election - CL, SS, SPI, TR, and SC

	Commissioner of Labor: Berry-Meeker-Write-in						Secretary of State: Marshall-LaPaglia				Sup. of Public Instruc.: Johnson-Atkinson				Treasurer: Folwell-Blue				Supreme Court Justice: Morgan-Edmunds			
District	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Wi	Wi %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Morgan	Morgan %	Edmunds	Edmunds %
1	17,593	51.95%	16,235	47.94%	35	0.10%	18,375	54.12%	15,577	45.88%	16,406	48.35%	17,523	51.65%	17,159	50.93%	16,531	49.07%	16,918	58.47%	12,018	41.53%
2	21,613	58.81%	15,097	41.08%	39	0.11%	18,629	50.96%	17,926	49.04%	19,091	52.11%	17,542	47.89%	20,433	56.26%	15,884	43.74%	16,593	50.63%	16,182	49.37%
3	20,041	62.15%	12,163	37.72%	42	0.13%	14,115	43.55%	18,295	56.45%	18,501	57.37%	13,747	42.63%	19,324	60.16%	12,796	39.84%	15,942	55.56%	12,752	44.44%
4	18,374	63.85%	10,379	36.07%	23	0.08%	12,351	42.81%	16,502	57.19%	17,307	60.11%	11,484	39.89%	17,888	62.51%	10,726	37.49%	13,556	55.45%	10,893	44.55%
5	13,749	44.18%	17,338	55.72%	31	0.10%	19,014	60.91%	12,205	39.09%	12,857	41.14%	18,398	58.86%	13,291	42.80%	17,764	57.20%	15,889	59.51%	10,811	40.49%
6	25,857	66.33%	13,088	33.57%	37	0.09%	15,700	40.22%	23,339	59.78%	24,258	62.38%	14,627	37.62%	25,078	64.89%	13,569	35.11%	17,781	53.54%	15,431	46.46%
7	21,825	58.26%	15,584	41.60%	51	0.14%	18,677	49.98%	18,695	50.02%	19,695	52.75%	17,643	47.25%	21,312	57.31%	15,873	42.69%	17,422	51.92%	16,136	48.08%
8	12,356	37.32%	20,681	62.46%	73	0.22%	22,709	68.60%	10,394	31.40%	11,117	33.66%	21,912	66.34%	11,554	35.09%	21,369	64.91%	17,021	59.02%	11,820	40.98%
9	21,459	59.23%	14,722	40.64%	47	0.13%	17,660	48.79%	18,535	51.21%	19,550	54.06%	16,616	45.94%	20,238	56.27%	15,730	43.73%	15,698	49.31%	16,138	50.69%
10	23,686	68.04%	11,095	31.87%	33	0.09%	13,973	40.24%	20,750	59.76%	21,958	63.31%	12,728	36.69%	23,084	66.89%	11,428	33.11%	15,621	52.49%	14,139	47.51%
11	16,154	39.81%	24,367	60.05%	59	0.15%	27,604	68.31%	12,806	31.69%	13,468	33.47%	26,776	66.53%	15,003	37.39%	25,122	62.61%	20,840	58.34%	14,882	41.66%
12	17,646	53.50%	15,305	46.40%	35	0.11%	17,621	53.44%	15,351	46.56%	16,237	49.32%	16,682	50.68%	16,584	50.59%	16,197	49.41%	15,940	56.80%	12,123	43.20%
13	29,486	71.98%	11,430	27.90%	47	0.11%	14,398	35.12%	26,603	64.88%	27,459	67.27%	13,362	32.73%	28,556	70.17%	12,141	29.83%	16,670	47.19%	18,653	52.81%
14	16,133	63.55%	9,214	36.29%	41	0.16%	10,510	41.29%	14,945	58.71%	15,362	60.66%	9,964	39.34%	15,817	62.71%	9,404	37.29%	13,056	59.61%	8,848	40.39%
15	13,327	70.22%	5,623	29.63%	29	0.15%	6,695	35.18%	12,336	64.82%	12,681	66.98%	6,252	33.02%	13,023	69.05%	5,838	30.95%	9,194	56.60%	7,051	43.40%
16	23,972	62.25%	14,503	37.66%	37	0.10%	16,912	43.84%	21,665	56.16%	22,756	59.28%	15,633	40.72%	23,311	60.89%	14,972	39.11%	18,236	54.11%	15,463	45.89%
17	33,463	68.09%	15,657	31.86%	26	0.05%	18,786	37.96%	30,706	62.04%	31,906	65.08%	17,122	34.92%	33,039	67.50%	15,905	32.50%	22,402	51.04%	21,490	48.96%
18	16,206	44.99%	19,778	54.90%	41	0.11%	22,212	61.54%	13,880	38.46%	14,573	40.66%	21,265	59.34%	15,226	42.56%	20,548	57.44%	18,161	59.43%	12,397	40.57%
19	26,115	63.24%	15,130	36.64%	48	0.12%	18,828	45.58%	22,480	54.42%	23,413	57.11%	17,583	42.89%	24,458	60.02%	16,292	39.98%	19,492	56.08%	15,264	43.92%
20	27,514	63.80%	15,570	36.11%	39	0.09%	19,582	45.34%	23,606	54.66%	24,579	57.41%	18,231	42.59%	25,774	60.53%	16,805	39.47%	20,013	55.55%	16,013	44.45%
21	12,983	42.38%	17,614	57.50%	36	0.12%	19,647	63.98%	11,059	36.02%	11,762	38.38%	18,883	61.62%	12,450	40.84%	18,038	59.16%	15,028	58.05%	10,859	41.95%
22	19,757	57.79%	14,383	42.07%	50	0.15%	17,117	50.07%	17,066	49.93%	18,283	53.54%	15,864	46.46%	19,123	56.37%	14,803	43.63%	16,775	55.59%	13,399	44.41%
23	13,704	38.67%	21,697	61.23%	34	0.10%	23,911	67.52%	11,502	32.48%	12,290	34.64%	23,193	65.36%	13,085	37.10%	22,185	62.90%	18,905	60.22%	12,489	39.78%
24	17,606	47.55%	19,384	52.35%	35	0.09%	22,130	59.77%	14,894	40.23%	15,887	42.92%	21,128	57.08%	17,069	46.28%	19,812	53.72%	19,149	57.63%	14,080	42.37%
25	18,029	46.59%	20,641	53.34%	30	0.08%	22,943	59.32%	15,734	40.68%	16,469	42.61%	22,178	57.39%	17,584	45.59%	20,985	54.41%	19,698	54.61%	16,372	45.39%
26	29,405	64.39%	16,214	35.51%	47	0.10%	20,115	44.13%	25,468	55.87%	26,660	58.57%	18,861	41.43%	28,373	62.71%	16,875	37.29%	18,873	47.04%	21,250	52.96%
27	11,899	35.53%	21,553	64.35%	39	0.12%	23,241	69.43%	10,234	30.57%	10,719	32.00%	22,775	68.00%	11,687	34.99%	21,712	65.01%	19,167	63.84%	10,858	36.16%
28	24,007	66.98%	11,800	32.92%	33	0.09%	15,437	43.07%	20,404	56.93%	22,098	61.63%	13,760	38.37%	23,422	65.84%	12,154	34.16%	15,189	47.13%	17,040	52.87%
29	8,580	18.75%	37,107	81.11%	64	0.14%	39,710	86.73%	6,075	13.27%	6,523	14.29%	39,129	85.71%	7,384	16.20%	38,200	83.80%	32,139	77.15%	9,518	22.85%
30	16,061	33.23%	32,213	66.66%	52	0.11%	35,415	73.21%	12,961	26.79%	13,536	28.04%	34,731	71.96%	14,776	30.69%	33,377	69.31%	29,604	68.47%	13,635	31.53%
31	9,994	22.64%	34,104	77.26%	44	0.10%	36,566	82.83%	7,582	17.17%	8,151	18.52%	35,860	81.48%	8,714	19.82%	35,258	80.18%	29,898	74.84%	10,053	25.16%
32	13,243	35.67%	23,843	64.22%	41	0.11%	26,398	71.16%	10,701	28.84%	11,493	31.03%	25,549	68.97%	12,647	34.21%	24,320	65.79%	20,571	61.45%	12,907	38.55%
33	10,833	27.71%	28,189	72.12%	66	0.17%	30,575	78.50%	8,376	21.50%	8,884	22.88%	29,942	77.12%	9,826	25.29%	29,022	74.71%	23,157	66.14%	11,854	33.86%
34	19,535	42.02%	26,887	57.84%	63	0.14%	30,539	66.04%	15,702	33.96%	16,783	36.51%	29,183	63.49%	18,734	40.81%	27,173	59.19%	22,950	56.03%	18,011	43.97%
35	28,835	55.97%	22,622	43.91%	58	0.11%	26,157	50.85%	25,279	49.15%	26,033	50.85%	25,167	49.15%	27,921	54.66%	23,163	45.34%	21,861	48.32%	23,382	51.68%
36	28,851	58.26%	20,618	41.64%	48	0.10%	24,609	49.88%	24,726	50.12%	25,508	51.89%	23,651	48.11%	27,909	56.99%	21,066	43.01%	20,548	47.02%	23,152	52.98%
37	30,236	58.56%	21,316	41.29%	77	0.15%	25,327	49.14%	26,213	50.86%	26,950	52.45%	24,433	47.55%	28,878	56.48%	22,248	43.52%	21,409	47.67%	23,499	52.33%
38	8,224	22.06%	28,988	77.76%	66	0.18%	30,788	82.81%	6,390	17.19%	6,893	18.63%	30,108	81.37%	7,394	19.97%	29,624	80.03%	22,731	68.80%	10,307	31.20%
39	16,605	37.96%	27,068	61.88%	70	0.16%	29,829	68.51%	13,708	31.49%	14,410	33.12%	29,096	66.88%	15,442	35.54%	28,008	64.46%	23,274	59.36%	15,936	40.64%
40	29,509	55.63%	23,500	44.30%	39	0.07%	27,384	51.88%	25,401	48.12%	26,270	49.97%	26,302	50.03%	28,704	54.70%	23,774	45.30%	22,009	46.85%	24,965	53.15%
41	21,958	47.42%	24,291	52.46%	56	0.12%	27,986	60.51%	18,266	39.49%	19,039	41.30%	27,062	58.70%	20,795	45.38%	25,033	54.62%	21,389	53.42%	18,650	46.58%
42	7,200	30.00%	16,761	69.84%	39	0.16%	17,870	74.24%	6,200	25.76%	6,424	26.81%	17,537	73.19%	6,676	27.91%	17,242	72.09%	13,093	60.96%	8,384	39.04%
43	9,102	30.54%	20,658	69.31%	46	0.15%	22,279	74.63%	7,575	25.37%	8,014	26.93%	21,745	73.07%	8,397	28.26%	21,316	71.74%	15,783	58.99%	10,973	41.01%
44	15,489	49.34%	15,861	50.52%	43	0.14%	18,314	58.43%	13,032	41.57%	13,656	43.63%	17,642	56.37%	14,406	46.23%	16,755	53.77%	14,635	52.80%	13,085	47.20%
45	22,772	60.79%	14,660	39.13%	29	0.08%	17,425	46.55%	20,005	53.45%	20,707	55.42%	16,660	44.58%	21,727	58.40%	15,478	41.60%	17,653	53.69%	15,225	46.31%
46	14,021	57.43%	10,355	42.41%	38	0.16%	12,079	49.70%	12,227	50.30%	13,550	55.69%	10,779	44.31%	13,388	55.26%	10,841	44.74%	12,109	56.71%	9,244	43.29%
47	10,572	44.57%	13,104	55.24%	46	0.19%	15,472	65.67%	8,089	34.33%	9,277	39.25%	14,356	60.75%	8,695	36.92%	14,855	63.08%	12,593	60.32%	8,283	39.68%
48	13,806	45.61%	16,424	54.26%	39	0.13%	18,397	60.79%	11,865	39.21%	12,489	41.20%	17,826	58.80%	12,794	42.52%	17,292	57.48%	14,216	55.76%	11,279	44.24%
49	21,466	43.39%	27,950	56.50%	54	0.11%	31,784	64.56%	17,449	35.44%	18,186	37.15%	30,763	62.85%	20,356	41.62%	28,557	58.38%	24,442	55.96%	19,235	44.04%
50	20,514	46.55%	23,516	53.36%	38	0.09%	26,774	60.83%	17,239	39.17%	18,178	41.34%	25,798	58.66%	19,147	43.75%	24,619	56.25%	23,290	59.43%	15,901	40.57%
51	18,894	58.26%	13,482	41.57%	53	0.16%	16,651	51.25%	15,838	48.75%	16,671	51.54%	15,677	48.46%	17,593	54.81%	14,503	45.19%	13,745	48.08%	14,843	51.92%
52	27,287	66.40%	13,774	33.52%	33	0.08%	16,304	39.54%	24,932	60.46%	25,373	61.89%	15,621	38.11%	26,287	64.36%	14,556	35.64%	15,938	44.57%	19,819	55.43%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-25.asc', modified 08/28/2017 04:08:41 PM

Printed 08/29/2017 {rptS08|dc2016GE|re1.4.0}

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections. Votes that could not be associated with a specific precinct were excluded. Reported statewide totals may therefore be marginally lower than official contest results.

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: 2016 General Election - CL, SS, SPI, TR, and SC

	Commissioner of Labor: Berry-Meeker-Write-in						Secretary of State: Marshall-LaPaglia				Sup. of Public Instruc.: Johnson-Atkinson				Treasurer: Folwell-Blue				Supreme Court Justice: Morgan-Edmunds			
District	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Wi	Wi %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Morgan	Morgan %	Edmunds	Edmunds %
53	21,477	62.83%	12,658	37.03%	46	0.13%	16,425	47.75%	17,974	52.25%	19,806	57.91%	14,393	42.09%	20,940	61.52%	13,100	38.48%	14,665	48.13%	15,806	51.87%
54	22,311	43.87%	28,497	56.03%	53	0.10%	32,111	63.04%	18,829	36.96%	19,592	38.59%	31,183	61.41%	21,101	41.72%	29,477	58.28%	27,419	60.15%	18,163	39.85%
55	22,681	65.99%	11,660	33.93%	27	0.08%	13,826	40.31%	20,472	59.69%	21,864	63.75%	12,432	36.25%	21,701	63.42%	12,515	36.58%	15,443	50.86%	14,919	49.14%
56	10,227	22.47%	35,225	77.39%	66	0.14%	38,095	83.69%	7,422	16.31%	7,896	17.41%	37,452	82.59%	9,032	19.97%	36,198	80.03%	30,893	76.70%	9,386	23.30%
57	7,368	19.11%	31,139	80.76%	50	0.13%	33,775	87.40%	4,869	12.60%	5,467	14.22%	32,986	85.78%	5,677	14.80%	32,673	85.20%	22,487	67.53%	10,810	32.47%
58	11,588	31.57%	25,080	68.32%	41	0.11%	28,100	76.66%	8,554	23.34%	9,347	25.60%	27,162	74.40%	9,646	26.48%	26,778	73.52%	19,517	61.60%	12,165	38.40%
59	27,950	61.53%	17,440	38.39%	33	0.07%	21,754	48.25%	23,328	51.75%	25,070	55.69%	19,946	44.31%	25,342	56.54%	19,482	43.46%	20,566	53.30%	18,019	46.70%
60	12,790	38.45%	20,454	61.48%	24	0.07%	23,127	69.76%	10,023	30.24%	10,687	32.42%	22,275	67.58%	11,046	33.56%	21,869	66.44%	16,484	59.06%	11,428	40.94%
61	28,918	61.67%	17,935	38.25%	35	0.07%	23,051	49.54%	23,479	50.46%	24,899	53.72%	21,452	46.28%	25,906	56.11%	20,261	43.89%	19,179	48.94%	20,013	51.06%
62	28,961	62.21%	17,554	37.71%	37	0.08%	22,657	48.98%	23,599	51.02%	25,108	54.55%	20,921	45.45%	26,015	56.78%	19,806	43.22%	18,073	47.07%	20,327	52.93%
63	21,921	60.51%	14,266	39.38%	43	0.12%	18,001	49.98%	18,014	50.02%	19,347	53.79%	16,621	46.21%	19,759	55.17%	16,053	44.83%	16,942	54.18%	14,330	45.82%
64	20,782	63.46%	11,933	36.44%	33	0.10%	14,947	45.95%	17,581	54.05%	18,784	57.75%	13,741	42.25%	18,967	58.63%	13,385	41.37%	15,082	53.23%	13,252	46.77%
65	24,214	66.63%	12,088	33.26%	37	0.10%	15,464	42.87%	20,605	57.13%	22,524	62.40%	13,575	37.60%	22,564	62.96%	13,272	37.04%	16,757	51.94%	15,508	48.06%
66	19,630	58.80%	13,719	41.09%	37	0.11%	17,159	51.87%	15,923	48.13%	17,524	53.04%	15,513	46.96%	17,568	53.35%	15,360	46.65%	16,318	56.31%	12,660	43.69%
67	31,918	76.27%	9,888	23.63%	44	0.11%	13,188	31.73%	28,374	68.27%	30,162	72.68%	11,340	27.32%	30,202	72.97%	11,189	27.03%	18,338	49.94%	18,385	50.06%
68	27,554	67.40%	13,284	32.49%	44	0.11%	15,231	37.21%	25,699	62.79%	26,225	64.40%	14,495	35.60%	26,889	66.29%	13,673	33.71%	14,972	43.08%	19,784	56.92%
69	24,084	67.98%	11,309	31.92%	33	0.09%	13,242	37.39%	22,175	62.61%	22,946	65.07%	12,318	34.93%	23,260	66.14%	11,906	33.86%	14,102	46.19%	16,431	53.81%
70	25,836	79.06%	6,819	20.87%	22	0.07%	9,465	29.19%	22,955	70.81%	24,297	74.97%	8,114	25.03%	24,538	75.89%	7,794	24.11%	13,365	46.20%	15,566	53.80%
71	12,217	36.76%	20,979	63.12%	39	0.12%	24,216	72.96%	8,973	27.04%	9,919	30.05%	23,085	69.95%	10,802	32.65%	22,282	67.35%	17,188	60.71%	11,123	39.29%
72	9,776	29.56%	23,241	70.28%	52	0.16%	26,160	79.10%	6,913	20.90%	7,805	23.74%	25,077	76.26%	8,598	26.04%	24,419	73.96%	17,881	63.03%	10,487	36.97%
73	28,250	73.49%	10,151	26.41%	39	0.10%	14,254	37.41%	23,850	62.59%	25,535	67.03%	12,558	32.97%	26,584	69.72%	11,545	30.28%	16,535	49.01%	17,205	50.99%
74	28,800	66.47%	14,481	33.42%	48	0.11%	19,248	44.68%	23,829	55.32%	25,625	59.63%	17,346	40.37%	27,035	62.65%	16,117	37.35%	20,594	53.44%	17,941	46.56%
75	26,215	64.51%	14,381	35.39%	44	0.11%	18,699	46.24%	21,742	53.76%	23,120	57.36%	17,188	42.64%	24,303	60.14%	16,109	39.86%	19,220	54.01%	16,367	45.99%
76	23,645	65.87%	12,212	34.02%	37	0.10%	15,309	42.86%	20,406	57.14%	21,882	61.44%	13,731	38.56%	21,967	61.75%	13,608	38.25%	16,145	50.23%	15,999	49.77%
77	31,367	77.32%	9,173	22.61%	28	0.07%	12,840	31.88%	27,442	68.12%	29,341	72.84%	10,940	27.16%	29,630	73.78%	10,531	26.22%	16,637	46.40%	19,215	53.60%
78	28,310	80.93%	6,648	19.00%	23	0.07%	9,448	27.22%	25,259	72.78%	26,680	76.90%	8,015	23.10%	26,938	77.85%	7,666	22.15%	13,354	42.80%	17,844	57.20%
79	22,498	63.60%	12,836	36.29%	40	0.11%	15,242	43.08%	20,138	56.92%	21,056	59.66%	14,239	40.34%	21,796	62.03%	13,340	37.97%	16,297	51.06%	15,620	48.94%
80	29,075	79.32%	7,563	20.63%	18	0.05%	10,730	29.49%	25,652	70.51%	27,026	74.49%	9,253	25.51%	27,481	75.87%	8,740	24.13%	16,071	49.69%	16,272	50.31%
81	27,300	76.33%	8,439	23.59%	28	0.08%	12,233	34.47%	23,257	65.53%	25,072	70.76%	10,358	29.24%	25,464	71.99%	9,910	28.01%	15,907	49.98%	15,918	50.02%
82	27,220	62.66%	16,186	37.26%	38	0.09%	19,183	44.31%	24,108	55.69%	25,199	58.46%	17,904	41.54%	25,658	59.63%	17,374	40.37%	19,096	50.41%	18,783	49.59%
83	21,847	62.26%	13,202	37.62%	41	0.12%	15,713	45.01%	19,196	54.99%	20,320	58.40%	14,476	41.60%	20,522	58.91%	14,317	41.09%	15,612	49.77%	15,759	50.23%
84	25,735	70.26%	10,855	29.63%	40	0.11%	13,460	36.87%	23,046	63.13%	24,863	67.97%	11,714	32.03%	24,751	68.00%	11,650	32.00%	15,023	47.03%	16,922	52.97%
85	25,703	75.91%	8,134	24.02%	23	0.07%	10,252	30.45%	23,421	69.55%	24,558	72.71%	9,219	27.29%	24,781	74.13%	8,647	25.87%	14,347	49.54%	14,615	50.46%
86	22,938	68.69%	10,422	31.21%	33	0.10%	13,338	40.07%	19,951	59.93%	21,512	64.53%	11,823	35.47%	21,721	65.51%	11,436	34.49%	15,582	50.73%	15,136	49.27%
87	26,641	76.23%	8,278	23.69%	29	0.08%	11,054	31.91%	23,583	68.09%	25,102	72.46%	9,539	27.54%	25,278	73.19%	9,258	26.81%	13,150	41.77%	18,329	58.23%
88	12,558	35.33%	22,939	64.53%	51	0.14%	25,327	71.40%	10,143	28.60%	10,771	30.64%	24,377	69.36%	11,713	33.29%	23,468	66.71%	17,108	58.93%	11,925	41.07%
89	26,058	74.89%	8,694	24.98%	45	0.13%	11,482	33.25%	23,053	66.75%	24,440	70.90%	10,033	29.10%	24,593	71.52%	9,793	28.48%	14,774	48.98%	15,390	51.02%
90	26,359	76.23%	8,195	23.70%	22	0.06%	11,970	34.93%	22,299	65.07%	24,412	71.05%	9,949	28.95%	24,754	72.48%	9,400	27.52%	15,165	49.01%	15,775	50.99%
91	28,830	77.98%	8,096	21.90%	46	0.12%	12,206	33.28%	24,469	66.72%	26,920	73.12%	9,896	26.88%	27,235	74.40%	9,370	25.60%	16,564	50.09%	16,505	49.91%
92	13,734	39.31%	21,158	60.57%	42	0.12%	23,088	66.10%	11,840	33.90%	12,454	35.86%	22,278	64.14%	12,856	37.08%	21,819	62.92%	17,163	58.93%	11,963	41.07%
93	24,219	59.81%	16,219	40.06%	52	0.13%	19,929	49.22%	20,559	50.78%	21,985	54.43%	18,403	45.57%	22,635	56.49%	17,435	43.51%	18,201	52.40%	16,531	47.60%
94	28,717	76.63%	8,728	23.29%	32	0.09%	11,758	31.62%	25,427	68.38%	27,546	74.03%	9,661	25.97%	27,551	74.32%	9,522	25.68%	16,674	49.70%	16,872	50.30%
95	29,400	70.38%	12,325	29.50%	51	0.12%	14,601	34.96%	27,161	65.04%	27,748	66.65%	13,883	33.35%	28,638	69.01%	12,861	30.99%	16,752	46.70%	19,118	53.30%
96	24,282	70.11%	10,317	29.79%	33	0.10%	13,369	38.82%	21,066	61.18%	22,161	64.56%	12,165	35.44%	22,614	66.14%	11,575	33.86%	14,468	48.11%	15,602	51.89%
97	29,057	75.71%	9,279	24.18%	41	0.11%	12,796	33.51%	25,395	66.49%	27,255	71.85%	10,678	28.15%	27,554	72.74%	10,326	27.26%	16,143	47.28%	18,003	52.72%
98	27,777	62.37%	16,703	37.51%	55	0.12%	19,419	43.65%	25,073	56.35%	25,705	58.15%	18,499	41.85%	27,013	61.34%	17,025	38.66%	18,125	50.73%	17,603	49.27%
99	8,228	24.49%	25,334	75.40%	37	0.11%	26,971	80.12%	6,692	19.88%	7,190	21.48%	26,287	78.52%	7,318	21.88%	26,130	78.12%	18,491	63.97%	10,415	36.03%
100	11,008	36.82%	18,838	63.01%	52	0.17%	20,726	69.29%	9,187	30.71%	9,900	33.28%	19,846	66.72%	10,293	34.65%	19,412	65.35%	14,126	56.19%	11,013	43.81%
101	11,081	29.43%	26,525	70.44%	50	0.13%	28,564	75.93%	9,055	24.07%	9,731	25.97%	27,740	74.03%	10,062	26.89%	27,361	73.11%	19,769	62.24%	11,991	37.76%
102	7,965	25.40%	23,352	74.46%	43	0.14%	25,407	81.11%	5,918	18.89%	6,506	20.92%	24,592	79.08%	7,207	23.17%	23,892	76.83%	16,345	63.28%	9,484	36.72%
103	25,990	62.40%	15,613	37.49%	46	0.11%	18,383	44.22%	23,193	55.78%	24,165	58.45%	17,180	41.55%	25,445	61.57%	15,883	38.43%	15,872	46.14%	18,529	53.86%
104	27,624	60.56%	17,940	39.33%	53	0.12%	21,983	48.32%	23,516	51.68%	24,872	55.23%	20,160	44.77%	27,580	61.20%	17,489	38.80%	16,524	44.40%	20,696	55.60%

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: 2016 General Election - CL, SS, SPI, TR, and SC

	Commissioner of Labor: Berry-Meeker-Write-in						Secretary of State: Marshall-LaPaglia				Sup. of Public Instruc.: Johnson-Atkinson				Treasurer: Folwell-Blue				Supreme Court Justice: Morgan-Edmunds			
District	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Wi**	**Wi %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Morgan**	**Morgan %**	**Edmunds**	**Edmunds %**
105	23,799	59.18%	16,371	40.71%	47	0.12%	18,822	46.74%	21,448	53.26%	22,211	55.55%	17,774	44.45%	23,407	58.65%	16,505	41.35%	15,916	48.78%	16,713	51.22%
106	9,872	30.30%	22,652	69.53%	56	0.17%	24,570	75.32%	8,052	24.68%	8,657	26.65%	23,825	73.35%	8,832	27.28%	23,546	72.72%	17,233	62.40%	10,382	37.60%
107	9,787	27.19%	26,159	72.68%	47	0.13%	28,088	78.00%	7,924	22.00%	8,466	23.63%	27,366	76.37%	8,705	24.28%	27,141	75.72%	19,385	63.25%	11,264	36.75%
108	22,402	66.12%	11,445	33.78%	35	0.10%	13,562	40.19%	20,180	59.81%	21,090	62.73%	12,529	37.27%	21,234	63.25%	12,336	36.75%	14,749	50.37%	14,535	49.63%
109	22,730	64.00%	12,741	35.87%	45	0.13%	15,026	42.46%	20,366	57.54%	21,168	60.10%	14,051	39.90%	21,589	61.31%	13,625	38.69%	16,034	51.75%	14,949	48.25%
110	22,926	69.54%	10,012	30.37%	32	0.10%	11,978	36.45%	20,885	63.55%	21,913	66.91%	10,835	33.09%	21,931	67.11%	10,748	32.89%	15,047	51.03%	14,439	48.97%
111	22,485	69.00%	10,068	30.89%	36	0.11%	12,297	37.84%	20,201	62.16%	21,427	66.03%	11,025	33.97%	21,559	66.64%	10,794	33.36%	15,066	50.24%	14,921	49.76%
112	24,140	73.23%	8,792	26.67%	31	0.09%	11,009	33.56%	21,797	66.44%	23,006	70.23%	9,752	29.77%	23,351	71.53%	9,294	28.47%	14,586	50.56%	14,262	49.44%
113	28,009	65.03%	15,029	34.90%	31	0.07%	17,343	40.11%	25,898	59.89%	26,801	62.09%	16,367	37.91%	27,483	64.14%	15,364	35.86%	19,070	50.66%	18,573	49.34%
114	12,741	27.46%	33,583	72.38%	77	0.17%	36,504	78.40%	10,056	21.60%	10,741	23.24%	35,470	76.76%	11,397	24.75%	34,643	75.25%	28,586	70.68%	11,861	29.32%
115	23,625	52.65%	21,201	47.25%	43	0.10%	24,152	53.69%	20,829	46.31%	21,630	48.52%	22,953	51.48%	22,472	50.53%	22,003	49.47%	23,331	58.65%	16,450	41.35%
116	23,777	57.92%	17,228	41.96%	49	0.12%	20,379	49.59%	20,718	50.41%	21,754	53.33%	19,041	46.67%	22,481	55.32%	18,155	44.68%	19,795	55.16%	16,092	44.84%
117	26,173	65.60%	13,703	34.34%	23	0.06%	16,076	40.26%	23,853	59.74%	24,807	62.25%	15,043	37.75%	25,601	64.62%	14,018	35.38%	17,834	51.06%	17,091	48.94%
118	24,050	62.47%	14,405	37.42%	41	0.11%	16,756	43.57%	21,698	56.43%	23,312	60.54%	15,196	39.46%	23,602	61.82%	14,577	38.18%	19,531	57.19%	14,621	42.81%
119	19,578	57.22%	14,599	42.67%	39	0.11%	17,349	50.74%	16,843	49.26%	18,229	53.35%	15,941	46.65%	18,507	54.72%	15,312	45.28%	17,270	56.70%	13,186	43.30%
120	28,268	71.99%	10,957	27.90%	43	0.11%	13,019	33.03%	26,395	66.97%	27,568	69.95%	11,842	30.05%	27,992	71.82%	10,983	28.18%	18,818	54.83%	15,503	45.17%
Totals:	**2,502,542**	**55.26%**	**2,020,865**	**44.63%**	**5,050**	**0.11%**	**2,359,430**	**52.20%**	**2,160,618**	**47.80%**	**2,283,041**	**50.66%**	**2,223,370**	**49.34%**	**2,370,201**	**52.77%**	**2,121,283**	**47.23%**	**2,152,022**	**54.46%**	**1,799,735**	**45.54%**

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: 2016 General Election - Court of Appeals

	Dietz Seat: Dietz-Rozier				Geer Seat: Murphy-Eagles-Buie						Hunter Seat: Hunter-Jones				Stephens Seat: Berger-Stephens				Zachary Seat: Zachary-Mitchell			
District	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Una	Una %	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %
1	16,888	51.46%	15,930	48.54%	15,980	48.32%	15,782	47.72%	1,311	3.96%	17,467	52.77%	15,634	47.23%	16,314	49.08%	16,927	50.92%	16,909	51.58%	15,872	48.42%
2	20,753	58.27%	14,862	41.73%	18,951	52.70%	15,067	41.90%	1,945	5.41%	21,082	58.85%	14,739	41.15%	19,790	54.36%	16,613	45.64%	20,625	58.22%	14,801	41.78%
3	19,136	61.04%	12,216	38.96%	17,843	56.49%	12,006	38.01%	1,735	5.49%	19,417	61.55%	12,132	38.45%	18,204	57.71%	13,339	42.29%	19,169	61.52%	11,992	38.48%
4	17,280	62.18%	10,509	37.82%	16,699	59.43%	10,028	35.69%	1,372	4.88%	17,932	64.05%	10,066	35.95%	17,039	60.81%	10,983	39.19%	17,419	63.05%	10,210	36.95%
5	13,091	43.36%	17,101	56.64%	12,150	40.05%	16,983	55.99%	1,201	3.96%	13,491	44.32%	16,946	55.68%	12,468	40.81%	18,086	59.19%	13,190	43.73%	16,971	56.27%
6	24,633	65.21%	13,143	34.79%	22,899	60.21%	12,997	34.17%	2,137	5.62%	25,103	66.16%	12,841	33.84%	23,413	61.65%	14,562	38.35%	24,682	65.56%	12,965	34.44%
7	21,200	58.10%	15,289	41.90%	19,673	53.36%	15,344	41.62%	1,854	5.03%	21,770	59.27%	14,960	40.73%	20,237	54.55%	16,858	45.45%	21,362	58.74%	15,004	41.26%
8	11,350	35.17%	20,922	64.83%	10,606	32.58%	20,221	62.12%	1,725	5.30%	11,664	35.99%	20,746	64.01%	10,773	33.31%	21,568	66.69%	11,450	35.62%	20,693	64.38%
9	20,461	57.84%	14,915	42.16%	19,291	54.07%	14,580	40.87%	1,805	5.06%	20,833	58.58%	14,730	41.42%	19,319	54.66%	16,023	45.34%	20,567	58.35%	14,683	41.65%
10	22,479	67.26%	10,944	32.74%	21,617	63.99%	10,714	31.72%	1,451	4.30%	23,208	68.91%	10,470	31.09%	21,879	65.17%	11,693	34.83%	22,652	68.28%	10,524	31.72%
11	14,584	37.24%	24,578	62.76%	12,540	31.69%	24,160	61.06%	2,869	7.25%	14,961	38.06%	24,344	61.94%	13,159	33.17%	26,510	66.83%	15,070	38.69%	23,879	61.31%
12	16,626	51.93%	15,390	48.07%	16,028	49.74%	14,935	46.34%	1,263	3.92%	17,122	53.23%	15,046	46.77%	16,065	50.03%	16,043	49.97%	16,663	52.32%	15,186	47.68%
13	28,027	70.88%	11,516	29.12%	26,473	66.11%	11,476	28.66%	2,097	5.24%	28,651	71.82%	11,242	28.18%	27,374	68.04%	12,857	31.96%	28,189	71.53%	11,220	28.47%
14	15,371	62.49%	9,227	37.51%	14,038	56.28%	8,846	35.46%	2,060	8.26%	15,620	63.05%	9,154	36.95%	15,028	59.94%	10,042	40.06%	15,575	63.53%	8,942	36.47%
15	12,687	69.00%	5,700	31.00%	11,617	62.47%	5,436	29.23%	1,543	8.30%	12,853	69.35%	5,680	30.65%	12,438	66.32%	6,317	33.68%	12,780	69.82%	5,523	30.18%
16	22,809	60.88%	14,657	39.12%	21,654	57.46%	13,994	37.13%	2,038	5.41%	23,428	62.42%	14,102	37.58%	22,286	59.20%	15,358	40.80%	23,001	61.73%	14,257	38.27%
17	32,451	67.39%	15,702	32.61%	30,286	62.59%	15,506	32.04%	2,597	5.37%	33,096	68.63%	15,127	31.37%	31,010	64.11%	17,363	35.89%	32,932	68.69%	15,010	31.31%
18	14,694	42.14%	20,173	57.86%	13,281	37.90%	19,037	54.33%	2,724	7.77%	15,019	43.08%	19,842	56.92%	13,921	39.72%	21,127	60.28%	15,075	43.47%	19,605	56.53%
19	23,970	60.44%	15,689	39.56%	21,809	54.57%	15,120	37.83%	3,038	7.60%	24,229	61.14%	15,397	38.86%	22,546	56.23%	17,553	43.77%	24,272	61.67%	15,088	38.33%
20	25,050	60.58%	16,303	39.42%	22,719	54.62%	15,607	37.52%	3,267	7.85%	25,523	61.75%	15,812	38.25%	23,629	56.55%	18,155	43.45%	25,395	61.96%	15,593	38.04%
21	12,032	40.77%	17,478	59.23%	11,433	38.29%	17,231	57.71%	1,192	3.99%	12,547	42.12%	17,243	57.88%	11,678	39.63%	17,791	60.37%	12,312	41.97%	17,021	58.03%
22	17,813	53.90%	15,238	46.10%	17,904	54.01%	13,923	42.00%	1,322	3.99%	19,223	58.15%	13,833	41.85%	18,132	54.60%	15,074	45.40%	18,689	57.23%	13,965	42.77%
23	12,993	38.08%	21,128	61.92%	12,209	35.87%	20,739	60.94%	1,086	3.19%	13,594	39.41%	20,904	60.59%	12,454	36.10%	22,045	63.90%	12,885	37.87%	21,140	62.13%
24	17,055	47.33%	18,978	52.67%	15,862	43.80%	19,213	53.06%	1,137	3.14%	17,546	48.39%	18,714	51.61%	16,328	44.87%	20,062	55.13%	17,188	47.78%	18,788	52.22%
25	17,669	46.47%	20,352	53.53%	16,642	43.46%	20,476	53.47%	1,179	3.08%	18,082	47.31%	20,140	52.69%	16,938	44.41%	21,204	55.59%	17,781	46.84%	20,178	53.16%
26	27,497	62.87%	16,240	37.13%	25,620	58.03%	15,717	35.60%	2,816	6.38%	28,353	64.49%	15,615	35.51%	26,332	59.17%	18,170	40.83%	28,301	64.93%	15,286	35.07%
27	11,542	35.58%	20,899	64.42%	10,922	33.32%	20,981	64.00%	878	2.68%	11,986	36.66%	20,708	63.34%	10,908	33.43%	21,723	66.57%	11,533	35.64%	20,829	64.36%
28	22,630	65.92%	11,700	34.08%	21,619	62.20%	11,276	32.44%	1,863	5.36%	23,578	68.27%	10,959	31.73%	21,811	62.28%	13,211	37.72%	23,093	67.64%	11,050	32.36%
29	7,279	16.18%	37,717	83.82%	5,908	13.07%	37,252	82.38%	2,058	4.55%	7,613	16.88%	37,485	83.12%	6,303	13.88%	39,110	86.12%	7,585	16.88%	37,341	83.12%
30	15,045	31.74%	32,357	68.26%	13,268	27.83%	32,215	67.58%	2,184	4.58%	15,429	32.47%	32,087	67.53%	13,743	28.62%	34,283	71.38%	15,336	32.44%	31,944	67.56%
31	8,548	19.67%	34,903	80.33%	7,434	17.04%	34,119	78.18%	2,086	4.78%	8,758	20.13%	34,753	79.87%	7,903	18.02%	35,943	81.98%	8,935	20.61%	34,410	79.39%
32	12,797	35.41%	23,343	64.59%	11,839	32.59%	23,288	64.10%	1,202	3.31%	13,494	37.10%	22,875	62.90%	12,213	33.37%	24,391	66.63%	12,947	35.90%	23,114	64.10%
33	9,385	24.75%	28,535	75.25%	8,251	21.62%	27,479	72.02%	2,426	6.36%	9,689	25.47%	28,354	74.53%	8,747	22.82%	29,586	77.18%	9,839	26.11%	27,846	73.89%
34	18,525	41.62%	25,982	58.38%	16,005	35.52%	26,621	59.08%	2,433	5.40%	19,604	43.77%	25,186	56.23%	16,516	36.38%	28,884	63.62%	19,090	43.22%	25,079	56.78%
35	27,499	55.09%	22,421	44.91%	25,344	50.26%	22,475	44.57%	2,604	5.16%	28,029	55.89%	22,119	44.11%	26,105	51.51%	24,572	48.49%	28,219	56.80%	21,460	43.20%
36	27,312	57.09%	20,529	42.91%	25,017	51.81%	20,806	43.09%	2,460	5.09%	27,973	58.23%	20,067	41.77%	25,662	52.78%	22,955	47.22%	27,940	58.70%	19,659	41.30%
37	28,208	56.55%	21,674	43.45%	25,846	51.29%	21,679	43.02%	2,871	5.70%	28,715	57.35%	21,351	42.65%	26,580	52.46%	24,087	47.54%	28,918	58.23%	20,746	41.77%
38	7,227	19.97%	28,964	80.03%	6,265	17.17%	28,193	77.26%	2,034	5.57%	7,480	20.57%	28,881	79.43%	6,591	17.98%	30,069	82.02%	7,568	21.04%	28,396	78.96%
39	15,193	35.79%	27,260	64.21%	13,779	32.21%	26,565	62.10%	2,432	5.69%	15,541	36.47%	27,077	63.53%	14,279	33.19%	28,739	66.81%	15,611	36.96%	26,628	63.04%
40	28,419	55.65%	22,646	44.35%	25,519	49.51%	23,580	45.75%	2,444	4.74%	28,934	56.35%	22,413	43.65%	26,346	50.70%	25,617	49.30%	28,917	56.91%	21,891	43.09%
41	20,126	44.95%	24,648	55.05%	17,766	39.33%	24,641	54.55%	2,768	6.13%	20,642	45.91%	24,316	54.09%	18,516	40.78%	26,889	59.22%	20,742	46.49%	23,875	53.51%
42	6,513	27.61%	17,080	72.39%	5,739	24.27%	16,469	69.65%	1,437	6.08%	6,630	28.07%	16,993	71.93%	6,086	25.68%	17,610	74.32%	6,733	28.56%	16,838	71.44%
43	8,188	28.02%	21,037	71.98%	7,216	24.60%	20,373	69.47%	1,739	5.93%	8,472	28.98%	20,762	71.02%	7,692	26.15%	21,718	73.85%	8,432	28.94%	20,707	71.06%
44	14,235	46.51%	16,371	53.49%	12,798	41.73%	15,834	51.63%	2,037	6.64%	14,720	48.05%	15,917	51.95%	13,428	43.57%	17,389	56.43%	14,570	47.70%	15,977	52.30%
45	21,395	58.45%	15,208	41.55%	19,823	54.05%	14,454	39.41%	2,399	6.54%	21,978	59.99%	14,658	40.01%	20,601	55.96%	16,216	44.04%	21,782	59.59%	14,770	40.41%
46	12,877	54.64%	10,691	45.36%	12,789	54.00%	9,669	40.82%	1,227	5.18%	13,777	58.15%	9,916	41.85%	12,940	54.57%	10,774	45.43%	12,992	55.45%	10,437	44.55%
47	8,901	38.88%	13,995	61.12%	8,660	37.83%	12,763	55.75%	1,469	6.42%	9,648	41.91%	13,373	58.09%	8,927	38.60%	14,202	61.40%	8,873	38.92%	13,924	61.08%
48	12,622	43.43%	16,443	56.57%	11,619	39.45%	15,901	53.99%	1,933	6.56%	13,109	44.76%	16,180	55.24%	12,220	41.25%	17,401	58.75%	12,761	44.06%	16,205	55.94%
49	20,010	42.01%	27,616	57.99%	17,282	35.89%	28,058	58.27%	2,809	5.83%	20,649	43.15%	27,209	56.85%	17,912	37.04%	30,453	62.96%	20,437	43.16%	26,918	56.84%
50	19,170	44.53%	23,881	55.47%	17,411	40.16%	23,768	54.82%	2,174	5.01%	19,656	45.48%	23,566	54.52%	18,239	41.71%	25,488	58.29%	19,306	44.96%	23,634	55.04%
51	17,332	56.04%	13,596	43.96%	15,452	49.64%	12,941	41.57%	2,736	8.79%	17,744	57.34%	13,200	42.66%	16,279	52.06%	14,991	47.94%	17,572	57.13%	13,188	42.87%
52	26,868	67.51%	12,930	32.49%	24,612	61.13%	13,449	33.40%	2,202	5.47%	27,079	67.68%	12,931	32.32%	25,420	62.76%	15,085	37.24%	26,965	68.14%	12,608	31.86%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-25.asc', modified 08/28/2017 04:08:41 PM

Printed 08/29/2017 {rptS09|dc2016GE|re1.4.0}

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections. Votes that could not be associated with a specific precinct were excluded. Reported statewide totals may therefore be marginally lower than official contest results.

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: 2016 General Election - Court of Appeals

	Dietz Seat: Dietz-Rozier				Geer Seat: Murphy-Eagles-Buie						Hunter Seat: Hunter-Jones				Stephens Seat: Berger-Stephens				Zachary Seat: Zachary-Mitchell			
District	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Una	Una %	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %
53	20,389	62.00%	12,498	38.00%	19,003	57.30%	12,182	36.73%	1,978	5.96%	20,908	63.23%	12,159	36.77%	19,323	58.06%	13,957	41.94%	20,667	62.87%	12,203	37.13%
54	20,879	42.44%	28,320	57.56%	18,749	37.73%	28,411	57.17%	2,534	5.10%	21,353	43.12%	28,171	56.88%	19,455	39.00%	30,426	61.00%	21,288	43.16%	28,038	56.84%
55	21,846	65.64%	11,437	34.36%	20,528	61.18%	11,439	34.09%	1,584	4.72%	22,241	66.47%	11,221	33.53%	21,289	63.35%	12,319	36.65%	21,647	65.21%	11,547	34.79%
56	8,631	19.42%	35,814	80.58%	6,918	15.46%	35,190	78.63%	2,647	5.91%	9,093	20.41%	35,457	79.59%	7,620	16.94%	37,364	83.06%	8,975	20.25%	35,338	79.75%
57	5,556	14.76%	32,096	85.24%	4,570	12.07%	31,412	83.00%	1,866	4.93%	6,016	15.92%	31,780	84.08%	5,115	13.47%	32,868	86.53%	5,647	15.01%	31,970	84.99%
58	9,528	26.68%	26,187	73.32%	8,433	23.46%	25,658	71.39%	1,848	5.14%	10,087	28.11%	25,791	71.89%	8,942	24.75%	27,188	75.25%	9,650	27.05%	26,029	72.95%
59	25,154	57.34%	18,713	42.66%	23,229	52.72%	18,723	42.49%	2,110	4.79%	25,802	58.54%	18,275	41.46%	24,433	54.86%	20,101	45.14%	25,275	57.63%	18,586	42.37%
60	10,935	33.93%	21,290	66.07%	9,675	29.86%	20,988	64.78%	1,738	5.36%	11,279	34.87%	21,071	65.13%	10,237	31.42%	22,349	68.58%	11,007	34.22%	21,159	65.78%
61	25,974	57.77%	18,986	42.23%	22,910	50.64%	20,040	44.29%	2,293	5.07%	26,656	58.96%	18,557	41.04%	23,984	52.36%	21,822	47.64%	25,802	57.56%	19,021	42.44%
62	25,908	58.13%	18,662	41.87%	22,933	50.95%	20,080	44.61%	2,000	4.44%	26,561	59.20%	18,302	40.80%	23,970	52.51%	21,675	47.49%	25,894	58.20%	18,595	41.80%
63	19,795	56.40%	15,303	43.60%	18,147	51.49%	15,231	43.22%	1,866	5.29%	20,223	57.44%	14,982	42.56%	19,009	53.50%	16,522	46.50%	19,948	56.92%	15,099	43.08%
64	19,086	59.95%	12,749	40.05%	17,630	55.20%	12,643	39.59%	1,665	5.21%	19,356	60.69%	12,537	39.31%	18,422	57.28%	13,738	42.72%	19,060	60.07%	12,670	39.93%
65	22,647	64.05%	12,714	35.95%	21,068	59.10%	12,545	35.19%	2,033	5.70%	22,985	64.63%	12,579	35.37%	22,024	60.53%	14,363	39.47%	22,811	64.61%	12,496	35.39%
66	17,765	55.65%	14,157	44.35%	16,410	50.83%	13,871	42.97%	2,003	6.20%	18,474	57.40%	13,708	42.60%	17,285	53.24%	15,184	46.76%	17,704	55.52%	14,186	44.48%
67	30,308	75.24%	9,976	24.76%	28,265	69.75%	9,801	24.19%	2,457	6.06%	30,739	76.00%	9,708	24.00%	29,185	72.18%	11,250	27.82%	30,405	75.14%	10,059	24.86%
68	26,402	66.51%	13,296	33.49%	24,601	61.45%	13,241	33.07%	2,192	5.48%	26,595	66.81%	13,210	33.19%	25,512	63.65%	14,572	36.35%	26,465	66.86%	13,119	33.14%
69	23,181	67.27%	11,281	32.73%	21,566	62.07%	11,138	32.06%	2,040	5.87%	23,414	67.76%	11,138	32.24%	22,414	64.46%	12,358	35.54%	23,145	67.37%	11,209	32.63%
70	24,384	76.84%	7,351	23.16%	22,905	71.60%	7,094	22.17%	1,993	6.23%	24,729	77.46%	7,196	22.54%	23,999	74.40%	8,256	25.60%	24,418	77.17%	7,225	22.83%
71	10,425	32.32%	21,832	67.68%	8,737	26.95%	21,587	66.60%	2,090	6.45%	10,376	32.14%	21,912	67.86%	9,393	28.88%	23,134	71.12%	10,504	32.71%	21,612	67.29%
72	8,383	26.05%	23,794	73.95%	6,753	20.83%	23,931	73.80%	1,742	5.37%	8,322	25.83%	23,897	74.17%	7,180	22.13%	25,262	77.87%	8,346	26.05%	23,689	73.95%
73	26,214	70.51%	10,964	29.49%	24,010	64.13%	11,005	29.40%	2,423	6.47%	26,579	71.22%	10,743	28.78%	24,985	66.58%	12,541	33.42%	26,840	71.83%	10,524	28.17%
74	26,495	63.11%	15,486	36.89%	23,708	56.26%	15,742	37.36%	2,691	6.39%	26,528	63.10%	15,511	36.90%	24,851	58.68%	17,500	41.32%	26,400	63.26%	15,335	36.74%
75	24,034	61.10%	15,301	38.90%	21,420	54.21%	15,339	38.82%	2,755	6.97%	23,966	60.86%	15,414	39.14%	22,633	56.97%	17,098	43.03%	24,013	61.33%	15,138	38.67%
76	22,436	64.14%	12,546	35.86%	20,502	58.15%	12,524	35.52%	2,231	6.33%	22,789	64.83%	12,363	35.17%	21,452	61.03%	13,699	38.97%	22,443	64.35%	12,431	35.65%
77	29,713	75.44%	9,672	24.56%	27,546	69.71%	9,807	24.82%	2,163	5.47%	29,941	75.76%	9,581	24.24%	28,710	72.40%	10,946	27.60%	29,724	75.63%	9,580	24.37%
78	26,891	79.24%	7,045	20.76%	25,451	74.42%	6,769	19.79%	1,981	5.79%	27,337	79.99%	6,839	20.01%	26,577	77.12%	7,883	22.88%	26,869	79.43%	6,957	20.57%
79	21,727	63.15%	12,680	36.85%	20,505	59.22%	12,543	36.22%	1,579	4.56%	22,154	64.01%	12,454	35.99%	20,919	60.40%	13,714	39.60%	21,607	63.07%	12,650	36.93%
80	27,389	76.91%	8,221	23.09%	25,611	71.53%	8,230	22.99%	1,962	5.48%	27,743	77.62%	8,000	22.38%	26,957	74.85%	9,057	25.15%	27,354	76.99%	8,177	23.01%
81	25,647	73.85%	9,081	26.15%	23,411	67.09%	9,122	26.14%	2,360	6.76%	25,901	74.43%	8,899	25.57%	25,016	71.25%	10,092	28.75%	25,444	73.57%	9,143	26.43%
82	25,920	60.90%	16,643	39.10%	23,524	54.91%	16,299	38.04%	3,020	7.05%	26,228	61.41%	16,480	38.59%	24,733	57.49%	18,292	42.51%	26,102	61.38%	16,425	38.62%
83	20,822	60.56%	13,561	39.44%	18,941	54.77%	13,113	37.92%	2,526	7.30%	21,117	61.19%	13,394	38.81%	19,842	57.36%	14,753	42.64%	20,877	60.80%	13,461	39.20%
84	24,724	69.81%	10,690	30.19%	22,820	63.85%	10,583	29.61%	2,335	6.53%	24,926	69.97%	10,700	30.03%	23,634	66.21%	12,064	33.79%	24,548	69.56%	10,740	30.44%
85	24,618	75.39%	8,038	24.61%	23,337	70.57%	7,617	23.04%	2,113	6.39%	25,735	77.32%	7,548	22.68%	23,827	72.32%	9,119	27.68%	24,095	74.52%	8,239	25.48%
86	22,363	67.82%	10,612	32.18%	20,552	62.39%	10,480	31.82%	1,907	5.79%	22,461	68.25%	10,448	31.75%	20,483	62.27%	12,412	37.73%	21,765	66.26%	11,083	33.74%
87	25,579	75.47%	8,313	24.53%	23,715	69.31%	8,288	24.22%	2,212	6.47%	25,663	75.25%	8,439	24.75%	24,552	71.64%	9,721	28.36%	25,308	74.92%	8,473	25.08%
88	11,231	32.82%	22,991	67.18%	9,404	27.32%	22,838	66.36%	2,174	6.32%	11,603	33.80%	22,730	66.20%	9,879	28.74%	24,492	71.26%	10,856	31.77%	23,315	68.23%
89	24,856	73.66%	8,886	26.34%	22,860	67.23%	8,958	26.35%	2,183	6.42%	24,944	73.68%	8,909	26.32%	23,655	69.81%	10,230	30.19%	24,547	73.01%	9,075	26.99%
90	24,860	74.12%	8,679	25.88%	23,149	68.82%	8,413	25.01%	2,073	6.16%	25,365	75.31%	8,317	24.69%	24,007	70.68%	9,958	29.32%	24,726	73.88%	8,740	26.12%
91	27,264	75.61%	8,797	24.39%	25,372	69.91%	8,474	23.35%	2,445	6.74%	27,866	76.86%	8,388	23.14%	26,650	72.61%	10,055	27.39%	27,260	75.77%	8,719	24.23%
92	12,627	37.24%	21,276	62.76%	11,115	32.57%	20,689	60.62%	2,326	6.82%	12,711	37.39%	21,282	62.61%	11,650	34.28%	22,330	65.72%	12,670	37.40%	21,207	62.60%
93	22,390	57.78%	16,360	42.22%	20,257	51.65%	15,548	39.64%	3,418	8.71%	22,490	59.07%	15,586	40.93%	21,485	54.50%	17,938	45.50%	22,343	57.72%	16,367	42.28%
94	27,638	76.02%	8,719	23.98%	25,758	70.28%	8,423	22.98%	2,469	6.74%	27,915	76.38%	8,633	23.62%	26,606	72.70%	9,992	27.30%	27,490	75.77%	8,789	24.23%
95	28,282	70.04%	12,095	29.96%	25,801	63.32%	12,010	29.47%	2,937	7.21%	28,550	70.40%	12,006	29.60%	26,980	66.22%	13,761	33.78%	28,392	70.47%	11,900	29.53%
96	22,978	68.31%	10,662	31.69%	20,920	61.82%	10,818	31.97%	2,104	6.22%	22,992	68.20%	10,722	31.80%	21,496	63.63%	12,288	36.37%	22,721	67.81%	10,788	32.19%
97	27,658	74.58%	9,428	25.42%	25,671	68.45%	9,500	25.33%	2,334	6.22%	27,944	74.84%	9,396	25.16%	26,441	70.99%	10,807	29.01%	27,454	74.28%	9,505	25.72%
98	26,400	61.73%	16,370	38.27%	23,926	55.68%	16,878	39.27%	2,170	5.05%	26,755	62.38%	16,137	37.62%	24,414	56.98%	18,431	43.02%	26,181	61.26%	16,559	38.74%
99	7,215	22.03%	25,540	77.97%	6,321	19.18%	24,871	75.48%	1,757	5.33%	7,283	22.18%	25,559	77.82%	6,689	20.33%	26,206	79.67%	7,226	21.95%	25,691	78.05%
100	10,185	35.10%	18,828	64.90%	8,824	30.25%	18,502	63.43%	1,845	6.32%	10,509	36.10%	18,599	63.90%	9,247	31.74%	19,890	68.26%	10,030	34.58%	18,976	65.42%
101	9,769	26.74%	26,760	73.26%	8,603	23.43%	26,049	70.93%	2,073	5.64%	9,928	27.06%	26,765	72.94%	8,933	24.37%	27,730	75.63%	9,774	26.65%	26,907	73.35%
102	6,789	22.55%	23,320	77.45%	5,425	17.87%	22,923	75.53%	2,003	6.60%	7,075	23.39%	23,178	76.61%	5,791	19.11%	24,515	80.89%	6,588	21.79%	23,648	78.21%
103	25,100	62.43%	15,102	37.57%	22,586	55.86%	15,744	38.94%	2,103	5.20%	25,601	63.46%	14,741	36.54%	23,135	57.42%	17,155	42.58%	24,689	61.51%	15,451	38.49%
104	27,080	61.88%	16,682	38.12%	23,012	52.28%	18,813	42.74%	2,190	4.98%	28,053	63.99%	15,790	36.01%	23,548	53.25%	20,672	46.75%	25,571	59.08%	17,711	40.92%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-25.asc', modified 08/28/2017 04:08:41 PM

Printed 08/29/2017 {rptS09|dc2016GE|re1.4.0}

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections. Votes that could not be associated with a specific precinct were excluded. Reported statewide totals may therefore be marginally lower than official contest results.

HBK-25 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2: 2016 General Election - Court of Appeals

	Dietz Seat: Dietz-Rozier				Geer Seat: Murphy-Eagles-Buie						Hunter Seat: Hunter-Jones				Stephens Seat: Berger-Stephens				Zachary Seat: Zachary-Mitchell			
District	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Una**	**Una %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**
105	22,947	59.16%	15,843	40.84%	20,454	52.45%	16,336	41.89%	2,205	5.65%	23,281	59.87%	15,604	40.13%	21,063	53.96%	17,975	46.04%	22,554	58.24%	16,174	41.76%
106	8,640	27.33%	22,971	72.67%	7,558	23.75%	22,247	69.91%	2,017	6.34%	8,735	27.55%	22,967	72.45%	7,934	25.00%	23,802	75.00%	8,588	27.06%	23,152	72.94%
107	8,544	24.41%	26,456	75.59%	7,481	21.28%	25,691	73.09%	1,979	5.63%	8,711	24.80%	26,408	75.20%	7,900	22.48%	27,245	77.52%	8,670	24.66%	26,484	75.34%
108	21,168	64.87%	11,461	35.13%	19,626	59.60%	11,289	34.28%	2,013	6.11%	21,345	65.21%	11,389	34.79%	20,241	61.43%	12,709	38.57%	20,960	64.62%	11,476	35.38%
109	21,554	62.74%	12,798	37.26%	20,029	57.75%	12,722	36.68%	1,930	5.57%	21,821	63.21%	12,699	36.79%	20,644	59.41%	14,106	40.59%	21,473	62.78%	12,728	37.22%
110	22,127	69.23%	9,836	30.77%	20,681	64.13%	9,888	30.66%	1,682	5.22%	22,322	69.44%	9,823	30.56%	21,313	66.01%	10,974	33.99%	21,864	68.73%	9,947	31.27%
111	21,886	68.74%	9,952	31.26%	20,510	63.95%	9,920	30.93%	1,641	5.12%	22,083	69.04%	9,903	30.96%	21,233	65.89%	10,993	34.11%	21,551	67.97%	10,156	32.03%
112	23,688	73.16%	8,691	26.84%	21,993	68.09%	8,488	26.28%	1,819	5.63%	23,706	73.36%	8,609	26.64%	22,478	69.69%	9,776	30.31%	23,201	71.88%	9,078	28.12%
113	27,467	65.03%	14,770	34.97%	25,646	60.39%	14,657	34.51%	2,166	5.10%	27,664	65.34%	14,673	34.66%	25,959	61.43%	16,298	38.57%	27,339	64.81%	14,845	35.19%
114	11,363	25.04%	34,023	74.96%	9,794	21.46%	32,655	71.55%	3,189	6.99%	12,567	27.60%	32,963	72.40%	10,188	22.36%	35,385	77.64%	11,370	25.15%	33,842	74.85%
115	22,685	51.75%	21,153	48.25%	20,600	46.73%	20,696	46.94%	2,791	6.33%	23,526	53.50%	20,446	46.50%	21,159	48.07%	22,855	51.93%	22,529	51.62%	21,118	48.38%
116	22,546	56.57%	17,310	43.43%	20,529	51.13%	16,923	42.15%	2,701	6.73%	23,316	58.27%	16,696	41.73%	21,091	52.62%	18,989	47.38%	22,552	56.78%	17,164	43.22%
117	25,354	65.09%	13,596	34.91%	23,574	60.09%	13,529	34.48%	2,131	5.43%	25,483	65.28%	13,556	34.72%	23,988	61.26%	15,172	38.74%	25,260	64.96%	13,625	35.04%
118	23,537	62.81%	13,935	37.19%	22,493	59.37%	13,024	34.38%	2,369	6.25%	23,957	63.50%	13,771	36.50%	22,450	59.59%	15,226	40.41%	23,119	61.85%	14,262	38.15%
119	18,833	56.49%	14,508	43.51%	18,090	53.56%	13,449	39.82%	2,236	6.62%	18,921	56.56%	14,533	43.44%	17,390	51.96%	16,081	48.04%	18,501	55.69%	14,718	44.31%
120	27,946	72.90%	10,387	27.10%	26,536	68.66%	9,968	25.79%	2,146	5.55%	28,129	73.17%	10,314	26.83%	26,729	69.30%	11,843	30.70%	27,540	72.18%	10,615	27.82%
Totals:	**2,350,800**	**53.54%**	**2,040,100**	**46.46%**	**2,156,688**	**48.77%**	**2,013,586**	**45.53%**	**252,225**	**5.70%**	**2,400,169**	**54.44%**	**2,008,351**	**45.56%**	**2,231,049**	**50.31%**	**2,203,187**	**49.69%**	**2,358,465**	**53.88%**	**2,018,808**	**46.12%**

EX. 4

2017 Senate Floor Redistricting Plan – 4th Ed



SCT-2

Printed by the NC General Assembly, August 28, 2017.

EX. 5

STC-2 - 2017 Senate Floor Redistricting Plan - 4th Ed: Population Deviation

District	2010 Pop	Ideal Pop	Deviation	Deviation %
1	196,665	190,710	5,955	3.12%
2	183,118	190,710	-7,592	-3.98%
3	182,039	190,710	-8,671	-4.55%
4	192,477	190,710	1,767	0.93%
5	189,510	190,710	-1,200	-0.63%
6	187,925	190,710	-2,785	-1.46%
7	182,118	190,710	-8,592	-4.51%
8	200,133	190,710	9,423	4.94%
9	197,372	190,710	6,662	3.49%
10	183,566	190,710	-7,144	-3.75%
11	193,194	190,710	2,484	1.30%
12	182,438	190,710	-8,272	-4.34%
13	192,266	190,710	1,556	0.82%
14	194,087	190,710	3,377	1.77%
15	195,003	190,710	4,293	2.25%
16	197,303	190,710	6,593	3.46%
17	182,304	190,710	-8,406	-4.41%
18	192,915	190,710	2,205	1.16%
19	182,067	190,710	-8,643	-4.53%
20	184,237	190,710	-6,473	-3.39%
21	184,316	190,710	-6,394	-3.35%
22	182,730	190,710	-7,980	-4.18%
23	197,306	190,710	6,596	3.46%
24	192,673	190,710	1,963	1.03%
25	197,991	190,710	7,281	3.82%
26	196,115	190,710	5,405	2.83%
27	195,363	190,710	4,653	2.44%
28	197,138	190,710	6,428	3.37%
29	190,676	190,710	-34	-0.02%
30	198,458	190,710	7,748	4.06%
31	197,532	190,710	6,822	3.58%
32	194,378	190,710	3,668	1.92%
33	199,013	190,710	8,303	4.35%
34	197,843	190,710	7,133	3.74%
35	189,794	190,710	-916	-0.48%
36	189,509	190,710	-1,201	-0.63%
37	185,257	190,710	-5,453	-2.86%
38	182,674	190,710	-8,036	-4.21%
39	184,099	190,710	-6,611	-3.47%
40	183,426	190,710	-7,284	-3.82%
41	184,172	190,710	-6,538	-3.43%
42	191,556	190,710	846	0.44%
43	197,035	190,710	6,325	3.32%
44	185,394	190,710	-5,316	-2.79%
45	198,833	190,710	8,123	4.26%
46	191,738	190,710	1,028	0.54%
47	187,477	190,710	-3,233	-1.70%
48	184,866	190,710	-5,844	-3.06%
49	193,282	190,710	2,572	1.35%
50	194,102	190,710	3,392	1.78%
Total:	**9,535,483**			

STC-2 - 2017 Senate Floor Redistricting Plan - 4th Ed: Population 2010, US Senate 2010, President 2012

	2010 Census		US Senate 2010: Marshall-Burr-Beitler								US President 2012: Obama-Romney-Johnson							
District	Total Pop	18+ Pop	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %
1	196,665	153,426	25,606	43.60%	31,904	54.33%	1,196	2.04%	19	0.03%	45,482	48.87%	46,490	49.95%	950	1.02%	150	0.16%
2	183,118	143,986	17,393	31.26%	37,109	66.70%	1,070	1.92%	63	0.11%	31,516	35.91%	55,323	63.03%	761	0.87%	168	0.19%
3	182,039	141,242	31,118	52.62%	27,064	45.76%	926	1.57%	30	0.05%	50,170	56.97%	37,383	42.45%	406	0.46%	104	0.12%
4	192,477	145,928	32,883	57.59%	23,457	41.08%	750	1.31%	10	0.02%	56,149	61.10%	35,208	38.32%	433	0.47%	100	0.11%
5	189,510	146,760	22,397	47.49%	24,190	51.29%	556	1.18%	20	0.04%	45,546	52.42%	40,573	46.70%	648	0.75%	117	0.13%
6	187,925	140,779	10,015	33.20%	19,362	64.19%	769	2.55%	16	0.05%	20,842	36.78%	35,080	61.91%	588	1.04%	155	0.27%
7	182,118	137,302	20,490	42.11%	27,572	56.66%	583	1.20%	14	0.03%	37,221	46.96%	41,578	52.46%	434	0.55%	22	0.03%
8	200,133	158,646	26,597	38.48%	41,161	59.54%	1,344	1.94%	25	0.04%	42,274	42.05%	57,243	56.94%	821	0.82%	202	0.20%
9	197,372	158,279	23,736	38.00%	37,303	59.72%	1,394	2.23%	32	0.05%	46,065	45.68%	53,212	52.77%	1,246	1.24%	312	0.31%
10	183,566	136,365	18,810	40.24%	27,283	58.36%	647	1.38%	10	0.02%	29,823	41.92%	40,745	57.27%	468	0.66%	107	0.15%
11	193,194	141,728	23,256	39.26%	34,955	59.02%	994	1.68%	24	0.04%	41,040	42.70%	54,070	56.26%	783	0.81%	221	0.23%
12	182,438	133,366	16,935	38.82%	25,854	59.27%	817	1.87%	16	0.04%	29,243	40.66%	41,830	58.16%	695	0.97%	157	0.22%
13	192,266	142,807	19,514	49.67%	19,146	48.73%	605	1.54%	25	0.06%	36,038	53.66%	30,451	45.34%	520	0.77%	156	0.23%
14	194,087	140,836	31,356	61.63%	18,506	36.38%	980	1.93%	33	0.06%	64,173	68.04%	29,080	30.83%	911	0.97%	153	0.16%
15	195,003	155,372	33,921	61.74%	19,809	36.05%	1,188	2.16%	28	0.05%	66,963	66.58%	31,880	31.70%	1,554	1.55%	183	0.18%
16	197,303	146,752	27,789	46.71%	29,992	50.41%	1,690	2.84%	24	0.04%	59,269	54.76%	47,171	43.58%	1,575	1.46%	225	0.21%
17	182,304	127,938	22,007	36.88%	36,146	60.58%	1,492	2.50%	20	0.03%	43,729	42.94%	56,687	55.66%	1,280	1.26%	153	0.15%
18	192,915	141,239	26,298	38.31%	40,810	59.45%	1,499	2.18%	41	0.06%	46,564	42.61%	61,381	56.17%	1,119	1.02%	212	0.19%
19	182,067	131,993	16,551	42.14%	22,006	56.03%	697	1.77%	19	0.05%	33,383	47.48%	36,221	51.51%	570	0.81%	142	0.20%
20	184,237	142,941	40,914	76.58%	11,670	21.84%	815	1.53%	26	0.05%	79,586	79.30%	19,709	19.64%	942	0.94%	125	0.12%
21	184,316	134,664	24,791	64.97%	12,787	33.51%	560	1.47%	21	0.06%	52,485	70.53%	21,264	28.58%	524	0.70%	141	0.19%
22	182,730	141,258	29,403	54.21%	23,800	43.88%	1,018	1.88%	15	0.03%	53,654	58.60%	36,961	40.37%	774	0.85%	168	0.18%
23	197,306	155,496	43,402	61.53%	25,502	36.15%	1,599	2.27%	35	0.05%	72,262	64.41%	38,204	34.05%	1,386	1.24%	339	0.30%
24	192,673	147,633	19,692	36.36%	33,126	61.16%	1,313	2.42%	29	0.05%	37,586	41.57%	51,828	57.32%	814	0.90%	187	0.21%
25	197,991	152,423	24,146	43.32%	30,550	54.81%	1,018	1.83%	23	0.04%	41,643	45.66%	48,824	53.53%	631	0.69%	110	0.12%
26	196,115	147,126	12,742	30.20%	28,243	66.95%	1,165	2.76%	36	0.09%	30,042	36.90%	50,505	62.03%	749	0.92%	124	0.15%
27	195,363	149,849	22,624	33.08%	44,339	64.82%	1,395	2.04%	43	0.06%	45,643	40.21%	66,503	58.59%	1,063	0.94%	289	0.25%
28	197,138	152,041	32,175	71.88%	11,898	26.58%	652	1.46%	37	0.08%	76,219	79.28%	19,017	19.78%	694	0.72%	214	0.22%
29	190,676	145,058	14,509	29.44%	33,627	68.24%	1,119	2.27%	20	0.04%	25,330	30.83%	55,787	67.90%	876	1.07%	173	0.21%
30	198,458	154,651	18,011	32.71%	35,585	64.63%	1,442	2.62%	24	0.04%	32,115	36.33%	55,203	62.45%	866	0.98%	208	0.24%
31	197,532	150,121	18,305	27.87%	46,061	70.13%	1,292	1.97%	21	0.03%	36,109	34.00%	68,971	64.95%	1,068	1.01%	49	0.05%
32	194,378	146,637	26,071	60.42%	16,353	37.90%	705	1.63%	18	0.04%	61,949	70.29%	25,484	28.92%	700	0.79%	0	0.00%
33	199,013	152,338	17,207	31.47%	36,147	66.12%	1,285	2.35%	32	0.06%	31,078	34.17%	58,644	64.47%	953	1.05%	284	0.31%
34	197,843	148,320	15,298	28.04%	37,834	69.35%	1,397	2.56%	26	0.05%	30,033	32.23%	61,877	66.41%	978	1.05%	290	0.31%
35	189,794	132,039	13,415	29.02%	31,743	68.68%	1,034	2.24%	30	0.06%	30,954	35.05%	56,278	63.72%	854	0.97%	228	0.26%
36	189,509	137,603	16,691	32.42%	33,671	65.41%	1,115	2.17%	0	0.00%	34,337	38.31%	54,340	60.63%	939	1.05%	14	0.02%
37	185,257	143,412	25,673	70.58%	9,978	27.43%	703	1.93%	20	0.05%	62,709	76.14%	18,651	22.65%	794	0.96%	207	0.25%
38	182,674	134,933	28,643	71.61%	10,769	26.93%	569	1.42%	15	0.04%	65,195	76.92%	18,683	22.04%	666	0.79%	214	0.25%
39	184,099	138,352	20,085	31.61%	42,253	66.50%	1,164	1.83%	32	0.05%	40,182	38.03%	64,289	60.85%	942	0.89%	235	0.22%
40	183,426	134,379	25,370	64.51%	13,288	33.79%	638	1.62%	30	0.08%	55,925	72.56%	20,350	26.40%	622	0.81%	178	0.23%
41	184,172	135,214	17,773	38.46%	27,479	59.46%	943	2.04%	18	0.04%	43,121	46.53%	48,482	52.31%	868	0.94%	205	0.22%
42	191,556	146,308	16,533	30.70%	35,956	66.76%	1,337	2.48%	33	0.06%	28,675	33.04%	56,787	65.43%	1,033	1.19%	293	0.34%
43	197,035	149,991	14,895	31.63%	31,082	66.01%	1,113	2.36%	0	0.00%	31,879	37.10%	53,179	61.89%	869	1.01%	0	0.00%
44	185,394	141,718	17,792	34.23%	33,049	63.59%	1,112	2.14%	22	0.04%	29,375	34.80%	54,018	63.99%	803	0.95%	224	0.27%
45	198,833	159,078	20,603	34.28%	37,811	62.92%	1,655	2.75%	29	0.05%	31,463	35.00%	56,629	63.00%	1,425	1.59%	366	0.41%
46	191,738	149,705	16,531	33.18%	31,940	64.11%	1,325	2.66%	23	0.05%	26,481	33.57%	51,262	64.98%	1,012	1.28%	132	0.17%
47	187,477	147,841	21,314	34.98%	38,045	62.44%	1,540	2.53%	33	0.05%	29,486	35.14%	53,113	63.30%	1,022	1.22%	282	0.34%
48	184,866	147,107	22,200	34.84%	39,941	62.68%	1,558	2.45%	21	0.03%	36,540	39.02%	55,677	59.45%	1,092	1.17%	344	0.37%
49	193,282	154,410	33,055	52.87%	27,761	44.40%	1,664	2.66%	44	0.07%	59,546	57.71%	41,650	40.36%	1,433	1.39%	560	0.54%
50	194,102	156,458	25,165	38.43%	38,165	58.28%	2,112	3.23%	38	0.06%	34,201	38.27%	53,578	59.95%	1,294	1.45%	297	0.33%
Totals:	**9,535,483**	**7,253,848**	**1,141,700**	**43.04%**	**1,454,082**	**54.82%**	**55,554**	**2.09%**	**1,263**	**0.05%**	**2,171,293**	**48.33%**	**2,267,353**	**50.47%**	**44,448**	**0.99%**	**9,519**	**0.21%**

Populations values derive from the 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File. Election results were provided by the NC State Board of Elections. Votes that could not be associated with a specific precinct were excluded. Reported statewide totals may therefore be marginally lower than official contest results.

STC-2 - 2017 Senate Floor Redistricting Plan - 4th Ed: Governor 2012, Lt Governor 2012, US Senate 2014

	Governor 2012: Dalton-McCrory-Howe								Lieutenant Governor 2012: Coleman-Forest				US Senate 2014: Tillis-Hagan-Haugh							
District	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %
1	44,567	48.84%	44,051	48.28%	2,609	2.86%	20	0.02%	48,060	53.59%	41,627	46.41%	30,750	50.80%	28,027	46.30%	1,702	2.81%	48	0.08%
2	28,530	32.65%	57,217	65.47%	1,615	1.85%	26	0.03%	32,786	38.21%	53,018	61.79%	36,899	60.46%	21,609	35.41%	2,340	3.83%	182	0.30%
3	48,711	55.68%	37,737	43.14%	1,024	1.17%	10	0.01%	52,590	61.35%	33,128	38.65%	24,793	41.50%	32,737	54.80%	2,084	3.49%	128	0.21%
4	54,777	59.84%	35,877	39.20%	869	0.95%	10	0.01%	57,424	63.60%	32,867	36.40%	22,999	38.20%	35,596	59.12%	1,565	2.60%	45	0.07%
5	42,553	49.27%	42,332	49.02%	1,463	1.69%	16	0.02%	46,467	54.65%	38,559	45.35%	24,088	47.07%	25,389	49.62%	1,612	3.15%	81	0.16%
6	18,744	33.55%	35,659	63.82%	1,459	2.61%	13	0.02%	22,010	40.37%	32,513	59.63%	21,858	61.65%	11,859	33.45%	1,681	4.74%	59	0.17%
7	35,570	45.13%	42,240	53.59%	988	1.25%	24	0.03%	38,551	49.66%	39,078	50.34%	26,667	51.80%	23,095	44.86%	1,663	3.23%	55	0.11%
8	37,873	38.02%	59,764	59.99%	1,972	1.98%	15	0.02%	44,067	45.14%	53,565	54.86%	37,130	53.02%	28,989	41.40%	3,786	5.41%	125	0.18%
9	39,195	39.52%	56,871	57.34%	3,086	3.11%	30	0.03%	45,150	46.86%	51,202	53.14%	31,405	48.37%	30,133	46.41%	3,278	5.05%	109	0.17%
10	28,848	40.68%	41,165	58.06%	879	1.24%	14	0.02%	31,760	45.62%	37,856	54.38%	25,555	55.54%	18,517	40.24%	1,855	4.03%	85	0.18%
11	38,275	39.95%	55,989	58.43%	1,536	1.60%	16	0.02%	42,124	44.69%	52,143	55.31%	35,971	54.98%	27,183	41.55%	2,180	3.33%	88	0.13%
12	27,109	37.87%	43,004	60.08%	1,437	2.01%	32	0.04%	30,845	43.91%	39,400	56.09%	25,363	55.53%	18,263	39.99%	1,965	4.30%	81	0.18%
13	37,211	56.10%	27,970	42.17%	1,133	1.71%	20	0.03%	41,068	63.31%	23,805	36.69%	17,801	44.87%	19,985	50.38%	1,822	4.59%	64	0.16%
14	58,672	62.53%	32,941	35.11%	2,194	2.34%	25	0.03%	63,510	68.66%	28,991	31.34%	17,819	30.19%	39,531	66.97%	1,595	2.70%	85	0.14%
15	60,067	60.28%	36,307	36.43%	3,262	3.27%	17	0.02%	65,850	67.55%	31,639	32.45%	18,694	28.84%	43,940	67.79%	2,056	3.17%	125	0.19%
16	50,214	46.93%	53,318	49.83%	3,431	3.21%	29	0.03%	56,759	54.38%	47,610	45.62%	29,618	41.04%	40,216	55.72%	2,223	3.08%	119	0.16%
17	36,898	36.47%	61,457	60.74%	2,795	2.76%	27	0.03%	42,704	43.23%	56,086	56.77%	37,808	53.25%	30,870	43.48%	2,175	3.06%	151	0.21%
18	40,253	37.06%	65,931	60.70%	2,390	2.20%	41	0.04%	45,684	42.88%	60,851	57.12%	42,062	53.07%	34,607	43.66%	2,464	3.11%	130	0.16%
19	30,963	44.61%	36,944	53.23%	1,479	2.13%	15	0.02%	34,446	50.59%	33,642	49.41%	22,411	51.75%	19,246	44.44%	1,595	3.68%	58	0.13%
20	73,527	74.12%	23,053	23.24%	2,558	2.58%	56	0.06%	77,591	79.52%	19,983	20.48%	10,716	17.15%	50,551	80.89%	1,148	1.84%	81	0.13%
21	49,230	67.25%	22,322	30.49%	1,629	2.23%	23	0.03%	52,102	72.03%	20,227	27.97%	12,414	29.17%	28,851	67.79%	1,235	2.90%	58	0.14%
22	49,395	54.52%	39,138	43.20%	2,049	2.26%	25	0.03%	53,909	60.96%	34,519	39.04%	23,144	38.59%	34,913	58.22%	1,839	3.07%	73	0.12%
23	65,604	59.22%	42,009	37.92%	3,103	2.80%	63	0.06%	70,358	64.96%	37,947	35.04%	24,700	30.65%	53,699	66.63%	2,120	2.63%	72	0.09%
24	33,361	37.22%	54,353	60.64%	1,899	2.12%	25	0.03%	37,312	42.46%	50,562	57.54%	33,277	55.76%	24,156	40.47%	2,156	3.61%	94	0.16%
25	38,495	42.60%	50,372	55.74%	1,458	1.61%	44	0.05%	43,394	49.27%	44,680	50.73%	32,665	52.10%	27,623	44.06%	2,319	3.70%	87	0.14%
26	27,007	33.28%	52,574	64.79%	1,553	1.91%	14	0.02%	30,150	37.93%	49,336	62.07%	30,068	62.15%	16,341	33.77%	1,894	3.91%	80	0.17%
27	38,429	34.12%	71,796	63.74%	2,379	2.11%	31	0.03%	44,058	40.13%	65,723	59.87%	45,334	55.88%	33,720	41.56%	1,979	2.44%	101	0.12%
28	70,102	73.90%	22,507	23.73%	2,210	2.33%	37	0.04%	74,547	79.67%	19,022	20.33%	11,198	20.24%	42,845	77.44%	1,216	2.20%	70	0.13%
29	22,078	26.93%	58,230	71.04%	1,648	2.01%	14	0.02%	26,730	33.30%	53,543	66.70%	33,575	65.72%	15,182	29.72%	2,234	4.37%	98	0.19%
30	29,519	33.57%	56,635	64.40%	1,761	2.00%	21	0.02%	34,035	39.65%	51,802	60.35%	34,563	59.33%	20,515	35.22%	3,032	5.20%	144	0.25%
31	30,238	28.46%	73,840	69.50%	2,146	2.02%	27	0.03%	35,556	34.29%	68,123	65.71%	44,330	62.51%	24,129	34.02%	2,308	3.25%	149	0.21%
32	56,426	64.53%	29,125	33.31%	1,865	2.13%	23	0.03%	60,504	70.43%	25,402	29.57%	14,750	28.49%	35,624	68.81%	1,315	2.54%	85	0.16%
33	24,785	27.34%	64,437	71.09%	1,406	1.55%	17	0.02%	31,147	35.25%	57,223	64.75%	35,720	61.30%	18,960	32.54%	3,436	5.90%	156	0.27%
34	23,382	25.22%	67,657	72.97%	1,652	1.78%	30	0.03%	29,848	33.11%	60,303	66.89%	39,563	64.03%	18,656	30.19%	3,385	5.48%	187	0.30%
35	23,416	26.70%	62,790	71.60%	1,463	1.67%	22	0.03%	29,912	35.04%	55,458	64.96%	34,426	63.13%	18,044	33.09%	1,864	3.42%	196	0.36%
36	25,791	28.80%	62,144	69.39%	1,621	1.81%	2	0.00%	34,159	39.33%	52,691	60.67%	32,506	57.95%	21,038	37.51%	2,379	4.24%	167	0.30%
37	51,818	64.06%	27,303	33.76%	1,742	2.15%	22	0.03%	59,561	75.67%	19,152	24.33%	9,453	21.56%	33,142	75.58%	1,198	2.73%	58	0.13%
38	56,519	67.34%	25,968	30.94%	1,406	1.68%	34	0.04%	63,329	76.88%	19,045	23.12%	9,325	20.38%	35,376	77.33%	988	2.16%	58	0.13%
39	25,507	24.25%	78,167	74.31%	1,487	1.41%	25	0.02%	36,685	36.04%	65,104	63.96%	38,383	57.57%	26,513	39.77%	1,665	2.50%	111	0.17%
40	47,247	61.83%	27,759	36.32%	1,390	1.82%	23	0.03%	54,059	72.25%	20,761	27.75%	11,035	25.82%	30,532	71.45%	1,089	2.55%	74	0.17%
41	31,204	33.96%	59,005	64.21%	1,665	1.81%	15	0.02%	40,500	45.39%	48,721	54.61%	27,089	49.95%	25,308	46.66%	1,685	3.11%	153	0.28%
42	22,115	25.57%	62,937	72.78%	1,402	1.62%	19	0.02%	28,289	33.50%	56,166	66.50%	35,350	63.19%	17,371	31.05%	3,046	5.44%	176	0.31%
43	25,879	30.15%	58,602	68.27%	1,337	1.56%	18	0.02%	31,620	37.82%	51,992	62.18%	31,406	60.24%	18,283	35.07%	2,321	4.45%	123	0.24%
44	25,417	30.23%	57,452	68.34%	1,189	1.41%	15	0.02%	29,967	36.62%	51,872	63.38%	33,139	60.95%	18,439	33.91%	2,656	4.88%	138	0.25%
45	27,277	30.55%	59,444	66.57%	2,558	2.86%	22	0.02%	32,247	37.36%	54,077	62.64%	35,618	59.70%	20,428	34.24%	3,477	5.83%	137	0.23%
46	20,724	26.21%	56,753	71.77%	1,579	2.00%	18	0.02%	27,156	35.42%	49,516	64.58%	31,230	61.54%	16,228	31.98%	3,151	6.21%	136	0.27%
47	31,588	37.71%	50,318	60.07%	1,840	2.20%	17	0.02%	31,802	39.23%	49,272	60.77%	34,520	58.39%	21,336	36.09%	3,184	5.39%	80	0.14%
48	32,660	35.31%	57,355	62.00%	2,456	2.66%	30	0.03%	36,359	40.13%	54,243	59.87%	36,913	55.81%	26,545	40.13%	2,601	3.93%	87	0.13%
49	54,517	53.45%	43,870	43.01%	3,574	3.50%	32	0.03%	58,927	58.95%	41,030	41.05%	25,653	36.55%	41,569	59.23%	2,875	4.10%	89	0.13%
50	32,983	37.31%	52,535	59.42%	2,866	3.24%	27	0.03%	36,353	42.19%	49,816	57.81%	35,080	55.57%	24,594	38.96%	3,343	5.30%	115	0.18%
Totals:	**1,925,270**	**43.18%**	**2,437,224**	**54.67%**	**94,512**	**2.12%**	**1,191**	**0.03%**	**2,174,021**	**49.88%**	**2,184,891**	**50.12%**	**1,416,834**	**48.84%**	**1,370,303**	**47.23%**	**108,779**	**3.75%**	**5,251**	**0.18%**

STC-2 - 2017 Senate Floor Redistricting Plan - 4th Ed: President 2016, US Senate 2016, Governor 2016

	US President 2016: Trump-Clinton-Johnson								US Senate 2016: Burr-Ross-Haugh						Governor 2016: Cooper-McCrory-Cecil					
District	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Write-In**	**Write-In %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**
1	51,124	54.37%	39,690	42.21%	2,437	2.59%	781	0.83%	50,422	54.75%	39,232	42.60%	2,441	2.65%	40,704	43.98%	50,100	54.13%	1,749	1.89%
2	58,542	63.89%	30,012	32.76%	2,242	2.45%	829	0.90%	58,109	64.13%	28,994	32.00%	3,512	3.88%	30,960	34.02%	58,265	64.02%	1,788	1.96%
3	37,998	44.82%	45,070	53.16%	1,193	1.41%	523	0.62%	37,690	45.00%	44,065	52.61%	2,002	2.39%	44,887	53.29%	38,505	45.71%	842	1.00%
4	34,714	39.56%	51,323	58.49%	1,231	1.40%	485	0.55%	34,873	40.05%	50,550	58.06%	1,648	1.89%	52,322	59.88%	34,269	39.22%	793	0.91%
5	40,021	45.23%	45,333	51.24%	2,245	2.54%	881	1.00%	41,386	47.29%	43,487	49.70%	2,634	3.01%	45,427	51.71%	41,041	46.71%	1,389	1.58%
6	40,099	64.39%	19,577	31.44%	1,985	3.19%	610	0.98%	39,097	63.90%	19,028	31.10%	3,064	5.01%	20,040	32.62%	39,685	64.59%	1,718	2.80%
7	41,031	53.33%	33,966	44.15%	1,362	1.77%	579	0.75%	40,925	53.84%	33,171	43.64%	1,921	2.53%	33,894	44.35%	41,571	54.40%	958	1.25%
8	69,138	60.31%	41,895	36.54%	2,660	2.32%	948	0.83%	67,784	60.07%	40,579	35.96%	4,470	3.96%	44,922	39.64%	65,885	58.14%	2,506	2.21%
9	55,097	50.39%	48,749	44.58%	3,901	3.57%	1,602	1.47%	55,887	51.89%	46,846	43.49%	4,974	4.62%	54,155	50.05%	50,866	47.01%	3,173	2.93%
10	43,565	59.90%	27,558	37.89%	1,169	1.61%	439	0.60%	43,032	59.87%	27,012	37.58%	1,835	2.55%	28,135	38.91%	43,298	59.88%	879	1.22%
11	57,543	55.97%	41,835	40.69%	2,470	2.40%	968	0.94%	57,652	56.39%	41,591	40.68%	2,987	2.92%	45,263	44.10%	55,757	54.33%	1,612	1.57%
12	44,964	59.19%	28,240	37.18%	2,047	2.69%	709	0.93%	44,404	58.94%	28,264	37.51%	2,673	3.55%	30,211	39.98%	43,695	57.83%	1,656	2.19%
13	34,909	54.33%	27,879	43.39%	1,101	1.71%	361	0.56%	33,313	53.25%	27,703	44.28%	1,548	2.47%	27,663	43.72%	34,916	55.19%	690	1.09%
14	27,353	28.07%	65,857	67.58%	2,784	2.86%	1,450	1.49%	29,490	30.45%	64,478	66.57%	2,890	2.98%	67,188	69.13%	28,058	28.87%	1,940	2.00%
15	27,357	26.16%	71,491	68.37%	3,905	3.73%	1,805	1.73%	31,106	29.93%	69,520	66.90%	3,291	3.17%	74,070	71.04%	27,793	26.66%	2,406	2.31%
16	40,924	34.26%	71,524	59.88%	4,721	3.95%	2,268	1.90%	47,090	39.70%	67,617	57.00%	3,913	3.30%	74,271	62.34%	41,984	35.24%	2,880	2.42%
17	56,562	48.80%	52,520	45.32%	4,792	4.13%	2,020	1.74%	61,244	53.15%	50,014	43.40%	3,971	3.45%	56,237	48.60%	56,738	49.03%	2,745	2.37%
18	60,254	49.94%	54,218	44.93%	4,035	3.34%	2,152	1.78%	65,138	54.20%	51,537	42.88%	3,507	2.92%	57,638	47.79%	60,683	50.32%	2,283	1.89%
19	37,569	51.71%	32,312	44.48%	2,044	2.81%	723	1.00%	37,683	52.49%	31,575	43.98%	2,528	3.52%	32,430	45.06%	37,879	52.63%	1,660	2.31%
20	15,723	14.64%	87,146	81.16%	2,761	2.57%	1,745	1.63%	19,607	18.37%	84,748	79.40%	2,382	2.23%	87,566	81.92%	17,525	16.39%	1,802	1.69%
21	21,456	29.36%	49,019	67.07%	1,906	2.61%	707	0.97%	21,888	30.37%	47,719	66.21%	2,461	3.41%	47,707	66.14%	22,682	31.45%	1,739	2.41%
22	37,322	39.28%	54,243	57.08%	2,241	2.36%	1,220	1.28%	38,620	40.93%	53,100	56.28%	2,628	2.79%	55,918	59.07%	37,192	39.29%	1,560	1.65%
23	35,663	29.19%	80,987	66.28%	3,534	2.89%	2,005	1.64%	39,933	32.86%	78,407	64.52%	3,177	2.61%	83,440	68.47%	36,205	29.71%	2,211	1.81%
24	53,036	55.49%	39,216	41.03%	2,381	2.49%	945	0.99%	53,644	56.54%	38,083	40.14%	3,145	3.31%	42,372	44.53%	50,986	53.58%	1,795	1.89%
25	51,626	55.82%	38,014	41.10%	2,073	2.24%	779	0.84%	50,943	55.86%	37,449	41.07%	2,798	3.07%	39,947	43.57%	50,130	54.68%	1,603	1.75%
26	54,446	64.64%	27,269	32.37%	1,788	2.12%	729	0.87%	53,193	63.86%	26,713	32.07%	3,384	4.06%	30,384	36.36%	51,246	61.33%	1,928	2.31%
27	60,891	51.72%	51,460	43.71%	3,690	3.13%	1,695	1.44%	64,651	55.25%	48,752	41.66%	3,607	3.08%	56,361	48.05%	58,431	49.81%	2,511	2.14%
28	17,691	18.66%	73,851	77.88%	2,070	2.18%	1,220	1.29%	19,041	20.34%	71,990	76.89%	2,600	2.78%	74,483	79.38%	17,465	18.61%	1,885	2.01%
29	61,447	71.12%	22,259	25.76%	2,062	2.39%	628	0.73%	60,373	70.54%	21,959	25.66%	3,259	3.81%	26,603	30.94%	57,516	66.90%	1,851	2.15%
30	60,630	66.76%	27,458	30.23%	1,981	2.18%	748	0.82%	59,336	65.92%	27,371	30.41%	3,299	3.67%	32,270	35.77%	56,074	62.16%	1,869	2.07%
31	67,558	60.88%	38,216	34.44%	3,596	3.24%	1,599	1.44%	70,992	64.24%	35,655	32.26%	3,871	3.50%	43,491	39.30%	64,639	58.41%	2,539	2.29%
32	24,035	26.97%	61,506	69.02%	2,410	2.70%	1,161	1.30%	26,595	30.11%	59,121	66.94%	2,601	2.95%	62,623	70.89%	23,752	26.89%	1,959	2.22%
33	64,774	68.70%	26,494	28.10%	2,181	2.31%	837	0.89%	62,061	66.50%	26,482	28.38%	4,782	5.12%	29,794	31.73%	61,866	65.89%	2,231	2.38%
34	68,634	68.50%	27,894	27.84%	2,583	2.58%	1,080	1.08%	66,829	67.44%	27,349	27.60%	4,916	4.96%	32,618	32.78%	64,115	64.43%	2,775	2.79%
35	61,627	62.37%	32,773	33.17%	3,156	3.19%	1,249	1.26%	62,768	64.34%	30,646	31.41%	4,148	4.25%	34,249	34.89%	61,659	62.80%	2,268	2.31%
36	58,898	58.78%	37,086	37.01%	2,957	2.95%	1,253	1.25%	58,847	59.32%	35,738	36.02%	4,620	4.66%	39,591	39.69%	57,611	57.75%	2,561	2.57%
37	17,060	19.75%	64,797	75.01%	3,224	3.73%	1,303	1.51%	20,986	24.67%	60,840	71.53%	3,229	3.80%	65,025	76.04%	18,122	21.19%	2,365	2.77%
38	17,399	20.08%	66,052	76.22%	2,040	2.35%	1,171	1.35%	18,697	21.82%	64,114	74.82%	2,877	3.36%	65,258	75.88%	18,759	21.81%	1,986	2.31%
39	53,290	48.86%	49,607	45.48%	4,029	3.69%	2,147	1.97%	60,928	56.18%	43,928	40.51%	3,591	3.31%	50,569	46.40%	56,080	51.46%	2,335	2.14%
40	18,662	24.20%	55,240	71.64%	2,109	2.74%	1,100	1.43%	20,031	26.30%	53,262	69.92%	2,880	3.78%	54,730	71.54%	19,904	26.02%	1,868	2.44%
41	47,467	45.06%	52,383	49.73%	3,968	3.77%	1,525	1.45%	50,899	48.91%	48,756	46.85%	4,413	4.24%	55,322	52.95%	45,891	43.92%	3,263	3.12%
42	62,200	68.66%	24,968	27.56%	2,410	2.66%	1,012	1.12%	60,484	67.58%	24,627	27.52%	4,390	4.90%	28,398	31.52%	59,501	66.04%	2,202	2.44%
43	58,532	63.77%	29,967	32.65%	2,319	2.53%	961	1.05%	57,121	63.01%	29,387	32.41%	4,151	4.58%	32,375	35.49%	56,833	62.29%	2,025	2.22%
44	60,549	67.77%	26,071	29.18%	1,947	2.18%	779	0.87%	58,536	66.29%	26,018	29.46%	3,755	4.25%	28,778	32.38%	58,278	65.57%	1,820	2.05%
45	63,539	65.43%	29,273	30.14%	2,850	2.93%	1,454	1.50%	62,607	65.23%	29,246	30.47%	4,123	4.30%	34,731	35.93%	59,576	61.64%	2,343	2.42%
46	59,157	70.85%	21,367	25.59%	2,003	2.40%	965	1.16%	56,771	68.88%	21,718	26.35%	3,937	4.78%	25,410	30.59%	55,667	67.01%	1,991	2.40%
47	62,657	69.28%	24,632	27.24%	2,027	2.24%	1,125	1.24%	58,592	65.91%	26,662	29.99%	3,648	4.10%	30,561	34.14%	56,662	63.29%	2,298	2.57%
48	59,387	57.55%	38,942	37.74%	3,068	2.97%	1,791	1.74%	59,206	58.02%	38,853	38.08%	3,980	3.90%	43,781	42.79%	55,594	54.34%	2,935	2.87%
49	42,657	38.15%	62,892	56.25%	3,333	2.98%	2,919	2.61%	42,590	38.49%	63,580	57.46%	4,477	4.05%	68,148	61.36%	39,430	35.50%	3,485	3.14%
50	62,972	64.60%	30,185	30.97%	2,908	2.98%	1,412	1.45%	59,345	61.97%	32,160	33.59%	4,252	4.44%	37,461	38.95%	55,660	57.87%	3,059	3.18%
Totals:	**2,359,749**	**49.90%**	**2,180,316**	**46.10%**	**129,929**	**2.75%**	**59,397**	**1.26%**	**2,392,439**	**51.13%**	**2,119,696**	**45.30%**	**167,190**	**3.57%**	**2,300,381**	**48.95%**	**2,296,039**	**48.86%**	**102,729**	**2.19%**

District plan definition file: 'STC-2.asc', modified 08/28/2017 07:33:17 PM

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptS04|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections. Votes that could not be associated with a specific precinct were excluded. Reported statewide totals may therefore be marginally lower than official contest results.

STC-2 - 2017 Senate Floor Redistricting Plan - 4th Ed: Lieutenant Governor 2016, Attorney General 2016

	Lieutenant Governor 2016: Forest-Coleman-Cole						Attorney General 2016: Stein-Newton			
District	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %
1	48,887	53.74%	39,694	43.63%	2,389	2.63%	41,583	46.48%	47,878	53.52%
2	57,464	64.37%	29,461	33.00%	2,347	2.63%	31,586	35.67%	56,959	64.33%
3	36,795	44.57%	44,483	53.88%	1,277	1.55%	46,645	56.99%	35,203	43.01%
4	34,410	39.91%	50,529	58.61%	1,273	1.48%	52,643	61.20%	33,369	38.80%
5	40,621	47.11%	43,512	50.47%	2,085	2.42%	46,133	53.94%	39,399	46.06%
6	38,286	63.97%	19,181	32.05%	2,380	3.98%	21,095	35.69%	38,018	64.31%
7	40,568	54.08%	33,075	44.09%	1,368	1.82%	35,414	47.66%	38,891	52.34%
8	67,778	61.04%	40,423	36.40%	2,836	2.55%	46,574	42.31%	63,502	57.69%
9	55,658	52.85%	45,433	43.14%	4,230	4.02%	52,224	50.00%	52,214	50.00%
10	42,788	60.42%	26,733	37.75%	1,292	1.82%	29,456	42.04%	40,606	57.96%
11	58,079	57.42%	40,863	40.40%	2,206	2.18%	44,650	44.36%	55,998	55.64%
12	44,688	59.95%	27,889	37.41%	1,970	2.64%	31,338	42.46%	42,472	57.54%
13	31,027	50.72%	28,932	47.29%	1,215	1.99%	31,776	52.53%	28,714	47.47%
14	29,615	30.90%	63,499	66.25%	2,733	2.85%	67,070	70.69%	27,808	29.31%
15	31,054	30.36%	67,628	66.12%	3,603	3.52%	72,967	71.91%	28,509	28.09%
16	46,657	40.05%	65,661	56.36%	4,187	3.59%	72,088	62.40%	43,435	37.60%
17	61,118	53.95%	48,551	42.86%	3,610	3.19%	54,056	48.17%	58,173	51.83%
18	65,737	55.37%	50,017	42.13%	2,978	2.51%	56,598	48.17%	60,903	51.83%
19	36,907	52.31%	31,248	44.29%	2,396	3.40%	34,037	48.49%	36,152	51.51%
20	19,185	18.22%	83,359	79.15%	2,779	2.64%	86,851	82.88%	17,944	17.12%
21	21,160	29.80%	47,450	66.83%	2,392	3.37%	49,389	70.04%	21,127	29.96%
22	38,606	41.51%	52,229	56.16%	2,172	2.34%	56,476	61.26%	35,710	38.74%
23	39,577	33.12%	76,646	64.14%	3,271	2.74%	81,625	68.71%	37,164	31.29%
24	53,605	57.24%	37,361	39.90%	2,682	2.86%	41,879	45.02%	51,134	54.98%
25	50,305	56.16%	37,163	41.49%	2,105	2.35%	40,658	45.81%	48,086	54.19%
26	53,344	64.97%	26,615	32.42%	2,143	2.61%	29,789	36.51%	51,795	63.49%
27	63,938	55.63%	47,827	41.61%	3,173	2.76%	53,395	46.69%	60,970	53.31%
28	18,391	19.91%	71,106	76.98%	2,870	3.11%	73,859	80.42%	17,984	19.58%
29	60,028	71.22%	22,140	26.27%	2,123	2.52%	25,906	30.85%	58,069	69.15%
30	58,294	65.99%	27,915	31.60%	2,133	2.41%	31,805	36.19%	56,074	63.81%
31	70,063	64.57%	35,450	32.67%	3,001	2.77%	41,687	38.62%	66,260	61.38%
32	25,455	29.35%	58,737	67.72%	2,546	2.94%	62,056	71.84%	24,322	28.16%
33	63,686	69.23%	25,779	28.02%	2,523	2.74%	31,643	34.65%	59,668	65.35%
34	68,327	70.14%	26,276	26.97%	2,819	2.89%	31,963	33.10%	64,604	66.90%
35	64,009	66.65%	29,246	30.45%	2,778	2.89%	34,286	36.04%	60,858	63.96%
36	60,075	61.47%	34,586	35.39%	3,075	3.15%	39,935	41.23%	56,928	58.77%
37	20,798	24.91%	59,245	70.95%	3,458	4.14%	63,054	75.94%	19,972	24.06%
38	18,972	22.41%	63,018	74.44%	2,671	3.15%	66,011	78.42%	18,160	21.58%
39	61,873	58.01%	41,777	39.17%	3,014	2.83%	48,508	45.88%	57,227	54.12%
40	20,511	27.27%	52,044	69.20%	2,649	3.52%	55,415	74.24%	19,225	25.76%
41	51,912	50.76%	46,633	45.60%	3,727	3.64%	52,559	51.84%	48,820	48.16%
42	62,124	70.39%	23,616	26.76%	2,521	2.86%	29,767	33.94%	57,931	66.06%
43	59,203	66.00%	28,144	31.38%	2,351	2.62%	33,269	37.48%	55,502	62.52%
44	60,310	69.07%	24,946	28.57%	2,066	2.37%	30,418	35.20%	56,007	64.80%
45	61,715	65.78%	29,124	31.04%	2,988	3.18%	34,295	36.91%	58,628	63.09%
46	58,375	71.73%	21,046	25.86%	1,958	2.41%	26,887	33.35%	53,722	66.65%
47	58,679	67.02%	26,179	29.90%	2,697	3.08%	29,406	33.95%	57,204	66.05%
48	59,503	59.12%	37,910	37.67%	3,237	3.22%	41,434	41.50%	58,406	58.50%
49	41,430	38.08%	62,703	57.63%	4,673	4.29%	67,209	62.26%	40,747	37.74%
50	59,029	62.59%	31,893	33.82%	3,390	3.59%	35,488	38.03%	57,825	61.97%
Totals:	**2,390,619**	**51.88%**	**2,084,975**	**45.25%**	**132,360**	**2.87%**	**2,294,855**	**50.20%**	**2,276,276**	**49.80%**

District plan definition file: 'STC-2.asc', modified 08/28/2017 07:33:17 PM

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections. Votes that could not be associated with a specific precinct were excluded. Reported statewide totals may therefore be marginally lower than official contest results.

EX. 6

2017 Senate Floor Redistricting Plan – 4th Ed: County - District

County	District	Total County Pop	Total District Pop	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Alamance	24	151,131	192,673	151,131	100.00%	78.44%
Alexander	42	37,198	191,556	37,198	100.00%	19.42%
Alleghany	45	11,155	198,833	11,155	100.00%	5.61%
Anson	25	26,948	197,991	26,948	100.00%	13.61%
Ashe	45	27,281	198,833	27,281	100.00%	13.72%
Avery	46	17,797	191,738	17,797	100.00%	9.28%
Beaufort	3	47,759	182,039	47,759	100.00%	26.24%
Bertie	3	21,282	182,039	21,282	100.00%	11.69%
Bladen	8	35,190	200,133	35,190	100.00%	17.58%
Brunswick	8	107,431	200,133	107,431	100.00%	53.68%
Buncombe	48	238,318	184,866	45,036	18.90%	24.36%
	49	238,318	193,282	193,282	81.10%	100.00%
Burke	46	90,912	191,738	90,912	100.00%	47.41%
Cabarrus	36	178,011	189,509	178,011	100.00%	93.93%
Caldwell	46	83,029	191,738	83,029	100.00%	43.30%
Camden	1	9,980	196,665	9,980	100.00%	5.07%
Carteret	2	66,469	183,118	66,469	100.00%	36.30%
Caswell	30	23,719	198,458	23,719	100.00%	11.95%
Catawba	42	154,358	191,556	154,358	100.00%	80.58%
Chatham	23	63,505	197,306	63,505	100.00%	32.19%
Cherokee	50	27,444	194,102	27,444	100.00%	14.14%
Chowan	1	14,793	196,665	14,793	100.00%	7.52%
Clay	50	10,587	194,102	10,587	100.00%	5.45%
Cleveland	44	98,078	185,394	98,078	100.00%	52.90%
Columbus	13	58,098	192,266	58,098	100.00%	30.22%
Craven	2	103,505	183,118	103,505	100.00%	56.52%
Cumberland	19	319,431	182,067	182,067	57.00%	100.00%
	21	319,431	184,316	137,364	43.00%	74.53%
Currituck	1	23,547	196,665	23,547	100.00%	11.97%
Dare	1	33,920	196,665	33,920	100.00%	17.25%
Davidson	29	162,878	190,676	162,878	100.00%	85.42%
Davie	31	41,240	197,532	41,240	100.00%	20.88%
Duplin	10	58,505	183,566	58,505	100.00%	31.87%
Durham	20	267,587	184,237	184,237	68.85%	100.00%
	22	267,587	182,730	83,350	31.15%	45.61%
Edgecombe	4	56,552	192,477	56,552	100.00%	29.38%
Forsyth	31	350,670	197,532	156,292	44.57%	79.12%
	32	350,670	194,378	194,378	55.43%	100.00%
Franklin	18	60,619	192,915	60,619	100.00%	31.42%
Gaston	43	206,086	197,035	197,035	95.61%	100.00%
	44	206,086	185,394	9,051	4.39%	4.88%
Gates	1	12,197	196,665	12,197	100.00%	6.20%
Graham	50	8,861	194,102	8,861	100.00%	4.57%
Granville	22	59,916	182,730	59,916	100.00%	32.79%
Greene	5	21,362	189,510	21,362	100.00%	11.27%
Guilford	24	488,406	192,673	41,542	8.51%	21.56%
	26	488,406	196,115	54,363	11.13%	27.72%
	27	488,406	195,363	195,363	40.00%	100.00%

2017 Senate Floor Redistricting Plan – 4th Ed: County - District

County	District	Total County Pop	Total District Pop	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Guilford	28	488,406	197,138	197,138	40.36%	100.00%
Halifax	4	54,691	192,477	54,691	100.00%	28.41%
Harnett	12	114,678	182,438	114,678	100.00%	62.86%
Haywood	50	59,036	194,102	59,036	100.00%	30.41%
Henderson	48	106,740	184,866	106,740	100.00%	57.74%
Hertford	1	24,669	196,665	24,669	100.00%	12.54%
Hoke	21	46,952	184,316	46,952	100.00%	25.47%
Hyde	1	5,810	196,665	5,810	100.00%	2.95%
Iredell	34	159,437	197,843	159,437	100.00%	80.59%
Jackson	50	40,271	194,102	40,271	100.00%	20.75%
Johnston	10	168,878	183,566	61,630	36.49%	33.57%
	11	168,878	193,194	97,354	57.65%	50.39%
	12	168,878	182,438	9,894	5.86%	5.42%
Jones	6	10,153	187,925	10,153	100.00%	5.40%
Lee	12	57,866	182,438	57,866	100.00%	31.72%
Lenoir	7	59,495	182,118	59,495	100.00%	32.67%
Lincoln	44	78,265	185,394	78,265	100.00%	42.22%
Macon	50	33,922	194,102	33,922	100.00%	17.48%
Madison	47	20,764	187,477	20,764	100.00%	11.08%
Martin	3	24,505	182,039	24,505	100.00%	13.46%
McDowell	47	44,996	187,477	44,996	100.00%	24.00%
Mecklenburg	37	919,628	185,257	185,257	20.14%	100.00%
	38	919,628	182,674	182,674	19.86%	100.00%
	39	919,628	184,099	184,099	20.02%	100.00%
	40	919,628	183,426	183,426	19.95%	100.00%
	41	919,628	184,172	184,172	20.03%	100.00%
Mitchell	47	15,579	187,477	15,579	100.00%	8.31%
Montgomery	29	27,798	190,676	27,798	100.00%	14.58%
Moore	25	88,247	197,991	88,247	100.00%	44.57%
Nash	11	95,840	193,194	95,840	100.00%	49.61%
New Hanover	8	202,667	200,133	5,295	2.61%	2.65%
	9	202,667	197,372	197,372	97.39%	100.00%
Northampton	3	22,099	182,039	22,099	100.00%	12.14%
Onslow	6	177,772	187,925	177,772	100.00%	94.60%
Orange	23	133,801	197,306	133,801	100.00%	67.81%
Pamlico	2	13,144	183,118	13,144	100.00%	7.18%
Pasquotank	1	40,661	196,665	40,661	100.00%	20.68%
Pender	8	52,217	200,133	52,217	100.00%	26.09%
Perquimans	1	13,453	196,665	13,453	100.00%	6.84%
Person	22	39,464	182,730	39,464	100.00%	21.60%
Pitt	5	168,148	189,510	168,148	100.00%	88.73%
Polk	47	20,510	187,477	20,510	100.00%	10.94%
Randolph	26	141,752	196,115	141,752	100.00%	72.28%
Richmond	25	46,639	197,991	46,639	100.00%	23.56%
Robeson	13	134,168	192,266	134,168	100.00%	69.78%
Rockingham	30	93,643	198,458	93,643	100.00%	47.19%
Rowan	33	138,428	199,013	138,428	100.00%	69.56%
Rutherford	47	67,810	187,477	67,810	100.00%	36.17%
Sampson	10	63,431	183,566	63,431	100.00%	34.55%

District plan definition file: 'STC-2.asc', modified 08/28/2017 07:33:17 PM

Data Source: 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File - North Carolina

Printed 09/07/2017 {rptG01|dc2016GE|re1.6.0}

2017 Senate Floor Redistricting Plan – 4th Ed: County - District

County	District	Total County Pop	Total District Pop	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Scotland	25	36,157	197,991	36,157	100.00%	18.26%
Stanly	33	60,585	199,013	60,585	100.00%	30.44%
Stokes	30	47,401	198,458	47,401	100.00%	23.88%
Surry	30	73,673	198,458	33,695	45.74%	16.98%
	45	73,673	198,833	39,978	54.26%	20.11%
Swain	50	13,981	194,102	13,981	100.00%	7.20%
Transylvania	48	33,090	184,866	33,090	100.00%	17.90%
Tyrrell	1	4,407	196,665	4,407	100.00%	2.24%
Union	35	201,292	189,794	189,794	94.29%	100.00%
	36	201,292	189,509	11,498	5.71%	6.07%
Vance	3	45,422	182,039	45,422	100.00%	24.95%
Wake	14	900,993	194,087	194,087	21.54%	100.00%
	15	900,993	195,003	195,003	21.64%	100.00%
	16	900,993	197,303	197,303	21.90%	100.00%
	17	900,993	182,304	182,304	20.23%	100.00%
	18	900,993	192,915	132,296	14.68%	68.58%
Warren	3	20,972	182,039	20,972	100.00%	11.52%
Washington	1	13,228	196,665	13,228	100.00%	6.73%
Watauga	45	51,079	198,833	51,079	100.00%	25.69%
Wayne	7	122,623	182,118	122,623	100.00%	67.33%
Wilkes	45	69,340	198,833	69,340	100.00%	34.87%
Wilson	4	81,234	192,477	81,234	100.00%	42.20%
Yadkin	34	38,406	197,843	38,406	100.00%	19.41%
Yancey	47	17,818	187,477	17,818	100.00%	9.50%
			Total:	**9,535,483**		

District plan definition file: 'STC-2.asc', modified 08/28/2017 07:33:17 PM
Data Source: 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File - North Carolina
Printed 09/07/2017 {rptG01|dc2016GE|re1.6.0}

2017 Senate Floor Redistricting Plan – 4th Ed: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Aberdeen	25	6,350	197,991	6,350	100.00%	3.21%
Ahoskie	1	5,039	196,665	5,039	100.00%	2.56%
Alamance	24	951	192,673	951	100.00%	0.49%
Albemarle	33	15,903	199,013	15,903	100.00%	7.99%
Alliance	2	776	183,118	776	100.00%	0.42%
Andrews	50	1,781	194,102	1,781	100.00%	0.92%
Angier (Harnett)	12	4,247	182,438	4,247	100.00%	2.33%
Angier (Wake)	17	103	182,304	103	100.00%	0.06%
Ansonville	25	631	197,991	631	100.00%	0.32%
Apex	16	37,476	197,303	230	0.61%	0.12%
	17	37,476	182,304	37,246	99.39%	20.43%
Arapahoe	2	556	183,118	556	100.00%	0.30%
Archdale (Guilford)	26	333	196,115	116	34.83%	0.06%
	27	333	195,363	217	65.17%	0.11%
Archdale (Randolph)	26	11,082	196,115	11,082	100.00%	5.65%
Archer Lodge	11	4,292	193,194	4,292	100.00%	2.22%
Asheboro	26	25,012	196,115	25,012	100.00%	12.75%
Asheville	48	83,393	184,866	12,335	14.79%	6.67%
	49	83,393	193,282	71,058	85.21%	36.76%
Askewville	3	241	182,039	241	100.00%	0.13%
Atkinson	8	299	200,133	299	100.00%	0.15%
Atlantic Beach	2	1,495	183,118	1,495	100.00%	0.82%
Aulander	3	895	182,039	895	100.00%	0.49%
Aurora	3	520	182,039	520	100.00%	0.29%
Autryville	10	196	183,566	196	100.00%	0.11%
Ayden	5	4,932	189,510	4,932	100.00%	2.60%
Badin	33	1,974	199,013	1,974	100.00%	0.99%
Bailey	11	569	193,194	569	100.00%	0.29%
Bakersville	47	464	187,477	464	100.00%	0.25%
Bald Head Island	8	158	200,133	158	100.00%	0.08%
Banner Elk	46	1,028	191,738	1,028	100.00%	0.54%
Bath	3	249	182,039	249	100.00%	0.14%
Bayboro	2	1,263	183,118	1,263	100.00%	0.69%
Bear Grass	3	73	182,039	73	100.00%	0.04%
Beaufort	2	4,039	183,118	4,039	100.00%	2.21%
Beech Mountain (Avery)	46	24	191,738	24	100.00%	0.01%
Beech Mountain (Watauga)	45	296	198,833	296	100.00%	0.15%
Belhaven	3	1,688	182,039	1,688	100.00%	0.93%
Belmont	43	10,076	197,035	10,076	100.00%	5.11%
Belville	8	1,936	200,133	1,936	100.00%	0.97%
Belwood	44	950	185,394	950	100.00%	0.51%
Benson (Harnett)	12	0	182,438	0	0.00%	0.00%
Benson (Johnston)	12	3,311	182,438	3,311	100.00%	1.81%
Bermuda Run	31	1,725	197,532	1,725	100.00%	0.87%
Bessemer City	43	5,340	197,035	5,340	100.00%	2.71%
Bethania	31	328	197,532	0	0.00%	0.00%
	32	328	194,378	328	100.00%	0.17%

District plan definition file: 'STC-2.asc', modified 08/28/2017 07:33:17 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 09/07/2017 {rptG03|dc2016GE|re1.6.0}

2017 Senate Floor Redistricting Plan – 4th Ed: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Bethel	5	1,577	189,510	1,577	100.00%	0.83%
Beulaville	10	1,296	183,566	1,296	100.00%	0.71%
Biltmore Forest	48	1,343	184,866	0	0.00%	0.00%
	49	1,343	193,282	1,343	100.00%	0.69%
Biscoe	29	1,700	190,676	1,700	100.00%	0.89%
Black Creek	4	769	192,477	769	100.00%	0.40%
Black Mountain	49	7,848	193,282	7,848	100.00%	4.06%
Bladenboro	8	1,750	200,133	1,750	100.00%	0.87%
Blowing Rock (Caldwell)	46	49	191,738	49	100.00%	0.03%
Blowing Rock (Watauga)	45	1,192	198,833	1,192	100.00%	0.60%
Boardman	13	157	192,266	157	100.00%	0.08%
Bogue	2	684	183,118	684	100.00%	0.37%
Boiling Spring Lakes	8	5,372	200,133	5,372	100.00%	2.68%
Boiling Springs	44	4,647	185,394	4,647	100.00%	2.51%
Bolivia	8	143	200,133	143	100.00%	0.07%
Bolton	13	691	192,266	691	100.00%	0.36%
Boone	45	17,122	198,833	17,122	100.00%	8.61%
Boonville	34	1,222	197,843	1,222	100.00%	0.62%
Bostic	47	386	187,477	386	100.00%	0.21%
Brevard	48	7,609	184,866	7,609	100.00%	4.12%
Bridgeton	2	454	183,118	454	100.00%	0.25%
Broadway (Harnett)	12	25	182,438	25	100.00%	0.01%
Broadway (Lee)	12	1,204	182,438	1,204	100.00%	0.66%
Brookford	42	382	191,556	382	100.00%	0.20%
Brunswick	13	1,119	192,266	1,119	100.00%	0.58%
Bryson City	50	1,424	194,102	1,424	100.00%	0.73%
Bunn	18	344	192,915	344	100.00%	0.18%
Burgaw	8	3,872	200,133	3,872	100.00%	1.93%
Burlington (Alamance)	24	49,308	192,673	49,308	100.00%	25.59%
Burlington (Guilford)	24	655	192,673	655	100.00%	0.34%
Burnsville	47	1,693	187,477	1,693	100.00%	0.90%
Butner	22	7,591	182,730	7,591	100.00%	4.15%
Cajah's Mountain	46	2,823	191,738	2,823	100.00%	1.47%
Calabash	8	1,786	200,133	1,786	100.00%	0.89%
Calypso	10	538	183,566	538	100.00%	0.29%
Cameron	25	285	197,991	285	100.00%	0.14%
Candor	29	840	190,676	840	100.00%	0.44%
Canton	50	4,227	194,102	4,227	100.00%	2.18%
Cape Carteret	2	1,917	183,118	1,917	100.00%	1.05%
Carolina Beach	9	5,706	197,372	5,706	100.00%	2.89%
Carolina Shores	8	3,048	200,133	3,048	100.00%	1.52%
Carrboro	23	19,582	197,306	19,582	100.00%	9.92%
Carthage	25	2,205	197,991	2,205	100.00%	1.11%
Cary (Chatham)	23	1,422	197,306	1,422	100.00%	0.72%
Cary (Wake)	15	133,812	195,003	15,939	11.91%	8.17%
	16	133,812	197,303	99,176	74.12%	50.27%
	17	133,812	182,304	18,697	13.97%	10.26%

District plan definition file: 'STC-2.asc', modified 08/28/2017 07:33:17 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 09/07/2017 {rptG03|dc2016GE|re1.6.0}

2017 Senate Floor Redistricting Plan – 4th Ed: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Casar	44	297	185,394	297	100.00%	0.16%
Castalia	11	268	193,194	268	100.00%	0.14%
Caswell Beach	8	398	200,133	398	100.00%	0.20%
Catawba	42	603	191,556	603	100.00%	0.31%
Cedar Point	2	1,279	183,118	1,279	100.00%	0.70%
Cedar Rock	46	300	191,738	300	100.00%	0.16%
Centerville	18	89	192,915	89	100.00%	0.05%
Cerro Gordo	13	207	192,266	207	100.00%	0.11%
Chadbourn	13	1,856	192,266	1,856	100.00%	0.97%
Chapel Hill (Durham)	20	2,836	184,237	2,836	100.00%	1.54%
Chapel Hill (Orange)	23	54,397	197,306	54,397	100.00%	27.57%
Charlotte	37	731,424	185,257	183,353	25.07%	98.97%
	38	731,424	182,674	173,878	23.77%	95.18%
	39	731,424	184,099	138,568	18.94%	75.27%
	40	731,424	183,426	162,819	22.26%	88.77%
	41	731,424	184,172	72,806	9.95%	39.53%
Cherryville	43	5,760	197,035	5,760	100.00%	2.92%
Chimney Rock Village	47	113	187,477	113	100.00%	0.06%
China Grove	33	3,563	199,013	3,563	100.00%	1.79%
Chocowinity	3	820	182,039	820	100.00%	0.45%
Claremont	42	1,352	191,556	1,352	100.00%	0.71%
Clarkton	8	837	200,133	837	100.00%	0.42%
Clayton (Johnston)	11	16,116	193,194	16,116	100.00%	8.34%
Clayton (Wake)	14	0	194,087	0	0.00%	0.00%
Clemmons	31	18,627	197,532	18,627	100.00%	9.43%
Cleveland	33	871	199,013	871	100.00%	0.44%
Clinton	10	8,639	183,566	8,639	100.00%	4.71%
Clyde	50	1,223	194,102	1,223	100.00%	0.63%
Coats	12	2,112	182,438	2,112	100.00%	1.16%
Cofield	1	413	196,665	413	100.00%	0.21%
Colerain	3	204	182,039	204	100.00%	0.11%
Columbia	1	891	196,665	891	100.00%	0.45%
Columbus	47	999	187,477	999	100.00%	0.53%
Como	1	91	196,665	91	100.00%	0.05%
Concord	36	79,066	189,509	79,066	100.00%	41.72%
Conetoe	4	294	192,477	294	100.00%	0.15%
Connelly Springs	46	1,669	191,738	1,669	100.00%	0.87%
Conover	42	8,165	191,556	8,165	100.00%	4.26%
Conway	3	836	182,039	836	100.00%	0.46%
Cooleemee	31	960	197,532	960	100.00%	0.49%
Cornelius	41	24,866	184,172	24,866	100.00%	13.50%
Cove City	2	399	183,118	399	100.00%	0.22%
Cramerton	43	4,165	197,035	4,165	100.00%	2.11%
Creedmoor	22	4,124	182,730	4,124	100.00%	2.26%
Creswell	1	276	196,665	276	100.00%	0.14%
Crossnore	46	192	191,738	192	100.00%	0.10%
Dallas	43	4,488	197,035	4,488	100.00%	2.28%

District plan definition file: 'STC-2.asc', modified 08/28/2017 07:33:17 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

2017 Senate Floor Redistricting Plan – 4th Ed: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Danbury	30	189	198,458	189	100.00%	0.10%
Davidson (Iredell)	34	294	197,843	294	100.00%	0.15%
Davidson (Mecklenburg)	41	10,650	184,172	10,650	100.00%	5.78%
Dellview	43	13	197,035	13	100.00%	0.01%
Denton	29	1,636	190,676	1,636	100.00%	0.86%
Dillsboro	50	232	194,102	232	100.00%	0.12%
Dobbins Heights	25	866	197,991	866	100.00%	0.44%
Dobson	45	1,586	198,833	1,586	100.00%	0.80%
Dortches	11	935	193,194	935	100.00%	0.48%
Dover	2	401	183,118	401	100.00%	0.22%
Drexel	46	1,858	191,738	1,858	100.00%	0.97%
Dublin	8	338	200,133	338	100.00%	0.17%
Duck	1	369	196,665	369	100.00%	0.19%
Dunn	12	9,263	182,438	9,263	100.00%	5.08%
Durham (Durham)	20	228,300	184,237	166,605	72.98%	90.43%
	22	228,300	182,730	61,695	27.02%	33.76%
Durham (Orange)	23	30	197,306	30	100.00%	0.02%
Durham (Wake)	16	0	197,303	0	0.00%	0.00%
Earl	44	260	185,394	260	100.00%	0.14%
East Arcadia	8	487	200,133	487	100.00%	0.24%
East Bend	34	612	197,843	612	100.00%	0.31%
East Laurinburg	25	300	197,991	300	100.00%	0.15%
East Spencer	33	1,534	199,013	1,534	100.00%	0.77%
Eastover	19	3,628	182,067	3,628	100.00%	1.99%
Eden	30	15,527	198,458	15,527	100.00%	7.82%
Edenton	1	5,004	196,665	5,004	100.00%	2.54%
Elizabeth City (Camden)	1	45	196,665	45	100.00%	0.02%
Elizabeth City (Pasquotank)	1	18,638	196,665	18,638	100.00%	9.48%
Elizabethtown	8	3,583	200,133	3,583	100.00%	1.79%
Elk Park	46	452	191,738	452	100.00%	0.24%
Elkin (Surry)	45	3,921	198,833	3,921	100.00%	1.97%
Elkin (Wilkes)	45	80	198,833	80	100.00%	0.04%
Ellenboro	47	873	187,477	873	100.00%	0.47%
Ellerbe	25	1,054	197,991	1,054	100.00%	0.53%
Elm City	4	1,298	192,477	1,298	100.00%	0.67%
Elon	24	9,419	192,673	9,419	100.00%	4.89%
Emerald Isle	2	3,655	183,118	3,655	100.00%	2.00%
Enfield	4	2,532	192,477	2,532	100.00%	1.32%
Erwin	12	4,405	182,438	4,405	100.00%	2.41%
Eureka	7	197	182,118	197	100.00%	0.11%
Everetts	3	164	182,039	164	100.00%	0.09%
Fair Bluff	13	951	192,266	951	100.00%	0.49%
Fairmont	13	2,663	192,266	2,663	100.00%	1.39%
Fairview	36	3,324	189,509	3,324	100.00%	1.75%
Faison (Duplin)	10	961	183,566	961	100.00%	0.52%
Faison (Sampson)	10	0	183,566	0	0.00%	0.00%
Faith	33	807	199,013	807	100.00%	0.41%

District plan definition file: 'STC-2.asc', modified 08/28/2017 07:33:17 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 09/07/2017 {rptG03|dc2016GE|re1.6.0}

2017 Senate Floor Redistricting Plan – 4th Ed: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Falcon (Cumberland)	19	258	182,067	258	100.00%	0.14%
Falcon (Sampson)	10	0	183,566	0	0.00%	0.00%
Falkland	5	96	189,510	96	100.00%	0.05%
Fallston	44	607	185,394	607	100.00%	0.33%
Farmville	5	4,654	189,510	4,654	100.00%	2.46%
Fayetteville	19	200,564	182,067	67,434	33.62%	37.04%
	21	200,564	184,316	133,130	66.38%	72.23%
Flat Rock	48	3,114	184,866	3,114	100.00%	1.68%
Fletcher	48	7,187	184,866	7,187	100.00%	3.89%
Forest City	47	7,476	187,477	7,476	100.00%	3.99%
Forest Hills	50	365	194,102	365	100.00%	0.19%
Fountain	5	427	189,510	427	100.00%	0.23%
Four Oaks	10	1,921	183,566	1,921	100.00%	1.05%
Foxfire	25	902	197,991	902	100.00%	0.46%
Franklin	50	3,845	194,102	3,845	100.00%	1.98%
Franklinton	18	2,023	192,915	2,023	100.00%	1.05%
Franklinville	26	1,164	196,115	1,164	100.00%	0.59%
Fremont	7	1,255	182,118	1,255	100.00%	0.69%
Fuquay-Varina	17	17,937	182,304	17,937	100.00%	9.84%
Gamewell	46	4,051	191,738	4,051	100.00%	2.11%
Garland	10	625	183,566	625	100.00%	0.34%
Garner	15	25,745	195,003	21,922	85.15%	11.24%
	17	25,745	182,304	3,823	14.85%	2.10%
Garysburg	3	1,057	182,039	1,057	100.00%	0.58%
Gaston	3	1,152	182,039	1,152	100.00%	0.63%
Gastonia	43	71,741	197,035	71,741	100.00%	36.41%
Gatesville	1	321	196,665	321	100.00%	0.16%
Gibson	25	540	197,991	540	100.00%	0.27%
Gibsonville (Alamance)	24	3,148	192,673	3,148	100.00%	1.63%
Gibsonville (Guilford)	24	3,262	192,673	3,262	100.00%	1.69%
Glen Alpine	46	1,517	191,738	1,517	100.00%	0.79%
Godwin	19	139	182,067	139	100.00%	0.08%
Goldsboro	7	36,437	182,118	36,437	100.00%	20.01%
Goldston	23	268	197,306	268	100.00%	0.14%
Graham	24	14,153	192,673	14,153	100.00%	7.35%
Grandfather	46	25	191,738	25	100.00%	0.01%
Granite Falls	46	4,722	191,738	4,722	100.00%	2.46%
Granite Quarry	33	2,930	199,013	2,930	100.00%	1.47%
Grantsboro	2	688	183,118	688	100.00%	0.38%
Green Level	24	2,100	192,673	2,100	100.00%	1.09%
Greenevers	10	634	183,566	634	100.00%	0.35%
Greensboro	24	269,666	192,673	3,810	1.41%	1.98%
	27	269,666	195,363	84,432	31.31%	43.22%
	28	269,666	197,138	181,424	67.28%	92.03%
Greenville	5	84,554	189,510	84,554	100.00%	44.62%
Grifton (Lenoir)	7	186	182,118	186	100.00%	0.10%
Grifton (Pitt)	5	2,431	189,510	2,431	100.00%	1.28%

District plan definition file: 'STC-2.asc', modified 08/28/2017 07:33:17 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 09/07/2017 {rptG03|dc2016GE|re1.6.0}

2017 Senate Floor Redistricting Plan – 4th Ed: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Grimesland	5	441	189,510	441	100.00%	0.23%
Grover	44	708	185,394	708	100.00%	0.38%
Halifax	4	234	192,477	234	100.00%	0.12%
Hamilton	3	408	182,039	408	100.00%	0.22%
Hamlet	25	6,495	197,991	6,495	100.00%	3.28%
Harmony	34	531	197,843	531	100.00%	0.27%
Harrells (Duplin)	10	23	183,566	23	100.00%	0.01%
Harrells (Sampson)	10	179	183,566	179	100.00%	0.10%
Harrellsville	1	106	196,665	106	100.00%	0.05%
Harrisburg	36	11,526	189,509	11,526	100.00%	6.08%
Hassell	3	84	182,039	84	100.00%	0.05%
Havelock	2	20,735	183,118	20,735	100.00%	11.32%
Haw River	24	2,298	192,673	2,298	100.00%	1.19%
Hayesville	50	311	194,102	311	100.00%	0.16%
Hemby Bridge	35	1,520	189,794	1,509	99.28%	0.80%
	36	1,520	189,509	11	0.72%	0.01%
Henderson	3	15,368	182,039	15,368	100.00%	8.44%
Hendersonville	48	13,137	184,866	13,137	100.00%	7.11%
Hertford	1	2,143	196,665	2,143	100.00%	1.09%
Hickory (Burke)	46	66	191,738	66	100.00%	0.03%
Hickory (Caldwell)	46	18	191,738	18	100.00%	0.01%
Hickory (Catawba)	42	39,926	191,556	39,926	100.00%	20.84%
High Point (Davidson)	29	5,310	190,676	5,310	100.00%	2.78%
High Point (Forsyth)	31	8	197,532	8	100.00%	0.00%
High Point (Guilford)	26	99,042	196,115	53,625	54.14%	27.34%
	27	99,042	195,363	42,257	42.67%	21.63%
	28	99,042	197,138	3,160	3.19%	1.60%
High Point (Randolph)	26	11	196,115	11	100.00%	0.01%
High Shoals	43	696	197,035	696	100.00%	0.35%
Highlands (Jackson)	50	4	194,102	4	100.00%	0.00%
Highlands (Macon)	50	920	194,102	920	100.00%	0.47%
Hildebran	46	2,023	191,738	2,023	100.00%	1.06%
Hillsborough	23	6,087	197,306	6,087	100.00%	3.09%
Hobgood	4	348	192,477	348	100.00%	0.18%
Hoffman	25	588	197,991	588	100.00%	0.30%
Holden Beach	8	575	200,133	575	100.00%	0.29%
Holly Ridge	6	1,268	187,925	1,268	100.00%	0.67%
Holly Springs	17	24,661	182,304	24,661	100.00%	13.53%
Hookerton	5	409	189,510	409	100.00%	0.22%
Hope Mills	19	15,176	182,067	15,176	100.00%	8.34%
Hot Springs	47	560	187,477	560	100.00%	0.30%
Hudson	46	3,776	191,738	3,776	100.00%	1.97%
Huntersville	41	46,773	184,172	46,773	100.00%	25.40%
Indian Beach	2	112	183,118	112	100.00%	0.06%
Indian Trail	35	33,518	189,794	33,456	99.82%	17.63%
	36	33,518	189,509	62	0.18%	0.03%
Jackson	3	513	182,039	513	100.00%	0.28%

District plan definition file: 'STC-2.asc', modified 08/28/2017 07:33:17 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 09/07/2017 {rptG03|dc2016GE|re1.6.0}

2017 Senate Floor Redistricting Plan – 4th Ed: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Jacksonville	6	70,145	187,925	70,145	100.00%	37.33%
Jamestown	26	3,382	196,115	0	0.00%	0.00%
	27	3,382	195,363	3,382	100.00%	1.73%
Jamesville	3	491	182,039	491	100.00%	0.27%
Jefferson	45	1,611	198,833	1,611	100.00%	0.81%
Jonesville	34	2,285	197,843	2,285	100.00%	1.15%
Kannapolis (Cabarrus)	36	33,194	189,509	33,194	100.00%	17.52%
Kannapolis (Rowan)	33	9,431	199,013	9,431	100.00%	4.74%
Kelford	3	251	182,039	251	100.00%	0.14%
Kenansville	10	855	183,566	855	100.00%	0.47%
Kenly (Johnston)	10	1,176	183,566	763	64.88%	0.42%
	11	1,176	193,194	413	35.12%	0.21%
Kenly (Wilson)	4	163	192,477	163	100.00%	0.08%
Kernersville (Forsyth)	31	23,071	197,532	23,067	99.98%	11.68%
	32	23,071	194,378	4	0.02%	0.00%
Kernersville (Guilford)	27	52	195,363	52	100.00%	0.03%
Kill Devil Hills	1	6,683	196,665	6,683	100.00%	3.40%
King (Forsyth)	31	619	197,532	619	100.00%	0.31%
King (Stokes)	30	6,285	198,458	6,285	100.00%	3.17%
Kings Mountain (Cleveland)	44	9,242	185,394	9,242	100.00%	4.99%
Kings Mountain (Gaston)	43	1,054	197,035	1,054	100.00%	0.53%
Kingstown	44	681	185,394	681	100.00%	0.37%
Kinston	7	21,677	182,118	21,677	100.00%	11.90%
Kittrell	3	467	182,039	467	100.00%	0.26%
Kitty Hawk	1	3,272	196,665	3,272	100.00%	1.66%
Knightdale	14	11,401	194,087	11,401	100.00%	5.87%
Kure Beach	9	2,012	197,372	2,012	100.00%	1.02%
La Grange	7	2,873	182,118	2,873	100.00%	1.58%
Lake Lure	47	1,192	187,477	1,192	100.00%	0.64%
Lake Park	35	3,422	189,794	3,422	100.00%	1.80%
Lake Santeetlah	50	45	194,102	45	100.00%	0.02%
Lake Waccamaw	13	1,480	192,266	1,480	100.00%	0.77%
Landis	33	3,109	199,013	3,109	100.00%	1.56%
Lansing	45	158	198,833	158	100.00%	0.08%
Lasker	3	122	182,039	122	100.00%	0.07%
Lattimore	44	488	185,394	488	100.00%	0.26%
Laurel Park	48	2,180	184,866	2,180	100.00%	1.18%
Laurinburg	25	15,962	197,991	15,962	100.00%	8.06%
Lawndale	44	606	185,394	606	100.00%	0.33%
Leggett	4	60	192,477	60	100.00%	0.03%
Leland	8	13,527	200,133	13,527	100.00%	6.76%
Lenoir	46	18,228	191,738	18,228	100.00%	9.51%
Lewiston Woodville	3	549	182,039	549	100.00%	0.30%
Lewisville	31	12,639	197,532	12,639	100.00%	6.40%
Lexington	29	18,931	190,676	18,931	100.00%	9.93%
Liberty	26	2,656	196,115	2,656	100.00%	1.35%
Lilesville	25	536	197,991	536	100.00%	0.27%

District plan definition file: 'STC-2.asc', modified 08/28/2017 07:33:17 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 09/07/2017 {rptG03|dc2016GE|re1.6.0}

2017 Senate Floor Redistricting Plan – 4th Ed: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Lillington	12	3,194	182,438	3,194	100.00%	1.75%
Lincolnton	44	10,486	185,394	10,486	100.00%	5.66%
Linden	19	130	182,067	130	100.00%	0.07%
Littleton	4	674	192,477	674	100.00%	0.35%
Locust (Cabarrus)	36	215	189,509	215	100.00%	0.11%
Locust (Stanly)	33	2,715	199,013	2,715	100.00%	1.36%
Long View (Burke)	46	752	191,738	752	100.00%	0.39%
Long View (Catawba)	42	4,119	191,556	4,119	100.00%	2.15%
Louisburg	18	3,359	192,915	3,359	100.00%	1.74%
Love Valley	34	90	197,843	90	100.00%	0.05%
Lowell	43	3,526	197,035	3,526	100.00%	1.79%
Lucama	4	1,108	192,477	1,108	100.00%	0.58%
Lumber Bridge	13	94	192,266	94	100.00%	0.05%
Lumberton	13	21,542	192,266	21,542	100.00%	11.20%
Macclesfield	4	471	192,477	471	100.00%	0.24%
Macon	3	119	182,039	119	100.00%	0.07%
Madison	30	2,246	198,458	2,246	100.00%	1.13%
Maggie Valley	50	1,150	194,102	1,150	100.00%	0.59%
Magnolia	10	939	183,566	939	100.00%	0.51%
Maiden (Catawba)	42	3,308	191,556	3,308	100.00%	1.73%
Maiden (Lincoln)	44	2	185,394	2	100.00%	0.00%
Manteo	1	1,434	196,665	1,434	100.00%	0.73%
Marietta	13	175	192,266	175	100.00%	0.09%
Marion	47	7,838	187,477	7,838	100.00%	4.18%
Mars Hill	47	1,869	187,477	1,869	100.00%	1.00%
Marshall	47	872	187,477	872	100.00%	0.47%
Marshville	35	2,402	189,794	2,402	100.00%	1.27%
Marvin	35	5,579	189,794	5,579	100.00%	2.94%
Matthews	39	27,198	184,099	27,198	100.00%	14.77%
Maxton (Robeson)	13	2,230	192,266	2,230	100.00%	1.16%
Maxton (Scotland)	25	196	197,991	196	100.00%	0.10%
Mayodan	30	2,478	198,458	2,478	100.00%	1.25%
Maysville	6	1,019	187,925	1,019	100.00%	0.54%
McAdenville	43	651	197,035	651	100.00%	0.33%
McDonald	13	113	192,266	113	100.00%	0.06%
McFarlan	25	117	197,991	117	100.00%	0.06%
Mebane (Alamance)	24	9,600	192,673	9,600	100.00%	4.98%
Mebane (Orange)	23	1,793	197,306	1,793	100.00%	0.91%
Mesic	2	220	183,118	220	100.00%	0.12%
Micro	10	441	183,566	441	100.00%	0.24%
Middleburg	3	133	182,039	133	100.00%	0.07%
Middlesex	11	822	193,194	822	100.00%	0.43%
Midland (Cabarrus)	36	3,073	189,509	3,073	100.00%	1.62%
Midland (Mecklenburg)	39	0	184,099	0	0.00%	0.00%
Midway	29	4,679	190,676	4,679	100.00%	2.45%
Mills River	48	6,802	184,866	6,802	100.00%	3.68%
Milton	30	166	198,458	166	100.00%	0.08%

District plan definition file: 'STC-2.asc', modified 08/28/2017 07:33:17 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 09/07/2017 {rptG03|dc2016GE|re1.6.0}

2017 Senate Floor Redistricting Plan – 4th Ed: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Mineral Springs	35	2,639	189,794	2,639	100.00%	1.39%
Minnesott Beach	2	440	183,118	440	100.00%	0.24%
Mint Hill (Mecklenburg)	39	22,669	184,099	14,885	65.66%	8.09%
	40	22,669	183,426	7,784	34.34%	4.24%
Mint Hill (Union)	36	53	189,509	53	100.00%	0.03%
Misenheimer	33	728	199,013	728	100.00%	0.37%
Mocksville	31	5,051	197,532	5,051	100.00%	2.56%
Momeyer	11	224	193,194	224	100.00%	0.12%
Monroe	35	32,797	189,794	32,797	100.00%	17.28%
Montreat	49	723	193,282	723	100.00%	0.37%
Mooresboro	44	311	185,394	311	100.00%	0.17%
Mooresville	34	32,711	197,843	32,711	100.00%	16.53%
Morehead City	2	8,661	183,118	8,661	100.00%	4.73%
Morganton	46	16,918	191,738	16,918	100.00%	8.82%
Morrisville (Durham)	20	0	184,237	0	0.00%	0.00%
Morrisville (Wake)	16	18,576	197,303	18,576	100.00%	9.41%
Morven	25	511	197,991	511	100.00%	0.26%
Mount Airy	30	10,388	198,458	9,838	94.71%	4.96%
	45	10,388	198,833	550	5.29%	0.28%
Mount Gilead	29	1,181	190,676	1,181	100.00%	0.62%
Mount Holly	43	13,656	197,035	11,715	85.79%	5.95%
	44	13,656	185,394	1,941	14.21%	1.05%
Mount Olive (Duplin)	10	51	183,566	51	100.00%	0.03%
Mount Olive (Wayne)	7	4,538	182,118	4,538	100.00%	2.49%
Mount Pleasant	36	1,652	189,509	1,652	100.00%	0.87%
Murfreesboro	1	2,835	196,665	2,835	100.00%	1.44%
Murphy	50	1,627	194,102	1,627	100.00%	0.84%
Nags Head	1	2,757	196,665	2,757	100.00%	1.40%
Nashville	11	5,352	193,194	5,352	100.00%	2.77%
Navassa	8	1,505	200,133	1,505	100.00%	0.75%
New Bern	2	29,524	183,118	29,524	100.00%	16.12%
New London	33	600	199,013	600	100.00%	0.30%
Newland	46	698	191,738	698	100.00%	0.36%
Newport	2	4,150	183,118	4,150	100.00%	2.27%
Newton	42	12,968	191,556	12,968	100.00%	6.77%
Newton Grove	10	569	183,566	569	100.00%	0.31%
Norlina	3	1,118	182,039	1,118	100.00%	0.61%
Norman	25	138	197,991	138	100.00%	0.07%
North Topsail Beach	6	743	187,925	743	100.00%	0.40%
North Wilkesboro	45	4,245	198,833	4,245	100.00%	2.13%
Northwest	8	735	200,133	735	100.00%	0.37%
Norwood	33	2,379	199,013	2,379	100.00%	1.20%
Oak City	3	317	182,039	317	100.00%	0.17%
Oak Island	8	6,783	200,133	6,783	100.00%	3.39%
Oak Ridge	27	6,185	195,363	6,185	100.00%	3.17%
Oakboro	33	1,859	199,013	1,859	100.00%	0.93%
Ocean Isle Beach	8	550	200,133	550	100.00%	0.27%

District plan definition file: 'STC-2.asc', modified 08/28/2017 07:33:17 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 09/07/2017 {rptG03|dc2016GE|re1.6.0}

2017 Senate Floor Redistricting Plan – 4th Ed: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Old Fort	47	908	187,477	908	100.00%	0.48%
Oriental	2	900	183,118	900	100.00%	0.49%
Orrum	13	91	192,266	91	100.00%	0.05%
Ossipee	24	543	192,673	543	100.00%	0.28%
Oxford	22	8,461	182,730	8,461	100.00%	4.63%
Pantego	3	179	182,039	179	100.00%	0.10%
Parkton	13	436	192,266	436	100.00%	0.23%
Parmele	3	278	182,039	278	100.00%	0.15%
Patterson Springs	44	622	185,394	622	100.00%	0.34%
Peachland	25	437	197,991	437	100.00%	0.22%
Peletier	2	644	183,118	644	100.00%	0.35%
Pembroke	13	2,973	192,266	2,973	100.00%	1.55%
Pikeville	7	678	182,118	678	100.00%	0.37%
Pilot Mountain	30	1,477	198,458	1,477	100.00%	0.74%
Pine Knoll Shores	2	1,339	183,118	1,339	100.00%	0.73%
Pine Level	10	1,700	183,566	1,700	100.00%	0.93%
Pinebluff	25	1,337	197,991	1,337	100.00%	0.68%
Pinehurst	25	13,124	197,991	13,124	100.00%	6.63%
Pinetops	4	1,374	192,477	1,374	100.00%	0.71%
Pineville	39	7,479	184,099	0	0.00%	0.00%
	41	7,479	184,172	7,479	100.00%	4.06%
Pink Hill	7	552	182,118	552	100.00%	0.30%
Pittsboro	23	3,743	197,306	3,743	100.00%	1.90%
Pleasant Garden	27	4,489	195,363	4,489	100.00%	2.30%
Plymouth	1	3,878	196,665	3,878	100.00%	1.97%
Polkton	25	3,375	197,991	3,375	100.00%	1.70%
Polkville	44	545	185,394	545	100.00%	0.29%
Pollocksville	6	311	187,925	311	100.00%	0.17%
Powellsville	3	276	182,039	276	100.00%	0.15%
Princeton	10	1,194	183,566	1,194	100.00%	0.65%
Princeville	4	2,082	192,477	2,082	100.00%	1.08%
Proctorville	13	117	192,266	117	100.00%	0.06%
Raeford	21	4,611	184,316	4,611	100.00%	2.50%
Raleigh (Durham)	20	1,067	184,237	1,067	100.00%	0.58%
Raleigh (Wake)	14	402,825	194,087	137,563	34.15%	70.88%
	15	402,825	195,003	148,006	36.74%	75.90%
	16	402,825	197,303	69,134	17.16%	35.04%
	17	402,825	182,304	6	0.00%	0.00%
	18	402,825	192,915	48,116	11.94%	24.94%
Ramseur	26	1,692	196,115	1,692	100.00%	0.86%
Randleman	26	4,113	196,115	4,113	100.00%	2.10%
Ranlo	43	3,434	197,035	3,434	100.00%	1.74%
Raynham	13	72	192,266	72	100.00%	0.04%
Red Cross	33	742	199,013	742	100.00%	0.37%
Red Oak	11	3,430	193,194	3,430	100.00%	1.78%
Red Springs (Hoke)	21	0	184,316	0	0.00%	0.00%
Red Springs (Robeson)	13	3,428	192,266	3,428	100.00%	1.78%

District plan definition file: 'STC-2.asc', modified 08/28/2017 07:33:17 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 09/07/2017 {rptG03|dc2016GE|re1.6.0}

2017 Senate Floor Redistricting Plan – 4th Ed: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Reidsville	30	14,520	198,458	14,520	100.00%	7.32%
Rennert	13	383	192,266	383	100.00%	0.20%
Rhodhiss (Burke)	46	700	191,738	700	100.00%	0.37%
Rhodhiss (Caldwell)	46	370	191,738	370	100.00%	0.19%
Rich Square	3	958	182,039	958	100.00%	0.53%
Richfield	33	613	199,013	613	100.00%	0.31%
Richlands	6	1,520	187,925	1,520	100.00%	0.81%
River Bend	2	3,119	183,118	3,119	100.00%	1.70%
Roanoke Rapids	4	15,754	192,477	15,754	100.00%	8.18%
Robbins	25	1,097	197,991	1,097	100.00%	0.55%
Robbinsville	50	620	194,102	620	100.00%	0.32%
Robersonville	3	1,488	182,039	1,488	100.00%	0.82%
Rockingham	25	9,558	197,991	9,558	100.00%	4.83%
Rockwell	33	2,108	199,013	2,108	100.00%	1.06%
Rocky Mount (Edgecombe)	4	17,524	192,477	17,524	100.00%	9.10%
Rocky Mount (Nash)	11	39,953	193,194	39,953	100.00%	20.68%
Rolesville	14	3,786	194,087	0	0.00%	0.00%
	18	3,786	192,915	3,786	100.00%	1.96%
Ronda	45	417	198,833	417	100.00%	0.21%
Roper	1	611	196,665	611	100.00%	0.31%
Rose Hill	10	1,626	183,566	1,626	100.00%	0.89%
Roseboro	10	1,191	183,566	1,191	100.00%	0.65%
Rosman	48	576	184,866	576	100.00%	0.31%
Rowland	13	1,037	192,266	1,037	100.00%	0.54%
Roxboro	22	8,362	182,730	8,362	100.00%	4.58%
Roxobel	3	240	182,039	240	100.00%	0.13%
Rural Hall	31	2,937	197,532	2,937	100.00%	1.49%
Ruth	47	440	187,477	440	100.00%	0.23%
Rutherford College	46	1,341	191,738	1,341	100.00%	0.70%
Rutherfordton	47	4,213	187,477	4,213	100.00%	2.25%
Salemburg	10	435	183,566	435	100.00%	0.24%
Salisbury	33	33,662	199,013	33,662	100.00%	16.91%
Saluda (Henderson)	48	12	184,866	12	100.00%	0.01%
Saluda (Polk)	47	701	187,477	701	100.00%	0.37%
Sandy Creek	8	260	200,133	260	100.00%	0.13%
Sandyfield	13	447	192,266	447	100.00%	0.23%
Sanford	12	28,094	182,438	28,094	100.00%	15.40%
Saratoga	4	408	192,477	408	100.00%	0.21%
Sawmills	46	5,240	191,738	5,240	100.00%	2.73%
Scotland Neck	4	2,059	192,477	2,059	100.00%	1.07%
Seaboard	3	632	182,039	632	100.00%	0.35%
Seagrove	26	228	196,115	228	100.00%	0.12%
Sedalia	24	623	192,673	623	100.00%	0.32%
Selma	10	6,073	183,566	6,073	100.00%	3.31%
Seven Devils (Avery)	46	28	191,738	28	100.00%	0.01%
Seven Devils (Watauga)	45	164	198,833	164	100.00%	0.08%
Seven Springs	7	110	182,118	110	100.00%	0.06%

District plan definition file: 'STC-2.asc', modified 08/28/2017 07:33:17 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 09/07/2017 {rptG03|dc2016GE|re1.6.0}

2017 Senate Floor Redistricting Plan – 4th Ed: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Severn	3	276	182,039	276	100.00%	0.15%
Shallotte	8	3,675	200,133	3,675	100.00%	1.84%
Sharpsburg (Edgecombe)	4	209	192,477	209	100.00%	0.11%
Sharpsburg (Nash)	11	1,252	193,194	1,252	100.00%	0.65%
Sharpsburg (Wilson)	4	563	192,477	563	100.00%	0.29%
Shelby	44	20,323	185,394	20,323	100.00%	10.96%
Siler City	23	7,887	197,306	7,887	100.00%	4.00%
Simpson	5	416	189,510	416	100.00%	0.22%
Sims	4	282	192,477	282	100.00%	0.15%
Smithfield	10	10,966	183,566	10,966	100.00%	5.97%
Snow Hill	5	1,595	189,510	1,595	100.00%	0.84%
Southern Pines	25	12,334	197,991	12,334	100.00%	6.23%
Southern Shores	1	2,714	196,665	2,714	100.00%	1.38%
Southport	8	2,833	200,133	2,833	100.00%	1.42%
Sparta	45	1,770	198,833	1,770	100.00%	0.89%
Speed	4	80	192,477	80	100.00%	0.04%
Spencer	33	3,267	199,013	3,267	100.00%	1.64%
Spencer Mountain	43	37	197,035	37	100.00%	0.02%
Spindale	47	4,321	187,477	4,321	100.00%	2.30%
Spring Hope	11	1,320	193,194	1,320	100.00%	0.68%
Spring Lake	19	11,964	182,067	11,964	100.00%	6.57%
	21	11,964	184,316	0	0.00%	0.00%
Spruce Pine	47	2,175	187,477	2,175	100.00%	1.16%
St. Helena	8	389	200,133	389	100.00%	0.19%
St. James	8	3,165	200,133	3,165	100.00%	1.58%
St. Pauls	13	2,035	192,266	2,035	100.00%	1.06%
Staley	26	393	196,115	393	100.00%	0.20%
Stallings (Mecklenburg)	39	399	184,099	399	100.00%	0.22%
Stallings (Union)	35	13,432	189,794	7,778	57.91%	4.10%
	36	13,432	189,509	5,654	42.09%	2.98%
Stanfield	33	1,486	199,013	1,486	100.00%	0.75%
Stanley	43	3,556	197,035	2,790	78.46%	1.42%
	44	3,556	185,394	766	21.54%	0.41%
Stantonsburg	4	784	192,477	784	100.00%	0.41%
Star	29	876	190,676	876	100.00%	0.46%
Statesville	34	24,532	197,843	24,532	100.00%	12.40%
Stedman	19	1,028	182,067	1,028	100.00%	0.56%
Stem	22	463	182,730	463	100.00%	0.25%
Stokesdale	27	5,047	195,363	5,047	100.00%	2.58%
Stoneville	30	1,056	198,458	1,056	100.00%	0.53%
Stonewall	2	281	183,118	281	100.00%	0.15%
Stovall	22	418	182,730	418	100.00%	0.23%
Sugar Mountain	46	198	191,738	198	100.00%	0.10%
Summerfield	27	10,232	195,363	10,232	100.00%	5.24%
Sunset Beach	8	3,572	200,133	3,572	100.00%	1.78%
Surf City (Onslow)	6	292	187,925	292	100.00%	0.16%
Surf City (Pender)	8	1,561	200,133	1,561	100.00%	0.78%

District plan definition file: 'STC-2.asc', modified 08/28/2017 07:33:17 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 09/07/2017 {rptG03|dc2016GE|re1.6.0}

2017 Senate Floor Redistricting Plan – 4th Ed: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Swansboro	6	2,663	187,925	2,663	100.00%	1.42%
Swepsonville	24	1,154	192,673	1,154	100.00%	0.60%
Sylva	50	2,588	194,102	2,588	100.00%	1.33%
Tabor City	13	2,511	192,266	2,511	100.00%	1.31%
Tar Heel	8	117	200,133	117	100.00%	0.06%
Tarboro	4	11,415	192,477	11,415	100.00%	5.93%
Taylorsville	42	2,098	191,556	2,098	100.00%	1.10%
Taylortown	25	722	197,991	722	100.00%	0.36%
Teachey	10	376	183,566	376	100.00%	0.20%
Thomasville (Davidson)	29	26,493	190,676	26,493	100.00%	13.89%
Thomasville (Randolph)	26	264	196,115	264	100.00%	0.13%
Tobaccoville (Forsyth)	31	2,441	197,532	2,441	100.00%	1.24%
Tobaccoville (Stokes)	30	0	198,458	0	0.00%	0.00%
Topsail Beach	8	368	200,133	368	100.00%	0.18%
Trent Woods	2	4,155	183,118	4,155	100.00%	2.27%
Trenton	6	287	187,925	287	100.00%	0.15%
Trinity	26	6,614	196,115	6,614	100.00%	3.37%
Troutman	34	2,383	197,843	2,383	100.00%	1.20%
Troy	29	3,189	190,676	3,189	100.00%	1.67%
Tryon	47	1,646	187,477	1,646	100.00%	0.88%
Turkey	10	292	183,566	292	100.00%	0.16%
Unionville	35	5,929	189,794	5,843	98.55%	3.08%
	36	5,929	189,509	86	1.45%	0.05%
Valdese	46	4,490	191,738	4,490	100.00%	2.34%
Vanceboro	2	1,005	183,118	1,005	100.00%	0.55%
Vandemere	2	254	183,118	254	100.00%	0.14%
Varnamtown	8	541	200,133	541	100.00%	0.27%
Vass	25	720	197,991	720	100.00%	0.36%
Waco	44	321	185,394	321	100.00%	0.17%
Wade	19	556	182,067	556	100.00%	0.31%
Wadesboro	25	5,813	197,991	5,813	100.00%	2.94%
Wagram	25	840	197,991	840	100.00%	0.42%
Wake Forest (Franklin)	18	899	192,915	899	100.00%	0.47%
Wake Forest (Wake)	18	29,218	192,915	29,218	100.00%	15.15%
Walkertown	31	4,675	197,532	1,620	34.65%	0.82%
	32	4,675	194,378	3,055	65.35%	1.57%
Wallace (Duplin)	10	3,880	183,566	3,880	100.00%	2.11%
Wallace (Pender)	8	0	200,133	0	0.00%	0.00%
Wallburg	29	3,047	190,676	3,047	100.00%	1.60%
Walnut Cove	30	1,425	198,458	1,425	100.00%	0.72%
Walnut Creek	7	835	182,118	835	100.00%	0.46%
Walstonburg	5	219	189,510	219	100.00%	0.12%
Warrenton	3	862	182,039	862	100.00%	0.47%
Warsaw	10	3,054	183,566	3,054	100.00%	1.66%
Washington	3	9,744	182,039	9,744	100.00%	5.35%
Washington Park	3	451	182,039	451	100.00%	0.25%
Watha	8	190	200,133	190	100.00%	0.09%

District plan definition file: 'STC-2.asc', modified 08/28/2017 07:33:17 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 09/07/2017 {rptG03|dc2016GE|re1.6.0}

2017 Senate Floor Redistricting Plan – 4th Ed: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Waxhaw	35	9,859	189,794	9,859	100.00%	5.19%
Waynesville	50	9,869	194,102	9,869	100.00%	5.08%
Weaverville	49	3,120	193,282	3,120	100.00%	1.61%
Webster	50	363	194,102	363	100.00%	0.19%
Weddington (Mecklenburg)	39	7	184,099	7	100.00%	0.00%
Weddington (Union)	35	9,452	189,794	9,452	100.00%	4.98%
Weldon	4	1,655	192,477	1,655	100.00%	0.86%
Wendell	14	5,845	194,087	5,845	100.00%	3.01%
Wentworth	30	2,807	198,458	2,807	100.00%	1.41%
Wesley Chapel	35	7,463	189,794	7,463	100.00%	3.93%
West Jefferson	45	1,299	198,833	1,299	100.00%	0.65%
Whispering Pines	25	2,928	197,991	2,928	100.00%	1.48%
Whitakers (Edgecombe)	4	402	192,477	402	100.00%	0.21%
Whitakers (Nash)	11	342	193,194	342	100.00%	0.18%
White Lake	8	802	200,133	802	100.00%	0.40%
Whiteville	13	5,394	192,266	5,394	100.00%	2.81%
Whitsett	24	590	192,673	590	100.00%	0.31%
Wilkesboro	45	3,413	198,833	3,413	100.00%	1.72%
Williamston	3	5,511	182,039	5,511	100.00%	3.03%
Wilmington	8	106,476	200,133	5,295	4.97%	2.65%
	9	106,476	197,372	101,181	95.03%	51.26%
Wilson	4	49,167	192,477	49,167	100.00%	25.54%
Wilson's Mills	10	2,277	183,566	2,277	100.00%	1.24%
	11	2,277	193,194	0	0.00%	0.00%
Windsor	3	3,630	182,039	3,630	100.00%	1.99%
Winfall	1	594	196,665	594	100.00%	0.30%
Wingate	35	3,491	189,794	3,491	100.00%	1.84%
Winston-Salem	31	229,617	197,532	45,882	19.98%	23.23%
	32	229,617	194,378	183,735	80.02%	94.52%
Winterville	5	9,269	189,510	9,269	100.00%	4.89%
Winton	1	769	196,665	769	100.00%	0.39%
Woodfin	49	6,123	193,282	6,123	100.00%	3.17%
Woodland	3	809	182,039	809	100.00%	0.44%
Wrightsville Beach	9	2,477	197,372	2,477	100.00%	1.25%
Yadkinville	34	2,959	197,843	2,959	100.00%	1.50%
Yanceyville	30	2,039	198,458	2,039	100.00%	1.03%
Youngsville	18	1,157	192,915	1,157	100.00%	0.60%
Zebulon (Johnston)	11	0	193,194	0	0.00%	0.00%
Zebulon (Wake)	14	4,433	194,087	4,052	91.41%	2.09%
	18	4,433	192,915	381	8.59%	0.20%
			Total:	**5,250,071**		

District plan definition file: 'STC-2.asc', modified 08/28/2017 07:33:17 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 09/07/2017 {rptG03|dc2016GE|re1.6.0}

2017 Senate Floor Redistricting Plan – 4th Ed: Split VTD Detail

County	VTD	District	Total VTD Pop	VTD Pop in District	Percent of VTD Pop in District
Cumberland	G1	19	9,054	7,999	88.35%
		21	9,054	1,055	11.65%
	G11	19	31,242	31,242	100.00%
		21	31,242	0	0.00%
	G2	19	34,282	5,010	14.61%
		21	34,282	29,272	85.39%
Guilford	HP	27	9,926	6,647	66.97%
		28	9,926	3,279	33.03%
	JEF2	24	3,363	3,363	100.00%
		28	3,363	0	0.00%
Mecklenburg	223.1	38	8,790	827	9.41%
		41	8,790	7,963	90.59%
	230	37	9,345	715	7.65%
		41	9,345	8,630	92.35%
New Hanover	W03	8	2,640	1,764	66.82%
		9	2,640	876	33.18%
	W29	8	4,956	3,531	71.25%
		9	4,956	1,425	28.75%
Wake	16-09	15	4,924	3,027	61.47%
		17	4,924	1,897	38.53%

District plan definition file: 'STC-2.asc', modified 08/28/2017 07:33:17 PM

VTDs ('Voting Districts') derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Printed 09/07/2017 {rptG05|dc2016GE|re1.6.0}

2017 Senate Floor Redistricting Plan – 4th Ed: Population Deviation

District	2010 Pop	Ideal Pop	Deviation	Deviation %
1	196,665	190,710	5,955	3.12%
2	183,118	190,710	-7,592	-3.98%
3	182,039	190,710	-8,671	-4.55%
4	192,477	190,710	1,767	0.93%
5	189,510	190,710	-1,200	-0.63%
6	187,925	190,710	-2,785	-1.46%
7	182,118	190,710	-8,592	-4.51%
8	200,133	190,710	9,423	4.94%
9	197,372	190,710	6,662	3.49%
10	183,566	190,710	-7,144	-3.75%
11	193,194	190,710	2,484	1.30%
12	182,438	190,710	-8,272	-4.34%
13	192,266	190,710	1,556	0.82%
14	194,087	190,710	3,377	1.77%
15	195,003	190,710	4,293	2.25%
16	197,303	190,710	6,593	3.46%
17	182,304	190,710	-8,406	-4.41%
18	192,915	190,710	2,205	1.16%
19	182,067	190,710	-8,643	-4.53%
20	184,237	190,710	-6,473	-3.39%
21	184,316	190,710	-6,394	-3.35%
22	182,730	190,710	-7,980	-4.18%
23	197,306	190,710	6,596	3.46%
24	192,673	190,710	1,963	1.03%
25	197,991	190,710	7,281	3.82%
26	196,115	190,710	5,405	2.83%
27	195,363	190,710	4,653	2.44%
28	197,138	190,710	6,428	3.37%
29	190,676	190,710	-34	-0.02%
30	198,458	190,710	7,748	4.06%
31	197,532	190,710	6,822	3.58%
32	194,378	190,710	3,668	1.92%
33	199,013	190,710	8,303	4.35%
34	197,843	190,710	7,133	3.74%
35	189,794	190,710	-916	-0.48%
36	189,509	190,710	-1,201	-0.63%
37	185,257	190,710	-5,453	-2.86%
38	182,674	190,710	-8,036	-4.21%
39	184,099	190,710	-6,611	-3.47%
40	183,426	190,710	-7,284	-3.82%
41	184,172	190,710	-6,538	-3.43%
42	191,556	190,710	846	0.44%
43	197,035	190,710	6,325	3.32%
44	185,394	190,710	-5,316	-2.79%
45	198,833	190,710	8,123	4.26%
46	191,738	190,710	1,028	0.54%
47	187,477	190,710	-3,233	-1.70%
48	184,866	190,710	-5,844	-3.06%
49	193,282	190,710	2,572	1.35%
50	194,102	190,710	3,392	1.78%
Total:	**9,535,483**			

2017 Senate Floor Redistricting Plan – 4th Ed: Total Population by Race and Ethnicity

		Total Population by Race															Total Population by Ethnicity					
District	Total	White	% White	Black	% Black	NA	% NA	A/PI	% A/PI	Other	% Other	MR	% MR	MR Black	% MR Black	Total Black	% Total Black	Hisp	% Hisp	Non Hisp	% Non Hisp	White Non Hisp	% White Non Hisp
1	196,665	131,460	66.84%	56,366	28.66%	898	0.46%	1,407	0.72%	3,218	1.64%	3,316	1.69%	1,730	0.88%	58,096	29.54%	7,458	3.79%	189,207	96.21%	128,004	65.09%
2	183,118	141,819	77.45%	29,866	16.31%	897	0.49%	2,942	1.61%	3,336	1.82%	4,258	2.33%	2,025	1.11%	31,891	17.42%	8,925	4.87%	174,193	95.13%	137,354	75.01%
3	182,039	89,912	49.39%	82,680	45.42%	1,675	0.92%	678	0.37%	4,879	2.68%	2,215	1.22%	1,459	0.80%	84,139	46.22%	8,250	4.53%	173,789	95.47%	87,556	48.10%
4	192,477	86,035	44.70%	93,230	48.44%	2,478	1.29%	1,202	0.62%	7,029	3.65%	2,503	1.30%	1,494	0.78%	94,724	49.21%	10,980	5.70%	181,497	94.30%	83,086	43.17%
5	189,510	109,925	58.00%	65,221	34.42%	736	0.39%	2,788	1.47%	7,138	3.77%	3,702	1.95%	2,119	1.12%	67,340	35.53%	12,256	6.47%	177,254	93.53%	106,076	55.97%
6	187,925	137,985	73.43%	30,961	16.48%	1,295	0.69%	3,876	2.06%	5,869	3.12%	7,939	4.22%	3,869	2.06%	34,830	18.53%	18,294	9.73%	169,631	90.27%	128,775	68.52%
7	182,118	103,893	57.05%	62,620	34.38%	703	0.39%	1,805	0.99%	9,488	5.21%	3,609	1.98%	1,877	1.03%	64,497	35.41%	16,079	8.83%	166,039	91.17%	98,708	54.20%
8	200,133	149,569	74.73%	38,043	19.01%	1,832	0.92%	920	0.46%	6,244	3.12%	3,525	1.76%	1,668	0.83%	39,711	19.84%	11,449	5.72%	188,684	94.28%	145,369	72.64%
9	197,372	159,484	80.80%	25,692	13.02%	974	0.49%	2,537	1.29%	4,758	2.41%	3,927	1.99%	1,738	0.88%	27,430	13.90%	10,512	5.33%	186,860	94.67%	154,890	78.48%
10	183,566	111,091	60.52%	43,227	23.55%	1,909	1.04%	804	0.44%	23,132	12.60%	3,403	1.85%	1,474	0.80%	44,701	24.35%	33,411	18.20%	150,155	81.80%	103,082	56.16%
11	193,194	129,508	67.04%	48,709	25.21%	1,200	0.62%	1,534	0.79%	8,734	4.52%	3,509	1.82%	1,855	0.96%	50,564	26.17%	15,769	8.16%	177,425	91.84%	123,846	64.10%
12	182,438	124,703	68.35%	36,699	20.12%	1,850	1.01%	1,711	0.94%	12,308	6.75%	5,167	2.83%	2,526	1.38%	39,225	21.50%	24,083	13.20%	158,355	86.80%	115,452	63.28%
13	192,266	74,612	38.81%	50,350	26.19%	53,347	27.75%	1,260	0.66%	8,422	4.38%	4,275	2.22%	1,824	0.95%	52,174	27.14%	13,594	7.07%	178,672	92.93%	71,228	37.05%
14	194,087	89,475	46.10%	75,472	38.89%	1,275	0.66%	6,053	3.12%	15,856	8.17%	5,956	3.07%	3,359	1.73%	78,831	40.62%	30,282	15.60%	163,805	84.40%	78,979	40.69%
15	195,003	113,829	58.37%	55,952	28.69%	1,000	0.51%	7,958	4.08%	11,386	5.84%	4,878	2.50%	2,537	1.30%	58,489	29.99%	22,027	11.30%	172,976	88.70%	105,789	54.25%
16	197,303	138,446	70.17%	22,370	11.34%	803	0.41%	24,931	12.64%	5,552	2.81%	5,201	2.64%	2,006	1.02%	24,376	12.35%	14,677	7.44%	182,626	92.56%	130,736	66.26%
17	182,304	145,251	79.68%	19,843	10.88%	1,048	0.57%	6,269	3.44%	5,813	3.19%	4,080	2.24%	1,650	0.91%	21,493	11.79%	14,589	8.00%	167,715	92.00%	137,943	75.67%
18	192,915	150,548	78.04%	29,085	15.08%	706	0.37%	4,029	2.09%	4,987	2.59%	3,560	1.85%	1,572	0.81%	30,657	15.89%	11,123	5.77%	181,792	94.23%	145,567	75.46%
19	182,067	113,289	62.22%	47,161	25.90%	3,833	2.11%	4,417	2.43%	5,303	2.91%	8,064	4.43%	4,200	2.31%	51,361	28.21%	16,426	9.02%	165,641	90.98%	105,632	58.02%
20	184,237	78,320	42.51%	75,279	40.86%	990	0.54%	9,803	5.32%	15,008	8.15%	4,837	2.63%	2,525	1.37%	77,804	42.23%	26,198	14.22%	158,039	85.78%	69,640	37.80%
21	184,316	72,047	39.09%	85,672	46.48%	5,819	3.16%	4,499	2.44%	7,383	4.01%	8,896	4.83%	5,419	2.94%	91,091	49.42%	19,587	10.63%	164,729	89.37%	64,259	34.86%
22	182,730	109,127	59.72%	56,596	30.97%	953	0.52%	3,127	1.71%	9,277	5.08%	3,650	2.00%	2,010	1.10%	58,606	32.07%	15,954	8.73%	166,776	91.27%	103,961	56.89%
23	197,306	147,732	74.87%	24,320	12.33%	914	0.46%	9,791	4.96%	9,960	5.05%	4,589	2.33%	1,750	0.89%	26,070	13.21%	19,245	9.75%	178,061	90.25%	139,856	70.88%
24	192,673	138,951	72.12%	36,021	18.70%	1,251	0.65%	2,285	1.19%	10,298	5.34%	3,867	2.01%	2,055	1.07%	38,076	19.76%	18,657	9.68%	174,016	90.32%	132,426	68.73%
25	197,991	128,514	64.91%	53,141	26.84%	6,004	3.03%	1,851	0.93%	4,868	2.46%	3,613	1.82%	1,613	0.81%	54,754	27.65%	9,568	4.83%	188,423	95.17%	124,805	63.04%
26	196,115	141,538	72.17%	33,637	17.15%	1,352	0.69%	4,683	2.39%	11,046	5.63%	3,859	1.97%	1,866	0.95%	35,503	18.10%	20,563	10.49%	175,552	89.51%	133,824	68.24%
27	195,363	154,989	79.33%	25,327	12.96%	706	0.36%	7,516	3.85%	3,268	1.67%	3,557	1.82%	1,753	0.90%	27,080	13.86%	8,470	4.34%	186,893	95.66%	150,559	77.07%
28	197,138	71,636	36.34%	100,459	50.96%	1,257	0.64%	8,286	4.20%	9,915	5.03%	5,585	2.83%	3,749	1.90%	104,208	52.86%	18,473	9.37%	178,665	90.63%	65,342	33.15%
29	190,676	156,521	82.09%	19,652	10.31%	914	0.48%	2,465	1.29%	8,310	4.36%	2,814	1.48%	1,254	0.66%	20,906	10.96%	14,334	7.52%	176,342	92.48%	151,361	79.38%
30	198,458	159,306	80.27%	29,464	14.85%	690	0.35%	939	0.47%	4,914	2.48%	3,145	1.58%	1,648	0.83%	31,112	15.68%	9,378	4.73%	189,080	95.27%	155,578	78.39%
31	197,532	166,565	84.32%	17,517	8.87%	705	0.36%	3,362	1.70%	6,127	3.10%	3,256	1.65%	1,551	0.79%	19,068	9.65%	12,064	6.11%	185,468	93.89%	161,642	81.83%
32	194,378	88,052	45.30%	76,303	39.25%	901	0.46%	3,601	1.85%	20,498	10.55%	5,023	2.58%	2,998	1.54%	79,301	40.80%	32,207	16.57%	162,171	83.43%	79,549	40.92%
33	199,013	156,546	78.66%	29,022	14.58%	665	0.33%	2,595	1.30%	7,264	3.65%	2,921	1.47%	1,476	0.74%	30,498	15.32%	12,810	6.44%	186,203	93.56%	151,863	76.31%
34	197,843	162,653	82.21%	20,239	10.23%	626	0.32%	3,055	1.54%	7,908	4.00%	3,362	1.70%	1,599	0.81%	21,838	11.04%	14,593	7.38%	183,250	92.62%	157,129	79.42%
35	189,794	148,259	78.12%	23,137	12.19%	800	0.42%	3,166	1.67%	10,658	5.62%	3,774	1.99%	1,643	0.87%	24,780	13.06%	20,667	10.89%	169,127	89.11%	139,589	73.55%
36	189,509	144,844	76.43%	27,640	14.59%	674	0.36%	3,746	1.98%	8,766	4.63%	3,839	2.03%	2,005	1.06%	29,645	15.64%	17,067	9.01%	172,442	90.99%	138,035	72.84%
37	185,257	73,960	39.92%	81,353	43.91%	982	0.53%	6,686	3.61%	17,429	9.41%	4,847	2.62%	2,594	1.40%	83,947	45.31%	31,375	16.94%	153,882	83.06%	63,213	34.12%
38	182,674	66,173	36.22%	90,378	49.48%	896	0.49%	11,890	6.51%	8,257	4.52%	5,080	2.78%	3,188	1.75%	93,566	51.22%	16,713	9.15%	165,961	90.85%	60,111	32.91%
39	184,099	157,162	85.37%	11,898	6.46%	520	0.28%	8,433	4.58%	2,942	1.60%	3,144	1.71%	1,297	0.70%	13,195	7.17%	9,111	4.95%	174,988	95.05%	151,583	82.34%
40	183,426	75,564	41.20%	72,601	39.58%	1,192	0.65%	6,685	3.64%	21,371	11.65%	6,013	3.28%	3,453	1.88%	76,054	41.46%	36,939	20.14%	146,487	79.86%	63,466	34.60%
41	184,172	136,087	73.89%	26,574	14.43%	671	0.36%	9,326	5.06%	7,114	3.86%	4,400	2.39%	1,980	1.08%	28,554	15.50%	17,806	9.67%	166,366	90.33%	126,999	68.96%
42	191,556	159,475	83.25%	15,084	7.87%	587	0.31%	5,777	3.02%	7,233	3.78%	3,400	1.77%	1,787	0.93%	16,871	8.81%	14,633	7.64%	176,923	92.36%	153,059	79.90%
43	197,035	153,360	77.83%	30,570	15.52%	810	0.41%	2,446	1.24%	6,211	3.15%	3,638	1.85%	1,848	0.94%	32,418	16.45%	11,902	6.04%	185,133	93.96%	148,675	75.46%
44	185,394	151,869	81.92%	25,533	13.77%	522	0.28%	1,313	0.71%	3,313	1.79%	2,844	1.53%	1,454	0.78%	26,987	14.56%	8,293	4.47%	177,101	95.53%	147,567	79.60%
45	198,833	182,769	91.92%	4,884	2.46%	469	0.24%	1,086	0.55%	7,080	3.56%	2,545	1.28%	895	0.45%	5,779	2.91%	12,734	6.40%	186,099	93.60%	177,874	89.46%
46	191,738	168,005	87.62%	10,807	5.64%	657	0.34%	4,007	2.09%	5,257	2.74%	3,005	1.57%	1,374	0.72%	12,181	6.35%	9,227	4.81%	182,511	95.19%	165,066	86.09%
47	187,477	169,454	90.39%	9,923	5.29%	624	0.33%	891	0.48%	3,915	2.09%	2,670	1.42%	1,153	0.62%	11,076	5.91%	7,779	4.15%	179,698	95.85%	166,204	88.65%
48	184,866	165,613	89.59%	6,456	3.49%	703	0.38%	2,229	1.21%	6,474	3.50%	3,391	1.83%	1,340	0.72%	7,796	4.22%	14,066	7.61%	170,800	92.39%	158,868	85.94%
49	193,282	168,070	86.96%	13,271	6.87%	789	0.41%	1,829	0.95%	5,141	2.66%	4,182	2.16%	1,892	0.98%	15,163	7.85%	11,576	5.99%	181,706	94.01%	162,527	84.09%
50	194,102	174,955	90.14%	2,323	1.20%	9,008	4.64%	1,077	0.55%	3,373	1.74%	3,366	1.73%	677	0.35%	3,000	1.55%	7,947	4.09%	186,155	95.91%	171,293	88.25%
Totals:	**9,535,483**	**6,528,950**	**68.47%**	**2,048,628**	**21.48%**	**122,110**	**1.28%**	**215,566**	**2.26%**	**414,030**	**4.34%**	**206,199**	**2.16%**	**102,828**	**1.08%**	**2,151,456**	**22.56%**	**800,120**	**8.39%**	**8,735,363**	**91.61%**	**6,223,995**	**65.27%**

District plan definition file: 'STC-2.asc', modified 08/28/2017 07:33:17 PM

Printed 09/07/2017 {rptS02|dc2016GE|re1.6.0}

Data Source: 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File. A = Asian, NA = American Indian and Alaskan Native, PI = Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander, MR = Multi-Race, Hisp = Hispanic or Latino (of any race)

2017 Senate Floor Redistricting Plan – 4th Ed: Voting Age Population by Race and Ethnicity

		Voting Age Population by Race															Voting Age Population by Ethnicity					
District	Total	White	% White	Black	% Black	NA	% NA	A/PI	% A/PI	Other	% Other	MR	% MR	MR Black	% MR Black	Total Black	% Total Black	Hisp	% Hisp	Non Hisp	% Non Hisp	White Non Hisp	% White Non Hisp
1	153,426	104,891	68.37%	43,040	28.05%	726	0.47%	1,079	0.70%	2,097	1.37%	1,593	1.04%	591	0.39%	43,631	28.44%	4,836	3.15%	148,590	96.85%	102,599	66.87%
2	143,986	114,847	79.76%	22,129	15.37%	701	0.49%	2,157	1.50%	2,256	1.57%	1,896	1.32%	658	0.46%	22,787	15.83%	5,698	3.96%	138,288	96.04%	111,947	77.75%
3	141,242	73,437	51.99%	61,976	43.88%	1,229	0.87%	505	0.36%	2,917	2.07%	1,178	0.83%	673	0.48%	62,649	44.36%	4,846	3.43%	136,396	96.57%	72,096	51.04%
4	145,928	69,155	47.39%	68,618	47.02%	1,829	1.25%	875	0.60%	4,215	2.89%	1,236	0.85%	635	0.44%	69,253	47.46%	6,616	4.53%	139,312	95.47%	67,346	46.15%
5	146,760	90,259	61.50%	47,513	32.37%	561	0.38%	2,200	1.50%	4,399	3.00%	1,828	1.25%	823	0.56%	48,336	32.94%	7,585	5.17%	139,175	94.83%	87,784	59.81%
6	140,779	106,403	75.58%	22,411	15.92%	1,022	0.73%	3,195	2.27%	4,183	2.97%	3,565	2.53%	1,351	0.96%	23,762	16.88%	12,031	8.55%	128,748	91.45%	100,211	71.18%
7	137,302	81,975	59.70%	45,871	33.41%	542	0.39%	1,435	1.05%	5,777	4.21%	1,702	1.24%	715	0.52%	46,586	33.93%	9,670	7.04%	127,632	92.96%	78,872	57.44%
8	158,646	122,365	77.13%	28,653	18.06%	1,349	0.85%	711	0.45%	3,902	2.46%	1,666	1.05%	575	0.36%	29,228	18.42%	7,062	4.45%	151,584	95.55%	119,726	75.47%
9	158,279	131,486	83.07%	18,808	11.88%	759	0.48%	1,950	1.23%	3,199	2.02%	2,077	1.31%	700	0.44%	19,508	12.33%	6,983	4.41%	151,296	95.59%	128,394	81.12%
10	136,365	86,702	63.58%	32,311	23.69%	1,402	1.03%	576	0.42%	13,858	10.16%	1,516	1.11%	493	0.36%	32,804	24.06%	19,654	14.41%	116,711	85.59%	82,077	60.19%
11	141,728	97,548	68.83%	35,392	24.97%	854	0.60%	1,110	0.78%	5,285	3.73%	1,539	1.09%	656	0.46%	36,048	25.43%	9,332	6.58%	132,396	93.42%	94,234	66.49%
12	133,366	95,207	71.39%	26,002	19.50%	1,249	0.94%	1,293	0.97%	7,430	5.57%	2,185	1.64%	791	0.59%	26,793	20.09%	14,029	10.52%	119,337	89.48%	89,824	67.35%
13	142,807	59,791	41.87%	37,019	25.92%	37,826	26.49%	976	0.68%	5,173	3.62%	2,022	1.42%	642	0.45%	37,661	26.37%	8,181	5.73%	134,626	94.27%	57,735	40.43%
14	140,836	69,359	49.25%	53,293	37.84%	843	0.60%	4,496	3.19%	9,947	7.06%	2,898	2.06%	1,422	1.01%	54,715	38.85%	18,788	13.34%	122,048	86.66%	62,719	44.53%
15	155,372	97,485	62.74%	40,365	25.98%	719	0.46%	6,720	4.33%	7,169	4.61%	2,914	1.88%	1,297	0.83%	41,662	26.81%	14,145	9.10%	141,227	90.90%	92,031	59.23%
16	146,752	106,436	72.53%	16,353	11.14%	530	0.36%	17,229	11.74%	3,682	2.51%	2,522	1.72%	878	0.60%	17,231	11.74%	9,686	6.60%	137,066	93.40%	101,257	69.00%
17	127,938	103,709	81.06%	14,038	10.97%	702	0.55%	4,330	3.38%	3,480	2.72%	1,679	1.31%	577	0.45%	14,615	11.42%	8,534	6.67%	119,404	93.33%	99,406	77.70%
18	141,239	111,676	79.07%	21,458	15.19%	504	0.36%	2,976	2.11%	3,071	2.17%	1,554	1.10%	575	0.41%	22,033	15.60%	6,803	4.82%	134,436	95.18%	108,563	76.86%
19	131,993	85,973	65.13%	32,885	24.91%	2,825	2.14%	3,364	2.55%	3,546	2.69%	3,400	2.58%	1,421	1.08%	34,306	25.99%	9,961	7.55%	122,032	92.45%	81,184	61.51%
20	142,941	65,057	45.51%	56,347	39.42%	721	0.50%	8,324	5.82%	9,731	6.81%	2,761	1.93%	1,326	0.93%	57,673	40.35%	17,302	12.10%	125,639	87.90%	59,037	41.30%
21	134,664	56,157	41.70%	61,795	45.89%	4,028	2.99%	3,674	2.73%	4,891	3.63%	4,119	3.06%	2,181	1.62%	63,976	47.51%	12,183	9.05%	122,481	90.95%	51,051	37.91%
22	141,258	87,762	62.13%	42,704	30.23%	699	0.49%	2,511	1.78%	5,798	4.10%	1,784	1.26%	797	0.56%	43,501	30.80%	10,071	7.13%	131,187	92.87%	84,384	59.74%
23	155,496	119,697	76.98%	19,176	12.33%	668	0.43%	7,341	4.72%	6,280	4.04%	2,334	1.50%	743	0.48%	19,919	12.81%	12,147	7.81%	143,349	92.19%	114,647	73.73%
24	147,633	110,411	74.79%	26,866	18.20%	862	0.58%	1,684	1.14%	6,042	4.09%	1,768	1.20%	707	0.48%	27,573	18.68%	10,843	7.34%	136,790	92.66%	106,561	72.18%
25	152,423	103,471	67.88%	38,904	25.52%	4,113	2.70%	1,375	0.90%	2,901	1.90%	1,659	1.09%	560	0.37%	39,464	25.89%	5,774	3.79%	146,649	96.21%	101,124	66.34%
26	147,126	110,716	75.25%	23,912	16.25%	985	0.67%	3,183	2.16%	6,665	4.53%	1,665	1.13%	597	0.41%	24,509	16.66%	12,033	8.18%	135,093	91.82%	106,264	72.23%
27	149,849	122,037	81.44%	18,391	12.27%	501	0.33%	5,264	3.51%	2,066	1.38%	1,590	1.06%	659	0.44%	19,050	12.71%	5,259	3.51%	144,590	96.49%	119,248	79.58%
28	152,041	60,854	40.02%	74,960	49.30%	920	0.61%	6,001	3.95%	6,278	4.13%	3,028	1.99%	1,847	1.21%	76,807	50.52%	11,753	7.73%	140,288	92.27%	56,727	37.31%
29	145,058	122,043	84.13%	14,531	10.02%	674	0.46%	1,737	1.20%	4,852	3.34%	1,221	0.84%	327	0.23%	14,858	10.24%	8,186	5.64%	136,872	94.36%	119,141	82.13%
30	154,651	126,059	81.51%	23,020	14.89%	512	0.33%	665	0.43%	2,998	1.94%	1,397	0.90%	512	0.33%	23,532	15.22%	5,488	3.55%	149,163	96.45%	123,919	80.13%
31	150,121	129,566	86.31%	12,822	8.54%	494	0.33%	2,290	1.53%	3,586	2.39%	1,363	0.91%	478	0.32%	13,300	8.86%	7,184	4.79%	142,937	95.21%	126,504	84.27%
32	146,637	72,999	49.78%	56,123	38.27%	615	0.42%	2,722	1.86%	11,639	7.94%	2,539	1.73%	1,334	0.91%	57,457	39.18%	18,656	12.72%	127,981	87.28%	67,789	46.23%
33	152,338	123,262	80.91%	21,273	13.96%	534	0.35%	1,744	1.14%	4,231	2.78%	1,294	0.85%	436	0.29%	21,709	14.25%	7,467	4.90%	144,871	95.10%	120,528	79.12%
34	148,320	125,065	84.32%	14,564	9.82%	447	0.30%	2,053	1.38%	4,782	3.22%	1,409	0.95%	441	0.30%	15,005	10.12%	8,691	5.86%	139,629	94.14%	121,716	82.06%
35	132,039	105,593	79.97%	15,744	11.92%	569	0.43%	2,170	1.64%	6,370	4.82%	1,593	1.21%	516	0.39%	16,260	12.31%	12,265	9.29%	119,774	90.71%	100,426	76.06%
36	137,603	109,049	79.25%	18,811	13.67%	485	0.35%	2,572	1.87%	5,166	3.75%	1,520	1.10%	587	0.43%	19,398	14.10%	9,898	7.19%	127,705	92.81%	105,106	76.38%
37	143,412	62,855	43.83%	59,914	41.78%	734	0.51%	5,304	3.70%	11,669	8.14%	2,936	2.05%	1,364	0.95%	61,278	42.73%	21,046	14.68%	122,366	85.32%	55,559	38.74%
38	134,933	53,599	39.72%	63,924	47.37%	642	0.48%	9,015	6.68%	5,116	3.79%	2,637	1.95%	1,469	1.09%	65,393	48.46%	10,407	7.71%	124,526	92.29%	49,672	36.81%
39	138,352	119,769	86.57%	8,646	6.25%	378	0.27%	6,054	4.38%	1,968	1.42%	1,537	1.11%	516	0.37%	9,162	6.62%	6,106	4.41%	132,246	95.59%	115,971	83.82%
40	134,379	61,156	45.51%	50,712	37.74%	820	0.61%	5,010	3.73%	13,532	10.07%	3,149	2.34%	1,540	1.15%	52,252	38.88%	23,514	17.50%	110,865	82.50%	53,224	39.61%
41	135,214	102,847	76.06%	18,481	13.67%	477	0.35%	6,702	4.96%	4,650	3.44%	2,057	1.52%	785	0.58%	19,266	14.25%	11,555	8.55%	123,659	91.45%	96,829	71.61%
42	146,308	125,192	85.57%	11,314	7.73%	447	0.31%	3,627	2.48%	4,368	2.99%	1,360	0.93%	434	0.30%	11,748	8.03%	8,698	5.94%	137,610	94.06%	121,409	82.98%
43	149,991	120,517	80.35%	21,596	14.40%	623	0.42%	1,798	1.20%	3,862	2.57%	1,595	1.06%	530	0.35%	22,126	14.75%	7,396	4.93%	142,595	95.07%	117,542	78.37%
44	141,718	118,580	83.67%	18,471	13.03%	398	0.28%	968	0.68%	2,108	1.49%	1,193	0.84%	376	0.27%	18,847	13.30%	5,126	3.62%	136,592	96.38%	115,955	81.82%
45	159,078	148,321	93.24%	3,875	2.44%	374	0.24%	839	0.53%	4,269	2.68%	1,400	0.88%	328	0.21%	4,203	2.64%	7,751	4.87%	151,327	95.13%	145,249	91.31%
46	149,705	133,675	89.29%	8,348	5.58%	486	0.32%	2,512	1.68%	3,329	2.22%	1,355	0.91%	365	0.24%	8,713	5.82%	5,654	3.78%	144,051	96.22%	131,914	88.12%
47	147,841	135,556	91.69%	7,623	5.16%	461	0.31%	646	0.44%	2,340	1.58%	1,215	0.82%	251	0.17%	7,874	5.33%	4,560	3.08%	143,281	96.92%	133,656	90.41%
48	147,107	134,555	91.47%	4,762	3.24%	527	0.36%	1,600	1.09%	4,036	2.74%	1,627	1.11%	390	0.27%	5,152	3.50%	8,675	5.90%	138,432	94.10%	130,372	88.62%
49	154,410	137,183	88.84%	9,803	6.35%	634	0.41%	1,357	0.88%	3,246	2.10%	2,187	1.42%	665	0.43%	10,468	6.78%	7,266	4.71%	147,144	95.29%	133,666	86.57%
50	156,458	143,449	91.69%	1,906	1.22%	6,111	3.91%	811	0.52%	2,174	1.39%	2,007	1.28%	246	0.16%	2,152	1.38%	4,936	3.15%	151,522	96.85%	141,130	90.20%
Totals:	**7,253,848**	**5,155,756**	**71.08%**	**1,497,453**	**20.64%**	**87,111**	**1.20%**	**158,730**	**2.19%**	**256,529**	**3.54%**	**98,269**	**1.35%**	**38,780**	**0.53%**	**1,536,233**	**21.18%**	**492,330**	**6.79%**	**6,761,518**	**93.21%**	**4,964,325**	**68.44%**

District plan definition file: 'STC-2.asc', modified 08/28/2017 07:33:17 PM

Printed 09/07/2017 {rptS03|dc2016GE|re1.6.0}

Data Source: 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File. A = Asian, NA = American Indian and Alaskan Native, PI = Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander, MR = Multi-Race, Hisp = Hispanic or Latino (of any race)

2017 Senate Floor Redistricting Plan – 4th Ed: Voter Registration by Party and Race

		Registration by Party															Registration by Race Without Regard to Party			
		% D	Racial %s among D's				% R	Racial %s among R's				% U	Racial %s among U's				% L				
District	Total		White % of D	Black % of D	NA % of D	Other % of D		White % of R	Black % of R	NA % of R	Other % of R		White % of U	Black % of U	NA % of U	Other % of U		% White	% Black	% NA	% Other
1	142,178	44.76%	46.64%	50.47%	0.25%	2.65%	23.96%	94.67%	2.73%	0.19%	2.41%	30.81%	84.14%	9.76%	0.23%	5.88%	0.46%	69.90%	26.28%	0.23%	3.59%
2	133,713	31.49%	55.64%	39.91%	0.21%	4.25%	37.21%	95.11%	1.30%	0.18%	3.40%	30.85%	84.58%	7.82%	0.29%	7.31%	0.45%	79.38%	15.49%	0.23%	4.90%
3	120,325	60.87%	30.53%	66.15%	0.82%	2.49%	18.88%	91.84%	5.47%	0.20%	2.48%	20.04%	71.16%	20.61%	0.46%	7.77%	0.21%	50.32%	45.47%	0.63%	3.58%
4	132,057	62.61%	24.25%	71.43%	1.22%	3.10%	18.54%	90.38%	6.80%	0.28%	2.55%	18.64%	63.98%	25.59%	0.75%	9.68%	0.22%	44.00%	50.80%	0.96%	4.24%
5	127,175	48.32%	33.84%	61.53%	0.18%	4.45%	25.07%	93.15%	3.63%	0.13%	3.09%	26.11%	70.33%	18.69%	0.30%	10.68%	0.50%	58.44%	35.59%	0.20%	5.77%
6	109,801	29.49%	43.34%	47.95%	0.29%	8.42%	35.18%	90.36%	2.41%	0.33%	6.90%	34.63%	76.38%	12.09%	0.40%	11.13%	0.70%	71.58%	19.24%	0.34%	8.84%
7	115,078	47.86%	30.16%	64.93%	0.16%	4.75%	29.42%	92.72%	3.21%	0.17%	3.89%	22.39%	66.91%	21.15%	0.25%	11.69%	0.32%	56.94%	36.80%	0.18%	6.08%
8	161,630	35.08%	55.55%	40.31%	0.66%	3.49%	33.09%	95.39%	1.44%	0.34%	2.84%	31.44%	86.22%	6.92%	0.48%	6.37%	0.39%	78.50%	16.81%	0.50%	4.19%
9	163,842	31.37%	65.07%	28.72%	0.25%	5.96%	32.45%	95.15%	0.97%	0.17%	3.71%	35.51%	82.89%	6.19%	0.30%	10.63%	0.67%	81.31%	11.55%	0.24%	6.90%
10	105,849	43.32%	39.77%	53.38%	0.77%	6.09%	33.19%	94.11%	2.37%	0.46%	3.06%	23.17%	73.90%	12.98%	0.80%	12.33%	0.31%	65.82%	26.95%	0.67%	6.56%
11	142,068	39.19%	38.02%	56.63%	0.50%	4.85%	34.33%	95.00%	2.00%	0.21%	2.79%	26.07%	76.80%	12.45%	0.43%	10.33%	0.42%	67.87%	26.16%	0.38%	5.59%
12	115,340	38.19%	46.21%	46.05%	0.63%	7.11%	33.42%	92.83%	1.79%	0.42%	4.96%	27.81%	73.29%	12.33%	0.63%	13.75%	0.57%	69.50%	21.66%	0.57%	8.27%
13	110,811	64.21%	29.93%	39.59%	27.57%	2.91%	14.46%	76.09%	4.11%	16.42%	3.38%	21.13%	52.62%	16.84%	21.80%	8.75%	0.20%	41.45%	29.60%	24.71%	4.23%
14	138,762	50.91%	25.44%	63.29%	0.26%	11.02%	18.39%	86.85%	4.42%	0.23%	8.50%	30.24%	51.90%	24.37%	0.32%	23.41%	0.46%	44.92%	40.47%	0.27%	14.34%
15	143,032	46.67%	41.44%	47.94%	0.28%	10.34%	18.47%	88.98%	3.19%	0.17%	7.66%	34.17%	62.05%	15.40%	0.30%	22.24%	0.68%	57.49%	28.29%	0.27%	13.95%
16	155,626	32.76%	57.07%	24.55%	0.34%	18.04%	26.35%	90.10%	0.98%	0.20%	8.72%	40.22%	68.18%	6.48%	0.29%	25.05%	0.67%	70.42%	10.93%	0.28%	18.37%
17	147,868	28.78%	61.12%	28.07%	0.30%	10.51%	35.43%	93.57%	0.85%	0.18%	5.41%	35.18%	80.34%	5.55%	0.26%	13.86%	0.60%	79.52%	10.35%	0.24%	9.89%
18	154,971	33.19%	55.88%	36.46%	0.28%	7.38%	35.47%	93.68%	1.03%	0.12%	5.16%	30.83%	80.32%	7.00%	0.23%	12.44%	0.51%	76.97%	14.65%	0.21%	8.17%
19	115,170	40.28%	34.63%	55.38%	1.48%	8.51%	29.05%	87.71%	3.24%	1.28%	7.78%	30.16%	59.17%	19.75%	1.62%	19.46%	0.50%	57.63%	29.27%	1.46%	11.63%
20	157,050	57.73%	32.79%	58.10%	0.30%	8.81%	11.15%	85.99%	6.28%	0.22%	7.51%	30.65%	55.22%	21.59%	0.30%	22.89%	0.47%	45.75%	40.94%	0.29%	13.02%
21	126,217	53.16%	14.30%	75.47%	2.31%	7.92%	17.13%	78.04%	8.49%	1.97%	11.50%	29.26%	41.92%	33.59%	2.26%	22.22%	0.45%	33.53%	51.49%	2.24%	12.75%
22	131,526	51.14%	42.97%	51.60%	0.25%	5.18%	20.76%	93.65%	2.61%	0.21%	3.53%	27.71%	71.52%	14.16%	0.34%	13.98%	0.40%	61.54%	30.89%	0.27%	7.31%
23	164,042	44.75%	68.80%	21.68%	0.25%	9.27%	18.26%	93.17%	1.17%	0.18%	5.48%	36.45%	74.28%	5.25%	0.26%	20.22%	0.54%	75.31%	11.85%	0.25%	12.59%
24	132,564	38.15%	46.94%	45.93%	0.31%	6.82%	33.99%	95.89%	1.35%	0.21%	2.55%	27.44%	77.57%	10.12%	0.31%	12.00%	0.43%	72.12%	20.79%	0.28%	6.81%
25	135,607	43.42%	42.53%	51.20%	1.68%	4.59%	28.47%	93.53%	2.10%	1.21%	3.16%	27.76%	79.67%	10.50%	2.24%	7.59%	0.34%	67.49%	25.77%	1.71%	5.02%
26	124,762	31.07%	44.04%	48.55%	0.32%	7.08%	41.46%	95.99%	1.36%	0.25%	2.40%	27.05%	78.95%	10.47%	0.41%	10.18%	0.42%	75.18%	18.52%	0.31%	5.99%
27	152,854	32.22%	59.95%	33.03%	0.26%	6.76%	38.86%	96.18%	0.88%	0.14%	2.80%	28.45%	80.10%	8.29%	0.26%	11.34%	0.48%	79.87%	13.38%	0.21%	6.54%
28	141,585	60.95%	18.92%	74.49%	0.32%	6.27%	12.65%	84.40%	8.29%	0.41%	6.90%	25.96%	44.27%	35.48%	0.41%	19.85%	0.44%	33.96%	55.78%	0.35%	9.90%
29	121,726	28.67%	62.57%	32.21%	0.26%	4.96%	44.46%	97.13%	0.69%	0.21%	1.97%	26.48%	87.73%	5.36%	0.33%	6.58%	0.38%	84.68%	10.98%	0.26%	4.08%
30	128,998	36.43%	59.59%	37.16%	0.18%	3.08%	37.54%	96.43%	1.01%	0.17%	2.39%	25.69%	86.69%	6.30%	0.25%	6.76%	0.35%	80.48%	15.55%	0.19%	3.78%
31	147,443	26.05%	65.39%	28.17%	0.18%	6.26%	44.75%	96.49%	0.58%	0.14%	2.78%	28.79%	85.10%	5.65%	0.22%	9.03%	0.41%	85.07%	9.24%	0.17%	5.52%
32	131,319	53.92%	26.95%	65.85%	0.18%	7.02%	19.04%	90.50%	4.66%	0.22%	4.63%	26.58%	58.83%	24.51%	0.32%	16.35%	0.46%	47.72%	42.97%	0.22%	9.08%
33	134,917	29.89%	53.28%	42.17%	0.20%	4.35%	41.48%	96.32%	1.09%	0.16%	2.43%	28.30%	84.34%	8.63%	0.23%	6.80%	0.33%	80.02%	15.53%	0.19%	4.26%
34	141,402	25.01%	60.70%	33.06%	0.19%	6.04%	43.88%	96.67%	0.78%	0.13%	2.43%	30.71%	86.87%	5.51%	0.25%	7.37%	0.40%	84.61%	10.33%	0.18%	4.88%
35	140,888	26.94%	52.42%	37.95%	0.32%	9.31%	41.34%	95.38%	0.99%	0.21%	3.43%	31.30%	81.65%	6.99%	0.30%	11.06%	0.42%	79.46%	12.84%	0.27%	7.43%
36	140,406	30.39%	48.74%	42.96%	0.26%	8.03%	38.31%	95.40%	1.23%	0.19%	3.18%	30.80%	78.03%	9.79%	0.33%	11.84%	0.49%	75.79%	16.59%	0.26%	7.36%
37	146,242	54.27%	25.19%	66.71%	0.30%	7.80%	15.25%	86.97%	6.79%	0.22%	6.01%	29.77%	59.96%	22.57%	0.35%	17.12%	0.70%	45.28%	44.08%	0.30%	10.33%
38	139,655	59.08%	14.16%	77.20%	0.27%	8.38%	13.75%	84.83%	7.49%	0.24%	7.44%	26.68%	45.49%	32.59%	0.35%	21.57%	0.49%	32.45%	55.45%	0.29%	11.81%
39	148,432	25.65%	70.41%	19.92%	0.33%	9.35%	40.76%	95.67%	0.53%	0.17%	3.64%	33.16%	82.60%	4.55%	0.26%	12.59%	0.44%	84.81%	6.84%	0.24%	8.10%
40	124,804	55.20%	21.41%	67.63%	0.33%	10.63%	16.61%	86.23%	6.10%	0.31%	7.36%	27.70%	51.05%	27.20%	0.37%	21.38%	0.49%	40.57%	45.98%	0.34%	13.11%
41	150,419	31.50%	48.98%	38.86%	0.32%	11.85%	32.96%	93.86%	1.27%	0.17%	4.69%	34.94%	75.47%	9.17%	0.32%	15.05%	0.60%	73.23%	15.90%	0.27%	10.61%
42	128,896	26.39%	67.86%	24.96%	0.14%	7.04%	43.09%	96.74%	0.64%	0.09%	2.54%	30.17%	86.83%	4.33%	0.18%	8.65%	0.36%	86.10%	8.18%	0.13%	5.58%
43	135,709	32.74%	52.19%	41.64%	0.24%	5.93%	37.92%	96.10%	1.04%	0.20%	2.67%	28.92%	80.10%	9.55%	0.35%	10.00%	0.42%	77.04%	16.82%	0.26%	5.89%
44	125,055	34.18%	60.75%	35.47%	0.16%	3.62%	37.64%	96.61%	0.89%	0.13%	2.37%	27.81%	87.24%	5.84%	0.19%	6.72%	0.36%	81.71%	14.10%	0.16%	4.02%
45	137,100	28.08%	89.69%	6.17%	0.13%	4.01%	40.84%	97.69%	0.29%	0.07%	1.95%	30.54%	92.33%	1.81%	0.17%	5.69%	0.53%	93.77%	2.41%	0.12%	3.70%
46	123,031	28.60%	80.60%	14.81%	0.15%	4.44%	41.57%	97.65%	0.42%	0.11%	1.82%	29.33%	91.85%	2.61%	0.17%	5.38%	0.51%	91.03%	5.18%	0.14%	3.65%
47	128,210	32.19%	84.57%	12.44%	0.13%	2.86%	37.02%	97.24%	0.58%	0.10%	2.08%	30.38%	92.51%	2.55%	0.17%	4.77%	0.41%	91.69%	5.01%	0.13%	3.16%
48	143,860	25.76%	84.48%	9.69%	0.22%	5.61%	35.36%	96.71%	0.36%	0.13%	2.80%	38.38%	90.92%	2.06%	0.24%	6.78%	0.50%	91.29%	3.42%	0.20%	5.09%
49	158,041	41.07%	82.25%	11.70%	0.20%	5.85%	22.55%	95.22%	0.80%	0.16%	3.82%	35.72%	86.77%	3.12%	0.29%	9.82%	0.65%	86.83%	6.12%	0.22%	6.83%

District plan definition file: 'STC-2.asc', modified 08/28/2017 07:33:17 PM

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections. Voter registration snapshot as of November 12, 2016. Note that voter records that could not be associated with a geographic location were excluded.

D = Democratic, R = Republican, L = Libertarian, NA = Native American. In this chart, the 'Other' race categories also include multi-race voters and those voters for whom a race indicator was not present in the source data.

2017 Senate Floor Redistricting Plan – 4th Ed: Voter Registration by Party and Race

		Registration by Party															Registration by Race Without Regard to Party			
		% D	Racial %s among D's				% R	Racial %s among R's				% U	Racial %s among U's				% L				
District	Total		White % of D	Black % of D	NA % of D	Other % of D		White % of R	Black % of R	NA % of R	Other % of R		White % of U	Black % of U	NA % of U	Other % of U		% White	% Black	% NA	% Other
50	144,162	33.57%	92.40%	2.36%	2.56%	2.68%	33.80%	96.43%	0.17%	1.33%	2.06%	32.18%	90.80%	0.88%	3.11%	5.21%	0.45%	93.25%	1.14%	2.32%	3.30%
Totals:	**6,822,218**	**39.52%**	**46.08%**	**46.13%**	**1.19%**	**6.60%**	**30.24%**	**94.05%**	**1.80%**	**0.40%**	**3.75%**	**29.77%**	**75.43%**	**11.39%**	**0.72%**	**12.47%**	**0.46%**	**69.48%**	**22.21%**	**0.81%**	**7.51%**

District plan definition file: 'STC-2.asc', modified 08/28/2017 07:33:17 PM

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections. Voter registration snapshot as of November 12, 2016. Note that voter records that could not be associated with a geographic location were excluded.

D = Democratic, R = Republican, L = Libertarian, NA = Native American. In this chart, the 'Other' race categories also include multi-race voters and those voters for whom a race indicator was not present in the source data.

2017 Senate Floor Redistricting Plan – 4th Ed: Voter Registration by Gender, Age, and Ethnicity

		Voter Registration by Gender						Voter Registration by Age								Voter Registration by Ethnicity					
District	Total	Male	% Male	Female	% Female	Undesig.	% Undesig.	18-25	% 18-25	26-40	% 26-40	41-65	% 41-65	66+	% 66+	Hispanic	% Hisp	Non-Hisp	% Non-Hisp	Undesig.	% Undesig.
1	142,178	65,057	45.76%	75,136	52.85%	1,985	1.40%	13,909	9.78%	31,086	21.86%	63,561	44.71%	33,622	23.65%	886	0.62%	83,965	59.06%	57,327	40.32%
2	133,713	60,599	45.32%	70,671	52.85%	2,443	1.83%	12,970	9.70%	29,240	21.87%	56,626	42.35%	34,877	26.08%	1,934	1.45%	109,960	82.24%	21,819	16.32%
3	120,325	53,278	44.28%	64,791	53.85%	2,256	1.87%	12,202	10.14%	24,583	20.43%	52,398	43.55%	31,142	25.88%	866	0.72%	94,807	78.79%	24,652	20.49%
4	132,057	57,956	43.89%	72,265	54.72%	1,836	1.39%	15,086	11.42%	30,589	23.16%	57,540	43.57%	28,842	21.84%	1,498	1.13%	106,829	80.90%	23,730	17.97%
5	127,175	55,388	43.55%	68,559	53.91%	3,228	2.54%	21,756	17.11%	36,014	28.32%	49,293	38.76%	20,112	15.81%	2,284	1.80%	111,725	87.85%	13,166	10.35%
6	109,801	48,534	44.20%	59,369	54.07%	1,898	1.73%	14,571	13.27%	35,312	32.16%	43,246	39.39%	16,672	15.18%	4,564	4.16%	88,343	80.46%	16,894	15.39%
7	115,078	50,515	43.90%	61,901	53.79%	2,662	2.31%	13,684	11.89%	26,833	23.32%	50,121	43.55%	24,440	21.24%	2,400	2.09%	87,497	76.03%	25,181	21.88%
8	161,630	74,065	45.82%	84,774	52.45%	2,791	1.73%	13,431	8.31%	30,629	18.95%	69,661	43.10%	47,909	29.64%	1,978	1.22%	117,754	72.85%	41,898	25.92%
9	163,842	71,786	43.81%	84,907	51.82%	7,149	4.36%	21,808	13.31%	43,693	26.67%	65,196	39.79%	33,145	20.23%	2,595	1.58%	121,178	73.96%	40,069	24.46%
10	105,849	47,003	44.41%	57,086	53.93%	1,760	1.66%	12,140	11.47%	23,314	22.03%	46,251	43.70%	24,144	22.81%	4,145	3.92%	85,365	80.65%	16,339	15.44%
11	142,068	64,750	45.58%	75,395	53.07%	1,923	1.35%	16,491	11.61%	33,654	23.69%	66,925	47.11%	24,998	17.60%	3,098	2.18%	112,847	79.43%	26,123	18.39%
12	115,340	51,529	44.68%	61,833	53.61%	1,978	1.71%	13,918	12.07%	29,882	25.91%	50,008	43.36%	21,532	18.67%	4,882	4.23%	87,166	75.57%	23,292	20.19%
13	110,811	48,860	44.09%	61,285	55.31%	666	0.60%	13,071	11.80%	26,315	23.75%	47,972	43.29%	23,453	21.16%	1,283	1.16%	99,928	90.18%	9,600	8.66%
14	138,762	59,092	42.59%	73,077	52.66%	6,593	4.75%	20,085	14.47%	43,273	31.19%	58,173	41.92%	17,231	12.42%	6,127	4.42%	93,344	67.27%	39,291	28.32%
15	143,032	62,935	44.00%	71,835	50.22%	8,262	5.78%	25,182	17.61%	47,028	32.88%	51,267	35.84%	19,555	13.67%	4,534	3.17%	97,444	68.13%	41,054	28.70%
16	155,626	69,812	44.86%	79,860	51.32%	5,954	3.83%	18,135	11.65%	47,290	30.39%	70,429	45.26%	19,772	12.70%	4,639	2.98%	109,009	70.05%	41,978	26.97%
17	147,868	68,491	46.32%	75,252	50.89%	4,125	2.79%	16,699	11.29%	37,276	25.21%	72,955	49.34%	20,938	14.16%	3,788	2.56%	107,581	72.75%	36,499	24.68%
18	154,971	71,227	45.96%	79,311	51.18%	4,433	2.86%	17,673	11.40%	35,104	22.65%	74,761	48.24%	27,433	17.70%	2,976	1.92%	122,050	78.76%	29,945	19.32%
19	115,170	50,155	43.55%	59,907	52.02%	5,108	4.44%	15,349	13.33%	31,599	27.44%	49,938	43.36%	18,284	15.88%	5,414	4.70%	80,425	69.83%	29,331	25.47%
20	157,050	66,644	42.43%	84,364	53.72%	6,042	3.85%	23,347	14.87%	55,919	35.61%	56,501	35.98%	21,283	13.55%	5,251	3.34%	105,222	67.00%	46,577	29.66%
21	126,217	53,219	42.16%	67,482	53.47%	5,516	4.37%	18,175	14.40%	39,192	31.05%	50,500	40.01%	18,350	14.54%	6,749	5.35%	89,251	70.71%	30,217	23.94%
22	131,526	57,613	43.80%	70,125	53.32%	3,788	2.88%	14,174	10.78%	33,542	25.50%	57,796	43.94%	26,014	19.78%	2,785	2.12%	99,175	75.40%	29,566	22.48%
23	164,042	71,305	43.47%	85,026	51.83%	7,711	4.70%	29,265	17.84%	40,663	24.79%	63,457	38.68%	30,657	18.69%	4,633	2.82%	123,811	75.48%	35,598	21.70%
24	132,564	58,547	44.17%	71,233	53.73%	2,784	2.10%	14,912	11.25%	30,344	22.89%	58,698	44.28%	28,610	21.58%	3,182	2.40%	104,209	78.61%	25,173	18.99%
25	135,607	60,122	44.34%	72,669	53.59%	2,816	2.08%	13,740	10.13%	29,164	21.51%	57,338	42.28%	35,365	26.08%	1,447	1.07%	115,941	85.50%	18,219	13.44%
26	124,762	56,989	45.68%	66,493	53.30%	1,280	1.03%	14,759	11.83%	28,406	22.77%	55,454	44.45%	26,143	20.95%	3,347	2.68%	99,662	79.88%	21,753	17.44%
27	152,854	69,824	45.68%	81,959	53.62%	1,071	0.70%	15,680	10.26%	33,016	21.60%	70,312	46.00%	33,846	22.14%	2,664	1.74%	134,651	88.09%	15,539	10.17%
28	141,585	59,936	42.33%	78,634	55.54%	3,015	2.13%	29,758	21.02%	41,392	29.23%	50,427	35.62%	20,008	14.13%	3,720	2.63%	111,524	78.77%	26,341	18.60%
29	121,726	56,352	46.29%	64,378	52.89%	996	0.82%	12,704	10.44%	25,233	20.73%	55,965	45.98%	27,824	22.86%	1,845	1.52%	99,192	81.49%	20,689	17.00%
30	128,998	59,114	45.83%	69,157	53.61%	727	0.56%	12,600	9.77%	25,308	19.62%	59,589	46.19%	31,501	24.42%	1,438	1.11%	107,718	83.50%	19,842	15.38%
31	147,443	67,402	45.71%	77,630	52.65%	2,411	1.64%	15,045	10.20%	30,260	20.52%	69,125	46.88%	33,013	22.39%	2,728	1.85%	118,623	80.45%	26,092	17.70%
32	131,319	55,441	42.22%	71,515	54.46%	4,363	3.32%	17,837	13.58%	37,312	28.41%	52,032	39.62%	24,138	18.38%	5,130	3.91%	92,524	70.46%	33,665	25.64%
33	134,917	62,283	46.16%	70,933	52.58%	1,701	1.26%	15,588	11.55%	30,175	22.37%	59,326	43.97%	29,828	22.11%	1,780	1.32%	115,424	85.55%	17,713	13.13%
34	141,402	66,096	46.74%	73,659	52.09%	1,647	1.16%	15,534	10.99%	31,091	21.99%	66,291	46.88%	28,486	20.15%	2,985	2.11%	121,107	85.65%	17,310	12.24%
35	140,888	65,805	46.71%	73,323	52.04%	1,760	1.25%	18,272	12.97%	31,596	22.43%	69,334	49.21%	21,686	15.39%	4,849	3.44%	117,317	83.27%	18,722	13.29%
36	140,406	63,388	45.15%	74,258	52.89%	2,760	1.97%	16,231	11.56%	34,717	24.73%	65,667	46.77%	23,791	16.94%	3,919	2.79%	108,541	77.31%	27,946	19.90%
37	146,242	65,215	44.59%	77,273	52.84%	3,754	2.57%	20,185	13.80%	59,254	40.52%	51,357	35.12%	15,446	10.56%	5,494	3.76%	107,885	73.77%	32,863	22.47%
38	139,655	59,931	42.91%	75,930	54.37%	3,794	2.72%	24,140	17.29%	43,169	30.91%	56,770	40.65%	15,576	11.15%	5,307	3.80%	101,946	73.00%	32,402	23.20%
39	148,432	67,471	45.46%	78,670	53.00%	2,291	1.54%	15,679	10.56%	34,848	23.48%	68,554	46.19%	29,351	19.77%	3,345	2.25%	125,848	84.78%	19,239	12.96%
40	124,804	53,523	42.89%	68,016	54.50%	3,265	2.62%	17,747	14.22%	38,639	30.96%	50,999	40.86%	17,419	13.96%	7,164	5.74%	91,906	73.64%	25,734	20.62%
41	150,419	67,949	45.17%	79,647	52.95%	2,823	1.88%	16,199	10.77%	43,183	28.71%	70,852	47.10%	20,185	13.42%	5,949	3.95%	120,563	80.15%	23,907	15.89%
42	128,896	59,696	46.31%	67,866	52.65%	1,334	1.03%	13,461	10.44%	27,477	21.32%	58,871	45.67%	29,087	22.57%	2,511	1.95%	108,222	83.96%	18,163	14.09%
43	135,709	60,335	44.46%	72,589	53.49%	2,785	2.05%	14,670	10.81%	32,575	24.00%	61,456	45.29%	27,008	19.90%	2,799	2.06%	109,047	80.35%	23,863	17.58%
44	125,055	57,306	45.82%	65,888	52.69%	1,861	1.49%	12,736	10.18%	26,040	20.82%	58,418	46.71%	27,861	22.28%	1,812	1.45%	104,389	83.47%	18,854	15.08%
45	137,100	63,957	46.65%	71,563	52.20%	1,580	1.15%	23,703	17.29%	27,897	20.35%	53,489	39.01%	32,011	23.35%	2,380	1.74%	115,712	84.40%	19,008	13.86%
46	123,031	57,756	46.94%	64,468	52.40%	807	0.66%	12,597	10.24%	25,274	20.54%	54,610	44.39%	30,550	24.83%	1,391	1.13%	107,328	87.24%	14,312	11.63%
47	128,210	59,458	46.38%	67,005	52.26%	1,747	1.36%	12,651	9.87%	25,392	19.81%	56,264	43.88%	33,903	26.44%	1,176	0.92%	105,167	82.03%	21,867	17.06%
48	143,860	65,104	45.26%	76,329	53.06%	2,427	1.69%	12,809	8.90%	29,149	20.26%	59,107	41.09%	42,795	29.75%	2,329	1.62%	108,911	75.71%	32,620	22.67%
49	158,041	70,734	44.76%	83,274	52.69%	4,033	2.55%	16,804	10.63%	43,639	27.61%	64,393	40.74%	33,205	21.01%	2,424	1.53%	111,529	70.57%	44,088	27.90%
50	144,162	66,320	46.00%	75,944	52.68%	1,898	1.32%	15,270	10.59%	28,233	19.58%	59,341	41.16%	41,318	28.66%	1,239	0.86%	123,879	85.93%	19,044	13.21%
Totals:	**6,822,218**	**3,055,867**	**44.79%**	**3,614,514**	**52.98%**	**151,837**	**2.23%**	**834,432**	**12.23%**	**1,704,813**	**24.99%**	**2,938,614**	**43.07%**	**1,344,359**	**19.71%**	**163,663**	**2.40%**	**5,323,441**	**78.03%**	**1,335,114**	**19.57%**

District plan definition file: 'STC-2.asc', modified 08/28/2017 07:33:17 PM

Printed 09/07/2017 {rptS05|dc2016GE|re1.6.0}

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections. Voter registration snapshot as of November 12, 2016. Note that voter records that could not be associated with a geographic location were excluded.

2017 Senate Floor Redistricting Plan – 4th Ed: 2016 General Election - PR, USS, and GV

	US President: Trump-Clinton-Johnson-Write-in								US Senate: Burr-Ross-Haugh						Governor: Cooper-McCrory-Cecil					
District	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	WI	WI %	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %
1	51,124	54.37%	39,690	42.21%	2,437	2.59%	781	0.83%	50,422	54.75%	39,232	42.60%	2,441	2.65%	40,704	43.98%	50,100	54.13%	1,749	1.89%
2	58,542	63.89%	30,012	32.76%	2,242	2.45%	829	0.90%	58,109	64.13%	28,994	32.00%	3,512	3.88%	30,960	34.02%	58,265	64.02%	1,788	1.96%
3	37,998	44.82%	45,070	53.16%	1,193	1.41%	523	0.62%	37,690	45.00%	44,065	52.61%	2,002	2.39%	44,887	53.29%	38,505	45.71%	842	1.00%
4	34,714	39.56%	51,323	58.49%	1,231	1.40%	485	0.55%	34,873	40.05%	50,550	58.06%	1,648	1.89%	52,322	59.88%	34,269	39.22%	793	0.91%
5	40,021	45.23%	45,333	51.24%	2,245	2.54%	881	1.00%	41,386	47.29%	43,487	49.70%	2,634	3.01%	45,427	51.71%	41,041	46.71%	1,389	1.58%
6	40,099	64.39%	19,577	31.44%	1,985	3.19%	610	0.98%	39,097	63.90%	19,028	31.10%	3,064	5.01%	20,040	32.62%	39,685	64.59%	1,718	2.80%
7	41,031	53.33%	33,966	44.15%	1,362	1.77%	579	0.75%	40,925	53.84%	33,171	43.64%	1,921	2.53%	33,894	44.35%	41,571	54.40%	958	1.25%
8	69,138	60.31%	41,895	36.54%	2,660	2.32%	948	0.83%	67,784	60.07%	40,579	35.96%	4,470	3.96%	44,922	39.64%	65,885	58.14%	2,506	2.21%
9	55,097	50.39%	48,749	44.58%	3,901	3.57%	1,602	1.47%	55,887	51.89%	46,846	43.49%	4,974	4.62%	54,155	50.05%	50,866	47.01%	3,173	2.93%
10	43,565	59.90%	27,558	37.89%	1,169	1.61%	439	0.60%	43,032	59.87%	27,012	37.58%	1,835	2.55%	28,135	38.91%	43,298	59.88%	879	1.22%
11	57,543	55.97%	41,835	40.69%	2,470	2.40%	968	0.94%	57,652	56.39%	41,591	40.68%	2,987	2.92%	45,263	44.10%	55,757	54.33%	1,612	1.57%
12	44,964	59.19%	28,240	37.18%	2,047	2.69%	709	0.93%	44,404	58.94%	28,264	37.51%	2,673	3.55%	30,211	39.98%	43,695	57.83%	1,656	2.19%
13	34,909	54.33%	27,879	43.39%	1,101	1.71%	361	0.56%	33,313	53.25%	27,703	44.28%	1,548	2.47%	27,663	43.72%	34,916	55.19%	690	1.09%
14	27,353	28.07%	65,857	67.58%	2,784	2.86%	1,450	1.49%	29,490	30.45%	64,478	66.57%	2,890	2.98%	67,188	69.13%	28,058	28.87%	1,940	2.00%
15	27,357	26.16%	71,491	68.37%	3,905	3.73%	1,805	1.73%	31,106	29.93%	69,520	66.90%	3,291	3.17%	74,070	71.04%	27,793	26.66%	2,406	2.31%
16	40,924	34.26%	71,524	59.88%	4,721	3.95%	2,268	1.90%	47,090	39.70%	67,617	57.00%	3,913	3.30%	74,271	62.34%	41,984	35.24%	2,880	2.42%
17	56,562	48.80%	52,520	45.32%	4,792	4.13%	2,020	1.74%	61,244	53.15%	50,014	43.40%	3,971	3.45%	56,237	48.60%	56,738	49.03%	2,745	2.37%
18	60,254	49.94%	54,218	44.93%	4,035	3.34%	2,152	1.78%	65,138	54.20%	51,537	42.88%	3,507	2.92%	57,638	47.79%	60,683	50.32%	2,283	1.89%
19	37,569	51.71%	32,312	44.48%	2,044	2.81%	723	1.00%	37,683	52.49%	31,575	43.98%	2,528	3.52%	32,430	45.06%	37,879	52.63%	1,660	2.31%
20	15,723	14.64%	87,146	81.16%	2,761	2.57%	1,745	1.63%	19,607	18.37%	84,748	79.40%	2,382	2.23%	87,566	81.92%	17,525	16.39%	1,802	1.69%
21	21,456	29.36%	49,019	67.07%	1,906	2.61%	707	0.97%	21,888	30.37%	47,719	66.21%	2,461	3.41%	47,707	66.14%	22,682	31.45%	1,739	2.41%
22	37,322	39.28%	54,243	57.08%	2,241	2.36%	1,220	1.28%	38,620	40.93%	53,100	56.28%	2,628	2.79%	55,918	59.07%	37,192	39.29%	1,560	1.65%
23	35,663	29.19%	80,987	66.28%	3,534	2.89%	2,005	1.64%	39,933	32.86%	78,407	64.52%	3,177	2.61%	83,440	68.47%	36,205	29.71%	2,211	1.81%
24	53,036	55.49%	39,216	41.03%	2,381	2.49%	945	0.99%	53,644	56.54%	38,083	40.14%	3,145	3.31%	42,372	44.53%	50,986	53.58%	1,795	1.89%
25	51,626	55.82%	38,014	41.10%	2,073	2.24%	779	0.84%	50,943	55.86%	37,449	41.07%	2,798	3.07%	39,947	43.57%	50,130	54.68%	1,603	1.75%
26	54,446	64.64%	27,269	32.37%	1,788	2.12%	729	0.87%	53,193	63.86%	26,713	32.07%	3,384	4.06%	30,384	36.36%	51,246	61.33%	1,928	2.31%
27	60,891	51.72%	51,460	43.71%	3,690	3.13%	1,695	1.44%	64,651	55.25%	48,752	41.66%	3,607	3.08%	56,361	48.05%	58,431	49.81%	2,511	2.14%
28	17,691	18.66%	73,851	77.88%	2,070	2.18%	1,220	1.29%	19,041	20.34%	71,990	76.89%	2,600	2.78%	74,483	79.38%	17,465	18.61%	1,885	2.01%
29	61,447	71.12%	22,259	25.76%	2,062	2.39%	628	0.73%	60,373	70.54%	21,959	25.66%	3,259	3.81%	26,603	30.94%	57,516	66.90%	1,851	2.15%
30	60,630	66.76%	27,458	30.23%	1,981	2.18%	748	0.82%	59,336	65.92%	27,371	30.41%	3,299	3.67%	32,270	35.77%	56,074	62.16%	1,869	2.07%
31	67,558	60.88%	38,216	34.44%	3,596	3.24%	1,599	1.44%	70,992	64.24%	35,655	32.26%	3,871	3.50%	43,491	39.30%	64,639	58.41%	2,539	2.29%
32	24,035	26.97%	61,506	69.02%	2,410	2.70%	1,161	1.30%	26,595	30.11%	59,121	66.94%	2,601	2.95%	62,623	70.89%	23,752	26.89%	1,959	2.22%
33	64,774	68.70%	26,494	28.10%	2,181	2.31%	837	0.89%	62,061	66.50%	26,482	28.38%	4,782	5.12%	29,794	31.73%	61,866	65.89%	2,231	2.38%
34	68,634	68.50%	27,894	27.84%	2,583	2.58%	1,080	1.08%	66,829	67.44%	27,349	27.60%	4,916	4.96%	32,618	32.78%	64,115	64.43%	2,775	2.79%
35	61,627	62.37%	32,773	33.17%	3,156	3.19%	1,249	1.26%	62,768	64.34%	30,646	31.41%	4,148	4.25%	34,249	34.89%	61,659	62.80%	2,268	2.31%
36	58,898	58.78%	37,086	37.01%	2,957	2.95%	1,253	1.25%	58,847	59.32%	35,738	36.02%	4,620	4.66%	39,591	39.69%	57,611	57.75%	2,561	2.57%
37	17,060	19.75%	64,797	75.01%	3,224	3.73%	1,303	1.51%	20,986	24.67%	60,840	71.53%	3,229	3.80%	65,025	76.04%	18,122	21.19%	2,365	2.77%
38	17,399	20.08%	66,052	76.22%	2,040	2.35%	1,171	1.35%	18,697	21.82%	64,114	74.82%	2,877	3.36%	65,258	75.88%	18,759	21.81%	1,986	2.31%
39	53,290	48.86%	49,607	45.48%	4,029	3.69%	2,147	1.97%	60,928	56.18%	43,928	40.51%	3,591	3.31%	50,569	46.40%	56,080	51.46%	2,335	2.14%
40	18,662	24.20%	55,240	71.64%	2,109	2.74%	1,100	1.43%	20,031	26.30%	53,262	69.92%	2,880	3.78%	54,730	71.54%	19,904	26.02%	1,868	2.44%
41	47,467	45.06%	52,383	49.73%	3,968	3.77%	1,525	1.45%	50,899	48.91%	48,756	46.85%	4,413	4.24%	55,322	52.95%	45,891	43.92%	3,263	3.12%
42	62,200	68.66%	24,968	27.56%	2,410	2.66%	1,012	1.12%	60,484	67.58%	24,627	27.52%	4,390	4.90%	28,398	31.52%	59,501	66.04%	2,202	2.44%
43	58,532	63.77%	29,967	32.65%	2,319	2.53%	961	1.05%	57,121	63.01%	29,387	32.41%	4,151	4.58%	32,375	35.49%	56,833	62.29%	2,025	2.22%
44	60,549	67.77%	26,071	29.18%	1,947	2.18%	779	0.87%	58,536	66.29%	26,018	29.46%	3,755	4.25%	28,778	32.38%	58,278	65.57%	1,820	2.05%
45	63,539	65.43%	29,273	30.14%	2,850	2.93%	1,454	1.50%	62,607	65.23%	29,246	30.47%	4,123	4.30%	34,731	35.93%	59,576	61.64%	2,343	2.42%
46	59,157	70.85%	21,367	25.59%	2,003	2.40%	965	1.16%	56,771	68.88%	21,718	26.35%	3,937	4.78%	25,410	30.59%	55,667	67.01%	1,991	2.40%
47	62,657	69.28%	24,632	27.24%	2,027	2.24%	1,125	1.24%	58,592	65.91%	26,662	29.99%	3,648	4.10%	30,561	34.14%	56,662	63.29%	2,298	2.57%
48	59,387	57.55%	38,942	37.74%	3,068	2.97%	1,791	1.74%	59,206	58.02%	38,853	38.08%	3,980	3.90%	43,781	42.79%	55,594	54.34%	2,935	2.87%
49	42,657	38.15%	62,892	56.25%	3,333	2.98%	2,919	2.61%	42,590	38.49%	63,580	57.46%	4,477	4.05%	68,148	61.36%	39,430	35.50%	3,485	3.14%
50	62,972	64.60%	30,185	30.97%	2,908	2.98%	1,412	1.45%	59,345	61.97%	32,160	33.59%	4,252	4.44%	37,461	38.95%	55,660	57.87%	3,059	3.18%
Totals:	**2,359,749**	**49.90%**	**2,180,316**	**46.10%**	**129,929**	**2.75%**	**59,397**	**1.26%**	**2,392,439**	**51.13%**	**2,119,696**	**45.30%**	**167,190**	**3.57%**	**2,300,381**	**48.95%**	**2,296,039**	**48.86%**	**102,729**	**2.19%**

District plan definition file: 'STC-2.asc', modified 08/28/2017 07:33:17 PM

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections. Votes that could not be associated with a specific precinct were excluded. Reported statewide totals may therefore be marginally lower than official contest results.

2017 Senate Floor Redistricting Plan – 4th Ed: 2016 General Election - LG, AG, AD, CA, and CI

	Lieutenant Governor: Forest-Coleman-Cole						Attorney General: Stein-Newton				Auditor: Wood-Stuber				Comm. of Agriculture: Troxler-Smith				Comm. of Insurance: Causey-Goodwin			
District	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**
1	48,887	53.74%	39,694	43.63%	2,389	2.63%	41,583	46.48%	47,878	53.52%	42,731	48.40%	45,548	51.60%	49,313	55.29%	39,872	44.71%	45,498	51.35%	43,099	48.65%
2	57,464	64.37%	29,461	33.00%	2,347	2.63%	31,586	35.67%	56,959	64.33%	33,826	38.88%	53,171	61.12%	58,287	66.47%	29,406	33.53%	55,299	63.57%	31,694	36.43%
3	36,795	44.57%	44,483	53.88%	1,277	1.55%	46,645	56.99%	35,203	43.01%	47,807	59.25%	32,883	40.75%	38,431	46.95%	43,430	53.05%	33,845	41.85%	47,028	58.15%
4	34,410	39.91%	50,529	58.61%	1,273	1.48%	52,643	61.20%	33,369	38.80%	54,684	64.47%	30,133	35.53%	35,792	41.82%	49,804	58.18%	31,395	36.92%	53,630	63.08%
5	40,621	47.11%	43,512	50.47%	2,085	2.42%	46,133	53.94%	39,399	46.06%	47,464	56.21%	36,975	43.79%	41,908	49.34%	43,021	50.66%	38,859	46.08%	45,477	53.92%
6	38,286	63.97%	19,181	32.05%	2,380	3.98%	21,095	35.69%	38,018	64.31%	21,765	37.57%	36,165	62.43%	38,081	65.20%	20,329	34.80%	37,415	64.44%	20,648	35.56%
7	40,568	54.08%	33,075	44.09%	1,368	1.82%	35,414	47.66%	38,891	52.34%	36,652	49.80%	36,943	50.20%	41,358	55.66%	32,950	44.34%	37,586	51.20%	35,830	48.80%
8	67,778	61.04%	40,423	36.40%	2,836	2.55%	46,574	42.31%	63,502	57.69%	44,299	40.82%	64,233	59.18%	68,295	62.82%	40,422	37.18%	66,220	61.08%	42,201	38.92%
9	55,658	52.85%	45,433	43.14%	4,230	4.02%	52,224	50.00%	52,214	50.00%	49,105	48.02%	53,148	51.98%	57,516	56.21%	44,807	43.79%	55,248	54.12%	46,840	45.88%
10	42,788	60.42%	26,733	37.75%	1,292	1.82%	29,456	42.04%	40,606	57.96%	31,127	45.12%	37,861	54.88%	43,975	62.67%	26,198	37.33%	39,618	57.11%	29,755	42.89%
11	58,079	57.42%	40,863	40.40%	2,206	2.18%	44,650	44.36%	55,998	55.64%	46,814	47.16%	52,459	52.84%	62,115	61.90%	38,227	38.10%	54,122	54.59%	45,021	45.41%
12	44,688	59.95%	27,889	37.41%	1,970	2.64%	31,338	42.46%	42,472	57.54%	32,770	44.95%	40,126	55.05%	47,303	64.13%	26,460	35.87%	41,610	57.08%	31,291	42.92%
13	31,027	50.72%	28,932	47.29%	1,215	1.99%	31,776	52.53%	28,714	47.47%	32,230	54.14%	27,298	45.86%	29,363	48.68%	30,951	51.32%	28,700	47.92%	31,191	52.08%
14	29,615	30.90%	63,499	66.25%	2,733	2.85%	67,070	70.69%	27,808	29.31%	65,487	69.87%	28,245	30.13%	34,957	37.05%	59,401	62.95%	27,525	29.47%	65,878	70.53%
15	31,054	30.36%	67,628	66.12%	3,603	3.52%	72,967	71.91%	28,509	28.09%	69,132	69.22%	30,738	30.78%	39,795	39.56%	60,790	60.44%	28,648	28.83%	70,734	71.17%
16	46,657	40.05%	65,661	56.36%	4,187	3.59%	72,088	62.40%	43,435	37.60%	66,947	58.88%	46,761	41.12%	56,122	49.18%	57,990	50.82%	44,238	39.20%	68,626	60.80%
17	61,118	53.95%	48,551	42.86%	3,610	3.19%	54,056	48.17%	58,173	51.83%	51,831	46.91%	58,663	53.09%	69,027	62.01%	42,286	37.99%	57,790	52.62%	52,029	47.38%
18	65,737	55.37%	50,017	42.13%	2,978	2.51%	56,598	48.17%	60,903	51.83%	55,256	47.68%	60,631	52.32%	73,109	62.58%	43,714	37.42%	60,022	52.07%	55,242	47.93%
19	36,907	52.31%	31,248	44.29%	2,396	3.40%	34,037	48.49%	36,152	51.51%	34,514	49.64%	35,010	50.36%	38,594	55.34%	31,146	44.66%	35,406	51.08%	33,908	48.92%
20	19,185	18.22%	83,359	79.15%	2,779	2.64%	86,851	82.88%	17,944	17.12%	83,108	80.42%	20,238	19.58%	23,470	22.63%	80,245	77.37%	18,382	17.83%	84,732	82.17%
21	21,160	29.80%	47,450	66.83%	2,392	3.37%	49,389	70.04%	21,127	29.96%	49,748	71.09%	20,226	28.91%	22,541	32.12%	47,628	67.88%	20,662	29.57%	49,215	70.43%
22	38,606	41.51%	52,229	56.16%	2,172	2.34%	56,476	61.26%	35,710	38.74%	55,984	61.69%	34,773	38.31%	42,014	45.71%	49,910	54.29%	34,962	38.53%	55,782	61.47%
23	39,577	33.12%	76,646	64.14%	3,271	2.74%	81,625	68.71%	37,164	31.29%	77,133	66.07%	39,617	33.93%	45,870	38.99%	71,778	61.01%	37,866	32.52%	78,583	67.48%
24	53,605	57.24%	37,361	39.90%	2,682	2.86%	41,879	45.02%	51,134	54.98%	41,057	44.72%	50,762	55.28%	58,978	63.27%	34,244	36.73%	51,748	56.29%	40,179	43.71%
25	50,305	56.16%	37,163	41.49%	2,105	2.35%	40,658	45.81%	48,086	54.19%	41,020	47.20%	45,886	52.80%	52,735	59.94%	35,249	40.06%	43,307	49.14%	44,821	50.86%
26	53,344	64.97%	26,615	32.42%	2,143	2.61%	29,789	36.51%	51,795	63.49%	29,587	36.98%	50,417	63.02%	55,980	68.79%	25,399	31.21%	51,906	64.46%	28,624	35.54%
27	63,938	55.63%	47,827	41.61%	3,173	2.76%	53,395	46.69%	60,970	53.31%	50,394	44.80%	62,092	55.20%	73,095	64.23%	40,715	35.77%	62,520	55.75%	49,631	44.25%
28	18,391	19.91%	71,106	76.98%	2,870	3.11%	73,859	80.42%	17,984	19.58%	73,010	80.02%	18,224	19.98%	23,157	25.26%	68,504	74.74%	18,444	20.28%	72,496	79.72%
29	60,028	71.22%	22,140	26.27%	2,123	2.52%	25,906	30.85%	58,069	69.15%	26,136	31.55%	56,714	68.45%	63,680	75.91%	20,210	24.09%	57,664	69.55%	25,247	30.45%
30	58,294	65.99%	27,915	31.60%	2,133	2.41%	31,805	36.19%	56,074	63.81%	31,967	37.08%	54,250	62.92%	62,696	71.11%	25,474	28.89%	55,414	64.01%	31,154	35.99%
31	70,063	64.57%	35,450	32.67%	3,001	2.77%	41,687	38.62%	66,260	61.38%	39,332	37.05%	66,829	62.95%	74,575	69.65%	32,495	30.35%	67,716	63.99%	38,103	36.01%
32	25,455	29.35%	58,737	67.72%	2,546	2.94%	62,056	71.84%	24,322	28.16%	60,804	71.24%	24,552	28.76%	28,245	33.03%	57,256	66.97%	24,785	29.16%	60,209	70.84%
33	63,686	69.23%	25,779	28.02%	2,523	2.74%	31,643	34.65%	59,668	65.35%	30,614	34.18%	58,955	65.82%	65,176	71.93%	25,438	28.07%	60,237	66.93%	29,764	33.07%
34	68,327	70.14%	26,276	26.97%	2,819	2.89%	31,963	33.10%	64,604	66.90%	30,583	32.38%	63,855	67.62%	67,687	70.91%	27,766	29.09%	64,516	68.22%	30,053	31.78%
35	64,009	66.65%	29,246	30.45%	2,778	2.89%	34,286	36.04%	60,858	63.96%	32,540	34.70%	61,237	65.30%	63,938	68.28%	29,697	31.72%	60,853	65.16%	32,540	34.84%
36	60,075	61.47%	34,586	35.39%	3,075	3.15%	39,935	41.23%	56,928	58.77%	38,709	40.79%	56,194	59.21%	61,642	64.47%	33,965	35.53%	56,844	59.81%	38,197	40.19%
37	20,798	24.91%	59,245	70.95%	3,458	4.14%	63,054	75.94%	19,972	24.06%	60,840	74.06%	21,311	25.94%	23,753	29.08%	57,941	70.92%	20,913	25.73%	60,358	74.27%
38	18,972	22.41%	63,018	74.44%	2,671	3.15%	66,011	78.42%	18,160	21.58%	65,260	77.98%	18,424	22.02%	19,918	23.87%	63,533	76.13%	18,395	22.09%	64,884	77.91%
39	61,873	58.01%	41,777	39.17%	3,014	2.83%	48,508	45.88%	57,227	54.12%	44,207	42.51%	59,793	57.49%	65,553	63.61%	37,508	36.39%	58,994	57.41%	43,765	42.59%
40	20,511	27.27%	52,044	69.20%	2,649	3.52%	55,415	74.24%	19,225	25.76%	54,271	73.23%	19,835	26.77%	21,668	29.30%	52,273	70.70%	19,603	26.56%	54,215	73.44%
41	51,912	50.76%	46,633	45.60%	3,727	3.64%	52,559	51.84%	48,820	48.16%	49,544	49.58%	50,388	50.42%	53,237	53.78%	45,753	46.22%	50,428	51.11%	48,238	48.89%
42	62,124	70.39%	23,616	26.76%	2,521	2.86%	29,767	33.94%	57,931	66.06%	28,367	32.90%	57,846	67.10%	62,303	72.01%	24,217	27.99%	58,327	67.77%	27,735	32.23%
43	59,203	66.00%	28,144	31.38%	2,351	2.62%	33,269	37.48%	55,502	62.52%	32,135	36.95%	54,828	63.05%	57,559	66.03%	29,613	33.97%	55,198	63.46%	31,785	36.54%
44	60,310	69.07%	24,946	28.57%	2,066	2.37%	30,418	35.20%	56,007	64.80%	29,455	34.82%	55,143	65.18%	58,856	69.09%	26,333	30.91%	55,765	65.71%	29,101	34.29%
45	61,715	65.78%	29,124	31.04%	2,988	3.18%	34,295	36.91%	58,628	63.09%	33,477	37.00%	56,996	63.00%	63,178	68.68%	28,815	31.32%	57,781	63.75%	32,857	36.25%
46	58,375	71.73%	21,046	25.86%	1,958	2.41%	26,887	33.35%	53,722	66.65%	25,842	32.63%	53,350	67.37%	57,084	71.56%	22,685	28.44%	53,812	67.83%	25,517	32.17%
47	58,679	67.02%	26,179	29.90%	2,697	3.08%	29,406	33.95%	57,204	66.05%	29,536	34.65%	55,704	65.35%	59,396	69.01%	26,673	30.99%	55,899	65.67%	29,226	34.33%
48	59,503	59.12%	37,910	37.67%	3,237	3.22%	41,434	41.50%	58,406	58.50%	40,608	41.14%	58,088	58.86%	63,293	63.99%	35,621	36.01%	58,470	59.68%	39,510	40.32%
49	41,430	38.08%	62,703	57.63%	4,673	4.29%	67,209	62.26%	40,747	37.74%	65,189	61.36%	41,048	38.64%	45,982	43.09%	60,735	56.91%	41,060	38.83%	64,679	61.17%
50	59,029	62.59%	31,893	33.82%	3,390	3.59%	35,488	38.03%	57,825	61.97%	35,766	38.92%	56,130	61.08%	60,877	65.85%	31,575	34.15%	56,627	61.82%	34,973	38.18%
Totals:	**2,390,619**	**51.88%**	**2,084,975**	**45.25%**	**132,360**	**2.87%**	**2,294,855**	**50.20%**	**2,276,276**	**49.80%**	**2,250,664**	**50.00%**	**2,250,696**	**50.00%**	**2,521,477**	**55.64%**	**2,010,452**	**44.36%**	**2,268,142**	**50.47%**	**2,226,295**	**49.53%**

2017 Senate Floor Redistricting Plan – 4th Ed: 2016 General Election - CL, SS, SPI, TR, and SC

	Commissioner of Labor: Berry-Meeker-Write-in						Secretary of State: Marshall-LaPaglia				Sup. of Public Instruc.: Johnson-Atkinson				Treasurer: Folwell-Blue				Supreme Court Justice: Morgan-Edmunds			
District	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Wi	Wi %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Morgan	Morgan %	Edmunds	Edmunds %
1	49,833	56.21%	38,740	43.70%	85	0.10%	44,360	49.92%	44,499	50.08%	46,648	52.55%	42,123	47.45%	48,334	54.83%	39,821	45.17%	42,750	56.50%	32,918	43.50%
2	58,965	67.47%	28,332	32.42%	99	0.11%	34,005	38.82%	53,588	61.18%	54,798	62.86%	32,378	37.14%	56,998	65.61%	29,870	34.39%	39,494	51.58%	37,077	48.42%
3	36,590	45.10%	44,450	54.78%	96	0.12%	49,743	61.25%	31,464	38.75%	33,441	41.23%	47,673	58.77%	35,492	43.93%	45,299	56.07%	41,168	57.00%	31,060	43.00%
4	34,368	40.31%	50,804	59.59%	90	0.11%	56,091	65.84%	29,096	34.16%	30,920	36.27%	54,339	63.73%	33,283	39.19%	51,647	60.81%	46,607	60.88%	29,946	39.12%
5	42,379	49.97%	42,291	49.87%	138	0.16%	48,450	57.16%	36,306	42.84%	38,573	45.58%	46,055	54.42%	39,955	47.43%	44,277	52.57%	39,835	53.63%	34,436	46.37%
6	39,006	67.02%	19,110	32.84%	83	0.14%	22,360	38.32%	35,990	61.68%	37,066	63.84%	20,999	36.16%	38,123	65.94%	19,692	34.06%	29,306	58.47%	20,813	41.53%
7	40,625	55.01%	33,154	44.89%	72	0.10%	38,374	51.96%	35,473	48.04%	37,315	50.61%	36,414	49.39%	38,972	53.10%	34,425	46.90%	35,182	56.52%	27,064	43.48%
8	68,561	63.27%	39,711	36.65%	86	0.08%	46,743	42.96%	62,071	57.04%	64,743	59.92%	43,311	40.08%	66,982	62.14%	40,804	37.86%	51,381	53.44%	44,763	46.56%
9	60,097	58.51%	42,505	41.38%	114	0.11%	51,561	50.16%	51,242	49.84%	53,528	52.47%	48,480	47.53%	56,068	55.25%	45,413	44.75%	49,421	57.46%	36,593	42.54%
10	42,043	60.41%	27,466	39.46%	87	0.13%	33,524	48.13%	36,128	51.87%	38,893	55.87%	30,722	44.13%	40,854	59.09%	28,285	40.91%	31,507	52.31%	28,729	47.69%
11	58,751	58.82%	41,041	41.09%	85	0.09%	48,561	48.69%	51,164	51.31%	53,582	53.77%	46,063	46.23%	57,057	57.50%	42,181	42.50%	44,656	49.39%	45,762	50.61%
12	45,272	61.67%	28,040	38.19%	102	0.14%	35,764	48.51%	37,956	51.49%	41,017	55.91%	32,342	44.09%	43,342	59.46%	29,545	40.54%	31,152	47.74%	34,104	52.26%
13	30,980	51.48%	29,101	48.36%	98	0.16%	34,010	56.78%	25,892	43.22%	28,894	48.19%	31,062	51.81%	28,268	47.32%	31,473	52.68%	30,582	58.01%	22,138	41.99%
14	31,836	33.68%	62,526	66.15%	156	0.17%	68,031	72.25%	26,133	27.75%	27,602	29.39%	66,302	70.61%	29,604	31.54%	64,243	68.46%	51,633	61.46%	32,372	38.54%
15	34,356	34.03%	66,446	65.82%	150	0.15%	73,513	73.16%	26,969	26.84%	28,524	28.53%	71,463	71.47%	31,967	31.99%	67,950	68.01%	55,912	62.38%	33,720	37.62%
16	51,485	44.95%	62,917	54.93%	131	0.11%	71,934	63.01%	42,233	36.99%	43,999	38.70%	69,690	61.30%	48,644	42.92%	64,683	57.08%	55,163	54.91%	45,306	45.09%
17	64,711	58.10%	46,525	41.77%	137	0.12%	55,385	49.87%	55,678	50.13%	57,360	51.81%	53,350	48.19%	62,131	56.39%	48,046	43.61%	46,229	47.45%	51,189	52.55%
18	66,183	56.68%	50,465	43.22%	125	0.11%	59,148	50.80%	57,285	49.20%	59,647	51.42%	56,351	48.58%	64,581	55.80%	51,154	44.20%	49,781	48.25%	53,391	51.75%
19	39,075	56.01%	30,610	43.88%	77	0.11%	35,836	51.42%	33,863	48.58%	35,190	50.58%	34,379	49.42%	36,993	53.40%	32,280	46.60%	32,825	53.48%	28,549	46.52%
20	23,207	22.33%	80,607	77.55%	125	0.12%	86,851	83.51%	17,153	16.49%	18,391	17.74%	85,281	82.26%	20,197	19.51%	83,333	80.49%	70,558	74.95%	23,584	25.05%
21	23,296	33.23%	46,701	66.62%	100	0.14%	50,465	71.84%	19,778	28.16%	20,687	29.53%	49,369	70.47%	21,555	30.86%	48,300	69.14%	36,233	58.37%	25,842	41.63%
22	39,772	43.45%	51,674	56.45%	96	0.10%	58,937	64.50%	32,438	35.50%	34,326	37.58%	57,020	62.42%	37,204	40.93%	53,701	59.07%	49,862	60.85%	32,080	39.15%
23	43,317	36.85%	74,101	63.04%	130	0.11%	82,126	69.83%	35,476	30.17%	37,101	31.64%	80,160	68.36%	40,339	34.53%	76,484	65.47%	68,524	65.43%	36,212	34.57%
24	58,172	62.77%	34,405	37.12%	97	0.10%	43,472	47.23%	48,565	52.77%	52,108	56.66%	39,860	43.34%	52,810	57.70%	38,712	42.30%	42,520	53.33%	37,212	46.67%
25	51,324	58.43%	36,426	41.47%	91	0.10%	42,898	48.94%	44,763	51.06%	47,036	53.77%	40,444	46.23%	47,926	55.03%	39,160	44.97%	39,325	51.51%	37,021	48.49%
26	56,292	69.35%	24,827	30.59%	50	0.06%	31,221	38.75%	49,354	61.25%	52,340	65.04%	28,136	34.96%	52,866	65.84%	27,431	34.16%	34,461	48.37%	36,781	51.63%
27	71,989	63.43%	41,416	36.49%	84	0.07%	53,534	47.49%	59,185	52.51%	62,834	55.99%	49,392	44.01%	64,990	58.14%	46,789	41.86%	45,107	47.84%	49,184	52.16%
28	24,079	26.36%	67,178	73.53%	104	0.11%	74,314	81.37%	17,013	18.63%	18,773	20.65%	72,145	79.35%	19,449	21.44%	71,248	78.56%	50,878	64.59%	27,896	35.41%
29	63,451	75.92%	20,068	24.01%	52	0.06%	28,103	33.88%	54,848	66.12%	58,580	70.77%	24,190	29.23%	59,418	71.89%	23,234	28.11%	37,453	50.62%	36,541	49.38%
30	61,298	70.15%	25,981	29.73%	98	0.11%	34,688	40.00%	52,038	60.00%	57,005	65.60%	29,892	34.40%	57,462	66.52%	28,925	33.48%	40,158	51.65%	37,587	48.35%
31	76,771	71.68%	30,223	28.22%	101	0.09%	42,187	39.65%	64,212	60.35%	68,553	64.59%	37,580	35.41%	72,117	67.77%	34,298	32.23%	47,919	51.01%	46,020	48.99%
32	30,998	36.21%	54,494	63.65%	120	0.14%	62,227	72.77%	23,280	27.23%	25,620	30.11%	59,482	69.89%	27,390	32.12%	57,895	67.88%	44,937	61.24%	28,440	38.76%
33	65,156	71.89%	25,396	28.02%	82	0.09%	33,004	36.64%	57,083	63.36%	61,021	67.85%	28,916	32.15%	61,207	68.17%	28,581	31.83%	39,849	49.28%	41,008	50.72%
34	69,225	72.60%	26,022	27.29%	110	0.12%	32,703	34.42%	62,312	65.58%	65,726	69.18%	29,288	30.82%	66,804	70.55%	27,886	29.45%	39,152	47.17%	43,855	52.83%
35	64,733	68.94%	29,067	30.96%	93	0.10%	34,001	36.20%	59,928	63.80%	61,960	66.22%	31,610	33.78%	62,850	67.40%	30,393	32.60%	36,091	44.71%	44,632	55.29%
36	62,233	64.86%	33,621	35.04%	97	0.10%	40,241	42.12%	55,304	57.88%	58,097	61.04%	37,084	38.96%	58,799	61.83%	36,305	38.17%	41,451	49.18%	42,826	50.82%
37	25,344	30.83%	56,751	69.03%	123	0.15%	62,319	75.91%	19,772	24.09%	21,246	26.08%	60,220	73.92%	23,267	28.57%	58,166	71.43%	40,958	60.74%	26,478	39.26%
38	21,875	26.16%	61,631	73.71%	112	0.13%	65,995	78.91%	17,633	21.09%	19,067	22.89%	64,230	77.11%	19,379	23.29%	63,820	76.71%	45,292	63.46%	26,083	36.54%
39	64,652	62.16%	39,247	37.73%	117	0.11%	46,956	45.21%	56,914	54.79%	59,515	57.76%	43,527	42.24%	63,934	62.04%	39,115	37.96%	38,732	45.52%	46,359	54.48%
40	22,829	30.80%	51,174	69.05%	108	0.15%	55,377	74.64%	18,817	25.36%	20,251	27.44%	53,545	72.56%	21,094	28.62%	52,617	71.38%	37,778	59.92%	25,268	40.08%
41	54,723	54.93%	44,781	44.95%	119	0.12%	50,701	50.90%	48,905	49.10%	50,549	51.08%	48,402	48.92%	52,757	53.45%	45,953	46.55%	43,297	53.40%	37,790	46.60%
42	63,679	73.26%	23,146	26.63%	96	0.11%	30,279	35.05%	56,111	64.95%	59,593	69.11%	26,631	30.89%	60,141	70.02%	25,755	29.98%	36,562	48.25%	39,215	51.75%
43	59,262	67.55%	28,370	32.34%	94	0.11%	33,827	38.70%	53,572	61.30%	55,933	64.27%	31,101	35.73%	56,451	64.92%	30,498	35.08%	38,821	50.66%	37,815	49.34%
44	60,338	70.48%	25,175	29.41%	95	0.11%	31,832	37.32%	53,455	62.68%	56,920	67.01%	28,017	32.99%	57,416	67.75%	27,331	32.25%	38,218	49.47%	39,032	50.53%
45	63,768	69.56%	27,818	30.35%	83	0.09%	36,548	40.08%	54,637	59.92%	59,049	64.74%	32,166	35.26%	60,065	66.27%	30,575	33.73%	41,402	51.29%	39,325	48.71%
46	58,660	73.39%	21,199	26.52%	69	0.09%	27,730	34.89%	51,750	65.11%	55,315	69.54%	24,233	30.46%	55,735	70.40%	23,433	29.60%	33,479	46.53%	38,472	53.47%
47	59,160	69.13%	26,341	30.78%	82	0.10%	31,388	36.78%	53,948	63.22%	56,858	66.60%	28,516	33.40%	57,520	67.87%	27,229	32.13%	39,013	52.37%	35,482	47.63%
48	61,995	62.93%	36,437	36.99%	76	0.08%	42,536	43.09%	56,177	56.91%	58,293	59.26%	40,075	40.74%	60,225	61.59%	37,560	38.41%	44,413	51.54%	41,765	48.46%
49	45,777	42.99%	60,566	56.88%	138	0.13%	67,679	63.41%	39,055	36.59%	41,130	38.84%	64,775	61.16%	42,785	40.53%	62,781	59.47%	59,103	63.11%	34,549	36.89%
50	60,051	65.32%	31,788	34.58%	97	0.11%	37,898	41.19%	54,112	58.81%	57,424	62.41%	34,587	37.59%	58,401	64.11%	32,687	35.89%	45,892	56.42%	35,451	43.58%
Totals:	**2,502,542**	**55.26%**	**2,020,865**	**44.63%**	**5,050**	**0.11%**	**2,359,430**	**52.20%**	**2,160,618**	**47.80%**	**2,283,041**	**50.66%**	**2,223,370**	**49.34%**	**2,370,201**	**52.77%**	**2,121,283**	**47.23%**	**2,152,022**	**54.46%**	**1,799,735**	**45.54%**

District plan definition file: 'STC-2.asc', modified 08/28/2017 07:33:17 PM

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections. Votes that could not be associated with a specific precinct were excluded. Reported statewide totals may therefore be marginally lower than official contest results.

2017 Senate Floor Redistricting Plan – 4th Ed: 2016 General Election - Court of Appeals

	Dietz Seat: Dietz-Rozier				Geer Seat: Murphy-Eagles-Buie						Hunter Seat: Hunter-Jones				Stephens Seat: Berger-Stephens				Zachary Seat: Zachary-Mitchell			
District	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Una	Una %	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %
1	47,545	55.28%	38,458	44.72%	44,277	51.18%	38,026	43.95%	4,217	4.87%	48,801	56.38%	37,756	43.62%	45,320	52.21%	41,488	47.79%	47,750	55.64%	38,074	44.36%
2	56,245	66.47%	28,368	33.53%	52,927	61.96%	28,109	32.90%	4,390	5.14%	57,225	67.15%	27,993	32.85%	54,191	63.41%	31,272	36.59%	56,290	66.88%	27,873	33.12%
3	35,378	44.95%	43,330	55.05%	33,400	42.12%	43,161	54.43%	2,732	3.45%	36,781	46.35%	42,577	53.65%	33,970	42.80%	45,403	57.20%	35,360	45.02%	43,186	54.98%
4	33,118	40.04%	49,586	59.96%	30,889	37.27%	49,481	59.70%	2,508	3.03%	34,263	41.12%	49,059	58.88%	31,732	37.95%	51,873	62.05%	33,216	40.24%	49,327	59.76%
5	39,883	48.30%	42,684	51.70%	37,680	45.22%	41,494	49.80%	4,150	4.98%	40,768	49.12%	42,235	50.88%	37,828	45.75%	44,863	54.25%	40,048	48.69%	42,195	51.31%
6	37,104	65.92%	19,185	34.08%	34,123	59.86%	18,419	32.31%	4,462	7.83%	37,694	66.46%	19,022	33.54%	36,341	63.33%	21,041	36.67%	37,404	66.71%	18,664	33.29%
7	38,320	53.74%	32,989	46.26%	36,627	50.92%	32,356	44.99%	2,942	4.09%	39,588	55.12%	32,231	44.88%	37,199	52.21%	34,048	47.79%	38,754	54.72%	32,072	45.28%
8	65,025	61.36%	40,952	38.64%	61,508	57.82%	39,043	36.70%	5,820	5.47%	67,049	63.29%	38,889	36.71%	63,249	59.46%	43,123	40.54%	66,505	63.18%	38,755	36.82%
9	54,519	55.33%	44,011	44.67%	49,333	49.74%	41,920	42.26%	7,938	8.00%	55,401	56.25%	43,093	43.75%	51,312	51.55%	48,228	48.45%	55,395	56.65%	42,396	43.35%
10	39,350	58.96%	27,392	41.04%	38,394	56.84%	26,397	39.08%	2,760	4.09%	41,262	61.37%	25,976	38.63%	38,490	56.89%	29,168	43.11%	40,036	60.32%	26,332	39.68%
11	56,056	57.89%	40,775	42.11%	52,531	53.81%	40,354	41.33%	4,742	4.86%	57,594	59.17%	39,740	40.83%	53,749	54.93%	44,100	45.07%	57,143	59.18%	39,420	40.82%
12	42,397	60.25%	27,968	39.75%	38,929	54.89%	26,921	37.96%	5,069	7.15%	43,499	61.61%	27,109	38.39%	40,077	56.28%	31,138	43.72%	43,004	61.29%	27,156	38.71%
13	27,776	47.77%	30,368	52.23%	27,239	46.72%	27,772	47.63%	3,295	5.65%	29,784	50.99%	28,629	49.01%	27,797	47.49%	30,736	52.51%	27,878	48.25%	29,904	51.75%
14	29,072	31.72%	62,569	68.28%	26,130	28.28%	61,071	66.09%	5,204	5.63%	29,846	32.42%	62,211	67.58%	27,109	29.18%	65,788	70.82%	30,026	32.96%	61,073	67.04%
15	31,018	31.86%	66,347	68.14%	26,686	27.16%	65,335	66.51%	6,219	6.33%	32,257	32.99%	65,510	67.01%	28,079	28.43%	70,699	71.57%	32,103	33.18%	64,651	66.82%
16	47,483	42.93%	63,110	57.07%	41,587	37.24%	63,215	56.60%	6,877	6.16%	48,631	43.77%	62,484	56.23%	43,124	38.45%	69,029	61.55%	48,667	44.22%	61,397	55.78%
17	60,743	56.46%	46,844	43.54%	55,445	51.04%	47,231	43.48%	5,959	5.49%	62,008	57.41%	45,999	42.59%	57,061	52.21%	52,234	47.79%	62,256	58.13%	44,844	41.87%
18	64,004	56.70%	48,870	43.30%	58,397	51.18%	50,252	44.04%	5,457	4.78%	65,770	57.95%	47,727	42.05%	60,153	52.34%	54,783	47.66%	65,259	58.10%	47,070	41.90%
19	36,473	53.56%	31,622	46.44%	33,341	48.83%	30,353	44.46%	4,582	6.71%	37,470	54.98%	30,685	45.02%	34,804	50.78%	33,733	49.22%	37,187	54.71%	30,786	45.29%
20	20,070	19.64%	82,129	80.36%	16,821	16.38%	81,045	78.93%	4,820	4.69%	20,721	20.24%	81,657	79.76%	17,887	17.33%	85,300	82.67%	20,854	20.45%	81,142	79.55%
21	21,048	30.68%	47,550	69.32%	18,760	27.23%	45,816	66.50%	4,319	6.27%	21,748	31.64%	46,989	68.36%	19,968	28.86%	49,222	71.14%	21,653	31.64%	46,789	68.36%
22	37,719	42.23%	51,601	57.77%	34,018	37.80%	51,551	57.28%	4,429	4.92%	38,547	42.98%	51,139	57.02%	35,435	39.00%	55,426	61.00%	37,957	42.65%	51,038	57.35%
23	39,639	34.68%	74,651	65.32%	35,012	30.36%	74,037	64.20%	6,282	5.45%	40,907	35.62%	73,944	64.38%	36,810	31.76%	79,097	68.24%	40,552	35.52%	73,629	64.48%
24	52,880	58.90%	36,901	41.10%	48,684	54.00%	36,775	40.79%	4,694	5.21%	53,904	59.85%	36,161	40.15%	51,010	56.13%	39,876	43.87%	53,062	59.20%	36,573	40.80%
25	48,785	57.77%	35,668	42.23%	44,917	52.55%	35,804	41.89%	4,747	5.55%	49,882	58.64%	35,178	41.36%	46,640	54.30%	39,252	45.70%	48,797	58.03%	35,287	41.97%
26	52,602	66.76%	26,190	33.24%	49,380	62.20%	25,476	32.09%	4,535	5.71%	53,601	67.58%	25,710	32.42%	51,691	64.62%	28,303	35.38%	52,681	67.04%	25,896	32.96%
27	64,860	59.56%	44,033	40.44%	57,753	52.66%	46,674	42.56%	5,247	4.78%	66,380	60.62%	43,123	39.38%	60,471	54.43%	50,620	45.57%	64,681	59.54%	43,959	40.46%
28	19,090	21.46%	69,863	78.54%	16,523	18.47%	68,361	76.42%	4,575	5.11%	20,342	22.78%	68,959	77.22%	17,830	19.84%	72,052	80.16%	19,384	21.81%	69,508	78.19%
29	59,627	73.48%	21,520	26.52%	55,203	67.66%	21,536	26.40%	4,846	5.94%	60,461	74.26%	20,956	25.74%	58,447	71.21%	23,625	28.79%	59,343	73.36%	21,555	26.64%
30	57,591	67.65%	27,546	32.35%	53,526	62.51%	27,017	31.55%	5,086	5.94%	58,645	68.53%	26,930	31.47%	56,134	64.52%	30,875	35.48%	57,599	67.79%	27,373	32.21%
31	71,069	68.70%	32,385	31.30%	63,646	61.32%	33,718	32.49%	6,426	6.19%	71,055	68.60%	32,524	31.40%	66,609	63.78%	37,834	36.22%	70,929	68.86%	32,078	31.14%
32	26,751	32.15%	56,465	67.85%	22,669	27.08%	55,767	66.62%	5,270	6.30%	26,654	31.99%	56,672	68.01%	24,361	29.03%	59,542	70.97%	26,903	32.46%	55,969	67.54%
33	61,848	70.49%	25,891	29.51%	57,362	64.90%	25,638	29.01%	5,391	6.10%	62,742	71.21%	25,371	28.79%	59,630	67.62%	28,551	32.38%	61,866	70.47%	25,920	29.53%
34	66,216	71.79%	26,024	28.21%	61,163	65.68%	25,604	27.50%	6,352	6.82%	67,070	72.29%	25,705	27.71%	63,560	68.31%	29,482	31.69%	66,745	72.31%	25,556	27.69%
35	62,329	68.33%	28,882	31.67%	58,176	63.24%	28,664	31.16%	5,149	5.60%	62,926	68.75%	28,598	31.25%	60,443	65.60%	31,692	34.40%	62,225	68.42%	28,716	31.58%
36	59,440	63.28%	34,490	36.72%	54,267	57.45%	33,714	35.69%	6,485	6.86%	60,228	63.90%	34,025	36.10%	56,722	59.93%	37,919	40.07%	59,710	63.65%	34,099	36.35%
37	22,137	28.00%	56,937	72.00%	18,218	22.88%	56,280	70.68%	5,132	6.44%	22,952	28.92%	56,419	71.08%	19,272	24.23%	60,250	75.77%	21,488	27.15%	57,655	72.85%
38	19,046	23.42%	62,295	76.58%	16,707	20.44%	60,343	73.81%	4,705	5.75%	19,330	23.68%	62,287	76.32%	17,595	21.54%	64,073	78.46%	19,131	23.42%	62,554	76.58%
39	62,856	62.78%	37,272	37.22%	55,321	54.93%	40,211	39.93%	5,176	5.14%	64,519	64.26%	35,883	35.74%	56,674	56.24%	44,091	43.76%	60,829	61.07%	38,770	38.93%
40	20,826	28.91%	51,219	71.09%	18,020	24.87%	50,198	69.29%	4,230	5.84%	21,236	29.39%	51,026	70.61%	18,939	26.17%	53,425	73.83%	20,541	28.47%	51,615	71.53%
41	51,662	53.77%	44,416	46.23%	46,443	48.08%	44,549	46.12%	5,599	5.80%	52,208	54.18%	44,145	45.82%	47,703	49.53%	48,604	50.47%	51,408	53.50%	44,681	46.50%
42	60,735	72.03%	23,579	27.97%	55,908	65.80%	23,670	27.86%	5,394	6.35%	60,987	72.07%	23,636	27.93%	57,544	67.98%	27,106	32.02%	60,018	71.46%	23,968	28.54%
43	56,375	66.59%	28,287	33.41%	52,522	61.46%	28,033	32.80%	4,902	5.74%	56,934	66.94%	28,119	33.06%	54,084	63.24%	31,442	36.76%	55,893	66.35%	28,347	33.65%
44	58,018	69.73%	25,188	30.27%	53,995	64.30%	25,286	30.11%	4,698	5.59%	58,581	70.01%	25,091	29.99%	55,788	66.47%	28,147	33.53%	57,409	69.27%	25,465	30.73%
45	60,093	67.94%	28,354	32.06%	55,372	62.12%	27,135	30.44%	6,633	7.44%	60,790	69.10%	27,183	30.90%	57,923	64.59%	31,757	35.41%	59,947	67.83%	28,429	32.17%
46	56,585	72.55%	21,406	27.45%	52,489	66.95%	21,155	26.99%	4,751	6.06%	56,899	72.76%	21,306	27.24%	53,425	68.14%	24,977	31.86%	55,582	71.56%	22,090	28.44%
47	57,694	69.09%	25,809	30.91%	54,008	64.32%	24,824	29.56%	5,136	6.12%	59,068	70.16%	25,122	29.84%	55,201	66.00%	28,432	34.00%	56,520	68.05%	26,539	31.95%
48	59,942	62.32%	36,237	37.68%	55,555	57.40%	35,868	37.06%	5,360	5.54%	60,740	62.98%	35,699	37.02%	56,502	58.51%	40,067	41.49%	59,741	62.24%	36,249	37.76%
49	43,084	41.42%	60,931	58.58%	38,666	36.95%	58,964	56.34%	7,022	6.71%	45,396	43.50%	58,972	56.50%	39,799	38.10%	64,659	61.90%	42,956	41.46%	60,645	58.54%
50	58,674	65.46%	30,953	34.54%	56,141	61.96%	28,963	31.96%	5,511	6.08%	59,025	65.64%	30,897	34.36%	55,367	61.44%	34,742	38.56%	57,780	64.69%	31,539	35.31%
Totals:	**2,350,800**	**53.54%**	**2,040,100**	**46.46%**	**2,156,688**	**48.77%**	**2,013,586**	**45.53%**	**252,225**	**5.70%**	**2,400,169**	**54.44%**	**2,008,351**	**45.56%**	**2,231,049**	**50.31%**	**2,203,187**	**49.69%**	**2,358,465**	**53.88%**	**2,018,808**	**46.12%**

EX. 7

NORTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY

HOUSE REDISTRICTING COMMITTEE AND
SENATE REDISTRICTING COMMITEE

TRANSCRIPT OF THE PROCEEDINGS

In Raleigh, North Carolina
Wednesday, July 26, 2017
Reported by Carol M. Smith

Worley Reporting
P.O. Box 99169
Raleigh, NC 27624
919-870-8070

SEN. HISE: The committee will come to order. Thank you, members of the Committee, members of the public. I welcome you to our first meeting of the year, joint meeting of the Redistricting Committee. We're going to begin in just a minute. We'll be hearing from Representative Lewis first, and then potentially from staff.

I will announce before we begin the House Sergeant-at-Arms, identify those. Reggie Sills up here at the front, Marvin Lee at the front as well, David Leighton in the back, Mark Cone. From the Senate side, Terry Barnhardt behind us, Tom Burroughs, Steve McKaig and Becky McCreary -- Myrick, sorry. Thank you all for being with us today, and the service you provide.

Without further ado, we're going to let Representative Lewis do a brief presentation to the Committee. I will also ask when we open for questions and others, to let members know, we do have a court reporter here today who will be doing a verbatim transcript of the concept, so we are asking that any time you're recognized by the Chair to speak, that you would identify your name so that we make sure we have that as part of the court

record. I think that will be -- get everything we need.

Thank you. I will address -- a member has brought it to my attention there are individuals that have signs that are in here. That is allowed; however, you may not use those signs to obstruct the view of others, which would include holding them up at others, and I will maintain decorum within this meeting, and ask all members to do so, and I will make sure that this meeting -- this Committee can conduct its business as Chair, so without any further ado on that, Representative Lewis?

REP. LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and good afternoon. My name is David Lewis. I am the Chair of the House Select Committee on Redistricting. It's my pleasure to welcome you to this joint meeting of the House and Senate Redistricting Committees. I sincerely thank you for being here today.

As you are aware, the General Assembly will be redrawing legislative districts this year to comply with a Court order. As we await further guidance from the Court on how to proceed and how this process should be conducted, we wanted to

convene today's meeting for organizational and informational purposes.

If the Court allows us ample time to do so, we intend to include as much public input as possible, and as much input from the Committees, and ultimately, the full General Assembly will deliberate together regarding these new districts.

Tomorrow, the three-judge panel with jurisdiction over our case will meet to consider the timeline for the redistricting process. Our attorneys will advocate on behalf of the General Assembly for a timeline that would allow for a redistricting session to occur in early November.

Between now and then, Senator Hise and I envision a process that would include these Committees meeting to discuss and adopt criteria for drawing new maps, and ultimately to make recommendations to the General Assembly regarding new districts in the House and Senate redistricting plans.

We would anticipate that public hearings would be conducted throughout this process. Committee members can expect at least three sets of these public hearings to occur in August, September, and October, with the exact date and

location to be determined by these Committees.

For informational purposes, you have three sets of documents in front of you. The first is the county groupings for both House and Senate plans that were filed on behalf of the defense in the Covington case. This case is available on the NCGA redistricting website.

These may or may not turn out to be the final county groupings. There will be a time for your comments as well as comments from the public on county grouping plans that will be required to be used in the redistricting process in order to comply with the Stephenson decision.

The second set of documents are redistricting plans that were prepared by Common Cause. In full disclosure, that organization is currently involved as Plaintiffs in litigation that has been filed against the General Assembly. To our knowledge, these are the only redistricting plans that have been released and submitted to the public in this process thus far.

These maps are provided for informational purposes only today. One thing that you will notice is the county groupings used to prepare the Common Cause maps are the same as those that were

filed in the legal case.

For those of you who may be new to looking at these maps, the dark blue lines illustrate the county groupings. Again, you do have one for both the House and the Senate.

The population numbers that we will be required to use are from the 2010 Census. These are the numbers that will be used to construct new district highlights during this process. For your information, an ideal Senate district is made up of 190,710 people, and an ideal House district is made up of 79,462 people.

I want to let you know that two e-mails have been set up for receiving public comments. They are 2017houseredistricting@ncleg.net, and 2017senateredistricting@ncleg.net. Additionally, a web page has been set up for public comment. A link to that page can be found on the website at ncleg.net. It will go live today when this joint committee adjourns. A folder will be made so that each member of the General Assembly will be enabled to review the public comment that is collected via our website.

Mr. Chairman, with your permission, I'd like to ask you to recognize Erika Churchill of the

central staff to explain to members the resources that are available to them through the General Assembly to help during the redistricting process.

MS. CHURCHILL (STAFF): Thank you, Mr. Chair. For members of the General Assembly, there are multiple avenues of resources available to you. There is a terminal that you can use to draw maps if you choose to do so. You will just simply need to schedule an appointment in a block -- blocks of up to two hours. You would -- if you decide you want to do that, please contact Peter Capriglione to set up a time, and the location of that particular terminal is in Room 213 of the Legislative Office Building.

You can also ask for any drafting or information request of the central staff, and we will assist you with that. Contact myself or Karen Cochrane-Brown, and we'll get that assigned and work with you.

Please remember that for members of the General Assembly, upon enactment of a House, Senate, or North Carolina Congressional map, all drafting information requests to any legislative employee, including the partisan and nonpartisan staff, do automatically become public record. Each

member of the General Assembly is the custodian of their own public records, so if you choose to draw a map using the member terminal, you will be responsible for maintaining a copy of that.

For the central staff and for the rest of the legislative employees, we will also maintain copies of everything that is done, and if a public records request is issued, we will respond accordingly.

SEN. HISE: Representative Lewis?

REP. LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr. Chairman, again, I'd like to thank everyone for their time in being here today and your willingness to serve on these committees. We will be back in touch with you soon to offer additional information and to let you know the schedule for additional meetings. With that, Mr. Chairman, if there are inquiries, I'd be happy to try and take them.

SEN. HISE: I will now open -- members of the Committee who would like to -- please, if you are asking a question, please identify yourself for our court reporter. Representative Jackson?

REP. JACKSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Darren Jackson, Representative. Representative Chairman Lewis, you mentioned the Common Cause

maps, and in looking at the expert map that was submitted in federal court, it's a -- it's colored differently than it was when submitted to federal court, and so my question is basically this. Has there been a determination made whether every district in the state needs to be redrawn, or just those in clusters with affected districts?

REP. LEWIS: Thank you for that question, Representative Jackson. We are effectively waiting for guidance from the Court on that matter. It would be really premature for me to be able to answer that at this point.

SEN. HISE: Other questions from members of the Committee? Senator Clark?

SEN. CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman --

SEN. HISE: Please identify yourself for the court reporter.

SEN. CLARK: Senator Clark, Senate District 21. Mr. Chairman, would you have the staff provide the Committee members with a 2016 election stat pack for the Common Cause redistricting plan that we have before us here?

REP. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman?

SEN. HISE: Erika Churchill.

MS. CHURCHILL: Senator Clark, we can prepare that and have that distributed to the Committee members.

SEN. CLARK: Thank you. When can we expect to have that?

MS. CHURCHILL: We will shoot for this afternoon, but it may be tomorrow.

SEN. CLARK: Thank you.

SEN. HISE: Follow-up?

SEN. CLARK: Yes. Mr. Chairman, it was indicated that the members will be -- I mean, it wasn't indicated that we will be able to, so my question is, will the members be able to submit recommended criteria for use in developing the maps that we will be considering within this Committee?

REP. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to respond to that. The answer is yes, sir, that is our intent, is for this Committee to -- to discuss and debate and adopt criteria. We also hope to take public input on what that criteria should be, and it will be that criteria that will be used to produce the maps.

SEN. HISE: I've got a Representative pointing to someone over here. Next Representative?

SEN. CLARK: Follow-up?

SEN. HISE: Oh, Senator Clark. I'm sorry.

SEN. CLARK: Yes. At what point will we be allowed to submit criteria that we recommend for consideration by this Committee, and in what form?

REP. LEWIS: Thank you for that question, Senator Clark. The answer is, you can certainly submit it as early as right now. I would encourage you to either use one of the two e-mail addresses that I provided earlier just to keep up with it, or you're certainly welcome to e-mail either Chairman Hise or me, and we'll make sure that it is distributed to the members, and then when the criteria is actually discussed at the Committee, we will debate it then.

SEN. CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SEN. HISE: Representative Michaux?

REP. MICHAUX: Representative Michaux. A couple of questions, Representative Lewis, if you don't mind. You indicated that these maps we have here are the only ones that have been released for public consumption. Are there any other maps that have not yet been released? For instance, anything that has been drawn by Dr. Hofeller or anybody else

that you know of that have not yet been released?

REP. LEWIS: None that I know of, sir.

REP. MICHAUX: Another question, Mr. Chairman.

SEN. HISE: Follow-up?

REP. MICHAUX: Yes, sir. Mr. Chairman, we have known for some time now that the House and Senate districts that were drawn were unconstitutional, and here we are in August now sitting this Committee. Can you tell us why the special session called by the Governor to handle the matter was not -- was overruled and was not put into session so we could start this process prior to this time?

REP. LEWIS: Representative Michaux, as best I can recall -- I may need to consult the House Journal on that, but as best I can recall, the call from the Governor was issued while the General Assembly was already in session; therefore, there was no need for an extraordinary -- there was no extraordinary circumstance requiring us to be called back.

As you know as one of the most senior and distinguished members of this body, the redistricting process is an extremely disruptive

and time-consuming process. The order to redraw the maps that you refer to ordered us not to use the 2011 plans again. It is certainly our intent to fully comply with the court order ordering us to redraw in our next session. We are in our next session at this time.

Further, when the final ruling from the Supreme Court came out -- and I hope you will bear with me. I don't remember the exact date, but it was in early June, and we were in the final weeks of the budget negotiations, and we felt, "we" meaning the leadership, felt that it would make more sense to go ahead and finish the public business of passing a budget and the other bills, and then be able to turn our attention to this very important matter.

Again, it is contemplated that we can have these maps drawn by November. That would give the Court time to review the maps if it chose to, and then people would be able to file, as is the current law, starting in February of next year.

REP. MICHAUX: Follow-up, Mr. Chair?

SEN. HISE: Follow-up.

REP. MICHAUX: Mr. Lewis, I agree with you that it was in June that the Court made the

final determination that the districts were unconstitutional as drawn, and that basically we as a body now are operating with an unconstitutional makeup. Did you ever consider that in terms of trying to move forward with redistricting to put us back in a constitutional manner?

REP. LEWIS: Representative Michaux, you are a much more experienced legislator than I am, and you are an attorney, and more experienced in these matters than I am.

To the best of my knowledge, the courts have held that the legislative bodies that are constituted -- that are constituted, that are made up, are empowered to exercise all the authorities granted to them, so I believe that the members sitting in this room are consti -- are able to proceed with the business of drawing the maps, and it is our intent to do so to comply with the order of the Court.

SEN. HISE: Representative Farmer-Butterfield? Please introduce yourself.

REP. FARMER-BUTTERFIELD: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Representative Farmer-Butterfield. A couple of questions; one is a little bit of history.

In 2002, we redrew the lines for the districts in about two weeks, and that was ordered by the Courts, and it was probably more difficult then because we had to go through the Justice Department for clearance due to the Voting Rights Act, and with the technology we have now, I'm wondering why it would take so long to get this done.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you for that question, Representative Farmer-Butterfield. I think it's important to note that neither you nor I were seated in 2002, so any direct evidence of what went on there, we would have read in the press like anyone else; however, I think it is important to note that if you're going to get public input and allow for the true deliberation of an issue like this, that it just takes time to do it.

The amount of time that we have proposed, of course, is at the discretion of the Court. The Court may very well change that, but it is -- it is contemplated that we will need time to get input from the public on what the criteria should be, and then once that criteria is established, to get input on how the maps themselves should be drawn, and then get -- then get input on if the maps

should be enacted.

REP. FARMER-BUTTERFIELD: Follow-up?

SEN. HISE: Follow-up.

REP. FARMER-BUTTERFIELD: I wasn't here. Like you said, you and I came at the same time; however, I did follow it because I was here as a government relations person with another organization, so I was in that. However, my understanding -- and staff might be able to answer this -- is that there is a statute now on the books that relates to this. It's 120-3.4, that reflects that in statute, so I just wanted to indicate that.

REP. LEWIS: So your question is to have staff recite Section 123.4, if I --

REP. FARMER-BUTTERFIELD: 120-3.4.

SEN. HISE: 120-3.4. We'll read what the statue is without the context.

REP. LEWIS: Mr. Chair, while staff is preparing to read that, could I make a quick response?

SEN. HISE: Sure.

REP. LEWIS: Representative Farmer-Butterfield, you're very right to point out that statute. I will point out that it is my reading of that statute that it says that state courts must

give at least two weeks, so the two weeks is a minimum. It is not necessarily a guideline. It's not anything other than a state statute that applies to state courts. As you know, we're here today because of the federal court ruling.

REP. FARMER-BUTTERFIELD: Follow-up?

SEN. HISE: We're still waiting on the staff finding that statute.

MS. CHURCHILL: Mr. Chairman, I'm ready. The correct citation is 120-2.4. It has two subsections. Subsection (a), "If the General Assembly enacts a plan apportioning or redistricting State legislative or congressional districts, in no event may a court impose its own substitute plan unless the court first gives the General Assembly a period of time to remedy any defects identified by the court in its findings of fact and conclusions of law. That period of time shall not be less than two weeks. In the event the General Assembly does not act to remedy any identified defects to its plan within that period of time, the court may impose an interim districting plan for use in the next general election only, but that interim districting plan may differ from the districting plan enacted by the

General Assembly only to the extent necessary to remedy any defects identified by the court."

Subsection (b), "Notwithstanding any other provision of law or authority of the State Board of Elections under Chapter 163 of the General Statutes, the State Board of Elections shall have no authority to alter, amend, correct, impose, or substitute any plan apportioning or redistricting state legislative or congressional districts other than a plan imposed by a court under this section or a plan enacted by the General Assembly."

SEN. HISE: Thank you. Follow-up?

REP. FARMER-BUTTERFIELD: Yes. Since we are drawing remedial maps, and have a lot of information in place already, how long do you project this will take?

REP. LEWIS: Thank you for that question, Representative Farmer-Butterfield. As I think I said in my earlier remarks, we would hope by mid-November.

SEN. HISE: Representative? Please identify yourself.

REP. GILL: Representative Rosa Gill. I think I heard you correct in your opening remarks to say that the website would have the calendar for

the hearings. Is that correct?

REP. LEWIS: I don't believe I said that in my opening remarks, Representative, but we will certainly have the dates once this Committee establishes them.

REP. GILL: Follow-up?

SEN. HISE: Follow-up.

REP. GILL: Will we have a map -- will the Committee have a map, proposed map, prior to any of the hearings?

REP. LEWIS: Thank you for that question. The Chairs would contemplate that there may be maps coming in from various members at any time, and as the staff has already alluded, there are resources for members to use in producing their maps. It would be the Chairs' preference, Chairs, plural, preference, that this Committee, along with input from the public, develop criteria for drawing the maps and use that criteria in drawing the maps, so the answer, in long form, I suppose, would be we would take Committee and public input on what the criteria should be, draw the maps, and then take Committee and public input on the maps themselves.

REP. GILL: Thank you.

SEN. HISE: Any other questions or

comments? Senator Van Duyn, please identify yourself.

SEN. VAN DUYN: Senator Terry Van Duyn, District 49. Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you, Representative Lewis. Excuse me. You mentioned in your opening remarks that the clustering that we see in that one in Map 3 may change. What are the circumstances that you think might -- excuse me -- dictate a change?

REP. LEWIS: Thank you very much, Senator, for that question. Let me try to explain a little bit further. When the defendants in the Covington case, which was -- when the defendants in the Covington case, the General Assembly, responded, the consultant that we used produced this grouping map that you see before you as his best attempt to comply.

What I was trying to make clear is this may very well be how the counties are grouped, but I have not personally reviewed it, and the Committee has not personally reviewed it to see if there is a different way to group the counties.

SEN. VAN DUYN: Follow-up?

SEN. HISE: Follow-up.

SEN. VAN DUYN: In my understanding, that

was Tom Hofeller. Will be he involved in this process again?

REP. LEWIS: Yes.

SEN HISE: Further questions or comments? Senator Smith-Ingram?

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just want to reiterate that the --

SEN. HISE: Please identify yourself before you start.

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: Yes. Senator Erica Smith-Ingram, Senate District 3, eight counties in eastern North Carolina. Representative Lewis, can we make sure that when we have our hearings that we make them geographically diverse and reachable? In the last hearings that we held regarding congressional redistricting, there were very limited opportunities in eastern North Carolina to attend those hearings.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you for that question, Senator. Let me say that I think that's very important. I think that's very important that we do indeed seek as much public input as we can. I think geographic diversity is very important, and I think frankly, we did a good job of that in 2011. The two-week time span in 2016 made it a little bit

harder to do, but I will welcome your input and advice on where you would suggest that we receive public input. We usually work with the community colleges, but I would welcome your advice on that.

SEN. HISE: Representative Brockman? Please identify yourself.

REP. BROCKMAN: Representative Cecil Brockman, from Guilford County. Representative Lewis, the last time we drew the congressional districts, you said that it was the intent that, you know, this body would draw parts and districts that were in favor of the Republican majority. Will that be the intent this time as we start to redraw these maps, to have these maps be majority Republican again?

REP. LEWIS: Well, thank you for that question, Representative. The response to that would be first of all to point out that the criteria that was adopted by the Committee did include the 10-3 that you refer to. It will be the prerogative of this Committee to determine what the criteria are in the drawing of the maps.

SEN. HISE: Senator Van Duyn?

SEN. VAN DUYN: Thank you. Terry Van Duyn, District 49. Will Mr. Hofeller be available

to Democrats and maybe even the Black Caucus to consult?

REP. LEWIS: Dr. Hofeller is working as a consultant to the Chairs with the approval of the Speaker and the President Pro Tem of the Senate, so the short answer to your question is no. The long answer is, if the -- the Speaker and the President Pro Tem have indicated that the Minority Leader of the Senate and the Minority Leader of the House in working together can certainly request and have resources made available to them to hire map drawers if they see fit to do so.

SEN. VAN DUYN: Follow-up?

SEN. HISE: Follow-up.

SEN. VAN DUYN: And are there any other consultants that you expect to be using during this process?

REP. LEWIS: Thank you for that question. Ma'am, there are none that I intend to use.

SEN. VAN DUYN: Thank you.

SEN. HISE: Senator Clark?

SEN. CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Senator Clark, Senate District 21. Mr. Chair, is it the expectation that the Committee Chairs will use any type of analytical tools to assess the

extent of the partisan symmetry that will exist in the maps that we plan to enact as part of this process?

REP. LEWIS: Thank you for that question, Senator Clark. The intent of the Chairs is to adopt criteria in conjunction with the Committee, so if that's one of the criteria that the Committee agrees to use, then it will be used. If it's not, then it won't.

SEN. CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SEN. HISE: Representative Pierce?

REP. PIERCE: Representative Garland Pierce, House District 48. Representative Lewis, let me ask you a question. There are some folks here who could probably answer, but were there certain districts drawn years ago that were considered minority districts that a minority -- civil rights districts, or districts that were drawn that a minority person should have the ability to win in? I might not be stating that right, but were there districts drawn for minority districts? Am I asking the question right? I don't know.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you for the question, Representative Pierce. I think you asked it, so I

hope I can give you an efficient answer.

During the 2011 process, I think the Committee at the time, the Chairs, outlined the criteria that was used, and that was one of the criteria that was used at the time, but I would reiterate that it is going to be this Committee that determines the criteria with which the maps will be drawn going forward.

REP. PIERCE: Thank you, Representative Lewis.

SEN. HISE: Any other questions? Senator Smith-Ingram?

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Representative Lewis, as relates to the public hearings, will we have maps available, all versions of maps available to the public, or will we just be taking their remarks?

REP. LEWIS: Thank you for that question, Senator. It would be my desire that we would receive input from the public on what the criteria would be. We as a Committee, or perhaps individual members of the Committee, would produce maps that the public could view and then have the chance to comment on those maps, on actual maps.

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: Follow-up?

SEN. HISE: Follow-up.

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: Will Mr. Hofeller or other analysts be available at these public hearings in case there are questions from the public regarding the maps?

REP. LEWIS: Well, as you know, Senator, a public hearing is an opportunity for us to listen, so I would imagine that Dr. Hofeller may very well listen to the input that comes up, but I've never known a public hearing that involved a question-and-answer.

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: Last follow-up, Mr. Chair?

SEN. HISE: Final follow-up.

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: I understand that we will be receiving public input and listening to what the public has to share, but in also empowering the public, will we be able to put the maps on the website prior to the hearing so that they can look at the maps, review the maps themselves? That would formulate a lot more discussion, I would think.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you for that question, and the answer is yes, we will get the maps out so that folks can -- can indeed see them.

SEN. HISE: Just to follow up on that as well, it's important to know we will also have public terminals available for members of the public that wish to draw or construct a map. Representative Pierce again?

REP. PIERCE: Representative Lewis, let me ask you a question. I know I probably can get that information. Representative Pierce. If you could ask staff if they don't mind, could they give us the breakdown of Democrats, Republicans in most of the proposed new districts? Is that something possibly that they could do, or do I need to do that on my own? I mean on the proposed going forward. Excuse me.

SEN. HISE: Any other questions? Representative Michaux?

REP. MICHAUX: Mr. Chairman --

REP. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, just because the court reporter is recording, I just wanted to be clear that Representative Pierce withdrew what he asked.

REP. MICHAUX: Mr. Chairman, Representative Michaux again. Representative Lewis, we are now awaiting orders from the Court as to how this redistricting matter is to be carried

out; is that correct?

REP. LEWIS: Yes, sir.

REP. MICHAUX: Thank you.

SEN. HISE: Representative Farmer-Butterfield?

REP. FARMER-BUTTERFIELD: Thank you, Mr. Chair. In -- I think it was what, 2011, we had the public hearings available through closed-circuit tv, maybe, at the community colleges, and that seemed to have been effective. Will that be utilized again?

REP. LEWIS: Thank you for that question. That is indeed our intent.

SEN. CLARK: Mr. Chairman?

SEN. HISE: Senator Clark?

SEN. CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Senator Clark, District 21. You have indicated that terminals will be available for the public to construct maps and review maps. At those terminals, will analytical tools always be -- also be available for the public to analyze the performance of those district maps using, I guess, sample election data?

REP. LEWIS: Senator Clark, thank you for that question. Please understand I'm trying to

answer it as completely as I can. It -- yes, there will be political data that is there. I don't know what exact kind of analytical data you're referring to, so I don't know that I can answer what you're asking.

SEN. HISE: I'll just add that we'll produce what we call a stat pack consistent with the criteria established by the Committee.

SEN. CLARK: Follow-up?

SEN. HISE: Follow-up.

SEN. CLARK: Will they be able to do things such as perform efficiency gap calculations or mean-median difference calculations or member gaps for individual stats to be able to determine the extent of partisan -- partisan -- shall I say gerrymandering within the maps, or likelihood of?

REP. LEWIS: I don't know, sir. I know that the data that is produced allows individual members to analyze it in the way that they see fit. You can certainly request various analysis that you referred to. I'm sure that Senate staff can provide that as well. Whether or not the computer will automatically be able to do it, I'm just not intimately familiar with the computer software.

SEN. CLARK: Follow-up, Mr. Chair? Can

we count it as a request on our part that efficiency gap calculations be performed for all maps that we generate in this General Assembly body that might be considered for enactment?

REP. LEWIS: Let me do this if I could, Senator Clark. I personally have no issue with that. I think that would be best saved for our next meeting, when we discuss criteria.

SEN. CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SEN. HISE: Any other questions or comments?

(No response.)

SEN. HISE: Hearing none, thank you, Representative Lewis, for coming in. Thank you, members of the Committee.

(WHEREUPON, THE MEETING WAS CONCLUDED AT 2:13 P.M.)

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

COUNTY OF WAKE

CERTIFICATE

I, Carol M. Smith, a duly commissioned Notary Public in and for the State of North Carolina, do hereby certify that on July 26, 2017, this proceeding was held before me, this proceeding being reported by me verbatim and then reduced to typewritten form under my direct supervision; that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of said proceedings to the best of my ability and understanding; that I am not related to any of the parties to this action; that I am not interested in the outcome of this case; that I am not of counsel nor in the employ of any of the parties to this action.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereto set my hand, this the 4th day of August, 2017.

Carol M Smith

Notary Public

Carol M. Smith
Notary Number
19943320153

EX. 8

NORTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY
JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDISTRICTING

TRANSCRIPT OF THE PROCEEDINGS

In Raleigh, North Carolina
Friday, August 4, 2017
Reported by Robbie W. Worley

Worley Reporting
P.O. Box 99169
Raleigh, NC 27624
919-870-8070

REP. LEWIS: Good morning. The Joint Select Committee on Redistricting will come to order. The Chair is pleased to welcome the members and guests that are here. The Chair appreciates the assistance of our Sergeants-at-Arms in preparing and maintaining this meeting. From the House, Reggie Sills, Warren Hawkins, Rey Cooke, Dean Marshbourne. From the Senate, Hal Roach, Linda Matthews, John Enloe, and Terry Edmondson. The Chair is also pleased to welcome our court reporter today, Robbie Worley. The Chair thanks the central staff for their effort in preparing for today's meeting.

The purpose of today's meeting will be to discuss criteria to remedy the ruling of the Covington court that was issued to us in an order on July 31st of this year.

Today's meeting will proceed as follows. There's going to be a presentation regarding the county groupings. We are then going to receive input from other members of the committee on criteria that should be considered. And at that point, we're going to move to a time to receive input from the public. The public will be asked to make their remarks in a two-minute time frame. The

Chair would point out that there was an advance sign-up outside. The Chair has directed that that sign-up remain open for the -- at least another 30 minutes in case some people have not yet arrived.

The Chair would point out that we have also opened up committee room 544 in this building. This meeting is only being livestreamed online. It is being broadcast in that room as well. If there are people in room 544, we welcome them, and we will, if they are signed up to speak, will be calling their name so that they do not miss their opportunity to speak.

At this time, the Chair is going to yield the chair to Chairman Dollar.

REP. DOLLAR: Thank you, Chairman Lewis. And we also remind you, maybe a little bit unlike our normal meetings, if you seek recognition for a question or a comment as a member, as a member, you need to identify yourself for the court reporter for the record that's being taken. So the gentleman from Harnett County is recognized for his presentation.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm David Lewis, the senior chair of the House Redistricting Committee. I'd like to talk with the

members and our guests here today about the various criteria that will be considered. The primary purpose of my presentation is to talk about two of the criteria that we know that we will need to operate under.

The first one we discussed last week is the one person, one vote requirement, and for your records, in the House, of 120 members, the ideal population based on the 2010 Census is 79,462 people. For the Senate, under the 2010 population, the ideal population is 190,710 people. There is a plus or minus five percent variance that can be applied to these figures.

My presentation is going to focus now on county groupings. All of you were distributed last week a map that is labeled "2010 Census Population by County." It looks like this. This shows the 2010 Census population for North Carolina's 100 counties.

I'd like to talk about the Stephenson rule that will be applied in the drawing of these maps. First of all, groupings of counties, which we'll discuss in a moment, but groupings of counties must be filled with whole districts. Districts may not deviate in total population by

more than plus or minus five percent from the ideal population, and districts within groupings must have a -- must have the least possible number of crossings over adjacent county boundaries. Next slide, please.

Groupings drawn under this rule are primarily generated using a mathematical, formulaic process. Next slide, please.

Here is how the grouping process develops using the 2010 Census data for the county populations. Next slide.

Members, the counties that you see here that are highlighted in purple are single-county groups. That means that districts can be drawn within these counties, and districts must be drawn within these counties without including expansion into other counties. The purple indicates one-county groups. Next slide, please.

The red color that you see indicates two-county groups. That means if you -- in order to reach the ideal House population, you have to combine two counties in order to draw the districts. Next slide, please.

The yellow or orange indicates three-county groupings. Next slide, please.

The bright yellow indicates a four-county grouping under the Stephenson criteria. The green indicates a five-county grouping under the Stephenson criteria. The dark green indicates a six-county grouping, and finally, the blue color is a seven-county grouping in the middle of our state.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask that the House and Senate Sergeant-at-Arms distribute the exhibits that are labeled "County Groupings for 2017 House Plan" and "County Groupings for 2017 Senate Plan" to the members of the committee at this time.

REP. DOLLAR: The Sergeant-at-Arms will be directed to distribute the materials.

(Pause.)

REP. LEWIS: Members, the Chair would -- pardon me. I would point out that the illustrations that we've shown are just for the House to show you how the counties are grouped in the House. The maps that are being distributed also show the county groupings for the Senate; we just did not place them in the PowerPoint presentation.

Mr. Chairman, I believe there are extras. We have members that are here that may not be on

the committee; if the Sergeant-at-Arms could give those to them as well.

(Pause.)

Mr. Chairman, with your permission, I'll continue my remarks.

REP. DOLLAR: The gentleman is recognized.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I would point out that the county groupings that we have discussed is a mandatory requirement and is based on math. The maps that are presented to you are our best efforts to determine what the ideal county groupings should be. If there are alternative ways to exceed the county groupings that we have provided here, where more one-counties are created, or more two-counties, or more three-counties, et cetera, I would ask that members please submit those so that they can be reviewed before and included in the discussion of our meeting on next Thursday.

I would point out that the county grouping rule is the strongest constitutional requirement anywhere in the country. This guides us in being able to draw fair districts, and again, if members are able to determine a better county

grouping that complies with the requirements, we look forward to reviewing them.

Mr. Chairman, with your permission, I request that the Sergeant-at-Arms distribute what is labeled map 6. It reads, "Comparison of 2011 enacted to optimum House county maps," and also map 3, which reads, "Comparison of 2011 enacted to optimum Senate county groups."

REP. DOLLAR: The Sergeant-at-Arms will distribute the materials requested.

(Pause.)

REP. LEWIS: And, Mr. Chairman, as before, the members that are present that are not on the committee, I would request that they receive these maps as well. And further, Mr. Chairman, if there are extra maps once the members have received theirs, if we could make plans to distribute those to the members of the public who are here at the conclusion of the meeting.

REP. DOLLAR: So ordered.

REP. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I believe most members have their maps now. May I continue my presentation?

REP. DOLLAR: The gentleman may proceed.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Members, the map that you have before you that is labeled map 6, "Comparison of 2011 Enacted to Optimum House County Groups," and map 3, which reads, "Comparison of 2011 Enacted to Optimum Senate County Groupings," this comes from a public court filing that was made on October 31st of 2016. I would point out that the county groupings map that you just received, which showed what we believe to be the optimum county groupings, those groupings also appear on this map.

The areas that are in green are county groups that are unaffected by the court ruling and will not require a remedy. In plainer speak, that means that the areas in green will not require a redraw of the districts.

The area in yellow, these are unaffected county groupings, but districts within those groupings will require remedies.

The areas in white are areas in which both the county grouping has changed and will require the districts to be modified within them.

Mr. Chairman, I think at this time, only on my presentation, if there are questions on my presentation, I'd be glad to take them at this time.

REP. DOLLAR: Representative Michaux?

REP. MICHAUX: Yes. Would you explain the numerical identification on these maps?

REP. DOLLAR: And if you will hold for just a moment, Chairman Lewis. Representative Michaux, if you would identify yourself by name and county for the record.

REP. MICHAUX: Representative Michaux, Durham County.

REP. DOLLAR: Thank you, sir.

REP. MICHAUX: Give us the definition of the numerical numbers -- the numbers on these maps.

REP. LEWIS: Representative Michaux, thank you for that question. I should have pointed that out.

Members, if you'll refer, just to make it easier, if you'll refer to the map that reads "County Groupings for 2017 House Plan," what Representative Michaux has asked, the county groupings have a code in them. The code contains three numbers. The first number is simply an identifier of the county group. What's more important and helps us do our jobs, the second number, for instance, let me use an exact example here.

If you'll look in the eastern part of our state, the county grouping that includes Currituck, Dare, Hyde and Pamlico, you'll see that the second number in there is 04. That means there are four counties in that grouping. The third number that is in that, 01, means that those four counties create one seat. So that means four counties, one seat.

To go to the middle of our state, if you'll look at Wake County, which is one of the counties in purple, that's a one-county group, you'll notice that the second number there is 01. That means it's a one-county group. The third number is 11; that means that it creates 11 seats within that one county. The same is true on the Senate map.

REP. DOLLAR: Further members wishing to ask questions of Chairman Lewis at this time? Seeing none.

REP. LEWIS: With that, Mr. Chairman, I will conclude my remarks, and I know that you will recognize members of the committee that wish to offer criteria to be considered.

REP. DOLLAR: Members, are there any members wishing recognition for the purpose of

providing criteria to be considered in the -- in the drawing of the map? I don't see anyone wishing to be recognized at this time. Senator Smith-Ingram?

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: Yes, Mr. Chair. Senator Smith-Ingram, Senate District 3, eight counties, eastern North Carolina. I wish to submit criteria to be considered.

REP. DOLLAR: So, does the lady have -- you're submitting this written comment. Did you have copies, or did you want to add further explanation to this, or just -- what does the lady desire?

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'd like for copies to be distributed.

REP. DOLLAR: Does the Sergeant-at-Arms have copies for distribution? (Pause.)

We'll have them made and distributed. Did you -- Madam Senator, did you wish any -- any comment at this time in addition to your --

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: Not at this time. Thank you.

REP. DOLLAR: Thank you. Other members? Senator Clark.

SEN. CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I've

already submitted some recommendations in writing, but I do have one additional recommendation I would like to speak to, and I will submit it in writing later if that's appropriate.

REP. DOLLAR: And I didn't catch -- I apologize for not hearing. If you would identify yourself for the record.

SEN. CLARK: Sorry. Senator Clark, Senate District 21.

REP. DOLLAR: The gentleman will proceed with his comments.

SEN. CLARK: Okay. Currently -- and this is essentially a process requirement or a recommendation. Currently, on the North Carolina General Assembly website, we have the ability to go and find out who represents me, what I -- excuse me. What I ask that the committee do is make available to the citizens of North Carolina a capability, once we provide a map for them to review, a capability for them to go onto the website and see who would represent me under the new maps that are being proposed for enactment.

REP. DOLLAR: Noted. Thank you very much for the recommendation. Other -- other members seeking recognition at this time? Representative

Michaux.

REP. MICHAUX: Representative Michaux from Durham again. This goes back to Representative Lewis's presentation, if you don't mind. Could you clear up just one or two other matters on the maps involving the county groupings? Actually, just one matter.

REP. LEWIS: I'll be glad to yield, Mr. Chairman.

REP. MICHAUX: Representative Lewis, let me be clear, and so the committee will be clear, it needs to identify these code numbers in here. And I'm particularly interested in the -- the second two, the second number and the third number. For instance, in Wake County, that's a one-county grouping. You've got 11. That county is -- there are 11 representatives in that one county, coming out of that one county. You have not made any designations as to how those 11 are to be elected, have you, yet?

REP. LEWIS: Thank you for that question, Representative. No, we have made no designations for how those 11 seats would be designed, and will not do so until after this committee adopts criteria next week.

REP. DOLLAR: And for the record, that's Representative Lewis responding. Representative Michaux, you have a follow-up?

REP. MICHAUX: Yes. The other question is, for instance, in a two-county grouping, we're looking at that each representative representing 79,400 and some-odd people. For example, in a two-county grouping, what are the mathematics in that? For instance, you've got Durham and Chatham together. What are the mathematics in that two-county grouping, to get to that 79,000 that the four representatives will represent?

May I follow up? You understand, it's easier to do it for a one-county group, but for a two-county group, how many are coming out of one county, how many are coming out of another county?

REP. LEWIS: Thank you for that question, Representative Michaux. And again, this is David Lewis from Harnett County. The question you asked is regarding the 2017 House Plan map that was passed out, I believe, right? There are 33,000 -- pardon me. There are 3000-and -- there are 331,092 people that comprise the total population of those three counties that are linked there, Durham, Orange and Chatham. If you divide that number by

the number that you've already said, the 79,492, that will yield four seats. But beyond that, I'm not sure I understand your question.

REP. MICHAUX: May I follow up?

REP. DOLLAR: Follow-up.

REP. MICHAUX: Well, now, you've got me confused. Now, you said the three-county grouping. I'm looking at a two-county grouping with Durham and Chatham, right? And not Orange?

REP. LEWIS: Representative Michaux, thank you for correcting me, sir. I'm looking at the same map you are. I simply glanced down and didn't notice the -- for the record, the county groupings are illustrated with a thick black line, and there is indeed a thick black line between Orange and Durham; I just simply didn't see it. Yes, this is a two-county grouping, as you pointed out, sir.

REP. MICHAUX: Follow-up. Representative Michaux again, follow-up.

REP. DOLLAR: Follow-up.

REP. MICHAUX: What I'm asking, for instance, taking that Durham-Chatham group, you've got four representatives. Each representative is supposed to represent 79,430-some-odd people. How

did you mathematically come up with Durham -- in other words, the total population between Durham County and Chatham County, does that exceed more than four times 79,000, or less than four times 79,000?

REP. LEWIS: Thank you for the question. Again, this is David Lewis. The population of Durham in 2010 was 267,587. The population of Chatham in 2010 was 63,505. That totals up to 331,092. So if we divide that by the ideal population of 79,462, it equals 4.16, which would be within the plus or minus five percent range.

REP. DOLLAR: The gentleman continues to be recognized for his questions.

REP. MICHAUX: Thank you, sir. Representative Michaux from Durham. The figure you just gave me, 331,092, is the total population for both counties. Is that correct?

REP. LEWIS: That is correct, sir.

REP. MICHAUX: And if you've got four representatives representing that 331, doesn't that population come out to be somewhere around a little over 80-some thousand people there, which may be outside your five percent deviation?

REP. LEWIS: No, sir, because again, it's

331,092. The ideal -- if there were -- if this was a congressional draw, and we were under absolute zero deviation rules, we would have to have every district the same size. But the Stephenson criteria has provided that there is a plus or minus five percent, and again, I can -- I'll be happy to go through the math on my phone here, like I was trying to do. But I -- what I have represented this map to be is what I believe to be the optimum county groupings for the House and the Senate. What I've asked the members to do is, if they find a more optimum map, to bring that map forward so that it can be reviewed.

REP. DOLLAR: And as further explanation, Representative Michaux, and this is Chairman Dollar, staff has handed me, and you might want to write these numbers down. The ideal population for four members for House seats would be 317,884. The range, however, which is what Chairman Lewis is discussing, the range for four members would be anywhere from 301,956 to 333,740. That would be the range for a four-member grouping. Durham and Chatham together, as it has been mentioned, that's 331,092. So that fits in that range.

REP. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman?

REP. DOLLAR: The gentleman is recognized.

REP. LEWIS: This is David Lewis. I'd like to point out to the members that the last time we met, we passed out a chart that's labeled "2010 District Population Ranges and County Populations." We can certainly re-pass that out to the members, but it shows the plus or minus five percent that the chairman just referenced.

REP. DOLLAR: Senator Clark.

SEN. CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Senator Clark, Senate District 21. You indicated on map 3 and map 6 that the clusters shown in green did not require -- there is no requirement to change them, nor is there a requirement to change the districts within them. Is it the position of the leadership of this committee and the leadership of the General Assembly that the districts within those particular clusters shall not be changed as a part of this process?

REP. LEWIS: This is David Lewis, and the answer is yes.

SEN. CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

REP. DOLLAR: Further questions from members of the joint committee, or further offers

of criteria from members of the committee at this time? Senator Speciale -- I mean, Representative Speciale.

REP. SPECIALE: Yeah, don't demote me. Could we get a copy -- I know you gave a copy last week of those numbers, but could we get that? Not every one of us have them with us today.

REP. LEWIS: Yes, sir, we can get that -- staff can get that for you. Representative Michaux.

REP. MICHAUX: Yeah, I'm still trying to get my mind clear. Representative Michaux, from Durham, Representative Lewis.

REP. DOLLAR: The gentleman may ask his question.

REP. MICHAUX. In response to Senator Clark's question, am I to understand that these counties on this House county group, the green counties will not be affected by what you-all are proposing to make changes with? Is that what I'm hearing?

REP. LEWIS: Thank you for the question. Again, this is David Lewis. Let me try to explain it a different way. We believe in the maps that were passed out that illustrate the optimum county

groupings, the ones labeled "County Groupings for 2017 House Plan" and then "County Groupings for 2017 Senate Plan, we believe that these are the ideal county groupings. We believe that if the ideal county groupings match the county groupings that were used in 2011, that no change would be required within those counties.

REP. DOLLAR: Further questions at this time, or offers of criteria from the members?

Thank you. Seeing none, the Sergeant at Arms will pass out the sheet entitled "IDS Policies 2017 Restricting Operations." This sheet here. Committee will be at ease for just a moment while the Sergeant at Arms pass these out.

REP. DOLLAR: Chairman Lewis is recognized.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, this is not pertaining to the criteria but we felt it important to discuss it with the committee. This is the policies developed by the central staff and our information services division that we propose would govern access and empower members of the General Assembly and also the public that wish to directly participate in the drawing of districts that have access to the computers and the staff.

In short explanation, I would offer that this is the same policy that we used in 2016, and I believe the same policy that we used in 2011. If there are detailed questions on this, Mr. Chairman, I respectfully ask that they be directed to staff.

REP. DOLLAR: Any questions on these procedures? And please know, as you look over these, you can always call staff later and contact them with any additional clarification that you might need.

Okay. Seeing no questions on that --

REP. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman.

REP. DOLLAR: The chairman is recognized.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you. This is David Lewis again. Members, for full disclosure, the Chairs are providing this as the direction that we have issued to staff. If there are concerns with it, please bring those to the Chairs. But we didn't want to share this so that you would all have access and that members of the public would have access and would be more enabled to utilize resources if they wish to directly participate in the drawing of districts.

REP. DOLLAR: Senator Smith-Ingram.

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

As relates to public access, when you provide the room for the general public that's here in Raleigh, are we going to be accommodating maybe some of those same opportunities when you go further east, for those in the public who cannot drive to Raleigh?

REP. DOLLAR: The gentleman is recognized.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Senator, I appreciate the question. I also want to say that I appreciate your steadfast advocacy for the East. We have not in the past been able to provide actual physical resources offsite and will not be able to provide it this time as well. I would point out that there are several free websites, if you will, that allow people to access and draw maps, and we will certainly -- we did last time and would again receive and review those. So we will not be able to provide the actual physical resources offsite but we will certainly review maps that the public may draw using software that they can access online.

REP. DOLLAR: Senator Clark.

SEN. CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Senator. Senator Clark, Senate District 21.

My question regards potential staff report for the minority party with regard to providing full-time, if you will, legislative analysis division individual, to support us in possibly the creation of our maps and interpretation thereof and the creation of data. And the reason I ask this is, due to no fault of their own, they are under significant time restraints. Often our attempts to avail ourselves of those services are not successful. So I was wondering if there was a possibility that we could get a dedicated resource for that particular purpose.

REP. DOLLAR: The gentleman is recognized.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you for that question, Senator. The Chairs have actually discussed that. As you know, our central staff works very hard. They work very hard to serve all of the members. We want very much to facilitate as much involvement and participation in the -- trying to reach an acceptable remedy for this Court order.

If the minority leaders in the House and the Senate were to request that, I'm sure we could

make that occur. We would ask the Legislative Services officer to deal with that.

I also would point out that the Speaker and the President Pro Tem have also made an offer to the respective caucus leaders in the House and the Senate. If they wish to hire outside map-drawing aid, that has been offered as well.

REP. DOLLAR: Further questions. Seeing none, thank you.

Before we go to taking public comments and input on the criteria, are there any members wishing to make any further comments with regard or offer any criteria for the drawing at this time?

Well, with that, seeing no hands, we will begin the public comment portion of our committee meeting today. As -- just to remind everyone, we will keep decorum. If you have signs, please do not display them in any way in which they would block the view of someone behind you. There will be a two-minute time limit. Sergeant-at-Arms will keep that.

We will call out the first five individuals that there are, and we'll call them out five a time. If you would line up with the mic there in the back, and again, be sure to identify

yourself for the record, as a public record is being kept of this.

I would also remind members, this is not an interactive period of time. Questions will not be taken of members of the public. This is our opportunity to listen to what they have to say in their presentations. Representative Floyd?

REP. FLOYD: How many public speakers do we have signed up so far?

REP. DOLLAR: To the Chair's view, it appears we have about -- roughly -- between 40 and 45 speakers.

REP. FLOYD: Thank you.

REP. DOLLAR: We would also ask, to be certain that any of the groups -- if you are representing a group in particular, please identify that when you begin your comments. So at this time, we will call up to the mic in the back, the first five --

Hold on just a moment. Representative Torbett.

REP. TORBETT: Just to rehash a little bit, there was a document for Senator Smith-Ingram presented. Was it going to be copied and distributed?

SEN. DOLLAR: Yes, sir.

SEN. TORBIN: I'm just making sure that's going to happen.

SEN. DOLLAR: That will happen.

REP. TORBETT: A reminder. Thank you.

REP. DOLLAR: Yes, sir.

When the -- just to be clear with the Sergeant-at-Arms, if that item has been copied now, if you are ready, go ahead and distribute that. We will distribute that before we recognize our first group of folks.

Let me go ahead and call up the first group, and then we'll get this started once this sheet has been distributed to the members.

Ira Botvinick, Phyllis Demko, Steve Hall, Mike Jennings, Dr. Heather Simmon, if y'all will line up there. And I apologize if have mispronounced anyone's name. And if you'll hold for just one moment until the Sergeant-at-Arms has finished distributing their materials.

Also, to remind you in the back, you will need to make sure that the green light is on. Turn it on when you get ready.

Okay. Seeing the materials distributed, the gentleman, if you would identify yourself and

your comments not to exceed two minutes. The gentleman is recognized.

IRA BOTVINICK: Thank you. I am a voter, always have voted. My name is Ira Botvinick. I reside in Wake County.

I am angry about legislative districts that gerrymand [sic]. I am pissed that my tax dollars are being wasted to defect concocted legislative districts. I want my vote to matter. I did not come here to criticize Republicans. The truth is, the majority parties have gerrymanded. Gerrymanding is wrong, and it must stop now.

Redistricting should foster to the great extent possible, competition, so as to provide better government for all North Carolinians. The antitrust laws of Chapter 75 of the General Statutes prohibit entering into noncompetitive agreements, and this should be the guiding principle of your deliberations.

In this state, we care so much about fairness and competition, that General Statutes, Chapter 75, always award triple damages and attorney fees for business that engage in anti-competitive practices. And this state law subjects violators to imprisonment of up to two years. The

business of government should be no different.

If what I'm saying is too difficult for you to legislate in that it is human nature to be self-protective, I request that you vote for House Bill 200 and Senate Bill 209, that establish a nonpartisan process for drawing legislative districts.

In conclusion, when Benjamin Franklin left the Constitutional Convention that established our Federal Constitution, he was asked, "Dr. Franklin, what type of government do we have?" Benjamin Franklin replied, "A republic, if you can keep it." Thank you.

REP. DOLLAR: If members of the audience would refrain from public demonstrations, the next individual is recognized for time not to exceed two minutes. If you would identify yourself.

PHYLLIS DEMKO: Good morning. My name is Phyllis Demko, and I'm from Cary. I realize this is not about congressional districts, but to make my point, I'm offering a quote. This is from the minutes of the Redistricting Committee for Congressional Districts, February 16, 2016. One of the members of the committee said as follows: "I want to make clear that we are going to use

political data in drawing this map. It is to gain partisan advantage. I want that criteria to be clearly stated and understood."

He acknowledged that this would be a political gerrymander and, indeed, the adopted criteria expressly instructed the mapmakers to draw a new district map that would maintain partisan advantage.

The data actually was only related to election results. Other than population, that was the only criterion used. This is blatant partisan gerrymandering. This is putting politics over the welfare of citizens of the state.

We have seen the results of partisan gerrymandering in North Carolina as well as throughout the country. So whether policy gerrymandering is legal per se, and that's an open question before the Supreme Court at this point, we as citizens of this democracy know for sure that it is wrong. I ask you, therefore, to adopt criteria that do not include addresses of candidates or incumbents and that residents' voting histories not be considered. Thank you.

REP. DOLLAR: The next person will proceed. Identify yourself and you're recognized

for time not to exceed two minutes.

STEVE HALL: Good morning. My name is Steve Hall. Thank you all for your service. You obviously have a very complex task before you with many competing voices and allegiances to consider. As someone who led numerous institutions that had such a challenge, I always advise myself in my quiet moments, and other fellow leaders, "What are your core principles? What is the guiding light that motivates you to do the work you do?"

And when I thought about this opportunity to address you this morning, what occurred to me as something if I was sitting in your shoes, might sound something like this. To do my best to ensure that each and every North Carolina citizen has a voice that can be expressed with equal weight and potential impact. I suggest that isn't really a mathematical idea. It's a bit more complex than that. And I would encourage you to embody those additional elements as you deliberate how to draw up your maps. Thank you.

REP. DOLLAR: Thank you. The next individual is recognized to identify yourself and you are recognized for a time not to exceed two minutes.

MIKE JENNINGS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the committees. My name is Mike Jennings. I have lived in Wake County -- in North Caroling for about years. I want to thank you for the opportunity this morning, and I am speaking just for myself. Others are going to talk in more detail about criteria that are fair, transparent, and actively involve public.

I could talk in more detail about that but I want to go -- and I agree with those criteria. But I want to go further, why those criteria are important to me. Before Congress adopted the Constitution, the Voting Rights Act, there was the Golden Rule. We were given the Golden Rule. Excuse me. I believe the criteria that you will hear about this morning will create an open process and promote fairness in elections. I think that would be consistent with the Golden Rule.

I know in the past others have drawn districts to favor them. I agreed and that was wrong. It's time to turn the corner. Let's do the right thing. Let's do it, let's treat others as you would have them treat you. I encourage you to allow to be touched by the better angels of your

nature, to turn the other cheek to those who have used the redistricting process to their own advantage and rise above partisanship as you draw new maps. It's the right thing to do. My children, my grandchildren are depending upon you to keep this a democracy that works for everybody. Remember, the Golden Rule says, "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you."

Thank you very much.

REP. DOLLAR: Thank you. The next five individuals past Ms. Simon at the moment, is Richard Greene, if you would line up -- Trina Harrison, Pam Schwingl. Jen Jones and Paula Jennings. So if y'all would like up.

And, Ms. Simon, you are recognized for time not to exceed two minutes.

HEATHER SIMON: My name is Heather Simon. I'm from Cary, North Carolina, and I'm here representing myself today. I took time off work today to come comment because nonpartisan redistricting is fundamentally about preserving our democracy. The redistricting process is only happening today because the legislature failed to create legal and constitutional districts in the first place. The fact that you have again hired

the same consultants to draw the -- that drew the current illegal maps is troubling. The legislative redistricting process much be carried out in a nonpartisan manner, ideally by an independent commission and with the opportunity for the public -- the public to comment on the final district maps. To guarantee that the process remains fair and unbiased, the legislature should exclude political information like voter registration data and past election results when drawing maps.

Both Democrats and Republicans won statewide races in the last election, indicating that voters in North Carolina are fairly evenly split. In contrast, whenever elections were based on districts, the scale leaned very heavily towards Republicans as demonstrated by [unintelligible] majorities in both the State House and State Senate. Any process that is designed to favor some voices or opinions over others is fundamentally undemocratic and goes against the spirit of the North Carolina and U.S. constitutions.

As legislators, you took an oath to uphold both. Section 2 of Article 1 of the state constitution states, "All political power is vested

in and derived from the people. All government of right originates from the people, is founded upon their will only, and is instituted solely for the good of the whole." The current districts do not represent a government originating from the will of the people.

If you believe in democracy, you have an obligation to design truly fair and representative districts when drawing new maps. Attempts at gerrymandering for the purpose of gaining political advantage are short-sighted and undermine the core democratic principles. The issues faced by the state will change and the demographics will change but once lost democracy is very hard to regain.

REP. DOLLAR: The next individual recognized is Mr. Greene?

RICHARD GREENE: Yes.

REP. DOLLAR: For a time not to exceed two minutes.

RICHARD GREENE: Richard Greene, Wake County. Thank you, Mr. Chair; thank you, members of the committee. I'm a small businessman. I've closed my business to be here today. What I've learned in being a small businessman is, innovation and progress is dependent on competition and

listening to what is going on around you. The business world is full of large, very powerful companies that have failed -- Kodak, Xerox -- who failed to follow that lesson. The same is true in government.

So I urge you adopt a districting process that is nonpartisan in nature, that is based on geography and doesn't deal with any demographic information of any measure. I believe this is critical to our legislative process, it is critical to the progress of our communities, and it is critical to our democracy. Thank you for the time today.

REP. DOLLAR: Thank you. Next individual is recognized for a time not to exceed two minutes.

TRINA HARRISON: Thank you. Members of the Committee, members of the General Assembly. My name is Trina Harrison. I'm from Alamance County.

Racially-based districting is partisan districting. For too long, regardless of which party has held power in Raleigh, the politicians have chosen their voters. It's time for we, the voters, to get back to being able to choose our representatives. That's all. Thank you.

REP. DOLLAR: Next lady is recognized for

time not to exceed two minutes.

PAM SCHWINGL: Hi. My name is Pam Schwingl. I'm from Cedar Grove, Orange County, North Carolina. Thirty years ago, I moved to North Carolina based on its reputation for fairness, balance or progress and it support of agriculture and education. I have lived both in southern Orange County, northern Orange County and in Person County, and I've seen that wherever I vote, my vote really doesn't matter.

I could stay home on election day. Incumbents would be voted in and change would be difficult. Democrats would win in Orange and Republicans would win in Person. This has only worsened since the 2011 -- since the last Census and new maps were drawn. The result is that only a few people vote, it's very suppressive of the vote, and because of these gerrymandered districts that we now know why this happens, and it's called an efficiency gap, and it's something that I think should be included in the criteria for choosing these districts.

Because it really is a situation where the individual vote is undermined. The one person, one vote is undermined. So let's make districts

that are competitive. It has been done before, it has been done in other states, and let's get candidates that can appeal to a broad range of people that can really start solving our problems. So I would recommend that we basically use criteria that does not set partisan targets, does not protect incumbents, does not exclude threats to incumbents, and use criteria that excludes data on party registration, on race and ethnicity except where required by the Federal Voting Rights Act.

And then when the maps are drawn, report to us the quantitative efficiency gap to see how far or how close we are to the one person/one gap rule. And please, let us know at each step what you're doing, why you're doing it, and provide to us a log of all your actions. Thanks.

REP. DOLLAR: Thank you. Ms. Jones, recognize for a time not to exceed two minutes.

JEN JONES: Thank you, sir. My name is Jen Jones. I live in the great county of Orange, but I grew up on a tobacco farm in the great county of Warren. And as my mother says, "Our family has been here since Jesus wept." I also, in the interest of full disclosure, work for Democracy North Carolina, which I hear has been fighting

since Jesus wept for both parties not to gerrymander. So I am very unpopular with everyone in front of me.

Despite that, I am here for the former purpose: to speak as a North Carolina about criteria that matter to me and my mama. I want fair maps, and I want them to be devoid of racial and partisan gerrymandering. I'd kind of like for them by the principles of equal protection under the constitution. And since we are a Southern state -- I would argue the most fabulous one -- I would like the principles of the Voting Rights Act to be a part of that, too.

But most important to me, as a communications person, is having public input and transparent and informed public input. But just as leadership is confident in Thomas Hofeller to redraw our maps, the same man who did so in 2011, I am confident that those maps have already been drawn, that the criteria for those maps is already set. And I would really appreciate as a member of the public, to see those maps and be able to provide informed public comment at the hearings you so graciously are providing later this month, based on those maps.

So I would ask, please, as a North Carolina constituent and voter, show us the maps, and I promise you, as a North Carolinian, we will tell you exactly how we feel about them. Thank you so much.

REP. DOLLAR: The next is -- Ms. Jennings if you will just hold for a moment. The next five individuals, if you would line up. Lloyd Chambless, William Smith, Janis Ramquist, Dianna Wyne, and Janet Hoy.

Ms. Jennings, you are recognized for a time not to exceed two minutes.

PAULA JENNINGS: Thank you. Thank you for allowing me to speak. My name is Paula Jennings. I'm here as a North Carolina citizen, a Wake County citizen, and most of all, a patriot. I'm speaking for myself, and I want to use a phrase we've often heard: liberty and justice for all. Liberty and justice for all. This phrase is recited as part of the Pledge of Allegiance with little thought for its deeper meaning.

I come here today also as a granddaughter of a World War I veteran, the daughter of a beloved World War II veteran. These men suffered greatly over their years because of their service. I come

here today as a mother and a grandmother. I come here today for the memory of what all of our ancestors stood for and what they went to war for, and for the legacy I wish to leave my children and grandchildren.

Part of the liberty and justice for which I speak is dependent on transparency, where one vote counts more -- does not count more than another, and when the result of an election is not a foregone conclusion. Transparency in the process of drawing impartial districts is the most important criteria for which I advocate today. Transparency.

Complete transparency such as can be found in live streaming of all hearings and meetings. I advocate on behalf of future generations and for the large table of democracy which I hope they can all come to. Thank you.

REP. DOLLAR: Thank you. Mr. Chambless, you are recognized for a time not to exceed two minutes.

LLOYD CHAMBLISS: I am Lloyd Chambless from Orange County. A recent study has found that the North Carolina redistricting process ranks among the worst in the world. Our democracy in

North Carolina is right there with the worst democracies in the world. Our legislature does not represent us; it represents the maps they drew.

The recent court finding was that our districts were not legal, in other words, did not represent the people of the state because of racial gerrymandering. Hopefully an up and coming Supreme Court decision will find that partisan gerrymandering is unconstitutional. That is yet to be seen.

But here we are. We have an opportunity. We're looking forward to the Census in 2020, where new maps will have to be drawn. Democrats could be in charge then, so it's an opportunity when we don't know who is going to win, to do something about it, to draw some fair maps, to make the process nonpartisan, to not allow looking at past election results or registration, to get it out of the hands of the legislature except for final approval.

So let's take this opportunity to right the process. Let's redraw the maps. Why do you start -- why do you start with the same maps and say, we don't have to redraw most of the districts. Let's start over. It's easy to draw maps. Just

start ignoring all the political requirements that you've put into it to -- so gerrymandering. So let's make this a nonpartisan process, start over, and do it right. Thanks.

REP. DOLLAR: Mr. Smith, you are recognized for time not to exceed two minutes.

WILLIAM SMITH: William Smith, Raleigh, North Carolina. As a veteran and someone who has also sworn an oath to defend this great nation of ours, and a patriot, I am extremely concerned by the state of our democracy today. Our representatives should be able to be held accountable for their actions by the people from which they derive their power.

Therefore, I propose the following criteria for the redistricting process in North Carolina: A prohibition on using partisan data. Maps submitted should be able to pass the efficiency gap test or the best available test for gerrymandering that is currently available. Voting precincts should not be divided.

I would very much prefer that an independent, nonpartisan commission be appointed to draw our district maps but should a commission not be appointed, then the governor should be granted

veto power over any redistricting bill produced by the General Assembly.

All of us are aware of the oath: first, do no harm. Bringing back Dr. Thomas Hofeller, who failed so miserably in protecting democracy when drawing the 2011 maps, only shows that you desire to continue to undermine our democracy. Representative David Lewis, who was also involved in the failed 2011 maps and Dr. Hofeller should not be involved in this important process.

I wish I had more time to go into the damage gerrymandering does to both parties and to our great nation. I respectfully request that this body restore democracy to this great state. Thank you.

REP. DOLLAR: Ms. Ramquist, you are recognized for a period not to exceed two minutes.

JANIS RAMQUIST: My name is Janis Ramquist. I'm a resident of Raleigh. I have known some of you for decades, and this is a very personal statement. I know you as good people who want to serve your state, and it is very sad to me that so many people distrust you and believe the worst in you. I think that you could change the course of this by adopting better criteria,

measurable criteria. There are mathematical equations that can measure whether you are overly partisan in your district, whether they are compact, and whether they meet the Voting Rights Act compliance.

I thank Representative Lewis and Senator Hise for increasing the transparency but it could be improved. Every scrap of information that is used to draw a map should be available to the public. You are doing the public's business.

There is a rumor that red maps have been drawn already. I hope not. But if they have, I hope you will disclose them now.

Redistricting is the foundation of our democracy, and I beseech you to please honor the integrity of the General Assembly. Thank you.

REP. DOLLAR: Thank you. Ms. Wynn, you are recognized for a time not to exceed two minutes.

DIANNA WYNN: My name is Dianna Wynn, and I'm a resident of Wake County. I am part of a large and growing segment of North Carolinians who are unaffiliated voters. However, I believe I speak for many unaffiliated voters, Republican voters, and Democratic voters, who are increasingly

dismayed by the role of partisan politics in drawing our voting maps.

In fact, polling across the nation and specifically in North Carolina, reveals that a majority of voters favor a nonpartisan approach to redistricting. To that end, I respectfully request that this committee adopt the following criteria for fair voting maps. First, adopt politically neutral criteria. No addresses of candidates or incumbents should be used, and residents' voting histories and party affiliations should not be considered when defining our voting districts.

Second, districts should be compact and contiguous. Voters within a district should not be unnecessarily dispersed, and no voting district should be geographically divided or split by another district. In other words, all portions of a district must connect.

Third, avoid dividing counties and municipalities where possible. Fourth, avoid dividing communities of interest, where possible. Communities of interest typically have social, cultural, racial, ethnic or economic interest in common. Finally, and obviously, voting maps should comply with all relevant provisions of the Voting

Rights Act.

Voters are tired of politics as usual. We want our legislators to stop gerrymandering and end the practice of politicians handpicking their voters. We simply want fair and impartial maps. Thank you for your consideration and the opportunity to speak here today.

REP. DOLLAR: Thank you. Let me make a notation. If any of those who have spoken or who will be speaking here shortly, want to submit your comments or share -- you know, if you had something in writing and you want to share that, put that in the hands of the staff, you can hand those either to the Sergeant-at-Arms or to the committee staff up here. I just want to make sure that you knew that opportunity.

Also, let me identify the next five individuals that will be recognized in line. Lee Mortimor. And for the press, if you are looking at your sheet, number 17 who is signed up has withdrawn. So the person after Mortimor would be David Williams, Zack Klien, and Dallas Woodhouse.

So if those individuals would line up. And Ms. Hoy, if you would identify yourself, of course, and for time not to exceed two minutes.

JANET HOY: Yes, thank you very much. My name is Janet Hoy. I live in Orange County but I'm here today as the co-president of the League of Women Voters of North Carolina. The League, as you probably know, is a 100-year-old, nonpartisan, political organization that encourages active and informed participation in government. Since 1966, the League of Women Voters of the US, our national organization, has advocated for impartial electoral maps with both transparent redistricting processes and even more importantly, significant opportunities for public participation.

Today's public comments are about criteria. Our recommendations focus on three primary objectives: transparency, public engagement and fairness. The League recommends this committee commit to the following: disclose all criteria and assumptions used throughout the process; exclude partisan targets; exclude data on voters' party registration and past voting history; exclude data on incumbents' or candidates' addresses, exclude data on race and ethnicity except where necessary to comply with federal law, meaning the Voting Rights Act; analyze each set of maps using generally accepted measures of

compactness and report the results by district and for the set of maps as a whole. Strictly apply the Stephenson process to define the VRA districts and, most importantly, make maps available for review and comment by the public in advance of hearings and again before the maps are finalized.

We urge this committee to ensure that these criteria are reflected in any maps that have been or will be drawn. Furthermore, we ask that the committee's maps and the criteria used to draw them, be promptly publicized, without delay, from the moment they are created, so that citizens of North Carolina will have full opportunity to consider and respond to them.

The League of Women Voters of North Carolina represents thousands of League members across the state as well as many more thousands of supporters, each of whom is one of your constituents. It is critically important to the League and to every North Carolinian that maps are fair, impartial, and that every North Carolinian's vote counts.

REP. DOLLAR: Mr. Mortimor, you are recognized for a time not to exceed two minutes.

LEE MORTIMOR: Thank you. I'm Lee

Mortimor from Durham County. I have been a resident of North Carolina for almost my entire life. I'm a member of North Carolina Common Cause but am speaking on behalf of myself today.

The way redistricting has been done for the past decade makes a complete mockery of elections and voting. It didn't start with Republicans in 2011 but abuse of redistricting has reached a new and unprecedented level in this most recent cycle. We need to bring legitimacy and fairness to elections in voting and to make our representatives accounting through competitive elections. The essential first step toward a meaningful redistricting form, is to create a nonpartisan process that excludes all partisan and political considerations and draws districts that are geographically compact and respect legitimate communities of interest.

Just today, in Venezuela, we are witnessing the turmoil and disruption that can result when a legislature comes to power through an election process that lacks legitimacy. If we do not bring legitimacy to our elections, I fear something similar could happen here. Thank you.

REP. DOLLAR: Next on our list is Mr.

Williams. If you will identify yourself. You are recognized for time not to exceed two minutes.

DAVID WILLIAMS: I will. My name is David Williams. I'm from Transylvania County. I represent Transylvania Indivisible, and I stand as the chair of Indivisible North Carolina's fair voting action group.

But I'm really neither of those things. I'm a husband, I'm a father, I'm a grandfather, I'm a son, I'm a brother, I'm a cousin, I'm a friend, I'm an educator. But in January, I chose to put those things aside and to become a resistor. I chose to fight for a country in which facts are true, whether we like them or not. Where science is accepted as the pathway to truths and where truth is valued.

I chose to fight for a state where the people's business is conducted publicly without attempts to avoid meaningful input, for a state that celebrates the value of human diversity and strips no one of its voice. For a state where every voice has a voice and every vote is a voice for a state government of the people, by representatives of the people, for the welfare of the people. I chose to fight for the future for my

son and my grandson.

I choose to resist those forces that seek to destroy those things that made this country great. A more perfect union, where justice for all under the rule of law is the law, excepting none. A more perfect union with opportunity for all to pursue lives well-lived, lives of meaning, a more perfect union giving all the right to embrace the blessings of liberty, a more perfect union bestowing on all the right to seek happiness and make that which is good even better. To oppose a hostile force that strips its people of the Constitution's guarantee of equality through a voice embodied in a vote, one voice, one vote.

By the deeds of the majority, democracy, civility, negotiation, compromise, transparency, respect for minority voice, views in accountability have been derided and eroded to the point they do not exist in public practice. Those who do not learn from history are doomed to repeat it. By the exercise of its power, this group, and the legislature, have been branded, perhaps unfairly, as racist and as self-seeking. Thank you.

REP. DOLLAR: Mr. Klien, you are recognized for a time not to exceed two minutes.

ZACK KLIEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee. I'm Zack Klien, residing in North Carolina. I'm going to be brief in my statement. In regards to redistricting, it is my opinion that counties should be kept as whole as possible. Race should not be a determining factor used in redrawing the maps, and it's clear that the courts cannot make up this matter, and it's best not to use it. Thank you.

REP. DOLLAR: Mr. Woodhouse, before we recognize you, let me call the next five individuals. Beth Gerall, Louise Kinnard, Amy Porter, Bob Phillips and Donald Mial. If y'all will line up.

Mr. Woodhouse, you are recognized for a time not to exceed two minutes.

DALLAS WOODHOUSE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am Dallas Woodhouse. I am the Executive Director of the North Carolina Republican Party, proudly celebrating its 150th anniversary this year. As a party, we certainly support, using traditional criteria in the redistricting process, both keeping counties as whole as possible, and we think the Goldilocks standard of using race, we have to use a little bit of race, but not too much

race ought to go away, and that no racial considerations ought to be made.

We also think the use or discussion of statewide election data is completely irrelevant, even though it is largely favorable to the North Carolina Republican Party, that has won an overwhelming amount of the statewide election races in the past six years.

We do not elect people on a system of Parliament, like they do in Europe. It is not the job of this committee to make a political party that lost 76 North Carolina counties in the presidential election competitive because they are uncompetitive in vast swaths, vast areas of the state. Again, 76 counties were won by the presidential candidate in North Carolina. And it is not the job of the committee to make that party competitive when it cannot do so itself in huge areas of the state. One, the minority party in this body has a geographic problem that it has to correct, and that is not the job of this committee to correct.

One final note with regards to the 53rd North Carolina House District as a proud alumnus of Campbell University, I believe that our university

has been well represented, and we would like to wholly keep Campbell University in the 53rd district. Thank you very much.

REP. DOLLAR: The lady is recognized for a time not to exceed two minutes.

BETH GERALL: Thank you for letting us speak today. We appreciate it. I'm Beth Gerall from Orange County. I'm going to make several points that other folks have made today but I think it's important for you, the committee members, to hear these over and over again. That the districts that appear after this process demonstrate that one person/one vote is the outcome. They should be equal in population size as much as possible. They should be compact and contiguous. They should make sense.

In creating the districts, communities should not be divided, make efforts to respect the county lines, and if a county must be split, have an honest explanation as to why that was done. In creating the districts, addresses of lawmakers, current and past, party affiliation, voting history of the voters, or any other data other than that which is required by law, should not be used to help a party or a politician in any way.

Before districts are approved, they must be evaluated and demonstrate party competitiveness and no racial bias. The maps should ensure that voters choose their elected officials and not that politicians choose their voters. Thank you for the opportunity to speak.

REP. DOLLAR: Ms. Kinnard, you will be recognized for a time not to exceed two minutes.

LOUISE KINNARD: Thank you very much for letting me speak.

I think the districts should -- oh, I'm Louse Kinnard from Lillington, Harnett County. The district -- I think the districts should be drawn as geometrically as possible so we don't have that snaking where they go like this and around -- like using squares or rectangles. And I understand that you can't do that with every district but as much as possible, include -- have that geometrical design.

I realize that in the past the Democrats have done the same things. I mean, maybe not as bad or maybe not as well. But I understand that, that every time there is a switch in parties, they redistrict to their own political advantage. Let -- we can do better than that.

It should be politically and racially nonpartisan, and before the maps are finalized, I think the public would like to see them and -- so they can have some input and maybe conduct town hall meetings so more of the public can be there to hear their representative. Because that's who they go to first. That's all I have. Thank you very much.

REP. DOLLAR: Thank you. Ms. Porter, you are recognized for time not to exceed two minutes.

AMY PORTER: Thank you for opportunity to speak my piece. My name is Amy Porter, and I am a registered unaffiliated voter from Graham, North Carolina. I am a lifelong citizen of North Carolina. I'm also a veteran teacher in North Carolina, the North Carolina School System. My husband a decorated vet -- Vietnam veteran, owns his own business, and we own a small farm in Alamance County.

I speak on behalf of all North Carolina residents: Republican, Democrats and the independent voters like me who have voted for both parties. I want to see the end of political gerrymandering. Districts cannot be drawn intentionally, unduly favoring any political party.

We must change this in the form of legislation: a change to the State Constitutional form -- Constitutional.

We should form an independent commission to draw district lines. There should be no consideration for voters, a party affiliation, or voter history, in the creation of fair districts. I disagree with Dallas Woodhouse in that statement. Remember that you work for us.

REP. DOLLAR: Mr. Phillips, you are recognized for a time not to exceed two minutes.

BOB PHILLIPS: Thank you. Good morning. I'm Bob Phillips with Common Cause North Carolina. As most of you know, the organization I work for has been pushing for redistricting reform for many years. We are nonpartisan. We have worked with Republicans and Democrats alike on this issue, and we believe that gerrymandering in wrong, regardless of which party does it.

At this moment, you have an opportunity, you have an opportunity to end gerrymandering now if you adopt fair criteria. What does that look like? The place to start is taking politics out of the process. Don't draw districts to favor a political party or an incumbent. That means, don't

look at past election results or where incumbents live when drawing the maps.

The other important rule to follow is abide by the Voting Rights Act. Stop using race to gerrymander. Don't compact or divide minority communities to weaken their voting strength. Follow those rules and you'll get maps that are more compact, contiguous in keeping communities of interest together. You'll also get more districts that are competitive, so we the people can hold you, our elected officials, more accountable.

Finally, the mapmaking process needs to be more open and transparent. No more hired partisan guns in back rooms committing gerrymandering. Ideally maps should be drawn by an independent entity, not the lawmakers.

Now, everything is found in House Bill 200, a bipartisan piece of legislation filed this year that has not been considered. The fact is, a majority of you, this committee, has either voted for or sponsored legislation that would provide the criteria I've just outlined. Let me say that again. Most of you in this room have supported nonpartisan redistricting, and you've done it since the shift of power in 2011. There are a lot of

you. I can look out and I know most of you. A lot of you, both sides of the aisle, who remember and know what it was like to be on the wrong side of gerrymandering. You didn't like it, and that's why you supported reform. I just ask you, support reform, support fair criteria. End gerrymandering now.

REP. DOLLAR: Before we call the next individual, let me call the final six individuals. If you would line up, we have on our list: Greg Flynn, James Wood, Nan Fulcher, Siobhan Millen, Laura Holley, Gerrick Brenner.

Mr. Mial, you are recognized for a time not to exceed two minutes.

DONALD MIAL: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen. My name is Donald Mial. I'm a citizen of Wake County. I have come before this honorable body today to voice my concern for fair elected districts. You see, I served this state and the country for a total of 67 years: 32 years in North Carolina Army National Guard, and 35 years as a State employee, deploying to Iraq with the 3rd BCT to win the hearts and minds of the citizens there. Because their government had failed them.

I believe in government to be responsible to its citizens. You have the power to win the hearts and minds of our citizens of North Carolina by voting and approving fair districts, whereby all people of North Carolina represent -- will be represented equally and fairly. Thank you.

REP. DOLLAR: Mr. Flynn, you are recognized for time not to exceed two minutes.

GREG FLYNN: Thank you. I am Greg Flynn, a Wake County voter for the past -- sorry. I'm still Greg Flynn -- a Wake County voter, and for the past six years. For the past six years, I have been under assault from redistricting, which has had to be fought off on the battlefields of federal court. Even my precinct has two congressional districts in it.

In addition to United States and state redistricting struck by the courts, my county commission and school board districts have been successfully challenged in federal court. It was absurd as a plaintiff to have to drive up to Richmond, Virginia, to defend voting rights here in Wake County, North Carolina. These districts were neither fair nor legal. Please don't repeat this debacle.

Please create compact districts that don't resemble crime scene blood splatters. Please create districts that represent and engage all voters, Republican, Democratic, unaffiliated, and even Libertarians. There is more to life than the epic and chaotic struggle between the two main parties.

The growing ranks of unaffiliated voters, which will soon eclipse one of the parties signals dissatisfaction with the current political scheme and the desire to end the chaos. Please let us see the maps you likely have created already, so we can get down to business and not waste another six years. Finally I ask that the Senate Chair recuse himself until the State Board of Elections concludes the investigation of his campaign finances. Thank you.

REP. DOLLAR: Mr. Wood, you are recognized for time not to exceed two minutes.

JAMES WOOD: Thank you. James Wood from Raleigh. So the objective here is to draw fair legislative districts. I feel like I could get down with a pencil and paper and draw pretty decent districts in about five minutes. So what I'm wondering is why an intervention of the United

States Supreme Court is necessary for this General Assembly to draw fair legislative districts.

In any classroom or workplace, if you turn something in late, five days late, you know exactly what is going to happen to you. You get an F or you get fired. But more than five years late? Forget about it. You know, maybe I could understand that it was an honest mistake. If the General Assembly had acknowledged the problem and worked expediently to remedy it, the first time these districts were found unconstitutional in court.

But I have watched you fight justice tooth and nail. Others have, no doubt, have watched you, too. What kind of impression do you think you are making to young people? I can give you a hint that it's not too good. We are done with your pettiness, and in the not-so-distant future, when we are up there, running the show, things are going to be different around here. Thank you.

REP. DOLLAR: Ms. Fulcher, you are recognized for a time not to exceed two minutes.

NAN FULCHER: Hi. My name is Nan Fulcher, and I'm from Hillsborough. In creating

the 2011 legislative districts for the State of North Carolina, Representative Lewis, in his role as House Redistricting Committee Chair, failed to uphold his oath of office to support the Constitution of the State of North Carolina and the Constitution of the United States. However, there is no remedy for this failure.

In the absence of a formal remedy, I respectfully ask Representative Lewis to step down from the current redistricting committee. Your resignation would acknowledge the plight of all of the residents living in the 28 illegal districts who have not been able to participate in democracy since 2011. From our perspective, the perspective of "We the People," an individual right with no remedy is no right at all. Please show your compassion for the citizens of North Carolina by choosing to step down. You will show you value justice, you will give a sense of remedy to those that deserve it, and you will restore your faith in you as a legislator, and your commitment to uphold the Constitution. Thank you.

REP. DOLLAR: Ms. Millen, before I recognize you, we had two additional people that we had called. Laura Holley and Gerrick Brenner. Are

those individuals here? Okay. So you are here. I will make sure to call you, then.

Ms. Millen, you are recognized for time not to exceed two minutes.

SIOBHAN MILLEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Siobhan Millen. Thank you for allowing me to comment this morning. I'm impressed by your statements last week at this committee meeting and your attorney, Mr. Strach's argument at the federal court, that this committee intends to seek plentiful public input into its redistricting efforts. Indeed, the three-judge panel's order last week lauded your commendable goal of obtaining and considering public input and engaging in robust debate and discussion.

My suggestion would be that you add one more criteria to the standard ones that many have already suggested this morning. To be clear, these standard criteria are compactness, contiguity, respect for political subdivisions, disregard of the party registration voters, disregard of the addresses of the incumbent representative, avoidance of petty double-bunking of the minority party, compliance with one man, one vote principle, minimizing excessive efficiency gaps within

legislative district in compliance with the Voting Rights Act.

The addition criteria which I suggest is that you keep in mind that North Carolina currently has 2.6 million registered Democrats, 2 million registered Republicans, and 2 million unaffiliated voters. The districts you create should elect Senators and House members roughly in proportion to those numbers.

The current overwhelming Republican majority in both chambers suggest that something has gone seriously awry in North Carolina. As evidence of this atrophied democracy, in the 2016 election, nearly half of the contests for the North Carolina House and Senate had only one major party candidate on the ballot. Our General Assembly should reflect our electorate, and for this to happen we need competitive districts. But as Judge Eagles and Judge Wynn noted last week in Greensboro, this committee seems not to take seriously its job of drawing more constitutional districts. In an ominous sign made public in this very room last week, Representative Lewis disclosed that the Joint Committee intends to use again the services of Dr. Tom Hofeller and crafting with his

custom surgical precision, new districts for the General Assembly. This is of concern because Tom Hofeller is a paid consultant for the Republican National Committee, who was described by the Atlantic Magazine in 2012, as a gimlet-eyed, semi-clandestine political operative. So with the federal court overseeing this process, this committee should make all meetings with Dr. Hofeller transparent to the public. Thank you.

REP. DOLLAR: Ms. Holley, you are recognized for time not to exceed two minutes.

LAURA HOLLEY: Thank you. My name is Laura. I'm from Apex, so Wake County.

REP. DOLLAR: Could you give us your last name as well, please?

LAURA HOLLEY: Holley.

REP. DOLLAR: Thank you.

LAURA HOLLEY: While I am affiliated with various organizations, including the Democrat Party, and currently as a precinct chair, here as a nonpartisan fan of well-functioning democracy, representing myself and all NC residents, D's, R's, and U's, to truly represent all of us and be responsive to all of the voter constituencies.

Based upon objective, comprehensive

published data from multiple sources, maps that were so extremely gerrymandered, tweaked by advanced software modeling capabilities, every fact-based indication underscores that my beloved adopted state of North Carolina functionally or empirically -- both -- murdered democracy in 2011. Let's work collaboratively to revive it, starting with implementing fair map being mandates that are strictly honored and practiced. Such as nonpartisan process for drawing new maps, written explicit protocols for transparency before, during and after the map-drawing process, to allow for public and media openness.

As a subnote to that, for input before maps are drawn, I would ask that all reference materials are handed out to the larger committee body, that these documents are also provided to the media and public at least 48 hours in advance of meetings, such as today's. I would further like to see mechanisms, if not already existing, put in place for public input before, during and after each map drawing both online and in person. Thank you.

REP. DOLLAR: Is Gerrick Brenner here and wishing to speak? (No response.) Okay. Having

not, that is the last individual on our list, and the public hearing portion of this committee meeting is officially closed.

Before we close our meeting otherwise, let me make a couple of notations. One, as you see on the screen, and for those who are listening in, the comment opportunities, opportunities for public input, there are opportunities to send in written comments as well as submissions online. There is an opportunity for that as well as the General Assembly's websites, so I would take note of that.

Again, if you had any written comments for those of you who make presentations today during the public comment period, if you wanted to hand those -- if you would like to hand those to the -- any of the Sergeant at Arms or the staff up here, please feel free to do that. The criteria for usage of the terminals will be posted on the Committee's website as well. That was the information that was passed out earlier today.

Questions from members of the Committee? Yes, sir. Representative Moore.

REP. MOORE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. A quick question. Will there be a schedule for remote hearings, public hearings, and I would like

to add that if that's the case -- first of all, could I get to that particular question first, and I will have a follow-up question or a statement.

REP. DOLLAR: Chairman Lewis is recognized.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you for the question, Representative Moore. This is David Lewis from Harnett County. The intent is to indeed publish a schedule. It largely depends on when we can get the maps drawn. As you have heard today, one of the things that the public expects is to be able to see the maps in order to comment on them. Our goal is -- our goal is to be able to conduct and receive input on August 22nd or August 23rd. We will have a firmer date after the criteria is adopted by this committee next week and the process of drawing the maps can begin.

REP. MOORE: Follow-up. And let me just say, I didn't say in front of this, I'm Rodney Moore, House District 99, for the record.

And secondly, when we have the schedule for these remote hearings or public hearings, I would request for the record that you would have a member of the majority and the minority party there. I know in the past when we've done them

before, you've had certain members in those particular areas to kind of preside over the meeting. I would ask that you would have at least one member of the minority party there as well to represent that interest, or represent that particular voice.

REP. DOLLAR: The Chairman is recognized.

REP. LEWIS: Representative Moore, I thank you for that suggestion. I would point out that that was indeed our practice in 2011, and the desire of the Speaker and the President Pro Tem for the members to attend is one of the reasons that we have been called back when we have. So as soon as we have an idea that we'll have a map to show and the public will have time to look at it, we will announce a series of remote sites across the state and here in Raleigh, of course. We will encourage members of both parties to either attend them here in Raleigh or go onsite -- on the remote sites.

REP. MOORE: Thank you, sir.

REP. MICHAUX: Representative Michaux from Durham County. A couple of questions.

When do you plan to have the criteria drawn so that we can sit down and start talking maps?

REP. DOLLAR: Chairman Lewis, I will recognize you for that.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you for the question, Representative Michaux. The intent is for this committee to meet next Thursday and adopt the criteria. We have received criteria today from members of the public. There are also members of this committee that have sent forward criteria. We anticipate continuing to receive that through next week, and then when we meet on Thursday, we will allow all the criteria to be disclosed and discussed and adopted. And once this committee -- has adopted it, I will instruct the map drawer to begin using that criteria to draw the map.

REP. DOLLAR: Representative Michaux.

REP. MICHAUX: Follow-up. Representative Michaux again, from Durham. Chairman Lewis, I keep trying to emphasize it, but you have shown us some maps here today, several of them, showing county groupings. Can you assure this body right now that no redistricting maps have yet been drawn?

REP. LEWIS: Thank you for the question. I can assure this body that none has been drawn at my direction, and that I have direct knowledge of. The only map I'm aware of was submitted by an

independent group and presented to this committee last week.

REP. DOLLAR: Follow-up.

REP. MICHAUX: Just to be clear, I'm talking about anything that any chairman or members of the Republican Party or anybody. No map has yet been drawn that should be handed out here? I'm -- people are concerned about the fact -- they think you've already drawn the maps. I want to make sure, coming from you, that you have not yet drawn maps.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you for the question. I have not yet drawn maps nor have I directed that maps be drawn, nor am I aware of any other entity operating in conjunction with the leadership that has drawn maps.

REP. DOLLAR: Further questions? If not, the next -- Representative Jackson.

REP. JACKSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My question was on criteria. Will we be adopting criteria as a joint committee or will the House members first have a chance to adopt criteria for the House and the senators allowed to adopt criteria for the Senate maps?

REP. DOLLAR: Let me allow Senator --

Chairman Hise to address that.

CHAIRMAN HISE: Thank you. It is our intent to have joint criteria. Obviously it will be the committee's choice and recommendation once it is approved for its criteria, but it is our intent to have the same criteria established for each map.

REP. DOLLAR: Further questions of Committee members at this time? If not, our next meeting will be next Thursday, August 10, at 10:00 a.m., here in room 643. With that, the meeting is adjourned. Thank you.

(End of proceedings.)

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

COUNTY OF WAKE

CERTIFICATION OF TRANSCRIPT

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript of proceedings held on August 4, 2017, is a true and accurate transcript of the proceedings as transcribed by me or under my supervision. I further certify that I am not related to any party or attorney, nor do I have any interest whatsoever in the outcome of this action.

This 7th day of August, 2017.

Robbie Worley

EX. 9

NORTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY
JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE ON REDISTRICTING

TRANSCRIPT OF THE PROCEEDINGS
AUGUST 10, 2017 SESSION

In Raleigh, North Carolina
Thursday, August 10, 2017
Reported by Robbie W. Worley

Worley Reporting
P.O. Box 99169
Raleigh, NC 27624
919-870-8070

SEN. HISE: Recognize Representative Lewis for an announcement.

REP. LEWIS: Ladies and gentlemen, good morning. It is my intent at this time to announce that the Democrats have requested, and have been granted, an opportunity to caucus in Room 423 of this building. So any Democrats that are in the room, the Democrats are going to caucus in Room 423. There will be a joint Republican caucus, House and Senate, in Room 415 immediately upon the recess. The recess will take place at the conclusion of my announcement and will be in effect until 10:35.

So with that, Mr. Chairman, may I be recognized for a motion?

SEN. HISE: You are so recognized.

REP. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of caucusing, I move that this Committee stand in recess until 10:35 a.m.

SEN. HISE: The motion is that the Committee stand in recess until 10:35 a.m. Is there any objection?

REP. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, if I could speak briefly?

SEN. HISE: Go ahead.

REP. LEWIS: I believe I did a poor job of trying to announce that the Democrats are going to caucus in Room 423, and the Republicans are going to caucus in Room 415.

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: Point of clarification. During the recess, are we going to have the information on the criteria?

REP. LEWIS: Thank you for that question, Senator. A copy of the criterion the Chair is intending to present was given to the Democratic Leader of the House, and it's my belief he does intend to share that at this caucus.

SEN. HISE: Any objection? Hearing none, the Committee will stand in recess 'til 35.

(Proceedings went off the record.)

SEN. HISE: The committee will come to order. Thank you, members of the committee, members of the public. If you'd please come to order again. I will begin by announcing our Sergeant at Arms for today's meeting. If you could please identify yourself?

In the House we have Reggie Sills, Malachi McCullough, Jim Morgan and Young Bae. In the Senate we have Terry Barnhardt, Jim Hamilton, Frances Patterson, Hal Roach. And I will announce

for everyone, as well, our court reporter that is with us today, Robbie Worley. Thank you for being here today, and for your work on this Committee meeting.

Having gone through the requested caucuses this morning, and others, I will go ahead and open up. I think he's going to need just a second. Recognize Representative Lewis.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. I'm David Lewis, the Senior Redistricting Chairman for the House. At last week's meeting, I distributed to the Committee and to the public what I believe were the ideal county groupings. The maps were titled "County Groupings for 2017 Senate Plan" and "County Groupings for 2017 House Plans." As I mentioned then, it is our intent to use these county groupings. If there is anyone who knows of a different county grouping formula that is more optimal, I'm asking them to submit that map to the Committee as soon as possible. As of now, no map with more optimal groupings has been submitted.

The purpose of today's meeting is for the Committee to adopt criteria by which the maps will be drawn. After review of the public comment, the

online public input database, the committee meeting last week, and the proposed criterion submitted in writing by Senators Smith-Ingram, Blue and Clark, Chairman Hise, Chairman Dollar and I submit the following criteria for adoption.

Mr. Chairman, with your permission, I would like for the criteria labeled "Equal Population" to be distributed to the Committee and displayed for the public on the overhead screens.

(Pause.)

Mr. Chairman, I believe members have copies, and it's displayed on the screen. May I proceed?

SEN. HISE: You may.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, the first criterion that I propose that the Committee adopt is titled "Equal Population." The Committee shall use the 2010 Federal Decennial Census Data as the sole basis of population for drawing legislative districts in the 2017 House and Senate plans. The number of persons in each legislative district shall comply with a plus or minus five percent population deviation standard established by Stephenson versus Bartlett. That is the criterion. And to speak on it, this

criterion is very similar to what was submitted to the Committees by Senator Smith-Ingram and Senator Clark.

The Chair has proposed that we use the census data from the 2010 Census in drawing the legislative district this time because that is the standard that is required by law. We will also comply with a plus or minus five percent population deviation standard established by Stephenson I. Mr. Chairman, this is my proposal for this criterion. I'd be happy to answer any questions at your direction.

SEN. HISE: Representatives, just for notation for members of the Committee, I thought it was important to realize that even those these may be numbered or referred to as the first criterion, this is a nominal designation and does not necessarily list ordinal or order of importance of the criteria listing. Any questions or comments regarding the first proposed criterion?

Representative Dollar, yes?

REP. DOLLAR: Mr. Chairman, for a motion to adopt the criterion by the Committee.

UNIDENTIFIED MEMBER: Mr. Chair, division?

SEN. HISE: It is the intent of the Chair to call for a roll-call vote for all votes.

UNIDENTIFIED MEMBER: Thank you.

SEN. HISE: Thank you. So, Representative Dollar, and to make that a joint, I will say the Chairmen of the Committee have moved for adoption of the first criterion. We will begin with the House of Representatives, if there is no objection at this point, and allow the Clerk to call the roll. If you're in favor of the adoption, please signify by saying aye. If you're opposed to the adoption, please signify by saying no. Are we not ready?

CLERK: Yeah. Representative Bell? Representative Jackson?

REP. JACKSON: Nay. I'm sorry, aye. Aye. Warming up.

CLERK: Okay. Jackson, aye. Representative Stevens?

REP. STEVENS: Aye.

CLERK: Stevens, aye. Representative Szoka?

REP. SZOKA: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Szoka, aye. Representative Brawley?

REP. BRAWLEY: Brawley, aye.

CLERK: Representative Brawley, aye. Representative Brockman?

REP. BROCKMAN: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Brockman, aye. Representative Burr?

REP. BURR: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Burr, aye. Representative Davis? Representative Davis? Representative Dixon?

REP. DIXON: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Dixon, aye. Representative Dobson?

REP. DOBSON: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Dobson, aye. Representative Dulin?

REP. DULIN: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Dulin, aye. Representative Farmer-Butterfield?

REP. FARMER-BUTTERFIELD: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Farmer-Butterfield, aye. Representative Floyd? Representative Floyd? Representative Garrison?

REP. GARRISON: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Garrison, aye.

Representative Gill?

REP. GILL: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Gill, aye.

Representative Grange?

REP. GRANGE: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Grange, aye.

Representative Hall? Representative Hall?

Representative Hanes?

REP. HANES: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Hanes, aye.

Representative Hardister?

REP. HARDISTER: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Hardister, aye.

Representative Harrison?

REP. HARRISON: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Harrison, aye.

Representative Hastings?

REP. HASTINGS: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Hastings, aye.

Representative Howard?

REP. HOWARD: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Howard, aye.

Representative Hunter?

REP. HUNTER: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Hunter, aye.

Representative Hurley?

REP. HURLEY: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Hurley, aye.

Representative Johnson?

REP. JOHNSON: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Johnson, aye.

Representative Jones? Representative Jones?

Representative Jordan?

REP. JORDAN: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Jordan, aye.

Representative Malone?

REP. MALONE: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Malone, aye.

Representative Michaux?

REP. MICHAUX: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Michaux, aye.

Representative Moore?

REP. MOORE: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Moore, aye.

Representative Pierce?

REP. PIERCE: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Pierce, aye.

Representative Reives?

REP. REIVES: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Reives, aye.

Representative Willingham?

REP. WILLINGHAM: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Willingham, aye.

Representative Speciale?

REP. SPECIALE: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Speciale, aye.

Representative Rogers?

REP. ROGERS: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Rogers, aye.

Representative Saine?

REP. SAINE: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Saine, aye.

Representative Wray?

REP. WRAY: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Wray, aye.

Representative Yarborough?

REP. YARBOROUGH: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Yarborough, aye.

Representative Torbett?

REP. TORBETT: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Torbett, aye.

Representative Hall?

REP. HALL: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Hall, aye.

Representative Bell?

REP. BELL: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Bell, aye. Oh, Representative Lewis?

REP. LEWIS: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Lewis, aye. Representative Dollar?

REP. DOLLAR: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Dollar, aye. I think that's it.

SEN. HISE: Are there any members of the Committee that are members of the House that were not recorded in the process? Hearing none before we get into roll call of the Senate.

CLERK: Senator Bishop?

SEN. BISHOP: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Bishop, aye. Senator Blue? Senator Blue? Senator Clark?

SEN. CLARK: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Clark, aye. Senator Daniel? Senator Harrington?

SEN. HARRINGTON: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Harrington, aye. Senator Jackson?

SEN. JACKSON: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Jackson, aye. Senator

Lee? Senator Lee, aye. Senator Lowe?

SEN. LOWE: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Lowe, aye. Senator Newton?

SEN. NEWTON: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Newton, aye. Senator Rabon? Senator Smith-Ingram?

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Smith-Ingram, aye. Senator Van Duyn?

SEN. VAN DUYN: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Van Duyn, aye. Senator Wade?

SEN. WADE: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Wade, aye. Senator Hise?

SEN. HISE: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Hise, aye. Senator Brown?

SEN. BROWN: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Brown, aye.

SEN. HISE: Any members of the Senate who were not recorded in the roll-call vote? Hearing none. By a vote of 38 to 0 in the House, 12 to 0 in the Senate, the first criterion is adopted by the Committee. Representative Lewis, you're

represented here -- recognized to present the second criterion.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If the Sergeant at Arms would distribute to the members of the Committee the criterion labeled "Contiguity." And I will display for the public on the screens this criterion. What I'll do is when they're doing the vote count, I'll pass out the next one. Okay?

Mr. Chairman, I believe members have copies. If I may be recognized to proceed?

SEN. HISE: You're recognized.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, this criterion simply reads "Contiguity." Legislative districts shall be comprised of contiguous territory and contiguity by water is sufficient. This is another criterion that is similar to what was submitted to the Committees by Senator Clark and Senator Smith-Ingram. Legislative districts are required to be composed of contiguous territory, and this criterion would simply adhere to the legal requirements. Be glad to answer any questions.

SEN. HISE: Senator Clark?

SEN. CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator Clark. It does somewhat look like the criterion that Senator Smith-Ingram and I recommended. However, I do not believe it is complete enough. And it is my preference that the Chair would accept an amendment to use the complete contiguity definition as submitted to us -- as submitted by us to the Committee previously.

REP. LEWIS: Senator, with your indulgence and permission, we will ask staff to prepare an amendment that would accomplish those goals. I will ask the Chair to displace this until that can be done, and we'll move on to the -- to the next one. Would that be okay, sir?

SEN. CLARK: Thank you, sir.

SEN. HISE: Sergeant at Arms will begin to pass out the third criterion, if that's okay? Representative Lewis, you are recognized to present the Criterion Number 3.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I believe members are getting copies. I'll be happy to hold if I need to. This criterion is entitled "County Groupings and Traversals." It reads, the Committee shall draw legislative districts within county groupings as required by Stephenson versus Bartlett. Within county groupings, county lines

shall not be traversed except as authorized by Stephenson I, Stephenson II, Dickson I and Dickson II. And if I may speak on the criterion, Mr. Chairman?

SEN. HISE: So recognized.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, this is another element of the criterion that was contained in Senator Smith-Ingram and Senator Clark's proposed criterion. Though the words may be different, I think the practical effect is the same. The rules for the county groupings and traversals were first established in -- were first established in Stephenson I and have been affirmed in later cases.

Last week, we released the county grouping plans that, I believe, are optimal for complying with Stephenson. I explained how they were constructed. We have not received any alternative county grouping plans. As I spoke to in my opening comments, it is our intent to use the maps of county -- of optimal county groupings that were passed out last week. And with that, Mr. Chairman, I'll be happy to yield to any questions.

SEN. HISE: Any questions or comments regarding the grouping, regarding this criterion?

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: Mr. Chair?

SEN. HISE: Senator Smith-Ingram.

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'd like clarification on what the requirements of Stephenson and Dickson are when they authorize traversing county lines, since that's not really clear from the criterion on its face.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you for that question, Senator. And, you know, it's probably evident to you and everyone in this room that I'm not an attorney, but I will do my best to explain it. It is my understanding that the traversal rule means that if you are drawing districts in a multiple-group county and you essentially draw a district into a county, that you can't draw back out of the county and go back in. Sort of, weave back and forth. That's not a legal term, but I'm trying my best to answer your question.

SEN. HISE: Follow-up?

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: Thank you, Representative Lewis, because I'm not an attorney either. So thank you.

SEN. HISE: Any other questions or comments regarding this criterion? Okay. Hearing none. Representative Dollar?

REP. DOLLAR: Motion for adoption.

SEN. HISE: Again, the Chairman moves for the adoption of Criterion Number 3 for consideration by the Committee. Seeing no other questions or comments, I will begin with the Senate this time and ask for the Clerk to call the roll.

CLERK: Senator Bishop?

SEN. BISHOP: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Bishop, aye. Senator Blue? Senator Brown?

SEN. BROWN: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Brown, aye. Senator Clark?

SEN. CLARK: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Clark, aye. Senator Daniel? Senator Harrington?

SEN. HARRINGTON: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Harrington, aye. Senator Jackson?

SEN. JACKSON: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Jackson, aye. Senator Lee?

SEN. LEE: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Lee, aye. Senator Lowe?

SEN. LOWE: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Lowe, aye. Senator Newton?

SEN. NEWTON: Senator Newton, aye. Senator Rabon? Senator Smith-Ingram?

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Smith-Ingram, aye. Senator Van Duyn?

SEN. VAN DUYN: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Van Duyn, aye. Senator Wade?

SEN. WADE: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Wade, aye. Senator Hise?

SEN. HISE: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Hise, aye.

SEN. HISE: Members, I do think it is different to what we have. The Sergeant at Arms are passing out the next criterion during this process. If the House Clerk will call the roll.

CLERK: Representative Jackson?

REP. JACKSON Aye.

CLERK: Representative Jackson, aye. Representative Szoka?

REP. SZOKA: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Szoka, aye. Representative Bell?

REP. BELL: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Bell, aye. Representative Stevens?

REP. STEVENS: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Stevens, aye. Representative Brawley?

REP. BRAWLEY: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Brawley, aye. Representative Brockman?

REP. BROCKMAN: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Brockman, aye. Representative Burr?

REP. BURR: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Burr, aye. Representative Davis? Representative Davis? Representative Dixon?

REP. DIXON: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Dixon, aye. Representative Dobson?

REP. DOBSON: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Dobson, aye. Representative Dulin?

REP. DULIN: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Dulin, aye. Representative Farmer-Butterfield?

REP. FARMER-BUTTERFIELD: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Farmer-Butterfield, aye. Representative Floyd? Representative Floyd? Representative Garrison?

REP. GARRISON: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Garrison, aye. Representative Gill?

REP. GILL: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Gill, aye. Representative Grange?

REP. GRANGE: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Grange, aye. Representative Hall?

REP. HALL: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Hall, aye. Representative Hanes?

REP. HANES: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Hanes, aye. Representative Hardister?

REP. HARDISTER: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Hardister, aye. Representative Harrison?

REP. HARRISON: Aye.

CLERK: I'm sorry. Could you repeat that?

REP. HARRISON: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Harrison, aye. Representative Hastings?

REP. HASTINGS: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Hastings, aye. Representative Howard?

REP. HOWARD: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Howard, aye. Representative Hunter?

REP. HUNTER: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Hunter, aye. Representative Hurley?

REP. HURLEY: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Hurley, aye. Representative Johnson?

REP. JOHNSON: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Johnson, aye. Representative Jones? Representative Jones? Representative Jordan?

REP. JORDAN: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Jordan, aye. Representative Malone?

REP. MALONE: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Malone, aye. Representative Michaux?

REP. MICHAUX: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Michaux, aye.

Representative Moore?

REP. MOORE: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Moore, aye.

Representative Pierce?

REP. PIERCE: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Pierce, aye.

Representative Reives?

REP. REIVES: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Reives, aye.

Representative Willingham?

REP. WILLINGHAM: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Willingham, aye.

Representative Speciale?

REP. SPECIALE: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Speciale, aye.

Representative Marsh -- Rogers?

REP. ROGERS: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Rogers, aye.

Representative Saine?

REP. SAINE: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Saine, aye.

Representative Torbett?

REP. TORBETT: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Torbett, aye. Representative Wray?

REP. WRAY: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Wray, aye. Representative Yarborough?

REP. YARBOROUGH: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Yarborough, aye. Representative Lewis?

REP. LEWIS: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Lewis, aye. Representative Dollar?

REP. DOLLAR: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Dollar, aye.

SEN. HISE: How many? By a vote in the Senate of 12 to 0 and the House of 38 to 0, the third presented criterion is adopted by the Committee.

Members, you should have in front of you now the fourth presented criterion for the Senate, entitled "Compactness." Representative Lewis, you're recognized to explain.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, this criterion reads, "Compactness." The Committee shall make reasonable efforts to draw legislative districts in 2017 House and Senate

plans to improve the compactness of the current districts. In doing so, the committees may use a guide. The minimum Reock dispersion or Polsby-Popper perimeter scores identified by Richard H. Pildes and Richard G. Niemi in the article entitled "Expressive Harms, 'Bizarre Districts,' and Voting Rights: Evaluating Election-District Appearances After Shaw v. Reno." And to speak to that, Mr. Chairman --

SEN. HISE: You are so recognized.

REP. LEWIS: -- this criterion is also very similar to that as submitted by Senator Clark and Senator Smith-Ingram. The key difference is that the Chairs are recommending to the Committees that the Committees may use as a guide a minimum Reock and Polsby-Popper score for drawing the legislative district that appears in a law review article referenced before in my remarks.

The reason we are recommending these methods as scores as a guide is because they have been cited as relevant to judging compactness of districts. I would also point out that these were some of the criteria that have been submitted via the online portal. They were some of the criteria that were referenced in the hearings last week.

And they also are part of the criteria that outside groups have submitted to this Committee to be considered. Be happy to answer any questions.

SEN. HISE: Representative Jackson?

REP. JACKSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Chairman Lewis, my understanding is that the Maptitude software will calculate about eight different types of compactness; is that correct?

REP. LEWIS: I don't know.

REP. JACKSON: Mr. Chairman, is there anybody on staff that can answer that question for me?

SEN. HISE: Do you know how many it can calculate? It appears we're going to have to get that response for you.

REP. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, while we're getting that, may I speak to why I think the gentleman is --

SEN. HISE: Sure.

REP. LEWIS: -- asking me.

SEN. HISE: You may respond to the question.

REP. LEWIS: Representative, the reason that these two were picked is that these are the two that the Courts have -- have referred to.

Obviously, members of the Committee would be able to use any other criterion or any other compactness gauge that they saw fit in doing their own personal evaluations. But to the best of our knowledge, these are the two that the Courts have referred to.

SEN. HISE: Representative Jackson, for a follow-up?

REP. JACKSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So just to follow up on that, so we would not be precluded from using the other scores available in Maptitude?

REP. LEWIS: You would not; no, sir.

SEN. HISE: Any other questions, comments? Senator Clark?

SEN. CLARK: Mr. Chair, is it possible for you to give us the Reader's Digest version of what these -- what these actually do?

REP. LEWIS: Thank you for the question, Senator. I will certainly -- I will certainly try. The perimeter compactness is commonly associated with the Polsby-Popper score. This is the area of the district compared to the area of a circle within the same perimeter of the district. Again, there's a scale established of 1.0 to 0.0. And districts that are drawn with borders that wander

in irregular ways will produce a lower compactness score when compared with a circle of the same perimeter.

The other test, the Reock, is a measure of the ratio of the district area to area. In other words, the area inside of the district itself. Also, using a circumscribing circle. I realize that is perhaps not as clear as I would like to be. I would just reiterate that these are two compactness tests that the courts have used. They are two of the ones that you have mentioned in the past. They are two of the ones that several of the independent groups that have contacted our office have encouraged us to use. And, therefore, we would recommend -- or I recommend to the Committee that we attempt to use them in drawing our districts.

SEN. HISE: Representative Michaux?

REP. MICHAUX: Yeah, Mr. Lewis, I have a semantic problem with this. It says the Committee shall make reasonable efforts to draw. And then you say in doing so the Committee may use as a guide. And my information is that there are at least eight other guides out there that can be used. And I guess my question borders on the same

thing Representative Jackson asked. Why would you limit yourself if you're going to make it may, and if you've got at least six other reasonable guidelines that you can use? In spite of the fact that it may have -- that others may have mentioned it.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you for the question, Representative. My response is simply these are the two best-known, if you will, measures of compactness. And to my understanding, these are the two that the courts have referred to. I think these are the two that are best understood. And again, this would not preclude you as a member or anyone else who chose to use other grades of compactness. We're just trying to signal, to be candid with you, that we want to try to draw more compact seats. And there has to be some measure of that. These may not be the ideal two, but these are the two that, I think, are best known. And again, these are the two that the courts have referenced.

REP. MICHAUX: May I follow up, Mr. Chair?

SEN. HISE: Follow-up.

REP. MICHAUX: Well, in the final

analysis, will your maps, or whatever you draw, make reference to which one of these -- or which -- any of those criteria were used be -- be specifically pointed out when you do it?

REP. LEWIS: Yes, sir.

SEN. HISE: Representative Dollar?

REP. DOLLAR: For a motion --

SEN. HISE: Hold on just a minute. Representative Moore would like to speak.

REP. DOLLAR: Well, then let me ask a question, because -- Chairman Lewis, isn't it the case that this is the most precise guidelines that the -- to your knowledge, that the General Assembly's ever adopted with respect to compactness?

REP. LEWIS: Thank you for the question, and the answer is yes.

REP. DOLLAR: Thank you.

SEN. HISE: Representative Moore.

REP. MOORE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Representative Lewis, a quick -- something that came to mind. Are these two methods that you're talking about -- were they used in the map-drawing process in 2011? Or was there another -- there was a -- there was another methodology used other than

these two that you're referencing now?

REP. LEWIS: Thank you for the question, Representative. To the -- to the best of my knowledge, they were not used in 2011. To be completely transparent and to express my total understanding of this, I was not even aware that these tests were there in 2011. But I am now.

SEN. HISE: Any other questions or comments? None. Representative Dollar is recognized for a motion.

REP. DOLLAR: Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of the criterion.

SEN. HISE: Okay. I have to hold that again. Apparently, Representative Farmer-Butterfield now has a question.

REP. FARMER-BUTTERFIELD: I had my hand up. I don't think you saw that beforehand.

SEN. HISE: I can't see through people.

REP. FARMER-BUTTERFIELD: I know that. I understand.

I just wanted to make sure I'm clear. Staff were going to give us the other -- whether or not there were eight other different ways? And I had not heard that information from staff.

SEN. HISE: At the point the question was

asked, the staff was unaware. And I said we'd have to get that question.

REP. FARMER-BUTTERFIELD: All right.

ERIKA CHURCHILL (STAFF): Representative Farmer-Butterfield. Available in Maptitude is the Reock test, the Schwartzberg test, the Perimeter test, the Polsby-Popper test, the Length-Width test, the Population Polygon test, the Minimum Convex Polygon test, the Population Circle test and the Ehrenburg test.

REP. FARMER-BUTTERFIELD: Thank you. Follow-up?

SEN. HISE: Follow-up.

REP. FARMER-BUTTERFIELD: I think that I heard earlier that if this passes with just these two, it will not preclude using the other six, or the others? Is that the case or not?

REP. LEWIS: Thank you for that question. The answer is yes, the other ones could be used. Again, we're trying to respond to requests from the public, from members who've said try to make the districts a little more compact. And so this is saying that these two may be used. But yes, you may use all of them if you want to.

SEN. HISE: Okay. Someone else?

Somebody was pointing to someone? Senator Lowe?

SEN. LOWE: Yes, I may have missed it. But one of the things that I noticed or heard was, I know we're using two approaches. There's eight possible approaches. Why is it that we're just looking at these two? I want real clarity on that.

SEN. HISE: Maybe I'm going to explain a little bit of this. Each one of these methods will yield a score. And a score of any particular district will be between, generally, zero and one. I don't think there's any, as I understand it, concave in the designs. Zero to one will be the ratio of some two numbers that are coming in. That will give you a measure of compactness. There are eight measures. There are infinite numbers of ways anyone can come up to determine what they mean when they say something is compact.

There are only two that have been used in court rulings by the Supreme Court in regards to redistricting. These are these two. We both set those as the standard we will use to measure compactness of districts. But that calculation can be done for any number of the other standards that might be in the pack or the infinite number of standards that someone else could come up with and

make an argument. Senator Smith-Ingram?

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I believe, for clarification, I need to find out. Staff, Erika Churchill, just listed out -- was it about ten of those tools that are available on Maptitude?

SEN. HISE: Nine? She says the number is nine.

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: Also included, is there an explanation in Maptitude that will give us the reliability of each of those tools and the performance as well as the range?

SEN. HISE: Reliability is probably not a factor that would apply to these in a manner. But it will give you an explanation of the calculation.

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: Just for clarity, because there are nine different measurements. It would be nice to have the data on the reliability of each tool so you can look at each tool and their performance to be able to determine which is the better tool in terms of a higher percentage of reliability.

SEN. HISE: I think I'll take the comment. But again, I would say that reliability is not necessarily a factor that is -- this is

talking about how compact is the district? And the test will determine how compact the district is. So, Representative Jackson?

REP. JACKSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It appears that we are looking at dispersion and perimeter, but we are leaving out population measures in these tests. And I was wondering, from staff, if any of the seven other tests include population measures in their scoring?

SEN. HISE: I'll let you answer the question.

MS. CHURCHILL (STAFF): Representative Jackson, we are reading from the Maptitude documentation. And it does appear that there's at least two tests, the Population Polygon test and the Population Circle test, that take into consideration district population to the approximate population of the area that is being used. We're happy to print this for the Committee if you all would like.

REP. JACKSON Follow-up, Mr. Chairman?

SEN. HISE: Follow-up.

REP. JACKSON Then I guess the question for Chairman Lewis would be, wouldn't we want to consider population as well? And why that test

would not be one of the ones that we use a score for?

REP. LEWIS: Well, thank you for that question, Representative. To be candid, I'm not familiar with the particular test that you have asked about. I realize that you're asking about a specific test that the computer program is capable of running. I would just point out that, in my mind, the population issue is the one-person-one-vote plus or minus five percent that we adopted as a criterion earlier today. And as I've said before, you would certainly have every access to run the reports or get whatever scores that you want to -- want to review.

But again, I would just point out to the members, the reason that these two are specified in here is these are the ones the Courts have written about in recent redistricting court rulings.

SEN. HISE: Follow-up?

REP. HARDISTER: Follow-up, Mr. Chairman. So is it -- is it -- is it your understanding that the Court has not written about some of these other test scores that Maptitude can also provide?

REP. LEWIS: Well, thank you for the question. And to be clear, Representative, I don't

know that they have or they have not. I'm simply stating in the cases that I reviewed, these were the two that were used.

SEN. HISE: Any other questions or comments? Hearing none, upon Representative Dollar's motion and the motion of the Chairs, we move to add the fourth criterion, Compactness, to those. Any other questions or comments? Hearing none, we'll have the Clerk call the roll of the House.

CLERK: Representative Jackson?

REP. JACKSON: No.

CLERK: Representative Szoka?

REP. SZOKA: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Stevens?

REP. STEVENS: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Bell?

REP. BELL: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Brawley?

REP. BRAWLEY: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Brockman?

REP. BROCKMAN: No.

CLERK: Representative Brockman, no. Representative Burr?

REP. BURR: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Burr, aye. Representative Davis? Representative Davis? Representative Dixon?

REP. DIXON: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Dixon, aye. Representative Dobson?

REP. DOBSON: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Dobson, aye. Representative Dulin?

REP. DULIN: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Dulin, aye. Representative Farmer-Butterfield?

REP. FARMER-BUTTERFIELD: No.

CLERK: Representative Farmer-Butterfield, no. Representative Floyd? Representative Floyd? Representative Garrison?

REP. GARRISON: No.

CLERK: Representative Garrison, no. Representative Gill?

REP. GILL: No.

CLERK: Representative Gill, no. Representative Grange?

REP. GRANGE: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Grange, aye. Representative Hall?

REP. HALL: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Hall, aye.

Representative Hanes?

REP. HANES: No.

CLERK: Representative Hanes, no.

Representative Hardister?

REP. HARDISTER: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Hardister, aye.

Representative Harrison?

REP. HARRISON: No.

CLERK: Representative Harrison, no.

Representative Hastings?

REP. HASTINGS: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Hastings, aye.

Representative Howard?

REP. HOWARD: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Howard, aye.

Representative Hunter?

REP. HUNTER: No.

CLERK: Representative Hunter, no.

Representative Johnson?

REP. JOHNSON: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Johnson, aye.

Representative Hurley?

REP. HURLEY: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Hurley, aye. Representative Jones? Representative Jones? Representative Jordan?

REP. JORDAN: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Jordan, aye. Representative Malone?

REP. MALONE: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Malone, aye. Representative Michaux?

REP. MICHAUX: No.

CLERK: Representative Michaux, no. Representative Moore?

REP. MOORE: No.

CLERK: Representative Moore, no. Representative Pierce?

REP. PIERCE: No.

CLERK: Representative Pierce, no. Representative Reives?

REP. REIVES: No.

CLERK: Representative Reives, no. Representative Willingham?

REP. WILLINGHAM: No.

CLERK: Representative Willingham, no. Representative Speciale?

REP. SPECIALE: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Speciale, aye. Representative Rogers?

REP. ROGERS: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Rogers, aye. Representative Saine?

REP. SAINE: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Saine, aye. Representative Torbett?

REP. TORBETT: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Torbett, aye. Representative Wray?

REP. WRAY: No.

CLERK: Representative Wray, no. Representative Yarborough?

REP. YARBOROUGH: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Yarborough, aye. Representative Lewis?

REP. LEWIS: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Lewis, aye. Representative Dollar?

REP. DOLLAR: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Dollar, aye.

SEN. HISE: Senate Clerk will call the roll.

CLERK: Senator Bishop?

SEN. BISHOP: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Bishop, aye. Senator Brown?

SEN. BROWN: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Brown, aye. Senator Clark?

SEN. CLARK: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Clark, aye. Senator Daniel? Senator Harrington?

SEN. HARRINGTON: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Harrington, aye. Senator Jackson?

SEN. JACKSON: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Jackson, aye. Senator Lee?

SEN. LEE: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Lee, aye. Senator Lowe?

SEN. LOWE: No.

CLERK: Senator Lowe, no. Senator Newton?

SEN. NEWTON: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Newton, aye. Senator Rabon? Senator Smith-Ingram?

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: No.

CLERK: Senator Smith-Ingram, no.

Senator Van Duyn?

SEN. VAN DUYN: No.

CLERK: Senator Van Duyn, no. Senator Wade?

SEN. WADE: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Wade, aye. Senator Hise?

SEN. HISE: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Hise, aye.

SEN. HISE: Thank you, members of the Committee. By a vote of 24 to 14 in the House and 9 to 3 in the Senate, the criterion is adopted -- fourth criterion presented, Compactness, is adopted by the Committee.

I believe, members, now it is the intent to return to the second introduced criterion, Contiguity. And the members should have -- Senator Clark has passed out an amendment or, probably more accurately, a rewrite of the criterion. Senator Clark will be recognized to explain his amendments.

SEN. CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Chair. What you have before you is essentially an expansion of the initial criterion disseminated by the Committee chairs. But the problem with the explanation submitted by the Committee chairs is that it does not -- it's not expansive enough. For instance,

let me give you an example. You can be in a particular district, and although it may be connected by a land-mass, that land-mass is not navigable by car, boat -- by car or any other form transportation for the purpose of conducting commerce. So instead of saying something is contiguous, just because there's a little strip, what this particular definition would say is that it's not considered contiguous unless you can actually conduct commerce from one part of the district to another part of the district without first having to go outside of your district in through another district.

REP. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman?

SEN. HISE: Representative Lewis?

REP. LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, I want thank Senator Clark. He has been extremely helpful in providing information for us to review. I did review the language that he proposed for quite a long time. I'm not in support of the amendment for the following reasons.

One, I'm not familiar with the commercial patterns and the layout of highways and roads all across the state. And I assume that most members on this Committee would say the same. Also, there

are elements of contiguity that can change, while geographic features themselves do not. That's why I feel it's wise to stick to contiguity as a legal requirement for adopting in this criterion. I also don't know in the amount of time that the Committee has to draw the districts, that we could develop a legal definition to match what the gentleman is attempting to do. And with that, I would ask members to vote down the amendment.

SEN. HISE: Representative Stevens?

REP. STEVENS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Representative Lewis, in looking at some of these maps, particularly with our rocky, rocky coast, has anybody submitted an alternative map that would allow us to accomplish what he's hoping to accomplish? I mean, wouldn't we break up our optimum groups to try to do that?

REP. LEWIS: Thank you for the question. The first answer is no. To my knowledge, nobody has submitted any additional county grouping that is more optimal than the one that we passed out. I think what the gentleman's trying to do actually deals with districts within the groupings. And I just don't know that it is possible to do that, either. There are precincts that overlap and

things like that. I just don't know how to develop a legal -- I don't know how to define what the gentleman is trying to do. And therefore, I don't think we can adopt it as a criterion.

SEN. HISE: Senator Clark?

SEN. CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You're right. I'm speaking to the areas within the clusters; not between clusters. Now, you're correct that I don't know how to solve the problem for every single district. But that's why we have a committee. Members here, they do know how to do that collectively. And there is a phrase up here. I say that we want to do this to the extent practicable. There may be circumstances in which it is not practicable. But there are many in which there are practicable solutions. I can certainly tell you how to do it within my district as it currently exists today.

And with regard to legal definition, that's why we have staff here to support us. There are a lot of things I cannot come up with the legal definition for. But with the systems of our able staff, we are more than able to accomplish that.

REP. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman?

SEN. HISE: Representative Lewis.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just to speak to Senator Clark's last point. To be clear, it's the intent of adopting the criterion that this Committee is adopting today to produce a draft map. And the draft map will be produced and distributed. Members of the Committee will be able to offer the kind of insight that Senator Clark has proposed. We also intend to hold public hearings across the state to receive feedback. And members of the public may be able to offer input and advice that gets closer to what the Senator is trying to accomplish here. I want to point out that I've spent a lot of time trying to figure out how to incorporate this language. And I simply don't know how to do it. And so, again, I would ask members to vote against the amendment.

SEN. HISE: Senator Smith-Ingram?

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I guess I have a question, Representative Lewis, but first, a statement. In looking at the geographical compactness in the example based on the submitted one, it is a challenge when you're connecting counties by a body of water. For example, Pasquotank and Hyde are connected, but there's no means to traverse between them. You

would have to drive an hour around the district, going through another district, to get to your district. When you connect with a river, such as my district, you end up with counties from one point -- from the western point to the eastern point. That's a two hour and 41 minute drive out to the coast. And that makes it very problematic when you're covering that type of territory.

So my question is, in light of those examples, would you consider this to be commensurate with geographical compactness? The language of the amendment certainly promotes that for me, and I'm wondering, do you see that?

REP. LEWIS: Thank you for the question, and the short answer is, I don't see that. I do understand the lady's point about the -- the size of some of the districts that have to be drawn, but I would point out, that oftentimes, that's directly related to the physical size of the counties themselves.

We, this General Assembly -- this is getting off redistricting a bit, but this General Assembly will continue to have to address the fact that our rural areas, especially in the northeastern part of the state, are large in land

mass and smaller in population than our urban centers are. And there's just no way to get around that.

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: Okay. For clarification follow-up --

SEN. HISE: Follow-up.

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: So do you consider contiguity and geographic compactness commensurate with one another?

REP. LEWIS: Well, thank you for the question. I understand contiguity which, by the way, Representative Torbett gave me a breakdown on how to say the word. I really do -- I really do appreciate that. Apparently, I'm not doing a very good job. But I understand that to mean that the borders join, if you will. Compactness means that you want to draw districts that are compact. I don't know that those -- everything that we do, all of the criteria that we're going to discuss today, has got to be harmonized and used together. I don't know that these are the exact same thing, so I don't know that I would agree with that premise.

SEN. HISE: Thank you. And, Senator Smith-Ingram, we would like -- several of us would like to see the drive across our district reduced

to two and a half hours, so thanks for the comment. Representative Brawley?

REP. BRAWLEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Bill Brawley, Mecklenburg County. When I read Senator Clark's amendment, and he talked about accessible for commerce, the first thought that came to mind was roads. And I'm sitting next to Chairman Torbett of Transportation who, along with myself, were two of the co-sponsors for strategic transportation investments law. And we were thinking of the number of cases where you would drive out of a House district on a road and then back into the same district, just because of the way our road network is set up and the incredible need for more roads for commerce that we have.

I had concerns of it for that reason. I would think that this might be a reasonable discussion we have when we've finished our $70 billion backlog of construction. But right now, the shortage of roads would make this much more difficult than it appears on the surface. And would agree that I would tend to have concerns about this. I believe the compactness and contiguity are being addressed and the roads -- we're not going to be able to solve that today.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SEN. HISE: Thank you. Senator Clark and Senator Brown.

SEN. CLARK: Again, I would like to emphasize my definition, as written, says to the extent practicable. If it's not practicable, of course we're not going to do it. However, there are many circumstances in which it is practicable.

SEN. HISE: Senator Brown.

SEN. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think the county groupings piece is the concern -- or has created concern, I think, that Senator Clark's bringing up. But that's a court ruling that I don't think there's any flexibility on, on how the groupings can be drawn. Is that correct, Representative Lewis?

REP. LEWIS: Well, certainly, sir. Thank you for the question. The county groupings are -- are required by the court, yes.

SEN. HISE: Senator Clark again.

SEN. CLARK: I need to clarify again. My statement has nothing to do with county groupings. We're talking about internal to the groupings, the actual districts themselves within a grouping.

SEN. HISE: Any other questions or

comments? Hearing none, we will take into consideration of amending the proposed criteria plan as presented by Senator Clark. We will begin with the Senate this time. The Senate Clerk will call the roll.

CLERK: Senator Bishop?

SEN. BISHOP: No.

CLERK: No. Senator Blue? Senator Brown?

SEN. BROWN: No.

CLERK: Senator Brown, no. Senator Clark?

SEN. CLARK: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Clark, aye. Senator Daniel? Senator Harrington?

SEN. HARRINGTON: No.

CLERK: Senator Harrington, no. Senator Jackson?

SEN. JACKSON: No.

CLERK: Senator Jackson, no. Senator Lee?

SEN. LEE: No.

CLERK: Senator Lee, no. Senator Lowe?

SEN. LOWE: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Lowe, aye. Senator

Newton?

SEN. NEWTON: No.

CLERK: Senator Newton, no. Senator Rabon? Senator Smith-Ingram?

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Smith-Ingram, aye. Senator Van Duyn?

SEN. VAN DUYN: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Van Duyn, aye. Senator Wade?

SEN. WADE: No.

CLERK: Senator Wade, no. Senator Hise?

SEN. HISE: No.

CLERK: Senator Hise, no.

SEN. HISE: The Clerk of the House will please call the roll.

CLERK: Representative Jackson?

REP. JACKSON: Yes.

CLERK: Representative Jackson, aye. Representative Szoka?

REP. SZOKA: No.

CLERK: Representative Szoka, no. Representative Stevens?

REP. STEVENS: No.

CLERK: Representative Stevens, no.

Representative Bell?

REP. BELL: No.

CLERK: Representative Bell, no.

Representative Brawley?

REP. BRAWLEY: Brawley, no.

CLERK: Representative Brawley, no.

Representative Brockman?

REP. BROCKMAN: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Brockman, aye.

Representative Burr?

REP. BURR: No.

CLERK: Representative Burr, no.

Representative Davis? Representative Davis?

Representative Dixon?

REP. DIXON: No.

CLERK: Representative Dixon, no.

Representative Dobson?

REP. DOBSON: No.

CLERK: Representative Dobson, no.

Representative Dulin?

REP. DULIN: No.

CLERK: Representative Dulin, no.

Representative Farmer-Butterfield?

REP. FARMER-BUTTERFIELD: Aye.

CLERK: Representative

Farmer-Butterfield, aye. Representative Floyd? Representative Floyd? Representative Garrison?

REP. GARRISON: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Garrison, aye. Representative Gill?

REP. GILL: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Gill, aye. Representative Grange?

REP. GRANGE: No.

CLERK: Representative Grange, no. Representative Hall?

REP. HALL: No.

CLERK: Representative Hall, no. Representative Hanes?

REP. HANES: Yes.

CLERK: Representative Hanes, aye. Representative Hardister?

REP. HARDISTER: No.

CLERK: Representative Hardister, no. Representative Harrison?

REP. HARRISON: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Harrison, aye. Representative Hastings?

REP. HASTINGS: No.

CLERK: Representative Hastings, no.

Representative Howard?

REP. HOWARD: No.

CLERK: Representative Howard, no.

Representative Hunter?

REP. HUNTER: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Hunter, aye.

Representative Johnson?

REP. JOHNSON: No.

CLERK: Representative Johnson, no.

Representative Hurley?

REP. HURLEY: No.

CLERK: Representative Hurley, no.

Representative Jones? Representative Jones?

Representative Jordan?

REP. JORDAN: No.

CLERK: Representative Jordan, no.

Representative Malone?

REP. MALONE: No.

CLERK: Representative Malone, no.

Representative Michaux?

REP. MICHAUX: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Michaux, aye.

Representative Moore?

REP. MOORE: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Moore, aye.

Representative Pierce?

REP. PIERCE: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Pierce, aye.

Representative Reives?

REP. REIVES: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Reives, aye.

Representative Willingham?

REP. WILLINGHAM: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Willingham, aye.

Representative Speciale?

REP. SPECIALE: No.

CLERK: Representative Speciale, no.

Representative Rogers?

REP. ROGERS: No.

CLERK: Representative Rogers, no.

Representative Saine?

REP. SAINE: No.

CLERK: Representative Saine, no.

Representative Wray?

REP. WRAY: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Wray, aye.

Representative Yarborough?

REP. YARBOROUGH: No.

CLERK: Representative Yarborough, no.

Representative Torbett?

REP. TORBETT: No.

CLERK: Representative Torbett, no. Representative Lewis?

REP. LEWIS: No.

CLERK: Representative Lewis, no. Representative Dollar?

REP. DOLLAR: No.

CLERK: Representative Dollar, no.

SEN. HISE: By a vote of 4 in favor, 8 against in the Senate, and I believe I saw that it's 14 in favor, 24 against -- 28 against? 14 in favor, 24 against in the House. The motion to amend the second submitted criterion fails. Criterion Number 2, Contingency, is now back before the Committee.

REP. DOLLAR: Mr. Chairman?

SEN. HISE: Representative Dollar.

REP. DOLLAR: I would move the adoption of Criterion Number 2.

SEN. HISE: Motion by the Chairs for the adoption of Criterion Number 2. Is there any other questions or comments regarding the criteria? Seeing none, we will move into a vote on this process, and we will ask the Clerk of the House to call the roll.

CLERK: Representative Jackson?
REP. JACKSON: No.
CLERK: Representative Jackson, no. Representative Szoka?
REP. SZOKA: Aye.
CLERK: Representative Szoka, aye. Representative Stevens?
REP. STEVENS: Aye.
CLERK: Representative Stevens, aye. Representative Bell?
REP. BELL: Aye.
CLERK: Representative Bell, aye. Representative Brawley?
REP. BRAWLEY: Brawley, aye.
CLERK: Representative Brawley, aye. Representative Brockman?
REP. BROCKMAN: No.
CLERK: Representative Brockman, no. Representative Burr?
REP. BURR: Aye.
CLERK: Representative Burr, aye. Representative Davis? Representative Davis? Representative Dixon? Representative Dixon?
REP. DIXON: Aye.
CLERK: Representative Dixon, aye.

Representative Dobson?

REP. DOBSON: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Dobson, aye.

Representative Dulin?

REP. DULIN: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Dulin, aye.

Representative Farmer-Butterfield?

REP. FARMER-BUTTERFIELD: No.

CLERK: Representative Farmer-Butterfield, no. Representative Floyd? Representative Floyd? Representative Garrison?

REP. GARRISON: No.

CLERK: Representative Garrison, no.

Representative Gill?

REP. GILL: No.

CLERK: Representative Gill, no.

Representative Grange?

REP. GRANGE: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Grange, aye.

Representative Hall?

REP. HALL: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Hall, aye.

Representative Hanes?

REP. HANES: No.

CLERK: Representative Hanes, no.

Representative Hardister?

REP. HARDISTER: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Hardister, aye.

Representative Harrison?

REP. HARRISON: No.

CLERK: Representative Harrison, no.

Representative Hastings?

REP. HASTINGS: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Hastings, aye.

Representative Howard?

REP. HOWARD: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Howard, aye.

Representative Hunter?

REP. HUNTER: No.

CLERK: Representative Hunter, no.

Representative Johnson?

REP. JOHNSON: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Johnson, aye.

Representative Hurley?

REP. HURLEY: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Hurley, aye.

Representative Jones? Representative Jones?

Representative Jordan?

REP. JORDAN: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Jordan, aye.

Representative Malone?

REP. MALONE: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Malone, aye.

Representative Michaux?

REP. MICHAUX: No.

CLERK: Representative Michaux, no.

Representative Moore?

REP. MOORE: No.

CLERK: Representative Moore, no.

Representative Pierce?

REP. PIERCE: No.

CLERK: Representative Pierce, no.

Representative Pierce? Representative Reives, excuse me.

REP. REIVES: No.

CLERK: Representative Reives, no.

Representative Willingham?

REP. WILLINGHAM: No.

CLERK: Representative Willingham, no.

Representative Speciale?

REP. SPECIALE: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Speciale, aye.

Representative Rogers?

REP. ROGERS: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Rogers, aye.

Representative Saine?

REP. SAINE: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Saine, aye.

Representative Wray?

REP. WRAY: No.

CLERK: Representative Wray, no.

Representative Yarborough?

REP. YARBOROUGH: Yes.

CLERK: Representative Yarborough -- Yarborough, aye. Representative Torbett?

REP. TORBETT: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Torbett, aye.

Representative Lewis?

REP. LEWIS: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Lewis, aye.

Representative Dollar?

REP. DOLLAR: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Dollar, aye.

SEN. HISE: Okay. Clerk of the Senate will call out the roll.

CLERK: Senator Bishop?

SEN. BISHOP: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Bishop, aye. Senator Blue? Senator Brown?

SEN. BROWN: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Brown, aye. Senator Clark?

SEN. CLARK: No.

CLERK: Senator Clark, no. Senator Daniel? Senator Harrington?

SEN. HARRINGTON: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Harrington, aye. Senator Jackson?

SEN. JACKSON: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Jackson, aye. Senator Lee?

SEN. LEE: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Lee, aye. Senator Lowe?

SEN. LOWE: No.

CLERK: Senator Lowe, no. Senator Newton?

SEN. NEWTON: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Newton, aye. Senator Rabon? Senator Smith-Ingram?

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: No.

CLERK: Senator Smith-Ingram, no. Senator Van Duyn?

SEN. VAN DUYN: No.

CLERK: Senator Van Duyn, no. Senator Wade?

SEN. WADE: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Wade, aye. Senator Hise?

SEN. HISE: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Hise, aye.

SEN. HISE: By a vote of 24-14 in the House and a vote of 8 to 4 in the Senate, the second submitted criteria, Contiguity, is passed and is adopted by the committee. The committee will stand at ease for just a few minutes.

(Proceedings went off the record.)

SEN. HISE: Thank you, members of the committee. The next item we will consider is labeled as Number 6 in the process. As soon as I get to it.

REP. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, may I speak briefly on 5 for just a moment?

SEN. HISE: Go ahead.

REP. LEWIS: Members, the reason that I asked the Chair to skip what is labeled Number 5 -- by the way, these numbers are so that I would not forget to get through one of them. The reason that I ask that Number 5 be split -- be not discussed at the moment and displaced, staff is trying to get a firm definition of precinct versus voting tabulation district. The Court, in its opinion,

wrote about precincts, which is why this criteria says the word "precinct," but we're trying to get a -- just get a staff understanding on if it's precinct or voting tabulation district, which is -- I know some of you are wondering why we moved past that. We're just trying to get a technical clarification, which is why I asked the chair to take up Number -- what is labeled Number 6, municipal boundaries, next. So with that, Mr. Chair, if I can speak on that.

SEN. HISE: Do all members have a copy of Number 6, municipal boundaries? Okay. Representative Lewis, you're recognized to explain.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, this says that the committees may consider municipal boundaries when drawing legislative districts in the 2017 House and Senate plan. This -- and if I may speak on it, this is another criteria that comes in response to public inquiry.

At last week's committee hearing, Dianna Wynn of Wake County asked the committee to consider not dividing municipalities where possible. The chairs are proposing that consideration be made when drawing these new district lines. Would like

to state for the record that, as this is based on the 2010 census, that the municipality boundaries that would be looked at would be the 2010 boundaries as well. And with that, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to move the -- the adoption of this criteria.

SEN. HISE: Okay. Any questions or comments? Representative Jackson?

REP. JACKSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Chairman Lewis, since we are bound by law to consider communities of interest, I'm wondering why the may instead of the shall is used in this criteria. That's my first question.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you for the question, Representative Jackson. The may is empowering language that says that the map drawer may and rightfully should consider municipality boundaries when they can. As you know, not all municipalities are laid out in neat design, so sometimes it may not be possible to do that. As to communities of interest, and I know you are an attorney; I am not, but, to be clear, we couldn't find a concise definition of what a community of interest is, which is why it's not one of the criteria that we have proposed as of yet.

SEN. HISE: Follow-up?

REP. JACKSON: Chairman Lewis, well, one thing, under the law, the words "may" or "should" actually have different meanings and you used "may" and "should." And so I guess the first question would be, would you consider changing "may" to "should"?

REP. LEWIS: Thank you for the question. The -- and as always, you're -- you're right. The reason -- and we talked a lot about how to present these criteria to where they made the most sense to everyone, and the word "should" is used in what I would consider to be criteria that absolutely positively must be followed, like the one-person-one-vote rule.

There are other criteria, in fact, in the letter that Senator Blue wrote to us, he called them actually secondary criteria. There are other criteria that may be considered. One of those is the municipal boundaries. So I would say that I would prefer the word "may" to stay in this, and that when the maps are drawn, that we may very well consider municipal boundaries.

REP. JACKSON: Follow-up --

SEN. HISE: Follow-up?

REP. JACKSON: If -- if I could. I'll just stay on the communities of interest. I don't think it's addressed in any of the other proposed criteria. And so I do have a question about that. I understand from -- from your previous announcement at committee and from reading the newspaper that we're going to be using the same map drawer as last time, Mr. Hofeller. And I would ask, you know, who will be helping Mr. Hofeller draw the maps to make sure that communities of interest are protected?

REP. LEWIS: Thank you for the question. Dr. Hofeller was hired at the direction of myself and Senator Hise. For the House, I will be working with him to help produce the map that will be presented to the committee and to the public. At that time, all the members of the committee certainly have access to amend the map. The members of the public who wish to comment on the map -- if you or any other member or a citizen who takes time to engage in this process thinks that certain communities should be recombined in certain ways, we will certainly be open to reviewing that at that time.

REP. JACKSON: Okay.

SEN. HISE: Any other questions, comments? Representative Michaux?

REP. MICHAUX: Yeah, Mr. Chair -- Chairman Lewis, going back to the matter of communities of interest, are there not communities of -- you say there's no legal definition that you have found, but are there not communities of interest identified in each community in this state? For instance, there's a community -- communities of interest, rural, urban, educational, whatever. There are various communities of interest throughout the state. Well, why should they not be identified in here and used?

REP. LEWIS: Thank you for the question, Representative. I don't disagree with you at all. I would simply point out that because a community of interest can be defined in any number of ways, exactly as you just did, and some of those communities of interest actually overlap, some contradict each other, perhaps, I don't know that there is a definitive way to define that. But I would point out to the committee that the criteria that I'm asking to adopt is that the committee may consider municipal boundaries when drawing the lines.

SEN. HISE: Follow-up?

REP. MICHAUX: But -- but have you not had -- even in your last drawing, did you not consider communities of interest and have they not been considered in pervious redistricting matters that were drawn up in the past?

REP. LEWIS: Thank you for the question, Representative. I know that the concept of communities of interest were discussed. I don't know to what degree that they were considered in the map drawing.

SEN. HISE: Representative Reives?

REP. REIVES: Thank you, Chair. And, Chairman Lewis, again with the committees of interest, I understand that there are -- that you haven't found concise, clear definitions, but as Representative Michaux was just stating, I think they've been referred to, even by the Supreme Court, as early as Bush v. Vera, when George Bush was governor, when they had a redistricting case based on race and unconstitutionality where they discussed that and gave several examples of things that were considered communities of interest. If we use that as part of the criteria, I mean, wouldn't we be able to refer to that and then kind

of know it when we see it when we're discussing it?

REP. LEWIS: Thank you for the question, Representative. Respectfully, I don't think communities of interest is in contradiction to this proposed criteria of municipal boundaries. If we -- if the committee wishes to try to come up with a definition and offer additional criteria, we can certainly consider that at that time, but I don't think any desire to define or include the words "communities of interest" is in opposition to the criteria that I've proposed, and I would appreciate the committee's support on.

SEN. HISE: Follow-up?

REP. REIVES: Thank you. So in light of that, and I -- I would agree with you that not -- not -- they're not necessarily in opposition to each other, would you be opposed to an amendment that includes the term "communities of interest," just in case we have a situation where the municipal lines don't necessarily recognize a community of interest?

REP. LEWIS: Representative, thank you for the question. In short, I proposed the criteria before us -- before you that I believe the committee may consider when drawing the lines. I

do not believe that there is a concise definition that everyone can agree to that defines what a community of interest in -- is.

In the examples that Representative Michaux gave earlier in his comments, he referred -- you may have an educational community, if you will. And I'm not trying to focus on Durham, but you may be talking about Duke University or North Carolina Central. That's an educational community of interest. It may be directly next to a very blue-collar type area. Those two aren't necessarily communities of interest when you're drawing the lines.

So, again, I think we're getting a little bit far from what I had hoped would be a pretty simple criteria. At this time, I would not support an amendment to this criteria for communities of interest because municipalities are defined and understood. Communities of interest aren't even agreed to in this room.

SEN. HISE: I have Representative Jordan and Representative Michaux.

REP. JORDAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. There was an earlier colloquy between Representative Jackson and Representative Lewis

discussing "may" and "should." Just to clarify, shouldn't that have been "may" and "shall"?

REP. LEWIS: It may should have.

REP. JORDAN: Thanks.

SEN. HISE: Representative Michaux.

REP. MICHAUX: Yeah. Mr. Lewis, to -- to the -- you have here the committees may consider municipal boundaries. You're giving them an option as to whether or not they want to consider municipal boundaries. Why not give them the option of whether or not they would want to consider communities of interest? We know what communities of interest are. We can identify communities of interest. Why can't you go ahead on -- if you going to give them a choice, what other choice do they have other than municipal boundaries, when you say they may consider municipal boundaries?

REP. LEWIS: Well, thank you for that question, Representative. Let me try to be a little clearer. One of the criteria and one of the recurring themes of public input that we've got is to try not to split municipalities. As you know, there are numerous examples throughout the state where municipalities have actually annexed into other counties. They start in one county and

continue into another county. That is not compatible with the Stephenson requirement for how counties are grouped.

So the reason it says "may" is that I, personally, believe that is important, and I think that everyone on this committee will have the chance -- if we do not consider municipal boundaries in such a way that is acceptable to the committee, they'll have a chance to weigh in and amend and attempt to change the way that is done. But, again, this is just simply trying to respond to input that we got. Will we always consider municipal boundaries? Probably not, because we won't be able to. But this is -- this is an aspirational goal.

SEN. HISE: And I think it's also important to point out that municipal boundaries, when municipalities expand or others are not bound to limit themselves to complete Census tracts. And a Census tract is the smallest layer of data we have in order which to divide districts on.

REP. MICHAUX: I understand --

SEN. HISE: Follow-up.

REP. MICHAUX: And I understand that, Mr. Chairman, but what I'm getting at is that there are

communities of interest that sometimes overshadow municipal boundaries and could be used and should be used in terms of criteria for redistricting. I mean, there's no doubt in my mind that you got within an -- within a municipal area, you've got an urban community and you've got a suburban community and you've got maybe an agrarian community all combined in one. Why -- and -- and, if it's large enough, you could have representation from all three. I mean, I'm trying to get communities of interest in there because they seem to be the salient factor in all of redistricting.

SEN. HISE: I'll just follow up. I think that was more of a comment, but I will say that, is there a specific community of interest that you are submitting?

REP. MICHAUX: I hadn't thought about it right now. All I know is that there's a difference -- there's a suburban community -- a suburban community and an agrarian community. And they are both communities of interest. One involves agrarian and the other involves suburban-type things. All these communities of interest where people have like -- with similarities are alike. Particularly in those

communities of interest.

SEN. HISE: Representative Lewis?

REP. LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman and specifically Representative Michaux and other members, the -- it is my understanding that the communities of interest, as defined by the courts, are largely covered in what we call the Stephenson county groupings. Many of what we are talking about, what is a community of interest and what is not, is an objective and not a subjective tone or goal. It's not a definable thing. Counties, municipality, precinct lines are things that are all community-of-interest-type things that we're going to seek to preserve.

But what may be a community of interest for me, when I draw the map that I present, you may correct and say you did not recognize that this community and this community should be joined. And I'm -- I'm communicating to you that I'll work with you at -- at that point.

At this point, I don't know how we can -- a municipality is a defined thing. All I'm saying is that the committee may consider the defined, understood, legally-recognized thing, as opposed to the abstract, objective community of interest. And

I would urge the committee to adopt this criteria.

SEN. HISE: Senator Clark?

SEN. CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Would you allow staff to prepare an amendment to this particular item, stating to the effect that members of this General Assembly can submit definitive community of interests, if you will, so that the amendment right read something to the effect that the committees may consider municipal boundaries and committees -- communities of interest, as defined by a member of this body when drawing legislative districts?

REP. LEWIS: Well, thank you for the question, Senator Clark. And to be clear, certainly, I have no control over what amendments are sent forth.

SEN. CLARK: I would like to send forth an amendment to that effect.

REP. LEWIS: Acknowledged. With that, Mr. Chairman, perhaps we could displace this and come back to it once it can be prepared to what Senator Clark has asked for.

SEN. HISE: We will displace this to consider another Senator Clark amendment.

REP. LEWIS: And, Mr. Chairman, we can --

Mr. Chairman, perhaps now we can return to 5. I think we've got -- got that cleared up.

SEN. HISE: Okay. All members have Criteria Number 5, fewer split precincts? Representative Lewis, you're -- you're recognized to explain and debate.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This -- this criteria says that the committee shall make reasonable efforts to draw legislative districts in the 2017 House and Senate plans to split fewer precincts than the current legislative redistricting plans. To elaborate, the Chair should receive input from the public, including input from William Smith of Raleigh at last week's committee meeting, urging the committees to split fewer precincts in new legislative redistricting plans. We are proposing this criteria in response to that public input.

SEN. HISE: Representative Torbett?

REP. TORBETT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think this is a very good, common-sense amendment and would move for adoption of the proposed criteria.

SEN. HISE: Okay. Representative Jackson.

REP. JACKSON: Mr. Chairman, I submitted some alternative language the staff has and I believe is ready to be passed out at your direction.

SEN. HISE: Okay. I'm assuming, then, Senator Jackson has moved to amend the criteria. That's what's coming in. I think we'll have staff go ahead and pass that out. Okay. I will take this brief moment for a little personal privilege and we'll recognize the Speaker of the House.

SPEAKER MOORE: Yes. Good afternoon. I just wanted you all to join me in welcoming a special guest. Thank you. Thank you. I just wanted you all to join me in welcoming a special guest we have today. This is Cliff Rosenberger. He's the Speaker of the House in Ohio. And he's here visiting in North Carolina today on some economic development initiatives. And so I would hope you all would join me in welcoming the Speaker of Ohio with us here today.

MR. ROSENBERGER (VISITOR): Hi. Thank you. Thank you very much. I appreciate it.

SPEAKER MOORE: I told him this was the only -- we weren't in session, this is the only official meeting today. So we're doing some things

economic development related, but I wanted you all to know that he was here. And so he knows we're all here hard at work. I think they're going back into session here --

MR. ROSENBERGER (VISITOR): September. We go in, in September. So -- and about to do the very same thing you're all doing, so keep up the hard work.

So thank you all very much.

SPEAKER MOORE: Thanks.

SEN. HISE: Representative Jackson, you've sent forward your amendment; you're recognized to explain it.

REP. JACKSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So my alternate language just adds a sentence to Chairman Lewis's --

REP. JORDAN: Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman. Over here, Jordan. Can I see a copy before we begin discussion?

SEN. HISE: You can. We're actually apparently waiting on a row to receive them. They can have mine. Does everybody got one? Everyone seen the amendment? Okay. Representative Jackson, go ahead.

REP. JACKSON: So by my reading of the

way Number 5 as -- as proposed, you know, if we just split one fewer precinct, we've accomplished that goal, and clearly we want to do more than that. We want to severely limit the number of split precincts. And so my amendment would propose that we only split precincts to achieve population balance in compliance with the equal protection criteria, so that's the plus or minus five percent, and that we explicitly state we shall not split precincts to achieve partisan advantage.

SEN. HISE: Representative Lewis?

REP. LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Members, I've reviewed Senator -- Senator Jackson, I apologize, the Chairman's getting to me. I've reviewed Representative Jackson's amendment, and I do not disagree with it in spirit. However, I would ask you not to support the amendment because, once the maps are drawn, the committee will have the ability to review them and to offer whatever explanation they may so choose as to why a precinct was split or not split. I think this is a noble criteria, but it's a largely unworkable one, in terms of trying to define why was this -- this precinct split where it was. So, with that, I would -- I don't think it's a workable criteria to

use, and I would ask members to vote down this amendment.

SEN. HISE: Senator Van Duyn?

SEN. VAN DUYN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'd just like to respond to that, because you started your presentation by saying that this was in response to public comment. And clearly what we heard from nearly everyone who made public comment -- I think there was one exception. What people were asking for was districts that represent the voters, not districts that represent political parties. And I think what Representative Jackson's amendment does is get to the heart of what they were requesting.

And so, with all due respect, I think it is the most important part of what they were asking for, is that we not split precincts for political advantage. And I think it's important that we acknowledge -- if we're going to do public comment, I think we have to acknowledge it. That doesn't mean we need to go along with it necessarily, but we need to address what they ask for and either say why we will or will not follow what they said.

And clearly they want us to move away from political -- using redistricting for political

advantage. And one of the most disruptive ways of redistricting for political advantage is slicing and dicing individual precincts. I worked as a precinct judge before I was an elected official and when you have multiple ballots within a precinct, it is extraordinarily challenging. And -- and just not fair to our voters.

REP. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman.

SEN. HISE: Representative Lewis?

REP. LEWIS: I -- I want to thank the lady for her comments. I would say that I think the public comment is important and, as elected representatives, we must take it into account and must do our best to honor what is shared with us. Let me take another stab at this. Every line that is drawn on the map that is not mandated by the Stephenson criteria or whatnot is -- in one way or the other, will have political ramifications. So if we adopt the Jackson amendment, what will happen is, with respect, some of you in here will say, "Look, you split this precinct to gain a partisan advantage." And I'll say, no, "I split it to comply with the equal population requirement." And you'll say, "No, you split it to" -- because wherever we split it, it will have political

consequences one way or the other. So it's not a realistic goal to adopt a criteria that you cannot achieve.

SEN. HISE: Representative Jackson?

REP. JACKSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just for the record, I'll note I'm covering Speaker Blue as well, so that's why I'm doing twice as much today. Chairman Lewis, I wonder, other than population balance, what other reasons would you have to split a precinct?

REP. LEWIS: Thank you for that question, Representative Jackson. We just went through or -- and are going to go back through a long conversation about municipal -- municipal boundaries. Cities don't annex along precinct lines, so that is a reason that you may split a precinct. It may be more important to keep the city as whole as you can than to worry about, per se, how the precincts fall. If I had a precinct map in here, almost literally of any county in this state, I could show you how municipalities don't follow precinct lines.

SEN. HISE: Any other questions or comments? Senator Clark?

SEN. CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I

just have a comment. I don't see a problem with us explicitly stating that we should not split precincts other than for population balance. Case in point, I belong to a two-county cluster, and on the Cumberland County side of my district, I have about -- people from about 41 precincts vote in District 21. Of those 41, 33 are split, and for the life of me, I can't understand why 33 out of 41 precincts should be split.

SEN. HISE: Any other questions or comments? Okay. None. I believe Representative Torbett had made the motion when we began -- Jackson, sorry, for the amendment. So Representative Jackson has moved to amend the submitted criteria.

UNIDENTIFIED MEMBER: Second, Mr. Chair.

SEN. HISE: Motion doesn't require a second, but as we will see no more discussion or debate, we will move into a vote. And I believe we will begin with the House as the order.

CLERK: Representative Jackson?

REP. JACKSON: Yes.

CLERK: Representative Jackson, yes. Representative Szoka?

REP. SZOKA: No.

CLERK: Representative Szoka, no. Representative Stevens?

REP. STEVENS: No.

CLERK: Representative Stevens, no. Representative Bell?

REP. BELL: No.

CLERK: Representative Bell, no. Representative Brawley?

REP. BRAWLEY: No.

CLERK: Representative Brawley, no. Representative Brockman?

REP. BROCKMAN: Yes.

CLERK: Representative Brockman, aye. Representative Burr?

REP. BURR: No.

CLERK: Representative Burr, no. Representative Davis? Representative Davis? Representative Dixon?

REP. DIXON: No.

CLERK: Representative Dixon, no. Representative Dobson?

REP. DOBSON: No.

CLERK: Representative Dobson, no. Representative Dulin.

REP. DULIN: No.

CLERK: Representative Dulin, no. Representative Farmer-Butterfield?

REP. FARMER-BUTTERFIELD: Yes.

CLERK: Representative Farmer-Butterfield, aye. Representative Floyd? Representative Floyd? Representative Garrison?

REP. GARRISON: Yes. Aye.

CLERK: Representative Garrison, aye. Representative Gill?

REP. GILL: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Gill, aye. Representative Grange?

REP. GRANGE: No.

CLERK: Representative Grange, no. Representative Hall?

REP. HALL: No.

CLERK: Representative Hall, no. Representative Hanes?

REP. HANES: Yes.

CLERK: Representative Hanes, aye. Representative Hardister?

REP. HARDISTER: No.

CLERK: Representative Hardister, no. Representative Harrison? Representative Harrison? Representative Hastings?

REP. HASTINGS: No.

CLERK: Representative Hastings, no. Representative Howard?

REP. HOWARD: No.

CLERK: Representative Howard, no. Representative Hunter?

REP. HUNTER: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Hunter, aye. Representative Johnson?

REP. JOHNSON: No.

CLERK: Representative Johnson, no. Representative Jones? Representative Jones? Representative Jordan?

REP. JORDAN: No.

CLERK: Representative Jordan, no. Representative Malone?

REP. MALONE: No.

CLERK: Representative Malone, no. Representative Michaux?

REP. MICHAUX: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Michaux, aye. Representative Moore?

REP. MOORE: Yes.

CLERK: Representative Moore, aye. Representative Pierce?

REP. PIERCE: Yes.

CLERK: Representative Pierce, aye. Representative Reives?

REP. REIVES: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Reives, aye. Representative Willingham?

REP. WILLINGHAM: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Willingham, aye. Representative Speciale?

REP. SPECIALE: No.

CLERK: Representative Speciale, no. Representative Rogers?

REP. ROGERS: No.

CLERK: Representative Rogers, no. Representative Saine?

REP. SAINE: No.

CLERK: Representative Saine, no. Representative Wray?

REP. WRAY: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Wray, aye. Representative Yarborough?

REP. YARBOROUGH: No.

CLERK: Representative Yarborough, could you repeat that?

REP. YARBOROUGH: No.

CLERK: Representative Yarborough, no. Representative Harrison? Representative Lewis?

REP. LEWIS: No.

CLERK: No. Representative Dollar?

REP. DOLLAR: No.

CLERK: Representative Dollar, no.

REP. HURLEY: Mr. Chair, I was skipped.

CLERK: Oh, I'm sorry. Representative Hurley?

REP. HURLEY: No.

CLERK: No. Representative Torbett?

REP. TORBETT: No.

CLERK: Representative Torbett, no.

SEN. HISE: The Clerk will call the roll for the Senate?

CLERK: Senator Bishop?

SEN. BISHOP: No.

CLERK: Senator Bishop, no. Senator Blue? Senator Brown?

SEN. BROWN: No.

CLERK: Senator Brown, no. Senator Clark?

SEN. CLARK: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Clark, aye. Senator Daniel? Senator Harrington?

SEN. HARRINGTON: No.

CLERK: Senator Harrington, no. Senator Jackson?

SEN. JACKSON: No.

CLERK: Senator Jackson, no. Senator Lee?

SEN. LEE: No.

CLERK: Senator Lee, no. Senator Lowe?

SEN. LOWE: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Lowe, aye. Senator Newton?

SEN. NEWTON: No.

CLERK: Senator Newton, no. Senator Rabon? Senator Smith-Ingram?

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Smith-Ingram, aye. Senator Van Duyn?

SEN. VAN DUYN: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Van Duyn, aye. Senator Wade?

SEN. WADE: No.

CLERK: Senator Wade, no. Senator Hise?

SEN. HISE: No.

CLERK: Senator Hise, no.

REP. HARRISON: Mr. Chair?

SEN. HISE: Who's speaking?

REP. HARRISON: It's Representative Harrison on the back row.

SEN. HISE: Ah, affirmative. Thank you very much.

REP. HARRISON: May I be recorded as an aye, please, on the amendment?

SEN. HISE: By a vote of 13 in favor, 24 against in the House. Four in favor, eight against in the Senate, the amendment fails. The criteria estimated is back before the committee. Any other questions or comments? Senator Van Duyn?

SEN. VAN DUYN: I also have an amendment to Number 5.

SEN. HISE: Okay.

SEN. VAN DUYN: And I believe it's been prepared. Representative Lewis, I -- I think your point about --

UNIDENTIFIED MEMBER: Mr. Chair, can we hold until we get a copy of the amendment. Because I don't see it up on the screen or --

SEN. HISE: Chairs will pass out -- the Sergeant in Arms will pass out the amendments.

Senator Van Duyn, it's -- the opinion of the Chair is that this is the same amendment that

was just submitted, but it's some wording changes, but I will give you an opportunity to explain how this is different from what we just decided.

SEN. VAN DUYN: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Representative Lewis, I take your point that two people might disagree about whether or not a particular line is drawn for political advantage, but I -- I do think we can agree about whether a line needs to be moved in terms to meet the requirements of population distribution. And all I'm saying is that we agree that we will only split a precinct if it is necessary for -- to achieve the population requirements that we've already agreed to.

SEN. LEE: Point of order, Mr. Chairman. If I may --

SEN. HISE: Senator Lee?

SEN. LEE: It sounds like we're going in and debating the substance of what we just debated. I -- I thought the comment was, how is this different than -- than what we just voted on, as opposed to reliving the substance of what we just debated.

SEN. HISE: That is what I gave her the opportunity to explain, and Representative Lewis

wouldn't speak. So we kind of have a joint -- two committees going here, so I'm going to make sure to let him.

(Pause.)

SEN. HISE: Okay. Thank you, Senator Van Duyn. The opinion of the chair is the amendment is functionally equivalent to the previous amendment submitted and would be out of order as already considered by the committee.

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: Mr. Chair?

SEN. HISE: Senator Smith-Ingram?

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: I'd like to state my objection to the ruling of the Chairs. This amendment is clearly differential in that it does not expressly recite the achievement of partisan advantage.

SEN. HISE: Thank you, Senator Van Duyn. I'd -- probably would need to question under the rules if that's an appeal to the decision of the Chair.

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: Yes.

SEN. HISE: Okay. The clerk will call the roll for the Senate.

UNIDENTIFIED MEMBER: Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, would you please explain how one needs to

vote to uphold the ruling of the chair so we do not inadvertently vote the wrong way?

REP. MICHAUX: Mr. Chairman, they've been voting the wrong way already, so why not let them keep on doing it?

SEN. HISE: Thank you, members of the committee. As it was a member of the Senate to make the motion to overrule the Chair, it would be a vote of the Senate to overrule the Chair. It was specific to the Senate. Members of the Senate would vote aye to overrule the Chair, no to not overrule the Chair. Clerk will call the roll.

CLERK: Senator Bishop?

SEN. BISHOP: No.

CLERK: Senator Bishop, no. Senator Blue? Senator Brown?

SEN. BROWN: No.

CLERK: Senator Brown, no. Senator Clark?

SEN. CLARK: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Clark, aye. Senator Daniel? Senator Harrington?

SEN. HARRINGTON: No.

CLERK: Senator Harrington, no. Senator Jackson?

SEN. JACKSON: No.

CLERK: Senator Jackson, no. Senator Lee?

SEN. LEE: No.

CLERK: Senator Lee, no. Senator Lowe?

SEN. LOWE: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Lowe, aye. Senator Newton?

SEN. NEWTON: No.

CLERK: Senator Newton, no. Senator Rabon? Senator Smith-Ingram?

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Smith-Ingram, aye. Senator Van Duyn?

SEN. VAN DUYN: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Van Duyn, aye. Senator Wade?

SEN. WADE: No.

CLERK: Senator Wade, no. Senator Hise?

SEN. HISE: No.

CLERK: Senator Hise, no.

SEN. HISE: By a vote of 4 to 8, the motion to overrule the Chair -- by a vote of 4 to 8, the motion to overrule the Chair fails. The motion will be back before us to adopt criteria,

fewer split precincts. Representative Lewis, any other comments?

REP. LEWIS: No, sir. I move the adoption of the amendment -- the adoption of the criteria as presented.

SEN. HISE: Representative Torbett and the Chairs will move for the adoption of the amendment. We will enter into a roll call vote seeing no other questions or comments. We will --

UNIDENTIFIED MEMBER: Mr. Chairman, I don't think it's the amendment, I think it's the adoption.

SEN. HISE: You are correct. It is the adoption of the criteria, fewer precincts split. And I think this one was 5. It doesn't have a number on the screen. So we will begin with a call of the roll of the House. Thank you.

CLERK: Representative Jackson?

REP. JACKSON: No.

CLERK: Representative Jackson, no. Representative Szoka?

REP. SZOKA: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Szoka, aye. Representative Stevens?

REP. STEVENS: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Stevens, aye. Representative Bell?

REP. BELL: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Bell, aye. Representative Brawley?

REP. BRAWLEY: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Brawley, aye. Representative Brockman?

REP. BROCKMAN: No.

CLERK: Representative Brockman, no. Representative Burr?

REP. BURR: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Burr, aye. Representative Davis? Representative Davis? Representative Dixon?

REP. DIXON: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Dixon, aye. Representative Dobson?

REP. DOBSON: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Dobson, aye. Representative Dulin?

REP. DULIN: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Dulin, aye. Representative Farmer-Butterfield?

REP. FARMER-BUTTERFIELD: No.

CLERK: Representative Farmer-Butterfield, no. Representative Floyd? Representative Floyd? Representative Garrison?

REP. GARRISON: No.

CLERK: Representative Garrison, no. Representative Gill?

REP. GILL: No.

CLERK: Representative Gill, no. Representative Grange?

REP. GRANGE: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Grange, aye. Representative Hall?

REP. HALL: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Hall, aye. Representative Hanes?

REP. HANES: No.

CLERK: Representative Hanes, no. Representative Hardister?

REP. HARDISTER: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Hardister, aye. Representative Harrison?

REP. HARRISON: No.

CLERK: Representative Harrison, no. Representative Hastings?

REP. HASTINGS: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Hastings, aye. Representative Howard?

REP. HOWARD: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Howard, aye. Representative Hunter?

REP. HUNTER: No.

CLERK: Representative Hunter, no. Representative Hurley?

REP. HURLEY: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Hurley, aye. Representative Johnson?

REP. JOHNSON: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Johnson, aye. Representative Jones? Representative Jones? Representative Jordan?

REP. JORDAN: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Jordan, aye. Representative Malone?

REP. MALONE: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Malone, aye. Representative Michaux?

REP. MICHAUX: No.

CLERK: Representative Michaux, no. Representative Moore? Representative Moore?

REP. MOORE: Nay.

CLERK: Representative Moore, no.
Representative Pierce?
REP. PIERCE: No.
CLERK: Representative Pierce, no.
Representative Reives?
REP. REIVES: No.
CLERK: Representative Reives, no.
Representative Willingham?
REP. WILLINGHAM: No.
CLERK: Representative Willingham, no.
Representative Speciale?
REP. SPECIALE: Aye.
CLERK: Representative Speciale, aye.
Representative Rogers?
REP. ROGERS: Aye.
CLERK: Representative Rogers, aye.
Representative Saine?
REP. SAINE: Aye.
CLERK: Representative Saine, aye.
Representative Wray?
REP. WRAY: No.
CLERK: Representative Wray, no.
Representative Yarborough?
REP. YARBOROUGH: Aye.
CLERK: Representative Yarborough, aye.

Representative Torbett?

REP. TORBETT: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Torbett, aye. Representative Lewis?

REP. LEWIS: Aye.

CLERK: Aye. Representative Dollar?

REP. DOLLAR: Aye.

CLERK: Aye. Representative Dollar, aye.

SEN. HISE: Clerk will call the roll for the Senate.

CLERK: Senator Bishop?

SEN. BISHOP: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Bishop, aye. Senator Blue? Senator Brown?

SEN. BROWN: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Brown, aye. Senator Clark?

SEN. CLARK: No.

CLERK: Senator Clark, no. Senator Daniel? Senator Harrington?

SEN. HARRINGTON: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Harrington, aye. Senator Jackson?

SEN. JACKSON: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Jackson, aye. Senator

Lee?

SEN. LEE: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Lee, aye. Senator Lowe?

SEN. LOWE: No.

CLERK: Senator Lowe, no. Senator Newton?

SEN. NEWTON: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Newton, aye. Senator Rabon? Senator Smith-Ingram?

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: No.

CLERK: Senator Smith-Ingram, no. Senator Van Duyn?

SEN. VAN DUYN: No.

CLERK: Senator Van Duyn, no. Senator Wade?

SEN. WADE: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Wade, aye. Senator Hise?

SEN. HISE: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Hise, aye.

SEN. HISE: By a vote in the House of 24 to 14 and a vote in the Senate of 8 to 4, Criteria 5, as submitted, is adopted, fewer split precincts by the committee.

Members, we will now go to -- back to proposed criteria number 6, municipal boundaries.

I will have an amendment. Before we get into it, I want to quickly state that if you have a proposed amendment for any of the criteria -- they have been submitted to everyone this morning -- I would ask that you get with staff now and have that drafted in this process so that, as we go forward in the future, we don't have to displace a criteria and can go ahead move through the time-cumbersome process. So, that being said, it was submitted by, I can't read that signature. So who submitted? Senator Clark, you're recognized to explain your amendment.

SEN. CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Committee members, what this does is exactly what Representative Lewis indicated that he'd be willing to do. It just puts it in writing. He indicated that if we came to him with concerns about communities of interest, that the committee may consider those. And that's what this particular amendment says, it says that if a member of this body comes forward with a community of interest that they can specifically categorize, that the committee may consider them.

SEN. HISE: Representative Lewis?

REP. LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and

thank you, Senator Clark, for sending forward the amendment. I don't believe that I can have a hard-and-fast definition of what a community of interest is. I think your -- the way you've drafted the amendment is artful and points out that what I may consider a community of interest, you may not, which means it is appropriate, once the map is drawn, to discuss amendments to the map in which you can discuss specific communities of interest. I don't believe it belongs in this criteria and would ask members to vote it down.

SEN. HISE: Other questions or comments? Seeing none, we will move into a vote on the -- Senator Clark has moved to amend the criteria, as identified. We will begin with a call of the roll of the Senate.

CLERK: Senator Bishop?

SEN. BISHOP: No.

CLERK: Senator Bishop, no. Senator Blue? Senator Brown?

SEN. BROWN: No.

CLERK: Senator Brown, no. Senator Clark?

SEN. CLARK: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Clark, aye. Senator

Daniel? Senator Harrington?

SEN. HARRINGTON: No.

CLERK: Senator Harrington, no. Senator Jackson?

SEN. JACKSON: No.

CLERK: Senator Jackson, no. Senator Lee?

SEN. LEE: No.

CLERK: Senator Lee, no. Senator Lowe?

SEN. LOWE: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Lowe, aye. Senator Newton?

SEN. NEWTON: No.

CLERK: Senator Newton, no. Senator Rabon? Senator Smith-Ingram?

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Smith-Ingram, aye. Senator Van Duyn?

SEN. VAN DUYN: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Van Duyn, aye. Senator Wade?

SEN. WADE: No.

CLERK: Senator Wade, no. Senator Hise?

SEN. HISE: No.

CLERK: Senator Hise, no.

SEN. HISE: Call the roll of the House.
CLERK: Representative Jackson?
REP. JACKSON: Yes.
CLERK: Jackson, aye. Representative Szoka?
REP. SZOKA: No.
CLERK: Szoka, no. Representative Stevens?
REP. STEVENS: No.
CLERK: Stevens, no. Representative Bell? Representative Bell? Representative Brawley?
REP. BRAWLEY: No.
CLERK: Brawley, no. Representative Brockman?
REP. BROCKMAN: Yes.
CLERK: Brockman, aye. Representative Burr?
REP. BURR: No.
CLERK: Burr, no. Representative Davis? Davis? Representative Dixon?
REP. DIXON: No.
CLERK: Dixon, no. Representative Dobson?
REP. DOBSON: No.

CLERK: Dobson, no. Representative Dulin?

REP. DULIN: No.

CLERK: Dulin, no. Representative Farmer-Butterfield?

REP. FARMER-BUTTERFIELD: Aye.

CLERK: Farmer-Butterfield, aye. Representative Floyd? Representative Floyd? Representative Garrison?

REP. GARRISON: Aye.

CLERK: Garrison, aye. Representative Gill?

REP. GILL: Aye.

CLERK: Gill, aye. Representative Grange?

REP. GRANGE: No.

CLERK: Grange, no. Representative Hall?

REP. HALL: No.

CLERK: Hall, no. Representative Hanes?

REP. HANES: Yes.

CLERK: Hanes, aye. Representative Hardister?

REP. HARDISTER: No.

CLERK: Hardister, no. Representative Harrison?

REP. HARRISON: Aye.

CLERK: Harrison, aye. Representative Hastings?

REP. HASTINGS: No.

CLERK: Hastings, no. Representative Howard?

REP. HOWARD: No.

CLERK: Howard, no. Representative Hunter?

REP. HUNTER: Aye.

CLERK: Hunter, aye. Representative Johnson?

REP. JOHNSON: No.

CLERK: Johnson, no. Representative Jones? Representative Jordan?

REP. JORDAN: No.

CLERK: Jordan, no. Representative Malone?

REP. MALONE: No.

CLERK: Malone, no. Representative Michaux?

REP. MICHAUX: Aye.

CLERK: Michaux, aye. Representative Moore?

REP. MOORE: Yes.

CLERK: Moore, aye. Representative Pierce?

REP. PIERCE: Aye.

CLERK: Pierce, aye. Representative Reives?

REP. REIVES: Aye.

CLERK: Reives, aye. Representative Willingham?

REP. WILLINGHAM: Aye.

CLERK: Willingham, aye. Representative Speciale?

REP. SPECIALE: No.

CLERK: Speciale, no. Representative Rogers?

REP. ROGERS: No.

CLERK: Rogers, no. Representative Saine?

REP. SAINE: No.

CLERK: Saine, no. Representative Wray?

REP. WRAY: Aye.

CLERK: Wray, aye. Representative Yarborough?

REP. YARBOROUGH: No.

CLERK: Yarborough, no. Representative Torbett?

REP. TORBETT: No.

CLERK: Torbett, no. Representative Hurley?

REP. HURLEY: No.

CLERK: Hurley, no. Representative Bell?

REP. BELL: No.

CLERK: Bell, no. Representative Lewis?

REP. LEWIS: No.

CLERK: Lewis, no. Representative Dollar?

REP. DOLLAR: No.

CLERK: Dollar, no.

SEN. HISE: By a vote of 4 to 8 in the Senate and by a vote of 14 to 24 in the House, the motion fails. The Criteria Number 6, municipal boundaries, is back before the committee. Representative Dollar?

REP. DOLLAR: Motion to approve the criteria.

SEN. HISE: The chairmen have moved for the approval of the criteria. Any other comments or discussions? Seeing none. Clerk will begin with the call of the roll of the House.

CLERK: Representative Jackson?

REP. JACKSON: No.

CLERK: Representative Jackson, no. Representative Szoka?

REP. SZOKA: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Szoka, aye. Representative Stevens?

REP. STEVENS: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Stevens, aye. Representative Bell?

REP. BELL: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Bell, aye. Representative Brawley?

REP. BRAWLEY: Brawley, aye.

CLERK: Representative Brawley, aye. Representative Brockman?

REP. BROCKMAN: No.

CLERK: Representative Brockman, no. Representative Burr?

REP. BURR: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Burr, aye. Representative Davis? Representative Davis? Representative Dixon?

REP. DIXON: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Dixon, aye. Representative Dobson?

REP. DOBSON: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Dobson, aye. Representative Dulin?

REP. DULIN: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Dulin, aye. Representative Farmer-Butterfield?

REP. FARMER-BUTTERFIELD: No.

CLERK: Representative Farmer-Butterfield, no. Representative Floyd? Representative Floyd? Representative Garrison?

REP. GARRISON: No.

CLERK: Representative Garrison, no. Representative Gill?

REP. GILL: No.

CLERK: Representative Gill, no. Representative Grange?

REP. GRANGE: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Grange, aye. Representative Hall?

REP. HALL: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Hall, aye. Representative Hanes?

REP. HANES: No.

CLERK: Representative Hanes, no. Representative Hardister?

REP. HARDISTER: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Hardister, aye. Representative Harrison?

REP. HARRISON: No.

CLERK: Representative Harrison, no. Representative Hastings?

REP. HASTINGS: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Hastings, aye. Representative Howard?

REP. HOWARD: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Howard, aye. Representative Hunter?

REP. HUNTER: No.

CLERK: Representative Hunter, no. Representative Hurley?

REP. HURLEY: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Hurley, aye. Representative Johnson?

REP. JOHNSON: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Johnson, aye. Representative Jones? Representative Jones? Representative Jordan?

REP. JORDAN: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Jordan, aye. Representative Malone?

REP. MALONE: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Malone, aye.
Representative Michaux?
REP. MICHAUX: No.
CLERK: Representative Michaux, no.
Representative Moore?
REP. MOORE: No.
CLERK: Representative Moore, no.
Representative Pierce?
REP. PIERCE: No.
CLERK: Representative Pierce, no.
Representative Reives?
REP. REIVES: No.
CLERK: Representative Reives, no.
Representative Willingham?
REP. WILLINGHAM: No.
CLERK: Representative Willingham, no.
Representative Speciale?
REP. SPECIALE: Aye.
CLERK: Representative Speciale, aye.
Representative Rogers?
REP. ROGERS: Aye.
CLERK: Representative Rogers, aye.
Representative Saine?
REP. SAINE: Aye.
CLERK: Representative Saine, aye.

Representative Wray?

REP. WRAY: No.

CLERK: Representative Wray, no.

Representative Yarborough?

REP. YARBOROUGH: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Yarborough, aye.

Representative Torbett?

REP. TORBETT: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Torbett, aye.

Representative Lewis?

REP. LEWIS: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Lewis, aye.

Representative Dollar?

REP. DOLLAR: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Dollar, aye.

SEN. HISE: Clerk, call the roll of the Senate.

CLERK: Senator Bishop?

SEN. BISHOP: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Bishop, aye. Senator Blue? Senator Brown?

SEN. BROWN: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Brown, aye. Senator Clark?

SEN. CLARK: No.

CLERK: Senator Clark, no. Senator Daniel? Senator Harrington?

SEN. HARRINGTON: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Harrington, aye. Senator Jackson?

SEN. JACKSON: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Jackson, aye. Senator Lee?

SEN. LEE: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Lee, aye. Senator Lowe?

SEN. LOWE: No.

CLERK: Senator Lowe, no. Senator Newton?

SEN. NEWTON: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Newton, aye. Senator Rabon? Senator Smith-Ingram?

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: No.

CLERK: Senator Smith-Ingram, no. Senator Van Duyn?

SEN. VAN DUYN: No.

CLERK: Senator Van Duyn, no. Senator Wade?

SEN. WADE: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Wade, aye. Senator Hise?

SEN. HISE: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Hise, aye.

SEN. HISE: By a vote of 24-14 in the House and a vote of 8 to 4 in the Senate, the proposed criteria on municipal boundaries is considered adopted by the Committee. Members should now have Criterion Number 7, incumbency protection. Representative Lewis.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This criteria reads, reasonable efforts and political considerations may be used to avoid pairing incumbent members of the House or Senate with another incumbent in legislative districts drawn in 2017 House and Senate plans. The Committee may make reasonable efforts to ensure voters have a reasonable opportunity to elect non-paired incumbents of either party to a district in the 2017 House and Senate plans.

To speak on it briefly, since last week's Committee meeting, Senator Blue has written the Chairs on the subject of criteria. In his letter, he writes, "incumbency protection is not legally required in redistricting, but it may be considered as a secondary criterion after first ensurance" -- after first "ensuring", pardon me -- "compliance with federal and state law."

The Chairs do not agree with all of Senator Blue's letter, but we do agree with this statement. I'll further add that the courts have ruled that incumbency is a traditional redistricting criteria, and I will urge members to adopt this criteria. Happy to answer any questions.

SEN. HISE: Representative Jackson.

REP. JACKSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I -- I don't have a question. I just have a statement, if that's okay. I -- you -- you know, this is -- the thing about redistricting that really bothers me is that the court has now ruled that the maps from 2011 were unconstitutional. At the -- at the time, the partisan divide between -- in the House was 68-52, and by the use of unconstitutional maps, the majority is now 74 to 46. So it seems just ridiculous to me that you would get to now say we get to protect the members that we were able to elect by using unconstitutional maps.

What's more is that, you know, you -- you've addressed other criteria such as municipalities and splitting precincts, but then we're going to say that in order to protect the

incumbents, we can violate these other things that we've done or -- other criteria that we've adopted. And I just don't think incumbency protection has any role in this, especially in this term. I think it's unfair that we're -- that a majority obtained by unconstitutional districts is now going to try to be protected by using criteria like redistricting, and so I would ask you to vote against this.

SEN. HISE: Mr. Chairman.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you. I would like to point out to the members that the Republican majority was earned in 2010 when the voters elected us in districts drawn by the Democrats. And that is where the balance of legislative seats shifted in those seats.

I would point out again that recognizing the residencies of incumbents is an -- is a traditional principle. What does this mean? This means that there may be two senators who live in Durham less than a mile apart from each other. We can certainly disregard their residencies, if that's what this Committee wishes to do. But I think we are selling ourselves short if we don't acknowledge, at least, that the residences of

people who have been elected in districts is a relevant criteria to consider. I would urge members to vote for this criteria.

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Representative Lewis, could you provide clarification on the second sentence in this rule. More specifically, what -- what is "a reasonable opportunity to elect non-paired incumbents for either party." What does that entail?

REP. LEWIS: Thank you very much for the question, Senator. I can interpret it the way that I interpret it, if that's okay. There will be -- and, in fact, I think the press has written about, there will be pairings of incumbents that will not be able to be avoided in the drawing of this map because of other criteria. This is simply saying that the map makers may take reasonable efforts to not pair incumbents unduly.

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: Follow-up.

SEN. HISE: Follow-up?

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: Can you give me an example of what that looks like with the non-paired incumbents?

REP. LEWIS: Yes, ma'am. When I release the map.

SEN. HISE: Senator Van Duyn.

SEN. VAN DUYN: I'd just like to make a comment. And that is, whatever districts we draw, they should represent the voters and not elected officials. I just fundamentally believe that incumbency should not be a criteria. Traditionally, it may have been done that way, but I think we're hearing clearly from the people of North Carolina that they want that to change.

SEN. HISE: Any other questions or comments? Senator Brown.

SEN. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Representative Lewis, it's -- the -- the other criteria that mostly has already been adopted will address this issue pretty much anyway. Because the grouping of the counties -- that criteria alone will group existing members against each other, and there's no way around that. I think what you're talking about -- I think you used an example in Durham County, you know, where maybe there's a way that you might -- can work though that situation. But again, I think the criteria is going to group certain members against certain members, and that will be pretty much the way it is. I think the way that it's worded -- that it's when practicable.

And so --

SEN. HISE: Thanks. Representative Jackson.

REP. JACKSON: I had a question for Chairman Lewis.

SEN. HISE: Thank you.

REP. JACKSON: Chairman Lewis, so I -- the way I -- the way I see it, you have -- you have traditional redistricting criteria like federal constitutional law that is the first criteria you use, and then state constitutional law. And then you have things like this, and I -- I wonder, when you have something like incumbency protection and then you also have protecting municipal lines, how will the map drawer decide which one of those to give priority to?

REP. LEWIS: Thank you for the question, Representative Jackson. The answer is that we are here today to adopt criteria that I can use in working with the map drawer to bring a map back to this Committee and back to the public for their input; that we don't need to get into a may or shall discussion again, but you simply do the best that you can with the information that -- that you have.

SEN. HISE: Representative Dollar.

REP. DOLLAR: For a motion, but Mr. Chair, I would also observe it sounds like some people are volunteering to be not -- not -- not to be considered in that. Now, maybe that should be noted. Mr. Chairman, I would make a motion to adopt the incumbency protection criteria.

REP. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, before we vote, may I make one point for the record?

SEN. HISE: Go ahead.

REP. LEWIS: I also want to add to my initial remarks on this criteria. Another member in here declared that -- said that our districts were declared illegal and that's what had produced the majority. I would point out that the court has ruled that 28 of the 170 districts are illegal, not all of them.

SEN. HISE: Any other questions or comments? Hearing none, Representative Dollar and the Chairman move for the adoption of the proposed criteria listed as Number 7, incumbency protection. We'll begin with a call of the roll of the Senate.

CLERK: Senator Bishop.

SEN. BISHOP: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Bishop, aye. Senator

Blue. Senator Brown.

SEN. BROWN: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Brown, aye. Senator Clark.

SEN. CLARK: No.

CLERK: Senator Clark, no. Senator Daniel. Senator Harrington.

SEN. HARRINGTON: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Harrington, aye. Senator Jackson.

SEN. JACKSON: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Jackson, aye. Senator Lee.

SEN. LEE: Lee: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Lee, aye. Senator Lowe.

SEN. LOWE: No.

CLERK: Senator Lowe, no. Senator Newton.

SEN. NEWTON: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Newton, aye. Senator Raven. Senator Smith-Ingram.

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: No.

CLERK: Senator Smith-Ingram, no. Senator Van Duyn.

SEN. VAN DUYN: No.

CLERK: Senator Van Duyn, no. Senator Wade.

SEN. WADE: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Wade, aye. Senator Hise.

SEN. HISE: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Hise, aye.

SEN. HISE: Call the roll of the House.

CLERK: Representative Jackson.

SEN. JACKSON: No.

CLERK: Representative Jackson, no. Representative Szoka.

REP. SZOKA: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Zoka, aye. Representative Stevens.

REP. STEVENS: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Stevens, aye. Representative Bell.

REP. BELL: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Bell, aye. Representative Brawley.

REP. BRAWLEY: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Brawley, aye. Representative Brockman.

REP. BROCKMAN: No.

CLERK: Representative Brockman, no.

Representative Burr.

REP. BURR: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Burr, aye.

Representative Davis. Representative Davis.

Representative Dixon.

REP. DIXON: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Dixon, aye.

Representative Dobson.

REP. DOBSON: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Dobson, aye.

Representative Dulin.

REP. DULIN: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Dulin, aye.

Representative Farmer-Butterfield. Representative Farmer-Butterfield.

REP. FARMER-BUTTERFIELD: No.

CLERK: Representative Farmer-Butterfield, no. Representative Floyd.

Representative Floyd. Representative Garrison.

REP. GARRISON: No.

CLERK: Representative Garrison, no.

Representative Gill.

REP. GILL: No.

CLERK: Representative Gill, no.

Representative Grange.

REP. GRANGE: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Grange, aye. Representative Hall.

REP. HALL: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Hall, aye. Representative Hanes.

REP. HANES: No.

CLERK: Representative Hanes, no. Representative Hardister.

REP. HARDISTER: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Hardister, aye. Representative Harrison.

REP. HARRISON: No.

CLERK: Representative Harrison, no. Representative Hastings.

REP. HASTINGS: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Hastings, aye. Representative Howard.

REP. HOWARD: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Howard, aye. Representative Hunter.

REP. HUNTER: No.

CLERK: Representative Hunter, no. Representative Johnson.

REP. JOHNSON: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Johnson, aye. Representative Jones. Representative Jones. Representative Jordan. Representative Jordan.

REP. JORDAN: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Jordan, aye. Representative Malone.

REP. MALONE: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Malone, aye. Representative Michaux.

REP. MICHAUX: No.

CLERK: Representative Michaux, no. Representative Moore.

REP. MOORE: No.

CLERK: Representative Moore, no. Representative Pierce.

REP. PIERCE: No.

CLERK: Representative Pierce, no. Representative Reives.

REP. REIVES: No.

CLERK: Representative Reives, no. Representative Willingham.

REP. WILLINGHAM: No.

CLERK: Representative Willingham, no. Representative Speciale.

REP. SPECIALE: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Speciale, aye. Representative Rogers.

REP. ROGERS: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Rogers, aye. Representative Saine.

REP. SAINE: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Saine, aye. Representative Wray.

REP. WRAY: No.

CLERK: Representative Wray, no. Representative Yarborough.

REP. YARBOROUGH: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Yarborough, aye. Representative Torbett.

REP. TORBETT: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Torbett, aye. Representative Hurley.

REP. HURLEY: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Hurley, aye. Representative Lewis.

REP. LEWIS: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Lewis, aye. Representative Dollar.

REP. DOLLAR: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Dollar, aye.

SEN. HISE: 8 having voted in favor in the Senate, 4 against. 24 in favor in the House and 14 against. Criteria listed as Number 7, incumbency protection, is adopted by the Committee. Next in front of me, ladies and gentlemen, we have criteria listed as Number 8, election data.

REP. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman.

SEN. HISE: Representative Lewis.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, this criteria reads, election data. Political consideration and election results data may be used in drawing up legislative districts in 2017 House and Senate plans. I believe this is pretty self-explanatory, and I would urge members to adopt the criteria.

SEN. CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Chair. In our previous Committee meeting, I asked that for each map that was brought forward for consideration that an efficiency gap analysis be conducted. Are we going to be able to do that?

SEN. HISE: Representative Lewis?

REP. LEWIS: Thank you for that question, Senator Clark. Let me make a few points on the efficiency gap, if I can. First of all, the article that talks about the efficiency gap, which

is entitled, I believe, "Partisan Gerrymandering and Efficiency Gap" by Stephanopoulos and McGhee, proposes the use of an efficiency gap concept that is yet to be peer-reviewed by any other legal or academic scholars. Further, I think it's important to point out that the efficiency gap itself is designed to measure election results, and it is based on past election results. It's very hard, and -- and I did read your letter closely -- I would think it would be disingenuous to try to create proxy election results in order to try to measure an efficiency gap.

Further, I think it's important to understand that if you buy into, if you will, the efficiency gap criteria, we would actually be moving away from our current system of government to a -- a European-style parliamentary system. I further believe that the use of this criteria would require the legislature to severely gerrymander in order to dictate a predetermined outcome and that drawing would require the legislature to reject Constitutionally-required redistricting criteria, such as the county-grouping formula.

I say all that to say that I do not believe that the efficiency gap; one, can be

applied prospectively as it has been written about; two, I reject the argument that an efficiency gap test is a necessary or needed thing. I do not believe that anyone's vote is wasted, which is the premise that the efficiency gap operates on.

So with that said, you could certainly request, once the maps were drawn, any type of report that you wanted to do, but it would not -- it is not contemplated by me that an efficiency gap would be run on the map that is initially presented to this Committee.

SEN. HISE: Senator Clark?

SEN. CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Chair. First of all, efficiency gaps can be calculated prospectively. There are a lot of articles out there regarding the efficiency gap. And secondly, the capability to do so does exist. And then also, with regard to the notion of the wasted votes, that's not -- it's not implying that an individual's vote is wasted. What is being indicated is that the distribution of those votes through gerrymandering devalues the votes of the citizens, and that is something we should not be doing. So if we're not going to use methods such as the efficiency gap, what method are we going to

use to ensure partisan symmetry? And then what would we do with this political -- political data that you plan on collecting?

REP. LEWIS: Thank you for the question. The criteria says that election results may be used in drawing. We are not going to ensure the outcome of anything one way or the other.

SEN. CLARK: Mr. Chair?

SEN. HISE: A follow-up, I'm assuming?

SEN. CLARK: I'm still not clear on that response. You're going to collect the political data. What specifically would the Committee do with it?

REP. LEWIS: The -- thank you for the question. The answer is, the Committee could look at the political data as evidence to how, perhaps, votes have been cast in the past. It is important though, Senator -- you and I have severe disagreements on very few things, but the efficiency gap is one of them. I would encourage anyone who is listening to this who is interested in it to review it and to review the 2016 election for the General Assembly for the House, and you will find out that, based on the article that is written, there is no efficiency gap under the plans

that have been struck down. So I have a real concern and I'm not sure -- again, a test which purely analyzes past election results to determine if there are wasted votes or if there is an efficiency issue, can be done prospectively.

SEN. HISE: Senator Clark.

SEN. CLARK: I guess I disagree with you on the results of using the efficiency gap analysis as any member should desire. I can provide you with my calculations that I have done myself using Microsoft Excel and -- and their -- they tell a different story, and, as a matter of fact, I had the process vetted by the UNC School of Government, and I'd be more than happy to distribute that and discuss it with anyone that's willing to review that with me.

And also, back to the wasted votes analysis, like I said, that's not an indication that an individual has wasted their vote by exercising their constitutional right. That speaks of the fact that the votes are being distributed in a way that benefit the majority party and if you -- I'm sure you read, when you read Stephanopoulos' material, that you saw that, for the most part, any particular plan that had an efficiency gap

exceeding 8 percent, they fell about 1.5 percent outside of the mean and that was a rarity. As a matter of fact, I think only about 12 percent of the legislative plans over the last 50 years had efficiency gaps that high.

SEN. HISE: Senator Smith-Ingram.

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Chair Lewis, would you be able to provide a representative list of three to four items entailed with political considerations and election results data?

REP. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I apologize, and Senator, I didn't understand your question.

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: Okay. So I'm asking for examples. What would be some examples of the political considerations that are going to utilized, as well as, can you give me a list of three to four items or considerations that will fall under using elections results data?

REP. LEWIS: May I give you ten?

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: Sure.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you. The 2010 US Senate race, the 2012 race for President, the 2012 race for Governor, the 2012 race for Lieutenant Governor, the 2016 race for US Senate, 2016 race

for President, 2016 race for US Senate, 2016 race for Governor, 2016 race for Lieutenant Governor and 2016 race for Attorney General.

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: Thank you. Follow up. Thank you, Mr. Chair. That answers my questions as it relates to the election results data. Can you provide a representative list of what is considered under political considerations? Can you define that or give me the parameters of what those items could include?

REP. LEWIS: Well, ma'am, political considerations simply are historical representations of past voting performance.

SEN. HISE: Follow-up?

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: Does the leadership have a goal of maintaining the current partisan advantage in the House and the Senate? Is that considered political consideration?

REP. LEWIS: Representative [sic], thank you for the question. The -- the leadership has no such goal.

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: Last follow-up.

SEN. HISE: Final follow-up.

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: So for clarification on what you just said, Chair Lewis, partisan

advantage is not going to fall under the category of political considerations.

REP. LEWIS: Well, ma'am, I'm -- again, I'm trying to think about how to answer your question differently than I did before. Again, the entire process of where lines are drawn, every result from where a line is drawn will be an inherently political thing. I am saying that redistricting in itself is an inherently political process. It is right and relevant to review past performance in drawing districts, so I -- I'm sorry if I'm not answering your question. I'm trying to understand it as best I can.

SEN. HISE: Senator Clark.

SEN. CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Chair. You indicated part of the political data that would be evaluated would be the past elections, for the most part; you identify quite a few. Now, you said previously that they could provide no indication of what might happen in the future. Otherwise, they couldn't be used prospectively as we would do with the efficiency gap calculations. So if you're not going to use those results prospectively, and you -- for what reason, you just want to take a look at them and see what happened in the past, I

don't see how that can add value to anything if you don't anticipate that they can inform you about what might happen in the future.

REP. LEWIS: Senator, thank you for the question. Again, I think the efficiency gap is -- seeks to somehow create some kind of proportional -- proportionate representation thing, and unless we're going to get to the point where we have Prime Minister Moore and Lord Berger, I don't see what -- that's relevant at this point.

SEN. HISE: Follow up.

SEN. CLARK: First of all, efficiency gaps deals with single-member districts, which is what do have in the United States of America. So back to my other point, if we can't use --

REP. LEWIS: Excuse me, sir. I believe the efficiency gap is a cumulative thing. That's what the article says, which is how you apply it to a state plan, which is how you and I both just agreed that most state plans in the US fall underneath it, including the 2016 plan in which the House of Representatives of this state was elected.

SEN. CLARK: Okay. So clearly we're not going to agree on the efficiency gap, so back to the other point.

SEN. HISE: Follow-up.

SEN. CLARK: Sorry, Mr. Chair. Follow up. Okay. You indicated that you were going to look at election data, so that -- still these other questions that I have. If you're not going to look at the election data for the purpose of determining prospectively what might happen and just want to see what happened in the past, what good does looking to see what happened in the past do us, if we're not going to use it for what might happen in the future?

REP. LEWIS: I believe that the consideration of political data in terms of election results is an established districting criteria, and it's one that I propose that this committee use in drawing the map.

SEN. HISE: Representative Dollar.

REP. DOLLAR: Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of the election data criteria.

SEN. HISE: Any other questions or comments? Seeing none, Clerk will begin with the call of the roll of the House.

CLERK: Representative Jackson.

REP. JACKSON: No.

CLERK: Representative Jackson, no.

Representative Szoka.

REP. SZOKA: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Szoka, aye.

Representative Stevens.

REP. STEVENS: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Stevens, aye.

Representative Bell.

REP. BELL: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Bell, aye.

Representative Brawley.

REP. BRAWLEY: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Brawley, aye.

Representative Brockman.

REP. BROCKMAN: No.

CLERK: Representative Brockman, no.

Representative Burr.

REP. BURR: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Burr, aye.

Representative Davis. Representative Davis.

Representative Dixon.

REP. DIXON: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Dixon, aye.

Representative Dobson.

REP. DOBSON: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Dobson, aye.

Representative Dulin.

REP. DULIN: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Dulin, aye. Representative Farmer-Butterfield.

REP. FARMER-BUTTERFIELD: No.

CLERK: Representative Farmer-Butterfield, no. Representative Floyd. Representative Floyd. Representative Garrison.

REP. GARRISON: No.

CLERK: Representative Garrison, no. Representative Gill.

REP. GILL: No.

CLERK: Representative Gill, no. Representative Grange.

REP. GRANGE: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Grange, aye. Representative Hall.

REP. HALL: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Hall, aye. Representative Hanes.

REP. HANES: No.

CLERK: Representative Hanes, could you please repeat that?

REP. HANES: No.

CLERK: Representative Hanes, no.

Representative Hardister.

REP. HARDISTER: Yes.

CLERK: Representative Hardister, aye.

Representative Harrison.

REP. HARRISON: No.

CLERK: Representative Harrison, no.

Representative Hastings.

REP. HASTINGS: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Hastings, aye.

Representative Howard.

REP. HOWARD: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Howard, aye.

Representative Hunter.

REP. HUNTER: No.

CLERK: Representative Hunter, no.

Representative Hurley.

REP. HURLEY: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Hurley, aye.

Representative Johnson.

REP. JOHNSON: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Johnson, aye.

Representative Jones. Representative Jones.

Representative Jordan.

REP. JORDAN: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Jordan, aye.

Representative Malone.

REP. MALONE: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Malone, aye.

Representative Michaux.

REP. MICHAUX: No.

CLERK: Representative Michaux, no.

Representative Moore. Representative Moore.

Representative Pierce.

REP. PIERCE: No.

CLERK: Representative Pierce, no.

Representative Reives.

REP. REIVES: No.

CLERK: Representative Reives, no.

Representative Reives, no. Representative Willingham.

REP. WILLINGHAM: No.

CLERK: Representative Willingham, no.

Representative Speciale.

REP. SPECIALE: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Speciale, aye.

Representative Rogers.

REP. ROGERS: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Rogers, aye.

Representative Saine.

REP. SAINE: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Saine, aye. Representative Wray.

REP. WRAY: No.

CLERK: Representative Saine, no. Wray, no. Representative Yarborough.

REP. YARBOROUGH: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Yarborough, aye. Representative Torbett.

REP. TORBETT: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Torbett, aye. Representative Lewis.

REP. LEWIS: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Lewis, aye. Representative Dollar.

REP. DOLLAR: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Dollar, aye.

SEN. HISE: Committee clerk, call the roll of the Senate members.

CLERK: Senator Bishop.

SEN. BISHOP: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Bishop, aye. Senator Blue. Senator Brown.

SEN. BROWN: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Brown, aye. Senator Clark.

SEN. CLARK: No.

CLERK: Senator Clark, no. Senator Daniel. Senator Harrington.

SEN. HARRINGTON: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Harrington, aye. Senator Jackson.

SEN. JACKSON: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Jackson, aye. Senator Lee.

SEN. LEE: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Lee, aye. Senator Lowe.

SEN. LOWE: No.

CLERK: Senator Lowe, no. Senator Newton.

SEN. NEWTON: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Newton, aye. Senator Rabon. Senator Smith-Ingram.

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: No.

CLERK: Senator Smith-Ingram, no. Senator Van Duyn.

SEN. VAN DUYN: No.

CLERK: Senator Van Duyn, no. Senator Wade.

SEN. WADE: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Wade, aye. Senator Hise.

SEN. HISE: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Hise, aye.

SEN. HISE: By a vote of 24 to 13 in the House and 8 to 4 in the Senate, Criteria Number 8, election data is adopted by the criteria [sic]. Members, you will have in front of you now Criteria Number 9. This is Number 9, no consideration of racial data.

REP. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman?

SEN. HISE: Representative Lewis.

REP. LEWIS: I propose the following criteria that is No Consideration of Racial Data. Data identifying the race of individuals or voters shall not be used in drawing of legislative districts in 2017 House and Senate plans. In 2011, 40 counties in this state were under the preclearance standard, under Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act. In the intervening time, that preclearance from the Justice Department has been lifted by the U.S. Supreme Court. It will not be incumbent upon this General Assembly to seek preclearance for these plans.

In drawing the current legislative districts, the General Assembly conducted an unprecedented effort to reach out to interested

parties, receive public input, receive expert testimony and hear from members of this body about evidence relevant for drawing districts under the Voting Rights Act. Despite the voluminous record that was established by the General Assembly during the 2011 redistricting process, the three-judge panel in the Covington case said that this did not constitute substantial evidence that would justify using race to draw districts in compliance with the requirements of the VRA.

Therefore, we do not believe it is appropriate, given the Court's order, in this case for these committees to consider race when drawing districts. Be happy to answer any questions.

SEN. HISE: Representative Michaux.

REP. MICHAUX: Yeah. Mr. Chairman, you indicated that the Section 4 of the Voting Rights Act was stricken down. It was in effect when this -- when this redistricting was done initially. It is not now. But the redistricting that you did when it was in effect, the decision of the Court came out that it was racial gerrymandering, after the provision was stricken down. Is that correct? After the provision in the -- in the Voting Rights Act had been stricken, the decision that the -- you

did racial gerrymandering in 2011. Is that correct?

REP. LEWIS: If I understood your question, then chronologically, I believe Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act was stricken down --

REP. MICHAUX: No, no, no. It was Section 4, but go ahead. 4 was stricken, which made 5 ineffective. Now, go ahead.

REP. LEWIS: And the decision that this Committee is here to react to was issued after that time, yes.

REP. MICHAUX: Further question.

SEN. HISE: Follow-up.

REP. MICHAUX: So the decision of the three-panel court in the Covington case indicated that it was racial gerrymandering involved that caused them to declare the districts unconstitutional. Is that correct?

REP. LEWIS: It's my understanding the wording they used was "improper use of race." I don't believe they used the words racial gerrymandering.

REP. MICHAUX: Well, they -- did they use the words "racial demographic"?

REP. LEWIS: I don't recall, sir. I

don't have it before me.

REP. MICHAUX: Well, I have it before me right here, and what I --

REP. LEWIS: Then you should have just stated that. It would have saved a little time.

REP. MICHAUX: Do you understand that by not using race, you're defeating your own purpose? Because if the districts were declared unconstitutional because of race, if you don't use race to correct it, how are you going to show the Court that they still are not unconstitutional?

REP. LEWIS: We believe that the court order illustrates that we did not have sufficient evidence to consider race in the drawing of districts. I'm not aware of any additional information that has been submitted by any member of this Committee or anyone else since this decision has come out. Therefore, it is my recommendation that race not be a consideration in drawing of these districts.

REP. MICHAUX: Another question.

SEN. HISE: Follow-up.

REP. MICHAUX: Would you agree that the decision that came down in the Covington case indicated that race was the predominant factor as

their reason for calling the districts unconstitutional because of racial -- racial demographics? If you want to put it that way.

REP. LEWIS: Sir, I've explained to you my understanding of what the court order is. And I am here today advocating that no race be considered in drawing the districts. That is my understanding of the court order. There's no other way I can answer your question.

REP. MICHAUX: Another question.

REP. LEWIS: Probably the same answer.

REP. MICHAUX: How are you going to prove to the Court that you did not violate their order in terms of racial gerrymandering?

REP. LEWIS: It's my understanding that the order speaks for itself in that the evidence did not justify the use of race in drawing districts. Therefore, I'm recommending to this Committee that race not be a criteria in drawing the 2017 House and Senate plans.

REP. MICHAUX: Mr. Chairman, I just have a statement I want to make.

SEN. HISE: Comment.

REP. MICHAUX: Racial demogratic -- demographic data can also be useful, because it can

signify whether race was a predominant factor motivating the legislature's decision. That comes directly from the Covington case.

You have been charged. What the Court told you was that racial disparity, racial demographics played a major role in the redistricting that you did. You were ordered. You are now ordered to correct that. In order to show that you have corrected that, you cannot escape the fact that race has to be in there somewhere. There's no way you can do it, Mr. Lewis. I don't care how you cut it.

REP. LEWIS: Race --

REP. MICHAUX: You've got -- you've got to tell the Court, we came in and we went back and used racial demographics from one place or another place to correct the mistakes that we made in the past.

REP. LEWIS: Sir, what I will tell the Court is that the Committee adopted a criteria I hope that excluded the consideration of race in drawing the maps.

REP. MICHAUX: But may I follow -- I just -- I'm -- I'm -- the -- you excluded race. You are still saying you excluded race. You are

still using race as a factor, even by saying you excluded race. So you've got to consider it somewhere down the line in order to make the fact that you excluded it relevant.

To you, it may be a play on words. But there's a distinction there that you ought to understand. That -- in other words, the Court says if we go back to the way it was, where race was not a predominant factor, then race still has to play. Because there are people out there who are the -- are of a racial composure that have to be considered in doing this. If not, you're still short-changing race. You're still short-changing a group of people by not considering them. And that's where your big problem is. If you don't consider us -- if you don't consider me, whether you say it or not, you are still considering race.

REP. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is making a series of statements I certainly don't intend to respond to, a series of statements that I don't agree with.

SEN. HISE: Representative Farmer-Butterfield.

REP. FARMER-BUTTERFIELD: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I wanted to ask staff to tell us how this

criteria relates to the obligation to comply with Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act?

SEN. HISE: Questions are directed to the Chairman of the Committee. Representative Lewis, would you like to respond, or would you like to have staff -- staff tends not to respond to intent, further-going. But I will let them see what statements they may want to make.

REP. FARMER-BUTTERFIELD: I think I need a legal opinion, that's all. Thank you.

MS. CHURCHILL (STAFF): Representative Farmer-Butterfield, I think we would need some time to reflect upon that. But generally, I think what you are trying to ask about is Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. And, generally, that burden is placed on the voter or the person bringing the suit. It would not be placed on the legislature enacting the plan.

SEN. HISE: Representative Jackson.

REP. JACKSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'll just -- I'm going to just read from the conclusion of the Court. Because that's not the way the Court wrote it in the Covington opinion. Court said that Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act continues to play an important role in

redistricting. And legislatures must undertake a specific -- specific -- a district-specific analysis to identify and cure potential Section 2 violations. So the Court, at least, has put that requirement on us.

Further, the Court said, our decision today should in no way be read to imply that majority-black districts are no longer needed in the state of North Carolina. And I just -- I don't -- don't see this criteria as matching up with what the Court concluded in the Covington case. And so I would encourage members to vote against this criteria.

SEN. HISE: Yeah. Senator Smith-Ingram.

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Chair Lewis, if this particular criterion passes, then what metric is going to be used to ensure that the new districts to not abridge or deny voters of color?

REP. LEWIS: Ma'am, what I can tell you is, I believe, in 2011, this General Assembly sought out and received input from every source that was willing to work with us in expert testimony and did its best, at that time, to comply with the instructions and advice that we received.

That being said, the Covington court, it's my understanding, has said that we did not have a sufficient amount of data in order to draw the districts as they were drawn. No one, to my knowledge, has submitted additional data for this Committee to review. Therefore, this criteria would propose that race would not be a consideration in the drawing of the maps.

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: Follow-up.

SEN. HISE: Follow-up.

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: Is there a metric that can be used to ensure that voters of color are not disenfranchised or that their rights are not abridged?

REP. LEWIS: Ma'am, thank you for the question. Again, I would refocus this conversation on the criteria that the Chairs will take back and execute the undertaking of the first map. If there is additional data that you or other members of the Committee would like to see reviewed, if there are additional maps, if there are other things that you would like us to consider, once it's done, then we will certainly be glad to do that. Again, we will not be using race in the drawing of the additional.

SEN. HISE: Representative Dollar.

REP. DOLLAR: Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of the criteria.

SEN. HISE: Representative Dollar has moved the adoption of the proposed Criteria Number 9, No Consideration of Racial Data. Any other comments or questions?

REP. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, there is one additional comment, please?

SEN. HISE: You are so recognized.

REP. LEWIS: Just wanted to respond to my friend from Wake, Representative Jackson. We do not believe, in light of the Covington opinion, that there is substantial evidence in the record to justify the use of race in drawing districts. Given the Court's order in this case, we believe the only way to comply with the legal requirements regarding the drawing of districts is not to consider race in that process.

SEN. HISE: Okay. Now back to Senator Lowe.

SEN. LOWE: Yes, I do have a statement.

SEN. HISE: Recognized for a comment.

SEN. LOWE: Thank you, sir. And that is, we live in the South. When in the South has race not been a factor? Because what I'm hearing

doesn't really add up.

REP. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I'd point out that the gentleman said that was a statement. And I certainly took him at his word that that was a statement.

SEN. HISE: Any other comments or questions? Seeing none, we will begin, then, for consideration of this, the roll call of the Senate members.

CLERK: Senator Bishop?

SEN. BISHOP: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Bishop, aye. Senator Blue? Senator Brown?

SEN. BROWN: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Brown, aye. Senator Clark?

SEN. CLARK: No.

CLERK: Senator Clark, no. Senator Daniel? Senator Harrington?

SEN. HARRINGTON: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Harrington, aye. Senator Jackson?

SEN. JACKSON: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Jackson, aye. Senator Lee?

SEN. LEE: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Lee, aye. Senator Lowe.

SEN. LOWE: No.

CLERK: Senator Lowe, no. Senator Newton?

SEN. NEWTON: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Newton, aye. Senator Rabon? Senator Smith-Ingram?

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: No.

CLERK: Senator Smith-Ingram, no. Senator Van Duyn?

SEN. VAN DUYN: No.

CLERK: Senator Van Duyn, no. Senator Wade?

SEN. WADE: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Wade, aye. Senator Hise?

SEN. HISE: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Hise, aye.

SEN. HISE: Committee Clerk, call the members of the House.

CLERK: Representative Jackson?

REP. JACKSON: No.

CLERK: Representative Jackson, no. Representative Szoka?

REP. SZOKA: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Szoka, aye. Representative Stevens?

REP. STEVENS: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Stevens, aye. Representative Bell?

REP. BELL: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Bell, aye. Representative Brawley?

REP. BRAWLEY: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Brawley, aye. Representative Brockman?

REP. BROCKMAN: No.

CLERK: Representative Brockman, no. Representative Burr?

REP. BURR: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Burr, aye. Representative Davis? Representative Davis? Representative Dixon?

REP. DIXON: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Dixon, aye. Representative Dobson?

REP. DOBSON: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Dobson, aye. Representative Dulin?

REP. DULIN: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Dulin, aye. Representative Farmer-Butterfield?

REP. FARMER-BUTTERFIELD: No.

CLERK: Representative Farmer-Butterfield, no. Representative Floyd? Representative Floyd? Representative Garrison?

REP. GARRISON: No.

CLERK: Representative Garrison, no. Representative Gill?

REP. GILL: No.

CLERK: Representative Gill, no. Representative Grange?

REP. GRANGE: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Grange, aye. Representative Hall?

REP. HALL: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Hall, aye. Representative Hanes?

REP. HANES: No.

CLERK: Representative Hanes, no. Representative Hardister?

REP. HARDISTER: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Hardister, aye. Representative Harrison?

REP. HARRISON: No.

CLERK: Representative Harrison, no. Representative Hastings?

REP. HASTINGS: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Hastings, aye. Representative Howard?

REP. HOWARD: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Howard, aye. Representative Hunter?

REP. HUNTER: No.

CLERK: Representative Hunter, no. Representative Hurley?

REP. HURLEY: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Hurley, aye. Representative Johnson?

REP. JOHNSON: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Johnson, aye. Representative Jones? Representative Jones? Representative Jordan?

REP. JORDAN: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Jordan, aye. Representative Malone?

REP. MALONE: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Malone, aye. Representative Michaux?

REP. MICHAUX: No.

CLERK: Representative Michaux, no. Representative Moore? Representative Moore? Representative Pierce?

REP. PIERCE: No.

CLERK: Representative Pierce, no. Representative Reives?

REP. REIVES: No.

CLERK: Representative Reives, no. Representative Willingham?

REP. WILLINGHAM: No.

CLERK: Representative Reives, no. Representative Speciale?

REP. SPECIALE: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Speciale, aye. Representative Rogers?

REP. ROGERS: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Rogers, aye. Representative Saine?

REP. SAINE: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Saine, aye. Representative Wray?

REP. WRAY: No.

CLERK: Representative Wray, no. Representative Yarborough?

REP. YARBOROUGH: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Yarborough, aye. Representative Torbett?

REP. TORBETT: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Torbett, aye. Representative Lewis?

REP. LEWIS: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Lewis, aye. Representative Dollar?

REP. DOLLAR: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Dollar, aye.

SEN. HISE: By a vote of 8 in favor, 4 against and 24 in -- in the Senate and 24 in favor and 13 against in the House, Criteria Number 9, No Consideration of Racial Data is adopted by the Committee.

Members, this exhausts the recommendations of criteria put forward by the Chairmen in this process. We'll now open up if members of the Committee have a specific criteria they would like to introduce. Senator Clark?

SEN. CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to send forth an amendment for consideration.

SEN. HISE: Suspend while the members of -- while it's passed out.

(Proceedings went off the record.)

SEN. HISE: Do all members of the Committee have a copy? If we do, I recognize Senator Clark.

SEN. CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Representative Lewis, when we were doing the redistricting for the congressional seats in 2016 --

SEN. HISE: Yeah, let me --

UNIDENTIFIED MEMBER: Mr. Chairman, I don't -- I don't think I have that. I have --

SEN. HISE: I believe I have Committee members who did not receive --

UNIDENTIFIED MEMBER: What does it say? Is --

SEN. CLARK: Title is Partisan Advantage.

SEN. HISE: A -- Senator Clark called number 10, Partisan Advantage.

SEN. CLARK: Okay. When we were doing the 2016 congressional redistricting process, it was stated by Mr. Lewis here that one of the express purposes was to maintain the partisan advantage. I guess you could say this is a renouncement criteria, if you will. And it states that maintaining or establishing a partisan

advantage for any party shall not, emphasize not, be a criterion for the construction or approval of House and Senate district plans.

SEN. HISE: We'll start with Representative Lewis, then I'll get back.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I would say that the nine criteria that have been extensively debated by the Committee are the committee -- are the criteria that the Chairs recommend. And I would not advocate for passage of this tenth one.

SEN. HISE: Representative Speciale.

REP. SPECIALE: Isn't this what we essentially already discussed and already decided not to approve? I mean --

SEN. HISE: It is [inaudible] that this is a substantial difference, but it is a similar topic. So any other questions or comments? Senator Van Duyn?

SEN. VAN DUYN: I'd just like to be on record in saying I think this is the most important criteria, given what we heard in public comment.

SEN. HISE: Any other questions or comments? Hearing none, Senator Clark has moved for the adoption of the criteria listed as Number

10, Partisan Advantage. The -- I believe we were at the House. Clerk of the House Committee will call the roll.

CLERK: Representative Jackson?

REP. JACKSON: Yes.

CLERK: Representative Jackson, yes. Representative Szoka?

REP. SZOKA: No.

CLERK: Representative Szoka, no. Representative Stevens?

REP. STEVENS: No.

CLERK: Representative Stevens, no. Representative Bell?

REP. BELL: No.

CLERK: Representative Bell, no. Representative Brawley?

REP. BRAWLEY: No.

CLERK: Representative Brawley, no. Representative Brockman?

REP. BROCKMAN: Yes.

CLERK: Representative Brockman, yes. Representative Burr?

REP. BURR: No.

CLERK: Representative Burr, no. Representative Davis? Representative Davis?

Representative Davis? Representative Dixon?

REP. DIXON: No.

CLERK: Representative Dixon, no.

Representative Dobson?

REP. DOBSON: Representative Dobson, no.

Representative Dulin?

REP. DULIN: No.

CLERK: Representative Dulin, no.

Representative Farmer-Butterfield? Representative Farmer-Butterfield, yes. Representative Floyd? Representative Floyd? Representative Garrison?

REP. GARRISON: Yes.

CLERK: Representative Garrison, yes.

Representative Gill?

REP. GILL: Yes.

CLERK: Representative Gill, yes.

Representative Grange?

REP. GRANGE: No.

CLERK: Representative Grange, no.

Representative Hall?

REP. HALL: No.

CLERK: Representative Hall, no.

Representative Hanes?

REP. HANES: Yes.

CLERK: Representative Hanes, yes.

Representative Hardister?

REP. HARDISTER: No.

CLERK: Representative Hardister, no.

Representative Harrison?

REP. HARRISON: Yes.

CLERK: Representative Harrison, yes.

Representative Hastings?

REP. HASTINGS: No.

CLERK: Representative Hastings, no.

Representative Howard?

REP. HOWARD: No.

CLERK: Representative Howard, no.

Representative Hunter?

REP. HUNTER: Yes.

CLERK: Representative Hunter, yes.

Representative Hurley? Representative Hurley, no.

Representative Johnson?

REP. JOHNSON: No.

CLERK: Representative Johnson, no.

Representative Jones? Representative Jones?

Representative Jordan?

REP. JORDAN: No.

CLERK: Representative Jordan, no.

Representative Malone?

REP. MALONE: No.

CLERK: Representative Malone, no. Representative Michaux?

REP. MICHAUX: Yes.

CLERK: Representative Michaux, yes. Representative Moore? Representative Moore? Representative Pierce?

REP. PIERCE: Yes.

CLERK: Representative Pierce, yes. Representative Reives?

REP. REIVES: Yes.

CLERK: Representative Reives, yes. Representative Willingham? Representative Willingham? Representative Willingham? Representative Speciale?

REP. SPECIALE: No.

CLERK: Representative Speciale, no. Representative Rogers?

REP. ROGERS: No.

CLERK: Representative Rogers, no. Representative Saine?

REP. SAINE: No.

CLERK: Representative Saine, no. Representative Wray?

REP. WRAY: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Wray, yes.

Representative Yarborough?

REP. YARBOROUGH: No.

CLERK: Representative Yarborough, no.

Representative Torbett?

REP. TORBETT: No.

CLERK: Representative Torbett, no.

Representative Lewis?

REP. LEWIS: No.

CLERK: Representative Lewis, no.

Representative Dollar?

REP. DOLLAR: No.

CLERK: Representative Dollar, no.

SEN. HISE: Committee Clerk for the Senate will call the roll of the Senate members.

CLERK: Senator Bishop?

SEN. BISHOP: No.

CLERK: Senator Bishop, no. Senator Blue? Senator Brown?

SEN. BROWN: No.

CLERK: Senator Brown, no. Senator Clark?

SEN. CLARK: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Clark, aye. Senator Daniel? Senator Harrington?

SEN. HARRINGTON: No.

CLERK: Senator Harrington, no. Senator Jackson?

SEN. JACKSON: No.

CLERK: Senator Jackson, no. Senator Lee?

SEN. LEE: No.

CLERK: Senator Lee, no. Senator Lowe?

SEN. LOWE: Yes.

CLERK: Senator Lowe, yes. Senator Newton?

SEN. NEWTON: No.

CLERK: Senator Newton, no. Senator Rabon? Senator Smith-Ingram?

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Smith-Ingram, aye. Senator Van Duyn?

SEN. VAN DUYN: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Van Duyn, aye. Senator Wade?

SEN. WADE: No.

CLERK: Senator Wade, no. Senator Hise?

SEN. HISE: No.

CLERK: Senator Hise, no.

SEN. HISE: By a vote of 13 in favor, 24 opposed in the House, and a vote of 4 in favor, 8

opposed in the Senate, the proposed criteria fails. Any other criteria? Senator Smith-Ingram?

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I wish to send forward an additional criterion.

SEN. HISE: Okay. This is criteria titled, Total Black Voting Age Population.

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: Yes, it is, thank you, Mr. Chair.

SEN. HISE: Sergeant-at-Arms will disperse. And make sure we get that second row back there, Representative Jordan.

(Proceedings went off the record.)

SEN. HISE: Members, before moving into that, I will say we've actually had some comments from those listening online that it is, at times, hard to hear members. So we'll ask you to please speak directly into your microphones. I also have been somewhat remiss in reminding members to please identify yourself and your district when speaking. That would have helped the court reporter if I'd have said that a lot earlier in this process. But I can correct it now. And hopefully we'll be able to deal with those issues.

If everyone has a copy now of the proposed criteria which, for record-keeping

purposes right now, I'll identify as 10-A, Total Black Voting Age Population. Senator Smith-Ingram will be recognized to explain.

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The proposed criteria sets forth the explanation and the reason why we're here today. In the Covington case, the U.S. Supreme Court deemed that the 28 districts that were found unconstitutional were packed with African-Americans. So in order to obviate that and reduce the cost, because we're now at $5.4 million that the North Carolina General Assembly has spent in redistricting, that to add this portion to the criteria would prevent us having to come back here again for the same reason at an additional cost to our taxpayers.

So in order to promote fiduciary responsibility and commitment, the 28 districts that were deemed unconstitutional shall not have a total black voting age population higher than that which existed in those enacted legislative districts, in effect, in 2010, except for when it is naturally occurring, which may be the case in some of our demographic areas across the state.

SEN. HISE: Senator Smith-Ingram, just let me ask a question for clarification before we

begin. When you read your amendment, you said the Covington case shall not have a total black population. As I have the amendment in front of me and signed, it says shall have.

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: It should be shall not. I'm sorry. So it goes with none. It starts out with none, and then there's shall.

SEN. HISE: Okay. I was just confused, because it was written -- read different than what I have. So it should be that none of the nine districts shall have a voting age population higher than that which existed in those enacted districts that were, in effect, in 2010.

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: Yes. For clarification, Mr. Chair, it's none of the nine Senate and 19 House districts deemed as unconstitutional. So it's the 28 districts that were deemed unconstitutional. Okay. Representative Lewis?

REP. LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to speak briefly to the comment that was made. I understand that through the use of Twitter, the NC Senate Democrats have been tweeting out a graphic entitled NC General Assembly Redistricting Litigation Costs. I want to point out that that's

in error. It's inaccurate. And certainly the tweet should stop and the figure that was quoted is wrong.

I also would point out, regarding Amendment 10A, that we have established that we will not use race in the drawing of these lines. This amendment, 10A, would, in effect, establish a mechanical criteria for the drawing of districts that uses race. It's in conflict with criteria that says we will not use race. I would urge members to vote it down.

SEN. HISE: Senator Clark.

SEN. CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Senator Clark, Senate District 21. The court order which essentially brought us back here said that we should justify any black voter age population in excess of 50 percent. How are we going to know whether or not we met that requirement by not exceeding 50 percent?

SEN. HISE: Representative Dollar.

REP. DOLLAR: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Members of the Committee, based on the comments Senator Smith-Ingram mentioned, I would just read to you verbatim, Page 3, Footnote 1 of the Covington decision as written by the Court, states

as follows, "In reaching this conclusion, we make no finding that the General Assembly acted in bad faith or with the discriminatory intent in drawing the challenged districts which were precleared by the Justice Department pursuant to Section 5 of the VRA, nor do we consider the challenged districts involved any impermissible packing of minority voters. As plaintiffs acknowledged, they bring no such claim."

SEN. HISE: Any other questions or comments? Senator Clark?

SEN. CLARK: I don't think I -- excuse me. Senator Clark, Senate District 21. I don't think I've had my question answered. In the three-judge panel, they indicated that we should have no districts with a black-voting-age -- black-voting-age population in excess of 50 percent. How do we make sure we achieve that objective?

SEN. HISE: I assumed the question was rhetorical. But I think the response given is that was not what they said. Representative Michaux.

REP. MICHAUX: He should've little bit further into that footnote -- in the footnote.

SEN. HISE: Recognized for a comment.

REP. MICHAUX: Yes, I'm sorry. Representative Michaux. The footnote of the comment Representative Dollar made, it said -- it certainly said that. But it also says, nor do we consider whether the challenged districts -- whether the challenged districts involved any impermissible packing. They didn't rule out any impermissible packing. It just says they didn't consider it in this decision. And that was not a -- that was a footnote in the decision. And --

SEN. HISE: Representative Dollar.

REP. DOLLAR: That's not what the footnote reads here. And I would also point out to the gentleman that what is -- is noted here, in the record, is as plaintiffs acknowledge, they bring no such claim. No such claim was brought in the case to start with.

SEN. HISE: Senator Brown.

SEN. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Harry Brown, District 6. Senator Smith-Ingram's provision, or criteria, mentions that it's the nine Senate districts and 19 House districts. But those districts, in the new maps, no longer exist. So I don't know how they are relevant in this particular case. Because the new maps, those districts are no

longer relevant any longer.

SEN. HISE: Any other questions, comments?

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: Mr. Chair, clarification.

SEN. HISE: Yeah.

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: I am not aware that there are any maps. Are there maps that Senator Brown that we don't? Because how can you draw maps without the criteria being voted on?

SEN. BROWN: I'll follow. I should have been more specific. With the new county groupings, that is impossible.

SEN. HISE: And I'm assuming we can get a copy of the 2010 map, as well the 2011 maps, if the Senator needs those. Senator Smith-Ingram has moved for the adoption of the criteria that I am labeling as 10A for here, Total Black Voting Age Population. Seeing no other comments or questions, we will begin with a roll call of the Senate.

CLERK: Senator Bishop?

SEN. BISHOP: No.

CLERK: Senator Bishop, no. Senator Blue? Senator Brown?

SEN. BROWN: No.

CLERK: Senator Brown, no. Senator Clark?

SEN. CLARK: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Clark, aye. Senator Daniel? Senator Harrington?

SEN. HARRINGTON: No.

CLERK: Senator Harrington, no. Senator Jackson?

SEN. JACKSON: No.

CLERK: Senator Jackson, no. Senator Lee? Senator Lee, no. Senator Lowe?

SEN. LOWE: Yes.

CLERK: Senator Lowe, yes. Senator Newton? Senator Newton, no. Senator Rabon? Senator Smith-Ingram?

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: Yes.

CLERK: Senator Smith-Ingram, yes. Senator Van Duyn?

SEN. VAN DUYN: Yes.

CLERK: Senator Van Duyn, yes. Senator Wade?

SEN. WADE: No.

CLERK: Senator Wade, no. Senator Hise?

SEN. HISE: No.

CLERK: Senator Hise, no.

SEN. HISE: Committee Clerk will call the members of the House.

CLERK: Representative Jackson?

REP. JACKSON: Yes.

CLERK: Representative Jackson, yes. Representative Szoka?

REP. SZOKA: No.

CLERK: Representative Szoka, no. Representative Stevens?

REP. STEVENS: No.

CLERK: Representative Stevens, no. Representative Bell?

REP. BELL: No.

CLERK: Representative Bell, no. Representative Brawley?

REP. BRAWLEY: No.

CLERK: Representative Brawley, no. Representative Brockman?

REP. BROCKMAN: Yes.

CLERK: Representative Brockman, yes. Representative Burr?

REP. BURR: No.

CLERK: Representative Burr, no. Representative Davis? Representative Dixon?

REP. DIXON: No.

CLERK: Representative Dixon, no. Representative Dobson?

REP. DIXON: No.

CLERK: Representative Dobson, no. Representative Dulin?

REP. DOBSON: No.

CLERK: Representative Dulin, no. Representative Farmer-Butterfield? Representative Farmer-Butterfield, yes. Representative Floyd? Representative Garrison?

REP. DULIN: Yes.

CLERK: Representative Garrison, yes. Representative Gill?

REP. GILL: Yes.

CLERK: Representative Gill, yes. Representative Grange?

REP. GRANGE: No.

CLERK: Representative Grange, no. Representative Hall?

REP. HALL: No.

CLERK: Representative Hall, no. Representative Hanes?

REP. HANES: Yes.

CLERK: Representative Hanes, yes. Representative Hardister?

REP. HARDISTER: No.

CLERK: Representative Hardister, no. Representative Harrison?

REP. HARRISON: Yes.

CLERK: Representative Harrison, yes. Representative Hastings?

REP. HASTINGS: No.

CLERK: Representative Hastings, no. Representative Howard?

REP. HOWARD: No.

CLERK: Representative Howard, no. Representative Hunter?

REP. HUNTER: Yes.

CLERK: Representative Hunter, yes. Representative Hurley?

REP. HURLEY: No.

CLERK: Representative Hurley, no. Representative Johnson?

REP. JOHNSON: No.

CLERK: Representative Johnson, no. Representative Jones? Representative Jordan? Representative Jordan, no. Representative Malone?

REP. MALONE: No.

CLERK: Representative Malone, no. Representative Michaux?

REP. MICHAUX: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Michaux, aye. Representative Moore? Representative Pierce?

REP. PIERCE: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Pierce, aye. Representative Reives?

REP. REIVES: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Reives, aye. Representative Willingham?

REP. WILLINGHAM: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Willingham, aye. Representative Speciale?

REP. SPECIALE: No.

CLERK: Representative Speciale, no. Representative Rogers?

REP. ROGERS: No.

CLERK: Representative Rogers, no. Representative Saine?

REP. SAINE: No.

CLERK: Representative Saine, no. Representative Wray?

REP. WRAY: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Wray, aye. Representative Yarborough?

REP. YARBOROUGH: No.

CLERK: Representative Yarborough, no. Representative Torbett?

REP. TORBETT: No.

CLERK: Representative Torbett, no. Representative Lewis?

REP. LEWIS: No.

CLERK: Representative Lewis, no. Representative Dollar?

REP. DOLLAR: No.

CLERK: Representative Dollar, no.

SEN. HISE: By a vote of 4 in favor, 8 opposed in the Senate, and a vote of 13 in favor, 24 opposed in the House, the proposed criteria fails. Members, I have no other proposed criteria in front of --

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: Mr. Chair?

SEN. HISE: Yes?

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: Just to clarify the record, thank you, I would like to make a statement. I was in error. I was off by $600,000. It is not 5.4 million that has been spent. Since 2011, it's actually 4.8 million. But to our hard-working North Carolinians who send us here for good governance, that's still a heck of a lot of money.

SEN. HISE: Any other business to come before the Committee? Representative Jackson.

REP. JACKSON: I handed out some criteria as well, Mr. Chairman. That has been -- it has been handed out to all the members.

SEN. HISE: Okay.

(Proceedings went off the record.)

REP. JACKSON: It did, Mr. Chairman. And I understand that some of these may have been considered in part of the other ones. And I'd be happy to take the time to divide these up into six individual things and then have the Chair rule and appeal. But it just seems like, to me, it might be more time efficient if we just voted on these six together. And so I'd move adoption without further comment.

SEN. HISE: Okay. We have adoption request without comment. I will give the opportunity. Seeing none, we will begin the process of adopting the six criteria listed here. We will begin with a those in favor vote. Those opposed to adoption vote no. We will begin with a roll call of the House. Committee Clerk, call the roll.

CLERK: Representative Jackson?

REP. JACKSON: Yes.

CLERK: Representative Jackson, yes. Representative Szoka?

REP. SZOKA: No.

CLERK: Representative Szoka, no. Representative Stevens?

REP. STEVENS: No.

CLERK: Representative Stevens, no. Representative Bell?

REP. HALL: No.

CLERK: Representative Bell, no. Representative Brawley?

REP. BRAWLEY: No.

CLERK: Representative Brawley, no. Representative Brockman?

REP. BROCKMAN: Yes.

CLERK: Representative Brockman, yes. Representative Burr?

REP. BURR: No.

CLERK: Representative Davis? Representative Dixon?

REP. DIXON: No.

CLERK: Representative Dixon, no. Representative Dobson?

REP. DOBSON: No.

CLERK: Representative Dobson, no. Representative Dulin?

REP. DULIN: No.

CLERK: Representative Dulin, no. Representative Farmer-Butterfield?

REP. FARMER-BUTTERFIELD: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Farmer-Butterfield, yes. Representative Floyd? Representative Garrison?

REP. GARRISON: Yes.

CLERK: Representative Garrison, yes. Representative Gill? Representative Gill, yes. Representative Grange?

REP. GRANGE: No.

CLERK: Representative Grange, no. Representative Hall?

REP. HALL: No.

CLERK: Representative Hall, no. Representative Hanes?

REP. HANES: Yes.

CLERK: Representative Hanes, yes. Representative Hardister?

REP. HARDISTER: No.

CLERK: Representative Hardister, no. Representative Harrison?

REP. HARRISON: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Harrison, yes. Representative Hastings?

REP. HASTINGS: No.

CLERK: Representative Hastings, no. Representative Howard? Representative Howard, no. Representative Hunter? Representative Hunter, yes. Representative Hurley? Representative Hurley, no. Representative Johnson? Representative Johnson, no. Representative Jones? Representative Jordan? Representative Jordan, no. Representative Malone?

REP. MALONE: No.

CLERK: Representative Malone, no. Representative Michaux.

REP. MICHAUX: Yes.

CLERK: Representative Michaux, yes. Representative Moore? Representative Pierce?

REP. PIERCE: Yes.

CLERK: Representative Pierce, yes. Representative Reives?

REP. REIVES: Yes.

CLERK: Representative Reives, yes. Representative Willingham?

REP. WILLINGHAM: Yes.

CLERK: Representative Willingham, yes.

Representative Speciale?

REP. SPECIALE: No.

CLERK: Representative Speciale, no.

Representative Rogers?

REP. ROGERS: No.

CLERK: Representative Rogers, no.

Representative Saine?

REP. SAINE: No.

CLERK: Representative Saine, no.

Representative Wray?

REP. WRAY: Aye.

CLERK: Representative Wray, yes.

Representative Yarborough?

REP. YARBOROUGH: No.

CLERK: Representative Yarborough, no.

Representative Torbett?

REP. TORBETT: No.

CLERK: Representative Torbett, no.

Representative Lewis?

REP. LEWIS: No.

CLERK: Representative Lewis, no.

Representative Dollar?

REP. DOLLAR: No.

CLERK: Representative Dollar, no.

SEN. HISE: Committee Clerk, call the

roll of the Senate members.

CLERK: Senator Bishop?

SEN. BISHOP: No.

CLERK: Senator Bishop, no. Senator Blue? Senator Brown?

SEN. BROWN: No.

CLERK: Senator Brown, no. Senator Clark?

SEN. CLARK: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Clark, aye. Senator Daniel? Senator Harrington?

SEN. HARRINGTON: No.

CLERK: Senator Harrington, no. Senator Jackson?

SEN. JACKSON: No.

CLERK: Senator Jackson, no. Senator Lee? Senator Lee, no. Senator Lowe?

SEN. LEE: Yes.

CLERK: Senator Lowe, yes. Senator Newton? Senator Newton, no. Senator Rabon? Senator Smith-Ingram?

SEN. SMITH-INGRAM: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Smith-Ingram, aye. Senator Van Duyn?

SEN. VAN DUYN: Aye.

CLERK: Senator Van Duyn, aye. Senator Wade?

SEN. WADE: No.

CLERK: Senator Wade, no. Senator Hise?

SEN. HISE: No.

CLERK: Senator Hise, no.

SEN. HISE: By a vote of 13 in favor, 24 opposed in the House, 4 in favor, 8 opposed in the Senate, the six proposed criteria are rejected by the Committee. Senator Clark?

SEN. CLARK: Thank you. Senator Clark, Senate District 21. I just wanted to make one comment before we depart here. I did submit to the Committee a list of about 14 criteria. I'm not asking that we go over those one by one. Most of them have been covered during the course of this debate. I just wanted to let it know -- be known for the record that they have been submitted.

SEN. HISE: Those are clearly part of the record so -- any other matters to come before the Committee? I will announce, then, for members that -- first, just to recap, the Committee adopted nine criteria for redistricting. Those will be compiled, and we will put that list available on the website. And that will be given to the drawer

of the map to make sure those designs for the Committee follow these criteria.

(Proceedings went off the record.)

SEN. HISE: Members of the press, just to let you know, if you're doing interviews, they will be up here, where we will have the Court Reporter available for that process. Thanks for coming in. Representative Torbett.

REP. TORBETT: Is there any information or intelligence you can give us on further activity of this Committee at this time?

SEN. HISE: We were talking about that we will obviously in session on the 18th. We anticipate the meetings to be on the 21st, 22nd, 23rd time frame that's coming in. So members have that, but I would also say keep watch on the website, as well as your e-mails. There may be things released from the Committee in that interim. Seeing no other items come before the Committee, having exhausted our business, this Committee will stand adjourned.

(End of proceedings.)

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

COUNTY OF GRANVILLE

CERTIFICATION OF TRANSCRIPT

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript of proceedings held on August 10, 2017, is a true and accurate transcript of the proceedings as transcribed by me or under my supervision. I further certify that I am not related to any party or attorney, nor do I have any interest whatsoever in the outcome of this action.

This 26th day of August, 2017.

Robbie W. Worley

EX. 10

NORTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY
JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE ON REDISTRICTING

TRANSCRIPT OF THE PROCEEDINGS
PUBLIC HEARING - RALEIGH SITE

In Raleigh, North Carolina
Tuesday, August 22, 2017
Reported by Robbie W. Worley

Worley Reporting
P.O. Box 99169
Raleigh, NC 27624
919-870-8070

REP. LEWIS: The public hearing on redistricting is called to order. I'd like to begin by welcoming all of you that are here. Like to ask your indulgence. We do have remote sites that are hooked up. I've been asked by the technical staff to please ask our members to be as quiet as they can. It aids in the other locations being able to hear what's being said and aids us in being able to hear what's being said at the other locations. I'd like to recognize the House and Senate Sergeant at Arms that we have located throughout the state and thank them for their help in making today a success.

In a moment, I'm going to recognize the Sergeant at Arms and the members that are present at Raleigh. We're then going to go to each remote site as a test and ask the presiding chair at each remote site to please introduce the members and Sergeant at Arms that are at your site as well. So with that in Raleigh, for the House Sergeant at Arms we have Garland Shepheard, Reggie Sills, Marvin Lee, Terry McCraw and Thomas Terry. For the Senate, we have Larry Hancock, Charles Marsalis and Becky Myrick. I'd also would point out that our court reporter is here, Robbie Worley of Raleigh,

and we appreciate her continued dedicated service. Again, I welcome everyone to this public hearing on redistricting.

I am Representative David Lewis, the Senior Chairman of the House Select Committee on Redistricting. With me today are Chairman Senator Ralph Hise of the Senate Redistricting Committee and also Chairman Representative Nelson Dollar of the House Committee. With me in Raleigh are Representatives Jackson, Dixon, Farmer-Butterfield, Garrison, Gill, Grange, Davis, Howard, Hunter, Hurley, Michaux, Malone, Willingham, Wray and also Senators Blue, Lee, Newton, Harrington, Gunn and McKissick.

At the Raleigh site, did I miss any member of the committee? The Chair would also point out there are several members who are here who are not members of the committee. We certainly welcome them and thank them for their attendance. We're going to go now to Beaufort Community College -- to Beaufort Community College. I'd like for the Chair to introduce himself and the members that are there with him at this time.

SEN. BROWN: Thank you. Hi, my name's Harry Brown. I'm in the Senate. I represent

District 6, which is Onslow and Jones County. Mike Speciale in the House. Mike -- sorry, now I have to get it right. Mike -- Mike, you represent the Beaufort and --

REP. SPECIALE: Craven County.

SEN. BROWN: -- Craven and Pamlico County. Then Norm Sanderson, who's in the Senate, he represents District 3 -- 2, which is Carteret, Craven and Pamlico County. Our Sergeant at Arms on the House side is Bill Bass, Jim Moran and Jim Hamilton from the Senate. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you, Senator Brown. Next, we'd like to go to Halifax Community College. Would the chairman at Halifax Community College recognize themselves and their members and their support staff, please?

REP. J. BELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm Representative John Bell. Oh, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Representative John Bell, Halifax Community College. With us today is Sergeant at Arms from the House, Bill Moore and Doug Harris, Sergeant at Arms from the Senate, Tom Burroughs and Frances Patterson. We also have in attendance Representative Bobbie Richardson and staff from Senator Angela Bryant's office. Thank you, Mr.

Chairman.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you, Representative Bell. We'd now like to test and introduce our Fayetteville site. Fayetteville Community College -- Fayetteville Technical Community College, I guess it would be. If the chairman there could introduce themselves and members.

REP. SZOKA: All right. Mr. Chairman, I'm here. This is Representative John Szoka. My co-chair is Senator Brent Jackson. Other representatives here --

REP. LEWIS: Representative Szoka, if you could hold just a minute. We're having trouble with Fayetteville. Let's try it again.

REP. SZOKA: Is this better?

REP. LEWIS: Yes, sir.

REP. SZOKA: All right. Thank you, Mr. Chair. My name is Representative John Szoka. The co-chair here is Senator Brent Jackson. Representatives in attendance are Representative Billy Richardson, Representative Floyd, Representative Lucas and Representative Pierce. Our House Sergeant at Arms are Jonas Cherry and David Leighton and our Senate Sergeant at Arms are Giles Jeffreys and Terry Edmondson. Thank you.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you. I'm going to go now to the Guilford County Community College, our site at Guilford County. If the chairman there could identify themselves and their members.

REP. STEVENS: Hi. We can't hear you yet. Can you hear me yet?

REP. LEWIS: Yes, ma'am. We can hear you.

REP. STEVENS: Representative Sarah Stevens. I'm chairing this committee along with Senator Trudy Wade. Our Sergeant at Arms from the House side are Warren Hawkins and Malachi McCullough. And we have Hal Roach from the Senate. In addition, we have two other members present. We have Representative Evelyn Terry and Senator Gladys Robinson. Did I leave anyone out? Yep, we're good.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you, ma'am. We'll now go to Central Piedmont Community College in Charlotte. If the presiding chairman could sign in and introduce himself and -- or herself and the members that are present.

REP. TORBETT: Good evening, Chairman Lewis. John Torbett, member of North Carolina House District 8. With us tonight is Senator

Waddell, Representative Dulin, Secretary -- Secretary -- Senator Bishop, Representative Cunningham, Representative Carney, Representative Bell and Representative Pittman. Our Sergeant at Arms from the House side, Joe Crook, Russell Salisbury. For the Senate, Linda Matthews and Billy Fritscher. We're ready to go.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you, Representative Torbett. And Caldwell Community College. If we could sign in to Caldwell Community College.

SEN. DANIEL: Thank you. I'm Senator Warren Daniel. With me from the list of the delegations tonight are Representative Jonathan Jordan from Watauga County, Representative Hugh Blackwell from Burke County and Representative Destin Hall from Caldwell County. Sergeants at Arms, if you would raise your hands. Here from the House, is Bill Riley, Barry Moore, Terry Barnhardt and John Enloe. And we also have Officer Kane from the General Assembly Police in Raleigh.

REP. LEWIS: Very good. We welcome you all. Ladies and gentlemen, today's hearing is an effort on the part of the two committees to hear public comments on the proposed 2017 House and Senate plans to comply with the court's order in

Covington versus the State of North Carolina. Besides this location here Raleigh in Room 643 of the Legislative Office Buildings, we have identified and recognized six satellite locations. They are Central Piedmont Community College in Charlotte, Fayetteville Technical Community College in Fayetteville, Caldwell Community College in Hudson, Guilford Technical Community College in Jamestown, the Halifax Community College in Weldon and Beaufort Community College in -- in Washington.

I'd like to remind members of the public that we are also accepting comment online at the General Assembly website and via physical e-mail as well as anyone. We are accepting comment in those forms if there is someone who would like to offer input but was not able to be here today. Members of the committee do have and will have ability to review and view the submitted written comments. Now that the introductions and the sound checks are out of the way, I'd like to thank the members of the public for being here today and for participating in the democratic process.

As you may be aware, the General Assembly has a deadline of September 1st for approving new districts. The committee released maps over the

weekend for review. Those maps are online. I'm also told that there are hard copies at each site. Our hearing tonight is so that we can hear from you and your input on the districts themselves. You should have noticed an opportunity to sign up with the Sergeant at Arms as you walked in the room.

The Chair will also pause and point out that there are members of the public that are in Room 544, which is also in the Legislative Office Building, who are able to hear what is being said in here. Many of those have signed up to speak, and we will certainly have staff coordinating back and forth to welcome them into this room when it's their turn to speak.

Each speaker, when recognized, will have three minutes to speak. The Sergeant at Arms will have a yellow card that he will flash when your three minutes are nearing a close. He will -- he or she will hold up a red card when your time has expired. You may comment on whatever aspects of the map you would like to. This is a free country, and this is an open hearing.

It is helpful if your comments focus on the maps that have been presented or alternative ideas you have for complying with the court order.

I want to emphasize that the committee has adopted criteria after its first meeting and that criteria has been public for weeks now. Those criteria are equal population, congruity, abiding by the mandatory county groupings, trying to keep towns, cities and precincts whole where possible, incumbency protection, consideration of election data, and drawing districts without regards to race or ethnicity.

What we'd like to hear from the public, specifically, is how to better meet our goals in complying with those criteria. Addressing comments towards a specific House or Senate district and referencing a specific criteria that could be better met would help this committee and its work. Reading off prepared talking points or sending form e-mails is also an accepted way to go on record. However, when those comments stray from the objective of the day, which is to comply with the court order to redraw the maps, they may not be the most constructive help. You are, of course, free to do so anyway. With that -- do we have the printed copies?

FEMALE SPEAKER: We're working on that.

REP. LEWIS: Do we have Raleigh?

FEMALE SPEAKER: Yes.

REP. LEWIS: So with that, we're going to move now to -- what? Did you want to say anything, Senator Hise?

SEN. HISE: Briefly.

REP. LEWIS: I'd like to recognize Senator Hise, the Chairman of the Senate Redistricting Committee, for some comments.

SEN. HISE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a moment to clear up any confusion. We do have -- one of the interest groups in the state has been sending out information today that there were public hearings today and tomorrow, and listed sites for tomorrow hearing. Today is the only hearings for this committee, only public hearings for this committee. Therein, I just wanted to make sure to clear up that confusion.

REP. LEWIS: All we're going to do in an effort to try to facilitate moving around and getting as many people to speak in as timely a fashion as possible, we're going to start in Raleigh. And then we're going to go to Jamestown and then to Caldwell, based on the list I have. In Raleigh -- and the Chair will apologize if there are names that are mispronounced. The Chair would

ask, when you speak, if you would please pronounce your name, so that the court reporter could record it. The Chair is going to call three names at a time in Raleigh, and then move to the next location where we will take two at that location.

So the first three in Raleigh -- the Chair, again, apologizes for any mispronunciations -- Tawana Revels or Nevels, I apologize for the handwriting -- Eva F. Lee and Julie Tomkovic, if you would please approach the microphone in the rear. You see our Sergeant at Arms is standing there. He will help you speak.

We can turn the camera now from the Chair to the public. And to prepare, in Jamestown, the first two are Janice Siebert and Allen Megginson. So if the Chairman there could prepare for that. But again, Tawana Revels or Nevels, I apologize if I misspoken the name, we welcome you. And you have -- if you would, please state your name, and then you have three minutes.

MS. LEE: My name is Eva F. Lee. Ladies and gentlemen of the Joint Committee and everyone at all the satellite locations and on live stream, I come to you today as a mom. I'm a Raleigh resident, who was, on March 21st of this year, hit

head on while parked in the carpool lane at West Millbrook Middle School on Strickland, a school that has been passed over for rebuilding many times. A school where my son's art teacher has a budget of roughly $300 for 150 students and 180 school days. A school with a building that occasionally smells like swamp gas when it is hot. The carpool lane would be moved off Strickland if the school was rebuilt.

The North Carolina General Assembly controls our state. I am greatly disheartened, even embarrassed, by the label that North Carolina is no longer a democracy. Politicians should not select their voters. You used the same consultant whose work was well-known and ruled unconstitutional. How is this different? This committee is reflective of the supermajority created by the gerrymandering. It feels like a sham. I think it is time in clear view of Charlottesville to call this process what it is; it feels like computerized apartheid. We do not want to be remembered as the folks who did their best Jim Crow impersonation to disenfranchise minorities, and continue to disenfranchise with judicial gerrymandering. Do not give the label of

racists to your children.

This committee, or rather the supermajority in control, needs to listen to the hearts and souls of the generations who fought for liberty and justice for all and not be remembered as the epitome of evil. Don't act like Nazis. I'm Jewish; I can say that. Stop gerrymandering now. Let me be clear; gerrymandering is white supremacy. We deserve reparations for the last seven years of litigation. Give us automatic voter registration at age 18 as a reparation. We deserve reparations for the past seven years. Thank you.

REP. LEWIS: As the next speaker is coming up, we will welcome you. The Chair would -- the Chair would again remind the people, the members and the people that are present to please be quiet so that the comments can be heard. Would you please state your name? And you have three minutes.

MS. TOMKOVIC: Hi, my name is Julie Tomkovic, and I wish these maps were a little bit more detailed so I could address them specifically. But my comments are going to be about the value of balanced and competitive districts. If competition is good for business and for consumers, then it

should be equally good for government and for citizens. Gerrymandered districts hurt North Carolina citizens of all political stripes, because they stack the decks so heavily in favor of one party or another. But there is no true competition of ideas, values and candidates in the general election. This pushes the more competition to primaries, where candidates are encouraged to become more and more extreme in order to interest a smaller pool of voters.

As we all know, extremists can certainly win elections. They just don't govern well. For example, a small group of extremists can -- can hijack a legislature and make them vote for ridiculous things, like if we can use what bathroom, as well as serious things, like who can sue for discrimination and who cannot. I vote for balanced, competitive districts, that -- to produce the best government. And I hope that you will also vote for balanced, competitive districts as well.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you. Thank you. Is Tawana Revels or Nevels here? Not seeing that person, the Chair would like to enter for the record. The Chair was handed public comment on redistricting core messages to share. This is

produced and handed out by Democracy North Carolina. The Chair wants to make this a part of the permanent record of this committee. And copies will be provided to all of the members. Now, going to go to the Jamestown site.

REP. STEVENS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Can you hear us?

REP. LEWIS: We can.

REP. STEVENS: Okay. It's Representative Stevens. I just wanted to let you know that we had three more legislative members to join us. Senator Lowe, I believe he stepped out already again for a moment. We have Representative Pricey Harrison, and Representative Cecil Brockman. Wanted to let you know that we are ready for our other speakers. Take the floor.

MS. SIEBERT: Thanks. I'm Janice Siebert, a mother in Guilford County since 2006. What's the cost of gerrymandering? The cost is so many of us are lacking representation on the ballot. My representative and senator do not listen to me, because they don't have to. They listen only to those who vote for them and to their big money donors. They do not represent my positions, my vote does not count in my district,

because it is structured to keep the current party in power.

What is the cost of gerrymandering? The cost of laws passed that benefit so few. Laws that hurt our state in the long run. Laws that damage our environment. Laws that limit public educations. Laws that limit full access to the polls. Laws that transfer control of local government to the people to Raleigh. Laws that limit access to healthcare for thousands of North Carolinians. They've passed these laws, because they can. Because they have gerrymandered the same districts, they guarantee their power in Raleigh.

What is the cost of gerrymandering? The cost of defending the unconstitutional districts and the unconstitutional laws that the General Assembly has passed. It is our tax dollars that pay the attorneys, our tax dollars that could be better spent on something else. That should be spent on anything else that would benefit the people in North Carolina. We do not see that the current process and the current maps hold any promise to be any different from the past. We are tired of paying for gerrymandering.

MR. BEGGINS: Good day. My name is Alan

Megginson. I live in Winston-Salem, and I'd first like to thank you for holding these hearings regarding the creation of fair, bipartisan election maps for our state, and for all of the citizens that have come out today to voice their concerns. Thank you as well. My biggest fear, quite frankly, is that the comments made here today from across the state will fall on deaf ears, and the citizens of this great state would once again go unheard.

I'm here today because the issue of fair voting maps is one that concerns me as a citizen. This issue concerns me not for my own individualized impact, but for the thousands of North Carolina citizens whose voices are muted through rigged and unfair elections. I look at these proposed -- proposed maps, and I see little to no changes of the way they rigged their system for one side. I see no bipartisan effort to create fair maps that hear the voices of each and every citizen in this state. Instead, I see districts like my own that are whittled out with small slivers of the community set aside for the minority party, as if this somehow creates the illusion that these maps are fair.

There are many solutions to this issue

that would result in fair elections in this state. I've heard suggestions of different districting by ZIP codes. I've heard of districting by county. Population setting the number of representatives and senators. In fact, most of the suggestions I have heard have been far more plausible and fair than what you have presented to the citizens as your fix. I use that pun intentionally as all you have done with these maps is continue to fix the system.

Clearly these maps represent the level of concern our Assembly members have for their constituents. This is not myth, this is fact. Across the state, our citizens are dealing with issues for solutions that either get been dismissed or being ignored, simply because it doesn't fit the agenda. This needs to stop. If you want to be an assembly member and represent the people of this state in a manner that is beneficial for all citizens, if you cannot or will not do so, then expunge and get out of the way to allow someone else to create fair election maps so that you might be released of your burdens.

In closing, our state's motto is esse quam videri, to be rather than to seem. However,

the current state of affairs in the General Assembly, perhaps along with new maps, we adopt new order. [Inaudible] democracy laws. Thank you.

REP. LEWIS: We're now going to move to the Caldwell site, and then followed by the Washington site. I think it may actually go smoother if we do three from each site. So if the Chairman can hear me, we're going to do three from each site. We're going to go to Caldwell. We're going to do Todd Scott, Debra Moore, and Pastor Keith or Keit. And then we're going to Washington, and we're going to do Raynor James, Hal James and Carl Mischka. So we'll go to the Caldwell site next.

MR. SCOTT: Good afternoon. My name is Todd Scott. I'm the first vice-president of Statesville NAACP branch. In August of 2016, a three-judge panel ruled that 28 of 170 North Carolina House and Senate districts were drawn in the second rate and weakened the power of the African-American voters. They were illegal racial gerrymanders. The public and lawmakers appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court, but it agreed with the panel.

On August the 1st, 2017, that panel gave

legislators a new deadline. Present new district, redraw district maps to the judges by September 1st for the use of 2018 legislative elections. This is all a sham. All these maps we got is a sham. This is like going to school on the first day of school and your teacher tell you, we having the end of the year test today, end of discussion.

Legislative leaders continue to stall and avoid fixing their unconstitutional maps. Federal judges have rebuked them for not taking it seriously. [Inaudible] of correcting their legal matters, the public lawmakers say they are serious, but they have hired the same consultant, Thomas Hofeller, who drew the current legal maps. He is nationally known for rigging maps to help his Republican clients. Declared that he would -- that they will not consider the race of the voters, as if that would stop them from drawing bias maps. In fact, that approach ignored the directive of the courts to say, well, the black voters have a fairer chance to elect candidates of their choice in their districts.

They have declared they want to see the past election outcomes and the ability of their party to win elections in the district. They admit

they redraw the districts for partisan advantage. They have refused to review -- reveal the new map Hofeller has already drawn, which would give North Carolinians time to provide informed input through a public hearing. We should have been in a bigger area than we are today, but who found out about this? They didn't want everybody to know about it. How can the public trust legislators elected from illegal districts to draw fair maps, especially when they use the same mapmaker and highly partisan voters.

North Carolina lawmakers have used unlawful gerrymandering to win elections in 2012, 2014, and 2016. Then in the past, [unintelligible] illegitimate General Assembly. The legal maps are protecting legislators from being held accountable by voters. About 90 percent of us think legislators now have seats with no or little vote partisan competition. General Senate -- General Assembly leaders have spent $4.8 million of taxpayers' monies to defend their maps in court. And they got beat every time. I would like to leave this to all the legislators, Matthew 25:40; "The king will reply, truly I tell you, whatever you did for one of the least of these brothers and

sisters of mine, you did it for me." You did it to me.

MS. MOORE: Hi. My name is Debra Moore. I'm with the Statesville branch of the NAACP. North Carolinians demands -- demand reform. North Carolinians are tired of gerrymandering and politicians --

MALE SPEAKER: Can we get a mic for the speaker? This is ridiculous. Get her a mic so we can hear her.

MS. MOORE: A new poll shows that four out of five voters, so 80 percent, say that it is not fair for politicians to draw their own districts. That includes 85 percent of the democracy -- Democrats, 74 percent of the Republicans, 80 percent of the independents as well as 70 percent of [inaudible] --

REP. LEWIS: Ms. Moore?

MS. MOORE: -- and 80 percent of African Americans.

REP. LEWIS: Ms. Moore?

MS. MOORE: [Inaudible.]

REP. LEWIS: Ms. Moore. We're going to add -- we're going to add a minute to your time. If you could, please speak a little bit closer to

the mic and perhaps a little bit slower. There's a -- there's a delay --

MS. MOORE: The redistricting practice must be open. Avoid racial and constant -- gerrymandering allows [inaudible] pick their own political representatives, not the other way around. We should research practices in other states that adopt principles that encourage deep community involvement. Fair redistricting should follow these basic principles. [Inaudible] is the key. Map drawers must ensure that it is possible for black voters to elect their own candidate of choice as declared by voting acts rights. One person, one vote must be equal population and obey all the laws.

Map drawers must create compact districts without [inaudible]. Districts must be -- not be stacked and joined into one -- and joined into one block of current lawmakers. Voting district or voters of the data [inaudible]. Respect communities of interest. Map drawers must avoid dividing the community's assembly [inaudible] effort and local government districts. Respect boundaries. Maps must show effort to keep counties whole. Before it is approved, a map must equal and

override basics. We need the children to recognize that important message of fairness.

SEN. DANIEL: We do not bring equipment with us. This equipment is provided for us. I apologize for any inconvenience. This is the best that we have at this point.

REP. LEWIS: If we're not able to get order at the Caldwell site, we're going to move to another site. We're going to move to the Washington site -- Washington site. The Chair regrets that a person lost their opportunity to speak because of the actions of the folks there. We're moving to the Washington site.

MR. KEITH: I'll be very brief about this.

REP. LEWIS: We're moving to the Washington site.

MR. KEITH: How many city limits were [inaudible] --

REP. LEWIS: We don't seem to have any control in Raleigh, either.

MR. KEITH: Now, anytime you divide a city limit, you're going to have two different state senators representing you. The city is collecting taxes. The state's collecting taxes and

the county's collecting taxes. Any time you set [inaudible], the city [inaudible], you've done the same exact thing as moving an unwanted relative into your house to share it with them because you're going to have to come to a consensus on all these different issues.

That's basically all I got to say. But anytime you divide a city limit or encroach on a city limit to meet your quota, that's where the problem comes in. But it is not fair for residents to live in a municipality anywhere and have you voting for this district on one side and this district on the other and pay taxes to that city and that county. If all these could be -- all these municipalities need to be under one city's district. That's all I've got to say, and thank you very much.

REP. LEWIS: Is it possible to go to the Washington site now? (Pause.) Is this the Washington site? The Chairman there could please recognize Raynor James, Hal James and Carl -- Carl Mischka.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Raynor James and Hal James and Carl --

CHAIRMAN MISCHKA: Mischka.

MS. JAMES: I'm Raynor James. Ladies and gentleman of the legislature, I come from a different perspective, but no [inaudible] approval. I, too, although I'm a constitutional conservative, speak in this?

SEN. BROWN: You may. You're fine. You're fine.

MS. JAMES: Although I'm a constitutional conservative, I, too, dislike having communities divided, if it's a city or county, whatever. I think that we should be able to try harder to keep them contiguous. There is another concern I have that is much stronger than that. Yes, Republicans do have control. The Republican platform is very, very well aligned with my platform; however, there is only a small percentage of people in the legislature, ladies and gentlemen, who truly adhere to that platform.

Some of those are being put into districts that are not hospitable to them and that is an absolute tragedy. Larry Pittman, Cabarrus County, is one of those examples. Cabarrus County will have three different districts in it. We will be with another conservative Republican. There is someone who's less conservative right next door.

One of the conservatives will go. This is not good.

There are Republicans all around the state that are writing resolutions that they will not support Republicans just because they have an R after their name if that Republican does not record his support for the Republican platform. Please don't make the mistake you appear to be headed for. Please take corrective action and make this right.

MR. JAMES: I'm Hal James. I live at 305 [unintelligible] in Craven County. I belong to the Coastal Carolina Taxpayers Association, an organization that advocates minimum government and maximum freedom, the preservation of free enterprise in the United States Constitution. We have two champions of, air quote, the General Assembly. The districts are reorganized by these new district maps in such a way as to separate them from their base supporters. They're stacked -- they're hooked as District 1 surrender the [inaudible]. Districts 82 and maybe a part of 83, unless your [inaudible] both of these gentlemen have been very supportive of our cause.

I selected five bills that had been considered by the present legislature to help

determine the support of our cause by members of the General Assembly. They are, one, the [inaudible] bill, House Bill 746, two, the national [inaudible] North Carolina [inaudible] constitutional regulation of concealed weapons, HB145, the actually get rid of common core bill, HB417, the bill to exempt ocular surgery from the certificate of need bill or HB344, and the marine fisheries regulation bill, the HB867. That wasn't a random selection. At the beginning of the session those were the -- the issues that we wanted addressed by this assembly. Due to Pittman has not been able to vote on any of these bills, but he's tried hard.

Representative Pittman has been a primary sponsor on three of the four bills and the fifth bill, marine fisheries regulation, he do not want passed. Representative Pittman has strongly supported our position. Please reject these proposed district maps until these deficiencies are corrected. Thank you.

MR. MISCHKA: My name is Carl Mischka. I'm the chairman of the Third District GOP and a past chairman of Craven County GOP. I'd like to defer my time to my vice-chair. Is that possible?

He's on your list to a point that we'll never get to and -- and he has some very constructive redistricting comments to make.

REP. LEWIS: What's the name, Mr. Mischka?

MR. MISCHKA: [Inaudible.]

MR. JAMES: Oh, I think we will get to him eventually. We're going to go through this whole list so --

MR. MISCHKA: If you're going to do that, thank you.

REP. LEWIS: We're going to now go to the Charlotte site and the first three speakers, Jacob Hunt, Sarah Fellman and Henry Martinat. Go to the Charlotte site and recognize those three speakers, please.

MR. HUNT: Good afternoon. My name is Jacob Hunt. I'm a resident of Huntersville, North Carolina. I must admit that I am not adept at the complex demographics of our state to know whether the new districts are gerrymandered or not. Perhaps -- perhaps if it fixes the racial gerrymandering, well, then, if so, that is a victory indeed, but seeing that it was made primarily by one political party, I'm still

skeptical of its innovation.

So I'm here to call upon the General Assembly of North Carolina to end political gerrymandering, which undermines our democracy. After the election in 2016, Governor Cooper narrowly won by just 0.2 percent. Now, in a politically blind system, this would naturally be coupled with a near 50-50 split among the parties in the General Assembly. Yet Republicans hold a two-thirds majority in both chambers. Clearly something is awry.

I recognize that political gerrymandering is not illegal, but that does not mean it's right. The process greatly diminishes the voice of the people and undermines our will.

I am generally annoyed when the government is compared to a business, because they serve two wholly different purposes. However, there are some similarities. When a business has an inferior or unpopular product, the consumers can reject it. It's now up to the business to improve the product, give the consumers what they want or face the effects of the free market. When voting districts are designed by the legislatures, they do not have to face the consequences of unpopular

policy. This, of course, leads them to pursue policy that serves not the collective good, but rather the good of the few.

I understand that when the Democrats controlled the General Assembly they too drew districts along politically favorable lines, but how many times must we repeat the same mistakes? How hyper-partisan must we become before this cycle is finally broken?

So again, on the general -- I call upon the General Assembly to uphold democracy and allow voters to choose their policymakers, not allow policymakers to choose their voters. Thank you.

MS. FELLMAN: Good afternoon. My name is Sarah Fellman. I'm from Charlotte. I'm a proud 2014 graduate of Providence High. Go Panthers.

And I'm here today to talk about racial and partisan gerrymandering. As we all know, the courts declared many of our legislative districts unconstitutional racial gerrymandered. Now you, members of the Joint Redistricting Committee, are tasked with remedying this violation of the Constitution.

But what do good districts look like? First of all, good districts must follow the court

directive to consider race to ensure that minority voters have a fair chance to elect candidates of their choice. In the court case the State actually argued that it considered race in the 2011 redistricting process to comply with the Voting Rights Act that mandates that minority voters should have this opportunity. However, the State could not prove that it used race for such benevolent reasons, and instead the Court ruled that the use of race unconstitutionally violated minority voters' rights.

Fortunately this is your opportunity to make amends and truly empower minority voices. So how are you doing? Well, the other day Representative Lewis tweeted that race was not considered in the drawing of the new proposed maps, but not considering race is not enough. The Court was very clear that race should be considered in the drawing of legislative maps, but that it should be used to empower minority voters, not silence their voices by shoving them into as few districts as possible. But empowering minority voters to have the opportunity to elect candidates goes beyond a just consideration of race. In a state like North Carolina where race -- where voting is

racially polarized and where, as you are well aware, upwards of 90 percent of black voters consistently support Democrats, only a legislative map drawn without partisan bias can be an appropriate remedy to an unconstitutional racial gerrymander.

But instead, as Representative Lewis has admitted and as newly-released voting data show, these maps were drawn with an aim to cement the Republican majority in Raleigh, even if Democrats overwhelmingly win the popular vote. The problem is that in North Carolina partisanship is racism. Partisan bias in districting prevents minority voters and those that agree with them from having their voices heard in Raleigh in proportion to their vote share. Concentrating Democrats, often synonymous with minorities, into a small number of districts is wrong whether it's for Republicans' advantage, whites' advantage or both. And with that, I urge you, members of the redistricting committee, to do the right thing by creating new maps that ensure that minority voices are heard in Raleigh and that let voters choose their politicians without stacking the deck against one political party before a single ballot is cast.

REP. LEWIS: I believe we had one more in Charlotte.

MR. MARTINAT: If you look on your map and look at the Southwest up to Pineville, around -- down to Pineville up to Huntersville, Cornelius, that's my district. My name's Henry Martinat, and I'm a taxpayer in Mecklenburg County. I pay a daggone lot of taxes and I'm a property owner. And I have to drive up 77 all the time and it's really -- takes about an hour and a half to two hours to get to get to down here to go all the way up there. Now, that district represents Pineville, Charlotte, Davidson, Huntersville --

REP. LEWIS: Mr. Martinat, if you could possibly speak into the microphone so the rest of us could hear you.

MR. MARTINET: I'm sorry. Davidson, Huntersville, Cornelius, Pineville and Charlotte, okay? So how does this -- how does this one senator represent all of these distinct municipalities, you know, faithfully and effectively?

It's my -- it's my -- I'm -- I'm saying that any senator, Democrat or Republican, can't effectively represent the way -- this district the

way it's drawn. So it's -- it's going to be a problem for whoever has to represent this particular district, and I think it should be redrawn. That's all I have to say.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you. We're going to now move to the Fayetteville location, and after Fayetteville we'll go to Weldon. In Fayetteville, Bobbie R. Shaffer, Jerry Reinoehl and Minister -- apologize, Eronomy, I believe, is the last name. So Representative Szoka or Senator Jackson.

MS. SHAFFER: My name is Bobbie Shaffer. I'm -- and I am a citizen -- I'm a citizen of the United States, and I wasn't planning on coming here today. I been -- I watch the political arena on TV, on the paper -- in the paper and stuff, but today when I saw this map of existing North Carolina senate district, it reminded me of when my little kids were small and they were coloring and I would look and I'd say, you're coloring out of the line. Looked like whoever drew this map was certainly coloring out of the line and -- and the proposed district is not a whole lot better.

But I just have one thing to say, that God said that a house divided could not stand, and it seems like we're getting more divided as the

days go by. And it -- to me, my answer is, it's greed. It's not wanting to help the fellow person that's less privileged than you are. I built my life on helping people that's less fortunate than I am, and I -- I guarantee you, you people that don't do that is missing a blessing.

I just wanted to see the ones that drew these maps. If you need any help I'll be glad to help you. 'Cause I think I can do a better job and I do have the people at heart and not my next run to see if I'm going to be re-elected. And, you know, that aggravates me when the politicians is always saying, I can't do this because -- oh, no, I can't do that because I might not get elected next year. Well, who do you think you're up there for, yourself? You're up there for us. You're working for us and -- and we expect you to work for everybody's betterment, not for just Republicans or Democrats.

I never liked that anyway. I like to -- people to work together for the good of everybody and I hope that y'all will do better next time. Thank you.

MR. REINOEHL: Mr. Chairman, good afternoon. My name is Jerry Reinoehl. 516

Deerpath Drive, Fayetteville, North Carolina.

I support the House redistricting plan for Cumberland County, my county of residence, for the following reasons. First, the number of split VTD's between two or more districts in Cumberland County under the current 2011 plan will be reduced from 31 of the 77 precincts to six of the 77 precincts for the proposed plan. The plan confines the splits between only two House districts, while the current plan includes several VTD's split between three House districts. The boundaries of House District 43, my district, is tightened up considerably to look more like an ink spot rather than ink splatter.

I believe the benefit of these changes to Cumberland County will result in the following. First, fewer ballot types may be -- reduce the cost of elections. Secondly, it will reduce opportunities for poll workers to make errors in selecting the current ballot. It should result in fewer spoiled ballots and more accurate contest results, with more voters using the correct ballot type. Next, it may provide better constituent representative with a tight voting district boundaries. And finally, it will benefit

candidates for the House of Representatives by reducing the number of precincts and perhaps enticing additional citizens to run for elections, because it would also reduce, then, the cost of campaigning -- a competitive campaign. And with the fewer number of precincts it will enable better get-out-to-vote campaigns in terms of knocking doors and doing other things. Thank you.

MINISTER ERONOMY: By the name of God, the beneficent and the merciful, the all-wise, true and living God, I give you all the greetings of As-salamu alaikum, which is heard around the world. That's my introduction when I go the North Carolina state legislature for the past 35 years, with deans for Fayetteville State University to see my team, which is Marvin Lucas and the Legislative Black Caucus. I have been going before Marvin Lucas went up there.

Greetings, everyone. Fayetteville has a solution for the rest of the country. We must realize who we are. The other lady before, like myself, we see Fayetteville as a shining light on the hill. Others see it differently.

Now, God says in scripture, "The devil's strategy is secretive meetings." Secretive

meetings. The secret meeting that took place last weekend, I saw Angela, from the Legislative Black Caucus, on television, and she was jumping up and down. As spokeperson for Legislative Black Caucus, where are the maps? They should have given those maps to her and the Legislative Black Caucus and rest of the Democrats especially, last Friday.

Now, here we are in Fayetteville. We have great growth and development. We have the baseball stadium's coming. We have Fort Bragg, the largest military base in the world and the second Pentagon in the world. More generals and officers than any other place in America except Washington D.C. Pentagon. Part of my work includes that.

Now, in terms of, where do we go from here, let's look the history. The Fayetteville Observer used to have monument on the front of the paper, a picture of the Market House, or the slave house. As part of my work with Clinton Harris, a lot of y'all know him around the state, we forced the Fayetteville Observer to take that picture off. That was about 20 years ago.

So, really, we're out front. Thank you. We're really out front. The other thing I was -- the other thing we want [inaudible] in, I think

it's Harnett County, come out and be seen and be heard. He's one of our good friends. We are glad that -- we are very elated to see our Legislative Black Caucus, Marvin Lucas, Garland Pierce and, yes, Billy Richardson finally showed up. We are not going to mention the other one, though.

Okay. Now, clearly understand this is the 150th of Fayetteville University's anniversary, the second oldest university in the state. We want everybody in the country to come to our celebration. My time has run out, but I want to thank you for the American experience, which is the greatest country in the world, and we are going to show the rest of the country how to follow Fayetteville. Thank you very much.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you. And we're now going to go to Weldon with Marques Thompson, William Hodge and Kim Eng Koo. And then we will be returning to Raleigh with M. Eisenberg, Tony Quartararo, Gina Cruz, in that order. So we will go to Weldon now. Or we could just stay in Fayetteville. Ladies and gentlemen, I apologize. We're doing the best we can to coordinate with the off-site switch.

MR. THOMPSON: [Inaudible] North Carolina

that many other southern states don't have. And so when we have a good process we get good results for our democracy. So in order to have good results from a democracy, we need fair maps. Fair maps -- it's key to that.

So let's look at the process that went into making these maps. We have -- the maps were drawn by someone that was known for rigging systems across the nation. This -- the process of making these maps were -- was -- said that they would discount or not consider race, which was the whole reason why the -- the maps were unconstitutional in the first place. But yet they would consider who won in the past and that would be a consideration for drawing the maps. And the last thing is that -- talking about this process of drawing these fair maps, we just got the maps just recently. I mean, we've known about this process for a while. These were just given to us Friday and today and the -- a lot of the data, we still don't have.

So it's been a bad process. And when you have bad processes, you get bad results, right? So we already had a legislature that was elected by unconstitutional districts, so that's a bad process. Well, we're trying to get that process

fixed. And in order to do that, we -- we need due processes, and so I urge this legislature to do this for democracy. We're not talking about left or right here. We -- want the best results for North Carolina. And that means the best process in our democracy. So let's go back to the drawing board, get someone that everyone can agree on as a fair arbiter and let's draw these maps so we can get this competitive advantage that only democracy gives us.

MR. HODGE: My name is William Hodge, and I'm a 35-year Halifax County native. I didn't understand the need for a statewide public hearing on voter suppression issues, especially because we didn't have the appropriate data to study before we could come make our comments. I have some general comments today, but I will agree with the last speaker, bad process.

The topic is not new. The nation's Supreme Court and our state court have ruled often about the use of racism, unacceptable parameter for establishing voter districts. The legislature has purposely dragged their feet for three state election cycles where racist -- where race was used as an illegal factor in establishing voting

districts. This resulted in a Republican, veto-proof control of state government. And that's never a good situation.

Why is race an issue in 2017? In 2012, nationwide, only 16 percent of African-Americans were registered Republicans and only six percent voted for the Republican presidential candidate. This small percentage is shrinking daily, especially after the last two weeks of news from Charlottesville, Virginia. Race is an issue, especially in northeastern North Carolina. According to the 2013 Census data, neighboring Bertie County had the highest percentage of blacks population in North Carolina, 62 percent. Halifax County's 53 percent was the fifth-highest.

Seven counties in North Carolina were above 50 percent black population, all Halifax County neighbors. Contrarily, 34 mostly western counties have black populations under 10 percent and 23 of these counties were under five percent. The Republicans used their legislative powers to diminish the majority/minority voting black population in eastern North Carolina by assigning black voters into as few voting districts as possible.

From my perspective, other critical issues have been left unattended by the General Assembly. Eastern North Carolina has a history of underfunding and unperforming public education, a majority government responsibility. This has resulted in unacceptable academic performance in public schools in eastern Northern -- North Carolina. Six of the -- six of the bottom nine academic deficiency school districts are in Halifax and neighboring counties.

Without sufficiently-funded education, the area has been unable to recruit employees to represent textile jobs. Halifax County's seven percent June unemployment rate was the fourth highest in the state. Neighboring counties experienced five highest jobless rates. North Carolina lawmakers' recklessly gerrymandering practices has led to cost litigation and put our state in the national spotlight.

Our legislators must enact House Bill 200, which will establish a nonpartisan redistricting process. The bill has overwhelming public -- public support with both red and blue legislative support. Thank you.

DR. KOO: My name is Kim Eng Koo, and I'm

a retired neurosurgeon. I live in Rocky Mount, North Carolina, in Nash County and I'm a member of the Rocky Mount Racial Justice Group.

Last year, the redistricting plans had been judged to illegal and legal and guilty of racial gerrymandering by the highest legal structure of the land, the US Supreme Court. You are tasked to redraw new district maps for public review by September the 1st in preparation for the 2018 elections.

First, I want to point out that releasing the maps and information on the redrawn district maps so late and so last-minute on the day before public hearings is an act of disrespect to all the people of this state. We need time to study and respond to them. You're not giving us our due. This last-minute release maneuver smacks of dishonesty and secrecy, a lack of openness, which is a disgraceful act for public officials, paid for with public dollars.

Second, when I look at the new maps, I'm amazed by the contortions and variegated shapes of many areas. It looks like a collage and a distortion of reality. It's so twisted. It takes a lot of work and conscious thought to come up with

such a map. The persons or persons involved must have some direct purpose for coming up with such a contorted picture. And not to mention getting paid with millions of our tax money add insult to injury, indeed. It represents to me a combination of the attempt by the current party in power to hold onto their power at the expense of electoral freedom and it is all racist and divisist.

The North Carolina legislature has already acquired quite a bit of notoriety for its electoral shenanigans. Some examples we have encountered at the last elections include limited early voting times, changing voting places to be less accessible to people of color and poor people, photo ID requirement and decreasing the number of places where new and unregistered voters can sign up. The electoral freedom of poor people and people of color keeps getting narrower and more hemmed in. Now you're dictating to us where to vote with this new map. Of course, it also impacts on who is running for that district, so we have few choices, less voices and no power.

Do you not think that this will -- that we will just allow this without a fight. This country is already -- already is in uproar over the

many racist and divisive moves by the central government. Already both black and white people of conscience are standing firm and standing together to beat this reactionary tide, like the event in Charlottesville and the recent events here to remove icons of oppression.

I respectfully submit that you redraw your redistricting map to reflect the diversity of our people here and to not target minority people, people of color or poor people. It will go far to reflect decency and some moral integrity among you guys.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you. We're now going to move to the Raleigh site here, and we're going to increase the number of each speakers at each site to four before we move to the next speaker coming in, in the interest of the time that it's going. I will also take this opportunity to remind people that kind of the midpoint at 6:30 will be -- we will be closing the sign-up list. So if you have not yet signed up, you would need to do so by that time period, if you wish to speak. We'll begin with M, period, Eisenberg -- is how he signed up and you're recognized for three minutes.

MR. EISENBERG: My name is Michael

Eisenberg. I live in Raleigh, North Carolina. I had no intention of speaking today.

I have been to every one of these meetings and listened to the public issue very thoughtful and intelligent suggestions on this matter. I have listened to Representative Lewis tell us time after time how he wants to listen to the public and work with Democrats and abide by the decisions of the Court. After reading the N&O this morning regarding the political data rebuild on the maps, I knew I must speak out.

Representative Lewis was either not listening or he was lying when he made the above comments. These maps are -- these maps are as bad or worse than the ones we -- that were drawn in 2011. Probably not as bad in regards to race, but I'll defer my opinion on that until I hear Reverend Barber's comments. In regards to partisanship and the spirit of public opinion and listening to the citizens, please, our 50-50 state is now more -- is now going to be more gerrymandered than before.

The Republicans showed in the meeting to decide the -- the Republicans showed in the meeting to decide the criteria that they had no interest in working with Democrats when they voted unanimously

to turn down sensible amendments they offered. You have once again showed your true colors. You do not care about the vast majority of the people in North Carolina. You don't care about their well-being, because if you did, you would -- you would be for the health of the state's environment and the health of the people, but you said no to Medicaid expansion and yes to an 18-month moratorium on new projects.

You don't care about the children or you would not be attempting to destroy the public education that serve -- served the state so well. You don't care about women because you have continuously attempted to pass laws that would take away their healthcare. You don't care about the people of color because you have passed voter-suppression laws. You don't care about the poor or you would not have eliminated the income tax credit for the working poor.

But you do care about the wealthy because you did take away -- you did eliminate the estate tax for 223 families. We do know who you care about as you continuously work to cut taxes for -- that favor the wealthy and businesses by lowering the rate to the lowest in the South. You care

about the wealthiest and the businesses as -- as you have continuously brought about deregulation.

They are the winners with the maps were drawn. The people have called for fair maps and you've turned your backs on them. Your -- your ideas are morally bankrupt and the -- and the people confirmed that by electing Roy Cooper for governor.

I was taught you don't hate the player, you hate the game. In this game, you must hate both, as the game was rigged and it's not rigged in the favor of the people. I heard a 19-year-old at one of these meetings eloquently tell you that when his age group takes over this body, that tactics like these will never take place again.

I will leave you the words of my father, who so eloquently said to me when I was a young man and had guided me through my life. One word for me and you do exactly as you please. So all I can is I hope that if you do not redraw these maps, the courts take these maps and throw them in the dustbin where they belong and appoint a special council to redraw the maps. Shame on you.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you. A few things that -- for the other sites that we believe will

help with this transition between sites. We've been asked to change the order. So after the three more speakers in Raleigh, we'll go to Central Piedmont, then to Caldwell, then Guilford Tech, then Halifax, then Beaufort, then Fayetteville Tech. We've also, when making a change been asked to reference them by the community college. So we hope that with the technical issues that we'll address them. Given that, we'll move on to our second speaker here in Raleigh. Tony Quartararo.

MR. QUARTARARO: Hi, my name is Tony Quartararo. When my family and I moved to North Carolina 11 years ago, we fell in love with a place we believed was the heart of the New South, a place of progress, where people valued education, the planet, civil rights, racial and social justice and a collaborative open exchange of thoughts for the good of all the people. Sadly, we subsequently feared that we moved to the Tar Heel version of the Hatfields and the McCoys. Why? Because of what one grandfather did to another grandfather 40 years ago, one political party felt entitled, because they can, to crush the very soul of North Carolina and return to the ways of the Old South with its implicit and if not explicit white supremacy.

In the December special session, this fear was confirmed as I watched the supermajority immorally and unethically getting even and more for their grandfathers as they used phrases such as "it's constitutional, it's legal and it's what you did before." But I never heard -- I never heard "this will help the people; this will make our state better."

I'm disgusted with both parties. North Carolina has devolved to a Lord of the Flies scenario with the supermajority picking on the weak and marginalized. I'm disgusted with gerrymandering and voter suppression that allows an illegal and immorally skewed supermajority to exist which steamrolls anyone and anything that stands in the way of their special interest supporters. Whatever happened to the idea of public service for the public good?

I am sure many of you remember the movie Karate Kid. In the competition at the end of the movie, the evil sensei tells the students to deliver an illegal strike that injures the kid. When the kid meets the bully in the finals, the sensei once again tells his student, the bully, to unethically attack the kid's damaged leg.

Ultimately, the kid wins against the bullies.

Even now, in the North Carolina legislature, there's also a sensei and his two henchmen who have created these God-forsaken, immoral and unethical maps. And the people in this room know who they are. But the people of North Carolina, especially the poor and the people of color, are like The Karate Kid. They will overcome illegal, unethical and immoral legislative behavior which continues even today, since these maps will only have Confederate racism 17 percent of the districts.

The committee's choice is simple. Do what is right, moral and ethical for all of North Carolina's people. Create full and equitable voting districts or face the inevitable turning of the tide and the historical ignominy. The choice is yours. Do not be a Tar Heel version of the disgrace who sits in the White House and always remember. All political power comes from the people.

REP. LEWIS: Gina Cruz. You're recognized for a time not to exceed three minutes.

MS. CRUZ: Hello. My name is Gina Cruz. I am the North Carolina state director for

Progressive Turnout Project. I'm also a concerned North Carolinian who lives here in Raleigh.

Progressive Turnout Project has been working tirelessly to fight for fair maps for myself and my fellow North Carolinians. We deserve fair voting maps that are drawn by a nonpartisan redistricting commission. We deserve maps that are drawn without the use of any partisan voter data. We deserve maps that comply with the Voting Rights Act. We deserve maps that don't protect incumbents who won based on maps that were ruled racially gerrymandered. We deserve access to the map-drawing process.

We deserve ample time to both review the maps and plan to attend these public comment periods. Four days is not sufficient time for new maps to be reviewed. It cuts the public out of the process. Holding these meetings at 4:00 p.m. on a Tuesday afternoon is unfair to the working class families that you represent. Look at how many people are here and across the state with four days' notice. Had we had ample time, we would have filled 20 more rooms at least.

We deserve representatives who actually represent North Carolinians. This committee needs

to do better.

REP. LEWIS: Melva Fager Okun? You're recognized for a time not to exceed three minutes.

MS. OKUN: Good evening and thank you so much for this opportunity to comment. My name is Melva Fager Okun, and I've lived in Carrboro for over 40 years. During that time, I've regularly walked these halls, speaking to senators and representatives about environmental and health protections. These include making our schools, restaurants and bars and hospitals tobacco-free, of which I am very proud. I never thought someday I'd return to ask for protection of the vote.

We desperately need new, fair and legal voting districts. I've waited a year for new maps and instead got them the day before this public hearing. That immediately tells me how much you value the public's input.

I wondered how a group with leaders from 28 illegally-drawn voting districts could possibly be charged with drawing the new maps. And I was shocked to hear that the same company that drew the illegal maps was rehired to draw the new maps. Your actions are stunning and memorial -- memorable. You are creating and solidifying your

legacy.

I am currently reading a book about the fight for the right to vote by African-American leaders returning from World War II. The top leaders, such as Medgar Evers, ruled that they risk their lives in doing so and too many were murdered fighting for this right. Instead of denying the right to vote, you are engaged in something also horrific. You've worked tirelessly to make people's votes meaningless while also making it harder to vote. This is your legacy. You are the equivalent of white supremacists.

But I, and millions of North Carolinians, are paying attention. Some of us are here today to let you know we will do everything we can to stop you from your ill-intended deeds. We see this as a vital issue, the keystone to a democracy. I expect this will finally be decided by the courts. I attended the -- the judicial hearing a few weeks ago of the US District Court where this issue of the voting maps was discussed. I applaud the courts for their action.

I conclude my comments by saying I've heard the former US Attorney General Eric Holder state that North Carolina is the worst state in the

nation, the worst, regarding gerrymandering. That may be okay for the current leadership of the General Assembly and the officials from the 28 officially -- illegally-drawn voting districts, but it's not okay for the people of the state.

I am not worn down. I am not discouraged. In my work for public health protections that you all benefit from, I learned the basic truths. Where the greatest need is, the greatest -- hello? Where the greatest need is found -- where the greatest need is, the greatest cure can be found. That is my hope for you, me, your families, your grandchildren -- is that one day soon, we will have the most fair and just voting districts for the good of the whole. May it be so. Let's go.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you. We will now move for four speakers to the Central Piedmont site. After four speakers, we will move to the Caldwell Site.

MS. GARCIA: Thank you for allowing me to speak. My name is Tricia Garcia. I live in Mecklenburg County, and I lived here for 28 years. I'm in a room with a max capacity of 70 people for the largest population center of the state. This

public-forum platform is decreasing public input because of its inefficiency. Having microphones not muted at all of the sites while people are speaking, including the Chair of the whole committee's mic not muted, is very frustrating for people who want to listen and actually get input. But I do thank you for the opportunity to -- to speak.

We appreciate the committee's work to produce maps to improve upon the current map, but there is a long way to go, as we've heard a lot of people say. Real public participation requires time. Citizens have had only three days to look at the House map and two days for the Senate and just a day for the data. This severely limits the amount of time and has denied voters the real chance to have their say.

Some of the committee's nine criteria such as more compactness and less precinct splitting were welcome improvements, while others have no place in drawing fair districts. For some criteria, the committee gave us yardsticks without numbers on them, making it impossible to measure the fairness. For example, the criteria called for splitting fewer precincts, but no data was provided

on how or when to split a precinct.

So what about the maps? The committee made the right choice in adopting county groupings that conform to the North Carolina Constitution, producing a map that improves on the current one, even if that does not itself guarantee that the districts also comply. We also see some progress on compactness, with some better average scores than previous Senate maps. The House districts are less squiggly, but the new maps apparently don't score any better on all of the measures. This suggests that we are still falling short of fair districts. The promise to split fewer precincts came without a target, but we're glad to see that the new maps split far fewer precincts. The House map still splits 49, but there are a lot less than 394 split precincts in 2011.

The committee attempted to avoid pitting incumbents against each other. This criteria simply has no place in a fair process. Elections should be to protect voters' ability to have their say, not protect incumbents. We haven't been able to assess how the use of political considerations in election results affected the maps, but misuse -- I guess my time's up. Sorry.

MS. BLEIWEIS: When I run for state legislature, I'm going to mandate that every microphone be lowered a foot. That's going to be the new law.

My name is Barbara Bleiweis. I am the -- my name is Barbara Bleiweis. I am the Fair Elections Chair for the League of Women Voters of Charlotte, Mecklenburg. The League was formed in 1920 that secured -- it was part of a movement that secured the right to vote for women. The 100th anniversary of that movement is coming soon and yet we still continue to fight for fair elections. I represent one of over 2,000 chapters of the League throughout the US and one of 18 here in North Carolina. We educate voters on election processes and issues, including gerrymandering and how it rigs elections.

Today, our fight continues to end gerrymandering and to reform the redistricting process to create fair maps. Our position on gerrymandering is well-documented and indeed, to a large extent, has been validated by the Supreme Court on June 5th, when they upheld the lower Court's ruling that the existing district maps violated the constitutional rights of North

Carolina voters. And at that time, new maps were ordered and due September 1st.

Since that time, the League has watched legislators and -- continue to manipulate the process, and we were appalled. We received notice on 17 August to have public comments on 22 August on maps that we got on 19 and 20 August, using and -- creating maps that use criteria that -- then that the net effect of it is disenfranchisement of groups of voters using partisanship as a veiled cover for race. The decision to limit time for response, as well as limiting room for seating, only underscores the fact that you might have no interest in what we have to say [inaudible].

The effort to be transparent is disingenuous. It erodes public trust in you and undermines the democratic process. These hearings lack the authenticity that we need and the accountability that we demand of elected officials.

This isn't about Republican. It's not about Democrat. It's not about retribution for what happened in the past. It is about integrity and fairness to the voters, to we the people.

The good news is, you have a chance to fix this. So on behalf of the League of Women

Voters, we ask you, find a way to make maps fair. Find a way that it will respect voter laws and ensure that all our votes will count. Thank you.

MR. READY: Are we still working? Hi, I'm Dan Ready. I'm a relative newcomer to North Carolina. Hi, I'm Dan Ready. I'm a relative newcomer to the state. I've only been here about eight years, but I have grandchildren who are going to grow up here and that brings me to this process -- this arcane process of redistricting our state.

Also, I was raised to have -- to believe that democracy is something sacred. I've never in my life, since the time I was eligible to vote, missed an election. The only time I -- my vote might not have been counted was when I was on active duty, and I don't think my absentee ballot got back on time. That's why I'm so appalled at what I've seen in the last few years to try to steal the right to vote from people, their sacred right to vote, simply because they might not vote the right way.

And this redistricting process -- I'm not naive -- I know has always been a partisan process. But there are certain lines you don't cross. There

are certain extremes you go to. And other people have spoken eloquently already to this process that we're going through now. And the excuse obviously is that we're under the gun because the Court said something has to happen by September 1st. But we're under the gun on this process because of the previous actions of the legislature. And you have a responsibility to something other than political power. And I wish you would recognize it.

However, the bottom line at this point is, I don't think there's any way to have a proper prospect -- process, excuse me, in the limited time between now and September 1st. So rather than speak to a committee of the legislature who has failed in their responsibilities and now doesn't have time to properly execute them and clearly doesn't respect this sacred thing called democracy, I'd like to speak directly to the courts involved. Please, see these maps for what they are.

I personally think one of the political branches, the legislature, should conduct this process. But the legislature, through its own actions, has made this impossible through their negligence, through their lack of taking the responsibilities to us citizens seriously. And so

I would implore the Court. See the maps for what they are. Throw them out. This is one time when I think we would all be better served, regardless of our political stripe, by the courts writing the district. This is one time we need the courts to draw the districts and take our legislature out because they have proven that they deserve to be taken out of the process this time.

Please, I hope to God the courts will throw these maps out and give us a map that is true to that sacred ideal of democracy that we should all believe in. Thank you so much.

REP. LEWIS: I have that it is three speakers, and we're doing four speakers at Central Piedmont. Next on the list in Central Piedmont I have David Taylor for the fourth speaker.

MR. TAYLOR: Good afternoon. My name is David Taylor. I'm a resident here in Charlotte.

So many -- so many speakers before me have spoken so more eloquently than I'm able to, including Mr. Ready. I would remind the people assembled that the state constitution guarantees that our power is derived from the people and is instituted solely for the good of the whole. I'm sorry. If you can't hear -- our constitution

guarantees that the power is derived from the people and is instituted solely for the good of the whole, but over the last four years, most of our discourse has been about health -- about bathrooms, monuments and campus speech codes rather than about healthcare, schools, roads and jobs.

Most of this is due to the partisan nature of our politics where 80 percent of districts of this state are safely held by one party or the other with no chance for competition. This puts the hands -- the power in the hands of the most extreme members of either party and pretty much disenfranchises 75 percent of our voters because they don't participate in the primary process and don't have a legitimate choice in the general election.

Please, please, let's try to end the partisanship in our state's politics. It's destroying the state. Thank you.

REP. LEWIS: We will now move to Caldwell for four speakers. First speaker I have on the list is Cotton Johnson. If we could transfer to the Caldwell site.

MR. JOHNSON: I'm Cotton Johnson. I'm a Republican. I was the [inaudible] since 1905. I

later moved on to become the youngest state [inaudible] special assistant for governor in the history of the state and that record has not been broken. I've examined the districts, at least our district, and I give an opinion that our district is not gerrymandered whatsoever. Other districts may. I have not addressed them. [Inaudible] the Raleigh News & Observer, which is a [inaudible] that it's not favorable to the Republican Party at all. However, [inaudible] the detail or [inaudible] the process [inaudible] in talking about the districts here I said [inaudible] Burke County more than anything else. I think another thing that indicates that our district was not gerrymandered is that Senator [inaudible] Randleman and Wilkes. Senator [inaudible] have never indicated that she understands the needs of our district. During the course of her time, Caldwell is 64th per capita income. Watauga is 49th. Ashe is 60th. Allegheny is 73rd. She wants to dismiss all this and vote with the high-income districts. She also wants to talk about tax issues and middle class tax reduction which is a lie. She supported a bill in the legislature last session that resulted in [inaudible] a year to get a $19,000 tax

reduction. [Inaudible] I rest my case. That's all the time I get. I'll give it to someone else.

MS. HUFFMAN: Good evening. My name is Sarah Huffman, and I live in Hickory. I'm under -- I can be under many umbrellas and I'm not going to take up a lot of time. I was in the League of Women Voters for 38 years. I proudly served on the Board of Hickory [inaudible]. So I'm here today to make it very brief.

I want to address the General Assembly with a few facts. There's a recent poll, very recent, shows that four out of five North Carolinian voters, that is 80 percent, say there's say it's not fair for politicians to draw their own districts. The poll includes 85 percent Democrats, 74 percent Republicans and 80 percent of Independents. The redistricting process must be open over racial or partisan gerrymandering and allow voters to pick their own political representatives and not the other way around.

Now, do you -- in these new maps, you could still pick the same consultant, Thomas Hofeller who drew the current illegal maps and how on earth can you expect to come out with a new map that is representative of every voter in North

Carolina? These new maps -- now I've had a short time, very, very short time to study them -- only corrects about 10 percent.

What's happened to the other 90 percent? Well, we need to redo them. The General Assembly leaders have spent $8,000,000 of -- of taxpayers' money to defend their maps in court, and they keep losing. I want to end my little speech by saying, stop wasting our money and get a nonpartisan committee to draw new maps. Thank you.

MS. MORETZ: I'm Mary Moretz, and I am from Boone. That is in Watauga County for those of you who might not know. Hearing what Russians or other alien nations might do -- might do to cause Americans to lose faith in our election process pales in comparison to what we have done to ourselves. How are we to have a legitimate democracy, when the Constitution is willfully manipulated to take away the principle of one person, one vote via gerrymandering?

Both parties are guilty. I'm old so I know it's both parties. Oh, how you must congratulate yourselves or have a letter, maybe. You have manipulated the system. It is only a matter of time until the present minority party

will exchange places with the majority party and play the payback game. And perhaps with a vengeance.

Let's end that now, let's resolve to pass a North Carolina constitutional amendment that reforms the process of redistricting, so that it's fair for all citizens now and in the future. In order to accomplish such a change, what we need are legislators who are statesmen and not politicians. What we need are legislators who believe that equality and democracy are more important than party.

What we need are legislators who rise above the petty of gotcha, and rise to the challenge of integrity, honesty and fairness. What we need are legislators who reflect the moral code upon which our nation was built. And not politicians who are full of themselves for their clever exploitation. Yes, Democrats, I am giving you a tongue lashing. And, yes, Republicans I am giving you a tongue lashing, too. Don't make me have to come to Raleigh.

You call me an unconstitutional liar when I talk government to my high school students. I told them that, indeed, America is the shining the

city on the hill that models for all nations and all peoples. That our democracy harbors all people of all races, colors, and creeds through its practice of one person, one vote. You have made a mockery of our ideals.

I'm calling on you now to repent and clean up your act. I'd like to suggest a [inaudible] for redistricting. One, in accordance with the Constitution of the United States, each district shall have populations, equal populations. Two, the creation of each district shall protect the rights -- the ethnic voting rights in accordance of Shaw versus Reno. Three, districts shall be compact. Four, districts shall follow established political boundaries such as cities and counties. Thank you, the overwriting concept of promoting one person, one vote should and must be our mission. Thank you.

REP. LEWIS: Waiting for the fourth speaker, Caldwell. I have --

MS. WENGERD: [Inaudible] Hi, my name is Carolyn Wengerd. My name is Carolyn Wengerd. I'm a student of mathematics. I'm also a teacher of mathematics. Okay. And when I came in today I got handed these pretty maps. Somebody had to use

eight crayons to color them. Now, if you know anything about mathematics it should not take eight crayons, it should take far fewer. And there's no data behind this. I -- I look at these and see the big picture, but without data they're meaningless.

Now, one person I heard say, that some they came out today, that's nice. I was looking for a [inaudible]; I couldn't find any. But I really would wish you guys would come into the 21st century. There's software out there, unbiased software. We don't need a biased consultant, Republican or Democrat. Software does this no matter what your state, no matter what county you're in. Finish your games [inaudible]. Thank you.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you. I will remind all sites that these outbursts of applause will not be tolerated and are unhelpful when transitioning between sites and only serve to slow down the process. We are now going to move onto the Guilford Tech site, for four speakers.

REP. STEVENS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Representative Stevens, here again. We've had one more representative join to us. Representative [inaudible] joins this facility, I wanted to

announce that. We are prepared with our four speakers. We have Michael Owens, Derick Smith, Betsy Price and Chanelle James. We are ready.

MR. OWENS: I'd like to start by thanking the General Assembly for holding this forum. I don't envy the work you have ahead of you. My name is Michael Owens. I am honored to serve as the vice-chair for the Forsyth County Republican Party.

I'd also like to take a moment in time to thank the General Assembly for the work they've done in the last few years. They repaid roughly $3 billion to the federal government a year ahead of schedule. With increase in teacher pay more than once and then established a rainy-day fund with hundreds of millions of dollars, to be used in the event of an emergency or natural disaster. They've done all of this while lowering personal and business income taxes for building North Carolina to one of the best states in the country to do business.

In regards to the maps, whatever the outcome of this process, there's going to be a lawsuit. You can take race into account, there is going to be a lawsuit. You cannot take race into account, there is going to be a lawsuit. I know it

and you know it.

To accentuate that, there is someone in the room with me today, who assumed for sake of the voter ID, I doubt it's a coincidence that they are here today. I wonder if those -- those organizations were included at all in this process. If not, why not? If for no other reason than to have them at least partially accountable for the outcome. And I'll leave with this so those in the minority party who have talked so much about gerrymandering. I wonder if you considered your district's gerrymander when you were, in fact, the majority party for well over a century. Thank you.

REP. STEVENS: Here, here, go ahead.

MR. SMITH: Good afternoon, North Carolina. My name is Derick Smith. I am the political actions chair for the Greensboro Chapter of the NAACP. I'm also the political action chair for the state congress of Chapters of the NAACP. And I stand here with my president, Rev. Cardes Brown, from the Greensboro Chapter of the NAACP.

And I want to get right off the bat to this whole deal about Mr. Thomas Hofeller. Let's think about these cases that we've had to deal with, here in North Carolina. The list is long;

Dickson versus Rucho, City of Greensboro versus Guilford County Board of Elections, Senator Wade. We've had to deal with the Harris-Cooper case. The -- the list is -- is quite long and of course the famous Covington case with Supreme Court. Ruled nine to zero, even with Clarence Thomas on board, ruling these are unconstitutionally constituted districts. Yet somehow, in their infinite wisdom, this General Assembly believes that it must continue to pay Thomas Hofeller to continue to do this to the taxpayers of the state of North Carolina.

So the message that they are sending is, either they like what he's doing and they're -- or they're just are rewarding incompetence. I believe they like what he's doing, because they can maintain power to keep the system all locked up in the legal process, while they maintain power. So, number one, Thomas Hofeller got to go.

Number two, let's talk about race. One of the criteria that the General Assembly believes that it needs to show [inaudible] is that it needs to take race completely off the table. As though there is no equal protection clause, as though there is no Voting Rights Act Section 2. 'Cause

they got in trouble with race by packing black votes into specific districts to maintain their power illegally. Now they just want to do away with it. Don't even consider race, as though the Voting Rights Act doesn't apply. We're not going to let them do it.

And the third thing I want to talk about is don't let this General Assembly hoodwink you into believing that incumbency is about incumbents. First of all, it is, in the fact that's what they are trying to protect, which is not in the interest of anybody in the state of North Carolina. It's only in the interest of people who are incumbents. But here's the issue, the incumbency that there's -- that they're protecting is illegal. It's been illegal since all these courts have ruled that's illegal. So what they are trying to protect --

REP. LEWIS: One minute, okay. Time is up.

MR. SMITH: Oh, time is up. But you know what they are trying to protect. Don't let them do it, North Carolina.

REP. STEVENS: Betsy Price and then Chanelle James.

MS. PRICE: Hello, my name is Betsy Price. I stand here tired. I'm tired of it being [inaudible] or seeing it on the news, a new law passed that I disagree with. I'm tired of a legislature of Raleigh that passes laws that discriminate. And I'm tired of them passing them in the middle of the night. And I'm tired of a legislature that fights our governor and Attorney General at every turn. These, I believe, are the results of gerrymandering.

And I'm also confused. Confused that the Republicans in Raleigh chose the same guy to redraw the maps that were drawn wrong the first time. And confused that they used my tax money to do it, $50,000. And I'm also confused why the ruling party gets to choose to redraw the maps. That rule needs to go.

So I propose to the good people of North Carolina that we appoint an independent council, chosen by the people to draw these maps. Use ZIP codes to draw them, so that people that live together, work together and play together, can choose who they to represent them.

Gerrymanders sounds a lot like jerry-rigged to me. First it was lizards, then

snakes, I wonder what creature lurks out there this time. So I say no to the new maps, draw them and make them fair.

MS. JAMES: Hello, my name is Chanelle Beverly James, and I am a citizen of Greensboro. I'm also a Plaintiff in the Covington case, that federal lawsuit in which three-judge court invalidated 28 states -- state House and state districts as unconstitutional racial, gender -- gerrymanders.

I'm here today to discuss my concerns about the criteria this committee is using to draw its proposed maps. First, your criteria is flawed because three of the committee's criteria use the 2011 plans as a starting point for measuring success. But these plans have been ruled unconstitutional racial gerrymanders. The proper benchmark to use would be the last constitutional plans, those that came before 2011 plans. Instead, the committee is officially tying its current maps to the unconstitutional maps, perhaps its criteria on compactness, split precinct and incumbency protection.

On election data, the committee's decision to allow drawing maps based on political

consideration is simply a repeat of the process that followed to ensure partisan advantages when you re-draw -- re-drew congressional districts in 2016. This use of political power is improper. Data on incumbents' addresses and past election terms should be used only to ensure that the districts do not unruly favor any party or individual, while complying with federal laws not to ensure partisan outcomes. We believe this improper use of political data likely exposes the legislature for liability for partisan gerrymandering, just as with the [inaudible] plans.

Second, with respect to compactness, it seems funny to us, even having had the maps for such a small amount of time, that the legislature has -- prioritizing incumbency protection over the facts. The North Carolina Supreme Court has explained that compliance with the state constitutional whole county provision requires that districts must be compact. Incumbency protection, while perhaps an acceptable consideration, if applied evenly to incumbents of both parties, should not supersede requirements of the state constitution. That's your failure to establish criteria that are openly [inaudible] state

constitutional criteria, above other criteria is [inaudible] problematic.

Finally, this committee's decision to altogether equal or race is a problem and it defies the directional support. The use of race in redistricting is not an all-or-nothing approach. Issues of race are a nuance and not just in redistricting. The law reflects is explained at length by the Covington Court and is reiterated by this committee on some of your members, although they were ignored. This Court has instructed the General Assembly that a one-size-fits-all racial classification violates the Constitution and hurts voters like me.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you. Having had four speakers, we'll move to the Halifax Community College site that's coming in and for four speakers.

REP. J. BELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We had Speaker Number 4, Janet Hoy, and Speaker Number 5, Richard Siat, withdraw their names. We'll start with Speaker Number 6, Edith Braginton, and then move to Speakers Number 7, 8 and 9.

MS. BRAGINTON: Thank you. My name is, Edith Braginton, and I live in Halifax. This is

the first time that I have ever felt moved to come to any kind of a meeting like this. And it is because I feel the maps, the gerrymandered maps, are so bad. It is very important that people speak up when they see these things.

I think the maps should be free from partisan politics, first of all. I think that they should comply with the Civil Rights Act. I think that the maps should be fair. Gerrymandering hurts all of us. We have to get rid of it now. I understand that politicians currently in power would like to stay in power. I understand that politicians want to win. You don't have to be scared. All you have to do is represent all of us. You can win if you represent all of us. Gerrymandering equals voter suppression. Don't do that.

REP. J. BELL: Mr. Chairman, we also had, for the record, Senator Smith-Ingram join us.

MS. CLAYTON: I'm Eva Clayton, the former member of Congress. I speak today because I want to be on record so I'll be clear that the right to vote is the most precious right we have as an American. And indeed, redistricting is one way to deny that. I, for one, know the value of

redistricting was part of the challenge that indeed created the two congressional districts in North Carolina. This is no more than a sham.

If the process is flawed, the product is flawed. And to the extent that this hearing is being called at the last minute, very limited information, to the extent we use the same system that created the illegal system in the very beginning. The audacity to think that the system would be so naive to think that you could do this to Americans.

We are just coming from the whole celebration of the accident of Charlottesville. Indeed, we understand what it is to be American or not to be American pushing on statutes. Well, the statute that created the civil rights law is essential to being in America, so North Carolinian delegates or members of the Senate, General Assembly or the House, to the extent that you say that all Americans, indeed, should be free, all Americans are equal -- to the extent that you say that and believe that, this redistricting plan has, indeed, to be redrawn. Thank you.

MS. ROSS-HOLMES: Good afternoon. My name is Carolyn Ross-Holmes, and I'm a resident of

Weldon. My message to all of the legislators assembled: candidates must be electing by all of the diverse groups that are located in jurisdictions. Gerrymanding is not necessary when candidates campaign and learn the people for which you represent in all shades and beliefs abide by the law.

I agree with many of the comments made earlier by my fellow citizens in this room. It's all about the process, such as -- including paying attention to the crowd in your respective rooms to gain insight of those assembled here and noticing what they agree to or not. So in the spirit of ensuring our vote is not suppressed neither shall our show of support for comments made that I think would be helpful in your report of public feelings using -- by using sign language. I think that's what we've been reduced to do. This is another example of how one must seek and gain understanding of the people you are elected to serve. Thank you.

MR. HERTZENRATER: I don't know how the -- how the rooms are set up in other places here. My name is Warren Hertzenrater. I'm the pastor of Jackson Baptist Church. I don't know how the other rooms are set up in other places; it

appears that people are talking to a crowd of people. Here we speak to a camera, a wall and three guys in suits. And I've certainly spoken to three guys in suits before when we have low attendance on a Sunday, but I prefer to speak to a crowd, and there's a crowd here. So I'm going to turn around and get a timer going so hopefully I won't go over the three minutes.

I -- I wonder, I'm not asking for a vote, but how well we're able to hear what's going on in other places. I've struggled to hear the comments going on and -- and it seems to me that people who have prepared things to say are being disrespected by the fact that their words get jumbled and -- and -- and messed up so that people across the state, in what's supposed to a public hearing are not able to be heard. It would appear that in the process of creating these districts we have found another way to suppress people's voices.

There's lots of ways to silent people's voices. One is to deny them the vote, which we have done this in this state. We have a long history of doing that, even after suffrage, even after the Voting Rights Act; even after 2017 we still find ways to do it. Another way to silence

people is to place them in districts by drawing lines around and through counties and through neighborhoods. Another way to do it is to threaten people with expulsion as they choose to express their appreciation for a speaker as the person before me has just said.

Another way which seems trivial by comparison is to use technology and equipment that is inadequate to the task of spreading a public hearing across the public, across the state. And I realize it's a tiny thing. I'm no expert at doing this kind of thing but I've been involved in webcasts before, and this is probably the worst one I've ever seen. It -- it -- I just -- you know, I think there's glass fiber going all over the state between community colleges. I can't understand why it works this way.

Why, if this is so important, are there such inadequate resources are brought into play to accomplish, or to fail to accomplish? The technology makes voices sound like Mr. Ed and Fred Munster and Mickey Mouse stuck down in a well. And that's disrespectful and it disregards the importance of what's going on here. It seems like it's just another little tiny thing, just like

another little tiny vote, just like another little percentage difference that it makes when you move a congressional line. But all these just things make things unjust.

A man I know named Tex Sample once told -- talked with us about the problem he had with his two sons who had a hard time sharing the task of mowing the lawn. The old one would always take the easy part, leaving the hard part for the younger one. Tex drew a map of the room and he -- or a map of the yard and he said -- the older one -- said to the older one divide the yard up any way you want and said to the younger one, you pick which side you want to mow. I wish we could do voting that way.

REP. LEWIS: That will then move us on to Beaufort Community College -- four speakers.

MR. WICKERSHAM: My name is Dave Wickersham. I live at 838 Sunshine Drive in Arapahoe, North Carolina. I am the chairman of the Republican Party of Pamlico County. My comments today specifically address Pamlico County.

On February the 8th, 1872, the General Assembly of North Carolina ratified, quote, "an act to lay off and establish a new county by the name

of Pamlico," end quote. This new county was made up of land from the existing counties of Craven and Beaufort and we have formed a close relationship with them over the last 145 years.

A computer line drawn on a map does not recognize the people, the lives or their daily activities. We are an inland county, we are not a coastal county. We are not connected in any way to the other counties in this proposed redistricting. Pamlico County is not contiguous with Dare, Hyde or Carteret counties. The only connection is a long drive through Beaufort County via Washington or a tedious ferry ride. On the other hand, Craven and Carteret County are accessible by a four-lane highway or a very short, convenient, 20-minute ferry ride.

We do banking, air travel, car buying, shopping and enjoy dining and entertainment in our neighboring counties. Our retired military are constantly commuting back and forth to Cherry Point. Our children take bus trips to the North Carolina Aquarium and other points of interest in our neighboring counties. The closest hospital and other much-needed medical services are only 25 miles away. There is a significant flow of people

between our three counties.

Our inland coastal location on the Neuse and Pamlico rivers have resulted in very special state regulations that Dare, Hyde and Currituck don't have. Of course they have their own set of burdensome regulations to deal with. To be blunt, our modest population of 13,000 means the much larger counties to our north will mean that we simply will be lost in the shuffle. It is hard to imagine anyone elected in this proposed new district would spend much time with us or, more importantly, represent our needs and concerns in the legislature. I implore you to reconsider this alignment and leave Pamlico County with neighbors with whom we work, live, recreate and worship as a community of shared interests. Please examine again not only your responsibility to comply with a court order, but your human responsibility of doing the right thing instead of just taking yet another political expedient action.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak. I can only hope and pray my words are heard. Please let us stay as we are with our neighbors and shared communities in Craven, Beaufort and Carteret. Because in the case of Pamlico County,

as far as the redistricting goes, it is not fair, it is not contiguous, it is not more compact and it is not respectful of community and shared interests. Thank you.

REP. J. BELL: Ray Leary.

MR. LEARY: Thank you. Good evening, my name is Ray Leary. I reside in Chocowinity, North Carolina, and I'm here representing the Citizens of Better Government of Beaufort County. We do not understand why this committee has chosen to include Beaufort County in a North Carolina senatorial district that has no commonality with coastal communities. Beaufort County has approximately 80 statute miles of estuary and waters, and Beaufort County is connected by this association and historically to the coastal counties of Hyde and Dare counties. We --

MALE SPEAKER: Can't hear -- no broadcast -- all we can hear [inaudible] -- turn it up.

MR. LEARY: Well, it says it's on. I'll just talk louder. We have nothing in common with Vance, Northampton and Warren counties. We do not know why anyone would suggest this plan. It makes no sense. If there is a plausible explanation for

this gerrymandering, we would certainly like to hear why that is from this committee. We do not need this, we do not want this, and we do not deserve to be shut out in Raleigh. It is -- is it not sufficiently corrupt that Beaufort County has to endure limited voting for county representatives? And now this new Senate district map was conjured up to deprive us of representation in the North Carolina Senate.

The redistricting committee has been provided with an acceptable modification to the new maps by the Beaufort County Republican Party Executive committee. The Beaufort County Citizens for Better Government supports this revision and respectfully requests you correct this rather egregious redistricting plan. Such a change will actually better comply with the published criteria for redistricting than the current proposed map does. Thank you for allowing the citizens to provide you with these recommendations and we sincerely hope you will honor not only our request, but others who have proposed this same modification. Thank you very much.

MR. SEIGHMAN: My name is Gerald Seighman. I'm a Beaufort County resident, and I

did not intend to come to this meeting, but the more I thought about it, the more upset I am. Holding a meeting at 4 o'clock is not a public meeting because in Beaufort County we're a Tier 1 community. And a lot of the people that are working, they cannot afford to take off the half-day and lose those wages to come make comments, so I thought I would just come. If you look at Beaufort County, fishing, crabbing, shrimping, that's what we do. We're a coastal community.

And I look at the map, but I see we are with Vance, Warren and Northampton. They're -- they're landlocked, they don't have any water. So if we have political representation from someone that wins the election up in those counties, they have no clue what Beaufort County does. We should be put back into the coastal community where the representation will have some knowledge of at least what we do in this county. Thank you.

MS. JONES: My name is Mary Jones, and I'm from Washington County and I don't like speaking in public. But addressing the topic of how our neighborhoods and counties have been so split up before, these new districts are more

compact than the current ones that we are now under. These districts respect our community and our shared interest with our neighbors. These districts respect the principle of contiguity with means -- which means being close or drawn together, with all parts of each district being connected. It is this way for our county; it may not be said for some of you others. But I endorse these maps. There are -- there are less split-up counties than before.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you. I will announce, it looks like we have about nine minutes if any more individuals are wishing to sign up to speak. Tonight in about nine minutes, at 6:30, the sign-up list will close. If nothing else, we'll move on to Fayetteville Tech for four speakers.

REP. SZOKA: That's Ana Blackburn, Deandrea Newsome, Lynn Hanka, Roberta Waddle -- that's four, and if they go to five, Mr. Buxton.

MS. BLACKBURN: Good evening, I'm Ana Blackburn. I'm the state's Latino liaison for the North Carolina NAACP. Democracy is once again at stake because it is being stolen by an illegitimate General Assembly. This is not just my opinion but that of the court system. The Supreme Court found

the North Carolina white supermajority rigged the election by using racist gerrymandering to win their seats. I am personally tired about hearing that the Republicans gerrymandered as well. We are talking about the here and the now. Two wrongs don't make a right.

Here we go again. With all that in mind, and after being found guilty by the Supreme Court, nine to zero, of racist gerrymandering, you would think that at least a logical person would take steps to admit and attempt to remedy the situation honestly, but no, not our North Carolina supermajority. They turned around and hired the very consultant who drew the previous racist, gerrymandered maps and, to add insult to injury, gave him a raise.

Public records show that Mr. Hofeller has received 50,000 of public funds to redraw the map once again. Yet, whenever we exercise our right to protest and rally, the rhetoric we hear from the supermajority is, the people elected us, they have spoken, stop your whining.

Well, I'm here to tell you, the people haven't spoken, because you saw to that by rigging the maps, which is exactly what you are attempting

to once again do. The public, this public hearing, is a sham. And what a total disrespect to the people of North Carolina, the hard-working voters of this state that you will hold seven hearings, at this time when so many people cannot get here and call that you are honest leadership and trying to do the right thing by the people. It would be a bigger crisis to democracy if I would not stand up to the injustice that this General Assembly is trying to do by silence the people of North Carolina. (Comments in Spanish.) Forward together, not one step back.

MS. NEWSOME: Hello, my name is Resistance, and I'm a resident of Cumberland County. And so I have a message to Chairman Lewis and also Vice-Chairman Szoka. Stop insulting the intelligence of the residents of our great state. It is about time that you all become representative of who you represent. It has been way too long that you think that this is the best that you can do. Are you serious? I am infuriated, disrespected, upset that this is why we're here today.

And to think that -- when you look at our Cumberland County as it -- as it comes down to the

House district, that it's a conflict of interest as our vice chairman's district gets larger, if you look at the maps. The definition of insanity is to do the same thing over and over and over again and expect different results. So the members of the redistricting committee, maybe you're a little insane and it's time for you to come home.

REP. LEWIS: Representative Szoka, could you have the speaker repeat her name?

MS. NEWSOME: Resistance.

REP. SZOKA: Resistance.

MS. HANKA: My name is Lynn Hanka. I'm a --

REP. LEWIS: Representative Szoka --

MS. HANKA: -- I'm a relative newcomer to North Carolina, and I chose to stay here because I love this state. And the more that I learn about the antics of gerrymandering and voter suppression by the legislature the more horrified I am. I would remind you that a core tenet of democracy is that a healthy democracy requires a principled opposition. A healthy democracy requires a principled opposition because a plurality of perspectives is how we progress as a society and support everyone, from the most privileged to the

most vulnerable.

The legislative super-majority has lost sight of this requirement of a principled opposition, doing everything they can to stamp out any opposition. And so we have a sick democracy in our state that's infected with partisanship, disenfranchisement and cruelty to the most vulnerable people.

These new maps show intent to protect the illegal supermajority. And so the sickness that infects our democracy will continue if these maps are adopted.

For us to heal our democracy, we must have a truly open process that allows voters to choose their representatives. End the partisan and racial gerrymandering now, so that our representatives truly represent all of us. Thank you.

REP. LEWIS: Representative Szoka, could you please read the speakers' names so far?

MS. WADDLE: Good evening. I am Roberta Waddle --

REP. LEWIS: Ma'am, you can hear me?

MS. WADDLE: I'm chair of the Cumberland County Democratic Party. Every legislative

district in Cumberland has been redrawn. While the lines in the districts do appear to be more compact, I have no data on the results of these changes. I don't know whether these districts help or hinder our party; they probably don't. I don't know if redistrict will meet justice department approval regarding racial distribution. I cannot determine if they are fair.

I would very much like to comment on the proposed redistricting maps presented here today. However, the process has been so secret and the hearings scheduled without sufficient time to evaluate them, it is very hard to do so.

The reason we are so rushed at this time is because the legislators in charge have delayed redrawing of the districts as long as they could, and they have not allowed for public input. Courts have ruled that the current maps are gerrymandered with surgical precision. Considering that the new maps have been drawn under the same legislative direction and done by the same technical services, it seems likely that we would have a very similar outcome.

I call for an independent commission to draw maps that allow fair representation for all.

Meaning that minorities would have a fair chance to be represented in the legislature, that the parties would be proportionally represented and that there would be fair, safe districts for all. Thank you.

REP. LEWIS: Ms. Waddle, please state your name.

MS. WADDLE: I did. Oh, okay. I am Roberta Waddle. Chair of the Cumberland County Democratic Party.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you. Could you give me the previous two speakers. I -- someone's name was not what I had on the list. Could you give me the name for the previous two speakers?

REP. SZOKA: Mr. Chair, the second speaker was Deandrea Newsome of Advance Carolina and the third speaker was Lynn Halka of Cape Fear Indivisible.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you very much. We will now move on. We're going to go to -- we will increase the number of speakers on each site to five as that does seem to expedite it slightly. And there was one change, but we're coming back here to Raleigh. We will begin with Rosalie Dominik, then Bobo Ayres, then Rachel Lichte, Corey Williams and Aylett Colston.

So in that order we'll begin with Rosalie Dominik.

MS. DOMINIK: Hi, I'm Rosalie Dominik of Durham. And I think the message you've been hearing is very clear. We need an approach to redistricting that is transparent, acceptable to both parties and enduring. This is the only way to ensure a true democracy. Plus, as long -- until we have a long-term solution to drawing districts, we won't have the opportunity for our officials to spend all the time they need to spend and the -- and the funds that are available on education, health care and infrastructure development.

They'll be distracted by the redistricting problem, until it's truly solved in a -- in a nonpartisan way. So the process used to draw the proposed maps, you know, lacks transparency and appears to have, once again resulted in maps that are rigged in favor in one party -- of one party. The citizens of North Carolina truly deserve better. And this is a problem you can fix. You have that power. It's -- it's one of the things that you can fix pretty easily. So I hope that you will do the right thing. Thank you.

SEN. HISE: Bobo Ayres, you're recognized for time not to exceed three minutes.

MS. AYRES: Hi, my name is Bobo Ayres. I am a fiscal conservative, a stay-at-home mom, so I'm literally nobody. I'm sure you guys all have families. And if your children misbehave, you would reprimand them. And if they did it again, you would probably reprimand them again, right?

So in this case, I'm not sure why we're going back to the same guy to draw the same maps. And I'm not sure why you would expect the people to encourage it. To say, yay, you made the same mistake again. So I'm just asking you to stop wasting your time and our money on unnecessary lawsuits. Lawsuits come because an injustice has been done. Thank you for hearing me.

SEN. HISE: Thank you. We'll now move to Rachel Lichte for a time period not exceed three minutes. Is Rachel not here? Okay. Moving on, Corey Williams. Come to order. Recognizing Corey Williams for a time not to exceed three minutes.

MS. WILLIAMS: Hi there. If it helps you, I was Number 9. I am a mom from House District 56 and Senate District 23. And I brought my very expensive visual aids with me today. In

November of last year I had no idea what Senate district I lived in or House District.

I was at the PTA. I was volunteering, but I wasn't really watching what was going on here. The special sessions turned that around for me, and I really began to pay attention. I came down. Some of you, I recognize because I sit in your office and don't leave until you talk to me. But I wanted to know what was going on in this state. And I wanted to find the dedicated civil servants who set aside their interest and serve for $14,000 a year and do this. So clearly you care. And I've met some thoughtful, capable, dedicated, North Carolinians.

I've had lunch with you, and I respect you. I've also seen some of the most contemptible stunts, the likes of which would land these two guys in the naughty corner. This set of maps, naughty corner.

I sat in the Greensboro courtroom and listened to Mr. Starch -- I'm going to get his name wrong -- his very thin argument. They were not delaying the process for partisan reasons. They were instead dedicated to ensuring that the public comment is heard and taken under advisement. And

these people clearly care. We've heard great comments from North Carolinians around this state. I'm glad to hear that you want public comment and I'm hoping that this time Mr. Hofeller hears all of these public comments.

So we're not at the pool today. They put on their suits to come see you, so I could let you know what I think. These maps don't just fail the efficiency gap test, they fail the chuckle test. And while I realize it's still legal, it's not ethical, it's not right and it's not long for this world. We're all waiting for the Wisconsin Supreme Court decision and we're all tired of the they-did-it-first argument. I don't want them to do it, and you guys shouldn't be doing it, either.

In terms of racial gerrymandering, releasing these maps on Saturday has not given me adequate chance to really assess whether a remedy has been achieved here. But I'll tell you, as a black woman, I have listened over and over to protestations that the people -- the members of this body are not racist. All I can say to you at this moment, with no data, is that I hope that when we look hard at the work that you've done, it won't be found wanting. Because mamas will come to the

ballot box and we're going to send everybody who is -- is not providing effective remedy to the naughty corner.

There are some bill sponsors who are to be commended. We saw House Bill 200. We saw Representative Brust's computer redistricting be proposed this session. This isn't -- those are all Republicans. This isn't really an issue of partisanship. It's an issue of incumbency.

So when you go home tonight and you look at your little people, and you tuck them in and you brush your teeth and look at yourself in the mirror -- just like I'm going to do -- ask yourselves, do I feel good about this? Am I happy with these maps? Is this fair to North Carolina? Thanks.

SEN. HISE: Aylett Colston. You're recognized for a time period not to exceed three minutes.

MS. COLSTON: Hi. My name's Aylett Colston. I live here in Wake County. I'm speaking to you today as a North Carolinian and as the mother, wife, sister and daughter of North Carolinians.

At the beginning of this meeting today,

if you guys can remember back that long ago -- been here awhile already, it feels like -- you asked for the public's help in complying with the court order, and I am so happy to hear that. It's great to ask for help when you need it.

I always think it's helpful to go back and think about the basics. To remind ourselves of the basics. Why do we have voting districts to begin with? It is so that people have a representative. Someone to look out for them and the interest of their community when it comes to writing the laws and making the decisions that affect all of our everyday lives.

I've already written to you and have outlined the reasons that voting districts should be drawn with the purpose of ensuring that every person in North Carolina has a voice, and every person in North Carolina has the opportunity to elect someone to represent them. They should not be drawn for making it easier for politicians to keep their jobs.

I have heard a lot of reasons given for why the maps were drawn the way they were, both back in 2011 and also the new proposed ones. What I have not heard is anybody say they drew these

maps because they thought it was in the best interest of North Carolinians to draw them this way.

I have not heard one person involved in drawing the maps say we drew them that way because we thought that was what would ensure the best future for North Carolina. What I would really like to hear is somebody involved in -- when you're drawing the maps, is for you to say and then for you to follow through. And when you're making these decisions in drawing the maps, think about -- ask yourselves these questions, two questions. Will this help the people of North Carolina? Number two, will this improve North Carolina's future?

You guys asked for help in complying with the court order -- I only have three minutes, so if it's possible to incorporate things by reference, I'd point you to this handy dandy little guide to redistricting that your own staff did a great job on. It's in your public website. Anyone can download it. The only thing that's changed is there are now fewer protections for historically disenfranchised communities. I'd also like to mention the actual court opinion that kind of takes

you through all the law and kind of how you got here. It's not too late to do the right thing. Thank you.

SEN. HISE: Thank you. Next we'll have Claudia Koonz and then Andrea George, as we had one not present. Claudia Koonz, you're recognized for a time period not to exceed three minutes.

MS. KOONZ: Thank you very much. My name is Claudia Koonz, and I'm speaking as a citizen of North Carolina who's worried about our state in a time of polarized politics. I'm also here as a historian from Duke University. I'm a historian of Germany in the 20th century. And I particularly am interested in what happens when polarized party politics takes the place of national concern.

Nonpartisan electoral maps are a first step towards restoring the trust that is the bedrock of democracy. That kind of trust is what we need here. I have to say, I have never done this before. I've never even come to a meeting like this, but I have been horrified by the amount of cynicism and apathy I feel among -- just people I run into every day. So let's step back from our situation today. What can we learn from the past? The textbooks tell us that Hitler destroyed

democracy in 1933. That's wrong.

German politicians killed off German democracies, starting in the late twenties, by putting their partisan political self-interest above the common good. Even after the Great Depression, with one-third unemployment. Action was urgent. What did politicians do? Nothing. Major bills died for want of the majority.

Five national elections in four years produced no workable coalitions, only more gridlock. Humorists laughed. They said politics looked like a barbell. All the weight at either end, but the outcome wasn't funny. The more politicians fought, the more rigid they became. A dangerous spiral set in.

Voter cynicism and politicians' partisan rigidity grew neck and neck. So what's happening here today? I think Eva Clayton said this more eloquently than I can possibly say it. But we have been waiting all summer for these maps and now, at the 11th hour -- when it is too late -- I suggest we need a fresh start. We need to ask for an incomplete. Take a -- get rid of the deadline.

Do not trust the firm that drew these maps. Pass House Bill 200. Appoint a panel of

experts -- mathematicians, demographers and geometrists -- to redraw nonpartisan districts. Make both sides equally unhappy.

From a historian's perspective, I close with just this thought. Voter disgust can lead to apathy. It can produce low turnouts and declining pride, but disgust can also produce rage, a potent force to be considered by every legislature concerned with his or her reelection. Think of where we were yesterday, all of us at 2:45 in the afternoon. We all felt together watching an incredible eclipse. That's the kind of feeling of community and togetherness I hope you will help us achieve in our political lives. Thank you.

SEN. HISE: Next up is Andrea George. I recognize for a time period not to exceed three minutes.

MS. GEORGE: Hi, hello, my name is Andrea George. First of all I just want to say I -- thank you for the privilege of being in this country. And thank you for the privilege of being able to vote. And I just want to give a reminder that there are places in this world where people will walk for a week to vote. And making voting as easy as possible for everybody is -- I can't see that as

a priority. It's a privilege. It's a privilege that people died for and -- and we need to respect that.

Secondly, I've heard a lot about division. As I've sat here most of what I've heard about is division. I've heard [inaudible] but one speaker earlier comment about the devil's tactics. The devil's tactics are division. And we keep dividing ourselves by race and color and creed, division gives [inaudible] to division. We will never come together.

Secondly, I'm pleased, personally, to see a map that's brought about without racial considerations with more racial data. I am thrilled because that's where we want to be. That's where our future, I hope, will be one day. And as far as I understand, it follows the Voting Rights Acts.

The communities are contiguous for the most part. I heard maybe one -- one coastal community complaining about that, but for the most part the precincts and the -- and the -- the -- the -- the districts are contiguous. And -- and that's important. People living together sharing common leaders, maybe we will unite instead of

divide. Thank you.

SEN. HISE: Thank you. Members of the committee as well as members of the public, we're going to need to suspend for a few minutes to give our -- ask questions about our court reporter and give her a few moments to catch her breath, as we may say, in this process. So our committee will suspend.

(Recess.)

REP. LEWIS: Come back to order, please. Come back to order, please. Ladies and gentlemen, the public -- going to announce to you that on the current signups we have here at the central location in Raleigh, we have a total of 221 speakers left to speak. That would require, at the pace we are moving, approximately 11 hours. That is in excess of what a court reporter would be able to deal with in making the transcripts. Fortunately, in case of technology issues, we took each site in the state and it is prepared to record on its own as an individual hearing.

There are actually two recordings at each site, one for the House and one for the Senate, which can be delivered to court reporters to create a transcript. And that is what we are going to do.

The seven sites now will operate independently of each other. And we will move through and be able to get through the public comment in a much more time-efficient manner.

That being said, I know that the other sites that are out there that can still hear me. We've also had some technical issues transitioning back and forth. If you have any issues or others, please feel free to contact us. We still have tech support and others available, but the Sergeant at Arms that are adept on how to operate the recording equipment to make sure that we have the multiple recordings for each of the public hearing sites.

We will then be able to have multiple court reporters compile one record that would be available for the members of the committee as we move forward in this process.

We will then continue here in Raleigh with the list of speakers that we have. Next up on the list, I have -- I'll go through the list I have in front of me, William Smith, Gloria Faley. I have an Octavia Rainey, but it has been removed.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: No.

REP. LEWIS: Okay. Octavia Rainey, then Susan, handwriting is always interesting, McClana

and Linda Duda.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: McClanahan. McClanahan.

REP. LEWIS: Okay. Begin with William Smith. We will be called -- William Smith will be recognized for a time period not to exceed three minutes. Is William Smith here?

(Pause in proceedings; audio from remote feed plays.)

REP. LEWIS: If we could silence the audio at the other sites.

(Pause in proceedings; audio from remote feed plays.)

SEN. HISE: We'll call again for a William Smith. Seeing no William Smith, we'll move to Gloria Faley.

MS. FALEY: My name is Gloria Faley. I live in Orange County. I was born and raised in North Carolina. As a matter of fact my teenage job was topping tobacco, for those of you that can remember those days. So I've been here a long time.

I am horrified at this process. I am -- I got here at 1 o'clock. The rules were to make sure that you got your name on the list. If you

got your name by the list you were going down one by one. That's not happened. I've also noted of all the folks that are here exactly what party -- what party is not here very much. That party that has actually left since these proceedings have started. It tells me something about the process. Your decision is already made. It's a sham.

Let's talk a little bit more about the process, shall we? The law -- lines were drawn, Tom Hofeller. He's a California software guy. He's one by -- according to Atlantic Monthly, one of the members of the league of dangerous mapmakers. A California native that has never lived in North Carolina. He doesn't even know about people like me, a North Carolinian. Why was not an independent group -- nonpartisan, of North Carolina voters, appointed by you and the legislature and the governor? Why? Again, it's a sham.

Now, let's talk about the voters for a minute. The maps themselves for a minute. The voters in Robeson proposed district, which covers most of Greensboro, supports -- supported Clinton over Trump 78 percent to 19 percent. In Wade proposed district Trump received 52 percent of the

vote to 44 percent for Clinton.

It looks like that if three of the Guilford County four senators would be Republicans, two of them live in other districts. This is beyond racial profiling. This is making sure that Guilford County, which is heavily Democrat, gets cut out of the process. In fact, the public hearing only had 20 to 30 seats. How little do you care about Guilford County?

The maps should be free of partisan politics, ignoring voting registration data and past election results. They must also ignore incumbent addresses, avoid intentionally double-bunking incumbents in order to focus on getting one of them out of office. These maps were be -- drawn behind closed doors and voters have not been given sufficient time to review any of the proposed maps before the public hearing. I want to be clear. I'm almost done. The push for the fair districts is not about getting more Democrats elected. It is about --

SEN. HISE: Speaker's time has expired.

MS. FALEY: You know, I will --

REP. LEWIS: Octavia Rainey, you're recognized for a time period --

MS. FALEY: People are frustrated enough that this will --

REP. LEWIS: Octavia Rainey, you're recognized for a time period not to exceed three minutes.

MS. RAINEY: Good afternoon. My name is Octavia Rainey, and I would like to thank you for the opportunity to speak today. I'm here because I am very concerned that I'm a firm believer in anything you do that there should be transparency, fairness and equity in any process. That is how we engage. And we listen to other people's opinion whether we want to hear them or not. But listening to differences of opinion only make you a better and a stronger person that will also enable you to make better decisions.

I have concerns that leaders offered inadequate time to review and -- and analyze the proposed maps. I have strong concerns about the time in which the maps was released at one time and then the data at another time. And this was for the House and the Senate.

It truly concerned me that when the data was released at two different, separate times, it was hard to analyze what was actually going on,

what was being presented before us. And it also gave an air, a feel, of something was wrong with this process. And this General Assembly should not be about that. This General Assembly should be about transparency. We all know what happened to the last map. We know the last map was wrong. The Court said that the last map was wrong.

My concern is why will we go to the same individual to help us draw another map and use that as a benchmark? That is completely wrong. We should begin to look at bringing in an independent body to help us draw the maps. We should all want fair maps. We should all want to increase everyone's right to vote, but we should always want to make sure that everyone, regardless of race, creed, color or national origin, would have an opportunity to run for office, not a gerrymandering running for office. Thank you.

SEN. HISE: Susan McClanahan, you're recognized for a time period not to exceed three minutes.

MR. SMITH: My name is William Smith.

SEN. HISE: Susan McClanahan, you're recognized for a time period not to exceed three minutes.

MS. MCCLANAHAN: Thank you for this time. My name is Susan B. McClanahan. I am from Orange County. I'm speaking as a North Carolina citizen, voter and taxpayer. When you entered the North Carolina General Assembly, you placed your left hand on the Bible and raised your right hand in the air to swear to an oath to support the Constitution of the United States.

One year ago, a federal three-judge panel ruled that you had violated that oath by using illegal, illegitimate, unconstitutional, racially-discriminatory voting maps in three different North Carolina elections. Republican lawmakers appealed to the US Supreme Court. On August 1, 2017, all nine members of the US Supreme Court unanimously agreed that your maps were unconstitutional, yet you have continued to use those illegal maps as the basis for these new maps for 2018. Plus you have used the very same consultant, Thomas Hofeller, who drew those illegal maps.

In your repeatedly failed attempts to litigate and defend these illegal and racially discriminatory maps, you have wasted millions of taxpayer dollars. You have continued to drag your

feet, to delay and obstruct the process by which voting maps are drawn. You have excluded other lawmakers and North Carolina citizens from the process. You have been secretive and have waited until the last minute to disclose the new proposed maps and the data that was used to draw them.

Because of your repeated racially-discriminatory actions, the people of North Carolina have no confidence that you will live up to your oath to create constitutional and nondiscriminatory voting maps. Put simply, you have shown that you cannot be trusted with this very important task. Before you once again violate your solemn oath and before you waste further taxpayer dollars, I urge you to reject these maps and allow an independent, nonpartisan commission to draw fair, legal, nondiscriminatory and constitutional maps so that neither party will be guilty of violating their oath when future voting maps are prepared. Thank you.

SEN. HISE: Linda Duda?

REP. LEWIS: She didn't show.

SEN. HISE: All right. Linda Duda? Not here. We'll return now to William Smith, who was not here when previously called.

MR. SMITH: Thank you very much for allowing me to speak. I was out of the room. I did not know that there was a time to come back in. Hello, my name is William Smith, a concerned citizen living here in Raleigh. Our founding fathers establish -- established our democracy such with the First Amendment. Our nation would be built on the ability of all to express their ideas and that the best ideas would prevail. Here we are now, again, with the free market of ideas that is our democracy being ground under the heel of big government interference.

The government has no business telling me and mine and my community who should represent us. I don't want my tax dollars wasted on propping up this system of political welfare. A system that is creating a generation of politicians who have lost the ability to stand on their own and be successful because they have become dependent on the state to keep their elected offices. The spirit of political entrepreneurship should be allowed to thrive without any government regulations that place limits on how much value a person's vote has.

The free market of ideas should not be weighed down by such burdensome government

regulations. I do not wish to be your enemy. I would very much prefer that we all stand united to conserve and protect our great democracy. Thank you, and God bless the United States.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you. The next speakers I have on the list in order: Gary George, Siva Shaperio, Lloyd Chambless, Larry Reid, and at best we can attempt to decipher is Jean Prinisor. Any of those individuals present? As they may be in the other room, we will call in a moment.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: It's my understanding where the people in the other room will be advised to come up here. I don't know that that's been done yet. Someone's going back.

REP. LEWIS: That's okay. It's entire list numbered 14 to 18, so we'll continue to move through the list. Are you one of those individuals?

MR. GEORGE: I was the first one you called. Gary George.

SEN. HISE: Gary George, you're recognized for a time period not to exceed three minutes.

MR. GEORGE: Thank you, sir. The first thing I'd like to say is I'm from Raleigh, North

Carolina. And I've only been here about five years, but I really like North Carolina and I -- I feel like a -- an established North Carolinian. I served in the -- in the military and worked for the military for 42 years. So I learned something from that and that's be brief, be bright and be gone and I'll try to do exactly that.

Thank you for your service. I hear a lot of people throwing innuendos and statements and -- and things that you -- $14,000 a year is a small civil-service stipend. And each and every one of you deserve our thank yous. Whether we agree with what you're doing or not, you're here working for us, and I appreciate that. That's the first thing I wanted to say.

The second thing I wanted to say was, my wife stood up here and said, "Let's not be so divisive." And I've got to go along with that. And the third thing -- a friend of mine wrote a book. It's called The -- The Hebrew Guy Who Has No Names. And in it he talks about two Jewish men getting together and discussing the subject and having three opinions. Now, this is not anti-Semitic. What he's saying is they have strong feelings and they're discussing those strong

feelings, but they're going to come together. Look in the Scripture and find out what God says and do that. That's the third opinion. That's the one that counts and that's what I'd like to see more of in -- in this -- in this group.

I looked at that map and I think it -- an honest attempt was made at -- at the rules of -- of the law. Whether or not it satisfies what the -- the Court said, whether or not it satisfies what people feel has been injustice in the past, I can't honestly say. But I'm asking y'all to work at unity. Don't be so divisive. Thank you.

SEN. HISE: Thank you. I'll also announce that as many individuals have left, the overflow room in 544 is now closed. There's no one waiting there. Siva Shaperio? No one responding. Lloyd Chambliss? No one responding. Larry Reid? No one responding, and Jean Prinisor, I'm going to guess. No one responding. One, two -- Ontario Parny or possibly Octario? Okay. Max Poteat; P-O-T-E-A-T? Tyler Swanson? Sorry, are you Max?

MR. POTEAT: Yes, sir.

REP. LEWIS: Okay. Max Poteat, you're recognized for a time period not to exceed three minutes.

MR. POTEAT: Good evening. My name is Max Poteat, and I'm currently a rising sophomore from Orange County. I would like to thank the Committee for the opportunity for public comment. I would like to offer my opinion that the new maps are such a clear example of partisan gerrymandering that even young people like me can see.

You spent millions of North Carolinian -- North Carolinian taxpayer dollars defending your maps in the racial gerrymandering case. And now there's a partisan gerrymandering case pending. I really hope that you don't plan to spend millions of NC tax dollars trying to defend these maps, too. I understand that the Democrats played an equal role, when they were empowered, with having unfair maps.

It's time they give the constituents that you represent, the people who elected you, a fair, democratic election and representation. Thank you, Mr. Chair, and the members of the Committee.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you. Next, Tyler Swanson, with the NC -- N -- NAACP?

MR. SWANSON: Good evening. Thank you for this opportunity to address this Committee. Again, my name is Tyler Swanson. I want to, for

the record, put out an official North Carolina NAACP statement in regards to these maps. I want to address this with y'all.

As we all know, the right to vote is not a game. It's a sacred right that is warranted of blood and sweat and tears of many of our ancestors. This General Assembly did not stop adopt -- adopting unjust -- unjust and unlawful criteria when it was disingenuous in applying this criteria to adopt it.

The same body -- which is an illegal body, by the way, said it would not consider race at all when it -- in its proposed maps. And the proposed maps appear to contain districts that are very similar to the illegal ones that was drawn in 2011. And continues to stack black and brown voters into non-compacted districts.

For example, from our preliminary -- excuse me -- analysis, House District 21 continues -- as it did in the illegal 2011 plans -- to sprawl into Sampson County and Wayne Counties to maximize the black votes, populations in the district and limit the power of those black voters who vote -- who votes would have a greater impact on the very drawn -- in a fairly drawn district,

excuse me.

That's same for this district's -- that's true for North Carolina District 19. Which is nearly entirely located in Hoke County except for the piece that I'm -- except -- I'm sorry, excuse me. I can't see my own handwriting here. Yes, let me just re-say that again. This is true for Senate District 19 which is entirely located in Hoke County. Which the illegal 2011 plan disfigures the district borders by reaching into Cumberland County to grab black voters, who would otherwise be casting their ballots in the Senate District 20.

What we want and what the people want are fair maps. Maps that really represent the people. Maps that give people a people's voice and opportunity. And what you all have done by hiring the same individual -- thank you sir, the same individual who's drawn these illegal maps, you all are continuing the same process. And as one of our fellow North Carolinians said, insanity is doing the same thing over and over again, expecting to get the same results.

Well, we're here to let you all know that these maps are -- do not represent the people. These maps are unjust and the people of North

Carolina deserve a government that is of, for and by the people. And one thing since this body is constituted by the North Carolina Constitution, let me just remind you all that all political power derives from the people. I'm going to say that one more time. All political power derives from the people. And please allow the people to have a voice. Thank you.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you. Jane Pinsky, North Carolina Coalition for Lobbying and Government Reform. You're recognized for a time not to exceed three minutes.

MS. PINSKY: Thank you. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the opportunity to speak. I have some prepared remarks and I'm happy -- oh, I'm sorry. I'm Jane Pinsky, and I'm with the North Carolina Coalition for Lobbying and Government Reform. And I will be happy to give you copies of my remarks for the Committee members.

Before I start those remarks, I have a brief story to tell. As many of you know, I've been working on this issue for ten years. And a lot of people, including some of my family members, think I'm crazy. And they say why do you keep doing this? Well, the answer is very simple. My

paternal grandfather snuck out of a penal colony in Siberia in the late 19th century; hitchhiked, walked and rode trains across Russia. Got to his hometown and was told that the Cossacks were looking for him and he couldn't stay there.

He came to the United States as a young man under 20 and made his way, raised four children and 12 grandchildren. And one of the things he always told us was that he made that trek across Russia because he was fighting for his voice in his government. And he couldn't have that in Russia, but he came to the United States. And he reminded every one of us that it was our responsibility to speak up and to have a voice. Gerrymandering takes away that voice.

The Coalition which I represent is made up of groups spanning the political and ideological spectrum, including the John Locke Foundation and Common Cause. Two groups that don't often even come into the same room.

Since its creation in 2005, the Coalition has pushed for nonpartisan redistricting in our state. We strongly believe that the people of North Carolina are best served when voters get to choose their elected officials, not when elected

officials choose their voters. Redistricting must be free of partisan influence. And in this case that is incumbent protection.

Former representative Ric Killian, who is a Republican from Mecklenburg County, says North Carolina and every other state should adopt a nonpartisan redistricting plan to ensure citizens can choose their elected officials rather than elected officials choosing their constituents.

People across North Carolina agree; 80 percent of North Carolinians think we should have a change. More than 250 local elected officials agree. There are present and former members of the North Carolina General Assembly who agree. Many other Republican leaders, including municipal mayor Mark Stohlman, who helped his town adopt a nonpartisan process for their -- drawing their town council thinks -- their town -- town council districts also agree.

Mayor Stohlman says when the town of Morrisville carried out a special redistricting earlier this year, we considered only major geographic boundaries and getting each district population count as close as possible. That made the difference and made it easy for Morrisville.

We urge you to adopt their criteria and to move forward. Thank you.

REP. LEWIS: Russ Stephenson, Raleigh City Council. You're recognized. Russ Stephenson, not present? Alan Longman, Progressive Democratic Caucus of Harnett County?

MR. LONGMAN: Hello and good evening. The reason that I'm here -- well, my name is Alan Longman. I'm from the Progressive Democratic Caucus of Harnett County. The reason I am here is that many things today, a long day, which you brought up many, many points. Mainly racism is a concern; segregation is a concern. And non-representation of many groups is a concern everyone has had.

The reason is that if you really, really want the people to judge you at -- at your job. In companies where managers, our people, our boss judges us. And we expect to cater to them and be judged by them. When we are sitting here not representing everybody and we're not representing what's -- what's right and what -- what we believe in and what the people are representative. We are afraid of what the people are going to say about us. So we cut them out. We end their

representation. We become centered on one or two beliefs.

Gerrymandering has been a problem. It's not just a party problem. It's not a GOP problem. It's -- it has been a democratic problem. As far back as you go, you have gerrymandering. The problem isn't -- has to do with human nature and the fact that it's a conflict of interest for the legislature to be making the laws. Otherwise you'd have at least one year which you did not have it. There isn't.

So you have to remove the human element out of it. There are programs -- software programs, that are known and never used, that would remove the human element out of it. And therefore you would have very accountable -- you could use the same data, people could check it from all over academia. And you could sit there and say this was done right, properly, and could answer to the people in full representation according to the law. Right now you don't have that.

To go out there and build your own software and have certain limits and conditions put into it isn't -- isn't where it's at. Don't reinvent the wheel. The software is already there.

What I'm looking forward to is that everybody has problems with extremists in their -- in their politics and when you have gerrymandering, they dominate what the programs are for that -- for that party. And nobody likes doing or being forced to do what they don't believe in.

That leaves good people within each party unable to do their job, or the reason why they came there to be a politician in the first place was to better things. They're not able to do that with gerrymandering. We can end gerrymandering by sitting here and putting the software programs that are already in there instead of reinventing the wheel. And end this ridiculousness and be leaders in North Carolina, setting the pace for the nation.

It's not right, now that we're doing the software program, it's the future of what it's going to be for us from here on out. And that's what we should be looking for, not to keeping one party in, but to end this problem for good. Thank you.

REP. LEWIS: Dianna Wynn. After that, I have Paula Jennings and Bonnie Wright. Dianna Wynn, you are recognized for a time not to exceed three minutes.

MS. WYNN: Good evening. My name is Dianna Wynn and I'm an unaffiliated voter in Wake County. I spoke before you less than three weeks ago regarding recommended criteria for redistricting and today I'll be brief. I appreciate that this committee adopted some elements of the criteria I recommended. However, I ask you to recall the numerous members of the public who spoke passionately earlier this month.

I, along with the overwhelming majority of those speaking, called for politically neutral criteria. We want voting maps that do not consider incumbents' addresses or residents' voting histories and party affiliations. The majority of those speaking at this hearing today and earlier this month request politically neutral criteria. And polling shows that a majority of North Carolinians support a nonpartisan approach to redistricting.

We certainly did not ask for an incumbent protection plan. You asked for public input, and the voters spoke. But it's as if our politicians are wearing noise-cancelling headphones and willfully ignoring the voters. It is my sincere hope that our legislators will stop engaging in

redistricting designed to protect themselves and will truly listen to the voters. Thank you for the opportunity to again speak before you here today.

REP. LEWIS: Paula Jennings. You are recognized for a time not to exceed three minutes.

MS. JENNINGS: Hello. My name is Paula Jennings. I'm from Cary, North Carolina. I spoke at the last hearing advocating for transparency and for fair districts so that my vote and every vote counts in North Carolina. You did allow me to speak, but unfortunately, I don't think you really heard me. I'm a grandmother. I have grandchildren that come to my home, and we have rules at my home. One of them is you have to put your listening ears on, and, believe me, we've had a few time-outs when that did not happen.

I am saddened today that my vote and other votes do not count the same. I am saddened today that the patriots in my family, who taught me when I was knee-high to a grasshopper some rules, which I would like to reiterate today. One was to be honest. One was to have integrity. The other was to treat others as you would like to be treated. Have I always done those things? No. Have you? No.

But I was also taught that when I do wrong, when I make a mistake, that I own up to it. That I ask for forgiveness and ask to do it right, to give me another chance. I'm asking today that you acknowledge your mistake in this partisan, gerrymandering process and that you make it right. That is the right thing to do. Thank you.

SEN. HISE: Bonnie Wright? Seeing none, we'll move to Marshall Botonovic? Not there. Lee Brian? Lee Brian? Paula -- Bonnie Wright, Marshall Botonovic, Lee Brian. Okay. Suzanne Miller. You're recognized for a time not to exceed three minutes.

MS. MILLER: Hello. My name is Suzanne Miller, and thank you for taking the time to listen to my concerns. I came here today representing two separate things. First off, I am a resident of Apex, North Carolina, here in Wake County. And in looking at the way that the maps were drawn, it slices up Apex in four, five different directions. And the saddest part of it, taking the party politics out of it, is that there's nobody totally representing the needs of Apex, North Carolina, at this point, the way that the maps are drawn.

And that, of course, is a huge concern to

me as a resident of North Carolina, with a daughter in a public elementary school in Apex, North Carolina, to not feel as though there is somebody representing our city.

I also come to you as an educator. I am a teacher in Chapel Hill, and we actually did a unit not too long ago on the Voting Rights Act. And we looked at the Voting Acts Right then and now. And we actually studied gerrymandering and voter suppression quite a bit, but it was an argumentative unit where students got to see both sides. They had to address one side and also address the counterargument.

And the interesting thing was, overwhelmingly, my students -- and that's across all races, genders -- all of them advocated for fair maps. You know, they learned about Rosanell Eaton, they learned about Fenning Himner [phonetic], they learned about, you know, so much history about gerrymandering. And all of them consistently wrote arguments that promoted the idea of fair maps. And I ask that you consider that, when and if you decide to reexamine the maps.

And if it does not happen, I would like to hope that Wisconsin does something right and

gets us independent councils in every state in the United States. Thank you.

SEN. HISE: Lee Rafalow? Lee Rafalow? Okay. Sarah Brady Wagner? Sarah Brady Wagner? Okay. Becky Winders? You're recognized for a time not to exceed three minutes.

MS. WINDERS: Good evening. My name is Becky Winders, and I live in Durham Precinct 35.3, Parkwood Fire Station, House District 30 and Senate District 20. Both have declared by -- have been declared by the Court to be illegally drawn, and my precinct has been split up many ways. So I have been personally damaged by the unfair partisan redistricting in 2011.

Though I have been happy enough with the quality of my legislators and may -- may even have voted for some of them, if they had opposition, my vote had zero impact on the election because I had no choice about who to vote for. The 2011 process, which was dominated by the Republican majority, also benefitted my Democratic incumbent legislators while disenfranchising me and the other citizens.

And I have little hope that the -- that the maps that will be produced through this current redistricting process will be more fair because

they've been drawn by the same mapmaker under the leadership of the same committee chairs that the 2011 maps were -- that were done. They have drawn -- been drawn without consideration of whether African American voters have a fair chance to elect candidates of their choice as the Voting Rights Act requires.

They have been drawn to protect incumbents and for partisan advantage. And legislative leaders have stalled until the last minute, failing to allow enough time for the public to have informed input on the maps and data for the Committee to incorporate -- maps and data -- or -- or for the Committee to incorporate public comments into the final maps. With respect to the Committee, I believe that our best chance for this redistricting to be fair is for the Court to reject these maps and have maps drawn by an independent individual or group.

Now, I call on -- on the Committee and the General Assembly to do better in a redistricting that will take place after the 2020 census. The people of North Carolina are tired of gerrymandering. It is not fair for politicians to draw their own districts. We need an independent

commission to do it in a transparent participatory process. If that requires a constitutional amendment, please put it on the 2018 ballot. And thank you for the opportunity to speak.

SEN. HISE: W. David Austin. You're recognized for a time not to exceed three minutes.

MR. AUSTIN: Hi. My name is Dave Austin. I'm a Durham resident. A lot of my attention over the past legislative session was focused in other places, specifically farm worker health and safety. But I thought I remembered, in looking at or trying to remember headlines, that there seemed to be a lot of promise in this particular issue of how we could vote more fairly. Because it seemed like -- I thought I remembered -- that nonpartisan district creation had a lot of benefits that were described in the press and even a lot of support.

So I had hopes that this legislative redistricting commission would acknowledge those benefits. And it seemed like it might do that. But the analysis in The News and Observer this morning sort of dashed those hopes, documenting so many non-competitive races, both in the House and in the Senate. So I thought to myself well, maybe I was just misremembering and those headlines were

somehow in my imagination. So I went back and tried to find out where I'd gotten that impression.

Who supports nonpartisan voting districts in North Carolina? Well, there was a poll that says 59 percent of North Carolina voters do so, with just 15 percent opposed. Who supports nonpartisan voting districts? A nonpartisan panel of 10 retired North Carolina judges and justices, including two former Supreme Court justices. Who supports nonpartisan voting districts? Two of North Carolina's most prominent Republicans: former Governor Jim Martin and Charlotte's former mayor, Richard Vinroot. Who supports nonpartisan voting districts? 240 civic leaders across North Carolina, who had signed a petition calling on the legislature. A dozen towns and cities across the state. More than 100 North Carolina business leaders. A bipartisan group of North Carolina legislators through their House Bill 200. 68 percent of North Carolina independent voters in 13 states.

If I was a legislator, I would have said maybe this is not a bad position. We can wait and be number 49 or 50 of those states that implement this idea whose time has come or we can, once

again, be leaders in the South. The opportunity is still there and I hope you'll take it.

SEN. HISE: Linda Gunnels? Linda Gunnels? Lavaria Blum? Lavaria Blum? Okay. David Meeker, or a small business owner? David Meeker? Anne Robotti -- R-O-B-O-T-T-I? Recognized for a time not to exceed three minutes.

MS. ROBOTTI: Hi, everybody. My name is Anne Robotti. I am a North Carolina resident for the past four years. My husband did his -- served his country at Camp Lejeune here. And I have two children attending North Carolina's fine universities and two other children attending its fine public schools. Having said that, I have five children and a full-time job and a part-time job, and the machinations that I had to go through to get here at 4 o'clock on a Wednesday afternoon and stay until 8 o'clock would defy description.

I feel that truly open public comment -- do you need me to pause while you read whatever you're reading?

REP. LEWIS: No, ma'am. I was trying to take notes on what you were saying. You're more than welcome --

MS. ROBOTTI: Okay.

REP. LEWIS: -- to continue. I would point out that sign-up was open 'til 6:30.

MS. ROBOTTI: Thank you. I feel that truly open public comment should take place over the course of several days, different time periods. I feel there should be at least one weekend day. And I feel that there should be time during the day, also during the week and nights -- evenings.

So why am I here? I'm here to say that if you need to gerrymander your district to get reelected, then you have lost the hearts and the minds of your constituents. And I'm here because I'm just not jaded enough to think that that doesn't matter. I think that it should matter and I think that to some of you that it does matter. And I want to encourage you to keep fighting for the fair districts that people of North Carolina deserve.

A lot of you that are still here I recognize as Democrats. And I also want to say to you that as a life-long Democrat, I am so tired. And I had actually never heard the word gerrymandering until I moved to North Carolina. But do not make me come back here in 2020 and remind you all that I will not tolerate this from

anyone. Thank you very much. Have a nice evening.

SEN. HISE: Thank you. Amy Cox, FLIP NC. You have three minutes.

MS. COX: Amy Cox from Durham. And less than 36 hours ago, the data for these maps were finally released; the maps themselves, just two days earlier. The goal was clear, for the people of North Carolina to have as little time as possible to understand what you've done before our only opportunity for public comment. But what you've done is clear. You shamelessly used the court order requiring you to redraw the illegally, racially-gerrymandered districts to shore up Republican-held districts and further limit competition.

Of the 16 most competitive Republican-held House districts, 11 have been slanted more heavily for Republicans while only two were drawn more favorably for Democrats based on 2016 Presidential election results. This is a flagrant attempt to benefit from the order to redraw illegal, racially-biased maps and a blatant disregard for the spirit of the order and the people of North Carolina.

Many of the redrawn districts lie well

beyond the areas affected by racially-gerrymandered districts. These maps used the most recent election results and data on demographic changes to try to preserve as many Republican-held districts as possible.

The proposed House map moves districts lines as far away as Alleghany County and Burke County near Boone, over 100 miles from the nearest racially-gerrymandered district ordered to be redrawn near Guilford County. The lack of respect for democracy and the will of the people of North Carolina is appalling. You've shown what happens to democracy in this state with these maps in your hands. It's time for the court to take them out of your hands and order independent redistricting. Thank you.

SEN. HISE: Julian Pridgen; P-R-I-D-G-E-N. You have a time period not to exceed three minutes.

MR. PRIDGEN: Good evening. My name is Reverend Julian Pridgen, and I am a plaintiff in Covington versus North Carolina, the federal lawsuit in which a three judge court invalidated 28 state House and Senate districts as unconstitutional racial gerrymanders. First, your

delay in release of the data supporting your proposed maps has undermined our ability to prepare meaningful input for this public hearing. It is clear to us that you continue to not take this remedial process seriously and that you have no intention of enacting fair and legal maps.

Second, we do not believe these maps remedy the racial gerrymandering the court found. For example, in Cumberland County, the proposed Senate districts do the same things as those in the 2011 plans. Black voters are packed into Senate District 21 by use of a non-compact district arm that reaches into Cumberland County. Similarly, State District 28 and House District 57, both in Guilford County, are greater than 50 percent black in voting age population and failed to remedy the racial gerrymanders the federal court hailed were unconstitutional. There are other examples.

Thirdly, what we have identified in the little time available for us to analyze your maps is that your configurations of House Districts in Wake and Mecklenburg County violate the state constitutional prohibition on mid-decade redistricting. House Districts 36, 37, 40 and 41 in Wake County were not declared unconstitutional

and do not touch a district that was ruled unconstitutional. The same is true for House District 105 in Mecklenburg County. As such, Article 2, Sections 3 and 5, do not allow you to redraw those districts until after the next decennial census.

We have drawn various -- I'm sorry, variations, rather -- or versions, rather -- of the House districts in Wake and Mecklenburg County that correct the unconstitutional racial gerrymanders identified by the court: House 33, 38 -- House Districts 33, 38, 99, 102 and 107 -- and do not change districts that have been or are unaffected by these constitutional flaws. Thus, our Wake and Mecklenburg County configurations comply with both the state and federal Constitution. I have brought paper copies of both county maps and our attorneys will be happy to supply you with any additional data on these maps you -- if you would like it.

We urge you to take seriously the need to draw redistricting maps that will comply with state and federal constitutions and will be fair to voters of North Carolina. Thank you for your time.

SEN. HISE: Gerald Givens, Jr., the Raleigh-Apex NAACP. You have a -- you have a time

period not to exceed three minutes.

MR. GIVENS: In 2003, I served in the 332nd -- [inaudible]?

FEMALE SPEAKER: What is your name?

MR. GIVENS: My name? Gerald Givens, Jr., first vice-president, Raleigh-Apex NAACP. In 2003, I served in the 332nd Air Expeditionary Wing, Tallil Air Base, Iraq, providing combat support to approximately 26,000 coalition service members and civilians. The 332nd is a direct descendant of an organization of the World War II 332nd Fighter Group, known as the Tuskegee Airmen, a group of African-American military heroes who served with honor and distinction in a racially-segregated unit, even though most of them couldn't vote in their own country.

In 2005, when Iraqis held up their index finger marked with purple indelible ink and a security bar to prevent double voting, I knew that every Tuskegee Airman's life was not in vain because black men, like myself, helped to make that possible. I'm Gerald Givens, Jr., the first vice-president of the Raleigh-Apex NAACP, a 20-year United States Air Force honorably retired veteran.

Since 1790 until today, the North

Carolina legislature has viewed a free black man as a problem. I chose the year 1790 because before that time, it's extremely difficult to get any records about free black people. However, starting that year, it's clear that North Carolina viewed a free black man as a dilemma, according to the law. Today, it's safe to say that the more things change, the more things stay the same.

Here it is, 230 years later and this body continues to legislate with the view that the free black man is a problem. Racial gerrymandering, voter suppression, voter ID laws being followed out with racial, surgical precision. The oath taken by legislators in this state is not for white supremacy. However, it is for the good of the whole as written in our state Constitution.

Draw the map of North Carolina House and Senate districts that honor the North Carolina soldiers, sailors, marines and airmen who died for the free elections at home and abroad. Draw the map of the North Carolina House and Senate districts that give the free black man his voice. And quit trying to regulate through the law how blacks and whites relate in our state according to an acceptable and unacceptable racist beliefs.

The white supremacy in our state breaks my heart. But no matter how many times that this body uses the law to give white men an unfair advantage, free black men like my grandfather, who fought in World War II, grandfather who fought in the Korean War, father who fought in the Vietnam War, we will fight back at the ballot box, we will fight at the court right along with the NAACP and our coalition partners. Forward together and not one step back.

SEN. HISE: Jerry Coleman. Jerry Coleman; then I have Brenda Brough for Erin Trager that's for -- coming in. And James Holcomb. Any of those three present? Robert Aldrich. Okay. You are --

MS. BROUGH: Breana Brough.

REP. LEWIS: Breana Brough for Erin Trager?

MS. BROUGH: She signed up for me earlier. Is that okay?

REP. LEWIS: Okay. That's --

MS. BROUGH: Okay. Couldn't get here 'til I got off work. My name is Breana Brough. I'm a lifelong North Carolina resident, and I live in Durham. I appreciate you all taking the time to

listen to these comments today and I hope you will really listen and truly consider what your constituents are telling you.

The current legislature was elected under unconstitutional racially-gerrymandered legislative maps. This body's refusal to draw fair maps despite being court ordered to do so now represents a breach of trust and a blatant and cynical attempt to hold onto power acquired through illegal means. While these new proposed maps may not utilize the same surgical precision to disenfranchise African-American voters as the old maps, it is also plain that these new maps do not cure all the constitutional problems identified in the 2011 plans. There are still districts where it appears that race predominated in the construction of the district without any justification; Senate Districts 21 and 28 and House District 57, for example.

I have read the argument that these maps are excusable because in the past, Democrats have been guilty of gerrymandering districts in their favor. I find this argument to be petty and frankly, ridiculous. Our government doesn't have to work this way. We can do better. You can do

better. If you care about the best interests of the people of North Carolina, you will do the right thing and allow an independent commission to draw fair, nonpartisan maps so that all North Carolinians can be confident that their voice matters and their interests are represented in the NCGA. Thank you for your time.

SEN. HISE: Thank you. Robert Aldrich? Then I have Karen Daniels and Erik Raudsep; R-A-U-D-S-E-P. Any of those three individuals present? Robert Aldrich?

MR. RAUDSEP: Erik Raudsep.

REP. LEWIS: Erik Raudsep. Okay. You're recognized for a time not to exceed three minutes.

MR. RAUDSEP: My name is Erik Raudsep, and I am from Durham County; District 31, one of the districts to be found unfair. I'm also a member of the Libertarian Party. Seeing the monitors, we have great attendance around the state and I also applaud all involved citizens throughout the state of North Carolina. And over the many years that I have been working with the Libertarian Party, I've gotten to know several of the esteemed individuals who sit before me. And it's good to see you again.

Seeing this process being played out through a local, state and even unfortunately, once again, the national level, this process is not a cheap one. Wisconsin, it cost in excess of 2 million; in Arizona, in excess of 3.6. And with all of the legal battles that are ensued here in North Carolina regarding this redistricting, I am sure far more. There is no reason that North Carolina would be any different when this process is done. The Republicans are at fault in this round, but both political parties must be held accountable for this dilemma.

This should be a call to action to create real solutions to ensure this never happens again. We must draft and enact fair plans for this and future redistricting by a non-biased -- a nonpartisan process so the evils of gerrymandering districts can never happen again.

In conclusion, you must remember when the term gerrymandering was coined in 1812 by the newspapers of Massachusetts, it was made as a word of warning and unfairness; not a goal to aspire to. Just because it is legal does not make it right. I implore that this esteemed body bring back common sense and fairness to the state of North Carolina.

Thank you.

SEN. HISE: Lekha Shupeck? You're recognized for a time not to exceed three minutes.

MS. SHUPECK: My name is Lekha Shupeck. I live in Chapel Hill, but I grew up in Moore County. I have looked over these maps. I have read about them in many different publications and on many different mediums. I have downloaded the PDFs full of statistics that were released just yesterday. And what I have to say to Republicans on the redistricting committee is this. The people of North Carolina are not stupid. You need to try harder.

In the first place, I'm thinking about this ruse that Republicans have carried on, that they've been scrambling to draw these maps over the last two weeks. That is why the public couldn't see the maps until a couple of days ago; why the statistical analyses weren't released until yesterday, barely 24 hours before this hearing. And yet right there on the map posted online that you can look up -- moved from District 34 to District 31 is Senator Andrew Brock, who resigned in June. And I am told that the maps also do not reflect changes made to precincts in Wake County

way back in April.

So what I would like to know is, what dusty drawer in Mr. Hofeller's office have these maps been sitting in for the past six, eight, 10 or 12 months? Like I said, we are not stupid. Try harder.

Furthermore, we all know that North Carolina is a purple state. Every time there is a statewide election, the vote is split roughly 50-50 between Democrats and Republicans. And yet these maps have been designed so that Republicans retain not just a majority, but a supermajority in the legislature. This is after you received an avalanche of public comments stating that North Carolina voters want fair, impartial districts that represent voters, not parties.

Instead of listening to these public comments, which the court ordered you to do, Republicans in the legislature have decided to protect their oligarchy and continue to disenfranchise North Carolina citizens who want to have an equal voice in their government. And we know that you are playing these disgraceful political games with our votes rather than creating an equitable democracy.

We know that you are more interested in making North Carolina a billionaire's paradise where the rich no longer contribute to society and the poor go without health care and basic services while our homes are sprayed with garbage juice and their water is polluted by coal ash.

We know this because we are not stupid. And so I'm telling you on behalf of my fellow citizens, you need to try harder. Also, if you want targeted criticism, your polls v. popular scores suck.

REP. HISE: Madison Roberts. Madison Roberts, you are recognized for a time not to exceed three minutes.

MS. ROBERTS: Hi. My name is Madison Roberts, and I live in Raleigh. One of the things that most concerns me about the new maps is the lack of transparency and assurance of good faith. Very little has been done to reassure me that I can trust the intent and process of maps directed by a legislature that already utilized illegal, racially-motivated districts in the first place. My trust in your ability to do this was further eroded when you hired Thomas Hofeller, the same consultant who directed the current illegal maps,

to lead this project. How can I believe that this isn't going to be a repeat of the 2011 maps when you yourselves are on the record stating that the previous election data will be used to draw the maps with political considerations in mind?

Where is the statistical justification of how this will improve fairness? With maps drawn without transparency, let alone fairness, how can I trust that I and others will be fairly represented? Illegal, racially and politically-gerrymandered maps remove our ability to hold you, our elected officials, accountable for the direction of our state.

I call for more transparency and evaluation of the statistical rationale used to draw any proposed maps to ensure that they have been created fairly and without extreme racial and political bias. I don't believe you have executed the current redistricting project in good faith and you have not earned my confidence. Thank you.

SEN. HISE: Carol Rist with Common Cause and Democracy NC.

MS. RIST: I'm sure I can walk. Okay. My name is Carol Rist. I'm a resident of Durham County. I'm not a native of North Carolina, but I

am the descendant of North Carolinians who took up arms to fight for government which was fair to all the residents. My fourth great-grandfather, William Hinson and his father, Charles Hinson, were regulators. They fought the colonial government. Not to change the form of their government, but simply to make the colony's political process more equal. They wanted better economic conditions for everyone instead of a system that benefitted colonial officials.

I stand with my ancestors, demanding that the state's political process be more equal. We have lived under unconstitutional districting for all too long. The General Assembly has spent $4.8 million of taxpayer money to defend their maps in court. My ancestors would have understood my anger and stood by me in asking why have you spent $4.8 million of North Carolina taxpayer's money defending unconstitutional maps?

It is well past time to produce maps for North Carolina following the practices used in those states whose districts have been declared legal. Since you waited so long to release your maps, I haven't been able to learn whether or not they follow those practices. If the maps which you

have produced don't follow the practices of the states whose districts have been declared legal, then throw the maps out and start all over again. I demand what my regulator ancestors demanded; to make the state's political process more equal. Thank you.

SEN. HISE: Dean Morgan with You Can Vote? And then I would have Isabel Geffner. Dean Morgan is not present? Okay.

MS. GEFFNER: Thank you very much. My name is Isabel Geffner. And I am a resident and taxpayer here in North Carolina. I have been just enormously humbled by the wisdom and passion of my fellow state residents and citizens, both here in Raleigh and in the various areas that we were able to see earlier. And the thing that really resonates with me most is that what we are -- what I am experiencing and I think what I am sharing with others is that there has been an erosion of trust among the citizens of this state. And -- and the very fiber and fabric of community and society is based on trust.

And there are people who have been way more articulate than I can be about the statistics and facts that have led us to this moment. What I

feel most resonant about and -- and what I feel that I need to express most is that what we need to do in our state is to rebuild the trust between the people and our government. And it is exceedingly difficult to do that when the person who is hired to redraw those maps is someone who has drawn maps that have been found to be illegal and unconstitutional.

When the very people who have hired that organization come from districts which have been determined to be illegal and unconstitutional, how can we, the citizens and voters and taxpayers of this state, trust that you are representing us in a way that is fair, honest and that holds integrity? I would like to cede the remaining 50 seconds of my time to the committee and to ask you to tell us how are you going to use this loud cry of public response in the days that follow before the vote. Thank you.

SEN. HISE: Charles Upchurch with the Wendell/Wake NAACP. You are recognized for a time not to exceed three minutes.

MR. UPCHURCH: Good evening. My name is Charles Upchurch. I'm with the Wendell/Wake County NAACP. I represent east of Raleigh, Knightdale,

Wendell, Zebulon, Rolesville, Wake Forest. Now, I heard someone say a while ago that gerrymandering is equal to white supremacy. If it's not completely true, then it's leaning in that direction. I want the same things all of you want. The very same things. I've got children. I've got 18 grandchildren. I want them all to get what they are supposed to have.

And we talk about voting. We talk about voting in our family. And I hear it all the time; my vote ain't going to count. And I called them a lie 'cause that's one thing I believe, is you've got to do what you've got to do. Now, voting gets you some of these things that I say I want for my children. I want them to get a good education. I want them to have a decent life. Most of that comes from being able to vote. And if they can't get to the ballot box and do what they need to do, then they don't have a voice to do that.

The courts say that the maps are illegal. Then you go and get somebody to draw them. And then you turn around and use my money again to pay them again to do the same thing. Would you do that if somebody come and -- to work on your roof in your house and -- and you weren't satisfied? Would

you call them back to -- to redo the job? You would say no. You were going to get you somebody. And I implore you to get an independent council. Thank you.

SEN. HISE: Rick Wynn with Common Cause.

MALE SPEAKER: No. That's not mine.

SEN. HISE: Rick Wynn with Common Cause. Andrea Cash with Indivisible and FLIP NC. Andrea Cash. Phyllis Demko, Common Cause. I don't think that's Phyllis. Phyllis Demko, Common Cause. Sara Ferguson. You're recognized for a time not to exceed three minutes.

MS. FERGUSON: Thank you. Good evening. My name is Sara Ferguson. I'm here as an independent citizen of North Carolina. It saddens me that North Carolina has become a nationally recognized example of blatant gerrymandering. This new redistricting map was created by the same people with the same self-serving ideals as the map that the Supreme Court ruled illegal.

The purpose of this new map is to protect incumbent legislatures. It does not serve the voters and the voters do not support this. This process has to change. Our voting districts should be drawn by a nonpartisan commission with citizen

oversight. Incumbency protection and previous election results should not be considered in the drawing of district boundaries.

You'll need to earn your re-elections. It's not right to hold a free ticket. My message to the committee and legislature today is this. Give up your redistricting power and start respecting the voters. Thank you.

SEN. HISE Amanda Howell.

MS. HOWELL: My name is Amanda Howell. I grew up in rural North Carolina in northern Gaston County. I went to college in Boone and taught there, and I came to Wake County to ironically teach Civics and Economics at Garner Senior High.

I'm here because partisan redistricting is hurting our state. It has gone on for too long and is costing taxpayer dollars to continue to litigate, defend and redraw maps. I know that this has happened on both sides. However, I also know that pointing a finger and saying he started it is not a good excuse for children. And it is certainly not a good excuse for adults who are representing our state.

This is money that is wasted. It could be used for schools, senior citizens,

transportation and other things that our state desperately needs. Non-partisan redistricting is supported on both sides. We have bills that have been proposed by both sides. It is time for our state to listen to the people and move to nonpartisan redistricting. Nonpartisan district commissions have worked better in other states to support voters and operate with more public support and acceptance. It allows everyone to feel confident in the integrity and the results of our elections.

Failure to do so with so much public support on both sides represents partisanship and an unwillingness to truly represent the people of our state. You have bipartisan bills that have already been presented. You have the ability to follow through with these bills. The question is, do you have the will? Thank you.

SEN. HISE: Alison Mahaley. You're recognized for a time not to exceed three minutes.

MS. MAHALEY: Thank you. My name is Allison Mahaley, and I'm the local president of a chapter of the Americans United for the Separation of Church and State. I'm here today to call out the ruling party for perpetrating fraud and deceit

on the good people of North Carolina.

I want to remind you that just because you can do something doesn't mean that you should. I am fearful of what you have done to our democracy. The entire electoral process has been exposed as racist and you, the North Carolina General Assembly, hold your offices illegally. I have seen you use your ill-begotten power to try and ruin our public schools. And that is what drove me out of the classroom and into activism.

You used your power to siphon money from public schools and send it to religious schools that are not accountable. These schools indoctrinate children to a fear of hell, to bigotry against gay people and who knows what else because these schools are exempt from oversight. You did this because you had the power to do it, not because the people of North Carolina wanted you to.

The overwhelming majority of North Carolinians do not support vouchers. And yet, you got re-elected because of the way your districts are drawn. The Supreme Court ruled these districts are unconstitutional. Politicians choosing their voters instead of voters choosing their politicians have made checking your power impossible. And yet

you keep bringing legislation to limit voting rights and delete the power of African-Americans.

All of this is enough to cause so many to lose faith in our democracy. Some have already sought alternative means of justice, but those of us who have seen this obscenity before have a better plan. And let me tell you, we are getting organized. We are organizing to take our power back. We are in the streets. We are going door-to-door. We are talking to Democrats, Republicans and Independents, and all of them want fair maps. All of them want a nonpartisan commission to redraw the maps and give the power back to the people. Thank you.

SEN. HISE: Dennis Burns -- Burns with Common Cause? You're recognized for a time not to exceed three minutes.

MR. BURNS: Good evening. Dennis Burns, board chair of Common Cause. I'm speaking on behalf of our 10,000 members and allies around the state. And there have been so many great comments, I think what I will do is just spend a few minutes with a little bit of history.

For 20 years -- 20 years, we have objected to the closed door partisan process in

which Democratic and Republican politicians pick their own voters to guarantee in gerrymandered districts the incumbency. In 2011, with the new GOP majority, most of whom were allies of ours, the House overwhelmingly passed our bipartisan, nonpartisan process. What happened? There it goes. And a fair districts bill so we hoped for improvement, but the Senate ignored it. In -- when reform bills, again, introduced by bipartisan supporters, were introduced in 2013 and then in 2015, we again saw no progress.

So in 2016, we had to go to the federal courts in Common Cause versus Rucho to get a hearing to start talking about the damage that this process in these noncompetitive districts are doing to our democracy in the state. And thank you for the historian telling us about Europe in the 1920s and '30s. So now, even orders from the federal judiciary and the Supreme Court cannot seem to change things in a growing and changing North Carolina.

Please, give our citizens a nonpartisan process like in House Bill 200, with 45 sponsors, didn't even get a hearing this year. Please, our fair map bill. Our 10,000 members and the hundreds

who came out today are going to keep trying because three out of four North Carolina voters want us to get rid of this outdated, partisan redistricting process and move into the 21st century. Thank you very much.

SEN. HISE: Bob Hall, Democracy NC?

MR. HALL: Good evening. I am Bob Hall, Executive Director of Democracy North Carolina. And you've heard a lot of criticism about this public hearing process, how disrespectful it is to the public. You also didn't give us the public maps. The maps that were for the public to -- to see. And you didn't give us the data until very late. Also very disrespectful. And you didn't give us the registration of the voters in these districts or the race of the voters. You said you were not going to look at the race of the voters in drawing the maps, as though that would protect you from being accused of drawing racially-biased districts. But it's clear that the practice has continued.

You've heard illustrations here -- named districts, House District 57, Senate Districts 21 and 28, where you're packing more African-Americans into the districts. Because of your fetish for

protecting elephants, you voted to use partisan election outcomes. That was your priority; partisan election outcomes to protect incumbents, to draw the new maps to protect the incumbents. And so many of these districts are rigged to make them less competitive than they are now.

In a few cases, your eagerness is even pushing beyond the state constitution and you've heard that, in drawing districts that are not ordered, you don't need to redraw these districts, that you're violating the state constitution ban against causing redistricting in the middle of the decade. The bottom line is, the new maps are partisan gerrymandering in the extreme and here's two ways to see this.

First, over 90 percent of the new districts are not competitive based on the data that you furnished us here a day or so ago. You look at the five statewide elections where candidates won by two percentage points. These are very competitive elections; Tillis versus Hagan, Cooper versus McCrory. Five competitive districts with less than two percent differences, but in most all of the districts -- the legislative districts you've drawn, the gap between those candidates is

more than 10 percent. In fact, there's only 15 out of the 170 House and Senate districts where candidates win by less than 10 percentage points in at least four of those five elections. That is to say in a 155 of the 170 districts, 90 percent -- that's 90 percent of the districts, you and I know who the winner is going to be.

The second way to look at this is in a partisan gerrymandering -- through the partisan gerrymandering tool called the efficiency gap that measures partisan gerrymandering. The plan that has an efficiency gap of over seven percent is highly partisan. The Campaign Legal Center in the last 24 hours has examined the Senate and the House plans. And they find, looking at those plans, that the efficiency gap is over 11 percent, illustrating extreme partisan gerrymandering. Please take a look at that and draw new lines. Thank you.

SEN. HISE: Thank you. Marcia Everett? Recognized for a time not to exceed three minutes.

MS. EVERETT: Hi. My name is Marcia Everett. I'm from Harnett County. I really came to talk to all of y'all. The most important thing in our country is our self-governance, our -- our ability to vote. It gives us our liberty and

without it, we'd be fighting in the streets. Our forefathers wrote a pretty good law and it's no shame to make some adjustments. They made some and fortunately, we can too.

Even though we disagree on many things, I know we all agree on playing fairly. So what do you do when you get a new game and you open it up? The first thing you do is you take out the rules to figure out who's going -- how the game is played. And those rules apply to everybody playing the game. It applies to the black people, to the white people, to the men, to the women and most importantly, it should apply to the rich and poor.

Voting has a lot of problems, but our forefathers wrote a great law in that they let that law be a living document. Now there are many groups working on ways to fix voting and I think you all should avail yourselves to their ideas. You should study them. Imagine living with them. The idea that I like for gerrymandering is called choice of representation. And you can look that up and you'll probably find direct representation.

You can also go to the Facebook page and you'll find that choice of representation was written by Jim Mueller, but he pronounces it --

it's spelled like Mueller, M-U-E-L-L-E-R. And he ran for office in Wisconsin and when he didn't win, he wondered why all the people who voted for him would not get him as a representative? He thinks that should be a right; that you should have the right to be represented by the person that you choose.

So how it works, or how it would work with only two parties, is that after an election on -- you would count the votes. And say somebody got 400,000 and the other one got 400,100. Usually, the 100 would win, but he says that they both should go and then when the bills come through their office, they would put 400,000 towards the vote and 400,100 against the vote -- 400,100. Anyway, you get what I'm saying. You use the votes to put towards the bills for and against. All right? This would eliminate districts entirely.

Now, I guess my thing is more than three minutes, so basically what I'm saying is, there's lots of things we can do to fix all kinds of problems with voting. You guys need to not take bills based on who's in the majority. The bills need to be addressed in order. These bills have our lives on them. We don't have two years to wait

for another election and another election before you work on these -- these issues. Thank you.

REP. LEWIS: Mary Lucas? Victoria Shick? Victoria Shick? Nan Friedman? Nan Friedman? Taylor Cook? Ma'am, you are?

MR. COOK: Hi there. I am Taylor Cook. I am from Durham, North Carolina. Thank you for the time and the opportunity to speak this evening. And most importantly, thank you everyone for coming out. Let's give yourselves a round of applause and maybe some spirit fingers like we've been doing tonight.

I wasn't surprised at all, really, to -- in the new maps that were recently drawn in response to a request by the courts. I expected them to be unfair and not representative of our population since the author of them is the same author who drew illegal and unfair maps in 2011. Would you be surprised by a thief who steals or a liar who lies? Of course not. The main problem sits with those who choose to put the thief in charge of protecting the bank.

My disappointment lies with those who gave the responsibility of drawing a fair map to those who have proven incapable of doing so. North

Carolina Republicans are not interested in fair maps. They're not interested in a representative democracy. They are surely interested in taking and retaining power. Their interests are not shared by their constituents. As our nation's courts have repeatedly confirmed, North Carolina Republicans consistently draw unfair and illegal maps. For some reason they continue to be involved in the process of redrawing the maps, despite the fact that they can't stop breaking the law when they do it. Why would we ask them to do something they don't have the capacity to do and clearly aren't interested in doing?

We are a so-called purple state. In the past 10 years, we voted for senators, governors and presidents from each major party. Yet Republicans currently hold supermajorities in both houses of our General Assembly. The only explanation is illegal and unfair maps drawn by our current crop of Republicans. What's more, since the maps are illegal, it's fair to say that many of our state representatives should not even in office, much less have any say in how the maps are drawn. But here we are, letting the thieves choose how the bank is guarded yet again. Why do we continue to

let the fox guard the henhouse?

Our state will not progress and solve problems if we don't have fairly selected representatives working on our behalf. Unfair maps have a long history not only in our state, but also in our country. While the origins elsewhere may differ, one common theme persists when looking at the history of illegal maps in North Carolina -- race. These very lawmakers have already been found guilty of identifying every voting [inaudible] and then motivated high voter turnout among black voters and then eliminated them, targeting black people with almost surgical precision. They're clearly in the business of suppressing minority votes. The intent and motivator is clear -- racism. Racist mapmaking has no place in North Carolina.

There are several different constructive solutions for more fair maps. And I'm not going to go into the details of all the options now. They're well-documented and I'm sure you know where to find them if you can go look. But rest assured, none of them involve asking the illegally-selected party in power put a partisan mapmaker who previously drew illegal maps. Thank you very much.

SEN. HISE: Ladies and gentlemen, we have -- of speakers who are left to -- signed up to speak, we have 47 individuals who are left signed up to speak. It is obvious to the chairman that that exceeds the number of people in the room who are listening at this point. So at the advice of the other chairs, if members just -- if you have previously signed up to speak and you would just like to line up to speak, we'll be able to move this a little more quickly than 47 individuals called through the ranks of the system.

But it will be exceptionally important that you begin by stating your name and the organization you represent. And if you've already spoken, you have already spoken to the committee.

MR. OJUTIKU: Good evening.

SEN. HISE: Good evening.

MR. OJUTIKU: Question. My name is Adeniya Ojutiku. I represent the interests of over 3,000 registered black Republicans in North -- Wake County and also members of the African-American Faith-Based Organization of the -- of the Carolinas. Lived in Raleigh for the past nearly eight years. I'm a US citizen, a legal immigrant -- not illegal, legal immigrant and my

world view of self is not -- is -- is racially neutral. Okay? So I empathize with so many here that may not be so privileged.

I would like to submit that your redistricted map plan, whether led by Republicans or Democrats, had been able to adequately fix the issues confronting blacks and minority issues. Only fair and equitable legislation as well as some policies that carry everybody along can. Possible gerrymandering by either party may have in the past been a strategy to manipulate and the enforcement of inclusion or exclusion of minority groups as accused and should not be a guiding principle for any legislative redistricting map. This is because it employs and exploits our crudest instincts of racial prejudices.

If as an effort in good faith, then we support the redistricting plan put forth by the criteria that is given to the General Assembly because they confirm with the stipulated guidelines and criteria given to the joint redistricting committee. The new districts herein outlined are also more compact than current ones through the maps, splitting only few precincts. We are pleased that the General Assembly has drawn these maps

without recourse to racial data, biases or prejudices.

However, in conclusion, we demand that each political party recognizes the need for racial inclusion, eliminating candidates for all elections so that everyone shall [inaudible] a keen sense of belonging and an enduring need for sincere contributions to making our state a great one. Thank you.

DR. SPEARMAN: Good evening. I am T. Anthony Spearman, the third vice president, here to further push the official position of the North Carolina NAACP and the Reverend Dr. William J. Barber onto the record.

Maps should have considered race and should reflect fair districts. We will stand up for our shared democratic principles of fairness. The Grand Old Party caucus admits that they considered, one, past election outcomes, and two, the ability of the Republican Party to win in these districts and that they are drawing these maps for partisan advantage.

House Districts 10, 36 and Senate District 41, for example, combine different communities and fractured communities of interest

and appear to serve only the purpose of creating a Republican advantage in those districts. Substituting party for race for the purpose of achieving that same racially discriminatory election outcome and limiting the voting power of people of color is a cynical strategy that undermines our democracy and fails to remedy the illegal maps.

These maps are not the answer. We do not trust these maps, which were drawn by the same hired helper who drew the 2011 racially-gerrymandered maps and which were commissioned by an illegal legislature that has failed at every turn to act with integrity. Instead, an independent special master should be tasked with drawing new maps to ensure that it is the law that is followed and not the directives of an illegal legislature that the federal courts have already found guilty of intentionally acting to suppress the votes of African-Americans and that numerous federal and state courts have been found guilty of passing legislation that flouts the federal and state constitutions and the will of the people.

These games must stop. At least one federal court has enjoined an unconstitutionally

constituted legislature from taking any further actions until the redistricting process could be completed. See Butterworth versus Dempsey, the Federal District Court decision from Connecticut. And in addition, Costner and Dalton ought to be considered because citizens have a right to vote as soon as possible for their representative under constitutional apportionment plans. Federal courts have also shortened the terms of those legislators who had been elected under illegal maps.

If there's ever been a time that the preamble of the United States Constitution ought to be considered and to prevail, that time is right now. "We the People of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty," that time is now. These maps are not the answer.

SEN. HISE: Thank you. Please state your name for the record, and you're recognized for a time not to exceed three minutes.

MS. SMALLEY-MCMAHAN: Good evening. I'm Barbara Smalley-McMahan. I'm here tonight in the -- in my capacity as the Political Action Chair

with Raleigh-Apex NAACP. And I want to give a shoutout to the North Carolina NAACP and Bob Hall and Democracy North Carolina for the hard work they've done to point out the flaws in the redistricting plan that -- that you are presenting.

As I make my own comments tonight on behalf of our branch, I want to acknowledge that the racialized maps you drew in 2011 were sadly a major, if unintended, victory for many in our state who make up hate groups. My understanding is that the Nazis, the KKK and white supremacists who recently went to Charlottesville didn't go there because of the statue. They chose Charlottesville as their location specifically because that city is known for taking a strong stance on dismantling systemic racism. I'd love to tell you some of the things they've implemented. We could use a little bit of that around here.

In response to our President's defense of these hate groups, people on all sides of the political aisle are coming together to say we will no longer tolerate those who want to dominate and continue to promote racialized systems -- that includes our voting system. If you doubt that we're coming together, I want to share a news

report with you that I heard yesterday as my husband and I drove to Greenville, South Carolina, to see the eclipse.

According to that news report, the alumni from the conservative Liberty University was mailing in their -- y'all know what I want to say -- they're mailing in their diplomas because they do not agree with Jerry Falwell coming out and -- and not denouncing the racism in our President. And they are starting a strong moral movement for others to follow suit. The antidote to racism is democracy -- of, by and for the people. Where everyone has equal access to the polls to cast their vote in favor of their interest, and that includes their interest in healthcare, public schools, livable wages --

SEN. HISE: Thank you.

MS. SMALLEY-MCMAHAN: -- and reform of the criminal justice system. Thank you.

SEN. HISE: Next speaker is recognized. Please state your name and you're recognized not to exceed three minutes.

MR. SFEIR: My name is Mark Sfeir. I'm from Durham. One moment, please. As we know, gerrymandering across America has inevitably led to

unresponsive governments as politicians representing both major parties have embraced districts where they face no serious electoral challenges, wanting incentives for legislators to meet their constituent's needs.

As it relates to alternatives to the previous districts, mathematical techniques to randomize the political profile of a given district and thus make elections fair, such as computational geometry and Monte Carlo simulations, exist, are well-established, and are prepared to take into account considerations of population, zoning and topography if needed and as deemed constitutional. Amidst this talk of technical solutions to gerrymandering, however, I want to say that almost anything is preferable to a system where the ruling parties draw their own lines.

It is time to consider mathematical methods for generating districts, which could be amply used by nonpartisan transparence, open source commission of elected experts in order to move our state in a radically new and better direction, setting a new standard even among states for fairness of elections. California was able to effectively counter gerrymandering under the --

under the direction of Arnold Schwarzenegger, and so can we. And -- thank you, that's all I have.

SEN. HISE: Thank you. Next speaker, please state your name. You're recognized for three minutes.

MR. WEEKS: Eugene Weeks, I'm a member of the Wake County Voting Coalition and a former member of the Raleigh City Council for five-and-a-half years. As a 20-year Air Force veteran, serving my country, it amazed me that I'm here tonight talking about voter rights.

I did not see this during the time that I was serving my country, and I don't think I need to be seeing this now. I'm going -- we've heard many comments tonight and I'm going to just reiterate probably -- of all the comments we've had, I just want to reiterate what I thought the courts passed down for you to do and not to do. And I think this'll be what I call a lesson; a plan that you can go by.

First, three months ago the courts plainly ruled that race cannot be used to obtain partisan advantages. In order to be fair, new maps must be compact, contiguous and must comply with the Voting Rights Act to give minority voters an

opportunity to elect their candidates of choice -- not your candidates of choice. The maps must also be free from partisan politics, ignoring voter registration data and past election results. They must also ignore incumbent addresses to avoid intentionally double-bunking two incumbents in order to force one of them out of office.

Unfortunately, the new redistricting process is too partisan to ensure that their maps -- that fair maps are drawn. The maps have been drawn behind closed doors after midnight and any other time that you can do it without the public being around. And voters have not been given sufficient time to review any of the maps before the public hearing.

At the end of the day, these maps have still been drawn by the same GOP lawmakers and consultants using the same software as the previous maps and approved by the unconstitutional legislature that was elected using those racial -- racial gerrymandered maps. For years, you have waged a three-prong war on democracy through racial and partisan gerrymandering, unconstitutional assault on voter rights and partisan meddling with the judicial system.

Unfortunately, this new redistricting is simply another part of the assault on democracy. We need to stop it now. As we stated in the military, do the right thing because it's the right thing to do. Throw these maps into File 13. Thank you.

SEN. HISE: Next. State your name. You're recognized not to exceed three minutes.

MS. GRIFFIN: Hi. My name is Maryclare Griffin. I came here from Durham. I'm a North Carolina resident. So just also, there was some confusion earlier about how this process works on your end, so many of us signed up very early in the day, some as early as 4:00. So earlier you advised a woman that if she'd just come at 6:30, she could've spent less time here. I don't think that's very clear.

Anyway, moving on. So a lot of people have said a lot of things that I wanted to say up here already and they've said it very well. So we know that the maps are still racially gerrymandered, I think you know that too. And we also know that this hearing is really a farce. I also think those of you who made these maps know that. That said, I did want to make one point that

I don't think I heard people make, which is that I think you're probably feeling pretty comfortable today and this year.

As we all know, when it comes down to it, we can't really distinguish partisan gerrymandering from racial gerrymandering. And the fact is, in states like North Carolina, where racial gerrymandering is highly -- where race has correlated with political party, you can keep trying to hide racial gerrymandering behind partisan gerrymandering. And honestly, for now you will probably succeed.

But I'm here today to look you in the eye and actually thank you, because of your arrogance and the maps you made in 2011, the Supreme Court not only struck them down, but Clarence Thomas joined in a decision, that among other things, legal scholars agree set a precedent that we may not be able to distinguish racial gerrymandering from partisan gerrymandering, and that does not mean that we'll just have to be okay with racial gerrymandering; that means that you have laid the groundwork to eradicate partisan gerrymandering altogether.

Now, today, you could make a decision.

You could move forward and make better maps -- listen to the people here. I don't think you'll go do that, and in the meantime, I just hope that this will be worth it to you. As you move forward with these racial maps, you will expedite the process of eradicating partisan gerrymandering and you will be remembered as having done things that are very undemocratic and shameful. That is all I have to say on this matter. I will also comment, I very much appreciate those who have listened very sincerely to the speakers. I've also seen many people staring at their phones and their computers and through notes that could not possibly be urgent. This is your job. Take it seriously.

SEN. HISE: Next speaker, please state your name. You're recognized for a time not to exceed three minutes.

MS. DONALYN: Hi. My name is Stacy Donalyn [phonetic]. I live in Chatham County, North Carolina, for the last four years. During the '90s, I lived here in Chatham County and Orange County for six years, and really if this was two weeks ago, I probably won't be here speaking, but it's not. It's -- it's two weeks later, and in the 10 years that I lived -- for 10 years before I live

here, again, in Chatham County, I lived in Charlottesville, Virginia, and, you know, people could go there and lose their lives by standing in for justice, then I can get through my jitters and come here and speak on a microphone.

Thing to know about me is I'm actually a Pollyanna, and I'm a little bit more jaded this year than last, but I still believe in the basic goodness in people and the fairness of our system. I'm still really hopeful that we can win the day by goodness and fairness. However, witnessing, sort of, this messy process in the last couple of years with these different maps, made me wonder a few things about the Committee and the assembly in general. Why did you get into politics? I would hope that you saw an injustice and you wanted to go and fight it and said how can I do it; I know, I'll get elected and I'll make change.

Hopefully, you were thinking of the good of all North Carolina and by extension our country, but if you didn't do that, what were you thinking? Was it just for greed? For power-grabbing? Did you just want power and self-advancement? I think all the people here and all the people in -- in the other venues tonight are saying that's not the way

to go. You need to think about us. Think of yourselves as North Carolinas, but remember that you're representing the entire state.

The distinguishing by the first round of district maps and now this new one, the same committee working on it, the same analyst working on it, shows me that you're not quite on board yet with goodness and fairness. Thank you. I don't know about these colorful maps; they look a lot like the other colorful maps -- a couple less squiggly lines. I just think that -- you know, think about it more -- less political terms and more product terms. If you send out, you know, our Olympic athletes and you want them to compete fairly and win the day, you don't want the other side doping. You're -- you're doping our government and you need to stop.

So let's call for fairness. Let's -- I'm asking you to act in good conscience. Not in more greed, not in moral greed and power grabbing and to fashion fair and nonpartisan district maps, like the HB200 calls for. Failing maps -- if you map the districts according to partisan affiliations, then make it 50/50 -- go Republicans and Democrat 50/50 and just see where the elections stand out.

We can't have good dialogue if we don't have people who can speak on both sides and work together. And if you believe in the power of your convictions, your stances, then you'll suddenly run out. If not, then the other one will, and we can talk and move forward. Thank you very much.

SEN. HISE: Thank you. Next speaker, please state your name. You're recognized for a time not to exceed three minutes.

MS. MATHIS: My name is Kirsten Mathis. My husband and I live in Wake County. Thank you very much for holding this hearing, and I look forward to many more.

When my husband and I moved to North Carolina two years ago, we had always paid attention to politics and voted, but never in our lives have we been so shocked and appalled by the actions of our legislators that we felt compelled to attend a town hall meeting. Because these meetings were scheduled so last minute, he could not get away from work, so I am also speaking on his behalf. His name is Mike.

It may seem apparent that we usually lean progressive, but we have on many occasions voted across party lines for the right candidate. I

shouldn't have to explain that to convince myself that you might care, but your actions as legislators prove otherwise. You clearly need every last vote you can get. Unless these new maps prove to be innocent of racist and partisan gerrymandering, you won't have a snowball's chance in a North Carolina August of getting our votes.

Our state's history of excelling at racist and partisan gerrymandering should have disqualified the very politicians who drew the unconstitutional maps in the first place from hiring the same partisan consultants, Thomas Hofeller, to redraw the new maps. This is tantamount to allowing a person who has been convicted of burglary to wire the new security system.

If you showed as much dedication to representing the constituents who pay you as you do toward rigging the elections in your favor, your jobs as legislators -- legislators will be secure. Until that day comes, you have inspired my husband and I to be more politically active than ever and to do everything in our power to make sure each vote counts. Thank you very much.

SEN. HISE: Next speaker, please state

your name. You're recognized for a time not to exceed three minutes.

MR. BOTTS: Dewey Botts, number 58, from North Carolina. I feel like I'm in a third-world authoritarian country, not a democracy where we the people have a right to vote. Because these maps are racially discriminating and more elusive than the last maps, and because these maps are clearly more politically biased, and because these maps are blatantly unfair, I request the three-judge panel immediately the ditch this fiasco and appoint their map master to draw nonpartisan maps for all the people of North Carolina -- House Bill 2 would do that.

My experience over here taught me not to close this way, but I have to say this. In my last years of my second career, I was in this building many times and must say this drawn out process is an embarrassment to me, to our state and is sadly mean-spirited.

SEN. HISE: Next speaker, please state your name. You're recognized for a time not to exceed three minutes.

MS. CAMERON: Good evening. My name is Chris Cameron, and I'm from Durham County. The

current legislators were elected based on unconstitutional, racially-gerrymandered maps. Our courts have mandated that North Carolina districts be redrawn. To be fair, the districts must be compact, contiguous and must comply with the Voting Rights Act to give minority voters an opportunity to elect the candidates of their choice.

These maps were drawn in defiance of the court orders. On top of that, the public was given very little time to review the new maps that were released, beginning Saturday, while public comment was scheduled to be held today. We need a process that will produce nonpartisan maps. Since the same North Carolina Republican GOP lawmakers have been unable to provide nonpartisan maps, we must have the maps drawn by a nonpartisan group to produce more fair maps that restore our ability to successfully elect representatives that have our own interest at heart. The redistricting Committee, along with these maps that have been produced, are despicable. Shame on you. I urge the General Assembly to go back and give the constituents of this great state nonpartisan maps. We want our democracy back. Thank you.

SEN. HISE: Next speaker, please state

your name. You're recognized for a time not to exceed three minutes.

MS. COLE: Good evening. My name is Susan Perry Cole. I'm from Edgecombe County, and I'm speaking as a concerned citizen tonight.

I think it's worth noting that after the lengthy court battles, the North Carolina General Assembly had the golden opportunity to propose a redistricting plan that would include fair, constitutional, un-gerrymandered new districts. Sadly -- very sadly, that is not the route the legislative leadership chose to take. Instead it is plain that extreme partisanship drove the construct of the district lines, extreme partisanship giving an unfair advantage to Republican voters. That strategy has no place in a meaningful democracy.

Many districts are uncompetitive, so said the Raleigh News & Observer in a front-page article today. Just 10 of 50 Senate districts will likely be competitive, and just 19 of 120 House districts are competitive.

Let me take a moment to comment on the fact that the legislative leadership offered inadequate time to review and analyze the proposed

remedial maps. It appears that the legislative leaders purposely refrained from releasing the data files in order to impede a full analysis before the public hearing. This is a very cynical and insulting move to the citizens of this state.

It's also plain that the enacted map did not cure all the constitutional problems identified in the 2011 plan. There are still districts where it appears that race predominated in the construction of the district. Examples of that would be Senate District 21, 28 and House District 57. The proposed House plan does not remedy all the racial gerrymandering in the 2011 plan. The House plan perpetuates the same strategies of racial gerrymandering, unnecessarily packing black voters in districts and limiting their political statewide power.

So let me conclude by just urging this body to reject the plan that's on the table. Go back to the drawing boards. Respect the citizens of this state and draw a fair plan. Thank you.

SEN. HISE: Next speaker, please state your name. You're recognized for a time not to exceed three minutes.

MS. BREMER: Thank you. My name is

Jennifer Bremer, and I live in Orange County. I'm here representing the League of Women Voters. I want to thank you very much for this opportunity to comment on the draft maps. We appreciate the Committee's work to produce maps that improve on the current maps, but it still -- seems we still have ways to go.

We would like to emphasize that while we don't see the Committee members as foxes and we certainly do not see ourselves as hens, we're still letting the foxes guard the henhouse. We need to put the voters, not the politicians in the drivers' seat. Voter participation in drawing the maps is key to making this happen. The real public participation requires time and citizens have had only three days to look at the House map, two days for the Senate map and just a day for the data.

By putting off the map drawing to the last minute, the legislature has denied voters a real chance to have their say. Some of the Committee's nine criteria, such as more compactness and less precinct splitting, were welcome, but others have no place in drawing fair districts. But even for the appropriate criteria, the Committee gave us yardsticks that don't have any

numbers on them. This makes it pretty hard to say how the new districts really measure up. For example, the criteria called for splitting fewer precincts, but didn't set a target or say how to decide which ones to split.

So what about the maps themselves? We appreciate the Committee's reporting of at least some data on how to propose maps perform against their criteria, and we've used this information to attempt to assess them ourselves.

Since time is short, I'm just going to hit the highlights. The Committee clearly made the right choice in adopting county groupings that conform to the North Carolina Constitution, producing a map that improves on the current one in that respect, even if it does not by itself guarantee that the district also complied. We also see some progress on compactness with somewhat better average scores than last time for the Senate maps on both majors. The House districts have much less squiggly boundaries, but the new maps apparently don't score much better on either measure.

This suggests we're still falling short of fair districts. The promise to split fewer

precincts came without a target, but we're glad to see that the new maps split far fewer precincts -- in the House just 49, which is still a lot less than the 394 split in 2011. The Committee decided to avoid pitting incumbents against each other. This criterion simply has no place in a fair process. Elections should be all about protecting voters' ability to have their say, not protecting incumbents.

We hadn't been able to assess how the political considerations and election results affected the maps, but misuse of this data to determine election outcomes is really what gerrymandering is all about.

Exclusion of racial data also makes it impossible to say whether in all cases, minority voters have a reasonable chance to elect their preferred candidate, so we can't say whether the maps meet this core requirement in the Voting Rights Act. Overall, given that more data are needed for a full assessment, for now we'll just also, like a previous speaker, grade the Committee's work as incomplete. However the Court responds to the maps that the General Assembly submits, let's work together for a truly fair

participate -- participatory and transparent process. Thank you.

SEN. HISE: Next speaker, please identify your name. You're recognized for a time not to exceed three minutes.

MR. MCALLISTER: Good evening, Chairman Lewis and members of the Committee. My name is Stephen McAllister. I'm an unaffiliated voter, and I live here in Raleigh. I'm grateful for the opportunity to be heard tonight. There are a couple of things that I wanted to address.

First, and reference was made to this a little earlier, today the Campaign Legal Center released an analysis examining the efficiency gap of the current maps, and they're just shy of 12 percent for both the House, which was 11.98 percent, and the Senate, which is 11.87 percent. My understanding is that the author of this, Ruth Greenwood, addressed this in the form of a memo to this Committee, and I just wanted to ask that you make sure that this memo be included as part of the record if it isn't already. It can be found at campaignlegalcenter.org.

I would note that her conclusion about the maps were that this 12 -- roughly 12 percent

efficiency gap was an extraordinarily large efficiency gap that she concluded would give an enormous Republican edge in the coming two elections, and so the concern is that racial gerrymandering has been supplanted with just pure partisan gerrymandering.

The other thing I wanted to share with you was an analogy and -- and we're talking about efficiency gaps, and the concept of gerrymandering can be fairly complex. I think sometimes it's helpful to think of things in more simplistic terms, and at the risk of oversimplifying, I'd like you to imagine the following hypothetical.

Imagine that you invite your neighbors over for a pizza party. Your neighbor, his wife and their two kids join you, your wife and your two kids around your dinner table. You take the pizza out of the oven, you bring it over to the table and you slice it up into eight pieces -- one for everybody. You dish out a piece to everyone, you say grace, and then an awkward silence falls over the table. As folks looked down at their plates, they look around the table and then they look back at you, because the slices aren't equal. Your slice and your wife's slice and your kids' slices

are all significantly bigger than the slices you gave to your neighbor and his family. In fact, you gave your family two-thirds of the pizza, and you gave your neighbor and his family only a third of the pizza.

Now, this is sort of silly, because no one would treat their neighbors that way. In fact, you'd never even think about doing this, but just imagine that you did do this. Just indulge the hypothetical. Imagine that your pizza had a roughly 12 percent efficiency gap in its slicing. How do explain this to your wife and your neighbor and the children sitting around the table?

Would you say well, my own family is more important to me than yours, so I decided to give them most of the pizza? In fact, I would have given my family even bigger slices if I could have, but I couldn't figure out a way to make those slices any bigger. You wouldn't do that, but that's what you're doing with these maps. I'd ask you to reconsider and be better versions of yourself. Thank you.

SEN. HISE: Next speaker, please state your name. You're recognized for a time not to exceed three minutes.

MS. FANSLAU: Thank you. I'm Reverend Cathy Fanslau, and I live in Raleigh. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the House and Senate working to get these maps ready, however long it took. Being asked to do this task again is surely burdened -- burdensome and tedious.

Our state legislators have faithfully, again, done their best to prepare these maps in a fair and colorblind manner. It is my hope that the Courts accept the work that has been done in these maps and refrain from making changes. Based on the 2010 Census, these districts align with the one man, one vote goals, and you did a good job of keeping precincts together. My precinct changes.

However, I am still in the same district, and you respected city and town boundaries the best you could. I live in the diverse community by choice and I'm thankful that you've showed respect in at least keeping me in the same district, even though not the same precinct, but in my opinions, segregating such populations only creates more tension. It's not your job to create a partisan war.

If the state is moving to become more Republican, it's the responsibility of the

Democrats to change that. You surely can't accomplish creating more Democratic districts by how you draw lines. These maps are fair and legal. They follow the letter of the law, as understood today. Better policies in our state can make a difference on both sides of the aisle. Maps enable North Carolina to be fair and respectful of all people.

Thank you for all of the hard work in preparing these maps, and it is my prayer that somehow, someday we do find ourselves in unity. Thank you.

SEN. HISE: Thank you. Next speaker, please state your name. You'll be recognized for a time not to exceed three minutes.

MS. SALZER: Thank you, sir. My name is Grace Salzer. I'm a native of North Carolina and four years a resident of Wake County.

Right now, I am so proud of my state and everybody here who has taken the time out of their busy schedules to come to this hearing. I know many of you have been here for hours.

What I'm not proud of right now is the North Carolina General Assembly and its unconstitutional machinations -- most especially

from the North Carolina GOP. Y'all are acting not just like losers, but sore losers. You're changing the rules of the game because you are afraid to fight fair. And don't get me wrong, gerrymandering is wrong regardless of party, which is why the only proper solution is going to emerge from an independent voting commission.

The NCGOP used unconstitutional means to get their way last time, and now they're putting lipstick on a pig and trying to convince me that it's not a pig. Y'all, this is North Carolina. I've been to enough pig pickings that I know what one looks like. Give us an independent voting commission or stop pretending you actually give a damn about party over people or people over party. I want the people of this great state to only have to worry about fighting over things like eastern versus western barbeque, or Duke versus Carolina basketball, not their fundamental right to have a voice in the democratic process.

Look to make it easier to vote, not harder. Consider race only inasmuch as you can make sure that the votes of people of color count, not to unconstitutionally redraw districts. Resist your baser urges and the silence on the power and

let an unbiased, outside party redraw these maps. You can do better; you know you can do better. So please, for the sake of our citizens, start acting better.

SEN. HISE: Next speaker, please state your name. You're recognized for a time not to exceed three minutes.

MS. DITTMER: Ladies and gentlemen, thank you for allowing me to speak today. My name is Melissa Dittmer, and I have been a Raleigh resident for nearly 30 years. I'm also a mom.

I have been hearing members of the NCGOP whining that Democrats gerrymandered the state for years. It's honestly like listening to my seven-year-old son. It's time to grow up. If the GOP is not ready to do that, it's time for all of you to step aside. We are disgusted with the childishness, and frankly with the plantation owner mentality. North Carolina deserves equality and justice. We also deserve legislators who are picked by the constituents, not illegally gerry -- gerrymandered districts, which were deliberately created to allow legislatures to pick voters who will vote them in. It is time to put this in the hands of a nonpartisan committee, so the very

people who created the unconstitutional maps are not involved in redrawing them. Let's see what happens when the districts are drawn in a non-partisan manner. Thank you.

SEN. HISE: Next speaker, please state your name. You're recognized for a time not to exceed three minutes.

MR. COOK: Hello. My name is Mitchell Cook. First of all, I'd like to say that I just graduated from NC State, and usually on the first day of class -- some of us stay, the Professor says; I don't want to see any cell phones in class on the first day, and after that it's not an issue, so with that -- anyway. I'd like to just ask -- ask you what are we doing? Does it help democracy? Does it forward the principles of democracy, which you were all elected to uphold?

We all know why the districts are drawn the way they are. Everyone in the room knows why gerrymandering happening -- is happening and we know that it has happened.

I just want all the lawmakers in the room to ask themselves; do my own political aspirations, do aspirations of my party really deserve to supersede the will of the people and the principles

of democracy? I think everyone in the room knows in their heart what is the right answer, and whether or not the lawmakers will choose to act on the right answer -- what is just and what is fair and not necessarily what is just illegal, is up to their own will, but I really hope you can find in yourself to do that, because ultimately you have to look in the mirror at night and live with yourselves and ask yourself, did I do something to just help myself, or was I really working for the good of the people and really helping everybody and all the North Carolinians. Because we're North Carolinians first. We're not Democrats or Republicans. We're all North Carolinians. Thank you.

SEN. HISE: Next speaker, please state your name. You're recognized for a time not to exceed three minutes.

MS. GOLDSHLAG: My name is Marni Goldshlag. I am from Durham. I'm a volunteer with Democracy North Carolina, and I'm an Indivisible.

I'm here today because I feel strongly that the legislature which was elected from gerrymandered districts which the courts have declared illegal, should not be the body redrawing

the districts. I don't believe that this legislature will draw maps which are any more fair than the old ones.

This is especially true because they're using the same mapmaker and clearly have partisan goals in mind. These legislatures have -- legislators have used unlawful gerrymandered maps to win elections in 2012, 2014 and 2016. They have spent millions of taxpayers' dollars defending these bad maps in court, while writing terrible laws and being totally unaccountable for their actions.

Enough is enough. It's time that North Carolina have districts which are drawn fairly without racial or partisan bias. It's time for our districts to allow competition for the legislative seats. It's time for the legislature to stop playing these games and for the courts to take the process over. Ultimately, it's time for a nonpartisan commission to be the entity to draw legislative maps. Thank you.

SEN. HISE: Next speaker, please state your name. You're recognized for a time not to exceed three minutes.

MS. FOSTER: Thank you, I appreciate your

time. My name is Caroline Foster. I'm from Durham, North Carolina, but I grew up in Davidson County. So I appreciate, again, the time for those of you that have stayed, it means a lot to us as citizens.

So you've heard a lot of people saying the same thing over and over again today. The courts and the people of North Carolinas are in near-unanimous agreement. We demand a nonpartisan districting process. Despite the guidance of the courts and popular opinion, the North Carolina legislature has acted to obstruct and subvert the creation of their voting districts yet again.

In the context of the racially polarized population, which we have in North Carolina, partisan gerrymandering is the same as a racial gerrymandering. You have unapologetically, unabashedly announced that partisan gerrymandering is in fact your objective, and that you will grossly ignore data that would help you service minority communities. This de facto embrace of the old, shameful Jim Crow playbook makes the actions of this legislative -- legislature especially troubling.

These are not the actions of true public

servants. These actions are motivated by selfishness and fear. Each of you has, in this moment, the opportunity to do better, to be better. A true public servant finding their districts rejected by the Courts and their voters would go above and beyond to make their districts and to be open about the process that produced them. I am certain such a public servant would not re-hire the same consultant who produced the flawed maps to begin with.

For North Carolinians to have confidence in our government, we demand better and open compliance with the law and not secretive processes designed to protect an illegal, unconstitutionally, unconstitutional supermajority.

Nonpartisan redistricting is very clearly a popular issue. Embrace it and then get to work. Winning in the voting booth, rather than try to cling to power through backroom machinations. If you are too afraid to fight a fair fight at the polls, what does that say about your ability to faithfully represent the people of North Carolina?

Thank you again for your time. I appreciate you staying, and I hope that you use this as an opportunity to reconsider your actions

and do the right thing. Thank you again.

SEN. HISE: Thank you. Next speaker, please state your name. You're recognized for a time not to exceed three minutes.

MS. FULCHER: Good evening. My name is Nan Fulcher, and I'm from Hillsborough, and I'd like to speak to two issues.

One is considering the maps. These maps appear to have all the criteria that the redistricting committee has agreed to -- equal population, contiguity, county grouping, municipal boundaries, incumbency protection, compactness, and fewer split districts. Compared to the 2011 maps, the new ones are a huge improvement. The districts are built exclusively on intact voter tabulation districts, at least from the resolution of the urban areas that I could see, and you can tell at the glance they -- they look compact. They look better without any fancy calculations, and they don't have all the squiggly lines that people hate. The maps, then, are a great success because they prove you can meet the Committee criterion and still achieve extreme partisan gerrymandering, nonetheless.

Congratulations; you've achieved the goal

on the very first try. Things should be wrapping up more quickly than the public even suspected. It is time, also, for the public and all people involved in redistricting to understand these criteria can be used as smoke screens for more partisan, extreme boundary drawing. A long time ago, they were developed to help the process to make things look better and less gerrymandered, but now they're working against us. People need to see this.

The second issue is transparency of the redistricting process. The redistricting committee should provide a list of the technicians that are assisting Dr. Hofeller and whether they're staff or contractors, a list of legal counsel, and to specify the location of the mapping process. The reason these issues are important is they relate to what happened in the 2001 mapping process. Testimony from the Dickson versus Rucho -- the redistricting case has the following information. Several lawyers were co-counsel, including former Republican Representative and Budget Director Art Pope, who directly influenced the boundaries of the districts. Some staff were hired four months prior to the release of Census data to work on the

groupings and the last point is the Republican Party Headquarters contain the redistricting data base, and those sorts of things should not be repeated.

SEN. HISE: Thank you. Next speaker, please state your name. You're recognized for a time not to exceed three minutes.

MR. PHILLIPS: Good evening. I'm Bob Phillips with Common Cause North Carolina, and not my intention to have been to be the last speaker, but here I am -- I guess even my board chair has left the building. But I will say this, I've been very impressed with the number of people who've come here and at all the other the satellite sites. They've come with a lot of emotion and a lot of passion. You all may not have agreed with everything that has been said today and this evening, but I hope that it does give you a representation that a lot of folks are upset, and a lot of folks do feel like we need to change the way we do redistricting and you all -- many of you know me, I'm a lobbyist. I've had the opportunity to come to your offices and talk to you directly about the cause of redistricting reform.

And when I look up from the dais and I

look around the room, I see a lot of allies for redistricting reform. Some of you former champions, some of you current champions, that elusive goal of getting everyone together at the same time doesn't have to be elusive. We're not going to give up on that. But what I will say and you know that when I've talked to you all in your offices, is we need a new process. We need fairness. We simply need to take the politics out of the process.

I remember 15 years ago, when I've stood shoulder to shoulder with other folks -- with the late Senator Ham Horton, a Republican who was the champion in this body for redistricting reform. And we stand shoulder to shoulder with the bipartisan group of lawmakers who also are supportive of redistricting reform. And Senator Horton's bill and the House Bill 200 and all the bills that have been filed in between have the same thing in common; it had fairness. It had a sense of taking politics out of the process. It was an independence to it as well as more transparency.

I know that you all do know what the right thing to do, and I know that a lot of you all have heard that tonight, and I know that some

people will say, well, there's no such thing as a nonpartisan process, and I say that's a bit of a cynical view. You have rules that you have to follow -- equal population, whole county, abiding by the Voting Rights Act. The rule to take politics out of the process can also be a rule you follow. It's an insurance policy for both parties, so that when you're in the minority, you know that you're not going to be gerrymandered into irrelevance.

I don't really know whether the maps are fair and legal; the Courts will decide that. But I do know that the paths to a fair and legal map is reform, and I know that a majority of North Carolinians want you to take that path. So again, thank you for your service to the state.

SEN. HISE: Thank you. Any other speakers which signed up prior the 6:30 deadline, wishing to speak at this point? Seeing none, the chair will recognize Chairman Lewis for a statement.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to thank all the members and the public that are here tonight. I want to thank you for participating. I would like to say one of the

speakers who spoke earlier before she left early, commented on the number of empty chairs that were in this room. I did want to state for the record that we have 10 members of the Committee who were presiding at the satellite sites, and by my count at least six members of the minority party who are also present at the satellite sites. I think the characterization that the Committee was not present is certainly not a fair one.

We will work to continue to comply with the order of the Court, which states, for the record, that 14 days after -- 14 work days after receipt of the order of the Court is when the House map was released -- 19 total days. So, again, I appreciate everyone for their time tonight. We will -- it's our intention to continue this discussion on Thursday after we've reviewed the comment from tonight, and again, I do hope everyone travels home safely.

SEN. HISE: Having exhausted the list of speakers wishing to give public comment, this public comment meeting is adjourned.

(End of proceedings.)

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

COUNTY OF GRANVILLE

CERTIFICATION OF TRANSCRIPT

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript of proceedings held on August 22, 2017, is a true and accurate transcript of the proceedings as transcribed by me or under my supervision. I further certify that I am not related to any party or attorney, nor do I have any interest whatsoever in the outcome of this action.

This 28th day of August, 2017.

Robbie W. Worley

EX. 11

NORTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY
JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE ON REDISTRICTING

TRANSCRIPT OF THE PROCEEDINGS
PUBLIC HEARING CONCLUSION - BEAUFORT SATELLITE SITE

In Raleigh, North Carolina
Tuesday, August 22, 2017
Transcribed by Brad Worley

Worley Reporting
P.O. Box 99169
Raleigh, NC 27624
919-870-8070

(Transcriptionist's note: the following transcript is of proceedings held at the satellite hearing site following disconnection of the communications feed from the central Raleigh site.)

SEN. BROWN: All right. Next on my list I have Lloyd Jones. Mr. Jones?

Before you start, Mr. Jones -- Mr. Jones, before you start -- I don't know if you've heard, but each individual site is going to go ahead and record responses or your comments tonight, so all this will be in the record. So if you'd just feel free to say what you were going to say before this change. This will allow us to move along so you won't have to be here to midnight tonight, okay? All right, Mr. Jones.

MR. JONES: My name is Lloyd Jones, Jr. I live in Roper, which is in Washington County. I believe these maps comply with the Voting Rights Act. These maps strictly follow the old county provision as allowed by law. I hope the courts will respect the constitutional role that legislatures have in drafting district lines. The drawing of legislative districts is the responsibility of the elected branches of government. I respectfully request that the courts

refrain from changing redistricting laws and standards after the lines have been drawn.

And President Trump won 76 of North Carolina's 100 counties. You can't win the legislature while losing North Carolina's small and medium cities, as well as almost all of the rural areas. No maps can fix this for Democrats. Only better policies can. These maps are fair and legal. Thank you.

SEN. BROWN: All right. Next I have Carol Phelps from Washington County.

MR. PHELPS: I'm Carol Phelps. I'm from Creswell, a little town in Washington County. I spent 24 years in the Air Force and spent 22 years working for NCDOT. So I'm retired now. Now, what I gave up to come here today, I gave up half a fishing trip with my brother this morning, right on the Alligator River. But it wasn't a total loss, because I caught a baby crab, two baby perch, a really nice bass that I couldn't keep because it's a half-an-inch too short, and a catfish, and it'd been a shame to put him in the pan by itself. So I hit the road and -- and came on up here.

I'd like to commend the panel that worked on these maps, because now Washington County is one

piece. My job as the Chair was twice as hard when it was split down the middle. So I really appreciate that. I think you put a -- a -- a fair job as you could putting it together. And though everybody's never going to be happy, there's so much that can be said and done, but there has to be a point where the line is drawn and we go forward. I hope nothing changes quickly that we have to go through this mess again, because it causes a whole lot of hard feelings with everybody, in every party.

With that being said, my family reunion gets nasty, because my cousin is the Chairman of the Democratic Party in Washington County. So we stay on different sides of the front yard once when the party starts. But I thank you for your time. I thank you for all the work that you do. And I'm proud to be a citizen of the State of North Carolina and the United States of America.

SEN. BROWN: Thanks for that. Richard Friend?

MR. FRIEND: I prefer not to hold the mic. If I can, can I put it on my cuff?

SEN. BROWN: Yes.

MR. FRIEND: My name is Richard Friend.

I live in New Bern, Craven County. In Covington v. the State of North Carolina, the U.S. District Court found that the North Carolina legislature had violated the U.S. Constitution by illegally drawing 28 districts. This has created a pretend or illegitimate democracy. The -- the legislature continues in its pretend democracy today with these hearings.

The concept of notice and opportunity is a well-established principle in law. An excellent example of that is North Carolina Statute 160A-364, which is the statute that controls notice for zoning changes. That statute requires two publications in a newspaper of general publication in a period not less than 10 and not more than 25 days before the hearing.

This hearing -- the original notice on this hearing came out Friday. At least that was the first notice I received. And that was through the internet, not from the legislature, not from any public source, but from a private source. The maps were published then, at least one of them; the second one came out shortly after that. And the data supporting them, this 16-page document, I printed this out this morning. I was able to

access it late last night, less than 24 hours before this hearing.

I ask the U.S. District Court to reject this sham of a public hearing for lack of appropriate notice. The legislature seems to place the importance of zoning changes considerably higher than the voting -- excuse me -- voting rights -- requirements. Thank you.

SEN. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Friend. Next I have C.F., I think it's Pittenger.

MS. PITTENGER: My name is Brett Pittenger. I am from New Bern, North Carolina. The spirit of the federal gerrymandering ruling calls for a transparent and thorough effort representing all the voters in North Carolina. The Joint Redistricting Committee had, at one point, the opportunity to use a -- or utilize a non-partisan approach, and they rejected it, moving forward with their -- their maps protecting gerrymandering and the incumbents largely elected by the gerrymandering process.

If the legislature moves forward with these maps, which many of us think is what you're going to do no matter how many of us are outraged, it is my hope that the three-member federal panel

finds not only these maps, but your intent morally reprehensible and removes this responsibility -- this redistricting responsibility from the legislature and places it with a non-partisan commission. Thank you.

SEN. BROWN: Thank you, Ms. Pittenger. Next I have Bill Roach.

MR. ROACH: I'm from Carteret County, and I came along to the speakers today. And I wrote all this stuff down, and now it's all jumbled up. But it looks like we started out on this because our first effort to redistrict ended up in the Supreme Court, and they told us we did it wrong. It cost us about, what, four or five hundred dollars? And we're probably going to do the same thing; it's going to cost us more money. I hope, at some point, if they have something where it says, we can't give teachers a raise because we don't have enough money in the budget, that the legislature will be ashamed of themselves. Or there will be a rainy day fund shortage where we have a hurricane down here in Beaufort County.

A couple of thoughts that I heard today that I -- they talked about -- one guy said something about, well, the Democrats did it for

years. And they did. And they did it for Jim Crow laws. They did to suppress -- for racial suppression for 100 years. They were wrong. The Republicans got into power. They've done it. The Supreme Court said, you tried to keep a certain group of people -- make it harder for them to get to the polls. Okay. The Supreme Court said it. It's not -- not a matter of -- doesn't amount to nothing. So here's another group.

Any time that you're trying to suppress a group who may or may not agree with your opinion, Democrat, Republican, liberal, conservative, you're a supressionist. You're a supremist. And if you happen to be white, fill in the blank. So if you support it -- now, I don't think all the majority parties did this, but if you support the system that's set up to do it, sorry. It's just -- that's the way it is.

I think this is the most important issue that we've got going right now. I think if we could resolve this one issue to where we have non-partisan, we could have a true debate in North Carolina. We could have -- we could -- we could have this state improved for everyone. We'd have a conversation about what's right, about what we

think is right. You wouldn't you have to worry if you were -- if you win your primary, all I have to do is out-conservative or out-liberal whoever that is. I've got to get to the left of Bernie or to the right of whoever, and then I'm going to win because I'm safe. Let's have a conversation, figure out a way to make it a non-partisan agreement. Other states are doing it; it's working for them. Thank you.

SEN. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Roche. Next I have Jodi, is it Lones?

MS. LONES: Lones.

SEN. BROWN: Lones, sorry.

MS. LONES: I'll be brief because I don't have a lot to say. Because, frankly, I haven't time to look at the maps. I'm a full-time taxpayer. I had something going on this weekend. And even though the legislature has known about this since June 5th at the early -- at the latest, I mean, here we sit, right before the deadline, trying to have a public hearing, trying to have everybody speak at once. And I just wanted to express how frustrated I am with this process and how it really hasn't given us an opportunity to speak.

SEN. BROWN: Thank you, Ms. Lones. Next, Helen Robinson.

MS. ROBINSON: My name is Helen Robinson. I'm a voter in New Bern. I'm a taxpayer in New Bern. And I think I realize today that I'm an unhappy donor to the legal fund to pay for bad maps. The citizens of North Carolina have been given about 48 hours to review a proposal that was ordered months ago. We're now trying, with limited time and limited information available, to decide whether this proposal represents a good-faith effort to comply with the Court and to respect the rights and needs of all voters.

Gerrymandering has long been a tool of partisan politics. Democrats have used gerrymandering in North Carolina for years. So have Republicans. Republicans have now taken, in recent years, this practice to a whole new level. Sorry, but I believe that taxation without representation is wrong.

We're trying to understand whether the Republicans in Raleigh have operated in good faith. It appears that they have simply used more invisible stitches to sew together this surgical procedure that they've done. The lack of time for

review, the failure to provide adequate explanatory information and the rehire of surgeon/mapmaker Tom Hofeller are clear signs to me of continuing lack of good faith.

The plan we have before us today seems to me like a weak imitation of a credible attempt to really cooperate with the direction of the Court. It is not fair and it is not wise for politicians to draw their own districts. We should know that by now in North Carolina. Most North Carolinians, no matter what their political affiliation, are sick and tired of gerrymandering. I wonder when the politicians are gonna hear that. We're sick and tired of it. We have learned the lesson, I think.

It's time for an independent commission. An independent commission seems to be the only way, in North Carolina, that we're going to be able to achieve a more fair system.

SEN. BROWN: Thank you, Ms. Robinson.

MS. ROBINSON: Yes.

SEN. BROWN: Next is Michael Shachter.

MR. SHACHTER: Very good, yep. Hard to pronounce; hard to spell. Okay. I'm Michael Shachter. I'm the first vice president of the

Craven County Branch of the North Carolina NAACP. And I've lived in Craven County for about 40 years. And I'm an unaffiliated voter. These hearings are a sham because the maps just came out, and there was no time to have any analysis of the implications for the effects on black or other minority voters.

It is unlikely that these maps could have been drawn fairly or justly because of the way they were done and who was in charge of the process. That is, the same people that were elected under the illegal, unconstitutional and racially gerrymandered district maps that the U.S. Supreme Court rejected and sent back to be withdrawn. These same people were, once again, in charge of drawing these maps. So it is very unlikely that much has changed with this discriminary outcome of these districts.

It is also -- the entire project is in violation of the Voting Rights Act, which states that the voting power of black citizens should be -- should not be diluted by any means. This would be in violation of the principle of one man -- well, one person, one vote and the true meaning of this -- of the concept.

The new voting districts should be drawn in a non-partisan process, not in a matter to protect incumbents or members of any political party. They should provide all voters, and black voters in particular, with the opportunity to elect people of their choosing. The districts should be drawn to represent the voting power in proportion to the characteristics of the population of our state. And, therefore, our representatives in government would truly represent the will of the people.

We have -- we have not had the time to analyze these maps, but it's extremely unlikely that these maps and districts will accomplish this goal. And that will mean that they are still in violation of the Court's orders.

SEN. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Schachter. Next I have Jeffrey -- is it Bower?

MR. BARKER: Barker.

SEN. BROWN: Barker, okay. I'll give you a pad, here. I'm sorry.

MR. BARKER: Old man with a left hand. Good evening. My name is Jeffrey Barker. I'm a relatively new resident of Beaufort County. Before coming to Beaufort County, I spent nearly 30 years

being a lobbyist and a deeply involved observer and speaker with a legislature of another state. During that period, I was also general counsel to the Common Cause of the state and co-author on a brief for the Supreme Court of that state, by which we successfully sued the Senate of that state over redistricting issues in 1982. Redistricting and gerrymandering have been near and dear to my intellectual and emotional and political heart ever since.

I was convinced when I relocated to North Carolina, 40 years after graduating at UNC, that things would be different here. But, as I've written to many of my friends in that other state, it seems like North Carolina's having a race to the bottom with many of the other states, and they're darn near close to winning. This particular process here is an absolute, certain proof of that.

There is something terribly, terribly wrong, members of the legislature and the General Assembly, when a party that receives just over 50 percent of the statewide vote can garner over 66 percent of the seats in the General Assembly. There is something terribly wrong with the districts that lead to such malapportionment and

maldistricting. And the United States Supreme Court has agreed that the decisions that were made in 2011 were unconstitutional.

And yet, as you've heard time and time again here today and from the other locations throughout the state, the legislature continues to turn a deaf ear to this problem and to press forward as if nothing had happened after dragging its feet so long that the process, for us, has been entirely rigged by virtue of the fact that we did not get these maps until less than five days ago. And we still have not had adequate access or time to review the data underlying these maps, much less the opportunity to address the entire committee, as opposed to two members, whose appearance here today I appreciate. Nonetheless, a personal appearance is a whole lot better than the dry transcript that's going to come out of this hearing.

And I hope the legislature will recall that a functioning democratic republic only functions properly when its elected officials realize that they are there at the choice of their constituents, not for the purpose of telling their constituents what they're supposed to believe. We don't ask legislators to do things. We inform them

of our positions. And we have every right and expectation for them to responsibly respect and respond to our expectations. Thank you.

SEN. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Barker. Bill Hines.

MR. HINES: Thank you for this opportunity. I'm really happy that you noticed that Eastern North Carolina had no opportunity to present its citizens' viewpoints on gerrymandering. And that, finally, we were finally given this opportunity at the very last minute.

The Joint House and Senate Redistricting Committee passed criteria for drawing the maps. Most of the criteria did not reflect requests from the public at previous input hearings and were passed despite objections from Democratic lawmakers. Will our input to be taken into consideration from these hearings?

The data and the files that were used to shape the new districts were only released late -- late last night. So it was too late to conclude if the new redistrict plan -- excuse me, redistricting included transparency, compact and contiguous districts, the efficiency gap calculation, equal population, no racial or partisan gerrymandering.

All these things must be considered.

Using the same consultant that drew the original, unconstitutional districts to help draw these changes, will only result in similar embedded, slanted influence. Use a non-partisan process to redraw unconstitutional legislative districts. You should pass House Bill 200 and reform redistricting measures that would take drawing maps out of the hands of politicians. I resent the process that occurred today that didn't allow me to share that with the other four meetings so that other interested people around the state could light up their legislators and let them know about House Bill 200.

I want everyone's vote to matter. Gerrymandering is wrong. It's time to fix the -- these unconstitutional violations. Do the right thing and rise above partisanship. You must perceive -- you must preserve democracy in North Carolina. Thank you.

SEN. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Hines. Next, I have Sharon Evans with Democracy NC. No? Next I have Keith Kidwell, Chairman of Beaufort County GOP.

MR. KIDWELL: I'll stand if it's all

right, Chairman?

SEN. BROWN: Yeah.

MR. KIDWELL: I find it more difficult to speak when sitting for some reason. My name is Keith Kidwell, the Beaufort County Republican Party Chairman. Also, the first vice chairman of the Third Congressional District for the Republican Party. I want to thank our legislature for their work on these maps, although I do have some disagreement with them.

I also want to point out a couple of things that I've heard over and over here this evening. From us, as -- as well as on the -- the other locations and that is the use of the word democracy. People, we are not a democracy. Look at your historic documents, we are a republic.

Benjamin Franklin was asked, when he left the -- the writing of the constitution, Mr. Franklin, what have you given us? And he stated, a republic, if you can keep it, ma'am.

Thomas Jefferson said a democracy is the most evil form of government contrived by man. I ask any of you who refer to us as a democracy to go back and read your history books; we are not.

I also ask you to look up the word

gerrymandering in the dictionary. It comes from a salamander-shaped voting district. I do not see but one salamander-shaped voting district. I see blocks, I see sections. I don't see gerrymandering on this map, by and large. There is one, and that's the Third -- the Third Senatorial District.

With that said, Beaufort County has issues that are unique to coastal, water-bearing, and our economic engines that we have in Beaufort County. We are not closely affiliated in any way, shape, or form with Warren or Vance County or Northampton County. That's why I take issue with the Third Senatorial District. It does not work well. If you have somebody who's -- who is a representative, I don't care if they're Republican or Democrat, if they're from Beaufort County, how do they represent people in Vance County? How do they fairly understand those people's issues? Or if they're elected from Vance or Warren or Northampton, how do they understand issues we have unique to here in Beaufort County? That deal with fishing and hurricane and wind insurance and hail insurance. They don't understand that.

There's no way you can ask one senator to represent people in a district that runs 160 miles.

It would take you nearly three hours to go from one end to the other. That is absolutely unacceptable. I spoke with Senator Hise yesterday in reference to this. He indicated that this was the only way these maps could be drawn based on what the Court had said.

Representative Speciale, I'll like to ask you today, I would like to meet again with Chairman Hise, between now -- Chairman of this committee, between now, and then when these maps are finalized. Because in 24 hours, Mr. Rader and I have come up with at least six other viable options that would keep Beaufort County in a more centralized location without true gerrymandering, because that's what we do have.

With that said, I want to thank everybody for coming out here to -- this evening. This is the American process. This is what we are supposed to do. So please remember we are a republic. We are not a democracy. Come now, represent the people you speak for. Do a good job, I love what y'all have done tonight. Thank you for coming out.

SEN. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Kidwell. Next I have Tim Buck. He left? Wilbur Costellow? Hood Richardson?

MALE SPEAKER: Gone.

SEN. BROWN: Pam Woods?

MS. WOODS: Here.

Good afternoon. I'm Pam Woods. I'm the President of Craven County Branch NAACP. Today we've heard a lot, a lot of statements and a lot of information, some of which I'm sure none of us had before. But we've been given information at the last minute for us to consider, not very good. I'm just going to make a couple points because most of the information has been passed.

I see on these maps that counties that have totally different geographic economic issues and interests have been grouped together. That doesn't make sense to me. And I'm sure if it doesn't make sense to me, with my level of understanding, it doesn't make sense to a lot of other people.

We should've been working on this or fixing this problem a long time ago. And I truly don't believe that this was just done. I heard it said earlier that they've known since June. I'm sure they did this long before 48 hours ago. It was given to us 48 hours ago, because they wanted to wait 'til the last minute. And I don't think

what we say or do is going to really matter, but we have to say it.

We must let people know how we feel, or they will continue to do whatever they want in the way they want. I think it was totally disrespectful for us to be here at 4:00 p.m. in a room this small. It can't be a public meeting if the public can't get here. They can't get here, and they can't fit in here. And after being here an hour they would've sweated and died in here. But that's just how I feel, 'cause I'm hot all the time.

So I think this was an open meeting, as was said earlier, but not a public meeting, a public hearing. And that's okay. Because a lot of things were said, and I'm sure if there is a real transcript, somebody will read it.

Using the same consultant to redraw the lines, I think was terrible. It's just the same as hiring a thief that does the vault. You think everything's going to be in there when you're done. You can't trust the results. It's just not good. And for us to believe that we -- for them to believe that we trust the results is not good.

I think it's important that we read -- we

all read and pass -- help to pass House Bill 200. It's a very informative bill, and it will enlighten anyone who reads it. Thank you for your time.

SEN. BROWN: Thank you, Ms. Woods. Next I have, and I -- this name's tough.

MR. CAGIATI: That's got to be me. Alessandro Cagiati.

SEN. BROWN: Thank you, sir.

MR. CAGIATI: Thank you for the opportunity. Thank you for the opportunity to utilize my constitutional right. As elected officials, you all took, among other things, an oath to withhold, excuse me, to uphold the Constitution and defend it. In 2011, legislation was promulgated, enacted and passed that was later deemed unconstitutional.

Now, you have the gentlemen who drew that up initially, that wonderful colored map, doing it again, with more money spent for him to do it. Whiskey tango foxtrot are you thinking?

Furthermore, with regards to this meeting, you've had at least six months, possibly a year to come up with it. On Friday, it became knowledge that this meeting was going to be held. Sunday you released the map; yesterday, you

released the backup data. Well, I'm sorry, but obviously more people showed up than anybody anticipated. The fact that they showed up is great. The fact that this meeting is held three days before you're going to vote on it, you have two days to review the testimony or opinion, statements of the public that you asked for.

Like Mr. Sanderson, who has been conspicuously absent since before the break, I hope the rest of you do not turn your back on the statements made by the people here. And it is truly regrettable that we are unable to share our views with the other people at the other sites, as they have been able to hear ours. If this testimony is in fact written down, it should be read by each and every member of the committee. And I hope the three-judge panel that is looking over this reads it as well. Thank you.

SEN. BROWN: Thank you. Next I have Beth Bucksot?

MS. BUCKSOT: Bucksot. Ever so close. I've been called much worse.

Good evening. Thank you for bearing with us in the public, including this -- this opportunity to speak. I live in Pamlico County,

North Carolina. My name is Beth Bucksot and I'm on the Chamber of Commerce board, I'm secretary for that, and also past president. And I'm the Director of Economic Development for Pamlico County. My boss, Tim Buck, was here a little while ago. He had to leave to attend another meeting, but I can tell you that our County Commissioners passed a resolution opposing the House District.

One of the reasons would be is that we would lose our representatives, who happens to be a Republican representative, Speciale. So you look at this map, showing it to you, the big area in blue is the new House District for Pamlico County. And it looks like it's a contiguous area, but it's not. That big area, blue, is apropos, because most of what you see there is water. There is no land mass connecting Pamlico County to Hyde, Dare or Currituck Counties. So that's just the opening on there.

I have here with me a letter from the Pamlico County Chamber of Commerce executive that I would like to read to you. It says, [inaudible] We thank you for taking the time to gather input from local towns, counties, individuals, agencies that would be impacted by the proposed House

district laws. This is a very important matter that impacts every citizen in the State of North Carolina. We request that due to the inadequacies listed below that you reconsider the proposed redistricting plan and leave our district as is or at the very least leave Pamlico County in a district with Craven County.

We understand that the parameters you've been given to set new districts are extremely difficult to meet. However, we have citizens and businesses in Pamlico County, as well as many of our surrounding neighbors, have great concerns regarding the current House redistricting proposal. and its impact on the historic, economic, social and civic well-being of our communities. If you move forward with this proposed district, which includes our county, there will be severe impact on small, rural, economically distressed communities, including minority communities in the county and surrounding counties. Many of these communities already lack adequate electoral -- electoral voice due to low population counts. They would, as a result of access issues created by this district, suffer the loss of what little representation, the combined interagency and nonprofit resources they

have available to them.

In addition, contiguous counties within current districts have longstanding interagency agreements in place that affect shared workforce, kindergarten through 12th, and community college education. Social service agencies, economic development organizations, nonprofits, shelters for people, animal shelters, chambers of commerce, councils of government and regional transportation, this is just to name a few. This new plan would decimate many of these collaborative efforts and detrimentally -- detrimentally impact distressed populations by creating new barriers to access services.

We recognize that those who drew the new districts did not understand the transportation demographics created by considering counties as contiguous that only have large bodies of water that touch and not land masses. The state map used by the House is a perfect example of this. It looks as though Pamlico and Hyde County are connected, but it does not show why.

Thank you.

SEN. BROWN: Thank you. Next I have R.J. Hemby. Mr. Hickman? Patricia, I think it's

Garrison?

MS. GARRISON: Yes.

Good evening. Patricia Garrison, Guilford County. I had the opportunity to meet with one of the North Carolina Senators, and they were explaining to me how the redistricting actually occurred. You'll be happy to know we get to do this again in 2020. I wonder how many people will be happy then. 'Cause the redistricting occurs when the Census occurs.

Number 1, population. Population is Number 1 in determining how the maps are drawn. You get a county, and that population is calculated. So all the one counties who get their population calculated, they're Number 2 -- Number 1. Then you get two counties, then you get three counties, and it's all done according to population.

So when you get to smaller counties, with a less-dense population, you have to combine these counties. That's how it's done. Okay? Beaufort County, okay, will change in its senatorial district. I don't agree with it. I would rather Beaufort County had stayed as it is so that their [inaudible] and economic, recreation, et cetera,

would all be represented by our senator. That's not how it's drawn, and it's according to population.

I have sat here and I have listened to people in the audience call people names and insinuate that these people that drew these maps are not honorable people. I know some of these people personally, and they are honorable, and they have tried to do a good job. And they did not draw these maps according to racial bias.

I'm proud to live in North Carolina. My family has lived in North Carolina ever since my ancestors came here from Germany 100 years ago. I'm proud to be in North Carolina. I'm not ashamed of it. Do we have things to improve upon? We certainly do. A little history lesson. In 2012 was the first time that the Republican Party became the supermajority in 150 years. That's a history lesson.

I think it's time that we come together and we try to have a conversation and we respect each other in the conversation.

SEN. BROWN: Thank you, Ms. Garrison. Next I have Noel Cayton. Next is Jim Kohr.

MR. KOHR: Kohr.

SEN. BROWN: Okay. Jim.

MR. KOHR: Thank you. I'm Jim Kohr, Craven County. I pastor Freedom Baptist Church. I'm happy with my district, because it doesn't appear as though much is going to change, but I do have several things I'd like to state. First of all, I agree with the gentleman from Beaufort County, and thank you so much. We live in a representative republic, not a democracy.

With that being said, I'd like to address our legislators and say thank you. Thank you, number one, for this site that you provided for us. I know some have said, you know, complained about the size and whatnot, but otherwise we would've had to drive all the way to Raleigh, so thank you. Also thank you for drawing these maps. And while I don't agree with everything, I appreciate your effort in the maps.

One thing that I -- does concern me is Pamlico County. I'm not from there, but they always have been closely associated with us and Craven County. And if you look at the -- as been said many times, the -- the other counties connected by water, we're actually connected by land. And I think it'd be detrimental to those

people.

Many times throughout the evening, it has been said about -- that the -- it appears as though the districts are trying to protect incumbents. But a quick glance over the House redistricting shows 83, 24, 61, 51, and 91 have two representatives already in those districts. So somebody's going to get -- not be there. And it appears as though some of these actually have two very strong conservatives in the same district, so I don't understand that -- and I try to stick to facts, not feelings.

Going back to the fact that we are a republic, I'd also like to address the courts, and have -- remind them that we do have three equal branches of government. It is the legislators' responsibility to determine law. It is their responsibility to determine the constitutionality, and I hope they'd go back to the Constitution and not their political agenda when they determine the constitutionality of these maps. Thank you.

SEN. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Kohr. Next I have Steven Rader.

MR. RADER: Steven Rader, Beaufort County Republican Party. First thing I'd like to do is to

thank the legislature for the hard work they've done on putting these maps together. I know they've heard -- had a hard job, because the law has changed dramatically. In 2011 you had one set of laws where they had to include race and consider that very heavily. And now the Courts have said you can't include race. So they've -- they've been bounced back and forth by these ward heelers in black robes. And they've had a tough job. And we don't need any more of the court interference power grabs of the legislature's power. We need to -- they need to respect the separation of powers.

Now, some people have mentioned these non-partisan commissions. They sound good on paper, but the experience of California and Arizona shows that they often are -- end up being more partisan in their mapmaking than legislators, so that that's really not a good way to go. Sounds good on surface, not good in reality.

People talk about fair elections; voter ID is the key to that. International best practice on fair elections. And we have, again, ward heelers in black robes that are blocking that in North Carolina. There's much good in these maps. But there are some things, particularly that we in

Beaufort County are very concerned about, and that is our Senate district.

We're placed in a district that we have no chance of electing a senator, and a senator that's going to be responsive to the northern end of the district where all the population is and can get elected without giving us diddly-squat, in terms of time or consideration. That's not a good district to be in. For decades, under both Democrat and Republican redistricting, we have been grouped with the counties on the coast. We have a lot in common with them.

Now, one of the issues that's come out in all of this with these pods that were drawn, is they say that, well, if you end up in a one-member pod that we can't do anything, those lines are sacrosanct. But if you're in a multi-member pod, there're all sorts of ways you can rejigger the lines. The problem here is the line between the First and Third Senatorial District. And we've put forward three proposals of ways that could be redrawn to combine communities of interest, to reduce the -- the deviation in population to equalize that better, and also to make them more compact, 'cause one of these districts is now 11

counties.

What's been done has put form over substance. And we think that by saying it works one way for single-member pods and another way for multi-member pods is deny us equal protection of the laws. And so we have the committee, and if necessary, the courts look at that.

SEN. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Rader. Patricia did you put your -- Garrison, name down twice by chance?

MS. GARRISON: No.

SEN. BROWN: Okay. Well, then very similar name. He'll -- here, looks like a Patricia -- and it looks like Garrison again. I --

MR. BARKER: No, I did not write my name twice.

SEN. BROWN: Okay. Anybody with a name close to that that I may be messing up here? Next up, VCR parts, it looks like the sign is -- okay. Judy -- Judy Merik?

MS. MERIK: Julie.

SEN. BROWN: Okay. Julie Merik. You can use the mic.

MS. MERIK: Thank you. My name is Julie Merik. I'm from Pitt County. It's really hard to

speak about the map that we've been given on such short notice. However, I believe that this map and really any map that has created under this -- the current process is -- is unacceptable. It seems to me, as a resident of North Carolina, that the way that we draw our voting districts is fundamentally broken and has been for a long time.

We, in North Carolina, have world-class institutions. Our state university system, our community college systems, private colleges, universities, experts in our state government, in private citizen groups and just among our citizens. We have demographers, legal scholars. We have ethicists, people who think and have thought long and hard about redistricting, and who have the skills to draw law-abiding, fair maps. All of these resources right here in our state, and yet the members of the General Assembly responsible for drawing our voting maps, and this map, insist on using out-of-state consultants.

They've created maps through less than transparent processes. They've dragged their feet, and here we are, mere days after a map has been released, having our public hearing. So why? Why are we ignoring our best people? Why are we

ignoring the requests of so many people in this room and across the -- the state? Of many of our representatives in the General Assembly that we change the way that we do this redistricting? We'd move to a better system. Why are we allowing representatives elected by and who wrote a discriminatory maps to try again?

I ask these questions, but I feel most of us know why. It's not that the people that drew these maps are worried that the people living in North Carolina -- be it by a bipartisan commission cannot draw a fair map, they're worried that they can. And they're afraid of that map. And they're afraid of that map, because that map would not allow them, as Representative David Lewis said, gaining partisan advantage. And that's the goal of this map, possibly. We don't know; we haven't had time to look at it, right? But that the goal of -- of -- that has been the goal of the way that they've drawn these maps.

And that's not serving us. That's not creating a map that represents us well. And so I say, just go back to the drawing board. Consider carefully your ethical and moral obligations to us, the people of North Carolina. Fix the process, and

then give us a good map. And then we'll come back here, and we can talk about that map. I'd love to. But we can't do that until we fix the process. So thank you.

SEN. BROWN: Thank you. Next I have John Haywood.

MR. HAYWOOD: Okay. Well, first I want to thank William Barber for streaming this live on Facebook, or I would've missed more than half the hearing. I know he's not here, but at least he'll be in the record there.

Most of what I've heard tonight about problems with the process, I agree with. And I want to reiterate that a hearing three days after the maps have been released and a day after the data is released is just ridiculous. And we really need to improve on this process and come up with something that's fair.

There's not much left to say that hasn't been said. But I would also like to make the point that these maps, just like the previous maps, seem to be symptomatic of a larger problem. Our democracy, I think, is in the process of breaking down. And if -- I think if we let this happen, the future will not judge us kindly at all.

Now, I -- I truly believe that all members of the legislature are doing what they believe is best for our state. But I really think they need to think about what -- how the process works, and is it fair? I know we're in a republic, but our republic should be representative of the voters. And right now, with the maps we have, it will not be representative of the voters.

Finally, these maps are going to also -- the -- everybody knows the big problem with them is they favor extremism over moderation. And I think moderation's what we all need, not more extremism.

I hate to sound cynical, but after just observing this, I have the feeling that the majority party who's been drawing these maps has just been doing the bare minimum. And I think they're trying to draw this out as long as possible, and they're going to try and keep this in the courts through 2018 and possible -- possibly 2020. At this point, I think probably our best hope is that the courts throw these maps out. And that's about all I have to say, thank you.

SEN. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Haywood. That's all I have on the list. Is there anyone else that would like to speak? All right. If not,

I just want to thank y'all for coming this afternoon. I know it's been a long afternoon. We appreciate this input. This is -- this is not an easy job, as -- as you may know, I promise. And the input that you've given us, we're going to take back, and I promise we'll take a look at this input. And again, I just want to thank you for being here, and -- and sharing your ideas on what we could.

(End of proceedings.)

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

COUNTY OF WAKE

CERTIFICATION OF TRANSCRIPT

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript of proceedings held on August 22, 2017, is a true and accurate transcript of the proceedings as transcribed by me or under my supervision. I further certify that I am not related to any party or attorney, nor do I have any interest whatsoever in the outcome of this action.

This 28th day of August, 2017.

Brad Worley

Brad Worley, transcriptionist
Worley Reporting
P.O. Box 99169
Raleigh, NC 27624
919-870-8070
brad@worleyreporting.com

EX. 12

NORTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY
JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE ON REDISTRICTING

TRANSCRIPT OF THE PROCEEDINGS
PUBLIC HEARING CONCLUSION - CHARLOTTE SATELLITE SITE

In Raleigh, North Carolina
Tuesday, August 22, 2017
Transcribed by Brad Worley

Worley Reporting
P.O. Box 99169
Raleigh, NC 27624
919-870-8070

(Transcriptionist's note: the following transcript is of proceedings held at the satellite hearing site following disconnection of the communications feed from the central Raleigh site.)

REP. TORBETT: Well, we're going to move on. Are y'all ready? All right, the same rules apply. The same rules apply; you get three minutes. We have a gentleman right here, Sergeant at Arms, that's going to give you the one-minute warning and tell you when time is up. We can, if it's more effective, also have people if you would, on deck -- even though I'm using a baseball analogy over here.

So now we're going to jump ahead. Remember y'all voted for this. We're going to let Abby Connors, if she hadn't gone to sleep yet. Abby, come up here, young lady.

(Pause in proceedings; audio from Raleigh feed plays.)

REP. TORBETT: What Ralph is telling you is that we have devices up here that are recording this for this evening, okay? So all that will be heard by the court reporter --

(Pause in proceedings; audio from Raleigh feed plays.)

REP. TORBETT: And so -- so your words will be captured, they will be recorded onto the court document, if you would, just as if we were all in Raleigh, for example. Okay? So I just wanted to let you know that.

We're going to move forward with this. Abby, you made some people mad at me, because I let you go first, but I don't care. Are you good? I'm a granddad, I told them a minute ago. Abby Connors, tell us what you'd like for us to hear.

MS. CONNORS: My name is --

REP. TORBETT: It's all good.

MS. CONNORS: My name is -- oh --

REP. TORBETT: It's okay, hon.

MS. CONNORS: I'm so sorry, I get really nervous.

REP. TORBETT: You're doing great. You're doing great. Take your time.

MS. CONNORS: My name is Abigail Connors, and I am nine years old, and I live in Charlotte. I came here with my mom because the decisions being made to redistrict will even impact my first elections. Oops, I mean my first election. Districts should be fair -- everyone -- for everyone. Elections should be about what all

people want. We should pick who we want to speak for us in Congress. They should not speak -- be picking us. Thank you.

REP. TORBETT: Now back to the list. Who -- who's on deck? Casey Throneburg, Beth Henry, Anne Clifford, Sally Kneidel. All right. Hang on one second. Let me ask a question here. Sergeant at Arms, do we need to still use this microphone, or was it for -- only for thing?

SERGEANT AT ARMS: It's only for that, yes.

REP. TORBETT: So if they stand actually closer to here, you'll hear them more easier for the recording; is that correct?

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Okay.

REP. TORBETT: Y'all get that? When you speak, disregard the microphone; come to this area right here right here so you can be picked up by these microphones. Thank you.

MR. THORNBURG: Hello, my name is Casey Throneburg. Thank you for holding these hearings, but I'm not particularly optimistic, given that we have -- since we haven't been given time to fully analyze these maps and they were drawn by the same consultants who drew the previous maps which we

wasted $4.8 million defending, and the Supreme Court unanimously upheld the decision that those maps were racially gerrymandered.

Although this hearing isn't about Congressional districts, since those already had to be redrawn, I do think our 2012 Congressional election illustrates the severe impact of gerrymandering. That year 81,000 more North Carolinians chose Democratic representatives for Congress than Republicans, but we elected three Democratic representatives and ten Republicans. Republicans won 76.92 percent of the seats, with only 48.75 percent of the votes.

Before those 2012 maps were unveiled, Congressman Patrick McHenry bragged to Politico about packing black voters into a new majority-minority district. State Representative and Redistricting Chair David Lewis, tried to explain the motivations were partisan instead of racial. Lewis stated, "We want to make clear that we are going to use political data in drawing this map. It is to gain partisan advantage." Lewis also stated they were drawing districts to elect ten Republicans and three democrats because, quote, "I do not believe it's possible to draw a map with

11 Republicans and two Democrats."

Courts have not said partisan gerrymandering is legal, but instead that it is difficult to measure. The best method may -- may be with the efficiency gap. And an analysis by Professor Simon Jackson counted out of 512 US elections, dating back to 1976, North Carolina's past three elections were -- had the seventh, eighth, and 13th most pro-Republican efficiency gaps. Last year, Republicans won 64 percent of the General Assembly with only 53 percent of the votes. That doesn't even account for unchallenged districts, where safe incumbents must pander to party extremes to survive primaries. This lack of accountability leads to extreme partisanship. Under fair maps, the Republicans wouldn't have a supermajority, and unconstitutional legislation such as the Voter Identification Verification Act would not have become law.

While white nationalists like those in Charlottesville deserve vehement condemnation, they have not systematically undermined the will of African Americans in a way comparable to the North Carolina legislature. Gerrymandering and disenfranchising voters is less overt, but has a

greater impact. Courts ruled North Carolina's voter ID laws targeted black voters with surgical precision, but an Election Board audit found only one instance in 2016 where a photo ID would have prevented an impersonation attempt. Gerrymandering, however, essentially nullifies hundreds of thousands of votes.

Politicians should not draw districts based on partisanship, predicted outcomes, or incumbency protection. 80 percent of North Carolinians agree voters should be able to choose their representatives instead of politicians choosing their voters. Districts should adhere to geographic boundaries, be compact, and not split communities or precincts like the proposed maps do, such as like with the districts of Senators Ford and Tarte, here in Mecklenburg.

Our elected officials are to represent and serve the people, so let's have fair maps and a battle of ideas. Cheating by gerrymandering and disenfranchising voters is unpatriotic, disgusting and not sustainable. Thank you to those who fight gerrymandering, like Democracy NC and Common Cause. I urge the legislature to draw fair maps and give us all a voice. Thank you.

REP. TORBETT: Thank you. Beth Henry.

MS. HENRY: I'm Beth Henry, a lifelong North Carolinian. I am horrified to see our state still in the national news for anti-voter laws and unfair legislative maps that target African Americans with almost surgical precision. As recent events in Charlottesville reminded us, our country and our state need racial reconciliation and healing, but instead of healing, gerrymandering promotes racial divisions and resentment. Racial gerrymandering robs African Americans of their constitutional right to one person, one vote. This is wrong.

Most North Carolinians understand that we are all better off when all people are treated with fairness and respect, when all are encouraged to participate in our democracy, when all votes have meaning. I urge the Committee and the legislature to reject maps that have the impact of disenfranchising African Americans. Please, at this critical time, recognize how important it is to make these maps fair.

I'm also concerned that when districts are not competitive, lawmakers do not listen to the people. The maps and inadequate data just came

out, and there hasn't been time to analyze them thoroughly, but initial reviews suggest that the maps are only slightly better than the court reject -- those the court rejected that's racist. 90 percent of the districts seem solidly tilted to one side or the other. This lack of competition leads to unaccountable legislators, whatever their part. Unaccountability amounts to taxation without representation. Unaccountability means money replaces the vote. I urge the Committee not to approve any districts that lack partisan competitiveness or show racial bias.

REP. TORBETT: Thank you, Beth. All right. Anne Clifford. By the way, while Anne's coming up here, I'm going to tell y'all have been great. We've been hearing about complaints from other places; y'all have been great. Thank y'all for that. Anne Clifford.

MS. CLIFFORD: Yes, Anne Clifford from Mecklenburg County. And based on the reaction that I've heard that you've had for other speakers, I'm counting on your Southern hospitality and your concern for my feelings. Feelings are a big thing now, right?

So I'll begin by saying that hopefully

the judiciary will respect the constitutional duty of the legislature to draw district lines. The maps as drawn are fair and legal. There are more compact districts following the whole county provision. There are fewer precincts split, and city and state boundaries are respected to the best of the ability to do so.

Gerrymandering? Look no further than the historical Congressional 12th. The gerrymandering is only a rallying cry when Democrats are in the minority. When they were in the majority, it was a non-issue. Disenfranchised? Look no further than the Charlotte City Council and the Mecklenburg County Board of Commissioners.

Maps cannot give the Democrats victories they fail to gain on their own in elections. I can go through elections the Democrats have recently failed to win in greater detail, quote percentages or data, but simply put, the Democrats have lost nine out of ten Presidential elections, three straight Senate elections, 14 out of the last 18 partisan statewide elections. Drawing district lines don't guarantee outcome, but better policies that reflect the will of the voters do.

REP. TORBETT: Sally Kneidel. Next up,

Debbie Snowdon, William Brice, Austin Miller Orteneau. Did I do that okay?

MS. KNEIDEL: I'm Sally Kneidel. I'm a retired teacher and writer. I've been in Charlotte all my life. I've been thinking about the difference between gerrymandering and the strategies of the KKK and the neo-Nazis. Most Americans oppose the KKK and the neo-Nazis, especially their violence and their hatred. Gerrymandering is different from that. It's inconspicuous, almost invisible. It's carried out mostly by polite, white men in expensive suits, doing their prestigious jobs.

Most Americans don't even know what gerrymandering means, and yet the violence of the neo-Nazis and the gerrymandering of the elite are very similar in their effects. Both are white supremacist tactics to put down and disconnect people of color. Both can be effective, but in the end, gerry -- gerrymandering is much more effective and more dangerous.

Gerrymandering is killing our democracy. Not only does it leave a large portion of our population without representation, it moves us closer to a repressive, totalitarian government

owned by the ultra-rich. It says -- gerrymandering says loud and clear, quote, you don't count, you have no voice, you are other. We will knock you off the playing field. We are in control. We now own the government, and we have rigged it so we will stay in control.

I heard on NBC that North Carolina is ground zero for voter suppression largely because of gerrymandering. We are the state most tainted by racist politics, most dishonored. I used to love this state where I was born, where my dad was a politician back in the day. Now, I feel ashamed to live here in this madness. I'm glad my dad can't see it.

To the legislators, please honor our democracy and our Constitution. Please act like you have principles. If you don't, we are going to wind up in a very ugly future that is a far cry from what the Founding Fathers intended.

REP. TORBETT: Debbie Snowdon.

MS. SNOWDON: My name's Debbie Snowdon. I'm from Denver, North Carolina, and I don't know about you all, but I'm tired of being told that this system is okay because it was done to us, so now we can do it to you. That's a kindergartener's

excuse, and we need to grow up.

There are people's lives at stake. Peoples' quality of life suck because of this gerrymandering. It is so unconscionable that Raleigh continues this madness. Sorry, I'm not shaking because I'm nervous; I'm shaking because I'm mad.

The new maps are just crazy. They're submitted this late just because gerrymandering lets you do that because you don't have to listen to us. As we've heard, 90 percent of these districts are still completely locked up. And you can call it racial gerrymandering, you can call it partisan gerrymandering; it all comes down to the same thing. It's racial. We know that in North Carolina, there is no difference between the two.

This just simply means the extreme partisanship and the polarization in this state will continue. That less than 80 percent of the electorate will still continue to determine who gets in office and what policies are going to be heard, which is why, of course, we got HB2. So again, you're using the exact same company whose maps were illegally drawn, and we get to pay for it. Thank you very much.

Now, I want to share some really frightening results and they were frightening for me, anyway. This is a 2012 Electoral Integrity Project study. This assessed the integrity of electoral processes throughout the world. Within the United States, North Carolina ranked last of all the 50 states. And some of the quotes from the findings of this report are -- I'll keep it short.

"North Carolina is a deeply flawed, partly-free democracy that is only slightly ahead of the failed democracies that constitute much of the Third World." And "North Carolina can no longer be considered as a full-functioning democracy." And also, "North Carolina is the worst entity in the world ever analyzed by the Electoral Integrity Project."

I was so alarmed by these findings that I went up to Raleigh and I made appointments with my two legislators, who are, of course, Republican. There's Representative Saine and there's Senator Curtis. Both of them said to me, "Hey, you did it to us." That's -- that -- that was what I got in return. They were very frank about it. Screw you. You did it to us.

These results have been brought to

your -- these results have been brought to the legislators' attention many times, but they just brush them aside in favor of maintaining a status quo. Well, this might make their lives comfortable, and it might make their seats secure, but I've got to tell you. It's leaving many of our citizens stranded on the outside of this system and we're waving worthless ballots. Thank you.

REP. TORBETT: William Brice? William Brice? Is William in the room? I don't -- I apologize on first name. Austin or Anston Miller Orteneau? Nancy Wiggins?

MS. WIGGINS: Good afternoon. I'm Nancy Wiggins. I've been a voter in Mecklenburg County since 1977. The purpose of my testimony is to implore the state legislature to finally make the most equitable districts that are fair-minded regarding the citizens, giving them competitive choice for their representation.

Since Gomillion v. Lightfoot, Baker v. Carr and Reynolds v. Sims, the directive of the U.S. Supreme Court has been to have equitable proportional representative districts regarding population and socioeconomic demographic factors of citizens. For far too long, the legislative agenda

on this matter has been to satisfy and maintain the -- the dominating partisan representatives in the legislature. Totally ignoring the needs of the citizens of the -- that they represent.

North Carolina -- North Carolinians, excuse me, and Americans are practical people, and their structure of government reflects their desire to have practical policies that serve the greater needs. Currently, we are operating under an erroneous assumption that these citizens and constituents are better served by an artificially -- artificial district representation system that does not fit their needs or beliefs. Let's please live up to our commitment as Americans and as North Carolinians to live by our motto.

In Mecklenburg County, the most egregious of these senatorial -- of the districts that I have noticed under the brief amount of time I've been given to look at them, is the State Senate District 41. It needs to be more geographical -- geographically relevant to the citizens -- for the citizens' representation of this county. Thank you.

REP. TORBETT: Thank you, ma'am. Martin Doherty? Have I pronounced your name wrong?

Martin? Martin? Mary Degree? Mary? You're next, dear. Rachel Campbell? Is Rachel in the room? Jay Leach? Jay, you're going to be right after Mary. Ronnie Long? Ronnie, you're going to be right after Jay.

MS. DEGREE: My name is Mary Degree, and I'm a state officer of the NAACP. The right to vote is not a game. It is a sacred right won both through the blood, sweat and tears of our ancestors and it's -- you know what? It's a low-down, dirty shame that we're here today in the 21st century, going through maps. Despite having come to power by using racism for the -- their partisan gain, the GOP -- GOP caucus is unrepentant. There has been no acknowledgement or apology to the people of North Carolina, particularly to African Americans and other people of color, whose voting power was suppressed by the GOP's unconstitutional and racial, unjust maps for six years.

To the contrary, the all-white leadership of the General Assembly has played, and continues to play, the same game of putting their own interests and discriminatory agenda above the will of the people. We do not trust these maps which were driven -- drawn by the same hired helper --

helper who drew the 2011 racially-gerrymandered maps, and which was commissioned by an illegal legislature that has failed at every turn to act with integrity.

Instead, an independent special master should be tasked with drawing new maps to ensure that the law is followed and not the directives of an illegal legislature that the federal courts have already found guilty of intentionally acting to suppress the votes of African Americans, and that numerous federal and state courts have been found guilty of passing legislation that flaunts the federal and state constitution and the will of the people.

These games must stop. The GOP leadership of the General Assembly has repeatedly argued before the courts that it is impossible to quickly remedy their unconstitutional maps. But now that they have lost their Supreme Court appeal, we see the truth, that maps can be created in days when the General Assembly decides it has to. We deserve an apology for the inexcusable games that people have played. Justice delayed is justice denied. Thank you.

REP. TORBETT: Jay Leach? Jay Leach?

MR. LEACH: I don't know about you, but I look forward to the day when the economic miracle in North Carolina is so miraculous that the County of Mecklenburg can afford a microphone that amplifies voices. I understand they're making them now.

I'm Jay Leach, and I'm minister of the Unitarian Universalist Church of Charlotte. Here and around our state today, many have asserted and will assert that Republican redistricting is a regressive, irresponsible, racially-biased offense of a system steeped in white supremacy. I don't disagree with that assessment. Regrettably, it is insufficient.

Yes, Republicans are the problem now, but they are following a cynically crass course invoked by North Carolina's Democrats to their own biased ends. Ever since Governor Gerry of Massachusetts used this political sleight of hand to create his salamander-shaped district, the status quo has used gerrymandering to protect and defend its own interests. Nothing I or anyone could say today will change this. You will keep on with surgical precision cynically trying to defend your own power. While Democrats -- when Democrats are back

in the majority, they will do the same thing.

If you wonder why the fastest-growing political affiliation is unaffiliated and why many opt not to participate at all, look no further than this practice. Your shared cynicism has not only fueled the raging fire of political animosity and encouraged the mass exodus from party politics, it has sown the seeds of social unrest. You have colluded to create the kind of mistrust we saw in our streets last September and which we will surely see again. When people cannot trust the political process, they will look for and find ways outside of it to give deepest expression to their concerns, complaints, aspirations and ideals. It is abundantly clear today. We do not, we cannot and we should not trust this long-practiced process.

REP. TORBETT: Ronnie Long? Next up, Ralph Geddes or Geltes. Ralph here? Mary, I apologize for the last name -- Hasmart [phonetic]? Mary? Mary? Louise Woods? All right. You'll be next. Bueller? Bueller? Yvonne F. Rhines? Is it Ms. Rhines, or is it Devonne? I'm sorry if I'm mispronouncing. Is she here? Okay. Go ahead, sir.

MR. LONG: Good evening, ladies and

gentlemen, and to the Chairman of the Committee, Mr. Lewis. I appreciate the opportunity to speak here. My name's Ronnie Long. I'm a -- been elected as an at-large member for the North Carolina 8th District Republican Party. I'm also a business owner in Cabarrus County, a father, grandfather and a great-grandfather. Don't let the gray hair fool you; I'm only 47.

A word to our members of the House and the Senate that are here. You guys have caught hell tonight. One thing that some of the public may not know is that they had planned to have a longer time to work on this situation. They were supposed to be going to Raleigh on September 6th and work on this through November 15th. My understanding is it was what -- within the last three weeks, the courts have come back and said, you got until -- and then they shut us down quite a bit.

I am not in favor of the maps that we have drawn. Now, the Committee has done as good a job as possibly they could with what they had to work with. I have to tell you, I'm very disappointed in the people that they hired to do this work. I think anybody with any kind of common

sense could have sat down, thrown darts at a map over their shoulder and done a better job than our quote, hired map drawer has done.

The gerrymandering has got to stop. We can't use that as an excuse anymore, though. We have got to set up a system here in North Carolina that represents all of the voters. I don't care if you're pink, green with purple polka dots. Doesn't matter whether you've got an R, a D, a U, or a whatever behind your name. We all need to have fair representation.

These folks that we have elected to represent us need to know that we're standing behind them, but they also need to know that they work for us. We remind them of that, and we ask them to please go back to Raleigh, take this information that we've given them in public hearing. And I have to say, this has been one of the worst episodes of a public hearing I have ever seen. Learn from it, put us together a map that will pass Superior Court or Supreme Court final say-so and get us back on track like we need to be. Enough of this he said, she said, the Democrats did it, the Republicans did it.

Look, let's get it right, folks. We got

a very short time to do it in. The Committee's done as good a job, I guess, as they feel like they could in a short period of time, but quite frankly, I think they left us woefully short. Thank you for your time.

REP. TORBETT: Thank you. Louise? Louise Woods? James Doermann?

MR. DOERMANN: Yeah?

REP. TORBETT: James, you're next. Steve Abraham? Steve Abraham? Carl Gandel? You're next after James. Bob Diamond? Not here. Chris Turner?

MS. WOODS: I thank for the opportunity to speak to you today -- tonight. I'm Louise Woods. I am a resident now of Mecklenburg County for the last 50 years, but I grew up in eastern North Carolina in the Farmville area. And my family for generations and generations has lived there, since before the Revolution, as a matter of fact. And so I have a heritage, my heart -- is as a North Carolinian and my heart breaks right now. My heart breaks when I feel like that the ideal that I was taught in public school, the ideal that I felt that North Carolinians believe -- North Carolinians believed in and were working toward has

been destroyed. And that is one man, one woman, one vote. My heart breaks because I'm -- I am -- for the last seven years voted, and my vote hasn't counted.

How long do we have to wait? How long is justice denied? How long when we know that my senatorial -- state senatorial district, for example, is like this in a little circle and got a big table that goes across Independence Boulevard on North Independence -- goes across Independence Boulevard down to Monroe Road, all the way down to Villa Heights.

Now, it doesn't take any -- it really doesn't take anything but a little logic to know that that was gerrymandering and that that took away the rights of African Americans. It took away the rights of everyone who lived in that district, and that's happened all over the state. In seven years, nothing. We still don't have our right to vote. And I'm angry about that. I'm frustrated.

I want to tell you that -- that any public school -- excuse me, student in North Carolina could tell you that if half of the people vote -- it's Democrats, approximately. If half of the people that vote as Republicans, and if

two-thirds of the legislature is in either party and one-third in the other party, something's wrong. It doesn't take a judge to figure that out. Anybody in the legislature knows it. You know it's wrong, and you need to do something about it, and you need to do it now.

One other thing that I don't understand. Republicans -- many Republicans, I believe, really would like to have non-partisan maps. I know every Democrat I've talked to now, since the Democrats are not in charge, but every Democrat now is saying they want non-partisan maps. So why don't you get together? Why is House Bill 200 not even allowed to be put up for a vote? Why doesn't every representative demand that your leader put it up for a vote and then take it to the Senate? Give people a chance. Give our -- give our -- at least give our leaders a chance to vote on a non-partisan plan. Thank you.

REP. TORBETT: Thank you. Thank you for coming out. James Doermann. How do you pronounce the last name?

MR. DOERMANN: Doermann.

REP. TORBETT: Doermann.

MR. DOERMANN: Yep.

REP. TORBETT: Excellent. Thank you.

MR. DOERMANN: Good evening. My name's Jim Doermann; I live here in Charlotte. In 2005, in December, I was part of the force of Marines that was occupying a part of Iraq. And we were encouraging the voters of Iraq to participate in the first free and fair elections that the nation of Iraq had had since 1958.

And now 12 years later, I'm in my own state watching my fellow citizens have to fight to have free and fair elections in their own state, here in the United States of America? You can't understand how upsetting that is to me to know that we'll send people overseas and dump trillions of dollars into wars overseas to spread democracy, and then we have officials in our own cities and states that fight against letting us have fair and free representation in our own country. It's disgusting and it's anti-American.

There have been a lot of really great points that have been made here tonight. And I don't want to rehash a lot of the same ones because -- you know, whether it's been coming from Republicans or Democrats, the overwhelming message coming from everyone is that these maps don't work.

These maps are terrible.

The solution coming from both sides of your constituency is set up a system, a non-partisan committee or some non-partisan form of creating voting districts that don't create such partisan divides. Everyone's pointed this out. It's the Democrats did it, the Republicans did it. You know, like, we've heard this time and again tonight, and it's time to put a stop to that. You can do that. Be the representatives who stand up to the -- you know, the House majority whips or whoever it is that's -- that's forcing this to continue. Stand up to them and vote for your constituents. Thank you.

REP. TORBETT: Thank you, James. Carl Gandel, then Chris Turner. Gavin Edwards? Gavin Edwards? Gavin Edwards? Robin Taylor? Robin Taylor? Susan Harden? Susan Harden? I'm sorry, Carl, go right ahead.

MR. GANDEL: My God. My fellow North Carolinians. Oh, look it's 2017, it's 2017 and we're still talking about race. Are you kidding? Are you kidding? Unbelievable. 2017 and we still have a racism problem. It's never been a race problem. Notice I said it's a racism problem. We

still have a racism problem. It has always been a racism problem; never a race problem.

And thanks to the hate rhetoric of our divider in chief, it's only getting worse. So I say to our fine representatives in Raleigh, who are tasked with getting these maps right, to get colorblind. Get it right. Get on the right side of -- of history. Get woke. Country over party. Country over party. Do it right.

REP. TORBETT: Thank you, Carl. Chris Turner.

MR. TURNER: Thank you very much. I come before you as the elected official for the Mecklenburg County Republican Party. I am a millennial. I have been here for about eight years. I work for a company here in Charlotte. I'm raising my family here in Charlotte.

First of all, I want to thank our representatives. It is disappointing to hear from grown adults terms like white supremacist, Nazis, neo-Nazis for people who are drawing maps. There's a big difference. I'm a history major. I'm a religion major. I might have been out of class for a while, but there's a big difference between that and drawing maps.

That being said, as the representative for Mecklenburg County and speaking about the county, let's get past platitudes. Let's get past the talking points. Let's look at the statistics. In 2016, Hillary Clinton won Mecklenburg County by 294,000 votes to 150,000 votes against Donald Trump. That is two-to-one. Two-to-one. In our State House, we have eight Democrats and four Republicans. Two-to-one. Sounds like the maps that they drew work just fine.

In the Senate, it's three-to-two. Democrats to Republicans. The maps got it right. Am I disappointed in that? Do I wish Mecklenburg County would be more Republican? Absolutely. That's why I ran for office, and that's why I'm going to continue to work to turn that around. Because in Raleigh since 2010, Republicans have proven that the Carolina comeback is real.

We have lower taxes, we have better business, we owe less debt to the government and we all as citizens have more opportunity. That being said, look at the city council. Nine-to-two; Democrats to Republicans. You don't hear me complaining about districts. We've got more work to do in Mecklenburg County as Republicans. The

county commission, I think, is seven-to-two. You don't hear me complaining about district drawings.

I'm going to work harder and bring better policies in these local races to win the way we have done on the state and national level. This is not about districting. Donald Trump, whether you like him or not, he won 76 counties out of our state. Our state has rejected Democratic policies, and we are seeing that countless times in non-partisan and partisan races across our state.

As soon as people realize that the Republican values that are being led through our Raleigh leaders are what's best for our county and for our state, then the better we'll be able to move past this absolutely ridiculous statement that our maps are what's holding Democrats down. It's their policy. Thank you very much.

REP. TORBETT: Thank you. Dan Steele. Dan, you're next. Laura McNamara. Okay. Sarah Cassie -- Casey? Sarah Casey? I'm sorry, but Dimple Shah? Is that right? Okay. Did I do your name okay? Excellent. Thank you. Abbey Dunn. Joanna Hollingsworth? Joanna Hollingsworth? Elliott Willingham? Elliott Willingham? Steve Rundle? Steve Rundle? Jay Moore? Jay Moore?

Lenise Melton? Okay. So we have Dan, right?

MR. STEELE: Yes, sir.

REP. TORBETT: We have Dan Steele, Laura McNamara, Dimple Shah, Steve Rundle, Lenise Melton and Mary Bowman. Is that correct? Thank you. Dan, sorry.

MR. STEELE: It's all right. My name is Dan Steele, and I was born just a few blocks from this spot, grew up on Rea Road, graduated from Myers Park High School, and I've spent a combined total of seven years on two degrees from UNC Chapel Hill. I say all that simply to provide a background as to how much of a personal, vested interest I have in the future of my state.

I'm also a healthcare professional. And so directly serving the citizens of this state is my professional mission, as well as my personal conviction. Every doctoral program including the clinical doctorates like the one I recently completed, involves training in research methods and principles.

One of the most basic concepts in research is that of bias. Much attention is paid in peer-reviewed settings to conflict of interest and how those can cast doubt on the validity of all

findings that follow them. It's important to remember that bias does not require malicious intent in order to negatively affect the outcome of any scientific undertaking. This is a basic and uncontested principle known to every first-year PhD student.

I will not use this public forum to express my personal opinions on the -- on the intent of the GOP lawmakers who drew our current legislative maps. What I will say to the Republican legislators is that if you wish to be taken seriously in your assertions, that your intentions are to have fairly represented elections in North Carolina, then prove it by appointing an independent non-partisan committee to draw legislative maps using scientific statistical methods to ensure as fair a system of representation as possible.

The current method of politicians choosing their own voters is a glaring red flag that would immediately fail peer -- fail to pass peer review in any respected research journal. I understand that politics is not a laboratory science. But the impact of what happens in the legislature tangibly effects the lives of millions

of vulnerable citizens like the patients I treat every day. So surely any honest public servant owes his or her constituents the most fair and systematic way possible to determine their representatives. Take this decision out of the hands of both Republicans and Democrats. Demonstrate your willingness to eliminate even the appearance of a conflict of interest and take the first step towards restoring shattered voter trust in our democratic system. Thank you.

REP. TORBETT: Thank you, Dan. Laura McNamara.

MS. MCNAMARA: Hello. Thank you for being here. Thank you for staying so late. I'm Laura McNamara. I'm from Charlotte, North Carolina. I'm 27 years old, and I know a lot of people my age would like to voice their opinions here today, but they couldn't be here at the four o'clock start time. So I do feel I'm speaking on behalf of many like-minded folks; that I'm ashamed to be part of a state that is called the worst efforts of gerrymandering in the United States. It -- it ashames me and it's why I'm here today because I just felt like I needed to say something. I needed to protest. I needed people to hear that

we are not okay with this.

The new maps are not fair. They are still unfairly divided by race and income throughout party lines that were designed by legislators that are interested in their own benefit. I understand it has happened in the past, and I just want it to stop. I want non-partisan efforts to re-draw the maps. I want new maps. The current maps are -- I echo other speakers in saying that we need the courts to throw them out and we need non-partisan people to create a new map in order to create a fair voting system that respects democracy. We need maps that are free from partisan politics, that ignore voter registration data, past election results, and incumbent addresses that are used to draw the lines that benefit the people in power.

The new maps must comply with the Voting Rights Act to give minority voters, whose voices in North Carolina have been suppressed for decades, the chance to elect candidates of their choice. This is an issue that is imperative to upholding a democracy, and we cannot expect a fair representation of our citizens until these maps are fairly drawn. Again, thank you for being here and

staying 'til the end, and thank you for listening.

REP. TORBETT: Thank you.

MS. MCNAMARA: Thank you.

REP. TORBETT: Dimple Shah. Thank you.

MS. SHAH: Thank you. Thanks for having me. My name is Dimple Shah. I live in Matthews, North Carolina. These maps are still being gerrymandered. Less than 36 hours before the only opportunity for public comment on the proposed new legislative maps, the NCGOP finally released the correlating election data. We see why they don't want the public to have time to see and understand these new maps.

We compared the proposed maps to the current unconstitutional ones. Of the 16 GOP-held NC District House Districts Flip NC has identified as the most flippable based on past election results, 11 have been slanted more heavily for the GOP while only two were drawn more favorably for Democrats. The other three were unchanged.

Make no mistake; the NCGOP is actually trying to benefit from having drawn illegal racially-biased maps in the first place and the court order to redraw them. These lawmakers were elected under unconstitutional maps, and now

they've used the most recent election results of data on demographic changes to try to preserve as many Republican-held districts as possible and limit competition. This is what racism looks like.

Though the GOP can, and will, technically argue that they fixed the problem of overt racial gerrymandering, they have simply returned to a model of precise partisan gerrymandering no fairer than the model used to draw the illegal maps in the first place. This is an arrogant, cynical attempt to adhere to the court's ruling while blatantly disregarding the spirit of the order to draw districts that would result in fair representation for all NC -- North Carolina citizens.

These new proposed maps are actually more favorable to the GOP than the current ones, and they do nothing to address the fact that the current legislature was elected based on unconstitutional maps. This is a clear attempt by the NCGOP to cement their illegal super-majority, and one that the court should reject for a number of reasons.

Most flagrantly, they've reached well beyond the areas affected by racial gerrymandering and redrawn many districts that were completely

unaffected by the court ruling. The court ordered the NCGOP to address a narrow set of districts it determined had been racially gerrymandered with near-surgical precision, and the NCGOP has used the court order as a chance to redraw much of the legislative map in its favor.

Historically, Democrats and Republicans have both been responsible for gerrymandering. Now, the GOP is showing that they have no interest in drawing fair maps. The future of North Carolina's democracy depends on all of its citizens to make their voices heard and demand the power to draw legislative maps be removed from the legislature. And they should be drawn independently, and we should have fair maps. I tell my children that they must play fairly, and it's not too much to ask for our legislature to play fairly as well. Thank you.

REP. TORBETT: Thank you, Dimple. Steve Rundle.

MR. RUNDLE: Bless your all's hearts for being here so late. Good God. I'm - I'm going to be brief and not rehash too much, but I do want to point out that one of the fundamental things at -- at work here is a racial bias and a discriminatory

intent. What we -- we have to look at what happened back in 2013 when the Supreme Court removed the shackles off North Carolina and were -- and they no longer had to submit their voting plans to the Justice Department. It -- Katie, bar the door. We -- we got voter ID laws. You know, voter suppression measures. Things to make it harder for those of -- in our communities of color and those, you know, who are -- they would be biased against due to race or party to get out to vote. Plain and simple.

And what we have here, just to look at the maps that we have coming out or look at the process that is keeping all of us here for hours on end, essentially a process that -- that gives you only a fifth of the voice because you're taking the entire state at one time as in a -- in a commentary period. And -- and a process that doesn't give you the data backing up the maps to really be able to evaluate in time.

So when we have had a legislature that -- that has tried -- tried to get away with stuff, been found by the courts to have discriminatory intent in what -- in what they have tried to get -- get away with in the past. This -- this map is --

is supposedly a correction of that. It's clearly not. It's just the latest example, exactly, of - of the egregious way this -- this legislature has tried to suppress the vote and -- and, you know, have a racially biased intent in the way they are doing things.

So bless your hearts. I -- I -- I would also support a non-partisan way of doing this. You know, it's simply become too refined with -- with the -- with the electronics and the way they can literally gerrymander things right down the middle of the street these days, you know, based -- based on voter things. You know, for years and years you could never get it that -- that fine. Now, both parties have the technologies, so we have to move to a non-partisan way of doing this.

But I -- I just have to point out, tonight with the process that's taking this long, keeping us all here, and -- and suppressing comments from a lot of people because of the cumbersomeness of the process. You know, it is just the -- the latest example of, you know, a legislature that doesn't want to open this up to comment, that doesn't want to pay attention to the courts and does -- doesn't want to -- and we will

see you in court again. Thank you.

REP. TORBETT: Lenise -- Lenise Melton. Did I do your name -- first name right?

MS. MELTON: Yes, that is correct.

REP. TORBETT: Thank you. And then Mary Bowman. Thank you, Mary.

MS. MELTON: My name is Lenise Melton. I'm a resident of Gaston County. I work here in Charlotte. All of my voting life has taken place in North Carolina. I grew up in South Carolina. I'm just really discouraged about this whole thing. I'm going to say that it feels like theater to me. Like, nobody really cares what the citizens want. I'm sort of like the voting process; I've got an appeal, but I'll do my best.

In a democracy, the voters are supposed to pick the representatives. The representatives are not supposed to pick the voters, but both sides do. It doesn't really have a lot of sway with me. When Democrats were doing it, they weren't nearly as good at it, and two wrongs do not make a right. I'm pretty sure my parents taught me that. I'm pretty sure all your parents taught you that. They taught you that. I like to see the best in people. I like to think that whatever's in their heart,

it's for the good of all of us. And it's just really getting hard to always think that.

I really like this gerrymandering map. I don't know if anybody else has showed it to you. How you take a representative population, and there's four ways to do it. There's straight line. There is perfect, so that it comes out equally. There's compact, but completely unfair. And there's neither compact nor fair. And it feels like North Carolina picks winner number four. And the entire -- and we're leading the way. Other people are going yeah, let's do that. We're setting a terrible example.

And my other chart that I brought -- and it's not about the state legislature, because I have a full-time job. I'm not an activist. I'm not representing anybody, so I don't have time to dig through all these maps and figure this out for the state legislature. But I don't think -- that guy that was just quoting statistics about how it's exactly right because of Hillary's vote? I don't really think that's a good representative example.

This is a New York Times thing that lines up nine states. North Carolina comes in third behind West Virginia and South Carolina for the

most unrepresentative legislative nationally. I think in '12, we were 44 percent Democrat votes and got three out of 13 seats, for 23 percent. And then it got worse. It got to 44 percent and we still have the same, you know, terrible 23 percent of our, you know, national seats. And you know, when are you going to be ashamed? When it's 51 percent, and we still only get 23 percent of the seats?

I just would beg you to be the bigger party. Be noble. Show us all in North Carolina and the country that we can do this non-partisan and we can win on ideas. We're a purple state. We need purple representatives. Thank you.

REP. TORBETT: Thank you, Lenise. Mary Bowman?

MS. BOWMAN: My name is Mary Bowman, and I am a minister here in Charlotte, North Carolina. I just really wanted to weigh in, in a general way, about just the importance that every voice really matters in North Carolina. That I think gerrymandering we've seen so often that we're seeing our elections determined at the primary stages. That we're really not allowing full votes to be cast and to be heard. And it's just

something that's so important.

Many others have pointed out that both parties are certainly guilty of this. I'm right in the middle of reading about Alexander Hamilton and the forming of our country. And we simply are asking for true, sort of, leadership in terms of allowing the process to really benefit all voices. And just really encourage that the current legislature would -- would take leadership. That they would allow that neither party has done this process very well and that it's really time to turn it over to an independent and bipartisan commission that can really analyze and get things to a more fair value. So thank you.

REP. TORBETT: Thank you, Mary. Ladies and gentlemen, wow. We started out, the room was just absolutely burning up. We had to turn the AC up as high as it would go. Thank you all so very much for attending. Very much, from the bottom of my heart. This is -- this means a whole lot when you participate, and we need more of that across our state and -- and country.

MR. WILLINGHAM: I thought I was on as well.

REP. TORBETT: What's your name, sir?

MR. WILLINGHAM: Elliott Willingham.

REP. TORBETT: I'm sorry. I called your name earlier, and I marked you off for some reason.

MR. WILLINGHAM: I didn't hear you, obviously.

REP. TORBETT: I'm sorry. We have one more. Elliott Willingham.

MR. WILLINGHAM: Thank you. I'm coming here from work. As a teacher, I'm always good about showing this like -- what this looks like to me. And also as a lifelong Presbyterian, my grandmother -- go back to my grandmothers of elder, many, many years. And she always went back to Micah. Love justice, show mercy and walk humbly in the eyes of God.

So when I looked at the map the other day for the district that I'm assigned to according to the new representative map, that's a combination of 67 and 99. To me, it kind of looks like this. Forgive me, I'm not -- not the best drawer. There. All right. Kind of like a fat cat, if you may, with the tail that's been cut off. Kind of what my -- my neighbor's cat used to look like when some relatives got a hold of the -- the tail here.

In any case, you have a -- a district

here where you have one representative, Representative Moore, who lives in Charlotte. Now, coming against Representative Burr, who lives in Albemarle down here. With fully about 50 miles between them, correct? Okay. Well, not 50 miles -- I'm sorry. About 50 minutes in terms of driving distance between you.

Now, how is -- when I looked at the map, how is this going to best benefit those families and constituents that live in Charlotte versus those that live in -- I guess this is fast-growing suburban Cabarrus County, rural Cabarrus County going into Stanly County which is mostly rural as well? It doesn't make sense. It's not showing that basic common-sense principle about, you know, love and justice, showing mercy -- mercy, and being humble in the way that we utilize our -- our -- our -- our -- ideas in terms of democracy.

Again, being a lifelong Presbyterian, we're supposed to believe in representative government. We're supposed to believe in making sure the people are represented fairly. This, in this particular case, isn't showing that to me. And that's beyond all the other historical issues that happened with our redistricting efforts here.

Please keep this in mind. There's got to be something better here. There's got to be. The fat cat really ain't working.

REP. TORBETT: Thank you very much. Let me start by announcing that I'm not seeing anybody else that was here to speak and I did not call your name. I do apologize again, Elliott. All right. That -- that is all I have. Thank you all for being here. Thank you all for participating and this meeting is -- unless anyone has any last -- adjourned.

(End of proceedings.)

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

COUNTY OF WAKE

CERTIFICATION OF TRANSCRIPT

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript of proceedings held on August 22, 2017, is a true and accurate transcript of the proceedings as transcribed by me or under my supervision. I further certify that I am not related to any party or attorney, nor do I have any interest whatsoever in the outcome of this action.

This 28th day of August, 2017.

Brad Worley

Brad Worley, transcriptionist
Worley Reporting
P.O. Box 99169
Raleigh, NC 27624
919-870-8070
brad@worleyreporting.com

EX. 13

NORTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY
JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE ON REDISTRICTING

TRANSCRIPT OF THE PROCEEDINGS
PUBLIC HEARING CONCLUSION - FAYETTEVILLE SATELLITE SITE

In Raleigh, North Carolina
Tuesday, August 22, 2017
Transcribed by Brad Worley

Worley Reporting
P.O. Box 99169
Raleigh, NC 27624
919-870-8070

(Transcriptionist's note: the following transcript is of proceedings held at the satellite hearing site following disconnection of the communications feed from the central Raleigh site.)

REP. SZOKA: Ladies and gentlemen, because some of the other sites are having difficulty with their audio and their video, a decision has been made to disconnect all the remote sites. And we're going to continue this public hearing here today just within the site where we are right now.

So we have been recording everything that we've been doing so far. Everything that has been said here and everything that will be said here will become a part of the permanent record, will be transcribed by a court reporter when the tape of this, which -- as I said, it's been recorded from the beginning until now and will be through the end, is sent out to Raleigh. So any questions about that? Yes. Yes, ma'am?

FEMALE SPEAKER: So is this over with now?

SEN. JACKSON: No, ma'am.

REP. SZOKA: Well, it's not over right now. No, ma'am. We're going to continue this --

we had a committee that was distributed over the state. Now we're -- we're going to continue with myself and Senator Jackson as the chair here to run the committee for the public hearing right here, right now. And if you were signed up on the list by 6:30, you'll still have your opportunity to be heard. All of your comments will be transcribed by the court reporter and will be entered into the permanent record. So --

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: John, if everyone's still here, we have 15 speakers.

REP. SZOKA: Okay. So let me go through the list here to make sure that you're here. And if you are here, would you just raise your hand? If somebody isn't here -- is out in the parking lot on a smoke break and comes back in -- when they're called, the rules say that they'll be allowed to speak after everybody else is here.

So the next two minutes or so, we'll get Mr. Buxton up, then Linda Devore, Hiram Reynolds, Ray Hudson, James Baker, Harold Mendelson, I'm sorry if I butcher your name, Amariche Hawkins, Lelia Harrington, Maude Gibbs, Susan Mills, Michael Mills, Al McSurely, O'Linda Watkins, Dennis Biddle and Mitch Colvin.

So you'll still have three minutes to speak, and when you come up to the microphone, please identify yourself. And if you choose to say what group you're representing if you're representing something, however you choose to do it, say that for the record. And the Sergeant-at-Arms here will keep time as he's been doing. He flashes up the one-minute warning. When he puts up to stop, that means stop.

So any -- any questions on that? It's really the same thing we're doing -- we've just been doing here. So -- you're ready now?

MR. BUXTON: Yes, sir.

REP. SZOKA: Please identify yourself for the record, and you have three minutes.

MALE SPEAKER: If you feel comfortable about picking that thing up out of the microphone stand, go ahead and talk into it that way. Either way.

MR. BUXTON: I'm Jimmy Buxton, President of the Fayetteville branch of the NAACP, here in Fayetteville, North Carolina. I'm really disappointed to stand here as I did back in 2011 in Raleigh in the same manner that this is the comments about redistricting and actually having

people to tell the representatives at that time that they were drawing racial gerrymandering districts.

I'm also disappointed that when I went to my state representative, who I thought maybe could give me some information on the maps that were drawn this past Friday and Sunday night, they were put out at that time, that he could give me some information on it. At that time, he told me he didn't have any information, mainly because he was not called to sit in on this redistricting, which means that's a sham. If he sits on this redistricting committee and was not allowed to have input for this map drawing, it's a sham.

The three-judge panel has already deemed that these maps that were drawn before 2011 were unconstitutional. After reviewing the redrawn maps, I feel that they are unconstitutional. These maps were drawn to benefit those who are set in their mind to not give Medicaid to thousands of people, to cut education, to take away the power of the duly elected governor.

Gerrymandering is a way of forcing the outcome of the elections in their favor. I hope and I pray that this three-judge panel will hold

every legislator that is responsible for this in contempt and have these maps redrawn again and that can be fair to elect people that -- and will elect -- to elect and to reject those people that are duly running for the election. Thank you.

REP. SZOKA: Thank you, sir. Next is Ms. Linda Devore. Please approach the mic, identify yourself and you'll have three minutes when you start talking. Thank you.

MS. DEVORE: My name is Linda Devore. I'm not here to represent any organization. These are my own remarks. I've lived in Fayetteville for 37 years. And my ideas and my thoughts on not only the 2011 districts, the 2001 districts, the 1991 districts, the 1981 districts and the districts we're looking at today may not reflect any particular group's perspective other than my own.

First of all, I want to thank our members in the legislature for the good work they've done. Because as I look at the new districts, the ones that are proposed here tonight, I realize that for a very long time, we've been -- this -- that these districts go a long ways towards correcting a wrong that's existed in our state for a very long time. You don't have to look back very far. Just go back

to the 2001 districts if you want to.

You know, in -- in the 1970s, the Supreme Court of the United States made what I consider to be a very unfortunate decision. They decided that -- that in spite of -- of the bad rap that gerrymandering deserved and had gotten over the years, that political gerrymandering would be allowed in this country. So as a result of that, in the 1980s, the 1990s, the early 2000s and after the Census of 2010, states across the country, whether they be Republican or Democratic legislatures, have increasingly engaged in gerrymandering for political whim because the Supreme Court said that that was constitutional in this country.

There is a case before the Supreme Court which will be heard this fall, which comes out of Wisconsin. The case is Gill versus Whitford, which may reverse that. And that will be for the benefit of all of us. But what I want to tell you is that the maps we're looking at tonight are by far, on their face, the least gerrymandered districts we've had in the State of North Carolina in the 37 years that I have lived here.

I was one of the first to speak out in

early 2012 and 2013 about the designer districts that were created in 2011. You know, it wasn't just here in North Carolina. Software got to the point by 2011 that either party could design districts to benefit their partisan interests. There were irregular boundaries in our districts, there were land bridges joining largely contiguous areas, split precincts, split communities. And if you look at the line, the line in our county between the Senate 19 and 21 District, the boundary was an embarrassment to fairness. I don't see how anybody could see a different way, no matter which side of the aisle you're on.

We need a reset. And here's the thing; these nine districts that we're looking at tonight, they are a reset. We are looking at compact districts, regular boundaries. They bring together communities of common interest. There are nine municipalities in Cumberland County. Eight of them are -- eight of them are unsplit. The ninth -- the ninth municipality, which is Fayetteville, is too large to be within one district.

Y'all, we're looking at the best job I've seen in Cumberland in the state of North Carolina in the 37 years I've been here. Thank you.

REP. SZOKA: Please finish up. Thank you. All right. Hold your applause, please. Hiram Reynolds. Hiram Reynolds. Hiram Reynolds. All right. We'll go on. If Mr. Reynolds shows up, he'll be able to finish speaking then. Ray Hudson. Sir, please identify yourself for the record, and then you have three minutes.

MR. HUDSON: Certainly. Yes, I have -- if you're the gentleman I want to speak to, do you mind if I turn this mic around?

REP. SZOKA: Either way. Whatever makes you comfortable.

MR. HUDSON: My name is Ray Hudson. I'm from Montgomery County, a rural county. Somebody said you live in the sticks --

REP. SZOKA: Would you -- excuse me, would you get closer to the mic, so that you it gets picked up.

MR. HUDSON: Certainly. My name is Ray Hudson. I live in Montgomery County, it's a rural county, close from -- is this good? Well, someone said, do you live in the sticks? I have to drive five miles to get to the sticks to buy gas. That's how far out I live. And something I was told in that community is you don't use harsh words,

particularly in mixed groups like this when we just don't know anybody. But to be perfectly blunt, my parents told me that, my teachers. But frankly, they never encountered the legislature we've got now. And I'm going to have to use some blunt words.

North Carolina used to be known for intelligent, progressive leadership. We have a little bounce in our step. We saw somebody from South Carolina be blunt, we go hmm. Well, folks, we can't do that anymore. North Carolina is not that intelligent, progressive leadership anymore. We're about bathrooms, gerrymandered districts and voter suppression. And I'm ashamed of it. There's no excuse for it.

Now, this -- I used to teach. I've done a number of things and I told those children, you be proud you're American. And I still tell people that. That the political system works, it's fair, you have to keep fighting. That's a lie now. It's a flat out lie. You have disenfranchised people.

You got a man -- and I'm going to use -- I'm going to say a -- well, scoundrel crook, whatever to draw those first districts. And then, lord, you give them the job a second time. That's

like the crook got repelled the first time, so we're going to let him have another crack at breaking into the house. Don't tell me that's fair. It's simply not. And here's what's so bad about that.

You probably figured out I am a staunch Democrat, and I am, and a proud one. But I want two strong, competitive parties that we can respect. Going to be blunt with you. Conservative -- heard that first word when what it meant was, we didn't want the blacks in the schools. It was a code word for a bigot. If I'm insulting somebody, I'm sorry. But y'all can fix that. You can have Eisenhower-type conservatives where we can respect you and disagree with you. You start by coming up with a fair commission to put together the districts. And I thank you for your time and have a good day.

REP. SZOKA: Thank you for your comments, sir. Next up is Mr. James Baker.

MR. BAKER: My name is James Baker from Cumberland County. First of all, thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed redistricting for the North Carolina Senate and House. I have two points I'd like to make.

First, from what I've seen in the preliminary maps, both those presented here today and those presented in other settings and from what I've read about the redistricting plans in various media outlets, the new districts apparently respect the principle of contiguity; all the parts of each districts seem to be connected. Along with this, the new districts seem a good bit more compact than some of the ones we presently have.

As a former elections worker myself, I'm encouraged when we don't have a lot of voting precincts that are split by district lines. I'm also encouraged that the new district boundaries, for the most part, don't seem to violate municipal boundaries very often. For the most part, district lines should hopefully allow citizens to vote with the same neighbors they work and shop and play and worship and go to school with. Wherever possible, district lines should respect communities and neighborhoods. And as far as I can tell, most of these do. That's my first point.

My second is this. Elected legislature -- elected legislators have a constitutional role in drawing district lines. We do not have a parliamentary system. Statewide

election results have never been expected to determine the precise percentage of legislative seats won or lost. To the best of my knowledge, it has never been constitutionally required of the executive branch or the judicial branch, or for that matter the legislative majority that they should compensate for weak performance at the ballot box on the part of the current legislative minority. Now, policy differences exist, but that's not the same thing as legality. It's easy to call something unethical or immoral or unfair, but that's not the same thing as legality, either.

And finally, it's easy to charge that something is illegal; but just saying it's that way doesn't make it so. As long as the proposed districts comply with the one man, one vote requirement; as long as they contain approximately equal populations under the 2010 Census; as long as they comply with the Voting Rights Act; as long as they follow the law as it's currently understood; specifically, yes, to include court precedents and rulings now in effect; then these maps are legal, and they deserve our support. Thank you.

REP. SZOKA: Thank you, sir. Next speaker is Mr. Harold Mendelson. Sir, please

identify yourself for the record, and you have three minutes.

MR. MENDELSON: My name is Harold Mendelson. I am from Moore County, and I appreciate the opportunity to speak tonight. I would like to say that the purpose of the redistricting is based on the ruling of the Fourth District Court of Appeals which stated that they felt the existing maps were racially biased. The redistricting as shown in the new maps did not use race as a determining factor in forming the new districts. It is in compliance with the court's mandate.

Other comments would have the redistricting ignore party affiliation. While this could be a better than -- better than the current methods, it is not the purpose of the redistricting. And this issue has no bearing on requirements of the federal court's requirements at this time.

In 1965, the Voting Rights Act established the rules to determine the -- the rules of establishing voting districts. Up until 2010, the Democrats determined the districts and used party affiliation and population in determining the

districts. When the Republicans came to power in 2008 in spite of the Democrat gerrymandering and maintaining control in 2010, this was the first time that the Republicans had an opportunity to create these maps.

In 2011, the Department of Justice approved these voting maps. And then in 2016, there were number of lawsuits that were instigated against the maps being racially biased. And eventually the -- the Department of Justice joined in on these suits. This brings to light that the real reason behind the lawsuits -- and the reason was to -- and that reason was to reduce the power of Republicans. When the Democrats were in power, why didn't they remove political affiliation from the districts?

The comments here was that an outside company created maps. That's not correct. The outside company supplied the software, and the legislators supplied the limitations or -- or the actual specific areas for that -- redrawing the maps.

All right. Now, these new districts comply with the federal courts; at least, apparently so. It would obviously be up to them to

make the final determination. If the -- if the public wants to remove party affiliation from -- from determining districts, then they should ask their representatives to create bills that will do so. If the representatives don't respond to the voters, then they have absolutely -- that can be resolved in the elections.

REP. SZOKA: Sir, if you could finish up?

MR. MENDELSON: I'm done.

REP. SZOKA: Thank you very much. Our next speaker -- and again, I apologize if I butcher your name -- is Amariche Hawkins. Is -- is there anybody with the last name of Hawkins here? Hawkins, one more time? All right. We'll hold that to the end as well. Next speaker would be Lelia Harrington or Harringbon.

MS. HARRINGTON: Harrington.

REP. SZOKA: Sorry. Again, I apologize.

MS. HARRINGTON: It's okay. You said Lelia.

REP. SZOKA: Lelia, okay. I was never a good speller. So --

MS. HARRINGTON: Hi --

REP. SZOKA: If you'd approach the mic, identify yourself for the record, please. And you

have three minutes. Thank you.

MS. HARRINGTON: Hi. Hi. My name is Lelia Harrington. I'm a retired veteran. And I'm speaking here on behalf of myself and on the veterans. Now, I had a look at that map. You have 76 districts for the Republicans on that map and 52 for the Democrats. And I'm not even familiar with this map because I haven't had a chance to really study it. I just briefed over it.

Now, my vote should count. Now, you all can get up here and you can -- like the young -- like the man before me and you can talk about oh, this map is great. But you don't know this map is great. This map is crap. I fought 21 years. I served 21 years in the American Armed Forces. Army. For the First Amendment. The Second Amendment. Every damn amendment on the Constitution. How many of you all have served? And here I stand. Every day I have to fight for my rights as a woman that served and you all have not. I have to fight for my right for me to vote.

My son was kicked off voter registration -- who served in the Armed Forces. Why is that? And you going to tell me this is fair? No, it's not fair. It's a piece of crap. I

counted, and I don't even know that much about this map yet. Okay. You are going to win. You fear my vote. But instead of you reaching across the aisle getting to know me, you would rather suppress my voice. You can reach across the aisle and get to know me. Hi, my name is Lelia Harrington. This is who I am. Oh, you don't want to shake my hand? Okay. I -- this is what I'm talking about. This man don't want to shake the hand of a black woman who served in the Armed Forces, but he wants to tell you he's fair. What, is my hand too dark for you? Am I too dark for you? See, you fear my vote because you don't like me. But my vote is going to count. This is crap, and it will be turned down. And this time the courts will do it. Said all I had to say.

REP. SZOKA: Thank you for your comments. And just for the record, three of the four legislators up here are veterans. Next is Maude Gibbs.

MS. HARRINGTON: You served 21 years? I don't think so. And if you couldn't shake my hand you shouldn't be called --

REP. SZOKA: Ma'am, your time is up, please. Is Maude Gibbs here?

MS. GIBBS: Yes, I'm here.

REP. SZOKA: Yes, ma'am. Please approach the mic. Identify yourself for the record, and you have three minutes. Thank you.

MS. GIBBS: Yes, sir. Thank you. My name is Maude Gibbs. A lot of the stuff I've seen here today is ridiculous. The disrespect I've seen to one of our legislators. Whether you like him or not, I know he served this country. I know this for a fact. My family -- I have a third of my family are veterans. My ex-husband's a veteran. And let me tell you one thing. Half my family are officers. Army, Air Force and Navy, all three branches. I have several first cousins who are [inaudible].

This is craziness, is what's going on in this country right now. This gerrymandering been going on forever; definitely in the Democrat party. Let's keep it real, missy. So when -- when Republican got a chance to do it, now you want to cry it's not fair. It was fair all the other time. Might as well continue being fair now. Sitting in these churches, telling lies. Knowing you're lying, not telling the truth. You know what's in your heart.

Everybody gets an opportunity to get the upper hand, you going to take advantage of the upper hand. They got the upper hand now, and the only reason they got the upper hand is because the people voted for them. If the citizens walking around didn't want them, they wouldn't be up there. That's just setting; one, two, three. Whether you're black or white, it doesn't matter -- an eye for God. Let's keep it real. Let's call it like it is. What's goose -- what's good for the goose is good -- is good for the gander, my grandmother always used to say. That's what I got to say.

Anybody don't like it -- don't care if you're black or white. I don't look at color. I look at -- I vote according to what you -- what you stand for. What you believe in your hearts. And for HB2, let me tell you one thing. I supported the ex-governor on HB2 because I'm going to stand on my true Christian values. I'm not selling out for 30 pieces of -- of gold -- of silver. Thank you.

REP. SZOKA: Thank you for your comments, ma'am. Next speaker is Susan Mills. Please approach the mic, identify yourself for the record, and you'll have three minutes. Thank you.

MS. MILLS: Thank you. My name is Susan Mills. I am from Cumberland County, and I am a schoolteacher. And I want to thank you all for the pay raise that we got. We really do appreciate it, and it's something that we hadn't seen under the Democrats. So thank you very much.

I'm very pleased the General Assembly has drawn the maps in a color-blind way with no use of racial data. These maps are fair and they're legal. Excuse me, we've all given everybody else courtesy, so if we could please do that, too. These maps are fair and legal. They follow the letter of the law as understood today. The districts are fair and compact. They split fewer precincts. City and town boundaries are respected where possible.

And I would like to say it's great to be able now that I'm going to be able to look out my window and see that my neighbors have the same sign that I have in my yard because across the street, we didn't have that. So now with the districts being redrawn we're going have that. So the towns and cities are all going be more compact and much more in common than other places.

Let's face it: there's no way to please

everybody. However, I really do believe that these districts are fair to all and comply with the one man, one vote law. I thank you all for your time. Thank you for all that you do. And hopefully we'll keep these districts. Thank you.

REP. SZOKA: Thank you for your comments. The next speaker is Michael Mills. Sir, please approach the mic, identify yourself for the record, and you'll have three minutes to speak.

MR. MILLS: Michael Mills, Cumberland County. I want to thank you guys for this opportunity to come and speak. I actually support the new districts. I also recognize that when the Democrats were in control, they did the same thing. So, you know, we -- we can't now all of a sudden choose sides and direction.

These new districts will not solve the Democrats' problems. They need a new -- they need to change their policies. For example, Democrats lost nine out of the ten presidential elections. They've lost three straight US Senate elections and 14 out of the last 18 partisan statewide elections. So clearly, the Republicans have gained approximately 125,000 state -- elector -- citizens and the Democrats have lost about that same amount.

So you guys are still running for election the next go-round, the Democrats need to get candidates and run against you guys. Thank you.

REP. SZOKA: Thank you for your comments, sir. Next speaker is Al McSurely. Sir, please approach the microphone, identify yourself for the record, and you'll have three minutes.

MR. MCSURELY: My name is Al McSurely, 81 years old. Been a lawyer for 29 years. Worked with the NAACP for every part of my life -- for 60 years, fighting against racism. I just want to try to clarify a few very bad mistakes that some of the speakers have been made.

There's [inaudible] suits; I think the two people -- two people that mentioned. One they're talking about, of course, the voter suppression suit, that was Fourth Circuit. And Supreme Court upheld that for just the Fourth Circuit. That has nothing to do with this hearing today. The hearing today is about a three-judge federal court that ruled that these -- the same maps that are hanging up there are unconstitutional -- they didn't change them at all. And this -- this case has been decided nine to nothing by Neil Gorsuch, by Clarence Thomas and

all -- all nine of the Supreme Court. So there's no appeal to this. People are kind of upset, there's going to be some kind of appeals on this. This case is not appealable. This case has been decided by nine Supreme Court judges.

The three judges that heard it -- and those of you who are here that were up in Greensboro, went up there and saw the three judges. Margaret Eagles, Jim Wynn and Schroeder -- I mean Schroeder who heard the first part of the -- of the big case. And they ruled three to nothing, a narrow three to nothing ruling stood up in the Supreme Court. That was what was adopted. So there's no more appeals. This is it.

So when the all-white Republican caucus that will be in Raleigh gets that case -- last August, the -- 12 months ago and had it for 12 months and decided not to do -- to sit on their hands for 12 months, and now are waiting until last night to tell us how they designed these new maps, they presented what lawyers call a bad faith and what the Old Testament calls unclean hands. So they've come to the court with unclean hands of sitting on something for 12 months, being in contempt both of the federal court here and of the

Supreme Court now by not recognizing any of the law that they have to go by.

So what is obviously going to happen and I -- I hope the reason I get up to talk is that the three-judge court -- this will go back to them next week in September. And they will look at it to see whether these maps meet what the Supreme Court said is the law of the case. There is no other law. And they -- and they will argue that this -- this all-white supermajority caucus that has been running our state for the last six and a half years --

REP. SZOKA: Sir, would you finish up, please?

MR. MCSURELY: -- come to court with unclean hands. And I'm hoping that the judges get a sense of how these bogus hearings were put together. Not talking about how you run this, but I'm just talking about -- general.

REP. SZOKA: Thank you, sir.

MR. MCSURELY: Gentlemen, I thank you for your courtesy. Thank you.

REP. SZOKA: Thank you, sir, for your comments. Is O'Linda Watkins here? Yes, ma'am. Please identify yourself for the official record,

and you'll have three minutes. Thank you.

MS. WATKINS: Thank you. My name is O'Linda Watkins. I'm President of Moore County NAACP. Our preliminary analysis shows House District 21 continues as it did in the illegal 2011 plans to sprawl into Sampson and Wayne Counties to maximize the black voter population in the district and limit the power of those black voters whose votes would have greater impact in fairly-drawn districts.

The same is true in Senate District 19, which is nearly entirely located in Hoke County itself except for a protrusion that is in the illegal 2011 plans. The biggest addition to the border are reaching into Cumberland County to grab black voters who would otherwise be casting their ballots in Senate District 20. Likewise, Senate District 28 in Guilford County retains -- retains the same irregular shape it did in the illegal 2011 plans and similar packing black voters into it's odd [inaudible] shape.

These maps also grandfather in race discrimination by protecting incumbents who were elected in under the 2011 racially-gerrymandered maps. Instead of protecting those incumbents who

were elected under unconstitutional maps, the proper comparison would be to the -- to the last constitutional maps for General Assembly seeks prior -- and to the 2011 were drawn.

The GOP caucus admits that they considered one, past election outcomes and two, the ability of the Republican Party to win these districts, and that they have drawn these maps for partisan advantages. House District 10 and 36 and Senate District 41, for example, combines different communities and fractured communities of interest and appear to serve only the purpose of creating a Republican advantage in those districts.

We do not trust these maps, which were drawn by the same odd helper who drew the 2011 racially-gerrymandered maps and which were commissioned by an illegal legislature that has failed at every turn to act with integrity. Instead, an independent special master could be tasked with drawing new maps to ensure that it is the law that is followed and not the directions of an illegal legislature that the federal courts have already found guilty and intentionally -- of intentionally acting to suppress the votes of African-Americans, and that numerous federal and

state courts have found guilty of passing legislators that ignores the federal and the state constitution and the will of the people. The -- these games must stop. Thank you.

REP. SZOKA: Thank you for your comments, ma'am. The next speaker is Dennis Biddle or Bidell. Yes, sir. Please approach the microphone, identify yourself for the record, and you'll have three minutes to speak.

MR. BIDDLE: Good evening. My name is Dennis Biddle. I'm a Cumberland County resident. After carefully listening to all these different comments and statements over the last two hours regarding the reconstruction or realignment of the matter at hand -- the reconstruction, realigning of mapping to me personally is nothing more than an underlying attempt to camouflage its efforts to continue the economic control for the few.

It reminds me of the 1835 treaty in which the Supreme Court found it that it was legal to remove a nation of people to a -- a prison in Oklahoma, to take through political process -- and states -- Arkansas, Louisiana, Texas -- from a people. From my ancestors, that -- I'm a -- a -- think it's like a one percent blood of -- my

great-great grandmother was Caddo Indian from Arkansas. And they had to move. But the only expense is to a prison. And other folk came in. It -- this ploy is nothing more than another repeated attempt to control the distribution of the wealth generated by middle America.

I must move personally towards the recommendation that was made by the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King. He spoke about the disproportion of the land and -- and the disproportion of loans given to only certain people in this country to allow them to economically grow financially. He recommended that if those that stand behind these -- these ruthless and deplorable decisions to control and manipulate wealth, that we move to our other agenda. And that other agenda is nothing more than we will mobilize and we will control the support that we make in this American economy. And for those that -- those companies that represent these officials in these offices, they will feel the economic pinch in reference to their behaviors. Thank you.

REP. SZOKA: The last speaker we have is Mitch Colvin. Is he still here? Again, is Mitch Colvin here? According with the rules that were

established, I'll go back and repeat the names of the folks who didn't respond the first time, because we are at the end. Hiram Reynolds? Amariche Hawkins? Or Mitch Colvin? Seeing no one respond, we have gone through the list of everyone who signed up here at Fayetteville for this public hearing.

Before we adjourn the public hearing, I would just like to thank the -- Senator Brent Jackson and my fellow House members, Representative Floyd and Representative Lucas, for being here, as well as all the members who signed up to give -- or all the members of the public, that is, who signed up to give testimony today. We appreciate your comments, whether you submitted them today verbally or in writing. I'd also like to thank our staff, the Sergeant-at-Arms and the local law enforcement folks who supplemented our Sergeant-at-Arms. There being no further testimony, this public hearing in Fayetteville is adjourned.

(End of proceedings.)

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

COUNTY OF WAKE

CERTIFICATION OF TRANSCRIPT

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript of proceedings held on August 22, 2017, is a true and accurate transcript of the proceedings as transcribed by me or under my supervision. I further certify that I am not related to any party or attorney, nor do I have any interest whatsoever in the outcome of this action.

This 28th day of August, 2017.

Brad Worley

Brad Worley, transcriptionist
Worley Reporting
P.O. Box 99169
Raleigh, NC 27624
919-870-8070
brad@worleyreporting.com

EX. 14

NORTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY
JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE ON REDISTRICTING

TRANSCRIPT OF THE PROCEEDINGS
PUBLIC HEARING CONCLUSION - HUDSON SATELLITE SITE

In Raleigh, North Carolina
Tuesday, August 22, 2017
Transcribed by Brad Worley

Worley Reporting
P.O. Box 99169
Raleigh, NC 27624
919-870-8070

(Transcriptionist's note: the following transcript is of proceedings held at the satellite hearing site following disconnection of the communications feed from the central Raleigh site.)

SEN. DANIEL: Because of the problems they've experienced and the number of -- really, there's a high volume of speakers that are still left in the metropolitan areas, so they just want the areas to each do their own speakers that are remaining. I think we have maybe eight here that are still wanting to speak.

And so this will -- hopefully, you'll be recorded by these gentlemen down here so it still all can be part of the record, and we're going to see if we can video it too. I'm not sure if they can do that without the -- that's the point. So the next speaker, then, is Josh Brannon. Stand right here. So you're recognized for three minutes, Josh.

MR. BRANNON: So my question to any legislators who still believe in gerrymandering is, would you -- if it were legal to break into voting machines and flip the ballots, would you do that? And if not, then how do you justify gerrymandering, because to democracy, it is exactly the same thing.

In -- in North Carolina, it's -- it's very hard to quantify the effect that -- that gerrymandering has on -- on the state-level districts simply because there's so many districts that don't have challengers due to the districts being so partisan in the first place.

However, as a proxy, we can use the congressional districts in North Carolina, and in 2016, 47 percent of ballots cast in North Carolina for Congress were cast for Democrats. We elected 23 percent of Democrats to Congress. We undermined half of Democratic ballots. That's functionally no different from breaking into voting machines, flipping half of the Democratic votes to Republican.

And, you know, if -- if we're going to continue to pretend we live in a democracy, we have to fix that. We can't have a situation where one party, each -- each voter has one and a half votes and the other party, each voter only has half a vote. That -- that's what we have right now. It's -- it's looking like for the General Assembly, the -- the outcome is going to be the same. The -- the numbers have already been crunched, and out of -- out of 16 districts that were the closest to

being flipped to Democratic this past election season, 11 have now moved to be more Republican. So we're -- we're actually more gerrymandered now and not less. We have to fix this. We have to -- we have to return to a national democracy, and we -- we have to have a system where one person has one vote, full stop. Thank you.

SEN. DANIEL: The next speaker is Ted Alexander, and then following Mr. Alexander will be Charles Senf.

MR. ALEXANDER: Thank you. My name is Ted Alexander. I'm from Shelby. I serve as the 10th District Chairman for the North Carolina GOP. That covers Polk, Rutherford, Cleveland, Gaston, Lincoln, and parts of Buncombe, Catawba, and Iredell Counties. I do want to thank you for the opportunity to speak today and for holding these hearings.

I'm here in support of these maps for redistricting. And while I know that they're probably not perfect, from what I've seen, what I've heard, otherwise these maps -- compared to previous maps drawn by both Republicans and Democrats in the past, are a vast improvement from where they've been set.

The new districts, I've heard some comments that I've agreed with, the fact that they do. They are more contiguous. I think the legislature's tried their -- their best to keep the counties together where it's -- it's possible. They are smaller and more compact for the most part, and I do think that for the most part, they represent the common interest of the communities and they does -- do -- they do split fewer precincts. But my point regardless of any of that, and -- and this is my particular major point, is -- is that I know that the courts follow the North -- the North Carolina Constitution Article IV, Section 4, which says that the legislature is responsible for drawing these districts and not the courts. The -- the legislature are the elected officials. And they -- that is the body that was designated by the Constitution to do these districts.

The fact is, in North Carolina, the Republicans in the past almost decade have gained in registration by about 125,000 voters. Simultaneously, the Democrats have lost almost the same, similar amount of voter registration. They -- the fact is, they have lost -- Democrats have lost nine out of the last ten presidential

elections, and they have lost three straight United States Senate races, and 14 out of the -- they've lost 14 out of the 18 partisan statewide races. These are statewide races. And I think my estimation is that these maps are simply a reflection of that reality of voter registration.

I'm concerned that continued litigation of these maps and districts will only serve to create continued unnecessary expense, chaos, and uncertainty for voters and candidates alike.

I'm a native of North Carolina. I grew up in Burke County. I can't recall a time in our state's history where districts have been challenged over and over and over just because someone or some group doesn't like the outcome. I would respectfully request and urge the courts to abstain from further undue interference. Thank you for your courtesy.

SEN. DANIEL: Next is Mr. Charles Senf. And if I didn't mention this, please identify yourself to the microphone so that it'll be in the record.

MR. SENF: Good evening. My name is Charles Senf. I'm from Lenoir, North Carolina. I -- I -- there's so much you want to say after

what you've listened to tonight. Transparent, inclusive, nonpartisan American democracy. We were not created equal or given our rights by the political operatives sequestered in the proverbial back room. The United States Constitution demands but a simple count of male citizens and slaves to apportion legislative districts. No mention of race, religion, habits, voting registration were required then or now.

The information age has provided partisan hacks the ability to effect [inaudible] schemes with unerring precision. The computer offers a solution to the divisiveness this scheme has brought across America. Simply eliminate race, religion, gender, ethnicity, and political affiliation from the data fed into the redistricting programs. Publish open source the program and databases used so anyone might verify the process and duplicate the results. An inclusive, transparent, nonpartisan process to ensure our citizens choose their representatives and not the gerry way around. To paraphrase an old technical maxim, partisan in, partisan out. Thank you.

SEN. DANIEL: Thanks. Next speaker will

be Mr. Norm Bossert. And following Mr. Bossert will be Cindy Sellers.

MR. BOSSERT: Thank you. My name is Norm Bossert. I'm here from Transylvania County. I had a nice drive to get here. I was looking at my map up there, and I just want you all to know a fly landed directly on Macon County. I'm not sure what that means, but it means something. I'm sure of that.

In 2010, I lived in Senate District 15. We had a Senator named John Snow. Fine man, hard worker, good representative for us who ran a race against Phone-in Jim Davis -- Senator Jim Davis. That was in a Democratic gerrymander. John Snow lost that election, and we Democrats have tried to figure out why for a long time.

The bottom line is, in the districts that have been gerrymandered by the Democrats, a Republican won. And that 2010 year was a real critical election year here in North Carolina. It concerned everybody because eventually, a fellow named Tom Apodaca, who was a tremendous supporter, a tremendous supporter of nonpartisan gerrymandering in the state, nonpartisan redistricting, lost his passion for that when the

Republicans came into power. Find that interesting.

I find a hopeful note -- just as a bit of history, I find a very hopeful note right now; I'm glad you all are doing hearings. I wish they had been done differently, but I'm glad you're doing them. You certainly heard a lot of people who have opinions, strong opinions, but I'm very, very excited, because near where I live, there's a Republican named Chuck McGrady, and he was one of the principal sponsors of House Bill 200. Along with people like Stevens, Jordan, Hardister, Adcock, Ager, Ball, Beasley, Bell, Brockman, Butler, Carney, of course, Brian Turner, a good friend of mine. All of those folks, Democrats and Republicans, looking to change the way we redistrict in North Carolina.

Now, House Bill 200 isn't perfect from my point of view, and I don't love it, but at least it's a bill, I think, that has its heart in the right place, looking to redistrict this state in a nonpartisan fashion with a nonpartisan committee. I hold that to you, the current Senate and current General Assembly will look more carefully at the House Bill 200 and revisit this whole redistricting

business. The way you've done it is just going to create a lot of disorder in the state, and there's too much partisan discord already.

I personally am sick to death of the acrimony between Democrats and Republicans. I -- the gentleman who spoke earlier about the numbers of people registering, I would just remind Republicans that 39 percent of the voters in this state are registered Democrats, 30 percent are Republicans, but 30 percent are a growing group called unaffiliated voters. They're sick of it, too. They're really sick of it, and they are going to hammer us all. Thank you.

SEN. DANIEL: Next speaker is Cindy Sellers, and then following Ms. Sellers will be Emily Wilkins.

MS. SELLERS: Wake up. Get woke. If you haven't heard that phrase get woke, you're going to hear it again sometime. My name -- good evening. My name is Cindy Sellers, and I live in Alexander County. I'm retired, proud retired schoolteacher, but I am a disenfranchised voter. I have watched this state slide down the slope for hopelessness and feeling like the middle class doesn't matter anymore while carrying on their backs for the

taxes.

We have to fund the nonprofits to help the poor and watching the poor only get poorer while the rich get richer. Those without conscience gerrymander voting districts so they can stay in power and follow the directions of ALEC, the -- the legislative agenda, ALEC, and they're -- they're pushing us down -- that down our throats.

To me, there's a little bit of white supremacy that may be going on there. I'm not sure about that, I'm still wondering about that. But the Koch brothers don't care anything about us. You guys are supposed to, be in separate opinion on you guys. Being blue in a red state is infuriating, and those of us who are paying attention can see through all the games being played against the citizens by Republican legislators who march lockstep to the ALEC tune. Democratic legislators were not even given the chance to debate the devastating laws to benefit the rich and the corporation in the past. Even -- not even from the past, not even from this state.

Throw the maps you have created in secret out in the trash, please. Computer programs to intentionally favor either group should be

outlawed, and maps should be drawn with both parties present. Shame on all of you who call yourselves a Christian in these times of racism and dirty politics and won't stop this. I'm a proud United Methodist and a Rotarian, and I bet some of the legislators are too, maybe many of them. One of the things that we say at the end of all our meetings is, is it fair to all concerned? Set things straight now. Change your ways. It's not too late. You know this is not right, and my vote should count. And indivisible, we were -- will persist to resist. Thank you.

SEN. DANIEL: Next speaker is Ms. Emily Wilkins, and then will be followed by Lynn Dorfman. Is Ms. Dorfman still here? And so after that would-be Thelma Eley.

MS. ELEY: You've got that right.

SEN. DANIEL: You'll be the last one. You get the last word.

MS. ELEY: All right. Very good.

MS. WILKINS: Hi. My name is Emily Wilkins, and I'm from Durham, North Carolina. And it is my pleasure to be accompanying you here tonight because I'm traveling back from the eclipse today. So on my way home, I have to do something

political, switch it up.

In light of the unanimous Supreme Court rulings, what prevents North Carolina voters from free and fair elections? Gerrymandered maps, which disenfranchise black voters with surgical precision. These maps are no improvement. Black lives matter. Punching some folk into small pockets and stretching districts through six counties to enhance representation of predominantly white people repeats the same illegal districting.

I'd like to draw your attention to the following on the Senate redistricting plan. Please look at the District 47. It includes Madison, Yancey, Mitchell, McDowell, Rutherford, and Polk. These are six counties on the outskirts of Asheville. Also, look at Senate District 3: Vance County, Warren County, Northampton County, Bertie County, Martin County, and Beaufort County. You've already heard from your Republican colleagues that they don't like this, and I don't like it, either. Those are on the outskirts of Raleigh. Then, we have the concentrated areas. 41, suburbs of Charlotte, 28 for Greensboro, 29 for Winston-Salem, Franklin County dips into downtown Raleigh, number 18.

Dividing us by race is an old strategy to deprive everyone of access to economic, social, and political parity. Forward together, not one step back. Forward together, not one step back. Forward together, not one step back. Thank you.

SEN. DANIEL: Final speaker is Ms. Eley.

MS. ELEY: Oh, that's me. I thought Lynn --

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Lynn Dorfman.

SEN. DANIEL: Oh, did she come back yet? Oh, she did not? Okay.

MS. ELEY: All right. Good evening. My name is Thelma Eley, and I'm from Hickory, North Carolina. You know, sitting silently endorses agreement to an existing situation or circumstance. I stand before you today to loudly proclaim the disapproval of the quote, unquote redrawn maps. These maps are just -- they're unjust, and they do not allow proper representation of the people of North Carolina. The redrawn maps were created by the originator of the previously drawn maps, Thomas Hofeller.

Now, I believe that his goal remains the same. And that goal is the goal of the existing governing body of North Carolina, the Republican

Party. Those are the ones who -- they have proven year over year that their concern is not for the marginalized, but for those who have those deep pockets and who look more like them. Gerrymandering is not just and does not provide the voices of all North Carolinians to be heard.

As a member and a citizen of these United States of America, I -- I have the sacred right of being able to vote unencumbered and without suppression. A trusted entity must be engaged to draw the maps equitably that would provide the citizens of North Carolina the ability to voice their opinions and elect officials that will represent our voices, our issues, and our concerns. The amount of time and money that we spend on this issue could have been utilized for education, healthcare, and infrastructure. One person, one vote, and my vote should be valued just like those of the majority party. Thank you.

SEN. DANIEL: Thank you, everybody. That concludes this hearing, so we're going to adjourn the Caldwell County hearing of the Senate Legislative Redistricting Committee. I appreciate everybody coming here. Everybody was very respectful. We didn't have any disturbances like

some of the other locations had, so I appreciate your participation, and good night and safe travels.

(End of proceedings.)

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

COUNTY OF WAKE

CERTIFICATION OF TRANSCRIPT

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript of proceedings held on August 22, 2017, is a true and accurate transcript of the proceedings as transcribed by me or under my supervision. I further certify that I am not related to any party or attorney, nor do I have any interest whatsoever in the outcome of this action.

This 28th day of August, 2017.

Brad Worley

Brad Worley, transcriptionist
Worley Reporting
P.O. Box 99169
Raleigh, NC 27624
919-870-8070
brad@worleyreporting.com

EX. 15

NORTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY
JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE ON REDISTRICTING

TRANSCRIPT OF THE PROCEEDINGS
PUBLIC HEARING CONCLUSION - JAMESTOWN SATELLITE SITE

In Raleigh, North Carolina
Tuesday, August 22, 2017
Transcribed by Brad Worley

Worley Reporting
P.O. Box 99169
Raleigh, NC 27624
919-870-8070

(Transcriptionist's note: the following transcript is of proceedings held at the satellite hearing site following disconnection of the communications feed from the central Raleigh site.)

REP. STEVENS: We are disconnecting from them, and we will conduct this as a separate hearing, so we don't have to stay here all night. And as -- as you heard, we will record your words, and they will be transcribed as part of whatever goes to the Court. So that being said, Mr. Brown, Cardes Brown, you are first, followed by Kay Brandon, Linda Sutton, Margaret Salinger and Anne Brady. For a time not to exceed three minutes, we'll still do the three-minute time.

MR. BROWN: Thank you so much for the opportunity to come --

REP. STEVENS: Wait a minute. Do we have our timekeeper? We -- we just need to get our timekeeper.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Real quick, folks, if you'd like to turn your chairs around, so you could see the speaker, feel free, but do not rearrange them as far as where they're at. Just simply pick them up and turn them around; that is fine.

MR. BROWN: Thank you so much for this

opportunity. I'm Cardes Brown. I have been privileged to serve in the Greensboro area now for more than 50 years as a pastor.

I'm very concerned about these proceedings today. The hearing, first of all, at a time when most people could not come that would've come. I think that was intentional, it was deliberate and it's obvious that we are here going through probably an exercise in futility. Our draconian legislators intended to do a mockery of -- of the democratic process. They have been doing that for quite some time, this is nothing new, and I hope that we are aware of what is being done.

First of all, they are to have this done by the first of September. They know that it is impossible to do it and do it properly in that time frame. I'm hoping that the Court will take the responsibility away from this draconian legislature and will decide for this state who should draw the map. First of all, we already know, we are wasting money, our money, taxpayers' money, going through this exercise in futility.

They have hired the same person to draw the maps that disenfranchised -- in fact, the Court

said, like a surgeon, intentionally disenfranchised African-American voters. So I have no hope that this is going to come out in a way that is fair and represents the will of the people. This is still to be a government of the people, for the people, by the people. And what has now happened is legislators have taken these things and they covered these things, they have no desire to represent the people. They are only representing their own selfish ambitions and -- and many of them.

I have gone before the General Assembly. I have been arrested. I've gone to jail fighting for something that is a constitutional right, and I'm hoping that we, who are here, will insist that by September 1 -- which they cannot draw maps complicit to the directions of the Court, that we will insist that the Court will take this process over. And many of them know that they would never be elected again. Most people recognize that these folk who have coveted and hoarded these positions would never be elected by the people if this process were fair.

So I'm hoping that we will stay together across this state and stand as one voice and insist

that we want a democratized government, and if we do it, the people will prevail. I'll stop. Thank you.

REP. STEVENS: Still -- still a court proceeding. Still being recorded. No applause, please. Thank you.

MS. BRANDON: Good afternoon. I am a resident of House District 57 and Senate District 28. The North Carolina legislature has allowed inadequate time to review the proposed map before a public hearing is being held. It appears this was done on purpose, to prevent the public from having the time to analyze the data in any meaningful way.

The public has not had an opportunity to comment on the criteria used to draw these maps. The criteria are believed to -- to be tainted because they used the 2011 maps that the Court struck down as being unconstitutional. The 2011 maps were racially gerrymandered and should not be used as the benchmark for drawing new maps.

The districts of the new map have been drawn with excessive amounts of wasted votes, which is an indication of continued partisan gerrymandering that undermines democracy. The House plan perpetuates the same strategy of racial

gerrymandering and unnecessarily packing black voters into districts limiting their statewide political power which was found to have been unconstitutional by the government.

My Senate District 28 has been [inaudible]. The legislature [inaudible] established a bipartisan committee to redraw the districts. It can be done, as is proved by the volunteer panel of retired Supreme Court judges and appellate court judges who created a non-partisan redistricting plan. Non-partisan redistricting is the only way to restore democracy in North Carolina.

MS. SUTTON: Good afternoon. My name is Linda Sutton. I'm a voter in Forsyth County affiliated with a lot of organizations. I'm a life member of the NAACP, but I'm mostly proud of being affiliated with Democracy North Carolina, a non-partisan organization that uses advocacy and education. Democracy North Carolina is an organization you need to check out. Go to our website, democracync.org, and you can view the same basic principles that we're giving to all of our legislators and this committee to use in redrawing these illegal maps.

Well, I just want to say something about this sham process. We're 200 people waiting in Raleigh and -- and don't know how many in the other areas. With seven locations mostly in small communities, would you expect to hear from the voters? No. It was set up that way. It's a rigged process, okay? The whole system is rigged. Short notice is just per statute. That's it. Just for -- you could've had it earlier. They dragged their feet in drawing this map, or maybe they didn't. Maybe they had the map drawn when, last month, month before last, right? Okay.

I'm just saying it's too little, too late. It's not going to make any difference. I believe they've already decided what they're going to do. So we're going to have to give it to our courts, we're going to have to take it further. It cannot be left at this level. Not at all.

The only other thing I want to say is -- no one has talked about this one, although they've talked about race a lot, but no one's talked about counting incarcerated persons, and so it is possible to count incarcerated persons who -- as residents of where they lived before they were incarcerated. You know, when you think outside the

box, this is just common sense.

But lastly, let me be clear, the old maps and the new proposed maps are nothing less than another power grab. They equate to the continuing white supremacy, and you know what that is. Money, power, greed and racism, okay? The voters and I are sick and tired of being sick and tired of being disenfranchised, disrespected, dismissed, which is disgraceful. To the point that people are saying North Carolina, you not even a democracy anymore, you know? I'm -- I'm -- I'm ashamed. I'm ashamed.

So I urge you, show some decency, some morals and some fairness in drawing these maps. Second thought, don't draw them, let the courts do it. Thank you.

MS. SALINGER: Hi. My name is Margaret Salinger. I'm a native of Greensboro. I represent the League of Women Voters of North Carolina. Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the draft maps. The League appreciates the committee's work to produce drafts that improve the current maps, but we certainly have a way of getting there. While we don't see the committee members as foxes, we certainly do not see ourselves as hens. We're still letting the foxes draw the maps. We need to

put the voters, not the politicians, in the driver's seat.

Voter participation in drawing the maps is the key to making this happen. Real public participation requires time and the means of assessing the degree to which these maps adhere to the criteria set by the committee as well as universally accepted standards of fairness. Citizens have had only three days to look at the House map, two days for the Senate, and just a day for the data. By delaying that drawing until the very last moment, the legislature has denied voters a real chance to have their say.

Some of the committee's nine criteria, such as more compactness and less precinct-splitting were appropriate, but others have no place in drawing fair districts. But even including appropriate criteria, the committee did not make it possible to determine how the new districts measure up. For example, the criteria called for splitting fewer districts, but didn't include a target or guidelines on when to split a precinct.

As for the maps, we appreciate the committee's reporting of at least some data on how

the proposed maps perform against their criteria, and we have used this information to -- to attempt to assess them ourselves. Since time is short, let me just hit on some of the highs and lows. The committee clearly made the right choice in adopting county groupings that conform to the North Carolina constitution, producing a map that improves on the current maps, but even if this does not, by itself, guarantee the districts -- that the districts also comply.

We also see some progress on compactness, with somewhat better average scores than last time when the Senate had [inaudible]. The House districts have fewer irregular [inaudible] boundaries; the new maps apparently will [inaudible]. This suggests that we are still falling short of fair districts.

The committee decided to avoid pitting incumbents against each other; this criterion simply has no place in a fair process. Elections should be all about protecting voters' ability to have their say, not protecting incumbents.

We haven't been able to assess how abusive political considerations of election results affected the maps, but misuse of these data

to predetermine election outcomes is what gerrymandering is all about. We share the legislature's belief in the power of competition to benefit -- benefit consumers and businesses. We believe it's good for democracy too.

Finally, the exclusion of racial data makes it impossible to say whether minority voters have a decent to elect their preferred candidates. So we can't say whether or not the League [inaudible]. Thank you.

MS. BRADY: Hello. My name is Ann Brady. I'm from Rockingham County, and I know we're all getting tired, so please forgive my redundancy. I'll try to be brief. I wanted to start with a quote I just found. Alice Ristroph is a professor at Brooklyn Law School and in the Atlantic, she published, quote, "We have figured out, more or less, how to count every person. We have not yet found a political system in which every person counts equally."

This redistricting process was non-transparent, was terrible. We had no time to analyze these maps so that we can give good feedback. We do know that Senator Berger's likely competitors were redistricted out of my district.

I do wish I felt my hour drive here would have an effect; is anybody listening?

Apparently 90 percent of the districts solidly are in favor of one party or the other where we aren't going to really have good elections. Overall, the new maps appear to be made to favor Republicans. Party favoritism should not be a factor in redistricting. So I also, as have most speakers, ask for these maps to be redone in a fair way, by the courts, by whomever.

Let me also mention, in 2015, House Bill 92 was introduced to establish a non-partisan, not bipartisan, non-partisan redistricting committee, and there were 83 bipartisan sponsors, and at least one is in here. It was killed in committee, never went to the floor, and so were subsequent attempts at legislation. If you won't do it now, please let a non-partisan redistricting commission bill get to the floor of the General Assembly, at least for debate.

At the beginning of this hearing, we were thanked for participating in the democratic process. Make our elections democratic. Every person should count equally. Thank you.

REP. STEVENS: Our next five speakers, we

have Walter Salinger, Mr. Salinger here? Walter Salinger. Lynn Bennett. Steve Cothran, and Sherry Conway Appel? Apple? Appel. Try to make an orderly line.

MR. SALINGER: How many folks are all more alert than I am? My name is Walter Salinger and I have to say that in my more than --

REP. STEVENS: Sorry, can I -- can I stop you for just a minute and -- and -- and we're just a little concerned. I'm going to let you have a whole three new minutes, but we're talking about needing to bring the mic that's -- the whole podium up here, because the actual recording devices are here. And there's just some concern that they're not getting a strong enough signal. He was watching the signals. I'm assuming they are.

(Discussion off record.)

REP. STEVENS: So please feel free to start over; you've got a whole new three minutes.

MR. SALINGER: Okay.

REP. STEVENS: And I'm sorry; I didn't mean to disrupt you.

MR. SALINGER: That's all right.

So, my name is Walter Salinger, and in my more than 75 years, I've watched a lot of politics

and a lot of politicians. I've seen elected officials who did things in office they knew weren't right, but what's going on right now in North Carolina's state -- court-ordered legislative redistricting process absolutely takes the cake, at least in my limited experiences.

What's so amazing about it is that usually when elected officials know that they're doing something wrong, they have the decency to try to hide it. But our brazen legislators don't even -- legislators don't even bother to try. The Supreme Court of the United States of America unanimously declared that our legislature is basically illegal; that current legislators held fake elections by creating and using unconstitutional voting districts.

Now, these same fake legislators are telling us that they've drawn fair maps; that they have finally created election districts that would allow us to elect real, not fake, legislators. Yet when they told us what kind of maps they were actually going to draw, they didn't even try to conceal the fact that one of their primary goals was to get themselves reelected. They called it incumbency protection, and somehow we the people

are supposed to believe these fake legislators when they now tell us that their new maps are fair. Personally, I find it easier to believe my lying eyes.

REP. STEVENS: Ms. Bennett.

MS. BENNETT: Hi, I'm Lynn Bennett. I live in Greensboro. Beginning in our school days, many of us elected class officers, voted for chairs of committees and chose leaders of teams. What we learned concerned the democratic process, the power of each person's voice, a fair way to choose direction.

Gerrymandering, the manipulation of the democratic process, dilutes individuals' voices in purposeful, unfair political practice. Gerrymandering is about partisan power, not about fair choice. Gerrymandering is not about what citizens need or prefer from their leaders, just the opposite. It is about what the leaders want for themselves. When one person's vote is diluted or denied, all of us feel the effect.

It's time for effective, fair, honest leadership by our political representatives. It is they who design the maps which determine for whom we can vote. It is they who have the

responsibility to uphold the principles of democracy. The newest political lines must permit every person to have an equal voice at the ballot box. Partisanship has no place in deciding voting districts.

At a recent community meeting, several retired judges discussed an exercise demonstrating nonpartisan redistricting. Their process took less than one half a day, and the result was a fair and easily-accomplished map for North Carolina. What is stopping our legislature from doing the same?

If they have listened to the people who have spoken today, the result will be a nonpartisan map which honestly, fairly, legally redistricts this state. Make our voting districts nonpartisan, fair and legal and put a stop to this manipulative process.

REP. STEVENS: Steve Cothran?

REV. COTHRAN: I am the Reverend Steve Cothran. I'm the associate pastor for youth and families at First Baptist Church in Greensboro. And I don't know if y'all heard about this, but there was a total solar eclipse yesterday. That means that the two celestial bodies that provide light to our world, in a rare event, worked

together yesterday, and the results were life-altering. Millions of Americans, millions, stood in awe just to catch a glimpse of that display of this incredibly rare phenomenon, and for many people, it was a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity.

Yesterday, I stood in the backyard where I grew up in South Carolina and during totality, we were able to stare directly at the sun for over two minutes. How on earth is that possible? It's possible because these two bodies worked together, and the world was amazed at the result.

You have that same power to amaze the world by working together. I know it's as rare -- sorry, more rare than a solar eclipse, but for the people of North Carolina, the people that you represent, or the people you should be representing, for those people, it will be truly even more life-changing. And it will be life-changing for you, our representatives, because that means you will have to give up some of your power. And that's scary, because you might not be the most powerful light in the sky anymore, but oh, what a wonderful opportunity that would open up for all of North Carolina whom you claim to serve.

But we don't even have time to ponder how

immoral it is for people elected by illegal, racially-gerrymandered maps to then be allowed to redraw those maps. It would be like coming home and your child has eaten your birthday cake and you say, "Son, that was wrong. You want some ice cream with that?" There are black brothers and sisters in this room today, thank God. And how is that possible? Because of the moral courage of four young men at a Woolworth lunch counter right up the road.

Do we think that you will do the right thing and fix this? You are fast creating a lot of cynics here, but we wouldn't be here if we didn't believe that you can and will repudiate racism instead of eclipsing equality. Otherwise, it's just about white supremacy. And you'll be redrawing those maps not by the bright light of freedom, but by the dim wit of a tiki torch while you mutter, we will not be replaced.

REP. STEVENS: Cheri Conway Appel. While she's on her way up, next will be Martha Shafer and Dominic Patofee.

MS. APPEL: Hi. I'm Sherry Conway Appel, and I'm a resident of Hillsborough. Can you hear me? All right. I wanted to thank the

representative and those here today who are here. We did not get to -- to speak in front of all the other committee members, but I do hope you will take our message, which is pretty loud and clear, I think, from -- not everyone, but from many of us.

I once worked for a member of Congress, and I know and understand the importance of public hearings and getting the public input on issues as critical as redistricting. But today's hearing, however, doesn't really meet the standard. We've had challenges with sound quality, with visual quality. This is the Research Triangle. Can't we do better?

But I think that's because of the speed of how this was put together, which was one of my big concerns. The lack of adequate notice, the lack of time, the lack of data that we got -- where we got this information. The criteria, as you have heard, is flawed.

We feel very strongly that the Court did not imply that race should not be considered. In fact, we believe the Court ruled that no voter should be disenfranchised because of their race. I am sure that someone -- and I hope someone now is looking at how these new proposed districts will be

represented in terms of -- so that each of these North Carolina voters can say they have a vote. But due to the rushed nature of this hearing, we don't have that information right now. Will we have that information in time before the legislature takes action? It's very important that we understand that.

Representation in the House and Senate should really roughly represent the way people vote in elections and others have talked about this.

In the case of 20 -- of 2016, we had a 20 -- 50 percent Rs to 47 percent Ds of the vote. The gubernatorial race was even closer. Clearly with these maps, you will continue to dilute the Democratic vote. You will -- through these maps you are already disenfranchising 20 percent of the voting public in your effort to keep the Republican stronghold on the House and Senate. This is pure gerrymandering by political affiliation. You may think it is legally right, but it is morally wrong.

When you think about Hillsborough, which is my area, this has been changed, and it's now combined with the rest of Orange County and Caswell County. One of the criteria that's used in other states is that districts represent a similar

community of interest. I would guess that the good people of Caswell may not feel as connected to those in Hillsborough, since only the connection is Route 86. By the way, the Senate map groups Orange and Chatham County together in one district.

In Maryland, I saw how the Democrats use political gerrymandering to this -- to their end. It was wrong there, and it's wrong here. Thank you.

REP. STEVENS: Ms. Shafer.

MS. SHAFER: Hi. I'm Martha Shafer. I'm a native North Carolinian. I live in Summerfield now, which is a rural community north of Greensboro within Guilford County. I'm going to tell a little bit of a personal story.

I was upset when I went to vote in 2016, finding that I had no alternative on my ballot to my incumbents, Phil Berger and John Blust. Why did they run unchallenged? Because my districts are so gerrymandered that no sane person would attempt a run against the Republican incumbents. Is this what democracy looks like? So I set out to advocate for my values with my representatives.

I have written John Blust 62 times. I am persistent. He has responded to me exactly once.

Why is he so unresponsive? Because he knows he can be. He doesn't need to listen to me or any other Democratic constituents in his district.

I've written Phil Berger seven times and received no responses from him. I've written numerous letters to the editor -- letters to the editor in the Greensboro News & Record, which have been published with various criticisms of him. Those letters won't matter much to Berger's new constituents, who live in the even safer district he is moving to. Berger is eluding accountability to his former constituents in northwest Guilford County by drawing himself out of my district. Is this what democracy looks like?

I was so excited when I learned that the legislative maps would be redrawn, hoping for even some small incremental improvement in the competitiveness of my districts. I naively hoped that as the unconstitutional districts became unpacked, there would be some spillover of Democrats whose -- whose votes had been previously wasted. Clearly, that is not the case. In the very short time I have had to look at the data since it's been made public, it appears that these new maps show that the redistricting committee is

collectively thumbing its nose at the federal judges.

What you have proposed is not a real remedy. By not considering race as a criterion, you use partisanship as a tool to increasingly waste the votes of people of color. I'd be surprised if any Democratic candidate is willing to run in my districts, which are even less competitive than they were before. Is this what you were trying to accomplish? Is this what democracy looks like? I implore the Court to not accept these maps and to remember that North Carolina has been said to not be a -- a -- a democracy anymore. That'll be doubly true now if the judicial branch does not intervene to put a stop to this malfeasance. This legislature is running hog wild.

REP. STEVENS: And you are welcome to submit your comments in writing to the committee.

MS. SHAFER: Thank you.

REP. STEVENS: Dominic Patofie? I -- I've called that three times. I don't think he's here. Gay Dillard? Gay Dillard? Okay. Miles Jones. Miles Jones. Tina Forsberg? Tina Forsberg. Todd Warren. Todd Warren. Lawrence

Cormier? You have the floor.

MR. CORMIER: Okay. Thank you. My name is Larry Cormier. I am a resident of Jamestown. And first a quote from the movie FM. "I'm mad as hell and I'm not going to take it anymore." This is 2017. We should not be here to demand racial equity. We should be fighting for honeybee survival. What is this? And alls I can say is shame, shame, shame.

You implement racially-gerrymandered districts, white supremists -- supremacists, excuse me. Shame. You fought and fought until the highest court in the land said unconstitutional. Any idiot could see this was immoral in addition to unconstitutional. Shame. You refuse to assemble in a timely manner per our governor's request. The courts had to demand action. Shame.

You released your maps on Saturday. Of course, we could not get any information in a timely manner. Shame. You set up inadequate facilities for three days. Here's three-day notice. What the heck could we find in three days? Actually, less than three days because most of the data wasn't there.

These few days, this process is like

taking a liquid oozing from pig farms, spraying it with aerosolizers all over us, just like someone in this room wants to do to us. You propose these maps in secret in an unbelievably partisan manner. Shame. The lovely lady early had to ask you if she could use her crayons to do a better job, and I'm sure she would. Shame.

You've shown your hatred and immorality towards minorities and marginalized citizens like HB2, the -- the monuments, refusal to -- to take those down, gerrymandering, to the extent that you would rather lose billions of dollars to the state than do the right, moral, legal thing. Shame.

HB200 is held up. I -- I'm not sure if HB200 is the right one, but it is the bill for gerrymandering. It is -- it has overwhelming bipartisan support. Move it forward. In response to previous speakers, congratulations on having teachers' pay to what? Number 47 in the nation? Come on, we can do a hell of a lot better than that. I'm so sick of the Republican Party using the I-know-you-are-but-what-am-I argument with the gerrymandering. And of course, the person who brought suit previously, of course, is here. Everything you're doing is illegal. Thank you.

REP. STEVENS: Joan Bars. I didn't mean to skip you if I did. Joan Bars. William Porter. Mr. Porter. Then Bill Doom. Bill Doom, you'll be next.

MR. PORTER: Good evening. It -- it is evening now almost. My name is William Porter. I'm from Thomasville, North Carolina. That's Davidson County, and I believe it is -- what, Montgomery County now for our senatorial district, but Davidson County for our House district.

I'm not going to presume to think that either of you are white supremacists or any of the other citizens who are here today representing our state, but I will say as a son of a US Marine veteran, deceased, who was trained at a segregated base down east, once upon a time, in North Carolina and now a -- a father-in-law of a soldier who's serving at Fort Bragg, I'd like to say that gerrymandering is wrong.

It's not good for the citizens. It's not good for the state. I moved here from North Carolina in 1980 -- I mean, from Texas in 1989, and I have phone calls almost daily -- at least weekly -- from my friends around the nation who look at North Carolina and see a sad situation, and

I'd like that to change as soon as possible. Thank you very much for your time.

REP. STEVENS: Thank you. Mr. Doom. Bill Doom.

MR. DOOM: My name is Bill Doom. I'm from Davidson County, and William and I are good friends, and I don't want to speak about these maps. I want to speak about the process.

We need an independent board, and these maps make it pretty clear why. Legislation has been submitted to create an independent board that could have a nonpartisan solution, but that just languishes. I suspect that most of the precinct, town and county issues that have been raised earlier this evening were created because the map was seeking favorable combinations of voters. An independent, nonpartisan solution could avoid those problems.

We have the same biased process run by the same people as before, with the same goal of disenfranchising as many people from other parties as possible. So these maps may be a little less racist than they were before in hopes that the Court won't notice, but otherwise, they're designed to accomplish the same purpose.

The maps are an insult, but this hearing is set up as an insult with the timing, the lack of data, the lack of space, the lack of electronic facilities, et cetera. All tell me that nobody really wanted any feedback, that they're going to do the minimum requirements by law and let it go. That is certainly a disrespect for self-rule. It is a disrespect for one citizen, one vote. It is a disrespect for democracy itself.

The argument that well, the Democrats did it before -- true, they did. But that is a middle school excuse for continuing to do the wrong thing. I don't remember Lincoln saying a government of some of the people, by some of the people, for some of the people, so let's stop the charade and do the right thing. Thank you.

REP. STEVENS: Rachel Samuels and Sam Sullivan. Is Sam Sullivan here? Then after Rachel Samuels will be Roxanne Griffin.

MS. SAMUELS: My name is Rachel Samuels and I am from Greensboro, North Carolina. I was a marcher on 4th and Water Street in Charlottesville, North Carolina [sic], on August 12th. I hold the Republican Party complicit and culpable with inspiring my attacker with their intolerant and

dog-whistling rhetoric.

I would have been -- I have been a voter since 1996, and I was voting with people who -- who represented Charlottesville Black Lives Matter. They were desperate to be heard. They urged us to run towards our attacker. I will never forget those calls for a medic and help and the terrified faces that I saw that I could not help. That is why I am here today.

The Republican General Assembly in the State of North Carolina has a vested interest in disenfranchising minority voters in this state. When have they delivered an open, fair, transparent and equitable process for minority voters? They haven't and they won't, because they want to preserve their privilege. When they don't -- when people are not able to vote, they win every time. But I've been 20 -- voting for 21 years. And they will not change. They never change their colors and they don't change their stripes.

So I am urging you in this General Assembly -- you are moral and if you are decent, prove me wrong. Prove me wrong. I'm 39 years old, and all you ever did was prove me right. But y'all ain't up to it. If you ain't up to it, get out of

the way. Because I'm part of an impatient generation, and our impatience is going to take over and make waves. Thank you for letting me speak.

REP. STEVENS: Roxanne Griffin. After Ms. Griffin will be Jocelyn Tsai and Georene Jones. It's okay, Roxanne. We won't start until you talk.

MS. GRIFFIN: Okay. Sorry about that. This country was founded as a result of a revolution over representation or lack thereof. But in nine -- in 1812, the great premise -- that great premise was undermined when Elbridge Gerry signed into law partisan districting for the advantage of his Democratic-Republican Party. So for the next 200 years, we have suffered the tit for tat of our two-political system.

Our Constitution does not say, we the politicians. It does not say, we the funders of politicians. It says, we the people. Our Constitution and amendments call for one citizen, one vote. Our Constitution and amendments are supposed to protect us from discrimination. But what it does not protect us from is engineered partisan advantage. Our Republican-dominated General Assembly readily admits that they used

racial demographics to allow them to achieve partisan advantage. It's legal.

The Swiss cheese of the new maps that we just got on Friday display the clear intent to maintain power, not fair representation. The division of communities for the sake of one party or the other maintaining power may be legal, but it is deplorable and dishonorable practice. One look at our voter rolls where -- where unaffiliated statistics continue to climb shows that there's a -- a clear loss of -- of faith in our government based on partisanship. It's past time that we reject gerrymandering. I urge you to live up to the -- whoops -- I urge you to live up to the ideals that our country was founded upon, representation and fairness.

That we only received these maps on Saturday and did not receive documentation to back up the justification for those new lines is unreasonable. This information should have been presented to us long before then so that we had an opportunity to digest it and understand what is being presented. This is not representation.

We have had bills presented, or -- or proposals, for nonpartisan districting. Our

birthright is the right to vote, the right to be represented. And when we gerrymander, regardless of who does it, and it's wrong no matter who does it, we are short-changing ourselves, all of us. Republican, Democrat, it makes no difference if we undermine our country. Thank you.

REP. STEVENS: Just -- just one thing. For the record, make sure to give your name.

MS. GRIFFIN: Oh, sorry. Roxanne Griffin, Rockingham County.

REP. STEVENS: Thank you. I know I said it a couple of times, but I needed you to be clarifying for me. Jocelyn Tsai. And after her, GeoRene Jones.

MS. TSAI: Quick question. Where is the microphone that is actually recording?

REP. STEVENS: GeoRene.

MS. TSAI: Where is the microphone that is actually recording?

REP. STEVENS: Right -- right there. Well, they're recording over here, yes.

MS. TSAI: Okay. All right. So I'm going to walk a little bit closer here. So my name is Jocelyn Tsai, and I drove from Carrboro, North Carolina, to say that I am against the proposed

maps on the grounds that I cannot trust them. The first reason is the Republican state legislature hired Thomas Hofeller to draw the current proposed maps. Mr. Hofeller drew the original unconstitutional maps in 2011 and is largely known for drawing unfair maps in other states.

As somebody trained personally in geospatial analysis, I personally know that there are plenty of mapmakers out there and cartographers without the stained work history. Why did state Republicans hire repeat -- a repeat offender? Well, it appears that Republicans have no interest in creating fair maps to represent the people of North Carolina.

A second problem I have with those maps is that they don't consider race. Our current and unconstitutional voting maps disenfranchises black people with surgical precision by creating districts with over 50 percent black voting age populations. As a way to seemingly avoid this issue, the Republicans have claimed for that -- for this round, race will not be used to draw maps. And that sounds awfully nice, but honestly, if you aren't explicitly addressing race, then you aren't showing how you're mitigating the original problem.

How do I personally know that the districts are no longer designed to concentrate black voters and thus disenfranchise people of color? In short, I can't trust these maps, because I don't know if they will continue to perpetuate institutional white supremacy.

Finally, I want to voice my dissent in the process itself. I'm upset that I did not hear about this meeting until late last week. And I personally called my state senator to complain that the people don't have enough time to prepare or respond to the maps. I also said that I'm upset that a person from Orange County, I have to drive to Guilford or to Raleigh to make sure that my voice is heard. We need open meetings like this in every county at different hours so that all citizens can be heard.

As a North Carolina resident that wants fair representation, I cannot accept these maps. I need new maps drawn by a nonpartisan organization with race explicitly addressed. I also need more time and transparency on the overall process so that North Carolina citizens all have the opportunity and time to analyze and comment on the proposed maps. Thank you very much.

REP. STEVENS: Interesting spelling, but I will get it right now. GeoRene Jones, please come up.

MS. JONES: Thank you. My name is GeoRene Jones. I am a resident of Rowan County, North Carolina, and I serve as the coordinator of social justice and advocacy ministries for the North Carolina Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

Today, I have heard citizens overwhelmingly beg you to find a way to toss the old maps, these newly redrawn maps, and establish new district maps with neutrality and fairness. This reminds me of my grandmother's solution when my cousins and I used to argue over the same toy. Since, she would say, you cannot figure out how to play with it together, it's mine now.

After reviewing this same issue in 13 different states across this country, I've found that those who are successful in ending gerrymandering chose to hand off responsibility for drawing maps to a completely independent, nonpartisan commission. This has been suggested numerous times today, and I support it entirely. Yes, this method pushes against our time limit, but

it provides to the Court a significant showing of good faith, particularly since this record of this meeting shows wide-ranging support for such an independent process.

I've heard it argued that this would cost us a lot of money. It would be way too expensive. And yet without reasonable independent solution, our litigation costs continue to mount. If we had done this earlier, how much healthier would we be as a state financially, emotionally and spiritually. And I've heard the argument, well, they -- well, if they jumped off a bridge, would you do it, too?

As a North Carolina citizen, I am always in favor of North Carolina showing good faith. And in this case, I hope we will place ourselves humbly at the mercy of the Court if necessary in order to provide all North Carolina's voters the unfettered opportunity to exercise the right to cast their sacred vote. Thank you.

REP. STEVENS: I'm going to try this name and hope I don't butcher it. Chris Buczynski.

MR. BUCZYNSKI: Close enough.

REP. STEVENS: Buczynski. All right. I'll let you pronounce it for the record.

MR. BUCZYNSKI: Yeah, my name's Chris Buczynski.

REP. STEVENS: Buczynski.

MR. BUCZYNSKI: Yeah. I'll make this quick. For the last federal legislative election, which is the only legislative election it's impossible to gerrymander, Senator Burr got about 51.1 percent of the vote. But somehow Republicans got 77 percent of federal House seats, 69 percent of the state Senate seats and 61 percent of state House seats. How are you doing [inaudible] that is what our representative democracy looks like?

It's bullshit. I know it's bullshit. You know it's bullshit. We know what you're doing. The Supreme Court told you to fix it. So fix it. Don't hire the same asshole that drew the last racist-ass map. Give us this new map that says nothing, has no real information on it and give the entire state two hours to discuss it. This whole process is a farce.

REP. STEVENS: And our final speaker, the final one I have listed is Leslie Martin. Ms. Martin.

MS. MARTIN: So my name is Leslie Martin. I'm from Oak Ridge, and I'm here to speak tonight

because, clearly, our legislature is up to the same shenanigans that got us here. A cursory look at the data they provided less than 24 hours ago shows -- and a look at the races that were within 10-point margins -- and by the way, that's not particularly competitive in my book. If I just lost a race by 10 points, I don't think I would go home, like, go to bed that night thinking, man, I just missed it. But that's what we're reduced to in terms of thinking about a race in competitive terms now.

Looking at the 2012 Presidential election, only 12 of the 120 proposed House districts met that criteria. So it's literally 10 percent. Okay? And I know Republicans think they're winning right now because their legislators have drawn themselves into more seats in power, but the only people winning right now are politicians, okay? Because the way that legislators are compacting these districts, the least competitive seats are actually held by Democrats, okay?

So there are 10 districts that had 50-plus-point margins, 50-point-plus margins in the aforementioned 2012 elections. And nine of those 10 seats were Democratic. The safest district in

the state is held -- is right here in Guilford County. It's District 57. It's represented by Pricey Harrison, and I love me some Pricey Harrison, okay? And why wouldn't I? 'Cause I'm a liberal Democrat. But if you're a Republican living in Pricey Harrison's seat, in her district, I guess you can just suck it up, buttercup. All right? Because her newly drawn district voted for Obama by 75 points, 75. And if you need to wrap your head around that, that was 87 to 12, 87 to 12. Okay? All right.

And as much as I want to see Pricey stay in the House, I don't think she should be given a golden ticket to stay there for the rest of her life. She should compete. Politicians should compete for their seats. The fact is in more than 80 districts, if you survive your primary, which is often uncontested, you could walk out in the streets and moon your constituents and get elected in November, and that ain't right. It's not right.

That's not democracy. It's not representative government, and it has to change. In Guilford County last year, only one out of six House seats even had a challenger. That's three Democrats and three Republicans, one challenged

seats. Because our seats are so uncompetitive that nobody thinks it's worth the effort to run.

These maps are just the same. They're not any better. All right? So it's clear that the legislators in Raleigh have no intentions of changing. They're up to the same shenanigans. These maps are an attempt to instill hopelessness in voters, to make citizens of both parties feel that they have no voice, and it is imperative that our judiciary take this responsibility away from the legislators and end this ridiculous nonsense. I'm done.

REP. STEVENS: Okay. I want to thank you all for staying with us. I want to thank you all for your comments. I want to thank you for your demeanor, because we've seen some of the others break out much more viciously. The last thing I want to do for the record is to indicate that I have been given certain written statements that will be put into the record. Mr. Buczynski --

MR. BUCZYNSKI: I -- I just said what I wrote.

REP. STEVENS: Okay. And I -- I've got that in writing. I've got something from the League of Women Voters. I have Anna Fesmire's

statement. I have Chanelle Darlene James, who submitted a two-paged typewritten statement. And then I have something from -- I think that says Roberta Lang. It is a two-page printed document from Democracy NC. Are there any other written statements coming forward, anything else we want to receive?

MALE SPEAKER: Could I ask a question?

REP. STEVENS: Yes, sir.

MALE SPEAKER: There was something on the web page that we could send something in. Can we still do that? And submit what we said?

REP. STEVENS: You can still submit written statements, and they can be considered by the committee. And -- and -- and again, thank you. And we will declare this meeting adjourned.

(End of proceedings.)

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

COUNTY OF WAKE

CERTIFICATION OF TRANSCRIPT

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript of proceedings held on August 22, 2017, is a true and accurate transcript of the proceedings as transcribed by me or under my supervision. I further certify that I am not related to any party or attorney, nor do I have any interest whatsoever in the outcome of this action.

This 28th day of August, 2017.

Brad Worley

Brad Worley, transcriptionist
Worley Reporting
P.O. Box 99169
Raleigh, NC 27624
919-870-8070
brad@worleyreporting.com

EX. 16

NORTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY
JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE ON REDISTRICTING

TRANSCRIPT OF THE PROCEEDINGS
PUBLIC HEARING CONCLUSION - WELDON SATELLITE SITE

In Raleigh, North Carolina
Tuesday, August 22, 2017
Transcribed by Brad Worley

Worley Reporting
P.O. Box 99169
Raleigh, NC 27624
919-870-8070

(Transcriptionist's note: the following transcript is of proceedings held at the satellite hearing site following disconnection of the communications feed from the central Raleigh site.)

REP. J. BELL: For those who couldn't understand what was said, due to some of the technical difficulty and the length of time between sites, we're going to actually conduct our own public hearing here for the people that are here. We will go through the list that's already been signed up according the rules put forth by the Committee. The Sergeant-at-Arms from the House and Senate will also start recording devices. If you give us just a minute to make sure everything is on go, we will run through everybody. Same rules apply, maximum of three minutes, and then we will go through the list, and then the court reporters will transcribe after the -- the hearing.

(Discussion off record.)

REP. J. BELL: I have six people left to speak. We will go in the order as they signed up. I have speaker number 10, Kim Castle, will be up first, and then Tom Metzger -- I apologize if I do mess up your name. Tom Metzger will be second, and then we will have on Jennifer Smyth, Gwen Wilkins,

John Horton and Ernestine Goldsberry will this finish us up.

So the Sergeant-at-Arms will be sitting right here; he'll start when you're ready. You'll hold up one-minute when you have one minute left, then stop when your times up. So y'all, what I do ask is that you state your name -- state your full name for the record, first and last name for the record, and the microphones and everything are up here. So you stand right here.

MS. CASTLE: I stand here?

REP. J. BELL: Yup, right up here.

MS. CASTLE: Good evening; my name is Kim Castle. I'm the vice president of African American caucus of the Hertford County, North Carolina, Democratic Party. I just want to speak on behalf of all the constituents who -- and everyone who worked so hard and so endlessly and gave the hard-earned monies to elect our senators -- or our legislators just for us to find out that we would be receiving -- we are being forced to have legislators that we don't know. We had no idea in -- who they are, we -- we know absolutely nothing about them.

Our legislators said to Erica

Ingram-Smith [sic], she worked so hard with us. We have a rapport with her, and just to know that she will be -- have -- she will be -- we will be [inaudible] this year. It's tragic, in of itself it's heartbreaking, it's basically speechless, and to me is strictly voter suppression, 'cause we gave so much of our time and -- you know, we -- it -- I mean myself personally, I have not slept, you know, certain nights, you know, with strategies trying to make sure, you know, that, you know, we -- we represent her and that we -- we make sure that she get a win, and now y'all are taking it away from us. Thank you.

REP. J. BELL: Tom Metzger will be the next speaker. Please step to the podium. Pronounce your name correctly if I messed it up; I apologize, and you have up to three minutes. Thank you, sir.

MR. METZGER: My name is Tom Metzger, and I'm here as a citizen who loves his state and democratic processes.

North Carolina's motto is, to be and not to seem. Well, let's live up to that and not be a poser. Let's be a democracy based on the will of the people, not an oligarchy based on the will of a

privileged select few. The most essential element of a shift toward democracy in North Carolina is for the people to elect their representatives, not the way -- the other way around. Enough, enough, enough.

The current General Assembly, due to the history of gerrymandering, is not a duly-elected body, and is therefore not legitimate. They cannot serve. How could they expect us, we the people, to accept these new maps that represent more of the same blatant, partisan, racist behavior perpetuated by illegitimate, aspiring oligarchs? No. Unacceptable.

By the way, even a moderately socialized five-year-old doesn't try to give away by misbehavior by saying, he or she started it. Democrats' past misbehavior does not justify Republicans' current misbehavior. Any group of people, for instance, North Carolinians, can be expected to have different opinions and perspectives. When those differences are cynically exploited by those who abuse power to divide and conquer, we all lose -- all lose.

Better to wisely utilize the diversity of perspectives to come up with creative, workable

solutions that most folks can accept as fair. A purple state that's ruled from the far right is a recipe for trouble. Unfair, illegal gerrymandering is at the core of the problem. I call for fair, reasonable, nonpartisan districting. They won't erase our differences, nothing will or should, but it's my opinion that it is the right thing to do and will make things better for us all. Thank you very much.

REP. J. BELL: Thank you. Next speaker, Jennifer Smyth.

MS. SMYTH: Gentlemen, I apologize. I missed the part where you introduced yourselves. I'd like to know who I'm speaking with, if you don't mind.

REP. J. BELL: I'm Representative John Bell.

MS. SMYTH: Okay.

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: And I'm a staff -- I'm a Sergeant-at-Arms.

REP. J. BELL: And he's a Sergeant-at-Arms staff. So you also have Senator Don Davis, Representative Bobbie Richardson, and Senator Smith-Ingram here as well.

MS. SMYTH: Thank you.

REP. J. BELL: You have up to three minutes to speak, and please state your name for the record.

MS. SMYTH: All right. My name is Jennifer Smyth, and I live in a teeny, tiny, little corner of Bertie county, known as the town of Roxobel. I'm about a half an hour from Scotland Neck, which is in Halifax County. I'm about a half an hour from Jackson, which is in Northampton county. I'm about a half an hour from Ahoskie, which is in Hertford County, and which is where I'm proud to work for the last 12 years. And I'm about half an hour from my county seat in Windsor. That's my community of interest.

In order to get anything, to go anywhere, I've got to drive a half an hour, which, to those of you who spend a lot of time in Raleigh, it's going to sound like it's a whole lot, but really, it's -- it's as easy as getting on and off the beltline and going where you need to go.

It's a great place to live, to work and to learn, but that's my community of interest, right there: Northampton County, Halifax County, Hertford County, Bertie County. We have familial ties there, we have geographic ties, we have

economic ties.

Bertie County shops at the Super Wal-Mart in Hertford County. There's a lot of our money going into Hertford County, and now we've been separated from Hertford County in both the House and the Senate redistricting plans, and there is not but one reason for that; Bertie County is 61 percent black. It's racism, pure and simple, and it's nothing but a blatant attempt to minimize and dilute the black vote in Northeastern North Carolina. We see you. We know who you are. We believed you the first time. So that's the House plan. Instead of having me with my community of interest, I'm now with Chowan County.

Let me tell you about Edenton right now. The most prominent realtor in Edenton is Sotheby's -- Sotheby's. They sell off antiques for rich folks. That's the most prominent realtor in my county -- 25 percent of the county is in poverty, and the way they've drawn this district, I'm going to be represented by a transplant from Virginia, a retiree who can afford to buy real estate in Edenton, and my black neighbors are going to be represented by a man who can afford to buy real estate in Edenton. And if I'm shaking, it's

cause I'm mad, and that's just the House map.

This Senate redistricting plan -- y'all think we don't know what you did? That man in Beaufort County doesn't know. That man in -- in Beaufort County has no idea he's a sacrificial lamb. That the Republican Party was willing to give up 15,000 GOP votes to make it look cute, when they double-bunked two black women. The same two black women that they went after in that 3 a.m. budget bill, and y'all is going to tell me that's not racist -- I am not done.

REP. J. BELL: Ma'am -- ma'am, your three minutes are up.

MS. SMITH: Uh-uh -- yeah. Uh-uh.

REP. J. BELL: Ma'am, your three minutes are up.

MS. SMITH: Go ahead and take me --

REP. J. BELL: Sergeant-at-Arms.

MS. SMITH: -- cause I'm not done.

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Ma'am, thank you. Thank you.

MS. SMYTH: There a whole lot of white folks' tip-toe around the fact that this is racist, and I'm not having it.

(Interruption by applause.)

REP. J. BELL: Sergeant-at-Arms, please remove the people that are clapping. Ma'am. Sergeant-at-Arms, please remove the gentleman. Please remove the lady, thank you.

(Pause in proceedings.)

REP. J. BELL: Next speaker, Gwen Wilkins.

MS. WILKINS: Okay. My name is Gwen Wilkins; I'm from Nash County. Good evening. It is a fact we would not be here this evening if some lawmakers had not forced the hand of a federal court and made them rule that those very lawmakers that control the House and Senate gave too much emphasis to race when drawing our district lines, but here we are, and here I stand.

I am here to voice my concerns and disappointment with the way these district maps have been drawn, and I pray those concerns do not fall on deaf ears. I pray you all are keeping an open mind and have a genuine concern for the people you serve -- all of them, and I pray your mind is not already made up.

I have a concern. I question how you, in good conscience, could schedule public hearings when you have just released the maps a day or two

before the hearing. The voters of this state have not had ample time to review them, and you know it. You should be ashamed. You then schedule these hearings knowing full well many of us would have to leave work early or not be able to participate at all.

From what I could see of the newly drawn maps, you have certainly drawn them to favor one political group over another and have made some lawmakers' district almost impossible for them to return to. You should be ashamed. You may have been elected in a certain House or Senate district, but you serve all the people of North Carolina, or at least you are supposed to.

I am of the opinion your mind is already made up, though, and the public hearings going on across this state are just a farce to appease us, so you can satisfy the requirement of the federal court. If elected officials of any party have to result to partisan gerrymandering to win elections, I can only determine that they are doing so because they do not have the confidence or the self-esteem to win an election the old-fashioned way, that is, presenting their platform to and interacting with the voters. Partisan gerrymandering is a crutch.

Stand on your own merits rather than on leaning on wrongfully drawn districts to win a race.

Lastly, the lines you have drawn intentionally protect the supermajority of the political party already in power, rather than the people of this state. Sure, you used a few sacrificial lambs of your own party when redrawing the lines to make it appear that the lines were drawn fairly. Do you really think that voters are that naive? I urge Republican Senator Ralph Hise, Chief of the Redistricting Committee, to work with House and Senate colleagues from opposite sides of the political spectrum to draw lines that are reflective of a democracy North Carolina can be proud of. Thank you.

REP. J. BELL: Our next speaker is John Horton. Mr. Horton, please state your name for the record, and you have up to three minutes.

MR. HORTON: Thank you, sir. Good afternoon -- afternoon. It's evening now. Good evening. My name is John Horton. Life resident of Hertford County for 65 years, been active in the local politics, been elected to eight, four-year terms.

Gentleman, I'm not here to bash the

Republicans tonight, 'cause you all have been bashed and probably deserve it, but I'm here to appeal to your sense of political dignity. I've seen gerrymandering before. The Democrats tried that, it didn't work, to the satisfaction to a lot of the citizens. The Republicans tried that, it didn't work. Here we are again.

We're in the 21st century, and it is time that we move towards a computer-based model of redistricting. We're too intelligent not to be able to do that. I'd rather be angry over a computer and calling it a racist before I will call you one -- I will not call you one. You're representing all the citizens of Hertford County. Move where people can't say you got a personal interest, and the only way I see out of this, is a computer-based model with one of the variables in that model, not to split not one county. Thank you, very much.

REP. J. BELL: Our last speaker is this evening, Eustice Goldsberry.

MS. GOLDSBERRY: Ernestine.

REP. J. BELL: Ernestine, excuse me. I apologize. Ernestine, please state you name for the record, and you have up to three minutes.

Thank you.

MS. GOLDSBERRY: My name is Ernestine Goldsberry, and I learned to vote -- began voting in 1965, which I had to learn the Preamble to the Constitution of the United States of America, but by time it was time to vote, they had demolished it, because they had passed the Civil Rights Act.

I have been away from Northampton County for 50 years. I moved back here three years, and I thought it had changed, but I see, from what I see now, it has not. It says, look at us now. We're back in the same predicament 50 years ago that you're doing now. The same hatred, the same prejudice is here. There's no need for to divide these counties like this and take them away. Take them away from the economics of the counties that are trying to bring businesses into the different counties and being the people -- the older people.

You got -- you have to think of someone but yourself, and I'm not going -- I'm not going, like, the gentlemen before me, I'm not going to call you prejudiced. Because you've -- every one of us know what's in our hearts. You can believe it or not. I'm ashamed. I'm appalled to say that I came back to Northampton County, and it's still

the same way. Fifty years have not prospered us, and that is a shame.

We're in the 21st century, and I'm not going to get up here and try to tell you what you should do, 'cause everybody in their hearts knows what's right and wrong, but this is choice that you make, and I'm ashamed to say I'm a North Carolina citizen, because the country is looking at us. Every time you turn the TV on, it's North Carolina this, North Carolina that, so I'm -- that's all I have to say. I'm just ashamed that I ever moved back here.

REP. J. BELL: Thank you, ma'am. Ladies and gentlemen, that concludes our -- and the people that have signed up for the public hearing. I want to thank Representative Bobbie Richardson, Senator Don Davis and Senator Smith-Ingram for attending. I'd thank our Sergeant-at-Arms, our -- our law enforcement here locally -- our General Assembly law enforcement. I want to thank the staff from the General Assembly, and I also want to thank Halifax Community College and the staff here at Halifax Community College.

If you'd like to -- to listen to other comments, I believe the -- the Committee hearing in

Raleigh, you can go through the North Carolina General Assembly website and log into the committee room there and finish hearing the comments, and all of this will be transcribed by the court reporters as soon as possible for the record. With that said, this committee hearing is closed. Thank you.

(End of proceedings.)

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

COUNTY OF WAKE

CERTIFICATION OF TRANSCRIPT

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript of proceedings held on August 22, 2017, is a true and accurate transcript of the proceedings as transcribed by me or under my supervision. I further certify that I am not related to any party or attorney, nor do I have any interest whatsoever in the outcome of this action.

This 28th day of August, 2017.

Brad Worley

Brad Worley, transcriptionist
Worley Reporting
P.O. Box 99169
Raleigh, NC 27624
919-870-8070
brad@worleyreporting.com

EX. 17

NORTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY
SENATE COMMITTEE ON REDISTRICTING

TRANSCRIPT OF THE PROCEEDINGS
AUGUST 24, 2017 SESSION

In Raleigh, North Carolina
Thursday, August 24, 2017
Reported by Rebecca P. Scott

Worley Reporting
P.O. Box 99169
Raleigh, NC 27624
919-870-8070

SEN. HISE: The Committee will come to order. Thank you, members of the Committee and members of the public that are here today. Very briefly, I'll begin by going through the Sergeant at Arms for the Senate for this meeting of the Senate Redistricting Committee. Terry Barnhardt, Terry Edmondson, Frances Patterson, and Hal Roach. Thank you.

And we do have one page with us today, Tanner Minton. Right here. Thank you very much for coming here and being part of this today.

Members, we will have one bill before us today. That is Senate Bill 691, the 2017 Senate Districts. I will be presenting that in just a moment and will hand the gavel over to Senator Brown to conduct the meeting while I present.

But just a few rules. I am going to ask, kind of particularly regarding the complex nature of amendments and others to this particular bill, if members are wishing to amend the particular bill, if you would send forth your amendments so that we can begin to get those in order and in place before we begin this process or while we're in the presentation.

So that being said, I will turn the gavel

over for 691, and I do believe we have a PCS.

To let you-all know, while this is a pretty standard procedure, I do want everyone to note that we do have a court reporter here, so it will be important that anytime you are recognized, you would state your name for the record so that we may adequately transcribe this for the proceedings.

SEN. BROWN: Thank you, Senator Hise. So, Senator Hise, I'm going to turn it over to you to present the bill.

SEN. HISE: Thank you, Senator Brown. And I guess I would begin by offering a PCS for consideration.

SEN. BROWN: Okay. I need a motion for the PCS. Senator Tillman makes that motion. All in favor say aye.

(Voice vote.)

SEN. BROWN: Any opposed? The ayes have it. Senator Hise?

SEN. HISE: Thank you, members of the committee---

SEN. TILLMAN: Senator Brown, I'll take that motion back. Let one of the official members make that.

SEN. BROWN: Senator Tillman, are you

throwing us a curve? Since you're not on the Committee, I should have caught that. I think Senator Harrington made the same motion at the same time.

SEN. TILLMAN: I heard her.

SEN. BROWN: So Senator Harrington makes that motion. All in favor?

(Voice vote.)

SEN. BROWN: Any opposed? All right. The motion carries. Senator Hise?

SEN. HISE: Thank you. I think all members should have in front of them an overall copy of the map as well as the stat-pack from the Committee available for the map of the redistricting. I'm going to take a few minutes and go over the criteria of the Committee and a bit on how the maps that are presented meet the criteria that the committees for both the House and the Senate established for drawing maps.

To begin with, I will begin with equal population. The committees were required to use the 2010 federal decennial Census data as the sole basis of population for drawing legislative districts in these plans. The number of persons in each legislative district shall comply with the

plus or minus five percent population deviation standard established in Stephenson versus Bartlett.

You'll see from the first page of the stat-pack the total population for all 50 Senate Districts under the 2010 Census. The most overpopulated district is by 4.94 percent, Senate District 8, which is composed of Bladen, Brunswick, and Pender Counties in whole and a part of New Hanover County. This district was not redrawn in this process and was not affected by the court order.

The most underpopulated district -- underpopulated district is Senate District 3. It is underpopulated at negative 4.55 percent. It is a district in the northeast which is composed of whole counties including Vance, Warren, Northampton, Bertie, Martin, and Beaufort Counties. That is a six-county pod that under the Stephenson decision would meet that criteria.

Contiguity, the second standard. Legislative districts shall be comprised of contiguous territory. Contiguity by water would be sufficient. You will find that the legislative districts -- you will find that the legislative districts are meeting that legal criteria, and all

the districts are contiguous within the process.

Next county groupings and traverses. The Committee shall draw legislative districts within county groupings as required by Stephenson v. Bartlett. Within county groupings shall not be -- within county groupings shall not be traversed except as authorized by Stephenson I, Stephenson II, Dickson I, and Dickson II. The rules for county groupings were established in Stevenson I and have been affirmed in later cases. The map follows the county grouping formula listed several weeks ago.

We have not received as a committee any more optimal or alternative group plans. The map does not traverse any county. More than once is prohibited by Stephenson I, and though it requires the formula announced -- does not require the maximizing of keeping counties whole, you will see that the map presented keeps 88 counties whole of the 100 counties in North Carolina.

Just to briefly clarify on that, as the hierarchy determined in the Stephenson's decision, we must create all one-county groupings. There existed only one, and that would have been in Mecklenburg that was coming to the Senate. Then we

must create all possible two-county groupings, then all possible three-county groupings. You cannot sacrifice creating a three-county grouping for later sacrificing having more four-county groupings. So it is required for the smallest number of counties to be formed within a district.

Standard number 4, compactness. The Committee shall make reasonable efforts to draw legislative districts in the 2017 House and Senate plans that improve the compactness of current districts. We established two guides for use for determining that. The Reock dispersion and Polsby-Popper scores which dealt with the parameter. And so coming in, we set -- the committee adopted as a guide for compactness minimal score drawings for those.

For the Reock score, it was -- we have no district lower than the .15 minimum threshold, and then the---

SEN. BROWN: A lot of P's.

SEN. HISE: ---Polsby-Popper score, the minimum threshold adopted by the Committee of .05. None of the districts you will find adopting this were below those minimum standards. And this plan improves on the compactness of the 2011 Senate plan

and fares historically well against any Senate plans adopted by the legislature over the last few decades.

Criteria number 5, fewer split precincts. The Committee shall make reasonable efforts to draw legislative district plans that split fewer precincts that the current legislative redistricting plans. Following public input urging this Committee to split fewer precincts in the drawing of these plans, the Committee chose to adopt this as criteria.

The 2011 Senate plan split 257 precincts. The plan you have before you now splits only nine precincts. Two of those splits were retained in New Hanover County because those districts were not redrawn. Two splits are made to avoid the double-bunking of incumbents. The other splits were either made in a place that does not divide a population so that while the precinct may be split for compactness, there is no population in one side or other of that division, or to follow a new precinct line that has been established since 2011.

Criteria number 6, municipal boundaries. The Committee may consider municipal boundaries when drawing legislative districts in these plans.

Multiple members of the public asked the committee to consider not dividing municipalities where possible, and the Committee adopted that criteria. This plan splits just 25 municipalities in North Carolina in populations -- in places where there is population or the city does not cross a county line.

By any measure, the plan splits far fewer counties than the one adopted in 2011. It fares historically well against all Senate plans adopted by the General Assembly over the last two decades, especially in light of the annexation done by municipalities over that time frame and does not always follow -- that does not always follow county boundaries.

Number 7, incumbency protection. Reasonable efforts and political considerations may be used to avoid pairing incumbent members of the House or Senate with another incumbent in the legislative districts in the 2017 House and Senate plans. The Committee may make reasonable efforts to ensure voters have a reasonable opportunity to select -- to elect nonpaired incumbents of each party to a district in the 2017 Senate plans. The Committee adopted criteria pledging to make

reasonable efforts not to double-bunk incumbents.

The map does double-bunk eight members. Three pairs of Republicans and one cross-party pair. Senator Randleman and Senator Ballard were -- were double-bunked by necessity within their county grouping. Senator Krawiec and incoming Senator Barrett were potentially double-bunked by the necessity with their county groups.

Senator Alexander and Senator Barefoot were double-bunked in Wake County, but Senator Barefoot has already announced that he does not intend to seek reelection. And Senator Smith-Ingram and Senator Cook were doubled-bunked by necessity as well within their county groups.

Criteria number 8, election data. Political considerations and election data may be used in the drawing of legislative districts in the 2017 House and Senate plans. For this purpose, we selected ten races from 2010 to 2016. The 2010 US Senate race, 2012 Presidential, Governor, and Lieutenant Governor race, the 2014 Senate race, and the 2016 President, US Senate, Governor, Lieutenant Governor, and Attorney General races. So you should have information on each of those in your

stat-pack.

Criteria number 9, no consideration of racial data. Data identifying the race of individuals or voters shall not be used in the drawing of legislative districts in the 2017 House and Senate maps. In the drawing of these maps in the Senate, we did not consider race of individuals in the drawing of the maps or the assignment of voters to a particular district.

In 2011, 40 counties in the state were under the preclearance standards under Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act. In the intervening time, that preclearance from the Justice Department has been lifted by a Supreme Court decision. It will not be incumbent upon this General Assembly to seek preclearance for these plans.

In the drawing of the current legislative districts, the General Assembly conducted an unprecedented effort to reach out to interested parties, receive public input, receive expert testimony, and hear from members of the body about legally relevant evidence regarding the drawing of districts under the Voting Rights Act.

Despite a voluminous record that was established by the General Assembly during the 2011

redistricting process, the three-judge panel in the Covington case said that this did not constitute substantial evidence that would justify using race to draw districts in compliance with the requirements of the Voting Rights Act. Therefore, we do not believe it is appropriate, given this Court's order in this case, for the Committee to consider race when drawing districts.

We have asked on multiple occasions and will continue to ask this Committee for any legal significant evidence of racially polarized voting that this Committee should consider in this process. We have received none to date, but we remain open to receiving that information from any members who wish to submit such.

Members have in front of us now -- that is the picture of the maps as they currently exist. Obviously, you have a larger version sitting in front of you. With that being said, I will open up for any discussions. I would reiterate that if we could please receive any amendments that you would have to expedite this process.

SEN. BROWN: All right. Questions for Senator Hise? Senator Clark?

SEN. CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator Hise, you brief the various compactness measures in terms of the limitations. Could you bring that back up for us?

SEN. HISE: I can try. That's a technology request.

SEN. CLARK: Those. Go back. Yeah. I don't recall having seen those before. Were they presented at a previous committee meeting? I must have missed that.

SEN. HISE: These are the standards, and I think we have some of that literature, if we can -- if you need copies of it, that have established these as the minimum standards for using these criteria.

SEN. CLARK: Were they approved by the Committee?

SEN. HISE: They were presented to the Committee in that process as the use of those scores, and as in many other things, the score has a .05 value. These are the standards for using those criteria.

SEN. CLARK: Could I receive a copy of those? I don't recall going over that or even having been provided a copy.

SEN. BROWN: We'll get you a copy of

that, Senator Clark. Other questions? Senator Blue?

SEN. BLUE: So a question, yes, Senator Hise. The criteria said you may use, so it is your statement that you used this compactness standard on all the districts?

SEN. HISE: All of the districts meet the .05 and .15 levels of the two tests.

SEN. BLUE: I'm sorry. I didn't understand that.

SEN. HISE: All of the districts in the Senate are above the standards of .05 or .15 established by the test.

SEN. BROWN: Follow-up, Senator Blue?

SEN. BLUE: Yeah. Did you at any point in drawing these districts, or the map drawer, determine what the Court was looking for when it said that certain districts were racially discriminatory and how you would cure that remedy?

SEN. HISE: What we have received, and I would state it in this manner, is that we received from the Courts that race was overutilized in the drawing of districts, standards that we had previously presented, as well as having a target race. So we have in this case, given the changes

in the Voting Rights Act or others, we have not drawn this with any consideration of race. So, therefore, we did not overutilized race in the drawing of the maps.

SEN. BROWN: Follow-up?

SEN. BLUE: Follow-up. So it's your considered opinion that the Court did not want you to look at race in order to cure what it had determined to be a racially discriminatory scheme?

SEN. HISE: In my determination, the Court said that we had overutilized race previously. In this version of the maps, we did not utilize race at all.

SEN. BLUE: Follow-up?

SEN. BROWN: Follow-up.

SEN. BLUE: I just want to make sure. It's your interpretation of the Court's opinion that you don't need to use race in order to determine that you've remedied a violation that they said was based on race?

SEN. HISE: I would again say that the Court had determined previously that we overutilized race. That was the finding of the Court, and their remedy in redrawing it to us is that at this point, we have not utilized race at

all.

SEN. BROWN: Senator Blue?

SEN. BLUE: Since my district in Wake County was one of those that the Court determined you used race to too great of a degree, did you look any way at all in simply reducing the racial percentage of the existing districts as a cure for the gerrymander rather than radically changing districts?

SEN. HISE: We did not -- we did look at any statistics regarding race in the development of these maps.

SEN. BROWN: Follow-up?

SEN. BLUE: In formulating the plan to draw new districts to cure the gerrymanders, what made you determine to totally reconstitute several of the existing districts?

SEN. HISE: We were given by the Courts, I believe, nine districts in the Senate in which we had overutilized race. We were also given directive by the Courts as a whole that -- against setting a particular target for race in that process, and so the remedy that the Committee adopted to deal with that was to not consider race at all. Therefore, it would not be claimed that we

somehow overutilized race when we did not use race at all.

SEN. BROWN: Senator Clark?

SEN. CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Senator Hise, in our criteria regarding compactness, we did state very clearly here that one of our objectives was to make sure that the compactness values were improved as we moved from the enacted plan as we moved to the proposal. Why is it that some of the compactness scores of some of the existing districts -- why did they not improve?

SEN. HISE: I believe you'll find that the compactness scores as a whole improved and that each individual district meets the standards of compactness.

SEN. BROWN: Follow-up?

SEN. CLARK: We were not provided those individual standards of compactness of all of the districts. Although as a whole, some of the values may have improved, but some of the districts themselves, the compactness values did not improve, and I want to understand why that was the case.

May I make a comment?

SEN. BROWN: Senator Clark, go ahead.

SEN. CLARK: The criteria, as put here before us in the paper and was approved by the Committee, says the plan should be there to improve the compactness the current districts. We did not improve the compactness all the current districts.

SEN. HISE: We did improve the compactness of the districts as a whole.

SEN. CLARK: That may have been the case, but that's not what our criteria says. It does not says "the districts as a whole."

SEN. HISE: No. The criteria does not say each individual district shall have a lower compactness score. You are correct. It does not say that. It says we will improve compactness as a whole in all the districts.

SEN. BROWN: Senator Clark?

SEN. CLARK: I have the criteria before me, and what you just said is not correct. It does not say improve the compactness as a whole. It says "improve the compactness of the districts." And if we go to Mecklenburg County, more specifically, we see there are three districts, which happen to be Democratic districts, that have improved compactness scores. The two Republican ones do not. And I was wondering what brought

about that disparity.

SEN. HISE: As you will find, the compactness of the state is a fixed manner in the manner in which you divide it. Improving the compactness score will be improving the average of all the compactness across the district, and that's what will meet that standard.

SEN. BROWN: Senator Clark?

SEN. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, with all the compactness scores out there, there's only one suitable for comparing the compactness of one plan versus another, and that's the perimeter score. The Polsby-Popper and Reock scores are not designed to determine the relevant performance in regards to compactness of one plan versus another.

SEN. BROWN: Senator Blue?

SEN. BLUE: A question, again, Mr. Chairman. If I could go back to the incumbency protection provision of the criteria. Did you ascertain how many current members were seeking reelection?

SEN. HISE: We did not other than information went out for individuals who were -- where their address was located. We went with that file as we had it at the time. When individuals

announced or told us directly that they were not running, we considered that information.

SEN. BROWN: And that was about a week or two ago, wasn't it, Senator Hise?

SEN. HISE: Yes, it was.

SEN. BLUE: So in Wake County double-bunked where you had an option -- because I think in the other three, it was because of the groupings -- why did you choose to double-bunk and leave an open district right next door to one of the members that you moved into a district that already had a member in it?

SEN. HISE: We do not double-bunk in Wake County. Senator Barefoot announced to me and then publicly that he was not seeking reelection.

SEN. BROWN: Senator Blue?

SEN. BLUE: Did you inquire of any other Senators -- did you inquire of any of the African-American Senators whether they were seeking reelection?

SEN. HISE: No one else provided us information that they were not intending to run, except Senator Tucker did, I mean, but in Wake, no one else provided us that information.

SEN. BROWN: Senator Blue?

SEN. BLUE: Then if, in fact, a major portion of a Senator who you double-bunked in Wake County -- a major portion of his district was right next door without an incumbent in it, what were the factors in the decision to not put him in the district that was already part of his district but to double-bunk in another district?

SEN. HISE: I would say, once again, that we did not double-bunk any members in Wake County.

SEN. BLUE: Follow-up?

SEN. BROWN: Follow-up.

SEN. BLUE: But the reason I ask that is that you made a big deal out of compactness and those things, and yet, there are several examples where you squiggled and reached down through areas that could be much more compact to accommodate specific members when there's no compelling reason to do that if the sole reason is to keep from double-bunking.

Let me ask this question a different way, if I could.

SEN. BROWN: Okay.

SEN. BLUE: Do you read incumbent protection in the criteria to mean that you take care of an incumbent in a district that he or she

can get reelected in or simply not to double-bunk him with another person in the same district?

SEN. HISE: I think if you look at Wake County specifically, I'm sure that individuals may find other ways in which they -- they could have chosen to double-bunk anyone, but I would say that it is also noted that those two homes are close together by any standard. I believe on this map many people would find it hard to distinguish, as in the circles don't continue, but we were able to take what was Senator Barefoot's district as it was drawn and to draw Senator Alexander into that district to avoid double-bunking with Senator Chaudhuri.

SEN. BLUE: Further follow-up?

SEN. BROWN: Senator Blue, go ahead.

SEN. BLUE: Then, knowing that Senator Barefoot was not running for reelection, did you consider making the district that he was serving in as well as the adjoining districts more compact by having him double-bunked with another Senator in Wake County?

SEN. HISE: This -- this district as it is met the -- both of the compactness scores that we have established, and therefore, this is the

district we have chosen to avoid the double-bunking.

SEN. BROWN: All right. Any other questions for Senator Hise? Senator Van Duyn?

SEN. VAN DUYN: Thank you. Several of my constituents traveled significant distances to make public comment. Was it yesterday or the day before?

SEN. HISE: I believe it was Tuesday.

SEN. VAN DUYN: Are we going to get some analysis of that public comment so that we can see what it is that -- what their opinions were?

SEN. HISE: The court reporters--- Let me check and see the status on that.

(Pause in proceedings.)

SEN. HISE: The court reporters are developing the transcription of those. The comments submitted online are available to the members through a particular point, and I think we can update those each day. We've been taking online submissions since we began this process from individuals. As soon as the court reporters have finished the transcribing of those comments, those will be available as well as I believe there are audio and, in some respects here in Wake County,

potentially video of those comments, as they would go forward, that is available to members upon request.

SEN. VAN DUYN: Follow-up?

SEN. BROWN: Follow-up, uh-huh.

SEN. VAN DUYN: Are we going to do any analysis on those comments?

SEN. HISE: Members are free to do any analysis they wish on those.

SEN. VAN DUYN: Okay. Well, now I haven't read them, but I listened for a couple of hours, and I also, of course, was here for the public comment that we did on the criteria, and one of the things I heard over and over and over and over and over again, in fact, all but one comment on our public comment on criteria, was the need for independent nonpolitical districts.

Did you make any effort to draw more politically balanced districts?

SEN. HISE: I'm trying -- that question is very different from the comments leading up to it. What we did -- the independent districting issue that has continually come up is inconsistent, one, with the court order that we have received as well as the duties and obligations of the General

Assembly. The court order was directed to the General Assembly to redraw districts. I don't think there's much doubt about that.

I would also say that the US Constitution as well as the North Carolina Constitution assigns to the General Assembly to draw districts, and so much so that the North Carolina Constitution establishes that even for the veto of the Governor -- nothing regarding redistricting is subject to the veto of the Governor. It's solely within the purview of the legislature.

I believe strongly that it is our role to draw these districts and our job and responsibility to draw these districts. I don't -- I have told many people I don't believe in unicorns, fairies, or the mythical nonpartisan commission. There are several studies that are out there that also show -- and we have one of those that the results I can show -- that show you have no changes in partisan makeups for districts drawn by nonpartisan redistricting committees versus those drawn by general assemblies.

SEN. BROWN: Follow-up?

SEN. VAN DUYN: One more. So -- but part of the criteria was that you were able to look at

political information?

SEN. HISE: We selected ten election results, and you have all that information.

SEN. VAN DUYN: That's correct. So did you use -- how did you use that data? Did you use it to balance districts or to unbalance districts?

SEN. HISE: We have used it to report on all the districts and how they fall in the political makeup. We did make partisan considerations when drawing particular districts. We did not, however, as has also been suggested from members and others in the comments -- we did not try to go with some parliamentary version that we see in Europe and other places in which a certain percentage of the votes should equate to a certain percentage of the seats or assign them in that manner. The results of each election in a district should result in one representative for that district.

SEN. BROWN: Okay. Other questions for Senator Hise? Senator Clark?

SEN. CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think the recent comment just made by Mr. Hise there -- excuse me -- Senator Hise referred to the use of the efficiency gap because during our

previous committee hearing, I did mention that it would be preferable, I thought, for the Committee to adopt a standard, in other words, how high of an efficiency gap would be acceptable.

And the comment was made during that time that it was some kind measure for parliamentary systems and that it could not be used prospectively for determining the extent of partisan advantage or lack thereof within a single member district program.

So with that said, if you don't mind, I have a statement that I would like to read that sort of clarifies that or clears that up.

SEN. BROWN: That would be fine, Senator Clark. Also, I think the statement, if I remember right, was that that was the two criteria that was used by the Courts or mentioned in the court proceedings. But go ahead.

SEN. CLARK: So let's see. And this is about an e-mail that I sent to Dr. Stephanopoulos, who happens to be the individual who developed efficiency gap analysis process, and it says, "Dr. Stephanopoulos: I argued in a committee hearing today that the efficiency gap method could be used prospectively to determine the efficiency

gap of a plan being considered for adoption by using recent election results of statewide candidates. My counterpart across the aisle argued that it could not. Do you have a position on the prospective use of the efficiency gap?" Excuse me.

"I have created a tool using Microsoft Excel for that purpose. I am not asking you to make a political judgment in this matter, just the suitability of your method for voluntary adoption by a legislative body for the use of establishing district plans that exhibit partisan symmetry, in other words, does not exhibit partisan advantage, on a prospective basis."

And in response, Dr. Stephanopoulos, the author of the efficiency gap method, "The efficiency gap absolutely can be used prospectively to evaluate a district plan as can any other measure of partisan gerrymandering. Since seats and votes can be forecast, it follows that metrics that are based on seats and votes can be forecast as well. In fact, in our original complaint in the North Carolina congressional litigation which was filed before the November 2016 election, we did use the efficiency gap prospectively. See paragraph 66 through 69 of the attached.

"That being said, election predictions are never perfect. That's why the best prospective approach is to calculate efficiency gap using other methods for a range of plausible election outcomes. That gives you a sense of how the map could perform over the spectrum of reasonable possibilities."

And that's exactly what you-all did when you decided to use political data and you decided to use past election results of -- I think you indicated about eight or nine different elections. You just, for whatever reason, do not want to acknowledge the efficacy of the efficiency gap. And, also, Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit this document for the record that was provided with that e-mail.

SEN. BROWN: That will be fine, Senator Clark.

SEN. HISE: To comment briefly, first, I would state that the request to use efficiency gap as a criteria was considered by the Committee and rejected. I will say that. Secondly, I will say that there seems to be a little bit -- and I know this will get into the technical nature, but whether or not something can be used prospective is a different question than whether something can be

taken from separate districts concurring in a different election in districts that did not exist prior to an election can be combined in such a manner that would then be used prospectively.

If the districts were consistent in the past elections and future elections, then there is the potential that it could be used prospectively. That is not the case in redistricting. These districts are significantly different, and there is no account for the variance between races that exists in the model provided.

SEN. CLARK: Mr. Chairman?

SEN. BROWN: Senator Clark.

SEN. CLARK: It's hard for me to understand for what purpose are you going to use political data if you're not using it prospectively for your own uses?

SEN. HISE: You have -- you have received in your stat-pack the summation of political data for which it has been used.

SEN. CLARK: Mr. Chairman?

SEN. BROWN: Senator Clark.

SEN. CLARK: I have indeed received that stat-pack with the political data, but I'm wondering for what purpose did you-all use that

data.

SEN. HISE: For the purpose of consideration of this Committee.

SEN. BROWN: Senator Clark?

SEN. CLARK: And for the purposes of consideration for this Committee, does that mean prospectively?

SEN. HISE: We have provided the results of ten elections that will be used in the drawing of maps. We have made no attempts to combine those in such a manner that would forecast future elections or provided any data as to the variance that would exist in those forecasts.

SEN. BROWN: Other questions for Senator Hise? Senator Blue?

SEN. BLUE: So that I fully understood, I thought I heard Senator Van Duyn's question about the public hearings. Are you changing the original map that was sent out Sunday night in any manner at all based on the comments from the 200 plus people, or however many signed up, for the public hearing that commented on Tuesday?

SEN. HISE: There is no change to the PCS that was proposed between now and then. Members of this Committee are free to make proposed amendments

to the maps. I have had conversations on at least one of those amendments that may be considered going forward that would change the maps, but between the committee hearing and what is the proposed PCS, you'll find, as normal in legislation, at least for this session, we've made no changes.

SEN. BROWN: Senator Blue, I will tell you in both our Washington and Beaufort Community College, there was a lot of concern about Beaufort County. I tried to figure out a new configuration based on those comments, but it would affect the groupings and the order of the groupings. So it just made it impossible to address the issues that were brought up that night.

SEN. HISE: I think it's also fair to point out that almost none of the comments in public comment were in any manner directly related to the shape of a district, to the pairings of districts, or to the communities covered within a particular district, and no alternatives were submitted in any public comment.

SEN. BROWN: Senator Blue?

SEN. BLUE: Just one follow-up. On several occasions, Mr. Chairman, I suggested that

40 plus years of litigation has taught me that when parties of different opinions and different ideas sit down and work through things, you can usually fix a lot of problems that people identify, even the problem -- I heard the problems in Beaufort County and tend to know that there are ways to fix it, but you can't fix something if the parties who are interested don't talk it through and figure out how to fix it.

SEN. HISE: I will comment specifically on the Beaufort County issue. I have met with several groups from Beaufort County, in addition, have received multiple options that they have presented for how the counties could be podded together. I do not believe a solution exists that does not break a smaller county podding that existed.

I can assure you that if we found that, we are ready to move and make the adjustments necessary for doing so. But one had broken a three-county pod to make a four-county pod. Several of them had broken the six-county pod to create seven- and nine-county pods. We have considered each of those, but they fail to meet the criteria of establishing the smallest number of

counties in a grouping that Stephenson requires.

SEN. BROWN: Senator Blue?

SEN. BLUE: If you wanted to, I can still help you fix it.

SEN. BROWN: Senator Blue, if you'd like to set that up, we surely would take a look. Senator Lowe?

SEN. LOWE: Going back to the public comments because I heard just as much as all of the rest of you, and one of my things that I've been interested in knowing is, there are criteria by which you will actually consider the public comments, number one, and to follow up to that, because it seems like when you say anybody can consider or look at anything, that's kind of a serendipity way of looking at these issues, and I'm think that what we heard in public comment are some very, very serious issues about this whole process.

So how do you look at the public comments in a real way?

SEN. HISE: I will also say that Common Cause submitted and that Representative Lewis put into the record of the Committee their two-page talking points which summarized almost all the speakers that were there that night, and in fact,

many read different parts of it or reread the same parts of it when giving their comments.

But we are taking the committee evaluation as a whole, and we're looking at that process of public comment for anyone that was submitting information of county poddings, of communities of interest, what were determined by those of the particular districts and what they are and what they should be.

I will tell you that I am saddened by the fact that we did not receive much of that information within the public comment section. There were a lot of comments about process or how long this map was had before this was there or how long those and types of things, but not necessarily things---

We are under a timeline. The Court gave us till September 1st and some potential of maybe a two-week extension if we danced a certain way, coming in, but for all practical purposes, we have a deadline of Friday of next week.

We have a legislative process that requires five voting days in that. We are under that gun. We received the order at the first of August. We had one month to comply with the order

that was received, and it has been a compressed time line, and we made clear to the Courts that we felt like we could extend a full time line into November 15th -- would be the deadline necessary. We gave the compressed time line, and it has compressed some considerations of public comment and others, but particularly in what we were looking for in those public comments, specifics about districts, or when we did the criteria, specifics about the criteria and others considered.

Those were both used to develop how members chose to vote on that criteria and are available for all the committee members to review and will be part of the court record.

SEN. BROWN: Senator Lowe?

SEN. LOWE: Follow-up. There was also some concern about the shape of District 28 that came up on more than one occasion.

SEN. HISE: That is the district designed for the city limits, predominantly following the city limits of the town of Greensboro, but it was a criteria of the Committee, I would say, to keep the municipality boundaries within the districts, and we feel that's what we've done with that district.

SEN. BROWN: Any other follow-up?

Senator Clark?

SEN. CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You talked about VTDs earlier, and I must commend you-all for splitting very few this time around compared to the last time around. But a couple of those that were split -- at least one in particular happened to be in my district, Senate District 21, between I and Senator Meredith.

Could you provide some explanation as to why Dr. Hofeller decided to split that particular VTD. I believe it was G11.

SEN. HISE: I'm assuming that's the number in which I'll reference. The one that is in that district is a zero population split. There is no residential population on one side of that split. So it improved compactness, but no -- all voting individuals are within the same precinct that they would have been otherwise. But it does -- by dividing the district in such a way that there is no population living on the other side, it does improve the compactness scores of the districts.

SEN. BROWN: Senator Clark?

SEN. CLARK: Thank you. That's what I assumed was done, but I was somewhat surprised by

that because I know, generally speaking, people associate compactness with lack of gerrymandering, if you will, but in this particular case, that was a substantial landmass that was essentially added to my district for the sake of improving a compactness score.

And I just think we need to understand that essentially you can manipulate VTDs for what I call an audit form, although they have no impact on the performance of the district whatsoever.

SEN. HISE: Yes, compactness is generally in some manner a ratio of the perimeter to the area or of the area inside a district to a circle that encompass the entire district.

SEN. CLARK: Comment?

SEN. BROWN: Senator Clark.

SEN. CLARK: That is incorrect for Reock and Polsby-Popper, which you-all chose to use, but if you used the perimeter, that would not be correct. As a matter of fact, as I indicated earlier, the perimeter method for measuring compactness is one that's used across plans to determine the compactness of one plan versus another.

SEN. BROWN: Other questions for Senator

Hise? If not, I'm looking for a motion.

SEN. BISHOP: Mr. Chairman, I---

SEN. BROWN: Senator Bishop?

SEN. BISHOP: I do have one comment, although not a question, for Senator Hise, and maybe a comment and then a question for someone else.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I did say I don't have a question for Senator Hise, but I have a comment and then perhaps a question for Blue.

Senator Blue, I was struck by the comment about working together and how sometimes if you don't do that, you don't get to the best solution, with which I wholeheartedly agree. I also have had some experiences, and I suspect you have too over the course of time, that when you're in an environment where somebody might be devoted to using every word as an excuse to commence -- pursue litigation, sometimes that freezes up that process.

And so I would ask whether Senator Blue would yield to a question?

SEN. BROWN: Senator Blue?

SEN. BLUE: I would invoke Rule 408, but I would yield.

SEN. BISHOP: You'll yield provisionally,

is that it, Senator? So, Senator, what I heard you say at the end of the exchange with Senator Hise is that you have a fix for the podding situation involving Beaufort County, and I would urge you, if you do, to say what it is, what the solution is.

SEN. BLUE: I suggested, Senator Bishop, several weeks ago--- How long has it been since we were in regular session? ---anyhow, at the end of regular session---

SEN. BISHOP: Not long enough.

SEN. BLUE: Not long enough, you're right there. ---at the end of regular session that I thought that this is the kind of issue that would offer itself---

SEN. BROWN: Hold on, Senator Blue.

SEN. BLUE: ---that would offer itself---

(Interruption by technical malfunction.)

SEN. BLUE: Is that it?

SEN. BROWN: There you go.

SEN. BLUE: ---that this was the kind of issue that would offer itself for resolution if, in fact, those who were directly impacted -- in this case in the Senate, the nine districts that the Court ruled were racial gerrymanders. If the people who represented those districts, which means

they represent the people who brought the lawsuit against the State from those districts, were to sit down with the leaders in the redistricting process in this body, that there could probably be a resolution of this issue without just throwing the balls up in the air and seeing what might happen.

If you're working in that environment -- if you're working in that environment, a careful reading of Stephenson allows you to do things. I mean you mechanically and methodically go one pod, two pods with two counties, three pods, and all of that. But there are other alternatives even through Stephenson, and if you look at the 2003 redistricting plan, there were exceptions from the kind of grouping that you're talking about primarily because there was an agreement to do it under the gun of the lawsuit that was pending at the time.

SEN. BISHOP: Follow-up?

SEN. BROWN: Follow-up.

SEN. BISHOP: Senator Blue, then, do I understand that what you're saying is that there would have to be some consensual process involving some use of race so that you wouldn't be using the strict podding, and therefore, you would resolve

that issue in Beaufort County?

SEN. BLUE: That among other issues.

SEN. BISHOP: And I don't know if there are other issues--- Follow-up?

SEN. BROWN: Follow-up.

SEN. BISHOP: If that would be so, then, assume that you had sort of a consensual workout. You came to an agreement among whatever parties are participating. How could you assure, then, that some other person wouldn't commence and pursue litigation saying that whatever consideration was given to race was not too much? Consequently, we'd have another unexhausting, unending string of litigation about how much consideration of race is permissible without being then accused of engaging in a racial gerrymander?

SEN. BLUE: Because if the Plaintiffs agreed to the resolution that you had, then that case is resolved and it's over with, and quite frankly, Senator Bishop, by the time this thing goes through the process again, you're in another round of redistricting anyhow.

SEN. BISHOP: That's not very comforting.

SEN. BLUE: But the point is -- the point is, I think that you can just eyeball the map, and

Stephenson isn't so rigid that it would say you'd go from the coast to the middle of North Carolina the way that pod does. I can understand the frustration of the people in Beaufort County.

SEN. BISHOP: If I could follow up one more time, Mr. Chairman?

SEN. BROWN: Senator Bishop.

SEN. BISHOP: So you made reference just then to the Plaintiffs, that maybe the Plaintiffs would agree. But the state has ten million people in it, and as soon as one group of Plaintiffs agrees -- I mean the example that we have here where there was a completed set of litigation in one court system, and then people who were even acquainted perhaps with the Plaintiffs in the first set of lawsuits but different brought other litigation.

Can you imagine a situation in which you could be assured that whatever group was involved in a consensual arrangement like you've described could exhaust the possibility of yet another plaintiff and yet more litigation?

SEN. BLUE: What you said basically makes the point. Even with the resolution of this by Court action, which is how the other would be

resolved, one of the ten million people in North Carolina could still start a new lawsuit. So you settle cases one at a time, and you might anticipate others coming, but until they're brought, you don't have them.

Even -- even when you go back to court sometime in September to determine whether this is a satisfactory resolution of this, there is a possibility that somebody else could still bring another lawsuit. They could bring other lawsuits because of new violations in this redistricting plan, different from the ones that the Court said constituted the racial gerrymander.

So you always have the possibility of litigation, and this doesn't preclude it any more than having a resolution among the parties would conclude it.

SEN. BISHOP: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SEN. BROWN: Senator Hise, do you want to respond to that?

SEN. HISE: I just want to comment on it briefly, and I will tell you -- probably am saddened -- I had a lot of hope that someone had found a new podding for that area that was coming in, although that doesn't seem to be the case.

Having whole county provisions is our state constitution. That was reestablished -- you can see the history of the chaos that happened before the Courts reestablished and reminded the General Assembly we have a provision of whole counties and how it's interpreted under Stephenson.

I would fail to agree that a group of individuals, even individuals that were party to a lawsuit, could come together and establish constitutional matters for the State of North Carolina, coming in. Again, I would say I am disheartened that we have not found a county pod that would do better in that process without creating larger county pods.

SEN. BROWN: Senator Clark?

SEN. CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I guess this discussion we're having now goes back to the notion of the BVAP. Under the [inaudible] my district has, I believe, a black voting age population of about 52 percent, and the Court ordered to us -- the reason we're here today -- it said that we'd have to justify any district with a BVAP in excess of 50 percent. Under the proposed map, is my BVAP now under 50 percent?

SEN. BROWN: Senator Hise?

SEN. HISE: Senator Clark, I will reiterate. I have not seen any racial data for these districts and none was used in the development or drawing or assignment of voters within these districts. Perhaps you have made a request to staff to receive that information and are asking for that.

If there is something you would like to submit to the Committee, you are full within your rights to do, and we would take the time to consider that, coming in, but I obviously cannot -- can't answer a question about something that I do not have and have not received.

SEN. BROWN: Senator Clark?

SEN. CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Then, given that you have not looked at it and have not received it, you don't know whether or not these maps or proposals would actually comply with the court order; is that what I'm understanding you to say?

SEN. HISE: I think that is -- no, I would not say that -- I would not equate the two. I think the Courts were actually quite clear that a target was not allowed under any circumstances so asking whether or not I have information about

whether something met a particular target, I could not comply to what the Court has ordered us to do. I have simply asked the question as if you have received that information about what the voting percentages are in the district and if you're asking to submit that to this Committee.

SEN. BROWN: Senator Clark?

SEN. CLARK: Actually, what I wanted to know is whether or not you have made a determination as to whether or not the maps you're proposing comply with the court order in that the BVAPs for any district be 50 percent or less, and apparently not.

SEN. HISE: The Courts clearly did not give us any targets and clearly laid out that we cannot use targets, and I do believe strongly that these maps comply with the order of the Court.

SEN. BROWN: Any other questions? Senator Blue?

SEN. BLUE: Yeah. And I'm going to be honest with Senator Bishop. I gave him a candid answer, but I think he suspects that there is a more specific answer. And that answer, Senator Bishop, is that if you discussed with some of the members, there may be some reasons and the Court

anticipated -- I heard the argument, I read their opinions -- that there may be reasons that you could still determine that some districts needed a special push and you had to consider race.

That's what the court order said. It did not say you can't use it. The Voting Rights Act and the Fourteenth Amendment are the ones that circumscribe how we use it. But I'm just saying, as talking points and in a full analysis, when parties who are fully informed about the issues sit down and talk about it, there are ways that you can fix most of the problems, and you wouldn't have been violating the North Carolina Constitution, Senator Hise.

SEN. BROWN: Here's what I'm going to do, if it's okay. I'm going -- let's take about a five-minute recess. If anybody's got any amendments -- five or ten minutes -- we'll take however long it takes -- please get them up here. I'm going to give you about five minutes, maybe ten minutes to get them up here so we can look at them. So let's do that. Let's come back in order at about quarter after. That will give us ten minutes.

(Recess, 3:03 - 3:46 p.m.)

SEN. BROWN: Members of the Committee, I hate to do this to you, but I'm going to have to. We've got session at four o'clock, and we've got a new member that's going to be sworn in at four o'clock. So we're going to recess and go to session, do that, and then try to get back here right after session, if that works for everyone.

SEN. RABON: The session may have been moved to four-thirty. We better check.

SEN. BROWN: Senator Rabon, can you check on that real quick? Senator Rabon, I bet you can move it back to four.

(Recess, 3:48 - 4:35 p.m.)

SEN. BROWN: We'll call the meeting back to order. I have five amendments that have been sent forth. I want to be sure. Are there any other amendments that someone would like to send forth? If not, I'll recognize Senator Clark for an amendment.

SEN. CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The amendment that I've sent forth as to 691 essentially what it does is move the Vander community into Senate District 21. Currently, it's in Senate District 19, and I believe it does more appropriately -- a more appropriate fit to be with

Senate District 21.

SEN. BROWN: Senator Hise?

SEN. HISE: I had to modify it a little bit to make sure we did not split another precinct for the community and do believe that this takes in Senator Clark's home as is now on the map versus previous iterations. So given those two considerations of doing this for incumbency protection, I would ask that members would support the amendment.

SEN. BLUE: Okay. Any questions on the amendment? Senator Bishop?

SEN. BISHOP: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is a question for Senator Clark. Do you believe that the district as amended is legal under all legal theories?

SEN. CLARK: Actually, I believe a more appropriate view of what the district should look like is represented here. You see the orange bar which would be an addition to Senate District 21 and a subtraction from District 19, and the hash marks there would be subtractions from District 21, and I believe it would provide a better compactness for Senate District 21 as well as provide more competitiveness between the two districts. That's

all.

SEN. BISHOP: Follow-up, Mr. Chairman?

SEN. BROWN: Senator Bishop.

SEN. BISHOP: I'm not sure if I followed that. You were showing some detail, and really, I was asking maybe a more general question, which is you've proposed an amendment to that particular district, and so -- and I'm glad to get whatever detailed explanation you want to give, but maybe before you gave a detailed explanation, if you'd just say, do you believe that the district as you're amending it is legal under all applicable legal theories?

SEN. BROWN: Senator Clark?

SEN. CLARK: I believe the amendment I'm providing is legal under all legal theories. It just changes the distribution of the population by approximately 300.

SEN. BISHOP: So it's roughly 300 people? Is that what it is?

SEN. BROWN: Senator Hise, any comments on the amendment?

SEN. HISE: No. We're glad that it meets Senator Clark's legal standards for the districts as well, coming in, so we appreciate that and would

ask that you support the amendment.

SEN. BROWN: All right. Any more questions on the amendment? If not, I'm going to ask you to raise your hand so that we can get a count on the vote. So all those in favor of the amendment, please raise their hand.

(Show of hands vote.)

SEN. BROWN: All right. I have 13 in favor and none against, so the amendment passes.

Next, Senator Blue, I think you have one for Wake County -- an amendment?

SEN. BLUE: I do.

SEN. BROWN: Okay. You're recognized, Senator Blue. Let's get it passed out first, Senator Blue.

(Pause.)

SEN. BROWN: Okay. I think everybody's got a copy. Senator Blue, you're recognized.

SEN. BLUE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. What this amendment does -- I was trying to find -- yeah, AMT30 does, it switches precincts, and all of these, by the way, are whole precincts. That's one of the reasons -- or entire VTDs -- that's one of the reasons you get some of the jagged edges. There are no split precincts in it.

But what it does, it simply switches precincts between the proposed District 15 for Senator Chaudhuri and 14, which is my current district, and it basically restores most of my current district to its current form. And since Senator Chaudhuri's district is new -- his old district would have gone south and west, but now that's occupied by 16. It does not affect any of the other three districts in Wake County. It is just those two.

And part of the reason is it's aimed at fixing the gerrymander, I think, as it was defined in Wake County, but it keeps the historic areas of the African-American community together in the same district. It unites the communities of interest. It does not substantially change the performance, as you have calculated it, in either of these districts and has no effect on the remaining districts.

SEN. BROWN: All right. Questions for Senator Blue? Senator Bishop?

SEN. BISHOP: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Senator Blue, in the course of -- you know, all this is new to me, but in the course of hearing the majority's proposals, I've heard a lot about

Dr. Hofeller being the consultant. Who helped you draw this?

SEN. BLUE: Staff.

SEN. BISHOP: Staff and you?

SEN. BLUE: Staff and me. I happen to know the precincts and the nature of them, which is usually a pretty helpful exercise. What the version of Senate Bill 691 does, it uses the artificial separator of the Raleigh beltline, and consequently, it caused everything inside the beltline out of the district, and there's no real reason to do that.

It doesn't change any -- significantly the percentages or what have you. I think it -- you're not considering it, but still the African-American percentage in this district, because it's exchanging with 15, is still below 40 percent, and the performance, I think, if you run it through the performance metrics that you've used to determine the party favorites, since it's between two heavily Democratic districts, it does not change that, either.

But what it does do, it unites the inside the beltline communities with the outside the beltline communities up to the Neuse River.

SEN. HISE: A follow-up or two, Mr. Chairman?

SEN. BROWN: Follow-up, Senator Bishop.

SEN. BISHOP: So I take it from a couple of comments you made that you used race in drawing the map?

SEN. BLUE: Not really. Not really. I just know the precincts. Some of them -- the inside of the beltline precincts in Wake County in southeast Raleigh are heavily black precincts, but as I've explained to you several times before, the rapid growth in Raleigh has probably integrated this town much more so than some of those big cities in the state that haven't grown as rapidly. So you're going to still get comparable race percentages even when you go outside the beltline.

But what this map does, it reunites the Raleigh communities, incorporates Knightdale as your original map did in its entirety, but it has more Raleigh downtown in it rather than Raleigh north of the beltline.

SEN. BISHOP: Follow-up?

SEN. BROWN: Follow-up.

SEN. BISHOP: If I could explore that just a little bit more.

SEN. BLUE: Sure.

SEN. BISHOP: So you made reference to historically black areas, and -- but you said you're not really using race. It's hard for me -- and as you know, some of that is current discussion we've had in here so far and what the criteria have been. Could you reconcile those for me?

SEN. BLUE: In what regard?

SEN. BISHOP: I got the last comment, but the fact that you've made comments about in looking at this, you were interested in historically black areas, but you haven't -- when I said "Did you use race," you said, "Not really," and I just wanted to see if I can get clarity on that.

SEN. BLUE: I used it to the extent that I know the characteristics of the precincts. I can pretty call them up, but I know the characteristics of the ones in the proposed 16 as well because I've worked extensively in these areas. And inside the beltline in southeast Raleigh historically is an African-American area. It's going through tremendous justification now, not just justification, but the housing patterns in it are changing and it's becoming much more integrated.

But historically these communities are

related to those that I've added it back to just outside the beltline. For example, probably one of the biggest churches in the county is outside the beltline but most of their parishioners come from inside the beltline. And so it's things like that. But, yeah, I'm very familiar with the racial makeup of this district. I'm familiar with the racial makeup of all of the districts in this map.

And I think that when we go to the reason that we're here is to correct the racial gerrymander, and when we draw that district like this, it basically brings the percentage down, but it still unites communities of interest and it abides by pretty much, as best I can tell, all the other criteria that we were using.

Yeah, I mean I know what the racial component is, and I know that it does not exceed 40 percent and it does not exceed 50 percent, and that's how I put it together.

SEN. BISHOP: Follow-up?

SEN. BROWN: Follow-up.

SEN. BISHOP: So are you able to say that you don't consider this -- the districts in this map to be a racial gerrymander?

SEN. BLUE: Oh, absolutely, this is not a

racial gerrymander, and I don't -- I don't see any Court that would rule this to be a racial gerrymander because the way they define gerrymanders is without any good reason. You can look at race and you're supposed to look at it when you're districting, but you can't allow it to become the predominant factor in the way -- in your decision-making process when assign people to districts. But you're supposed to look at it. I mean that's one of the requirements if you're going to redistrict and comply with the Voting Rights Act and the Fourteenth Amendment.

And so being cognizant of the racial composition and desiring to preserve the communities of interest, those kinds of things -- and what this district -- what this district does -- in 2003 when they settled on it -- and I was not in the legislature that year -- when they settled on it, it had a low African-American percentage. I say low. It was about 40 percent, and the map that was passed back in 2011, the percentage in that district was taken north of 50 percent. And the Court basically decided that there was no reason, no justification using race to increase that district from 40 percent African-

American primarily to 50 percent, and that was an impermissible use of race, and so race became the predominating factor in drawing the district.

And so where I take it is back close to where its historical origins were when it was first created. I'm not using race as the predominant reason to design it this way. I'm just fixing the gerrymander. This fixes the gerrymander that was in Wake County. I mean, this is not necessarily the only way to fix it, but it fixes it.

SEN. BISHOP: Follow-up?

SEN. BROWN: Follow-up.

SEN. BISHOP: So you're confident that none of the districts in this map amendment are racial gerrymanders?

SEN. BLUE: 14 is not a racial gerrymander. The only way the others would become racial gerrymanders -- quite frankly, the only way they would become racial gerrymanders is if, in fact, you were using race to gain an intentional partisan advantage. That is a racial gerrymander, the same as if you're taking districts far north of where that have got to be to perform as the Voting Rights Act contemplated.

Senator Hise mentioned Section 5 of the

Voting Rights Act. Actually, it was Section 4 of the Voting Rights Act that was struck down so you don't have to have Section 5 clearance. But the Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act is still very alive, and so you still have, in looking at the history, a Gingles analysis that you've got to do since the major Supreme Court case in this area came from North Carolina. And so if you did a Gingles analysis, you couldn't justify taking this district north of 30 percent -- I mean north of 50 percent, probably not north of the 40 percent if race was the primary reason that you were drawing it.

So this is not a racial gerrymander. I don't see any direct racial gerrymanders in this cluster, that is, Wake County. But if it is determined that race was used, people were put in these districts in order to create a political gerrymander, then the racial gerrymander would apply, and it would be violative of the Constitution and of the Voting Rights Act.

SEN. BISHOP: Follow-up?

SEN. BROWN: Follow-up.

SEN. BISHOP: And I want to make sure I've got the full feel for your sense about the

amendment. Are you confident, then, that all the districts in Wake County, as you propose to amend them, are legal under, you know, whatever applicable legal theories are?

SEN. BLUE: I have not put the race test on all of these districts. I simply haven't had time. I know that this one would not be illegal. I don't know whether -- an argument would be made that 15 is a political gerrymander, so you'd have to determine whether you were assigning people to it based on race in order to effectuate the political gerrymander. I have not done that analysis on 15. It is not a racial gerrymander when I amend it the way I did because you don't have -- I think the percentage goes down south of 30 percent.

Indeed, the way that we've drawn these districts, as you've draw them here, District 15 has a higher percentage of African-American voters than District 14, but if someone were to make the argument -- and I don't know that it will be me -- that that's a political gerrymander, you would have to analyze it from that angle. What this would do, from a racial standpoint, is make it less of one because it's not packing an incredible number of

African-Americans in another district.

But, again, the analysis of whether there are political gerrymanders in Wake County is a separate analysis. I think -- I think that -- from what I gleaned initially from this, that there is -- 16 probably has the makings of a Democratic district in Wake County, and I guess if I were analyzing it, I would look at all five districts and figure out whether this is where your racial gerrymander occurred in Wake County as opposed to, say, the other urban counties.

But this does not extinguish the claim of racial gerrymanders based on political gerrymanders, but it does with respect to these districts.

SEN. BROWN: Follow-up?

SEN. BISHOP: Thank you. One more, I think. So that also applies to 15; that's not -- as you've drawn it, not a racial gerrymander?

SEN. BLUE: No, 15 is not a racial gerrymander, and again, in trying to put this together, I said that 15, based on your criteria, is a very high-performing Democratic district, somewhere in -- even after reconfigured, it's still a high-performing Democratic district in the

northern part of the sixties, and 14 is as well.

So I don't say that that extinguishes all claims of racial -- gerrymanders based on them being political gerrymanders. I'm pretty sure it does with the configuration of 14. I just don't know about 15 because I haven't done the deep drive in it, and it takes about five percent of the African-American votes out of 15 and returns them to 14, but it doesn't take 14 unreasonably high and it doesn't leave 15 unreasonably high.

So in a traditional analysis, you can't say that it's a racial gerrymander based on where you put people because of race if that were the reason you were doing it, but you've still got to go through with this entire map, and an analysis of whether the way it's designed, you've used race in any way at all to gain political advantage. And if you've done that in various sections of the map, then a political gerrymander becomes a racial gerrymander, and it will be struck down.

SEN. BISHOP: Mr. Chairman, I promised that was my last question, but I've got one more if you'll let me.

SEN. BROWN: One more. One more.

SEN. BISHOP: Because something you just

said sort of troubled me a little more so. What I heard you say -- and I think you said it a couple of times -- is that it doesn't -- your amendment doesn't extinguish the claim of a potential political gerrymander, and to make it a little more complex, that a political gerrymander might be a hidden racial gerrymander.

And when we were talking actually before we recessed, you and I over here, we were talking about how the specter of ever present litigation hanging over your shoulder sort of make it hard if you had people try to settle a controversy or something and they had -- and you said well, we're going to reach this settlement, but I'm going to keep these claims over here. I might want to litigate.

So when you say your -- your amendment would leave a potential political gerrymander claim in this -- if we adopted it, it would still be present, is that correct?

SEN. BLUE: Not totally so. I'm going to move away from being a lawyer and just give you a straight answer. It is my opinion -- since that's what you're seeking -- it is my opinion that this eliminates the gerrymander in Wake County. There

are districts that remain excessively high because you've got two districts that do these very high Democratic performances. If race were the reason that people were placed in these districts so that you could affect political gerrymanders in other places, this would be a political gerrymander.

But let me assure you this is not the angle from which a political gerrymander on the entire state map would be leveled. I'm convinced that, given the configuration -- and, again, I haven't fully analyzed it. I don't know the subnumbers look like -- the subsets, but if 15 -- if 16 is a Democratic leaning or Democratic district, within Wake County, you don't have the use of race to create political gerrymanders.

But, again, you've got, what, six or eight more counties where that might be the case, but it wouldn't be predicated on what's happening in Wake County.

SEN. BROWN: Senator Hise?

SEN. HISE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Let me see if I can kind of clear this up. As you might understand, math departments don't give out law degrees. So I struggle to -- I can get a binary better than I can come up with those

answers. This amendment deals with Districts 14 and 15 exclusively, and as -- so let me try to simplify this as much as I can.

In changing these two districts that exist here, you do not believe that a racial gerrymander exists in those two districts as you have changed them?

SEN. BLUE: That's right.

SEN. HISE: So I appreciate--- For comment?

SEN. BROWN: Comment, Senator Hise.

SEN. HISE: I would reiterate to the Committee that we have not had and do not have racial data on any of these districts and, therefore, have not sorted any individuals into districts on the basis of race that is coming in. I would reiterate that. I would take it under advisement from our colleague Senator Blue that it is his claim that Wake County is not a racial gerrymander, that it is -- Districts 14 and 15, as they're amended and changed, eliminate whatever concern there was and that these are not based on race but on historical communities. As he claims, it doesn't change the racial data.

I think I would be kind of inclined at

this point to accept that, that the cases coming out. Other members may have discussion, but I think, as I clearly got an answer, there is not a gerrymander in Wake County as a result of the changes that exist here in these districts.

SEN. BROWN: Any other questions for Senator Blue? Senator Hise, anything else to add?

SEN. HISE: No. I think that -- I think that covers it. I think it would be the concept that these do not change the political considerations nor would they violate any of the rules of the Committee to make these changes.

SEN. BROWN: All right. Hearing no more discussion, again, I'm going to ask that you raise your hands. All in favor of Senator Blue's amendment, please raise your hand.

(Show of hands vote.)

SEN. BROWN: I have 13 in favor and zero against. So the amendment passes.

Senator Blue, the next one?

SEN. BLUE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The next one is the -- it should be denominated -- it's the statewide map.

SEN. BROWN: This is the Mecklenburg one. I'm sorry. Mecklenburg first.

SEN. BLUE: Oh, Mecklenburg is the next one. Okay.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is just a rendering of Mecklenburg County using the criteria that we've adopted and just looking to see how you could comply with all of the criteria, have compactness, contiguity, and all of those things, and so this map ended up being a district that does that. They've got much smoother precinct lines in Mecklenburg County than they do in Wake County. I guess we follow more streams and creeks for the edges of precincts, but neither does this map break any precinct lines.

And it -- historically, Precincts 38 and 40, I believe, are the ones that have been earlier dominated African-American precincts -- are the two that got us in trouble. This fixes the problem with District 38 and 40 on being racial gerrymanders because it does not take either one of them over 50. They are compact. They basically stick strictly with the compliance in every other regards of the Stephenson decision. It's got partisan balance, as I understand it, in just looking at the numbers that way, and it complies with all the state and federal law that I'm aware

of in this area, and it has all of the traditional redistricting criteria observed.

That's what it does, and so it gives us a look at other maps that don't do some of the things that Senator Clark was addressing earlier in getting them out of -- out of shape because I think in the committee plan there's a district that goes from east to north to western Mecklenburg County that -- that seems to violate some of the redistricting rules.

SEN. BROWN: Questions for Senator Blue? Senator Bishop?

SEN. BISHOP: Mr. Chairman, I may be wearing out my welcome. I apologize, but I happen to be from Mecklenburg County. So I wanted to ask Senator Blue a couple questions about this one because I think I see five Democratic districts here.

Senator Blue, did you draw this map also -- you personally?

SEN. BLUE: I did not -- I did not use the cursor to pick out every place in it, and I have staff who worked with us once we got the basic makings of it. But like Dr. Hofeller, the Speaker and the President of the Senate gave us leeway to

get somebody who knew more about this than I did. And this one I didn't draw, as I did the Wake County maps, because I defer to you. I don't know Mecklenburg County as well as I do Wake County.

SEN. BISHOP: Could you---

SEN. BROWN: Senator Bishop, follow-up?

SEN. BISHOP: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I beg your pardon. Who was your hired hand, then?

SEN. BLUE: Hired hand is not a complimentary term, I don't think.

SEN. BISHOP: Forgive me. Consultant.

SEN. BLUE: The consultant is a fellow named Dr. Kareem Crayton. He has a distinguished career. He was a professor at UNC Chapel Hill Law School. He's got a PhD in political science. He has spent time doing this stuff, and at the late moment that we were able to get somebody, he happened to be available, so we asked him to come help us with some ideas.

SEN. BROWN: Follow-up, Senator Bishop?

SEN. BISHOP: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Did you and Dr. Crayton, did you say, consider political -- take political considerations into account in drawing this map?

SEN. BLUE: No. No. And that's one of

the criteria that wasn't the most compelling criteria. What we did -- we did look at race to make sure that we weren't violating the Court's order, we were breaking up the racial gerrymander, because these districts too -- one of them, Senator Bishop, I think Number 40, had been a district in Mecklenburg County where an African-American beat one of the most powerful senators in the General Assembly, Senator Odom, back the middle of the last decade, I think, and Malcolm Graham.

And it was less than 30 percent African-American, and it remained that through the end of the cycle. In 2011 when you redistricted it, you took it from about 29 to 30 percent to north of 50 percent. That's why the Supreme Court said it was a racial gerrymander because it's already proven, using all the Gingles criteria, that it could elect the candidate of choice of the minority community without you taking it up to this extreme level. And so this does not take it back down to the 29 or 30 percent, but it fixes the racial gerrymander consistent with what the Court said.

The other district in there was 38. When you took that one in 2011 from probably a 45, 46 percent majority African-American district to north

of 50, again, you couldn't justify it using the Gingles criteria, and the Court said that was a racial gerrymander. So when you took these two districts back down so that they wouldn't be gerrymanders, you then freed up all of the rest of it, and so it's just getting small compact districts in the rest of Mecklenburg County.

There may be some specific attributes of Mecklenburg County communities of interest and all of those that you're more familiar with, and perhaps the public hearings would have told us more about those kinds of things, but this is just our effort using the racial stuff that the Court said was not permissible and getting it down below those level and fixing the gerrymander, and then taking the rest of it and adjusting it.

SEN. BROWN: Follow-up?

SEN. BISHOP: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So taking Malcolm Graham's old district, for example, you said that it had been taken up over 50 percent and that was an impermissible racial gerrymander. So you said you took it back down and not to the number that it had been before you, I think you said, but to some other number?

SEN. BLUE: I think it's probably

somewhere in the high thirties.

SEN. BISHOP: How did you -- how did you pick that numerical target?

SEN. BLUE: There's nothing magical about it. It's just that when you wanted to get a concise, compact district and you know that you can't leave it in the high forties or fifties and be in compliance with the Court's ruling, not only the three-judge panel but the Supreme Court's ruling, then you try to get it back down -- because they're going to look at race. They've got to look at race to determine that you're no longer in violation of the constitutional provision. They're going to look at it whether we decide to play an ostrich and say we're not -- we say we're not looking at it. We can't use it as a predominant factor.

So you look at it to get it back where you're satisfying the requirements of the Court and eliminating the racial gerrymander. And so when you do that, I think you could take it down to 38, to 39 percent, and it will be totally acceptable because it meets all of the other criteria for redistricting, that that you have adopted as well as the traditional criteria.

SEN. BROWN: Follow-up?

SEN. BISHOP: How do you know that you can target any particular number?

SEN. BLUE: If, in fact -- and this is akin to the first question that you asked me. If, in fact, you get the Plaintiffs and the residents in that district and they're satisfied with it, you're not going to get a lawsuit. You can't speak for a hundred percent of the people a hundred percent of the time, but what creates conflicts, at least in the Courts, is when somebody brings a lawsuit.

I'm convinced that based on the performance of this district prior to 2012 that somebody who brought a suit saying that you're in violation of Gingles principles on this district would be wasting their money and their time. And so if I bring it down there and have pretty good confidence that it could withstand any kind of assault or any kind of attack that anybody brought against it, that's what I'm going to rely on, and that's why I say that if we bring it -- you could take it lower if you wanted to, but then you don't make it as compact and you don't make it as compliant with the other principles that you've

adopted on compactness using either of the tests that we talked about that you determine compactness by.

SEN. BROWN: Follow-up?

SEN. BISHOP: Are you saying that it might be unconstitutional because it targets a specific number without having additional evidence of racially polarized voting, but you believe nobody would sue about it?

SEN. BLUE: No. There's no doubt in my mind this district is not unconstitutional.

SEN. BISHOP: So you think as long as you set it down at 38, or whatever the number is you pick, that you can set a numerical target for racial balance without having any more evidence of racially polarized voting than we had?

SEN. BLUE: Frankly -- and this is my opinion. I don't write opinions for the Courts, but I share my opinions. Frankly, I think, Senator Bishop, that you could take the districts back to their pre-2011 levels based on the racial composition of them at that time, and all of them would have been racially compliant. I don't think you would have had any racial gerrymanders at all in this map if you had left these districts at the

same percentages that the Courts had approved earlier.

Now what you run the risk of -- what you run the risk of when you're not in this litigation stance -- what you run the risk of that a lot of people worry about is whether or not you're retrogressing with district; that is, where you can satisfy some of these Gingles principles, the law is you can't take it below certain levels that would perform as predicted when you do a Voting Rights Act analysis.

Since you've chosen not to do that analysis on this map, that was part of the reason that the Court kicked out the maps last year and -- well, as it went up through the court system -- because you had not done the analysis on these districts to see how they performed and see whether you could justify increasing the minority voting age population in these districts. Had you had the kinds of studies that would justify it, then you would have had to prescribe a remedy that took it up to a given level but didn't necessarily load additional African-Americans in that district.

That's what the law is. It fits a typical Fourteenth Amendment analysis compelling

state interest, and then if you find that that compelling state interest has been met, you then have to use the race in the analysis but only in a strictly limited way. You just can't use race to fix it all. You have to narrowly prescribe the remedy anytime you use race.

That's what the Fourteenth Amendment is about, and the narrowly prescribed remedy would be to put as few additional African-Americans in that district as you have to in order to still make it so that minorities can elect the candidate of their choice. It doesn't have to be a black candidate. It could be anybody, but you have to show those -- the Gingles factors, polarized voting, compactness, sufficient group within the area that you're looking at to draw a district, and you'll have to show that minorities can elect the candidate of choice. And that's because of the history that led to the enactment of the Voting Rights Act.

SEN. BROWN: Follow-up?

SEN. BISHOP: But isn't it true that the reason the Court told us that we had engaged in -- well, we -- I wasn't here, but that the General Assembly had engaged in an unconstitutional racial gerrymander is that one of the Gingles factors

wasn't met. You didn't have district by district evidence of racially polarized data of the quality and quantity sufficient to justify doing that. That's what it was, right? It wasn't that you can't put 50 percent plus one in a district; it was that you didn't have the predicate to do it.

SEN. BLUE: That's correct.

SEN. BISHOP: And do you have new evidence district by district that you haven't shared with us about racially polarized voting in the districts that you're proposing here?

SEN. BLUE: No, but what I do have is the performance over a decade at those low percentages. That is direct evidence that the districts are working the way that Voting Rights Act contemplated. You have got this that you're dealing with here, Senator Bishop. If you were creating districts that are going to stay that way in perpetuity, then America wouldn't have an opportunity to grow, and we wouldn't have an opportunity to migrate to the point that race does not matter.

And so -- so what the Court has done -- and I think you'll find this in most of the opinions -- whether it's a conservative Court or a

liberal Court -- what the Court has done is basically say if you can still meet the Gingles criteria, you will draw districts that have certain percentages.

If you will notice, once you leave North Carolina, not only in this last round of redistricting but historically, you've had districts that were represented with African-Americans that were much higher in their African-American black -- their black voting age population than the North Carolina districts because they could clearly demonstrate that race had been the motivating in voting in those states. North Carolina was substantially different, and so you didn't have these high percentages.

You read the cases and you follow this too. In Alabama, it was 67 percent. There were very few instances, one or two, in all of North Carolina where the numbers had to go that far in order to create an opportunity for minorities to elect a candidate of choice.

And so what the 31 percent says, if you can draw a district down there and you can show that minorities can elect the candidate of their choice with only a 29, 30 percent black voting age

population in that district -- or Hispanic or whatever the group is you're focusing on -- then if you use race as a predominant factor to go beyond that level, then you've violated the Voting Rights Act and probably violated the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution and several amendments to the North Carolina Constitution or several articles.

SEN. BROWN: Follow-up?

SEN. BISHOP: Let me ask another angle, then. Was that the main thing driving how these districts are formed, is setting the targets that you described, that they're lower but, nonetheless, looking at race and setting the numbers -- keeping the numbers where you think they should be?

SEN. BLUE: I put the numbers at a level that I feel pretty confident, and most of the lawyers who would work in this area, whether they're plaintiffs' lawyers or defendants' lawyers, would feel confident that you could not sustain a race discrimination claim based on the racial percentages in these districts.

SEN. BISHOP: What I'm trying to get at is, was that the predominant factor driving the design of these districts is setting the racial

balance at the numbers that you believe to be acceptable?

SEN. BLUE: The first consideration was to fix the racial gerrymander, and in order to fix the racial gerrymander, I knew that you had to take these districts far lower than they were with black population because these districts had already demonstrated that they could elect minorities without -- first, you don't want to use race. I mean, frankly, that's what we're all trying to get away from.

You don't want to use race, and so what you're trying to do is use it the least amount possible, and that's why I say it's got to be in narrowly tailored remedy, and in election laws, the narrowly tailored remedy is to use the smallest percentage based on race that you can use so that you keep coming down and you don't have to have racial discussions when you do redistricting.

So you can say that you're not considering race, but you haven't done the analysis that you've got to do, you haven't addressed the issue that the Court told us we've got to deal with in redrawing these districts because you can't say that you have fixed the racial gerrymander if you

can't say that you looked at what the racial makeup of these districts are.

SEN. BROWN: Senator Bishop?

SEN. BISHOP: So are the statistics here that reflect your analysis of what those racial targets are for the districts so that we can -- the Committee can have whatever information it needs in order to pass this amendment?

SEN. BLUE: All of the backup is available. I don't know if it's been passed out. But there are no targets, Senator Bishop, in the sense that, yeah, you go to X percent and Y percent. My target was to draw districts and our consultant was instructed to draw districts that would be compliant with the Court's ruling, one that does not have a racial gerrymander and you can't argue that the percentages of the black vote in these districts are put there solely because -- that's not the predominant reason that they're in these districts.

It went back, for the most part, to districts the way they existed in 2009 and took away from them because all of these districts have increased in population. The reason that my district in Wake County was so big in 2011, it was

the second most overpopulated district in the state because of all the new growth that's happening in these two urban areas, Wake County and in Mecklenburg County.

And so what this does, it sort of trims off the edges of those districts with all of the extra population. If you look at these districts now, you can rest assured that they have a much higher population now than they had in 2010, but to sort of peel off some of the extra growth that had occurred in them and get them back down to the levels that they looked like in 2010 just before the census.

SEN. BISHOP: Mr. Chairman?

SEN. BROWN: Follow-up.

SEN. BISHOP: I want to just shift out of this discussion of race. If you would, forgive me. It looks like this map sort of shatters Mecklenburg County like a mirror. Take, for example, your proposed 37, you've got -- I think Matthews is in there.

Actually, let me ask you this question: How many municipalities does this map split?

SEN. BLUE: Of course, it splits Charlotte, and I don't -- again, I don't think it

should split any other. It did observe the criteria. You know it better than I do. But, as you see, Charlotte is split because it's right in the middle of the map, and so you get at least -- I think at least three, maybe four big districts might border on Charlotte -- in fact, I'm sure that at least three of them do. I think four of them border on Charlotte.

SEN. BROWN: Follow-up?

SEN. BISHOP: We've got -- down on the eastern side, you've got Mint Hill and you've got Matthews. It looks to me like 40 and 37 would split Matthews. You've got 39 down here. I don't know if 39 and 38 split Pineville or not, but it looks like you do. You don't know whether you took that into consideration -- any of that?

SEN. BLUE: No, no. They're whole precincts, and it's my understanding that they comply with the other redistricting criteria and don't split -- I don't think they split towns down there any more than they're currently split, probably less. I know that was the case in Wake County where we -- we've got many more towns. We've got 12 towns in this county, and so we were basically trying to put them back together.

I don't think they're split, but again, you know the geography down there far better than I do. If they're split, they ought not be, but they're whole precincts and sometimes you'll split a town because you take the whole precinct, and some of it will be in town and some of it will not be in town. So that's going on, especially in these towns that don't have but 30- or 40,000 people population.

SEN. BROWN: One more follow-up?

SEN. BISHOP: It might be more than one. Have you measured--- Senator Clark has talked a lot about this efficiency gap. The professor named---

SEN. CLARK: Stephanopoulos.

SEN. BISHOP: Yes. ---Nick Stephanopoulos. I think he's George Stephanopoulos's brother, but I'm not positive about that. In 2008, I think he was with Obama for America before he came up with this. But have you measured his efficiency gap on this map?

SEN. BLUE: All the stats related to it should have been passed out. I gave the whole stat-pack on it. I understand a little bit. Believe it or not, I have a degree in mathematics,

and I understand some about this efficiency gap analysis, but I have not consumed myself with it the way our Chairman has and the way Senator Clark has.

But we performed the same analysis -- the staff did -- whatever we've got here -- they should have performed the same analysis as they did the other -- the other maps that they looked at.

SEN. BROWN: Follow-up?

SEN. BISHOP: Well, I'm just looking at the collection of materials, and it does look like what we've done in the other maps that have been provided by the majority. It does not include an efficiency gap analysis. I just wondered whether -- whether Dr. -- what's his name? No, no, no, no. The gentleman who drew these for you -- Kareem -- whether he computed an efficiency gap?

SEN. BLUE: I don't have an efficiency gap. That's not one they requested of me because the Committee didn't adopt it as a criteria. But if you were to do an efficiency gap on this thing, it would probably be as close to neutral as you would get.

SEN. BROWN: Senator Hise, do you want to

pick up and give Senator Bishop a break?

SEN. HISE: Well, I would just comment on that briefly in consideration, regardless of my issues with how you would calculate an efficiency gap, but when you can run -- I would simply state in very simple less mathematically complex terms that in Mecklenburg County, if you look at the races, roughly 30 to 42 percent of the vote goes for Republican candidates in Mecklenburg County. The end result of this would be no representatives in the Senate who were of the Republican Party. Some might call that an infinite efficiency gap, coming in -- coming in, but I'm sure that would -- whether or not I like the calculations, I'm sure, if you looked at the county, that would score quite horribly.

SEN. BROWN: Senator Clark?

SEN. CLARK: I'm just wondering how you used political data to determine that a certain party would obtain a certain number of seats. I thought you-all didn't do that. That's what I was told earlier.

SEN. HISE: I used the calculations you had used previously.

SEN. BROWN: Senator Clark, do you want

to follow up on that?

SEN. CLARK: Yes. So I was correct that means you do use political data prospectively to determine the outcomes of elections based upon these districts that we have drawn?

SEN. HISE: I do not.

SEN. BROWN: Senator Bishop?

SEN. BISHOP: I think just two more, I promise, Mr. Chairman. You know, to that point, as I said, I don't have great confidence in the efficiency gap. I think it sort of tends to give some sort of certain sense to something that's very certain, but that doesn't mean you can't use common sense. And so Senator Blue has spoken to that a good bit.

Senator Blue, I was just looking at the back -- if you flip over to the next-to-the-last of the long pages, it's got the President 2016 stats, and if I look at all those districts, 37, 38, 39, 40, and 41 in Mecklenburg County that have been drawn, the closest the Republican candidate for President would have gotten would have been 43 percent of the vote. You've got -- all five districts would have beat the Republican candidate.

And so, Senator Blue, you didn't

gerrymander this district?

SEN. BLUE: No. But it is a map drawn strictly to the criteria that you adopted that ought to govern mapmaking. That's what this map does.

SEN. BISHOP: It doesn't have any political consideration?

SEN. BLUE: No. No. It has political implications, but what it did, if you can configure these two minority districts -- not majority minority -- substantial plurality minority districts in other forms but come down to those percentages, you will probably fix the racial gerrymander in Mecklenburg County, but if you don't do that, you will neither fix the racial gerrymander---

And I'm not saying this is the only way to do it. What I said when I started out is, I wanted to look at alternative ways that you could draw maps based on your criteria that would fix the gerrymander, but you can approach it in a different way. I think that you still leave the gerrymander in the plans in Mecklenburg County in the map that's before us.

There are other ways to fix it, but this

is one observing all of the criteria that you adopted. They are more compact. They satisfy all the other tests that you set. There was just a little dialogue between Senator Clark and Senator Hise on whatever the guy's name was that you do these studies by.

This surpasses all the stuff that we've done in every other county when you draw it specifically like this because they're more compact, you're protecting incumbents. You'll see in some instances, they're just hanging on in the corners, but each one of them has a separate incumbent in it, so you haven't double-bunked any of them, and you observe all the criteria that you set forth.

SEN. BISHOP: If I could ask one more question and then maybe one quick comment, and I'll get out of the way. Sorry. So, you know, this thing about what constitutes fairness in drawing these maps, if I look at 37 again, Senator Blue, I'm sure that at least part of Matthews down at the southeastern end of the county in that district and the urban core of Charlotte.

And you talk about -- whether you call it communities of interest or what makes sense, do you

think that the people in Matthews have some interests that they need attended to that are in the nature of ring city, ring town interests that they don't have in common with the people who live in the core of Charlotte, and what would be fair about cramming them together in one district?

SEN. BLUE: Senator Bishop, have you looked at the Republican map for Mecklenburg County?

SEN. BISHOP: I have, sir.

SEN. BLUE: You remember one of the things that those who attended these public hearings is from Charlotte -- the biggest issue that folks raised is why would I want to go all the way around the county. There's nothing in common with the way these districts connect us -- one of the districts that you've drawn, and I suggest that I don't know where the similarity is at the bottom at the extreme left-hand corner in this map in Mecklenburg County and right in middle of where this district ends, but it's certainly compact. It's as compact as you probably could make that district, and it's a district that now complies with the Voting Rights Act and Fourteenth Amendment. It is a district that the Court said

you've got to redraw and you've got to change your percentage.

The same thing on 40. It is compact. It gets the percentages below where they have to be, and it meets all of the other criteria that you set forth, but it meets it in a better way than the map that's before us. When I say "before us," I mean the Committee's map.

And just in closing, let me simply say this. Is there a district in Mecklenburg County under the current mapping system that Trump won?

SEN. BISHOP: Mr. Chairman, my just closing comment. And Senator Blue is very skillful, but didn't answer the question whether Matthews would have interests -- they're concerned about being adequately represented with a district they elect -- with a representative they elect in common with somebody from Charlotte's core. I assure you that the Matthews people say that they wouldn't want it done that way, and it does -- for me it has sort of a galvanizing effect.

You know, I know people who are -- who are not in control, you know, can get very upset about the way things are done, but the notion that there's not politics in this, the notion that

there's not targeted of racial information in this, whatever number you're trying to set, you haven't cured evidentiary shortfalls that the Court said existed. I cannot conceive of that being the map for Mecklenburg County, and I hope the Committee won't support it.

SEN. BROWN: Senator Hise?

SEN. HISE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Despite -- I guess this is where we start breaking apart in this agreement. Despite claims that this meets all the criteria of the Committee, I think that it is clear that this map used race as a manner in which to divide individuals into districts. In fact, here you've set targets at 39 or 40 percent as to what those numbers should be and then placed individuals to meet those criteria that are coming in.

Also, it clearly fails on the concept of incumbency protection. My summary of this map is it is drawn solely for the purpose of making sure that no Republican incumbents in Mecklenburg County could ever be elected. Quite frankly, it's designed to make sure that no Republicans would ever be elected to the Senate from Mecklenburg County.

That's what's coming in despite those percentages within those counties. I think there is also a significant question about the municipalities that are divided. I would tell you that I feel this is inconsistent with the Committee's criteria and ask that you reject this amendment.

SEN. BROWN: Senator Clark?

SEN. CLARK: I would like to speak a moment on the criteria regarding compactness. Despite what was said earlier, our written criteria indicates that we should meet reasonable efforts to develop plans that improve the compactness of the current districts. With regard to District 39, it is worse with respect to the Reock and it's worse with respect to the Polsby-Popper, which we specifically identified as measures that we wanted improvement in.

In addition to that, we know that there are nine measures of compactness provided by the Maptitude software. It is also deficient in terms of the perimeter compactness measure, deficient in terms of polygon measure -- population polygon measure, it is worse off in the population circle method it's worse off in the Ehrenberg method, and

it is worse off in the minimum convex polygon method. So of the nine methods of measuring compactness, District 39, as proposed in the Senate plan, is worse in seven categories.

And with regard to efficiency gap, we don't use the efficiency gap to measure performance of an individual district within the state plan. The efficiency gap is used to measure the performance of the plan in its entirety.

SEN. BROWN: Senator Hise, any response?

SEN. HISE: I think the efficiency gap is apparently used how you want to use it. They're coming in to make a point. But I would say that I do say that, again, I would the Committee to reject the amendment.

SEN. BROWN: Any more questions on this amendment? If not, again, I'm going to ask by raising your hand, all those in favor of the amendment raise your hand, please.

(Show of hands vote.)

SEN. BROWN: Those opposed?

(Show of hands vote.)

SEN. BROWN: Nine to four. The amendment fails.

All right. Next, I have Senator Van

Duyn.

SEN. VAN DUYN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This amendment deals with District 28 in Guilford County. Has it been distributed?

SEN. BROWN: Has everybody got this amendment for Guilford County? Let's get that. Let's make sure everybody's got it.

(Pause in proceedings.)

SEN. BROWN: All right. It looks like we're good. Senator Van Duyn?

SEN. VAN DUYN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The objective of this amendment is to -- primarily to correct the defects that were previously caused by racial gerrymandering in District 28. It affects the surrounding districts as well, of course, but it also complies with state and federal laws. It respects the whole county -- excuse me -- the whole county provision as well as the need for compactness.

And with all due respect to Senator Bishop, I think we just fundamentally disagree about the need to review race in the process of correcting the previous maps. I mean, if you look at the 2011 District 28, one might suggest that if you start with that general outline, you don't have

to use race to create a racially gerrymandered district if you start out with an outline of a racially gerrymandered district. So for that reason, you have to consider race to make sure, in fact, that you have corrected the problems with the previous maps.

And this scheme does, in fact, do that by returning us -- not quite but to -- to the percentage of African-Americans that we had in 2003.

SEN. BROWN: Questions for Senator Van Duyn? Senator Bishop?

SEN. BISHOP: Thank you, Mr. Chair. What numerical target of African-Americans do you say is constitutional, Senator Van Duyn?

SEN. VAN DUYN: I'm sorry. Could you please repeat your question?

SEN. BISHOP: What numerical target for African-Americans do you say is constitutional?

SEN. VAN DUYN: I am saying that closer to the 2003 numbers is constitutional because those were constitutional maps.

SEN. BISHOP: What do you mean closer to; the same number or some number within what range?

SEN. VAN DUYN: No. Closer to than the

maps that were deemed unconstitutional.

SEN. BROWN: Follow-up?

SEN. BISHOP: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Could you say what number that is?

SEN. VAN DUYN: Well, the number I believe in the 2017 maps was 50.52 and that was significantly higher than where it was in 2003. Ours is at 45.3.

SEN. BISHOP: So you targeted 45.3?

SEN. VAN DUYN: No. No. We just targeted less than 50.5.

SEN. BROWN: Senator Hise, do you want to respond?

SEN. HISE: Senator Van Duyn, you specifically said what the percentage was of the minority in the district we had drawn, the 2017 maps. Could you repeat that?

SEN. VAN DUYN: I believe it was 50.52 which makes it a majority minority district.

SEN. HISE: And your intent was to get it below 50.3?

SEN. VAN DUYN: No. 50.52. In other words, to get it -- to get it closer to where it was in 2003.

SEN. BROWN: Follow-up, Senator Hise?

SEN. HISE: But no qualifications on "closer," just as long as it went under 50.5, you felt like it was a good number?

SEN. BROWN: Is that what Senator McKissick thinks?

SEN. VAN DUYN: I did work with Senator McKissick on these maps. So thank you for allowing me to discuss this with him. I was in Asheville and didn't have access to computers.

But -- so, as we said before, our real intent was not any particular number. Our real intent was to honor the wishes of the Court in that we demonstrate that these were no longer racially gerrymandered districts and majority minority districts. And so we needed to get them below 50 percent, but we didn't have a target so much as we wanted to demonstrate that these were not racially gerrymandered districts.

SEN. BROWN: Senator Hise, follow-up on that?

SEN. HISE: So, as I would state this, for your and McKissick's work on this, the concept here was that we will assign voters based on race, but we will not be using race excessively if we get below the 50 percent threshold?

SEN. VAN DUYN: Here's what I would say, okay? So we have -- we have a district that is shaped very similarly to what it was in the unconstitutional maps, and that clearly we cannot demonstrate, then, that we are in compliance with the Courts if we do not at least verify that those are no longer racially gerrymandered districts. So we used the criteria that included reducing the percentage of African-American voters in the district.

SEN. BROWN: Senator Blue?

SEN. BLUE: I'd like to ask Senator Hise a question, and he probably has anticipated what it is. But specifically in the court order, they say you've got to explain to them why you went over 50 percent in this district. What do you plan to tell them?

SEN. HISE: I would think as we go through this entire process -- I would even say that the Plaintiffs' attorneys clearly stated even to the Courts that when districts are created by other criteria that there may be naturally occurring districts that exceed 50 percent, but that the predominant criteria in drawing that map was not racing and could not have been race. There

were no criteria in drawing the map or assigning voters in which we used race in order to place individuals.

As a result of using the criteria we have, there may be -- and I still don't know what the numbers -- this is the first I've been told on this district -- there may be naturally occurring areas that have that -- a percentage of 50 percent, a percentage of 40 percent or 42 percent. Individuals group themselves into communities, particularly in urban areas that are compact in those, and naturally occurring districts may come out.

And I think any numbers that you find, which I'm willing to look at, are a result of naturally occurring districts that we did not assign any voters on the basis of race or move any voters to districts on the basis of race.

SEN. BROWN: Senator Blue?

SEN. BLUE: So, as I understand it, with a straight face, you're going to ask the legislative lawyers to stand in front of these three federal judges and say the same guy who drew the district in 2011 knew all of these statistics, he knew what the map looked like, he redrew the

districts in 2017, and he does not remember what the map looked like, he does not remember why he put 50 percent or greater in that district, and it just coincidentally happens that it looks like the same district, it's got over 50 percent, which is what he sought out to achieve in 2011, but we didn't know that was going to happen. That just naturally occurred. Is that going to be the answer?

SEN. HISE: I think no different than you would say that when you drew the maps, you used Maptitude and somehow guessing it has some long-term memory because it was the same software used or may happen to have been the same chair individuals were sitting in. Dr. Hofeller was given the criteria of this Committee, which was significantly different from the criteria of the previous committee as a result the court rulings, and from the criteria, drew maps that did not include race. Race was not part of the database. It could not be calculated on the system that is done.

I wasn't drawing. It was Rucho there that was drawing then versus me there now, but I can tell you that there is no consideration of race

in the drawing of these maps, hidden or otherwise, nor is there is there sorting of individuals on the basis of race in the districts in the maps as they exist, quite counter to the amendments that you have been proposing.

SEN. BROWN: Senator Bishop?

SEN. BISHOP: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a couple of other questions for Senator Van Duyn. Senator Van Duyn, I didn't get the -- or didn't retain the last name of the consultant that Senator Blue identified, but did the same gentleman -- his first name was Kareem -- did he draw your proposed amendment to Guilford?

SEN. VAN DUYN: Senator Bishop, with the Chair's permission, I worked with Senator McKissick on this. I can't answer that honestly because I don't know who he consulted with. Can I ask Senator McKissick that question?

SEN. BLUE: I'll allow that. You may need to identify yourself for the---

SEN. McKISSICK: Sure. This is Senator Floyd McKissick, Senator District 20. There is a gentleman who was used by the name of Mr. Kareem Crayton, C-r-a-y-t-o-n, who worked closely with this in looking at potential alternative plans for

the Guilford County as well as for Mecklenburg County, with the goal of trying to see what alternative configurations might be put forth for those particular clusters that would present an alternative for this Committee and for this body to consider as you move forward.

SEN. BROWN: Senator Bishop?

SEN. BISHOP: Senator Van Duyn, what does Dr. Crayton have against Senator Wade?

SEN. VAN DUYN: I don't believe he has anything against Senator Wade.

SEN. BISHOP: If you see on the map in your amendment, the little red dot there underneath the green District 28 and it's just in 27. I think that's Senator Wade's home, and that's in Senator Dr. Robinson's district, as I understand it. Is that correct?

SEN. VAN DUYN: No one's been double-bunked in this.

SEN. BISHOP: Do you know whether that district is favorable to Senator Wade's prospects for reelection or not?

SEN. VAN DUYN: I'm sorry. I honestly do not know.

SEN. BISHOP: And did not give that

any -- do you know whether Dr. Crayton gave any consideration to that in drawing the map?

SEN. VAN DUYN: We believe it would be favorable to Senator Wade. I think, if you look at the statistics that are attached, you can see that that, in fact, is the case.

SEN. BROWN: Senator Clark, I'm going to let you take off, and I'm going to let Senator Bishop think about that for just a second. I think he's got another question, but go ahead.

SEN. CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think, Mr. Hise, when you were addressing Senator Blue regarding what you would tell the Courts, you would tell them that maybe we had exceeded the 50 percent mark as the result of a naturally occurring district. I find that sort of puzzling because one of our members Senator Erica Smith-Ingram did submit criteria to this particular Committee which said that we would recognize naturally occurring districts. However, that was voted down. So are we saying that is now an acceptable criteria?

SEN. HISE: That is the statement of your Plaintiffs -- I'm sorry -- of the Plaintiffs in the case.

SEN. CLARK: Follow-up.

SEN. BROWN: Follow-up.

SEN. CLARK: Since you did mention the idea of a naturally occurring district, I even admitted at the time when one the members -- fellow members set it forth, I really didn't what the heck that meant anyway. So since you've considered that as appropriate, what is a naturally occurring district anyhow?

SEN. HISE: I simply stated with what you have with the reference. You can refer to their counsel as to what they meant when they referenced that, but districts come in at various percentages based on the way individuals group together and the way those are followed in without an intent or without a specific purpose of the General Assembly in drawing those maps.

SEN. BROWN: Senator Bishop, are you ready now?

SEN. BISHOP: I think so. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Senator Van Duyn, do you know how many municipalities you split in your proposed amendment?

SEN. VAN DUYN: I believe we have minimized the splitting of municipalities with this map.

SEN. BISHOP: My understanding is that the amendment splits eight municipalities, whereas the leadership's plan only splits four. Do you know that not to be correct?

SEN. VAN DUYN: I'm sorry. I am not sure of the exact number.

SEN. BROWN: Follow-up, Senator Bishop?

SEN. BISHOP: Kareem Crayton who helped you, I've been given some information that he's a widely cited expert on the intersection of law, politics, and race, and that his work -- formal training in law and political science whose primary work explores the relationship between race and politics and representative institutions. Is that Dr. Crayton that helped you?

SEN. VAN DUYN: Yes.

SEN. BLUE: I'll say -- if I---

SEN. BROWN: Senator Blue, go ahead.

SEN. BLUE: I'll add something to that since I know Dr. Crayton and I knew him well when he was a professor at Chapel Hill. He is nationally acclaimed, has written in this area, and all of the traditional, I think maybe Yale and Stanford or some different combination, and has spent his career in studying race and its

intersection with politics and critical race theory.

And, consequently, he would have some opinions that would be respected as to what -- what a gerrymandered district would look like because he's written about them and studied them. And so that was one of the reasons that he was attractive to us because the Court said these are gerrymandered districts. So rather than just eyeball on a computer terminal in trying to put stuff together, we figured we ought to talk to somebody who understood what gerrymandered districts look like. So you get the benefit of his couple of decades in writing and researching and teaching in this field.

SEN. BROWN: I'm just curious how he would know that.

SEN. BLUE: By studying them, doing extensive research. As I said, he is a lawyer and a political scientist, and his whole career has been in that field. It's like a neurosurgeon knowing that there are certain things that you touch in the brain and it causes a certain reaction. Inasmuch as a political science theory can be agreed to or confirmed upon folks with

different opinions, but that's his area of expertise.

SEN. BROWN: So that's his opinion, I guess. Senator Bishop?

SEN. BISHOP: If I can just offer a comment, Mr. Chairman. You know, first of all, I'll say put in mind when you described Dr. Crayton. So he's a political science and lawyer. Nick Stephanopoulos -- he's not a statistician. He's a political -- poli sci undergrad. Then he went to Obama for America and then he went -- and he's a lawyer. We've got a lot of political scientists and lawyers in this thing trying to tell us how statistics and things can get worked out with great certainty, and they just don't make common sense to me.

In this instance, you have Senator Van Duyn not even aware of how many municipalities are being split. It's a classic example of subordinating traditional districting principles to an absolute fixation on race, and I would hope the Committee doesn't accept this amendment.

SEN. BROWN: Senator Hise?

SEN. HISE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just to summarize again, it is clear counter to the

criteria established by this Committee that members are assigned to districts on the basis of race, race was used for drawing maps, it increases the number of municipalities that have been divided, also counter to the criteria of the Committee, and I would ask that members reject the amendment.

SEN. BROWN: Any other questions? Senator Van Duyn?

SEN. VAN DUYN: I'd like to make a couple of clarifying remarks. One is that both the 2017 maps that were presented by Senator Hise and this map do split municipalities, and I apologize for not having the comparison in terms of numbers, but this map was also drawn to accommodate incumbents, and I just wanted to point that out.

And then, finally, I just think it's important to say that one does not have to use race if you're drawing racially gerrymandered districts if you start out with district that was racially gerrymandered, and when we look at the 2017 maps that were presented by Senator Hise, we see a map that looks like it was based on the map that the Courts found to be racially gerrymandered. So with all due respect, the only way to make sure that it is not, in fact, the case is to consider race.

SEN. BROWN: Any other questions? Senator Hise?

SEN. HISE: Just a real quick comment. You know, I'm sorry that you look at a map that tends to outline the city limits of Greensboro and tend to think that that is now a racially motivated line that's coming in. Race was not considered. These maps are significantly different in size, shape, and population from what the previous maps that existed and the population, and any sort of eyeball comparison that "we think that kind of looks like the last one so you're in violation again" really misses the entire spirit of what is required for identifying racially polarized voting and making sure that it is occurring or not occurring and how you address that under the Voting Rights Act.

SEN. BROWN: Any other questions or comments on this amendment? If not, again, I'm going to ask you to raise your hands. All those in favor of the amendment, please raise your hand.

(Show of hands vote.)

SEN. BROWN: Those opposed?

(Show of hands vote.)

SEN. BROWN: I have nine against and four

for the amendment. So the amendment fails.

Next, I have Senator Blue. I think this is a statewide map.

SEN. BLUE: It is. Yes, it's got---

SEN. BROWN: Senator Blue, I don't know if they've passed it out. Let me make sure.

(Pause in proceedings.)

SEN. BROWN: Okay. Senator Blue?

SEN. BLUE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This map is denominated Covington Senate 27P remedy map, and it pretty much affects the same counties that we've talked about, the four urban counties primarily, of Mecklenburg, Guilford, Wake, and Cumberland. It's somewhat different than the two maps -- the three maps that we talked about earlier, especially the two with Guilford and Mecklenburg.

Yesterday the attorneys for the Plaintiffs in this case sent a letter to -- I think to the Committee Chairs saying that they had some ideas as to how to fix this since they represented the Plaintiffs, and they wanted to talk about some of their suggestions. I then authorized staff to draw legislation and let's see what the remedy map by the Plaintiffs would look like. This is it.

So to relieve any of Senator Bishop's angst, Dr. Crayton didn't help draw this map.

SEN. BISHOP: He did not?

SEN. BLUE: No. This is the map that the Plaintiffs -- this is the remedy that the Plaintiffs have offered and suggests that would basically resolve this case. And all the statistics relating to it are attached. We had staff run it through the same statistical analysis that the earlier maps were run through, and you'll see those are in the back of the map.

So it only affects the areas that were ruled unconstitutional and the areas around the nine districts where we had the controversy that's brought us back here. And so I'll answer any questions about it, but it -- just briefly, it strictly complies with the whole county provision. It just deals within clusters. It avoids pairing incumbents. It's kept all the incumbents separated. It cures the defects in all of the racial gerrymanders in these -- primarily in these four counties.

It does not -- it is not designed to give any particular party a particular advantage, and you'll look at the statistics and you will see. I

mean, to be perfectly frank with you, folks, it's hard for you to preserve 35 seats as an advantage without doing strange stuff. But this map does not set out to give any particular advantage to Democrats or Republicans, and I think if you analyze it, it still shows substantial advantages for Republicans if you analyze on the map based on the presidential election data and the other elections that you've used. But it does -- it makes it a fairer contest. It doesn't guarantee anybody's specific election, but at least it gives people a shot -- citizens a shot to choose their representative.

Again, it complies with all state and federal law including the law that was raised in the letter, I think, to Chairman Hise about redistricting districts that were not affected by the Court's decision. They pointed out in that letter -- and I take it you got the letter -- they pointed out in the letter that there were some additional issues raised by these maps in violation of the state constitution. It's a pretty thoughtful letter, a two-page letter.

And so once I saw that and saw that maps that they had finalized on, I thought it was

appropriate to put the third map before you so that you can debate it, analyze it, and figure out whether -- if you wanted to incorporate it into your maps or at least certain aspects of it. Because, again, it adopts all the traditional criteria, and it uses most of the criteria that we adopted as a committee, and here it is before you.

SEN. BROWN: Senator Blue, one real quick question before I let Senator Hise speak. You ran the amendment on Wake County. It looks to me like this is different than that amendment for Wake County. I'm just curious of that particular piece.

SEN. BLUE: It is. It's different from the amendment in Wake County.

SEN. BROWN: Senator Hise?

SEN. HISE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. You know, I think that perhaps the ridiculous nature of this probably -- of this map speaks for itself, but that somehow the remedy is to try to draw Guilford, Wake, and Mecklenburg County in such a manner that no Republican would be represented in any of those areas that would be coming through. So some sort of rectification for the fact that urban areas tend to -- what, 15 counties vote Democrat in this state and 85 vote Republican -- is that we should take

those areas and make sure that they're all Democratic representatives that were coming in.

It, for no good reason whatsoever, goes after Senator Barringer and Senator Chaudhuri to place them double-bunked together. It takes Senator Robinson and Senator Wade, once again, for no good reason. Also, Senator Bishop and Senator Jeff Jackson in Mecklenburg, that it just wants to throw those in and see what it could change out.

I think that speaks much more to the motive of the Plaintiffs than anything that has to do with racial issues or others that have occurred in the state. For what they have done, I think this is not even a serious proposal that's coming in, and I would ask the Committee to reject it.

SEN. BROWN: Senator Blue?

SEN. BLUE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I apologize to the Committee. I misspoke. I have looked at it. It does double-bunk in several districts. I was under the impression that it didn't. I present it to you because it is the proposal that the Plaintiffs have offered as their potential remedy that solves the issues that they've raised.

So I present it to you in that light and

acknowledge that Senator Hise is right. There are some places -- at least two or three places where it double-bunks in addition to the double-bunking in the Republican map. I think that that's accurate.

SEN. BROWN: Any other questions on this map? Senator Bishop?

SEN. BISHOP: As one double-bunked, may I ask this question? There's a case I have in mind. It's called Cox versus Larios, and in that one party purposefully double-bunked a bunch of people of the other party. Now, in the maps that I understand are proposed by Senator Hise -- or the map -- the double-bunking there is all -- I think basically all hurts Republicans and it's all driven by the pods.

And I'm just a freshman, but would you think maybe taking not only me but Senator Wade and Senator Barringer out by double-bunking would be for a partisan advantage?

SEN. BROWN: Senator Blue?

SEN. BLUE: I'll say this much. I think that when they drew the map, they're not as politically sensitive as those who serve, and so I look at the Wake portion of the map where they

double-bunked -- who is this? In 15, is that---

SEN. HISE: Chaudhuri.

SEN. BLUE: ---Chaudhuri and---

SEN. HISE: Barringer.

SEN. BLUE: ---Johnny Mac Alexander?

SEN. HISE: Chaudhuri and Barringer, I think.

SEN. BISHOP: It's Chaudhuri and Barringer, as I understand it.

SEN. BLUE: It's not Barringer unless Chaudhuri is in the blue portion. I can't see. Somebody's on the line. Something that could be easily fixed if you wanted to follow the concept. I can't tell who it is because it's small, but it looks like it's Chaudhuri and Barefoot that have been -- I mean Chaudhuri and Alexander and Barefoot.

SEN. BISHOP: Mr. Chairman?

SEN. BLUE: Okay. But, anyhow, it might have some similarity to the Common Cause map, but this is what they submitted. And as a double-bunkee, I don't know how you kick your bed mate out, but -- in Mecklenburg because you're double-bunked, you're right.

And I think lastly -- I can't tell

whether Senator Lee is double-bunked, but all of these districts are drawn so close to the line that if you are interested in pursuing this concept, you could easily fix it because it looks like the districts next to them are empty districts.

SEN. BROWN: Senator Bishop?

SEN. BISHOP: I would just observe that in double-bunking me with Jeff Jackson, they did it in Plaza, Midwood, and East Charlotte, not down in Ballantine and Matthews. I'm sure that's coincidental. But do you know who -- who was the "they" who prepared this?

SEN. BLUE: This is what the -- Plaintiffs' counsel asked could we take a look at what they proposed, and so, consequently, I had staff reduce to the form that we understand, that is, maps and legislation, that would accomplish what they proposed as their remedy.

SEN. BISHOP: Do you have any knowledge who helped them, who their consultant was, who the map drawer was?

SEN. BLUE: I don't know specifically who did it.

SEN. BROWN: Senator Bishop?

SEN. BLUE: I had no role in choosing who

they used. I don't know. I can't say specifically who they hired or paid for.

SEN. BROWN: Senator Bishop?

SEN. BISHOP: Who's the counsel you're referring to?

SEN. BLUE: Counsel for the Plaintiffs.

SEN. BISHOP: Is that Anita Earls?

SEN. BLUE: Yes. And so Anita then -- I had it sent it to staff. She sent it. There is communication with her.

SEN. BROWN: Follow-up, Senator Bishop?

SEN. BISHOP: If we were to adopt this amendment, it would undo -- I think you already said in response to the Chairman -- what you have already done by another amendment to Wake. It would also undo what we did for Senator Clark's district in Cumberland, right? Sir?

SEN. BLUE: Yes, that's correct.

SEN. BISHOP: I don't understand the purpose of this, then. Is it a litigation tactic to propose this?

SEN. BLUE: No. I offer you what the Plaintiffs have suggested their thoughts are about this remedy for the gerrymanders.

SEN. BISHOP: If I may, but you're

proposing---

SEN. BROWN: Senator Bishop.

SEN. BISHOP: You're proposing it as an amendment for this Committee to adopt, aren't you?

SEN. BLUE: For the Committee to adopt, yes, but I know that before committees adopt stuff, they look at it, and if you see something good in it that you like, the Committee could do a committee substitute and fix some of the obvious problems that you see in it.

SEN. BROWN: Senator Bishop?

SEN. BISHOP: Do you and Senator Clark support the adoption of this amendment?

SEN. BLUE: Yeah. But I probably would support a committee substitute if you want to fix some of the problems that you're suggesting because I'm a realist and a practical guy, and I know what the chances are that you'll adopt the amendment.

SEN. CLARK: And I'd like to add something also to that.

SEN. BROWN: Senator Clark?

SEN. CLARK: During the public hearings, many of our citizens indicated that they wanted us to pass maps that took into consideration their interests and their needs, not the needs of the

politicians. They want to be able to elect those who represent them.

If adopting this map -- which I can see the one that has partisan neutrality -- all this has a slight Republican edge to it. It's far less than what it is today, but if that means putting me out of office, I would gladly accept this map if it would provide for partisan stability or partisan balance throughout the state of North Carolina so that the individuals whom are elected to come here and to serve them are elected based on fair and nonpartisan maps.

SEN. BROWN: Senator Bishop?

SEN. BISHOP: My good friend, Senator Clark, and I hope to be a much better friends, but I will say that comes with poor grace given that your amendment was designed, in part, to fix an incumbency issue. And let me say this. Incumbency can be a problem, but what the Supreme Court of the United States recognized in Cox versus Larios is that you also can use double-bunking as a means of ripping down your partisan opponents.

The maps that are proposed by the majority don't do anything of the kind. This map has a pattern that is -- it cannot be imagined to

be a coincidence. It takes out two of the most senior members of the Republican majority and little old me. And I don't -- I mean to then profess that incumbency is all about protecting selfish officeholders is really a little bit too much. And I hope -- I trust that the Committee will not adopt this amendment.

SEN. BROWN: Senator Hise?

SEN. HISE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You know, perhaps the veils start to come off at this late hour, and we start to see that what the real motives behind all this is, an attempt to lessen the number of Republicans that represent in the Senate. That is the motive I think you see in these districts behind what they've proposed as a remedy. Senator Clark said even if it meant giving up his own seat, if he could just reduce the number and bring it to more balanced, he would do so.

I think we're seeing what the purpose is of why this is a court case in general, why we are here and others, and really the motives behind it. I think this map is their attempt to exemplify that and to see what manner in which they can hope to get additional seats regardless of how it affects minorities, incumbents, or others within this

state.

So I, again, would ask the Committee that we would reject this map, not even really from a committee member but submitted on their behalf and counter to previous amendments and to most of the criteria this Committee adopted.

SEN. BROWN: Senator Clark?

SEN. CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Senator Hise, you did represent my intent very well. As a matter of fact, I did submit criteria for recommendation that said that one of the objectives of the Committee should be to obtain partisan balance and partisan neutrality, whichever term you want to indicate. And, yes, that might end up meaning a reduction in the number of Republicans in the North Carolina Senate. But, like I said, I believe that we should have fair maps that provide for representation with respect to the way the people need it. Thank you.

SEN. BROWN: Senator Clark, they wouldn't be gerrymandered maps, would they?

SEN. CLARK: Oh, absolutely not. As a matter of fact, the efficiency gaps on those maps, you'll see that pretty much they still -- even these as well as the Common Cause map has about a 4

percent positive lean towards Republicans. As a matter of fact, if we're talking about what's gerrymandered, you can clearly see what's going on in Senate District 21, my particular district, which remains gerrymandered.

I mean, like I said, it's going to set up a situation where essentially I don't have general election opponent, and I'll pretty much walk back into the office here because of the way it's gerrymandered. If it was a balanced cluster, the Cumberland/Hoke cluster, what we would have is we'd have a more competitive district where I would actually have to run hard in the general election as well as my opponent across the aisle, which I think would serve the people of Cumberland and Hoke Counties better to actually have more competitive races as opposed to cakewalks during the general election.

SEN. BROWN: Senator Clark, I've got to respond to that. Would you say, then, this map that was just introduced as an amendment doesn't gerrymander in any way?

SEN. CLARK: It certainly does not. As a matter of fact -- or at least -- let me clarify that. With regard to the Hoke/Cumberland cluster,

I can explain that, if you want, with a little bit time.

SEN. BROWN: But you say it doesn't -- in your mind, it doesn't gerrymander, is what you're saying?

SEN. CLARK: Oh, absolutely not. If you look at the Cumberland/Hoke cluster, which is Senate District 21 and 19, which is this block up at the top there. And what it does is, it's like -- the intent of the Committee was to not split cities so it does not split Spring Lake, it does split Wade, does not split Falcon, does not split Eastover, does not split Hope Mills. In Senate District 19, no municipalities split except Fayetteville, which is split anyway, it's so large you're going to have to split it. And what it does is it keeps Fort Bragg -- Fort Bragg and Spring Lake with Senate District 21 and pretty much the southern border, it runs down slightly north of -- or should I say south of the Fort Bragg area.

Now, if this thing was -- like I said, it's not gerrymandered because it doesn't provide anyone any significant political advantage over where we're at right now. As a matter of fact, like I said, it would my task of becoming reelected

more difficult, and it might provide a little bit more of a challenge for Senator Meredith as well. But the people indicated time and time again during the public hearings that what they wanted is more fair and competitive elections.

This map is not something that would necessarily be in my best interest, as I say, if you're trying to win a general election. It is the furthest thing away from a gerrymander as you can get.

SEN. BROWN: I would disagree. When you look a few of these counties, I think it's pretty clear what this map is. Senator Hise, any other comments?

SEN. HISE: No.

SEN. BLUE: Just one clarifying -- if I could?

SEN. BROWN: Senator Blue?

SEN. BLUE: Because in listening to the discussion, I think that the point that needs to be made is that, again, we did some amendments, and I think appropriately so, but in looking at the statistics on this map -- and, again, I didn't draw it, but I'm just looking at it. I heard all the public comment. I've been following the Common

Cause's arguments over the last several years and as they've gotten more intense over the last year.

But when I look at this map and the Wake County districts, it's got two outright wins by Richard Burr and two that were at the 49 percent level, but two outright wins of over 50 percent, and I think it's got only one -- only one of the districts in Wake County voted Democratic in that election. There are also people who really want to move away from partisanship when it comes to making districts because that's how you get, I think, the debate going on so that the best ideas emerge, and we don't sort of resort to our tribal instincts within our respective caucuses and you get to discuss things in a much deeper and richer way in an election because you've got to debate and you've got to tell people what you stand for and that you'll be responsive to them, and there are some people very interested in that.

And winning 52, 53 percent in an election is not that bad. It basically recreates a riddle and you start addressing issues that need to be addressed. That's what these maps seem to do at least in Wake County, and again, I can't speak for the others because in Wake County in that Marshall

race, she was a resident of Wake County and lost four districts -- or lost three districts -- lost one -- two of them by one percentage point. That's a competitive district.

And I haven't had a chance to analyze it by the other seven or eight races that you used, but I would venture, if you put those races on this map, you will find those to be pretty competitive. You know, are there other configurations that -- if I were doing it myself individually that I'd have probably tried to come up with in Wake County, I probably would have. Would partisanship have gone into to a greater degree? Probably would have, but I think that we just can't cast a stone at everybody who has a different idea as to what competition is in these races.

And I bet you, if you go through that map and you look at these districts, you will find many more 48-52 districts, and they roll with the tide, depending on what the issues are and what people are thinking, and I happen to think that districts like that are more helpful too because it makes all of us gravitate toward the middle a whole lot more.

SEN. BROWN: Senator Clark?

SEN. CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And one more note regarding partisan advantage. I would like to remind the Committee that I was the one that submitted criteria that said partisan advantage would not be a criteria of this particular Committee, and that criteria was voted down.

SEN. BROWN: Senator Hise?

SEN. HISE: And just to follow up, I would say regardless of what was proposed and rejected, that is not the criteria of this committee that's coming in. And so, finally, I would ask that members would reject the amendment as proposed.

SEN. BROWN: Senator McKissick, you're not on this Committee. I'm sorry.

Any other comments or discussion on this amendment?

SEN. BROWN: If not, again, I'm going to ask you to raise your hands. All those in favor of the amendment, raise your hand.

(Show of hands vote.)

SEN. BROWN: Those opposed?

(Show of hands vote.)

SEN. BROWN: The amendment fails nine to four.

All right. That should bring the bill before us. So any discussions on the bill?

SEN. BISHOP: Mr. Chair?

SEN. BROWN: Senator Bishop.

SEN. BISHOP: If it's the appropriate time, I make a motion for a favor report to the PCS as amended rolled into a new PCS and changing the short title to read 2017 Senate Redistricting Committee Plan.

SEN. BROWN: Any discussion? Any more discussion? If not, again, I will ask you to raise your hand. All those in favor of Senate Bill -- the PCS rolled into a PCS -- into a new PCS and changing the short title to 2017 Senate Redistricting Committee Plan. All those in favor, raise your hand.

(Show of hands vote.)

SEN. BROWN: Those opposed?

(Show of hands vote.)

SEN. BROWN: It passes nine to four. I think that's right. Nine to four, so the bill passes. Anything else before the Committee? If not, we're adjourned.

(The proceedings were concluded at 6:25 p.m.)

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

COUNTY OF ROCKINGHAM

CERTIFICATION

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript of proceedings held on August 24, 2017, is a true and accurate transcript of the proceedings as transcribed by me or under my supervision. I further certify that I am not related to any party or attorney, nor do I have any interest whatsoever in the outcome of this action.

Certified this 30th day of August, 2017.

Notary Public

Rebecca P. Scott
Notary Number
19940530133

EX. 18

NORTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON REDISTRICTING

TRANSCRIPT OF THE PROCEEDINGS

In Raleigh, North Carolina
Friday, August 25, 2017
Reported by Robbie W. Worley

Worley Reporting
P.O. Box 99169
Raleigh, NC 27624
919-870-8070

REP. SZOKA: Good morning. I'm Representative John Szoka calling the meeting to order. I'd just like to recognize our Sergeant at Arms for today. We have Reggie Sills, Marvin Lee, David Leighton, Thomas Terry and Joe Crook. And that's going to pretty much be the extent of what I have to say here. The Chairmen are still getting some materials prepared, and they have asked me to put the Committee into recess until 9:45. So we stand in recess until 9:45. Thank you.

(Recess, 9:31 - 9:45 a.m.)

REP. DOLLAR: Committee will come back to order. Members will take their seats. Any extraneous conversations will be taken outside of the Committee room at this time.

The proposed Committee substitute for House Bill 927 is properly before the Committee for discussion without objection. So ordered. The -- at this time, I would also remind members that since we did have a short delay in starting, that we will -- all amendments -- all amendments will need to be in to the Chairs at no later than 10:45. So all amendments -- we had said 10:30, I believe, in the communication last night. We will extend that to 10:45 since we were slightly delayed.

I do want to say prior to recognizing Chairman Lewis for the presentation of the proposed Committee substitute, just a couple of very quick comments from myself. And I believe Chairman Lewis may have some additional comments. I do want to say after -- particularly after some of the comments that I've read and -- and reports and editorials, and some of the things that have been said in public, that the two Chairs -- the two joint Chairs are very honorable people. Some of the things said about them, I felt, were personal and -- and factually incorrect in terms of their character, in terms of their approach to this process, which I believe has been honorable and above board. No court has found otherwise in all of this process. In fact, the courts have found just to the opposite of -- of that.

I would also make just a quick personal note in terms of Dr. Hofeller. Dr. Hofeller is the same as any other central staff member or any consultant that either side might employ to assist them in the technical matters of drawing a map. And maps are part of the legislative process and, I believe, that when staff members or consultants are -- are maligned in terms of their intent and

the like with -- with clearly no evidence, that is improper. It's incorrect and -- and it's quite unfortunate and -- and I don't believe that that's where our best politics lie. We should debate the issues and not debate the personalities of particular individuals. Particularly when those folks do not know and are clearly not apprised of what their actual roles are in this very important constitutional process.

With that said, at this time I will recognize Chairman Lewis to present the -- to the Committee the proposed Committee substitute. I will also announce that following Chairman Lewis' presentation and any discussion, we will take a recess. That recess will run until we're -- we have the amendments and then we'll -- we will -- we'll come back and deal with -- with any amendments at that time. Representative Torbett, do you have a question?

REP. TORBETT: Just as a courteous reminder that members should state their name and their district when they make any comments for today.

REP. DOLLAR: Thank you, Representative Torbett. Your point is well taken. These

proceedings are the subject of Court record, or a record that could be potentially before the Court. We have a court reporter. And so if all members -- thank you for the gentleman's reminder. If all members would please state your name when you are asking your question or making a comment. So with that, Chairman Lewis is recognized.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm David Lewis, the senior Chair of the House Select Committee on Redistricting. I represent Harnett County. I want to welcome all the members and guests that are here today. Before I begin with presenting the 2017 House Redistricting Plan A, I want to go over some facts with this Committee.

After being ordered to do so by the Court, I, on behalf of the -- with authority designated by the speaker, produced a map within 14 business days -- 19 total calendar days. We had sought and proposed to the Court a longer period of time which would allow for more public input and, hopefully, more participation in this process. The Court -- I say this with the utmost respect -- chose, instead, to give us a deadline of September the 1st. In no way is that -- is this being

critical of the Court. This is stating for the record that the plan that I proposed publicly, which would have included a series of three statewide public hearing sessions, simply could not be met under the time frame that we were asked to act under by the Court.

I would like to also echo some of Chairman Dollar's comments. I will continue in every way I can to make this discourse as positive as it can be. I do think that there have been some erroneously-stated information regarding why we are here today. We are here today, based on my understanding of the Covington Court finding, that without substantial evidence -- without sufficient evidence, I should say, that race was a predominant factor in drawing 19 House seats. We were ordered to recreate the map in areas affected by those 19 seats by September the 1st. At no time did the Court reference that anyone was packed into any district. At no time did the Court reference that there was any bad intent on the part of this legislature in the 2011 process.

Today I sincerely hope that this Committee, through free and open debate, will be able to set an example of how positive political

discourse and disagreement can and should be dealt with in this country and in our state. Mr. Chairman, with that, I'll move into a presentation on the proposed Committee substitute.

First of all, I'd like to talk about the criteria that was used in the production of this map. The Committee -- this Committee adopted the criteria of equal population. The equal population means that one person, one vote. People's votes should count equally as much as they can. And by that, I mean the Court did give us a window to work in of plus or minus five percent. So the ideal population for a House district, as was stated in the earlier Committee meeting, is 79,462 people. You are allowed to go plus or minus that percentage by no more than five percent. So equal population was the first criteria adopted by this Committee. It was the criteria that was used in preparing this map.

We've discussed further, in regards to equal population, that a -- a error -- a margin of plus or minus five percent is arranged and -- or is allowed for under the law. I would point out, in disclosure, that the largest House Districts, or those with the most people, are House Districts 10,

21, 22 and 51. Those are 300 -- or excuse me, 3,972 people over the ideal county -- over the ideal district size.

I would state again that, as explained to this Committee, there is a mandatory county grouping optimization formula that's required under the Stephenson decision. The smallest House District in the plan is actually House District 109. It is 3,945 people below the ideal population, but I would point out that that was an unchanged House seat.

I'll -- I'll pause for just a moment to say, as we discussed in this Committee in an earlier presentation, the -- there were -- there were areas of the state in which the county groupings did not have to be changed to comply with this Court order. We did not change those county groupings. If you all recall, there was a map distributed to you the first time we met jointly with the Senate that showed areas. I believe those areas were in green, to refresh your memory. Those areas were not changed or touched by this map. This is simply a visual illustration of some of the districts. Again, House District 109 is unchanged in this plan, but it is the plan so I wanted to

share it with you.

Contiguity; Legislative Districts shall be comprised of continuous territory. This simply means, in my understanding, that you can't start a district here, run another district here and continue it somewhere else. They need to be contiguous. Contiguity by water is sufficient. This is an over -- this is a picture of the plan. There are areas primarily, and almost exclusively, in the eastern part of our state where great bodies of water are encompassed or surrounded by our counties. The barrier islands of our state, one of the greatest treasures that we have, create situations in which counties include these tremendous bodies of water.

This Committee further adopted that we would comply, as we're required to, by the county grouping and traversal rule. It means that the county -- that the Committee would draw legislative districts within county -- within county groupings as required by Stephenson versus Bartlett and in other court cases. And within the county groupings, counties like -- county lines should not be traversed into except as authorized by the Courts in Stephenson and the subsequent cases.

I put this back up only as a reminder. This was presented in greater detail to the Committee. You will notice that the purple color is a county in which, if you take the ideal population of 79,462 and divide it into the 2010 decennial -- the 2010 decennial census numbers, you are able to draw a whole number of seats. In certain examples, for instance in Lincoln County which was not -- not a changed county, their population is 80,000 people. That's within the plus or minus five percent; Lincoln County gets one seat. The counties that are one, that are kept whole in this, are illustrated in purple.

We were then required to go through and group counties in the smallest possible number of county groups. We were -- we had to optimize the number of two-county groups, shown in red on this map and also bordered by the darker black lines, illustrate what the two-county groups are. In the canary yellow color, shows the three-county groups. That means when we were -- when we could combine no more two-county groups, we then sought to combine three-county groups. The canary -- the canary yellow shows the three-county groups. The brighter yellow shows the four-county groups. When we could

no longer combine three counties and make whole House seats, we had to combine four counties. The lime green color shows a five-county group. The darker green or Kelly green color shows a six-county group, and the blue color is a seven-county grouping.

I think we've spent pretty good time talking about this, but I did want to state it again for the record and so it could be more fully understood by the Committee. I would point out that I do believe the Committee's criteria on county groupings and traversals was, in fact, met. I would point out, for reference, that the number of split counties in the 2001 House plan was 60, in the 2009 plan it was 46, in the 2011 plan, known as Lewis-Dollar-Dockham, were 49 split counties. In the 2017 House Plan A that you have before you, there are 40.

Compactness; the Committees shall make reasonable effort to draw legislative districts in the 2017 House and Senate plan that improve the compactness of -- of the current districts. In doing so the Committee may use, as a guide, the Reock dispersion and the Polsby-Popper scores as identified by the people that invented that

particular score -- those particular scores. I would point out that the map that I present to you today complies with that criteria. The criteria minimum for Reock is 0.15. The minimum compactness found in this plan for Reock is 0.2. The maximum is 0.7. The mean is 0.41 and the standard deviation is 0.09. I say all that to say that we were able to comply with this Committee's criteria in regard to the Reock score.

In regard to the Polsby-Popper score, the minimum criteria is 0.05 -- excuse me, yes, the criteria minimum is 0.05, the minimum district on this plan is at 0.2. The maximum is at 0.71. The mean is 0.31 and the standard deviation is 0.11. I say all that to say again, that based on the compactness criteria defined in the Polsby-Popper test, this map is compact. I'll be happy to go into greater detail on compactness. I will simply say that based on the -- and I will submit this for the record -- based on a comparison of reports with prior enacted plans, this is a compact plan.

One of the Committee's goals was to have fewer split precincts. The total number of split precincts, or split VTD's in this plan, as drawn, is 19. It's important -- it's important to point

out that there are 49 total splits, but those additional splits, between 19 and 49, occur in areas of the plan that were not impacted by the regrouping -- the new county optimization formula. What that means is, what we drew splits only 19 precincts. If you compare that with the 2011 plan, the Lewis-Dollar-Dockham 4 plan, there were 395 split precincts. The 2009 House plan split 285. 2001 House plan, as best we can tell, split 103. I would point out for the record, in total transparency, one of the -- there is one additional split VTD in Cumberland County. It -- it's a -- it's on the base, the Army base, there are no people that live there, it makes the map look more -- more compact.

We wanted to respect municipal -- municipal boundaries. The Committee adopted the criteria of municipal boundaries. We said that we may consider municipal boundaries when drawing legislative districts in 2017 House and Senate plan. Again, I think this plan meets that goal. The 2009 House plan split 123 municipalities. The 2011 house plan, Lewis-Dollar-Dockham, split 144. This plan splits 78.

An additional criteria that was adopted

by this Committee is incumbency protection. It reads, "reasonable efforts and political considerations may be used to avoid pairing -- to avoid pairing incumbent members of the House or Senate with another incumbent in legislative districts drawn in the 2017 House and Senate plans. The Committee may make reasonable efforts to ensure voters have a reasonable opportunity to elect non-paired incumbents of either party to a district in the 2017 House and Senate plans." Again, this plan meets that criteria.

The 2017 House Plan A pairs eight representatives. Six of those are paired together by the county grouping formula. There is one pair of Republican legislators that are grouped and there are two opposite party pairings. Again, these were caused by the county grouping formula. I will state, for the record, that we absolutely sought to avoid pairing incumbents in the -- in the preparing of this map. The only discretionary double-bunking in this plan is of two Republican representatives. This was necessary to create districts that are reasonably compact and to avoid opposite party double-bunking.

Election data; political consideration.

Election results data may be used in the drawing of the legislative districts in the 2017 House and Senate plans. As I stated for the record, the last time this Committee met, the following 10 races were used as a guide in meeting this criteria of the map. They are 2010 US Senate, 2012 President, 2012 Governor, 2012 Lieutenant Governor, 2014 United States Senate, 2016 President, 2016 United States Senate, 2016 Governor, 2016 Lieutenant Governor, 2016 Attorney General.

A criteria that was adopted by this Committee involved no consideration of racial data. Again, as I said in my opening remarks, the consideration of race, the Court made clear that we had not created a substantial enough record to justify race as the factor or as a criteria in drawing the districts, and therefore, it was not used.

Mr. Chairman, if I may? A couple of the members had asked the difference between the original House map that was released and the amended House map that was released. I'd like to, with your permission, just get that on the record as well and --

REP. DOLLAR: The gentleman's recognized

for that purpose.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you. Members, the changes that were made in the map that was released on Friday and the map that was subsequently released yesterday, were in the following county groupings. There were -- in the county grouping that includes Surry, Alleghany and Wilkes, there were changes that were made. These changes were made -- it's simply moving precincts. These were at the requests of members who currently serve in those areas. There were also changes made in the county grouping that runs from Richmond to Davie. This was at the request of one of the members who currently represents that area.

There were changes made in the county grouping that stretches from Bladen up through Greene. This was at the request of members who serve in that area. We also, members, made several changes at the request of members whose -- who are currently serving whose districts were inadvertently mis-numbered in the new map. Requests were received from members in Mecklenburg County and in Forsyth County. We granted every request for a number change because those were inadvertent mistakes on my part when the map was

first released. We did grant every one of those requests.

REP. DOLLAR: Chairman Lewis, you may have said this and I just didn't hear it, but there -- there was one other set of changes in -- in Johnston County --

REP. LEWIS: Yeah.

REP. DOLLAR: -- within Johnston County at -- at -- as I recall, at the -- the requests of those legislators.

REP. LEWIS: Yes, sir. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I attempted to reference that when I said that there were some changes in the grouping that runs from Bladen to Greene, but yes. There were -- the requests were specifically in Johnston. Thank -- thank you for that clarification.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I've concluded the formal part of my presentation. I'll be glad to try and answer questions or whatever's the will of the Committee at this point.

REP. DOLLAR: Questions from members of the Committee? And again, be sure when you're recognized to state your name. Questions from members of the Committee? Representative Pierce?

REP. PIERCE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

State representative Garland Pierce. Representative Lewis, do you have a map of the -- the change that you made yet? The ones that you just talked about?

REP. LEWIS: Thank you for the question, Representative Pierce. The map that you have before you, this is the new map.

REP. DOLLAR: Gentleman's recognized.

REP. LEWIS: I think Representative Michaux has a question.

REP. DOLLAR: I apologize. I was -- Chair was distracted for a moment. So, Representative Pierce, you got your question answered? All right. In that -- Representative Michaux is recognized.

REP. MICHAUX: Representative Michaux, Durham County. Yesterday, I think, you were presented a map and some changes to -- that were -- that were given you by the Plaintiffs in this matter.

REP. LEWIS: Yeah.

REP. MICHAUX: Were those matters considered in -- were redrawing, redistricting plan A?

REP. LEWIS: Thank you for that question,

Representative Michaux. I believe you're referring to the Covington Plaintiff's map, and I want to state, first of all, that I appreciate the submission of that map. I believe it came in at 2:05 on Tuesday and I can assure you that I did consider the map very thoroughly. We evaluated the ideas that they had. There were many areas of the state where the Covington map was similar to what was drawn by this Committee. There were areas of the state where we don't feel the Covington map met the criteria, but the short answer is yes. I reviewed it very -- very thoroughly and appreciate its submission.

REP. DOLLAR: Gentleman's recognized.

REP. MICHAUX: I -- I guess -- Representative Michaux again. I guess my question, did you incorporate any of the suggestions made by the Plaintiff's counsel in this -- in -- in these -- in the new maps that you drew?

REP. LEWIS: No, sir. Not to my knowledge.

REP. MICHAUX: Follow-up.

REP. DOLLAR: Gentleman's recognized.

REP. MICHAUX: You indicated that based on the criteria that this Committee passed on a

divided vote, that race was not used in making a determination. On the decision handed down by the three-panel court and by the United States Supreme Court, indicated that racial gerrymandering had occurred, which was unconstitutional. Can you tell me whether or not the matter of racial gerrymandering has been corrected by the maps that you -- the map that you have now drawn? And can you give me the statistics that show that that matter has been corrected?

REP. LEWIS: Thank you for the question. It's my understanding that the Covington Court ruled that this Committee had not -- or the Committee in 2011 had not established a sufficient record to justify the use of race in drawing legislative districts, therefore race was not a criterion that was used. There was no racial data reviewed in the preparation of this map, and I can provide you only the statistics that we have already provided which were used in drawing this map.

REP. MICHAUX: Further follow-up, Representative Michaux again.

REP. DOLLAR: Gentleman's recognized.

REP. MICHAUX: So you cannot give me any

statistic, any racial statistics, on the maps that you now have before this body for us to approve; is that correct?

REP. LEWIS: As race was not a criteria, that is absolutely correct. I would point out, I think, to the gentleman's larger question, though, it's my understanding that the Court said that without sufficient evidence, the General Assembly had drawn maps where race was the predominant factor. I'm aware of no additional data, that has been submitted to this Committee or to me for review, that would indicate that anybody else has developed a more -- that anyone has submitted any additional evidence that race should be considered. Therefore, it was not considered in the drawing of this map. And I do believe that by not considering race, that does correct the deficiency found by the Court.

REP. DOLLAR: Representative Jackson is recognized.

REP. JACKSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On Page 151 of the Covington opinion, it lays out the testimony that was received by the defendants about racially polarized voting and the history and locations of VRA districts by prior general

assemblies. And then it goes on to say this should be considered during legislative redistricting. And I would ask, was that considered?

REP. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman mind if I looked at -- if I got the material he was referencing from staff?

REP. JACKSON: It's on Page 151, starting with the second and third paragraph.

REP. LEWIS: Representative Jackson, apparently my staff tried to use Westlaw so our pages aren't lining up, but I can tell you that race was not used in the drawing of this map which I think is the -- the answer that you were trying to ask. I apologize for not having the exact case in front of me.

REP. JACKSON: Mr. Chairman, follow-up?

REP. DOLLAR: Gentleman is recognized for a follow-up.

REP. JACKSON: Okay. And on page 164 of the Court's conclusion it reads "Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act continues to play an important role in redistricting. And legislators must undertake a district-specific analysis to identify and cure potential Section 2 violations." So I would ask, did the map drawers undertake a

district-specific analysis to identify and cure potential Section 2 violations?

REP. LEWIS: Thank you for the question, Representative Jackson. The Committee had no additional information than what's provided in 2011, which the Covington Court said was inadequate.

REP. DOLLAR: Further questions from members of the Committee? Any further questions at this time? Seeing none, I would ask this of the Committee. Are there any members who are -- we had extended the time to 10:45 for submission of amendments to the Chairs. Are there any amendments that people intend to offer that have not been submitted to the Chair or that you anticipate submitting? I mean, if we could -- if we could have those now, we can -- we can go into a brief recess and just shorten the process. But I do not want to -- if someone's still contemplating something in the next 15 minutes, I don't want to preclude that necessarily unless we have all amendments.

So I'm -- I'm seeing no hands of -- so I'm assuming that all amendments that any Committee member is wishing to have considered by the

Committee have already been sent in to the chair. And seeing no -- seeing indication from any member otherwise, the Committee will stand in recess until 11:00. We'll come back at 11:00. We will take up any amendments that we have at that time, that have been already submitted at this time. Committee is in recess until 11:00.

(Recess, 10:20 - 11:00 a.m.)

REP. DOLLAR: Come back to order. Members, the first three amendments have been passed out. There's a fourth amendment, but since it's a little bit of a larger nature, we felt we could deal with these first three first before I --

REP. JORDAN: Mr. Chairman.

REP. DOLLAR: -- do that. Before I move forward -- Representative Jordan?

REP. JORDAN: I -- I only have two, Mr. Chairman.

FEMALE SPEAKER: I only have two.

REP. DOLLAR: You will have two that are -- have maps attached, one does not -- does not have a map attached. It's actually the first one that we're going to take up in just a moment. AST-85V1 offered by Representative Jackson; it's a one-page technical -- essentially, a technical

amendment. Okay. Well, if you will hold for that, we'll -- we'll take these amendments up in just a moment. Chairman Lewis, I believe, had a couple of quick comments and then Representative Michaux wished to be recognized and I'll get back to him.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is David Lewis from Harnett County again. The additional comment that I wanted to add is Representative Reives notified my office and this Committee that he was now a resident of Chatham County. And when I spoke earlier about the number of paired incumbents, I did not include Representative Reives in that number. However, the map that you have shows that because my office failed -- I failed to notify central staff of that. So the new maps that will be produced by Monday will clearly show that Representative Reives lives in Chatham County. That is my mistake and I apologize for it.

REP. DOLLAR: And, Chairman Lewis, that lowers the number of paired representatives to six. Representative Michaux is recognized.

REP. MICHAUX: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and we -- we welcome Representative Reives to the Durham County delegation.

REP. DOLLAR: Any -- any further questions at this time?

REP. MICHAUX: Yeah. Yeah, I've got a couple questions to --

REP. DOLLAR: Gentleman is recognized.

REP. MICHAUX: This is Representative Michaux again. Representative Lewis, can you tell me the party breakdown of the maps that you have redrawn that you have submitted to this Committee?

REP. LEWIS: I don't understand the question, Representative.

REP. MICHAUX: How many Republicans and how many Democrats show up in -- in the map that you're giving us?

REP. LEWIS: Well, Representative, as far as what shows up in the map, there should be 120 Republicans and Democrats.

REP. MICHAUX: May I follow up? Representative --

REP. DOLLAR: Follow-up.

REP. MICHAUX: You know what I mean, Representative Lewis. I'm trying to find out how many Democrats make up the 120 and how many Republicans make up the 120.

REP. LEWIS: Representative Michaux, I

don't -- I don't have that -- that information at hand.

REP. MICHAUX: May I follow up again?

REP. DOLLAR: Follow-up.

REP. MICHAUX: My -- I have information, and I have not been able to personally check it out and you can, you know, but I -- my understanding that under the maps that you have submitted with the changes you've made that Republican representation will increase by four and the Democratic representation will decrease by four. Is that correct?

REP. LEWIS: Well, Representative, thank you for the question. I don't have that information. I will tell you that the stat packs that were -- there were stat packs passed out that illustrate every -- the 10 races that we've already discussed. You could infer different things from that; I don't think they paint as clear a picture as what you are saying.

REP. DOLLAR: Gentleman's recognized.

REP. MICHAUX: Let me go to one other question, and this is on black voting age population. Do you have any information on any of the districts that you have created under the map

that is under consideration that show the black voting age population of any of the districts at all?

REP. DOLLAR: Representative Michaux, thank you for the question. I do not have any of that information. Certainly you could request that of central staff.

REP. MICHAUX: One follow-up?

REP. DOLLAR: Gentleman is recognized.

REP. MICHAUX: Was that information used in drawing these district -- black voting age population statistics used in drawing these districts that you submit for our approval?

REP. LEWIS: No, sir. And if I could expand on that answer, it's my reading of the Covington case that a district-specific analysis is required in order to use race. We are not using race in the construction of this map. We do not have information that says it would be required to be used. If you have that information, I'm certainly willing to review it, but at this time we have not received any additional information that indicates that race should be used, which is our understanding of the Covington Court's Order.

REP. DOLLAR: Gentleman wish to be

recognized for further questions? Seeing -- seeing none -- Representative Jackson.

REP. JACKSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just -- I wanted to ask a couple questions about public input. I know that I have not received any transcripts from the other sites that were cut off on Tuesday night. I was here until about 9:45 watching the people here shut up in Wake County, but I want to know if the transcripts are available and if anybody's reviewed the public comments from the areas where they didn't personally attend.

REP. DOLLAR: Chairman Lewis is recognized.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you for the question, Representative Jackson. The answer -- the specific answer to your question is, we've been told by central staff that the written transcripts will be available by Monday. I will tell you that I reached out to central staff and obtained the audio recordings and have reviewed them myself. Certainly, they are available to you in that same way.

I would speak, if I may, because there was -- the public hearings were not as smooth as I had hoped they would go. I would point out that we

had intended to have more public input, we certainly attempted to have public input and we value it. The -- it's come to my attention, after the fact, that some of the satellite sites weren't quite as big as perhaps we would have chosen if we could go back and do it again. Certainly, if we were going to have more than one, we would probably choose a different site.

I'm also aware that there were a few technical problems. I would say that the audio recordings that were made by both the House and Senate Sergeant at Arms -- well, let me be specific. The ones made by the House Sergeant at Arms don't seem to reflect that you were able to hear what the people are saying perfectly well. I did not listen to the Senate ones. They're supposedly the exact same.

REP. DOLLAR: Gentleman's recognized for a follow-up.

REP. JACKSON: And the online comments that were made, people who submitted comments online, who has been the person responsible for reviewing that? And have they all been reviewed?

REP. LEWIS: Thank you for that question. It is my understanding, and we can confirm this

with central staff, that a link to all the members of the Committee was sent with online comments. I asked for and received a printed version of the online comments that had been received prior to, I believe, Friday of last week. I've since gone through and looked at them. I don't know that any specific person was tasked to do it, but I did do it.

What you'll find when you look at them, there are -- and I'm only -- I'm only telling you this because I know that you will go and look at them. There's a couple of times in which the person tried to send as -- hit send and, apparently, it sent for -- four or five times. So when you look at it, you will notice that the same person just hit send more than one time. We've asked the staff when they have time, to go through and to kind of sort those out. But the only reason I point that out is that's one of the things that I -- that I saw when I reviewed the comments.

REP. DOLLAR: Representative Bell?

REP. JACKSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. John Bell, District 10. I have a question for Representative Lewis.

REP. DOLLAR: Now, gentleman's

recognized.

REP. JACKSON: Thank you. Mr. Lewis, before you went to break, Representative Michaux asked a question about similarities and if any of the Plaintiff's maps were put into consideration and he mentioned there were some similarities. I went back and looked and saw a number of similarities. Can you expand upon that, please, for the Committee?

REP. LEWIS: Yes, thank you for that question. What I understood him to ask was did we make any changes as a direct result of the map? And the short answer to that was no, but what I went on further to say is, I did analyze the map very closely and there are many districts, especially in the rural part of the state, that look exactly like the map that we submitted. So we did review the map district-by-district, and there is substantial similarities in many parts of the map.

REP. DOLLAR: Thank you. Any -- any further questions before we move to amendments? Representative Michaux is recognized.

REP. MICHAUX: Representative Michaux again, following up on Representative Bell's

question. There are also very distinct differences there to; are there not?

REP. LEWIS: Yes, sir.

REP. MICHAUX: Thank you.

REP. DOLLAR: Representative Torbett for a comment.

REP. TORBETT: Yeah, John Torbett, 1 House District 108, Gaston County for a comment, Mr. Chairman.

REP. DOLLAR: The gentleman is recognized.

REP. TORBETT: Thank you. In regards to similar remarks Representative Jackson was saying, I was chairing the Charlotte meeting. And I just wanted to go on record to let you guys know that it was a heavily attended meeting. Perhaps the room could have been bigger, you never know until after the fact. We had well over, I guess, 115 attendants. Most of the time the room was at occupancy. We had some waiting outside and even tried to manage an ante room to make adjustments for the people that were there.

We had members of this Committee and delegation members from Mecklenburg present, in -- in good attendance from both sides of the political

spectrum. And they were both attentive and respectful to any and all speakers that came forward. And we began at 4:00 and we ended at the last speaker. So it -- it was a very dignified process. The people speaking were -- were very respectful and very dignified. So there were very positive things that came out of those. So brief we held public comments in it, and perhaps in future years we will have ample enough time to have more of those where we can engage more of the public at these events.

REP. DOLLAR: Mr. Chair, thank you. Chairman Lewis is recognized.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you. I wanted to follow up on Representative Torbett's remarks. I don't know that we did a good enough job communicating this, but the reason the sign-up began when it did and ended when it did is we were trying to make sure folks knew that if they were able to go ahead and be there at 4:00, that they could. If it was going to take them a little bit later to be there -- that they could get there, they were allowed to sign up until 6:30. I had even -- and I'm happy to produce it -- I even had some e-mail traffic with folks where I had said if

you let me know that you are delayed in traffic, we'll extend it further. But the idea was to begin it at 4:00 so that people that were able to be here at 4:00 could go ahead start. But we knew that it was going to go on into the night, go on into the evening, which is why we had sign-up open until 6:30.

To the best of my knowledge, and we were still online by then with all the sites, nobody else showed up after 6:30 and asked to sign up. I can tell you, for the Raleigh site, we would have let that to happen. But we tried to accommodate as best we could with the time that we had.

REP. DOLLAR: Thank you, Chairman Lewis. Any -- seeing no other hands, we'll move to amendments. The first amendment that will be considered is Amendment AST-85V1, AST-85V1. Representative Jackson, you are recognized to present your amendment.

REP. JACKSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We -- earlier, we talked about people -- district numbers getting switched. This is one of the circumstances where this would restore Representative Collins back to the current district number he represents and Representative Richardson

back to the current district she represents. It would not change the district lines in any way.

REP. DOLLAR: Chairman Lewis.

REP. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, to be clear, what I understood Representative Jackson to say is that this is simply renumbering a district to reflect the current incumbent. That's certainly something that I would've done had I been made aware of it. I would urge the Committee to vote aye in support of this amendment.

REP. DOLLAR: All right. Seeing no further hands, all those in favor of the amendment, please signify by saying aye.

(Voice vote.)

REP. DOLLAR: Opposed, no. The ayes have it and the amendment is agreed to.

The next amendment is offered by Representative Hunter. It is amendment ABK-41V1, ABK-41V1. And, Representative Hunter, you are recognized to offer your amendment.

REP. HUNTER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Howard Hunter, 5th District. This amendment moves to amend the bill on Page 1, Lines 9 through 10 by deleting those lines and substituting District 1, Camden County, Chowan County, Pasquotank County and

Perquimans County. And on Page 2, Line 8, by deleting the line and substituting the following; District 5 Bertie County, Gates County, Hertford County, Tyrrell County, Washington County. This does not affect any other part of the state. It only redraws the grouping in District 1 and District 5. It falls in the plus or minus five percent.

Representative Steinburg also supports this amendment. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the Committee's support.

REP. DOLLAR: Chairman Lewis is recognized.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I want to begin by thanking Representative Hunter for his legislative courtesy. He did share this with me in advance.

I'm going to ask the members of the Committee to oppose the amendment because it does not match the county optimization schedule and requirement that we're required to meet. What it does is it will do away with a three-county grouping that's in the current map which includes Hertford, Gates and Pasquotank. And it will replace that with a five-county group that includes

Gates, Hertford, Bertie, Washington and Tyrrell. Because this does not -- this would then take the map out of optimal compliance with the Stephenson criteria, I will ask the Committee to vote no on this amendment.

REP. DOLLAR: Representative Stevens is recognized.

REP. STEVENS: Thank you. I have a -- Representative Stevens from District 90. I have a question for Representative Hunter, if I may?

REP. DOLLAR: Chairman, yield?

REP. LEWIS: I yield.

REP. DOLLAR: Gentleman yields.

REP. STEVENS: Representative Hunter, did -- is race a factor in any of these districts?

REP. HUNTER: I didn't consider race a factor in any of these districts.

REP. STEVENS: Was there any political consideration in the changing of this district?

REP. HUNTER: No. My district does not want to split the Roanoke-Chowan area, which is Hertford, Bertie and Gates.

REP. STEVENS: But you -- do you understand the criteria used about the optimum potting that we had to go with these particular

kind of constitutional potting?

REP. HUNTER: I understand the criteria. I'm just doing what my citizens asked me to do.

REP. DOLLAR: Any further questions? Hearing none, all in favor of the amendment, please signify by saying aye.

(Voice vote.)

REP. DOLLAR: Opposed, no.

(Voice vote.)

REP. DOLLAR: The ayes appear have it.

REP. LEWIS: The noes do.

REP. DOLLAR: The ayes -- excuse me. The noes appear to have it. And -- the noes do have it and the amendment is as agreed to.

REP. BELL: Representative Bell. Can we do a roll call on that vote for clarity, please?

REP. DOLLAR: Well, the vote -- the vote has been taken at this time. The next amendment is offered by Representative Speciale. It is ABK-41 -- no, excuse me. ABK-42V1, ABK-42V1. Representative Speciale, you are recognized to explain your amendment.

REP. SPECIALE: Ladies and gentlemen, this -- this really is a simple -- a simple thing here. It changes a couple of precincts and puts

two people back reasonably in the districts that they started out in so that the people that they represent know who they are. It -- there's -- there is a double-bunking. It was -- I don't know why it was switched around. I have not been able to -- to figure that out. But the bottom line -- I'm doing this for one of the other representatives who is not on the Committee and not able to submit this.

But it changes -- it does not change county groupings. All it does is put these -- two people back into the districts that they originally were in and takes away the confusion as to why in the world they were switched to begin with.

REP. DOLLAR: Chairman Lewis, you're recognized.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I also want to thank Representative Speciale for the proactive way he participated in the legislative process. He did share this amendment with me. I don't know if it was yesterday or the day before. So I wanted to speak about why I oppose the amendment, but I want to explain what created the need for this conversation at all.

If you refer to your county groupings, you'll see that there is a county grouping that contains six counties; a stretch from Davie in the north to Richmond in the south. Contained within that county grouping currently is one more member of this body than those counties' population would afford to be allocated to that area. That means that because of the county groupings, two of the incumbents in this group are going to be paired.

I spent a lot of time in trying to establish some kind of measurable criteria for deciding how that would be done. The options that I had, literally, were to draw a pairing perhaps in the extreme north of the district or the extreme south of the district. That was an option. Another option would've been to simply select at random.

The option that I chose to use, because it fits the criteria that the Committee adopted, which includes incumbency. So I looked at the -- the incumbency in terms of the number of years and the seniority of the members that were involved. The members that are paired in this county grouping are those that have served the least number of years here. It is no reflection on the quality of

their service or on them individually.

I can tell you if there was any way that I could have figured out how not to pair folks -- I've already said, that I did not intentionally pair any incumbent of any party in this map. This was forced by the county groups. I offer my rationale as to why the two that are paired are paired in this group. I would respectfully request that the Committee vote no on this amendment.

REP. DOLLAR: Representative Speciale is recognized for a second time.

REP. SPECIALE: So what I'm trying to -- what I'm trying to do is put it back where it was so that the -- there is no sacrificial lamb. They -- they drew this -- the way they drew it to -- they made the decision of who they wanted to get rid of. I mean, I'm not implying anything bad about Representative Lewis; I have the fullest faith in him, but that's the reality of what he just said. They decided who was going to stay and who was going to go.

And I say the fair thing to have done would have been not to have taken away those districts from the one person in the first place. So this will put the -- put it back where it was

and -- and make it much more fair in the end. That's why I ask for your support on this.

REP. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman?

REP. DOLLAR: Chairman Lewis is recognized.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you. I just wanted to speak a second time on the amendment. Just to be clear, the amendment that Representative Speciale has proposed still creates paired incumbents. There is no away around not pairing incumbents in this particular county group.

REP. DOLLAR: Further questions or comments from the Committee on the amendment? Seeing none, all those who favor the amendment, signify by saying aye.

(Voice vote.)

REP. DOLLAR: All those who are opposed to the amendment, please signify by saying no.

(Voice vote.)

REP. DOLLAR: The noes appear to have it. The noes have it and the amendment fails. At this time, the Sergeant at Arms will pass out the final amendment and Vice-Chairman Szoka is asked to come to the podium.

REP. SZOKA: All right. Just -- thank

you for your patience in passing out this latest amendment. Do all members of the Committee have a copy of Amendment H [inaudible] 27-ASA-101, Version 3? If you're a member of the Committee and you don't have a copy of that, please signify by raising your hand. We are still -- we're still in session here? Okay. Okay. Representative Jackson, you are free to present your amendment, sir.

REP. JACKSON: Okay. Mr. Chairman. Okay. Thank you, I'm going -- in an attempt to speed up things today, I'm just going to make some overall comments and then -- to explain why I'm introducing the amendment. Then I'll explain the amendment, if that's okay with the Chair.

REP. DOLLAR: That's fine.

REP. JACKSON: Okay. You know, the -- the public and House Democrats haven't had a very long time to review this plan. And of course, even less for the PCS, but it really is much of the same as what we've seen before. The same mapmaker was hired, who racially gerrymandered the first map. He drew the maps so unconstitutional that all nine Supreme Court justices reached agreement, which is kind of odd these days.

You know, we -- you sought public input, but from the public input that I heard, it appears that it's been ignored. The PCS wasn't even made public, to my knowledge, until about 10:10 this morning, when I saw it being handed out to members of the public. The transcripts of the public hearings have not been provided to anyone for us to review prior to today day.

It is clear from this drawing of this map that you have manipulated the drawing of African-American voters to diminish their influence in the general assembly. And you have doubled down on one of the most sweeping partisan gerrymanders in history, attempting to relegate us to a super-minority at a time when our electoral restraint is roughly equal to yours in this state.

However, you made a few new mistakes in this map that you didn't make in prior ones. You're violating our state constitutional prohibition on mid-decade redistricting by redrawing districts that do not need to be changed. You're violating the Stephenson decision and our state constitution by unnecessarily crossing county lines in several places. That is the reason why I am offering an alternative map, one that I believe

demonstrates the unconstitutional -- unconstitutionability [sic] of the PCS and provides a fair framework for North Carolina voters to elect members of the general assembly next year.

I am introducing this amendment, but I did not draw this map. I'll try to answer any questions I can to the best of my knowledge. The Plaintiffs in the Covington case did. They are not politicians picking their voters, but fair-minded people looking to move North Carolina along this decades-long redistricting travesty.

So why do I think this amendment is better? First, I'll -- I'll call it a firewall, but this amendment adopts a few simple rules. Districts and unchanged clusters that do not touch unconstitutional districts do not have to be changed. It's a rule required by our state constitution which prohibits mid-decade redistricting. In fact, the constitution reads, "When established, the Senate districts and the apportionment of Senators shall remain unaltered until the return of another decennial census of population taken by order of Congress." And then it still has the same exact thing for members of the House.

These provisions are cited in both of the Stephenson decisions. In Stephenson Number 1, it points out that the state constitution specifically enumerates four limitations upon redistricting. And number four is "Once established, the Senate and Representative districts and apportionment of senators and representatives shall remain unaltered until the next decennial census of population taken by order of Congress." That is cited in both Stephenson 1 and Stephenson 2, the exact same language.

Furthermore, the Court gave us a list of districts to change. And I would note that the districts in Wake County that number 40, 41, 36 and 37 were not in that list of districts that had to change nor was District 105 in Mecklenburg County. The PCS that's been introduced today does not adopt this approach of fixing the fewest number of districts because it wants to actually fix. And by fix, I mean it wants to improve the Republican performance in the remaining districts in Wake and Mecklenburg County.

My -- this amendment shows that you can fix the unconstitutional districts in Wake and Mecklenburg County and do that without changing the

noncontiguous districts. You can also do it better. And so I'm going to read you a little bit of what this map does in Wake County in particular. It splits fewer municipalities and the municipalities that it does split, it splits in fewer ways. And that's even taking into consideration that House districts 40, 41, 36 and 37 were frozen. So that I have -- I'm stuck with their splits that occurred in that map, but even considering that, I was able to split fewer municipalities.

One of the things from the 2001 plan that was mentioned earlier today was that that plan has actually been ruled -- was ruled unconstitutionally -- unconstitutional. It's not on the wall, I believe, but it was fixed by the 2003 plan. But one of the things people in my area really wanted is they wanted to see eastern Wake County as a community of interest put together in a complete district, and that was done in 2003. It is a community of interest. The mayor -- a different mayor came in 2011 and submitted testimony to the Redistricting Committee that eastern Wake County still believed it needed to be put together. And so in the amendment you see, you

will see that the towns of Knightdale, Wendell and Zebulon are considered a community of interest and are, in fact, together.

The Wake County portion of the map that I'm submitting is also superior on compactness scores to the map that the PCS puts before us. In Wake County, your compactness scores of the average for those 11 districts are .38 on the Reock score. The amendment that I'm putting forth has an average Reock score of .40. And that is taking, again, the four districts that had been drawn in the 2011 map which really pulled down the average because Districts 40 and 41 were .28. So really, I was redrawing seven districts and was able to do them in a much more compact way than the PCS does it.

On the other score of Polsby-Popper, the PCS score is -- at average of these 11 districts of .30. Again, the map that I've introduced drawn by the Covington Plaintiffs had a score of .32. Again, a superior drawing on one of the criteria determined by this Committee.

I do not -- we did not double-bunk any of the incumbents in Wake County or Mecklenburg County, I don't believe. I don't believe we did, but if we did, I could stand corrected, when --

when I finish speaking. Again, I didn't draw the map and so I'm just -- by my review of it.

In my drawing of Wake County, I didn't split one single precinct. In the seven districts that I had to redraw, I didn't split not one single precinct or VTD, is my understanding. And I'll -- I'll note that even this PCS that's being introduced, it's -- it splits precincts, especially in the southern part of the county. And, you know, there's been no explanation for why these precincts were split.

I do believe that this body is under a -- a court order to correct the racial gerrymander. And I do not believe that a total -- totally ignoring race is the way you fix a racial gerrymander. However, I would note that based on this prior percentage of African-Americans in the Wake County districts, this plan is superior to the enacted plan and reduces those numbers to below 50 percent. And the Court specifically held that we had to give a reason if you went above 50 percent. So that these districts should not go above 50 percent and would not -- we would not have to provide any reasoning for that.

As to why the amendment is better on the

whole county provision, I'd ask you to look at the Greene, Wayne, Johnston, Harnett, Lee, Sampson, Bladen cluster. In the PCS, House District 10 goes across three counties; Wayne, Greene and Johnston. This amendment has House District 21 cutting across only two; Wayne and Greene. There is no reason for this extra county transfers and it violates the whole county provision as interpreted by Stephenson.

If you also look at Rowan, Cabarrus, Stanley and Montgomery County -- and Richmond cluster, the PCS has two districts located solely within one county: House District 82 and House District 76. The amendment proposed has three: House District 77, House District 83 and House District 82.

And then on the -- the issue of racial gerrymandering. The original plan was an unconstitutional racial gerrymander. It's our opinion that your solution of ignoring race completely ignores the Voting Rights Act and federal law. It ignores the court order in the Covington case. It ignores the reality that in the South, race does matter and should be a factor in drafting a redistricting plan that is fair to all.

I don't know exactly how you can fix a racial gerrymander when you claim not to use race.

Your mapmaker claims extensive experience in North Carolina politics. He has drawn many, many maps over the years for North Carolina. Keeping racial data out of the computer does not preclude the use of race in drawing the maps. Certain election results, geography and the most rudimentary knowledge of North Carolina and its politics can lead to the illegal use of race in drawing map. The fact that he has lived here in North Carolina for at least the last three years gives him even more knowledge. I understand that in the partisan gerrymandering case that your GOP expert has admitted that you don't have to have racial data to pack black voters.

Like I said earlier, I did not draw the amendment map. My understanding, though, is the Plaintiffs did not use -- artificially cut themselves off from racial data. They used racial data as well as other political and demographic information to draw a map that treated African-Americans fairly. The amended map does not create artificially high concentrations of minority voters to diminish those voters' overall electoral

influence.

Finally, I believe that this amendment is better on the issue of partisan gerrymandering. The majority clearly thinks partisan gerrymandering is legal in this state. We -- we saw that in the congressional redistricting and we see it again today. I personally think the days are numbered on that -- that belief and the number might be getting pretty low. The US Supreme Court will decide the issue in the Wisconsin case being argued in, I believe, early October.

What is not uncertain is how gerrymandering, however, is undermining our democracy. My friends in the majority said that Democrats did it and now it's Republicans' turn. And I think if you believe that two wrongs make a right, then that makes perfect sense to me. But you can't ignore these numbers. Every statistical analysis of the current maps and the PCS demonstrate that North Carolina is the most gerrymandered state in history. What you've done and what you want to continue to do is beyond extreme.

Some say we are a purple state. Some say we are more of a reddish-purple state. The PCS

draws districts where a statewide winner, like Attorney General Stein, only wins 42 districts on this map. That's one third of this body. Republicans like to say that is not gerrymandering; that is just where Democrats live. Well, the amended map proves that this is not so. It draws a line where Attorney General Stein will win 56 districts. And reflecting where North Carolina is politically, that seems about right to me.

I believe the PCS is an extreme partisan gerrymander, but the amended map is not a democratic gerrymander. It simply sets the political table for the North Carolina House to reflect the political inclinations of the voters of the state. And I think that should be our goal. I would move for adoption of the amendment.

REP. DOLLAR: Representative Lewis, you are recognized.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As I've stated earlier, I do want to thank Representative Jackson for the legislative courtesy of sharing with me that he was going to offer this map. I want to speak briefly about the map itself, but I think I want to speak a little bit about also some of the comments that Representative Jackson

made.

The ways in which this map is similar to the Committee substitute that has been offered is, in fact, a result of the way the counties are combined. And I think Representative Jackson hit on a good point towards the end of his excellent remarks. About the way the pesky in the rural districts just won't vote for the extreme Democrats, so you've got to do everything you can to bust them up into ways that guarantee the election of Democrats.

Mr. Chairman, I want to send forward a blog post by Thomas Mills that he posted yesterday, in which he references that Democrats have got to broaden their appeal in rural areas of North Carolina and Virginia and redefine themselves with an economic message that has broad appear -- appeal. Right now, most rural residents see them as a party consumed with pushing an agenda of social change while ignoring the huge hurdles facing working class families outside a major -- outside of major urban areas. I couldn't have said it any better than this Democratic hack did. I'd like to send this forward as a part of the record.

I also want to go further regarding this

map. There are some differences. Representative Michaux asked me earlier about the differences in this map and the proposed Committee substitute that's before us. One, the Covington Plaintiffs' proposed map was drawn in secret with no public input that I'm aware of.

Representative Jackson mentioned several times that this map was better because he knew the race -- the race stats of certain areas. If those stats exist, I'd like for Representative Jackson to send them forward. Because it sounds like that there was some kind of mechanical target or quota that was used without the supporting evidence to do so, which is in direct violation to what the Covington Court said that we could do.

Regarding the map itself, I refute that the map better complies with the Stephenson rules. There are examples and I will give you the pods. There are examples of multiple transversals into counties that are not present in our map. That is a violation of the Stephenson criteria. I also would point out the gentleman mentioned the Bladen-Sampson area and in -- in particular criticized District 21. I would point out that one of the adopted criteria that the Committee had was,

in fact, incumbency protection. This double-bunks unnecessarily two seated members of the House.

Mr. Chairman, the map that Representative Jackson is seeking to amend, I will of course provide -- and have provided for the record -- does exceed -- the map that I have proposed, even as amended, does exceed in Reock score overall, the map that he has proposed. It is better in the Polsby-Popper score than the map that he has proposed.

With all due respect, I understand his comments were tailored largely around Wake County. The rest of the state has an interest in this too. And the Democratically-gerrymandered map that Representative Jackson has sent forward fails in those -- in those regards.

Further, I will ask the members to reject this map. The one point that Representative Jackson made that I think needs to be addressed, because we -- we spent a lot of time thinking about this. He references that districts that aren't touched by the districts that were declared unconstitutional should themselves be frozen. The -- I disagree with that, and I think it's a flawed legal theory because you definitely have to

consider race if you are trying to redraw lines that you're freezing around.

In other words, Wake County had districts that were struck down. Therefore, we redrew districts within Wake County. That is what the Court required us to do. We did not redraw districts that were in unaffected areas. And I know Representative Jackson may not be aware of this, but I believe this map does change the Onslow County drawings that were not touched. So I don't think that was an -- a completely accurate statement, but I don't think he misspoke. I think he was misled to that -- to that point.

There are some more points that I would like to make and may very well ask to speak a second time on this, but my initial reaction is certainly to ask members to vote this Democratic gerrymander down.

REP. SZOKA: Thank you, Chairman Lewis. Representative Dollar, you are recognized.

REP. DOLLAR: Thank you, Mr. Chair. A couple of points to -- to Chairman Lewis. Onslow Districts 15 and 14 violate what the gentleman said and that's very -- very clear and we won't necessarily accept that, but we didn't -- we didn't

change those lines. I have, in terms of traversals that are -- that we believe are not allowable, Districts 28, 90 and 67 appear to have multiple traversals that -- that are not in -- in line with those decisions of the -- of the United States Supreme Court as applied to North Carolina and -- and other court decisions, state and federal.

I would like to ask a question here of the gentleman, my colleague from Wake. Who -- who drew these maps?

REP. SZOKA: Does the chairman yield?

REP. JACKSON: I yield. I believe the Covington Plaintiffs, which are many groups including the NAACP, which was present at Tuesday night's meeting, had these maps drawn. They, themselves, introduced into the record, I believe, two of the -- I think maybe the Wake County and the Mecklenburg County drawings of this map. And then after Ms. Earls' letter to the Committee's chairs on Tuesday or Wednesday -- I can't -- whatever day she sent that and made that offer, I contacted her and asked her to share the entire map, which she did and I forwarded it to staff.

REP. DOLLAR: Follow-up, please. Thank you. So Representative Jackson, and -- and I

apologize 'cause I have bad hearing and -- but -- so could you tell us the -- much discussion has been made of the -- the technical map drawer that has assisted the -- the majority here in -- in drawing maps. So you do have the name of the individual who drew this underlying -- underlying map?

REP. SZOKA: Representative Jackson?

REP. JACKSON: I'm not trying to avoid your question, Representative Dollar, but I believe Susan Sitze and Erika Churchill drew this map from data provided by the Covington Plaintiffs. I know that they hired a former legislative staffer, Bill Gilkeson, who was assisting them with map drawing. But how many other people they may have employed or who had made -- had impact or input into that map, I couldn't possibly know.

REP. DOLLAR: Okay. Thank you. I say we got at least one name. Thank you. I mean, my question -- my observation would be on that is that, you know, it -- people criticize maps and want things to be transparent. And yet it's -- it's been very difficult the last two days determining who actually came up with -- with this particular -- that this amendment is based on.

But, you know, I have an observation here and it may be a question in just a moment, Mr. Chairman, and that is, to me this is clearly a political document. It double-bunks 18 individuals and members in total; 12 more than what the -- than what the PCS, in fact, actually does. Several of these appear to be quite political and gratuitous. For example, Representative Millis is paired with Representative Brenden Jones. Would the gentleman from Wake yield for a question?

REP. JACKSON: Representative Dollar, I'd be happy to yield to any questions you have as long as you're not going to try to infer motivation on things that you're not aware of.

REP. SZOKA: Does the gentleman yield for the question?

REP. JACKSON: I do. As long as it's a fair question.

REP. DOLLAR: Well, the -- see if this is a fair question. Do you -- my question is very straightforward. Why did you pair those two incumbents when the criteria did not call for that, that this Committee adopted, and I certainly see no particular reason to do that. Can you tell us why that was done?

REP. SZOKA: Representative Jackson?

REP. JACKSON: I cannot answer your question about why the Plaintiffs chose to double-bunk these particular two incumbents. I can tell you that the criteria that this Committee adopted did not give a -- a listing of priority. And so to the extent -- and I don't know if it's true, Representative -- Chairman Lewis appears to have the compactness scores for all these districts. To the extent, and possibly, the way the Plaintiffs drew it is more compact than the way the PCS draws it. So maybe they put compactness ahead of incumbency. I don't know the answer to that.

I know that there are nine or ten adopted criteria, no particular order was given. I assumed they did the constitutional requirements first. That's the way I would've drawn it. But other -- other way how -- what they've chose to put the next is -- you know, I have no way of knowing.

I would also answer to your previous question about the number of incumbents that you're including. That is you should not consider people who have announced their retirements. And so, I believe, this map does it to the extent of the

double-cut [sic] -- double-bunk some members, it does so in areas where there's already been a member announced that they're stepping down.

REP. DOLLAR: Follow-up?

REP. SZOKA: Follow-up.

REP. DOLLAR: So clearly, you -- you -- you're not precluding that politics may have been part of it. And to your point about the others, you -- this map bunks Representative Hardister and Representative Harrison. It bunks Representative Lambeth and Representative Terry. It bunks Representative Dulin and Representative Carney. I am not aware of any of those individuals. And -- and, again, in terms of Representative Millis and Representative Brenden Jones, I'm not aware that any of those eight individuals are -- are currently planning on leaving the General Assembly.

REP. SZOKA: Representative Jackson?

REP. JACKSON: Again, I can't speak for a map that I didn't draw, but I am familiar with some of the double-bunkings that you just mentioned. I believe the double-bunking in Guilford County was necessitated because your -- your PCS drew Representative Harrison with a greater than 60 percent, I believe, percentage of African-Americans

in her district, which was, in fact, one of the challenged districts that was ruled, I believe, unconstitutional. And so that was an attempt to fix that.

The gentleman -- I believe the lady and gentleman you discussed in Mecklenburg County were potentially double-bunked because of the freezing of House District 105 since it did not touch an affected district. And so that probably necessitated one double-bunking in the lower end of Mecklenburg County. That would be just a guess.

REP. DOLLAR: Follow-up?

REP. SZOKA: Follow-up.

REP. DOLLAR: You offered an amendment and -- and yet, you're -- you're kind of wanting to take ownership and not wanting to take ownership, which is strange to me in my legislative experience when it comes to -- to amendments. So again, I -- I -- I -- I mean, maybe -- I'll just ask it one more time in terms of these double-bunks.

I mean, these are -- are -- are -- are good members that I've mentioned. I think they're productive members and -- and, you know -- and some in both parties. And it just seems to me that there was no need for these double-bunkings. And

so -- so, Representative Jackson, do you -- you have no reason why you were putting all of your -- these colleagues that didn't have to be double-bunked together?

REP. SZOKA: Representative Jackson?

REP. JACKSON: Chairman Dollar, it is my understanding from reading the Covington opinion and from the different oral arguments and hearings that have been held since that decision, that the Federal Court instructed the Plaintiffs to give input to the General Assembly about when they saw -- when this process was taking place.

And so you provided a map on Saturday; data on Monday morning. The Plaintiffs responded with a map that they thought showed the defects that they saw in your -- in your -- in -- in your piece -- well, in the original proposal before the PCS. They sent that in letter format. I had drafted into an actual map so that everyone in the body could be aware of what it was -- what it was or what it did and that we could debate that. And that's simply what I did.

It's -- this is not the -- the map I would've drawn. I would've drawn Wake County a little differently 'cause I'm familiar with that.

And I would have gotten other members, perhaps, from Guilford or Forsyth County to help draw that area as well, if I'd have been doing it. The Plaintiffs may have done that; I'm just not aware.

REP. DOLLAR: Mr. Chairman, I -- I may come back for some other -- for some other questions. I would just -- and I know there's other members who have questions they want to ask and I don't want to dominate all the time. Except I would just make the observation -- I mean, it's just very clear to me, particularly on the issue of double-bunking here, that these were done for purely political and -- and -- and partisan reasons. And -- and I particularly regret when it's done to a number of members of both parties that are certainly good members.

REP. SZOKA: Thank you, sir. Next on my list here is Representative Stevens.

REP. STEVENS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I have a couple of question for Representative Jackson, if you'll yield?

REP. SZOKA: Will the gentleman yield?

REP. JACKSON: Yes, I will yield.

REP. STEVENS: Thank you. You indicated that a letter was sent and, based on that letter,

you had these maps drawn; is that correct?

REP. JACKSON: Based on that letter -- I asked the assignor of that letter, Ms. Anita Earls, to provide me with the data that showed those things could be fixed in the way she said they could be. I then took that data, which I believe was furnished in a Dropbox format, and sent it to staff and asked them to draw the map.

In the drawing of the map, they identified a few small errors such as, I think, unpopulated movements or something like that. And so there were a few technical corrections, so that this map is not identical to the data that was sent but is, I believe, in all relevant ways, the map that was sent.

REP. STEVENS: Has that --

REP. SZOKA: Follow-up?

REP. STEVENS: Please. Has that letter been offered into the -- to the record here?

REP. JACKSON: Yes, it -- it was. It was sent to everybody and was entered as part of the record, to my understanding. And I imagine it will be entered into the Federal Court record as well.

REP. STEVENS: Follow-up?

REP. SZOKA: Follow-up.

REP. STEVENS: Do you know how that differed from the criteria that this Committee used at all, if it did?

REP. JACKSON: Well, I -- I -- she -- and if you have not seen her letter, I can certainly get you a copy of it. I believe I do have it in my large paper folder here. She -- she noted some of the things that I went over today. One was changing districts that didn't need to be changed. One was some differences with the whole county provision and the Greene, Wayne, Johnston, Harnett, Lee, Sampson, Bladen cluster and the Rowan, Cabarrus, Stanly, Montgomery, Richmond cluster. And then she talks about the racial gerrymandering issue as well.

REP. STEVENS: Follow-up?

REP. SZOKA: Follow-up.

REP. STEVENS: So did she in -- did they, in fact, include racial data as a consideration in drawing the Covington map?

REP. JACKSON: Representative Stevens, I'm not sure if that is listed in the letter, but to my knowledge, the -- the racial data was considered in the drawing of their map; yes, ma'am.

REP. STEVENS: And -- and have --

REP. SZOKA: Follow up?

REP. STEVENS: Follow-up. And have you also listed or considered that racial data and posted it to the website?

REP. SZOKA: Representative Jackson?

REP. JACKSON: I want to make sure you're clear; they sent what's called, I believe, a shapefile, which is something that we can use to recreate the map that they drew. The data that you have before you is the data that has been created by staff, and it is in the same format as all the other amendments that you have requested.

However, if you request of staff, they can do you racial data based upon any amendment, as well as the PCS, the original proposal and this one as well. But I think what they've handed out is what you've used on every other map you've drawn, so that they remain consistent. But it does exist in the computer and can be pulled for you.

REP. STEVENS: Follow-up?

REP. SZOKA: Follow-up.

REP. STEVENS: Who requested the racial data? Was that you or was that the Covington Plaintiffs?

REP. JACKSON: Well, again, I -- it -- I

believe the Covington Plaintiffs considered it, but, again, they did not send us data. As far as what I have requested, I requested racial data on your original map that was released Saturday. I requested and received that data. Other members, I am aware, have requested racial data on other maps. And maybe the same map more than once and have seen posted in different areas, have been e-mailed to members' accounts and things of that nature. The only thing I requested was the racial data, I believe, for the original map.

REP. STEVENS: Follow-ups?

REP. SZOKA: Follow-up.

REP. STEVENS: Representative Jackson, are you aware on the Reock score that the mean score in Covington is 42 where it's only 41 in the House plan? And the standard deviation in Covington is 10 -- is .10, where the standard deviation of the House plan's only .09?

REP. JACKSON: No, I am not familiar with the compactness scores of any area in the proposal I listed other than in Wake County. Originally, I had planned to run a Wake County amendment, a Mecklenburg County amendment and a statewide amendment. But it -- just like all of your

questions, I think it's very clear what the vote total is going to be today. And so in the interest of time, I did not choose to cross examine members about how things were drawn and I've chosen not to waste your time by introducing multiple amendments that are doomed to fail.

REP. STEVENS: And if -- if I can follow up?

REP. SZOKA: Follow-up.

REP. STEVENS: Representative Jackson, did you know the House plan splits only 19 precincts in the impacted areas? Did you -- did you realize that?

REP. JACKSON: I believe I saw the Chairman's presentation and, I believe, there was a change from 40 some -- maybe 40 to 19 or something like that.

REP. STEVENS: Follow-up?

REP. DOLLAR: Follow-up.

REP. STEVENS: Did you look closely at your Covington plan to indicate that there were either 43 or 44 precincts impacted?

REP. JACKSON: So I -- I have not. I can tell you that the majority of those precincts that are split under the Covington plan are split as a

result of freezing in place those districts. That, we did not do as this PCS does, an attempt to split precincts for partisan advantage or to avoid an -- a potential primary or general election opponent or anything like that. The precincts are what you originally split in 2011. And because we didn't touch those districts, we can't touch those splits.

I will also say that that -- now, looking at that number can sometimes be confusing because a VTD may appear to be split, but in fact, it has been split by the Board of Election in two separate precincts. So you may look at a number and say oh, you've got to split VTD, but in fact, you just split it along precinct lines and did not, in fact, split precincts.

REP. STEVENS: Well, did you -- did you --

REP. DOLLAR: Would you like a follow-up?

REP. STEVENS: Follow-up, please. I'm sorry. Follow-up. Did you look at a split precinct in Pitt County that wound up being split between three different districts by the Covington Plan?

REP. JACKSON: Again, I have not. I -- I looked at Wake County and a little bit of

Mecklenburg County. Otherwise, I did not look.

REP. STEVENS: Follow-up?

REP. DOLLAR: Follow-up.

REP. STEVENS: And did you recognize that the Covington House plan also splits 15 municipalities, which is more than the House plan split?

REP. DOLLAR: Representative Jackson recognized.

REP. JACKSON: Can you tell me how many precincts the PCS for the House plan split? Because I believe -- I'm sorry. I'm assuming a fact not into evidence, Your Honor.

REP. STEVENS: The -- the -- the -- the House plan splits 19 precincts in impacted areas. There are clearly some legitimate reasons for those. But the Covington plan splits 43 or 44.

REP. JACKSON: Well, I think you'd moved on to ask me about municipalities, Representative Stevens.

REP. STEVENS: The municipalities -- the Covington plan split 50 municipalities and that's five more than the House plan.

REP. JACKSON: Okay. That -- so the House -- if based upon your representation that the

House plan only split 45, then if you say Covington splits 50, I would have no reason to disagree.

I would tell you that in the county I looked at, like Wake County, I -- I did a -- the Covington plan does a much better job of splitting the municipalities that does have to split in fewer places. For instance, Raleigh is split in eight -- into eight districts instead of nine. And I think Apex is split, maybe, into three instead of five and things of that nature. But because of the freezing, we cannot minimize the total amount of -- of -- of municipalities split.

REP. STEVENS: Follow-up?

And I'm particularly, I guess, looking at Wake, Guilford and Mecklenburg. I'm -- I don't think my microphone's coming on. Okay. It's still not -- okay. There it is.

REP. SPECIALE: Mr. Chairman?

REP. SZOKA: Representative Speciale?

REP. SPECIALE: Just as a point of order, could you please let the Plaintiff and the Defendant know that we're not in a court of law?

REP. SZOKA: This is an issue of great importance to not only this body, but all of the citizens of the state. And we'll hear all the

questions and responses until whenever we need to be here. Representative Stevens, you're recognized.

REP. STEVENS: Thank you. Thank you. And -- and Representative Jackson, I promise not to be much longer, but I'm particularly looking at Guilford and Mecklenburg. And the way they're split, don't they look more like a pinwheel than a compact district?

REP. SZOKA: Representative Jackson recognized.

REP. JACKSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Representative Stevens, I don't have the PCS map in front of me, so I can't do a comparison necessarily. But I would say that these maps do appear to be more start in the center and move outward. I believe, based upon -- in Guilford County, I believe, that's based upon, again, the need to get Representative Harrison's district to a different level for racial data. And -- and it -- it looks like, to me, to create more compact districts. But, again, you -- you might be better addressing these to the -- questions to the people who drew the maps.

REP. STEVENS: Mr. Chair?

REP. SZOKA: Yes, ma'am?

REP. STEVENS: I -- I just want to point out for the record that while I would like to address these to the people who made the map, they're not here.

REP. SZOKA: So noted.

REP. JACKSON: Mr. Chairman?

REP. SZOKA: Yes, sir?

REP. JACKSON: Are you sure they're not here?

REP. DOLLAR: Well, can -- if you would -- Representative Jackson, if you would call their names again, we will see if they are here.

REP. JACKSON: I don't know who drew the maps. Again, I know that Mr. Gilkeson had -- I think -- I don't think the Plaintiffs were invited to today's Committee, but if -- if you want to take a recess and invite them, maybe they'd be willing to come and answer your questions for you.

REP. SZOKA: Well, they may, but this is your amendment. I would've hoped that you would have brought the people necessary to support your amendment.

REP. STEVENS: Yeah --

REP. SZOKA: Representative Stevens?

REP. STEVENS: Mr. Chair, I just want to make the comment that, you know, he's -- he's trying to somewhat disavow himself now of the very map he's offered. Maybe it's not his dog, but he's walking it. He should have some obligation to know.

REP. DOLLAR: Ma'am, are you finished?

REP. SZOKA: Thank you very much. Next on the list -- and I have you all on the list, be assured -- is Representative Torbett.

REP. TORBETT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And at this time, if -- I would beg your difference. The maps that were presented when it comes down to your more heavily populated counties are -- are just -- aren't that clear. So I've had Mecklenburg pretty much magnetized or -- or magnified. If you would, Sergeant at Arms, can I ask, respectfully, if those would be distributed to the members?

REP. SZOKA: Yes, Sergeant at Arms, directed to you, pass those maps.

REP. TORBETT: And thank you. I do have a series of questions, Mr. Chairman. I would like to direct those questions to Representative Jackson of Wake.

REP. SZOKA: Does Representative Jackson yield to the questions? Thank you, sir. Representative -- well, Representative Torbett, let's hold on a minute until we get the maps passed out so that everybody's looking at the same thing.

REP. TORBETT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

(Pause.)

REP. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman?

REP. SZOKA: Yes, sir?

REP. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, Representative Jackson referenced earlier a letter that was sent to -- to me and signed by Anita Earls and Edward M. Speas and some other attorneys, I believe. Ms. Earls did send me an e-mail and asked this to be included in the Committee record. With your permission, I'd like to send it forward and I'd like the Sergeant at Arms to distribute it as well.

REP. SZOKA: Absolutely. I have it in my possession as stated and signed by the lady, and it will be entered into the Committee record and will be distributed to members of the Committee.

(Pause.)

REP. DOLLAR: Do all the members of the Committee have the map and a copy of the letter that has just been passed out? All right. It

would appear, seeing nothing to the contrary, that all members of the Committee have a copy of this map that Representative Torbett has passed out. And also, a member -- a copy of the letter that Representative Lewis asked to be passed out. Therefore, Representative Torbett, you have the floor.

REP. HARRISON: Excuse me, Mr. Chair, I don't have the map.

REP. SZOKA: Okay. Is she a member of the Committee?

REP. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman?

REP. SZOKA: And the Committee? Representative Lewis?

REP. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I think this might help Representative Harrison's request. The map was passed out as The Jackson Amendment. That is the map we're referring to. She's got it.

REP. SZOKA: Okay. I see that you've received everything now so, Representative Torbett, the floor is yours.

REP. TORBETT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Representative Jackson, do you feel the issue we're debating today is a -- one person, one vote in North Carolina is a -- a serious issue?

REP. JACKSON: Sir?

REP. TORBETT: I'm sorry, I'll repeat it. Do you feel the issue that we're addressing today in North Carolina as under one person, one vote and how those votes are defined and -- and relegated -- do you feel that's a pretty important issue?

REP. JACKSON: I do, Representative Torbett. I think my legislative record speaks for itself.

REP. TORBETT: Thank you, sir. Follow-up?

REP. SZOKA: Follow-up.

REP. TORBETT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In -- in your comments, you said you -- you would've drawn maps. And if you would have drawn maps, that this would have been different and that would have been different. As a member of the Committee, it's my understanding that myself and every member and you, as Minority Leader in the House of Representatives, had the opportunity to do just that and draw alternative maps. Is that a fair statement?

REP. JACKSON: I guess, theoretically.

REP. TORBETT: Thank you. So --

REP. SZOKA: Follow-up?

REP. TORBETT: The -- the importance that I -- I -- that I'm -- I'm concerned about this, is that you chose not to draw maps under an -- an issue that is extremely important to the people of North Carolina. But I'm also understanding that the map you presented today is not the map that you drew. Is that correct?

REP. JACKSON: Well, Representative Torbett, I mean, could you -- that's several questions in one, so --

REP. TORBETT: I can break them up if you'd like.

REP. JACKSON: Well, let's just -- if I don't answer your question, you can let me know. I did not draw this map; I think I made that very clear. I did attempt to draw some areas of the map. It would take one person not familiar with the computer system, with no -- you know, I have to go through staff to do these things. It -- it would take me quite a bit of time to draw the -- the entire state.

REP. TORBETT: I understand, as it would take any of us the same amount of time.

REP. JACKSON: Yeah, so, you know, I -- to do it right, you know, I would want to bring in

members from that area. I would've wanted to take public comment. You know, the week we weren't doing anything where Mr. Hofeller was drawing the map, you know, I would've -- if I had done it, I would've taken public comment that week about what do you want to see in the map. Then I would have released the map and took public comment. Okay. What's wrong with the map?

So I would've done things a little differently if I was drawing the map, but, again, I would have brought Representative Torbett in and, 'Tell me about the communities of interest in your area, Representative Torbett.'

You know, I -- I've talked about eastern Wake County being together. You know, I have a paper, Eastern Wake News; I would've asked -- you know, how to -- you got a [inaudible] fire station that your community rallies upon. I would've done things like that. So it would've taken me more than since this map was released on Saturday to get that done, yes, sir.

REP. TORBETT: Follow-up, Mr. Chairman.

REP. SZOKA: Follow-up.

REP. TORBETT: And -- and as -- would you think that it was within your purview or within

your opportunity to do exactly that, because I -- that -- I was feeling the same thing and could have done that any time. And you feel that you were -- that you couldn't, as Minority Leader, do that?

REP. JACKSON: Let's -- let's say it this way. I think it was a -- a task made more difficult by the majority, and I -- and I'll give you an example if you so -- so choose. Your mapmaker was retained, I believe, June 26th; they're joining 27th of this year. And he agreed that he would redraw the map for $50,000, a flat fee, so that he would have some -- so both sides would have some semblance of what it was going to cost and be certain. That same $50,000 was offered to the Democrat and the -- the leaders of the minority party in both the House and the Senate. However, it was offered in June, when you took advantage of it and got started. It was not offered to us until August 4th, that written letter. So, technically, did I have the ability? Yes, sir. Did I have the same ability that the majority party, I would dispute.

REP. TORBETT: Okay. Follow-up, Mr. Chairman.

REP. SZOKA: Follow-up.

REP. TORBETT: Thank you. Also in -- in your -- your opinion that you were stating about the map, that -- the secret map, which they -- I think it was stated earlier. You mentioned about the criteria, and -- and the criteria that was selected by this Committee. Based on the map that I've asked to be passed out, because the -- the larger map -- just, you can't see. Based on this map addressing Charlotte, which is right next to me, which is why I -- it's kind of -- I guess I'm asking you these questions. Can -- can you show me a town on that map that was not split, a municipality that was not split to obtain a certain voting outcome? Because I thought under our criteria that we would try to -- our -- our -- our absolute best to keep the municipalities in whole. Are you aware of any towns that weren't split; are you aware of any towns that were split?

REP. JACKSON: Representative Torbett, again, I will try to answer your questions and if I don't do a good job, please, tell me what I miss.

REP. TORBETT: Sure.

REP. JACKSON: One thing is, you referred to this as the secret map, and I take great offense to that description. I'd shared this map with

this -- this Committee in whole and -- well, particularly with the chairman of this Committee, immediately upon receiving it. Okay. So it -- I don't know where the word secret comes, but I shared it.

I didn't wait 'til the amendment deadline at 10:30, which got moved to 10:45. I actually shared this way earlier. In fact, I shared it before your side shared the PCS for today with us. So -- so I think calling it a secret map's a little unfair to me and how I do business. As far as municipalities, all I know about Mecklenburg County is what you've just handed me. It would appear to me that Huntersville is kept whole in this map. It would -- it would -- again, if I -- if -- when I'm talking, if I could be the only one [inaudible] --

REP. DOLLAR: The gentleman has the floor.

REP. JACKSON: It appears from your map that Huntersville applies all in the blue area, Davidson's all in yellow and that Cornelius appears to be across two different colors. Mount Holly appears to be all in green to the extent that it is all in Mecklenburg County; could be one of those municipalities that carries them to two counties

for all I know. Pineville, it looks like it's the majority in pink, but it's got the letter E on the gray area, which, again, in our map was a frozen district, so we didn't change that. So if it is split, it's split by that rule, the state constitution not changing anything. It looks like Matthews is clearly probably split. I have been to Matthews -- it's a pretty large city -- so I'll -- I'll -- I believe that that is split. Looks like Mint Hill split. And, of course, Charlotte is split into most, if not all of these districts. But --

REP. JACKSON: Thank you. Thank you for your answer and just for the -- for the record, Mount Holly is actually in Gaston County. So you approached on the map probably a little bit different there. Are -- are you aware that it splits almost every town possible just simply to retain or -- or to actually change or -- or give the voters more of an edge to not elect Republicans, but elect Democrats.

REP. JACKSON: So if you say more municipalities were split, then I'll take you at your word. Again, I'm very careful when I speak on the floor and when I speak in Committee. I've

given motivations to people that I don't know about. So I'm not going to agree with your -- your -- your description that they were motivated by partisanship because I don't know that. They will -- they'll have to answer that question for themselves. I can tell you that I understand the criteria they used were to freeze District 105, which was not contiguous to an impacted district and to cure the racial gerrymander that existed in several districts in Mecklenburg County. What they did after doing those two things and how they did it, you would have to ask them.

REP. TORBETT: Thank you. Follow-up, Mr. Chairman?

REP. DOLLAR: Follow up.

REP. TORBETT: Thank you. And I -- just for the record, I personally believe that the voters -- a lot of this debate that we have is useless because voters are of high intellect to understand that they vote for the individual more than the party anyway and that a lot of this is just, I guess, what we have to go through about every ten years.

Now, let me ask you something else. So also in your -- in your comments, you -- you

address -- and I think this question, I don't -- it's been a while since your comments were made. You addressed Chairman Lewis as -- as to offer an explanation on why these precincts were split, and I think you asked that in a pretty definitive question. So I would ask you, sir, on the map that you've submitted, could you provide the explanation why 10 precincts were split in Mecklenburg? And I can wait for your answer.

REP. JACKSON: (No response.)

REP. TORBETT: Mr. Chairman, just -- I think that will conclude my questions based on that.

REP. DOLLAR: Thank you, Representative Torbett.

REP. JACKSON: It appears from the lifting of split -- of split VTDs that we've been given that 10, in fact, are split. The number one -- the first one is VTD 87. That is split because it includes House District 105, which is a frozen precinct, so it couldn't be -- frozen district, so it couldn't be fixed under our state constitution. VTD 88 includes House District 105, which is frozen under the state constitution and could not be fixed. VTD 91 includes District 105, which -- so

that's a frozen district and could not be fixed. VTD 121 includes House District 105 and it's frozen and therefore it could not be fixed. VTD 129 includes House District 105, which is frozen and cannot be fixed.

VTD 225 includes House District 105; it's frozen and could not be fixed. VTD 227 includes House District 105 and could not be fixed. By my calculation, there are three VTDs that are split that did not include House District 105. I could not tell you if those were done for population, deviation -- to make the deviations right, if it was done for compactness, if it was done for incumbency or if it was done for political reasons or racial -- you know, to equalize the racial numbers in those districts. I couldn't tell you because I didn't draw it. I will tell you that only three of them were split as a result of any other reason other than the frozen district of House District 105.

REP. SZOKA: Thank you. Representative Gill, you're recognized.

REP. GILL: Thank you. I was just going to ask for the roll call at -- at the -- at the time of it.

REP. DOLLAR: Okay. Thank you. Representative Michaux, you're recognized.

REP. MICHAUX: Mr. Chairman. I've got a -- more of a statement than a -- than a question.

REP. SZOKA: That's fine.

REP. MICHAUX: These -- this map that you have before you in the amendment, introduced by Representative Jackson, who was asked to do it as constituents asked all of you to do. The half of you don't know what you're doing with them anyway, when the ask you to do it. He was asked to introduce these on behalf of the Plaintiffs in this matter, I don't know anybody in this body that is a member of the Plaintiffs, who -- in this body. The maps were drawn by the Plaintiff -- the map was drawn by the Plaintiffs, not using statewide money. They didn't -- they didn't get $50,000 to draw that map. They drew it as part of the action that they took that has found that you racially gerrymandered these districts.

So you can sit up here and talk about all the numbers that you got in there that you want. These people went out and said you did them wrong and they're the ones paying for trying to correct what you did wrong. And if you talk about

Democratic gerrymander on this map, what about the Republican gerrymander on your map? I mean, give me a break, folks. We can sit up hear all day and are you going to pass this. You going to sit up here and try to make a record, and we're doing the same thing. Fortunately, our record seems to be a little bit better than yours because you're trying to make up something that just ain't there. And you've got more to go even there -- even further down the line, you going to be looking at political gerrymandering, not racial gerrymandering, which is coming up very soon in the United States Supreme Court.

So you can sit here all day. I'm not going to sit here all day. I'm going to leave, because I know what you're going to do. You're going to pass it and you're going to send it on to the Court. The Court's going to look at it and I don't know what they're going to say, but I can give you a pretty darn good idea that somebody else is going to be drawing some maps somewhere down the line. So, have fun, y'all.

REP. SZOKA: Representative Brawley, you're recognized.

REP. BRAWLEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

As I've watched this debate -- first, I -- I would like to say something to Representative Jackson. And, to the gentleman, I was not intending to imply that you were misleading the Committee. I realize that you were presenting a plan you did not draw and believe that when you were making misstatements, they were honest errors because you were not familiar with the areas with which you were speaking. And if I gave any impression that I was questioning your honesty or that you were deliberately misleading this Committee, I would like to correct that. You are a man with whom I frequently disagree on issues, but who I find personably honorable.

I would also like to draw the Committee's attention to a court case a few years ago involving the Ford Pinto in a rear-end collision, which led to an explosion. During jury selection it was one of the first times that psychological testing was used to determine the jurors. And the people defending the case realized that women were much more likely to find for the Plaintiff, but discovered that if they asked the woman a question, can you drive a truck, that gave her the same view towards automobile maintenance that a man would

have. And one of the key things in the case was the gas cap had been left off of the car and that was the reason the Ford Motor Company said it actually blew up, because gas was splashing out.

I think that question is like this thing about freeze District 105 in Mecklenburg County. It looks innocuous, but it's actually the key to achieving the aims that -- I believe that the Democrats would like to achieve in this issue. By freezing 105, but having to move everything else, it allowed them to split Matthews and Mint Hill, a clear community of interest, into three pieces. Now, the reason -- well, one, I'm very familiar with it because I represent that area. I've lived in Matthews since 1982, and Matthews and Mint Hill or on Matthews-Mint Hill Road. We read the Matthews-Mint Hill weekly. We share a Park Commission slot on Mecklenburg County Board of Park Commissioners. Kids in Matthews go to middle school and elementary school in Mint Hill. Kids in Mint Hill go to high school in Matthews. We play in both sports leagues. They -- sometimes we wonder why the towns don't just merge. They do tend to vote very Republican; however, not always. Those towns have always elected whoever's in that

district, from Jim Black, Larry Digg, Sean LeMonde, Jim Gulley and me.

By chopping this into three pieces, northern Mint Hill is now part of Representative Autry's Democratic district and it will vote Democratic and will probably elect a Charlotte Democrat. The southern portion of Mint Hill and the northern portion of Matthews now runs into Charlotte and will probably elect a Democrat from Charlotte. And 104, having only the southern portion of Mathews, once -- is also subsumed in Democratic portions of the City of Charlotte. So these two southern towns, Matthews and Mint Hill, with a combined population of almost 60,000, will not be able to elect their own representative.

This also meant that redrawing 104 created a double bunk situation where Representative Dulin is now in the seat Representative Carney represents. The shifts around by holding 105 steady allowed the map drawers to create in District 107 a district that pulls a lot of Republican votes out of Huntersville and Cornelius and subsumes them into Democratic votes in Charlotte. I've been through the data on this. This map will elect 11 Democrats and one

Republican. To me, this looks like a partisan gerrymander of some of the most blatant types, by breaking apart communities which have separate identities and putting them under the dominance of the City of Charlotte. I would have to vote against this. My people would go crazy if I sold them out. Thank you.

REP. SZOKA: Thank you. Next on the list is Representative Jones.

REP. JONES: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just a brief comment and, during my comment, if I may pose a question to Chairman Lewis if he would respectfully yield.

REP. SZOKA: Will -- will the gentleman yield?

REP. JONES: I have listened closely to the a lot of the comments that have been made today and just over and over considered how -- how misleading some of the comments have been made, particularly regarding race and how I believe a casual observer who would be listening to this Committee meeting or -- just -- perhaps online or -- or whatever, could misconstrue something. But, Representative Lewis, you were here in the general assembly during some of the terms of the

past decade when the -- when the Democrats were in the majority and -- and drew the maps. And now you've been here during this decade when the Republicans have been in the majority and drawn the maps. As far as the racial makeup in the general assembly, after the Republicans drew the maps in 2011, the racial minorities end up with more seats in the general assembly or less seats?

REP. LEWIS: Thank you for that question, Representative Jones. I'll do my very best to answer it. Obviously, I can't speak for decades prior to me serving. I will tell you that, in 2011, we conducted extensive research and expert reports that indicated that racially polarized voting existed in the state. We interpreted that to mean that we needed to construct districts where minority populations would have an opportunity to elect the candidate of their choice. The Covington case -- the Covington Court reviewed the evidence -- the same evidence, the same expert reports that we had before us and determined that we did not have sufficient information to use race as a factor. Therefore, we did not use race when we drew these maps. I think the net result of what you asked, to my knowledge, there probably are more

African-Americans serving in both chambers today than there were in 2010. Excuse me, than there were in the prior -- yeah, than there were in -- in 2010, but I -- I also haven't personally looked at that number.

REP. JONES: Just a brief follow-up.

REP. SZOKA: Follow up.

REP. JONES: Representative Lewis, would you be surprised if I -- if I told you we currently have 25 racial minorities serving in the general assembly and that is a greater number, than we had -- than when the Democrats were drawing the maps during the past decade? Would that surprise you?

REP. LEWIS: I would have no reason to question your -- what you said. No, sir.

REP. JONES: Thank You.

REP. SZOKA: Representative Brockman, you're recognized.

REP. BROCKMAN: Okay. I -- I have a -- two questions and a comment. And I want to just comment on the last question or the last thing that Representative Jones said. Yes, there may be more African-Americans, but we have less power. We have a super-minority, so, you know, we have less power;

we have less influence. So, you know, you're really diluting the African-American voice, which is really kind of the point of why we're here. But then -- so my two questions are --

REP. SZOKA: Sir, who are your questions directed to?

REP. BROCKMAN: The Chairs.

REP. SZOKA: Specifically both or --

REP. BROCKMAN: Either Chair -- either Chair will be fine.

REP. SZOKA Okay.

REP. BROCKMAN: Thank you. I just want to know if any of the Chairs agree with Leader Jackson's statement that North Carolina is a purple state? That's my first question.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you for the question, representative. To be clear, I don't remember Representative Jackson using those words, but I will go with the presumption that he did. I would say that there are certain areas in North Carolina that tend to vote strongly Democratic. There are certain areas in North Carolina that tend to vote strongly Republican, and oftentimes those areas have direct correlation to where these communities lie within the state. But, as you know, we do not

have a proportional system of representation. The reason that it is -- yes, it is clear that a state that can elect a Democratic governor and a Republican lieutenant governor and a Republican senator and a Democratic AG, yes, it is clear that our state votes in different ways, but, as you know, those are at-large races. Nobody, to my knowledge -- except for one speaker at the public hearing in the Raleigh site, nobody, to my knowledge, has proposed completely changing our constitution to go into a proportional representation way.

We talked about this earlier and I kind of made it -- and by earlier I mean one of the earlier Committee meetings, I kind of made a joke that we elect members from districts who then choose a speaker and choose a president pro tem. We don't elect a prime minister because we have an executive branch. If we were to move to the kind of system that acknowledges a purple state, which is kind of a code word for there ought to be some way to change to have proportional representation, I think that far exceeds what the Covington Court has asked us to do and far exceeds the time in which we have to -- to do it.

REP. BROCKMAN: Okay. I was just simply asking if you think North Carolina is -- my follow-up question is, do you think North Carolina is a super red state, then, by you answering that question -- by the way you answered that question? In a way that produces -- in a way that that's super-majority for either party; would you say that? Is North Carolina -- do you think North Carolina -- North Carolinians would prefer a -- or the representation of North Carolina would be a supermajority for either party?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman? Representative Dollar?

REP. LEWIS: I know that Representative Dollar wants to address this, but if I could and -- 13 out of 17 statewide races this time were won by the person that had an R behind their name. Do I -- I don't particularly like, to be candid with you, the deep red or deep blue or whatever else. In fact, up until 20 years ago when they talked about the folks that are registered like me, they'd use blue and they'd use red for folks that are registered like you. So -- but I'll concede that when commentators talk about our state now, they may say red state and blue state and all this, I --

I get that. I'm trying to tell you that I think it's more complicated than -- than -- than that. I don't know that I would acknowledge that a state that elects 13 out of 17 statewide offices is necessarily a purple state. But maybe Representative Dollar might want to add to that.

REP. SZOKA: Representative Dollar, would you like to answer that question?

REP. DOLLAR: The gentleman made my point.

REP. SZOKA: Representative Brockman?

REP. BROCKMAN: And I'll just end with this comment. You know, North Carolina -- I think most political folks who look at North Carolina would say North Carolina is a purple state, a state that goes back and forth. Our governor's race was very tight and most of our statewide races are tight. You know, they go back and forth. You know, the problem with your argument, with due respect, is a county like Guilford County that has -- is a Democratic county, Wake County is probably a Democratic county. My county, for example, Guilford County, we've got three Democrats and three Republicans. You know, I don't necessarily think your argument holds up in those

particular counties.

I would urge this Committee to vote for Representative Jackson's amendment because this amendment would bring our state back to a more 50-50 equal playing field. And will, you know, make our state -- make our General Assembly a -- a purple General Assembly, which is what our state is. Thank you.

REP. LEWIS: Chairman.

REP. SZOKA: Representative Lewis?

REP. LEWIS: I don't want to jump in the queue. Was I next or --

REP. SZOKA: I thought you were going to respond to --

REP. LEWIS: Well, yeah, just to -- if I can, to speak on the point of the amendment. I actually agree with Representative Brockman said. Voting for this amendment that was submitted by the Covington Plaintiffs, which is clearly Democratic gerrymander, will find a way to take Democrats into areas that they can't currently win because their messaging problem will not allow them to win elections.

REP. SZOKA: Next in the queue is Representative Michaux for a second time.

REP. MICHAUX: Yeah -- yeah, Mr. Chairman, I have just more of a statement than a question. Representative Jones is absolutely right. As time went on, we picked up more black representation in this body. When I came to this body, Representative Jones, decades ago, there were only three of us here. Now there are 25 of us here. Through no thanks but anybody but hard work on folks who lived in those communities that did it because they got an opportunity to elect folks of their choice.

Now, you weren't responsible for that. I can tell you this, that during slavery time there were more black folks on plantations than white folks, but who ruled the roost? That's what the situation is now, if you want to get right down to it. There are plenty of us here, but we don't have the power or authority because of racial gerrymandering. And that's where we are.

REP. SZOKA: I have two members left in the queue and Representative Jackson, I have a procedural question for you. Because when you offered the amendment I didn't hear a motion for it, so before it slips the Chair's mind, I would like to make sure that there is a motion for your

amendment. You may have, but I can't remember.

REP. JACKSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm not sure if I did that as well. I would say that I would agree with some of the comments today about this amendment not being perfect, but I do believe it's superior to the PCS and, therefore, I would move for adoption.

REP. SZOKA: Thank you, sir. Representative Dollar, you're recognized.

REP. DOLLAR: Thank you. And I -- I realize the time and so I'll -- I'll try to -- I'll try to make this a little briefer than before. And that is -- but I do -- would like to ask, just so I can understand. Representative Jackson, would you yield for a question?

REP. JACKSON: I yield.

REP. DOLLAR: Thank you. My question would be, you mentioned redistricting resources that you became aware of in -- in April, on the -- on the Republican side. I guess my question is, at that point in time, did you put anything in writing to the speaker requesting any -- any resources at that time?

REP. JACKSON: In April, no, sir.

REP. DOLLAR: Thank you. Let me just

make some comments. I would -- I would just, again, comment, you know, in terms of resources and I -- I know Chairman Lewis has mentioned this, that resources equal on both sides were offered and the gentleman answered my question in terms of when he became aware. I would also make some broader points, though. One is that, along this line, you know, we've been talking about, well, you know, certain people get resources, certain people in General Assembly. But I would certainly think that folks should be reminded that when Republicans and others were challenging, successfully, the constitutionality of maps drawn by the general assembly in previous decades, I don't think the General Assembly offered them any new resources to carry forward what -- what were, in many cases, successful challenges in state and federal court that repaired a number of unconstitutional items that -- that were -- that we had in this state. And so, certainly, Republicans have been on -- on the -- in the -- about reforming and making our system better for a host of decades.

The other thing that I would just mention very quickly is -- and that is, when I look back at Wake County -- and I will not trouble my colleague

with any more questions at this point, but it's just very clear to me that there's some political gerrymandering going on here with the map that -- that these Plaintiffs, that -- that Representative Jackson is -- is offering.

Clearly, you have far more seats there that are Democrat. I mean what's -- what's being done to Representative Malone's district is clearly political motivation to make sure that Representative Malone cannot be re-elected. I think the same thing is true when you -- when you look at Mecklenburg County. This is just an attempt to gerrymander for the Democrats' purposes when, as Chairman Lewis points out, they have a hard time in a number of the rural areas and small towns to try to use a political gerrymander to attempt to make up for that in a -- in urban areas. And I would ask you to defeat the amendment.

REP. SZOKA: Further discussion for the debate? Representative Jackson?

REP. JACKSON: I thought I was in the cue?

REP. SZOKA: You're recognized now.

REP. JACKSON: Thought it would be fair if I got to respond to some things people had said

about me and motivations and things, if that's okay?

REP. SZOKA: You have the floor.

REP. JACKSON: First of all, there's been a lot of referring to this as a partisan gerrymander, this plan. You know, again, I will point out that Attorney General Stein, who won statewide in the PCS, only won in 42 districts and this -- this PCS -- this amendment, he wins in only 56 districts. If that's a Democratic partisan gerrymander and if the Republican one isn't a partisan gerrymander, I'd sure hate to see them. I think that those type of statewide numbers prove that, in fact, it is not a -- a gerrymander.

There were some questions about April and when I became aware. I became aware that $50,000 had been given to Mr. Hofeller when I read about it in the News and Observer. That was not in April; that was earlier this month. I can't remember if it was a day or two days before the offer was formally made to me. I will note, Mr. Hofeller was paid to do the clustering map because a clustering map was done last year about this time and that no offer was made to me or to Senator Blue, to my knowledge, to allow us to have money in addition to

do a clustering map. Clustering map is a mathematical thing under the Stephenson decisions. It takes a mathematician to develop some algorithms to do that and so I think it's a little unfair to say we've had a equal opportunity because that certainly is not true.

The purpose of this map is to show that the Plaintiffs' objections to the map that's being introduced today, the PCS, can be cured. I would not expect you to take my version of Wake or Mecklenburg County. However, when an attorney who has been fighting these redistricting maps since 2011 and, as Representative Dollar likes to say, has been extremely successful, in -- in fact, in getting the 9-0 result in front of the United States Supreme Court that the map was in fact racially gerrymandered, that she pointed out some constitutional deficiencies with your map -- your PCS. I would have expected you to go back in to Wake County and to Mecklenburg County and draw something that fit more to your liking in the partisan nature that would have protected Representative Malone. And it can be done, but you chose not to and so I guess we'll leave it up to the federal court whether they draw it themselves,

whether the adopt the Plaintiffs' map or whether they approve the PCS.

I do want to also follow up on what Representative Michaux was saying. Racial gerrymandering isn't about electing a higher number of African Americans. It's about giving African Americans the ability to elect candidates of their choice in more areas. For instance, Representative Michael Wray represents a majority minority district. In his counties, they have chosen him to represent them in several elections over minority opponents. That's their candidate of choice. The fact that he does -- is not black, doesn't mean they didn't get to elect their candidate of choice. In fact, they did do that.

Representative Harrison represents a very similar district and I, in fact, represent a district that, at the percentage of only 30 percent African American elected its candidate of choice in two elections before I was appointed to represent them, in fact, against me. She defeated me in her first election. And so that's what racial gerrymandering is about. It's not about creating a certain number of African Americans. It's about diluting their ability to elect their candidates of

choice by putting a high number of them into certain districts so that they don't have the opportunity to elect their candidate of choice in all the districts that surround them. That's what racial gerrymandering is all about.

I would just move for adoption of the amendment, mister -- Mr. Chairman.

REP. SZOKA: There's one more member that raised his hand. I recognize him, then we'll move to a vote on the amendment. Representative Jones?

REP. JONES: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and I appreciate your indulgence. I just wanted an opportunity to speak briefly, since -- since I was addressed personally by some of the members since I spoke.

You know, I was elected and I would just recall that the Republican majority was elected in 2010 under maps that the Democrats had drawn at the time and the whole suggestion that somehow we're here as a majority today because of Republican maps, I think, is -- is -- is incorrect. I think Representative Lewis alluded to it. We don't need to get into the red, blue, purple state, but I think it does, by saying that in the last 10 presidential elections, North Carolinians have

voted Republican nine times. In the last 16 US Senate elections, they've voted Republican 13 times.

So, you know, I seem to recall the time in the not too distant past when this body was 114 Democrats and 6 Republicans. And I'm -- I'm pretty sure there was never a time in this state where 95 percent of the people in the state were voting Democrat. Yeah, it was a -- more of a Democrat state in those days, but I say all that to say that, you know, some of the comments that came back, well, we have more racial minorities here than we've ever had, but we have less power.

And I would simply say, if that is the case, it is not because of race, it's because of your party. You've chosen to affiliate with a party that has less power in this state, less influence in this state because people of this state have moved away from your party and are no longer voting for your party like maybe they once did. And I think that's -- that's fair to point out. Whether you want to agree with it or not, it is the case. So, Mr. Chair, that is -- that's all I've got to say.

REP. SZOKA: Thank you. Having a motion

to adopt amendments --

MALE SPEAKER: Mr. Chair? Mr. Chairman?

REP. SZOKA: H327-AS-[inaudible] properly before us and Representative Gill having called for a roll call vote, the clerk will read the roll.

THE CLERK: Representative Bell?

REP. BELL: No.

THE CLERK: Representative Bell, no. Representative Jackson?

REP. JACKSON: Yes.

THE CLERK: Representative Jackson, yes. Representative Stevens?

REP. STEVENS: Yes.

THE CLERK: Representative Stevens, no. Representative Brawley?

REP. BRAWLEY: No.

THE CLERK: Representative Brawley, no. Representative Brockman?

REP. BROCKMAN: Yes.

THE CLERK: Representative Brockman, yes. Representative Burr?

REP. BURR: No.

THE CLERK: Representative Burr, no. Representative Davis?

REP. DAVIS: No.

THE CLERK: Representative Davis, no. Representative Dixon?

REP. DIXON: No.

THE CLERK: Representative Dixon, no. Representative Dobson?

REP. DOBSON: No.

THE CLERK: Representative Dobson, no. Representative Dulin?

REP. DULIN: No.

THE CLERK: Representative Dulin, no. Representative Farmer- Butterfield?

REP. FARMER-BUTTERFIELD: Yes.

THE CLERK: Representative Farmer-Butterfield, yes. Representative Floyd?

REP. FLOYD: Yes.

THE CLERK: Representative Floyd, yes. Representative Garrison?

REP. GARRISON: Yes.

THE CLERK: Representative Garrison, yes. Representative Gill?

REP. GILL: Yes.

THE CLERK: Representative Gill, yes. Representative Grange?

REP. GRANGE: No.

THE CLERK: Representative Grange, no.

Representative Hall?

REP. HALL: No.

THE CLERK: Representative Hall, no.

Representative Hanes?

REP. HANES: Yes.

THE CLERK: Representative Hanes, yes.

Representative Hardister?

REP. HARDISTER: No.

THE CLERK: Representative Hardister, no.

Representative Harrison?

REP. HARRISON: Yes.

THE CLERK: Representative Harrison, yes.

Representative Hastings?

REP. HASTINGS: No.

THE CLERK: Representative Hastings, no.

Representative Howard?

REP. HOWARD: No.

THE CLERK: Representative Howard, no.

Representative Hurley?

REP. HURLEY: No.

THE CLERK: Representative Hurley, no.

Representative Hunter?

REP. HUNTER: Yes.

THE CLERK: Representative Hunter, yes.

Representative Johnson?

REP. JOHNSON: No.

THE CLERK: Representative Johnson, no. Representative Jones?

REP. JONES: No.

THE CLERK: Representative Jones, no. Representative Jordan?

REP. JORDAN: No.

THE CLERK: Representative Jordan, no. Representative Malone?

REP. MALONE: No.

THE CLERK: Representative Malone, no. Representative Michaux?

REP. MICHAUX: Yes.

THE CLERK: Representative Michaux, yes. Representative Moore?

REP. MOORE: Yes.

THE CLERK: Representative Moore, yes. Representative Pierce?

REP. PIERCE: Yes.

THE CLERK: Representative Pierce, yes. Representative Reives?

REP. REIVES: Yes.

THE CLERK: Representative Reives, yes. Representative Willingham?

REP. WILLINGHAM: Yes.

THE CLERK: Representative Willingham, yes. Representative Speciale?

REP. SPECIALE: No.

THE CLERK: Representative Speciale, no. Representative Rogers.

REP. ROGERS: No.

THE CLERK: Representative Rogers, no. Representative Saine?

REP. SAINE: No.

THE CLERK: Representative Saine, no. Representative Wray?

REP. WRAY: Yes.

THE CLERK: Representative Wray, yes. Representative Torbett?

REP. TORBETT: No.

THE CLERK: Representative Torbett, no. Representative Yarborough?

REP. YARBOROUGH: No.

THE CLERK: Representative Yarborough, no. Were there any members that missed? I apologize. There's a -- I had to make a new sheet. Oh, the Chairs, I'm sorry. Representative Lewis?

REP. LEWIS: No.

THE CLERK: Representative Lewis, no. Representative Dollar?

REP. DOLLAR: No.

THE CLERK: Representative Dollar, no. Representative Szoka?

REP. SZOKA: No.

THE CLERK: Representative Szoka, no.

REP. SZOKA: By a vote of 15 ayes, 26 no's, the amendment fails. We're back on -- we're back on the PCS. Representative Lewis, you're recognized.

REP. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to be recognized for a motion.

REP. SZOKA: You are recognized for a motion, sir.

REP. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I move that the proposed Committee substitute for House Bill 927 be reported favorably as to the PCS as amended and that that PCS be rolled into a new PCS and that the short title of that PCS be amended to read 2017 House Redistricting Plan A1.

REP. SZOKA: We have a motion before us. All those in favor should --

FEMALE SPEAKER: Mister --

REP. SZOKA: -- imply their support by say aye.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Mr. Chair?

REP. SZOKA: All those opposed, no.

MALE SPEAKER: Division.

MALE SPEAKER: Division.

REP. LEWIS: I think -- I think what happened is, they wanted to speak on the one question, but you should --

REP. SZOKA: Division having been called, clerk will call the roll.

MALE SPEAKER: We already started, right?

THE CLERK: Representative Jackson?

REP. JACKSON: No.

THE CLERK: Representative Jackson, no.

REP. HARRISON: Mr. Chair, are we going to be allowed to discuss the motion?

REP. SZOKA: Suspend for a moment. All right. All right. The chair apologizes. I did not see any hands raised. So since this isn't -- we'll suspend this vote and allow those people to be recognized that wish to speak on the PCS. So -- so who -- Representative Harrison recognized. Whoever else wants to talk, if you would raise your hand so I can look around and make sure that you're properly recognized?

REP. HARRISON: Thank you, sir.

REP. DOLLAR: Representative Harrison,

you have the floor.

REP. HARRISON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Pricey Harrison, District 57. Just a brief comment, I share many of the concerns that Representative Jackson articulated, but I did want to say, specifically with the district that I currently represent, which is House District 57, it was one of the constitutional -- one of the districts deemed to be unconstitutional based on racial gerrymandering. The current African-American composition is 47 percent and -- and -- African American and 47 percent white. The proposed district is now -- now I see 60 percent African American, which doesn't seem to cure the constitutional issue of racial gerrymandering.

There -- I do believe that there are ways to have -- to the extent that Democratic performance needed to be taken into account for the criteria that -- that the Midland Park neighborhood, which is split Precincts 15 and 48, that could've been included in the district and would've achieved a little bit more racial balance. That's why I was at Precinct 16 and -- and 35, which were adjacent -- I want to maintain the compactness. So I just wanted to make that point

for the record and I appreciate that. Thank you.

REP. SZOKA: Thank you. And, again, I apologize for my mistakes. Further discussion, further debate? Further discussion, further debate? I see now no one is indicating they wish to debate or discuss this further. Therefore, we have the motion properly before us and we have cancelled the last vote, so if anybody wants to say something about the vote because I'm about to call for the ayes and the no's. All right. Having said that, those in favor of the PSC submission made by Representative Lewis, please say aye.

(Voice vote.)

REP. SZOKA: Those opposed [inaudible] --

REP. MICHAUX: Mr. Chairman, I thought you were going to call the ayes and noes.

REP. SZOKA: Again, it was my mistake earlier that that was for the previous vote, which was cancelled, which I asked here again. If you -- are you calling division, sir?

REP. MICHAUX: Yes, I am.

REP. SZOKA: All right. The clerk will call the roll.

THE CLERK: Representative Jackson?

REP. JACKSON: Aye.

THE CLERK: Representative Stevens?
REP. STEVENS: Yes.
THE CLERK: Representative Stevens, yes -- Representative Stevens, aye. Representative Bell?
REP. BELL: Aye.
THE CLERK: Representative Bell, aye. Representative Brawley?
REP. BRAWLEY: Aye.
THE CLERK: Representative Brawley, aye. Representative Brockman?
REP. BROCKMAN: No.
THE CLERK: Representative Brockman, no. Representative Burr?
REP. BURR: Aye.
THE CLERK: Representative Burr, aye. Representative Davis?
REP. DAVIS: Yes.
THE CLERK: Representative Davis, aye. Representative Dixon?
REP. DIXON: Aye.
THE CLERK: Representative Dixon, aye. Representative Dobson?
REP. DOBSON: Aye.
THE CLERK: Representative Dobson, aye.

Representative Dulin?

REP. DULIN: Aye.

THE CLERK: Representative Dulin, aye.

Representative Farmer-Butterfield?

REP. FARMER-BUTTERFIELD: No.

THE CLERK: Representative Farmer-Butterfield, no. Representative Floyd?

REP. FLOYD: No.

THE CLERK: Representative Floyd, no.

Representative Garrison?

REP. GARRISON: No.

THE CLERK: Representative Garrison, no.

Representative Gill?

REP. GILL: No.

THE CLERK: Representative Gill, no.

Representative Grange?

REP. GRANGE: Aye.

THE CLERK: Representative Grange, aye.

Representative Hall?

REP. HALL: Aye.

THE CLERK: Representative Hall, aye.

Representative Hanes?

REP. HANES: No.

THE CLERK: Representative Hanes, no.

Representative Hardister?

REP. HARDISTER: Aye.

THE CLERK: Representative Hardister, aye. Representative Harrison?

REP. HARRISON: No.

THE CLERK: Representative Harrison, no. Representative Hastings?

REP. HASTINGS: Aye.

THE CLERK: Representative Hastings, aye. Representative Howard?

REP. HOWARD: Aye.

THE CLERK: Representative Howard, aye. Representative Hunter?

REP. HUNTER: No.

THE CLERK: Representative Hunter, no. Representative Hurley?

REP. HURLEY: Aye.

THE CLERK: Representative Hurley, aye. Representative Johnson?

REP. JOHNSON: Aye.

THE CLERK: Representative Johnson, aye. Representative Jones?

REP. JONES: Aye.

THE CLERK: Representative Jones, aye. Representative Jordan?

REP. JORDAN: Aye.

THE CLERK: Representative Jordan, aye. Representative Malone?

REP. MALONE: Aye.

THE CLERK: Representative Malone, aye. Representative Michaux?

REP. MICHAUX: No.

THE CLERK: Representative Michaux, no. Representative Moore?

REP. MOORE: No.

THE CLERK: Representative Moore, no. Representative Pierce?

REP. PIERCE: No.

THE CLERK: Representative Pierce, no. Representative Reives?

REP. REIVES: No.

THE CLERK: Representative Reives, no. Representative Willingham?

REP. WILLINGHAM: No.

THE CLERK: Representative Willingham, no. Representative Speciale?

REP. SPECIALE: No.

THE CLERK: Representative Speciale, no. Representative Rogers?

REP. ROGERS: Aye.

THE CLERK: Representative Rogers, aye.

Representative Saine?

REP. SAINE: Aye.

THE CLERK: Representative Saine, aye. Representative Wray?

REP. WRAY: No.

THE CLERK: Representative Wray, no. Representative Yarborough?

REP. YARBOROUGH: Aye.

THE CLERK: Representative Yarborough, aye. Representative Torbett?

REP. TORBETT: Aye.

THE CLERK: Representative Torbett, aye. Representative Lewis?

REP. LEWIS: Aye.

THE CLERK: Representative Lewis, aye. Representative Dollar?

REP. DOLLAR: Aye.

THE CLERK: Representative Dollar, aye. Representative Szoka?

REP. SZOKA: Aye.

THE CLERK: Representative Szoka, aye.

REP. SZOKA: Five out of -- 25 in the affirmative and 16 in negative. The motion passes. Thank you all for your attendance today. I know we were gone a little long. Representative Jackson?

REP. JACKSON: If I could ask a question, Mr. Chairman, about next week?

REP. SZOKA: Going to be be directed to -- I yield the chair to Representative Lewis.

REP. LEWIS: The gentleman may state his inquiry.

REP. JACKSON: Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman. I was just wondering if we will go through the same process again when the senate map crosses over or if that will just be done on the floor or we'll have to bring it back through and do amendments and stuff like that? I'm just planning for next week. That's all.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you for the question, Representative Jackson. The House rules that a bill received from the Senate is heard in the House Committee, so yes, we will hear the Senate plan in this Committee next week. The Senate -- I do not know -- and I would state for the record that -- I know the speaker made this same comment yesterday. We have the court reporter here today -- that we did have -- we did have consultation with you and also with Representative Bell that in lieu of having a session tomorrow that the House would do both its second and third readings on Monday.

I don't know what the Senate has agreed to. I do not know if the plan will arrive today or if it will arrive on Monday, but as soon as it arrives, we'll refer it to Committee and we will hear the bill. And depending on the day it arrives, the House will either take up the -- the Senate plan on Tuesday and Wednesday or Wednesday and Thursday, depending on when it arrives. And that answer, of course, assumes that we don't do second and third on the same day. Are there further inquiries for the Chair?

REP. FLOYD: Question, Representative Lewis.

REP. LEWIS: What purpose -- the gentleman, Representative Floyd may state his inquiry?

REP. FLOYD: Inquire. So that may be a Tuesday and Wednesday session next week?

REP. LEWIS: There will absolute -- there will absolutely be session on Tuesday and Wednesday of next week. I do not know if will take votes on two separate days. But, again, the goal is to have this ratified by the court deadline of September 1st, which is Friday. I think we'll -- if all goes to plan and it really does, we will beat the

court's deadline by one day.

REP. FLOYD: Thank you.

REP. LEWIS: Before we adjourn, I -- I do want to thank each and every one of you for your time today. I want to thank -- and I'm going to say this on the floor. The one thing that I think all of us can agree on, despite the divided votes, is how fortunate we are to -- I apologize -- to be served by great staff. This is a -- this has been a long day; for all our central staff, it's been a long week, for our sergeant-at-arms staff as well. So I will certainly thank them all on the server, but I think it was entirely appropriate to thank them from this -- from this chair as well.

Is there any further business for the Committee or any other inquires to the chair? The chair sees no one seeking recognition. This Committee, having completed its business, stands adjourned.

(End of proceedings.)

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

COUNTY OF WAKE

CERTIFICATION OF TRANSCRIPT

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript of proceedings held on August 25, 2017, is a true and accurate transcript of the proceedings as transcribed by me or under my supervision. I further certify that I am not related to any party or attorney, nor do I have any interest whatsoever in the outcome of this action.

This 5th day of September, 2017.

Robbie W. Worley

EX. 19

GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF NORTH CAROLINA

2017 LEGISLATIVE SESSION, SENATE FLOOR

SENATE BILL 691 SECOND READING

FRIDAY, AUGUST 25, 2017

Reported by:

Denise Myers Byrd, CSR 8340, RPR

Discovery Court Reporters and

Legal Videographers, LLC

4208 Six Forks Road

Suite 1000

Raleigh, North Carolina 27609

(919) 424-8242

denise@discoverydepo.com

[Reporter's Note: Proceedings in this session began at 10:27 a.m.]

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: The Senate will come to order. Sergeant-at-Arms will close the doors. Members will go to their seats. Members and guests will please silence all electronic devices.

Leading the Senate in prayer is Senator Jerry Tillman of Randolph County. All members and guests will please stand.

SENATOR TILLMAN: Thank you, Mr. President.

Ladies and gentlemen of the Senate, let us enter into a moment of prayer, please. I like to begin prayers, especially in our caucus and in other places, with a good bible verse, and I picked this one out for my good friend Reverend Lowe back there. I'm hoping one day, when he preaches again in Randolph County, he will preach on maybe -- maybe he can use this verse as a sermon title.

It's a verse I like from the Old Testament: Unless the Lord buildeth the house, those who would build it laboreth in vain. Lord we pray that you will be our foundation through

the life we build and the homes we build; that we will build it on you and the spiritual lessons that you have taught us through the Good Book. Guide and direct our thinking today, Lord, that you will be here in our midst to help us to do the work of the people and to do it with your blessings and your foundation. Oh, God, we pray in Christ's name. Amen.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Pate is recognized for a motion.

SENATOR PATE: Thank you, Mr. President.

The journal of August 24, 2017, has been examined and found to be correct. I move that we dispense with the reading of the journal and that it stand approved as written.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Without objection, the journal for August 24, 2017, stands approved as written.

Members' leaves of absence are requested and, without objection, are granted for Senators Cook, Jim Davis, Meredith, Tarte and Woodard.

Members, courtesies of the Chamber are extended to Denise Myers Byrd of Discovery Court

Reporters and Legal Videographers.

And also, Members, in the Chamber is former Senator Buck Newton. I saw him a little bit ago. Senator Newton, if you're still here -- in the back of the Chamber. Thank you for being with us today.

And with that, Members, unless there's something else, we'll go straight to the calendar.

SENATOR RABIN: Mr. President.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Rabin, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR RABIN: A motion, please.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: State your motion.

SENATOR RABIN: Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, we move to reconsider House Bill 140, Dental Plans Provider Contracts and Transparency, and House Bill 770, Various Clarifying Changes to Tuesday's floor calendar. That's August 29th.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Without objection --

SENATOR RABIN: Mr. President, also

move to suspend the rules and staff be allowed to sit with Senator Hise for today.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Without objection, so ordered.

Senate Bill 691. The clerk will read.

THE CLERK: Senate Bill 691, 2017 Senate Redistricting Committee Plan.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: And Senator Hise is recognized, but before he's recognized, Members, we also have a single volunteer page with us today. He was up here. Tanner Minton is a volunteer page today. He is Senator Randleman's grandson.

And Senator Hise is recognized to speak on to explain Senate Bill 691.

SENATOR HISE: Thank you, Mr. President.

Members of the Committee, there are a lot of individuals and staff and others and our committee members on the redistricting put a lot of hours in between in a definitely compressed timeline given to us by the Courts in order to get these maps to you today and be able to get them through the process before the deadline September 1st. I want to start by saying that I

am very grateful to all of them for the work they put into this.

The maps that you have in front of you that were amended in committee yesterday, we began by establishing criteria on which those maps would be drawn, and the maps that you have presented meet those criteria. Just to go through them briefly, what you have, and everyone should have, a printout copy of this, actually. I know there may be some challenges for how this works on the dashboard, but the full map that would be entitled 2017 Senate Redistricting Committee Plan.

First is equal population. You will see in your stat pack that each one of these 50 districts fall within the plus or minus 5 percent of the ideal population that is established by the Courts.

The contiguity, you'll find that each of these maps have contiguous borders with districts around them.

County groupings and traversals, which is probably the most complex of this and may have caused consternation. The rules for county groupings and transversals were established in

Stephenson one and have been affirmed in many other cases. This is a requirement that we group counties into the smallest number of counties possible that would form a whole number of senators within that district. This map follows the county groupings formula that we've released several weeks ago. We have asked on multiple occasions for anyone who could submit a more optimal county grouping process, and I believe that none exist and we have received none in the committee.

Compactness. The committee adopted as a guide for compactness Reock and Polsby-Popper scores for drawing legislative districts that appear. The reason these two are selected, these methods and scores were adopted as a guide is because they're the only ones that have been cited by the Courts as being relevant to judging the compactness of districts. So when we look at previous court rulings, these are the two measures that determine compactness.

The scores themselves lead to a minimum for Reock of .15 and a minimum for Polsby-Popper of .05, and you will find that all of the districts that are there meet those scores as

well as the stated goal of this. This plan improves the compactness of the districts as a whole that is coming in, and the 2011 Senate Plan -- compared to the 2011 Senate Plan and also fares against any -- well against any maps that have been produced by the Senate over the last two decades.

The next one, fewer split precincts. In response to public comment and others, the committee adopted criteria to lower the number of split precincts, which is what you will find in this map. The 2011 Senate Plan split 257 precincts. The plan that you have before you now only splits 9 precincts. Two of those were retained from the New Hanover County, the districts that were not redrawn. Two were made to avoid double-bunking of senators. The other splits were made in place that has zero population divide which would improve the compactness score or to follow a new precinct line that has been established since 2011.

Municipal boundaries. The next criteria the committee was asked to consider municipal boundaries when drawing legislative districts. Across this state, this plan splits

just 25 municipalities in places where there is a population or the city does not naturally cross a county line. Municipal boundaries are by no means compact or limited under annexation to even county borders which makes that a little more complex, but by any measure, this plan splits fewer municipalities than the one adopted in 2011 and fares historically well against senate plans adopted by the General Assembly over the last two decades.

Next is incumbency protection criteria adopted by the committee. The map, in effect, does double-bunk eight members. Three pairs are Republicans and one cross-party pair. No pairs of the minority party were double-bunked in these maps.

Senator Randleman, Senator Ballard were double-bunked by the necessity of their county grouping. Senator Krawiec and newly elect Senator Barrett were double-bunked by necessity within their county grouping. Senator Alexander and Senator Barefoot were double-bunked in Wake County; however, it was made known to the committee that Senator Barefoot announced that he does not intend to run for reelection. And

Senator Smith-Ingram and Senator Cook were also double-bunked by necessity of the county groupings.

Election data. We did consider political considerations in election data results. In drawing these, you have the report of each of the ten races from 2010 senate, 2012 presidential, governor, lieutenant governor, 2014 senate, and 2016 senate, governor, lieutenant governor and attorney general. You will have the results of each of those races as part of your stat pack.

And importantly, the last consideration would be that there would be no consideration of racial data. Data identifying the race of individuals was not used in the drawing of these maps. It was not used to assign voters to a particular district on the basis of their race.

It complies with all of the committees' criteria and, most importantly, now complies with the court order. I would ask for y'all to support it and would be more than happy to answer any questions.

Sorry, Mr. President. I do have a technical amendment, if that would be possible.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Send forward your amendment. The clerk will read.

THE CLERK: Senator Hise moves to amend the bill.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Hise is recognized to explain the amendment.

SENATOR HISE: Thank you, Mr. President.

Members of the Committee, apparently when transcribing this map for the new PCS, one of the line numbers was picked up in the copying and added in, so there's an extra 27 on Page 4. This would simply remove that.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Further discussion or debate on Amendment 1. Hearing none, the question before the Senate is the passage of Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 691. All in favor of the amendment will vote "aye," all opposed will vote "no." Five seconds will be allowed for the vote. The clerk will record the vote.

Senator Barrett "aye"; Senator Dunn "aye"; Senator Smith-Ingram "aye"; Senator Waddell "aye."

45 having voted in the affirmative and

none in the negative, Amendment 1 passes and the bill is back before you. Further discussion or debate on Senate Bill 691.

Senator Blue, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR BLUE: To send forth an amendment.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Send forward your amendment. And, Senator Blue, my understanding is you have two amendments on the deck already. If you can identify which one.

SENATOR BLUE: I will. Thank you very much, Mr. President. It is ATC-122, Version 1, looks like, the Wake County amendment.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: The clerk will read.

THE CLERK: Senator Blue moves to amend the bill.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: And Senator Blue is recognized to explain the amendment.

SENATOR BLUE: Thank you very much, Mr. President.

The committee yesterday, and I appreciated it, adopted an amendment that we had done involving just two districts in Wake County,

Senator Chaudhuri's district and the district that I represent.

And what the amendment failed to do was accurately reflect the precincts that we thought had been transferred. This corrects it. It only involves those two districts. It's been reviewed. I've talked to Senator Hise about it, and basically it's technical in nature, but pulls in the precincts that we thought were being pulled in in the Senate amendment yesterday afternoon. I move adoption of the amendment, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Further discussion or debate on Amendment 2.

Senator Bishop, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR BISHOP: To ask Senator Blue a question, if he'll yield.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Blue, do you yield?

SENATOR BLUE: I yield.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: He yields.

SENATOR BISHOP: Senator Blue, you and I had some interplay -- discussion yesterday in the committee meeting about your amendment that

was adopted then. I wanted to ask at this point do you remain convinced that the Wake County districts as further amended by your proposed amendment are not racial gerrymanders?

SENATOR BLUE: Not who gerrymandering? Racial gerrymandering?

SENATOR BISHOP: Yes, not racial gerrymandering.

SENATOR BLUE: They are not racially gerrymandering. And as I explained in the committee, I think that the way that Wake County is cures the gerrymander that the Court found in Wake County, and the only other avenue for it to be a racial gerrymander is if you used -- if you used race in order to get a political gerrymander. That's the way you would analyze it. And I think given the makeup of the districts in Wake County that you cure the racial gerrymander problem, and I don't think you have a political gerrymander in Wake County.

SENATOR BISHOP: May I follow up?

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Blue, do you yield for a follow-up?

SENATOR BLUE: I yield.

SENATOR BISHOP: Do you believe that

the districts in Wake County, as you would further amend them by this amendment, are legal under all applicable legal theories?

SENATOR BLUE: Again, I think that with the interchange of precincts, and they're all whole precincts, between the two districts that the committee had drawn that were Democratic districts more adequately cures the racial gerrymander.

Again, I have not done a total analysis of whether or not you've got a political gerrymander, but as I told you in the committee yesterday, I think the creation of District 16 as a competitive district, and it looks like a Democratic-leaning district, cures the foundation on which one would probably bring a political gerrymander claim, but the map still has high numbers of Democrats in a district and Republicans in a district, separate districts, and the way that the map is drawn has two strong Democrat, two strong Republican and it looks like a competitive leaning Democratic district.

And so from the chatter that I've heard about this area, you probably couldn't sustain that there's a political gerrymander specifically

in Wake County, but it does -- it does not address the broader issue of whether the map as a whole is a political gerrymander. You can't do that without analyzing all of the districts statewide.

SENATOR BISHOP: Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Further discussion or debate.

Senator Hise, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR HISE: Speak to the amendment.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: You have the floor.

SENATOR HISE: Thank you, Mr. President.

Members of the Committee, we discussed this quite a bit in committee yesterday and as well as had several conversations with Senator Blue. It is my determination that these maps were not drawn with the consideration of race, but, however, Senator Blue's knowledge of certain communities and where they fit and his claim that this would not -- would alleviate or would not create a racial gerrymander in Wake County.

Coming in, I would ask that the Members of the Senate would support this clarifying amendment to what was proposed yesterday.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Further discussion or debate on Amendment 2. Hearing none, the question before the Senate is the passage of Amendment 2, Senate Bill 691. All in favor will vote "aye," all opposed will vote "no." Five seconds will be allowed for the voting. The clerk will record the vote.

45 having voted in the affirmative and none in the negative, Amendment 2 passes and the bill is back before you.

Further discussion or debate on Senate Bill 691. Further discussion or debate on Senate Bill 691.

Senator Robinson, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR ROBINSON: To send forth an amendment.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Send forward your amendment. The clerk will read.

THE CLERK: Senator Robinson moves to amend the bill.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Robinson

is recognized to explain the amendment.

SENATOR ROBINSON. Thank you, Mr. President.

Ladies and gentlemen, you have before you on the dashboard an amendment for the way Guilford County, specifically Senate Districts 27, 28, and I believe 26 is in there somewhere, are drawn.

The approach to this was to develop districts that comply foremost with the state and federal law, particularly remedying the constitutional flaws that were found by the Court in the present districts we have. The Court specifically found that the violations included Senate District 28 which takes in part of Guilford County. And you can see that because every reference that you have heard about shape, different from what Senator Hise said yesterday in committee that there were no comments about shape, but in the comments in Guilford County, it was specifically about shape. And Senate District 28 is the one that was pointed out in terms of why the shape.

The proposal here remedies that violation and includes due consideration of the

factors adopted by the Redistricting Committee. This mapping proposal is more compact than the original map in 2011 that was invalidated by the Court as well as the proposal for the county that was just released by your Republican majority.

What seems to be the driving consideration, however, of your map in this county cluster is the maintenance of incumbents in their own districts. Your map also split more precincts, one of which was 3 which was a high voting precinct that's African American mostly.

The placement of incumbents in this county makes for a possible conflict of considerations like compactness. This amendment, however, maintains each incumbent in a single district, but it achieves a more normal shape.

Senate District 28, Guilford County, invalidated, in the Court's opinion, has a more compact shape under this amendment both in comparison to the 2011 map where we are currently serving and in the one you proposed. To accommodate the concern of keeping incumbents separated, however, sacrifices were made for compactness. Rather than wrap around almost the entirety of my district, Senate District 28,

which your map does, as this map has a more normal shape. This map addresses racial gerrymandering as required by the Courts.

While this committee -- your Redistricting Committee takes a surprising view that race should not be a consideration, we think it's noteworthy that this version of Senate 28 drawn here has a black voting age population that is lower than both the original 2011 unconstitutional plan and the Republican proposal.

According to the State's measures, the BVP is approximately 45 percent of this map as opposed to yours which was 50.52 percent. And in response to the overwhelming views expressed during public hearings, the districts were drawn with the goal of creating competitive districts. The voters have a chance to select their candidates and the outcome is not preordained.

There are many ways to have achieved a more compact plan in Guilford that is both fair to the voters and consistent with constitutional standards. Unfortunately, your map simply attempts to nuck and tuck your way to legality. That is not a good strategy to achieve court

compliance.

I recommend the amendment for your approval and your support.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Bishop, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR BISHOP: To ask Senator Robinson a question, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Robinson, do you yield?

SENATOR ROBINSON: I do.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: She yields.

SENATOR BISHOP: Senator Robinson, I have little expertise in drawing maps. I was intrigued by your first point that the shape -- I believe you said the shape of 28 is more normal under your map. Could you explain what you mean?

Well, let me say -- let me preface the question with saying that if I look at 28 on the map proposed by the majority and I look at the 28 on your map, they look similar to me. If I were to describe what that Rorschach block looks like, I'd say it looks sort of like a bird, but in either event, the same structure of it just seems similar. It's got -- yours has squiggly lines with outcroppings. It has the two sort of wing

structures.

Can you explain to the body what you mean when you say it has a more normal shape.

SENATOR ROBINSON: Sure.

Mr. President --

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: You may answer.

SENATOR ROBINSON: Senator Bishop, I don't know where you get your context from. However, if you compare this map with the one of the redistricting, you will see that the far left end curves farther up than the map that we propose.

Now, what I indicated in my presentation, too, is that -- and if you want to look at the VTDs, you'll see which ones have been dropped off, have been eliminated if you look at the data, and so that makes it more compact. And if we are looking at compactness according to criteria, then it requires both for Senate District 27 and 28 when you don't want to double-bunk incumbents, according to your criteria as well, that this map would still have somewhat of a partial circular shape.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Bishop, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR BISHOP: Ask a further question.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Robinson, do you yield?

SENATOR ROBINSON: Yes.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: She yields.

SENATOR BISHOP: So if I understand, the nature of the normal shape, though, is that it doesn't -- yours doesn't rise as much on the left; is that correct?

SENATOR ROBINSON: Do you see that?

SENATOR BISHOP: I see that it doesn't rise as much on the left. And you're saying that that means it's more normal.

SENATOR ROBINSON: I'm saying it's more compact.

SENATOR BISHOP: Further question, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Robinson, do you yield?

SENATOR ROBINSON: Yes.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: She yields.

SENATOR BISHOP: And does the map of Guilford County, as drawn in your amendment, split more municipalities?

SENATOR ROBINSON: The map splits -- your map splits High Point -- splits High Point and -- yeah, we split one other, Jamestown, in addition to High Point. And then you've split the far right end. As a matter of fact, your map splits a precinct that our map does not. Your map splits a major voting precinct.

SENATOR BISHOP: Further follow up.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Bishop asks if you yield for another question, Senator Robinson.

SENATOR ROBINSON: Yes, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: She yields.

SENATOR BISHOP: Do you split Summerfield?

SENATOR ROBINSON: My map does not. I need to look at it, but I'm pretty sure it doesn't.

SENATOR BISHOP: How about Kernersville?

SENATOR ROBINSON: Summerfield -- wait a minute. Wait a minute. Let me look at a VTD. No, it doesn't.

SENATOR BISHOP: Further question, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Robinson, do you yield?

SENATOR ROBINSON: Yes.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: She yields.

SENATOR BISHOP: I think I just asked about Kernersville. Do you split Summerfield?

SENATOR ROBINSON: I said no.

SENATOR BISHOP: Further question.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Robinson, do you yield?

SENATOR ROBINSON: Yes.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: She yields.

SENATOR BISHOP: So you're telling this body that this map only splits one more municipality that the majority map; is that correct?

SENATOR ROBINSON: Based on the VTDs that are listed here, most are in Greensboro. And I do know my voting precincts in Guilford County. High Point and then Jamestown is split between 27 and 28.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Bishop.

SENATOR BISHOP: A further question for Senator Robinson.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Robinson,

do you yield?

SENATOR ROBINSON: Yes.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: She yields.

SENATOR BISHOP: Were you involved in the preparation of this map, Senator Robinson?

SENATOR ROBINSON: Yes.

SENATOR BISHOP: Follow up, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Robinson, do you yield?

SENATOR ROBINSON: Yes.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: She yields.

SENATOR BISHOP: Did you work with Kareem Crayton also in the development of this map?

SENATOR ROBINSON: I worked with Senator McKissick. I believe he worked with Kareem Crayton.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Bishop.

SENATOR BISHOP: I have a follow-up question, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Robinson, do you yield?

SENATOR ROBINSON: Yes.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: She yields.

SENATOR BISHOP: You said that the black voting population of the map as amended is 45 percent.

SENATOR ROBINSON: Yes. A little less maybe.

SENATOR BISHOP: A little less?

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Further question?

SENATOR BISHOP: Yes, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Robinson, do you yield?

SENATOR ROBINSON: Yes, I do.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: She yields.

SENATOR BISHOP: What evidence did you rely upon to target that particular level of black voting population?

SENATOR ROBINSON: Senator Bishop, I relied on my own experience. The Senate District 28, based on the current district and the way you did it, is packed with African Americans. And I know the precincts. So it doesn't take a whole lot of research for me to know. Plus, I can look at the data.

Now, the Court said -- and I was sitting in the court -- when the issue was about racial gerrymandering, and that's exactly what

you did. So if you talk about racial gerrymandering, you are automatically talking about how many black folk did you pack. So you're a lawyer; you ought to know.

SENATOR BISHOP: Follow-up question, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Robinson, do you yield?

SENATOR ROBINSON: Yes.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: She yields.

SENATOR BISHOP: Other than your personal experience, did you have any other evidence concerning racially polarized voting that you used in deciding to target that district at 45 percent?

SENATOR ROBINSON: Senator Bishop, I have the racial compositions of every precinct, every district, et cetera, and you ought to have it too. So it's very easy to look to see what the percentage of voting age populations by race is in this state.

SENATOR BISHOP: Further question, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Robinson, do you yield?

SENATOR ROBINSON: Yes.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: She yields.

SENATOR BISHOP: Yes, ma'am. I'm not suggesting that the data is unavailable to determine how many voters of what a particular race might be in a district if someone sought that information.

The question I asked is do you have evidence about racially polarized voting beyond what was available to this body when it last redistricted which you used in making the decision to target at 45 percent.

SENATOR ROBINSON: Let me say, I said to you earlier that I worked with Senator McKissick who worked with Dr. Crayton in developing the prospectus behind this, so that should have been sufficient.

SENATOR BISHOP: No more questions.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Further discussion or debate on Amendment 3.

Senator Hise, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR HISE: Speak to the amendment.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: You have the floor.

SENATOR HISE: Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. A few things that I felt like I wanted to address.

I think it's clear to any analysis or anyone that says the district drawn in 28 here in the new map is different and then the one in the 2011 map, it is different than the one in this amendment that is coming forward.

The analysis being used to say that it racially gerrymanders is somebody looked at it and says, well, it kind of looks the same, and since it kind of looks the same, we say it must be a racial gerrymander, ignoring the fact that the Greensboro city limits also continued to look the same for all three maps and none of that area has been changed.

It's also being claimed that there is a split precinct. That is absolutely not accurate. There is a voter tabulation district that existed in 2011 that has been changed to reflect new precincts that now exist in Guilford County, and the borderline is now drawn along the new precinct line. As voter tabulation districts no longer exist in that process and new precincts are in place, we follow precinct boundaries.

Most importantly, it violates the criteria set by the committee that we would not sort voters on the basis of race. Not only does it violate that criteria, we heard in committee yesterday that it goes one step forward by selecting a very specific target on race based on one person's opinion and what they thought would be good and basically made the purpose of we're going to draw the race to that new target, something the Courts have clearly determined is not allowed in racial gerrymanders.

Had someone had done an actual study of racially polarized voting and the result of that had to come out to this number and presented that to the committee, we may be inclined to follow that number and draw the districts in that manner. That did not occur. This is based on a single individual's opinion that is there.

I will also say that the analysis of our staff of this from yesterday is that it splits seven municipalities that was coming up when you look at the municipal borders compared to the previous map that split four municipalities, so it would increase the number of split municipalities by three.

For those reasons that it fails to follow the criteria established by the committee, I would ask that you reject the amendment.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Further discussion or debate.

Senator Blue, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR BLUE: For a statement.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: You have the floor.

SENATOR BLUE: Thank you, Mr. President.

I would just like to refocus our attention on two things relating to this particular district. In the Courts' decision, both at the -- after the United States Supreme Court ruled on these districts, the three-judge panel, consisting of two District Court judges and a Court of Appeals judge, said that this body, once redistricting was done, would inform the Court as to any district where the BVAP, meaning black voter age population, exceeded 50 percent.

Now, in order to answer the Court's question, you've got to look and see whether any

of these nine districts exceed 50 percent BVAP. And that's common sense. The Court says tell me on any of the districts that you do why it went beyond 50 percent.

This district goes beyond 50 percent black population, black BVAP, as I understand it. And so the Court is going to require in the submission that you explain why that is. And if you tell the Court, well, lady and gentlemen of the Court, I don't know that it went beyond 50 percent because I didn't look at race in determining how to cure what you told me had to cure. We're going to look sort of strange saying that. Now, maybe the Court will believe it, maybe there's some explanation, but the Court is also going to look at the fact that the fellow who drew this district drew the unconstitutional district in 2011.

And although, as we get older our memories aren't what they are when we were younger, and maybe his has changed tremendously over six years, but I'm sure that if I were redoing the job, I would go back and look at my notes and I'd go back and look at why I did things the way that I did them, especially since

the Court is going to want to know how.

If you look at the map of 2011 and you superimpose on it the map of 2017 that is before you now, this amendment, a third grader, or even a three-year-old, can tell you that they're very similar in outline. And so if the same person drew them, the Court is going to imply that it was the same intent in the way that you drew it, and so now you explain to me why it's like this, why isn't that a reasonable conclusion.

And I'm just being honest with you in the way that you would approach somebody who told you. The design of the map in 2011 in this district looks eerily close to the design of the map in 2017.

So what Senator Robinson was trying to do in changing the 1st, taking it below 50 percent, so that unless something called it to the Court's attention in another way, it didn't have to be explained further.

What we've tried to do is give you some indication as to how you cure these gerrymanders. Not trying to gain partisan advantage, not trying to gain racial advantage, but at the end of the day, it is a Court, the third branch of

government, which interprets what we do and what laws do across the country that tells us what they want to see in order to determine that this problem that they've identified has been fixed.

All Senator Robinson has tried to do is fix it, and so the BVAP goes from 50 point whatever it is in the Senate plan down to 45, I think you said, in this plan. And that's simply saying that this is how we propose that you fix the gerrymander.

Oddly enough, oddly enough, in the Alabama case which gave rise to all of this litigation that went to the Supreme Court, in the Court's opinion, when it went back to the three-judge court in Alabama -- one member of whom, by the way, was one of the top three contenders to be appointed to the U.S. Supreme Court by President Trump. When it went back to the Alabama three-judge panel, Federal Court, the reason that they determined that there weren't gerrymanders or that some of them had been fixed is because the members representing some of those districts had agreed that this is a reasonable percentage for this plurality black district.

I keep saying again that the magic of

this place is that when we all work together, you can fix these problems, but you need to listen to the opinions of the folk who got 190,000 people in their districts, just like you've got 190,000 in your districts. That's the whole beauty of this legislature, at least the concept behind it that you bring people together from different backgrounds and different places and they work through the things that vex the state.

And so that's how the 45 percent makes sense, Senator Bishop. Because in the Alabama case, some senators had districts that went in excess of 60 percent African American, but because they agreed with the redistricting folk, they were able to design those districts and have an impact in the districts around them.

And those who are really interested in the political angle so much, I really do believe that we ought not play politics so deeply in this, but those who really believe in a political angle -- in Alabama they still ended up with huge majorities of Republicans, but they worked through it, again, because the members decided that this is not a gerrymander based on my experience with this district, and that is what

Senator Robinson was trying to share with you. That's it in a nutshell.

And in Guilford County, a county with half a million people, in Guilford County with two complete senate districts and then part of two other counties pulled in, there are plenty of other ways that you can shape the remaining three districts to try to accomplish whatever your ends are other than having districts that are competitive. But at least you fix the gerrymander in Guilford County that the Court at the Supreme Court level has said exists, and you save millions and millions and millions of taxpayer dollars from defending the undefensible -- the indefensible. That's the only point that she's trying to make.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Hise.

SENATOR HISE: See if Senator Blue will yield for a question.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Blue, do you yield?

SENATOR BLUE: Yes, sir, I yield.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: He yields.

SENATOR HISE: Thank you, Senator Blue. On multiple occasions now you or other members

have stated what the percentage of the black voting age population is in a particular district. And as you're aware, the committee as a whole has not seen that information and others, and I would ask simply what is your source for that information and are you planning to submit that at some point?

SENATOR BLUE: Thank you for that question, Senator Hise. I thought that it was part of the stat pack that had been submitted with these plans. It should have been. Because in order for them to analyze the districts the way they analyzed them, you had to know what the racial data was. And it's an attempt on the part of these members to address the particular racial gerrymander.

So, yes, race was looked at in these -- the only way I could determine that there was -- that the racial gerrymander in Wake County has been fixed is in looking at what the Court said was a racial gerrymander. In Wake County, the Court said that it was a racial gerrymander when the African American percentage in the district that I represent exceeded 41 percent because that had never been necessary. When the 2003

redistricting occurred, the BVAP was somewhere in the 40, 41 percent area. And I did not draw the senate district that I represent.

And so one of the ways that you do the Gingles analysis, which is the case that's controlling in a Section 2 case, which Wake County would have been, it was not a Section 5 county, that is, anything in happening in Wake County didn't have to get pre-cleared under Section 4 of the Voting Rights Act which was declared unconstitutional by the U.S. Supreme Court. We are a Section 2 county, as every county in the United States is.

And so the standard by which racial gerrymanders are determined under Section 2 is a case called Gingles, a North Carolina case, that was decided in 1984 that basically made us divide North Carolina into single-member districts across the state, at least started the process. And Gingles says there are three factors that have to be satisfied before you can use race in the drawing of a legislative, congressional, municipality, any kind of district, water district or anything.

You have to show, number one, that

there's enough compactness to draw a district.

Number two, you have to show that there's polarization among the non-minority voters so that they won't vote for an African American or a member of the minority.

And number three, you have to show a cohesiveness within those groups so that the minority can elect their candidate of choice. It doesn't have to be a minority candidate, but it has to be a candidate who's a choice of the minorities who live in that district so they have some influence on who's being elected.

And so in 2003, the Court looked at it, the State Supreme Court, by the way, looked at it and said that these Gingles factors exist in these districts that you just looked at. So they decided to set Wake County at the 40, 41 percent level. It was not a majority district. Said in some of the counties they went over 50 percent because of voting history and voting records. That's how these percentages were set.

In looking at it, the 2011 Redistricting Plan took Wake County from 41 to 50 plus percent African American in that district. There was no justification for it. First, there

was no disparity voting study done, but secondly, there was no justification anyhow because the district had been electing a minority in it before you used race for ten years. And so the Court would have determined that that is a sufficient level. And if you exceed that, then you got to have some compelling reason for having done it because the remedy, once you find it, under Gingles is, yes, you can use race, you can use race to determine how this district ought to look, but it's got to be narrowly tailored, that is, you've got to use the least intrusive method considering race that is possible to solve this issue that you got because there is a compelling state interest involved.

And so in an analysis of using Gingles on these districts, which is what the Court did, they said that you haven't shown this overriding need, but the Court also said -- the trial court also said we're not saying that you can't look at some of these districts to determine whether you ought to do it.

Now, you can do it with studies or you can do it with the members who represent those districts. You didn't have to spend tens of

millions of dollars to do these disparity studies. It's all about consulting with the people who represent them who can tell you what they're about.

In the trial, I think the Court asked a congressman in at least the congressional -- no, in the state case, asked a congressman who represented one of the congressional districts what do you think at least in your area part of the reasonable minority participation ought to be. It was not in urban North Carolina. He said maybe, you know, what you can achieve with 46, 47 percent. And they wanted to know because they wanted the feeling of somebody who represented the district.

Remember that the goal ultimately is to get away from the use of race and to make this place race neutral sometime down the road. And so the Court is not going to freeze in place using race to develop these issues. These districts are not paying attention to race to let them exist in perpetuity because that wouldn't be the goal of trying to create a race neutral, colorblind society.

And I think that that's what most of us

want to aspire to, and so that's why they are so sensitive with the way you determine that you've got to use race in developing these districts, and that's what the case is, would at least teach me, and if you read the cases especially through the South that have developed over the last five or six years, I think that that's a fair statement of it.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Hise, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR HISE: Follow up.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Blue, do you yield for a follow-up question?

SENATOR BLUE: Yes, sir. And I apologize. I didn't mean to go as long as I did.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: He yields.

SENATOR HISE: And that's why I was going to try to bring you back to the original question.

So you have requested the racial data from our staff and are planning to submit that?

SENATOR BLUE: Yes, sir. They have -- they have prepared it. I know that it was available yesterday. They have it and can make it available. They can submit it to the -- to

our clerk and she can put it on the dashboard so it's part of the discussion.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Further discussion or debate on Amendment 3.

Senator Bryant, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR BRYANT: To ask Senator Hise a question.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Hise, do you yield for a question?

SENATOR HISE: I yield.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: He yields.

SENATOR BRYANT: Senator Hise, you referenced having some data that correlated the precincts, updated precincts to VTDs, and I was wondering is that available on the website or to members. I've been requesting precinct data for the longest, and all I've been given is VTDs which I've had to try to correlate to precincts as best I can. So is there some data that is available to all of us in that regard?

SENATOR HISE: There is. We can get that put together, the staff can, provide you a precinct listing --

SENATOR BRYANT: That would help me --

SENATOR HISE: -- for a layer, and I think it's a layer for Maptitude as well.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Follow up.

SENATOR BRYANT: I just want to make a comment to say thank you, and that will help the community members who have had trouble making that county correlation. Thank you.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Further discussion or debate on Amendment 3.

SENATOR McKISSICK: Mr. President.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator McKissick, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR McKISSICK: Speak on the amendment.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: You have the floor.

SENATOR McKISSICK: First I would like to thank Senator Robinson for sending forth this amendment. I think it represents a fair, legal and competitive plan for Guilford County, and that's what it's all about, something where voters are provided options when it comes to choices.

And I think the committee, when it first established criteria, failed to include

race as a consideration. By failing to include race as a consideration, it made it impossible without doing detailed independent analysis, which we have certainly done, to determine the black voting age population in these various districts.

When you are looking at a case that was based upon an unconstitutional racial gerrymandering, it is impossible to come up with a cure without considering race or by doing it in a vacuum.

In this particular case you've got a district that was and still remains a majority-minority district. That is something that the Court will scrutinize very, very closely. That could have been avoided had race been one of the variables that was being considered.

The other thing that you failed to do was to write the various priorities in criteria that you established. You know, it's hard for me to know whether splitting municipalities is more important than incumbency. It's hard for me to know whether compactness is more important than the other variables. If you would establish and

write the criteria, it would have been far easier to evaluate plans.

Now the plan that is before you is a very compact plan. Could it have been done differently? Well, yes, it could have been done in a number of ways, but certainly incumbency protection being one of the things that was in the criteria dictated the way this map was drawn, and we respected that criteria in drawing this particular map.

Now, in terms of looking at whether these districts are competitive districts today, I would go and say looking at the political data that was part of the stat pack that they're clearly competitive districts. Of the four districts we're looking at, if you go back and look at the Walter Dalton race when he was running for governor, he would have won only one of those four. If you look at Kay Hagan and Tom Tillis, two of them would have gone for Tillis, two of them would have gone for Hagan.

Those are competitive districts. That's what people want in our state. They want a choice. They want an opportunity they know that when they go in and cast their vote there's

not already a predetermined outcome based upon the way the district lines have been drawn, that they've been gerrymandered perhaps in a partisan way.

In this case there's no admission of considering partisan advantage as part of the criteria, but when you go out and establish incumbency protection and those very incumbents are serving as a result of racially gerrymandered districts as found by the courts, then you have an inevitable outcome where you're protecting the illegal, improper games that occurred as a result of the unconstitutionally racially gerrymandered districts. That's a problem. Incumbency pretty much did that.

If it had not been for incumbency, this district could have been drawn differently and many others. And the thing that of I don't know when it counts and when it doesn't count in the rankings is that we can go down and look at Senator Smith-Ingram and Senator Horner, they are double-bunked. Well, I guess in that situation it was different. I don't know why we don't have over in Guilford County perhaps a double-bunking that could have created some

different districts there.

If the criteria were established in a way that made sense, are there perhaps a few district boundaries and municipalities that are split a little different, I'd be the first to admit a few of them are split a little different, but if we get more competitive districts that the voters want so that they can have a choice to choose their elected representatives rather than we choosing them, then it's the right direction for us to move in.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Bishop, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR BISHOP: To speak to the amendment.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: You have the floor.

SENATOR BISHOP: What I think we hear is that traditional redistricting criteria are being subordinated to a racial target. The target being 45 percent as opposed to 50 percent, I don't believe makes the difference.

Senator McKissick has said several times, well, we could have subordinated incumbency, but we didn't. Okay, that's one.

But another one is keeping municipal boundaries together. And you've decided to subordinate that, splitting more, giving leeway to the criteria that must predominate.

And with all due respect, the Court's opinion is crystal clear that there is a prerequisite for that. And you're right, Senator Blue, it's one of the Gingles criteria. You must have a strong basis in evidence that there is racially polarized voting on a district-by-district basis. And again, with all respect, I don't believe that is provided by the gut of a member who happens to be elected from that district. So this doesn't solve a problem. It does exactly what the three-judge panel and the United States Supreme Court said can't be done.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Further discussion or debate.

Senator Hise, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR HISE: Mr. President, if I could request if we could take a recess for about ten minutes to make sure that we can get the data into the system and up and that we can provide the precinct data that they have asked for before

we continue in the debate.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Without objection, the Senate will stand in recess ten minutes.

Will that be enough, Senator Hise?

SENATOR HISE: That will be enough.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Ten minutes.

(Recess.)

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: The Senate will come to order. Members will return to their seats.

Members, I am advised that the information that was to be loaded onto the computer is also going to be made available in print copy and that will take a little while longer. So without objection, the Senate will stand in recess until 12:00 noon. The Senate stands in recess.

(Recess.)

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: The Senate will come to order.

Members, I believe when we went into recess we were on Amendment 3 and no one at that time had the floor. So with that, is there further discussion or debate on Amendment 3?

Senator Robinson, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR ROBINSON: Thank you, Mr. President. To make a comment. I'd like to -- after some consultation with Senator Hise and Blue, I would like to withdraw the amendment.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: The sponsor of the amendment requests withdrawal of the amendment, and the amendment is withdrawn.

So we are back on the bill, Senate Bill 691. Further discussion or debate.

Senator Hise, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR HISE: See if Senator McKissick will yield for a question.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator McKissick, do you yield?

SENATOR McKISSICK: Yes.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: He yields.

SENATOR HISE: Senator McKissick, I believe that you had -- in the interim there have been some data submitted regarding the districts at your request. I was wondering if you would explain what that data is.

SENATOR McKISSICK: Sure. Data that's

been presented is certainly what I call a complete stat pack dealing with the Mecklenburg County amendment that was introduced yesterday in committee as well as the Guilford County amendment that was entered in committee yesterday. It's identical to the Guilford County amendment that was considered and entered into the record today and is withdrawn by Senator Robinson.

It should provide good comparative data and analysis, including black voting age population as well as the more traditional data that would be included in this type of stat pack, including performance with certain select races that were used as benchmarks, some of which I referred to earlier in my comments related to the discussion in Guilford County.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Further discussion or debate on Senate Bill 691.

Senator Bishop, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR BISHOP: To ask a question of Senator McKissick.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator McKissick, do you yield?

SENATOR McKISSICK: Sure.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: He yields.

SENATOR BISHOP: Thank you, Senator McKissick, for yielding. The data that you furnished, is the source of this data central staff?

SENATOR McKISSICK: Central staff was -- we provided central staff with some of the data. It looks as if when central staff put it on their system everything correlates with what was initially projected.

SENATOR BISHOP: Further question to Senator McKissick.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator McKissick, do you yield?

SENATOR McKISSICK: Yes.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: He yields.

SENATOR BISHOP: In my interchange with Senator Robinson, she made reference to a prospectus, I believe, that you developed together with Dr. Crayton. Is there such a prospectus? Does that documentation exist and have you submitted it as well?

SENATOR McKISSICK: I would not say there's been a prospectus. It was just

discussion and conversation which occurred. There wasn't a written prospectus in terms of a document, just ongoing dialogue and communication, looking at the shape and configuration of the districts, looking at the municipal boundaries, looking at incumbency issues, looking at compactness criteria, looking at what could be done to perhaps make the district somewhat more competitive in Guilford County, to take down the black voting age population below that 50 percent which the Court identified previously as being problematic.

SENATOR BISHOP: One further question for Senator McKissick.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator McKissick, do you yield?

SENATOR McKISSICK: Yes.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: He yields.

SENATOR BISHOP: Would you be willing to submit that data that was furnished to central staff so that anyone who is interested in it could the comparisons that you've indicated you made.

SENATOR McKISSICK: I believe they already have it.

SENATOR BISHOP: I beg your pardon.

SENATOR McKISSICK: I believe central staff already has all that data.

SENATOR BISHOP: One follow-up, then, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator McKissick, do you yield?

SENATOR McKISSICK: Sure.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: He yields.

SENATOR BISHOP: Would you be willing for it to be shared with the membership.

SENATOR McKISSICK: Yes, absolutely. That has been previously authorized, so it should be among the documents that either have been distributed to you or will be distributed to you shortly. And they were available at the time of the committee meeting yesterday.

SENATOR BISHOP: Thank you, Senator.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Further discussion or debate on Senate Bill 691.

Senator Horner, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR HORNER: Mr. President, I rise to speak to the bill.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: You have the

floor.

SENATOR HORNER: I will address the county groupings using solely a mathematical formula. I think that clearly ignores a community of interest that exists throughout our state, and I submit it does a disservice to the people we serve.

Let me share specifically how this formula-driven groupings affect two counties and their communities of interest. My home county of Wilson, it's grouped with Edgecombe and Halifax, and it's split from Nash County.

Senate maps from 1868, a century and a half, 150 years, with the exception of two years. In 2000, the interim Senate plans had put these two counties together. That to me appears to be -- I don't want to be self-serving, but a pretty darn good historical precedent, but the same thing occurs in Beaufort County, Senator Cook's county.

Since 1868, Beaufort County has been connected to Hyde, Tyrell, Dare, or Pamlico, all coastal counties as Beaufort County is, of the inner coast, if you accept that definition of coastal.

The farthest north Beaufort County has ever been was in '84 when it joined Martin. What Beaufort County has in common with Vance, Warren or North Hampton as a current optimal mathematical groupings do is beyond my comprehension. I don't see how anyone can logically say this makes any sense.

As Senator Blue pointed out yesterday in committee, the Season case allows for flexibility in using optimal groupings of counties, but because of the acrimony, I guess, and the fear of rebuke, we can't come together to do our jobs and do these things and overlook these discrepancies that the computer won't take care of. That might be why I don't buy my insurance or my stocks online. I like to look at a man that I can work with and work things out.

But if we let these computers drive these groupings, we're going to have these communities disjointed, and I simply think that it just does a disservice. And it's no one's fault that these groupings are the same, whether it's the current groupings, I think the exact same groupings that Common Cause and Southern Coalition came up with, but they're just computer

groupings. They're blind to the realities of local communities, and that's not -- that just doesn't fit with historical context and the public's interest.

And I believe the people lose. These groupings, they hurt Wilson County and it hurts Beaufort County as well and where they are paired. And for that reason, I can't support this bill. Thank you.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Further discussion or debate.

Senator Bryant, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR BRYANT: I rise to debate the bill.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: You have the floor.

SENATOR BRYANT: I want to discuss the continuing mantra that we've been engaging in about the consideration of race in the redistricting process and the rightness or wrongness of it. And there are three points I think are important to make or that I would like you to hear about that.

I'm assuming that there is some belief

underlying the choice of the criteria that by choosing a criteria to not look at race, that principle itself would somehow eliminate any finding of discrimination or illegal consideration of race or impact of race in these maps. And I would, of course, challenge that belief, that underlying belief.

I don't think just the adoption of a posture of not looking at race or principle to not use race eliminates the negative impact or the potential impact for racism to infect the process when there's so many other proxies for race, as we have been discussing in here are political results, geography, personal knowledge of the area, drawing illegal districts in the same places they existed before.

Many of you have mentioned proxies for -- on considering race, even having a principle that we will not consider race which means we won't consider race data, I guess, by precincts or otherwise in the drawing of the districts and assign people according to that. So I don't believe that principle itself means you're not discriminating, that's number one, and would challenge you to think about that.

Number two is there's a social science dynamic called modern racism or symbolic racism, and it's using a non-race-related posture to continue your advantage from previously using race for a discriminatory result. So having been found to have used race in ways that are unlawful and because they are harmful to the black community in this instance pretty much, you are symbolically turning the tables on us to suggest that we are now being unlawful to use race to correct the problem that harmed us. As you can see, that's a double bind that we could never get out of in order to get relief from the racism we have found to have been experiencing.

And then thirdly, there is a legal principle at stake. In a Texas appellate case involving a voting rights, in that instance there were Latino communities involved in that, the Court was clear that a Section 2 analysis is infected when the offending entity is using traditional redistricting principles that they have prioritized as a way to preclude a meaningful review of the dilutive effect, if any, of those same principles that they have enacted, which is the same circular logic that I was

complaining of in the social science dynamic in number two, in other words, using a non-race-related posture to preclude us from reviewing whether or not there is still a discriminatory effect to the criteria you have enacted.

And I believe those factors -- I would want you to take those factors into consideration as you continue to recite this mantra of we have enacted this criteria to not consider race and therefore any concerns you have about race are irrelevant, unlawfully inappropriate because we have this criteria. I hope at least hearing these three principles can help you back off of that mantra, if you will. Thank you.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Horner, your light is still on.

Senator Jeff Jackson, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR JACKSON: To send forth an amendment.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Send forward your amendment. The clerk will read.

THE CLERK: Senator Jackson moves to amend the bill.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Jackson

is recognized to explain the amendment.

SENATOR JACKSON: Thank you, Mr. President. This is the same amendment that Senator Blue offered in committee yesterday pertaining only to Mecklenburg. I think we can more fully satisfy the criteria that had been established. In particular, compactness. I think this amendment does that. It significantly increases the compactness particularly of Districts 41 and 39.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Further discussion or debate on Amendment 4.

Senator Bishop, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR BISHOP: To ask a question of Senator Jackson.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Jackson, do you yield?

SENATOR JACKSON: I do.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: He Yields.

SENATOR BISHOP: Senator Jackson, did you also work through Senator McKissick on this map?

SENATOR JACKSON: I did.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Bishop,

do you have a further question?

SENATOR BISHOP: I do.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Jackson, do you yield?

SENATOR JACKSON: I do.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: He yields.

SENATOR BISHOP: Senator McKissick, that is, worked with Dr. Kareem Crayton to develop this, but you did not work directly with Dr. Crayton?

SENATOR JACKSON: That's correct.

SENATOR BISHOP: Follow up.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Bishop, you have a follow-up?

SENATOR BISHOP: Yes, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Jackson, do you yield?

SENATOR JACKSON: I will yield for all subsequent questions, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: He yields to a series of questions.

SENATOR BISHOP: Thank you, Mr. President.

Senator Jackson, does this amended map split Matthews?

SENATOR JACKSON: I believe it splits some precincts in Matthews, yes. I believe it may also split some precincts in Mint Hill.

My understanding, in anticipation of any further question along this line, is that those are the only two municipalities that are split.

And if I said it splits the precincts, what I meant to say is it takes a precinct that traverses the boundary of Charlotte and Matthews and Charlotte and Mint Hill, so we would have had to have split a precinct in order not to have split that municipality is my understanding. I was not involved in the preparation of the map.

SENATOR BISHOP: Mr. President, to debate the amendment.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Bishop, you have the floor.

SENATOR BISHOP: Thank you, sir.

If you first consider the leadership of the proposed map of Mecklenburg County and you compare it to this proposed amendment, the proposed amendment, I submit, draws five Democrat Senate districts non-competitive.

The leadership map has three Charlotte

districts that are in-town districts, if you will, in the heart of Charlotte, and it has a district that unites the outer beltway suburban communities mainly along the Catawba River and the Lakes Norman and Wylie on the western border of Mecklenburg County. It has one district, District 39, that includes the remaining rural part of northeastern Mecklenburg County, the eastern Mecklenburg suburbs and some of Charlotte, most importantly Matthews and Mint Hill. The map does not double-bunk any sitting Mecklenburg County senator. Every member is placed into a district they have a chance to win.

And the politics indicate that if Republicans campaign really hard, they might have an opportunity to win two districts in Mecklenburg, while the Democrats, with the right candidates and the right message and the right campaigns, have an opportunity to win all five. So those districts in the map -- unamended map give all Mecklenburg County residents, whether they're Democrats or Republicans, residents of the suburbs or of the heart of Charlotte a chance to have their voice heard.

But this proposed amendment, I said yesterday, it's shattered Charlotte like a mirror. I think that's apt. You could also say it slices up Charlotte -- or Mecklenburg County like a pizza. So, for instance, Senator Jackson, who's from 37, would represent the very uptown area and now a fractured -- a more fractured Matthews. Senator Waddell would represent the university area as well as Mint Hill. There are different interests there, and they deserve to be taken into consideration.

In the discussion in committee yesterday that Senator Jackson has essentially adopted, the admission was that race was used as the predominant factor in drawing those districts. So the idea of having Matthews and Mint Hill be represented in accordance with their interests is subordinated again to a racial target. That is not what we should do.

So I would urge that you defeat this amendment.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Jackson, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR JACKSON: To speak to the amendment.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: You have the floor.

SENATOR JACKSON: Just to correct the record on a few points of Senator Bishop's remarks by saying this draws five Democratic districts, that is inaccurate. It draws a district that is going to lean strongly Republican, that being 39, it's got two that are going to lean strongly Democrat, and it has two that are going to be highly competitive, including mine, by the way. It takes me from a 75 percent district to about a 55 percent district.

So this is a more competitive map, certainly more competitive than the one that is being proposed in which there would only be one competitive district of the five senate districts in Mecklenburg.

Now, it's also -- will Senator Bishop yield for a question, Mr. President?

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Bishop, do you yield?

SENATOR BISHOP: I yield.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: He yields.

SENATOR JACKSON: Senator Bishop, my

original remarks pertained exclusively to compactness. And you made some visual metaphors regarding how these districts look now, the shattered mirror. What metaphor would you use for how District 41 looks under the proposed map? Not this amendment, but the proposed map. How does that district strike you as far as adhering to the criteria of compactness?

SENATOR BISHOP: Thank you for the question, Senator Jackson. I'd say District 41 looks like it combines communities of interest around the western boundary of the community just like I described it.

I think that -- you know, compactness -- I guess when you say they're more compact, if you look at 37 and it splinters all the way down from the core of the city -- or the core of the city of Charlotte all the way down to the eastern border of -- with Union County, that -- you know, I understand there's all these technical measures of compactness. I've also seen when courts are reviewing that say the eyeball can tell you as much as you need to know or it's very hard to make heads or tails of some of that statistical data, but common sense is

what ought to drive it.

And is 41 the most compact district? No, at least according to my -- looking at it with my eye, but I think the other districts appear to me to be more compact in the senate -- in the leadership map than in these five here. And when you consider in conjunction with another traditional criteria, I think you see a perfect example of why it is so easy to exploit -- if someone seeks to demagogue an issue, exploit the redistricting process to cast aspersions that are unjustified.

Because it's a balancing process, and it involves common sense and it involves some politics amid the other criterion, but that -- in addition to looking like five Democrat districts to me, it is -- the thing that pops out about the map that you're proposing by amendment is that you're seeking to subordinate, and that cannot be seen in any other way than seeking to subordinate the voice, to diminish the voice of the ring count in Mecklenburg County, and I don't think that's what we're called to do.

SENATOR JACKSON: Follow up.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Bishop,

do you yield for a follow-up?

SENATOR BISHOP: I yield.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: He yields.

SENATOR JACKSON: So you admit 41 fails the eyeball test when it comes to compactness.

SENATOR BISHOP: I wouldn't say that. I think it looks -- it looks less compact to me, but others look more compact.

SENATOR JACKSON: Follow up.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Bishop, do you yield?

SENATOR BISHOP: I yield.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: He yields.

SENATOR JACKSON: Senator Bishop, you alluded to some technical measures for compactness in addition to the eyeball test. So it's your understanding that there are several technical measures for compactness as well as just the eyeball test?

SENATOR BISHOP: I've heard them referred to in committee, a couple of them have been referred to and were adopted, and I understand the majority's map complies with them. I understand that there are others. I don't know anything in detail about the two that are part of

the committee criteria. I certainly don't know anything in detail about the other numerous statistical measures.

SENATOR JACKSON: Follow up.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Bishop, do you yield?

SENATOR BISHOP: I yield.

SENATOR JACKSON: Related to those technical measures, would you be surprised to learn that of the two adopted technical measures for compactness, your district -- the proposed district for 39 is less compact than the current -- the enacted map? In both of those two different technicals, the Reock and the Polsby-Popper, your district -- your proposed district is less compact than it is currently. Are you aware of that?

SENATOR BISHOP: I'm not surprised nor unsurprised or aware of it, no, I'm not. I have not compared nor studied the statistical numbers to see what those numbers would be. If I did create -- compare them to see which one was higher or lower, it wouldn't mean anything to me if I did.

The only thing I can do is look at the

face of the map, as I said, the eyeball test, and as a group, they're superior to the ones that you're proposing.

SENATOR JACKSON: Follow up.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Bishop, do you yield?

SENATOR BISHOP: I yield.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: He yields.

SENATOR JACKSON: So it doesn't concern you, then, that -- by your language it sounds like 41 likely fails the eyeball test, and by the technical measures adopted by your party, your district fails the technical test. So we have two districts in our county that are failing the compactness test. That doesn't concern you?

SENATOR BISHOP: It concerns me less than the idea that you would make voiceless Matthews and Mint Hill.

SENATOR JACKSON: Follow up.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Do you yield, Senator Bishop?

SENATOR BISHOP: I yield.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: He yields.

SENATOR JACKSON: How do we do that?

SENATOR BISHOP: I think I've explained

that fully.

SENATOR JACKSON: Follow up.

SENATOR BISHOP: I yield.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: He yields.

SENATOR JACKSON: Do you agree that we could do a better job with compactness for Mecklenburg County than this proposed map?

SENATOR BISHOP: I haven't seen all possibilities, but based on what I've seen, no.

SENATOR JACKSON: Thank you.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Further discussion or debate on Amendment 4.

Senator Hise, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR HISE: Speak to the amendment.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: You have the floor.

SENATOR HISE: Thank you, Mr. President.

Members of the Senate, to address a few areas on this amendment to consider, there are only two measures that we have found that have been utilized and recognized by the Courts to measure compactness. As I said before, those are the Reock and the Polsby-Popper measures.

This is -- as interpreted by the committee and research, these are pass/fails, do they meet compactness, do they not meet compactness. And what you will find is in a Reock score, any score over .15 or in the Polsby-Popper, any score over .05 would meet that requirement. All the districts being discussed here meet the requirements of being compact districts.

So now we may get into all kinds of consideration about what's more compact or what could be a higher score than this one or even, quite frankly, we can get into a discussion about what's the significance of the difference between the two, but what I actually think you'll find is that both meet the standard of compactness that are set out in literature and was set forth in the results by this committee.

When you look at this district as a whole, what you're going to see is there are two purposes. Number one: Is this used as pinwheel technique to continue to divide the city of Charlotte in such a way that looks like a pizza pie or a pinwheel, or whatever you call it, to make sure that the surrounding communities

outside of Charlotte -- you've heard some of them mentioned: Mint Hill and Matthews -- have no voice in the legislature, we're going to divide Charlotte in such a way that no one else gets a voice. This is also designed to make sure that Republicans have no voice in Mecklenburg County. I picked those races. Look at the last governor's race. Look at the race between two state senators, Josh Stein and Buck Newton, who was here earlier. All five carried by the Democrats. They want it all. They have become uncompetitive in the rest of the state is actually what it comes down to.

Democrats are really only competitive in about 15 percent of the state, a small number of the counties. And so what they have to do to try to even their numbers up, they need to take them all in Mecklenburg or they want to try to take all of the seats in Wake. Because, quite frankly, if you look at the progressions in the state, they're becoming less competitive than the entire rest of the state. So they want you to reward them with the urban areas so that they can take full representation in the urban areas to show the areas that -- quite frankly, their

message just isn't competitive in this state, and so they want to take the small areas where it is and create a partisan advantage for them. That's exactly what this map does in Mecklenburg County.

I would also note that this is drawn using race as a consideration, divides more municipalities than needed to be drawn. So I would ask that you reject the amendment.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Waddell, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR WADDELL: To speak to this amendment.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: You have the floor.

SENATOR WADDELL: You know, on Tuesday we asked the counties to come and to give their comments, and I sat there about seven hours in Mecklenburg County, and speaker after speaker came up and talked about the unfairness of what they saw in these maps, the maps that were presented by this committee.

So what are we going to do as a result of what we heard? I heard maybe two positive things and all the other 48 speakers had concerns. If we ask people to come together, and

I think it's important that we consider the things that they have presented to us.

Secondly, I've heard a lot here about the eyeball test. And here I'm looking at two maps and thinking about what you just said about the eyeball test and what it tells us. It tells us that this county's maps are more significant of the problems found unconstitutional by the Court and that you would think that this General Assembly would work hard to ensure that this part of the map would strictly comply with the Court's order. So I urge you to support this amendment. Thank you.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Further discussion or debate on the amendment.

Senator Clark, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR CLARK: Thank you, Mr. President. To ask Senator Bishop to yield for a question.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Bishop, do you yield?

SENATOR BISHOP: I yield.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: He yields.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Bishop, I

believe in part you said that the current -- or that the District 41 was represented in the Senate Plan here should be preserved as a result of protecting communities of interest.

SENATOR BISHOP: That's correct.

SENATOR CLARK: Are you aware that --

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Follow-up question.

SENATOR CLARK: Will you yield for a follow-up?

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: He yields.

SENATOR CLARK: Are you aware that Redistricting Committee rejected our recommendation that communities of interest be preserved as one of the criteria for the Redistricting Committee?

SENATOR BISHOP: Well, you know, I think the problem with the communities of interest, as I recall the discussion -- and perhaps my terminology was the wrong one to use because I specified the common interest I was talking about.

Communities of interest, unfortunately, can be a very vague term, and so if the committee were to adopt that as a criterion, it would be

opening Pandora's box in terms of what that could mean. It could mean -- in some member's view, it could end up contradicting the criterion of not considering race. And in fact, what's been done here, if you look at this as a whole, is that's what the committee questioning yesterday revealed is that race was the predominant consideration and subordinated traditional considerations.

The consideration, as I've articulated it with respect to 41 and those communities that are represented that have common interest, that's a narrowing of the communities of interest idea and it explains why it would be appropriate to consider it in my view in describing 41, albeit not as a vague, general term appropriate for the committee to have adopted.

SENATOR CLARK: Follow up.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Bishop, do you yield for a follow-up?

SENATOR BISHOP: I yield.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: He yields.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Bishop, I'm having a little bit of difficulty here distinguishing between a community of interest and common interest. I figure a community of

interest have interests in common. So could you explain a little bit more about how those differ.

SENATOR BISHOP: Well, I'm not suggesting that there's a distinction between common interest and community of interest.

What I was saying was that the notion of a community of interest in itself is not very descriptive. It can mean a wide variety of things. When I was describing the interest in connection with 41, it is -- I was rather specific about the things that it does reflect, that it unites the outer beltway, suburban communities mainly along the Catawba River, Lakes Norman and Wylie on the western border of Mecklenburg County. There are similarities that have to do with the geography of that area in interest that I can specifically point to.

That's -- I see nothing wrong with that consideration. In fact, I don't even know, there may have been some reference to this in the criteria. I don't have them before me, but it would also account for the fact that I can't -- I don't believe anyone -- we had a long discussion about it in the committee meeting about what communities of interest mean and don't mean, and

I think people were disinclined to be pinned down about what they meant, but some still wanted to make it a criteria and that's what the committee rejected. That's a different ball game than what I'm talking about.

SENATOR CLARK: Follow up.

SENATOR BISHOP: I yield.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: He yields.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Bishop, did the committee adopt criteria saying that we would respect a common interest?

SENATOR BISHOP: Senator Clark, you may have them before you. I don't have the list of criteria in front of me.

SENATOR CLARK: We do not.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Clark, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR CLARK: Ask Senator Hise to yield for a question.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Hise, do you yield?

SENATOR HISE: I yield.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: He yields.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Hise, you've referred to a specific standard numerical values

for the criteria of compactness. The first time we heard of those values were in the committee meeting yesterday, so I take -- I do not agree with your assertion that those values were approved by the committee. As a matter of fact, even after yesterday's committee meeting I asked that those values be provided to me since I had not seen them before, and I'm still waiting to receive them. Hopefully we could obtain those values.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Clark, is there a question there?

SENATOR CLARK: Okay. I'll state it in the form of a question. At what point did the criteria approve those values?

SENATOR HISE: The criteria of the particular test are innate in the performance of the test themselves. So coming in we have the research documentation on those, and that's been available to the committee and we can resubmit that to you if necessary.

SENATOR CLARK: At what point were those innate values provided to the committee?

SENATOR HISE: In the criteria it is specifically referred to as the Voting Rights

evaluating election district appearances after Shaw versus Reno '93. The reference to it is specifically listed at the bottom of Number 4 in the criteria of the committee.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Follow up.

SENATOR CLARK: Follow up.

Where do those values exist for the committee to make themselves -- for the committee members to find them?

SENATOR HISE: The literature reference to those values are specifically listed on the committee -- the new procedure adopted by the committee and presented to the --

SENATOR CLARK: Follow up.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Hise, do you yield?

He yields.

SENATOR CLARK: So you're saying you expect us to go out externally to find the literature to determine what the values are instead of the committee being -- having the values provided to us and place them to our folders on the website?

SENATOR HISE: I would marginalize this to say it would be significant to say if you were

performing any other statistical test and you were using a .05 value for statistical significance or others, those are innate within the measures themselves.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Clark, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR CLARK: Follow up.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Hise, do you yield for a follow-up?

SENATOR HISE: I yield.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: He yields.

SENATOR CLARK: Well, you talked about innateness of values, but I haven't seen any values, period.

SENATOR HISE: The reference to what are utilized for those values -- I can repeat again -- were in the references given to the committee, and that is the appropriate use of the test in a pass/fail manner of compactness or non-compactness.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Clark, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR CLARK: No more questions, sir.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Further discussion or debate.

Senator Jackson, your light is still on.

Senator McKissick, yes or no?

SENATOR McKISSICK: Yes.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: For what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR McKISSICK: Speak on the amendment.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: You have the floor.

SENATOR McKISSICK: I want to thank Senator Jackson for bringing this amendment forward. It's a very good amendment in terms of the configuration for Beaufort counties.

Like all measures of compactness, all traditional measures, these districts which are crafted and shown on this particular plan would be considered far more compact, far more compact than 2011.

Furthermore, in terms of competitiveness, it gives voters options. These are not drawn to be Democratic districts. Senator Bishop, I'd have to take issue with you. And in fact, if you were to look back when McCrory was running for governor and Dalton was

his opponent, out of these five districts, Dalton was defeated in three of them.

Okay. So if we have a Democrat running for governor and is defeated in three, I would not consider these to be the types of districts that necessarily are going to end up being some type of performance district for Democrats.

So I think what you have to do is look --

SENATOR BISHOP: Mr. President.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Bishop, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR BISHOP: To ask Senator McKissick a question.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator McKissick, will you yield?

SENATOR McKISSICK: I yield.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: He yields.

SENATOR BISHOP: Do you know where Pat McCrory is from, Senator McKissick?

SENATOR McKISSICK: There are several answers that I could reply to that, but I'll be politically correct. He originated from Mecklenburg County.

SENATOR BISHOP: One follow up,

Mr. President.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator McKissick, do you yield for a follow-up?

SENATOR McKISSICK: Yes.

SENATOR BISHOP: Are you aware that the presidential candidate in the most recent time, Donald Trump, would have lost every one of these districts, In fact, come no higher than 43 percent?

SENATOR McKISSICK: I think what it would show is that you have an enlightened populous in Mecklenburg County, and I respect their intelligence.

I mean, what I would like to see is districts which are competitive districts. That's what voters want to see, districts that are competitive districts, and that's what this particular map provides, districts are competitive districts.

We tried to respect voter tabulation districts in drawing these maps. We tried to minimize any breaks of municipal boundaries. There are only two little breaks of municipal boundaries reflected in the map.

And when it comes to race, the only

thing we did was to look at what you had in your proposed plan in terms of black voting age population. Now, we did not find on this particular map that you had any district drawn with black voting age populations that exceeded 50 percent that were majority-minority districts which the Court ruled against. So if you look at that and I think you satisfy that criteria by making that examination, then you don't have to go back and start making any kind of changes with race in mind, so that was not done when you look at this map.

What you do see is a map that reflects compact districts, you see competitive districts, you see districts where people in the city of Charlotte will be able to elect candidates of choice. And that's what it's all about. That's what they want. These are not partisan drawn.

Now, what you presented to us were partisan drawn and they produce a majority of Republican districts, and you took advantage of partisan advantage, but you called it incumbency.

There wasn't a single person double-bunked here. Everybody has a district to run from. They just have to get out there and

compete. They have to get out there and prove they're the better candidate. If it happens to be a Republican is the better candidate, a Republican will win that district. If a Democrat is a more competitive candidate, perhaps that Democrat is going to win that district.

But we haven't drawn these in a way that are going to necessarily provide anybody a safe district. I think there's one there that's probably more Democratic than the others. I don't even know if that member is coming back. He is an incumbent. I don't think those questions were ever asked. Perhaps that should have been asked of all the people serving in this chamber if we were going to use incumbency as a criteria.

None other criteria were ranked, so you could randomly pick and choose what you wanted to do when you got to a cluster. That's problematic.

I would encourage you to support this map, support fair, legal and competitive districts.

SENATOR BISHOP: Mr. President.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Bishop,

for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR BISHOP: Would Senator McKissick yield for a question?

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator McKissick, do you yield?

SENATOR McKISSICK: Yes, I will.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: He yields.

SENATOR BISHOP: So, Senator, are you saying that political considerations were the basis of the way this map looks?

SENATOR McKISSICK: I'm saying that what we wanted to do when we came and drew districts, we were trying to make certain that districts are drawn so that they would be competitive districts.

SENATOR BISHOP: Politically.

SENATOR McKISSICK: Competitive districts.

SENATOR BISHOP: Follow-up question.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator McKissick, do you yield for a question?

SENATOR McKISSICK: Yes.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: He yields.

SENATOR BISHOP: Politically competitive.

SENATOR McKISSICK: Politically competitive and offer voters choices and options, but that's ultimately up to the candidates who run any particular year to know exactly who will run. I don't know if you're running for reelection. If Senator Rucho had run, he might have different characteristics and attributes to voters in terms of appeal than you might and whoever might run in that district in the future might have different attributes than you.

In Senator Clark's district, he's certainly been in a district over the years that's been somewhat a competitive district, more so than your own.

SENATOR BISHOP: Follow up, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator McKissick, do you yield for a follow-up question?

SENATOR McKISSICK: Yes.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: He yields.

SENATOR BISHOP: I think you said a moment ago, you conceded that political considerations were taken into account, but I think you said that it was unnecessary to take racial considerations into account, you believed,

in these districts, but it appears to me, if I look at the data, the racial data that you have just submitted, that Districts 38 and 40 appear to have been targeted 45 percent. Is that not true?

SENATOR McKISSICK: They were not targets.

SENATOR BISHOP: Follow up.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator McKissick, do you yield for a follow-up?

SENATOR McKISSICK: Yes.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: He yields.

SENATOR BISHOP: Is it coincidence, then, that 38 has a black voting age population, according to your data, of 45.18 percent and District 40 has a black voting age population, according to your data, of 45.48 percent?

SENATOR McKISSICK: The numbers which I see here which were a part of the original submission. And one thing you have to understand, Senator Bishop, when you draw those maps and you import them into a different database, the results might be slightly different.

Originally, what I'm seeing for Senate

District 38 was 46.17 percent. I think yours originally had 48.46 percent for that very same district according to the database that was used.

SENATOR BISHOP: No further questions.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Brown, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR BROWN: To ask Senator McKissick a question.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator McKissick, do you yield?

SENATOR McKISSICK: Yes.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: He yields.

SENATOR BROWN: Senator McKissick, I know you had some help in drawing these maps, and listening to the debate with Senator Bishop, are you trying to tell, I guess, the Senate that you and the individual that helped you draw these maps didn't draw these maps to favor the Democrats? Are you saying that?

SENATOR McKISSICK: The maps were drawn in a way to provide competitive districts, competitive districts meaning districts where a Democrat might win or a Republican might win. There are certain concentrations of voters in certain areas. So, I mean, and that's just by

the lay of the land. But having said that, they were not drawn to be districts that would perform one way or another except provide a more competitive opportunity to voters to select a candidate of preference.

When we saw districts that were drawn disproportionately to provide partisan advantage in the maps that were proposed, so since they were drawn to provide partisan advantage in terms of what we saw based upon the comparative data that we received, we wanted to go back and see what alternative configurations there were. And I might say we received that data very late. I think the map came out on Sunday afternoon or evening. We didn't get the data until sometime on Monday. I think public hearings were Tuesday, and, you know, we had to get somebody involved quickly to analyze the details, analyze the facts and come up with some potential viable considerations that would be available to this body for consideration.

SENATOR BROWN: Follow up, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator McKissick, do you yield?

SENATOR McKISSICK: Sure.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: He yields.

SENATOR BROWN: Senator McKissick, I think Senator Bishop said President Trump got -- 43 percent I think is the most he said that he got in any of these districts.

So you're saying that you and the individual who helped you draw these maps felt like that 43 percent for Republican made these districts competitive, and if that's the case, then any district across the state where the loser of that particular district, if they could get 43 percent, then that's a competitive district and I guess that it's just up to a good candidate to make a difference in that particular district.

Is that what you're saying?

SENATOR McKISSICK: No, I've never made that statement. That would be a mischaracterization of any words which I spoken. I never suggested that at all.

There's a benchmark of races here. You go back and you look at the Tillis race. You go back and look at the Dalton race. You go back and look at the Obama race. You can look at a

variety of races. I mean benchmark races. You go back and look at Elaine Marshall's race. Elaine Marshall's race would give you a good indication the way performance is sometimes. And then you kind of look at a composite and you kind of base it upon all of that data that might be available to you to say, you know, hey, how might these districts be drawn.

We certainly felt that the districts that we saw, particularly with the Tarte district, District 41, going all the way around the outer borders of Mecklenburg County, it appeared to be certainly an effort to maintain that district as a Republican district. It seemed as if the goal based upon the maps we saw were to give all Republican incumbents a chance of returning, notwithstanding the fact that many of them perhaps are in those seats today because of the racial gerrymandering that occurred. If it had not been for that racial gerrymandering when the maps were adopted back in 2011 then District 41 probably wouldn't look like it looked and Tarte might not have been there.

SENATOR BROWN: One more, if I could, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator McKissick, do you yield?

SENATOR McKISSICK: Sure.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: He yields.

SENATOR BROWN: Senator McKissick, I think the way that the maps that are proposed are drawn, those districts create three what I would say are Democratic districts and two other districts that are very competitive. Your map draws five districts that are pretty much going to be Democratic districts.

So are you saying that a map that has five Democratic districts is a better map than three Democratic districts and two competitive districts?

SENATOR McKISSICK: What I'm saying is based that upon the parameters that this body adopted in terms of looking at compactness, in terms of looking at incumbency, in terms of looking at respecting municipal borders, in terms of trying to come up, not splitting the voter tabulation districts, that this is a better plan and a more viable plan and the type of plan that voters would prefer to see to elect candidates of choice.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Brown, for what purpose --

SENATOR BROWN: I've got one more after that response.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator McKissick, can you do one more?

SENATOR McKISSICK: This will be the last one.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: He yields.

SENATOR BROWN: Are those voters the Democratic voters?

SENATOR McKISSICK: No. No. They allow Republicans to vote in Mecklenburg County.

SENATOR BROWN: Just checking.

SENATOR McKISSICK: We want them to vote. They just need to be enlightened.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Further discussion or debate on Amendment 4.

Senator Clark, your light is on.

Okay. Further discussion or debate on Amendment 4. Hearing none, the question before the body -- before we get to that, the clerk reminds me Senator Curtis is allowed an excused absence for the remainder of the session.

With that, further discussion or

debate. Hearing none, the question before the Senate is the passage of Amendment 4 to Senate Bill 691. All in favor of the amendment will vote "aye"; all opposed will vote "no." The clerk will record the vote. Five seconds will be allowed for the vote.

14 having voted in the affirmative and 30 in the negative, Amendment 4 fails and the bill is back before you.

Further discussion or debate on Senate Bill 691?

Senator Blue, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR BLUE: To send forth an amendment.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Send forward your amendment. The clerk will read.

THE CLERK: Senator Blue moves to amend the bill.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Blue has the floor.

SENATOR BLUE: Thank you, Mr. President.

In case I get the question, the sergeant-at-arms staff will be handing out these

stat packs. I asked them to delay it because you've got a lot of them building up on your desk, and I wanted you to see the one relating to this, but I begin my comments.

This amendment is a statewide plan for North Carolina, and the reason that I submit it to you is that I've read a letter that was sent to Senator Hise and Representative Lewis by the lawyers for the plaintiffs in this case. And that letter had -- it must have been dated on Wednesday, I guess -- had looked at the plans that the statistics were made available for on Monday, that is, the proposed Senate Plan, and had listened to the public comments, and the lawyers had analyzed those things and, more than likely, talked with their clients.

And the letter suggested to Senator Hise and Senator Lewis that they still found flaws in the proposed Senate Plan and they made certain suggestions, at least broad observations about the Senate Plan and ways that it could be addressed. And so I then called staff and asked them to allow the lawyer to send -- oh, and in the letter she also said they had drawn some proposed districts. So I called staff and asked

them to receive this packet from the lawyers so that we could analyze it under the system that we have devised in the General Assembly that analyze these plans as well as to analyze it for the criteria in the stat packs, stat packs that you are being handed now.

And upon receipt of it, I looked at it, and I think that it made me realize that the reason we're here on this Friday afternoon is because the Supreme Court unanimously determined that the plan that we operating under had 28 racially gerrymandered districts, and so it made sense to me that the people who had convinced the Court that the districts were racially gerrymandered could have some useful information on how you address the gerrymander since that's what we are here to do. We can talk about all of the other things, but we're here to address the gerrymanders because the Court told us to address it.

So these are the districts that they proposed that would address the racial gerrymander in the nine areas where senate districts were determined to be racially gerrymandered. It observed the same cluster

arrangement. It did not challenge any of the clusters or does not challenge any of the clusters. And it addresses these gerrymanders primarily in the four urban counties -- major urban counties, biggest urban counties in the state: Wake, Mecklenburg, Cumberland and Guilford.

This is what it does. And you'll notice that in many ways that it doesn't really overlap the districts that we've talked about, even some of those that we've offered. The ones that have been offered on Guilford, that was withdrawn, as well as Mecklenburg show that there are different alternatives for looking at these districts based on the criteria that the committee adopted as its criteria.

These maps also look at that criteria, but they also look at it from the prism of what they consider to be required to bring these districts into compliance.

So let me share two quick things because I know that this is where the questions will be.

If you've had a chance to review briefly the stat pack, you will find that these

districts aren't drawn for partisan advantage. I analyzed it. I think when you count the districts based on the performance in past elections, in these proposed districts, the Democratic presidential candidate won 18 and the U.S. Senate race, the Democratic senatorial candidate won 17, and then the governor's race, the gubernatorial candidate won 21.

So you can't argue that they have been designed for partisan purposes. You can't argue realistically that it's a partisan gerrymander. The only Democrat who won a majority of districts in this iteration was the secretary of state who's been running for that office for 20 plus years, and she managed to eke out a victory in 26 of the 50 sitting candidates under this proposal.

And so I learned a long time ago -- I grew up on a farm, but I learned a valuable lesson, and that is that pigs get fat and hogs get slaughtered, and the amazing thing is that sometimes you reach too far. And these folk have offered a plan that solves the racial gerrymandered, which is why we're here, and at least it's a plan that should be considered as a way to get through this judicial crisis.

It does not stack the deck unfairly against the majority party in here, but it addresses this issue of a racial gerrymander. It only double-bunked sitting senators, I think, in two or three districts other than the ones that were required to be double-bunked because of the way the clusters were drawn. It even has in it districts that have high percentages of Democratic votes, some of them as high as 70 or 80 percent vote in the district.

So partisan politics was the last thing that would enter into this map. I think it is something that ought to be reviewed. I mean, I know that redistricting is a very private thing for those who serve, but it seems to me that they're trying to achieve some kind of broader goal in it, and I think it's the kind of plan that would lead to legal districts, the kind of plans that show that race was not unnecessarily relied on. I think that you'll find throughout this map that it addressed the racial gerrymander in each district, and in all but one I believe it took the racial percentage down, which is what created the problem of the racial gerrymander in the first place.

And so if you haven't addressed the issue specifically set forth in the way that the plaintiffs have addressed it, I think in the way they deal with some of these districts, I think we're setting ourselves up. And maybe in order to grab 35 or 34 or whatever the advantage might be, partisan advantage in the map that you submitted, that you're setting yourself up to maybe having a federal judge or a federal panel or a special master draw these districts in the affected area with implications and ramifications far beyond what you've considered in trying to perhaps get a bigger piece of the cake that is justified under the circumstances.

I recommend this to you and hope that you'll consider it.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Bishop, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR BISHOP: To ask a question of Senator Blue.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Blue, do you yield?

SENATOR BLUE: Yes, sir.

SENATOR BISHOP: Is this map devised for the purpose of double-bunking incumbent

Republican senators in order to -- in circumstances that would be unfavorable to them in order to defeat them?

SENATOR BLUE: I don't see how it is. It's double-bunked -- I'm trying to see the places. There may be a double-bunk down in your territory, Senator Bishop. There's a double-bunk in your territory. I see a double-bunk -- there was one in Wake and one in Guilford. I think those are the three double-bunks.

SENATOR BISHOP: Further question.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Blue, do you yield for a follow-up?

SENATOR BLUE: I yield.

SENATOR BISHOP: So if you look, Senator Blue, at 37, there in the heart of Mecklenburg, 37 is currently occupied by Senator Jeff Jackson over there, and the little red dot that's now in 37 happens to be me.

And so Senator Jackson and I are double-bunked, but we're not double-bunked down in southern Mecklenburg County or over towards Matthews. We're double-bunked in Plaza-Midwood, east Charlotte. Is that not devised to take out a Republican incumbent?

SENATOR BLUE: No, I wouldn't say that that's what it's devised to do. Because if you look at the plaintiffs' senate map, again, they have three of the same pairings of double-bunking that the committee map does, and that was not devised to take out incumbents. It was devised to meet the criteria that you had set forth, and that was unavoidable.

And again, in Wake, Mecklenburg and Guilford counties, there were racial gerrymanders, and the plaintiffs are suggesting that the way that you go about fixing it first is to devise or at least develop these basic districts. You can then move people out of -- out of -- I think in most of them, I seem to remember that the members were close to the line. And so just as with the plaintiffs' map, and I think that -- the map that's before you, just like with that map people got creative and moved Senator Alexander into another district to prevent his being double-bunked, and you notice that in my revise in Wake County, I allowed for that. If you look at the basis of the map, then there are places that you can adjust it to address those specific problems.

SENATOR BISHOP: Follow-up question.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Blue, do you yield?

SENATOR BLUE: I yield.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: He yields.

SENATOR BISHOP: Just to sort of extend the picture here beyond what I described about Senator Jackson and me, if you look in Guilford County, I think I described it as the bird district, it looks a little similar to me. It's Greensboro, as I understand it. Senator Robinson's District 28, there's a red dot there. That happens to be Senator Wade, as I understand. So Senator Wade is double-bunked with Senator Robinson not out in an area that Senator Wade is represented but in -- on territory that would be unfavorable to her.

And if you look over at Wake County, the double-bunking up in 15, 15 being Senator Chaudhuri's district, is, as I understand it, Senator Barringer, it might be Senator Alexander, but in either event, in all three cases it's true, isn't it, that the Republican incumbent is at a disadvantage in that double-bunking.

SENATOR BLUE: In this map I think

Senator Alexander is in the district with Senator Chaudhuri, but in the map that we amended, they're not in the same. So I'm saying that once you take the basic form that you want to fix the gerrymandering, you can deal with those issues because if you want incumbency to be one of the criteria, it is a criteria after you've dealt with the gerrymander.

Senator Bishop, I can't tell who's in this district in Guilford County. I see a blue dot and a red dot. I don't know whether -- I guess Senator Robinson is on the edge of her district. And we can deal with Guilford County in such a way that you can try to deal with the incumbency question, but you got to deal with the gerrymandering aspect of it first.

And you in Mecklenburg, I don't know where you live and where Senator Jackson lives, but since you're moving whole precincts, you can deal with those things and still observe the other criteria, the compactness -- you admit that the plan that's before us by the committee had deviated from the compactness standards because it goes all the way around the county.

So if you are then trying to

accommodate the question of incumbency, then that justifies you moving this incumbent out into another area that might be friendlier.

The map in and of itself is our first go at it without being concerned about incumbency and those things. Our first concern was to address the gerrymanders, and it's those four counties that you talked about that you find the double-bunking. It's been solved in Wake County, we're working on it in Guilford County, and that's the only way I know how to answer you.

SENATOR BISHOP: Further question, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Blue, do you yield?

SENATOR BLUE: I yield.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: He yields.

SENATOR BISHOP: So the committee accepted your amendment yesterday to Wake County and then today you came in with a further perfecting amendment to that to fix it. This, as I understand it, this statewide map hasn't been changed from the -- among other things the double-bunkings that I pointed out yesterday in committee as you're proposing it today, and if

the amendment were to be accepted, it would supersede the amendment that you've worked on twice for Wake County, correct?

SENATOR BLUE: That's correct. And if I had had time, if I had had time, I would have incorporated the Wake County amendment into this map.

SENATOR BISHOP: A further question.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Blue, do you yield?

SENATOR BLUE: I yield.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: He yields.

SENATOR BISHOP: Would it be fair to say that you don't really expect this amendment to be adopted. It's offered as a function of the litigation.

SENATOR BLUE: I do expect it to be adopted because it fixes the gerrymander, and if it's adopted, then I will then amend it to fix Wake County the way that we fixed it because there has to be more than one configuration that can address these issues.

This is one possibility, and I would reconcile it with what we've done in Wake County and attempt to reconcile it with fixing the

issues that you address of double-bunking in Mecklenburg County, in Guilford County, and I forget where the other one was. Maybe that's it. Those are the three outside of the ones that were mandated by the clustering.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Further discussion or debate on Amendment 5.

Senator Hise, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR HISE: Speak to the amendment.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: You have the floor.

SENATOR HISE: Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate.

I think you have before you an amendment litigation strategy for the court cases. I think that Senator Blue even inasmuch admitted yesterday that his choice would not have been to do the double-bunks and told us if we were working together to develop these that we could have come up with different solutions. And it's been clear that this is not a map developed by a member of the General Assembly but a map developed by a litigation group, a group that sued us.

But I think it offers a lot of insight into what this is all about. And I don't believe it's a racial gerrymander or other. It's about a group who represents the Democrats who have become uncompetitive in most of the State of North Carolina. I think they're down to winning 20 or so counties in a presidential race on some other ballot initiatives we've had. I think they were down to about seven counties that their policies could carry, and they want to draw the map so they don't have to change those policies or what they're promoting, but we'll take the areas where they are and they should have total domination.

Look at Guilford on this map. Look at Wake County on this map. Look at Mecklenburg County on this map. Any district drawn completely in that county the Democrats carry. Look at the presidential race and others. They might find some 60/40 race where they didn't win them all but -- that occurred several years ago, but if you want to look at the presidential races, the governor's races, this is the clean sweep of the urban counties for the Democrats so that they can continue their far left message and

try to be competitive statewide. That's literally what this entire map is about.

There's an actual report that's in your stat pack that tells us what members are double-bunked together. So when Barringer and Chaudhuri are bunked together for, as we've shown, no good reason, when Senator Wade and Robinson are bunked together, no good reason, for Bishop and Jeff Jackson all in ways to benefit the Democrat incumbents, as well as you'll see the blank areas in which they're creating open Democrat seats in this state. It's what it's all about for this group.

Now, they found an argument about how race is used, and we've addressed that argument by not using race. They said we used it excessively; we've addressed if by not using it at all. But they're still upset because they didn't get everything they wanted in the urban areas which requires total domination in those results.

So they also ignored what municipalities. They clearly would divide municipalities as they saw fit in addition to those challenges.

It's the responsibility of the General Assembly to draw districts. Now, I don't deny that it's not the right of a member to pick someone else's map and bring it forward, but this obviously in no way, even in these areas, represents the values of the Senate or the General Assembly as a whole. Pick each one of those urban counties. When the members offered a solution, it was very different from what this solution was that you had here, particularly even for the same issues.

So I ask that you reject this amendment. The outside groups are not the ones drawing their districts in the State of North Carolina. The General Assembly is. That is our obligation under the state constitution. That is our obligation under the federal constitution, and we don't hand that to outside groups for that purpose.

And for that, among many other reasons, including the use of race, once again, I would ask that you reject this amendment.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Bryant, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR BRYANT: To speak on the

amendment.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: You have the floor.

SENATOR BRYANT: I was wanting to respond to one comment that Senator Hise mentioned about the purpose of this proposal and this proposed amendment being to have domination in urban areas for the Democratic Party or for far-left ideas.

And I wanted to emphasize that what I care about in this proposal and in the case against racial gerrymandering is racial discrimination against my racial group in order to maintain political power for far-right ideas.

And I'm from a rural area. I don't benefit under any of these plans, personally speaking, in terms of my political options. However, I have a great concern about racial discrimination and unconstitutional legislative and political actions being taken that harm my racial group and our communities across the state. And this is not just an urban issue. It's also a rural issue.

And for that reason I would want to ask us to strongly consider this amendment. I agree

with Senator Blue there are some changes that have been raised, some issues that have been raised can be addressed. And I took this same position when Democrats were in power. I similarly fought. I was a part of helping with the Gingles cases and the other discriminate -- redistricting discrimination cases that have been brought in the state, because I also didn't like being discriminated against for the purposes of the domination of Democrats as well.

And so I just want to be clear on the record that my purpose is not that for -- as described by Senator Hise, and I sort of don't like a broad attribution to all our purposes in the manner that he did. And I know that the plaintiffs in this case who are from my area, their goal is not -- surely not power in urban areas and is not perpetuation of a left-wing agenda. It is fighting against the racial discrimination that we feel in our communities.

So I don't like him casting aspersions -- negative aspersions against the plaintiffs in the case who are 30 or 40 some citizens around the state, as well as the lawyers and professionals involved in helping to move

this litigation forward that has been affirmed unanimously by the Court of Appeals and the Supreme Court. So I guess they want a left-wing agenda in North Carolina as well. Thank you.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Further discussion or debate.

Senator Van Duyn, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR VAN DUYN: To speak on the amendment.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: You have the floor.

SENATOR VAN DUYN: I would have to agree with Senator Hise that it is our responsibility to draw these maps, and I think we made a very responsible step when we decided to take public comment before we drew the maps. And what we heard almost unanimously from that public comment was that what the people of North Carolina want is exactly what these maps represent and that is fair, legal, competitive Senate districts.

These maps did double-bunk people because that was not a criteria. That was one of our criterias, never one that we heard through

public comment. I think we have done a tremendous disservice to the people of North Carolina by consistently and over and over and over again refusing to listen to the people of North Carolina who made their voices heard very clearly, very clearly that what they wanted was fair, competitive districts, and that's what the plaintiffs are asking for and that's why I urge you to support this amendment.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Further discussion or debate on Amendment 5. Hearing none, the question before the Senate is the passage of Amendment 5 to Senate Bill 691. All in favor of the amendment will vote "aye"; all opposed will vote "no." Five seconds will be allowed for the voting. The clerk will record the vote.

14 having voted in the affirmative and 30 in the negative, Amendment 5 fails and the bill is back before us.

Further discussion or debate on Senate Bill 691.

Senator Hise, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR HISE: Send forth an amendment.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Send forward your amendment.

SENATOR HISE: Sorry. Maybe I need to physically send it forward. Senator Tillman's got the page duties today.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: The clerk will read.

THE CLERK: Senator Hise moves to amend the bill.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Senator Hise has the floor to explain Amendment 6.

SENATOR HISE: Senators, what this amendment simply does is that as we're getting a lot of submissions in and others so that we can -- this will all go to the courts and so we can clarify when something was submitted and others. This was an amendment, because we accepted other amendments today, to change the title of the bill that will denote that this was the second reading. We will need a similar amendment if we amend it on Monday so it shows that the change occurred in the third reading of the bill, but this will show that those changes occurred. It merely changes the short title of the bill.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Further discussion or debate on Amendment 6. Hearing none, the question before the Senate is the passage of Amendment 6 to Senate Bill 691. All in favor of the amendment will vote "aye"; all opposed will vote "no." Five seconds will be allowed for the voting. The clerk will record the vote.

Tillman "aye"; Bryant "aye"; McKissick "aye"; Ford "aye."

44 having voted in the affirmative and none in the negative, Amendment 6 passes and the bill is back before you.

Further discussion or debate on Senate Bill 691.

Senator Blue, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR BLUE: To debate the bill.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: You have the floor.

SENATOR BLUE: Thank you, Mr. President.

And I just want to make a very few observations because I think that we ought to seize upon teaching moments. We've been through

this process. The Court says that we have discriminatory districts, nine of them in the Senate, and they're discriminatory because of the racial makeup and what was done to create the racial makeup in those districts.

I'm hoping that having passed out these stat packs that show what the racial makeup is of the districts that you've now created will enable you to tell the Court how you've addressed the discrimination that they found in the original maps that you passed here.

I don't see how it can when you haven't considered race in solving the racial problems in the map. I mean, it just is anti-intuitive that you can fix a problem without addressing the problem. And that's what we've done here.

And it might be that you're sending a message to this three-judge panel that you don't take judicial orders very seriously, and that -- that is not a message that I want to be a part of it, not because I'm a member of the legislature but because I highly respect this third and co-equal branch of government because it's what's made this country, the whole concept of judicial review what it is, and so I hope that that's not

the message that you're trying to send.

But more importantly, I hope that we don't do a disservice to the citizens of this state by telling them that we've remedied this problem when we really haven't. There are some places in this map where that issue has been resolved. And, you know, the amazing thing is it was resolved not by what we did but to some degree because the clusters dictated that it be done that way.

And that sort of machine like, as was said earlier, we got free will, we're sentient, we can do things and think about them and change them, and again, that's the magic about this place. And I say that not because it's going to change anybody's mind but simply because it needs to be said.

And I say that I hope that it's been a teaching moment and this provides a teaching opportunity because half of you will be here the next time redistricting comes around, if you don't have -- well, you won't have to come back and solve these because if you haven't solved it, the three-judge panel will solve it for you, but, you know, the next regularly scheduled

redistricting round is two elections away, four years, and if history is any lesson, half of you will be here, the other half won't because of retirement, some voluntary, some involuntary. There are various other reasons.

We've already started preparing for the 2020 census all over the country, the way the Census Bureau is trying to get people to prepare VTDs in place of precincts and all of those things, the way the computers are beginning to be configured. I mean, it's a national discussion going on, and it's a discussion going on that pays no attention to party divide. There are just things that we need to do to make this redistricting work.

So it's right around the corner, and a good number of you will be here to do it in four years. And so I hope that the takeaway and the real lesson that we get from this teachable moment is it needs to be a cooperative process, it needs to be an inclusive process, and it needs not be focused solely on political advantage and using anything that might give us that political advantage.

In this case, unfortunately, the Courts

determined that race is what gave you the political advantage. Who knows what the issue will be next year, the year after next, but certainly in 2020. Who knows whether there will be some decision from the Supreme Court trying to add clarity into what goes into redistricting. Who knows whether it will be some decision, some modification on the Stephenson standards by the State Supreme Court. I don't know.

I said we're sentient. I'm not prescient and omniscient. I can't see into the future that far, but there will be things that we're not factoring in that will affect the 2021 redistricting, and I'm just asking you to take what you've learned from those who are here to inform us as to how we ought to go about the 2021 redistricting.

It can be far less painful, it can be much more cooperative, and it can satisfy the citizens of this state who are telling us in every way that they can that they're tired of all the partisan way in which we go about doing this, that they want to participate in the process and they just assume that the legislature not have anything else to do with it, whether it's an

independent commission or some other kind of way, that they would prefer something else. So I hope that we can register that.

Again, I don't believe that these maps directly address the specific issues in several places that the Court told us to address, and for that reason I think that this whole exercise has to be looked at, but what we learn from it as opposed to what it does to address that broader problem.

I invite you to share with certainly the members on the back row as you go in to preparing this process. You never can tell, the members on the back row might be the members on the front row regardless of what you say is happening across the state. This state is still a very fluid state, it's a rapidly changing state.

And the lesson that I again take away from most of the things that I do is one that I learned in the sandboxes, but it was underscored to me my first year in law school by my real property professor. He said, you know, the only way that you can guarantee that something will be fair, if it's to be split between people, you let

the one who draws out different people's portions -- he was talking about basically dividing up black acre or white acre, however you described the farm at the time -- is you let the one who's going to choose first not draw them, but you let the one who chooses last draw the maps, draw the division.

That's been wise advice over the years for me, and I suggest to you that sometimes you might want those that you think that you're punishing to participate in how you mete out that punishment because at the end of the day you might be the one receiving it.

We need to think about that with respect to these maps, and I hope that somewhere or other those lessons won't be lost on us.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Further discussion or debate.

Senator Hise, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR HISE: To speak a second time.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: You have the floor.

SENATOR HISE: Thank you, Mr. President.

Members of the Senate, I want to start by rebuffing what I think is an argument that somehow we don't care about what the Courts have said or what they did. We're all here today at a time that's not necessarily of our choosing, on a timeline not of our choosing to address a court order on a set of maps that Eric Holder and the Obama Justice Department pre-cleared before we ever passed them. Now they've run across the country and complain about these things, but they cleared them. We met all those standards. Some of the rules changed, parts of the Voting Rights Act are gone, and we're back here today once again.

But I will tell you in the drawing of these maps we have placed a lot of respect into what the Court says, beginning with the most recent ruling that we overutilized race in creating districts. So we have a solution for that. We will not use race in the creation of districts. Now, somebody's going to try to make some claim that by not using race we still used it and by the some standard we still overused race.

But we followed also the State Court

ruling and Stephenson and how they're written. I don't know that anyone believes that it was my intent to move Senator Cook's district or to put Senator Randleman or Ballard in the same district or to move Senator Horner in a district. Those were required under the Court rulings and we've accepted those and that's part of this map.

We've done those to respect the rulings of the Courts and how they've interpreted our constitutions. We put that process together. We've taken areas like Wake County where, in general, Republicans receive 40 percent of the votes in those counties, and you'll see that the proportions now fall out to, all likely, 40 percent of the seats in those counties. You'd see the same in Mecklenburg. We now have one competitive district with probably three Democratic districts and one Republican district, and how that compares -- that was what you would see in historic vote totals. We've taken those in the state. No, that's not enough for our opposition.

But we've taken in respect to what the Court says and what the law says and our responsibility to draw these maps given to us by

the people of this nation by our constitution to this body to draw these maps. We have answered the Court's questions with these maps, and we are prepared to move forward now with elections under these maps.

It's been a long process. I don't think anybody thinks the legal fight is over, but we have answered the legal questions that have been presented on those with these maps, and we continue to stand by that decision and we'll continue to fight anyone who tries to claim that it is not our authority under the constitution to draw the maps of the State of North Carolina.

I thank you all and I ask for your support for this and for the -- thanks for this long process that we continue to go through.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Further discussion or debate.

Senator Tillman has an excused absence for the remainder of the session.

Further discussion or debate on Senate Bill 691. Hearing none, the question before the Senate is the passage on the second reading of Senate Bill 691. All in favor will vote "aye"; all opposed will vote "no." Five seconds will be

allowed for the voting. The clerk will record the vote.

27 having voted in the affirmative and 16 in the negative, Senate Bill 691 has passed its second reading.

And, Senator Hise, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR HISE: To object to third reading

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Third reading having been objected to, the bill will remain on the calendar.

Senator Hise, do you have a further motion?

SENATOR HISE: And to also ask that the amendments be engrossed before the presentation of the third reading.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Without objection, so ordered, the amendments will be engrossed between second and third reading.

Members, that's all we have on our calendar. And are there any notices or announcements? Is there further business to come before the Senate? If not, Senator Pate is recognized for a motion.

SENATOR PATE: Thank you, Mr. President.

I move that the Senate do now adjourn subject to Senate Rule 24.1 and the receipt of House messages, to reconvene on Monday, August 28, 2017, at 5:00 p.m.

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: Motion is that the Senate do now adjourn subject to the stipulations stated by Senator Pate to reconvene on Monday, August 28, 2017, at 5:00 p.m. Seconded by Senator Hise. All in favor say "aye."

"Aye."

PRESIDENT PT BERGER: All opposed "no."

The "ayes" have it and the Senate stands adjourned.

[Reporter's Note: Proceedings in this session ended at 1:51 p.m.]

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA)
) C E R T I F I C A T E
COUNTY OF WAKE)

I, DENISE MYERS BYRD, Court Reporter and Notary Public, do hereby certify that the transcription of the foregoing proceeding was taken down by me stenographically to the best of my ability and thereafter transcribed under my supervision; and that the foregoing pages, inclusive, constitute a true and accurate transcription of said proceeding.

Signed this the 1st day of September 2017.

/s/ Denise Myers Byrd /s/
Denise Myers Byrd
CSR 8240, RPR, CLR 102409-2

A

a.m 2:2
ability 134:8
able 5:23 36:15 89:16
absence 3:20 99:24 131:19
absolutely 30:18 56:12
accept 57:24
accepted 111:19 112:1 121:18 130:7
accommodate 19:22 111:1
accomplish 37:8
account 81:22 92:23,25
accurate 30:18 134:10
accurately 13:4
achieve 20:25 42:12 105:16
achieved 20:20
achieves 19:16
acre 128:3,3
acrimony 58:11
Act 39:10 129:13
actions 117:20
actual 31:12 115:3
add 126:6
added 11:12
addition 24:4 70:16 71:16 115:24
address 16:2 30:3 38:15 57:2 74:20 102:16,18,19 102:22 108:25 111:7 112:22 113:1 127:5,6 127:9 129:6
addressed 101:22 105:21 106:1,3 115:15 115:17 118:3 123:9
addresses 20:2 103:3 105:3
addressing 123:15
adequately 15:8
adhering 69:7
adjourn 133:3,8
adjourned 133:16
adjust 108:24
admission 48:5 67:14
admit 49:6 71:4 110:21
admitted 113:18
adopt 79:25 82:10
adopted 7:12,16 8:10 9:7,9,12 12:24 14:1 19:1 67:14 71:22 72:10 73:12 80:16 84:12 97:21 98:18 103:16 112:15,18,19
adoption 13:11 60:8
advantage 34:23 34:24 48:6 61:4 77:3 89:21,22 95:7 95:9 104:1 106:6,7 125:22 125:24 126:2
advice 128:8
advised 51:12
affect 57:9 126:13
affirmative 11:25 17:11 100:7 120:18 122:11 132:3
affirmed 7:1 119:1
African 19:11 27:19 36:13 38:23 40:4,24
afternoon 13:11 95:14 102:9
age 20:8 28:20 32:22 38:2 46:5 53:11 55:10 89:2,5 93:14,16
agenda 118:19 119:4
ago 4:4 7:7 92:22 104:17 114:21
agree 74:5 83:3 117:25 119:14
agreed 35:23 36:14
Alabama 35:12 35:15,19 36:11 36:21
albeit 80:14
Alexander 9:21 108:20 109:21 110:1
alleviate 16:24
allow 99:13 101:23
allowed 5:1 11:20 17:9 31:11 99:23 100:6 108:22 120:16 122:7 132:1
allows 58:9
alluded 71:15
alternative 95:12
alternatives 103:14
amazing 104:20 124:7
Amen 3:8
amend 11:3 12:17 15:2 17:24 62:24 100:18 112:19 121:8,21
amended 6:4 14:3 27:2 64:24 110:2
amendment 10:25 11:2,6 11:15,17,18 12:1,7,9,14,20 12:24 13:3,10 13:11,14,25 14:4 15:2 16:12 17:3,5,7 17:12,20,22 18:1,5 19:14 19:19 21:2 23:24 29:20,23 30:8 32:3 34:4 44:4 45:9,14 45:19 49:15 51:23,25 52:6 52:8,9,9 53:3,5 53:7 62:20,22 63:1,3,8,12 65:16,22,23 67:1,21,25 69:6 70:18 74:12,15,21 77:8,12 78:12 78:15 86:8,12 86:13 99:18,21 100:2,3,8,15 100:17 101:5 111:19,21 112:1,2,6,14 113:7,10,16 116:13,22 117:1,7,25 119:10 120:9 120:11,13,14 120:19,25 121:2,11,13,17 121:21 122:2,4 122:5,12
amendments 12:10 121:18 132:16,19
American 19:11 36:13 38:23 40:5,24
Americans 27:20
amid 70:15
analysis 15:10 30:4,9 31:19 39:5 41:16 46:3 53:11 61:19
analyze 14:16 38:12 95:18,18 102:2,3,4
analyzed 38:13 101:15 104:2
analyzing 16:4
angle 36:18,21
annexation 9:4
announced 9:24
announcements 132:23
answer 10:22 22:6 32:24 111:11
answered 131:2 131:8
answers 87:22
anti-intuitive 123:14
anticipation 65:4
anybody 90:8 131:7
anybody's 124:16
apologize 43:15
apparently 11:9
appeal 92:8
Appeals 32:19 119:2
appear 7:15 70:5 93:3
appearances 84:1
appeared 97:13
appears 57:16 93:1
appellate 61:16
applicable 15:3
appointed 35:17
appreciated 12:24
approach 18:9 34:12
appropriate 80:13,15 85:18
approval 21:3
approve 83:15
approved 3:16 3:19 83:5

approximately 20:13
apt 67:3
area 15:24 30:15 39:2 42:9 60:15 67:7,9 81:16 106:11 109:15 111:3 117:15 118:16
areas 74:21 76:23,24,25 77:2 94:25 102:23 114:13 115:11,20 116:5 117:8 118:18 130:11
argue 104:9,10
argument 115:14,15 129:2
arrangement 103:1
articulated 80:9
asked 7:7 8:23 25:5 29:8 42:5 42:7 50:25 77:16 83:6 90:13,14 101:1 101:22,25
asking 120:8 126:14
asks 24:10
aspect 110:16
aspersions 70:12 118:22,22
aspire 43:1
Assembly 1:1 9:9 78:10 102:3 113:23 116:2,7,15
assertion 83:4
assign 10:17 60:22
assume 126:24
assuming 59:25
ATC-122 12:13
attempt 38:14 112:25
attempts 20:24
attention 32:14 34:19 42:21 125:13
attorney 10:10
attributes 92:7 92:10
attribution 118:14
August 1:4 3:13 3:18 4:22 133:6,10
authority 131:12
authorized 56:13
automatically 28:2
available 29:10 43:24,25 44:16 44:21 51:14 56:16 83:20 95:20 97:7 101:12
avenue 14:13
avoid 8:17
avoided 46:16
aware 38:3 72:17,19 79:6 79:12 88:5
aye 11:18,22,23 11:23,24 17:8 100:4 120:14 122:5,9,9,10 122:10 131:24 133:12,13
ayes 133:15

B

back 2:18 4:5 12:2 17:13 33:23,24 35:14 35:18 43:18 47:16 52:10 62:13 86:24 89:10 90:11 95:11 96:23,24 96:24 97:2,21 100:9 120:20 122:13 124:22 127:12,14 129:13
backgrounds 36:8
balancing 70:13
ball 82:4
Ballard 9:17 130:4
ballot 114:8
Barefoot 9:22,24
Barrett 9:20 11:22
Barringer 109:21 115:5
base 97:6
based 25:17 27:18 31:6,17 36:24 46:8 48:1 74:9 95:10 97:15 98:17 103:15 104:3
basic 108:13 110:4
basically 13:8 31:8 39:17 128:2
basis 10:18 31:3 50:9,11 91:10 108:23
Beaufort 57:19 57:21,23 58:1 58:3 59:7 86:14
beauty 36:5
becoming 76:21
beg 56:1
began 2:2 6:5
beginning 125:10 129:17
belief 59:25 60:7 60:7
believe 7:9 14:25 18:7 21:15 26:17 33:14 36:18,20 49:22 50:12 51:22 52:21 54:20 55:24 56:2 59:5 60:23 62:6 65:1,2 79:1 81:23 105:22 114:2 127:4
believed 92:25
believes 130:2
beltway 66:3 81:12
benchmark 96:22 97:1
benchmarks 53:15
benefit 115:9 117:16
BERGER 2:3 3:9,17 4:11,14 4:23 5:3,8 11:1 11:5,14 12:8 12:15,19 13:13 13:19,22 14:22 16:8,13 17:4 17:21,25 21:4 21:8,11 22:6 22:24 23:3,6 23:19,22 24:9 24:13 25:1,4,9 25:12,22,25 26:3,9,12,19 26:22,25 27:7 27:9,12 28:7 28:10,24 29:2 29:19,24 32:4 32:9 37:17,20 37:23 43:9,12 43:16 44:3,9 44:12 45:3,8 45:11,15 49:12 49:16 50:17 51:2,7,9,20 52:7,16,19 53:18,24 54:2 54:14,17 55:15 55:18 56:6,9 56:19,25 59:10 59:16 62:15,21 62:25 63:11,17 63:20,25 64:3 64:6,13,16,20 65:17 67:22 68:1,21,24 70:25 71:3,10 71:13 72:5 73:5,8,20,23 74:4,11,16 77:9,13 78:14 78:21,24 79:7 79:11 80:18,21 82:8,16,20,23 83:11 84:5,15 85:5,8,11,21 85:24 86:5,9 87:11,15,18 88:2 90:25 91:4,7,20,23 92:17,20 93:9 93:12 94:5,9 94:12 95:24 96:2 98:1,4 99:1,5,9,17 100:16,20 106:17,21 107:12 109:2,5 111:14,17 112:9,12 113:6 113:11 116:23 117:2 119:5,11 120:10 121:1,6 121:10 122:1 122:19 128:17 128:22 131:17 132:10,18 133:7,14
best 44:20 134:7
better 74:6 90:2 90:3 98:13,22
beyond 29:9 33:4,5,10 58:5 106:12 109:7
bible 2:16
bigger 106:13
biggest 103:5
bill 1:3 4:19,20 5:5,6,15 11:4 11:17 12:2,3 12:18 17:7,13 17:15,16,24 52:10,11 53:19 56:20,24 59:9 59:15 62:24 100:3,9,11,19 120:13,20,22 121:9,19,23,25

122:4,13,15,18 131:22,24 132:4,11
bind 61:12
bird 21:22 109:9
Bishop 13:15,17 13:23 14:7,21 14:25 16:6 21:4,6,12 22:7 22:24 23:1,7 23:12,17,23 24:8,9,14,19 24:24 25:5,8 25:13,22,23 26:4,7,13,19 26:20 27:1,6,8 27:13,16 28:5 28:11,16,22 29:3,18 36:11 49:12,14,18 53:20,22 54:3 54:12,18 55:13 55:19 56:1,4 56:10,18 63:13 63:15,21,25 64:2,7,12,13 64:15,22 65:15 65:17,19 68:19 68:21,23,25 69:9 70:25 71:2,6,10,12 71:14,20 72:5 72:7,18 73:5,7 73:16,21,22,25 74:3,8 78:19 78:21,23,25 79:5,17 80:18 80:20,22 81:3 82:7,9,12 86:23 87:10,11 87:13,19,25 88:5 90:24,25 91:2,8,16,19 91:24 92:15,21 93:8,13,21 94:4,15 96:4 106:17,19,24 107:7,11,15 109:1,6 110:9 111:12,18 112:8,13 115:9
Bishop's 68:4
bit 4:4 16:18 80:23 81:2
black 20:8 27:2 27:15 28:3 32:22 33:6,6 35:24 38:1 46:5 53:11 55:10 61:7 89:2,5 93:14 93:16 128:3
blank 115:11
blessings 3:7
blind 59:1
block 21:21
blue 12:4,6,9,12 12:17,19,21 13:17,19,21,23 14:5,9,22,24 15:4 16:20 32:6,8,11 37:18,20,22,24 38:8 43:12,14 43:22 50:8 52:6 58:8 63:4 100:12,14,18 100:20,22 106:20,21,23 107:4,12,14,16 108:1 109:2,4 109:25 110:10 111:14,16 112:4,9,11,17 113:17 118:1 122:16,18,21
Blue's 16:22
body 22:2 25:14 29:10 32:20 95:21 98:17 99:22 131:2
Book 3:3
border 66:5 69:19 81:14
borderline 30:22
borders 6:20 9:5 31:22 97:12 98:20
bottom 84:3
boundaries 8:22 8:24 9:3 30:25 49:4 50:1 55:6 88:22,24
boundary 65:10 69:12
box 80:1
branch 34:25 123:23
breaks 88:22,23
briefly 6:8 103:25
bring 15:16 36:7 43:18 103:19 116:4
bringing 86:12
broad 101:20 118:14
broader 16:2 105:16 127:9
brought 118:8
Brown 94:5,7,13 95:22 96:3 97:24 98:5 99:1,3,10,14
Bryant 44:5,7 44:13,25 45:4 59:12,14,18 116:23,25 117:4 122:9
Buck 4:3 76:9
build 2:24 3:1,1 3:2
buildeth 2:23
building 101:2
bunked 115:6,8
Bureau 125:8
business 132:23
buy 58:15
BVAP 32:21 33:1,6 35:6 39:1
BVP 20:13
Byrd 1:18 3:25 134:4,16,16

C

C 134:1,1
cake 106:13
calendar 4:9,21 132:12,22
call 53:1 75:24
called 34:18 39:16 61:2 70:23 89:22 101:22,25
campaign 66:16
campaigns 66:20
candidate 40:8,9 40:10 88:6 90:2,3,5 95:5 96:15 104:5,7 104:8
candidates 20:19 66:19 89:16 92:3 98:24 104:16
care 58:15 117:11 129:3
Carolina 1:1,23 39:16,18 42:11 101:6 114:6 116:15 119:4 119:20 120:3,5 131:13 134:1
carried 76:10
carry 114:10,18
case 35:12 36:12 39:5,6,16,16 42:7 43:4 46:7 46:12 48:5 58:9 61:16 96:10 100:24 101:9 117:11 118:16,23 125:25
cases 7:2 43:5 109:22 113:17 118:6,7
cast 47:25 70:11
casting 118:21
Catawba 66:4 81:13
caucus 2:15
Cause 58:24
caused 6:24
census 125:7,8
central 54:5,7,8 54:9 55:20 56:2
century 57:13
certain 16:22 53:14 91:13 94:24,25 101:20
certainly 46:4 47:6 53:1 68:15 72:1 92:12 97:9,13 126:4 127:11
certify 134:5
cetera 28:18
challenge 60:6 60:25 103:1,2
challenges 6:10 115:25
chamber 3:24 4:2,5 90:15
chance 20:18 66:13,24 97:16 103:24
change 114:11 121:18,22 124:13,16
changed 30:16 30:20 33:21 111:23 129:12
changes 4:21 89:10 118:1 121:23,24
changing 34:17 127:17
characteristics 92:7
Charlotte 65:10 65:11,25 66:2 66:10,24 67:2 67:4 69:18 75:23 76:1,4 89:16 107:24
chatter 15:23
Chaudhuri 110:2 115:6
Chaudhuri's 13:1 109:20
checking 99:14
choice 40:8,10 47:24 49:8 60:1 89:17

98:25 113:18
choices 45:23 92:2
choose 49:9 90:18 128:5
chooses 128:6
choosing 49:10 60:2 129:5,6
Christ's 3:8
circular 22:23 61:25
circumstances 106:14 107:2
cited 7:18
citizens 118:24 124:3 126:20
city 9:2 30:14 69:17,18 75:22 89:15
claim 15:17 16:23 129:22 131:11
claimed 30:17
clarify 121:16
clarifying 4:21 17:2
clarity 126:6
Clark 78:16,18 78:25 79:6,9 79:12 80:17,22 82:6,9,12,15 82:16,18,24 83:11,13,22 84:6,14,18 85:5,7,12,21 85:23 99:19
Clark's 92:11
clean 114:23
clear 30:4 50:6 61:19 113:22 118:11
cleared 129:11
clearly 31:10 47:15 57:4 115:23 120:6,6
clerk 5:5,6 11:2 11:3,20 12:15 12:17 17:10,22 17:23 44:1 62:22,23 99:22 100:5,17,18 120:16 121:6,8 122:7 132:1
clients 101:16
close 2:4 34:14 108:16
closely 46:16
CLR 134:17
cluster 19:8 90:19 102:25
clustering 113:5
clusters 103:2,3 105:7 124:9
co-equal 123:23
Coalition 58:25
coast 57:24
coastal 57:23,25
cohesiveness 40:7
coincidence 93:13
colorblind 42:24
combines 69:11
come 2:4 31:14 46:9 51:10,21 58:12 77:16,25 88:8 95:19 98:21 113:21 124:22 132:23
comes 45:22 71:5 76:13 88:25 124:21
coming 8:3 17:1 30:8 31:21 83:18 90:11
comment 8:9 45:5 52:4 117:5 119:17 119:19 120:1
comments 18:19 18:20 53:16 77:17 101:4,14
commission 127:1
committee 5:7 5:18,20 6:4,13 7:11,12 8:10 8:23 9:12,24 11:9 12:23 13:25 14:11 15:7,12 16:17 16:18 18:19 19:1 20:4,5 31:2,4,15 32:2 38:3 45:24 53:4,5 56:17 58:9 63:4 67:12 71:21 72:1 75:2,18 77:21 79:13,16 79:24 80:6,16 81:24 82:3,10 83:2,5,6,20,23 84:4,8,8,12,13 84:21 85:18 103:16 108:5 110:22 111:18 111:25
committees' 10:19
common 33:2 58:3,24 69:25 70:14 79:21 80:11,25 81:1 81:5 82:11
communication 55:4
communities 16:23 57:10 58:20 59:2 61:18 66:4 69:11 75:25 79:4,14,18,23 80:10,12 81:13 81:25 117:21 118:20
community 45:6 57:5 61:8 69:12 80:24,25 81:5,7
compact 9:4 19:2,19 20:21 22:17 23:16 47:4 69:16 70:2,5 71:7,8 72:12,16 75:8 75:11 86:18,18 89:14
compactness 7:12,13,19,21 8:2,20 19:14 19:24 22:18 40:1 46:24 55:7 63:7,9 69:2,8,15,21 71:5,16,18 72:11 73:15 74:6,24 75:3,4 75:16 83:1 85:19 86:15 98:18 110:21 110:23
comparative 53:10 95:10
compare 22:9 65:22 72:22
compared 8:4 31:22 72:20
compares 130:19
comparison 19:20
comparisons 55:22
compelling 41:7 41:14
compete 90:1
competitive 15:14,22 20:17 37:10 45:20 47:12,15,22 49:7 55:9 68:10,14,15,17 76:14,21 77:1 88:15,17,19 89:14 90:5,22 91:15,17,25 92:2,13 94:21 94:22 95:4 96:10,13 98:9 98:14 115:1 119:21 120:7 130:17
competitiveness 86:21
complain 129:10
complaining 62:1
complete 37:5 53:2
completely 114:18
complex 6:23 9:6
compliance 21:1 103:20
complies 10:19 10:20 71:23
comply 18:10 78:11
composite 97:5
compositions 28:17
comprehension 58:6
compressed 5:21
computer 51:14 58:14,25
computers 58:18 125:10
conceded 92:22
concentrations 94:24
concept 36:6 123:24
concern 19:22 73:9,15 111:6 117:18
concerned 111:5
concerning 28:13
concerns 62:10 73:16 77:25
conclusion 34:10
configuration 55:5 86:14 112:21
configurations 95:12
configured 125:11
conflict 19:13
congressional 39:22 42:6,8
congressman 42:6,7
conjunction 70:7
connected 57:22

connection 81:10
consider 8:23 10:4 60:19,20 62:9 65:20 70:7 74:21 78:1 80:14 87:5 103:19 106:16 117:25
consideration 10:13,14 16:21 18:25 19:7 20:6 46:1,2 59:20 60:5 62:7 67:11 75:11 77:6 80:7,9 81:19 95:21
considerations 10:5 19:14 80:8 91:9 92:23,25 95:20
considered 46:18 53:7 86:18 104:24 106:12 123:13
considering 41:13 46:10 48:6 60:18 80:4
consistent 20:22
consistently 120:3
consisting 32:18
consternation 6:24
constitute 134:10
constitution 116:16,18 131:1,12
constitutional 18:12 20:22
constitutions 130:10
consultation 52:5
consulting 42:2
contenders 35:17
context 22:8 59:3
contiguity 6:19
contiguous 6:20
continue 51:1 61:4 62:8 75:22 114:25 131:10,11,16
continued 30:14
continuing 59:19
Contracts 4:19
contradicting 80:3
controlling 39:6
conversation 55:1
conversations 16:19
convinced 14:2 102:13
Cook 3:22 10:1
Cook's 57:20 130:3
cooperative 125:20 126:19
copy 6:9 51:15
copying 11:11
core 69:17,18
corner 125:16
correct 3:14 23:10 25:16 61:11 64:11 68:3 79:5 87:23 112:3,4
corrects 13:5
correlate 44:19
correlated 44:14
correlates 54:10
correlation 45:7
count 48:19 70:22 104:2
counties 7:3,3 37:6 40:19 57:9,16,23 58:11 76:16 77:16 86:14 103:4,5,5 108:10 111:8 114:7,9,24 116:8 130:13 130:15
country 35:2 123:24 125:7 129:10
counts 48:19
county 2:9,19 6:22,24 7:6,9 8:15 9:3,5,18 9:21,23 10:2 12:14,25 14:2 14:11,13,18,20 15:1 16:1,25 18:6,16,20 19:4,8,13,17 23:24 25:20 30:21 37:3,3,4 37:11 38:19,21 39:7,8,9,12,13 40:17,23 45:7 45:20 48:24 53:3,4,6,17 55:10 57:3,10 57:12,19,20,21 57:23 58:1,3 59:6,7 65:21 66:6,8,12,22 67:4 69:19 70:22 73:14 74:7 76:6 77:4 77:18 81:15 87:24 88:12 97:12 99:13 107:22 108:22 109:9,18 110:10,13,24 111:9,10,19 112:3,6,20,24 113:2,2 114:16 114:17,18 130:11 134:2
county's 78:7
couple 71:21
course 60:6
court 1:19 3:25 7:20 10:21 14:12 18:12,13 19:4 20:25 27:23,24 32:17 32:18,19,21 33:2,7,9,10,14 33:15 34:1,7 34:25 35:13,15 35:18,19 37:11 37:12 38:20,22 39:12 40:13,14 41:5,17,19,19 42:5,19 46:15 50:16 55:11 61:19 78:9 89:7 102:10,14 102:19 113:16 119:2,3 123:1 123:9 126:5,9 127:6 129:6,17 129:25 130:6 130:24 134:4
Court's 19:18 32:24 34:19 35:14 50:5 78:11 131:3
courtesies 3:24
courts 5:22 6:18 7:18 20:3 31:10 48:10 69:22 74:23 121:15 125:25 129:3 130:9
Courts' 32:15
crafted 86:17
Crayton 26:14 26:18 29:15 54:21 64:8,10
create 16:25 42:23 72:22 77:3 98:7 123:4
created 48:25 105:24 123:8
creating 20:17 115:11 129:19
creation 15:13 129:20
creative 108:19
crisis 104:25
criteria 6:5,7 8:10,23 9:11 10:20 22:19,22 31:2,4 32:2 45:25 46:20 47:1,8,9 48:7 49:2,19 50:4,8 55:7 60:1,2 62:5,9,12 63:6 69:8 70:8 72:1 79:15 81:21 82:3,10,14 83:1,15,16,24 84:4 89:8 90:16,17 102:5 103:15,16,17 108:7 110:7,7 110:21 119:24
criterias 119:25
criterion 70:15 79:25 80:3
cross 9:2
cross-party 9:14
crystal 50:6
CSR 1:18 134:17
Cumberland 103:6
cure 14:18 33:12 33:13 34:22 46:10
cures 14:12 15:8 15:15
current 27:18 58:4,23 72:13 79:1
currently 19:20 72:16 107:17
Curtis 99:23
curves 22:11

D

Dalton 47:17 86:25 87:1 96:24
Dare 57:22
darn 57:18
dashboard 6:11 18:5 44:1
data 10:4,5,15 10:15 22:17 27:22 29:4 38:14 43:20 44:14,17,20 47:13 50:23,25

52:22,24,25 53:10,12 54:4 54:5,9 55:20 56:3 60:20 69:25 93:2,2 93:15,17 95:10 95:13,15 97:6
database 93:23 94:3
dated 101:10
Davis 3:22
day 2:18 34:25 128:12 134:12
deadline 5:24
deal 106:4 110:5 110:13,14,15 110:20
dealing 53:2
dealt 110:7
debate 11:15 12:3 13:14 16:9 17:5,14 17:15 29:20 32:5 44:4 45:9 50:18 51:1,25 52:11 53:19 56:20 59:11,14 63:12 65:16 74:12 78:15 85:25 94:15 99:18,20 100:1 100:10 113:7 119:6 120:11 120:21 122:2 122:14,18 128:18 131:18 131:21
decades 8:7 9:10
decided 36:23 39:17 40:17 50:2 119:16
deciding 28:14
decision 29:12 32:15 126:5,7 131:10
deck 12:10 105:1
declared 39:11
deeply 36:19
defeat 67:20 107:3
defeated 87:2,4
defending 37:14
definitely 5:21
definition 57:24
degree 124:9
delay 101:1
demagogue 70:10
Democrat 15:21 65:23 68:9 70:16 87:3 90:4,6 94:23 104:12 115:10 115:12
Democratic 15:7 15:22 68:5 86:22 90:10 98:8,11,13,14 99:11 104:5,6 105:9 117:8 130:18
Democratic-le... 15:15
Democrats 15:18 66:18,23 76:11,14 87:7 94:19 114:4,18 114:24 118:4 118:10
Denise 1:18 3:25 134:4,16,16
denise@disco... 1:25
denote 121:19
Dental 4:19
deny 116:2
Department 129:8
describe 21:21
described 69:13 109:7,9 118:13 128:4
describing 80:14 81:9
descriptive 81:8
deserve 67:10
design 34:13,14 36:15
designed 76:5 104:10
desk 101:3
detail 71:25 72:2
detailed 46:3
details 95:18
determination 16:20
determine 7:21 29:5 35:3 38:18 41:10,21 43:2 46:4 84:20
determined 31:10 35:20 39:15 41:5 102:10,24 126:1
determining 33:12
develop 18:9 42:20 64:9 108:13 113:20
developed 43:6 54:20 113:22 113:24
developing 29:16 43:3
development 26:14
deviated 110:23
devices 2:7
devise 108:13
devised 102:3 106:24 107:24 108:2,6,6
dialogue 55:3
dictated 47:8 124:9
differ 81:2
difference 49:22 75:14 96:15
different 18:18 30:6,7 36:7,8 48:23 49:1,5,6 67:10 72:14 82:4 92:7,10 93:22,24 103:14 113:21 116:9 128:1
differently 47:5 48:17
difficulty 80:23
dilutive 61:23
diminish 70:21
direct 3:4
direction 49:10
directly 64:9 127:5
disadvantage 109:24
Discovery 1:19 3:25
discrepancies 58:14
discriminate 118:6
discriminated 118:9
discriminating 60:24
discrimination 60:4 117:13,19 118:7,20 123:10
discriminatory 61:5 62:4 123:2,3
discuss 59:18
discussed 16:17 75:7
discussing 60:13
discussion 11:15 12:2 13:14,24 16:9 17:5,14 17:15 29:20 32:5 44:2,4 45:9 50:18 51:25 52:11 53:17,19 55:1 56:20 59:11 63:12 67:12 74:12 75:13 78:15 79:19 81:23 85:25 99:18,20,25 100:10 113:7 119:6 120:11 120:21 122:2 122:14 125:11 125:12 128:18 131:18,21
disinclined 82:1
disjointed 58:20
disparity 41:1 42:1
dispense 3:15
disproportion... 95:7
disservice 57:6 58:21 120:2 124:3
distinction 81:4
distinguishing 80:24
distributed 56:15,15
district 7:5 10:18 13:1,1 15:13,14,15,18 15:19,22 18:15 18:22 19:16,17 19:25,25 22:20 27:18,18 28:14 28:18 29:6 30:5,19 32:15 32:18,21 33:5 33:17,18 34:14 35:24 36:25 38:3,23 39:3 39:23,24 40:1 40:11,18,24 41:3,10 42:15 46:13,14 48:2 48:17 49:4 50:11,14 55:9 66:3,6,7,13 68:7,12,13,17 69:5,7,10 70:2 72:11,12,15,16 73:13 75:19 79:2 84:1 87:7 89:4,24 90:4,6 90:9 92:9,11 92:12,13 93:16 94:1,3 96:11 96:12,14,16 97:11,11,14,14 97:22 105:10 105:22 108:20 109:10,12,20

110:1,10,13 114:17 130:3,4 130:5,17,18
district-by- 50:10
districts 6:16,21 7:14,19,25 8:2 8:16,25 12:25 13:6 14:3,18 15:1,6,8,19 16:4 18:7,10 18:13 19:9 20:16,17 30:23 31:16 32:17 33:1,3 35:23 36:4,5,12,15 36:16 37:5,8,9 38:12 39:18 40:16 41:17,21 41:25 42:8,21 43:3 46:6 47:12,12,15,16 47:22 48:10,14 49:1,7 52:22 55:5 60:15,22 63:10 65:24 66:1,1,17,21 67:16 68:6,17 69:3 70:4,16 73:14 75:7,9 86:16,22 87:1 87:5 88:8,15 88:15,16,17,18 88:19,21 89:6 89:14,14,15,21 90:23 91:13,14 91:15,18 93:1 93:3 94:21,22 94:22 95:2,6 96:6,10 97:8,9 98:7,8,9,10,11 98:13,14,15,22 101:25 102:12 102:14,21,24 103:10,15,20 104:1,3,4,12 105:5,8,18 106:4,10 108:14 116:2 116:14 119:22 120:7 123:2,5 123:8 129:19 129:21 130:18
divide 8:19 39:17 75:22 76:3 115:23 125:13
divides 77:6
dividing 128:3
division 128:7
document 55:3
documentation 54:22 83:19
documents 56:14
doing 46:3,10 126:22
dollars 37:14 42:1
domination 114:14 115:20 117:7 118:10
Donald 88:7
doors 2:5
dot 107:18 109:12 110:11 110:11
double 61:12
double-bunk 9:13 22:21 66:11 107:6,7 107:8 119:23
double-bunked 9:15,18,20,22 10:2 48:22 89:24 105:4,6 107:5,21,21,23 108:21 109:14 115:5
double-bunking 8:17 48:25 106:25 108:4 109:19,24 111:9 113:1
double-bunki... 111:24
double-bunks 107:10 113:19
Dr 29:15 54:21 64:8,10
draw 31:9,16 39:2 40:1 93:21 94:17,18 96:8 106:10 114:10 116:2 119:15 128:5,6 128:7 130:25 131:2,13
drawing 7:14 8:24 10:6,16 21:13 39:22 47:9 60:15,21 67:15 88:21 94:14 116:14 129:15
drawn 6:6 15:7 15:20 16:21 18:8 20:8,16 23:24 30:5,22 47:8 48:2,17 77:5,7 86:22 89:4,18,20 90:7 91:14 94:20 95:2,6,9 97:8 98:7 101:24 104:1 105:7 114:17
draws 65:23 68:5,6 98:10 128:1
drew 33:17,17 34:7,8 91:12 119:17
drive 58:18 70:1
driving 19:6
dropped 22:16
due 18:25 50:5
Dunn 11:22
duties 121:5
Duyn 119:7,9,13
dynamic 61:2 62:1

E

E 134:1,1
earlier 29:14 53:16 76:10 124:12
easier 47:1
east 107:24
eastern 66:9 69:19
easy 28:19 70:9
edge 110:12
Edgecombe 57:11
eerily 34:14
effect 9:12 61:23 62:5
effort 97:13
eight 9:13
either 21:23 56:14 109:22
eke 104:15
Elaine 97:2,3
elect 9:19 40:8 89:16 98:24
elected 40:12 49:9 50:13
electing 41:3
election 10:4,5 84:1
elections 104:4 125:1 131:4
electronic 2:6
eliminate 60:3
eliminated 22:16
eliminates 60:10
else's 116:4
emphasize 117:10
enable 123:8
enacted 61:24 62:5,9 72:13
encourage 90:21
ended 36:21 133:18
ends 37:8
engaging 59:19
engrossed 132:16,20
enlightened 88:11 99:16
ensure 78:10
enter 2:14 105:12
entered 53:5,7
entire 76:22 115:2
entirety 19:25
entitled 6:12
entity 61:20
equal 6:14
Eric 129:7
especially 2:15 33:25 43:5
essentially 67:13
establish 46:25 48:7
established 6:17 6:25 8:21 32:2 45:25 46:21 49:2 63:7
establishing 6:5
et 28:18
evaluate 47:2
evaluating 84:1
evening 95:15
event 21:23 109:22
Everybody 89:24
evidence 27:13 28:13 29:9 50:9
exact 58:23
exactly 27:25 50:15 77:4 92:4 119:20
examination 89:9
examined 3:14
example 70:9
exceed 33:1 41:6
exceeded 32:22 38:24 89:5
exception 57:14
excess 36:13
excessively 115:17
exclusively 69:1
excused 99:23 131:19
exercise 127:7
exist 7:10 30:21 30:24 40:15 42:22 54:22 84:7
existed 30:19 60:16

exists 37:12 57:5
expect 84:19 112:14,17
experience 27:17 28:12 36:25
experiencing 61:14
expertise 21:13
explain 5:15 11:6 12:20 18:1 21:16 22:2 33:8 34:9 52:24 63:1 81:2 121:11
explained 14:10 34:20 73:25
explains 80:13
explanation 33:15
exploit 70:10,11
expressed 20:15
extend 109:6
extended 3:25
externally 84:19
extra 11:12
eye 70:4
eyeball 69:23 71:5,16,19 73:1,11 78:4,6

F

F 134:1
face 73:1
fact 24:5 30:13 33:16 80:4 81:19,22 83:5 86:24 88:8 97:17
factor 67:15
factoring 126:13
factors 19:1 39:20 40:15 62:6,7
facts 95:18
failed 13:3 45:25 46:19
failing 46:1 73:14
fails 32:1 71:4 73:11,13 100:8 120:19
fair 20:21 43:7 45:19 90:22 112:13 119:21 120:7 127:25
fall 6:16 130:14
far 22:10 24:5 47:1 69:7 86:18,18 104:21 106:12 114:25 126:12 126:18
far-left 117:9
far-right 117:14
fares 8:5 9:8
farm 104:18 128:4
farther 22:11
farthest 58:1
fat 104:19
fault 58:22
favor 11:18 17:8 94:18 100:3 120:14 122:5 131:24 133:11
fear 58:12
federal 18:11 35:19 106:9,9 116:17
feel 118:20
feeling 42:14
fellow 33:16
felt 30:3 96:8 97:9
fewer 8:8 9:7
fight 131:7,11
fighting 118:19
figure 80:25
find 6:19 7:24 8:11 41:8 75:4 75:15 84:9,19 89:3 103:25 105:20 111:8 114:20
finding 60:4
first 6:14 21:14 40:25 45:17,25 49:5 65:20 83:1 105:25 108:12 110:16 111:4,6 127:22 128:5
fit 16:23 59:3 115:24
five 11:19 17:9 43:6 65:23 66:20 68:5,17 70:7,16 76:10 87:1 98:10,13 100:5 120:15 122:6 131:25
fix 35:6,9 36:2 37:10 110:4 111:21 112:19 123:15
fixed 35:4,21 38:20 112:20
fixes 112:18
fixing 108:12 112:25
flaws 18:12 101:19
flexibility 58:10
floor 1:2 4:21 16:14 29:25 32:10 45:16 49:17 51:24 57:1 59:17 65:18 68:2 74:17 77:14 86:10 100:21 113:12 117:3 119:12 121:11 122:20 128:23
fluid 127:17
focused 125:22
folders 84:23
folk 28:3 36:3,14 104:21
follow 8:20 14:21 24:8 26:7 30:25 31:15 32:2 43:11 45:3 64:12 70:24 71:9 72:4 73:4 73:19 74:2 80:17 82:6 84:5,6,14 85:7 87:25 92:15 93:8 95:22
follow-up 14:23 26:20 28:5 43:13 56:4 64:14 71:1 79:7,10 80:19 85:9 88:3 91:19 92:18 93:10 107:13 109:1
followed 129:25
follows 7:5
Ford 122:10
foregoing 134:6 134:9
foremost 18:10
forget 113:3
Forks 1:21
form 7:4 83:14 110:4
former 4:3
formula 7:6 57:4
formula-driven 57:9
forth 12:6 17:19 45:18 62:19 75:17 100:14 106:2 108:7 120:25
forward 11:1 12:8 17:21 30:8 31:5 62:21 86:13 100:16 116:4 119:1 121:1,4 131:4
fought 118:5
found 3:14 14:12 18:12,14 48:10 61:6,14 74:22 78:8 101:18 115:14 123:10
foundation 2:25 3:7 15:15
four 31:23 47:15 47:19 103:4 111:7 125:1,17
fractured 67:7,7
frankly 75:13 76:20,25
free 124:12
freeze 42:19
Friday 1:4 102:9
friend 2:17
friendlier 111:3
front 6:3 82:14 127:15
full 6:11 76:24
fully 63:6 74:1
function 112:15
furnished 54:5 55:20
further 11:14 12:2 13:13 14:3 15:2 16:8 17:4,14,15 23:1,17 24:8 24:24 25:8,23 27:7 28:22 29:19 32:4 34:20 44:3 45:8 50:17 51:25 52:11 53:18 54:12 55:13 56:19 59:10 63:11 64:1 65:5 74:11 78:14 85:24 94:4 99:17,20,25 100:10 107:11 111:12,20 112:8 113:6 119:5 120:10 120:21 122:1 122:14 128:17 131:17,21 132:13,23
Furthermore 86:20
future 92:9 126:12

G

gain 34:23,24
game 82:4
games 48:12
general 1:1 9:9

10:10 78:9 80:15 102:3 113:23 116:1,7 116:15 130:12
gentlemen 2:13 18:4 33:9
geography 60:14 81:16
gerrymander 14:12,14,16,19 14:20 15:9,12 15:17,25 16:3 16:25 30:13 35:10 36:24 37:11 38:16,19 38:21,22 102:16,23 104:11 105:3 105:21,24 110:8 112:18 114:3
gerrymandered 48:3,9,13 102:12,15,25 104:23
gerrymanderi... 14:5,6,8,10 20:3 27:25 28:2 46:9 97:19,20 110:5 110:16 117:12
gerrymanders 14:4 30:10 31:11 34:22 35:21 39:15 102:19 103:3 108:11 111:7
getting 121:13
Gingles 39:5,16 39:20 40:15 41:9,16 50:8 118:6
give 34:21 66:22 77:16 97:3,16 125:23
given 5:22 14:17 44:18 85:17 130:25
gives 86:21
giving 50:3
go 2:5 4:8 6:7 33:23,24 43:15 47:13,16,25 48:7,20 84:19 89:10 95:11 96:23,23,24 97:2 108:12 111:5 121:15 126:16,22 127:12 131:16
goal 8:1 20:17 42:16,23 97:15 105:17 118:17
God 3:7
goes 31:5 33:5 35:6 110:24 126:6
going 31:9 33:7 33:13,16 34:1 34:7 42:19 43:18 51:14 58:19 68:7,9 68:10 75:20 76:3 77:22 87:6 90:6,8,15 97:11 98:10 124:15 125:12 125:12 128:5 129:21
good 2:16,17 3:3 20:25 31:8 53:10 57:18 86:13 96:14 97:3 115:7,8 125:17
government 35:1 123:23
governor 10:8,8 10:9,10 47:18 86:25 87:4
governor's 76:8 104:7 114:23
grab 106:6
grader 34:4
grandson 5:13
granted 3:21
grateful 6:1
great 117:18
Greensboro 25:18 30:14 109:11
grew 104:18
group 7:2 73:2 113:24,24 114:4 115:13 117:13,21
grouped 57:11
grouping 7:9 9:19,21
groupings 6:22 6:25 7:6 10:3 57:3,9 58:5,10 58:19,22,23,24 59:1,6
groups 40:7 116:13,19
guarantee 127:24
gubernatorial 104:8
guess 48:22 58:11 60:20 69:15 94:16 96:14 101:11 110:12 119:3
guests 2:6,10
guide 3:4 7:13 7:16
Guilford 18:6,16 18:20 19:17 20:21 23:24 25:19 30:21 37:3,4,11 45:20 48:24 53:4,6,17 55:9 103:7,12 107:9 108:10 109:8 110:10,13 111:10 113:2 114:15
gut 50:12

H

Hagan 47:19,21
half 37:4 57:14 124:20 125:2,3
Halifax 57:11
Hampton 58:4
hand 116:18
handed 102:6
handing 100:25
Hanover 8:15
happening 39:8 127:16
happens 50:13 90:2 107:19 109:13
happy 10:22
hard 46:21,23 66:16 69:24 78:10
harm 117:20
harmed 61:11
harmful 61:7
he'll 13:18
heads 69:24
hear 49:18 59:24
heard 15:23 18:17 31:4 66:25 71:20 76:1 77:23,23 78:3 83:2 119:18,25 120:5
hearing 11:15 17:5 62:12 99:21 100:1 120:11 122:2 131:22
hearings 20:16 95:16
heart 66:2,24 107:16
help 3:5 44:25 45:5 62:13 94:14
helped 94:17 96:8
helping 118:5,25
hey 97:7
high 15:17 19:10 24:2,2,4 25:20 105:8,9
higher 72:23 75:12 88:8
highly 68:10 123:22
Hill 65:3,11 66:11 67:9,17 73:18 76:2
Hise 5:2,8,14,16 11:3,5,7 13:7 16:10,12,15 18:18 29:21,23 30:1 37:17,18 37:24 38:9 43:9,11,17 44:7,9,11,13 44:22 45:1 50:19,21 51:5 51:6 52:5,12 52:14,20 74:13 74:15,18 82:18 82:20,22,24 83:16,24 84:10 84:15,24 85:8 85:10,15 101:8 101:18 113:8 113:10,13 117:5 118:13 119:14 120:23 120:25 121:3,8 121:10,12 128:19,21,24 132:6,8,13,15 133:11
historic 130:20
historical 57:18 59:3
historically 9:8
history 40:20 125:2
hogs 104:19
Holder 129:7
home 57:10
homes 3:1
honest 34:11
hope 62:12 106:15 123:25 124:2,18 125:18 127:2 128:15
Hopefully 83:9
hoping 2:18 123:6
Horner 48:21 56:21,23 57:2 62:15 130:5
hours 5:21 77:17
house 2:23 4:19

4:20 133:5
huge 36:21
hurt 59:6
hurts 59:6
Hyde 57:22

I

idea 67:16 73:17 80:12
ideal 6:17
ideas 117:9,14
identical 53:6
identified 35:4 55:12
identify 12:11
identifying 10:15
ignored 115:22
ignores 57:4
ignoring 30:13
illegal 48:12 60:4,15
impact 36:16 60:5,10,11
implications 106:11
imply 34:7
import 93:22
important 46:23 46:24 59:23 78:1
importantly 10:13,20 31:1 66:10 124:2
impossible 46:2 46:9
improper 48:12
improve 8:19
improves 8:2
in-town 66:1
inaccurate 68:6
inappropriate 62:11
inasmuch 113:17
inclined 31:15
include 45:25 46:1
included 18:14 53:13
includes 18:25 66:7
including 53:11 53:14 68:11 116:21
inclusive 125:21 134:10
incorporated 112:6
increase 31:24
increases 63:9
incumbency 9:11 46:23 47:6 48:8,14 48:16 49:25 55:6 89:22 90:15 98:19 110:6,15 111:1 111:5
incumbent 19:15 90:12 106:25 107:25 109:23 111:2
incumbents 19:8 19:12,22 22:21 48:8 97:16 108:6 115:10
indefensible 37:15
independent 46:3 127:1
indicate 66:15
indicated 22:13 55:22
indication 34:22 97:4
individual 94:17 96:8
individual's 31:18
individuals 5:19 10:16
inevitable 48:11
infect 60:11
infected 61:20
influence 40:12
inform 32:20 126:16
information 29:7 38:4,6 51:13 102:15
initially 54:11
initiatives 114:8
innate 83:17,23 85:3
innateness 85:13
inner 57:24
insight 114:1
instance 61:8,17 67:5
insurance 58:16
intelligence 88:13
intend 9:25
intent 34:8 130:3
interchange 15:5 54:18
interest 41:15 57:5,10 59:4 69:11 79:4,14 79:19,21,23 80:11,12,24,25 81:1,5,5,7,9,17 81:25 82:11
interested 36:17 55:21
interests 67:10 67:18 81:1
interim 52:21 57:15
interplay 13:24
interpreted 75:1 130:9
interprets 35:1
intrigued 21:14
introduced 53:3
intrusive 41:12
invalidated 19:3 19:18
invite 127:11
involuntary 125:4
involved 26:4 41:15 61:18 65:14 95:17 118:25
involves 13:6 70:14,14
involving 12:25 61:17
irrelevant 62:11
issue 16:2 27:24 41:14 70:11 86:23 105:3 106:2 117:22 117:23 124:6 126:2
issues 42:20 55:7 110:5 112:22 113:1 116:11 118:2 127:5
iteration 104:13

J

Jackson 62:17 62:19,23,25 63:2,16,17,19 63:21,24 64:3 64:5,11,16,18 64:24 65:1 67:5,13,22,24 68:3,25 69:10 70:24 71:4,9 71:14 72:4,8 73:4,9,19,24 74:2,5,10 86:1 86:12 107:18 107:20 109:8 110:18 115:9
Jamestown 24:3 25:20
Jeff 62:17 107:18 115:9
Jerry 2:9
Jim 3:22
job 33:23 74:6
jobs 58:13
joined 58:2
Josh 76:9
journal 3:13,15 3:18
judge 32:19 106:9
judges 32:18
judging 7:18
judicial 104:25 123:19,24
Justice 129:8
justification 40:25 41:2
justified 106:14
justifies 111:2

K

Kareem 26:14 26:18 64:8
Kay 47:19
keep 35:25
keeping 19:22 50:1
Kernersville 24:20 25:6
kind 30:11,12 39:23 89:10 97:5,5 105:16 105:17,18 127:1
kinds 75:10
know 6:10 22:8 25:19 27:20,22 28:4 33:10 34:1 38:13 42:12,13 43:23 46:21,22,24 47:24 48:18,23 69:14,20,23 71:24 72:1 77:15 79:17 81:19 87:19 90:11 92:4,5 94:14 95:17 97:7 103:22 105:14 110:11 110:17 111:11 118:15 124:7 124:25 126:9 127:23 130:2
knowledge 16:22 60:14
known 9:23
knows 126:2,4,7
Krawiec 9:19

L

laboreth 2:24
Ladies 2:13 18:4
lady 33:9
Lakes 66:5 81:13

land 95:1
language 73:10
late 95:13
Latino 61:18
law 18:11 127:22 130:24
laws 35:2
lawyer 28:4 101:23
lawyers 101:9 101:15 102:1 118:24
lay 95:1
layer 45:1,2
lead 7:22 105:18
leadership 65:20 65:25 70:6
Leading 2:8
lean 68:7,9
leaning 15:22
learn 72:10 127:8
learned 104:17 104:18 126:15 127:21
leaves 3:20
leeway 50:3
left 22:10 23:10 23:13 114:25
left-wing 118:18 119:3
legal 1:20 4:1 15:2,3 45:19 61:15 90:22 105:18 119:21 131:7,8
legality 20:24
legislative 1:2 7:14 8:24 39:22 117:19
legislature 36:6 76:3 123:21 126:24
lesson 104:19 125:2,19 127:19
lessons 3:2 128:16
letter 101:7,10 101:17,24
level 27:14 37:12 40:18 41:6
Lewis 101:8,18
lieutenant 10:8 10:9
life 3:1
light 62:16 86:1 99:19
limited 9:4
limits 30:14
line 8:21 9:3 11:11 30:23 65:5 108:16
lines 21:24 48:2
list 82:13
listed 25:18 84:3 84:11
listen 36:2 120:4
listened 101:14
listening 94:15
listing 44:24
literally 115:2
literature 75:17 84:10,20
litigation 35:13 112:16 113:16 113:24 119:1
little 4:3 9:5 21:13 27:4,6 49:5,6 51:15 80:23 81:2 88:23 107:18 109:10
live 40:11 110:18
lives 110:18
LLC 1:20
loaded 51:13
local 59:2
logic 61:25
logically 58:7
long 43:15 81:23 104:17 131:6 131:16
longer 30:24 51:16
longest 44:18
look 7:19 21:18 21:19,20 22:15 22:16 24:17,22 27:22 28:19 30:14 31:22 32:25 33:11,13 33:16,23,24 34:2 41:11,20 47:17,19 48:20 58:16 60:2 69:3,16 71:8 72:25 75:19 76:7,8,20 80:5 86:24 87:9 89:1,7,11 93:2 96:23,24,25,25 97:2,5,22 103:17,18 107:15 108:3 108:23 109:8 109:18 114:15 114:15,16,19 114:22
looked 30:10 38:17 40:13,14 40:16 97:22 101:11 102:7 127:8
looking 22:18 38:20 40:22 46:7 47:11,13 47:16 55:4,5,6 55:7,7 60:9 70:3,16 78:4 98:18,19,20 103:14
looks 12:14 15:14,21 21:21 21:22 30:11,12 34:14 54:9 69:5,11 71:7,7 75:23 91:10 109:10
Lord 2:23,24 3:4
lose 59:5
loser 96:12
lost 88:7 128:16
lot 5:19,20 27:21 78:3 101:2 114:1 121:14 129:16
Lowe 2:18
lower 8:10 20:9 72:23

M

ma'am 29:3
machine 124:11
magic 35:25 124:14
maintain 97:13 117:14
maintains 19:15
maintenance 19:8
major 24:7 103:4
majorities 36:22
majority 19:5 21:19 25:15 40:18 89:20 104:12 105:2
majority's 71:23
majority-mino... 46:14 89:6
makeup 14:17 123:4,5,7
making 29:11 45:6 89:9,10
man 58:17
managed 104:15
mandated 113:5
manner 31:17 85:19 118:15
mantra 59:19 62:8,14
map 6:11 7:5 8:12 9:12 11:10 15:17,20 16:2 19:3,7,9 19:20 20:1,1,2 20:13,23 21:16 21:19,20 22:9 22:11,22 23:23 24:1,2,5,6,7,16 25:14,15 26:5 26:15 27:2 30:6,7 31:23 34:2,3,13,15 47:8,10 63:23 64:24 65:14,21 65:25 66:11,21 66:21 68:14 69:5,6 70:6,18 71:23 72:13 73:1 74:7 77:4 78:11 88:18,24 89:4,12,13 90:22 91:10 95:14 98:9,12 98:13 105:12 105:21 106:7 106:24 108:3,5 108:17,18,19 108:23 109:25 110:2 111:4,22 112:7 113:22 113:23 114:11 114:15,16,17 115:2 116:4 123:14 124:6 130:7
mapping 19:2
maps 5:23 6:3,6 6:6,20 8:5 9:16 10:17 16:20 21:13 30:15 57:13 60:6 77:20,20 78:5 78:7 88:21 93:22 94:14,18 94:18,20 95:8 96:8 97:15,21 98:6 103:17 119:15,17,20 119:23 123:11 127:4 128:7,15 129:7,16 130:25 131:2,3 131:5,9,13
Maptitude 45:2
marginalize 84:24
Marshall's 97:2 97:3
Martin 58:2
master 106:10
mathematical 57:3 58:5
matter 24:5 83:5
Matthews 64:25 65:2,10 66:10 67:8,16 73:18

76:2 107:23
McCrory 86:25 87:20
McKissick 26:17 29:15 45:10,12 45:13,17 49:23 52:14,17,18,20 52:25 53:23,25 54:1,4,7,13,15 54:16,24 55:14 55:16,17,24 56:2,7,8,12 63:22 64:7 86:3,4,7,11 87:14,16,17,20 87:21 88:3,4 88:10 91:3,5,6 91:11,17,21,22 92:1,18,19 93:6,10,11,18 94:8,10,11,13 94:20 95:25 96:1,3,18 98:2 98:3,5,16 99:6 99:7,12,15 122:9
mean 21:16 22:3 43:15 72:23 80:2,2 81:8,25 81:25 88:14 94:25 97:1 105:13 123:14 125:11
meaning 32:22 94:22
meaningful 61:23
means 9:4 23:14 60:20,23
meant 65:9 82:2
measure 9:6 74:24
measures 7:21 20:12 69:21 71:15,18 72:3 72:9,10 73:12 74:22,25 85:4 86:15,16
Mecklenburg 53:2 63:5 65:21 66:6,8,9 66:12,18,22 67:4 68:18 70:22 74:7 76:6,18 77:4 77:18 81:15 87:24 88:12 97:12 99:13 103:6,13 107:17,22 108:9 110:17 113:2 114:16 130:16
meet 6:7 7:25 75:3,3,6,8,16 108:7
meeting 13:25 56:17 81:24 83:3,6
member 35:15 40:5 50:13 66:12 90:11 113:23 116:3 123:21
member's 80:2
members 2:5,5,9 3:24 4:2,7 5:10 5:18,20 9:13 11:9 16:17 17:1 30:2 35:22 36:23 37:25 38:15 41:24 44:17 45:6 51:10,12 51:22 74:20 84:9 108:16 113:14 115:4 116:8 127:12 127:14,14 129:1 132:21
Members' 3:20
membership 56:11
memories 33:20
mentioned 60:17 76:2 117:6
Meredith 3:22
merely 121:24
message 66:19 77:1 114:25 123:18,20 124:1
messages 133:5
met 129:11
metaphor 69:4
metaphors 69:2
mete 128:11
method 41:12
methods 7:16
midst 3:5
million 37:4
millions 37:13 37:13,13 42:1
mind 89:11 124:16
mine 68:11
minimize 88:22
minimum 7:22 7:23
minorities 40:11
minority 9:15 40:5,8,9 41:3 42:10
Mint 65:3,11 66:11 67:9,17 73:18 76:2
Minton 5:11
minus 6:16
minute 24:22,22
minutes 50:23 51:4,7
mirror 67:3 69:4
mischaracteri... 96:20
modern 61:2
modification 126:8
moment 2:14 92:22 124:19 125:20
moments 122:25
Monday 95:16 101:13 121:21 133:5,10
motion 3:10 4:13,15 132:14 132:25 133:7
move 3:14 4:18 5:1 13:11 49:11 108:14 118:25 130:3,5 131:4 133:3
moved 108:19
moves 11:3 12:17 17:23 62:23 100:18 121:8
moving 110:19 111:2
multiple 7:7 37:25
municipal 8:22 8:24 9:3 31:22 50:1 55:6 88:22,23 98:20
municipalities 9:1,7 23:25 31:21,24,25 46:22 49:4 65:6 77:7 115:23,24
municipality 25:15 39:23 65:13
Myers 1:18 3:25 134:4,16,16

N

name 3:8
narrowing 80:12
narrowly 41:11
Nash 57:12
nation 131:1
national 125:11
naturally 9:2
nature 13:8 23:8
necessarily 87:6 90:8 129:5
necessary 38:25 83:21
necessity 9:18 9:20 10:2
need 24:17 36:2 41:19 69:23 76:17 99:16 121:3,20 125:14 128:14
needed 77:7
needs 124:16 125:20,21,21
negative 12:1 17:12 60:10 100:8 118:22 120:19 122:12 132:4
neutral 42:18,23
never 38:25 61:12 96:18,21 119:25 127:13
new 8:15,20 11:10 30:6,20 30:22,24 31:9 84:12
newly 9:19
Newton 4:3,4 76:9
nine 33:1 102:23 123:2
non-compactn... 85:20
non-competitive 65:24
non-minority 40:3
non-race- 62:2
non-race-relat... 61:3
noon 51:17
normal 19:16 20:2 21:15 22:3 23:8,14
Norman 66:5 81:14
north 1:1,23 39:16,18 42:11 58:1,4 101:6 114:6 116:15 119:4,20 120:3 120:5 131:13 134:1
northeastern 66:8
Notary 134:5
note 2:1 77:5 133:17
notes 33:24
noteworthy 20:7
notice 103:9 108:21

notices 132:22
notion 81:6
notwithstandi... 97:17
nuck 20:24
number 7:3,4 8:10 31:14,16 31:24 39:25 40:2,6 47:6 60:24 61:1 62:2 75:21 76:15 84:3 125:17
numbers 11:11 15:18 72:20,21 76:17 93:18
numerical 82:25
numerous 72:2
nutshell 37:2

O

Obama 96:25 129:8
object 132:8
objected 132:11
objection 3:18 3:21 4:24 5:4 51:3,16 132:19
obligation 116:16,17
observations 101:20 122:24
observe 110:20
observed 102:25
obtain 83:9
obviously 116:5
occasions 7:8 37:25
occupied 107:17
occur 31:17
occurred 39:1 48:12 55:1 97:19 114:21 121:22,24
occurs 57:19
oddly 35:11,11
offending 61:20
offer 92:2
offered 63:4 103:11,12 104:22 112:15 116:8
offers 114:1
office 104:14
oh 3:7 101:23
Okay 49:25 83:13 87:3 99:20
Old 2:22
older 33:19
omniscient 126:11
once 32:20 41:8 110:3 116:21 129:13
one's 58:21
ones 7:17 22:15 73:2 103:11 105:5 113:4 116:13
ongoing 55:3
online 58:16
open 115:11
opening 80:1
operating 102:11
opinion 19:18 31:7,18 35:14 50:6
opinions 36:3
opponent 87:1
opportunity 47:24 66:17,20 95:4 124:20
opposed 11:19 17:8 20:14 49:21 100:4 120:15 122:6 127:9 131:25 133:14
opposition 130:22
optimal 7:9 58:4 58:10
options 45:22 86:21 92:2 117:17
order 2:4 5:22 10:21 14:15 32:24 35:3 38:12 51:10,21 61:13 65:12 78:12 106:5 107:1,3 117:13 129:7
ordered 5:4 132:19
orders 123:19
original 19:3 20:9 43:18 69:1 93:19 123:10
originally 93:25 94:2
originated 87:23
ought 28:4,18 36:19 41:10,22 42:10 70:1 105:13 122:24 126:16
outcome 20:19 48:1,11
outcroppings 21:25
outer 66:3 81:12 97:12
outline 34:6
outside 76:1 113:4 116:13 116:18
overlap 103:10
overlook 58:13
overriding 41:18
overused 129:23
overutilized 129:18
overwhelming 20:15

P

p.m 133:6,10,18
pack 6:15 10:12 28:3 38:10 47:14 53:2,13 103:25 115:4
packed 27:19
packet 102:1
packs 101:1 102:5,5 123:7
page 5:10,12 11:12 121:5
pages 134:9
painful 126:18
pair 9:14
paired 59:8
pairings 108:4
pairs 9:13,14
Pamlico 57:22
Pandora's 80:1
panel 32:18 35:19 50:15 106:9 123:18 124:24
parameters 98:17
pardon 56:1
part 10:11 18:15 37:5 38:10,14 42:9 44:2 47:14 48:6 66:8 71:25 78:10 79:1 93:19 118:5 123:20 130:7
partial 22:23
participate 126:23 128:11
participation 42:10
particular 10:18 27:14 29:5 32:15 38:2,15 46:12 47:10 63:7 83:17 86:17 88:18 89:4 92:4 96:12,15
particularly 18:11 63:9 97:10 116:10
partisan 34:23 48:3,6 77:3 89:18,20,22 95:7,9 104:1 104:10,11 105:11 106:7 126:22
parts 129:12
party 9:15 73:12 105:2 117:8 125:13
pass/fail 85:19
pass/fails 75:2
passage 11:17 17:7 100:2 120:13 122:4 131:23
passed 123:6,11 129:9 132:4
passes 12:1 17:12 122:12
Pat 87:19
Pate 3:9,11 132:24 133:1,9
paying 42:21
pays 125:13
PCS 11:10
people 3:6 36:3 36:7 37:4 42:3 47:23 57:7 59:5 60:22 77:25 82:1 89:15 90:14 102:13 108:14 108:19 119:19 119:23 120:2,4 125:8 127:25 131:1
people's 128:1
percent 6:16 20:13,14 27:3 28:15 29:12 32:23 33:1,4,5 33:11 34:18 36:10,13 38:24 39:2 40:17,19 40:24 42:13 49:21,21 55:11 68:12,12 76:15 88:9 89:6 93:4 93:15,17 94:1 94:2 96:5,9,13 105:10 130:12 130:15
percentage 28:20 35:24 38:1,23 105:23
percentages 40:21 105:8

perfect 70:9
perfecting 111:21
perform 95:2
performance 53:14 83:17 87:7 97:4 104:3
performing 85:1
period 85:14
perpetuation 118:18
perpetuity 42:22
person 34:6 89:23
person's 31:7
personal 28:12 60:14
personally 117:16
pertained 69:1
pertaining 63:5
physically 121:4
pick 90:18 116:3 116:7
picked 2:17 11:11 76:7
picture 109:7
pie 75:24
piece 106:13
pigs 104:19
pinned 82:1
pinwheel 75:21 75:24
pizza 67:5 75:23
place 8:18 30:25 36:1 42:18,19 84:22 105:25 124:15 125:9
placed 66:13 129:16
placement 19:12
places 2:16 9:1 36:8 60:16 107:6 108:24 124:6 127:6
plaintiffs 101:9 106:3 108:11 118:16,23 120:8
plaintiffs' 108:3 108:17
plan 5:7 6:13 8:1 8:4,4,12,13,25 9:6 20:10,21 35:7,8 40:23 45:20 47:3,4 79:3 86:17 89:2 98:22,23 98:23 101:5,13 101:19,21 102:11 104:22 104:24 105:17 110:22
planning 38:6 43:21
plans 4:19 9:8 38:11 47:2 57:15 101:11 102:4 105:19 117:16
play 36:19
Plaza-Midwood 107:23
please 2:6,10,14 4:13
plenty 37:6
plurality 35:24
plus 6:16 27:22 40:24 104:14
point 14:1 21:14 24:2,2,4 25:20 35:6 37:16 38:7 81:17 83:14,22
pointed 18:22 58:8 111:24
points 59:22 68:4
polarization 40:3
polarized 28:13 29:9 31:13 50:10
policies 114:10 114:11
political 10:5 14:15,20 15:11 15:16,25 16:3 36:18,20 47:13 60:14 91:9 92:22 117:14 117:17,20 125:22,23 126:2
politically 87:23 91:16,24 92:1
politics 36:19 66:15 70:15 105:11
Polsby-Popper 7:13,23 72:15 74:25 75:6
pops 70:17
population 6:14 6:17 8:19 9:2 20:8 27:2,15 32:22 33:6 38:2 46:5 53:12 55:11 89:3 93:14,16
populations 28:20 89:5
populous 88:12
portions 128:2
position 118:4
positive 77:23
possibilities 74:9
possibility 112:23
possible 7:4 10:25 19:13 41:13
posture 60:9 61:3 62:3
potential 60:11 95:19
power 117:14 118:4,17
pray 2:25 3:7
prayer 2:8,14
prayers 2:15
pre-cleared 39:9 129:8
preach 2:19
preaches 2:19
precedent 57:18
precinct 8:20 19:11 24:6,7 28:17 30:18,23 30:25 44:17,24 50:25 65:9,12
precincts 8:8,11 8:13,14 13:4,9 15:5,6 19:10 25:19 27:20 30:21,24 44:15 44:15,19 60:21 65:2,3,8 110:19 125:9
preclude 61:22 62:3
predetermined 48:1
predominant 67:15 80:7
predominate 50:4
preface 21:17
prefer 98:24 127:2
preference 95:5
preordained 20:19
preparation 26:5 65:14
prepare 125:8
prepared 43:23 131:4
preparing 125:6 127:13
prerequisite 50:7
prescient 126:11
present 18:13
presentation 22:14 132:16
presented 6:7 31:14 53:1 77:21 78:2 84:13 89:19 131:9
preserved 79:3 79:15
President 2:3,12 3:9,12,17 4:10 4:11,14,17,18 4:23,25 5:3,8 5:17 10:24 11:1,5,8,14 12:8,13,15,19 12:22 13:12,13 13:19,22 14:22 16:7,8,13,16 17:4,21,25 18:3 21:4,7,8 21:11 22:5,6 22:24 23:3,6 23:18,19,22 24:9,12,13,25 25:1,4,9,12,22 25:25 26:3,8,9 26:12,19,21,22 26:25 27:7,8,9 27:12 28:6,7 28:10,23,24 29:2,19,24 30:1 32:4,9,12 35:18 37:17,20 37:23 43:9,12 43:16 44:3,9 44:12 45:3,8 45:10,11,15 49:12,16 50:17 50:21 51:2,7,9 51:20 52:4,7 52:16,19 53:18 53:24 54:2,14 54:17 55:15,18 56:5,6,9,19,23 56:25 59:10,16 62:15,21,25 63:3,11,17,20 63:25 64:3,6 64:13,15,16,19 64:20,23 65:15 65:17 67:22 68:1,20,21,24 70:25 71:3,10 71:13 72:5 73:5,8,20,23 74:4,11,16,19 77:9,13 78:14 78:19,21,24 79:7,11 80:18 80:21 82:8,16 82:20,23 83:11 84:5,15 85:5,8 85:11,21,24 86:5,9 87:10

87:11,15,18 88:1,2 90:24 90:25 91:4,7 91:20,23 92:16 92:17,20 93:9 93:12 94:5,9 94:12 95:23,24 96:2,4 97:25 98:1,4 99:1,5,9 99:17 100:16 100:20,23 106:17,21 107:12 109:2,5 111:13,14,17 112:9,12 113:6 113:11,13 116:23 117:2 119:5,11 120:10 121:1,6 121:10 122:1 122:19,22 128:17,22,25 131:17 132:10 132:18 133:2,7 133:14
presidential 10:8 88:6 104:5 114:7,19 114:22
pretty 24:17 48:14 57:18 61:8 98:10
prevent 108:21
previous 7:20 31:23
previously 55:12 56:13 61:4
primarily 103:4
principle 60:3,9 60:19,23 61:16
principles 61:21 61:24 62:13
print 51:15
printout 6:9
priorities 46:20
prioritized 61:22
prism 103:18
private 105:14
probably 6:23 15:16,24 90:10 97:22 130:17
problem 14:19 35:4 48:14 50:14 61:11 79:18 105:24 123:15,16 124:5 127:10
problematic 55:12 90:20
problems 36:2 78:8 108:25 123:13
procedure 84:12
proceeding 134:6,11
Proceedings 2:1 133:17
process 5:24 7:9 30:24 39:19 59:21 60:12 70:11,13 123:1 125:20,21 126:23 127:13 130:10 131:6 131:16
produce 89:20
produced 8:6
professionals 118:25
professor 127:23
progressions 76:20
projected 54:11
promoting 114:12
property 127:23
proportions 130:14
proposal 18:24 19:2,4 20:11 104:16 117:6 117:11
propose 22:12 35:9
proposed 14:3 17:3 19:21 21:19 65:21,22 65:23 67:1 68:16 69:5,6 72:11,15 74:7 89:2 95:8 98:6 101:13,19,25 102:22 104:4 117:7
proposing 70:18 73:3 111:25
prospectus 29:16 54:20,22 54:25 55:2
protecting 48:11 79:4
protection 9:11 47:7 48:8
prove 90:1
provide 44:23 50:24 53:10 90:8 94:21 95:3,7,9
provided 45:22 50:12 54:8 83:7,23 84:22
Provider 4:19
provides 88:18 124:19
proxies 60:12,17
PT 2:3 3:9,17 4:11,14,23 5:3 5:8 11:1,5,14 12:8,15,19 13:13,19,22 14:22 16:8,13 17:4,21,25 21:4,8,11 22:6 22:24 23:3,6 23:19,22 24:9 24:13 25:1,4,9 25:12,22,25 26:3,9,12,19 26:22,25 27:7 27:9,12 28:7 28:10,24 29:2 29:19,24 32:4 32:9 37:17,20 37:23 43:9,12 43:16 44:3,9 44:12 45:3,8 45:11,15 49:12 49:16 50:17 51:2,7,9,20 52:7,16,19 53:18,24 54:2 54:14,17 55:15 55:18 56:6,9 56:19,25 59:10 59:16 62:15,21 62:25 63:11,17 63:20,25 64:3 64:6,13,16,20 65:17 67:22 68:1,21,24 70:25 71:3,10 71:13 72:5 73:5,8,20,23 74:4,11,16 77:9,13 78:14 78:21,24 79:7 79:11 80:18,21 82:8,16,20,23 83:11 84:5,15 85:5,8,11,21 85:24 86:5,9 87:11,15,18 88:2 90:25 91:4,7,20,23 92:17,20 93:9 93:12 94:5,9 94:12 95:24 96:2 98:1,4 99:1,5,9,17 100:16,20 106:17,21 107:12 109:2,5 111:14,17 112:9,12 113:6 113:11 116:23 117:2 119:5,11 120:10 121:1,6 121:10 122:1 122:19 128:17 128:22 131:17 132:10,18 133:7,14
public 8:9 20:16 95:16 101:14 119:17,18 120:1 134:5
public's 59:4
pulled 13:10 37:6
pulls 13:8
punishing 128:11
punishment 128:12
purpose 4:12 12:4 13:15 16:10 17:17 21:5 22:25 29:21 31:8 32:6 43:10 44:5 45:12 49:13 50:19 52:1,12 53:20 56:21 59:12 62:17 63:13 67:23 74:13 77:10 78:16 82:17 85:6,22 86:5 87:12 91:1 94:6 99:2 100:12 106:18 106:25 113:8 116:19,24 117:6 118:12 119:7 120:23 122:16 128:19 132:6
purposes 75:21 104:10 118:9 118:14
put 5:20 6:2 44:1,23 54:9 57:15 130:3,10

Q

question 11:16 13:18 17:6 21:7,18 23:2 23:17 24:10,24 25:8,23 26:21 27:7 28:5,22 29:8 32:25 37:19 38:9 43:13,19 44:8 44:10 52:15 53:22 54:12 55:13 63:15 64:1 65:5

68:20 69:10 78:20 79:8 82:19 83:12,14 87:14 91:3,19 91:21 92:18 94:8 99:21 100:1,24 106:19 107:11 109:1 110:15 111:1,12 112:8 120:12 122:3 131:22
questioning 80:6
questions 10:23 29:18 64:19,21 85:23 90:13 94:4 103:22 131:3,8
quick 103:21
quickly 95:18
quite 16:18 75:13 76:19,25

R

R 134:1
Rabin 4:10,11 4:13,16,25
race 10:15,18 14:15 16:21 20:6 28:20 29:6 31:3,6,9 33:11 38:17 39:21 41:4,9 41:10,13 42:17 42:18,20,21,23 43:3 46:1,2,10 46:16 47:17 59:20 60:2,5,5 60:9,10,13,18 60:19,20 61:5 61:6,10 62:9 62:10 67:14 76:8,8 77:6 80:4,7 88:25 89:11 96:23,24 96:25 97:2,3 104:6,7 105:19 114:7,19,20 115:15,16 116:21 123:13 126:1 129:18 129:20,22,24
races 10:7,11 53:14 76:7 96:22 97:1,1 114:23,23
racial 10:15 14:4 14:6,7,14,18 15:8 16:25 20:2 27:25 28:1,17 30:13 31:11 34:24 38:14,15,19,21 38:22 39:14 43:20 46:8 49:20 67:18 92:25 93:2 97:19,20 102:22 104:22 105:3,21,23,24 108:10 114:3 117:12,12,13 117:18,21 118:19 123:4,5 123:7,13
racially 14:9 28:13 29:9 30:10 31:13 48:9,13 50:10 102:12,14,24
racism 60:11 61:2,2,13
raised 118:2,3
Raleigh 1:23
ramifications 106:11
Randleman 9:17 130:4
Randleman's 5:13
Randolph 2:9,19
randomly 90:18
ranked 90:17
rankings 48:20
rapidly 127:17
reach 104:21
read 5:5 11:2 12:16 17:22 43:5 62:22 100:17 101:7 121:7
reading 1:3 3:15 121:20,22 131:23 132:5,9 132:10,17,20
real 125:19 127:22
realistically 104:11
realities 59:1
realize 102:8
really 36:17,18 36:20 66:16 76:14 103:9 112:14 124:5
reason 7:15 35:20 41:7 59:8 101:6 102:9 115:7,8 117:24 127:7
reasonable 34:10 35:23 42:10
reasons 32:1 116:20 125:5
rebuffing 129:2
rebuke 58:12
recall 79:19
receipt 102:7 133:4
receive 83:9 102:1 130:12
received 7:10 95:11,13
receiving 128:13
recess 50:22 51:3,8,17,18 51:19,23
recite 62:8
recognized 3:10 5:9,9,14 11:6 12:20 18:1 63:1 74:23 132:25
recommend 21:2 106:15
recommendati... 79:14
reconcile 112:24 112:25
reconsider 4:18
reconvene 133:5 133:9
record 11:20 17:10 53:8 68:4 100:5 118:12 120:16 122:7 132:1
records 40:20
red 107:18 109:12 110:11
redistricted 29:11
redistricting 5:7 5:20 6:12 19:1 20:5 22:10 32:20 36:14 39:1 40:23 49:19 59:21 61:21 70:11 79:13,16 105:14 118:7 124:21 125:1 125:15 126:6 126:14,17
redoing 33:23
redrawn 8:16
reelection 9:25 92:6
reference 18:17 54:19 81:20 84:2,10 85:15
referenced 44:14
references 85:17
referred 53:16 71:21,22 82:25 83:25
reflect 13:4 30:20 81:11
reflected 88:24
reflects 89:13
refocus 32:13
refusing 120:4
regard 44:21
regarding 52:22 69:3
regardless 127:15
register 127:3
regularly 124:25
reject 32:3 77:8 116:12,22
rejected 79:13 82:4
related 53:16 62:3 72:8
relating 32:14 101:3
released 7:6 19:5
relevant 7:18
relied 27:17 105:20
relief 61:13
rely 27:14
remain 14:2 132:11
remainder 99:24 131:20
remaining 37:7 66:7
remains 46:13
remarks 68:5 69:1
remedied 124:4
remedies 18:24
remedy 41:8
remedying 18:11
remember 42:16 108:16
reminds 99:23
remove 11:13
Reno 84:2
Reock 7:13,23 72:14 74:25 75:5
repeat 85:16
reply 87:22
report 10:6 115:3
Reported 1:17
Reporter 134:4
Reporter's 2:1 133:17
Reporters 1:19 4:1
represent 13:2 38:24 39:3

41:24 42:3 67:6,8 119:21
representation 76:24
Representative 101:8
representatives 49:9
represented 42:8,14 67:17 79:2 80:11 109:16
representing 35:22
represents 45:19 114:4 116:6
Republican 15:21 19:5 20:10 68:8 89:21 90:3,4 94:23 96:9 97:14,16 107:1 107:25 109:23 130:18
Republicans 9:14 15:19 36:22 66:16,23 76:6 99:13 130:12
request 50:22 52:23
requested 3:21 43:20
requesting 44:17
requests 52:8
require 33:7
required 20:3 103:19 105:6 130:6
requirement 7:2 75:7
requirements 75:8
requires 22:19 115:20
research 27:21 75:2 83:19
residents 66:22 66:23
resolved 124:7,8
respect 50:5,11 80:10 82:11 88:12,20 123:22 128:15 129:16 130:8 130:23
respected 47:9
respecting 98:20
respond 117:5
response 8:9 20:15 99:4
responsibility 116:1 119:15 130:25
responsible 119:16
rest 76:12,22
resubmit 83:20
result 31:13 48:9 48:12 61:5 77:22 79:3
results 10:6,11 60:14 75:18 93:23 115:21
retained 8:15
retirement 125:4
return 51:10
returning 97:17
revealed 80:6
Reverend 2:17
review 61:23 103:24 123:25
reviewed 13:7 105:13
reviewing 62:3 69:22
revise 108:22
reward 76:23
right 24:5 49:10 50:7 66:18,19 66:19 116:3 125:16
rightness 59:21
rights 39:10 61:17 83:25 129:12
ring 70:21
rise 4:12 12:5 13:16 16:11 17:18 21:5 22:25 23:9,13 29:22 32:7 35:12 43:10 44:6 45:12 49:13 50:20 52:2,13 53:21 56:22,23 59:13 59:14 62:18 63:14 67:23 74:14 77:10 78:17 82:17 85:6,22 86:6 87:12 91:1 94:6 100:13 106:18 113:9 116:24 119:8 120:24 122:17 128:20 132:7
River 66:4 81:13
road 1:21 42:18
Robinson 17:17 17:19,23,25 18:2 21:7,8,10 21:12 22:4,7 23:3,5,11,15 23:19,21 24:1 24:11,12,16,21 25:1,3,7,9,11 25:17,24,25 26:2,5,6,9,11 26:16,22,24 27:4,9,11,16 28:7,9,16,24 29:1,13 34:16 35:5 37:1 45:18 52:1,3 53:9 54:19 109:15 110:12 115:8
Robinson's 109:12
Rorschach 21:21
round 125:1
row 127:12,14 127:15
RPR 1:18 134:17
Rucho 92:6
Rule 133:4
ruled 32:17 89:7
rules 5:1 6:24 129:12
ruling 129:18 130:1
rulings 7:20 130:6,8
run 9:25 89:25 92:4,5,6,9 129:9
running 47:18 86:25 87:3 92:5 104:14
rural 66:7 117:15,23

S

s/ 134:16,16
sacrifices 19:23
safe 90:9
sandboxes 127:21
sat 77:17
satisfied 39:21
satisfy 63:6 89:8 126:19
save 37:13
saw 4:3 77:20 95:6,10 97:10 97:15 115:24
saying 5:25 21:18 23:13,15 33:13 35:9,25 41:20 68:5 81:6 82:10 84:18 91:9,11 94:19 96:7,17 98:12,16 110:3
says 30:5,11 33:2 39:20 123:1 129:17 130:24,24
scheduled 124:25
school 127:22
science 61:1 62:1
score 8:20 75:5,5 75:6,12
scores 7:14,16 7:22,25
scrutinize 46:15
Season 58:9
seats 2:5 51:11 76:19 97:18 115:12 130:15
second 1:3 121:20 128:21 131:23 132:5 132:20
Seconded 133:11
secondly 41:1 78:3
seconds 11:19 17:9 100:5 120:15 122:6 131:25
secretary 104:13
Section 39:6,7 39:10,12,15 61:19
see 6:15 18:16 22:10,15 23:11 23:12 28:19 32:25 35:3 37:18 52:14 58:6 61:12 70:9 72:21,22 75:20 81:18 88:14,16 89:13 89:14,15 93:19 95:11 98:24 101:3 107:4,5 107:8 110:10 115:10 123:12 126:11 130:13 130:16,20
seeing 93:25
seeking 70:19,20
seeks 70:10
seen 38:4 69:22 70:20 74:8,9 83:8 85:13
seize 122:25
select 20:18 53:14 95:4
selected 7:15

selecting 31:6
self-serving 57:17
senate 1:2,3 2:3 2:8,13 5:5,6,7 5:15 6:12 8:3,4 8:6,12 9:8 10:7 10:9,9 11:16 11:17 12:3 13:10 17:2,6,7 17:14,15 18:6 18:15,21 19:17 19:25 20:7 22:19 27:17 30:2 35:7 37:5 39:3 51:3,9,16 51:17,20 52:10 53:19 56:20 57:13,15 65:24 68:17 70:6 74:20 79:3 93:25 94:16 100:2,2,10 101:13,19,21 102:23 104:6 108:3 113:14 116:6 119:22 120:12,13,21 122:3,4,14 123:3 129:1 131:21,23,24 132:4,24 133:3 133:4,8,15
senator 2:8,11 3:9,11 4:3,4,10 4:11,13,16,25 5:2,8,12,14,16 9:17,17,19,20 9:21,22,24 10:1,1 11:3,5,7 11:22,22,23,23 12:4,6,9,12,17 12:19,21 13:1 13:7,15,17,17 13:19,21,23,23 14:5,7,9,21,22 14:24,25 15:4 16:6,10,12,15 16:19,22 17:17 17:19,23,25 18:2,18 21:4,6 21:6,8,10,12 21:12 22:4,7,7 22:24 23:1,3,5 23:7,11,12,15 23:17,19,21,23 24:1,8,9,10,12 24:14,16,19,21 24:24 25:1,3,5 25:7,8,9,11,13 25:17,22,23,24 25:25 26:2,4,5 26:6,7,9,11,13 26:16,17,19,20 26:22,24 27:1 27:4,6,8,9,11 27:13,16,16 28:5,7,9,11,16 28:16,22,24 29:1,3,13,14 29:18,21,23 30:1 32:6,8,11 34:16 35:5 36:11 37:1,17 37:18,18,20,22 37:24,24 38:8 38:9 43:9,11 43:12,14,17,22 44:5,7,7,9,11 44:13,13,22,25 45:1,4,10,11 45:13,17,18 48:21,21 49:12 49:14,18,23 50:7,19,21 51:5,6 52:1,3,5 52:12,14,14,16 52:18,20,20,25 53:8,20,22,23 53:24 54:1,3,3 54:7,12,13,14 54:16,18,19,24 55:13,14,15,17 55:19,24 56:1 56:2,4,6,8,10 56:12,18,18,21 56:23 57:2,19 58:8 59:12,14 59:18 62:15,17 62:19,23,25 63:2,4,13,15 63:16,17,19,21 63:21,22,24,25 64:2,3,5,7,7,11 64:12,13,15,16 64:18,22,24 65:1,15,17,19 66:12 67:5,8 67:13,22,24 68:3,4,19,21 68:23,25,25 69:9,10 70:24 70:25 71:2,4,6 71:9,10,12,14 71:14,20 72:4 72:5,7,8,18 73:4,5,7,9,16 73:19,21,22,24 73:25 74:2,3,5 74:8,10,13,15 74:18 77:9,11 77:15 78:16,18 78:19,21,23,25 78:25 79:5,6,9 79:12,17 80:17 80:18,20,22,22 81:3 82:6,7,9,9 82:12,12,15,16 82:18,18,20,22 82:24,24 83:11 83:13,16,22,24 84:6,10,14,15 84:18,24 85:5 85:7,8,10,12 85:15,21,23 86:1,3,4,7,11 86:12,23 87:10 87:11,13,13,15 87:17,19,20,21 87:25 88:2,4,5 88:10 90:24,25 91:2,2,4,6,8,8 91:11,16,17,19 91:20,22,24 92:1,6,11,15 92:17,19,21 93:6,8,9,11,13 93:18,21 94:4 94:5,7,7,9,11 94:13,13,15,20 95:22,24 96:1 96:3,3,4,18 97:24 98:1,3,5 98:5,16 99:1,3 99:5,7,10,12 99:14,15,19,23 100:12,14,18 100:20,22 101:8,17,18 106:17,19,20 106:21,23,24 107:4,7,11,12 107:14,15,16 107:17,20 108:1,20 109:1 109:2,4,6,8,11 109:13,14,14 109:15,19,21 109:21,25 110:1,1,9,12 110:18 111:12 111:14,16,18 112:4,8,9,11 112:13,17 113:8,10,13,17 115:7 116:23 116:25 117:4,5 118:1,13 119:7 119:9,13,14 120:23,25 121:3,4,8,10 121:12 122:16 122:18,21 128:19,21,24 130:3,4,5 131:19 132:6,8 132:13,15,24 133:1,9,11
senatorial 104:6
senators 3:22 7:5 8:17 36:12 76:9 105:4 107:1 121:12
send 11:1 12:6,8 17:19,21 62:19 62:21 100:14 100:16 101:23 120:25 121:1,4 124:1
sending 45:18 123:17
sense 33:2 36:11 49:3 58:7 69:25 70:14 102:13
sensitive 43:2
sent 101:7
sentient 124:12 126:10
separate 15:19
separated 19:23
September 5:25 134:12
sergeant-at-ar... 2:4 100:25
series 64:21
seriously 123:19
sermon 2:21
serve 57:7 105:15
serving 19:21 48:9 90:14
session 1:2 2:2 99:24 131:20 133:18
set 31:2 40:17,21 75:17,17 106:2 108:7 129:7
setting 106:5,8
seven 31:21 77:17 114:9
shape 18:17,20 18:21,23 19:16 19:19 20:2 21:14,15 22:3 22:23 23:8 37:7 55:4
share 37:1 57:8 103:21 127:11
shared 56:11
shattered 67:2 69:4
Shaw 84:2
short 121:24
shortly 56:16
show 39:25 40:2 40:6 76:25 88:11 103:13 105:19 121:23 123:7

shown 41:18 86:17 115:7
shows 121:21
Signed 134:12
significance 75:14 85:3
significant 78:7 84:25
significantly 63:8
silence 2:6
similar 21:20,24 34:6 109:10 121:20
similarities 81:15
similarly 118:5
simply 11:13 20:23 35:8 38:5 58:20 121:13 124:16
single 5:10 19:15 31:18 89:23
single-member 39:18
sir 37:22 43:14 43:22 65:19 85:23 106:23
sit 5:2
sitting 27:24 66:12 104:16 105:4
situation 48:22
six 1:21 33:22 43:7
slaughtered 104:20
slices 67:4
slightly 93:23
small 76:15 77:2
smallest 7:3
Smith-Ingram 10:1 11:23 48:21
social 61:1 62:1
society 42:24
solely 57:3 125:22
solution 116:9 116:10 129:19
solutions 113:21
solve 41:13 50:14 124:23 124:24
solved 111:9 124:23
solves 104:22
solving 123:13
somebody 30:10 34:12 42:14 95:17
somebody's 129:21
somewhat 22:23 55:9 92:13
Sorry 10:24 121:3
sort 21:22,25 31:3 33:13 109:6 118:13 124:11
sought 29:6
sounds 73:10
source 38:5 54:5
South 43:6
southern 58:24 107:22
speak 5:14 16:12 29:23 45:13 49:14 56:24 67:24 74:15 77:11 86:7 113:10 116:25 119:9 128:21
speaker 77:18 77:18
speakers 77:24
speaking 117:17
special 106:10
specific 31:6 81:11 82:25 108:25 127:5
specifically 15:25 18:6,14 18:21 57:8 81:17 83:25 84:3,11 106:2
specified 79:21
spend 41:25
spiritual 3:2
splinters 69:16
split 8:8,11,12 19:9 23:25 24:3,4,14 25:6 25:20 30:18 31:23,25 49:5 49:6 57:12 64:25 65:3,7 65:12,13 127:25
splits 8:14,18,25 9:6 24:1,2,2,6 24:7 25:14 31:21 65:1,8
splitting 46:22 50:3 98:21
spoken 96:20
sponsor 52:7
squiggly 21:24
stack 105:1
staff 5:1,19 31:20 43:21 44:23 54:6,7,8 54:9 55:21 56:3 100:25 101:22,25
stake 61:16
stand 2:10 3:16 51:3,17 131:10
standard 39:14 75:16 82:25 129:23
standards 20:23 110:23 126:8 129:11
stands 3:19 51:18 133:16
start 5:25 89:10 129:1
started 39:19 125:6
stat 6:15 10:12 38:10 47:14 53:2,13 101:1 102:5,5 103:25 115:4 123:7
state 4:14 8:25 18:10 28:21 36:9 39:19 40:14 41:15 42:7 47:23 57:6 76:9,12 76:15,21,22 77:1 83:13 96:11 103:6 104:13 114:5 115:12 116:14 116:16 117:22 118:8,24 124:4 126:9,20 127:16,16,17 127:18 129:25 130:21 131:13 134:1
State's 20:12
stated 8:1 38:1 133:9
statement 32:8 43:8 96:19
States 32:16 39:13 50:16
statewide 16:5 101:5 111:22 115:1
statistical 69:25 72:3,20 85:1,2
statistics 101:12
Stein 76:9
stenographica... 134:7
step 31:5 119:16
Stephenson 7:1 126:8 130:1
stipulations 133:9
stocks 58:16
straight 4:8
strange 33:13
strategy 20:25 113:16
strictly 78:11
strike 69:7
strong 15:20,21 50:9
strongly 68:7,9 117:25
structure 21:23
structures 22:1
studied 72:20
studies 41:23 42:2
study 31:12 41:1
subject 133:4,8
submission 33:8 93:20
submissions 121:14
submit 7:8 38:6 43:21,25 55:20 57:6 65:23 101:6
submitted 38:10 52:22 54:23 93:3 106:8 121:16
subordinate 50:2 70:19,20
subordinated 49:20,24 67:18 80:8
subsequent 64:19
suburban 66:3 81:12
suburbs 66:9,24
sued 113:25
sufficient 29:17 41:6
suggest 61:9 128:9
suggested 96:21 101:17
suggesting 29:4 81:4 108:11
suggestions 101:20
Suite 1:22
Summerfield 24:15,21 25:6
Sunday 95:14
superimpose 34:3
superior 73:2
supersede 112:2
supervision 134:9
support 10:22 17:2 21:3 59:8 78:12 90:21,22 120:9 131:15

Supreme 32:16 35:13,17 37:12 39:11 40:14 50:16 102:10 119:3 126:5,9
sure 22:4 24:17 33:22 50:23 52:25 54:1 56:8 75:25 76:5 96:1 98:3
surely 118:17
surprised 72:9 72:18
surprising 20:5
surrounding 75:25
suspend 5:1
sustain 15:24
sweep 114:24
symbolic 61:2
symbolically 61:9
system 50:24 54:10 102:2

T

T 134:1,1
tables 61:9
tabulation 30:19 30:23 88:20 98:22
tailored 41:11
tails 69:24
take 27:21 50:22 51:15 55:10 58:14 62:7 76:17,19,24 77:2 83:3 86:23 92:24 107:24 108:6 110:4 114:12 119:17 123:19 126:14 127:19
takeaway 125:18
taken 67:11 92:23 117:20 130:11,20,23 134:7
takes 18:15 20:5 65:9 68:11
talk 28:1 102:17
talked 13:7 77:19 85:12 101:16 103:10 111:8
talking 28:2 79:22 82:5 128:2
Tanner 5:11
target 27:14 28:14 29:12 31:6,9 49:20 49:21 67:19
targeted 93:4
targets 93:7
Tarte 3:22 97:10 97:23
taught 3:3
taxpayer 37:14
teach 43:4
teachable 125:19
teaching 122:25 124:19,19
technical 10:25 13:8 69:21 71:15,18 72:9 72:10 73:12,13
technicals 72:14
technique 75:22
tell 33:2,9 34:5 42:3 69:23 94:16 110:9 123:9 127:13 129:15
telling 25:13 124:4 126:20
tells 35:2 78:6,6 115:4
ten 10:7 41:4 50:23 51:3,7
tens 41:25
term 79:24 80:15
terminology 79:20
terms 18:23 47:11 55:2 80:1 86:13,20 89:2 92:8 95:9 98:18,19,19,20 117:17
territory 107:7,8 109:16
test 71:5,16,19 73:1,11,13,15 78:4,6 83:17 83:18 85:1,19
Testament 2:23
Texas 61:16
thank 2:11 3:11 4:5,16 5:16 11:7 12:12,21 16:6,15 18:2 30:1 32:11 37:24 38:8 45:5,7,18 52:3 54:3 56:18 59:9 62:14 63:2 64:22 65:19 69:9 74:10,18 78:13 78:18 86:11 100:22 113:13 119:4 122:21 128:24 131:14 133:1
thanks 131:15
theories 15:3
thing 46:19 48:18 57:19 70:17 72:25 89:1 93:20 104:20 105:11 105:14 124:7
things 30:2 32:14 33:25 36:9 47:7 58:13,17 77:24 78:2 81:9,11 101:15 102:18 103:21 110:20 111:6,23 124:13 125:10 125:14 126:12 127:20 129:10
think 14:11,17 14:19 15:4,13 20:6 25:5 30:4 35:8 42:5,9,25 43:7 45:2,19 45:24 49:18 57:4 58:20,23 59:23 60:8,25 63:5,8 67:3 69:14 70:4,8 70:22 71:7 73:25 75:15 78:1,9 79:18 82:1 87:8 88:10 89:8 90:9,12 92:21 92:24 94:1 95:14,16 96:4 96:5 98:6 102:8 104:2 105:4,12,17,20 106:3,4 107:9 108:15,18 109:9,25 113:15,17 114:1,6,8 119:15 120:1 122:24 124:13 127:7 128:10 128:14 129:2 131:7
thinking 3:4 78:5
thinks 131:7
third 34:4,25 121:22 123:22 132:8,10,17,20
thirdly 61:15
thought 13:4,9 31:7 38:9
three 9:13 30:15 31:25 35:16 37:7 39:20 40:6 59:22 62:13 65:25 87:2,4 98:7,14 105:5 107:10 108:4 109:22 113:4 130:17
three-judge 32:17 35:15,19 50:15 123:18 124:24
three-year-old 34:5
Tillis 47:20,20 96:23
Tillman 2:9,11 122:9 131:19
Tillman's 121:4
time 51:24 56:16 83:1 88:6 104:17 112:5,5 124:21 128:4 128:21 129:5
timeline 5:22 129:6
times 49:24
tired 126:21
title 2:21 121:19 121:24
today 3:4 4:6 5:2 5:11,12,23 47:12 53:8 97:18 111:20 111:25 121:5 121:18 129:4 129:13
told 15:12 33:12 34:12 102:19 113:19 127:6
Tom 47:19
top 35:16
total 15:10 114:13 115:20
totals 130:20
traditional 49:19 53:12 61:21 70:8 80:8 86:16
transcribed 134:8
transcribing 11:10
transcription 134:6,11
transferred 13:5
Transparency 4:20
transversals 6:25
traversals 6:22
traverses 65:10

tremendous 120:2
tremendously 33:21
trial 41:19 42:5
tried 34:21 35:5 88:20,21
tries 131:11
trouble 45:6
true 93:5 109:23 134:10
Trump 35:18 88:7 96:4
try 37:8 43:18 44:19 76:17,18 110:14 115:1 129:21
trying 34:16,23 34:23 37:1,16 42:23 91:13 94:16 98:21 105:16 106:12 107:5 110:25 124:1 125:8 126:5
tuck 20:24
Tuesday 77:15 95:16
Tuesday's 4:21
turning 61:9
twice 112:3
two 7:15,20 8:7 8:14,16 9:9 12:10,25 13:6 15:6,20,21 21:25 32:14,18 37:5,6 40:2 47:20,21 57:9 57:14,16 61:1 62:2 65:6 66:17 68:8,9 71:25 72:10,13 73:14 74:22 75:15,20 76:8 77:23 78:4 88:23 98:8,14 103:21 105:5 125:1
type 53:13 87:7 98:23
types 87:5
Tyrell 57:22

U

U.S 35:17 39:11 104:6
ultimately 42:16 92:3
unamended 66:21
unanimously 102:10 119:2 119:18
unavailable 29:4
unavoidable 108:8
uncompetitive 76:12 114:5
unconstitution... 20:10 33:17 39:11 46:8 78:8 117:19
unconstitution... 48:13
undefensible 37:15
underlying 60:1 60:7
underscored 127:21
understand 23:7 33:6 69:20 71:23,24 93:21 109:11,13,20 111:22
understanding 12:9 65:4,13 71:17
unfairly 105:1
unfairness 77:19
unfavorable 107:2 109:17
unfortunately 20:23 79:23 125:25
Union 69:19
United 32:16 39:13 50:16
unites 66:3 81:12
university 67:9
unjustified 70:12
unlawful 61:6 61:10
unlawfully 62:11
unnecessarily 105:19
unnecessary 92:24
unsurprised 72:19
updated 44:15
upset 115:18
uptown 67:6
urban 42:11 76:23,24 103:4 103:5,5 114:24 115:19 116:8 117:8,22 118:17
urge 67:20 78:12 120:9
use 2:20 39:21 41:9,10,12 42:17 43:3 60:10 61:10 69:4 79:20 85:18 90:15 116:21 129:20
useful 102:15
utilized 74:23 85:16

V

vacuum 46:11
vague 79:24 80:15
vain 2:24
valuable 104:18
value 85:2
values 82:25 83:2,4,7,10,15 83:23 84:7,11 84:20,22 85:13 85:14,16 116:6
Van 119:7,9,13
Vance 58:3
variables 46:17 46:25
variety 81:8 97:1
various 4:20 46:5,20 125:5
verse 2:16,20,22
version 12:13 20:7
versus 84:2
vex 36:9
viable 95:19 98:23
victory 104:15
Videographers 1:20 4:1
view 20:5 80:2 80:14
views 20:15
violate 31:4
violates 31:1
violation 18:25
violations 18:14
visual 69:2
voice 66:25 70:21,21 76:3 76:5,6
voiceless 73:17
voices 120:5
voluntary 125:4
volunteer 5:10 5:12
vote 11:18,19,20 11:21 17:8,8 17:10 40:4 47:25 99:13,16 100:4,4,5,6 105:10 120:14 120:15,17 122:5,6,8 130:20 131:24 131:25 132:2
voted 11:25 17:11 100:7 120:18 122:11 132:3
voter 30:19,23 32:22 88:20 98:21
voters 10:17 20:18,22 29:5 31:3 40:4 45:22 49:8 86:21 88:16 92:2,8 94:24 95:4 98:24 99:10,11
votes 105:9 130:13
voting 17:10 19:11 20:8 24:7 25:19 27:2,15 28:13 28:20 29:9 31:13 38:2 39:10 40:20,20 41:1 46:5 50:10 53:11 55:10 61:17 83:25 89:2,5 93:14,16 120:16 122:7 129:12 132:1
VTD 24:22
VTDs 22:15 25:17 44:15,18 125:9

W

Waddell 11:24 67:8 77:9,11 77:15
Wade 109:13,14 109:15 115:7
wait 24:21,22
waiting 83:8
Wake 9:22 12:14,25 14:2 14:11,13,18,20 15:1 16:1,25 38:19,21 39:6 39:8 40:17,23 76:19 103:6 107:9 108:9,22 109:18 111:9 111:19 112:3,6 112:20,24 114:16 130:11 134:2
Walter 47:17
want 5:25 22:14

22:20 34:1 35:3 43:1 45:4 47:23,23,24 49:8 57:17 59:18 62:7 76:11,18,22 77:2 86:11 88:16 89:18 99:15 110:4,6 114:10,22 117:24 118:11 119:3,20 122:23 123:20 126:23 128:10 129:1
wanted 14:1 30:3 42:13,14 82:2 90:18 91:12 95:11 101:3 115:19 117:10 120:6
wanting 117:4
Warren 58:3
wasn't 55:2 89:23
water 39:23
way 14:11,16 15:20 18:5 20:24 27:19 33:25 34:8,12 34:19 35:16 38:13,18 40:14 43:2 47:8 48:2 48:4 49:3 61:22 68:11 69:17,18 70:20 75:23 76:4 90:7 91:10 94:21 95:3 97:4,11 98:6 104:25 105:7 106:2,3 108:12 110:14,24 111:11 112:20 116:5 124:10 125:7,10 126:21,22 127:1,24
ways 20:20 37:7 39:4 47:6 61:6 101:21 103:9 115:9
we'll 4:8 114:12 131:10
we're 31:8 33:13 41:20 47:16 58:19 70:23 76:3 102:9,18 104:23 106:5 107:21,23 111:10 121:13 124:12 126:10 126:13 129:4 129:13
we've 7:6 34:21 59:19 103:10 103:11 112:24 114:8 115:6,15 115:17 122:25 123:16 124:4 125:6 130:6,8 130:11,20,23
website 44:16 84:23
Wednesday 101:11
weeks 7:7
went 33:3,10 35:13,14,18 36:12 40:19 51:22
weren't 35:20
western 66:5 69:12 81:14
white 128:3
wide 81:8
willing 55:19 56:10
Wilson 57:11 59:6
win 66:14,17,20 90:4,6 94:23 94:23 114:20
wing 21:25
winning 114:6
wise 128:8
withdraw 52:6
withdrawal 52:8
withdrawn 52:9 53:8 103:13
won 47:18 104:5 104:7,8,12
wondering 44:16 52:23
Woodard 3:23
words 62:2 96:20
work 3:6 6:1 26:13 36:1,8 58:17,17 63:22 64:9 78:10 125:15
worked 26:16,17 29:14,15 36:22 64:8 112:2
working 111:10 113:20
works 6:11
wouldn't 42:22 71:6 72:23 97:22 108:1
wrap 19:24
write 46:20 47:1
written 3:16,19 55:2 130:1
wrong 79:20 81:18
wrongness 59:22
Wylie 66:5 81:14

X

Y

y'all 10:21
yeah 24:3
year 92:4 126:3 126:3 127:22
years 33:22 41:4 43:7 57:14,14 92:12 104:15 114:21 125:2 125:18 128:8
yesterday 6:4 12:23 13:10,24 15:13 16:18 17:3 18:18 31:5,20 43:24 53:3,6 56:17 58:8 63:4 67:2 67:13 80:6 83:3 111:19,24 113:18
yesterday's 83:6
yield 13:18,20 13:21 14:23,24 21:9 23:4,20 24:10 25:2,10 26:1,10,23 27:10 28:8,25 37:19,21,22 43:13 44:10,11 52:15,17 53:25 54:15 55:16 56:7 63:18 64:4,17,18 68:20,22,23 71:1,2,11,12 72:6,7 73:6,7 73:20,22 74:3 78:19,22,23 79:9 80:19,20 82:7,19,21,22 84:16 85:9,10 87:16,17 88:3 91:3,5,21 92:18 93:10 94:10 95:25 98:2 106:22 107:13,14 109:3,4 111:15 111:16 112:10 112:11
yielding 54:4
yields 13:22 21:11 23:6,22 24:13 25:4,12 26:3,12,25 27:12 28:10 29:2 37:23 43:16 44:12 52:19 54:2,17 55:18 56:9 63:20 64:6,20 68:24 71:3,13 73:8,23 74:4 78:24 79:11 80:21 82:8,23 84:17 85:11 87:18 91:7,23 92:20 93:12 94:12 96:2 98:4 99:9 109:5 111:17 112:12
younger 33:21

Z

zero 8:18

0

05 7:24 75:6 85:2

1

1 11:15,17 12:1 12:13
1:51 133:18
10:27 2:2
1000 1:22
102409-2 134:17
12:00 51:17
14 100:7 120:18
140 4:19
15 7:23 75:5 76:15 109:19 109:19
150 57:14
16 15:13 132:4
17 104:7
18 104:5
1868 57:13,21
190,000 36:3,4
1984 39:17
1st 5:25 34:17 134:12

2

2 13:14 17:5,7 17:12 39:6,12 39:15 61:19
20 104:14 114:7
2000 57:15
2003 38:25 40:13
2010 10:7
2011 8:3,4,12,21 9:7 19:3,20 20:9 30:7,20 33:18 34:2,13

40:22 86:19 97:21
2012 10:7
2014 10:8
2016 10:9
2017 1:2,4 3:13 3:18 5:6 6:12 34:3,15 133:6 133:10 134:13
2020 125:7 126:4
2021 126:13,16
21 104:8
24 3:13,18
24.1 133:4
25 1:4 9:1
257 8:12
26 18:7 104:15
27 11:12 18:7 22:20 25:21 132:3
27609 1:23
28 18:7,15,22 19:17,25 20:7 21:15,18,19 22:20 25:21 27:18 30:5 102:11 109:12 133:6,10
29th 4:22

3

3 19:10 29:20 44:4 45:9 51:23,25
30 100:8 118:23 120:19
34 106:6
35 106:6
37 67:6 69:16 107:16,17,19
38 93:3,14 94:1
39 63:10 66:7 68:8 72:12

4

4 11:12 39:10 63:12 74:12 84:3 99:18,21 100:2,8
40 39:2 40:17 93:3,16 118:23 130:12,15
41 38:24 39:2 40:17,23 63:10 69:5,10 70:2 71:4 73:11 79:2 80:10,14 81:10 97:11,22
4208 1:21
424-8242 1:24
43 88:9 96:5,9 96:13
44 122:11
45 11:25 17:11 20:13 27:3 28:15 29:12 35:7 36:10 49:21 93:4
45.18 93:15
45.48 93:17
46 42:12
46.17 94:1
47 42:13
48 77:24
48.46 94:2

5

5 6:16 39:7 113:7 120:11 120:13,19
5:00 133:6,10
50 6:15 32:23 33:1,4,5,11 34:17 35:6 40:19,23 49:21 55:11 89:6 104:16
50.52 20:14
55 68:12

6

6 121:11 122:2,4 122:12
60 36:13
60/40 114:20
691 1:3 5:5,6,15 11:17 12:3 17:7,15,16 52:11 53:19 56:20 100:3,11 120:13,22 122:4,15 131:22,24 132:4

7

70 105:9
75 68:12
770 4:20

8

80 105:10
8240 134:17
8340 1:18
84 58:2

9

9 8:14
919 1:24
93 84:2

EX. 20

NORTH CAROLINA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES SESSION

NORTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TRANSCRIPT OF THE PROCEEDINGS

In Raleigh, North Carolina

Monday, August 28, 2017, 1:30 p.m.

PREPARED BY: Regina Toppins

RUFFIN CONSULTING, INC.

DIRECT DIAL: 252-243-9000

WWW.RUFFINCONSULTING.COM

SPEAKER MOORE: The House will come to order. Members will take their seats. Visitors will retire from the chamber. Sergeant-At-Arms will close the doors. Ask members and guests to please silence all electronic devices.

This afternoon's prayer will be offered by Representative Jones. We'd ask our members and our guests in the gallery to please stand and remain standing for the pledge of allegiance.

Representative Jones.

REPRESENTATIVE JONES: Let us pray. Our Father and our God, let us come before your throne today with praise and thanksgiving. You are a great God and a good God, full of love, mercy and grace. You're a God of truth. And in all our ways let us acknowledge you as God. Let us bring honor and glory to you today and everyday. We pray for our nation. We're calling in your word that blessed is the nation whose God is the lord. We lift up all of our people and all those in authority that they will seek and receive divine wisdom from above.

The psalm reminds us that it is better to put our trust in the Lord than to put our confidence in man. Let us put our trust in you, oh, Lord, our strength, and our redeemer.

Father, we lift up all that try to protect us, including our military and our law enforcement. We pray for their safety. We also lift up those that are dealing with weather-related disasters, such as the hurricane in the Texas area. We pray for their safety as well. We thank you for all your many blessings to us. You're a wonderful and a gracious God. As each may pray in their own way, I pray in the name of your son, my savior Jesus Christ, amen.

ASSEMBLY MEMBERS: Amen.

I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible with liberty and justice for all.

SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman from Harnett, Representative Lewis, is recognized for a motion.

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, the Journal for August 25th has been examined and found to be correct. I moved that it be approved as written.

SPEAKER MOORE: Representative Lewis moves the Journal for August 25th be approved as written. Those in favor will say Aye; those opposed say No. The Ayes have it. The Journal is approved as written.

Calendar. House vote 927. The Clerk will read.

The House will come to order. Members, Members, please give your attention to the Chair just a moment. We, I believe during these proceedings we have a court reporter, who is also trying to transcribe, so we'd ask that the conversations please be kept down so that the court reporter can do that as well as just general respect to our fellow members.

The Clerk will read.

HOUSE CLERK: Representatives Lewis and Dollar, House Bill 927, a Bill to be entitled Enact to realign the districts for elections of members of the North Carolina General Assembly. General Assembly of North Carolina enacts.

SPEAKER MOORE: Further discussion, further debate.

Does the gentleman from Harnett wish to explain the Bill?

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER MOORE: And, by the way, the Chair will suspend Rule 12D. The gentleman has the floor.

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker and Members, we are here today in order to comply with the Covington's Court order.

The court's specific finding was that despite a robust and extensive record produced by this General Assembly in 2011, there was not enough evidence of legally significant racially polarized voting to draw 19 majority/minority districts in the North Carolina House plan. It is important to note that the court did not find discriminatory intent on our part. Specifically the court that, "nor does it signify that the legislature acted in bad faith or with discriminary intent in its redistricting."

The process that we're using today is in response and at the order of the court. The court gave us a timeline that requires us to enact a plan by September 1st. We produced the first such redraw 14 business days, 19 total days after the court order. As I had announced before, it was our intent to have more public input and to produce the maps by early November; however, in no way should these remarks be construed as being critical of the court.

Our intention today is simply to comply with the order of the court. The timeline that the court allowed provided time for us to meet and to receive public input as we adopted the criteria, it provided for us to have one statewide public hearing last Tuesday and we have had a robust committee process

thus far.

As a note on the public hearing, I think it's important to point out that one of the most prevalent feedbacks that we received, in fact, I personally got 2,050 e-mails asking that the legislature produce a map to look at before the public hearings were held. We did that. I had hoped that activists and other speakers who engage with different aspects regarding the legislative process might would have offered a little more input on the specific map, but that's not what they chose to do.

I will attest that I did attend the public hearing in Raleigh, I did also listen to the audio recordings provided by the House Sergeant-At-Arms of the remote sites.

I'm very proud of the map that this committee has produced. We produced a redistricting plan that complies with the criteria that the committee adopted as well, and most importantly, as was stated in the federal law. Other proposals that I've seen fail to live up to this map and I hope to be able to tell you why.

First, this map complies with the equal population requirement as established in Stevenson versus Bartlett. No district exceeds the plus or

minus five percent population deviation.

Second, our map produces contiguous districts. We did our best to avoid using water contiguity where it was not required by the county groupings formula.

Third, our map does comply with the county groupings formula as established by Stevenson versus Bartlett decision, and unlike other maps I've seen, this map complies with the county traversals as authorized in the Stevenson decision. This map splits 39 counties, the fewest in over two decades of maps.

Fourth, this map is more compact, using the parameters or Polsby-Popper score and the dispersion score the Reock score. This map is more compact than maps enacted by the General Assembly over the past two decades, and it complies with the committee's criteria to use compactness as established by the test I've already mentioned.

Fifth, this map splits fewer precincts than maps produced over the past two decades. It splits 49 precincts total, but 30 of those are retained from unaffected county groupings. And by that I did clarify to the committee that when you do the county optimization plan, some of the existing districts did not need to be changed in order to comply with the

order of the court and, therefore, they are not changed on this map.

Sixth, this map splits less municipalities and respects more municipal boundaries than prior plans enacted over the past two decades. This map also complies with the rest of the committee's criteria of encompassing protection, the use of election data and no consideration of race. We avoided maliciously double bunking incumbents. Indeed, there are only six incumbents that are double debunked in this plan. Four of them are required by the county grouping formula.

Members, this plan accomplishes what the court has asked us to do. This plan reflects thoughtful consideration, it reflects public input and it reflects my genuine desire to comply with the order of the court.

I will have an amendment coming shortly, but I would ask you to support the plan as amended.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER MOORE: Further discussion, further debate?

For what purpose does the gentleman from Wake, Representative Martin, rise?

REPRESENTATIVE MARTIN: To see if the bill

sponsor would yield to a few questions.

SPEAKER MOORE: Does the gentleman from Harnett yield to the gentleman from Wake?

REPRESENTATIVE MARTIN: I yield, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER MOORE: He yields.

REPRESENTATIVE MARTIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to the bill sponsor also.

Representative Lewis, in looking at the map, I'm looking at Wayne County off in the eastern part of the state and specifically at District 10, and as you know, of course, our state constitution does have a whole county provision, which as we know when redistricting law and principles is not absolute, it's subject to other factors, but it is in our constitution. And so, in looking at Wayne County, I see that it's spread over, as I count them, three separate counties. I'm sorry, the District 10 is spread into Wayne County, Johnston County, and Greene County, but as I look at it, it seems pretty clear that you could have drawn that district into just two counties. What was the reason for that?

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: Thank you for the question, Representative Martin. First, if I could point out that Wayne County is in a 7-county grouping

that stretches from Bladen in the south to Greene in the north. It goes as far west as Lee and, again, as far east as Greene.

What we are required to do, as you know, is the optimum number for a county for a state House seat, and I'm looking at my notes to make sure I don't misspeak on this very important number, the optimum number for a state House seat is 79,462. As I said, we are allowed to have a plus or minus 5%. So what we did in producing this map is to, first of all, create the optimal county grouping, which is done by taking the 2010 population and divided it by this number. Once we got a whole number that we could use, we then set about dividing up the areas within the county group.

To your specific question, we actually did look at a drawing that would have done what you suggest. However, in keeping with the entire nine criteria that were adopted, we feel like this draw is the preferred way to go. I realize that this is the only map that is before us now. I would point out for the record that there have been other maps submitted during this process that also would have crossed into a third county, to use your analogy or to use your specific example, but to be perhaps a bit more clear,

we believe that we have drawn this in compliance with the Stevenson rules and been able to harmonize those with the nine criteria that the committee adopted.

REPRESENTATIVE MARTIN: Mr. Speaker?

SPEAKER MOORE: For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

REPRESENTATIVE MARTIN: To see if the bill sponsor will yield to a follow-up question.

SPEAKER MOORE: Does the gentleman yield to an additional question?

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: I yield.

SPEAKER MOORE: He yields.

REPRESENTATIVE MARTIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to the bill sponsor also.

I'd like to ask a question specifically with the part of your response where you said that in looking at it with this option that emerged with splitting the district over three counties versus a district that was just in two counties, that the option that we had before was in your words I think the preferred option. Would you be willing to elaborate a little bit more about what factors you considered in how you weighed them when determining that this was the preferred approach?

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: Thank you for the

question. There were nine criteria, I believe, Representative Martin, the best I can recall. This avoid us -- this helped us avoid having to pair incumbents in this draw.

REPRESENTATIVE MARTIN: Mr. Speaker?

SPEAKER MOORE: For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

REPRESENTATIVE MARTIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, to see if the bill sponsor would yield to another follow-up question.

SPEAKER MOORE: Does the gentleman yield to additional questions?

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: I do.

SPEAKER MOORE: He yields.

REPRESENTATIVE MARTIN: Thank you, Representative Lewis.

So, the way what I hear in that answer I think is that in applying various factors that the committee adopted, that you chose incumbent protection as you were deciding that this was the preferred option over perhaps compactness because District 10 as it shows up here being spread across three counties is perhaps not as compact as a district might be in just two counties, not to mention its interaction with the whole county provision of the Constitution.

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: Well, thank you for that question, Representative Martin.

I should further elaborate that again when you look at all of the criteria, including the most important, you know, compliance with the state constitution, I do believe that the other draw would have created, based on what we saw, additional county traversals as well. So, while this is does go into three counties, it doesn't weave in and weave out and so on. So, I do believe that this draw best conforms to the criteria that was adopted by the committee.

REPRESENTATIVE MARTIN: Thank you, sir. Mr. Speaker?

SPEAKER MOORE: Gentleman may state his purpose.

REPRESENTATIVE MARTIN: To see if the bill sponsor would yield to another question.

SPEAKER MOORE: Will the gentleman yield to an additional question?

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER MOORE: He yields.

REPRESENTATIVE MARTIN: Thank you, sir.

I'd like to shift to a little bit different part of the state over to Forsyth County, some districts there, and actually back over to Sampson and

Columbus. And there's districts in those counties that to my eye at least don't appear to be particularly compact. Would you mind telling me what the reason in a map that you say compactness was a top priority, why are these districts perhaps not as compact as other districts throughout the state?

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: Well, thank you for that question, Representative Martin. If I said that compactness was the top priority, then I misspoke. I said that was one of the criteria that was adopted by the committee, or at least that's what I intended to say.

The district in Forsyth County, House District 75, falls -- falls with the range of acceptable compactness as measured by the Polsby-Popper score. Again, not to try to repeat myself with you or the members of the House, when you apply all of the criteria that the committee was tasked with using, this is the draw that I feel best -- best meets all nine.

REPRESENTATIVE MARTIN: Mr. Speaker?

SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman may state his purpose.

REPRESENTATIVE MARTIN: Thank you, to see if the bill sponsor would yield to another question.

SPEAKER MOORE: Would the gentleman from Harnett yield to an additional question?

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: I do.

SPEAKER MOORE: He yields.

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: Thank you, and I'm very grateful to the bill sponsor for his patience with my questions.

So, my question is with regard to House District 75 in Forsyth County, which is squinting my aged eyes to look at it. Looks like it takes up the southeast corner of Forsyth County, runs along the southern border of Forsyth County and then takes up a chunk of southwest Forsyth County that that district is -- meets your criteria for compactness; is that correct?

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: Well, thank you for the question, Representative Martin.

One of the things that I would point out and I will have to look at the exact report, but you know Forsyth County, of course, is the home of the great city of Winston-Salem, and I believe that we're able to maintain and respect the municipal boundaries of Winston-Salem by using this draw. So, again I would reiterate that, yes, it is probably possible to draw a more compact district, but compactness was not the

only criteria or the only goal that we had in the production of these maps.

REPRESENTATIVE MARTIN: Mr. Speaker?

SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman may state his purpose.

REPRESENTATIVE MOORE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, to see if the bill sponsor would kindly yield to another question.

SPEAKER MOORE: Does the gentleman yield to an additional question?

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: I do.

SPEAKER MOORE: He yields.

REPRESENTATIVE MARTIN: Thank you, Representative Lewis. I appreciate your answer to that, and I wondered if you wouldn't mind also talking me through the other counties I mentioned, the districts in Sampson and Columbus counties look a little bit, again, to my untrained eye not particularly compact, and I wondered if you wouldn't mind discussing what the reasons for their lack of compactness would be.

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: Well, thank you for the question, Representative Martin.

The districts in the county grouping that you asked about which stretch from Bladen in the south

Greene in the North, I think you'll find that Bladen is a whole county, then we have enough of Sampson County to meet the population requirement. I did see a draw that may have perhaps been judged a bit more compact, but that would have created a situation where incumbents were paired.

Again, incumbency protection was not a primary goal, but it was one of the nine goals or one of the nine criteria that the committee adopted.

As far as the Columbus County draw, the Columbus County draw was a part of a grouping that stretches from Pender County in the east to Robeson County in the west, and what you will find when trying to draw this is when you start in Pender County and then you take enough population to meet the one person, one vote, it simply creates the district that you have there. Again, I would point out that the overall score of this map in compactness is within the guidelines that we have stated.

REPRESENTATIVE MARTIN: Mr. Speaker?

SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman may state his purpose.

REPRESENTATIVE MARTIN: To see if the bill sponsor would yield to a further question.

SPEAKER MOORE: Does the gentleman yield to

an additional question?

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: Yes, sir, I yield.

SPEAKER MOORE: He yields.

REPRESENTATIVE MARTIN: And thank you again for your patience, Representative Lewis.

So, you talked about in the context of these districts that at least in my eyes don't look as compact as a lot of the other ones, that a factor that you weighed here incumbent protection. Is it safe to say that in evaluating these maps for the best approach, that you weighed incumbent protection more heavily than compactness here?

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: Thank you for that question.

Again I would say that it was one of the criteria that was used in evaluating the maps. There are examples in this map where compactness was -- we could have been more compact had we not had incumbency protection as a goal. The most compact draw that I saw actually put five members in Wake County in the same seat, but that would not have been in keeping with the spirit and the other nine -- the other eight criteria that -- that were selected by the committee.

REPRESENTATIVE MARTIN: Mr. Speaker?

SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman may state his

purpose.

REPRESENTATIVE MARTIN: To see if the bill sponsor will let me take him to one final part of the state.

SPEAKER MOORE: Does the bill sponsor yield to an additional question?

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: I yield.

SPEAKER MOORE: He yields.

REPRESENTATIVE MARTIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you once again, Chairman Lewis. If we can take a look at the cluster that has Rowan, Davie Cabarrus and a few other counties in it, it looks to me that there are two districts in that cluster that are solely within one county, not the same county, but they're each within a single county. I think it's 76 and 82, but as I've looked at it, it seems that it's possible in that cluster to draw three house districts that would each be located within an individual county. What was the reasoning behind drawing the district this way?

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: Well, thank you for that question, Representative Martin.

Ironically, if you did the draw that you asked about, which would put two seats in Cabarrus

County, you would have an additional county traversal into Rowan County, which, respectfully, is something that you just questioned over in Wayne County.

REPRESENTATIVE MARTIN: Thank you, sir.

SPEAKER MOORE: For what purpose does the lady from Orange, Representative Insko, rise?

REPRESENTATIVE INSKO: To ask Representative Lewis a question.

SPEAKER MOORE: Does the gentleman yield to the lady from Orange?

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: Yes, sir.

SPEAKER MOORE: He yields.

REPRESENTATIVE INSKO: Representative Lewis, when we did -- when you all did the 2011 maps for the U. S. Congressional races, the balance shifted from 7 democrats and 6 republicans to 10 republicans and 3 democrats. Those maps were found to be unconstitutional and needed to be redrawn, which you all did. And I remember that you stood up on the floor of the House and said that you were going to redraw the maps, not paying any attention to race and that you intended to draw the maps that would result in 10 republicans and 3 democrats, and that if you could, you would draw 11, but you couldn't do that.

So, just looking at the split that we have

now between House democrats here, 74 and 46 democrats, how by the average year, what would the new maps produce in that ratio?

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: Well, Representative, first of all, thank you for the question. And if I may, as you sort of prefaced your question, I'd like to preface my answer.

Perhaps in 2016 I did use a little bit more hyperbole on the floor than I wish I had. I can tell you that I had no partisan target in mind when these maps were drawn.

To answer your question, I would point out that we have provided on your desk a stack pack of ten different races that ten different electoral contests, which were a part of the criteria adopted by the committee. You will find that there are relative districts that tend to perform one way or the other, but there are a whole lot that tend to vote both ways in terms of one year they may have selected the democratic nominee for governor, the next went they selected the republican.

The short answer to your question, which perhaps I should have done first, is as I had no direct outcome target in mind. I honestly don't know, nor have I seen any numbers that indicate what the

partisan results of this map would be.

REPRESENTATIVE INSKO: May I ask a follow-up?

SPEAKER MOORE: Representative Insko is recognized. Does the gentleman yield to an additional question?

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: Yes, sir.

SPEAKER MOORE: He yields.

REPRESENTATIVE INSKO: So, I haven't actually counted this map up either. I think the original one I saw had potential for 76 republicans seats and 44 democratic seats, but would it be fair to say that if you could draw -- if you could draw more districts that would be more favorable to republicans, that you would do that, or based on your comments in 2016 I guess congressional districts, so if you could do 11 you would. If you could do 77 for republicans, would that be your goal?

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: Well, thank you for your question, Representative.

The direct answer is my only goal in this is to comply with the order of the Covington Court. I would point out, though, because I think it goes to what you're saying is that there are a lot of factors that influence the outcome of elections. As you know,

you and I both served here for some time and there are a lot of things that influence elections: The amount of money that an incumbent can raise, let's just say, the things like that, the name ID, the level of constituency services that an incumbent provides. All those things influence the outcome of elections that are not a part of the map making process.

REPRESENTATIVE INSKO: Thank you.

SPEAKER MOORE: For what purpose does the gentleman from Cabarrus, Representative Pittman, rise?

REPRESENTATIVE PITTMAN: To send forth an amendment.

SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman is recognized to send forth an amendment. The Clerk will read.

HOUSE CLERK: Representative Pittman moves to amend the bill on page 23, lines 21 through 27, by deleting those lines and substituting the following.

SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman is recognized to debate the amendment.

REPRESENTATIVE PITTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Ladies and gentlemen, making adjustments in the districts in Rowan and Cabarrus counties does not require moving one incumbent's precinct into another incumbent's district and vice versa as the proposed

map would do. My amendment would undo this unnecessary maneuver so that each incumbent can remain in approximately the district each currently serves.

You know, there are a lot of folks in my district currently who have seen these maps and they're pretty upset about it, and they've been doing some research and they've given me some items that you might be interested to hear.

With the proposed map it is estimated that only about 10 percent of Cabarrus County motors -- excuse me, voters, can't talk today, would have the option of keeping their representative if they so choose. Approximately 120,000 voters would be disenfranchised to the extent that the legislature will have decided to remove their representative from them as opposed to the voters being able to make that decision themselves. Voters should be allowed to choose their representatives rather than the legislature or the courts choosing for them.

Cabarrus County is the 9th largest county in the state. Under the committee's map the eight larger ones all have complete districts within their counties. These include Mecklenburg, Wake, Guilford, Forsyth, Cumberland, Buncombe, New Hanover and Gaston. The next eight smaller counties all have two complete

districts within them. This includes Onslow, Johnson, Iredell, Alamance, Catawba, Randolph, Rowan and Robeson. Why is Cabarrus the only county in that size range being required to reach outside its borders to complete two districts? Cabarrus deserves the same treatment as every other large county.

If you make two incumbents switch districts, the constituents of each will lose the continuity of familiarity and service they have received from each of those representatives. That would serve no purpose except perhaps to dictate to the voters that they must choose someone else when that may not be their desire. These districts and others have been formed to favor members who have been in office longer, and to disfavor members who have not been here a long time. This is the sort of thing that I believe is causing many citizens in our state and across the nation to demand term limits. They are tired of long-term politicians protecting their own status as opposed to newer members the people might favor who don't intend to make a career of it.

Protecting long-term incumbents I believe is a problem. I understand it was a criteria that the committee chose to use in putting these maps together. However, you know, we serve two-year terms here and I

believe each term should be seen as standing alone. Doesn't matter if you've been here three or four years, doesn't matter if you've been here nine, ten years, 20 years, however long it may be, each election is a new thing and I believe the rights of all candidates should be respected. I mean I've had people run against me in the three elections that I've won and my attitude has always been they have just as much right to run as anybody, including myself. After all, these seats belong to the people, not to us.

I'm also being told that 90% of the voters in Cabarrus County under this proposed map would not be allowed to vote for their incumbent in Cabarrus County. Voters, again, should make that choice, not the legislature or the courts.

If someone wants to move into another district to run, I think they ought to get a house in that district and move themselves there, not move your whole precinct or that of an undesired opponent whether with or without Representative Johnson's consent this has been done, I couldn't say about that, but I know I was not consulted, I don't think Representative Ford was consulted about this configuration, and I'm pretty sure most of the voters in Cabarrus and Rowan County were not asked their

opinion.

Simply putting my precinct back into my current district and Representative Johnson's precinct back into her district is what my amendment would accomplish, and I tried to do as little moving around to accomplish that as I could.

What it entails is moving precincts 0404, 0405, 0406 and 0407 back into the 83rd District, and precincts 1209, 1212 and 0108 back into the 82nd District. That is within the 5%.

So, I appreciate your support for my amendment. Thank you.

SPEAKER MOORE: For what purpose does the gentleman from Harnett, Representative Lewis, rise?

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: To debate the amendment.

SPEAKER MOORE. The gentleman has the floor to debate the amendment.

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker and Members, if I could direct your attention to the 2017 House Redistricting Plan A, I'd like to talk a little bit about this amendment, but first I want to point out that this is an amendment that changes the county grouping that stretches from Richmond in the south to Davie in the

north. This county grouping is a part of the county optimal -- the optimal grouping scheme that both parties to the lawsuit agree exists. This is the optimal county grouping for this state. When you do that, there was literally one more incumbent, one more seated member of the General Assembly in this county group than the population of that county group would allow for.

I spent a lot of time trying to figure out what to do with that issue. The only ways that I knew to solve it, and I don't make light of this because I know everybody works hard and sacrifices a great deal to be up here, the options that I considered were you could have gone to the north end of the county group and grouped the incumbents that were there, you could have gone to the south and grouped them there. Frankly, you could have drawn them out of a hat, but the only criteria that I could think of to use that met with the criteria of the committee was to look at the length of incumbency. The -- to be clear, under no configuration, including the one that the gentleman from Cabarrus has just sent forward, under no configurations is there a way to avoid pairing incumbents in this group.

What his amendment proposes to do is to pair

a different two. I would ask you respectfully to vote this down. It's unfortunate and regretful that we have to make a choice like this, but I have made it using the data that I had, which included the criteria of the incumbency and that, of course, includes the number of terms that are served.

So, I would ask you to vote no on this amendment.

SPEAKER MOORE: For what purpose does the gentleman from Cabarrus, Representative Pittman, rise?

REPRESENTATIVE PITTMAN: Speak on the amendment a second time.

SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman is recognized to speak on the amendment a second time.

REPRESENTATIVE PITTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Ladies and gentlemen, just very briefly I would like to point out that I understand that either way somebody among the three of us that two are going to be paired. I would point out to you that geographically Representative Ford and Representative Johnson are much closer together than I am to either one of them. Thank you.

SPEAKER MOORE: Further discussion, further debate? If not, the question for the House is the

adoption of Amendment A1 sent forth by Representative Pittman. Those in favor will vote Aye, those opposed will vote No. The Clerk will open the vote.

Representative Rogers, Representative Corbin in chamber. Representative Alexander, Representative Collins.

Clerk will lock the machine and record the vote. 7 having voted in the affirmative; 102 in the negative. The amendment fails.

The gentleman from Harnett, Representative Lewis, is recognized to send forth the amendment. The Clerk will read.

THE CLERK: Representative Lewis moves to amend the bill on page 3, line 39 through page 4, line 2 by deleting those lines and submitting the following.

SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman has the floor to debate the amendment.

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I'd like to correct the record. When the committee met on Friday, there was an alternative proposal that had been submitted for consideration, and I erroneously stated the House plan that I submitted was more compact in

Wake County and I misspoke.

Representative Jackson from Wake County was kind enough to share with me on Friday that I had misspoke and provided the data to reemphasize that. Therefore, I worked on Saturday to try to improve the compactness scores. I also reached out for advice to some members of the House of the Wake County delegation for their input.

Therefore, despite what you may or may not think of the map, I would ask you to support this amendment. I think this map does a better job of keeping municipalities whole. I think this map is certainly more compact. The Reock score is increased by .019. The Polsby-Popper score is increased by 0.5.

Again, there is one fewer split town in this map, and I would urge members to please support this amendment.

SPEAKER MOORE: Further discussion, further debate? If not, the question for the House is the adoption of Amendment A2 sent forward by Representative Lewis. Those in favor will vote Aye, those opposed will vote No. The Clerk will open the vote.

The Clerk will lock the machine and record the vote.

64 having voted in the affirmative, and 46 in the negative the Amendment is adopted.

For what purpose does the gentleman from Lee, Representative Reives, rise?

He stepped off.

For what purpose does the lady from Franklin, Representative Richardson, rise?

REPRESENTATIVE RICHARDSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to ask the bill sponsor about three questions, please.

SPEAKER MOORE: Does the gentleman from Harnett yield to three questions?

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: I yield to all of them, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER MOORE: He yields, and after he answers each question in the interest of time, Representative Richardson, the lady is permitted to go onto the next question.

REPRESENTATIVE RICHARDSON: Okay, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My first question is I went to the public hearing in Halifax and there were quite a few people who were as was across the state. Was the information or the questions asked by those public hearings

included or impacted any of the changes in the maps that you presented?

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: Thank you for that question, Representative. The input that I can recall that we got was to make the districts compact. They were largely along the criteria that the committee has adopted. Unfortunately, I don't recall any specific criteria from the Halifax location that was incorporated in this drawing.

REPRESENTATIVE RICHARDSON: Thank you. I won't address that, but I just wondered.

My second question is that the plaintiffs had attorneys working for them. In deciding the maps that we are about to vote on, were any of the plaintiffs or the attorneys for the plaintiffs contacted and consulted about the results that will reflect in the maps that you've given us today?

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: Thank you for that question.

Certainly in my opinion would have been inappropriate for me to have contacted the plaintiffs attorneys to talk about this. I do appreciate the fact that the plaintiffs submitted maps for us to review. I, frankly, spent a lot of time reviewing it and I don't recall that there are any direct changes

to this map as a result of the map that the plaintiffs submitted.

REPRESENTATIVE RICHARDSON: Thank you.

My last question, it relates to the letter that attorney Anita Earle sent. Did that letter impact any changes once you received it from her?

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: Well, thank you for that question.

Certainly I do recall receiving the letter. I read the letter thoroughly. There are points of the letter that I would respectfully disagree with in terms of the way that the signers of the letter interpret various aspects of the law. Again, I think one of the biggest fallacies in the letter is the number of county traversals that following their theory of the law would create.

So, the short answer, and I apologize for continuing to do that, it's not my intent, I'm trying to recall, I do not recall that the letter left any direct changes in the map.

REPRESENTATIVE RICHARDSON: Thank you for your answers. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER MOORE: For what purpose does the gentleman from Lee, Representative Reives, rise?

REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: To ask the bill

sponsor a couple of questions.

SPEAKER MOORE: Does the gentleman from Harnett yield to inquiry?

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: I yield to all questions.

SPEAKER MOORE: He yields.

REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: Thank you, Chairman Lewis, and I'll try to make a couple of presumptions to go ahead and try not to ask you a whole bunch of questions.

I believe the reason we left the racial statistics out of the stack pack was to secure the racial gerrymander per the court's order. With that being said, we still had Dr. Hoffler doing the maps this time around. Was there a particular reason that we were picking Dr. Hoffler again?

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: Thank you for the question, Representative Reives. And to be clear, the map that you have before you is just like any other piece of legislation that comes up. The idea behind the map and the process that produces the map is a -- is the legislative -- is the legislative process. I feel and continue to feel that Dr. Hoffler was the best person to help us quickly comply with the order of the court. So, yes, I think he was the best one to

hire to help reproduce this map to present to you today.

REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: And follow-up?

SPEAKER MOORE: Gentleman yields to additional questions? He yields.

REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: Thank you.

And based on that, that because of the fact that he would have been the quickest, would have been because of the substantial amount of work and work product that he would have had from 2011; would that be fair to say?

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: Well, thank you for the question.

No, I don't think the 2011 plan would have had anything to do with it. I think it was more the we agreed that maptitude was the sort of the industry standard that's used nationwide, and he was just very fluent in being able to help legislators translate their desires to the maptitude program.

REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: Follow-up.

SPEAKER MOORE: Does the gentleman yield to additional questions?

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: Yes, sir.

SPEAKER MOORE: He yields.

REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: Based on that, is it

your belief, then, that he would not have used information that he had had available to him back in 2011 and his knowledge of the districts to kind of help push this process along?

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: Thank you for the question.

The only information that Dr. Hoffler had access to and used in preparing this map was that it was adopted by the criteria because that was the only -- was the criteria adopted by the committee because that was the only information that was loaded up on his computer.

REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: Follow-up.

SPEAKER MOORE: Does the gentleman yield to additional questions?

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: I yield.

SPEAKER MOORE: He yields.

REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: Thank you.

So, did we put anything in place to make sure that he wasn't using any other information, for instance, his knowledge of the racial data, statistics, district lines, things of that sort, that information that has previously been used this time around so as not to violate the court's order?

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: Thank you for the

question.

Part of his contract and certainly his instructions from me were to only use the criteria that was adopted by the committee.

REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: All right, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER MOORE: For what purpose does the gentleman from Durham, Representative Michaux, rise?

REPRESENTATIVE MICHAUX: To see if the gentleman would respond to a question or two.

SPEAKER MOORE: Does the gentleman from Harnett yield to the gentleman from Durham?

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: I do.

SPEAKER MOORE: He yields.

REPRESENTATIVE MICHAUX: Mr. Chairman, did you contact any of the members of the body before these maps were presented to the committee to get any individual input from them?

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: Representative Michaux, thank you for the question.

I have talked to members of the body throughout this process. Prior to the release of the first map I certainly had talked to probably Representative Dollar, who is the Chair of the committee with me, but I don't recall that I spoke to

any other member prior to the release of the first map. I've continued to talk with members along the way, which is why we put the map out was to get feedback from the members and the public and we have made certain changes in the map based on input from members.

REPRESENTATIVE MICHAUX: Follow-up.

SPEAKER MOORE: Does the gentleman yield to additional questions?

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: I yield.

SPEAKER MOORE: He yields.

REPRESENTATIVE MICHAUX: Let me try to make it simple. Did you seek out any information at all from the members of this body as to what they would like to see in any map that was drawn on a personal basis?

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: Thank you for that question, Representative Michaux.

I produced a map and have received input since then. I did not specifically seek out information from members prior to that.

REPRESENTATIVE MICHAUX: Follow-up.

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: I yield to all questions.

SPEAKER MOORE: He yields.

REPRESENTATIVE MICHAUX: In considering -- who -- who worked with you on consideration of the map that you submitted to the Redistricting Committee for their approval?

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: So, obviously Dr. Hoffler, who is a consultant that was hired drew the map at my direction, and Representative Dollar also added input to the maps after he had been named Co-chair of the committee.

REPRESENTATIVE MICHAUX: Another.

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: I yield to all questions.

SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman yields.

REPRESENTATIVE MICHAUX: So, you and Representative Dollar and Dr. Hoffler were the only ones who put a map together that was presented to the Redistricting Committee for their approval?

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: So, to be clear, primarily I directed how the map was produced, but, yes, the three people that you said were the ones that largely had seen it prior to its public publication.

REPRESENTATIVE MICHAUX: Follow-up?

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: I yield.

SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman yields.

REPRESENTATIVE MICHAUX: This won't take but

a couple more.

The court in turning -- in finding that the map you drew in 2011 was unconstitutional indicated that the maps were unconstitutional because they were racially gerrymandered. By racial gerrymandering, that race was brought into the map in order to make the maps that you drew; is that not correct?

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: Thank you for the question, Representative Michaux.

Certainly the court's ruling was that the maps were unconstitutional as racial gerrymander. It's my understanding that the reason the court made that determination is that they said that we had not established enough in the record to trigger the use of race in drawing districts.

REPRESENTATIVE MICHAUX: Follow-up?

SPEAKER MOORE: Will the gentleman yield to additional questions?

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: I do.

SPEAKER MOORE: He yields.

REPRESENTATIVE MICHAUX: You keep saying that the court says that you had not figured enough in there in order to trigger race, but did they not indicate to you that race was a predominant factor in the way that those lines were drawn in 2011?

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: Representative Michaux, I'm not sure I completely understand what you're asking. I have acknowledged that the court ruled that 19 of the state House districts were racial gerrymanders without the necessary supporting the information from the court. I mean that the court says the legislature did not have enough information to use race in the drawing of the maps. No additional information has been presented to me or to the Redistricting Committee to refute the court, therefore, we did not use race in drawing this map.

REPRESENTATIVE MICHAUX: One follow-up question.

SPEAKER MOORE: Does the gentleman yield to additional questions?

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: I do.

SPEAKER MOORE: He yields.

REPRESENTATIVE MICHAUX: How do you, then, correct, how do you correct a racially predominantly drawn district without including race in order to correct that predominance?

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: Thank you for the question.

It's my understanding that the ruling of the court was that we did not have enough evidence to

justify the use of race in drawing districts, therefore, if race is not used at all in the drawing of the districts, certainly a court would not be able to find because race had not been a factor at all, it certainly could not have been a factor that was incorrectly considered.

REPRESENTATIVE MICHAUX: Thank you.

SPEAKER MOORE: For what purpose does the gentleman from Wake, Representative Jackson, rise?

REPRESENTATIVE JACKSON: For a series of questions to the sponsor chair.

SPEAKER MOORE: Does the gentleman from Harnett yield to questions?

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: I yield.

SPEAKER MOORE: He yields, and Representative Jackson, you're welcome just to continue asking after each one.

REPRESENTATIVE JACKSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think it's only four questions, Chairman Lewis.

On Friday we talked about to back the scores, and you did make a change to Wake County, and so, I'll just ask was the map the committee considered on Friday what I'll call the Covington, the Covington map, is it still slightly better compacted scores than

the offer 927 as amended at this point?

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: Thank you for the question, Representative Jackson. The -- my understanding is that the Covington map is slightly better statewide on overall compactness and the -- in Wake County the now amended plan is better under the Reock score than the Covington map was and almost as good as the Covington map under the Polsby-Popper score.

REPRESENTATIVE JACKSON: Thank you.

Chairman Lewis, I noticed a series of split counties: Craven, Onslow, Pitt, Granville, Robeson, Johnston, Sampson, Nash, Harnett, Columbus and Stanly, and so, in my examination of those I didn't see a single place where the split worked to the advantage of the democratic party and to the detriment of the republican party, and I was just wondering if I was wrong or if you could point me to one those?

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: Well, thank you for that question, Representative Jackson. The -- I'm not aware of the outcome of how these splits effect various partisan performance of a district. Were I to gander, I would say that -- I would say that probably the placement of the line for population purposes in District 8 probably benefits democrats more than it

does republicans. That's one of the things I tried the say when we were adopting the criteria. Every choice, everywhere a line is made, there are political ramifications for where that line falls, and one of the reasons that I objected so much to the committee to trying to specify that a precinct or a county could only be split for population purposes, frankly, is I knew that where ever the line went, there would be political consequences for it and folks would blame me for violating the criteria.

REPRESENTATIVE JACKSON: And the last question I have for you is Representative Lewis or Chairman Lewis, is in Wake and Mecklenburg County there are five house districts that did not touch in any way districts that had been declared unconstitutional, and since you didn't consider race in redrawing these districts, can you tell us why it was necessary for you to change the boundaries of House District 105 in Mecklenburg County and House Districts 36, 37, 40 and 41 in Wake County?

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: The court ordered us to correct racial gerrymanders, that is, districts that use race too much. Freezing districts which do not touch the illegal district would require the core of the racial gerrymander as a starting point and then

we would be accused of racial gerrymandering all over again. Instead, we started with a blank slate. As you yourself have pointed out, the blank slate has let us do some good things. It's let us split fewer precincts, it's let us keep more municipalities whole.

The state constitution does assume that redistricting will be done after the census and not touched later on, but it does not speak to the situation we're in now, which is court ordered redistricting. In 2011 what I refer to as the VRA districts were created first. For example, in Wake County all of the remaining districts were drawn around the VRA seats. Therefore, all the remaining districts were, in fact, impacted by the Covington ruling.

In its ruling the Covington court criticizes split precincts. To correct that we needed to try to split less precincts in all of the districts that were in a group, and that's what we've done here in this drawing.

REPRESENTATIVE JACKSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SPEAKER MOORE: Further discussion, further debate? Does the gentleman wish to debate the bill?

REPRESENTATIVE JACKSON: I do.

SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman from Wake, Representative Jackson, is recognized to debate the bill.

REPRESENTATIVE JACKSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Ladies and gentlemen, I apologize in advance. My comments are probably about 10 minutes long. So, I tried to summarize them as best I could.

I want you to know that I do rise to oppose this redistricting plan today and I wanted to start with the issue of race, which I believe is at the heart of this plan and very much, unfortunately, part of the national public debate in recent months.

A lot of hate was on display a few weeks ago in Charlottesville, and I think the comments we heard at the public hearing last week were in large part a response to what happened in Charlottesville. So, from the beginning I want to state publicly and clearly and for the record that I do not think your plan is racial gerrymandered because my colleagues in this body are racist. No one in this body deserves to be called some of the names we heard that night or in some of the public comments that I have personally received. But today is the anniversary of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s I Have a Dream speech, and we have,

in fact, come a long way, but I do not believe we are at the point in this country, in the south or even in this state where you can no longer consider race in these type of decisions.

I do believe your plan is still a racial gerrymander, just as the plan from 2011 was found to be. I believe your plan racially gerrymanders so that you can lessen the opportunities of African-American voters to have their voices heard in more districts because that could in turn create more democratic districts. That is at the core of your supermajority.

The plan that we are passing today is every bit as constitutionally flawed as the one in 2011. House democrats have pointed out some of the flaws on the floor and in committee. The Covington plaintiffs have done so through written correspondence to the chairs and submission to alternative map. You have not made the necessary changes, but I'm going to point them out one final time.

First, there was the process you've known since June 5th that your maps were unconstitutional and needed to be redrawn and we did nothing. Governor Cooper attempted to call us into special session on June 7th; again we did nothing. Finally, you acted laying out a long, drawn out timetable for public

input and hearings. It sounded great except that it was now August. And remember last time you tried to schedule filing in December and that's a long process and prevents us from recruiting candidates. That's not a problem for your side with so many incumbents and maps to consult, but the court figured this out and rightly called you out on it.

So that foot-dragging process led to an evening of one public hearing conducted in probably one of the most bizarre fashions I've ever seen. As best I can tell, what input we did receive through the hearing or the online process was not used in any meaningful way. I have no doubt that the maps we see today have existed in some basic form for sometime, after all, the clusters were drawn last year around this time, yet they were released on a Saturday, but just as pictures with no data. It took another couple of days to get the data we all know existed.

The second flaw in the plan before us today is the alleged non-use of racial data. Nine Supreme Court justices, who rarely agree on anything, struck down your maps as a racial gerrymander. Some argued that the court did not find such a racial gerrymander, only that you considered race without the proper factual findings or that the law has somehow changed

since 2011. In my opinion that just isn't accurate.

The Federal courts have referred to the 2011 plan as a racial gerrymander at least seven different times in two separate court orders requiring you to re-draw these 19 unconstitutional House districts. Three federal judges issued an order instructing you on how to fix your map, including specific language directing the use of racial data. You are refusing to do so. You're pretending that the Voting Rights Act no longer exists.

You can look at page 151 of the court's opinion. There the court talks about the history of the prior Voting Rights Act districts in North Carolina and racially pulverized voting. The court says, "We would not dispute that some of the information is relevant and should be considered during a legislative redistricting."

Should be considered, that's what the court says. We didn't consider it. In the court's conclusion, "Section II of the Voting Rights Acts continues to play an important role in redistricting, and legislatures must undertake a district specific analysis to identify and cure potential Section II violations."

Again, note the magic words, legislatures

must. Again, we have not done that.

The maps before us today have stack packs with no racial data in them. You claim that means a racial gerrymander is impossible, yet the lines were drawn by the same expert who drew the maps in 2011. They used racial data so extensively as to be found unconstitutional. Dr. Hoffler spent months taking a scaffold to the North Carolina map and finding pockets of African-American voters to create 50% plus districts all across the state. He spent many more years helping the state answer pleadings, discovery requests, giving depositions and expert testimony. How do you instruct him now not to use what he knows all so well? It would be like telling Dale Jr. not to look at his speedometer. It's pointless. He still knows how fast he's going when he's in that car.

And you see it in the maps. You see racial gerrymanders that have not been cured. They live on, refusing to die like a character in The Walking Dead. If not, why do the districts look so similar to the ones last time?

What's more, you even refused to even check on the back end to make sure you have identified and cured potential Section II violations. The court has told you to do so, but you have refused. I'd ask that

you not cry foul if and when the court calls you to task on it. Everyone has warned you.

The third flaw I see is the unfortunate error of violating the whole county provision of the North Carolina Constitution. Your map splits more counties than the map I presented at committee. There are no unnecessary county traversals. Why not fix them now?

The fourth flaw also relates to the North Carolina Constitution. Unlike Georgia and other states, we cannot redistrict mid-decade without a court ordering us to do so. You abide by this constitutional rule by not redrawing areas like Alamance or New Hanover or Burke County, yet you violate the rule in Wake and Mecklenburg County.

It is possible and constitutionally required to leave districts unchanged that do not touch unconstitutional districts when the cluster is unchanged, yet you refuse to do so for reasons of politics.

There's no legal universe with your political reasons can trump the North Carolina Constitution. It's as clear as day. Article II, Section 5 says, "When established, the House districts in the apportionment of their representatives shall

remain unaltered until the return of another census of population taken by order of congress."

That same language is cited in both the Stevenson 1 and Stevenson 2 is one of the four constitutional limitations upon the redistricting authority of the General Assembly. Why would a party of strict constructionists ignore this prohibition?

Finally, I will point out the flaw that is obvious to anyone paying attention and that is partisan gerrymandering. Our current map is one of the most gerrymandered in the history of America. That is not an exaggeration. We are at the political center of the political scientists world, and you've doubled down what you did in 2011. And I know, I know you're going to say that democrats did it first, and there's two comments I'd like to say about that. First, at some point someone has to have the integrity and political courage to stop doing it. Obviously it won't be us today.

The second I looked up the last democratic plan of 2003, looking at the closest statewide race of 2000, which was the democratic candidate won by three points, the 2003 democratic gerrymander gave us, gave our party, the democratic party, 66 seats and yours 54. Obviously it was drawn at that time to help the

democrats, yet compared to what we have before us today, Attorney General Stein won in North Carolina. He wins over 42 seats in your plan. 35% of the North Carolina House.

In committee I presented a plan that resulted in Attorney General Stein winning 56 seats, and some of my republican friends were horrified, aghast. It was beyond the pale what I was proposing. I had a radical partisan gerrymander in favor of democrats, and imagine that, it was a plan that only gave you a simple majority. Your party's executive director said that the Covington's plaintiffs' plan was the racial gerrymander in this case and that what I was doing on Friday was an embarrassment.

Let me sum up those republic talking points for you. The plan before us today puts the democrats in the super minority, but it's completely fair and balanced. My amendment that would have put democrats in the close minority is the wildly partisan racial gerrymander. It takes a lot of gall to parrot those talking points. I encourage you to try it out in public sometime.

I know that partisan gerrymandering has not been struck down by the courts yet. Plans like the one before us today are putting us on that path.

There are bad democratic gerrymanders in states like Maryland, and bad republican ones in states like Wisconsin, but we remain the top dog in gerrymandering. Nobody does it like North Carolina. We're number one. The fact that you would do it again after your first maps were struck down by the courts is very interesting, to say the least. You could have drawn a more reasonable map that guaranteed you to stay in control of this body through 2020. You could have shown a little humility, a little moderation, a little caution knowing that the court this time has to approve this plan, but you didn't. You're going all in, and we'll see how this all works out in a few weeks.

On behalf of the House of Democrats I say that we will be voting against this plan. Thank you.

SPEAKER MOORE: For what purpose does the gentleman from Wake, Representative John, rise?

REPRESENTATIVE JOHNS: Briefly debate the bill.

SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman is recognized to debate the bill.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHNS: Since I announced my intention to seek election to this body nearly a year ago, I have consistently and repeatedly spoken of my

firm belief that the task of drawing electoral districts for the North Carolina House and the North Carolina Senate should be assigned to a wholly independent, impartial, and most importantly, a nonpartisan commission.

In the public comments recently heard by the Redistricting Committee, speaker after speaker after speaker expressed the identical sentiment.

As we've heard so often, politicians should not be put in the position of selecting their voters as opposed to citizens selecting their representatives. Our frail human nature being what it is, when those directly affected and indeed those who will specifically benefit by the process are those who themselves are making the critical decisions as to where the borders of legislative districts are set, it is inevitable that self-district -- self-interest and partisan concerns will creep in and in most instances will ultimately prevail.

My personal wish, and I believe the wish of the vast majority of North Carolinians, would have been that the General Assembly would have considered and early on passed a law establishing an independent redistricting commission. Bipartisan proposals to do so currently languish in the House Rules Committee,

and sadly, no such legislation was passed. What we have instead are the proposed maps before us, the many flaws of which have been pointed out in the questions and statements we have heard.

My primary and heartfelt goal, Mr. Speaker, will be to continue to see a significant change in this process, and one which will give our citizens the full confidence they deserve in their legislative districts.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER MOORE: For what purpose does the gentleman from Harnett, Representative Lewis, rise?

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: May I send forth an amendment?

SPEAKER MOORE: Representative wishes to send forth an amendment. Clerk will now read.

HOUSE CLERK: Representative Louis wishes to amend the bill by changing the short title from 2017 House Redistricting Plan A1 to 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2.

SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman is recognized to debate the amendment.

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker and Members, this is a purely

technical amendment recommend to me by essential staff. It simply makes it easier to identify the map that appeared on the calendar today from the map that now appears as amended with the Wake County amendment. Therefore, I would respectfully ask you to vote green and adopt this amendment. It just renames the map.

SPEAKER MOORE: Further discussion, further debate? If not, the question before the House is the adoption of Amendment A3 sent forward by Representative Lewis. Those in favor will vote Aye, those opposed will vote No. The Clerk will open the vote.

The Clerk will lock the machine and record the vote. 111 having voted in the affirmative, none in the negative. The bill is adopted. We're now back on the bill for the discussion, further debate.

For what purpose does the gentleman from Mecklenburg, Representative Alexander, rise?

For what purpose does the gentleman from Harnett, Representative Lewis, rise?

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, may I please ask the gentleman from Wake, Representative Jackson, a series of questions?

SPEAKER MOORE: Does the gentleman from Wake yield to the gentleman from Harnett?

REPRESENTATIVE JACKSON: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER MOORE: He yields and the gentleman will be permitted to simply propound additional questions.

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you Representative Jackson.

Representative Jackson, just to be clear, you pointed out what you identify as deficiencies in this process. Have you done or caused to be done a district by district on the houses that gives any specific information that race should have been used?

REPRESENTATIVE JACKSON: I have not done a specific district by district analysis, Representative Lewis. As I mentioned on Friday, I have seen some racial data statistics for the different plans, but I have not taken it down to the -- if you read, as you read the Covington opinion, it's a 160 something pages and it goes in each district and it talks about what was the breakdown of African-Americans in the 2003 plan and did they elect the candidate of their choice. I did not take it down through that level, no, sir. I've just seen the preliminary statistics.

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: Thank you.

Did you -- did you ask for the racial data on the plan that is before us now from staff or an

outside source?

REPRESENTATIVE JACKSON: I have certainly seen data on the plan as existed last week. The plan that's before us now has been amended a few times, and so, I've not asked for that data. I have also seen some preliminary racial data on the Covington plaintiffs' map, and I can't remember if it was at my request or if I was just copied on that e-mail, Representative Lewis.

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: May I ask one last question, Mr. Speaker?

SPEAKER MOORE: Yes, sir.

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you Representative Jackson.

Have you published this racial data or do you intend to? Is it a part of the record somewhere?

REPRESENTATIVE JACKSON: I believe it exists, Representative Lewis, in this computers. I have not published it. I believe that some members of my caucus have seen it as it applied to your previous plan as introduced to committee last week. I don't believe everyone on our side has seen the data as it exists for the Covington map. And, then, this weekend after you were kind enough on Saturday to share the Wake County amendment that you intended to run, I did

get a breakdown of some of the changes to some of those districts in Wake County and I've only shared that with a few members.

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you, Representative Jackson.

SPEAKER MOORE: Further discussion, further debate? If not, the question for the House is the passage of House Bill 927 on the second reading. Those in favor will vote Aye; those opposed will vote No. The Clerk will open the vote.

The Clerk will lock the machine and record the vote. 65 having voted in the affirmative; 47 in the negative. House Bill 927 passes at second reading and without objection be read a third time.

HOUSE CLERK: North Carolina enacts.

SPEAKER MOORE: Further discussion, further debate? If not, the question before the House the passage of House Bill 927 on the third reading. Those in favor will vote Aye; those opposed will vote No. The Clerk will open the vote.

The Clerk will lock the machine and close the vote. 65 having voted in the affirmative; 47 in the negative. House Bill 927 passes its third reading. The Bill is ordered enrolled and sent to the Senate. Strike that, the Bill is ordered in gross and

sent to the Senate.

Moving on to other business, Members, the Chair appoints the following members as well as constituting a committee on judicial redistricting. The committee members are as follows: Representative Berg, Chair; Representative Stevens, Vice Chair; Representative Ted Davis, Vice Chair; Representative John Bluss, Vice Chair. Members Representative Blackwell, Brisson, Bumgardner, Floyd, Goodman, Hall, Hastings, Harrison, Jackson, Jordan, John, Lewis, McNeil, Bobby Richardson, Rogers, Torbit, Ray and Zachary, and that's pursuant to Rule 26A.

We'll stand at ease momentarily. And since we have multiple Halls that was Representative Destin Hall.

The Clerk directs that 927 should be sent by special message to the Senate.

(HOUSE IS AT EASE.)

House will come back to order.

Members, for your planning purposes this is the schedule for today and for the next couple of days. First of all, we are -- we finished today's business. The Chair will direct, Mr. Clerk, that the three veto overrides: House Bill 205, House Bill 511, House Bill 576 be removed from today's calendar and

calendared for Wednesday, put on Wednesday's calendar.

Tomorrow we will have -- tomorrow we will have session at 1, but there will be no votes. Excuse me, 1 or 2, we haven't determined. I think we're going to go with 2, 2 o'clock tomorrow, but no votes tomorrow. The plan tomorrow is going to be that the Redistricting Committee will take up the Senate redistricting map. The chairman will make an announcement momentarily on that, and once that -- the committee process will be tomorrow. And then on Wednesday it is the Chair's intent that we take care of second and third reading on Wednesday.

Is there any objection to -- is there anybody going to object to the reading of the Senate redistricting map on Wednesday? Okay, then, the plan will be that we'll do second and third reading on the Senate map and on Wednesday. For ratification purposes and so forth, I believe we still may be here Thursday, but at least right now it would appear that the voting business will be done Wednesday, but I'm not sure. I know there are several other bills floating around. There are some comp reports folks are working on. So, those may be taken up Wednesday and Thursday as well, but that's where we are for right now.

The gentleman from Harnett, Representative Lewis, is recognized for an announcement.

The gentleman from Wayne, Representative Bell, is recognized for an announcement.

REPRESENTATIVE BELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Republican members, we're going to caucus on Wednesday. Right now the time is to be determined, but look somewhere in the 12 o'clock timeframe. So, prepare accordingly. Thank you.

SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman from Wake, Representative Dollar, is recognized for an announcement.

REPRESENTATIVE DOLLAR: Tomorrow the House Redistricting Committee will meet at 1:00, 1:00 in Room 643. We'll be there to take up the Senate's Redistricting Bill.

SPEAKER MOORE: And the Chair would intend we have session tomorrow too. Is there any -- the Chair would move the rules be suspended so that the House may meet at the same time the committee is meeting.

Is there an objection? Hearing none, so ordered.

For what purpose does the gentleman from

Wake, Representative Jackson, rise?

REPRESENTATIVE JACKSON: For an announcement.

SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman is recognized for an announcement.

REPRESENTATIVE JACKSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Our House democrats will caucus Wednesday at 1:00. Wednesday at 1:00 in our normal room. Thank you.

SPEAKER MOORE: So, just again to remind members, no votes in session tomorrow. It will be a no-vote session, but the Redistricting Committee will be meeting. There will be votes, however, on Wednesday and probably on Thursday.

Further notices and announcements?

For what purpose does the gentleman from Durham, Representative Michaux, rise?

REPRESENTATIVE MICHAUX: Inquiry of the Chair.

SPEAKER MOORE: Just a moment.

Members of the House will come to order. The gentleman is recognized for an inquiry.

REPRESENTATIVE MICHAUX: Barring any other order or anything coming from the court, what's on

schedule after Wednesday or Thursday?

SPEAKER MOORE: The Chair believes we'll be done Thursday. I don't foresee us being here on Friday. If the gentleman is asking what specific bills there are?

REPRESENTATIVE MICHAUX: No, I'm talking about after we leave here Wednesday or Thursday, when do we come back?

SPEAKER MOORE: Sometime in October we have a -- we'll have a reconvening date in October. That date has yet to be determined, but the Chair believes it will be during the second week of October.

REPRESENTATIVE MICHAUX: I thought the resolution -- pardon me, another question. I thought the resolution we passed called for a September date?

SPEAKER MOORE: That is in there. That will be amended in this adjournment resolution. The Chair doesn't believe there will be a need to be back that early. So, looks like you'll be safe until October.

REPRESENTATIVE MICHAUX: What's safe about that?

SPEAKER MOORE: Something to look forward to, Representative Michaux. It's just like Christmas, it just keeps repeating itself over and over again.

Further notices and announcements?

If not, gentleman from Harnett, Representative Lewis, recognized for a motion.

Just a moment.

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER MOORE: Just a moment, Representative Lewis. Oh, yes, the Chair apologizes. We actually have some pages with us today. If the pages would please come forward that are going to be serving with us this week. If you guys would come forward, I want to make sure I introduce these pages. I know a lot of members have left, but I would ask that you give your attention. A number of you probably have sponsored our pages who are here.

And to our pages, as the Clerk calls your name, please step forward and wave so that my colleagues and I will know who you are and where you're from. All right, the Clerk will introduce the pages.

HOUSE CLERK: Caroline Beason, Mecklenburg County, Sponsor Representative Dulin. Rhea Bagia, Mecklenburg County, Sponsor Representative Dulin. Zoe Byrd, Johnston County, Sponsor Representative Strickland. Tanner Harron, Guilford County, Sponsor Representative Faircloth. Emma Hiott, Stanly County, Sponsor Representative Burr. Carrie Holloway, Forsyth

County, Sponsor Representative Hanes. Victoria Hume, Orange County, Sponsor Representative Meyer. Timothy Parker, Wake County, Sponsor Representative Malone. Katherine Sanota, Mecklenburg County, Sponsor Representative Stone. Kirastacia Taylor, Orange County, Sponsor Representative Meyer. Maxwell Wagenseller, New Hanover County, Sponsor Representative Butler. Nate Worley, Buncombe County, Sponsor Representative Turner.

SPEAKER MOORE: Members, if you would please join me in welcoming our pages here this week.

(APPLAUSE.)

We're glad to have you with us this week. You may return to you post.

The gentleman from Harnett, Representative Lewis, is recognized for a motion.

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, in honor and memory or Richard Thomas McDowell, the father of Representative White, I move the House adjourn to reconvene Tuesday, August 29th, at 1 o'clock p.m. subject to the standard stipulation set forth in Rule 15.1, except, Mr. Speaker, may I change that and move that the House reconvene on Tuesday, August 29th, at 2 o'clock p.m.

SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman from Harnett

moves that the House be now adjourned, seconded by the lady from Johnston, Representative White, in honor and in memory of Richard Thomas McDowell, who is the father of Representative White, subject to the standard stipulations set forth in Rule 15.1 to reconvene Tuesday, August 29th at 2 p.m.

Those in favor say Aye.

HOUSE MEMBERS: Aye.

SPEAKER MOORE: Those opposed say no. The Ayes have it. We stand adjourned.

(HOUSE SESSION ADJOURNED AT 3:07 P.M.)

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

COUNTY OF DURHAM

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, Regina Toppins, Shorthand Reporter and Notary Public in and for the State of North Carolina, do hereby affirm that the foregoing pages contain a verbatim transcription of the above-captioned proceedings and have been transcribed to the best of my ability and understanding; I further affirm that I am not related to any of the parties to this action; that I am not interested in the outcome of this case; that I am not of counsel nor in the employ of any of the parties to this action.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereto set my hand, this the 28th day of August, 2017.

Regina Toppins, Notary Public
Notary Number: 200626300019

A

A1 30:1 57:19
A2 31:20 57:20
A3 58:9
abide 52:12
ability 70:9
able 6:22 11:2 15:21 24:16 36:18 43:3
above-caption... 70:8
absolute 9:14
acceptable 14:15
access 37:8
accomplish 27:5 27:6
accomplishes 8:13
accurate 50:1
accused 46:1
acknowledge 2:16
acknowledged 42:3
Act 50:9,13
acted 5:9 48:24
action 70:11,14
activists 6:8
Acts 50:20
added 40:8
additional 11:10 12:12 13:7,19 15:2 16:10 18:1 19:6 20:1 22:5 36:5,22 37:15 39:9 41:18 42:8,15 59:3
address 33:11
adjourn 68:19
adjourned 69:1 69:10,11
adjournment 66:17
adjustments 23:22
adopt 58:6
adopted 5:23 6:19 10:19 11:3 12:19 13:11 14:10 17:9 21:15 32:2 33:7 37:9 37:10 38:4 58:15
adopting 45:2
adoption 30:1 31:20 58:9
advance 47:7
advantage 44:15
advice 31:6
affirm 70:7,10
affirmative 30:8 32:1 58:14 61:12,22
African-Amer... 48:8 51:9
African-Amer... 59:19
afternoon's 2:6
aged 15:10
aghast 54:8
ago 47:14 55:25
agree 28:3 49:21
agreed 36:16
ahead 35:9
Alamance 25:2 52:14
Alexander 30:5 58:18
alleged 49:20
allegiance 2:9 3:11
allow 28:8
allowed 5:22 10:9 24:17 26:13
alternative 30:23 48:17
amen 3:9,10
amend 23:16 30:14 57:18
amended 8:19 44:1,6 58:4 60:4 66:17
amendment 8:18 23:12,14 23:19 24:1 27:4,12,16,18 27:22,24 28:25 29:8,12,14 30:1,9,11,18 31:11,17,20 32:2 54:18 57:14,16,22 58:1,4,6,9 60:25
America 3:12 53:11
amount 23:2 36:9
analogy 10:24
analysis 50:23 59:13
Anita 34:5
anniversary 47:24
announced 5:16 55:23
announcement 63:9 64:2,4,13 65:3,5
announcements 65:16 66:25
answer 12:17 16:14 21:7,12 21:22 22:21 34:17 51:11
answers 32:17 34:22
anybody 26:9 63:14
apologize 34:17 47:6
apologizes 67:6
appear 14:2 63:19
appeared 58:3
appears 58:4
APPLAUSE 68:12
applied 60:20
apply 14:18
applying 12:18
appoints 62:3
apportionment 52:25
appreciate 16:14 27:11 33:22
approach 11:24 18:11
approval 40:4 40:17
approve 55:12
approved 3:19 3:21,23
approximately 24:3,13
area 3:5
areas 10:14 52:13
argued 49:22
Article 52:23
asked 8:14 16:25 19:25 26:25 32:25 60:5
asking 6:5 42:3 43:17 66:4
aspects 6:9 34:13
Assembly 1:3 3:10 4:12,12 5:2 7:15 28:6 53:6 56:22
assigned 56:3
assume 46:6
attempted 48:23
attend 6:12
attention 4:2 20:21 27:21 53:9 67:12
attest 6:12
attitude 26:8
attorney 34:5 54:2,6
attorneys 33:13 33:15,22
audio 6:13
August 1:12 3:18,21 49:2 68:20,23 69:6 70:16
authority 2:20 53:6
authorized 7:10
available 37:2
average 21:2
avoid 7:3 12:3,3 28:23
avoided 8:9
aware 44:21
Aye 3:22 30:2 31:21 58:10 61:9,19 69:7,8
Ayes 3:23 69:10

B

back 13:25 27:2 27:4,8,9 37:2 43:21 51:23 58:15 62:19 66:8,18
bad 5:9 55:1,2
Bagia 67:20
balance 20:15
balanced 54:18
Barring 65:24
Bartlett 6:25 7:8
based 13:7 22:15 36:7,25 39:5
basic 49:14
basis 39:16
Beason 67:19
beginning 47:18
behalf 55:15
belief 37:1 56:1
believe 4:3 11:1 12:1 13:6,10 15:21 25:16,22 26:1,5 35:11 47:11 48:1,5,7 56:20 60:17,19 60:22 63:18 66:18
believes 66:2,11
Bell 64:4,5
belong 26:10
benefit 56:14
benefits 44:25
Berg 62:6
best 7:3 12:2

13:10 14:19,20 18:10 35:24,25 47:8 49:11 70:9
better 2:22 31:11 43:25 44:5,6
beyond 54:8
biggest 34:14
bill 4:10,10,17 8:25 9:8 11:7 11:14 12:9 13:16 14:25 15:6 16:7 17:23 19:2,5 23:16 30:14 32:10 34:25 46:24 47:3 55:20,22 57:18 58:15,16 61:8 61:13,18,23,24 61:25 62:24,24 62:25 64:17
bills 63:21 66:5
Bipartisan 56:24
bit 10:25 11:22 13:23 16:18 17:4 21:8 27:22 48:13
bizarre 49:10
Blackwell 62:9
Bladen 10:1 16:25 17:1
blame 45:9
blank 46:2,3
blessed 2:18
blessings 3:7
Bluss 62:8
Bobby 62:11
body 38:16,21 39:14 47:21,21 55:9,24
border 15:12
borders 25:4 56:16
boundaries 8:4 15:22 45:18
breakdown 59:19 61:1
briefly 29:17 55:19
bring 2:16
Brisson 62:9
brought 41:6
Bumgardner 62:9
bunch 35:9
Buncombe 24:24 68:8
bunking 8:9
Burke 52:14
Burr 67:25
business 5:15 62:2,23 63:20
Butler 68:8
Byrd 67:22

C

Cabarrus 19:13 19:25 23:10,23 24:10,20 25:3 25:5 26:12,13 26:25 28:22 29:10
calendar 3:24 58:3 62:25 63:1
calendared 63:1
call 43:24 48:23
called 47:22 49:7 66:15
calling 2:18
calls 52:1 67:14
candidate 53:22 59:20
candidates 26:6 49:4
car 51:16
care 63:11
career 25:21
Carolina 1:1,3 1:11 4:12,13 5:5 50:14 51:8 52:5,10,22 54:2,4 55:4 56:2,3 61:15 70:1,6
Caroline 67:19
Carolinians 56:21
Carrie 67:25
case 54:13 70:12
Catawba 25:2
caucus 60:20 64:7 65:8
caused 59:9
causing 25:16
caution 55:11
census 46:7 53:1
center 53:13
certain 39:5
certainly 31:13 33:20 34:9 38:2,23 41:10 43:3,5 60:2
CERTIFICA... 70:4
chair 4:2,20 38:24 43:11 62:3,6,6,7,8,23 64:18,20 65:20 66:2,11,17 67:6
Chair's 63:11
chairman 19:11 35:7 38:6,15 43:19 44:11 45:13 46:22 63:8
chairs 48:17
chamber 2:3 30:5
change 43:22 45:18 57:6 68:22
changed 7:25 8:2 49:25
changes 27:24 33:1,25 34:6 34:20 39:5 48:18 61:1
changing 57:18
character 51:19
Charlottesville 47:15,17
check 51:22
choice 26:14 29:3 45:3 59:20
choose 24:13,18 25:12
choosing 24:19
chose 6:11 12:19 25:24
Christ 3:9
Christmas 66:23
chunk 15:13
cited 53:3
citizens 25:17 56:11 57:7
city 15:21
claim 51:3
clarify 7:23
clear 9:20 10:25 28:20 35:18 40:18 52:23 59:7
clearly 47:19
Clerk 3:24 4:8,9 23:14,15 30:3 30:7,12,13 31:22,24 57:16 57:17 58:11,13 61:10,11,15,20 61:21 62:16,23 67:14,17,19
close 2:3 54:19 61:21
closer 29:22
closest 53:21
cluster 19:12,14 19:18 52:18
clusters 49:15
Co-chair 40:9
colleagues 47:20 67:16
Collins 30:6
Columbus 14:1 16:17 17:10,11 44:13
come 2:1,12 4:1 48:1 62:19 65:22 66:8 67:8,9
comes 35:20
coming 8:18 65:25
comments 22:15 47:7,15,23 53:16 56:6
commission 56:5,24
committee 5:25 6:17,19 7:23 11:3 12:19 13:11 14:11,18 17:9 18:23 21:16 25:24 28:19 30:22 33:6 37:10 38:4,17,25 40:3,9,17 42:10 43:23 45:5 48:15 52:6 54:5 56:7 56:25 60:21 62:4,5 63:7,10 64:15,21 65:13
committee's 7:16 8:6 24:21
comp 63:22
compact 7:12,14 12:23 14:3,6 15:25 16:19 17:5 18:8,18 18:19 30:25 31:13 33:5
compacted 43:25
compactness 7:17 12:21 14:4,9,15 15:14,25 16:21 17:18 18:12,17 31:6 44:5
compared 54:1
complete 24:22 24:25 25:5
completely 42:2 54:17
compliance 11:1 13:5
complies 6:18

6:23 7:9,16 8:6
comply 4:25 5:20 7:6,25 8:16 22:22 35:24
computer 37:12
computers 60:18
concerns 56:18
conclusion 50:20
conducted 49:9
confidence 2:23 57:8
configuration 26:24 28:21
configurations 28:23
conforms 13:10
congress 53:2
congressional 20:15 22:16
consent 26:21
consequences 45:9
consider 45:16 48:3 50:19
consideration 8:8,15 30:24 40:2
considered 11:23 28:13 43:6,23 49:24 50:16,18 56:22
considering 40:1
consistently 55:25
constituency 23:5
constituents 25:8
constituting 62:4
constitution 9:12,16 12:25 13:6 46:6 52:5 52:10,23
constitutional 52:13 53:5
constitutionally 48:13 52:16
constructionists 53:7
construed 5:19
consult 49:6
consultant 40:6
consulted 26:22 26:23 33:16
CONSULTING 1:23
contact 38:16
contacted 33:16 33:21
contain 70:7
contests 21:14
context 18:6
contiguity 7:4
contiguous 7:2
continue 35:23 43:17 57:6
continued 39:2
continues 50:21
continuing 34:18
continuity 25:8
contract 38:2
control 55:9
conversations 4:5
Cooper 48:23
copied 60:8
Corbin 30:4
core 45:24 48:11
corner 15:11
correct 3:19 15:15 30:22 41:7 42:19,19 42:21 45:22 46:17
correspondence 48:16
counsel 70:13
count 9:17
counted 22:10
counties 7:11 9:18,22 11:18 11:19 12:22,24 13:9 14:1 16:16,17 19:13 23:23 24:23,25 44:12 52:6
country 48:2
county 7:4,6,9 7:22,23 8:12 9:10,13,16,19 9:19,20,25 10:5,11,14,24 12:25 13:7,24 14:13 15:9,11 15:12,13,20 16:24 17:2,3 17:10,11,12,13 17:14 18:20 19:15,15,16,20 20:1,1,2,3 24:10,20,20 25:3,6 26:12 26:14,25 27:24 28:1,1,4,6,7,14 31:1,2,7 34:15 43:22 44:6 45:6,13,19,20 46:12 52:4,7 52:14,15 58:4 60:25 61:2 67:20,21,22,23 67:24 68:1,2,3 68:4,6,7,8 70:2
couple 35:1,8 41:1 49:17 62:21
courage 53:18
course 9:12 15:20 29:5
court 4:4,6,25 5:6,8,12,12,15 5:19,21,21 8:1 8:14,17 22:22 35:25 41:2,12 41:22 42:3,6,6 42:10,25 43:3 45:21 46:9,16 49:6,21,23 50:4,12,14,18 51:24 52:1,12 55:11 65:25
court's 5:1 35:13 37:24 41:10 50:11,19
courts 24:19 26:15 50:2 54:24 55:6
Covington 22:22 43:24,24 44:4,7,8 46:14 46:16 48:15 59:17 60:6,23
Covington's 4:25 54:12
Craven 44:12
create 10:10 34:16 48:10 51:9
created 13:7 17:5 46:11
creates 17:16
creep 56:18
criteria 5:23 6:18 7:16 8:7 10:19 11:3 12:1 13:4,11 14:10,18 15:14 16:1 17:9 18:16,23 21:15 25:23 28:18,19 29:4 33:6,8 37:9,10 38:3 45:2,10
critical 5:19 56:15
criticizes 46:16
crossed 10:23
cry 52:1
Cumberland 24:24
cure 50:23
cured 51:18,24
current 27:3 53:10
currently 24:3,5 56:25

D

Dale 51:14
data 8:8 29:4 31:4 37:21 49:17,18,20 50:8 51:3,6 59:15,24 60:3 60:5,6,15,22
date 66:10,11,15
Davie 19:12 27:25
Davis 62:7
day 52:23 70:16
days 5:15,15 49:18 62:22
Dead 51:19
deal 28:12
dealing 3:4
debate 4:15 8:22 23:19 27:15,18 29:25 30:18 31:19 46:24,24 47:2,13 55:19 55:22 57:22 58:8,16 61:7 61:17
debunked 8:11
decades 7:11,16 7:20 8:5
December 49:3
decided 24:15
deciding 12:20 33:13
decision 7:8,10 24:17
decisions 48:4 56:15
declared 45:15
deficiencies 59:8
delegation 31:8
deleting 23:17 30:15
demand 25:18
democratic 21:20 22:12 44:16 48:10 53:20,22,23,24 55:1
democrats 20:16,17,23 21:1,1 44:25 48:14 53:15

54:1,10,16,18 55:15 65:8
depositions 51:12
deserve 57:8
deserves 25:5 47:21
desire 8:16 25:12
desires 36:19
desk 21:13
despite 5:1 31:9
Destin 62:14
determination 41:13
determined 63:4 64:8 66:11
determining 11:23
detriment 44:16
deviation 7:1
devices 2:5
DIAL 1:24
dictate 25:11
die 51:19
different 6:8 13:23 21:14,14 29:1 50:3 59:15
direct 1:24 21:24 22:21 27:20 33:25 34:20 62:23
directed 40:19
directing 50:8
direction 40:7
directly 56:13
director 54:12
directs 62:16
disagree 34:11
disasters 3:4
discovery 51:11
discriminary 5:10
discriminatory 5:7
discussing 16:20
discussion 4:14 8:21 29:24 31:18 46:23 58:7,16 61:6 61:16
disenfranchised 24:14
disfavor 25:15
dispersion 7:13
display 47:14
dispute 50:15
district 6:25 9:11,18,21 11:18,19 12:21 12:23 14:13,14 15:9,13,25 17:16 19:21 23:25 24:3,5 26:17,18 27:3 27:4,8,10 37:22 42:20 44:22,25 45:19 45:24 50:22 59:10,10,13,13 59:18
districts 4:11 5:5 7:3,24 13:25 14:1,5,6 16:17,24 18:7 19:14,18 21:17 22:14,16 23:23 24:22 25:1,5,7 25:13 33:5 37:3 41:15 42:4 43:1,3 45:14,15,17,20 45:22,23 46:11 46:12,14,18 48:9,11 50:5 50:13 51:10,20 52:17,18,24 56:2,16 57:9 61:2
divided 10:12
dividing 10:14
divine 2:21
dog 55:3
doing 24:6 35:14 53:18 54:14
Dollar 4:10 38:24 40:7,15 64:12,14
doors 2:4
double 8:9,10
doubled 53:14
doubt 49:13
Dr 35:14,16,23 37:7 40:6,15 47:24 51:7
draw 5:4 10:19 12:4 13:6,10 14:19 15:23,24 17:4,10,11,14 18:19 19:18,24 20:22,24 22:13 22:13
drawing 10:17 19:20 33:9 41:15 42:8,11 43:1,2 46:20 56:1
drawn 9:21 11:1 21:11 28:17 39:15 41:25 42:20 46:12 48:25 49:15 51:5 53:25 55:8
Dream 47:25
drew 40:6 41:3 41:7 51:5
Dulin 67:20,21
Durham 38:8,12 65:18 70:2

E

e-mail 60:8
e-mails 6:5
Earle 34:5
early 5:17 56:23 66:19
ease 62:13,18
easier 58:2
east 10:3 17:12
eastern 9:10
effect 44:21
eight 18:22 24:21,25
either 22:10 29:18,22
elaborate 11:22 13:3
elect 59:20
election 8:8 26:4 55:24
elections 4:11 22:25 23:2,6 26:7
electoral 21:14 56:1
electronic 2:5
embarrassment 54:14
emerged 11:17
Emma 67:24
employ 70:13
enact 4:10 5:13
enacted 7:15 8:5
enacts 4:13 61:15
encompassing 8:7
encourage 54:21
enforcement 3:2
engage 6:8
enrolled 61:24
entails 27:7
entire 10:18
entitled 4:10
equal 6:23
erroneously 30:24
error 52:4
essential 58:1
established 6:24 7:7,17 41:14 52:24
establishing 56:23
estimated 24:9
evaluating 18:10,16
evening 49:9
everybody 28:12
everyday 2:17
evidence 5:3 42:25
exact 15:19
exaggeration 53:12
examination 44:14
examined 3:18
example 10:25 46:11
examples 18:17
exceeds 6:25
excuse 24:11 63:3
executive 54:11
existed 49:14,18 60:3
existing 7:24
exists 28:3 50:10 60:18,23
expert 51:5,12
explain 4:17
expressed 56:8
extensive 5:2
extensively 51:6
extent 24:14
eye 14:2 16:18
eyes 15:10 18:7

F

fact 6:4 33:23 36:7 46:14 48:1 55:5
factor 18:8 41:24 43:4,5
factors 9:15 11:22 12:18 22:24
factual 49:25
fail 6:21
fails 30:9
fair 22:12 36:11 54:17
Faircloth 67:24
faith 5:9
fallacies 34:14
falls 14:14,14 45:4
familiarity 25:9
far 6:1 10:2,3 17:10
fashions 49:10

fast 51:16
father 2:12 3:1 68:18 69:4
favor 3:22 25:13 25:20 30:2 31:21 54:9 58:10 61:9,19 69:7
favorable 22:14
federal 6:20 50:2,6
feedback 39:4
feedbacks 6:4
feel 10:19 14:19 35:23,23
fellow 4:7
fewer 7:19 31:15 46:4
fewest 7:11
Fifth 7:19
figure 28:9
figured 41:22 49:6
filing 49:3
final 19:3 48:19
Finally 48:24 53:8
find 5:7 17:1,13 21:16 43:4 49:23
finding 5:1 41:2 51:8
findings 49:25
finished 62:22
firm 56:1
first 5:14 6:23 9:24 10:10 21:5,23 27:23 30:21 32:22 38:23 39:1 46:11 48:20 53:15,17 55:6 62:22
five 7:1 18:20 45:14
fix 50:7 52:7
flag 3:11
flaw 49:19 52:3 52:9 53:8
flawed 48:13
flaws 48:14 57:3
floating 63:22
floor 4:21 20:20 21:9 27:17 30:17 48:15
Floyd 62:9
fluent 36:18
folks 24:4 45:9 63:22
follow-up 11:8 12:10 22:3 36:3,20 37:13 39:7,22 40:22 41:16 42:12
following 23:17 30:16 34:15 62:3
follows 62:5
foot-dragging 49:8
Ford 26:23 29:21
foregoing 70:7
foresee 66:3
form 49:14
formed 25:13
formula 7:5,7 8:12
Forsyth 13:24 14:13 15:9,11 15:12,13,20 24:24 67:25
forth 23:11,14 30:1,11 57:13 57:16 63:18 68:21 69:5
forward 28:22 31:20 58:9 66:22 67:8,10 67:15
foul 52:1
found 3:18 20:17 48:6 51:6
four 8:11 26:2 43:19 53:4
fourth 7:12 52:9
frail 56:12
Franklin 32:7
frankly 28:17 33:24 45:7
Freezing 45:23
Friday 30:22 31:3 43:21,24 54:14 59:14 66:4
friends 54:7
full 2:14 57:8
further 4:14,14 8:21,21 13:3 17:24 29:24,24 31:18,18 46:23 46:23 58:7,7 58:16 61:6,6 61:16,16 65:16 66:25 70:10

G

gall 54:20
gallery 2:8
gander 44:23
Gaston 24:24
general 1:3 4:7 4:12,12 5:2 7:15 28:6 53:6 54:2,6 56:22
gentleman 3:15 4:16,21 8:23 9:2,3 11:6,9 12:7,11 13:14 13:18 14:22 15:1 16:4,9 17:21,25 18:25 20:9 22:5 23:10,13,18 27:14,17 28:21 29:10,13 30:10 30:17 32:3,12 34:24 35:2 36:4,21 37:14 38:8,10,11,12 39:8 40:13,24 41:17 42:14 43:9,12 46:24 47:1 55:18,21 57:12,21 58:17 58:19,22,24,25 59:2 64:1,3,11 64:25 65:4,17 65:23 66:4 67:1 68:15,25
gentlemen 23:22 29:17 47:6
genuine 8:16
geographically 29:21
Georgia 52:10
gerrymander 35:13 41:11 45:25 48:6 49:22,23 50:3 51:4 53:23 54:9,13,20
gerrymandered 41:5 47:20 53:11
gerrymanderi... 41:5 46:1 53:10 54:23 55:4
gerrymanders 42:5 45:22 48:7 51:18 55:1
give 4:2 57:7 67:12
given 24:7 33:17
gives 59:10
giving 51:12
glad 68:13
glory 2:16
go 10:20 13:8 32:18 35:9 63:5
goal 16:1 17:8 18:19 22:18,21 57:5
goals 17:8
God 2:12,14,14 2:15,16,19 3:8 3:13
goes 10:2 22:23 59:18
going 20:20 29:19 48:18 51:16 53:15 55:12 63:5,6 63:14 64:7 67:8
good 2:14 44:8 46:4
Goodman 62:9
governor 21:20 48:22
grace 2:14
gracious 3:7
Granville 44:12
grateful 15:6
great 2:13 15:20 28:12 49:1
green 58:5
Greene 9:19 10:1,3 17:1
gross 61:25
group 10:15 28:7,7,14,24 46:19
grouped 28:15 28:16
grouping 8:12 9:25 10:11 16:24 17:11 27:24 28:1,2,4
groupings 7:5,7 7:22
guaranteed 55:8
guess 22:16
guests 2:4,8
guidelines 17:19
Guilford 24:23 67:23
guys 67:9

H

Halifax 32:23 33:8
Hall 62:9,15
Halls 62:14
hand 70:15
Hanes 68:1
Hanover 24:24 52:14 68:7
happened 47:17
hard 28:12
harmonize 11:2

Harnett 3:15 4:16 9:3 15:2 27:14 30:10 32:13 35:3 38:12 43:13 44:13 57:12 58:20,25 64:1 67:1 68:15,25
Harrison 62:10
Harron 67:23
Hastings 62:10
hat 28:17
hate 47:14
hear 12:17 24:8
heard 47:15,22 48:9 56:6,9 57:4
hearing 5:24 6:2 6:13 32:23 47:16 49:9,12 64:23
hearings 6:7 32:25 49:1
heart 47:12
heartfelt 57:5
heavily 18:12
held 6:7
help 35:24 36:1 36:18 37:4 53:25
helped 12:3
helping 51:11
hereto 70:15
Hiott 67:24
hire 36:1
hired 40:6
history 50:12 53:11
Hoffler 35:14,16 35:23 37:7 40:6,15 51:7
Holloway 67:25
home 15:20
honestly 21:24
honor 2:16 68:17 69:2
hope 6:21
hoped 6:7
horrified 54:7
house 1:1 2:1 3:24 4:1,9,10 5:6 6:14 10:5,8 14:13,17 15:8 19:18 20:20 21:1 23:15 26:17 27:21 29:25 30:25 31:7,19 42:4 45:14,19,19 48:14 50:5 52:24 54:4 55:15 56:2,25 57:17,19,19 58:8 61:7,8,13 61:15,17,18,23 62:18,19,24,24 62:25 64:14,21 65:8,22 67:19 68:19,23 69:1 69:8,11
houses 59:10
human 56:12
Hume 68:1
humility 55:10
hurricane 3:5
hyperbole 21:9

I

ID 23:4
idea 35:20
identical 56:8
identified 51:23
identify 50:23 58:2 59:8
ignore 53:7
II 50:20,23 51:24 52:23
illegal 45:24
imagine 54:10
impact 34:6
impacted 33:1 46:14
impartial 56:4
important 5:6 6:3 10:7 13:5 50:21
importantly 6:19 56:4
impossible 51:4
improve 31:5
inappropriate 33:21
include 24:23
included 29:4 33:1
includes 25:1 29:5
including 3:2 13:4 26:9 28:21 42:20 50:7
incorporated 33:9
incorrectly 43:6
increased 31:13 31:14
incumbency 17:7 18:18 28:20 29:5
incumbent 12:19 18:9,11 23:3,5 24:2 26:13 28:5
incumbent's 23:24,25
incumbents 8:9 8:10 12:4 17:6 25:7,22 28:15 28:24 49:5
independent 56:4,23
indicate 21:25 41:24
indicated 41:3
individual 19:19 38:18
indivisible 3:13
industry 36:16
inevitable 56:17
influence 22:25 23:2,6
information 32:24 37:2,7 37:11,20,23 39:13,21 42:6 42:7,9 50:16 59:11
input 5:17,23 6:10 8:15 31:8 33:4 38:18 39:5,19 40:8 49:1,11
inquiry 35:3 65:19,23
Insko 20:6,7,13 22:2,4,9 23:8
instance 37:21
instances 56:18
instruct 51:13
instructing 50:6
instructions 38:3
integrity 53:17
intend 25:20 60:16 64:18
intended 14:11 20:22 60:25
intent 5:7,10,16 34:18 63:11
intention 5:20 55:24
interaction 12:24
interest 32:17
interested 24:8 70:12
interesting 55:7
interpret 34:13
introduce 67:10 67:17
introduced 60:21
Iredell 25:2
Ironically 19:24
issue 28:10 47:11
issued 50:6
items 24:7

J

Jackson 31:2 43:9,10,16,18 44:3,10,20 45:11 46:21,25 47:2,4 58:23 59:1,6,7,12 60:2,14,17 61:5 62:10 65:1,2,6
Jesus 3:9
job 31:11
John 55:18 62:8 62:10
JOHNS 55:19 55:23
Johnson 25:1 29:22
Johnson's 26:20 27:3
Johnston 9:19 44:13 67:22 69:2
join 68:11
Jones 2:7,10,11
Jordan 62:10
Journal 3:18,21 3:23
Jr 51:14
Jr.'s 47:25
judged 17:4
judges 50:6
judicial 62:4
June 48:21,24
justice 3:14
justices 49:21
justify 43:1

K

Katherine 68:4
keep 41:21 46:5
keeping 10:18 18:21 24:12 31:12
keeps 66:24
kept 4:6
kind 31:3 37:3 60:24
kindly 16:7
King 47:25
Kirastacia 68:5
knew 28:10 45:8
know 9:12,13 10:4 13:5 15:19 21:24 22:25 24:4

25:25 26:22 28:12 47:9 49:18 53:14,14 54:23 63:21 67:11,16
knowing 55:11
knowledge 37:3 37:21
known 48:20
knows 51:13,16

L

lack 16:20
Ladies 23:22 29:17 47:6
lady 20:6,10 32:6,18 69:2
language 50:7 53:3
languish 56:25
large 25:6 47:16
largely 33:6 40:21
larger 24:21
largest 24:20
law 3:2 6:20 9:14 34:13,16 49:25 56:23
lawsuit 28:3
laying 48:25
leave 52:17 66:7
led 49:8
Lee 10:2 32:4 34:24
left 34:19 35:11 67:11
legal 52:21
legally 5:3
legislation 35:20 57:1
legislative 6:9 35:22,22 50:17 56:16 57:8
legislators 36:18
legislature 5:9 6:6 24:14,19 26:15 42:7
legislatures 50:22,25
length 28:20
lessen 48:8
let's 23:3
letter 34:4,5,9 34:10,11,12,14 34:19
level 23:4 59:21
Lewis 3:16,17 3:20 4:9,18,22 9:9,23 11:11 11:25 12:13,16 13:1,20 14:7 15:3,5,16 16:11,14,22 18:2,5,13 19:7 19:11,22 20:8 20:11,13 21:4 22:7,19 27:14 27:15,19 30:11 30:13,19 31:21 32:14 33:3,18 34:7 35:4,8,17 36:12,23 37:5 37:16,25 38:13 38:19 39:10,17 39:23 40:5,11 40:18,23 41:8 41:19 42:1,16 42:22 43:14,20 44:2,11,19 45:12,13,21 57:12,13,23 58:10,20,21 59:5,14,23 60:9,10,13,18 61:4 62:10 64:2 67:2,4,6 68:16,17
liberty 3:14
lift 2:19 3:1,3
light 28:11
limitations 53:5
limits 25:18
line 30:14,14 44:24 45:3,4,8
lines 23:16,17 30:15 37:22 41:25 51:4
listen 6:13
literally 28:5
little 6:10 11:22 13:23 16:18 21:8 27:5,22 55:10,10,11
live 6:21 51:18
loaded 37:11
located 19:19
location 33:8
lock 30:7 31:24 58:13 61:11,21
long 25:15 26:4 47:8 48:1,25 49:3
long-term 25:18 25:22
longer 25:14 48:3 50:10
look 6:6 9:20 10:17 13:4 15:10,19 16:17 18:7 19:12 28:19 50:11 51:15,20 64:9 66:22
looked 19:17 53:20
looking 9:9,10 9:16 10:6 11:17 20:25 53:21
looks 15:10 19:13 66:19
lord 2:19,23,24
lose 25:8
lot 18:8 21:18 22:24 23:2 24:4 28:9 33:24 47:14 54:20 67:11
Louis 57:17
love 2:14
Luther 47:25

M

machine 30:7 31:24 58:13 61:11,21
magic 50:25
maintain 15:22
majority 54:11 56:21
majority/min... 5:5
making 23:7,22 56:15
maliciously 8:9
Malone 68:3
man 2:24
maneuver 24:2
map 6:6,10,16 6:21,23 7:2,6,9 7:10,12,14,19 8:2,3,5 9:9 10:10,21 14:4 17:18 18:17 22:1,10 23:7 24:1,9,21 26:12 31:10,11 31:12,16 34:1 34:1,20 35:19 35:21,21 36:1 37:8 38:23 39:2,3,5,15,19 40:2,7,16,19 41:3,6 42:11 43:23,25 44:4 44:7,8 48:17 50:7 51:8 52:5 52:6 53:10 55:8 58:2,3,6 60:7,23 63:8 63:15,17
maps 5:17 7:8 7:11,15,20 10:22 16:2 18:10,16 20:14 20:17,21,22 21:2,11 24:5 25:24 33:1,13 33:17,23 35:14 38:17 40:8 41:4,7,11 42:8 48:21 49:6,13 49:22 51:2,5 51:17 55:6 57:2
maptitude 36:16 36:19
Martin 8:24,25 9:4,7,24 11:4,7 11:13 12:2,5,8 12:15 13:2,12 13:16,22 14:8 14:21,24 15:17 16:3,13,23 17:20,23 18:4 18:24 19:2,9 19:23 20:4 47:24
Maryland 55:2
matter 26:2,3
Maxwell 68:6
McDowell 68:18 69:3
McNeil 62:11
mean 26:6 42:6
meaningful 49:13
means 51:3
measured 14:15
Mecklenburg 24:23 45:13,19 52:15 58:18 67:19,21 68:4
meet 5:22 17:3 17:15 64:15,21
meeting 64:22 65:14
meets 14:20 15:14
member 28:6 39:1
members 2:2,4 2:7 3:10 4:1,2 4:7,11,24 8:13 14:17 18:20 25:14,15,20 27:20 31:7,16 38:16,21 39:2 39:4,6,14,21 57:25 60:19 61:3 62:2,3,5,8 62:20 64:7 65:12,22 67:11 68:10 69:8
memory 68:18

69:3
mention 12:24
mentioned 7:18 16:16 59:14
mercy 2:14
message 62:17
met 28:19 30:22
Meyer 68:2,6
Michaux 38:8,9 38:15,20 39:7 39:12,18,22 40:1,10,14,22 40:25 41:9,16 41:21 42:2,12 42:18 43:7 65:18,19,24 66:6,13,20,23
mid-decade 52:11
military 3:2
mind 14:3 16:15 16:20 21:10,24
minority 54:17 54:19
minus 7:1 10:9
minutes 47:7
misspeak 10:7
misspoke 14:9 31:1,4
moderation 55:10
moment 4:3 65:21 67:3,5
momentarily 62:13 63:9
Monday 1:12
money 23:3
months 47:13 51:7
MOORE 2:1 3:15,20 4:14 4:20 8:21 9:2,6 11:5,9,12 12:6 12:11,14 13:14 13:18,21 14:22 15:1,4 16:4,6,9 16:12 17:21,25 18:3,25 19:5,8 20:5,9,12 22:4 22:8 23:9,13 23:18 27:13,17 29:9,13,24 30:17 31:18 32:12,16 34:23 35:2,6 36:4,21 36:24 37:14,17 38:7,11,14 39:8,11,25 40:13,24 41:17 41:20 42:14,17 43:8,12,15 46:23 47:1 55:17,21 57:11 57:15,21 58:7 58:24 59:2 60:12 61:6,16 64:11,18 65:4 65:11,21 66:2 66:9,16,22 67:5 68:10,25 69:9
motion 3:16 67:2 68:16
motors 24:10
move 26:16,18 26:18 64:20 68:19,22
moved 3:19
moves 3:20 23:15 30:13 69:1
moving 23:24 27:5,7 62:2
multiple 62:14
municipal 8:4 15:22
municipalities 8:3 31:12 46:5

N

name 3:9 23:4 67:15
named 40:8
names 47:22
Nash 44:13
Nate 68:8
nation 2:17,18 3:13 25:17
national 47:13
nationwide 36:17
nature 56:12
nearly 55:24
necessary 42:5 45:18 48:18
need 7:25 66:18
needed 20:18 46:17 48:22
negative 30:9 32:2 58:15 61:13,23
new 21:2 24:24 26:5 52:14 68:7
newer 25:20
night 47:22
nine 10:18 11:3 12:1 14:20 17:8,9 18:22 26:3 49:20
no-vote 65:13
nominee 21:20
non-use 49:20
nonpartisan 56:5
normal 65:9
north 1:1,3,11 4:12,13 5:5 10:2 17:1 28:1 28:14 50:13 51:8 52:5,9,22 54:2,3 55:4 56:2,2,21 61:15 70:1,6
Notary 70:5,20 70:21
note 5:6 6:2 50:25
notes 10:6
noticed 44:11
notices 65:16 66:25
November 5:18
number 10:5,7,8 10:12,13 29:6 34:15 55:5 67:12 70:21
numbers 21:25

O

o'clock 63:5 64:9 68:20,24
object 63:14
objected 45:5
objection 61:14 63:13 64:23
obvious 53:9
obviously 40:5 53:18,25
October 66:9,10 66:12,19
offer 44:1
offered 2:6 6:10
office 25:14
oh 2:24 67:6
Okay 32:20 63:15
once 10:13 19:11 34:6 63:9
ones 18:8 24:22 40:16,20 51:21 55:2
online 49:12
Onslow 25:1 44:12
open 30:3 31:22 58:11 61:10,20
opinion 27:1 33:20 50:1,12 59:17
opponent 26:19
opportunities 48:8
oppose 47:9
opposed 3:22 24:16 25:19 30:2 31:22 56:11 58:11 61:9,19 69:9
optimal 10:11 28:2,2,4
optimization 7:24
optimum 10:5,7
option 11:17,20 11:21 12:21 24:12
options 28:13
Orange 20:6,10 68:2,5
order 2:2 4:1,25 4:25 5:12,15 5:21 7:25 8:1 8:16 22:22 35:13,24 37:24 41:6,23 42:20 50:6 53:2 62:19 65:22,25
ordered 45:21 46:9 61:24,25 64:24
ordering 52:12
orders 50:4
original 22:11
ought 26:17
outcome 21:24 22:25 23:6 44:21 70:12
outside 25:4 60:1
overall 17:18 44:5
overrides 62:24

P

p.m 1:12 68:20 68:24 69:6,11
pack 21:13 35:12
packs 51:2
page 23:16 30:14,14 50:11
pages 59:17 67:7 67:8,10,13,14 67:18 68:11 70:7
pair 12:3 28:25
paired 17:6 29:20
pairing 28:23
pale 54:8
parameters 7:13
pardon 66:14
Parker 68:3

parrot 54:20
part 5:7 9:10 11:16 13:24 17:11 19:3 21:15 23:7 28:1 38:2 47:12,16 60:16
particular 35:15
particularly 14:3 16:19
parties 28:3 70:11,13
partisan 21:10 22:1 44:22 53:10 54:9,19 54:23 56:18
party 44:16,17 53:6,24,24
party's 54:11
passage 61:8,18
passed 56:23 57:1 66:15
passes 61:13,23
passing 48:12
path 54:25
patience 15:6 18:5
paying 20:21 53:9
Pender 17:12,14
people 2:19 25:20 26:7,10 32:23 40:20
percent 7:1 24:10
perform 21:17
performance 44:22
permitted 32:18 59:3
person 17:16 35:24
personal 39:15 56:20
personally 6:5 47:23
picking 35:16
pictures 49:17
piece 35:20
Pitt 44:12
Pittman 23:10 23:11,15,20 29:10,11,15 30:2
place 37:19 44:15
placement 44:24
plaintiffs 33:12 33:15,15,21,23 34:1 48:15
plaintiffs' 54:12 60:7
plan 5:6,13 6:18 7:24 8:11,13 8:14,19 27:21 30:25 36:14 44:6 47:10,12 47:20 48:5,6,7 48:12 49:19 50:3 53:21 54:3,5,10,12 54:16 55:12,16 57:19,20 59:20 59:25 60:3,3 60:21 63:6,15
planning 62:20
plans 8:5 54:24 59:15
play 50:21
pleadings 51:11
please 2:4,8 4:2 4:5 31:16 32:11 58:22 67:8,15 68:10
pledge 2:9 3:11
plus 6:25 10:9 51:9
pockets 51:8
point 6:3 9:25 10:21 15:18 17:17 21:12 22:23 27:23 29:18,20 44:1 44:18 45:25 48:2,18 53:8 53:17
pointed 46:3 48:14 57:3 59:8
pointless 51:15
points 34:10 53:23 54:15,21
polarized 5:4
political 45:3,9 52:22 53:12,13 53:18
politicians 25:19 56:9
politics 52:20
Polsby-Popper 7:13 14:16 31:14 44:8
population 6:24 7:1 10:12 17:3 17:15 28:7 44:24 45:7 53:2
position 56:10
possible 15:24 19:18 52:16
post 68:14
potential 22:11 50:23 51:24
praise 2:13
pray 2:11,17 3:3 3:5,8,8
prayer 2:6
precinct 23:24 26:19 27:2,3 45:6
precincts 7:19 7:21 27:7,9 46:5,17,18
predominance 42:21
predominant 41:24
predominantly 42:19
preface 21:7
prefaced 21:6
preferred 10:20 11:21,24 12:20
preliminary 59:22 60:6
prepare 64:10
PREPARED 1:22
preparing 37:8
present 36:1
presented 33:2 38:17 40:16 42:9 52:6 54:5
presumptions 35:8
pretending 50:9
pretty 9:20 24:6 26:24
prevail 56:19
prevalent 6:4
prevents 49:4
previous 60:20
previously 37:23
primarily 40:19
primary 17:8 57:5
principles 9:14
prior 8:4 38:22 39:1,21 40:21 50:13
priority 14:5,9
probably 15:24 38:23 44:23,25 47:7 49:9 65:15 67:13
problem 25:23 49:5
proceedings 1:8 4:3 70:8
process 5:11,25 6:9 10:23 23:7 35:21,22 37:4 38:22 48:20 49:3,8,12 56:14 57:7 59:9 63:10
produce 5:17 6:6 21:3
produced 5:2,14 6:17,17 7:20 39:19 40:19
produces 7:2 35:21
producing 10:10
product 36:10
production 16:2
program 36:19
prohibition 53:7
proper 49:24
proposal 30:23
proposals 6:20 56:24
proposed 23:25 24:9 26:12 57:2
proposes 28:25
proposing 54:8
propound 59:3
protect 3:1
protecting 25:19 25:22
protection 8:7 12:19 17:7 18:9,11,19
proud 6:16
provided 5:22 5:23 6:14 21:13 31:4
provides 23:5
provision 9:13 12:25 52:4
psalm 2:22
public 5:17,23 5:24 6:2,6,12 8:15 32:22,25 39:4 40:21 47:13,16,23 48:25 49:9 54:22 56:6 70:6,20
publication 40:21
publicly 47:18
published 60:15 60:19
pulverized 50:14
purely 57:25
purpose 8:23 11:5 12:6 13:15 14:23 16:5 17:22 19:1 20:5 23:9 25:10 27:13

29:9 32:3,6 34:23 38:7 43:8 55:17 57:11 58:17,19 64:25 65:17
purposes 44:24 45:7 62:20 63:18
pursuant 62:12
push 37:4
put 2:23,23,24 18:20 19:25 37:19 39:3 40:16 54:18 56:10 63:1
puts 54:16
putting 25:24 27:2 54:25

Q

question 9:24 10:16 11:8,10 11:15 12:1,10 13:2,17,19 14:8,25 15:2,8 15:17 16:8,10 16:23 17:24 18:1,14 19:6 19:23 20:8 21:5,6,12,22 22:6,20 29:25 31:19 32:17,19 32:22 33:4,12 33:19 34:4,8 35:18 36:13 37:6 38:1,10 38:20 39:18 41:9 42:13,23 44:3,20 45:12 58:8 60:11 61:7,17 66:14
questioned 20:3
questions 9:1 12:12 15:7 32:11,13,25 35:1,5,10 36:5 36:22 37:15 39:9,24 40:12 41:18 42:15 43:11,13,19 57:3 58:23 59:4
quickest 36:8
quickly 35:24
quite 32:23

R

race 8:8 20:21 41:6,15,23,24 42:8,11,20 43:1,2,4 45:16 45:23 47:11 48:3 49:24 53:21 59:11
races 20:15 21:14
racial 35:11,13 37:21 41:5,11 42:4 45:22,25 46:1 47:20 48:5 49:20,22 49:23 50:3,8 51:3,4,6,17 54:13,19 59:15 59:24 60:6,15
racially 5:4 41:5 42:19 48:7 50:14
racist 47:21
radical 54:9
raise 23:3
Raleigh 1:11 6:13
ramifications 45:4
Randolph 25:2
range 14:14 25:4
rarely 49:21
ratification 63:17
ratio 21:3
Ray 62:11
re-draw 50:5
reach 25:4
reached 31:6
read 3:25 4:8 23:14 30:12 34:10 57:16 59:16,17 61:14
reading 61:8,13 61:18,24 63:12 63:14,16
realign 4:11
realize 10:20
reason 9:22 14:4 35:11,15 41:12
reasonable 55:8
reasoning 19:20
reasons 16:20 45:5 52:19,22
recall 12:2 33:4 33:7,25 34:9 34:19,19 38:25
receive 2:21 5:22 49:11
received 6:4 25:9 34:6 39:19 47:24
receiving 34:9
recognized 3:16 22:5 23:13,18 29:13 30:11 47:2 55:21 57:21 64:2,4 64:12 65:4,23 67:2 68:16
recommend 58:1
reconvene 68:20 68:23 69:6
reconvening 66:10
record 5:2 10:22 30:7,22 31:24 41:14 47:19 58:13 60:16 61:11
recordings 6:14
recruiting 49:4
redeemer 2:25
redistrict 52:11
redistricting 5:10 6:17 9:14 27:21 40:3,17 42:10 46:7,10 47:10 50:17,21 53:5 56:7,24 57:19,20 62:4 63:7,8,15 64:15,17 65:13
redraw 5:14 20:21
redrawing 45:17 52:13
redrawn 20:18 48:22
reemphasize 31:4
refer 46:10
referred 50:2
reflect 33:17
reflects 8:14,15 8:16
refuse 52:19
refused 51:22,25
refusing 50:8 51:19
refute 42:10
regard 15:8
regarding 6:9
Regina 1:22 70:5,20
regretful 29:2
reiterate 15:24
Reives 32:4 34:24,25 35:7 35:18 36:3,6 36:20,25 37:13 37:18 38:5
related 70:10
relates 34:4 52:9
relative 21:16
release 38:22 39:1
released 49:16
relevant 50:16
remain 2:8 24:2 53:1 55:3
remaining 46:12 46:13
remarks 5:18
remember 20:19 49:2 60:7
remind 65:11
reminds 2:22
remote 6:15
remove 24:15
removed 62:25
renames 58:6
Reock 7:14 31:13 44:7
repeat 14:16
repeatedly 55:25
repeating 66:24
report 15:19
reporter 4:4,6 70:5
REPORTER'S 70:4
reports 63:22
representative 2:7,10,11 3:16 3:17,20 4:18 4:22 8:24,25 9:4,7,9,23,24 11:4,7,11,13 11:25 12:2,5,8 12:13,15,16 13:1,2,12,16 13:20,22 14:7 14:8,21,24 15:3,5,16,17 16:3,6,11,13 16:14,22,23 17:20,23 18:2 18:4,5,13,24 19:2,7,9,22,23 20:4,6,7,7,11 20:13,13 21:4 21:4 22:2,4,7,9 22:19,20 23:8 23:10,11,15,20 24:12,15 26:20 26:23 27:3,14 27:15,19 29:10 29:11,15,21,21 30:1,4,4,5,5,10 30:13,19 31:2 31:21 32:4,7,8 32:14,18,20 33:3,4,10,18 34:3,7,21,24

34:25 35:4,7 35:17,18 36:3 36:6,12,20,23 36:25 37:5,13 37:16,18,25 38:5,8,9,13,15 38:19,19,24 39:7,10,12,17 39:18,22,23 40:1,5,7,10,11 40:14,15,18,22 40:23,25 41:8 41:9,16,19,21 42:1,1,12,16 42:18,22 43:7 43:9,10,14,16 43:18 44:2,3 44:10,19,20 45:11,12,21 46:21,25 47:2 47:4 55:18,19 55:23 57:12,13 57:15,17,23 58:10,18,20,21 58:22 59:1,5,6 59:7,12,13,23 60:2,9,10,13 60:14,17,18 61:4,5 62:5,6,7 62:7,8,14 64:1 64:3,5,12,14 65:1,2,6,18,19 65:24 66:6,13 66:20,23 67:2 67:4,6,20,21 67:22,24,25 68:1,2,3,5,6,8 68:9,15,17,19 69:2,4

representatives 1:1 4:9 24:18 25:10 52:25 56:12

reproduce 36:1

republic 3:12 54:15

republican 21:21 44:17 54:7 55:2 64:7

republicans 20:16,16,23 22:11,14,17 45:1

request 60:8

requests 51:12

require 23:24 45:24

required 7:4 8:11 10:4 25:4 52:16

requirement 6:24 17:3

requires 5:13

requiring 50:4

research 24:7

resolution 66:14 66:15,17

respect 4:7 15:22

respected 26:6

respectfully 20:2 29:1 34:11 58:5

respects 8:4

respond 38:10

response 5:12 11:16 47:17

rest 8:6

result 20:22 34:1

resulted 54:6

results 22:1 33:16

retained 7:21

retire 2:3

return 53:1 68:14

review 33:24

reviewing 33:24

Rhea 67:20

Richard 68:18 69:3

Richardson 32:7,8,18,20 33:10 34:3,21 62:11

Richmond 27:25

right 26:9 38:5 63:19,25 64:8 67:17

rightly 49:7

rights 26:5 50:9 50:13,20

rise 8:24 11:6 12:7 20:6 23:10 27:14 29:10 32:4,7 34:24 38:8 43:9 47:9 55:18 57:12 58:18,20 65:1 65:18

Robeson 17:12 25:3 44:12

robust 5:1,25

Rogers 30:4 62:11

role 50:21

room 64:16 65:9

Rowan 19:12 20:2 23:23 25:2 26:25

RUFFIN 1:23

rule 4:21 52:13 52:15 62:12 68:21 69:5

ruled 42:4

rules 11:2 56:25 64:20

ruling 41:10 42:24 46:15,16

run 26:7,9,17 60:25

runs 15:11

S

S 20:15

sacrifices 28:12

sadly 57:1

safe 18:9 66:19 66:20

safety 3:3,6

Sampson 13:25 16:17 17:2 44:13

Sanota 68:4

Saturday 31:5 49:16 60:24

savior 3:9

saw 13:7 18:20 22:11

saying 22:24 41:21

says 41:22 42:7 50:15,19 52:24

scaffold 51:8

schedule 49:3 62:21 66:1

scheme 28:2

scientists 53:13

score 7:13,14,14 14:16 17:18 31:13,14 44:7 44:9

scores 31:6 43:22,25

seat 10:6,8 18:21

seated 28:6

seats 2:2 19:25 22:12,12 26:10 46:13 53:24 54:3,6

second 7:2 29:12 29:14 33:12 49:19 53:20 61:8,13 63:12 63:16 66:12

seconded 69:1

Section 50:20,23 51:24 52:24

secure 35:12

see 8:25 9:17 11:7 12:9 13:16 14:24 16:7 17:3,23 19:2 38:9 39:15 44:14 49:13 51:17,17 52:3 55:13 57:6

seek 2:20 39:13 39:20 55:24

seen 6:21 7:8 21:25 24:5 26:1 40:21 49:10 59:14,22 60:3,5,20,22

selected 18:23 21:19,21

selecting 56:10 56:11

self-district 56:17

self-interest 56:17

Senate 56:3 61:25 62:1,17 63:7,14,17

Senate's 64:16

send 23:11,14 30:11 57:13,16

sent 28:22 30:1 31:20 34:5 58:9 61:24 62:1,16

sentiment 56:8

separate 9:18 50:4

September 5:14 66:15

Sergeant-At-... 2:3 6:14

series 43:10 44:11 58:23

serve 25:10,25

served 23:1 29:6

serves 24:3

service 25:9

services 23:5

serving 67:9

session 1:1 48:23 63:3 64:19 65:12,13 69:11

set 10:14 56:16 68:21 69:5 70:15

seven 50:3

share 31:3 60:24

shared 61:2

shift 13:23

shifted 20:15

short 21:22

34:17 57:18
Shorthand 70:5
shortly 8:18
shown 55:10
shows 12:22
side 49:5 60:22
signers 34:12
significant 5:4 57:6
signify 5:8
silence 2:4
similar 51:20
simple 39:13 54:11
simply 5:20 17:16 27:2 58:2 59:3
single 19:16 44:15
sir 13:12,22 18:2 20:4,11 22:7 36:23 59:21 60:12
sites 6:15
situation 17:5 46:9
six 8:10
Sixth 8:3
size 25:3
slate 46:2,3
slightly 43:25 44:4
smaller 24:25
solely 19:15
solve 28:11
somebody 29:19
son 3:9
sorry 9:18
sort 21:6 25:16 36:16 37:22
sounded 49:1
source 60:1
south 10:1 16:25 27:25 28:16 48:2
southeast 15:11
southern 15:12
southwest 15:13
speak 29:11,14 46:8
speaker 2:1 3:15 3:17,20 4:14 4:19,20,23,24 8:20,21 9:2,5,6 9:8 11:4,5,9,12 11:14 12:5,6,9 12:11,14 13:13 13:14,18,20,21 14:21,22 15:1 15:4 16:3,4,7,9 16:12 17:20,21 17:25 18:3,24 18:25 19:5,8 19:10 20:5,9 20:12 22:4,8 23:9,13,18,21 27:13,17,20 29:9,13,16,24 30:17,20,21 31:18 32:9,12 32:15,16,21 34:22,23 35:2 35:6 36:4,21 36:24 37:14,17 38:6,7,11,14 39:8,11,25 40:13,24 41:17 41:20 42:14,17 43:8,12,15,19 46:23 47:1,5 55:17,21 56:7 56:7,8 57:5,10 57:11,15,21,24 57:25 58:7,21 58:24 59:1,2,6 60:11,12,14 61:5,6,16 64:6 64:11,18 65:4 65:7,11,21 66:2,9,16,22 67:4,5 68:10 68:17,22,25 69:9
speakers 6:8
special 48:23 62:17
specific 5:1 6:10 10:16,25 33:7 50:7,22 59:11 59:13 66:4
specifically 5:8 9:11 11:15 39:20 56:14
specify 45:6
speech 47:25
speedometer 51:15
spent 28:9 33:24 51:7,10
spirit 18:22
split 20:25 31:15 44:11,15 45:7 46:4,17,18
splits 7:10,19,20 8:3 44:21 52:5
splitting 11:18
spoke 38:25
spoken 55:25
sponsor 9:1,8 11:8,14 12:9 13:17 14:25 15:6 16:7 17:24 19:3,5 32:10 35:1 43:11 67:20,21 67:22,23,25 68:1,2,3,4,6,7 68:9
sponsored 67:13
spread 9:17,19 12:22
squinting 15:9
stack 21:13 35:12 51:2
staff 58:2 59:25
stand 2:8 62:13 69:10
standard 36:17 68:21 69:5
standing 2:9 26:1
stands 3:13
Stanly 44:13 67:24
start 17:14 47:10
started 46:2
starting 45:25
state 9:11,12 10:5,8 13:5,14 13:24 14:6,22 16:4 17:21 18:25 19:4 24:21 25:17 28:4 32:24 42:4 46:6 47:18 48:3 51:10,11 70:1 70:6
stated 6:20 17:19 30:24
statements 57:4
states 3:12 52:11 55:1,2
statewide 5:24 44:5 53:21
statistics 35:12 37:22 59:15,22
status 25:19
stay 55:9
Stein 54:2,6
step 67:15
stepped 32:5
Stevens 62:6
Stevenson 6:24 7:7,10 11:2 53:4,4
stipulation 68:21
stipulations 69:5
Stone 68:5
stood 20:19
stop 53:18
strength 2:25
stretch 16:25
stretches 10:1 17:12 27:25
Strickland 67:23
strict 53:7
Strike 61:25
struck 49:21 54:24 55:6
subject 9:15 68:21 69:4
submission 48:17
submitted 10:22 30:24,25 33:23 34:2 40:3
submitting 30:15
substantial 36:9
substituting 23:17
suggest 10:18
sum 54:15
summarize 47:8
super 54:17
supermajority 48:11
support 8:19 27:11 31:10,16
supporting 42:5
Supreme 49:20
sure 10:6 26:24 37:20 42:2 51:23 63:21 67:10
suspend 4:21
suspended 64:20
switch 25:7

T

take 2:2 17:15 19:3,12 40:25 59:21 63:7,11 64:16
taken 53:2 59:16 63:23
takes 15:10,12 54:20
talk 24:11 27:22 33:22 39:2
talked 18:6 38:21,23 43:21
talking 16:15 54:15,21 66:6
talks 50:12 59:18
Tanner 67:23
target 21:10,24
task 52:2 56:1

tasked 14:19
Taylor 68:5
technical 58:1
Ted 62:7
tell 6:22 21:9 45:17 49:11
telling 14:3 51:14
ten 21:13,14 26:3
tend 21:17,18
term 25:18 26:1
terms 21:19 25:25 29:6 34:12
test 7:17
testimony 51:12
Texas 3:5
thank 3:6 4:18 4:22 8:20 9:7,8 9:23 11:13,14 11:25 12:8,15 13:1,12,22 14:7,24 15:5 15:16 16:6,13 16:22 18:4,13 19:9,11,22 20:4 21:5 22:19 23:8,20 27:12,19 29:15 29:23 30:19 32:8,20 33:3 33:10,18 34:3 34:7,21,22 35:7,17 36:6 36:12 37:5,18 37:25 38:5,6 38:20 39:17 41:8 42:22 43:7,18 44:2 44:10,19 46:21 47:4 55:16 57:10,23 59:5 59:6,23 60:13 60:14 61:4,5 64:5,10 65:6,9
thanksgiving 2:13
theory 34:16
thing 25:16 26:5
things 15:18 23:2,4,6 37:22 45:1 46:4
think 6:2 11:20 12:18 17:1 19:16 22:10,23 26:17,22 28:18 31:10,11,12 34:13 35:25 36:14,15 43:19 47:15,19 63:4
third 7:6 10:24 52:3 61:14,18 61:23 63:12,16
Thomas 68:18 69:3
thoroughly 34:10
thought 66:13 66:14
thoughtful 8:15
three 9:17 11:18 12:22 13:9 19:18 26:2,7 29:19 32:11,13 40:20 50:6 53:22 62:24
throne 2:12
Thursday 63:19 63:24 65:15 66:1,3,7
time 5:22 23:1 25:15 28:9 29:12,14 32:17 33:24 35:15 37:23 48:19 49:2,16 51:21 53:25 55:11 61:14 64:8,21
timeframe 64:9
timeline 5:13,21
times 50:4 60:4
timetable 48:25
Timothy 68:2
tired 25:18
title 57:18
today 2:13,17 4:24 5:11,20 24:11 33:17 36:2 47:10,24 48:12 49:14,19 51:2 53:19 54:2,16,25 58:3 62:21 67:7
today's 62:22,25
told 26:11 51:25
tomorrow 63:2 63:2,5,6,6,10 64:14,19 65:12
top 14:4,9 55:3
Toppins 1:22 70:5,20
Torbit 62:11
total 5:15 7:21
touch 45:14,24 52:17
touched 46:8
town 31:15
transcribe 4:5
transcribed 70:9
TRANSCRIPT 1:8
transcription 70:8
translate 36:18
traversal 20:1
traversals 7:9 13:8 34:15 52:7
treatment 25:6
tried 27:5 45:1 47:8 49:2
trigger 41:14,23
trump 52:22
trust 2:23,24
truth 2:15
try 3:1 14:16 31:5 35:8,9 39:12 46:17 54:21
trying 4:4 17:13 28:9 34:18 45:6
Tuesday 5:25 68:20,23 69:6
turn 48:10
Turner 68:9
turning 41:2
two 7:11,15,20 8:5 9:21 11:19 12:24 19:14,25 24:25 25:5,7 29:1,19 38:10 50:4 53:16
two-year 25:25
type 48:4

U

U 20:15
ultimately 56:19
unaffected 7:22
unaltered 53:1
unchanged 52:17,19
unconstitutio... 20:18 41:3,4 41:11 45:16 48:21 50:5 51:7 52:18
understand 25:23 29:18 42:2
understanding 41:12 42:24 44:4 70:10
undertake 50:22
undesired 26:19
undo 24:1
unfortunate 29:2 52:3
unfortunately 33:7 47:12
United 3:12
universe 52:21
unnecessary 24:2 52:7
untrained 16:18
upset 24:6
urge 31:16
use 7:17 8:7 10:13,24,24 21:8 25:24 28:18 38:3 41:14 42:8,11 43:1 45:23 50:8 51:13

V

various 12:18 34:13 44:22
vast 56:21
verbatim 70:7
versa 23:25
versus 6:25 7:7 11:18
veto 62:24
vice 23:25 62:6 62:7,8
Victoria 68:1
violate 37:24 52:15
violating 45:10 52:4
violations 50:24 51:24
Visitors 2:2
voices 48:9
vote 3:24 17:16 21:18 26:13 29:1,7 30:2,3,3 30:8 31:21,22 31:23,25 33:14 58:5,10,11,12 58:14 61:9,9 61:10,12,19,19 61:20,22
voted 30:8 32:1 58:14 61:12,22
voters 24:11,13 24:16,17 25:11 26:11,14,24 48:9 51:9 56:10
votes 63:3,5 65:12,14
voting 5:4 50:9 50:13,14,20 55:16 63:20
VRA 46:10,13

W

Wagenseller 68:7

Wake 8:24 9:3 18:20 24:23 31:1,2,7 43:9 43:22 44:6 45:13,20 46:11 47:1 52:15 55:18 58:4,22 58:24 60:25 61:2 64:11 65:1 68:3
Walking 51:19
want 27:23 47:9 47:18 67:10
wanted 47:10
wants 26:16
warned 52:2
wasn't 37:20
water 7:3
wave 67:15
way 3:8 4:20 5:18 10:20 12:17 19:21 21:17 28:23 29:19 34:12 39:3 41:25 45:15 48:1 49:13
Wayne 9:10,16 9:19,25 20:3 64:3
ways 2:15 21:18 28:10
we'll 55:13 62:13 63:16 64:16 66:2,10
we're 2:18 5:11 15:21 46:9 55:5 58:15 63:4 64:7 68:13
we've 46:19 56:9
weather-related 3:4
weave 13:9,9
Wednesday 63:1,11,12,15 63:17,20,23 64:8 65:8,9,15 66:1,7
Wednesday's 63:1
week 47:16 60:3 60:21 66:12 67:9 68:11,13
weekend 60:23
weeks 47:14 55:14
weighed 11:23 18:9,11
welcome 43:16
welcoming 68:11
went 21:20 32:22 45:8
west 10:2 17:13
WHEREOF 70:15
White 68:19 69:2,4
wholly 56:3
wildly 54:19
willing 11:21
winning 54:6
wins 54:3
Winston-Salem 15:21,23
Wisconsin 55:3
wisdom 2:21
wish 4:16 21:9 46:24 56:20,20
wishes 57:15,17
WITNESS 70:15
won 26:8 53:22 54:2
wondered 16:15 16:19 33:11
wonderful 3:7
wondering 44:17
word 2:18
words 11:20 50:25
work 36:9,9
worked 31:5 40:2 44:15
working 33:13 63:23
works 28:12 55:13
world 53:13
Worley 68:8
wouldn't 16:15 16:19
written 3:19,21 3:23 48:16
wrong 44:18
WWW.RUFF... 1:25

X

Y

year 21:2,19 49:15 55:24
years 26:3,4,4 51:11
yield 9:1,3,4 11:8,9,11 12:9 12:11 13:17,18 14:25 15:2 16:7,9 17:24 17:25 18:2 19:5,7 20:9 22:5 32:13,14 35:3,4 36:21 37:14,16 38:12 39:8,10,23 40:11,23 41:17 42:14 43:13,14 58:25
yields 9:6 11:12 12:14 13:21 15:4 16:12 18:3 19:8 20:12 22:8 32:16 35:6 36:4,5,24 37:17 38:14 39:11,25 40:13 40:24 41:20 42:17 43:15 59:2

Z

Zachary 62:12
Zoe 67:21

0

0.5 31:14
0108 27:9
019 31:14
0404 27:7
0405 27:8
0406 27:8
0407 27:8

1

1 53:4 63:3,4 68:20
1:00 64:15,15 65:9,9
1:30 1:12
10 9:11,18 12:21 20:16,23 24:10 47:7
102 30:8
105 45:19
11 20:24 22:17
111 58:14
12 64:9
120,000 24:13
1209 27:9
1212 27:9
12D 4:21
14 5:14
15.1 68:22 69:5
151 50:11
160 59:17
19 5:4,15 42:4 50:5
1st 5:14

2

2 30:15 53:4 63:4,5,5 68:23 69:6
2,050 6:5
20 26:4
2000 53:22
2003 53:21,23 59:19
200626300019 70:21
2010 10:12
2011 5:3 20:14 36:10,14 37:3 41:3,25 46:10 48:6,13 50:1,2 51:5 53:14
2016 21:8 22:16
2017 1:12 27:21 57:18,19 70:16
2020 55:9
205 62:24
21 23:16
23 23:16
252-243-9000 1:24
25th 3:18,21
26A 62:12
27 23:16
28 1:12
28th 70:16
29th 68:20,23 69:6

3

3 20:16,23 30:14
3:07 69:11
30 7:21
35% 54:3
36 45:20
37 45:20
39 7:11 30:14

4

4 30:14
40 45:20
41 45:20
42 54:3
44 22:12
46 21:1 32:1
47 61:12,22
49 7:20

5

5 52:24
5% 10:9 27:10
50% 51:9
511 62:24
54 53:25
56 54:6
576 62:25
5th 48:21

6

6 20:16
64 32:1
643 64:16
65 61:12,22
66 53:24

7

7 20:15 30:8
7-county 9:25
74 21:1
75 14:14 15:9
76 19:16 22:11
77 22:17
79,462 10:8
7th 48:24

8

8 44:25
82 19:17
82nd 27:9
83rd 27:8

9

90% 26:11
927 3:24 4:10 44:1 61:8,13 61:18,23 62:16
9th 24:20

EX. 21

NORTH CAROLINA SENATE SESSION

NORTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TRANSCRIPT OF THE PROCEEDINGS

In Raleigh, North Carolina

Monday, August 28, 2017, 5:00 p.m.

PREPARED BY: Karen Roche

RUFFIN CONSULTING, INC.

DIRECT DIAL: 252-243-9000

WWW.RUFFINCONSULTING.COM

SEN. BERGER: The Senate will come to order. The sergeant at arms will close the doors. Members, take your seats. Members and guests will please silence all electronic devices. Leading the Senate in prayer is Senator Norm Sanderson of Pamlico County. All members and guests, please stand.

SEN. SANDERSON: Thank you, Mr. President. I'd like to read just several verses of Scripture from the Book of Isaiah. Chapter 55, says "Seek you Lord while he may be found. Call ye upon him while he is near. Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts; and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him, and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon. For my thoughts are not your thoughts. Neither are your ways my ways" sayeth the Lord. Please pray with me. Lord, not our ways, but your ways. Not our thoughts, but your thoughts. Through and by the power of our Lord Savior Jesus Christ, Amen.

THE SENATE: Amen.

SEN. BERGER: Senator Pate is recognized for a motion.

SEN. PATE: Thank you, Mr. President. The journal of Friday, August 25, 2017, has been examined and is found to be correct. I move that we dispense

with the reading of the journal and that it stand approved as written.

SEN. BERGER: Without objection, the journal for August 25, 2017 stands approved as written.

Members, leaves of absence are requested and without objection are granted for Senators Barringer, Jim Davis, Ford, Jeff Jackson and Van Dunyn.

Courtesies of the chamber are extended to Karen Roche of Garrett Reporting Services. She is up on the dais next to the sergeant at arms.

Members, unless there's other business come before the Senate, we'll go straight into our calendar.

Senator Rabon, for what purpose do you arise?

SEN. RABON: Motion to address.

SEN. BERGER: State your motion.

SEN. RABON: Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President, I move that the rules be suspended until the end, that staff may accompany Senator Hise on the floor today.

SEN. BERGER: Without objection, so ordered.

SEN. RABON: Mr. President, I move that upon passage of third reading of Senate Bill 691, 2017 Senate Floor Redistricting Plan Second Reading be sent to the House by special message.

SEN. BERGER: Without objection, so ordered.

Senate Bill 691, the clerk will read.

THE CLERK: Senate Bill 691 2017 Floor Redistricting Plan, second reading.

SEN. BERGER: Senator Hise, could you step up here for just a moment?

Members, so you know, my understanding is that Senator McKissick had advised Senator Hise that there were a couple of amendments that were going to be offered and they are not available yet. What we're going to do is Senator Hise has an amendment that we can go ahead and run now. Once he runs his amendment, we'll take a recess waiting for the other amendments and then we'll proceed after that.

Senator Hise, for what purpose do you arise?

SEN. HISE: Send forth an amendment.

SEN. BERGER: Send forth your amendment. The clerk will read.

THE CLERK: Senator Hise moves to amend the bill.

Senator Hise is recognized to explain the amendment.

SEN. HISE: Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. As we're going through, we realize that there's going to be judges and others looking at these maps and we're trying to compact that and make as easy.

We had one of the original districts that is now numbered differently. I believe it was Senator Lowe's district. And just to avoid any confusion, it will change District 29 to District 32 and 32 to 29, so that the district numbers for that district will be consistent with the previous map to this map.

SEN. BERGER: Further discussion or debate on Amendment 7?

Hearing none, the question before the Senate is the passage of Amendment 7, Senate Bill 691. All in favor of the amendment will vote aye; all opposed to the amendment will vote no. Five seconds will be allowed for the voting. The clerk will record the vote.

(ELECTRONIC VOTE.)

SEN. BERGER: Senator Lee?

44 having voted in the affirmative and none in the negative. Amendment 7 passes and the bill is back before you.

Members, as previously indicated, we will take a recess until 5:40 --

SEN. BISHOP: Mr. President.

SEN. BERGER: Senator Bishop, for what purpose do you arise?

SEN. BISHOP: Before the body recesses, is it possible to ask Senator McKissick a question?

SEN. BERGER: Senator McKissick, do you yield?

SEN. McKISSICK: Yes, I yield.

SEN. P. BERGER: He yields.

SEN. BISHOP: Thank you, Senator McKissick. When we were last together, Senator, I had asked about what Senator Robinson referred to as a prospectus of information perhaps prepared by Dr. Creighton and understood in the course of some questions to you that you would provide that to the body. I sort of expected it to be here at the beginning of session today. Do you remember what I'm referring to? And do you intend to furnish that?

SEN. McKISSICK: I'm not aware of any prospectus of information. The only thing there's been is dialogue and conversation. It's not as if there's been a compilation of documents that have been created that would be the type of thing that one could easily put into the record and disseminate. It's just the substance of the conversations that occurred. So there's not really a document that embodies all of those conversations and all that dialogue that's taken place over the last perhaps week and a half or so.

SEN. BERGER: Senator Bishop, for what purpose do you arise?

SEN. BISHOP: Ask a question of Senator

McKissick.

SEN. BERGER: Senator McKissock, do you yield?

SEN. McKISSICK: Yes, I yield.

SEN. BISHOP: Did you intend to offer something as to the time we had that colloquy last week?

SEN. McKISSICK: I think I provided the same response last week. That's consistent with my recollections. You might have understood what I said differently. But there is not a set of documents or a memorandum or anything that summarizes the substance of those conversations. There were many, many conversations but not a set of documents that resulted from it and summarized their content.

SEN. BISHOP: Thank you, Mr. President.

SEN. McKISSICK: Mr. President.

SEN. BERGER: Senator McKissick, for what purpose do you arise?

SEN. McKISSICK: So see if I could ask Senator Bishop a question.

SEN. BERGER: Senator Bishop, do you yield?

SEN. BISHOP: I do.

SEN. BERGER: He yields.

SEN. McKISSICK: Senator Bishop, do you have any type of compilation of documents or information that's not currently in the record that was used as a basis for

the plan that's been submitted by the redistricting committee as a preferred plan?

SEN. BISHOP: I have been blissfully uninvolved, Senator McKissick. I do not have any such thing.

SEN. McKISSICK: Thank you.

SEN. BERGER: Members, with that, we will take a recess until 5:45. Senate stands in recess until 5:45.

(The proceeding recessed at 5:30 p.m.)

(The proceeding reconvened at 5:47 p.m.)

SEN. BERGER: Members, a short announcement. My understanding is we are still waiting for some materials to be brought over here. Rather than have those materials being disseminated while we're trying to listen to the speakers, we're going to extend the recess until 6 o'clock. Senate stands in recess until 6 o'clock.

(The proceeding recessed at 5:48 p.m.)

(The proceeding reconvened at 6:16 p.m.)

SEN. BERGER: The Senate will come to order. Members will return to their seats. Members, we are on the third reading, Senate Bill 691. Is there further discussion or debate?

Senator Robinson, for what purpose do you arise?

SEN. ROBINSON: To send forth an amendment.

SEN. BERGER: Send forward your amendment. The

clerk will read.

THE CLERK: Senator Robinson moves to amend the bill.

SEN. BERGER: Senator Robinson is recognized to explain the amendment.

SEN. ROBINSON: Thank you, Mr. President.

On last week Senator Hise asked if I would consider doing some additional amendments to the proposed Senate District 28. And what you have in front of you is actually the proposed changes to that. And what it basically does it has a little less compactness; however, it still keeps two specific things. One in terms of it does not double-bunk incumbents. It keeps separate districts for those. And then it also -- and one of the things we talked about was the current VAP is 52 percent and it decreases. It still decreases at less than 45 percent down to 43 percent. So there's a better distribution in terms of population. And still, there are commonalities amongst the communities that are in both Senate District 28 and 27. So I'll stop right there.

Most of the explanation I gave last week is specific to this one. But this, I think, does a better job in terms of the districts, especially 27, Senator's Wade district, and my 28.

SEN. BERGER: Further discussion or debate on Amendment 8.

Senator Hise, for what purpose do you arise?

SEN. HISE: Speak to the amendment.

SEN. BERGER: You have the floor.

SEN. HISE: Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Committee. You know, I think that we least had an opportunity to see something come forward that may have addressed some of the concerns. But what we see here is something where we continue to ignore the committee's criteria. This is still clearly a district drawn on the basis of race. Although, I will tell you, by the eyeball test, boy, these districts look a whole lot similar on these two maps. But I guess the claim is the eyeball doesn't apply when someone else drew them.

But there's only one purpose of this district. This is solely targeted at Senator Wade's district. It's an attempt to shave about eight points, depending on the race you're looking at, off of her race and try to change the balance of power so that there's more Democrats. That's what they're attempting to achieve in this amendment. That's what we're seeing come out over and over again. It also ignores the splitting of municipalities. As I understand, still splits Jamestown, still splits Summerfield -- two

municipalities that exist in the county and are now, contrary to the committee guidelines, broken up in the different districts.

So while I was hopeful at the potential we could have gotten from this draw, it seems like it was more important to make a political statement. So I will simply ask you that vote against this amendment.

SEN. BERGER: Further discussion or debate on Amendment 8?

Senator Robinson, for what purpose do you arise?

SEN. ROBINSON: To speak on the amendment.

SEN. BERGER: You have the floor.

SEN. ROBINSON: Thank you, Mr. President. Contrary to what Senator Hise says is that there were split the same three split municipalities before. But just to back up a little bit. And this map is drawn on the basis of the 2010 elections and when I came in. And that was 2003 data in terms of what's -- and if you look at a comparison in terms of what it was then and what it has since become, is more aligned with the 2003. And that district did not target an incumbent.

So I would take exception to the fact that it targets anybody in this one except that my district was targeted in 2011 when it was redrawn. But this one gives the opportunity to both incumbents for election.

We have to run for it, but it still gives the opportunity for everybody to compete for the seats.

SEN. BERGER: Further discussion or debate on Amendment 8?

Senator Brown, for what purpose do you arise?

SEN. BROWN: To ask Senator Robinson a question.

SEN. BERGER: Senator Robinson, do you yield?

SEN. ROBINSON: Yes.

SEN. BERGER: She yields.

SEN. BROWN: Senator Robinson, there are two full districts in Guilford County and, at this point, I would say that one of them is pretty much a Democratic county and the other one is a very competitive -- one is a Democratic district and the other one is a very competitive district. Looking at this map, I think it generates basically two Democratic Senate districts. Was the intent to gerrymander Guilford County to do that?

SEN. ROBINSON: Mr. President.

SEN. BERGER: You may answer.

SEN. ROBINSON: The intent here was, Senator Brown, to do what Senator Hise asked. If you look at Greensboro and based on the population, how they vote, and most of 28 is Greensboro, it's more of a Democratic voting area. But the Guilford County area around it

tends to be more Republican voting.

So if you look at it in terms of that, then you can understand 28 being more of Democratic percentages. But the intent simply is to give voters an opportunity to vote. If you want to go back to 2003, which I would prefer, it would -- you know, it would be a very clear map as far as I'm concerned.

But that was not the intent here. The intent with Mr. Creighton when we took information from Senator Hise was to do the best job we could in terms of creating a map that did not double-bunk incumbents.

SEN. BERGER: Further discussion or debate on Amendment 8?

Senator Brown, for what purpose do you arise?

SEN. BROWN: One more question, if I could.

SEN. BERGER: Senator Robinson, do you yield for a question?

SEN. ROBINSON: Yes.

SEN. BERGER: She yields.

SEN. BROWN: So I guess you're saying then after talking to your consultant that, trying to create two Democratic Senate districts was never the issue.

SEN. ROBINSON: That was not the intent here. The intent was to create, based on what the courts said, fair voting districts where citizens could make a

decision in terms of whatever candidates, whether it's incumbents or anybody else.

SEN. BROWN: It just happened to have turned out that way, I guess.

SEN. BERGER: Senator Brown, is there another question?

SEN. BROWN: That's okay.

SEN. BERGER: Further discussion or debate on Amendment 8?

SEN. McKISSICK: Mr. President.

SEN. BERGER: Senator McKissick, for what purpose do you arise?

SEN. McKISSICK: To speak on the amendment.

SEN. BERGER: You have the floor.

SEN. McKISSICK: First, I'd like to thank Senator Robinson for seeing this amendment forward. And what you really have here is a plan that allows for far more compact districts and far more competition within the districts.

I know last week there was some question about whether if, you know, Trump or Clinton would have won these districts. If you look at those particular criteria, you would have seen one of these districts being strongly carried by Clinton, one of them only marginally carried by Clinton, by a 1.3 percent margin,

and the other two carried by Trump. That allows for competition. It allows for choice among voters. And that's really what voters want. They want the opportunity to elect the politicians.

Now it could be argued and perhaps persuasively argued that, had it not been for racial gerrymandering, you would have seen a different outcome in the legislative races from this district than what we saw in terms of results. But I think these are good districts. So I want to commend Senator Robinson for her work on studying what could be done to come up with a configuration that would be improved. I think Senator Hise had suggested that she give it some thought and reflection over this past weekend. Certainly a great deal of depth and analysis went into it.

And one thing which I would like to do for the record in case it's not in the record already, I requested statistical packages be put together based upon 2016 data. For the record, I'd like to reflect the fact that they are there and been distributed to members and should be considered as part of the consideration before this body as we deliberate on this amendment. Thank you.

SEN. BERGER: Further discussion or debate on Amendment 8?

Senator Robinson, for what purpose do you arise?

SEN. ROBINSON: To ask Senator McKissick a question.

SEN. BERGER: Senator McKissick, do you yield?

SEN. McKISSICK: Yes, I do.

SEN. BERGER: He yields.

SEN. ROBINSON: Senator McKissick, as you look at the proposed map SRN-2 and you look at the cluster here, can you identify for me based on the configuration the political parties currently in that cluster?

SEN. McKISSICK: Within the clusters here within your district?

SEN. ROBINSON: No.

SEN. McKISSICK: Within the entire cluster. What we would have in this cluster is Senator Tillman who represents a portion of what is now the newly configured cluster. We would have Senator Gunn representing a portion of this particular cluster and we'd have Senator Wade representing a part of this particular cluster. In addition to yourself, it would be three Republicans and one Democrat.

As I said earlier, perhaps had it not been for the racial gerrymandering that took place previously back in 2011, perhaps you might have seen a different outcome considering the way they voted in the

presidential elections back in 2016.

SEN. BERGER: Further discussion or debate?

SEN. ROBINSON: Just a follow-up question.

SEN. BERGER: Senator Robinson, for what purpose do you arise?

SEN. ROBINSON: To ask Senator McKissick a follow-up.

SEN. BERGER: Senator McKissick, do you yield?

SEN. McKISSICK: Yes, I yield.

SEN. BERGER: He yields.

SEN. ROBINSON: Senator McKissick, in this particular cluster then, do all of those individuals you named in terms of representation have a part of Guilford County? They would represent a part of Guilford County?

SEN. McKISSICK: They would indeed. And incumbency has been, in fact, respected as this plan was developed -- one of the criteria of this committee. Of course, these criteria were not ranked, so there's no way to know what criteria had priority. But the way the original plan was presented, it was a majority/minority district even today after the courts have asked us to really reflect upon that and to go back and not have any racial gerrymanders.

SEN. ROBINSON: Follow-up question, Mr. Chair.

SEN. BERGER: Senator McKissick, do you yield?

SEN. McKISSICK: Yes, I do.

SEN. BERGER: He yields.

SEN. ROBINSON: So for clarification purposes, in this cluster of Guilford, Randolph, Alamance where four senators, incumbents are in this cluster, then there would be three Republicans and one Democrat. Am I correct, based on how it's drawn?

SEN. McKISSICK: That is exactly correct.

SEN. BERGER: Further discussion or debate on Amendment 8?

Hearing none, question before the Senate is the passage of Amendment 8, Senate Bill 691. All in favor of the amendment will vote aye; all opposed of the amendment all vote no. Five seconds will be allowed for the voting. The clerk will record the vote.

(ELECTRONIC VOTE.)

12 having voted in the affirmative and 33 in the negative, Amendment 8 fails and the bill, Senate Bill 691 is back before you.

Further discussion or debate?

SEN. CLARK: Mr. President.

SEN. BERGER: Senator Clark, for what purpose do you arise?

SEN. CLARK: To send forth an amendment.

SEN. BERGER: Send forward your amendment. The

clerk will read.

THE CLERK: Senator Clark moves to amend the bill.

SEN. BERGER: Let the record reflect that Senator Barringer is now in the chamber.

Senator Clark is recognized to explain the amendment.

SEN. CLARK: Thank you, Mr. President.

Senators, what this particular amendment does is it will modify the Hoke - Cumberland cluster which consists of Senate Districts 21 and 19. The major thrust of this modification is to move Fort Bragg into Senate District 21 as opposed to it being in Senate District 19. And I'll get to that in a moment.

But before I address that issue, I want to address a few other questions that might come my way. First of all, I see nothing illegal in this particular plan. And, secondly, race was not a consideration at all and it does not split any municipalities. As a matter of fact, I used the 2017 plan submitted by the Senate as a baseline in which there was only one municipality split and that was the city of Fayetteville. All of the other municipalities in Cumberland County as in the 2017 plan before us will reside in Senate District 19.

So back to the Fort Bragg issue. So why do I want to move that into Senate District 21 as opposed to Senate District 19? Well, I told myself -- well, apparently it's appropriate to use the Bishop criteria that was put forth by Senator Bishop back there. So although we're not considering communities of interest, we can and should consider cluster areas with interests that they hold in common.

And if you look at the layout of Cumberland County and where Fort Bragg is, you'll see that on the southern border of Fort Bragg you have several VTDs. Now these communities have a lot of in-common interests with Fort Bragg there. They share interests such as sporting, sustaining housing, entertaining the troops there. So it seems far more appropriate to group these -- to group Fort Bragg with these particular VTDs as opposed to connecting it to Senate District 19 which runs as we're making it now and then it goes out into the rural horses of the county.

And also, in addition, I looked at the House plan that was proposed by our counterparts in the House and they did conform with this idea of clustering areas with common interests. So if you look at the House plan you'll see that those VTDs right along the southern border of Fort Bragg are, in fact, clustered with it

within two House districts in the proposed plan. So that's why I believe Fort Bragg should really be linked with Senate District 21 as opposed Senate District 19.

Now the issue with this is Fort Bragg has about 25,000 folks in it. So when you move that over into Senate District 21, that is going to require some adjustment elsewhere within Senate District 21.

Now one of the criteria that I gave to Dr. Creighton is I understand that another unwritten rule is that if we have a cluster that has at least two Senate districts within it and that one of those Senate districts if it's possible to elect a Republican, then we want to make sure that is the case is in the future. So I told him, I said, "I want to make sure that Senate District 19 remains competitive to the extent that a Republican as sharp as Senator Meredith there could still get elected there." And he has, in fact, done that on my behalf. So we can take that one off the plate. Senator Meredith -- I'm sure he's proven time and time again that he can get elected in a Democratic leaning district and nothing will change there.

So you'll notice that the district here, Senate District 21, is more compact than the version in the 2017 plan. And as I indicated, it also protects Senate District 19 in the fact that a Republican can still get

elected there.

Let me see. Are there any other things I want to mention. So that's pretty much it in a nutshell. So if no one has any questions, I recommend that you consider supporting this particular amendment. Thank you.

SEN. BERGER: Senator Bishop, for what purpose do you arise?

SEN. BISHOP: To ask a question of Senator Clark.

SEN. BERGER: Senator Clark, do you yield?

SEN. CLARK: I yield.

SEN. BERGER: He yields.

SEN. BISHOP: Senator Clark, I read with interest a media account that the amendment to District 21 that we saw in committee, quote, "Was something the Republicans wanted to keep him," ie., you "out of Senate District 19 held by Wesley Meredith."

Now my first question is, the previous amendment to District 21, you offered that, didn't you, sir.

SEN. CLARK: I sure did.

SEN. BISHOP: And --

SEN. BERGER: Senator Bishop, follow-up?

SEN. BISHOP: Thank you, Mr. President. Yes, I would like to ask another question.

SEN. BERGER: Senator Clark, do you yield?

SEN. CLARK: I sure do.

SEN. BERGER: He yields.

SEN. BISHOP: The extension out into the east there, that is a modified version of what you offered previously; correct?

It has a slight modification. It just moves the lines a little bit. Nothing substantial.

SEN. BISHOP: Further question.

SEN. BERGER: Senator Clark, do you yield?

SEN. CLARK: I yield.

SEN. BERGER: He yields.

SEN. BISHOP: One other approach would be just to undue that extension to the location of your new house; correct?

SEN. CLARK: If you would like to do that, you can send forth an amendment to do that.

SEN. CLARK: Further question.

SEN. BERGER: Senator Clark, do you yield?

SEN. CLARK: I yield.

SEN. BERGER: He yields.

SEN. BISHOP: Do you intend to send forth an amendment to that effect?

SEN. CLARK: No. The amendment I intended to send forth is the one you're looking at now.

SEN. BISHOP: All right. Further question for Senator Clark.

SEN. BERGER: Senator Clark, do you yield?

SEN. CLARK: I yield.

SEN. BERGER: He yields.

SEN. BISHOP: You preempted a number of questions you thought might be asked and I appreciate your having done that to save time. I can't recall -- and as I've heard you say it, did you consider political data in the precinct changing that you did in this newest offered version of 21?

SEN. CLARK: I guess you could say that to the extent that I directed the gentleman working with me to make sure that Senate District 19 could still elect a Republican. So I guess you could say that, yeah, I did consider political data.

SEN. BISHOP: Follow-up for Senator Clark.

SEN. BERGER: Senator Clark, do you yield?

SEN. CLARK: I yield.

SEN. BERGER: He yields.

SEN. BISHOP: So do I understand then that the direction to Dr. Creighton was to make it so that a Republican could still win --

SEN. CLARK: That's correct.

SEN. BISHOP: -- but knowing that the district

was going to be less favorable to a Republican than as previously configured.

SEN. CLARK: That is not direction I gave, and I don't know whether it is less or not since I haven't looked at that. My main focus was I believe Fort Bragg should in Senate District 21, not Senate District 19.

SEN. BISHOP: Understood. Thank you.

SEN. BERGER: Further discussion or debate on Amendment 9?

Senator Hise, for what purpose to you rise?

SEN. HISE: Speak to the amendment.

SEN. BERGER: You have the floor.

SEN. HISE: Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Committee. I guess this debate on this amendment is going to whether or not Fort Bragg should be in Senator Meredith's district or Senator Clark's district.

To a point, it does not raise any -- as the speaker said, it doesn't raise any racial issues, it doesn't raise any other -- just where the base should be located. I don't think when you look at the numbers that you're going to see that that's why this area is being moved to the state. But I do find them really interesting.

I think if you look at 2016 as District 19 was previously drawn, Pat McCrory carried 52.63 -- now a 2

percentage point -- 2.5 percentage point movement. But it appears that that's not competitive under this model. So what we have to do is then draw it at where Pat McCrory would have 48.3. So minus 2 Republican is competitive, but plus 2.5 is not.

As a matter of fact, if you go to the Trump race and you'll find that Trump in the previously drawn district carried 51.71 percent of the district -- 1.7 over. Now that's not competitive; however, we've decided that now Trump carrying 47.37 percent coming to a 2.7 percent advantage, now that's competitive.

So this whole concept that we've been hearing about competitive. It is clearly a statement of where will Democrats win? That's what the amendments are looking for. And so we're going to use the ruse of where we're going to move a military base, probably a fairly strong Republican as our stance as a party for supporting our military, and I think if you look at the stance the other party has made on the military and others and their respect for it, I think you'll be clear to see why that favors Republicans. But we're going to use that ruse in this concept and say "Let's take a district and shift it more Democrat" with no good reasons coming in. So I will say that I see nothing in this that the courts would raise. It is not an issue of

race.

As we said, Senator Clark did ask that we extend this district out to pick up the new home that he had built, an address that we were not given prior to the consideration. And so we've accommodated that. But apparently that move was not enough. Now Senator Clark seems to want us to pick the areas that he wants to come with him to make sure that no one around him is competitive. So, again, I think it's important that we merely reject this amendment.

SEN. BERGER: Further discussion or debate on Amendment 9?

Senator McKissick, for what purpose do you arise?

SEN. McKISSICK: Speak on the amendment.

SEN. BERGER: You have the floor.

SEN. McKISSICK: I want to thank Senator Clark for setting forth the amendment. It makes total sense that you would have all of Fort Bragg in Senator Clark's district. There's no reason for it not to be there. Before the way the district line had been drawn, the only thing he got was an empty part of a field out in Fort Bragg. It didn't make any sense whatsoever. But by reconfiguring the district and the way that it's being configured today, it's within Senator Clark's

district. Yes, it is a somewhat more competitive district.

But these districts have the potential to flip back and forth depending upon the candidates who are running. If Senator Meredith is running and he appeals to a broad range of constituents, I have no doubts that he can prevail in the district that he has been provided with this plan. I have no doubts whatsoever. I also believe that Senator Clark with his district being configured the way it is, it relates more to communities of interest. You want to put all of Fort Bragg there.

To be quite frank, many of the people living in Fort Bragg probably vote absentee in other parts of the country. They don't necessarily vote in Cumberland County. And the actual number that do, to be quite candid with you, I'm not sure what that number would look like. Having said that, I think this is a valid amendment; one that really sets forth an alternative and I ask for your support.

SEN. BERGER: Further discussion or debate on Amendment 9?

Senator Brown, for what purpose do you arise?

SEN. BROWN: To ask Senator Clark a question.

SEN. BERGER: Senator Clark, do you yield?

SEN. CLARK: Sure.

SEN. BERGER: He yields.

SEN. BROWN: Senator Clark, is Fort Bragg all in -- I think it's all in Cumberland County, isn't it?

SEN. CLARK: No. Some of it's in Spring Lake, actually, and some of the training areas actually extend into Hoke County.

SEN. BROWN: But the majority of it is in Cumberland County.

SEN. CLARK: The majority of it is in Cumberland County. That's correct, sir.

SEN. BROWN: Follow-up.

SEN. BERGER: Do you yield, Senator Clark?

SEN. CLARK: Yes, I yield.

SEN. BERGER: He yields.

SEN. BROWN: So you think it's wise to take Fort Bragg which is mostly in Cumberland County and put it in a district that's mostly Hoke County?

SEN. CLARK: Actually, that's not correct. 75 percent of the voting population within Senate District 21 is in Cumberland County.

SEN. BROWN: On the map, though --

SEN. BERGER: Senator Brown.

SEN. BROWN: I'm sorry. Follow-up.

SEN. BERGER: Senator Clark, do you yield?

SEN. CLARK: I yield.

SEN. BERGER: He yields.

SEN. BROWN: On the map, though, most of Fort Bragg is in Cumberland County; correct?

SEN. CLARK: Actually, that might not be correct either if you consider the training area. Because if you look across the northern portion of Hoke County -- I haven't actually measured that area -- but much of the training area of Fort Bragg extends all the way clear across the top portion of Hoke County. As a matter of fact, y'all decided to give me all the training area in Cumberland County in Senate District 21, so you may as well give me the population as well.

SEN. BROWN: Speak to the amendment.

SEN. BERGER: Senator Brown, you have the floor to speak to Amendment 9.

SEN. BROWN: I think most of us know that most of Fort Bragg is in Cumberland County and I think what this amendment does is it takes Fort Bragg and put it in a district that's mostly Hoke County. I'm not sure why anybody would want to do that, and so I think this would be a bad amendment to do that.

SEN. BERGER: Further discussion or debate on Amendment 9?

Hearing none, the question before the Senate is the passage of Amendment 9, Senate Bill 691. All in

favor of the amendment will vote aye; all opposed to the amendment will vote no. Five seconds will be allowed for the voting. The clerk will record the vote.

(ELECTRONIC VOTE.)

SEN. BERGER: 12 having voted in the affirmative and 34 in the negative, Amendment 9 fails and the bill is back before us. Further discussion or debate on Senate Bill 691?

Senator Hise, for what purpose do you arise?

SEN. HISE: Send forth an amendment.

SEN. BERGER: Send forward your amendment. The clerk will read.

THE CLERK: Senator Hise moves to amend the bill.

SEN. BERGER: Senator Hise is recognized to explain Amendment 10.

SEN. HISE: Thank you, Mr. President, and Members of Senate, again. For clarification purposes and wind changes and others, I have come forward and as we've exhausted the amendments, I want to send forth the one that will change the title to 2017 Senate Floor Redistricting Plan Fourth Edition so we're clear as to when the changes occurred in this process. I'd ask for your support. It makes no substantive changes to the bill.

SEN. BERGER: Further discussion or debate on Amendment 10? Hearing none, the question before the Senate is the passage Amendment 10 to Senate Bill 691. All in favor of the amendment vote aye; all opposed will vote no. Five seconds will be allowed for the voting. The clerk will record the vote.

(ELECTRONIC VOTE.)

SEN P. BERGER: 46 having voted in the affirmative and none in the negative, Amendment 10 passes and Senate Bill 691 is back before us.

Is there further discussion or debate on Senate Bill 691?

Senator Pate, could you come up here, please?

SEN. BERGER: Senator Cook, for what purpose do you arise?

SEN. COOK: To debate the bill.

SEN. BERGER: You have the floor.

SEN. COOK: I rise today to defend Beaufort County. The proposed North Carolina Senate redistricting map was my own county in a politically untenable situation. The new map moves Beaufort from District 1 to District 3 which would include Martin, Bertie, Warren, Vance, and Northampton. These counties are not compatible with Beaufort. The plan places Beaufort into a six-county pod that is strongly liberal.

This conservative leading county will be drowned in a sea of liberalism. The plan will dilute the interest of Beaufort to the point of insignificance.

Beaufort has been a part of the eastern coastal district for about 150 years, and now it will be coupled with counties that are to the north and west of it. Counties with which it has little common interest.

Most of the folks of Beaufort are very happy with this proposed pod except for my wife who has been urging me to quit the Senate for years, and, of course, the chairman of the Beaufort County Democratic Party.

I understand that this proposed Senate map the Senate is attempting to conform to the pod policy advocated by the courts which require grouping counties into pods with little discretion or the exercise of judgement; however, Beaufort, with this proposed pod, is not a good thing and it will cause it to wander in a political death for years.

SEN. PATE: Is there further discussion or debate?

Senator Berger, for what reason do you arise? I'm sorry. Senator McInnis --

SEN. McKISSICK: That would be McKissick.

SEN. PATE: Senator McKissick, I finally recognized you. For what purpose do you arise, sir?

SEN. McKISSICK: I know Senator McInnis and I look so much alike. I guess we were brothers separated at birth. To speak on the plan.

The one thing that I'll essentially say is this. We've had a lot of debate. We've had a lot of discussion over the last several days, the last week, about what is right in terms of alternative plans for the North Carolina Senate and that's important and that is significant.

I think, unfortunately, one of the major criteria that were missed from the conversation when the redistricting committee set criteria was that fact they were sitting back and trying to correct an efficiency established by the court.

And the court basically said that race had been unconstitutionally used in a way that was used to draw these majority/minority districts. Somehow race was not considered at all. Now race should not have ever been a predominant factor that could have been used without a racially polarizing voting study. But race should be a factor that one could look at in terms of drafting and designing districts. That it could be one that is considered by this body. It was not one considered by this body, at least by the majority when plans were drafted.

When it comes to incumbency, it was not really established whether there was going to be a survey taken to find out who was running and who was not running to determine what that might do to the configurations of the districts.

We found out that several people weren't running and that certainly those districts within those clusters might have been designed differently. They might have been more compact. They might have been situated in a way that voters would have had a greater opportunity to pick a candidate of choice in a competitive race. The thing that shows up consistently when polls are done in this state is that people want competitive races. They want to be able to pick a candidate of choice.

They don't want maps gerrymandered in this state to give a single party, in this case, a particular Republican party, a leg up. They don't want to see it done for Democrats either. But the way to do it is to create competitive districts.

So I think we've missed an opportunity to really draw these maps in a way that allows more competitive districts to be drawn. Certainly there are going to be four open seats on this map as it's showing up today but based upon the topography of the districts that are open, three of them will certainly be Republican and

only one of them is likely to become a Democratic seat.

We can do better than this. We can make choices that people will embrace. We can come up with a way of working on both sides of the political aisle to create competitive districts so the voters have a choice. The voters can make decisions. And yes, the districts can be compact. Yes, we can avoid splitting precincts or voter tabulation districts. And, yes, we can make certain that when it comes to municipalities, we try to respect the boundaries when it's possible to do so, understanding the whole county provisions of the state constitution.

Unfortunately, this map which we've seen today is another opportunity to gerrymander. Only this time it's based upon incumbency. And those incumbents gain those positions as a result of maps that were drawn that were racially gerrymandered. So in my mind, many of those gains were illegal and improper gains. And the only way to correct them, the only way to go back and try to correct that wrong and that deficiency would be to consider race as part of the equation in redrawing the districts. And that we have failed to do. I think it's unfortunate that have we done so. I don't know what the courts will do when they have an opportunity to review things. Certainly the Democrats from Mecklenburg

County presented a viable alternative, a very viable alternative that allowed for competitive districts.

I know Senator Bishop said, "Well, Trump, might have lost. He'd only gotten 44 percent of the vote in some of those districts. Well, that depends upon the people in Charlotte and how they might vote in any given year. One could also argue that perhaps not all the members that were elected as a part of this body, as a party of the House, would have won those districts had it not been for the racial gerrymandered districts that were created down in Charlotte.

I know when Malcolm Graham came here, when Malcolm Graham was elected -- and so many of you that have been here for a while knew Malcolm -- he ran from a district that only had 28 percent African-American voting age population and he won against an established incumbent.

The only thing that any of us want to see are good, competitive districts, fair, reasonable and competitive. The courts have given us that opportunity. The courts have ruled that what was done before was illegal. It was wrong. It was unconstitutional racial gerrymander. The courts expect us to act responsibly. I'm afraid that we've negated our responsibility.

SEN. PATE: Is there further discussion or

debate?

Senator Berger, for what purpose do you arise?

SEN. BERGER: Thank you, Mr. President. To speak on the bill.

SEN. PATE: You have the floor.

SEN. BERGER: Thank you. Members of the Senate, I hear Democrats complain that they're not competitive in State Senate elections under the proposed maps because Republicans gerrymander the districts. Liberals in the media and academia have picked up on this theme and run with it. But in the publicly understood sense of the word, it is not truly a gerrymander.

Back in 2001, my first year serving in the Senate, I was one of only 15 Republicans elected to serve in this body. In a year North Carolina voted for George Bush for President by 13 points over the Democratic candidate Al Gore -- 56 percent to 43 percent.

The Democrats promptly embarked on a redistricting scheme for the State Senate that was by any measure a severe gerrymander intended to preserve that 35-15 partisan advantage. That map known as NC Senate Plan 1C divided -- divided 51 counties. Smaller counties like Sampson and Iredell were chopped up between four Senate districts each. One western North

Carolina district stretched and wound across pieces of nine counties running from the Georgia border up through Asheville and into McDowell County.

This fracturing and severe gerrymandering of counties was a relatively recent occurrence. In fact, prior to 1982, no county had ever been divided to form a State Senate district in North Carolina.

The requirements that Senate districts be made up of whole counties dates back in different forms to our state's original 1776 constitution which allotted one senator to every whole county. It was not until 1981 the U.S. Department of Justice decision that the North Carolina Constitution provision requiring counties be kept whole in drawing legislative districts violated the Voting Rights Act that our state began to see the sort of grossly gerrymandered districts like you see in the 2001 NC Senate Plan 1C.

These sorts of grotesque districts would probably still be the norm in North Carolina and, frankly, the Democratic party would probably still control the State Senate if not for a man from Beaufort County named Ashley Stephenson. Ashley passed away in 2009. In 2001 Ashley Stephenson filed a lawsuit asking the state courts to enforce the whole county provisions of the state constitution. He argued that the state did

not have a binary choice between either the whole county provision of the North Carolina Constitution and the Voting Rights Act, that, in fact, the state constitution and federal law could be harmonized.

In the landmark 2002 Stephenson decision, the State Supreme Court agreed with him and laid out a specific method to keep counties whole while complying with federal law. The system for drawing legislative districts laid out in the Stephenson decision requiring districts to comply with the Voting Rights Act -- required the districts to comply with the Voting Rights Act have roughly equal population, elect a single senator instead of multiple senators, and most importantly, create a process for grouping and keeping counties whole. They are the strongest anti-gerrymandering provisions for a legislature in the entire country. And the results of the decision are eminently evident.

The courted ordered 2002 State Senate map following the Stephenson decision divided just 16 counties as opposed to 51. The 2003 State Senate map, again, adopted by the Democrats to comply with the Stephenson decision, divided only 12 counties. The 2011 State Senate map adopted by this body divided 19 counties, and the proposed 2017 State Senate map before

you today divides just 12 counties. When map drawers divide between 10 and 20 counties, they simply cannot create the sort of redistricting mischief that they can when they divide 50-plus counties and they force decisions based on traditional redistricting principles over political considerations. For example, I ended up doubled-bunked and had a primary against former Senate Republican Leader Bob Shaw in the 2002 map.

I've heard people argue that this proposed Senate map is a political gerrymander. It is not. But the argument goes something like Republicans and Democrats should both get about the same number of seats in the State Senate because Pat McCrory and Roy Cooper tied at 49 percent of the vote in the governor's race. This ignores a couple of things. One, we are not a European country with proportional representation. That's not our system. If we were, the libertarian, Lon Cecil, who got 2 percent of the vote for governor, would be breaking all ties between McCrory and Cooper.

Number two, while the governor's race was a tie, in 2016 Republican candidates for the State Senate got almost 500,000 more votes than Democratic candidates.

But something else has been happening that folks arguing against this map haven't spoken about much. A North Carolina Democrat as a distinct political

personage and candidate type from a national Democrat has all but disappeared.

Think about this. Back in the 1990s and early 2000s Democrats won on average between 50 and 55 counties in competitive statewide races in North Carolina. In 1992 that number was right at 56. '96 it was 54. 2000 it was 56. Since 2010 Democrats have averaged between 30 and 35 wins in competitive statewide races. 30 to 35 county wins. In 2012 it was 36. In 2014 it was 32. In 2016 it was 31.

Consider the number of counties Democrats won in governor's races since 1992. Jim Hunt in 1992 won 69 counties. Jim Hunt in 1996 won 73 counties. Mike Easley in 2000 won 65. Mike Easley in 2004 won 70. Bev Perdue in 2008 won 60 counties. Walter Dalton in 2012 won 23 Counties. Roy Cooper in 2016 won 28.

So just to compare, Jim Hunt lost just 27 counties in 1996. Roy Cooper won just 28 counties in 2016. And Roy Cooper had actually won 63 counties in his competitive 2000 attorney general's race. Roy Cooper won 28 counties in his competitive 2016 governor's race. That is not gerrymander. It's happened all across the state.

Let's just take a few more obvious county examples. In the west, Madison County, historically

Democrats won Madison County in a slew of statewide races. In 2000 they won the governor, lieutenant governor, attorney general, superintendant of public instruction, labor and auditor races. In 2002 they won the U.S. Senate race. In 2004 they won superintendent, public instruction, labor, secretary of agriculture, auditor, lieutenant governor and governor. In 2008 they won treasurer, superintendent, labor, agriculture, auditor, insurance, governor and U.S. Senate. In 2016 Democrats did not carry Madison in a single statewide race. President Trump won 60 percent. Senator Burr won 57 percent. Statewide Republican candidates averaged at least 55 percent in Madison County.

Another example, Allegheny County. Democrats won Allegheny County in every competitive statewide race except the race for president in 2000. And Mike Easley won the county with nearly 58 percent in 2004. In 2016 Hillary Clinton won 24 percent. Deborah Ross won 25 -- 26 percent when she ran. Roy Cooper won 31 percent and Josh Stein took 34 percent of the votes in Allegheny County.

Rutherford County, Republicans averaged about 70 percent in Rutherford County in 2016. President Trump won 72 percent. Lieutenant Governor Forest, 71; Buck Newton, 70. Roy Cooper outperformed most of the other

Democrats on the ticket by winning just 32 percent of the vote in Rutherford County.

In the Piedmont - Person County, Democrats won Person County in the overwhelming majority of statewide races 2000, 2004 and 2008. Roy Cooper, Bev Perdue, Mike Easley, each one with 57 percent in 2000. In 2016 Elaine Marshall was the only Democrat who carried the county. Clinton and Ross won just 40 percent. Cooper won 43 percent.

In my home county of Rockingham in the 1990s and 2000s, Republicans rarely won in Rockingham County. It went for Jim Hunt twice, Beverly Perdue twice, Mike Easley twice, Roy Cooper in his 2002 race for attorney general. In 2016 Democrats averaged 38 percent in Rockingham County. In the two most prominent races, they won. Roy Cooper and Josh Stein won 39 percent each in Rockingham County.

In the east, Columbus County. In 2016 Columbus County went 60 percent for Trump, 59 percent of Senator Burg and Pat McCrory. It went 58 percent for Lieutenant Governor Forest, 55 percent for Superintendent Johnson, 56 percent for Treasurer Folwell. In 2008, just eight years before, Bev Perdue won 65 percent in Columbus County. Walter Dawson, 63 percent. In 2004 Democrats averaged over 63 percent in competitive statewide races

in Columbus. In 2000 they averaged 68 percent. Many cleared 70 percent. In Roy Cooper's 2000 race for attorney general, he won 67 percent in Columbus County. In the 2006 race for governor, he won less than 40 percent there.

Sampson County -- Democrats carried Sampson County in seven of the eight most competitive statewide races in 2000. They won the county in six of the eight most competitive in 2004. Since 2008 only one Democrat has won the county. Roy Cooper lost by 17 points -- 58 to 41 in 2016.

Robeson County, Democrats averaged 73 percent of Robeson County in 2000, 68 percent in 2004, 67 percent in 2008. In 2016 they lost the three top-of-the-ticket statewide races in Robeson County.

Terrell County, in 2000 Democrats won every competitive statewide race in Terrell County and their candidates averaged 71 percent. Roy Cooper won 74 percent; Mike Easley, 73 percent; Beverly Perdue, 74 percent. In 2004 Democrats won every competitive statewide race except for president averaging 62 percent. In the 2016 cycle, Democrats averaged 48 percent and Governor Cooper performed 33 points worse -- 41 percent -- in 2016 than he did in 2001.

Democrats are only competing in 20 to 30

Counties in North Carolina. That might be a viable strategy for squeaking out a close win in the occasional statewide race, but you cannot build a legislative majority in a state with 100 counties when you only compete in a quarter of them.

Do we really think all of these county shifts, these seat changes in a decade's time are the result of gerrymandering? Of course not. Gerrymandering didn't do that. Democrats did that. It's why Republicans were able to take the majority in State Senate in 2010 with a map drawn by the Democrats.

Granted, this trend isn't exclusive to North Carolina. Nationally Democrats have lost over 900 legislative seats since 2010, not to mention the U.S. House of Representatives, the U.S. Senate and the White House. A News & Observer headline two days after the 2010 midterms that wiped Democrats out of the U.S. House, in that headline the head of the Democratic party -- National Democratic Party, quote, "Voices regrets but signals no change of course."

And the losses continued in 2012, 2014 and 2016. The nonpartisan Cook Political Report says maybe 17 percent of the Democratic parties problems nationally are the result of new district lines. Something else clearly happened while Democrats were blaming

gerrymandering for putting and keeping them on the back row.

When I first ran for State Senate, many of the Democrats in this chamber and many of the Democrats running, shared the cultural values of North Carolina's moderate to conservative voters. They were pro-education, but many were also pro-business, pro-gun and pro-life.

But today, North Carolina Democrats, just like the National Democrats align with the powerful special interests like big national labor unions, far left environmentalists and the abortion lobby. It used to be that a North Carolina Democrat wouldn't be seen with a National Democratic presidential candidate like Michael Dukakis, Walter Mondale, John Kerry. Nowadays they rush to get endorsements from former President Obama and Hilary Clinton. It used to be North Carolina Democrats campaigned all over rural North Carolina. In 2016 that wasn't the case.

It's easy to understand why gerrymandering has been the bogeyman since they were swept out of power in 2010. It's easier to blame the maps, blame a process, blame anything, really, than it is to take responsibility for losing touch with the politics of voters in 75 of North Carolina's 100 counties.

But here's the hard truth. The Democratic party could be competitive in legislative elections all over the state if it competed in all 100 counties instead of only 30. There are more registered Democratic voters than Republican voters in 27 of the proposed districts. But if you're going to be competitive in legislative elections across the state, you're going to have bring back the North Carolina Democrat as a distinct political type separate from the national Democrat.

And the North Carolina Constitution requires legislative districts to be constructed out of whole counties. So unless you think the county lines in our state have been gerrymandered, it's pretty clear this is not a political gerrymander. And if the North Carolina Democratic party struggles to elect Republican senators under this map, it isn't because of the way the lines were drawn, but the platform that parties' candidates are running on.

But we're not here today because of a political gerrymandering claim. We're here to adopt a new legislative redistricting plan because the U.S. Supreme Court struck down the 2011 State Senate map ruling that nine of the districts including the map were racial gerrymanders. I think it is very important that we acknowledge this. The District Court ruled and the

Supreme Court affirmed that the 2011 map was racial gerrymander.

In 2011 the legislature made a decision based on a U.S. Supreme Court decision in the Strickland case to draw the minority district required by the Voting Rights Act with African-American voting populations of at least 50 percent. The Trial Court ruled that interpretation of the Strickland decision was, quote, "an error of law." And while the court acknowledged that, quote, "In reaching this conclusion, we make no finding that the General Assembly acted in bad faith or with discriminatory intent in drawing the challenge of the districts which were pre-cleared by the Justice Department pursuant to Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act," end of quote. The court's ruling must be respected and the error of law that resulted in racial gerrymanders must be corrected.

The U.S. Supreme Court has set several new precedents since the last body adopted legislative district maps. Most consequentially, the Supreme Court rendered Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act inoperative in Shelby County versus Holder. The Shelby County decision is important to understand how we are seeking to comply with the court's order.

To simplify, prior to Shelby County, North

Carolina's redistricting plans were subject to Section 5 preclearance by the United States Justice Department. The burden fell on the state to prove the proposed maps did not unfairly limit the opportunity of minority groups to elect candidates of their race.

Today, post-Shelby County, North Carolina's redistricting plans are not subject to Justice Department preclearance and the burden of proving that a plan limits a minority group's opportunity to elect a candidate of their choice rests with a plaintiff in a court challenge.

Senator Blue spoke Friday in detail about the Gingles factors that would allow the legislature to consider race in drawing a district. One, that they geographically compact minority community exists for which a majority/minority district can be drawn, two, that the minority community votes cohesively, and three, that the white majority typically votes together in sufficient numbers to block the minority community from electing a candidate of their choice. I won't expand on Senator Blue's comments on the first two Gingles criteria but do want to elaborate on the third criteria.

In 2011 the legislature commissioned two expert studies on racially polarized voting in North Carolina to support the decision to draw districts with

African-American populations of 50 percent. To my knowledge, these were the most complete and exhaustive studies ever entered into the record during a redistricting process.

In the Covington decision striking down the 2011 legislative maps, the court cited those legislative decisions as critical to determining the plan was a racial gerrymander. The court determined the expert reports did not -- did not sufficiently prove racially polarized voting to prove the third Gingles factor was present and justified drawing 50 percent minority districts. Quote, "Contrary to defendant's contentions, the Block and Brunell reports do not establish a strong basis in evidence for Gingles third factor in any potential district."

And in light of the 2014 Alabama Legislative Black Caucus versus Alabama Ruling, the court strongly objected to that legislature's decision to adopt -- I'm sorry -- strongly objected to the legislature's decision to adopt a 50 percent target to draw true minority/ majority districts. Quote, "In light of Alabama, we are mindful that a legislature's policy of prioritizing mechanical racial targets above all other districting criteria (save one-person, one-vote) provides particularly strong evidence of racial predominance."

We have carefully considered the court's order in Covington. Given the court's rejection of the 2011 expert reports, we do not believe we can develop a strong enough basis in evidence that the third Gingles factor is present to justify drawing districts on the basis of race. Nor, in spite of repeated requests by the redistricting committees have the public, plaintiffs in the Covington litigation, or members of this body presented evidence that the proposed map should be changed because the third Gingles factor is present and unaddressed.

So I strongly believe we have complied with the courts admonishment with that. Again, in quoting, "If during redistricting the general assembly had followed traditional districting criteria and in doing so, drawn districts that incidentally contained majority black populations, race would not have predominated in drawing those districts," end of quote.

With the information available to them, Senator Hise and the redistricting committee adopted nine criteria to use in drawing this proposed map. Some of the map drawing principles are inviable and must be followed like equal population contiguity and the North Carolina constitutional requirements on county grouping. And because we cannot prove the third Gingles factor,

not using racial election data, incumbency protection and municipal boundaries are secondary and occasionally internally contradictory considerations. They must be harmonized with each other while complying with the inviable criteria.

I believe that this redistricting plan put forward by Senator Hise's committee successfully harmonized the criteria adopted. This map is not a racial gerrymander and fully complies with both the court order and tradition redistricting principles.

I've also reviewed the data Senator McKissick requested and is placed on the members' dashboards. In the nine districts the court ruled where racial gerrymanders only the Guilford County District as the court predicted could incidentally occur when using traditional districting principles. In this case following Greensboro's municipal boundary continues to have a black voting age population over 50 percent and it has fallen from 56.5 percent to 50.5. The other eight previously unconstitutional districts now have black voting age populations ranging from 32.9 percent to 48.5 percent.

While the 2011 map had no districts with black voting age populations between 26.5 percent and 43 percent, the new map has five new districts that fall in

that range including one new district with a black voting age population of over 40 percent and two new districts with a black voting age populations over 30 percent.

This is important because the expert reports which you can see on your dashboards submitted by Alan Lichtman on behalf of the Democrats and plaintiffs in the Covington and Harris cases define all those districts as having the, quote, "Ability to elect a candidate who is the preferred choice of a cohesively voting minority community."

So while race was not used to draw this plan, I believe it fully remedies the racial gerrymander in the previous map while avoiding any new potential claims of both dilution under Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act.

In closing I'll say again, this map is not a racial gerrymander. This map is not a political gerrymander either. It complies with state and federal law. It remedies defects the court found in the previous map. It splits fewer counties. It divides far fewer precincts. I urge you to vote for the bill.

SEN. PATE: Is there further discussion or debate?

Hearing none, the question before the Senate is the passage of Senate Bill 691 on its third reading.

All in favor will vote aye; all opposed will vote no. Five seconds will be allowed for voting and the clerk will record the vote.

(ELECTRONIC VOTE.)

SEN. PATE: 31 having voted in the affirmative, 15 having voted in the negative, Senate Bill 691 passes its third reading. The amendments will be engrossed and the bill will be sent to the House by special message.

Notices and announcements. Are there any notices or announcements? Is there any further business to come before the Senate?

SEN. BLUE: Mr. President.

SEN. PATE: Senator Blue, for what reason do you arise?

SEN. BLUE: Point of personal privilege.

SEN. PATE: You have the floor, Senator.

SEN. BLUE: Thank you, Mr. President. Ladies and gentlemen of the Senate, I just wanted rise to make a quick observation. A friend of mine and many of ours was funeralized today down in Fayetteville. I had the fortune of knowing the Reverend Dr. C.R. Edwards since my teen years when he passed through the church in Fayetteville when I grew up in an adjoining county. And I just want to mention that C.R. Edwards was a major force in Fayetteville and Cumberland County from the

early 50s until his death, although he had moved to Raleigh and became one of my constituents here about 17 years ago in Knightdale. But Dr. Edwards served with me in the House of Representatives and he served here in the Senate while I served in the House. He served three terms here in the Senate and distinguished himself. If those who sit in seats 15 and 20 would look at the tags on your desk, you'll see his name on those. I think it was seats 15 and 20.

But, in addition to serving in these legislative chambers, he chaired his local school board in one of the most tumultuous times as that school board was going through its desegregation efforts. He served on the University Board of Governor's and distinguished himself well in a very, very well-lived life. He served as the president of the General Baptist State Convention.

So I would ask you, Mr. President, as we adjourn this evening that we adjourn in memory of the late Senator Dr. Reverend C.R. Edwards.

SEN. McKISSICK: Mr. President.

SEN. PATE: Senator McKissick, for what purpose do you arise?

SEN. McKISSICK: Point of personal privilege.

SEN. PATE: You have the floor.

SEN. McKISSICK: I find it quite ironic today

that it's August the 28th. I don't know if that date means much to many of you in this room but to many people from my generation, it was the date back in 1963, the famous march in Washington, the day that Dr. King gave his "I have a Dream" speech 54 years ago today. We talked about not judging people by the color of their skin, by the content of their character. We've come so very, very far as a state, and as a country in addressing those ills that affected us in that time frame. But I'm also reminded tonight when we're still here in a battle in North Carolina dealing with racial gerrymandering of how much further we have to go.

SEN. PATE: Further notices and announcements.

SEN. HORNER: Mr. President.

SEN. PATE: Senator Horner, for what purpose do you arise?

SEN. HORNER: One of personal privilege.

SEN. PATE: You have the floor.

SEN. HORNER: I'd like to end on a positive note after a tough day. Today is one of those important days in our state. It's the first day of school and everyone here has been responsible in some way to help this thing happen. And please tell a teacher "Thank you."

SEN. PATE: Senator Davis, for what purpose do you arise?

SEN. DAVIS: For a brief announcement.

SEN. PATE: You have the floor, Senator.

SEN. DAVIS: Thank you. Members, hopefully we also have another positive note to Senator Horner. And that is, even though we came short over the weekend, it was an awesome trip to Pennsylvania and we continue to support our Southeast, North State Greenville, North Carolina champions. And I want to share with everyone, we've been scrambling around today and we're going to work to get those little young men up here, hopefully Wednesday. And I just ask one thing of my dear friends in this chamber. Is when we get these little ones up here, just give them a high five and a hug. Thank you so much.

SEN. PATE: Further notices and announcements? Hearing none, is there further business to come before the Senate?

If not, Senator Berger is recognized for a motion.

SEN. BERGER: Thank you, Mr. President. I move that the Senate to now adjourn in memory of the late Senator Reverend Dr. Chauncy R. Edwards. Subject to the standard stipulations set forth in Senate Rule 24.1 and the receipt of messages from the House, we reconvene on Tuesday, August 29, 2017 at 2 p.m.

SEN. PATE: The motion is that the Senate do now adjourn, adjourning to the memory of Former Senator, the Reverend Dr. Chauncy R. Edwards, and subject to the stipulations stated by Senator Berger to reconvene Tuesday, August 29th -- what was the time again, Senator? -- 2 p.m., seconded by Senator Blue. All in favor say aye.

THE SENATE: Aye.

SEN. PATE: All opposed, no.

THE SENATE: (No response.)

SEN. PATE: The ayes have it and the Senate stands adjourned.

(There was a pause in the proceeding.)

THE CLERK: Message from the House. House Bill 927 Committee substitute by Representatives Lewis and Ballard, an act to realign the districts for the election of the members of the North Carolina House of Representatives is referred to redistricting committee.

(The proceeding concluded at 7:25 p.m.)

CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY - COURT REPORTER

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

COUNTY OF WAKE

I, KAREN ROCHE, Notary Public in and for the above county and state, do hereby certify that the proceeding was taken before me at the time and place hereinbefore set forth; that the proceeding was duly recorded by me by means of stenotype, which is reduced to written form under my direction and supervision; and that this is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, a true and correct transcript.

I further certify that I am neither counsel to any party nor interested in any way in the outcome of this proceeding.

This is the 28th day of August, 2017.

Karen Roche
Notary Public, Wake County,
North Carolina
Notary No. 201519800020

A

Ability 54:9
able 35:14 46:10
abortion 47:12
absence 3:5
absentee 28:13
abundantly 2:14
academia 38:10
accommodated 27:5
accompany 3:18
account 22:15
achieve 10:21
acknowledge 48:25
acknowledged 49:9
act 37:23 39:15 40:3,10,12 49:6,15,21 54:15 59:16
acted 49:11
actual 28:15
addition 16:20 20:20 56:10
additional 9:8
address 3:14 19:15,16 27:4
addressed 10:9
addressing 57:9
adjoining 55:23
adjourn 56:17 56:18 58:21 59:2
adjourned 59:12
adjourning 59:2
adjustment 21:7
admonishment 52:13
adopt 48:20 51:18,20
adopted 40:22 40:24 49:19 52:20 53:8
advantage 26:11 38:22
advised 4:7
advocated 33:14
affirmative 5:16 18:17 31:5 32:9 55:5
affirmed 49:1
afraid 37:24
African-Amer... 37:15 49:6 51:1
age 37:16 53:18 53:21,24 54:2 54:3
ago 56:3 57:5
agreed 40:6
agriculture 43:6 43:8
ahead 4:11
aisle 36:4
Al 38:17
Alabama 51:16 51:17,21
Alamance 18:4
Alan 54:6
align 47:10
aligned 11:20
alike 34:2
Allegheny 43:14 43:15,20
allotted 39:10
allow 50:13
allowed 5:12 18:14 31:2 32:5 37:2 55:2
allows 14:17 15:1,2 35:21
alternative 28:18 34:7 37:1,2
Amen 2:19,20
amend 4:18 9:2 19:2 31:13
amendment 4:10,11,15,16 4:21 5:8,10,11 5:12,17 8:24 8:25 9:5 10:2,4 10:22 11:7,9 11:11 12:4 13:13 14:9,13 14:16 15:22,25 18:10,12,13,14 18:18,24,25 19:7,9 22:5,15 22:19 23:17,23 23:24 25:9,11 25:14 27:10,12 27:15,18 28:18 28:21 30:13,15 30:18,21,23,25 31:1,2,6,10,11 31:16 32:2,3,4 32:9
amendments 4:8,12 9:8 26:14 31:20 55:7
analysis 15:15
announcement 8:10 58:1
announcements 55:9,10 57:13 58:15
answer 12:20
anti-gerryma... 40:16
anybody 11:23 14:2 30:20
apparently 20:4 27:6
appeals 28:5
appears 26:2
apply 10:15
appreciate 24:7
approach 23:13
appropriate 20:4,15
approved 3:2,4
area 12:25,25 25:21 30:5,7,8 30:10
areas 20:7,22 27:7 29:5
argue 37:7 41:9
argued 15:5,6 39:25
arguing 41:24
argument 41:11
arms 2:2 3:10
Asheville 39:3
Ashley 39:22,22 39:23
asked 6:5 9:7 12:22 17:21 24:7
asking 39:23
assembly 1:3 49:11 52:14
attempt 10:18
attempting 10:21 33:13
attorney 42:20 43:3 44:13 45:3
auditor 43:4,7,9
August 1:14 2:24 3:4 57:1 58:25 59:5 60:16
available 4:9 52:19
average 42:4
averaged 42:8 43:12,22 44:14 44:25 45:1,12 45:18,22
averaging 45:21
avoid 5:3 36:7
avoiding 54:14
aware 6:13
awesome 58:6
aye 5:11 18:13 31:1 32:4 55:1 59:7,8
ayes 59:11

B

back 5:17 11:16 13:5 16:24 17:1,22 18:19 20:1,5 28:4 31:7 32:10 34:13 36:19 38:13 39:9 42:3 47:1 48:8 57:3
bad 30:21 49:11
balance 10:20
Ballard 59:16
Baptist 56:16
Barringer 3:6 19:5
base 25:19 26:16
based 12:23 13:24 15:18 16:9 18:7 35:24 36:15 41:5 49:3
baseline 19:21
basically 9:11 12:16 34:15
basis 7:25 10:12 11:17 51:14 52:4,6
battle 57:11
Beaufort 32:18 32:21,24,25 33:3,4,8,11,16 39:21
began 39:15
beginning 6:10
behalf 21:18 54:7
belief 60:11
believe 5:2 21:2 25:5 28:9 52:3 52:12 53:6 54:13
Berger 2:1,21 3:3,15,20,25 4:4,16 5:7,15 5:22 6:1,3,23 7:2,16,20,22 8:6,10,19,25 9:4 10:1,5 11:8 11:12 12:3,7,9 12:20 13:12,16 13:19 14:5,8 14:11,14 15:24 16:4,6 17:2,4,8 17:10,25 18:2 18:9,22,25 19:4 22:7,11

22:13,23 23:1 23:3,10,12,19 23:21 24:3,5 24:18,20 25:8 25:12 27:11,16 28:20,24 29:1 29:12,14,22,24 30:1,14,22 31:5,11,15 32:1,8,14,17 33:21 38:2,3,6 58:18,20 59:4
Bertie 32:23
best 13:10 60:11
better 9:17,23 36:2
Bev 42:14 44:5 44:23
Beverly 44:12 45:19
big 47:11
bill 3:22 4:1,2,19 5:10,17 8:21 9:3 18:12,18 18:18 19:3 30:25 31:6,8 31:14,25 32:3 32:10,12,16 38:4 54:21,25 55:6,8 59:14
binary 40:1
birth 34:3
Bishop 5:21,22 5:24 6:4,23,25 7:4,14,19,20 7:21,23 8:3 20:4,5 22:7,9 22:14,22,23,24 23:4,9,13,22 24:1,6,17,21 24:25 25:7 37:3
bit 11:16 23:8
black 51:17 52:16 53:18,21 53:23 54:1,3
blame 47:22,22 47:23
blaming 46:25
blissfully 8:3
block 50:19 51:13
Blue 50:12 55:12,13,15,17 59:6
Blue's 50:21
board 56:11,12 56:14
Bob 41:8
body 5:24 6:9 15:22 34:23,24 37:8 38:15 40:24 49:19 52:8
bogeyman 47:21
Book 2:9
border 20:11,25 39:2
boundaries 36:10 53:2
boundary 53:17
boy 10:13
Bragg 19:12 20:1,10,11,13 20:16,25 21:2 21:4 25:5,15 27:19,23 28:11 28:13 29:2,16 30:3,8,17,18
breaking 41:19
brief 58:1
bring 48:7
broad 28:6
broken 11:2
brothers 34:2
brought 8:12
Brown 12:5,6,10 12:22 13:14,15 13:20 14:3,5,7 28:22,23 29:2 29:7,11,15,21 29:22,23 30:2 30:13,14,16
Brunell 51:13
Buck 43:24
build 46:3
built 27:4
burden 50:3,8
Burg 44:20
Burr 43:11
Bush 38:16
business 3:11 55:10 58:16

C

C.R 55:21,24 56:19
calendar 3:12
Call 2:10
campaigned 47:18
candid 28:16
candidate 35:11 35:14 38:17 42:1 47:14 50:10,20 54:10
candidates 14:1 28:4 41:21,22 43:12 45:18 48:17 50:5
carefully 52:1
Carolina 1:1,3 1:13 32:19 34:8 38:15 39:1,7,13,19 40:2 41:25 42:6 46:1,13 47:9,13,17,18 48:8,10,14 50:24 52:24 57:11 58:8 59:17 60:2,21
Carolina's 47:5 47:25 50:1,6
carried 14:24,25 15:1 25:25 26:8 44:7 45:6
carry 43:10
carrying 26:10
case 15:17 21:13 35:16 47:19 49:4 53:16
cases 54:8
Caucus 51:17
cause 33:17
Cecil 41:18
certain 36:9
certainly 15:14 35:7,22,25 36:25
CERTIFICA... 60:1
certify 60:6,13
Chair 17:24
chaired 56:11
chairman 33:11
challenge 49:12 50:11
chamber 3:8 19:5 47:4 58:12
chambers 56:11
champions 58:8
change 5:4 10:20 21:21 31:21 46:20
changed 52:10
changes 9:10 31:19,23,24 46:7
changing 24:10
Chapter 2:9
character 57:7
Charlotte 37:6 37:11
Chauncy 58:22 59:3
choice 15:2 35:11,14 36:5 40:1 50:10,20 54:10
choices 36:2
chopped 38:24
Christ 2:19
church 55:22
cited 51:6
citizens 13:25
city 19:22
claim 10:14 48:20
claims 54:14
clarification 18:3 31:18
Clark 18:21,22 18:24 19:2,6,8 22:10,11,12,14 22:21 23:1,2 23:10,11,16,18 23:19,20,24 24:2,3,4,12,17 24:18,19,24 25:3 27:2,6,17 28:9,23,24,25 29:2,4,9,12,13 29:18,24,25 30:4
Clark's 25:16 27:19,25
clear 13:6 26:20 30:8 31:22 48:13
cleared 45:2
clearly 10:11 26:13 46:25
clerk 4:1,2,17,18 5:13 9:1,2 18:15 19:1,2 31:3,12,13 32:6 55:2 59:14
Clinton 14:21 14:24,25 43:18 44:8 47:17
close 2:2 46:2
closing 54:16
cluster 16:8,10 16:14,15,17,18 16:20 17:12 18:4,5 19:10 20:7 21:10
clustered 20:25
clustering 20:22
clusters 16:11 35:7
coastal 33:4
cohesively 50:17 54:10
colloquy 7:5
color 57:6
Columbus 44:18

44:18,23 45:1 45:3
come 2:1 3:11 8:19 10:8,22 15:11 19:16 27:7 31:19 32:13 36:3 55:11 57:7 58:16
comes 35:1 36:9
coming 26:10,24
commend 15:10
comments 50:21
commissioned 50:23
committee 8:2 10:7 11:2 17:17 22:16 25:14 34:12 52:20 53:7 59:15,18
committee's 10:10
committees 52:7
common 20:8,23 33:7
commonalities 9:19
communities 9:19 20:6,12 28:10
community 50:15,17,19 54:11
compact 4:25 14:18 21:23 35:9 36:7 50:15
compactness 9:11
compare 42:17
comparison 11:19
compatible 32:24
compete 12:2 46:5
competed 48:3
competing 45:25
competition 14:18 15:2
competitive 12:13,15 21:15 26:2,5,9,11,13 27:9 28:1 35:11,13,19,21 36:5 37:2,19 37:20 38:7 42:5,8,20,21 43:15 44:25 45:7,9,17,20 48:2,6
compilation 6:16 7:24
complain 38:7
complete 51:2
complied 52:12
complies 53:9 54:18
comply 40:10,11 40:22 49:24
complying 40:7 53:4
concept 26:12 26:22
concerned 13:7
concerns 10:9
concluded 59:19
conclusion 49:10
configuration 15:12 16:9
configurations 35:5
configured 16:17 25:2 27:25 28:10
conform 20:22 33:13
confusion 5:3
connecting 20:17
consequentially 49:20
conservative 33:1 47:6
consider 9:8 20:7 22:5 24:9 24:16 30:5 36:21 42:11 50:14
consideration 15:21 19:18 27:5
considerations 41:6 53:3
considered 15:21 34:18,23 34:23 52:1
considering 16:25 20:6
consistent 5:6 7:7
consistently 35:12
consists 19:11
constituents 28:6 56:2
constitution 36:12 39:10,13 39:25 40:2,3 48:10
constitutional 52:24
constructed 48:11
consultant 13:21
CONSULTING 1:23
contained 52:16
content 7:13 57:7
contentions 51:12
contiguity 52:23
continue 10:10 58:6
continued 46:21
continues 53:17
contradictory 53:3
contrary 11:2 11:14 51:12
control 39:21
Convention 56:16
conversation 6:15 34:11
conversations 6:19,21 7:11 7:12
Cook 32:14,16 32:18 46:22
Cooper 41:13,19 42:16,18,19,21 43:19,25 44:5 44:8,13,16 45:10,18,23
Cooper's 45:2
correct 2:25 18:7,8 23:6,15 24:24 29:10,18 30:3,4 34:13 36:19,20 60:11
corrected 49:17
counsel 60:13
counterparts 20:21
counties 32:23 33:6,7,14 38:23,24 39:2 39:5,9,13 40:7 40:15,21,23,25 41:1,2,4 42:5 42:11,13,13,15 42:16,18,18,19 42:21 46:1,4 47:25 48:3,12 54:20
country 28:14 40:17 41:16 57:8
county 2:5 11:1 12:11,13,17,25 17:14,14 19:24 20:10,19 28:15 29:3,6,8,10,16 29:17,20 30:3 30:6,9,11,17 30:19 32:19,20 33:1,11 36:11 37:1 39:3,6,11 39:22,24 40:1 42:9,24,25 43:1,13,14,15 43:17,21,22,23 44:2,3,4,8,10 44:11,15,17,18 44:19,24 45:3 45:6,7,8,10,12 45:13,15,16,17 46:6 48:12 49:22,22,25 50:6 52:24 53:14 55:23,25 60:3,6,20
couple 4:8 41:15
coupled 33:5
course 6:8 17:18 33:10 46:8,20
court 34:14,15 40:6 48:22,25 49:1,4,7,9,18 49:20 50:11 51:6,8,17 53:10,13,15 54:19 60:1
court's 49:15,24 52:1,2
courted 40:19
Courtesies 3:8
courts 13:24 17:21 26:25 33:14 36:24 37:20,21,23 39:24 52:13
Covington 51:5 52:2,8 54:8
create 13:21,24 35:19 36:4 40:14 41:3
created 6:16 37:11
creating 13:11
Creighton 6:7 13:9 21:9 24:22
criteria 10:11

14:23 17:17,18 17:19 20:4 21:8 34:11,12 50:22,22 51:24 52:15,21 53:5 53:8
critical 51:7
cultural 47:5
Cumberland 19:10,24 20:9 28:14 29:3,8,9 29:16,20 30:3 30:11,17 55:25
current 9:15
currently 7:25 16:10
cycle 45:22

D

dais 3:10
Dalton 42:15
dashboards 53:12 54:6
data 11:18 15:19 24:10,16 53:1 53:11
date 57:1,3
dates 39:9
Davis 3:7 57:24 58:1,3
Dawson 44:24
day 57:4,20,21 60:16
days 34:6 46:16 57:20
deal 15:15
dealing 57:11
dear 58:11
death 33:18 56:1
debate 5:7 8:22 10:1 11:8 12:3 13:12 14:8 15:24 17:2 18:9,20 25:8 25:14 27:11 28:20 30:22 31:7 32:1,11 32:16 33:20 34:5 38:1 54:23
Deborah 43:18
decade's 46:7
decided 26:10 30:10
decision 14:1 39:12 40:5,9 40:17,20,23 49:3,4,8,23 50:25 51:5,18 51:19
decisions 36:6 41:5 51:7
decreases 9:16 9:16
defects 54:19
defend 32:18
defendant's 51:12
deficiency 36:20
define 54:8
deliberate 15:22
Democrat 16:21 18:6 26:23 41:25 42:1 44:7 45:9 47:13 48:8,9
Democratic 12:12,14,16,24 13:3,22 21:20 33:11 36:1 38:17 39:20 41:22 46:18,19 46:23 47:14 48:1,4,15
Democrats 10:21 26:14 35:18 36:25 38:7,19 40:22 41:12 42:4,7 42:11 43:1,10 43:14 44:1,3 44:14,24 45:6 45:12,16,20,22 45:25 46:9,11 46:13,17,25 47:4,4,9,10,17 54:7
Department 39:12 49:14 50:2,8
depending 10:18 28:4
depends 37:5
depth 15:15
desegregation 56:13
designed 35:8
designing 34:22
desk 56:8
detail 50:12
determine 35:4
determined 51:8
determining 51:7
develop 52:3
developed 17:17
devices 2:4
DIAL 1:24
dialogue 6:14,21
different 11:3 15:7 16:24 39:9
differently 5:2 7:9 35:8
dilute 33:2
dilution 54:15
DIRECT 1:24
directed 24:13
direction 24:22 25:3 60:10
disappeared 42:2
discretion 33:15
discriminatory 49:12
discussion 5:7 8:22 10:1 11:8 12:3 13:12 14:8 15:24 17:2 18:9,20 25:8 27:11 28:20 30:22 31:7 32:1,11 33:19 34:6 37:25 54:22
dispense 2:25
disseminate 6:18
disseminated 8:13
distinct 41:25 48:8
distinguished 56:6,14
distributed 15:20
distribution 9:18
district 5:3,4,4,5 5:5 9:9,20,25 10:11,16,17 11:21,23 12:14 12:15 15:8 16:12 17:21 19:13,14,25 20:2,3,17 21:3 21:3,6,7,15,21 21:22,23,25 22:15,18,20 24:14,25 25:6 25:6,16,16,24 26:8,8,23 27:3 27:20,21,24 28:1,2,7,9 29:17,19 30:11 30:19 32:22,22 33:5 37:15 39:1,7 46:24 48:25 49:5,20 50:14,16 51:15 53:14 54:1
districting 51:23 52:15 53:16
districts 5:1 9:14,24 10:13 11:3 12:11,16 13:22,25 14:18 14:19,22,23 15:10 19:11 21:1,11,12 28:3 34:17,22 35:5,7,19,22 35:24 36:5,6,8 36:22 37:2,5,9 37:10,19 38:9 38:25 39:8,14 39:16,18 40:9 40:10,11 48:5 48:11,23 49:13 50:25 51:12,21 52:5,16,18 53:13,20,23,25 54:3,9 59:16
divide 41:2,4
divided 38:23,23 39:6 40:20,23 40:24
divides 41:1 54:20
document 6:20
documents 6:16 7:9,12,24
doing 9:8 52:15
doors 2:2
double-bunk 9:13 13:11
doubled-bunk... 41:7
doubts 28:6,8
Dr 6:7 21:9 24:22 55:21 56:3,19 57:4 58:22 59:3
drafted 34:25
drafting 34:21
draw 11:5 26:3 34:16 35:21 49:5 50:25 51:20 54:12
drawers 41:1
drawing 39:14 40:8 49:12 50:14 51:11 52:5,17,21,22
drawn 10:11 11:16 18:7 25:25 26:7 27:21 35:22 36:16 46:11 48:17 50:16

52:15
Dream 57:5
drew 10:15
drowned 33:1
Dukakis 47:15
duly 60:8
Dunyn 3:7

E

earlier 16:22
early 42:3 56:1
easier 47:22
easily 6:17
Easley 42:14,14 43:16 44:6,13 45:19
east 23:4 44:18
eastern 33:4
easy 4:25 47:20
Edition 31:22
Edwards 55:21 55:24 56:3,19 58:22 59:3
effect 23:23
efficiency 34:13
efforts 56:13
eight 10:18 44:22 45:7,8 53:20
either 30:5 35:18 40:1 54:18
elaborate 50:22
Elaine 44:7
elect 15:4 21:12 24:14 40:12 48:15 50:5,9 54:9
elected 21:17,20 22:1 37:8,13 38:14
electing 50:20
election 11:25 53:1 59:17
elections 11:17 17:1 38:8 48:2 48:7
electronic 2:4 5:14 18:16 31:4 32:7 55:4
embarked 38:19
embodies 6:20
embrace 36:3
eminently 40:18
empty 27:22
ended 41:6
endorsements 47:16
enforce 39:24
engrossed 55:7
entered 51:3
entertaining 20:14
entire 16:14 40:17
environmenta... 47:12
equal 40:12 52:23
equation 36:21
error 49:8,16
especially 9:24
essentially 34:4
establish 51:13
established 34:14 35:2 37:16
European 41:16
evening 56:18
everybody 12:2
evidence 51:14 51:25 52:4,9
evident 40:18
exactly 18:8
examined 2:24
example 41:6 43:14
examples 42:25
exception 11:22
exclusive 46:12
exercise 33:15
exhausted 31:20
exhaustive 51:2
exist 11:1
exists 50:15
expand 50:20
expect 37:23
expected 6:9
expert 50:23 51:8 52:3 54:5
explain 4:20 9:5 19:6 31:16
explanation 9:22
extend 8:14 27:2 29:5
extended 3:8
extends 30:8
extension 23:4 23:14
extent 21:15 24:13
eyeball 10:13,15

F

fact 11:22 15:20 17:16 19:20 20:25 21:17,25 26:6 30:10 34:12 39:5 40:3
factor 34:19,21 51:10,14 52:5 52:10,25
factors 50:13
failed 36:22
fails 18:18 31:6
fair 13:25 37:19
fairly 26:17
faith 49:11
fall 53:25
fallen 53:19
famous 57:4
far 13:7 14:17 14:18 20:15 47:11 54:20 57:8
favor 5:11 18:12 31:1 32:4 55:1 59:7
favorable 25:1
favors 26:21
Fayetteville 19:23 55:20,23 55:25
federal 40:4,8 54:18
fell 50:3
fewer 54:20,21
field 27:22
filed 39:23
finally 33:24
find 25:22 26:7 35:3 56:25
finding 49:10
first 14:15 19:17 22:19 38:13 47:3 50:21 57:21
five 5:12 18:14 31:2 32:5 53:25 55:2 58:13
flip 28:3
floor 3:19,23 4:2 10:5 11:12 14:14 25:12 27:16 30:14 31:21 32:17 38:5 55:16 56:24 57:18 58:2
focus 25:5
folks 21:5 33:8 41:23
follow-up 17:3,7 17:24 22:23 24:17 29:11,23
followed 52:14 52:23
following 40:20 53:17
Folwell 44:22
force 41:4 55:25
Ford 3:7
Forest 43:24 44:21
form 39:6 60:9
former 41:7 47:16 59:2
forms 39:9
forsake 2:11
Fort 19:12 20:1 20:10,11,13,16 20:25 21:2,4 25:5,15 27:19 27:23 28:11,13 29:2,15 30:2,8 30:17,18
forth 4:15,16 8:24 18:24 20:5 23:17,22 23:25 27:18 28:4,18 31:10 31:20 58:23 60:8
fortune 55:21
forward 8:25 10:8 14:16 18:25 31:11,19 53:7
found 2:10,25 35:6 54:19
four 18:5 35:23 38:25
Fourth 31:22
fracturing 39:4
frame 57:10
frank 28:12
frankly 39:20
Friday 2:24 50:12
friend 55:19
friends 58:11
front 9:9
full 12:11
fully 53:9 54:13
funeralized 55:20
furnish 6:12
further 5:7 8:21 10:1 11:8 12:3 13:12 14:8 15:24 17:2 18:9,20 23:9 23:18 24:1 25:8 27:11 28:20 30:22 31:7 32:1,11 33:19 37:25

54:22 55:10 57:12,13 58:15 58:16 60:13
future 21:13

G

gain 36:15
gains 36:18,18
Garrett 3:9
general 1:3 43:3 44:14 45:3 49:11 52:14 56:16
general's 42:20
generates 12:16
generation 57:3
gentleman 24:13
gentlemen 55:18
geographically 50:15
George 38:16
Georgia 39:2
gerrymander 12:17 36:14 37:23 38:9,12 38:21 41:10 42:22 48:14 49:2 51:8 53:9 54:13,17,18
gerrymandered 35:15 36:17 37:10 39:16 48:13
gerrymanderi... 15:6 16:23 39:4 46:8,8 47:1,20 48:20 57:12
gerrymanders 17:23 48:24 49:17 53:14
Gingles 50:13 50:21 51:10,14 52:4,10,25
give 13:4 15:13 30:10,12 35:16 58:13
given 27:4 37:6 37:20 52:2
gives 11:25 12:1
go 3:12 4:11 13:5 17:22 26:6 36:19 57:12
God 2:13
goes 20:18 41:11
going 4:8,10,23 4:24 8:14 21:6 25:1,15,21 26:15,16,21 35:2,22 48:6,7 56:12 58:9
good 15:9 26:23 33:17 37:19
Gore 38:17
gotten 11:5 37:4
governor 41:18 43:2,3,7,7,9,24 44:21 45:4,23
governor's 41:14,20 42:12 42:22 56:14
Graham 37:12 37:13
granted 3:6 46:12
great 15:14
greater 35:10
Greensboro 12:23,24
Greensboro's 53:17
Greenville 58:7
grew 55:23
grossly 39:16
grotesque 39:18
group 20:15,16
group's 50:9
grouping 33:14 40:14 52:24
groups 50:5
guess 10:14 13:20 14:4 24:12,15 25:14 34:2
guests 2:3,6
guidelines 11:2
Guilford 12:11 12:17,25 17:13 17:14 18:4 53:14
Gunn 16:17

H

half 6:22
happen 57:23
happened 14:3 42:23 46:25
happening 41:23
happy 33:8
hard 48:1
harmonized 40:4 53:4,8
Harris 54:8
head 46:18
headline 46:16 46:18
hear 38:7
heard 24:9 41:9
hearing 5:9 18:11 26:12 30:24 32:2 54:24 58:16
held 22:18
help 57:22
hereinbefore 60:7
high 58:13
Hilary 47:17
Hillary 43:18
Hise 3:18 4:4,7 4:10,14,15,18 4:20,22 9:7 10:3,4,6 11:14 12:22 13:10 15:13 25:10,11 25:13 31:9,10 31:13,15,17 52:20
Hise's 53:7
historically 42:25
Hoke 19:10 29:6 29:17 30:6,9 30:19
hold 20:8
Holder 49:22
home 27:3 44:10
hopeful 11:4
hopefully 58:3 58:10
Horner 57:14,15 57:17,19 58:4
horses 20:19
house 3:24 20:20,21,23 21:1 23:15 37:9 46:15,16 46:18 55:8 56:4,5 58:24 59:14,14,17
housing 20:14
hug 58:13
Hunt 42:12,13 42:17 44:12

I

idea 20:22
identify 16:9
ignore 10:10
ignores 10:23 41:15
illegal 19:17 36:18 37:22
ills 57:9
important 11:6 27:9 34:8 48:24 49:23 54:5 57:20
importantly 40:14
improper 36:18
improved 15:12
in-common 20:12
incidentally 52:16 53:15
include 32:22
including 48:23 54:1
incumbency 17:16 35:1 36:15 53:1
incumbent 11:21 37:17
incumbents 9:13 11:25 13:11 14:2 18:5 36:15
indicated 5:19 21:24
individuals 17:12
information 6:7 6:14 7:24 13:9 52:19
inoperative 49:21
insignificance 33:3
instruction 43:4 43:6
insurance 43:9
intend 6:11 7:4 23:22
intended 23:24 38:21
intent 12:17,21 13:4,8,8,23,24 49:12
interest 20:6 22:15 28:11 33:2,7
interested 60:14
interesting 25:23
interests 20:7,12 20:13,23 47:11
internally 53:3
interpretation 49:7
inviable 52:22 53:5
Iredell 38:24
ironic 56:25
Isaiah 2:9
issue 13:22 19:15 20:1

21:4 26:25
issues 25:18

J

Jackson 3:7
Jamestown 10:25
Jeff 3:7
Jesus 2:18
Jim 3:7 42:12,13 42:17 44:12
job 9:24 13:10
John 47:15
Johnson 44:21
Josh 43:20 44:16
journal 2:24 3:1 3:3
judgement 33:16
judges 4:24
judging 57:6
Justice 39:12 49:13 50:2,7
justified 51:11
justify 52:5

K

Karen 1:22 3:8 60:5,19
keep 22:17 40:7
keeping 40:14 47:1
keeps 9:12,13
kept 39:14
Kerry 47:15
King 57:4
knew 37:14
Knightdale 56:3
know 4:6 10:7 13:6 14:20,21 17:19 25:4 30:16 34:1 36:23 37:3,12 57:1
knowing 24:25 55:21
knowledge 51:2 60:11
known 38:22

L

labor 43:4,6,8 47:11
Ladies 55:17
laid 40:6,9
Lake 29:4
landmark 40:5
late 56:18 58:21
law 40:4,8 49:9 49:16 54:19
lawsuit 39:23
layout 20:9
Leader 41:8
leading 2:4 33:1
leaning 21:21
leaves 3:5
Lee 5:15
left 47:11
leg 35:17
legislative 15:8 39:14 40:8 46:3,14 48:2,6 48:11,21 49:19 51:6,6,16 56:10
legislature 40:16 49:3 50:13,23
legislature's 51:18,19,22
Let's 26:22 42:24
Lewis 59:15
liberal 32:25
liberalism 33:2
Liberals 38:9
libertarian 41:17
Lichtman 54:7
lieutenant 43:2 43:7,24 44:20
life 56:15
light 51:16,21
limit 50:4
limits 50:9
line 27:21
lines 23:8 46:24 48:12,16
linked 21:2
listen 8:14
litigation 52:8
little 9:11 11:16 23:8 33:7,15 58:10,12
living 28:12
lobby 47:12
local 56:11
located 25:20
location 23:14
Lon 41:17
look 10:13 11:18 12:22 13:2 14:22 16:7,8 20:9,23 25:20 25:24 26:18 28:17 30:6 34:2,21 56:7
looked 20:20 25:5
looking 4:24 10:19 12:15 23:25 26:15
Lord 2:9,12,16 2:16,18
losing 47:24
losses 46:21
lost 37:4 42:17 45:10,14 46:13
lot 10:13 20:12 34:5,5
Lowe's 5:2

M

Madison 42:25 43:1,10,13
main 25:5
major 19:11 34:10 55:24
majority 29:7,9 34:24 44:4 46:4,10 50:18 51:21 52:16
majority/min... 17:20 34:17 50:16
making 20:18
Malcolm 37:12 37:13,14
man 2:11 39:21
map 5:6,6 11:16 12:15 13:7,11 16:8 29:21 30:2 32:20,21 33:12 35:23 36:13 38:22 40:19,21,24,25 41:1,8,10,24 46:11 48:16,22 48:23 49:1 52:9,21,22 53:8,23,25 54:14,16,17,20
maps 4:25 10:14 35:15,21 36:16 38:8 47:22 49:20 50:3 51:6
march 57:4
margin 14:25
marginally 14:25
Marshall 44:7
Martin 32:22
materials 8:11 8:13
matter 19:20 26:6 30:9
McCrory 25:25 26:4 41:13,19 44:20
McDowell 39:3
McInnis 33:22 34:1
McKissick 4:7 5:25 6:1,2,4,13 7:1,3,6,15,16 7:18,23 8:4,5 14:10,11,13,15 16:2,4,5,7,11 16:14 17:6,8,9 17:11,15,25 18:1,8 27:13 27:15,17 33:23 33:23,24 34:1 53:11 56:20,21 56:23,25
McKissock 7:2
means 57:2 60:9
measure 38:21
measured 30:7
mechanical 51:23
Mecklenburg 36:25
media 22:15 38:10
members 2:2,3 2:5 3:5,11 4:6 4:22 5:19 8:6 8:10,20,20 10:6 15:20 25:13 31:18 37:8 38:6 52:8 58:3 59:17
members' 53:12
memorandum 7:10
memory 56:18 58:21 59:2
men 58:10
mention 22:3 46:14 55:24
mercy 2:13
Meredith 21:16 21:19 22:18 28:5
Meredith's 25:16
merely 27:10
message 3:24 55:8 59:14
messages 58:24
method 40:7
Michael 47:14
midterms 46:17
Mike 42:13,14 43:16 44:5,12 45:19
military 26:16 26:18,19

mind 36:17
mindful 51:22
mine 55:19
minority 49:5 50:4,9,15,17 50:19 51:11 54:11
minority/ 51:20
minus 26:4
mischief 41:3
missed 34:11 35:20
model 26:2
moderate 47:6
modification 19:12 23:7
modified 23:5
modify 19:10
moment 4:5 19:14
Mondale 47:15
Monday 1:14
motion 2:22 3:14,15 58:19 59:1
move 2:25 3:17 3:21 19:12 20:2 21:5 26:16 27:6 58:20
moved 25:22 56:1
movement 26:1
moves 4:18 9:2 19:2 23:7 31:13 32:21
multiple 40:13
municipal 53:2 53:17
municipalities 10:24 11:1,15 19:19,23 36:9
municipality 19:22

N

name 56:8
named 17:13 39:22
national 42:1 46:19 47:10,11 47:14 48:9
nationally 46:13 46:23
NC 38:22 39:17
near 2:10
nearly 43:17
necessarily 28:14
negated 37:24
negative 5:17 18:18 31:6 32:9 55:6
neither 2:15 60:13
never 13:22
new 23:14 27:3 32:21 46:24 48:20 49:18 53:25,25 54:1 54:2,14
newest 24:11
newly 16:16
News 46:16
Newton 43:25
nine 39:2 48:23 52:20 53:13
nonpartisan 46:22
norm 2:5 39:19
north 1:1,3,13 32:19 33:6 34:8 38:15,25 39:7,13,19 40:2 41:25 42:5 46:1,12 47:5,9,13,17 47:18,25 48:8 48:10,14 49:25 50:6,24 52:23 57:11 58:7,7 59:17 60:2,21
Northampton 32:23
northern 30:6
Notary 60:1,5 60:20,22
note 57:19 58:4
notice 21:22
notices 55:9,10 57:13 58:15
Nowadays 47:15
number 24:6 28:15,16 41:12 41:20 42:6,11
numbered 5:2
numbers 5:5 25:20 50:19
nutshell 22:3

O

o'clock 8:15,16
Obama 47:16
objected 51:18 51:19
objection 3:3,6 3:20,25
observation 55:19
Observer 46:16
obvious 42:24
occasional 46:2
occasionally 53:2
occur 53:15
occurred 6:19 31:23
occurrence 39:5
offer 7:4
offered 4:9 22:20 23:5 24:11
okay 14:7
Once 4:11
one-person 51:24
one-vote 51:24
ones 58:12
open 35:23,25
opportunity 10:8 11:25 12:2 13:4 15:4 35:10,20 36:14 36:24 37:20 50:4,9
opposed 5:11 18:13 19:13 20:2,17 21:3 31:1 32:4 40:21 55:1 59:9
order 2:1 8:19 49:24 52:1 53:10
ordered 3:20,25 40:19
original 5:1 17:20 39:10
outcome 15:7 16:25 60:14
outperformed 43:25
overwhelming 44:4

P

P 6:3 32:8
p.m 1:14 8:8,9 8:17,18 58:25 59:6,19
packages 15:18
Pamlico 2:5
pardon 2:14
part 15:21 16:19 17:13,14 27:22 33:4 36:21 37:8
particular 14:22 16:18,20 17:12 19:9,17 20:16 22:5 35:16
particularly 51:25
parties 16:10 46:23
parties' 48:17
partisan 38:22
parts 28:13
party 26:17,19 33:11 35:16,17 37:9 39:20 46:19,19 48:1 48:15 60:14
passage 3:22 5:10 18:12 30:25 32:3 54:25
passed 39:22 55:22
passes 5:17 32:10 55:6
Pat 25:25 26:3 41:13 44:20
Pate 2:21,23 32:13 33:19,24 37:25 38:5 54:22 55:5,13 55:16 56:21,24 57:13,15,18,24 58:2,15 59:1,9 59:11
pause 59:13
Pennsylvania 58:6
people 28:12 35:6,13 36:3 37:6 41:9 57:3 57:6
percent 9:16,17 9:17 14:25 26:8,10,11 29:19 37:4,15 38:17,18 41:14 41:18 43:11,12 43:13,17,18,19 43:19,20,23,24 44:1,6,8,9,14 44:16,19,19,20 44:21,22,23,24 44:25 45:1,2,3 45:5,12,13,13 45:18,19,19,20 45:22,23,24 46:23 49:7 51:1,11,20 53:18,19,21,22 53:24,25 54:2 54:4
percentage 26:1 26:1

percentages 13:3
Perdue 42:15 44:5,12,23 45:19
performed 45:23
Person 44:3,4
personage 42:1
personal 55:15 56:23 57:17
persuasively 15:5
pick 27:3,7 35:11,14
picked 38:10
pieces 39:1
Piedmont 44:3
place 6:21 16:23 60:7
placed 53:12
places 32:24
plaintiff 50:10
plaintiffs 52:7 54:7
plan 3:23 4:3 8:1,2 14:17 17:16,20 19:18 19:20,24 20:21 20:23 21:1,24 28:8 31:22 32:24 33:2 34:3 38:23 39:17 48:21 50:9 51:7 53:6 54:12
plans 34:7,24 50:1,7
plate 21:19
platform 48:17
please 2:3,6,16 32:13 57:23
plus 26:5
pod 32:25 33:9 33:13,16
pods 33:15
point 12:11 25:17 26:1,1 33:3 55:15 56:23
points 10:18 38:16 45:10,23
polarized 50:24 51:10
polarizing 34:20
policy 33:13 51:22
political 11:6 16:10 24:9,16 33:18 36:4 41:6,10,25 46:22 48:8,14 48:19 54:17
politically 32:20
politicians 15:4
politics 47:24
polls 35:12
population 9:18 12:23 29:19 30:12 37:16 40:12 52:23 53:18 54:2
populations 49:6 51:1 52:17 53:21,24 54:3
portion 16:16,18 30:6,9
positions 36:16
positive 57:19 58:4
possible 5:25 21:12 36:10
post-Shelby 50:6
potential 11:4 28:3 51:15 54:14
power 2:18 10:20 47:21
powerful 47:10
pray 2:16
prayer 2:4
pre-cleared 49:13
precedents 49:19
precinct 24:10
precincts 36:7 54:21
preclearance 50:2,8
predicted 53:15
predominance 51:25
predominant 34:19
predominated 52:17
preempted 24:6
prefer 13:6
preferred 8:2 54:10
prepared 1:22 6:7
present 51:11 52:5,10
presented 17:20 37:1 52:9
preserve 38:21
president 2:7,23 3:16,17,21 4:22 5:21 7:14 7:15 9:6 10:6 11:13 12:19 14:10 18:21 19:8 22:24 25:13 31:17 38:3,16 43:11 43:16,23 45:21 47:16 55:12,17 56:16,17,20 57:14 58:20
presidential 17:1 47:14
pretty 12:12 22:3 48:13
prevail 28:7
previous 5:6 22:19 54:14,20
previously 5:19 16:23 23:6 25:2,25 26:7 53:20
primary 41:7
principles 41:5 52:22 53:10,16
prior 27:4 39:6 49:25
prioritizing 51:22
priority 17:19
privilege 55:15 56:23 57:17
pro-business 47:7
pro-education 47:7
pro-gun 47:7
pro-life 47:8
probably 26:16 28:13 39:19,20
problems 46:23
proceed 4:13
proceeding 8:8 8:9,17,18 59:13,19 60:6 60:8,15
PROCEEDIN... 1:8
process 31:23 40:14 47:22 51:4
prominent 44:15
promptly 38:19
proportional 41:16
proposed 9:9,10 16:8 20:21 21:1 32:19 33:9,12,16 38:8 40:25 41:9 48:5 50:3 52:9,21
prospectus 6:6 6:13
protection 53:1
protects 21:24
prove 50:3 51:9 51:10 52:25
proven 21:19
provide 6:9
provided 7:6 28:7
provides 51:24
proving 50:8
provision 39:13 40:2
provisions 36:11 39:24 40:16
public 43:3,6 52:7 60:5,20
publicly 38:11
purpose 3:13 4:14 5:22 6:23 7:17 8:23 10:3 10:16 11:10 12:5 13:14 14:12 16:1 17:4 18:22 22:7 25:10 27:13 28:22 31:9 32:14 33:25 38:2 56:21 57:15,24
purposes 18:3 31:18
pursuant 49:14
put 6:17 15:18 20:5 28:11 29:16 30:18 53:6
putting 47:1

Q

quarter 46:5
question 5:9,25 6:25 7:19 12:6 13:15,17 14:6 14:20 16:3 17:3,24 18:11 22:9,19,25 23:9,18 24:1 28:23 30:24 32:2 54:24
questions 6:8 19:16 22:4 24:7
quick 55:19

quit 33:10
quite 28:12,15 56:25
quote 22:16 46:19 49:8,9 49:15 51:12,21 52:18 54:9
quoting 52:13

R

R 58:22 59:3
Rabon 3:13,14 3:16,21
race 10:12,19,19 19:18 26:6 27:1 34:15,17 34:18,20 35:11 36:21 41:14,20 42:20,22 43:5 43:11,15,16 44:13 45:2,4 45:17,21 46:3 50:5,14 52:6 52:17 54:12
races 15:8 35:13 42:5,9,12 43:2 43:4 44:5,15 44:25 45:8,15
racial 15:6 16:23 17:23 25:18 37:10,22 48:23 49:1,16 51:8,23,25 53:1,9,13 54:13,17 57:11
racially 34:20 36:17 50:24 51:9
raise 25:17,18 25:19 26:25
Raleigh 1:13 56:2
ran 37:14 43:19 47:3
Randolph 18:4
range 28:6 54:1
ranging 53:21
ranked 17:18
rarely 44:11
reaching 49:10
read 2:8 4:1,17 9:1 19:1 22:14 31:12
reading 3:1,22 3:23 4:3 8:21 54:25 55:7
realign 59:16
realize 4:23
really 6:20 14:17 15:3 17:22 21:2 25:22 28:18 35:1,20 46:6 47:23
reason 27:20 33:21 55:13
reasonable 37:19
reasons 26:24
recall 24:8
receipt 58:24
recess 4:12 5:20 8:7,7,14,15
recessed 8:8,17
recesses 5:24
recognized 2:21 4:20 9:4 19:6 31:15 33:25 58:18
recollections 7:8
recommend 22:4
reconfiguring 27:24
reconvene 58:24 59:4
reconvened 8:9 8:18
record 5:13 6:18 7:25 15:17,17 15:19 18:15 19:4 31:3 32:6 51:3 55:3
recorded 60:8
redistricting 3:23 4:3 8:1 31:22 32:20 34:12 38:20 41:3,5 48:21 50:1,7 51:4 52:7,14,20 53:6,10 59:18
redrawing 36:21
redrawn 11:24
reduced 60:9
referred 6:6 59:18
referring 6:11
reflect 15:19 17:22 19:4
reflection 15:14
registered 48:4
regrets 46:20
reject 27:10
rejection 52:2
relates 28:10
relatively 39:5
remains 21:15
remedies 54:13 54:19
remember 6:11
reminded 57:10
rendered 49:21
repeated 52:6
Report 46:22
REPORTER 60:1
Reporting 3:9
reports 51:9,13 52:3 54:5
represent 17:14
representation 17:13 41:16
Representatives 46:15 56:4 59:15,18
representing 16:18,19
represents 16:16
Republican 13:1 21:12,16,25 24:15,23 25:1 26:4,17 35:17 35:25 41:8,21 43:12 48:5,15
Republicans 16:21 18:6 22:17 26:21 38:9,14 41:11 43:22 44:11 46:9
requested 3:5 15:18 53:12
requests 52:6
require 21:6 33:14
required 40:11 49:5
requirements 39:8 52:24
requires 48:10
requiring 39:13 40:9
reside 19:25
respect 26:20 36:10
respected 17:16 49:16
response 7:7 59:10
responsibility 37:24 47:24
responsible 57:22
responsibly 37:23
rests 50:10
result 36:16 46:7,24
resulted 7:12 49:16
results 15:9 40:17
return 2:12 8:20
Reverend 55:21 56:19 58:22 59:3
review 36:25
reviewed 53:11
right 9:20 20:24 24:1 34:7 42:6
Rights 39:15 40:3,10,11 49:5,14,21 54:15
rise 25:10 32:18 55:18
Robeson 45:12 45:13,15
Robinson 6:6 8:23,24 9:2,4,6 11:10,11,13 12:6,7,8,10,19 12:21 13:16,18 13:23 14:16 15:10 16:1,2,7 16:13 17:3,4,6 17:11,24 18:3
Roche 1:22 3:9 60:5,19
Rockingham 44:10,11,15,17
room 57:2
Ross 43:18 44:8
roughly 40:12
row 47:2
Roy 41:13 42:16 42:18,19,20 43:19,25 44:5 44:13,16 45:2 45:10,18
RUFFIN 1:23
rule 21:10 58:23
ruled 37:21 48:25 49:7 53:13
rules 3:17
ruling 48:22 49:15 51:17
run 4:11 12:1 38:11
running 28:5,5 35:3,4,6 39:2 47:5 48:18
runs 4:11 20:18
rural 20:19 47:18
ruse 26:15,22

rush 47:15
Rutherford 43:22,23 44:2

S

Sampson 38:24 45:6,6
Sanderson 2:5,7
save 24:8 51:24
Savior 2:18
saw 15:8 22:16
sayeth 2:15
saying 13:20
says 2:9 11:14 46:22
scheme 38:20
school 56:11,12 57:21
scrambling 58:9
Scripture 2:8
sea 33:2
seat 36:1 46:7
seats 2:3 8:20 12:2 35:23 41:12 46:14 56:7,9
second 3:23 4:3
secondary 53:2
seconded 59:6
secondly 19:18
seconds 5:12 18:14 31:2 32:5 55:2
secretary 43:6
Section 49:14,21 50:1 54:15
see 7:18 10:8,9 19:17 20:10,24 22:2 25:21 26:21,24 35:17 37:18 39:15,16 54:6 56:8
seeing 10:22 14:16
Seek 2:9
seeking 49:23
seen 14:23 15:7 16:24 36:13 47:13
SEN 2:1,7,21,23 3:3,14,15,16 3:20,21,25 4:4 4:15,16,22 5:7 5:15,21,22,24 6:1,2,3,4,13,23 6:25 7:2,3,4,6 7:14,15,16,18 7:20,21,22,23 8:3,5,6,10,19 8:24,25 9:4,6 10:1,4,5,6 11:8 11:11,12,13 12:3,6,7,8,9,10 12:19,20,21 13:12,15,16,18 13:19,20,23 14:3,5,7,8,10 14:11,13,14,15 15:24 16:2,4,5 16:6,7,11,13 16:14 17:2,3,4 17:6,8,9,10,11 17:15,24,25 18:1,2,3,8,9,21 18:22,24,25 19:4,8 22:7,9 22:11,12,13,14 22:21,22,23,24 23:1,2,3,4,9,10 23:11,12,13,16 23:18,19,20,21 23:22,24 24:1 24:3,4,5,6,12 24:17,18,19,20 24:21,24,25 25:3,7,8,11,12 25:13 27:11,15 27:16,17 28:20 28:23,24,25 29:1,2,4,7,9,11 29:12,13,14,15 29:18,21,22,23 29:24,25 30:1 30:2,4,13,14 30:16,22 31:5 31:10,11,15,17 32:1,8,14,16 32:17,18 33:19 33:23,24 34:1 37:25 38:3,5,6 54:22 55:5,12 55:13,15,16,17 56:20,21,23,24 56:25 57:13,14 57:15,17,18,19 57:24 58:1,2,3 58:15,20 59:1 59:9,11
Senate 1:1 2:1,4 2:20 3:12,22 3:22 4:1,2,23 5:9,10 8:7,15 8:19,21 9:9,20 12:16 13:22 18:11,12,18 19:11,13,13,21 19:25 20:2,3 20:17 21:3,3,6 21:7,11,11,14 21:22,24 22:17 24:14 25:6,6 29:19 30:11,24 30:25 31:8,18 31:21 32:3,3 32:10,11,19 33:10,12,13 34:8 38:6,8,14 38:20,23,25 39:7,8,17,21 40:19,21,24,25 41:7,10,13,21 43:5,9 46:10 46:15 47:3 48:22 54:24,25 55:6,11,18 56:5,6 58:17 58:21,23 59:1 59:8,10,11
senator 2:5,21 3:13,18 4:4,7,7 4:10,14,18,20 5:2,15,22,25 6:1,4,5,6,23,25 7:2,16,18,20 7:23 8:4,23 9:2 9:4,7 10:3,17 11:10,14 12:5 12:6,7,10,21 12:22 13:9,14 13:16 14:5,11 14:16 15:10,12 16:1,2,4,7,15 16:17,19 17:4 17:6,8,11,25 18:22 19:2,5,6 20:5 21:16,19 22:7,9,11,14 22:23 23:1,10 23:19 24:2,3 24:17,18 25:10 25:15,16 27:2 27:6,13,17,19 27:25 28:5,9 28:22,23,24 29:2,12,22,24 30:14 31:9,13 31:15 32:13,14 33:21,22,24 34:1 37:3 38:2 39:11 40:13 43:11 44:19 50:12,21 52:19 53:7,11 55:13 55:16 56:19,21 57:15,24 58:2 58:4,18,22 59:2,4,6,6
Senator's 9:24
senators 3:6 18:5 19:9 40:13 48:15
send 4:15,16 8:24,25 18:24 18:25 23:17,22 23:25 31:10,11 31:20
sense 27:18,23 38:11
sent 3:23 55:8
separate 9:14 48:9
separated 34:2
sergeant 2:2 3:10
serve 38:15
served 56:3,4,5 56:5,13,15
Services 3:9
serving 38:13 56:10
session 1:1 6:10
set 7:9,12 34:12 49:18 58:23 60:8
sets 28:18
setting 27:18
seven 45:7
severe 38:21 39:4
share 20:13 58:8
shared 47:5
sharp 21:16
shave 10:18
Shaw 41:8
Shelby 49:22,22 49:25
shift 26:23
shifts 46:6
short 8:10 58:5
showing 35:23
shows 35:12
sides 36:4
signals 46:20
significant 34:9
silence 2:3
similar 10:14
simplify 49:25
simply 11:7 13:4 41:2
single 35:16 40:12 43:10
sir 22:20 29:10 33:25
sit 56:7
sitting 34:13
situated 35:9
situation 32:21
six 45:8
six-county 32:25
skin 57:7

slew 43:1
slight 23:7
Smaller 38:23
solely 10:17
somewhat 28:1
sorry 29:23 33:22 51:19
sort 6:9 39:16 41:3
sorts 39:18
Southeast 58:7
southern 20:11 20:24
speak 10:4 11:11 14:13 25:11 27:15 30:13,15 34:3 38:4
speaker 25:18
speakers 8:14
special 3:24 47:10 55:8
specific 9:12,23 40:7
speech 57:5
spite 52:6
split 11:15,15 19:19,22
splits 10:24,25 54:20
splitting 10:23 36:7
spoke 50:12
spoken 41:24
sporting 20:14
Spring 29:4
squeaking 46:2
SRN-2 16:8
staff 3:18
stance 26:17,19
stand 2:6 3:1
standard 58:23
stands 3:4 8:7 8:15 59:12
state 3:15 25:22 35:13,15 36:11 38:8,20 39:7 39:15,21,24,25 39:25 40:3,6 40:19,21,24,25 41:13,21 42:23 46:4,10 47:3 48:3,7,13,22 50:3 54:18 56:16 57:8,21 58:7 60:2,6
state's 39:10
stated 59:4
statement 11:6 26:13
States 50:2
statewide 42:5,8 43:1,10,12,15 44:4,25 45:7 45:15,17,21 46:3
statistical 15:18
Stein 43:20 44:16
stenotype 60:9
step 4:4
Stephenson 39:22,23 40:5 40:9,20,23
stipulations 58:23 59:4
stop 9:20
straight 3:12
strategy 46:2
stretched 39:1
Strickland 49:4 49:8
striking 51:5
strong 26:17 51:13,25 52:4
strongest 40:15
strongly 14:24 32:25 51:17,19 52:12
struck 48:22
struggles 48:15
studies 50:24 51:3
study 34:20
studying 15:11
subject 50:1,7 58:22 59:3
submitted 8:1 19:20 54:6
substance 6:19 7:10
substantial 23:8
substantive 31:24
substitute 59:15
successfully 53:7
sufficient 50:19
sufficiently 51:9
suggested 15:13
summarized 7:13
summarizes 7:10
Summerfield 10:25
superintendant 43:3
superintendent 43:5,8 44:21
supervision 60:10
support 28:19 31:24 50:25 58:7
supporting 22:5 26:18
Supreme 40:6 48:21 49:1,4 49:18,20
sure 21:13,14,19 22:21 23:2 24:14 27:8 28:16,25 30:19
survey 35:2
suspended 3:17
sustaining 20:14
swept 47:21
system 40:8 41:17

T

tabulation 36:8
tags 56:7
take 2:3 4:12 5:19 8:6 11:22 21:18 26:22 29:15 42:24 46:10 47:23
taken 6:21 35:3 60:7
takes 30:18
talked 9:15 57:6
talking 13:21
target 11:21 51:20
targeted 10:17 11:24
targets 11:23 51:23
teacher 57:23
teen 55:22
tell 10:12 57:23
tends 13:1
terms 9:13,18 9:24 11:18,19 13:2,10 14:1 15:9 17:13 34:7,21 56:6
Terrell 45:16,17
test 10:13
thank 2:7,23 3:16 4:22 6:4 7:14 8:5 9:6 10:6 11:13 14:15 15:23 19:8 22:5,24 25:7,13 27:17 31:17 38:3,6 55:17 57:23 58:3,13,20
theme 38:10
thing 6:14,17 8:4 15:16 27:22 33:17 34:4 35:12 37:18 57:22 58:11
things 9:12,15 22:2 36:25 41:15
think 7:6 9:23 10:7 12:15 15:9,12 25:20 25:24 26:18,20 27:9 28:17 29:3,15 30:16 30:17,20 34:10 35:20 36:22 42:3 46:6 48:12,24 56:8
third 3:22 8:21 50:22 51:10,14 52:4,10,25 54:25 55:7
thought 15:13 24:7
thoughts 2:12 2:14,15,17,17
three 11:15 16:21 18:6 35:25 45:14 50:17 56:5
thrust 19:12
ticket 44:1
tie 41:20
tied 41:14
ties 41:19
Tillman 16:15
time 7:5 21:19 21:20 24:8 36:14 46:7 57:9 59:5 60:7
times 56:12
title 31:21
today 3:19 6:10 17:21 27:25 32:18 35:23 36:13 41:1 47:9 48:19 50:6 55:20 56:25 57:5,20 58:9
told 20:3 21:14
tonight 57:10
top 30:9
top-of-the-tic... 45:14
topography 35:24

total 27:18
touch 47:24
tough 57:20
tradition 53:10
traditional 41:5 52:15 53:16
training 29:5 30:5,8,10
transcript 1:8 60:12
treasurer 43:8 44:22
trend 46:12
Trial 49:7
trip 58:6
troops 20:14
true 51:20 60:11
truly 38:12
Trump 14:21 15:1 26:6,7,10 37:3 43:11,23 44:19
truth 48:1
try 10:19 36:9 36:20
trying 4:25 8:13 13:21 34:13
Tuesday 58:25 59:5
tumultuous 56:12
turned 14:3
twice 44:12,12 44:13
two 9:12 10:14 10:25 12:10,16 13:21 15:1 21:1,10 41:20 44:15 46:16 50:16,21,23 54:2
type 6:17 7:24 42:1 48:9
typically 50:18

U

U.S 39:12 43:5,9 46:14,15,17 48:21 49:4,18
unaddressed 52:11
unconstitutio... 37:22 53:20
unconstitutio... 34:16
understand 10:24 13:3 21:9 24:21 33:12 47:20 49:23
understanding 4:6 8:11 36:11
understood 6:8 7:8 25:7 38:11
undue 23:14
unfairly 50:4
unfortunate 36:23
unfortunately 34:10 36:13
uninvolved 8:3
unions 47:11
United 50:2
University 56:14
unrighteous 2:11
untenable 32:21
unwritten 21:9
urge 54:21
urging 33:10
use 20:4 26:15 26:22 52:21

V

valid 28:17
values 47:5
Van 3:7
Vance 32:23
VAP 9:15
verses 2:8
version 21:23 23:5 24:11
versus 49:22 51:17
viable 37:1,1 46:1
violated 39:14
Voices 46:19
vote 5:11,12,13 5:14 11:7 12:23 13:5 18:13,14,15,16 28:13,14 31:1 31:2,3,4 32:4,5 32:6,7 37:4,6 41:14,18 44:2 54:21 55:1,1,3 55:4
voted 5:16 16:25 18:17 31:5 32:8 38:15 55:5,6
voter 36:8
voters 13:4 15:2 15:3 35:10 36:5,6 47:6,25 48:4,5
votes 41:22 43:20 50:17,18
voting 5:13 12:25 13:1,25 18:15 29:19 31:3 32:5 34:20 37:16 39:15 40:3,10 40:11 49:5,6 49:14,21 50:24 51:10 53:18,21 53:24 54:2,3 54:11,15 55:2
VTDs 20:11,16 20:24

W

Wade 9:25 16:19
Wade's 10:17
waiting 4:12 8:11
Wake 60:3,20
Walter 42:15 44:24 47:15
wander 33:17
want 13:5 15:3,3 15:10 19:15 20:2 21:13,14 22:2 27:7,17 28:11 30:20 31:20 35:13,14 35:15,17 37:18 50:22 55:24 58:8
wanted 22:17 55:18
wants 27:7
Warren 32:23
Washington 57:4
wasn't 47:19
way 2:11 14:4 16:25 17:19,19 19:16 27:21,24 28:10 30:8 34:16 35:10,18 35:21 36:3,19 36:19 48:16 57:22 60:14
ways 2:15,15,16 2:17
we'll 3:12 4:11 4:13
we're 4:9,23,25 8:13,14 10:22 20:6,18 26:15 26:16,21 31:22 48:19,20 57:10 58:9
we've 26:9,12 27:5 31:20 34:5,5 35:20 36:13 37:24 57:7 58:9
Wednesday 58:11
week 6:22 7:5,7 9:7,22 14:20 34:6
weekend 15:14 58:5
well-lived 56:15
went 15:15 44:12,19,20
weren't 35:6
Wesley 22:18
west 33:6 42:25
western 38:25
whatsoever 27:23 28:8
white 46:15 50:18
wicked 2:11
wife 33:9
win 24:23 26:14 46:2
wind 31:19
winning 44:1
wins 42:8,9
wiped 46:17
wise 29:15
won 14:21 37:9 37:16 42:4,11 42:12,13,14,14 42:15,16,16,18 42:19,21 43:1 43:2,4,5,8,11 43:11,15,17,18 43:18,19,24 44:3,8,9,11,16 44:16,23 45:3 45:4,8,10,16 45:18,20
word 38:12
work 15:11 58:10
working 24:13 36:4
worse 45:23
wouldn't 47:13
wound 39:1
written 3:2,4 60:9
wrong 36:20 37:22
WWW.RUFF... 1:25

X

Y

y'all 30:10

ye 2:10
yeah 24:15
year 37:7 38:13 38:15
years 33:5,10,18 44:23 55:22 56:3 57:5
yield 6:1,2 7:2,3 7:20 12:7 13:16 16:4 17:8,9,25 22:11,12 23:1 23:10,11,19,20 24:3,4,18,19 28:24 29:12,13 29:24,25
yields 6:3 7:22 12:9 13:19 16:6 17:10 18:2 22:13 23:3,12,21 24:5,20 29:1 29:14 30:1
young 58:10

Z

0

1

1 32:22
1.3 14:25
1.7 26:8
10 31:16 32:2,3 32:9 41:2
100 46:4 47:25 48:3
12 18:17 31:5 40:23 41:1
13 38:16
15 38:14 55:6 56:7,9
150 33:5
16 40:20
17 45:10 46:22 56:2
1776 39:10
19 19:11,14,25 20:3,17 21:3 21:15,25 22:18 24:14 25:6,24 40:24
1963 57:3
1981 39:12
1982 39:6
1990s 42:3 44:10
1992 42:6,12,12
1996 42:13,18
1C 38:23 39:17

2

2 25:25 26:4 41:18 54:15 58:25 59:6
2.5 26:1,5
2.7 26:11
20 41:2 45:25 56:7,9
2000 42:7,14,20 43:2,16 44:5,6 45:1,2,8,13,16
2000s 42:4 44:11
2001 38:13 39:17,23 45:24
2002 40:5,19 41:8 43:4 44:13
2003 11:18,20 13:5 40:21
2004 42:14 43:5 43:17 44:5,24 45:9,13,20
2006 45:4
2008 42:15 43:7 44:5,22 45:9 45:14
2009 39:23
2010 11:17 42:7 46:10,14,17 47:22
2011 11:24 16:24 40:23 48:22 49:1,3 50:23 51:5 52:2 53:23
2012 42:9,15 46:21
2014 42:10 46:21 51:16
201519800020 60:22
2016 15:19 17:1 25:24 41:21 42:10,16,19,21 43:9,17,23 44:6,14,18 45:11,14,22,24 46:21 47:18
2017 1:14 2:24 3:4,22 4:2 19:20,24 21:24 31:21 40:25 58:25 60:16
21 19:11,13 20:2 21:3,6,7,23 22:16,20 24:11 25:6 29:20 30:11
23 42:16
24 43:18
24.1 58:23
25 2:24 3:4 43:18
25,000 21:5
252-243-9000 1:24
26 43:19
26.5 53:24
27 9:20,24 42:17 48:5
28 1:14 9:9,20 9:25 12:24 13:3 37:15 42:16,18,21
28th 57:1 60:16
29 5:4,4 58:25
29th 59:5

3

3 32:22
30 42:8,9 45:25 48:4 54:3
31 42:10 43:19 55:5
32 5:4,4 42:10 44:1
32.9 53:21
33 18:17 45:23
34 31:6 43:20
35 42:8,9
35-15 38:22
36 42:9
38 44:14
39 44:16

4

40 44:8 45:4 54:2
41 45:11,24
43 9:17 38:17 44:9 53:24
44 5:16 37:4
45 9:17
46 32:8
47.37 26:10
48 45:22
48.3 26:4
48.5 53:22
49 41:14

5

5 49:14,21 50:1
5:00 1:14
5:30 8:8
5:40 5:20
5:45 8:7,7
5:47 8:9
5:48 8:17
50 42:4 49:7 51:1,11,20 53:18
50-plus 41:4
50.5 53:19
500,000 41:22
50s 56:1
51 38:23 40:21
51.71 26:8
52 9:16
52.63 25:25
54 42:7 57:5
55 2:9 42:4 43:13 44:21
56 38:17 42:6,7 44:22
56.5 53:19
57 43:12 44:6
58 43:17 44:20 45:10
59 44:19

6

6 8:15,16
6:16 8:18
60 42:15 43:11 44:19
62 45:21
63 42:19 44:24 44:25
65 42:14 44:23
67 45:3,13
68 45:1,13
69 42:12
691 3:22 4:1,2 5:10 8:21 18:12,19 30:25 31:8 32:3,10 32:12 54:25 55:6

7

7 5:8,10,17
7:25 59:19
70 42:14 43:22 43:25 45:2
71 43:24 45:18
72 43:24
73 42:13 45:12 45:19
74 45:18,19
75 29:18 47:25

8

8 10:2 11:9 12:4 13:13 14:9 15:25 18:10,12 18:18

9

9 25:9 27:12 28:21 30:15,23 30:25 31:6
900 46:13
927 59:15

96 42:6

EX. 22

NORTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY
SENATE COMMITTEE ON REDISTRICTING

TRANSCRIPT OF THE PROCEEDINGS

In Raleigh, North Carolina
Tuesday, August 29, 2017
Reported by Robbie Worley

Worley Reporting
P.O. Box 99169
Raleigh, NC 27624
919-870-8070

SEN. HISE: Good morning. Welcome to the Senate Committee on Redistricting. Today we will be taking up House Bill 927, the 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2. Our Sergeant at Arms for today's meeting are Terry Edmondson, Larry Hancock, Frances Patterson and Hal Roach. Thank you all for being here today.

I don't have any of the Senate pages, but apparently we do have some House pages that are coming today to observe the process. So, welcome, and I hope you have a wonderful week here at the General Assembly.

With nothing else standing in front of us, I'm going to recognize Representative Lewis, who is going to do the presentation for House Bill 927. All members should have in front of them copies of the House maps, as well as the appropriate stat pack for those maps should be attached. Representative Lewis.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning. My name is David Lewis. I'm the senior chair for the House Redistricting Committee. I appreciate the chance to be here this morning. To begin my hour-and-a-half presentation, I asked Senator Berger to help me prepare my remarks.

Members -- excuse me. Senators, I do have prepared remarks, but the essence is that the Joint House and Senate Committees on Redistricting adopted -- the map that the House has passed, I feel, best embodies those criteria that were adopted. I feel they comply with all federal and state law, and I will be happy to answer any questions, but I would appreciate your support.

SEN. HISE: Any questions or comments from a member of the Committee? Seeing none, does anyone have a motion? Senator Bishop.

SEN. BISHOP: Move for favorable report.

SEN. HISE: Senator Bishop has moved for favorable report on House Bill 927. Final intent. Any other comments or questions?

Hearing none, all those in favor, please raise your hands.

(Show of hands vote.)

SEN. HISE: All those opposed.

(Show of hands vote.)

SEN. HISE: By a vote of 10 to 1, the motion for a favorable report carries. Thank you, Representative Lewis.

REP. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I want to express my sincere thanks to you, and also to the

members of the Committee for being here this morning.

SEN. HISE: Thank you very much. Having exhausted the agenda, this meeting stands adjourned.

(Meeting adjourned at 10:11 a.m.)

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

COUNTY OF GRANVILLE

CERTIFICATION OF TRANSCRIPT

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript of proceedings held on August 29, 2017, is a true and accurate transcript of the proceedings as transcribed by me or under my supervision. I further certify that I am not related to any party or attorney, nor do I have any interest whatsoever in the outcome of this action.

This 5th day of September, 2017.

Robbie W. Worley

EX. 23

NORTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON REDISTRICTING

TRANSCRIPT OF THE PROCEEDINGS

In Raleigh, North Carolina
Tuesday, August 29, 2017
Reported by Robbie Worley

Worley Reporting
P.O. Box 99169
Raleigh, NC 27624
919-870-8070

REP. DOLLAR: We are pleased to have with us this afternoon, four pages: Anna Hyatt, who is sponsored by Representative Justin Burr; Victoria Hume, sponsored by Representative Meyer; Nate Worley, sponsored by Representative Brian Turner; Sarah Byrd, sponsored by Representative Larry Stricklan. Thank you for being with us today. We also are being served today, as always very ably, by our Sergeants at Arms, Reggie Sills, David Leighton, Warren Hawkins, Johnny Bae, Thomas Terry, and Joe Crook.

We are here today to take up the Senate Bill 691, the 2017 Senate Floor Redistricting Plan. Senator Hise, you are welcomed to the committee. Sir, you are recognized to present your bill.

SEN. HISE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Given the Senate Committee meeting this morning, I will really say I'm trying to present to you maps that comply with the Court's order, that were drawn under the criteria established by the Committee, both the House and the Senate Committee meeting on redistricting, and that passed the Senate yesterday. And I will be more than happy to answer any questions that you may have.

REP. DOLLAR: Any members of the

Commission wishing to be recognized? Any questions?

Seeing none, Chairman Lewis.

REP. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to be recognized for a motion.

REP. DOLLAR: The gentleman is recognized for a motion.

REP. LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I move that Senate Bill 691 be reported favorable.

REP. DOLLAR: Members of the Committee have heard the motion. Further discussion, further debate?

Seeing none, all those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye.

(Voice vote.)

REP. DOLLAR: Those opposed, no.

(No responses.)

REP. DOLLAR: The ayes have it.

REP. LEWIS: Mr. Chair.

[Inaudible discussion.]

REP. DOLLAR: Division being requested. We will do a vote by a show of hands and total count. All those in favor of the motion, please signify by raising your hand.

(Show of hands vote.)

REP. DOLLAR: All those opposed, please raise your hand.

(Show of hands vote.)

REP. DOLLAR: 18 in the affirmative, 15 in the negative, and the motion passes. The committee is adjourned. Thank you.

(End of proceedings.)

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

COUNTY OF GRANVILLE

CERTIFICATION OF TRANSCRIPT

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript of proceedings held on August 29, 2017, is a true and accurate transcript of the proceedings as transcribed by me or under my supervision. I further certify that I am not related to any party or attorney, nor do I have any interest whatsoever in the outcome of this action.

This 5th day of September, 2017.

Robbie W. Worley

EX. 24

SENATE

NORTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY

2017 SESSION

IN RE: SECOND READING OF
HOUSE BILL 927
2017 HOUSE REDISTRICTING
PLAN A2

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

PHIL BERGER, PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE PRESIDING

Wednesday, August 30, 2017

9:30 a.m.

PREPARED BY: Audra M. Smith, RPR, FCRR
RUFFIN CONSULTING, INC.
DIRECT DIAL: 252-243-9000
WWW.RUFFINCONSULTING.COM

APPEARANCES

PHIL BERGER, PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

BILL RABON, CHAIRMAN, RULES AND OPERATIONS OF THE SENATE

SARAH LANG, PRINCIPAL CLERK

TERRY RUMLEY, ADMINISTRATIVE CLERK

PHILIP KING, SERGEANT-AT-ARMS

P R O C E E D I N G S

* * * * *

SENATOR RABON: The Senate will come to order. Without objection, the Senate will stand in recess to reconvene today at 10 a.m.

(A recess was taken from 9:33 to 10:17 a.m.)

SENATOR BERGER: The Senate will come to order. Sergeant of Arms will close the doors. Members will go to their seats.

Members and guests, please silence all electronic devices. Leading the Senate in prayer is Senator Deanna Ballard of Watauga County. All members and guests will please stand.

(Prayer lead by Senator Deanna Ballard.)

SENATOR BERGER: Senator Pate is recognized for a motion. The Senate will come to order. Senator Pate is recognized.

SENATOR PATE: Thank you. The Journal of August 29, 2017 has been examined and found to be correct. I move that we dispense with the reading of the Journal and that it stand approved as written.

SENATOR BERGER: Without objection, the

Journal of August 29, 2017 stands approved as written.

Members' leaves of absence are requested, and without objection, are granted for Senators Barringer, Britt, Jim Davis, Ford and Meredith.

And, members, courtesies of the chamber are extended to Audra Smith of CaseWorks, Incorporated who is our court reporter today.

We are now prepared to go into the calendar unless there's further business before we get to that point.

House Bill 927, second reading. The clerk will read.

MS. RUMLEY: House Bill 927 2017 House Redistricting Plan A2.

SENATOR BERGER: Senator Hise is recognized to explain the bill.

SENATOR HISE: Thank you, Mr. President. Members of the Senate. Everyone should have on their desk a copy of the map as well as the appropriate the staff pack for the House maps that were drawn.

Briefly just to go over, this meets the criteria established by both House and Senate

committees for the drawing of the maps under Equal Population Contiguity Compactness, both of our standards are met there. Has fewer split precincts. Does much better at protecting municipal boundaries.

There are six double bunk -- double bunking of six members. For double bunk as a result of county grouping formula and two other members of the majority party.

You should have also in that staff pack the election data that's there, and I think it is important to note these maps were drawn without the consideration of race and that individuals were not assigned to districts on the basis of their race.

I'd be more than happy to answer any questions anyone may have, but as they are, the House maps, I'll present them to you and see what you need to know.

SENATOR BERGER: Further discussion or debate on House Bill 927?

Senator Bryant, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR BRYANT: To speak on the bill, Mr. President.

SENATOR BERGER: Will yield the floor.

SENATOR BRYANT: Mr. President and members, I want to point out to you several concerns about the House district plan. There are several concerns still in terms of the racial gerrymandering. My understanding in that in Guilford County there are three of the districts that are almost on the same footprint as they were in the original plan that has been struck down by the courts. I don't have the black VAP data in front of me, but I can provide that to you if you're interested, but I think there are some high -- there are some still some packing in those districts in Guilford County, so I just want to bring that to your attention and surely recommend a more thorough look at that.

There are also some State constitutional concerns with this map. First of all, just on the issue of compactness and the eyeball test, I just bring your attention to -- I think it is House District -- look at 10 and 21. Look at that Greene and Wade, Sampson counties, that House District 21 is

interesting and probably could vary from some scientific study of some sort or another. So that's just one example of some areas where compactness is really challenged and serve as a partisan gerrymandering or I believe or perhaps some other purpose.

Also in Cabarrus County, and in that same Wayne/Greene cluster, there are some violations of the whole county provision. If you look at District 10, it crosses three counties when obviously it does not have to in order to meet to population requirements, and I think in Cabarrus County, if you look under -- that's District 83, 67, 83, 82. There -- Cabarrus County is carved up into three districts when of course the population requirements could be met without going into three districts. I think that surely begs the question of the whole county -- fidelity to the whole county provision.

And finally in Wake and Mecklenburg County in this map, there are districts that were changed that were not even affected by the court decision and not even affected by district that was -- even an adjacent

district as related to the court decision. They were just changed for no purpose other than perhaps improving the opportunities for the republican incumbents in those districts or some other reason. And our Constitution forbids redistricting outside of the 10-year cycle unless the court orders that to be done, and in this instance those districts are not ordered to be redistricted under this -- under the court order.

So on those matters, I would ask that we vote against these maps, that we take a little bit longer, or at least look at these concerns between second and third reading.

Why we would position ourselves for these challenges, I can't understand, given what we've been facing in terms of the cost of litigation and length of the litigation. We've already been through multiple courts who have struck down these maps under some of these same complaints. We're even adding new challenges to the ones we already have been ruled -- that we've already lost on. So I urge us to go against these maps and give these legitimate concerns further

consideration. Thank you.

SENATOR BERGER: Further discussion or debate?

SENATOR McKISSICK: Mr. President.

SENATOR BERGER: Senator McKissick, for what purpose do you rise? You have the floor.

SENATOR McKISSICK: To speak on the proposed plan.

SENATOR BERGER: You have the floor.

SENATOR McKISSICK: I think Senate Bryant shared some excellent observations in terms of concerns that many of us have about the plans here before us today, and this concern about going out and redrawing districts that were not impacted by the unconstitutional racial gerrymandering is certainly something to be concerned and how that violates our Constitution.

Just here in Wake County, that occurred in Districts 36, 37, 40 and 41 and down in Mecklenburg County down in District 105. So we should be very mindful of the scope and the extent to which we needed to take action based upon the ruling of the court, and I

think that going back and redrawing these unimpacted districts that are not contiguous with their having contact with some of these racial gerrymandering districts is, indeed, violation of our State Constitution and I encourage those to vote against this plan.

SENATOR BERGER: Further discussion or debate?

Senator Bryant, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR BRYANT: To speak briefly a second time, Mr. President.

SENATOR BERGER: You have the floor.

SENATOR BRYANT: Members, I forgot one additional point I wanted to bring to your attention and for the record. Overnight, I read -- it was brought to my attention a study that's been done by Dr. Elizabeth Saboko (phonetic) who is a genetic scientist who specializes in population variation -- population connectivity and variation. And in her study, she looked at the county groupings and analyzed the bias, the partisan bias in the decision making for splits within the county grouping, and one of these -- her

observations concerned me, and that was the effect in rural North Carolina, and she found that there was an observable bias against democrats in nearly half of the county groupings.

There's been a lot of talk about the democratic party not being competitive in parts of the state. But instead this shows that rural democrats, including African-American democrats, are being significantly harmed by the majority's proposed maps. It appears that rather than packing voters into the districts as was the complaint in the lawsuit, the plan now cracks voters by splitting them into districts based on race and party. So I just want to bring that to your attention.

And I look at my home district, Nash County for example on the House plan, the choices of going to the south in the Franklin County pairing, instead of to the north, creates that problem. And also there are other rural districts in the state where the choices of how to make the splits shows this pattern. So I wanted to bring this to your

attention and have this also stated for the record. Thank you.

SENATOR BERGER: Further discussion or debate? Is there further discussion or debate on second reading of House Bill 927?

Hearing none, the question for the Senate is the passage on second reading of House Bill 927. All in favor vote aye, all opposed will vote no. Five seconds will be allowed for the voting. The clerk will record the vote.

(Voting commenced.)

SENATOR BERGER: 30 having voted in the affirmative, and 15 in the negative. House Bill 927 has passed its second reading and will, without objection, be read a third time.

MS. RUMLEY: The General Assembly of North Carolina enacts.

SENATOR BERGER: Is there a discussion or debate on third reading on House Bill 927?

Hearing none, the question for the Senate is the third passage on third reading, and we are going to electronic vote third reading of this bill. Passage of third

reading of House Bill 927. All in favor vote aye, all opposed vote no. Five seconds will be allowed for the voting. Clerk will record the vote.

(Voting commenced.)

SENATOR BERGER: 30 having voted in the affirmative and 15 in the negative. House Bill 927 has passed its third reading and will be enrolled.

Members, this next order of business is the issue of recognition of the Little League team from Greenville and they are scheduled to be here at 11 o'clock. I would -- we'd entertain a motion that we stand at ease until 11 o'clock.

Senator Rabon, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR RABON: Thank you, Mr. President. I have a motion.

SENATOR BERGER: State your motion.

SENATOR RABON: Mr. President, I move the Senate stand at ease until 11 o'clock.

SENATOR BERGER: All in favor say aye. All opposed, no. The Senate will stand at ease until 11 o'clock.

(The Senate was at ease at 10:31 a.m.)

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA)

COUNTY OF FORSYTH)

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, Audra Smith, Registered Professional Reporter in and for the above county and state, do hereby certify that the transcription of the proceedings and events was transcribed hereinbefore set forth; that the transcription was performed under my direction and supervision, and that this is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, a true and accurate transcription to the best of my ability.

I further certify that I am neither of counsel to either party nor interested in the events of this case.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereto set my hand this 6th day of September, 2017.

_____

Audra Smith, RPR, FCRR

Notary Number: 201329000033

A

a.m 1:14 3:5,7 14:1
A2 1:7 4:16
ability 15:11
absence 4:3
accurate 15:10
action 9:24
adding 8:21
additional 10:15
adjacent 7:25
ADMINISTR... 2:6
affirmative 12:14 13:7
African-Amer... 11:10
allowed 12:10 13:3
analyzed 10:23
answer 5:16
APPEARAN... 2:1
appears 11:12
appropriate 4:22
approved 3:24 4:1
areas 7:3
Arms 3:9
Assembly 1:2 12:18
assigned 5:14
attention 6:16 6:22 10:16,17 11:17 12:1
Audra 1:22 4:8 15:4,19
August 1:13 3:21 4:1
aye 12:8 13:2,23

B

back 10:1
Ballard 3:13,16
Barringer 4:5
based 9:25 11:15
basis 5:15
begs 7:18
belief 15:10
believe 7:5
BERGER 1:12 2:3 3:8,17,25 4:17 5:20 6:1 9:2,5,10 10:7 10:13 12:3,13 12:20 13:6,20 13:23
best 15:9,10
better 5:4
bias 10:23,24 11:3
bill 1:6 2:4 4:13 4:15,18 5:21 5:24 12:5,8,15 12:21,25 13:1 13:8
bit 8:13
black 6:11
boundaries 5:5
briefly 4:24 10:11
bring 6:16,22 10:15 11:16,25
Britt 4:5
brought 10:17
Bryant 5:22,24 6:2 9:12 10:9 10:11,14
bunk 5:6,7
bunking 5:7
business 4:11 13:10

C

C 3:1
Cabarrus 7:7,13 7:15
calendar 4:11
Carolina 1:2 11:2 12:19 15:1
carved 7:15
case 15:14
CaseWorks 4:8
certainly 9:18
CERTIFICA... 15:3
certify 15:6,12
CHAIRMAN 2:4
challenged 7:4
challenges 8:16 8:22
chamber 4:7
changed 7:23 8:2
choices 11:20,24
clerk 2:5,6 4:14 12:10 13:3
close 3:9
cluster 7:8
come 3:3,8,19
commenced 12:12 13:5
committees 5:1
compactness 5:2 6:21 7:4
competitive 11:7
complaint 11:14
complaints 8:21
concern 9:15
concerned 9:18 11:1
concerns 6:4,5 6:20 8:14,25 9:13
connectivity 10:21
consideration 5:13 9:1
Constitution 8:5 9:19 10:5
constitutional 6:19
CONSULTING 1:23
contact 10:3
Contiguity 5:2
contiguous 10:2
copy 4:21
correct 3:22
cost 8:17
counsel 15:13
counties 6:25 7:11
county 3:14 5:8 6:7,15 7:7,9,13 7:15,19,20,22 9:20,22 10:22 10:25 11:4,19 11:21 15:2,5
course 7:16
court 4:9 7:24 8:1,7,10 9:25
courtesies 4:7
courts 6:10 8:19
cracks 11:14
creates 11:22
criteria 4:25
crosses 7:10
cycle 8:7

D

D 3:1
data 5:11 6:11
Davis 4:5
day 15:16
Deanna 3:13,16
debate 5:21 9:3 10:8 12:4,5,21
decision 7:24 8:1 10:24
democratic 11:7
democrats 11:4 11:9,10
desk 4:21
devices 3:12
DIAL 1:24
DIRECT 1:24
direction 15:8
discussion 5:20 9:2 10:7 12:3,4 12:20
dispense 3:22
district 6:4,23 6:25 7:10,14 7:25 8:1 9:22 11:18
districts 5:14 6:8,15 7:16,18 7:22 8:4,8 9:16 9:21 10:2,4 11:13,15,23
doors 3:10
double 5:6,6,7
Dr 10:18
drawing 5:1
drawn 4:23 5:12

E

E 3:1,1
ease 13:14,22,25 14:1
effect 11:2
either 15:13
election 5:11
electronic 3:12 12:24
Elizabeth 10:18
enacts 12:19
encourage 10:6
enrolled 13:9
entertain 13:14
Equal 5:2
established 4:25
events 15:7,13
examined 3:21
example 7:3 11:19
excellent 9:12
explain 4:18
extended 4:8
extent 9:24
eyeball 6:21

F

facing 8:17
favor 12:8 13:1 13:23
FCRR 1:22 15:19
fewer 5:3
fidelity 7:19
finally 7:21
First 6:20
Five 12:9 13:2
floor 6:1 9:7,10 10:13

footprint 6:9
forbids 8:6
Ford 4:6
forgot 10:14
formula 5:8
FORSYTH 15:2
forth 15:7
found 3:22 11:2
Franklin 11:20
front 6:11
further 4:11 5:20 8:25 9:2 10:7 12:3,4 15:12

G

G 3:1
General 1:2 12:18
genetic 10:19
gerrymanderi... 6:6 7:5 9:17 10:4
give 8:24
given 8:16
go 3:10 4:10,24 8:24
going 7:17 9:15 10:1 11:20 12:24
granted 4:4
Greene 6:24
Greenville 13:12
grouping 5:8 10:25
groupings 10:23 11:5
guests 3:11,14
Guilford 6:7,15

H

half 11:4
hand 15:16
happy 5:16
harmed 11:11
Hearing 12:6,22
hereinbefore 15:7
hereto 15:15
high 6:14
Hise 4:17,19
home 11:18
House 1:6,7 4:13,15,15,22 4:25 5:18,21 6:4,23,25 11:19 12:5,8 12:14,21 13:1 13:7

I

impacted 9:16
important 5:12
improving 8:3
including 11:9
Incorporated 4:9
incumbents 8:4
individuals 5:14
instance 8:8
interested 6:13 15:13
interesting 7:1
issue 6:21 13:11

J

Jim 4:5
Journal 3:20,23 4:1

K

KING 2:7
know 5:19
knowledge 15:9

L

LANG 2:5
lawsuit 11:14
lead 3:16
Leading 3:12
League 13:11
leaves 4:3
legitimate 8:25
length 8:18
litigation 8:18 8:18
little 8:13 13:11
longer 8:13
look 6:17,23,24 7:10,13 8:13 11:18
looked 10:22
lost 8:23
lot 11:6

M

M 1:22
majority 5:9
majority's 11:11
making 10:24
map 4:21 6:20 7:22
maps 4:23 5:1 5:12,18 8:12 8:20,24 11:12
matters 8:11
McKISSICK 9:4,5,8,11
Mecklenburg 7:21 9:22
meet 7:12
meets 4:24
members 3:10 3:11,14 4:7,20 5:7,9 6:3 10:14 13:10
Members' 4:3
Meredith 4:6
met 5:3 7:17
mindful 9:23
motion 3:18 13:14,19,20
move 3:22 13:21
multiple 8:19
municipal 5:5

N

N 3:1
Nash 11:18
nearly 11:4
need 5:19
needed 9:24
negative 12:14 13:7
neither 15:12
new 8:21
north 1:2 11:2 11:21 12:19 15:1
Notary 15:20
note 5:12
Number 15:20

O

O 3:1
o'clock 13:13,15 13:22,25
objection 3:4,25 4:4 12:16
observable 11:3
observations 9:12 11:1
obviously 7:11
occurred 9:20
ones 8:22
OPERATIONS 2:4
opportunities 8:3
opposed 12:9 13:2,24
order 3:4,9,19 7:12 8:10 13:10
ordered 8:9
orders 8:7
original 6:9
outside 8:6
Overnight 10:16

P

P 3:1
pack 4:22 5:10
packing 6:14 11:13
pairing 11:21
partisan 7:5 10:23
parts 11:8
party 5:9 11:7 11:16 15:13
passage 12:7,23 12:25
passed 12:15 13:8
Pate 3:17,19,20
pattern 11:25
performed 15:8
PHIL 1:12 2:3
PHILIP 2:7
phonetic 10:19
plan 1:7 4:16 6:4,9 9:9 10:6 11:14,19
plans 9:14
please 3:11,14
point 4:12 6:3 10:15
population 5:2 7:12,16 10:20 10:21
position 8:15
prayer 3:13,16
precincts 5:4
prepared 1:22 4:10
present 5:18
President 1:12 2:3 4:19 5:25 6:2 9:4 10:12 13:19,21
PRESIDING 1:12
PRINCIPAL 2:5
PRO 1:12 2:3
probably 7:1
problem 11:22
proceedings 1:11 15:6
Professional 15:4
proposed 9:9 11:12
protecting 5:5
provide 6:12
provision 7:9,20
purpose 5:22 7:6 8:2 9:6 10:9 13:16

Q

question 7:19

12:6,22
questions 5:17

R

R 3:1
Rabon 2:4 3:3 13:16,18,21
race 5:13,15 11:16
racial 6:6 9:17 10:4
read 4:14 10:17 12:16
reading 1:6 3:23 4:13 8:14 12:5 12:7,15,21,23 12:25 13:1,8
really 7:4
reason 8:5
recess 3:5,6
recognition 13:11
recognized 3:18 3:19 4:18
recommend 6:17
reconvene 3:5
record 10:16 12:2,11 13:3
redistricted 8:9
redistricting 1:7 4:16 8:6
redrawing 9:15 10:1
Registered 15:4
related 8:1
reporter 4:9 15:5
REPORTER'S 15:3
republican 8:4
requested 4:4
requirements 7:12,17
result 5:8
rise 5:23 9:6 10:10 13:17
RPR 1:22 15:19
RUFFIN 1:23
ruled 8:23
RULES 2:4
ruling 9:25
RUMLEY 2:6 4:15 12:18
rural 11:2,9,23

S

S 3:1
Saboko 10:19
Sampson 6:24
SARAH 2:5
scheduled 13:12
scientific 7:2
scientist 10:19
scope 9:23
seats 3:10
second 1:6 4:13 8:14 10:12 12:5,7,15
seconds 12:9 13:2
see 5:19
Senate 1:1 2:4 3:3,4,8,12,18 4:20,25 9:11 12:7,23 13:22 13:24 14:1
Senator 3:3,8,13 3:16,17,17,19 3:20,25 4:17 4:17,19 5:20 5:22,24 6:1,2 9:2,4,5,5,8,10 9:11 10:7,9,11 10:13,14 12:3 12:13,20 13:6 13:16,18,20,21 13:23
Senators 4:5
September 15:16
Sergeant 3:9
SERGEANT-... 2:7
serve 7:4
SESSION 1:3
set 15:7,15
shared 9:12
shows 11:8,24
significantly 11:11
silence 3:11
six 5:6,7
Smith 1:22 4:8 15:4,19
sort 7:2
south 11:20
speak 5:24 9:8 10:11
specializes 10:20
split 5:4
splits 10:24 11:24
splitting 11:15
staff 4:22 5:10
stand 3:5,15,24 13:14,22,24
standards 5:3
stands 4:1
state 6:19 10:5 11:8,23 13:20 15:1,5
stated 12:1
struck 6:10 8:20
study 7:2 10:18 10:22
supervision 15:9
surely 6:17 7:18

T

take 8:12 9:24
taken 3:6
talk 11:6
team 13:12
TEMPORE 1:12 2:3
terms 6:5 8:17 9:13
TERRY 2:6
test 6:22
Thank 3:20 4:19 9:1 12:2 13:18
think 5:11 6:13 6:23 7:13,18 9:11 10:1
third 8:14 12:16 12:21,23,23,24 12:25 13:8
thorough 6:17
three 6:7 7:10 7:16,18
time 10:12 12:17
today 3:5 4:9 9:14
transcribed 15:7
TRANSCRIPT 1:11
transcription 15:6,8,10
true 15:10
two 5:8

U

unconstitutio... 9:17
understand 8:16
understanding 6:6
unimpacted 10:2
urge 8:24

V

VAP 6:11
variation 10:20 10:21
vary 7:1
violates 9:19
violation 10:5
violations 7:9
vote 8:12 10:6 12:8,9,11,24 13:1,2,4
voted 12:13 13:6
voters 11:13,15
voting 12:10,12 13:3,5

W

Wade 6:24
Wake 7:21 9:20
want 6:3,16 11:16
wanted 10:15 11:25
Watauga 3:13
Wayne/Greene 7:8
We're 8:21
we've 8:17,19,23
Wednesday 1:13
WHEREOF 15:15
WITNESS 15:15
written 3:24 4:2
WWW.RUFF... 1:25

X

Y

yield 6:1

Z

0

1

10 3:5 6:23 7:10
10-year 8:6
10:17 3:6
10:31 14:1
105 9:22
11 13:13,15,22 13:25
15 12:14 13:7

2

201329000033 15:20
2017 1:3,7,13 3:21 4:1,15 15:16
21 6:24,25
252-243-9000 1:24
29 3:21 4:1

3
30 1:13 12:13 13:6
36 9:21
37 9:21

4
40 9:21
41 9:21

5

6
67 7:14
6th 15:16

7

8
82 7:14
83 7:14,14

9
9:30 1:14
9:33 3:6
927 1:6 4:13,15 5:21 12:5,8,15 12:21 13:1,8

EX. 25

NORTH CAROLINA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES SESSION

NORTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TRANSCRIPT OF THE PROCEEDINGS

In Raleigh, North Carolina

Wednesday, August 30, 2017, 2:00 p.m.

PREPARED BY: Regina Toppins

RUFFIN CONSULTING, INC.

DIRECT DIAL: 252-243-9000

WWW.RUFFINCONSULTING.COM

SPEAKER MOORE: The House will come to order. Members and guests will take their seats. Visitors will retire from the chamber. The Sergeant-At-Arms will close the doors. We ask all members and all guests with us today to silence any electronic devices.

This afternoon's prayer will be offered by Representative Arp. We ask members, guests and visitors to please stand, those in the gallery as well, and remain standing for the pledge of allegiance.

Representative Arp.

REPRESENTATIVE ARP: Thank you. If you would like, you may join with me in prayer.

Our heavenly father, we pause before you this morning to open our session. Lord, we have many emotions on our hearts, great joy and the celebration of youth and victory and celebration, but, Lord, also we have great concerns in our hearts for our fellow citizens in Texas, and even North Carolinians who have gone on down, both with volunteers and professionals, to help out with relief efforts. Lord, our hearts turn to them and ask for their safety that you provide them, Lord, that you minimum loss of life and that we grow together as a country and community, Lord,

through that which me makes us a strong as a nation because you've loved us and given us the spirit of love to help our fellow man.

As we undertake the business of this state I pray that you give us wisdom, humbleness and a genuine desire to love and those who you love to serve those in this great state. Lord, we just lift our efforts to you, ask that you bless them and give us wisdom and guidance to make the right decision. As we honor you with all we do. In Jesus' name I pray. Amen.

AUDIENCE: I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman from Harnett, Representative Lewis, recognized for a motion.

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, the Journal for August 29th has been examined and found to be correct. I move that it be approved as written.

SPEAKER MOORE: Representative Lewis moves that the Journal of August 29th be approved as written. Those in favor say Aye; those opposed say No. The Ayes have it. The Journal is approved as written.

The gentleman from Pitt, Representative

Murphy, is recognized to speak to a point of personal privilege as well as the representative statement if the gentleman desires.

REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We have a --

SPEAKER MOORE: Just a moment, the House will come to order. The gentleman has the floor.

REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY: Statement of personal privilege and recognize that I would like the Clerk to read.

SPEAKER MOORE: The Clerk will read in its entirety.

HOUSE CLERK: A Representative Statement, recognizing the North State Little League Team.

Whereas, the Little League Baseball World Series took place in Williamsport, Pennsylvania, between August 17th and 27th of, 2017; and

Whereas, the State of North Carolina was represented in the World Series by the North State Little League Team from Greenville, North Carolina; and

Whereas, North State defeated South Carolina, Florida, Tennessee, and Georgia to become the Southeastern region tournament champions; and

Whereas, North State went on to defeat the

regional tournament champions from the Midstate, Sioux Falls, South Dakota, by a score of 6-0; the West, Rancho Santa Margarita, California, by the score of 16-0; and the Southwest, Lufkin, Texas, by a score of 2-1; and

Whereas, North State's outstanding pitching earned the team's place in history by becoming the first team in the Little League Baseball World Series not to allow any hits in two consecutive games; and

Whereas, North State was defeated by Lufkin the United States championship game and by Mexico in the consolation game; and

Whereas, North State finished the World Series as second in the nation and fourth in the world;

Now, therefore, the members of the North State Little League Team and their coaches have brought great honor to the City of Greenville and the State of North Carolina for their outstanding performance and sportsmanship during the 2017 Little League Baseball World Series and deserve to be honored for their accomplishments.

In Witness Whereof, the undersigned certifies that the foregoing statement was read in the House and placed upon the Journal on the 30th day of

August, 2017. Submitted by Representative Gregory Murphy. House Principal Clerk, James White.

SPEAKER MOORE: Gentleman from Pitt has the floor to speak to a point of personal privilege.

REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Ladies and gentlemen, I present to you 12 young men and -- young men who have honored our state and they are now fourth in the world. With your pleasure I would like to call each one, and as I call their name, if they would stand.

Jacob Calder, JoeJoe Bryne, Will Casey, Drew Fields, Chase Anderson, Ashton Byers, Cameron Greenway, Luke Lambert, Bryce Jackson, Cash Daniels-Moye, Thomas Barrett, Matthew Matthijs. Mathias, thank you. Carson Hardee. Coaches: Jake Allen, Coach Mike Vaughn. Coach Team Manager, Brian Fields, and batting cleanup, Team Mom, Wagner Grubb.

Thank you all, thank you all for the --

(Applause.)

Thank you all for the memories that you've given us. I have a little something extra to say to you guys:

Take me out to the ball game, take me to see our All Stars. They've been pounding the baseball to

bits, giving their opponents all kind of fits. Let me root, root, root for our young men, they've represented us so well. For it's one, two, teams they sent home as their victories start to swell.

Verse Two: Take me to see our All Stars, their journey began months ago. Hours of practice learning techniques, pitching the baseball like major league freaks. Let them hit, pitch and run, mow the other teams down like grass. For it's one, two series they won by kicking them in the pants.

Take Coach Fields, Allen and Vaughn, Wagner Grubb, the team mom, traveling all over God's green earth, draining all the money from their parents' purse, but we root, root, root for our young men. Go rescue me, rescue the day because it's one, two hot dogs chugged down as we jump back in the fray.

Last: More wins in Williamsport, not ours. That's just the breaks of the game, but champions in our mind you'll always be, memories everlasting for all there to see. We'll always root, root, root for our state team. You surely have stolen our hearts, for as victors here you'll always be seen when the next season starts.

Congratulations, gentlemen. Thank you for a job well done.

(APPLAUSE.)

SPEAKER MOORE: Folks, no doubt we can tell clearly the ability to sing is not required to serve in the House of Representatives.

For what purpose does the gentleman from Scotland, Representative Pierce, rise?

REPRESENTATIVE PIERCE: To ask the member a question.

SPEAKER MOORE: Does the gentleman from Pitt yield to the gentleman from Scotland? He yields.

REPRESENTATIVE PIERCE: Who were the other two persons on the up front at the -- I don't think you called their names; could you tell us who they are, please?

REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY: That is Ms. Candy Smith, and is one of the coach's dads, who I can't remember. It's Jeff Fires.

REPRESENTATIVE PIERCE: Thank you.

(APPLAUSE.)

SPEAKER MOORE: On behalf of my colleagues now we appreciate you all being with us today. I tell you a lot of folks here were paying close attention to the games and were watching, and really are very proud of the hard work you did here, you and the support of your families to be traveling around the State and the

country. And so, you've made North Carolina very proud, and I know that no doubt years from now when you are a little older and you look back, you are going to appreciate even more what you all accomplished, not only for yourselves, but also your -- for Greenville and your home state. And I would ask my colleagues -- actually, does Representative Richardson -- for what purpose does the lady from Franklin, Representative Richardson, rise?

REPRESENTATIVE RICHARDSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to rise and congratulate my soror. My mayor and Candy Smith, she's a Delta, and we're so proud of her and her team and we say congratulations to all of you. All the Deltas around are very proud of you. Thank you.

(APPLAUSE.)

SPEAKER MOORE: But, again, I know and I know you all are on a tight schedule. Once again, thank you all, and I ask my colleagues to please join me again in congratulating these -- these folks.

(APPLAUSE.)

SPEAKER MOORE: Thanks again. Y'all are welcome to stay with us here in session, or we'll put you -- we'll put you to work here very quickly. Otherwise, thank you for being with us. All right,

thanks, y'all.

Senate Bill 691, the Clerk will read.

HOUSE CLERK: Senate Bill 691, a bill to enact to realign the districts of election of the North Carolina Senate. General Assembly of North Carolina annex.

SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman from Harnett, Representative Lewis, is recognized to address the bill.

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, may I make a request to the Chair?

SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman may state his request.

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, may I have staff on the floor to aid me?

SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman is permitted to have staff on the floor.

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER MOORE: And any other members who wish to have staff on the floor, the permission is extended as well.

The gentlemen has the floor.

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker and Members, the Senate map complies with state and federal law, it adheres to traditional districting principles and it remedies defects the court found in the previous map. It splits fewer counties and divides far fewer precincts and fewer municipalities than previous plans for this body.

The only members double bunked are those forced by the county grouping formula, and that is exclusively to the detriment of the majority party in this map. It fully cures the defects found by the Covington Court, and, for the record, I will note that this statement also applies to the House map.

At multiple points during the House debate, in committee and on the floor, members of the Democratic Party revealed that they had requested and received a statistical package that included the race for the 2017 House Redistricting Plan and they accepted amendment to Wake County that was passed yesterday. In addition, an Associated Press reporter has apparently also seen these statistics provided by the minority party. This data has already been released for the proposed Senate plan via request from Senator Floyd McKissick of Durham.

So that there wasn't an asymmetry of

information, yesterday morning I asked for central staff to prepare the full statistical package for the House plan as it passed on the House floor yesterday and posted to the House Select Committee on Redistricting's website. It has been posted there since yesterday just before the Senate committee considered our plan.

To be clear, race was not used in drawing of the map, and I did not request or see this information for the House plan until yesterday after the House plan passed this chamber. Since yesterday I have reviewed this data for our plan and believe it fully remedies the racial issues the court identified in the previous map. It also avoids any theoretical vote delusion claims under Section II of the Voting Rights Act.

An additional export -- pardon me. An additional report from the democratic plaintiff expert, Dr. Alan Lichman, has been entered into the Senate record, and I believe the report is relevant to our plans as well. Further, I believe our map complies with traditional redistricting principles outlined by the court.

Members, to get back to the map before us today, I believe the Senate map complies with the

committee's adopted criteria, state and federal law. For those reasons, I ask for your support in voting green to adopt this Senate map. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER MOORE: For what purpose does the gentleman from Cumberland, Representative Richardson, rise?

REPRESENTATIVE RICHARDSON: To debate the bill.

SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman is recognized to debate the bill.

REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS: Members of the General Assembly, I thought long and hard about speaking on this, and I felt moved by one of our colleague's comments in the last debate on the House plan, and that was Judge Joe John. To me he is like the E.F. Hutton of our body. When he talks, we ought to listen. And there's several -- what makes this place so magical and special is there are several of us like that. Representative McGrady is like that. And those wonderful, wise people when they get up and speak, they transcend party, they transcend the ages and they're a part of this body's politic that makes it special.

And we are at our best when we get away from

party, and we get away from the caucus and what the caucus wants us to do and we follow our hearts. And I know that each of you in 2008, if you ran in 2008 and you were elected, one of the things you ran on and one of the things I ran on is that if I got in this body and was reelected to this body again, that I would support and fight with all I could to make sure that we had impartial redistricting.

Now listen to what Representative Lewis just said. It comply -- we have had this expert that says it complies with this law, and we've had this expert say it complies with split districts, and we've had this looked at by numerous other people, and we've done this and we have done that to comply with the court order. Think about what your common sense is saying to what he just said there and what we put that man through in the last three weeks trying to draw these districts. What all's we had to do and all we should do is what Judge John said two days ago and that is follow our hearts, follow what people want us to do and say to the court here's how we're going to solve this problem. We are going to put six republicans of impeccable character on a commission and six democrats with impeccable character on the commission and we're going to let them draw the

districts.

Citizens ought to draw the districts that we are elected in and not us. When we were in power, we messed it up. You all ran and said you were going to fix it and now that you're in power, power is a very seductive thing, you all are messing it up. We ought to be ashamed of ourselves, and we ought to do the right thing, and the right thing here is I sat in these public hearings. Folks, people took the time from their jobs, from their homes, from their daily lives to come to those public hearings, what little bit of public hearings we gave them, and they made their voices clear, almost unanimous. Every person that came to those things almost to a -- almost to a person is almost unanimous demanded from us that we have a fair and impartial redistricting, and the only way to do it is to get us out of it and let the citizens draw the lines.

I would encourage each of us to vote against this, send it back to our caucuses and demand that we all go united to the court and say, court, we want a fair and impartial commission to do this. It is a fundamentally right thing to do, and each of us in our hearts know that that is the right things to do, and each one of us at one time or another has campaigned

and told our constituents that we would do that. And one of these days the citizens are going to have enough of these broken promises and they're going to send us home, and they should, because the right thing to do here is to let citizens draw the lines. Thank you.

SPEAKER MOORE: For what purpose does the gentleman from Cabarrus, Representative Pittman, rise?

REPRESENTATIVE PITTMAN: To speak on the bill.

SPEAKER MOORE: The Gentleman asks to debate the bill.

REPRESENTATIVE PITTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Ladies and gentlemen, I don't suspect I'm going to sway many people to do what I'm going to do today. I just want you to understand what I'm doing. I meant to say this Monday, I didn't hit my light in time because it doesn't matter whether it's the Senate of the House, I feel the same way about this whole process.

If the courts had simply said here's some guidelines that you need to follow next time you do redistricting, I don't think I'd have much of an argument against that. However, our state

constitution says that we do redistricting after the census every ten years. So, I'm voting no because I'm not willing to violate our state constitution by doing do it four years early. Thank you.

SPEAKER MOORE: For what purpose does the gentleman from Wake, Representative Hall, rise?

REPRESENTATIVE HALL: Speak to the bill.

SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman is recognized to debate the bill.

REPRESENTATIVE HALL: Members, I got elected in this body in 2012 along with a lot of colleagues on that side, which is the first year these new maps were in place, and my first real observation of my caucus I hate to say, but it was we whined a lot, we complained. We complained that you weren't treating us fairly, and I still remember the responses from a lot of you, it was that, that we did too, it was that elections have consequences.

I vividly remember the we did it too argument because that was the first time I talked on this floor. I didn't realize as a freshman that the Speaker rarely comes down unless he feels strongly about something. So, then Speaker Tillis had come down and talked about the rules, how they were much fairer than we had done with you guys. And there was

a lot of weight to that argument, but I made the freshman mistake of standing up and saying that's an irrational argument, just because we did it, you shouldn't. I don't want to tell you the consequences I suffered, but, needless to say, I did not win my first debate on this floor.

Because of the raw nerves it touched, I realized that there was probably a lot of truth to that, we did not treat you very well. The other thing that was said a lot was elections have consequences, and that's what we're here about. I agree, you're right, they do. We're here about maps and elections, so that's what I'd like to talk about. But the first thing I think that has to be said is that I don't think any of us should conflate winning elections with winning the hearts and mind of the people.

There are 120 opinions in this room on what that means, so instead of just adding mine to that, what I'd like to do is just throw out some actual numbers.

The first one, I'm going to get some grumbling, I know no one wants to hear this, but the first number is a million people. More than a million people, more than a million Americans voted for the democratic candidate for President in this last

election, yet we don't control the presidency, we don't control congress and we don't control this body. Move on quickly to congress and I'll talk about the first election after you guys drew the maps. In that first election when I came to this body in 2012, 50.93% of North Carolinians actually went to the poll, walked in and voted for the democratic person on their ballot for the US Congress in North Carolina. 49.6% voted for the republican. So, more people actually walked in the polls and voted for the democrat in that election, yet the result was you guys got a 10/3 split, 77% of the seats to 23. And I know what every member of this body is thinking right now, the same thing I'm thinking, we did it too, and you're right, we did.

Last week Leader Jackson pointed out the results here in the House, the elections, after the last time we drew the maps versus the last when you guys drew the maps. So, under the 2003 democratic gerrymander, and that's what it was, it was a gerrymander as well, they gave us 66 seats in that next election and you had 54.

My point is that I think your version is far more one-sided because right now after that election you had 77 seats to 43. And I think it's important,

an important point that Leader Jackson made that we also understand that elections have consequences, but we didn't give ourselves the supermajority in the state, in a state that votes almost equally every single time for democrats and republicans. And my point is that I think every member of this body is politically astute enough to understand that North Carolina is an extremely purple state. Every election it's almost an equal number of democrats that vote for you guys and vote for us.

In this body, in the North Carolina House, in the 2016 election roughly 48% of North Carolinians walked into the poll and voted for a democrat running for this body, the North Carolina House. You did win that election as well, and 52% of the voters voted for republicans, but if you look around this chamber it's 75 members on that side, which is obviously a supermajority.

I'm pointing out the disparities in the election from the President all the way down to this House because I honestly feel there's never been a time in America's history when the disparity between the will of the voters and the actual electoral outcome has been this great.

George Washington was revered for being the

first man that voluntarily gave up power, and I know that we can't be held to their standards. No one here, including myself is George Washington. I say that with a humility, again, of knowing that we did it as well, but the absolute empirical data of the votes cast in the state make clear that the people of North Carolina don't want us to have a supermajority.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER MOORE. For what purpose does the gentleman from Wake, Representative John, rise?

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN: Debate the bill.

SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman has the floor to debate the bill.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

First of all, I appreciate your not referring to me as the gentleman from E.F. Hutton, but more seriously, Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to repeat the full statement I made when this body was considering the proposed House plans, but everything I said on Monday is applicable again today as we consider these proposed Senate maps, characterized perhaps to an even greater degree by the flaws which mark the House maps.

In short, politicians who directly benefit

from the drafting of legislative districts should not be the drafters of those districts. We absolutely must have in North Carolina a truly independent, impartial and most importantly not partisan redistricting commission.

I'll be voting no as I did when we considered the House maps. I recommend the same to you. Thank you for your attention. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER MOORE: For what purpose does the lady from New Hanover, Representative Butler, rise?

REPRESENTATIVE BUTLER: To briefly debate the bill.

SPEAKER MOORE: The lady is recognized to debate the bill.

REPRESENTATIVE BUTLER: I had no intention, actually, of speaking on this issue today, but as I saw the young men from Greenville here, and I did watch their ball game, they should have won that thing. They were up 5 to nothing, and all those curly headed fellows in the front there did so well.

You know, the public like those boys expect nothing less than a level playing field. The public made that perfectly clear throughout meetings all across this state. I thought about what if we had

told those children, boys, do the best you can, but you're going to start six runs down, and you're going to bat left-handed even if you're a righty and you're going to have to hop on one foot to first base. That's not fair.

So, in life, in sports and in politics the public expects a level playing field, and what we have in North Carolina is a national reputation for sports earth politics, and none of us should be very proud of that in this body.

So, fairness, a level playing field and good conscience should rue the day. I vote you to vote no on these maps. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER MOORE: For what purpose does the gentleman from Wake, Representative Dollar, rise?

REPRESENTATIVE DOLLAR: To debate the bill.

SPEAKER MOORE: The gentlemen has the floor to debate the bill.

REPRESENTATIVE DOLLAR: Members of the House, there's been some arguments made here in the last few minutes that I just want to make a couple of points about. One, the gentleman says all of this is a purple state. Well, that's very deceptive and let me tell you why that's deceptive. In the last statewide election republicans won 13 of 17 statewide

races. 13 of 17. That seems a whole lot more leaning to the republican side, the conservative side of the actual issues, that are -- that come before our state and federal elected officials from here in North Carolina.

I would also remind one of the members, you know, talked about various formulas and who won this and who won that. I mean what do you want? Do you want proportional representation? Then you need to go change the U. S. Constitution if that's what you want. If you want a European system, go out there and get it. Don't try to boot strap it through all sorts of various and sundry mechanisms that, you know, professors and different things come up with around the -- around the country.

The fact is, is that you have a misdistribution of your voters of people willing to support you. That's your problem that you probably ought to go try to solve if you want to solve it.

I would also note just two other quick things. One, you know, when we talk about reform, I remember because I was around this town for a while now, and I remember cases going back to the early and mid '80's and coming forward and I seem to note that it was republicans who were helping with lawsuits or

initiating lawsuits to reform redistricting, and time and time again winning against in our state supreme court and winning in the United States Supreme Court. So, folks need look at themselves and look at your own history. Republicans have a history of reform here. We have the history of reform, hard fought. And that's the reason why we have some of the most stringent requirements of anywhere in the country like it's forgotten, it doesn't get reported on, but it's an actual fact. And we have complied in both the House and Senate map with those requirements, state as well as federal.

And it was also a fundamental question about what do the people want, what do the people want. Well, it occurs to me that we are debating the Senate maps, and I would point this out to everybody here and everybody listening, Senate republicans won a supermajority under the democrat maps, under the democrat maps. So, clearly, that was the will of the people. And I encourage you to vote for this bill.

SPEAKER MOORE: For what purpose does the lady from Durham, Representative Morey, rise?

REPRESENTATIVE MOREY: Thank you, to debate the bill.

SPEAKER MOORE: The lady has the floor to

debate the bill.

REPRESENTATIVE MOREY: Members, I echo the comments of my colleagues, and I just want to be reminded of the public hearings. And when we sat in Raleigh and watched the various people throughout the state speak, there was one young mother here in Raleigh who sat for two and a half hours. She had a one-year-old toddler, kept running in running out, disturbing and she finally got her opportunity to speak. And she said I'm a nobody to you. You won't hear my voice, but I care about fairness. I want a future for my child.

So, for all those people who spoke, I think this whole body did hear their voices, but they are asking for fair maps, and I echo my colleagues that we do need independent, nonpartisan redistricting; therefore, I'll be voting no. Thank you very much.

SPEAKER MOORE: For what purpose does the gentleman from Wake, Representative Jackson, rise?

REPRESENTATIVE JACKSON: I speak on the bill.

SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman has the floor to debate the bill.

REPRESENTATIVE JACKSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise, ladies and gentlemen, to oppose the Senate redistricting plan. I know that they've had a good debate on their and their chamber, and I know it's normal for us to just accept what the Senate does, and so, I'm not going to really get into many of the details.

I will point out something. I know for a fact that a nonpartisan redistricting bill has passed this chamber in the past and, you know, some people are kind of questioning if it passed only because we knew the Senate would never take it up, but I will say to you this: I floated this idea to many of the bills sponsors over the last several years. There's nothing that prevents the House from doing our own type of nonpartisan redistricting. We don't have to get the senate to go along with it in the House plans. We can do what we want. So, if you, in fact, in the last four years have voted for nonpartisan redistricting, we can make that happen.

As to this plan, I want to say that the racial gerrymandering issues in the Senate map is basically the same ones as I mentioned in the House map. Senate republicans did not use racial data, and in my opinion again what we have before us today does not apply to Federal court's order. Also, this map

does also double down on the partisan gerrymander from 2011. And I know I've read several people have complimented Senator Berger and the speech that he gave on the Senate floor about how my party's problem is not, in fact, gerrymandering, it's that we can't appeal to rule voters, and I understand talking points and I understand how people parrot that.

You know, I just simply don't agree with that, but if you accept that Senator Berger's argument is true, then you also have to accept the flip side of that argument, which is that democrats are doing really well in urban areas, but yet these maps don't reflect that truth. So, if you don't accept the notion that the maps are gerrymandered in the east and in the rural areas, you have to at least accept that they are, in fact, gerrymandered in the urban areas to prevent democrats from having more seats than they probably should.

In Wake County if you look at Senate District 18, and Senate District 15, Guilford County, if you look at Senate District 28 and Senate District 27, Forsyth, you can look at Senate District 29, and Senate District 31, and then Mecklenburg County, you can look at Senate District 41, which starts in the northeast portion of the county and goes down the

western border of the county, all the way down into the southern part of the county. And then you can look at the districts in Cumberland County in all its gerrymandered glory. In fact, it was gerrymandered pretty badly before it was added on, but then when they went and got the section adding Senator Clark's second home in, it really became a work of art.

I've not done an in-depth analysis of the Senate maps or the alternative maps, but it's really hard for me to imagine that this is the best we can do. We can draw maps that are less partisan, more compact and maps that don't repeat the racial gerrymander of 2011. I think that's what the court expected us to do. I think we'll be back here in 2019 doing this again after the court's vote it out. I'll be voting red today.

SPEAKER MOORE: For what purpose does the lady from Mecklenburg, Representative Cunningham, rise?

REPRESENTATIVE CUNNINGHAM: To speak on the bill.

SPEAKER MOORE: The lady has the floor to debate the bill.

REPRESENTATIVE CUNNINGHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

You know, as I sit here and I heard what my colleague said, Representative Hall, that we were whining. I'm not a whiner. I want to get that clear.

This redistricting is serious for the people of the State of North Carolina. It's two things that was said that really bothers me. One is that race was not taken into consideration. That was one of the criteria, and I understand that, but when I walk in a room, you know exactly who I am. I don't get to take off my skin and be anything else. So, I think it should always be taken into consideration. So that's the decision that they made.

The other thing is about this redistricting is it's all about power. It's about who gets to make the decisions for the whole State of North Carolina, for all the citizens of North Carolina. This is about power. Are you willing to share power with someone that is not equal to you? That's the question. Are you equal, are you ready to share power?

The redistricting that we're going under now that we have waited a decade almost for that was unconstitutional, that we were elected under, we've waited almost a decade for this to happen and it looks like we will have an additional wait. Are you ready to share power, that's what redistricting is about.

No, the maps are not exactly what I would like them to be, but do I have the power and are you willing to share the power? The people of North Carolina are looking for us to learn how to share power. Thank you.

SPEAKER MOORE: For what purpose does the gentleman from Nash, Representative Jordan, rise?

REPRESENTATIVE JORDAN: To debate the plans.

SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman is recognized to debate the bill.

REPRESENTATIVE JORDAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

There's a whole lot of stuff that I can stand up here and say, but I really just want to make two points. Aside from the fact that I'm a primary sponsor of the nonpartisan redistricting plan, so that makes me immune to a lot of the whining that's going on across the aisle.

The two points I'd like to make are follow-up on Representative Jackson's comments about how Senate District 21 in Cumberland County. Did you hear him very carefully? Did you hear him ask about that district? It looks like Puff The Magic Dragon to me. And that little puff there that came from Senator Clark, who apparently asked the Senate majority to add

that in for him I guess to gerrymander for him, although he's been one of the leading members talking about this deficiency gaps, how there are wasted voters for anybody who votes for a losing candidate, your vote is wasted, and anyone who votes for more than what the winning candidate needed is also wasted votes. I'm afraid the court is going to look at that, ridiculous formulas like that in the future. But the other point I'm going to make and I'm voting, I'm actually voting against this map and I wanted to explain why because I took some of my colleagues by surprise in committee yesterday, and that is for this reason: I thoroughly understand step one being the Senate county groupings, and I think that's very good. That is important for everyone to understand listening here today and listening online, that this process, even though it is not the non-partisan districting process that I would prefer, starts with actual objective steps and it included grouping the counties, all right.

Well, despite that, I'm going to vote against this because basically my area northwestern North Carolina is going to lose a Senate representative, and that's why I'll be voting against this map today. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER MOORE: Further discussion, further debate. If not, the question for the House, passage of Senate Bill 691 on second reading. Those in favor will vote Aye, those opposed will vote No. The Clerk will open the vote.

The Clerk will lock the machine and record the vote. 68 having voted in the affirmative; 47 in the negative. Senate Bill 691 passes the second reading.

Any overrule to that objection?

Clerk will read that in.

HOUSE CLERK: Senate Rule 691 annex.

SPEAKER MOORE: Any further discussion, further debate? If not, question for the House pass Senate Bill 691 on the third reading. Those in favor will vote Aye; those opposed will vote No. Clerk will open the vote.

Clerk will lock the machine and record the vote. 68 having voted in the affirmative; 47 in the negative. Senate Bill 691 passes the third reading. The Bill is ordered enrolled.

Members, we are about to take a recess until 3:30. It is right now it's -- actually, strike that, until 3:45. That will be a one-hour recess for a number of reasons. I believe the Majority Leader is

going to announce a caucus 30 minutes from now. Sorry, Representative Bell, I didn't realize you had stepped away from your desk.

Gentlemen is recognized for an announcement.

REPRESENTATIVE BELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Republicans, you just saw on your e-mail we're going to caucus 30 minutes after recess in Room 1228. That's 30 minutes after recess in Room 1228. Please be prompt. Thank you.

SPEAKER MOORE: Mr. Clerk, Chair directs that House Bill 717 revised judicial districts be removed from the Committee on Elections and Ethics Law; directs that it be referred to the Committee on Judicial Redistricting.

For what purpose does the gentleman from Chowan, Representative Steinberg, rise?

REPRESENTATIVE STEINBERG: A point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman is recognized to speak to a point of personal privilege.

REPRESENTATIVE STEINBERG: Thank you.

This tragedy unfolding in Texas from Hurricane Harvey reminds all of us of the immeasurable value of our service personnel who leave their homes and risk their lives to assist in rescuing citizens

from grave peril. As a North Carolina State Representative serving northeastern North Carolina, it is an honor to serve a district that includes a major coast guard installation located in Elizabeth City and officially designated All American Coast Guard City. Captain Joseph Deere, commanding officer of Air Station Elizabeth City and the magnificent men and women of the coast guard serving with C130 fixed wing aircraft and H60 helicopters and other personnel, courageously exemplify the best of the American spirit as they assist those in need in Texas and around the nation.

Today, I offer my continued thanks to the coast guard, their families and the civilians who support their mission for their exceptional commitment and work on behalf of the American people.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER MOORE: For what purpose does the gentleman from Guilford, Representative Quick, rise?

REPRESENTATIVE QUICK: A point of personal privilege.

SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman is recognized to speak to a point of personal privilege.

REPRESENTATIVE QUICK: Prior to my arrival here in the North Carolina House, District 58 was

represented by a gentleman named Mr. Ralph C. Johnson. Mr. Johnson passed away earlier this year, and this morning I was privileged to be part of a ceremony that re- named a new connector road in Greensboro, North Carolina, the Ralph C. Johnson Way.

I'd ask my colleagues here today if you would join me in acknowledging the work and life of former Representative Ralph C. Johnson as we celebrated his life in Greensboro earlier this morning.

(APPLAUSE.)

SPEAKER MOORE: For what purpose does the gentleman from Wake, Representative Jackson, rise?

REPRESENTATIVE JACKSON: Inquiry of the Chair.

SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman is recognized to inquire.

REPRESENTATIVE JACKSON: What time will we be coming back, Mr. Speaker?

SPEAKER MOORE: We're going to be back at 4 -- excuse me, at 3:45.

REPRESENTATIVE JACKSON: Inquiry of the Chair.

SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman is recognized.

REPRESENTATIVE JACKSON: Will we be done

today?

SPEAKER MOORE: Maybe. I hope so.

REPRESENTATIVE JACKSON: Okay, for an announcement.

SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman is recognized for an announcement.

REPRESENTATIVE JACKSON: House democrats will caucus at 3 o'clock in 12 -- I mean 14, whatever our normal room is.

SPEAKER MOORE: Thanks.

Members, if there's no more notices and announcements right now, subject to the standard stipulations set forth in Rule 15.1, the Chair directs the House to stand in recess until 3:45.

(THE HOUSE STANDS IN RECESS AT 2:47 P.M.)

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

COUNTY OF DURHAM

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, Regina Toppins, Shorthand Reporter and Notary Public in and for the State of North Carolina, do hereby affirm that the foregoing pages contain a verbatim transcription of the above-captioned proceedings and have been transcribed to the best of my ability and understanding; I further affirm that I am not related to any of the parties to this action; that I am not interested in the outcome of this case; that I am not of counsel nor in the employ of any of the parties to this action.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereto set my hand, this the 30th day of August, 2017.

Regina Toppins, Notary Public
Notary Number: 200626300019

A

ability 8:3 38:9
above-caption... 38:8
absolute 21:5
absolutely 22:2
accept 27:4 28:9 28:10,13,15
accepted 11:19
accomplished 9:5
accomplishme... 5:22
acknowledging 36:7
Act 12:16
action 38:11,14
actual 18:19 20:23 24:3 25:10 32:18
add 31:25
added 29:5
adding 18:18 29:6
addition 11:20
additional 12:17 12:18 30:24
address 10:8
adheres 11:2
adopt 13:3
adopted 13:1
affirm 38:7,10
affirmative 33:7 33:19
afraid 32:7
afternoon's 2:7
ages 13:22
ago 7:6 14:19
agree 18:11 28:8
aid 10:15
Air 35:6
aircraft 35:9
aisle 31:18
Alan 12:19
all's 14:18
allegiance 2:11 3:11
Allen 6:17 7:11
allow 5:9
alternative 29:9
Amen 3:10
amendment 11:19
America 3:12
America's 20:22
American 35:5 35:10,16
Americans 18:24
analysis 29:8
Anderson 6:13
annex 10:6 33:12
announce 34:1
announcement 34:4 37:4,6
announcements 37:12
anybody 32:4
apparently 11:21 31:25
appeal 28:6
Applause 6:20 8:1,19 9:16,21 36:11
applicable 21:21
applies 11:13
apply 27:25
appreciate 8:21 9:4 21:16
approved 3:19 3:21,23
area 32:22
areas 28:12,15 28:16
argument 16:25 17:20 18:1,3 28:9,11
arguments 23:20
Arp 2:8,12,13
arrival 35:24
art 29:7
ashamed 15:7
Ashton 6:13
Aside 31:15
asked 12:1 31:25
asking 26:15
asks 16:11
Assembly 1:3 10:5 13:13
assist 34:25 35:11
Associated 11:20
astute 20:7
asymmetry 11:25
attention 8:22 22:8
AUDIENCE 3:11
August 1:12 3:18,21 4:17 6:1 38:16
avoids 12:14
Aye 3:22 33:4 33:16
Ayes 3:23

B

back 7:16 9:3 12:24 15:20 24:23 29:14 36:19,20
badly 29:5
ball 6:24 22:19
ballot 19:8
Barrett 6:15
base 23:4
baseball 4:15 5:8,21 6:25 7:7
basically 27:22 32:22
bat 23:3
batting 6:18
becoming 5:7
began 7:6
behalf 8:20 35:16
believe 12:12,20 12:21,25 33:25
Bell 34:2,5
benefit 21:25
Berger 28:3
Berger's 28:9
best 13:25 23:1 29:10 35:10 38:9
bill 10:2,3,3,9 13:9,11 16:10 16:12 17:7,9 21:11,13 22:13 22:15 23:16,18 25:20,24 26:1 26:21,23 27:8 29:21,23 31:10 33:3,8,15,20 33:21 34:11
bills 27:12
bit 15:12
bits 7:1
bless 3:8
body 11:7 13:17 14:5,6 17:11 19:2,5,13 20:6 20:11,14 21:19 23:10 26:14
body's 13:23
boot 24:12
border 29:1
bothers 30:6
boys 22:22 23:1
breaks 7:18
Brian 6:17
briefly 22:12
broken 16:3
brought 5:18
Bryce 6:14
Bryne 6:12
bunked 11:8
business 3:4
Butler 22:11,12 22:16
Byers 6:13

C

C 36:1,5,8
C130 35:8
Cabarrus 16:8
Calder 6:12
California 5:3
call 6:10,10
called 8:13
Cameron 6:13
campaigned 15:25
candidate 18:25 32:4,6
Candy 8:15 9:12
Captain 35:6
care 26:11
carefully 31:22
Carolina 1:1,3 1:11 4:18,20 4:23 5:19 9:1 10:5,6 19:8 20:8,11,14 21:7 22:3 23:8 24:5 30:5,15 30:16 31:4 32:23 35:1,2 35:25 36:5 38:1,6
Carolinians 2:20 19:6 20:12
Carson 6:16
case 38:12
cases 24:23
Casey 6:12
Cash 6:14
cast 21:6
caucus 14:1,2 17:13 34:1,7 37:8
caucuses 15:20
celebrated 36:9
celebration 2:17 2:18
census 17:2
central 12:1
ceremony 36:3
CERTIFICA... 38:4
certifies 5:24
Chair 10:11 34:10 36:15,23 37:13
chamber 2:3 12:11 20:16 27:3,9
champions 4:24 5:1 7:18

championship 5:11
change 24:10
character 14:23 14:24
characterized 21:22
Chase 6:13
child 26:12
children 23:1
Chowan 34:16
chugged 7:16
citizens 2:20 15:2,18 16:2,5 30:16 34:25
City 5:18 35:4,5 35:7
civilians 35:14
claims 12:15
Clark 31:25
Clark's 29:6
cleanup 6:18
clear 12:8 15:13 21:6 22:24 30:3
clearly 8:3 25:19
Clerk 4:10,11 4:13 6:2 10:2,3 33:4,6,11,12 33:16,18 34:10
close 2:4 8:22
Coach 6:17,17 7:11
coach's 8:16
coaches 5:17 6:16
coast 35:4,5,8,14
colleague 30:2
colleague's 13:15
colleagues 8:20 9:7,19 17:11 26:3,15 32:11 36:6
come 2:1 4:7 15:11 17:23 24:3,14
comes 17:22
coming 24:24 36:19
commanding 35:6
comments 13:15 26:3 31:20
commission 14:23,25 15:22 22:5
commitment 35:15
committee 11:15 12:4,6 32:12 34:12,13
committee's 13:1
common 14:15
community 2:25
compact 29:12
complained 17:15,15
complied 25:10
complies 11:2 12:22,25 14:11 14:12
complimented 28:3
comply 14:10,14
concerns 2:19
conflate 18:15
congratulate 9:12
congratulating 9:20
congratulations 7:24 9:14
congress 19:2,3 19:8
connector 36:4
conscience 23:12
consecutive 5:9
consequences 17:18 18:4,10 20:2
conservative 24:2
consider 21:22
consideration 30:7,11
considered 12:7 22:7
considering 21:20
consolation 5:12
constituents 16:1
constitution 17:1,3 24:10
CONSULTING 1:23
contain 38:7
continued 35:13
control 19:1,2,2
correct 3:19
counsel 38:13
counties 11:5 32:19
country 2:25 9:1 24:15 25:8
county 11:9,19 28:19,20,23,25 29:1,2,3 31:21 32:14 38:2
couple 23:21
courageously 35:10
court 11:4,12 12:13,23 14:15 14:21 15:21,21 25:3,3 29:13 32:7
court's 27:25 29:15
courts 16:22
Covington 11:12
criteria 13:1 30:8
Cumberland 13:6 29:3 31:21
Cunningham 29:18,20,24
cures 11:11
curly 22:20

D

dads 8:16
daily 15:10
Dakota 5:2
Daniels-Moye 6:15
data 11:22 12:12 21:5 27:23
day 5:25 7:15 23:12 38:16
days 14:19 16:2
debate 11:14 13:8,11,15 16:11 17:9 18:6 21:11,13 22:12,15 23:16 23:18 25:23 26:1,23 27:3 29:23 31:8,10 33:2,14
debating 25:15
decade 30:21,23
deceptive 23:23 23:24
decision 3:9 30:12
decisions 30:15
Deere 35:6
defeat 4:25
defeated 4:22 5:10
defects 11:4,11
deficiency 32:3
degree 21:23
Delta 9:13
Deltas 9:15
delusion 12:15
demand 15:20
demanded 15:15
democrat 19:10 20:13 25:18,19
democratic 11:16 12:18 18:25 19:7,19
democrats 14:24 20:5,9 28:11,17 37:7
deserve 5:21
designated 35:5
desire 3:6
desires 4:3
desk 34:3
despite 32:21
details 27:6
detriment 11:10
devices 2:6
DIAL 1:24
different 24:14
DIRECT 1:24
directly 21:25
directs 34:10,13 37:13
discussion 33:1 33:13
disparities 20:19
disparity 20:22
district 28:20,20 28:21,21,22,23 28:24 31:21,23 35:3,25
districting 11:3 32:17
districts 10:4 14:12,18 15:1 15:2 22:1,2 29:3 34:11
disturbing 26:9
divides 11:5
dogs 7:16
doing 16:17 17:3 27:14 28:11 29:15
Dollar 23:15,16 23:19
doors 2:4
double 11:8 28:1
doubt 8:2 9:2
Dr 12:19
drafters 22:2
drafting 22:1
Dragon 31:23
draining 7:13
draw 14:17,25 15:2,18 16:5 29:11
drawing 12:8
drew 6:12 19:4 19:18,19

Durham 11:24 25:22 38:2

E

e-mail 34:6
E.F 13:17 21:17
earlier 36:2,9
early 17:4 24:23
earned 5:7
earth 7:13 23:9
east 28:14
echo 26:2,15
efforts 2:22 3:7
elected 14:4 15:3 17:10 24:4 30:22
election 10:4 19:1,4,5,11,22 19:24 20:8,12 20:15,20 23:25
elections 17:18 18:10,12,15 19:17 20:2 34:12
electoral 20:23
electronic 2:6
Elizabeth 35:4,7
emotions 2:17
empirical 21:5
employ 38:13
enact 10:4
encourage 15:19 25:20
enrolled 33:21
entered 12:19
entirety 4:12
equal 20:9 30:18 30:19
equally 20:4
Ethics 34:12
European 24:11
everlasting 7:19
everybody 25:16,17
exactly 30:9 31:1
examined 3:18
exceptional 35:15
exclusively 11:10
excuse 36:21
exemplify 35:10
expect 22:22
expected 29:14
expects 23:7
expert 12:19 14:10,11
explain 32:11
export 12:17
extended 10:22
extra 6:22
extremely 20:8

F

fact 24:16 25:10 27:8,17 28:5 28:16 29:4 31:15
fair 15:16,22 23:5 26:15
fairer 17:25
fairly 17:16
fairness 23:11 26:11
Falls 5:2
families 8:25 35:14
far 11:5 19:23
father 2:15
favor 3:22 33:3 33:15
federal 11:2 13:1 24:4 25:12 27:25
feel 16:20 20:21
feels 17:22
fellow 2:19 3:3
fellows 22:21
felt 13:14
fewer 11:5,5,6
field 22:23 23:7 23:11
Fields 6:13,18 7:11
fight 14:7
finally 26:9
finished 5:13
Fires 8:17
first 5:8 17:12 17:13,20 18:6 18:13,21,23 19:4,5 21:1,16 23:4
fits 7:1
fix 15:5
fixed 35:8
flag 3:11
flaws 21:23
flip 28:10
floated 27:12
floor 4:7 6:4 10:15,17,21,23 11:15 12:3 17:21 18:6 21:12 23:17 25:25 26:22 28:4 29:22
Florida 4:23
Floyd 11:24
folks 8:2,22 9:20 15:9 25:4
follow 14:2,20 14:20 16:23
follow-up 31:20
foot 23:4
forced 11:9
foregoing 5:24 38:7
forgotten 25:9
former 36:8
formula 11:9
formulas 24:7 32:8
Forsyth 28:22
forth 37:13
forward 24:24
fought 25:6
found 3:18 11:4 11:11
four 17:4 27:18
fourth 5:14 6:9
Franklin 9:9
fray 7:16
freaks 7:8
freshman 17:21 18:2
front 8:12 22:21
full 12:2 21:19
fully 11:11 12:12
fundamental 25:13
fundamentally 15:23
further 12:21 33:1,1,13,14 38:10
future 26:12 32:8

G

gallery 2:9
game 5:11,12 6:24 7:18 22:19
games 5:9 8:23
gaps 32:3
General 1:3 10:5 13:13
gentleman 3:15 3:25 4:3,7 6:3 8:5,9,10 10:7 10:12,16 13:6 13:10 16:8,11 17:6,8 21:10 21:12,17 23:15 23:22 26:19,22 31:7,9 34:15 34:19 35:19,22 36:1,13,16,24 37:5
gentlemen 6:7 7:24 10:23 16:15 23:17 27:1 34:4
genuine 3:5
George 20:25 21:3
Georgia 4:23
gerrymander 19:20,21 28:1 29:13 32:1
gerrymandered 28:14,16 29:4 29:4
gerrymanderi... 27:21 28:5
give 3:5,8 20:3
given 3:2 6:22
giving 7:1
glory 29:4
go 7:14 15:21 24:9,11,19 27:16
God 3:13
God's 7:12
goes 28:25
going 9:4 14:21 14:22,25 15:4 16:2,3,16,16 18:21 21:18 23:2,2,4 24:23 27:5 30:20 31:17 32:7,9 32:21,23 34:1 34:7 36:20
good 23:11 27:3 32:14
grass 7:9
grave 35:1
great 2:17,19 3:7 5:18 20:24
greater 21:23
green 7:12 13:3
Greensboro 36:4,9
Greenville 4:20 5:18 9:6 22:18
Greenway 6:14
Gregory 6:1
grouping 11:9 32:19
groupings 32:14
grow 2:25
Grubb 6:18 7:12
grumbling 18:22
guard 35:4,5,8 35:14
guess 32:1
guests 2:2,5,8
guidance 3:9
guidelines 16:23
Guilford 28:20

35:19
guys 6:23 17:25 19:4,11,19 20:10

H

H60 35:9
half 26:7
Hall 17:6,7,10 30:2
hand 38:15
Hanover 22:11
happen 27:19 30:23
hard 8:24 13:13 25:6 29:10
Hardee 6:16
Harnett 3:15 10:7
Harvey 34:23
hate 17:14
headed 22:21
hear 18:22 26:11,14 31:22 31:22
heard 30:1
hearings 15:9,11 15:12 26:4
hearts 2:17,19 2:22 7:21 14:2 14:20 15:24 18:16
heavenly 2:15
held 21:2
helicopters 35:9
help 2:22 3:3
helping 24:25
hereto 38:15
history 5:7 20:22 25:5,5,6
hit 7:8 16:18
hits 5:9
home 7:4 9:6 16:4 29:7
homes 15:10 34:24
honestly 20:21
honor 3:9 5:18 35:3
honored 5:21 6:8
hop 23:4
hope 37:2
hot 7:15
hours 7:6 26:7
House 1:1 2:1 4:6,13 5:25 6:2 8:4 10:3 11:13 11:14,18 12:3 12:3,4,10,10 13:15 16:20 19:17 20:11,14 20:21 21:20,24 22:7 23:20 25:11 27:14,16 27:22 33:2,12 33:14 34:11 35:25 37:7,14 37:15
humbleness 3:5
humility 21:4
Hurricane 34:23
Hutton 13:17 21:17

I

idea 27:12
identified 12:13
II 12:15
imagine 29:10
immeasurable 34:23
immune 31:17
impartial 14:8 15:16,22 22:4
impeccable 14:23,24
important 19:25 20:1 32:15
importantly 22:4
in-depth 29:8
included 11:17 32:19
includes 35:3
including 21:3
independent 22:3 26:16
indivisible 3:14
information 12:1,9
initiating 25:1
inquire 36:17
Inquiry 36:14 36:22
installation 35:4
intention 22:16
interested 38:12
irrational 18:3
issue 22:17
issues 12:13 24:3 27:21

J

Jackson 6:14 19:16 20:1 26:19,20,24 36:13,14,18,22 36:25 37:3,7
Jackson's 31:20
Jacob 6:12
Jake 6:16
James 6:2
Jeff 8:17
Jesus' 3:10
job 7:25
jobs 15:10
Joe 13:16
JoeJoe 6:12
John 13:16 14:19 21:10,11 21:14
Johnson 36:1,2 36:5,8
join 2:14 9:19 36:7
Jordan 31:7,8 31:11
Joseph 35:6
Journal 3:18,21 3:23 5:25
journey 7:6
joy 2:17
Judge 13:16 14:19
judicial 34:11 34:14
jump 7:16
justice 3:14

K

kept 26:8
kicking 7:10
kind 7:1 27:10
knew 27:11
know 9:2,17,18 14:3 15:24 18:22 19:12 21:1 22:22 24:7,13,21 27:2,3,7,9 28:2 28:8 30:1,9
knowing 21:4

L

ladies 6:7 16:15 27:1
lady 9:8 22:11 22:14 25:22,25 29:18,22
Lambert 6:14
law 11:2 13:1 14:11 34:13
lawsuits 24:25 25:1
Leader 19:16 20:1 33:25
leading 32:2
league 4:14,15 4:20 5:8,17,21 7:8
leaning 24:1
learn 31:4
learning 7:7
leave 34:24
left-handed 23:3
legislative 22:1
level 22:23 23:7 23:11
Lewis 3:16,17 3:20 10:8,10 10:14,18,24 13:12 14:9
liberty 3:14
Lichman 12:19
life 2:24 23:6 36:7,9
lift 3:7
light 16:18
lines 15:18 16:5
listen 13:18 14:9
listening 25:17 32:15,16
little 4:14,15,20 5:8,17,20 6:22 9:3 15:11 31:24
lives 15:11 34:25
located 35:4
lock 33:6,18
long 13:13
look 9:3 20:16 25:4,4 28:19 28:21,22,24 29:3 32:7
looked 14:13
looking 31:4
looks 30:23 31:23
Lord 2:16,18,22 2:24,25 3:7
lose 32:23
losing 32:4
loss 2:24
lot 8:22 17:11,14 17:17 18:1,8 18:10 24:1 31:13,17
love 3:3,6,6
loved 3:2
Lufkin 5:4,10
Luke 6:14

M

machine 33:6,18
Magic 31:23
magical 13:19
magnificent 35:7
major 7:7 35:3
majority 11:10 31:25 33:25
man 3:3 14:17 21:1

Manager 6:17
map 11:1,4,11 11:13 12:9,14 12:21,24,25 13:3 25:11 27:21,23,25 32:10,25
maps 17:12 18:12 19:4,18 19:19 21:22,24 22:7 23:13 25:16,18,19 26:15 28:12,14 29:9,9,11,12 31:1
Margarita 5:3
mark 21:24
Mathias 6:16
matter 16:19
Matthew 6:15
Matthijs 6:15
mayor 9:12
McGrady 13:20
McKissick 11:24
mean 24:8 37:8
means 18:18
meant 16:18
mechanisms 24:13
Mecklenburg 28:23 29:18
meetings 22:24
member 8:7 19:13 20:6
members 2:2,5 2:8 5:16 10:20 11:1,8,15 12:24 13:12 17:10 20:17 23:19 24:6 26:2 32:2 33:22 37:11
memories 6:21 7:19
men 6:8,8 7:2,14 22:18 35:7
mentioned 27:22
messed 15:4
messing 15:6
Mexico 5:11
mid 24:24
Midstate 5:1
Mike 6:17
million 18:23,23 18:24
mind 7:19 18:16
mine 18:18
minimum 2:24
minority 11:22
minutes 23:21 34:1,7,8
misdistribution 24:17
mission 35:15
mistake 18:2
mom 6:18 7:12
moment 4:6
Monday 16:18 21:21
money 7:13
months 7:6
MOORE 2:1 3:15,20 4:6,11 6:3 8:2,9,20 9:17,22 10:7 10:12,16,20 13:5,10 16:7 16:11 17:5,8 21:9,12 22:10 22:14 23:14,17 25:21,25 26:18 26:22 29:17,22 31:6,9 33:1,13 34:10,19 35:18 35:22 36:12,16 36:20,24 37:2 37:5,10
Morey 25:22,23 26:2
morning 2:16 12:1 36:3,10
mother 26:6
motion 3:16
move 3:19 19:3
moved 13:14
moves 3:20
mow 7:8
multiple 11:14
municipalities 11:6
Murphy 4:1,4,8 6:2,5 8:15

N

name 3:10 6:11
named 36:1,4
names 8:13
Nash 31:7
nation 3:1,13 5:14 35:12
national 23:8
need 16:23 24:9 25:4 26:16 35:11
needed 32:6
needless 18:5
negative 33:8,20
nerves 18:7
never 20:21 27:11
new 17:12 22:11 36:4
non-partisan 32:17
nonpartisan 26:16 27:8,15 27:18 31:16
normal 27:4 37:9
North 1:1,3,11 2:20 4:14,18 4:19,20,22,25 5:6,10,13,16 5:19 9:1 10:5,5 19:6,8 20:7,11 20:12,14 21:6 22:3 23:8 24:4 30:5,15,16 31:3 32:23 35:1,2,25 36:4 38:1,6
northeast 28:25
northeastern 35:2
northwestern 32:22
Notary 38:5,20 38:21
note 11:12 24:20 24:24
notices 37:11
notion 28:14
number 18:23 20:9 33:25 38:21
numbers 18:20
numerous 14:13

O

o'clock 37:8
objection 33:10
objective 32:19
observation 17:13
obviously 20:17
occurs 25:15
offer 35:13
offered 2:7
officer 35:6
officially 35:5
officials 24:4
Okay 37:3
older 9:3
Once 9:18
one-hour 33:24
one-sided 19:24
one-year-old 26:8
ones 27:22
online 32:16
open 2:16 33:5 33:17
opinion 27:24
opinions 18:17
opponents 7:1
opportunity 26:9
oppose 27:1
opposed 3:22 33:4,16
order 2:2 4:7 14:15 27:25
ordered 33:21
ought 13:17
15:2,6,7 24:19
outcome 20:24 38:12
outlined 12:23
outstanding 5:6 5:19
overrule 33:10

P

p.m 1:12 37:15
package 11:17 12:2
pages 38:7
pants 7:10
pardon 12:17
parents' 7:13
parrot 28:7
part 13:23 29:2 36:3
parties 38:11,13
partisan 22:4 28:1 29:11
party 11:10,16 11:22 13:22 14:1
party's 28:4
pass 33:14
passage 33:2
passed 11:19 12:3,11 27:8 27:10 36:2
passes 33:8,20
pause 2:15
paying 8:22
Pennsylvania 4:16
people 13:21 14:13,20 15:9 16:16 18:16,23 18:24 19:9 21:6 24:17 25:14,14,20 26:5,13 27:9 28:2,7 30:4 31:3 35:16
perfectly 22:24
performance 5:20
peril 35:1

permission 10:21
permitted 10:16
person 15:13,15 19:7
personal 4:1,9 6:4 34:18,20 35:20,23
personnel 34:24 35:9
persons 8:12
Pierce 8:6,7,11 8:18
pitch 7:8
pitching 5:6 7:7
Pitt 3:25 6:3 8:9
Pittman 16:8,9 16:13
place 4:16 5:7 13:19 17:13
placed 5:25
plaintiff 12:18
plan 11:18,23 12:3,7,10,11 12:12 13:16 27:2,20 31:16
plans 11:6 12:21 21:20 27:16 31:8
playing 22:23 23:7,11
please 2:9 8:14 9:19 34:9
pleasure 6:10
pledge 2:10 3:11
point 4:1 6:4 19:23 20:1,6 25:16 27:7 32:9 34:17,20 35:20,23
pointed 19:16
pointing 20:19
points 11:14 23:22 28:6 31:15,19
politic 13:23
politically 20:7
politicians 21:25
politics 23:6,9
poll 19:6 20:13
polls 19:10
portion 28:25
posted 12:4,5
pounding 6:25
power 15:3,5,5 21:1 30:14,17 30:17,19,25 31:2,3,5
practice 7:6
pray 3:5,10
prayer 2:7,14
precincts 11:5
prefer 32:18
prepare 12:2
PREPARED 1:22
present 6:7
presidency 19:1
President 18:25 20:20
Press 11:20
pretty 29:5
prevent 28:17
prevents 27:14
previous 11:4,6 12:14
primary 31:15
Principal 6:2
principles 11:3 12:22
Prior 35:24
privilege 4:2,9 6:4 34:18,20 35:21,23
privileged 36:3
probably 18:8 24:18 28:18
problem 14:22 24:18 28:4
proceedings 1:8 38:8
process 16:21 32:16,18
professionals 2:21
professors 24:14
promises 16:3
prompt 34:9
proportional 24:9
proposed 11:23 21:20,22
proud 8:23 9:2 9:13,15 23:9
provide 2:23
provided 11:21
public 15:9,11 15:12 22:22,23 23:7 26:4 38:6 38:20
puff 31:23,24
purple 20:8 23:23
purpose 8:5 9:8 13:5 16:7 17:5 21:9 22:10 23:14 25:21 26:18 29:17 31:6 34:15 35:18 36:12
purse 7:14
put 9:23,24 14:16,22

Q

question 8:8 25:13 30:18 33:2,14
questioning 27:10
quick 24:20 35:19,20,24
quickly 9:24 19:3

R

race 11:17 12:8 30:6
races 24:1
racial 12:13 27:21,23 29:12
Raleigh 1:11 26:5,7
Ralph 36:1,5,8
ran 14:3,4,5 15:4
Rancho 5:3
rarely 17:22
raw 18:7
re- 36:4
read 4:10,11 5:24 10:2 28:2 33:11
reading 33:3,9 33:15,20
ready 30:19,24
real 17:13
realign 10:4
realize 17:21 34:2
realized 18:8
really 8:23 27:5 28:12 29:7,9 30:6 31:14
reason 25:7 32:13
reasons 13:2 33:25
received 11:17
recess 33:22,24 34:7,8 37:14 37:15
recognize 4:9
recognized 3:16 4:1 10:8 13:10 17:8 22:14 31:9 34:4,19 35:22 36:16,24 37:5
recognizing 4:14
recommend 22:7
record 11:12 12:20 33:6,18
red 29:16
redistricting 11:18 12:22 14:8 15:16 16:24 17:1 22:5 25:1 26:16 27:2,8 27:15,18 30:4 30:13,20,25 31:16 34:14
Redistricting's 12:5
reelected 14:6
referred 34:13
referring 21:17
reflect 28:13
reform 24:21 25:1,5,6
Regina 1:22 38:5,20
region 4:24
regional 5:1
related 38:10
released 11:23
relevant 12:20
relief 2:22
remain 2:10
remedies 11:3 12:13
remember 8:17 17:16,19 24:22 24:23
remind 24:6
reminded 26:4
reminds 34:23
removed 34:12
repeat 21:18 29:12
report 12:18,20
reported 25:9
reporter 11:20 38:5
REPORTER'S 38:4
representation 24:9
representative 2:8,12,13 3:16 3:17,20,25 4:2 4:4,8,13 6:1,5 8:6,7,11,15,18 9:7,9,10 10:8 10:10,14,18,24 13:6,8,12,20 14:9 16:8,9,13 17:6,7,10 21:10,11,14 22:11,12,16 23:15,16,19 25:22,23 26:2

26:19,20,24 29:18,20,24 30:2 31:7,8,11 31:20 32:24 34:2,5,16,17 34:21 35:2,19 35:20,24 36:8 36:13,14,18,22 36:25 37:3,7
Representatives 1:1 8:4
represented 4:19 7:3 36:1
republic 3:12
republican 19:9 24:2
republicans 14:23 20:5,16 23:25 24:25 25:5,17 27:23 34:6
reputation 23:8
request 10:11,13 11:23 12:9
requested 11:16
required 8:3
requirements 25:8,11
rescue 7:15,15
rescuing 34:25
responses 17:16
result 19:11
results 19:17
retire 2:3
revealed 11:16
revered 20:25
reviewed 12:12
revised 34:11
Richardson 9:8 9:9,10 13:6,8
ridiculous 32:8
right 3:9 9:25 15:8,8,23,24 16:4 18:12 19:13,14,24 32:20 33:23 37:12
Rights 12:15
righty 23:3
rise 8:6 9:9,11 13:7 16:8 17:6 21:10 22:11 23:15 25:22 26:19 27:1 29:19 31:7 34:16 35:19 36:13
risk 34:25
road 36:4
room 18:17 30:9 34:7,8 37:9
root 7:2,2,2,14 7:14,14,20,20 7:20
roughly 20:12
rue 23:12
RUFFIN 1:23
rule 28:6 33:12 37:13
rules 17:24
run 7:8
running 20:13 26:8,8
runs 23:2
rural 28:15

S

S 24:10
safety 2:23
Santa 5:3
sat 15:8 26:4,7
saw 22:18 34:6
saying 14:16 18:2
says 14:10 17:1 23:22
schedule 9:18
score 5:2,3,4
Scotland 8:6,10
season 7:23
seats 2:2 19:12 19:21,25 28:17
second 5:14 29:7 33:3,8
section 12:15 29:6
seductive 15:6
see 6:24 7:5,20 12:9
seen 7:22 11:21
Select 12:4
senate 10:2,3,5 11:1,23 12:6 12:20,25 13:3 16:19 21:22 25:11,15,17 27:2,4,11,16 27:21,23 28:4 28:19,20,21,21 28:22,23,24 29:9 31:21,25 32:14,23 33:3 33:8,12,15,20
Senator 11:24 28:3,9 29:6 31:24
send 15:20 16:4
sense 14:15
sent 7:4
Sergeant-At-... 2:4
series 4:16,19 5:8,14,21 7:9
serious 30:4
seriously 21:18
serve 3:6 8:3 35:3
service 34:24
serving 35:2,8
session 1:1 2:16 9:23
set 37:13 38:15
share 30:17,19 30:25 31:3,4
short 21:25
Shorthand 38:5
side 17:12 20:17 24:2,2 28:10
silence 2:5
simply 16:22 28:8
sing 8:3
single 20:5
Sioux 5:1
sit 30:1
six 14:22,24 23:2
skin 30:10
Smith 8:16 9:12
solve 14:22 24:19,19
soror 9:12
Sorry 34:2
sorts 24:12
South 4:22 5:2
Southeastern 4:24
southern 29:2
Southwest 5:4
speak 4:1 6:4 13:22 16:9 17:7 26:6,10 26:20 29:20 34:20 35:23
Speaker 2:1 3:15,17,20 4:5 4:6,11 6:3,6 8:2,9,20 9:11 9:17,22 10:7 10:10,12,14,16 10:19,20,25 11:1 13:4,5,10 16:7,11,14 17:5,8,22,23 21:8,9,12,15 21:18 22:9,10 22:14 23:13,14 23:17 25:21,25 26:18,22,25 29:17,22,25 31:6,9,12 32:25 33:1,13 34:6,10,18,19 35:17,18,22 36:12,16,19,20 36:24 37:2,5 37:10
speaking 13:14 22:17
special 13:19,24
speech 28:3
spirit 3:2 35:10
split 14:12 19:12
splits 11:5
spoke 26:13
sponsor 31:16
sponsors 27:13
sports 23:6,8
sportsmanship 5:20
staff 10:15,17,21 12:2
stand 2:9 6:11 31:14 37:14
standard 37:12
standards 21:2
standing 2:10 18:2
stands 3:13 37:15
Stars 6:25 7:5
start 7:4 23:2
starts 7:23 28:24 32:18
state 3:4,7 4:14 4:18,19,22,25 5:10,13,17,19 6:8 7:21 8:25 9:6 10:12 11:2 13:1 16:25 17:3 20:4,4,8 21:6 22:25 23:23 24:3 25:2,11 26:6 30:5,15 35:1 38:1,6
State's 5:6
statement 4:2,8 4:13 5:24 11:13 21:19
States 3:12 5:11 25:3
statewide 23:25 23:25
Station 35:7
statistical 11:17 12:2
statistics 11:21
stay 9:23
Steinberg 34:16 34:17,21
step 32:13
stepped 34:3
steps 32:19
stipulations

37:13
stolen 7:21
strap 24:12
strike 33:23
stringent 25:8
strong 3:1
strongly 17:22
stuff 31:13
subject 37:12
Submitted 6:1
suffered 18:5
sundry 24:13
supermajority 20:3,18 21:7 25:18
support 8:24 13:2 14:7 24:18 35:15
supreme 25:2,3
sure 14:7
surely 7:21
surprise 32:12
suspect 16:15
sway 16:16
swell 7:4
system 24:11

T

take 2:2 6:24,24 7:5,11 27:11 30:9 33:22
taken 30:7,11
talk 18:13 19:3 24:21
talked 17:20,24 24:7
talking 28:6 32:2
talks 13:17
team 4:14,20 5:8 5:17 6:17,18 7:12,21 9:13
team's 5:7
teams 7:3,9
techniques 7:7
tell 8:2,13,21 18:4 23:24
ten 17:2
Tennessee 4:23
Texas 2:20 5:4 34:22 35:11
thank 2:13 4:4 6:5,16,19,19 6:21 7:24 8:18 9:10,15,19,25 10:18,24 13:3 16:5,13 17:4 21:8,14 22:8,8 23:13 25:23 26:17,24 29:24 31:5,11 32:25 34:5,9,21 35:17
thanks 9:22 10:1 35:13 37:10
theoretical 12:14
thing 15:6,8,8 15:23 16:4 18:9,14 19:14 22:20 30:13
things 14:4,5 15:14,24 24:14 24:21 30:5
think 8:12 14:15 16:24 18:14,15 19:23,25 20:6 26:13 29:13,14 30:10 32:14
thinking 19:13 19:14
third 33:15,20
Thomas 6:15
thoroughly 32:13
thought 13:13 22:25
three 14:17
throw 18:19
tight 9:18
Tillis 17:23
time 15:9,25 16:19,23 17:20 19:18 20:5,22 25:1,2 36:18
today 2:5 8:21 12:25 16:17 21:21 22:17 27:24 29:16 32:16,25 35:13 36:6 37:1
toddler 26:8
told 16:1 23:1
Toppins 1:22 38:5,20
touched 18:7
tournament 4:24 5:1
town 24:22
traditional 11:3 12:22
tragedy 34:22
transcend 13:22 13:22
transcribed 38:9
TRANSCRIPT 1:8
transcription 38:8
traveling 7:12 8:25
treat 18:9
treating 17:15
true 28:10
truly 22:3
truth 18:8 28:13
try 24:12,19
trying 14:17
turn 2:23
two 5:9 7:3,5,9 7:15 8:12 14:19 24:20 26:7 30:5 31:15,19
type 27:14

U

U 24:10
unanimous 15:13,15
unconstitutio... 30:22
undersigned 5:23
understand 16:17 20:2,7 28:6,7 30:8 32:13,15
understanding 38:10
undertake 3:4
unfolding 34:22
united 3:12 5:11 15:21 25:3
urban 28:12,16
use 27:23

V

value 34:24
various 24:7,13 26:5
Vaughn 6:17 7:11
verbatim 38:7
Verse 7:5
version 19:23
versus 19:18
victories 7:4
victors 7:22
victory 2:18
violate 17:3
visitors 2:3,9
vividly 17:19
voice 26:11
voices 15:13 26:14
voluntarily 21:1
volunteers 2:21
vote 12:14 15:19 20:9,10 23:12 23:12 25:20 29:15 32:5,21 33:4,4,5,7,16 33:16,17,19
voted 18:24 19:7 19:9,10 20:13 20:15 27:18 33:7,19
voters 20:15,23 24:17 28:6 32:4
votes 20:4 21:5 32:4,5,7
voting 12:15 13:2 17:2 22:6 26:17 29:16 32:9,10,24

W

Wagner 6:18 7:11
wait 30:24
waited 30:21,23
Wake 11:19 17:6 21:10 23:15 26:19 28:19 36:13
walk 30:8
walked 19:7,10 20:13
want 14:20 15:21 16:17 18:4 21:7 23:21 24:8,9 24:10,11,19 25:14,14 26:3 26:11 27:17,20 30:3 31:14
wanted 32:10
wants 14:2 18:22
Washington 20:25 21:3
wasn't 11:25
wasted 32:3,5,6
watch 22:19
watched 26:5
watching 8:23
way 15:17 16:20 20:20 29:1 36:5
we'll 7:20 9:23 9:24 29:14
we're 9:13 14:21 14:25 18:11,12 30:20 34:7 36:20
we've 14:11,12 14:13 30:22
website 12:5
Wednesday 1:12
week 19:16
weeks 14:17

weight 18:1
welcome 9:23
went 4:25 19:6 29:6
weren't 17:15
West 5:2
western 29:1
Whereof 5:23 38:15
whined 17:14
whiner 30:3
whining 30:3 31:17
White 6:2
Williamsport 4:16 7:17
willing 17:3 24:17 30:17 31:3
win 18:5 20:14
wing 35:8
winning 18:15 18:16 25:2,3 32:6
wins 7:17
wisdom 3:5,8
wise 13:21
wish 10:21
Witness 5:23 38:15
women 35:8
won 7:10 22:19 23:25 24:7,8 25:17
wonderful 13:21
work 8:24 9:24 29:7 35:16 36:7
world 4:15,19 5:8,13,15,21 6:9
written 3:19,22 3:24
WWW.RUFF... 1:25

X

Y

y'all 9:22 10:1
year 17:12 36:2
years 9:2 17:2,4 27:13,18
yesterday 11:20 12:1,3,6,10,11 32:12
yield 8:10
yields 8:10
young 6:8,8 7:2 7:14 22:18 26:6
youth 2:18

Z

0

1

10/3 19:11
12 6:7 37:8
120 18:17
1228 34:8,8
13 23:25 24:1
14 37:8
15 28:20
15.1 37:13
16-0 5:4
17 23:25 24:1
17th 4:17
18 28:20

2

2-1 5:5
2:00 1:12
2:47 37:15
2003 19:19
200626300019 38:21
2008 14:3,3
2011 28:2 29:13
2012 17:11 19:5
2016 20:12
2017 1:12 4:17 5:20 6:1 11:18 38:16
2019 29:14
21 31:21
23 19:12
252-243-9000 1:24
27 28:22
27th 4:17
28 28:21
29 28:22
29th 3:18,21

3

3 37:8
3:30 33:23
3:45 33:24 36:21 37:14
30 1:12 34:1,7,8
30th 5:25 38:16
31 28:23

4

4 36:20
41 28:24
43 19:25
47 33:7,19
48% 20:12
49.6 19:8

5

5 22:20
50.93 19:6
52% 20:15
54 19:22
58 35:25

6

6-0 5:2
66 19:21
68 33:7,19
691 10:2,3 33:3 33:8,12,15,20

7

717 34:11
75 20:17
77 19:25
77% 19:12

8

80's 24:24

EX. 26

H927-ABK-43-Districts 82 and 83



N
W E
S

0 5 10 15 20 Miles

H927-ABK-43-Districts 82 and 83

Printed by the NC General Assembly, August 28, 2017.

Plan: HBK-22
Plan Type:

Administrator
User:

Districts & Their Incumbents

Friday, August 25, 2017 4:50 PM

District	Name	Party	Previous District
1	Steinburg	Republican	1
2	Yarborough	Republican	2
3	Speciale	Republican	3
4	Dixon	Republican	4
5	Hunter	Democratic	5
6	Boswell	Republican	6
7	B.Richardson	Democratic	7
8			
9	Murphy	Republican	9
10	J.Bell	Republican	10
11	Duane Hall, II	Democratic	11
12	G.Graham	Democratic	12
13	McElraft	Republican	13
14	Cleveland	Republican	14
15	Shepard	Republican	15
16	Millis	Republican	16
17	Iler	Republican	17
18	Butler	Democratic	18
19	Davis	Republican	19
20	Grange	Republican	20
21	L.Bell	Democratic	21
22	Brisson	Democratic	22
23	Willingham	Democratic	23
24	S.Martin	Republican	8
24	Farmer-Butterfield	Democratic	24
25	Collins	Republican	25

District	Name	Party	Previous District
26	White	Republican	26
27	Wray	Democratic	27
28	Strickland	Republican	28
29	Black	Democratic	29
30	Morey	Democratic	30
31	Michaux	Democratic	31
32	Garrison	Democratic	32
33	Gill	Democratic	33
34	G.Martin	Democratic	34
35	Malone	Republican	35
36	Dollar	Republican	36
37	Williams	Republican	37
38	Holley	Democratic	38
39	Jackson	Democratic	39
40	John	Democratic	40
41	Adcock	Democratic	41
42	Lucas	Democratic	42
43	Floyd	Democratic	43
44	W.Richardson	Democratic	44
45	Szoka	Republican	45
46	Brenden Jones	Republican	46
47	C.Graham	Democratic	47
48	Pierce	Democratic	48
49	Ball	Democrat	49
50	Meyer	Democratic	50
51	Sauls	Republican	51
52	Boles	Republican	52
53	Lewis	Republican	53
54	Reives	Democratic	54
55	Brody	Republican	55
56	Insko	Democratic	56

Plan: HBK-22 Administrator:
Type: User:

District	Name	Party	Previous District
57	Harrison	Democratic	57
58	Quick	Democratic	58
59			
60	Brockman	Democratic	60
61	Faircloth	Republican	61
61	Hardister	Republican	59
62	Blust	Republican	62
63	Ross	Republican	63
64	Riddell	Republican	64
65	Bert Jones	Republican	65
66	Goodman	Democratic	66
67	Burr	Republican	67
68	Horn	Republican	68
69	Arp	Republican	69
70	Hurley	Republican	70
71	Terry	Democratic	71
72	Hanes	Democratic	72
73	Zachary	Republican	73
74	Conrad	Republican	74
75	Lambeth	Republican	75
76	Warren	Republican	77
77	Howard	Republican	79
78	McNiell	Republican	78
79			
80	Watford	Republican	80
81	Potts	Republican	81
82	Pittman	Republican	82
83	Johnson	Republican	83
83	Ford	Republican	76
84	R.Turner	Republican	84
85	Dobson	Republican	85
86	Blackwell	Republican	86

Plan:	HBK-22	Administrator:	
Type:		User:	

District	Name	Party	Previous District
87	Destin Hall	Republican	87
88	Belk	Democratic	88
89	Setzer	Republican	89
90	Stevens	Republican	90
91	K.Hall	Republican	91
92	Beasley	Democratic	92
93	Jordan	Republican	93
94	Elmore	Republican	94
95	Fraley	Republican	95
96	Adams	Republican	96
97	Saine	Republican	97
98	Bradford	Republican	98
99	R.Moore	Democratic	99
100	Autry	Democratic	100
101	Earle	Democratic	101
102	Carney	Democratic	102
103	Brawley	Republican	103
104	Dulin	Republican	104
105	Stone	Republican	105
106	Cunningham	Democratic	106
107	Alexander	Democratic	107
108	Torbett	Republican	108
109	Bumgardner	Republican	109
110	Hastings	Republican	110
111	T.Moore	Republican	111
112	Rogers	Republican	112
113	Henson	Republican	113
114	Fisher	Democratic	114
115	Ager	Democratic	115
116	B.Turner	Democratic	116
117	McGrady	Republican	117
118	Presnell	Republican	118

Plan:	HBK-22	Administrator:	
Type:		User:	

District	Name	Party	Previous District
119	Clampitt	Republican	119
120	Corbin	Republican	120

Number of Incumbents in District with more than one Incumbent:	6	
Number of Districts with No Incumbent:	3	
Number of Districts with Incumbents of more than one party:	1	
Number of Districts with Paired Democrats:	0	
Number of Districts with Paired Republicans:	2	

Plan Name: HBK-22
Plan Type:
Date: 08/25/2017
Time: 04:51:25PM
Administrator:

Measures of Compactness

08/25/2017

Sum	N/A	N/A
Min	0.20	0.12
Max	0.70	0.71
Mean	0.41	0.31
Std. Dev.	0.09	0.11

DISTRICT	Reock	Polsby-Popper
1	0.49	0.18
2	0.43	0.49
3	0.37	0.33
4	0.44	0.37
5	0.25	0.27
6	0.33	0.24
7	0.52	0.32
8	0.51	0.39
9	0.40	0.27
10	0.36	0.23
11	0.36	0.30
12	0.36	0.34
13	0.24	0.22
14	0.39	0.28
15	0.55	0.37
16	0.31	0.22
17	0.48	0.30
18	0.51	0.33
19	0.20	0.28
20	0.36	0.20
21	0.29	0.12
22	0.48	0.20
23	0.35	0.24
24	0.53	0.71
25	0.50	0.35
26	0.39	0.27
27	0.52	0.40
28	0.38	0.22
29	0.39	0.34
30	0.40	0.39
31	0.50	0.37
32	0.53	0.51
33	0.42	0.31
34	0.44	0.33
35	0.37	0.31
36	0.31	0.21
37	0.40	0.38
38	0.31	0.25
39	0.33	0.26
40	0.52	0.35

DISTRICT	Reock	Polsby-Popper
41	0.33	0.25
42	0.50	0.40
43	0.34	0.31
44	0.50	0.24
45	0.46	0.22
46	0.23	0.16
47	0.57	0.42
48	0.48	0.45
49	0.40	0.35
50	0.38	0.34
51	0.52	0.40
52	0.32	0.25
53	0.59	0.47
54	0.45	0.43
55	0.42	0.29
56	0.49	0.34
57	0.37	0.28
58	0.44	0.18
59	0.39	0.25
60	0.29	0.21
61	0.32	0.22
62	0.47	0.50
63	0.34	0.30
64	0.34	0.28
65	0.52	0.47
66	0.40	0.35
67	0.51	0.31
68	0.33	0.28
69	0.37	0.20
70	0.54	0.54
71	0.35	0.19
72	0.50	0.26
73	0.46	0.47
74	0.38	0.23
75	0.22	0.16
76	0.49	0.46
77	0.39	0.35
78	0.36	0.28
79	0.48	0.30
80	0.28	0.22
81	0.50	0.22
82	0.41	0.39
83	0.31	0.27
84	0.51	0.45
85	0.39	0.23
86	0.38	0.27
87	0.50	0.57
88	0.60	0.33
89	0.34	0.26
90	0.29	0.15
91	0.32	0.32
92	0.44	0.25
93	0.57	0.42
94	0.34	0.22
95	0.43	0.37
96	0.30	0.21

Plan Name:	HBK-22	Administrator:	
Plan Type:		User:	

DISTRICT	Reock	Polsby-Popper
97	0.33	0.52
98	0.70	0.64
99	0.43	0.42
100	0.43	0.35
101	0.51	0.34
102	0.64	0.43
103	0.27	0.32
104	0.49	0.35
105	0.49	0.37
106	0.43	0.44
107	0.38	0.20
108	0.44	0.32
109	0.46	0.47
110	0.36	0.26
111	0.40	0.28
112	0.39	0.30
113	0.24	0.21
114	0.39	0.13
115	0.38	0.19
116	0.35	0.23
117	0.40	0.28
118	0.36	0.15
119	0.36	0.20
120	0.40	0.37

HBK-22 Pittman Districts 82 and 83: County-District

County	District	Total County Pop	Total District Pop	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Alamance	63	151,131	75,550	75,550	49.99%	100.00%
	64	151,131	75,581	75,581	50.01%	100.00%
Alexander	94	37,198	83,358	37,198	100.00%	44.62%
Alleghany	90	11,155	82,779	11,155	100.00%	13.48%
Anson	55	26,948	75,792	26,948	100.00%	35.56%
Ashe	93	27,281	78,360	27,281	100.00%	34.81%
Avery	85	17,797	78,372	17,797	100.00%	22.71%
Beaufort	79	47,759	75,538	47,759	100.00%	63.23%
Bertie	1	21,282	77,143	21,282	100.00%	27.59%
Bladen	22	35,190	83,434	35,190	100.00%	42.18%
Brunswick	17	107,431	77,263	77,263	71.92%	100.00%
	18	107,431	77,681	30,168	28.08%	38.84%
Buncombe	114	238,318	82,902	82,902	34.79%	100.00%
	115	238,318	79,883	79,883	33.52%	100.00%
	116	238,318	75,533	75,533	31.69%	100.00%
Burke	86	90,912	79,175	79,175	87.09%	100.00%
	112	90,912	79,547	11,737	12.91%	14.75%
Cabarrus	67	178,011	82,583	30,593	17.19%	37.05%
	82	178,011	80,879	80,879	45.43%	100.00%
	83	178,011	81,381	66,539	37.38%	81.76%
Caldwell	87	83,029	83,029	83,029	100.00%	100.00%
Camden	1	9,980	77,143	9,980	100.00%	12.94%
Carteret	13	66,469	76,622	66,469	100.00%	86.75%
Caswell	50	23,719	80,866	23,719	100.00%	29.33%
Catawba	89	154,358	77,838	77,838	50.43%	100.00%
	96	154,358	76,520	76,520	49.57%	100.00%
Chatham	54	63,505	82,312	63,505	100.00%	77.15%
Cherokee	120	27,444	80,814	27,444	100.00%	33.96%
Chowan	1	14,793	77,143	14,793	100.00%	19.18%
Clay	120	10,587	80,814	10,587	100.00%	13.10%
Cleveland	110	98,078	75,573	21,930	22.36%	29.02%
	111	98,078	76,148	76,148	77.64%	100.00%
Columbus	16	58,098	81,425	29,208	50.27%	35.87%
	46	58,098	80,440	28,890	49.73%	35.91%
Craven	3	103,505	75,726	75,726	73.16%	100.00%
	79	103,505	75,538	27,779	26.84%	36.77%
Cumberland	42	319,431	81,439	81,439	25.50%	100.00%
	43	319,431	77,725	77,725	24.33%	100.00%
	44	319,431	80,973	80,973	25.35%	100.00%
	45	319,431	79,294	79,294	24.82%	100.00%
Currituck	6	23,547	76,421	23,547	100.00%	30.81%
Dare	6	33,920	76,421	33,920	100.00%	44.39%
Davidson	80	162,878	81,522	81,522	50.05%	100.00%
	81	162,878	81,356	81,356	49.95%	100.00%
Davie	77	41,240	82,918	41,240	100.00%	49.74%
Duplin	4	58,505	81,905	58,505	100.00%	71.43%
Durham	29	267,587	82,735	82,735	30.92%	100.00%
	30	267,587	83,272	83,272	31.12%	100.00%

HBK-22 Pittman Districts 82 and 83: County-District

County	District	Total County Pop	Total District Pop	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Durham	31	267,587	82,773	82,773	30.93%	100.00%
	54	267,587	82,312	18,807	7.03%	22.85%
Edgecombe	23	56,552	81,057	56,552	100.00%	69.77%
Forsyth	71	350,670	75,793	75,793	21.61%	100.00%
	72	350,670	76,245	76,245	21.74%	100.00%
	73	350,670	78,189	39,783	11.34%	50.88%
	74	350,670	79,963	79,963	22.80%	100.00%
	75	350,670	78,886	78,886	22.50%	100.00%
Franklin	7	60,619	78,432	60,619	100.00%	77.29%
Gaston	108	206,086	76,926	76,926	37.33%	100.00%
	109	206,086	75,517	75,517	36.64%	100.00%
	110	206,086	75,573	53,643	26.03%	70.98%
Gates	5	12,197	77,527	12,197	100.00%	15.73%
Graham	120	8,861	80,814	8,861	100.00%	10.96%
Granville	2	59,916	82,634	43,170	72.05%	52.24%
	32	59,916	83,140	16,746	27.95%	20.14%
Greene	10	21,362	83,434	21,362	100.00%	25.60%
Guilford	57	488,406	82,755	82,755	16.94%	100.00%
	58	488,406	82,137	82,137	16.82%	100.00%
	59	488,406	79,907	79,907	16.36%	100.00%
	60	488,406	81,856	81,856	16.76%	100.00%
	61	488,406	81,019	81,019	16.59%	100.00%
	62	488,406	80,732	80,732	16.53%	100.00%
Halifax	27	54,691	76,790	54,691	100.00%	71.22%
Harnett	28	114,678	83,431	5,681	4.95%	6.81%
	51	114,678	83,434	25,568	22.30%	30.64%
	53	114,678	83,429	83,429	72.75%	100.00%
Haywood	118	59,036	76,322	37,740	63.93%	49.45%
	119	59,036	75,548	21,296	36.07%	28.19%
Henderson	113	106,740	81,089	27,489	25.75%	33.90%
	117	106,740	79,251	79,251	74.25%	100.00%
Hertford	5	24,669	77,527	24,669	100.00%	31.82%
Hoke	48	46,952	83,109	46,952	100.00%	56.49%
Hyde	6	5,810	76,421	5,810	100.00%	7.60%
Iredell	84	159,437	77,282	77,282	48.47%	100.00%
	95	159,437	82,155	82,155	51.53%	100.00%
Jackson	119	40,271	75,548	40,271	100.00%	53.31%
Johnston	10	168,878	83,434	7,696	4.56%	9.22%
	26	168,878	83,432	83,432	49.40%	100.00%
	28	168,878	83,431	77,750	46.04%	93.19%
Jones	13	10,153	76,622	10,153	100.00%	13.25%
Lee	51	57,866	83,434	57,866	100.00%	69.36%
Lenoir	12	59,495	75,923	59,495	100.00%	78.36%
Lincoln	97	78,265	78,265	78,265	100.00%	100.00%
Macon	120	33,922	80,814	33,922	100.00%	41.98%
Madison	118	20,764	76,322	20,764	100.00%	27.21%
Martin	23	24,505	81,057	24,505	100.00%	30.23%
McDowell	85	44,996	78,372	44,996	100.00%	57.41%
Mecklenburg	88	919,628	76,022	76,022	8.27%	100.00%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-22.asc', modified 08/25/2017 04:53:18 PM

Data Source: 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File - North Carolina

Printed 08/25/2017 {rptG01|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

HBK-22 Pittman Districts 82 and 83: County-District

County	District	Total County Pop	Total District Pop	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Mecklenburg	92	919,628	77,172	77,172	8.39%	100.00%
	98	919,628	75,602	75,602	8.22%	100.00%
	99	919,628	77,141	77,141	8.39%	100.00%
	100	919,628	75,589	75,589	8.22%	100.00%
	101	919,628	79,876	79,876	8.69%	100.00%
	102	919,628	77,391	77,391	8.42%	100.00%
	103	919,628	76,381	76,381	8.31%	100.00%
	104	919,628	76,869	76,869	8.36%	100.00%
	105	919,628	75,967	75,967	8.26%	100.00%
	106	919,628	75,762	75,762	8.24%	100.00%
	107	919,628	75,856	75,856	8.25%	100.00%
Mitchell	85	15,579	78,372	15,579	100.00%	19.88%
Montgomery	66	27,798	83,032	27,798	100.00%	33.48%
Moore	52	88,247	76,894	76,894	87.13%	100.00%
	78	88,247	76,980	11,353	12.87%	14.75%
Nash	7	95,840	78,432	17,813	18.59%	22.71%
	25	95,840	78,027	78,027	81.41%	100.00%
New Hanover	18	202,667	77,681	47,513	23.44%	61.16%
	19	202,667	76,666	76,666	37.83%	100.00%
	20	202,667	78,488	78,488	38.73%	100.00%
Northampton	27	22,099	76,790	22,099	100.00%	28.78%
Onslow	4	177,772	81,905	23,400	13.16%	28.57%
	14	177,772	77,065	77,065	43.35%	100.00%
	15	177,772	77,307	77,307	43.49%	100.00%
Orange	50	133,801	80,866	57,147	42.71%	70.67%
	56	133,801	76,654	76,654	57.29%	100.00%
Pamlico	6	13,144	76,421	13,144	100.00%	17.20%
Pasquotank	5	40,661	77,527	40,661	100.00%	52.45%
Pender	16	52,217	81,425	52,217	100.00%	64.13%
Perquimans	1	13,453	77,143	13,453	100.00%	17.44%
Person	2	39,464	82,634	39,464	100.00%	47.76%
Pitt	8	168,148	75,926	75,926	45.15%	100.00%
	9	168,148	75,794	75,794	45.08%	100.00%
	12	168,148	75,923	16,428	9.77%	21.64%
Polk	113	20,510	81,089	20,510	100.00%	25.29%
Randolph	70	141,752	76,125	76,125	53.70%	100.00%
	78	141,752	76,980	65,627	46.30%	85.25%
Richmond	66	46,639	83,032	46,639	100.00%	56.17%
Robeson	46	134,168	80,440	51,550	38.42%	64.09%
	47	134,168	82,618	82,618	61.58%	100.00%
Rockingham	65	93,643	83,430	83,430	89.09%	100.00%
	91	93,643	82,843	10,213	10.91%	12.33%
Rowan	76	138,428	81,908	81,908	59.17%	100.00%
	77	138,428	82,918	41,678	30.11%	50.26%
	83	138,428	81,381	14,842	10.72%	18.24%
Rutherford	112	67,810	79,547	67,810	100.00%	85.25%
Sampson	21	63,431	83,434	15,187	23.94%	18.20%
	22	63,431	83,434	48,244	76.06%	57.82%
Scotland	48	36,157	83,109	36,157	100.00%	43.51%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-22.asc', modified 08/25/2017 04:53:18 PM

Data Source: 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File - North Carolina

Printed 08/25/2017 {rptG01|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

HBK-22 Pittman Districts 82 and 83: County-District

County	District	Total County Pop	Total District Pop	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Stanly	66	60,585	83,032	8,595	14.19%	10.35%
	67	60,585	82,583	51,990	85.81%	62.95%
Stokes	91	47,401	82,843	47,401	100.00%	57.22%
Surry	90	73,673	82,779	48,444	65.76%	58.52%
	91	73,673	82,843	25,229	34.24%	30.45%
Swain	119	13,981	75,548	13,981	100.00%	18.51%
Transylvania	113	33,090	81,089	33,090	100.00%	40.81%
Tyrrell	1	4,407	77,143	4,407	100.00%	5.71%
Union	55	201,292	75,792	48,844	24.27%	64.44%
	68	201,292	76,067	76,067	37.79%	100.00%
	69	201,292	76,381	76,381	37.95%	100.00%
Vance	32	45,422	83,140	45,422	100.00%	54.63%
Wake	11	900,993	81,539	81,539	9.05%	100.00%
	33	900,993	82,642	82,642	9.17%	100.00%
	34	900,993	81,525	81,525	9.05%	100.00%
	35	900,993	81,862	81,862	9.09%	100.00%
	36	900,993	81,926	81,926	9.09%	100.00%
	37	900,993	80,332	80,332	8.92%	100.00%
	38	900,993	83,094	83,094	9.22%	100.00%
	39	900,993	82,181	82,181	9.12%	100.00%
	40	900,993	80,912	80,912	8.98%	100.00%
	41	900,993	82,359	82,359	9.14%	100.00%
	49	900,993	82,621	82,621	9.17%	100.00%
Warren	32	20,972	83,140	20,972	100.00%	25.22%
Washington	1	13,228	77,143	13,228	100.00%	17.15%
Watauga	93	51,079	78,360	51,079	100.00%	65.19%
Wayne	10	122,623	83,434	54,376	44.34%	65.17%
	21	122,623	83,434	68,247	55.66%	81.80%
Wilkes	90	69,340	82,779	23,180	33.43%	28.00%
	94	69,340	83,358	46,160	66.57%	55.38%
Wilson	24	81,234	81,234	81,234	100.00%	100.00%
Yadkin	73	38,406	78,189	38,406	100.00%	49.12%
Yancey	118	17,818	76,322	17,818	100.00%	23.35%
			Total:	**9,535,483**		

HBK-22 Pittman Districts 82 and 83: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Aberdeen	52	6,350	76,894	6,350	100.00%	8.26%
Ahoskie	5	5,039	77,527	5,039	100.00%	6.50%
Alamance	64	951	75,581	951	100.00%	1.26%
Albemarle	66	15,903	83,032	2,814	17.69%	3.39%
	67	15,903	82,583	13,089	82.31%	15.85%
Alliance	6	776	76,421	776	100.00%	1.02%
Andrews	120	1,781	80,814	1,781	100.00%	2.20%
Angier (Harnett)	28	4,247	83,431	4,242	99.88%	5.08%
	53	4,247	83,429	5	0.12%	0.01%
Angier (Wake)	37	103	80,332	103	100.00%	0.13%
Ansonville	55	631	75,792	631	100.00%	0.83%
Apex	11	37,476	81,539	2	0.01%	0.00%
	36	37,476	81,926	7,166	19.12%	8.75%
	37	37,476	80,332	9,305	24.83%	11.58%
	41	37,476	82,359	21,003	56.04%	25.50%
Arapahoe	6	556	76,421	556	100.00%	0.73%
Archdale (Guilford)	59	333	79,907	217	65.17%	0.27%
	60	333	81,856	116	34.83%	0.14%
Archdale (Randolph)	70	11,082	76,125	11,082	100.00%	14.56%
Archer Lodge	26	4,292	83,432	4,292	100.00%	5.14%
Asheboro	70	25,012	76,125	21,327	85.27%	28.02%
	78	25,012	76,980	3,685	14.73%	4.79%
Asheville	114	83,393	82,902	66,182	79.36%	79.83%
	115	83,393	79,883	5,409	6.49%	6.77%
	116	83,393	75,533	11,802	14.15%	15.62%
Askewville	1	241	77,143	241	100.00%	0.31%
Atkinson	16	299	81,425	299	100.00%	0.37%
Atlantic Beach	13	1,495	76,622	1,495	100.00%	1.95%
Aulander	1	895	77,143	895	100.00%	1.16%
Aurora	79	520	75,538	520	100.00%	0.69%
Autryville	22	196	83,434	196	100.00%	0.23%
Ayden	12	4,932	75,923	4,932	100.00%	6.50%
Badin	66	1,974	83,032	1,974	100.00%	2.38%
Bailey	7	569	78,432	569	100.00%	0.73%
Bakersville	85	464	78,372	464	100.00%	0.59%
Bald Head Island	17	158	77,263	158	100.00%	0.20%
Banner Elk	85	1,028	78,372	1,028	100.00%	1.31%
Bath	79	249	75,538	249	100.00%	0.33%
Bayboro	6	1,263	76,421	1,263	100.00%	1.65%
Bear Grass	23	73	81,057	73	100.00%	0.09%
Beaufort	13	4,039	76,622	4,039	100.00%	5.27%
Beech Mountain (Avery)	85	24	78,372	24	100.00%	0.03%
Beech Mountain (Watauga)	93	296	78,360	296	100.00%	0.38%
Belhaven	79	1,688	75,538	1,688	100.00%	2.23%
Belmont	108	10,076	76,926	4,622	45.87%	6.01%
	109	10,076	75,517	5,454	54.13%	7.22%
Belville	18	1,936	77,681	1,936	100.00%	2.49%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-22.asc', modified 08/25/2017 04:53:18 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/25/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

HBK-22 Pittman Districts 82 and 83: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Belwood	111	950	76,148	950	100.00%	1.25%
Benson (Harnett)	53	0	83,429	0	0.00%	0.00%
Benson (Johnston)	28	3,311	83,431	3,311	100.00%	3.97%
Bermuda Run	77	1,725	82,918	1,725	100.00%	2.08%
Bessemer City	110	5,340	75,573	5,340	100.00%	7.07%
Bethania	74	328	79,963	328	100.00%	0.41%
Bethel	8	1,577	75,926	1,577	100.00%	2.08%
Beulaville	4	1,296	81,905	1,296	100.00%	1.58%
Biltmore Forest	116	1,343	75,533	1,343	100.00%	1.78%
Biscoe	66	1,700	83,032	1,700	100.00%	2.05%
Black Creek	24	769	81,234	769	100.00%	0.95%
Black Mountain	115	7,848	79,883	7,848	100.00%	9.82%
Bladenboro	22	1,750	83,434	1,750	100.00%	2.10%
Blowing Rock (Caldwell)	87	49	83,029	49	100.00%	0.06%
Blowing Rock (Watauga)	93	1,192	78,360	1,192	100.00%	1.52%
Boardman	46	157	80,440	157	100.00%	0.20%
Bogue	13	684	76,622	684	100.00%	0.89%
Boiling Spring Lakes	17	5,372	77,263	5,370	99.96%	6.95%
	18	5,372	77,681	2	0.04%	0.00%
Boiling Springs	111	4,647	76,148	4,647	100.00%	6.10%
Bolivia	18	143	77,681	143	100.00%	0.18%
Bolton	16	691	81,425	691	100.00%	0.85%
Boone	93	17,122	78,360	17,122	100.00%	21.85%
Boonville	73	1,222	78,189	1,222	100.00%	1.56%
Bostic	112	386	79,547	386	100.00%	0.49%
Brevard	113	7,609	81,089	7,609	100.00%	9.38%
Bridgeton	79	454	75,538	454	100.00%	0.60%
Broadway (Harnett)	53	25	83,429	25	100.00%	0.03%
Broadway (Lee)	51	1,204	83,434	1,204	100.00%	1.44%
Brookford	89	382	77,838	321	84.03%	0.41%
	96	382	76,520	61	15.97%	0.08%
Brunswick	16	1,119	81,425	1,119	100.00%	1.37%
Bryson City	119	1,424	75,548	1,424	100.00%	1.88%
Bunn	7	344	78,432	344	100.00%	0.44%
Burgaw	16	3,872	81,425	3,872	100.00%	4.76%
Burlington (Alamance)	63	49,308	75,550	23,248	47.15%	30.77%
	64	49,308	75,581	26,060	52.85%	34.48%
Burlington (Guilford)	59	655	79,907	655	100.00%	0.82%
Burnsville	118	1,693	76,322	1,693	100.00%	2.22%
Butner	2	7,591	82,634	7,591	100.00%	9.19%
Cajah's Mountain	87	2,823	83,029	2,823	100.00%	3.40%
Calabash	17	1,786	77,263	1,786	100.00%	2.31%
Calypso	4	538	81,905	538	100.00%	0.66%
Cameron	52	285	76,894	285	100.00%	0.37%
Candor	66	840	83,032	840	100.00%	1.01%
Canton	118	4,227	76,322	4,227	100.00%	5.54%
Cape Carteret	13	1,917	76,622	1,917	100.00%	2.50%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-22.asc', modified 08/25/2017 04:53:18 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/25/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

HBK-22 Pittman Districts 82 and 83: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Carolina Beach	19	5,706	76,666	5,706	100.00%	7.44%
Carolina Shores	17	3,048	77,263	3,048	100.00%	3.94%
Carrboro	50	19,582	80,866	81	0.41%	0.10%
	56	19,582	76,654	19,501	99.59%	25.44%
Carthage	52	2,205	76,894	6	0.27%	0.01%
	78	2,205	76,980	2,199	99.73%	2.86%
Cary (Chatham)	54	1,422	82,312	1,422	100.00%	1.73%
Cary (Wake)	11	133,812	81,539	51,109	38.19%	62.68%
	36	133,812	81,926	19,380	14.48%	23.66%
	37	133,812	80,332	2,024	1.51%	2.52%
	41	133,812	82,359	46,234	34.55%	56.14%
	49	133,812	82,621	15,065	11.26%	18.23%
Casar	111	297	76,148	297	100.00%	0.39%
Castalia	25	268	78,027	268	100.00%	0.34%
Caswell Beach	17	398	77,263	398	100.00%	0.52%
Catawba	89	603	77,838	603	100.00%	0.77%
Cedar Point	13	1,279	76,622	1,279	100.00%	1.67%
Cedar Rock	87	300	83,029	300	100.00%	0.36%
Centerville	7	89	78,432	89	100.00%	0.11%
Cerro Gordo	46	207	80,440	207	100.00%	0.26%
Chadbourn	46	1,856	80,440	1,856	100.00%	2.31%
Chapel Hill (Durham)	29	2,836	82,735	2,234	78.77%	2.70%
	54	2,836	82,312	602	21.23%	0.73%
Chapel Hill (Orange)	50	54,397	80,866	2,280	4.19%	2.82%
	56	54,397	76,654	52,117	95.81%	67.99%
Charlotte	88	731,424	76,022	72,044	9.85%	94.77%
	92	731,424	77,172	57,603	7.88%	74.64%
	98	731,424	75,602	0	0.00%	0.00%
	99	731,424	77,141	67,000	9.16%	86.85%
	100	731,424	75,589	64,757	8.85%	85.67%
	101	731,424	79,876	71,339	9.75%	89.31%
	102	731,424	77,391	77,391	10.58%	100.00%
	103	731,424	76,381	30,850	4.22%	40.39%
	104	731,424	76,869	76,869	10.51%	100.00%
	105	731,424	75,967	75,967	10.39%	100.00%
	106	731,424	75,762	74,391	10.17%	98.19%
	107	731,424	75,856	63,213	8.64%	83.33%
Cherryville	110	5,760	75,573	5,760	100.00%	7.62%
Chimney Rock Village	112	113	79,547	113	100.00%	0.14%
China Grove	83	3,563	81,381	3,563	100.00%	4.38%
Chocowinity	79	820	75,538	820	100.00%	1.09%
Claremont	89	1,352	77,838	1,352	100.00%	1.74%
Clarkton	22	837	83,434	837	100.00%	1.00%
Clayton (Johnston)	26	16,116	83,432	16,116	100.00%	19.32%
Clayton (Wake)	39	0	82,181	0	0.00%	0.00%
Clemmons	73	18,627	78,189	6,625	35.57%	8.47%
	75	18,627	78,886	12,002	64.43%	15.21%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-22.asc', modified 08/25/2017 04:53:18 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/25/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

HBK-22 Pittman Districts 82 and 83: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Cleveland	77	871	82,918	871	100.00%	1.05%
Clinton	21	8,639	83,434	4,242	49.10%	5.08%
	22	8,639	83,434	4,397	50.90%	5.27%
Clyde	118	1,223	76,322	1,223	100.00%	1.60%
Coats	53	2,112	83,429	2,112	100.00%	2.53%
Cofield	5	413	77,527	413	100.00%	0.53%
Colerain	1	204	77,143	204	100.00%	0.26%
Columbia	1	891	77,143	891	100.00%	1.15%
Columbus	113	999	81,089	999	100.00%	1.23%
Como	5	91	77,527	91	100.00%	0.12%
Concord	67	79,066	82,583	0	0.00%	0.00%
	82	79,066	80,879	48,154	60.90%	59.54%
	83	79,066	81,381	30,912	39.10%	37.98%
Conetoe	23	294	81,057	294	100.00%	0.36%
Connelly Springs	86	1,669	79,175	1,669	100.00%	2.11%
Conover	89	8,165	77,838	384	4.70%	0.49%
	96	8,165	76,520	7,781	95.30%	10.17%
Conway	27	836	76,790	836	100.00%	1.09%
Cooleemee	77	960	82,918	960	100.00%	1.16%
Cornelius	98	24,866	75,602	24,866	100.00%	32.89%
Cove City	79	399	75,538	399	100.00%	0.53%
Cramerton	108	4,165	76,926	1	0.02%	0.00%
	109	4,165	75,517	4,164	99.98%	5.51%
Creedmoor	2	4,124	82,634	4,124	100.00%	4.99%
Creswell	1	276	77,143	276	100.00%	0.36%
Crossnore	85	192	78,372	192	100.00%	0.24%
Dallas	110	4,488	75,573	4,488	100.00%	5.94%
Danbury	91	189	82,843	189	100.00%	0.23%
Davidson (Iredell)	95	294	82,155	294	100.00%	0.36%
Davidson (Mecklenburg)	98	10,650	75,602	10,650	100.00%	14.09%
Dellview	110	13	75,573	13	100.00%	0.02%
Denton	80	1,636	81,522	1,636	100.00%	2.01%
Dillsboro	119	232	75,548	232	100.00%	0.31%
Dobbins Heights	66	866	83,032	866	100.00%	1.04%
Dobson	90	1,586	82,779	1,436	90.54%	1.73%
	91	1,586	82,843	150	9.46%	0.18%
Dortches	25	935	78,027	935	100.00%	1.20%
Dover	79	401	75,538	401	100.00%	0.53%
Drexel	86	1,858	79,175	1,858	100.00%	2.35%
Dublin	22	338	83,434	338	100.00%	0.41%
Duck	6	369	76,421	369	100.00%	0.48%
Dunn	53	9,263	83,429	9,263	100.00%	11.10%
Durham (Durham)	29	228,300	82,735	79,803	34.96%	96.46%
	30	228,300	83,272	60,805	26.63%	73.02%
	31	228,300	82,773	71,653	31.39%	86.57%
	54	228,300	82,312	16,039	7.03%	19.49%
Durham (Orange)	50	30	80,866	30	100.00%	0.04%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-22.asc', modified 08/25/2017 04:53:18 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/25/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

HBK-22 Pittman Districts 82 and 83: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Durham (Wake)	41	0	82,359	0	0.00%	0.00%
Earl	111	260	76,148	260	100.00%	0.34%
East Arcadia	22	487	83,434	487	100.00%	0.58%
East Bend	73	612	78,189	612	100.00%	0.78%
East Laurinburg	48	300	83,109	300	100.00%	0.36%
East Spencer	76	1,534	81,908	1,534	100.00%	1.87%
Eastover	45	3,628	79,294	3,628	100.00%	4.58%
Eden	65	15,527	83,430	15,527	100.00%	18.61%
Edenton	1	5,004	77,143	5,004	100.00%	6.49%
Elizabeth City (Camden)	1	45	77,143	45	100.00%	0.06%
Elizabeth City (Pasquotank)	5	18,638	77,527	18,638	100.00%	24.04%
Elizabethtown	22	3,583	83,434	3,583	100.00%	4.29%
Elk Park	85	452	78,372	452	100.00%	0.58%
Elkin (Surry)	90	3,921	82,779	3,921	100.00%	4.74%
Elkin (Wilkes)	94	80	83,358	80	100.00%	0.10%
Ellenboro	112	873	79,547	873	100.00%	1.10%
Ellerbe	66	1,054	83,032	1,054	100.00%	1.27%
Elm City	24	1,298	81,234	1,298	100.00%	1.60%
Elon	64	9,419	75,581	9,419	100.00%	12.46%
Emerald Isle	13	3,655	76,622	3,655	100.00%	4.77%
Enfield	27	2,532	76,790	2,532	100.00%	3.30%
Erwin	53	4,405	83,429	4,405	100.00%	5.28%
Eureka	10	197	83,434	197	100.00%	0.24%
Everetts	23	164	81,057	164	100.00%	0.20%
Fair Bluff	46	951	80,440	951	100.00%	1.18%
Fairmont	47	2,663	82,618	2,663	100.00%	3.22%
Fairview	55	3,324	75,792	3,324	100.00%	4.39%
Faison (Duplin)	4	961	81,905	961	100.00%	1.17%
Faison (Sampson)	21	0	83,434	0	0.00%	0.00%
Faith	76	807	81,908	807	100.00%	0.99%
Falcon (Cumberland)	45	258	79,294	258	100.00%	0.33%
Falcon (Sampson)	22	0	83,434	0	0.00%	0.00%
Falkland	8	96	75,926	96	100.00%	0.13%
Fallston	111	607	76,148	607	100.00%	0.80%
Farmville	8	4,654	75,926	4,654	100.00%	6.13%
Fayetteville	42	200,564	81,439	67,394	33.60%	82.75%
	43	200,564	77,725	74,393	37.09%	95.71%
	44	200,564	80,973	51,354	25.60%	63.42%
	45	200,564	79,294	7,423	3.70%	9.36%
Flat Rock	113	3,114	81,089	3,114	100.00%	3.84%
Fletcher	117	7,187	79,251	7,187	100.00%	9.07%
Forest City	112	7,476	79,547	7,476	100.00%	9.40%
Forest Hills	119	365	75,548	365	100.00%	0.48%
Fountain	8	427	75,926	427	100.00%	0.56%
Four Oaks	28	1,921	83,431	1,921	100.00%	2.30%
Foxfire	52	902	76,894	902	100.00%	1.17%
Franklin	120	3,845	80,814	3,845	100.00%	4.76%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-22.asc', modified 08/25/2017 04:53:18 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/25/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

HBK-22 Pittman Districts 82 and 83: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Franklinton	7	2,023	78,432	2,023	100.00%	2.58%
Franklinville	78	1,164	76,980	1,164	100.00%	1.51%
Fremont	10	1,255	83,434	1,255	100.00%	1.50%
Fuquay-Varina	36	17,937	81,926	228	1.27%	0.28%
	37	17,937	80,332	17,709	98.73%	22.04%
Gamewell	87	4,051	83,029	4,051	100.00%	4.88%
Garland	22	625	83,434	625	100.00%	0.75%
Garner	33	25,745	82,642	21,767	84.55%	26.34%
	36	25,745	81,926	3,823	14.85%	4.67%
	39	25,745	82,181	155	0.60%	0.19%
Garysburg	27	1,057	76,790	1,057	100.00%	1.38%
Gaston	27	1,152	76,790	1,152	100.00%	1.50%
Gastonia	108	71,741	76,926	26,870	37.45%	34.93%
	109	71,741	75,517	41,847	58.33%	55.41%
	110	71,741	75,573	3,024	4.22%	4.00%
Gatesville	5	321	77,527	321	100.00%	0.41%
Gibson	48	540	83,109	540	100.00%	0.65%
Gibsonville (Alamance)	64	3,148	75,581	3,148	100.00%	4.17%
Gibsonville (Guilford)	59	3,262	79,907	3,262	100.00%	4.08%
Glen Alpine	86	1,517	79,175	1,517	100.00%	1.92%
Godwin	45	139	79,294	139	100.00%	0.18%
Goldsboro	10	36,437	83,434	2,531	6.95%	3.03%
	21	36,437	83,434	33,906	93.05%	40.64%
Goldston	54	268	82,312	268	100.00%	0.33%
Graham	63	14,153	75,550	14,153	100.00%	18.73%
Grandfather	85	25	78,372	25	100.00%	0.03%
Granite Falls	87	4,722	83,029	4,722	100.00%	5.69%
Granite Quarry	76	2,930	81,908	2,930	100.00%	3.58%
Grantsboro	6	688	76,421	688	100.00%	0.90%
Green Level	63	2,100	75,550	2,100	100.00%	2.78%
Greenevers	4	634	81,905	634	100.00%	0.77%
Greensboro	57	269,666	82,755	80,164	29.73%	96.87%
	58	269,666	82,137	76,171	28.25%	92.74%
	59	269,666	79,907	11,283	4.18%	14.12%
	60	269,666	81,856	14,170	5.25%	17.31%
	61	269,666	81,019	36,131	13.40%	44.60%
	62	269,666	80,732	51,747	19.19%	64.10%
Greenville	8	84,554	75,926	48,780	57.69%	64.25%
	9	84,554	75,794	34,649	40.98%	45.71%
	12	84,554	75,923	1,125	1.33%	1.48%
Grifton (Lenoir)	12	186	75,923	186	100.00%	0.24%
Grifton (Pitt)	12	2,431	75,923	2,431	100.00%	3.20%
Grimesland	9	441	75,794	441	100.00%	0.58%
Grover	111	708	76,148	708	100.00%	0.93%
Halifax	27	234	76,790	234	100.00%	0.30%
Hamilton	23	408	81,057	408	100.00%	0.50%
Hamlet	66	6,495	83,032	6,495	100.00%	7.82%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-22.asc', modified 08/25/2017 04:53:18 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/25/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

HBK-22 Pittman Districts 82 and 83: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Harmony	84	531	77,282	531	100.00%	0.69%
Harrells (Duplin)	4	23	81,905	23	100.00%	0.03%
Harrells (Sampson)	22	179	83,434	179	100.00%	0.21%
Harrellsville	5	106	77,527	106	100.00%	0.14%
Harrisburg	67	11,526	82,583	3,156	27.38%	3.82%
	82	11,526	80,879	8,370	72.62%	10.35%
Hassell	23	84	81,057	84	100.00%	0.10%
Havelock	3	20,735	75,726	20,735	100.00%	27.38%
Haw River	63	2,298	75,550	2,254	98.09%	2.98%
	64	2,298	75,581	44	1.91%	0.06%
Hayesville	120	311	80,814	311	100.00%	0.38%
Hemby Bridge	69	1,520	76,381	1,520	100.00%	1.99%
Henderson	32	15,368	83,140	15,368	100.00%	18.48%
Hendersonville	113	13,137	81,089	514	3.91%	0.63%
	117	13,137	79,251	12,623	96.09%	15.93%
Hertford	1	2,143	77,143	2,143	100.00%	2.78%
Hickory (Burke)	86	66	79,175	66	100.00%	0.08%
Hickory (Caldwell)	87	18	83,029	18	100.00%	0.02%
Hickory (Catawba)	89	39,926	77,838	5,448	13.65%	7.00%
	96	39,926	76,520	34,478	86.35%	45.06%
High Point (Davidson)	80	5,310	81,522	5,310	100.00%	6.51%
High Point (Forsyth)	75	8	78,886	8	100.00%	0.01%
High Point (Guilford)	59	99,042	79,907	33	0.03%	0.04%
	60	99,042	81,856	59,653	60.23%	72.88%
	61	99,042	81,019	39,356	39.74%	48.58%
High Point (Randolph)	70	11	76,125	11	100.00%	0.01%
High Shoals	110	696	75,573	696	100.00%	0.92%
Highlands (Jackson)	119	4	75,548	4	100.00%	0.01%
Highlands (Macon)	120	920	80,814	920	100.00%	1.14%
Hildebran	86	2,023	79,175	2,023	100.00%	2.56%
Hillsborough	50	6,087	80,866	6,087	100.00%	7.53%
Hobgood	27	348	76,790	348	100.00%	0.45%
Hoffman	66	588	83,032	588	100.00%	0.71%
Holden Beach	17	575	77,263	575	100.00%	0.74%
Holly Ridge	15	1,268	77,307	1,268	100.00%	1.64%
Holly Springs	37	24,661	80,332	24,661	100.00%	30.70%
Hookerton	10	409	83,434	409	100.00%	0.49%
Hope Mills	44	15,176	80,973	5,976	39.38%	7.38%
	45	15,176	79,294	9,200	60.62%	11.60%
Hot Springs	118	560	76,322	560	100.00%	0.73%
Hudson	87	3,776	83,029	3,776	100.00%	4.55%
Huntersville	98	46,773	75,602	36,997	79.10%	48.94%
	107	46,773	75,856	9,776	20.90%	12.89%
Indian Beach	13	112	76,622	112	100.00%	0.15%
Indian Trail	55	33,518	75,792	51	0.15%	0.07%
	68	33,518	76,067	7,845	23.41%	10.31%
	69	33,518	76,381	25,622	76.44%	33.54%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-22.asc', modified 08/25/2017 04:53:18 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/25/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

HBK-22 Pittman Districts 82 and 83: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Jackson	27	513	76,790	513	100.00%	0.67%
Jacksonville	14	70,145	77,065	27,897	39.77%	36.20%
	15	70,145	77,307	42,248	60.23%	54.65%
Jamestown	58	3,382	82,137	0	0.00%	0.00%
	59	3,382	79,907	4	0.12%	0.01%
	60	3,382	81,856	3,378	99.88%	4.13%
Jamesville	23	491	81,057	491	100.00%	0.61%
Jefferson	93	1,611	78,360	1,611	100.00%	2.06%
Jonesville	73	2,285	78,189	2,285	100.00%	2.92%
Kannapolis (Cabarrus)	82	33,194	80,879	9,248	27.86%	11.43%
	83	33,194	81,381	23,946	72.14%	29.42%
Kannapolis (Rowan)	77	9,431	82,918	5,529	58.63%	6.67%
	83	9,431	81,381	3,902	41.37%	4.79%
Kelford	1	251	77,143	251	100.00%	0.33%
Kenansville	4	855	81,905	855	100.00%	1.04%
Kenly (Johnston)	28	1,176	83,431	1,176	100.00%	1.41%
Kenly (Wilson)	24	163	81,234	163	100.00%	0.20%
Kernersville (Forsyth)	74	23,071	79,963	5,280	22.89%	6.60%
	75	23,071	78,886	17,791	77.11%	22.55%
Kernersville (Guilford)	61	52	81,019	52	100.00%	0.06%
Kill Devil Hills	6	6,683	76,421	6,683	100.00%	8.74%
King (Forsyth)	74	619	79,963	619	100.00%	0.77%
King (Stokes)	91	6,285	82,843	6,285	100.00%	7.59%
Kings Mountain (Cleveland)	110	9,242	75,573	0	0.00%	0.00%
	111	9,242	76,148	9,242	100.00%	12.14%
Kings Mountain (Gaston)	110	1,054	75,573	1,054	100.00%	1.39%
Kingstown	111	681	76,148	681	100.00%	0.89%
Kinston	12	21,677	75,923	21,677	100.00%	28.55%
Kittrell	32	467	83,140	467	100.00%	0.56%
Kitty Hawk	6	3,272	76,421	3,272	100.00%	4.28%
Knightdale	35	11,401	81,862	0	0.00%	0.00%
	39	11,401	82,181	11,401	100.00%	13.87%
Kure Beach	19	2,012	76,666	2,012	100.00%	2.62%
La Grange	12	2,873	75,923	2,873	100.00%	3.78%
Lake Lure	112	1,192	79,547	1,192	100.00%	1.50%
Lake Park	69	3,422	76,381	3,422	100.00%	4.48%
Lake Santeetlah	120	45	80,814	45	100.00%	0.06%
Lake Waccamaw	16	1,480	81,425	1,480	100.00%	1.82%
Landis	77	3,109	82,918	1,773	57.03%	2.14%
	83	3,109	81,381	1,336	42.97%	1.64%
Lansing	93	158	78,360	158	100.00%	0.20%
Lasker	27	122	76,790	122	100.00%	0.16%
Lattimore	111	488	76,148	488	100.00%	0.64%
Laurel Park	113	2,180	81,089	2	0.09%	0.00%
	117	2,180	79,251	2,178	99.91%	2.75%
Laurinburg	48	15,962	83,109	15,962	100.00%	19.21%
Lawndale	111	606	76,148	606	100.00%	0.80%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-22.asc', modified 08/25/2017 04:53:18 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/25/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

HBK-22 Pittman Districts 82 and 83: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Leggett	23	60	81,057	60	100.00%	0.07%
Leland	17	13,527	77,263	2,631	19.45%	3.41%
	18	13,527	77,681	10,896	80.55%	14.03%
Lenoir	87	18,228	83,029	18,228	100.00%	21.95%
Lewiston Woodville	1	549	77,143	549	100.00%	0.71%
Lewisville	73	12,639	78,189	10,883	86.11%	13.92%
	74	12,639	79,963	1,756	13.89%	2.20%
Lexington	80	18,931	81,522	0	0.00%	0.00%
	81	18,931	81,356	18,931	100.00%	23.27%
Liberty	78	2,656	76,980	2,656	100.00%	3.45%
Lilesville	55	536	75,792	536	100.00%	0.71%
Lillington	53	3,194	83,429	3,194	100.00%	3.83%
Lincolnton	97	10,486	78,265	10,486	100.00%	13.40%
Linden	45	130	79,294	130	100.00%	0.16%
Littleton	27	674	76,790	674	100.00%	0.88%
Locust (Cabarrus)	67	215	82,583	215	100.00%	0.26%
Locust (Stanly)	67	2,715	82,583	2,715	100.00%	3.29%
Long View (Burke)	86	752	79,175	752	100.00%	0.95%
Long View (Catawba)	96	4,119	76,520	4,119	100.00%	5.38%
Louisburg	7	3,359	78,432	3,359	100.00%	4.28%
Love Valley	84	90	77,282	90	100.00%	0.12%
Lowell	108	3,526	76,926	3,526	100.00%	4.58%
Lucama	24	1,108	81,234	1,108	100.00%	1.36%
Lumber Bridge	46	94	80,440	94	100.00%	0.12%
Lumberton	46	21,542	80,440	5,785	26.85%	7.19%
	47	21,542	82,618	15,757	73.15%	19.07%
Macclesfield	23	471	81,057	471	100.00%	0.58%
Macon	32	119	83,140	119	100.00%	0.14%
Madison	91	2,246	82,843	2,246	100.00%	2.71%
Maggie Valley	118	1,150	76,322	1,039	90.35%	1.36%
	119	1,150	75,548	111	9.65%	0.15%
Magnolia	4	939	81,905	939	100.00%	1.15%
Maiden (Catawba)	89	3,308	77,838	3,308	100.00%	4.25%
Maiden (Lincoln)	97	2	78,265	2	100.00%	0.00%
Manteo	6	1,434	76,421	1,434	100.00%	1.88%
Marietta	46	175	80,440	175	100.00%	0.22%
Marion	85	7,838	78,372	7,838	100.00%	10.00%
Mars Hill	118	1,869	76,322	1,869	100.00%	2.45%
Marshall	118	872	76,322	872	100.00%	1.14%
Marshville	55	2,402	75,792	2,402	100.00%	3.17%
Marvin	68	5,579	76,067	5,579	100.00%	7.33%
Matthews	103	27,198	76,381	27,198	100.00%	35.61%
Maxton (Robeson)	47	2,230	82,618	2,230	100.00%	2.70%
Maxton (Scotland)	48	196	83,109	196	100.00%	0.24%
Mayodan	91	2,478	82,843	2,478	100.00%	2.99%
Maysville	13	1,019	76,622	1,019	100.00%	1.33%
McAdenville	108	651	76,926	651	100.00%	0.85%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-22.asc', modified 08/25/2017 04:53:18 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/25/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

HBK-22 Pittman Districts 82 and 83: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
McDonald	47	113	82,618	113	100.00%	0.14%
McFarlan	55	117	75,792	117	100.00%	0.15%
Mebane (Alamance)	63	9,600	75,550	9,600	100.00%	12.71%
Mebane (Orange)	50	1,793	80,866	1,793	100.00%	2.22%
Mesic	6	220	76,421	220	100.00%	0.29%
Micro	28	441	83,431	441	100.00%	0.53%
Middleburg	32	133	83,140	133	100.00%	0.16%
Middlesex	7	822	78,432	822	100.00%	1.05%
Midland (Cabarrus)	67	3,073	82,583	3,073	100.00%	3.72%
Midland (Mecklenburg)	103	0	76,381	0	0.00%	0.00%
Midway	80	4,679	81,522	3,504	74.89%	4.30%
	81	4,679	81,356	1,175	25.11%	1.44%
Mills River	113	6,802	81,089	300	4.41%	0.37%
	117	6,802	79,251	6,502	95.59%	8.20%
Milton	50	166	80,866	166	100.00%	0.21%
Mineral Springs	55	2,639	75,792	688	26.07%	0.91%
	68	2,639	76,067	1,951	73.93%	2.56%
Minnesott Beach	6	440	76,421	440	100.00%	0.58%
Mint Hill (Mecklenburg)	100	22,669	75,589	7,784	34.34%	10.30%
	103	22,669	76,381	14,885	65.66%	19.49%
Mint Hill (Union)	69	53	76,381	53	100.00%	0.07%
Misenheimer	67	728	82,583	728	100.00%	0.88%
Mocksville	77	5,051	82,918	5,051	100.00%	6.09%
Momeyer	25	224	78,027	224	100.00%	0.29%
Monroe	55	32,797	75,792	3,133	9.55%	4.13%
	68	32,797	76,067	13,278	40.49%	17.46%
	69	32,797	76,381	16,386	49.96%	21.45%
Montreat	115	723	79,883	723	100.00%	0.91%
Mooresboro	111	311	76,148	311	100.00%	0.41%
Mooresville	95	32,711	82,155	32,711	100.00%	39.82%
Morehead City	13	8,661	76,622	8,661	100.00%	11.30%
Morganton	86	16,918	79,175	16,918	100.00%	21.37%
Morrisville (Durham)	31	0	82,773	0	0.00%	0.00%
Morrisville (Wake)	11	18,576	81,539	0	0.00%	0.00%
	41	18,576	82,359	11,226	60.43%	13.63%
	49	18,576	82,621	7,350	39.57%	8.90%
Morven	55	511	75,792	511	100.00%	0.67%
Mount Airy	90	10,388	82,779	10,388	100.00%	12.55%
Mount Gilead	66	1,181	83,032	1,181	100.00%	1.42%
Mount Holly	108	13,656	76,926	13,656	100.00%	17.75%
Mount Olive (Duplin)	4	51	81,905	51	100.00%	0.06%
Mount Olive (Wayne)	21	4,538	83,434	4,538	100.00%	5.44%
Mount Pleasant	67	1,652	82,583	1,652	100.00%	2.00%
Murfreesboro	5	2,835	77,527	2,835	100.00%	3.66%
Murphy	120	1,627	80,814	1,627	100.00%	2.01%
Nags Head	6	2,757	76,421	2,757	100.00%	3.61%
Nashville	25	5,352	78,027	5,352	100.00%	6.86%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-22.asc', modified 08/25/2017 04:53:18 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/25/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

HBK-22 Pittman Districts 82 and 83: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Navassa	18	1,505	77,681	1,505	100.00%	1.94%
New Bern	3	29,524	75,726	27,063	91.66%	35.74%
	79	29,524	75,538	2,461	8.34%	3.26%
New London	67	600	82,583	600	100.00%	0.73%
Newland	85	698	78,372	698	100.00%	0.89%
Newport	13	4,150	76,622	4,150	100.00%	5.42%
Newton	89	12,968	77,838	12,968	100.00%	16.66%
	96	12,968	76,520	0	0.00%	0.00%
Newton Grove	22	569	83,434	569	100.00%	0.68%
Norlina	32	1,118	83,140	1,118	100.00%	1.34%
Norman	66	138	83,032	138	100.00%	0.17%
North Topsail Beach	15	743	77,307	743	100.00%	0.96%
North Wilkesboro	90	4,245	82,779	5	0.12%	0.01%
	94	4,245	83,358	4,240	99.88%	5.09%
Northwest	18	735	77,681	735	100.00%	0.95%
Norwood	67	2,379	82,583	2,379	100.00%	2.88%
Oak City	23	317	81,057	317	100.00%	0.39%
Oak Island	17	6,783	77,263	6,783	100.00%	8.78%
Oak Ridge	62	6,185	80,732	6,185	100.00%	7.66%
Oakboro	67	1,859	82,583	1,859	100.00%	2.25%
Ocean Isle Beach	17	550	77,263	550	100.00%	0.71%
Old Fort	85	908	78,372	908	100.00%	1.16%
Oriental	6	900	76,421	900	100.00%	1.18%
Orrum	46	91	80,440	91	100.00%	0.11%
Ossipee	64	543	75,581	543	100.00%	0.72%
Oxford	2	8,461	82,634	239	2.82%	0.29%
	32	8,461	83,140	8,222	97.18%	9.89%
Pantego	79	179	75,538	179	100.00%	0.24%
Parkton	46	436	80,440	436	100.00%	0.54%
Parmele	23	278	81,057	278	100.00%	0.34%
Patterson Springs	111	622	76,148	622	100.00%	0.82%
Peachland	55	437	75,792	437	100.00%	0.58%
Peletier	13	644	76,622	644	100.00%	0.84%
Pembroke	47	2,973	82,618	2,973	100.00%	3.60%
Pikeville	10	678	83,434	678	100.00%	0.81%
Pilot Mountain	91	1,477	82,843	1,477	100.00%	1.78%
Pine Knoll Shores	13	1,339	76,622	1,339	100.00%	1.75%
Pine Level	28	1,700	83,431	1,700	100.00%	2.04%
Pinebluff	52	1,337	76,894	1,337	100.00%	1.74%
Pinehurst	52	13,124	76,894	13,124	100.00%	17.07%
Pinetops	23	1,374	81,057	1,374	100.00%	1.70%
Pineville	92	7,479	77,172	7,479	100.00%	9.69%
	104	7,479	76,869	0	0.00%	0.00%
Pink Hill	12	552	75,923	552	100.00%	0.73%
Pittsboro	54	3,743	82,312	3,743	100.00%	4.55%
Pleasant Garden	59	4,489	79,907	4,489	100.00%	5.62%
Plymouth	1	3,878	77,143	3,878	100.00%	5.03%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-22.asc', modified 08/25/2017 04:53:18 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/25/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

HBK-22 Pittman Districts 82 and 83: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Polkton	55	3,375	75,792	3,375	100.00%	4.45%
Polkville	111	545	76,148	545	100.00%	0.72%
Pollocksville	13	311	76,622	311	100.00%	0.41%
Powellsville	1	276	77,143	276	100.00%	0.36%
Princeton	10	1,194	83,434	1,194	100.00%	1.43%
Princeville	23	2,082	81,057	2,082	100.00%	2.57%
Proctorville	46	117	80,440	117	100.00%	0.15%
Raeford	48	4,611	83,109	4,611	100.00%	5.55%
Raleigh (Durham)	31	1,067	82,773	1,067	100.00%	1.29%
Raleigh (Wake)	11	402,825	81,539	28,950	7.19%	35.50%
	33	402,825	82,642	56,483	14.02%	68.35%
	34	402,825	81,525	81,282	20.18%	99.70%
	35	402,825	81,862	19,326	4.80%	23.61%
	36	402,825	81,926	6	0.00%	0.01%
	38	402,825	83,094	80,183	19.91%	96.50%
	39	402,825	82,181	36,700	9.11%	44.66%
	40	402,825	80,912	42,537	10.56%	52.57%
	49	402,825	82,621	57,358	14.24%	69.42%
Ramseur	78	1,692	76,980	1,692	100.00%	2.20%
Randleman	70	4,113	76,125	4,113	100.00%	5.40%
Ranlo	108	3,434	76,926	3,434	100.00%	4.46%
	110	3,434	75,573	0	0.00%	0.00%
Raynham	47	72	82,618	72	100.00%	0.09%
Red Cross	67	742	82,583	742	100.00%	0.90%
Red Oak	25	3,430	78,027	3,430	100.00%	4.40%
Red Springs (Hoke)	48	0	83,109	0	0.00%	0.00%
Red Springs (Robeson)	47	3,428	82,618	3,428	100.00%	4.15%
Reidsville	65	14,520	83,430	14,520	100.00%	17.40%
Rennert	46	383	80,440	383	100.00%	0.48%
Rhodhiss (Burke)	86	700	79,175	700	100.00%	0.88%
Rhodhiss (Caldwell)	87	370	83,029	370	100.00%	0.45%
Rich Square	27	958	76,790	958	100.00%	1.25%
Richfield	67	613	82,583	613	100.00%	0.74%
Richlands	4	1,520	81,905	1,520	100.00%	1.86%
River Bend	3	3,119	75,726	3,119	100.00%	4.12%
Roanoke Rapids	27	15,754	76,790	15,754	100.00%	20.52%
Robbins	52	1,097	76,894	1,097	100.00%	1.43%
	78	1,097	76,980	0	0.00%	0.00%
Robbinsville	120	620	80,814	620	100.00%	0.77%
Robersonville	23	1,488	81,057	1,488	100.00%	1.84%
Rockingham	66	9,558	83,032	9,558	100.00%	11.51%
Rockwell	76	2,108	81,908	2,108	100.00%	2.57%
Rocky Mount (Edgecombe)	23	17,524	81,057	17,524	100.00%	21.62%
Rocky Mount (Nash)	25	39,953	78,027	39,953	100.00%	51.20%
Rolesville	35	3,786	81,862	3,786	100.00%	4.62%
Ronda	90	417	82,779	417	100.00%	0.50%
Roper	1	611	77,143	611	100.00%	0.79%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-22.asc', modified 08/25/2017 04:53:18 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/25/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

HBK-22 Pittman Districts 82 and 83: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Rose Hill	4	1,626	81,905	1,626	100.00%	1.99%
Roseboro	22	1,191	83,434	1,191	100.00%	1.43%
Rosman	113	576	81,089	576	100.00%	0.71%
Rowland	47	1,037	82,618	1,037	100.00%	1.26%
Roxboro	2	8,362	82,634	8,362	100.00%	10.12%
Roxobel	1	240	77,143	240	100.00%	0.31%
Rural Hall	74	2,937	79,963	2,937	100.00%	3.67%
Ruth	112	440	79,547	440	100.00%	0.55%
Rutherford College	86	1,341	79,175	1,341	100.00%	1.69%
Rutherfordton	112	4,213	79,547	4,213	100.00%	5.30%
Salemburg	22	435	83,434	435	100.00%	0.52%
Salisbury	76	33,662	81,908	31,445	93.41%	38.39%
	77	33,662	82,918	2,217	6.59%	2.67%
Saluda (Henderson)	113	12	81,089	12	100.00%	0.01%
Saluda (Polk)	113	701	81,089	701	100.00%	0.86%
Sandy Creek	18	260	77,681	260	100.00%	0.33%
Sandyfield	16	447	81,425	447	100.00%	0.55%
Sanford	51	28,094	83,434	28,094	100.00%	33.67%
Saratoga	24	408	81,234	408	100.00%	0.50%
Sawmills	87	5,240	83,029	5,240	100.00%	6.31%
Scotland Neck	27	2,059	76,790	2,059	100.00%	2.68%
Seaboard	27	632	76,790	632	100.00%	0.82%
Seagrove	78	228	76,980	228	100.00%	0.30%
Sedalia	59	623	79,907	623	100.00%	0.78%
Selma	28	6,073	83,431	6,073	100.00%	7.28%
Seven Devils (Avery)	85	28	78,372	28	100.00%	0.04%
Seven Devils (Watauga)	93	164	78,360	164	100.00%	0.21%
Seven Springs	10	110	83,434	110	100.00%	0.13%
Severn	27	276	76,790	276	100.00%	0.36%
Shallotte	17	3,675	77,263	3,675	100.00%	4.76%
Sharpsburg (Edgecombe)	23	209	81,057	209	100.00%	0.26%
Sharpsburg (Nash)	25	1,252	78,027	1,252	100.00%	1.60%
Sharpsburg (Wilson)	24	563	81,234	563	100.00%	0.69%
Shelby	110	20,323	75,573	11,240	55.31%	14.87%
	111	20,323	76,148	9,083	44.69%	11.93%
Siler City	54	7,887	82,312	7,887	100.00%	9.58%
Simpson	9	416	75,794	416	100.00%	0.55%
Sims	24	282	81,234	282	100.00%	0.35%
Smithfield	26	10,966	83,432	2,993	27.29%	3.59%
	28	10,966	83,431	7,973	72.71%	9.56%
Snow Hill	10	1,595	83,434	1,595	100.00%	1.91%
Southern Pines	52	12,334	76,894	12,334	100.00%	16.04%
Southern Shores	6	2,714	76,421	2,714	100.00%	3.55%
Southport	17	2,833	77,263	2,833	100.00%	3.67%
Sparta	90	1,770	82,779	1,770	100.00%	2.14%
Speed	23	80	81,057	80	100.00%	0.10%
Spencer	76	3,267	81,908	3,267	100.00%	3.99%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-22.asc', modified 08/25/2017 04:53:18 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/25/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

HBK-22 Pittman Districts 82 and 83: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Spencer Mountain	108	37	76,926	37	100.00%	0.05%
Spindale	112	4,321	79,547	4,321	100.00%	5.43%
Spring Hope	25	1,320	78,027	1,320	100.00%	1.69%
Spring Lake	42	11,964	81,439	11,964	100.00%	14.69%
Spruce Pine	85	2,175	78,372	2,175	100.00%	2.78%
St. Helena	16	389	81,425	389	100.00%	0.48%
St. James	17	3,165	77,263	3,165	100.00%	4.10%
St. Pauls	46	2,035	80,440	2,035	100.00%	2.53%
Staley	78	393	76,980	393	100.00%	0.51%
Stallings (Mecklenburg)	103	399	76,381	399	100.00%	0.52%
Stallings (Union)	68	13,432	76,067	0	0.00%	0.00%
	69	13,432	76,381	13,432	100.00%	17.59%
Stanfield	67	1,486	82,583	1,486	100.00%	1.80%
Stanley	108	3,556	76,926	3,550	99.83%	4.61%
	110	3,556	75,573	6	0.17%	0.01%
Stantonsburg	24	784	81,234	784	100.00%	0.97%
Star	66	876	83,032	876	100.00%	1.06%
Statesville	84	24,532	77,282	20,541	83.73%	26.58%
	95	24,532	82,155	3,991	16.27%	4.86%
Stedman	45	1,028	79,294	1,028	100.00%	1.30%
Stem	2	463	82,634	463	100.00%	0.56%
Stokesdale	62	5,047	80,732	5,047	100.00%	6.25%
Stoneville	65	1,056	83,430	1,056	100.00%	1.27%
Stonewall	6	281	76,421	281	100.00%	0.37%
Stovall	32	418	83,140	418	100.00%	0.50%
Sugar Mountain	85	198	78,372	198	100.00%	0.25%
Summerfield	62	10,232	80,732	10,232	100.00%	12.67%
Sunset Beach	17	3,572	77,263	3,572	100.00%	4.62%
Surf City (Onslow)	15	292	77,307	292	100.00%	0.38%
Surf City (Pender)	16	1,561	81,425	1,561	100.00%	1.92%
Swansboro	14	2,663	77,065	2,663	100.00%	3.46%
Swepsonville	63	1,154	75,550	1,154	100.00%	1.53%
Sylva	119	2,588	75,548	2,588	100.00%	3.43%
Tabor City	46	2,511	80,440	2,511	100.00%	3.12%
Tar Heel	22	117	83,434	117	100.00%	0.14%
Tarboro	23	11,415	81,057	11,415	100.00%	14.08%
Taylorsville	94	2,098	83,358	2,098	100.00%	2.52%
Taylortown	52	722	76,894	722	100.00%	0.94%
Teachey	4	376	81,905	376	100.00%	0.46%
Thomasville (Davidson)	80	26,493	81,522	25,474	96.15%	31.25%
	81	26,493	81,356	1,019	3.85%	1.25%
Thomasville (Randolph)	70	264	76,125	264	100.00%	0.35%
Tobaccoville (Forsyth)	74	2,441	79,963	2,441	100.00%	3.05%
Tobaccoville (Stokes)	91	0	82,843	0	0.00%	0.00%
Topsail Beach	16	368	81,425	368	100.00%	0.45%
Trent Woods	3	4,155	75,726	4,155	100.00%	5.49%
Trenton	13	287	76,622	287	100.00%	0.37%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-22.asc', modified 08/25/2017 04:53:18 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/25/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

HBK-22 Pittman Districts 82 and 83: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Trinity	70	6,614	76,125	6,614	100.00%	8.69%
Troutman	84	2,383	77,282	2,169	91.02%	2.81%
	95	2,383	82,155	214	8.98%	0.26%
Troy	66	3,189	83,032	3,189	100.00%	3.84%
Tryon	113	1,646	81,089	1,646	100.00%	2.03%
Turkey	21	292	83,434	292	100.00%	0.35%
Unionville	55	5,929	75,792	337	5.68%	0.44%
	69	5,929	76,381	5,592	94.32%	7.32%
Valdese	86	4,490	79,175	4,490	100.00%	5.67%
Vanceboro	79	1,005	75,538	1,005	100.00%	1.33%
Vandemere	6	254	76,421	254	100.00%	0.33%
Varnamtown	17	541	77,263	541	100.00%	0.70%
Vass	52	720	76,894	720	100.00%	0.94%
Waco	110	321	75,573	321	100.00%	0.42%
Wade	45	556	79,294	556	100.00%	0.70%
Wadesboro	55	5,813	75,792	5,813	100.00%	7.67%
Wagram	48	840	83,109	840	100.00%	1.01%
Wake Forest (Franklin)	7	899	78,432	899	100.00%	1.15%
Wake Forest (Wake)	35	29,218	81,862	29,218	100.00%	35.69%
Walkertown	72	4,675	76,245	1,018	21.78%	1.34%
	74	4,675	79,963	3,657	78.22%	4.57%
Wallace (Duplin)	4	3,880	81,905	3,880	100.00%	4.74%
Wallace (Pender)	16	0	81,425	0	0.00%	0.00%
Wallburg	80	3,047	81,522	3,047	100.00%	3.74%
Walnut Cove	91	1,425	82,843	1,425	100.00%	1.72%
Walnut Creek	10	835	83,434	835	100.00%	1.00%
Walstonburg	10	219	83,434	219	100.00%	0.26%
Warrenton	32	862	83,140	862	100.00%	1.04%
Warsaw	4	3,054	81,905	3,054	100.00%	3.73%
Washington	79	9,744	75,538	9,744	100.00%	12.90%
Washington Park	79	451	75,538	451	100.00%	0.60%
Watha	16	190	81,425	190	100.00%	0.23%
Waxhaw	55	9,859	75,792	1,604	16.27%	2.12%
	68	9,859	76,067	8,255	83.73%	10.85%
Waynesville	119	9,869	75,548	9,869	100.00%	13.06%
Weaverville	115	3,120	79,883	3,120	100.00%	3.91%
Webster	119	363	75,548	363	100.00%	0.48%
Weddington (Mecklenburg)	103	7	76,381	7	100.00%	0.01%
Weddington (Union)	68	9,452	76,067	8,933	94.51%	11.74%
	69	9,452	76,381	519	5.49%	0.68%
Weldon	27	1,655	76,790	1,655	100.00%	2.16%
Wendell	35	5,845	81,862	2,091	35.77%	2.55%
	39	5,845	82,181	3,754	64.23%	4.57%
Wentworth	65	2,807	83,430	2,807	100.00%	3.36%
Wesley Chapel	68	7,463	76,067	6,877	92.15%	9.04%
	69	7,463	76,381	586	7.85%	0.77%
West Jefferson	93	1,299	78,360	1,299	100.00%	1.66%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-22.asc', modified 08/25/2017 04:53:18 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/25/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

HBK-22 Pittman Districts 82 and 83: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Whispering Pines	52	2,928	76,894	2,928	100.00%	3.81%
Whitakers (Edgecombe)	23	402	81,057	402	100.00%	0.50%
Whitakers (Nash)	25	342	78,027	342	100.00%	0.44%
White Lake	22	802	83,434	802	100.00%	0.96%
Whiteville	16	5,394	81,425	5,394	100.00%	6.62%
Whitsett	59	590	79,907	590	100.00%	0.74%
Wilkesboro	90	3,413	82,779	3	0.09%	0.00%
	94	3,413	83,358	3,410	99.91%	4.09%
Williamston	23	5,511	81,057	5,511	100.00%	6.80%
Wilmington	18	106,476	77,681	41,563	39.04%	53.50%
	19	106,476	76,666	33,947	31.88%	44.28%
	20	106,476	78,488	30,966	29.08%	39.45%
Wilson	24	49,167	81,234	49,167	100.00%	60.53%
Wilson's Mills	26	2,277	83,432	0	0.00%	0.00%
	28	2,277	83,431	2,277	100.00%	2.73%
Windsor	1	3,630	77,143	3,630	100.00%	4.71%
Winfall	1	594	77,143	594	100.00%	0.77%
Wingate	55	3,491	75,792	349	10.00%	0.46%
	69	3,491	76,381	3,142	90.00%	4.11%
Winston-Salem	71	229,617	75,793	75,779	33.00%	99.98%
	72	229,617	76,245	73,464	31.99%	96.35%
	73	229,617	78,189	17,422	7.59%	22.28%
	74	229,617	79,963	30,077	13.10%	37.61%
	75	229,617	78,886	32,875	14.32%	41.67%
Winterville	8	9,269	75,926	0	0.00%	0.00%
	9	9,269	75,794	8,391	90.53%	11.07%
	12	9,269	75,923	878	9.47%	1.16%
Winton	5	769	77,527	769	100.00%	0.99%
Woodfin	114	6,123	82,902	2,563	41.86%	3.09%
	115	6,123	79,883	2,717	44.37%	3.40%
	116	6,123	75,533	843	13.77%	1.12%
Woodland	27	809	76,790	809	100.00%	1.05%
Wrightsville Beach	19	2,477	76,666	2,477	100.00%	3.23%
	20	2,477	78,488	0	0.00%	0.00%
Yadkinville	73	2,959	78,189	2,959	100.00%	3.78%
Yanceyville	50	2,039	80,866	2,039	100.00%	2.52%
Youngsville	7	1,157	78,432	1,157	100.00%	1.48%
Zebulon (Johnston)	26	0	83,432	0	0.00%	0.00%
Zebulon (Wake)	35	4,433	81,862	381	8.59%	0.47%
	39	4,433	82,181	4,052	91.41%	4.93%
			Total:	**5,250,071**		

District plan definition file: 'HBK-22.asc', modified 08/25/2017 04:53:18 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/25/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

HBK-22 Pittman Districts 82 and 83: Split VTD Detail

County	VTD	District	Total VTD Pop	VTD Pop in District	Percent of VTD Pop in District
Alamance	03C	63	2,814	2,491	88.52%
		64	2,814	323	11.48%
	063	63	4,940	4,090	82.79%
		64	4,940	850	17.21%
	06W	63	1,973	1,617	81.96%
		64	1,973	356	18.04%
Brunswick	04	17	13,819	3,644	26.37%
		18	13,819	10,175	73.63%
Buncombe	05.1	114	2,748	1,691	61.54%
		115	2,748	1,057	38.46%
	100.1	114	9,126	8,524	93.40%
		115	9,126	602	6.60%
	102.1	114	5,975	1,385	23.18%
		116	5,975	4,590	76.82%
	104.1	114	3,081	2,345	76.11%
		115	3,081	736	23.89%
	19.1	114	2,159	1,843	85.36%
		116	2,159	316	14.64%
	24.1	114	3,211	1,964	61.16%
		116	3,211	1,247	38.84%
	52.1	115	5,279	3,762	71.26%
		116	5,279	1,517	28.74%
	57.1	114	3,534	315	8.91%
		115	3,534	1,149	32.51%
		116	3,534	2,070	58.57%
	60.2	114	1,300	164	12.62%
		115	1,300	1,136	87.38%
	64.1	114	2,671	820	30.70%
		115	2,671	1,851	69.30%
	70.1	114	3,508	2,418	68.93%
		115	3,508	1,090	31.07%
Craven	N4	3	6,831	5,069	74.21%
		79	6,831	1,762	25.79%
Cumberland	G2	43	34,282	29,272	85.39%
		45	34,282	5,010	14.61%
Durham	34	29	11,492	9,457	82.29%
		31	11,492	2,035	17.71%
Gaston	05	109	4,767	4,132	86.68%
		110	4,767	635	13.32%
Harnett	PR07	51	17,943	14,553	81.11%
		53	17,943	3,390	18.89%
	PR08	28	10,373	5,681	54.77%
		53	10,373	4,692	45.23%
Haywood	IH	118	3,815	3,256	85.35%
		119	3,815	559	14.65%
Johnston	PR04	10	1,929	413	21.41%
		28	1,929	1,516	78.59%
	PR26	26	4,445	297	6.68%
		28	4,445	4,148	93.32%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-22.asc', modified 08/25/2017 04:53:18 PM

VTDs ('Voting Districts') derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Printed 08/25/2017 {rptG05|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

HBK-22 Pittman Districts 82 and 83: Split VTD Detail

County	VTD	District	Total VTD Pop	VTD Pop in District	Percent of VTD Pop in District
Mecklenburg	001	102	1,950	102	5.23%
		104	1,950	1,848	94.77%
	069	104	5,121	3,240	63.27%
		105	5,121	1,881	36.73%
	134	98	8,939	4,410	49.33%
		107	8,939	4,529	50.67%
Moore	RBN	52	2,923	2,593	88.71%
		78	2,923	330	11.29%
	WEM	52	2,982	1,806	60.56%
		78	2,982	1,176	39.44%
New Hanover	CF03	18	8,711	828	9.51%
		20	8,711	7,883	90.49%
	W24	18	7,784	3,543	45.52%
		20	7,784	4,241	54.48%
	WB	19	2,473	2,473	100.00%
		20	2,473	0	0.00%
Onslow	GB12	4	6,284	5,776	91.92%
		14	6,284	508	8.08%
	HM05	14	8,258	5,303	64.22%
		15	8,258	2,955	35.78%
Pitt	1403A	9	7,871	3,868	49.14%
		12	7,871	4,003	50.86%
	1507	8	6,628	5,623	84.84%
		9	6,628	1,005	15.16%
Rockingham	HU	65	6,052	5,815	96.08%
		91	6,052	237	3.92%
Sampson	ROWA	21	3,210	1,577	49.13%
		22	3,210	1,633	50.87%
Union	017A	68	4,593	1,595	34.73%
		69	4,593	2,998	65.27%
	019	55	5,806	1,105	19.03%
		68	5,806	4,701	80.97%
	029A	68	5,935	5,079	85.58%
		69	5,935	856	14.42%
	029C	68	2,942	1,576	53.57%
		69	2,942	1,366	46.43%
	032	55	4,095	1,820	44.44%
		69	4,095	2,275	55.56%
	040	68	4,926	1,122	22.78%
		69	4,926	3,804	77.22%
Wake	08-02	34	5,481	1,936	35.32%
		40	5,481	3,545	64.68%
	12-05	36	9,236	5,460	59.12%
		37	9,236	3,776	40.88%
	16-09	33	4,924	3,027	61.47%
		36	4,924	1,897	38.53%
	18-08	11	5,677	2,521	44.41%
		36	5,677	3,156	55.59%
Wayne	09	10	5,273	3,733	70.79%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-22.asc', modified 08/25/2017 04:53:18 PM

VTDs ('Voting Districts') derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Printed 08/25/2017 {rptG05|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

HBK-22 Pittman Districts 82 and 83: Split VTD Detail

County	VTD	District	Total VTD Pop	VTD Pop in District	Percent of VTD Pop in District
Wayne	09	21	5,273	1,540	29.21%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-22.asc', modified 08/25/2017 04:53:18 PM
VTDs ('Voting Districts') derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.
Printed 08/25/2017 {rptG05|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

HBK-22 Pittman Districts 82 and 83: Population Deviation

District	2010 Pop	Ideal Pop	Deviation	Deviation %
1	77,143	79,462	-2,319	-2.92%
2	82,634	79,462	3,172	3.99%
3	75,726	79,462	-3,736	-4.70%
4	81,905	79,462	2,443	3.07%
5	77,527	79,462	-1,935	-2.44%
6	76,421	79,462	-3,041	-3.83%
7	78,432	79,462	-1,030	-1.30%
8	75,926	79,462	-3,536	-4.45%
9	75,794	79,462	-3,668	-4.62%
10	83,434	79,462	3,972	5.00%
11	81,539	79,462	2,077	2.61%
12	75,923	79,462	-3,539	-4.45%
13	76,622	79,462	-2,840	-3.57%
14	77,065	79,462	-2,397	-3.02%
15	77,307	79,462	-2,155	-2.71%
16	81,425	79,462	1,963	2.47%
17	77,263	79,462	-2,199	-2.77%
18	77,681	79,462	-1,781	-2.24%
19	76,666	79,462	-2,796	-3.52%
20	78,488	79,462	-974	-1.23%
21	83,434	79,462	3,972	5.00%
22	83,434	79,462	3,972	5.00%
23	81,057	79,462	1,595	2.01%
24	81,234	79,462	1,772	2.23%
25	78,027	79,462	-1,435	-1.81%
26	83,432	79,462	3,970	5.00%
27	76,790	79,462	-2,672	-3.36%
28	83,431	79,462	3,969	4.99%
29	82,735	79,462	3,273	4.12%
30	83,272	79,462	3,810	4.79%
31	82,773	79,462	3,311	4.17%
32	83,140	79,462	3,678	4.63%
33	82,642	79,462	3,180	4.00%
34	81,525	79,462	2,063	2.60%
35	81,862	79,462	2,400	3.02%
36	81,926	79,462	2,464	3.10%
37	80,332	79,462	870	1.09%
38	83,094	79,462	3,632	4.57%
39	82,181	79,462	2,719	3.42%
40	80,912	79,462	1,450	1.82%
41	82,359	79,462	2,897	3.65%
42	81,439	79,462	1,977	2.49%
43	77,725	79,462	-1,737	-2.19%
44	80,973	79,462	1,511	1.90%
45	79,294	79,462	-168	-0.21%
46	80,440	79,462	978	1.23%
47	82,618	79,462	3,156	3.97%
48	83,109	79,462	3,647	4.59%
49	82,621	79,462	3,159	3.98%
50	80,866	79,462	1,404	1.77%
51	83,434	79,462	3,972	5.00%
52	76,894	79,462	-2,568	-3.23%
53	83,429	79,462	3,967	4.99%
54	82,312	79,462	2,850	3.59%
55	75,792	79,462	-3,670	-4.62%
56	76,654	79,462	-2,808	-3.53%
57	82,755	79,462	3,293	4.14%
58	82,137	79,462	2,675	3.37%
59	79,907	79,462	445	0.56%
60	81,856	79,462	2,394	3.01%
61	81,019	79,462	1,557	1.96%
62	80,732	79,462	1,270	1.60%
63	75,550	79,462	-3,912	-4.92%
64	75,581	79,462	-3,881	-4.88%
65	83,430	79,462	3,968	4.99%
66	83,032	79,462	3,570	4.49%
67	82,583	79,462	3,121	3.93%
68	76,067	79,462	-3,395	-4.27%
69	76,381	79,462	-3,081	-3.88%
70	76,125	79,462	-3,337	-4.20%
71	75,793	79,462	-3,669	-4.62%
72	76,245	79,462	-3,217	-4.05%
73	78,189	79,462	-1,273	-1.60%
74	79,963	79,462	501	0.63%
75	78,886	79,462	-576	-0.72%
76	81,908	79,462	2,446	3.08%
77	82,918	79,462	3,456	4.35%
78	76,980	79,462	-2,482	-3.12%
79	75,538	79,462	-3,924	-4.94%
80	81,522	79,462	2,060	2.59%
81	81,356	79,462	1,894	2.38%
82	80,879	79,462	1,417	1.78%

HBK-22 Pittman Districts 82 and 83: Population Deviation

District	2010 Pop	Ideal Pop	Deviation	Deviation %
83	81,381	79,462	1,919	2.41%
84	77,282	79,462	-2,180	-2.74%
85	78,372	79,462	-1,090	-1.37%
86	79,175	79,462	-287	-0.36%
87	83,029	79,462	3,567	4.49%
88	76,022	79,462	-3,440	-4.33%
89	77,838	79,462	-1,624	-2.04%
90	82,779	79,462	3,317	4.17%
91	82,843	79,462	3,381	4.25%
92	77,172	79,462	-2,290	-2.88%
93	78,360	79,462	-1,102	-1.39%
94	83,358	79,462	3,896	4.90%
95	82,155	79,462	2,693	3.39%
96	76,520	79,462	-2,942	-3.70%
97	78,265	79,462	-1,197	-1.51%
98	75,602	79,462	-3,860	-4.86%
99	77,141	79,462	-2,321	-2.92%
100	75,589	79,462	-3,873	-4.87%
101	79,876	79,462	414	0.52%
102	77,391	79,462	-2,071	-2.61%
103	76,381	79,462	-3,081	-3.88%
104	76,869	79,462	-2,593	-3.26%
105	75,967	79,462	-3,495	-4.40%
106	75,762	79,462	-3,700	-4.66%
107	75,856	79,462	-3,606	-4.54%
108	76,926	79,462	-2,536	-3.19%
109	75,517	79,462	-3,945	-4.96%
110	75,573	79,462	-3,889	-4.89%
111	76,148	79,462	-3,314	-4.17%
112	79,547	79,462	85	0.11%
113	81,089	79,462	1,627	2.05%
114	82,902	79,462	3,440	4.33%
115	79,883	79,462	421	0.53%
116	75,533	79,462	-3,929	-4.94%
117	79,251	79,462	-211	-0.27%
118	76,322	79,462	-3,140	-3.95%
119	75,548	79,462	-3,914	-4.93%
120	80,814	79,462	1,352	1.70%
Total:	**9,535,483**			

HBK-22 Pittman Districts 82 and 83: Population 2010, US Senate 2010, President 2012

	2010 Census		US Senate 2010: Marshall-Burr-Beitler								US President 2012: Obama-Romney-Johnson							
District	Total Pop	18+ Pop	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %
1	77,143	60,226	11,572	46.71%	12,798	51.66%	398	1.61%	6	0.02%	19,188	51.49%	17,761	47.66%	255	0.68%	62	0.17%
2	82,634	64,057	9,138	42.84%	11,711	54.90%	479	2.25%	4	0.02%	16,284	44.54%	19,862	54.33%	322	0.88%	89	0.24%
3	75,726	57,749	6,926	34.46%	12,772	63.55%	390	1.94%	11	0.05%	13,877	41.67%	19,044	57.18%	308	0.92%	77	0.23%
4	81,905	60,243	6,889	39.27%	10,357	59.03%	292	1.66%	6	0.03%	11,345	38.94%	17,541	60.21%	200	0.69%	45	0.15%
5	77,527	60,228	10,791	55.68%	8,307	42.86%	273	1.41%	11	0.06%	20,871	60.75%	13,179	38.36%	249	0.72%	57	0.17%
6	76,421	60,608	8,872	34.50%	16,174	62.90%	661	2.57%	7	0.03%	14,765	38.52%	22,988	59.97%	532	1.39%	50	0.13%
7	78,432	58,921	9,576	42.69%	12,410	55.32%	440	1.96%	8	0.04%	15,958	44.13%	19,772	54.68%	331	0.92%	98	0.27%
8	75,926	58,873	10,135	61.68%	6,095	37.09%	195	1.19%	7	0.04%	22,626	66.47%	11,119	32.66%	254	0.75%	42	0.12%
9	75,794	59,235	7,527	37.19%	12,496	61.74%	210	1.04%	7	0.03%	15,362	42.01%	20,876	57.09%	280	0.77%	50	0.14%
10	83,434	62,414	6,595	29.90%	15,171	68.78%	287	1.30%	3	0.01%	11,116	32.12%	23,262	67.22%	212	0.61%	17	0.05%
11	81,539	64,508	11,704	51.72%	10,205	45.10%	709	3.13%	10	0.04%	24,808	59.62%	15,841	38.07%	856	2.06%	106	0.25%
12	75,923	57,405	10,406	46.00%	11,921	52.70%	282	1.25%	13	0.06%	17,724	49.08%	18,140	50.23%	210	0.58%	40	0.11%
13	76,622	61,839	7,638	28.48%	18,590	69.32%	538	2.01%	52	0.19%	12,458	31.09%	27,181	67.84%	359	0.90%	68	0.17%
14	77,065	56,588	4,167	33.67%	7,902	63.84%	301	2.43%	7	0.06%	9,736	39.75%	14,437	58.94%	253	1.03%	70	0.29%
15	77,307	59,638	3,006	31.19%	6,343	65.81%	284	2.95%	5	0.05%	6,424	34.97%	11,670	63.53%	225	1.22%	50	0.27%
16	81,425	62,717	10,108	39.84%	14,778	58.24%	474	1.87%	14	0.06%	16,124	42.93%	21,036	56.00%	314	0.84%	88	0.23%
17	77,263	64,270	9,560	31.61%	20,050	66.30%	624	2.06%	8	0.03%	15,595	36.15%	27,141	62.91%	333	0.77%	74	0.17%
18	77,681	61,478	11,041	55.09%	8,555	42.68%	437	2.18%	10	0.05%	22,442	61.89%	13,304	36.69%	413	1.14%	100	0.28%
19	76,666	60,681	8,459	32.87%	16,677	64.80%	587	2.28%	14	0.05%	16,301	40.73%	23,121	57.77%	483	1.21%	119	0.30%
20	78,488	63,095	9,000	33.59%	17,209	64.23%	570	2.13%	12	0.04%	16,368	39.38%	24,562	59.09%	499	1.20%	135	0.32%
21	83,434	62,990	11,059	53.59%	9,325	45.19%	248	1.20%	4	0.02%	20,461	59.78%	13,589	39.70%	173	0.51%	5	0.01%
22	83,434	63,053	11,647	44.71%	14,036	53.88%	357	1.37%	9	0.03%	15,826	44.07%	19,774	55.06%	257	0.72%	56	0.16%
23	81,057	61,743	14,653	59.95%	9,513	38.92%	269	1.10%	8	0.03%	24,825	62.80%	14,515	36.72%	147	0.37%	43	0.11%
24	81,234	61,182	13,631	51.47%	12,420	46.90%	428	1.62%	3	0.01%	20,875	53.38%	17,954	45.91%	242	0.62%	38	0.10%
25	78,027	59,741	12,874	49.23%	12,965	49.58%	303	1.16%	8	0.03%	21,791	53.51%	18,673	45.85%	191	0.47%	67	0.16%
26	83,432	58,967	8,134	33.11%	15,900	64.72%	520	2.12%	12	0.05%	15,202	36.94%	25,391	61.70%	445	1.08%	113	0.27%
27	76,790	59,572	13,603	61.65%	8,196	37.14%	261	1.18%	6	0.03%	24,188	66.17%	12,189	33.34%	143	0.39%	35	0.10%
28	83,431	61,419	6,884	32.21%	14,114	66.03%	369	1.73%	8	0.04%	11,854	34.87%	21,776	64.05%	289	0.85%	80	0.24%
29	82,735	67,058	18,865	79.26%	4,545	19.10%	373	1.57%	17	0.07%	38,148	82.20%	7,753	16.71%	435	0.94%	70	0.15%
30	83,272	64,089	17,881	60.80%	11,040	37.54%	478	1.63%	11	0.04%	31,862	67.06%	15,158	31.90%	424	0.89%	70	0.15%
31	82,773	61,422	16,672	78.56%	4,267	20.11%	275	1.30%	8	0.04%	33,340	80.93%	7,466	18.12%	349	0.85%	43	0.10%
32	83,140	63,471	15,476	60.71%	9,595	37.64%	411	1.61%	8	0.03%	26,033	65.34%	13,608	34.16%	154	0.39%	45	0.11%
33	82,642	66,254	13,483	69.46%	5,564	28.67%	351	1.81%	12	0.06%	27,937	72.34%	10,079	26.10%	543	1.41%	61	0.16%
34	81,525	64,976	15,394	50.33%	14,527	47.50%	642	2.10%	23	0.08%	27,560	56.56%	20,389	41.85%	680	1.40%	95	0.19%
35	81,862	57,121	9,236	37.21%	14,998	60.43%	565	2.28%	20	0.08%	19,055	42.91%	24,775	55.80%	480	1.08%	93	0.21%
36	81,926	59,799	10,864	35.93%	18,694	61.83%	668	2.21%	8	0.03%	19,655	41.26%	27,387	57.49%	537	1.13%	58	0.12%
37	80,332	54,852	8,827	36.88%	14,457	60.40%	639	2.67%	12	0.05%	19,102	43.33%	24,319	55.16%	587	1.33%	82	0.19%
38	83,094	59,601	14,163	70.94%	5,433	27.21%	354	1.77%	14	0.07%	29,904	76.88%	8,572	22.04%	358	0.92%	62	0.16%
39	82,181	58,177	14,627	64.63%	7,594	33.55%	402	1.78%	9	0.04%	28,601	69.83%	11,938	29.15%	347	0.85%	72	0.18%
40	80,912	59,480	12,203	36.45%	20,451	61.08%	811	2.42%	18	0.05%	21,540	42.12%	28,992	56.69%	547	1.07%	63	0.12%
41	82,359	55,518	9,441	44.16%	11,298	52.85%	636	2.98%	2	0.01%	22,252	52.85%	19,251	45.72%	541	1.28%	64	0.15%
42	81,439	57,374	8,476	69.63%	3,542	29.10%	150	1.23%	5	0.04%	18,934	73.86%	6,486	25.30%	161	0.63%	55	0.21%
43	77,725	59,350	11,403	65.17%	5,813	33.22%	270	1.54%	11	0.06%	23,644	72.26%	8,782	26.84%	225	0.69%	69	0.21%
44	80,973	59,789	8,858	46.26%	9,916	51.78%	366	1.91%	9	0.05%	17,939	53.66%	15,149	45.31%	292	0.87%	52	0.16%
45	79,294	57,377	7,955	39.32%	11,934	58.98%	335	1.66%	10	0.05%	15,275	42.60%	20,249	56.48%	249	0.69%	80	0.22%
46	80,440	59,587	6,977	43.94%	8,611	54.23%	284	1.79%	7	0.04%	12,303	45.76%	14,327	53.29%	203	0.76%	51	0.19%
47	82,618	60,831	8,315	57.29%	6,015	41.44%	173	1.19%	11	0.08%	17,243	63.29%	9,705	35.62%	221	0.81%	77	0.28%
48	83,109	59,851	9,247	55.26%	7,197	43.01%	281	1.68%	9	0.05%	18,291	58.54%	12,650	40.49%	258	0.83%	46	0.15%
49	82,621	66,094	13,382	49.54%	12,911	47.79%	710	2.63%	11	0.04%	26,848	56.30%	20,053	42.05%	695	1.46%	88	0.18%
50	80,866	62,232	15,177	53.97%	12,277	43.66%	657	2.34%	11	0.04%	24,313	55.84%	18,630	42.79%	471	1.08%	123	0.28%
51	83,434	59,547	7,714	41.44%	10,529	56.56%	364	1.96%	8	0.04%	14,314	44.67%	17,331	54.08%	328	1.02%	72	0.22%
52	76,894	60,407	8,130	31.91%	16,852	66.14%	491	1.93%	7	0.03%	14,828	36.08%	25,925	63.08%	289	0.70%	58	0.14%
53	83,429	62,151	8,067	38.56%	12,447	59.50%	400	1.91%	6	0.03%	13,061	39.03%	20,001	59.78%	325	0.97%	73	0.22%

Populations values derive from the 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File. Election results were provided by the NC State Board of Elections. Votes that could not be associated with a specific precinct were excluded. Reported statewide totals may therefore be marginally lower than official contest results.

HBK-22 Pittman Districts 82 and 83: Population 2010, US Senate 2010, President 2012

	2010 Census		US Senate 2010: Marshall-Burr-Beitler								US President 2012: Obama-Romney-Johnson							
District	Total Pop	18+ Pop	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %
54	82,312	64,361	16,920	53.96%	13,730	43.79%	695	2.22%	10	0.03%	26,235	55.99%	20,057	42.81%	473	1.01%	89	0.19%
55	75,792	57,260	7,418	36.90%	12,345	61.41%	326	1.62%	12	0.06%	13,756	39.49%	20,716	59.48%	275	0.79%	84	0.24%
56	76,654	62,430	19,313	77.49%	5,073	20.35%	522	2.09%	15	0.06%	34,936	78.94%	8,503	19.21%	669	1.51%	151	0.34%
57	82,755	64,200	14,697	81.20%	3,148	17.39%	243	1.34%	11	0.06%	36,447	86.99%	5,069	12.10%	296	0.71%	84	0.20%
58	82,137	62,753	12,047	63.92%	6,487	34.42%	288	1.53%	25	0.13%	27,946	73.09%	9,912	25.92%	286	0.75%	93	0.24%
59	79,907	61,233	9,808	38.24%	15,356	59.87%	480	1.87%	7	0.03%	18,869	42.66%	24,892	56.27%	368	0.83%	106	0.24%
60	81,856	61,808	9,568	57.73%	6,682	40.31%	309	1.86%	16	0.10%	23,485	67.53%	10,974	31.55%	253	0.73%	67	0.19%
61	81,019	63,506	9,721	33.66%	18,550	64.22%	586	2.03%	27	0.09%	19,567	41.33%	27,191	57.44%	446	0.94%	136	0.29%
62	80,732	60,423	9,300	34.11%	17,363	63.68%	595	2.18%	10	0.04%	19,556	41.92%	26,542	56.89%	449	0.96%	107	0.23%
63	75,550	57,278	8,482	38.39%	13,031	58.99%	571	2.58%	8	0.04%	15,509	43.71%	19,573	55.17%	330	0.93%	68	0.19%
64	75,581	58,410	6,964	35.86%	11,981	61.69%	458	2.36%	17	0.09%	13,366	41.39%	18,597	57.58%	267	0.83%	66	0.20%
65	83,430	64,719	7,496	33.32%	14,282	63.48%	706	3.14%	16	0.07%	14,675	39.12%	22,455	59.86%	299	0.80%	84	0.22%
66	83,032	63,266	10,774	47.23%	11,598	50.84%	428	1.88%	11	0.05%	16,209	46.56%	18,293	52.54%	287	0.82%	26	0.07%
67	82,583	62,630	6,659	26.05%	18,384	71.93%	506	1.98%	10	0.04%	11,108	27.80%	28,389	71.05%	412	1.03%	47	0.12%
68	76,067	49,871	5,344	28.78%	12,791	68.88%	426	2.29%	9	0.05%	13,160	35.92%	23,097	63.04%	316	0.86%	66	0.18%
69	76,381	54,263	5,446	30.22%	12,148	67.40%	419	2.32%	11	0.06%	12,576	36.44%	21,460	62.18%	368	1.07%	110	0.32%
70	76,125	57,325	3,558	21.14%	12,749	75.74%	513	3.05%	13	0.08%	8,189	25.84%	23,113	72.94%	343	1.08%	44	0.14%
71	75,793	57,481	9,798	58.11%	6,782	40.22%	275	1.63%	7	0.04%	23,956	69.74%	10,090	29.38%	302	0.88%	0	0.00%
72	76,245	58,071	11,678	66.54%	5,620	32.02%	248	1.41%	5	0.03%	27,128	76.55%	8,076	22.79%	235	0.66%	0	0.00%
73	78,189	59,318	6,106	25.80%	17,032	71.95%	529	2.23%	4	0.02%	12,278	32.31%	25,229	66.40%	441	1.16%	47	0.12%
74	79,963	60,453	8,675	32.94%	17,137	65.07%	516	1.96%	8	0.03%	16,896	39.09%	25,912	59.95%	415	0.96%	0	0.00%
75	78,886	59,414	7,130	32.40%	14,427	65.57%	435	1.98%	11	0.05%	16,022	40.59%	23,039	58.37%	407	1.03%	0	0.00%
76	81,908	62,585	7,822	37.03%	12,787	60.53%	502	2.38%	13	0.06%	15,191	41.45%	20,960	57.20%	360	0.98%	135	0.37%
77	82,918	63,076	6,663	26.24%	18,105	71.29%	617	2.43%	11	0.04%	11,587	28.89%	28,014	69.84%	394	0.98%	117	0.29%
78	76,980	58,404	4,029	21.41%	14,213	75.51%	567	3.01%	13	0.07%	8,233	24.08%	25,560	74.77%	335	0.98%	58	0.17%
79	75,538	58,785	8,646	35.68%	15,108	62.35%	466	1.92%	12	0.05%	14,321	39.25%	21,861	59.92%	236	0.65%	66	0.18%
80	81,522	61,819	4,779	23.10%	15,452	74.68%	458	2.21%	3	0.01%	9,557	26.44%	26,120	72.27%	383	1.06%	81	0.22%
81	81,356	62,187	6,468	30.99%	13,884	66.51%	508	2.43%	14	0.07%	11,067	31.81%	23,263	66.86%	393	1.13%	71	0.20%
82	80,879	57,548	7,263	32.63%	14,500	65.15%	493	2.22%	0	0.00%	15,936	39.26%	24,220	59.67%	433	1.07%	0	0.00%
83	81,381	60,263	7,027	36.70%	11,669	60.95%	445	2.32%	4	0.02%	14,210	42.62%	18,702	56.10%	398	1.19%	29	0.09%
84	77,282	58,924	7,244	32.03%	14,736	65.16%	617	2.73%	18	0.08%	12,673	34.35%	23,733	64.33%	356	0.96%	131	0.36%
85	78,372	62,493	6,014	26.73%	15,873	70.54%	595	2.64%	20	0.09%	9,740	29.02%	23,328	69.50%	389	1.16%	110	0.33%
86	79,175	61,639	7,764	37.95%	12,242	59.83%	450	2.20%	5	0.02%	12,429	38.01%	19,756	60.42%	393	1.20%	119	0.36%
87	83,029	64,243	6,908	31.41%	14,382	65.39%	690	3.14%	15	0.07%	10,898	31.49%	23,229	67.12%	479	1.38%	0	0.00%
88	76,022	57,630	10,228	65.20%	5,122	32.65%	325	2.07%	12	0.08%	24,610	71.63%	9,328	27.15%	337	0.98%	84	0.24%
89	77,838	59,483	6,177	29.81%	13,998	67.55%	532	2.57%	15	0.07%	11,364	32.70%	22,869	65.82%	392	1.13%	122	0.35%
90	82,779	64,448	7,116	31.71%	14,796	65.92%	526	2.34%	6	0.03%	10,337	30.79%	22,726	67.68%	406	1.21%	109	0.32%
91	82,843	63,967	6,435	27.34%	16,505	70.13%	587	2.49%	9	0.04%	10,448	28.75%	25,325	69.69%	459	1.26%	107	0.29%
92	77,172	58,012	8,592	56.26%	6,372	41.72%	302	1.98%	7	0.05%	21,244	64.97%	11,011	33.68%	342	1.05%	100	0.31%
93	78,360	65,985	10,383	39.34%	15,262	57.83%	729	2.76%	18	0.07%	17,118	42.54%	22,103	54.93%	803	2.00%	213	0.53%
94	83,358	64,525	7,672	29.90%	17,245	67.21%	729	2.84%	11	0.04%	10,263	27.92%	25,882	70.40%	503	1.37%	117	0.32%
95	82,155	59,928	5,680	27.90%	14,174	69.63%	496	2.44%	6	0.03%	13,403	33.96%	25,566	64.77%	391	0.99%	112	0.28%
96	76,520	58,080	6,470	31.28%	13,705	66.27%	495	2.39%	11	0.05%	12,700	36.45%	21,665	62.18%	378	1.08%	102	0.29%
97	78,265	59,784	6,958	30.01%	15,653	67.51%	564	2.43%	11	0.05%	11,021	29.97%	25,266	68.71%	369	1.00%	115	0.31%
98	75,602	56,018	6,849	32.00%	14,098	65.88%	445	2.08%	8	0.04%	16,276	39.21%	24,750	59.62%	402	0.97%	83	0.20%
99	77,141	55,130	12,757	73.89%	4,259	24.67%	232	1.34%	16	0.09%	26,889	79.03%	6,836	20.09%	215	0.63%	83	0.24%
100	75,589	56,173	9,157	57.35%	6,485	40.62%	314	1.97%	10	0.06%	21,275	67.14%	10,017	31.61%	329	1.04%	67	0.21%
101	79,876	58,931	12,051	68.58%	5,219	29.70%	291	1.66%	11	0.06%	28,250	74.39%	9,386	24.72%	257	0.68%	82	0.22%
102	77,391	59,231	10,729	74.35%	3,424	23.73%	269	1.86%	8	0.06%	25,970	80.44%	5,905	18.29%	324	1.00%	84	0.26%
103	76,381	56,360	7,849	32.02%	16,157	65.92%	488	1.99%	16	0.07%	16,067	38.44%	25,182	60.25%	416	1.00%	132	0.32%
104	76,869	59,384	9,634	33.26%	18,842	65.05%	476	1.64%	13	0.04%	18,349	39.25%	27,916	59.71%	393	0.84%	95	0.20%
105	75,967	56,011	7,111	32.05%	14,618	65.88%	454	2.05%	5	0.02%	16,507	40.61%	23,709	58.33%	356	0.88%	73	0.18%
106	75,762	57,932	9,986	67.03%	4,694	31.51%	214	1.44%	3	0.02%	23,892	73.26%	8,334	25.55%	299	0.92%	89	0.27%

Populations values derive from the 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File. Election results were provided by the NC State Board of Elections. Votes that could not be associated with a specific precinct were excluded. Reported statewide totals may therefore be marginally lower than official contest results.

HBK-22 Pittman Districts 82 and 83: Population 2010, US Senate 2010, President 2012

	2010 Census		US Senate 2010: Marshall-Burr-Beitler								US President 2012: Obama-Romney-Johnson							
District	Total Pop	18+ Pop	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %
107	75,856	55,478	12,601	72.88%	4,477	25.89%	207	1.20%	6	0.03%	27,803	76.86%	8,081	22.34%	222	0.61%	67	0.19%
108	76,926	59,400	5,880	32.51%	11,794	65.21%	413	2.28%	0	0.00%	12,869	38.42%	20,266	60.50%	362	1.08%	0	0.00%
109	75,517	56,493	6,277	33.20%	12,209	64.58%	419	2.22%	0	0.00%	14,138	40.79%	20,201	58.28%	321	0.93%	0	0.00%
110	75,573	57,987	6,366	33.61%	12,134	64.06%	439	2.32%	2	0.01%	11,593	35.29%	20,921	63.69%	314	0.96%	20	0.06%
111	76,148	58,045	7,206	36.13%	12,341	61.87%	390	1.96%	9	0.05%	11,633	35.72%	20,543	63.07%	306	0.94%	89	0.27%
112	79,547	61,671	6,370	30.24%	14,175	67.30%	509	2.42%	9	0.04%	10,646	32.71%	21,465	65.95%	351	1.08%	87	0.27%
113	81,089	66,177	11,159	36.07%	19,015	61.47%	754	2.44%	8	0.03%	15,774	37.46%	25,726	61.09%	477	1.13%	132	0.31%
114	82,902	67,453	17,655	66.88%	8,010	30.34%	725	2.75%	8	0.03%	33,044	72.54%	11,524	25.30%	682	1.50%	300	0.66%
115	79,883	63,911	12,292	44.29%	14,665	52.84%	766	2.76%	31	0.11%	20,831	47.82%	21,945	50.38%	592	1.36%	195	0.45%
116	75,533	58,114	9,048	38.38%	13,930	59.09%	585	2.48%	12	0.05%	16,743	43.40%	21,230	55.04%	447	1.16%	154	0.40%
117	79,251	62,434	8,152	32.28%	16,500	65.33%	596	2.36%	9	0.04%	13,707	36.65%	23,138	61.86%	435	1.16%	123	0.33%
118	76,322	60,837	12,403	42.23%	16,191	55.12%	767	2.61%	12	0.04%	15,098	41.30%	20,729	56.71%	548	1.50%	180	0.49%
119	75,548	61,452	10,591	46.03%	11,788	51.23%	619	2.69%	12	0.05%	15,557	47.80%	16,410	50.42%	543	1.67%	39	0.12%
120	80,814	65,097	9,909	32.86%	19,081	63.28%	1,143	3.79%	18	0.06%	11,787	30.01%	26,800	68.23%	517	1.32%	176	0.45%
Totals:	**9,535,483**	**7,253,848**	**1,141,700**	**43.04%**	**1,454,082**	**54.82%**	**55,554**	**2.09%**	**1,263**	**0.05%**	**2,171,293**	**48.33%**	**2,267,353**	**50.47%**	**44,448**	**0.99%**	**9,519**	**0.21%**

Populations values derive from the 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File. Election results were provided by the NC State Board of Elections. Votes that could not be associated with a specific precinct were excluded. Reported statewide totals may therefore be marginally lower than official contest results.

HBK-22 Pittman Districts 82 and 83: Governor 2012, Lieutenant Governor 2012, US Senate 2014

	Governor 2012: Dalton-McCrory-Howe								Lieutenant Governor 2012: Coleman-Forest				US Senate 2014: Tillis-Hagan-Haugh							
District	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %
1	19,104	52.09%	16,908	46.10%	653	1.78%	8	0.02%	20,570	57.32%	15,314	42.68%	11,858	47.79%	12,208	49.20%	729	2.94%	17	0.07%
2	14,964	41.36%	20,485	56.62%	721	1.99%	11	0.03%	16,970	48.44%	18,065	51.56%	12,193	52.00%	10,289	43.88%	921	3.93%	44	0.19%
3	12,556	38.05%	19,773	59.92%	658	1.99%	12	0.04%	14,086	43.44%	18,342	56.56%	12,612	56.92%	8,699	39.26%	804	3.63%	43	0.19%
4	11,015	38.19%	17,336	60.11%	481	1.67%	9	0.03%	12,235	43.31%	16,012	56.69%	10,607	58.61%	6,770	37.41%	701	3.87%	20	0.11%
5	20,700	61.40%	12,290	36.45%	721	2.14%	3	0.01%	21,685	65.17%	11,591	34.83%	7,987	40.13%	11,521	57.88%	382	1.92%	15	0.08%
6	13,800	36.70%	22,340	59.41%	1,446	3.85%	14	0.04%	15,559	42.25%	21,269	57.75%	16,135	58.33%	10,543	38.11%	962	3.48%	22	0.08%
7	14,682	40.75%	20,622	57.24%	713	1.98%	13	0.04%	16,471	46.60%	18,875	53.40%	13,313	52.56%	10,823	42.73%	1,140	4.50%	53	0.21%
8	21,272	62.86%	11,935	35.27%	624	1.84%	7	0.02%	22,701	68.07%	10,649	31.93%	6,095	33.50%	11,528	63.36%	540	2.97%	32	0.18%
9	13,954	38.44%	21,716	59.83%	624	1.72%	4	0.01%	15,785	44.22%	19,914	55.78%	12,511	56.57%	8,912	40.30%	654	2.96%	38	0.17%
10	10,584	30.70%	23,479	68.10%	406	1.18%	6	0.02%	11,878	35.06%	21,998	64.94%	15,412	64.62%	7,489	31.40%	918	3.85%	30	0.13%
11	21,518	52.40%	17,791	43.33%	1,743	4.24%	11	0.03%	24,145	60.33%	15,877	39.67%	9,402	36.09%	15,557	59.72%	1,039	3.99%	54	0.21%
12	17,079	47.65%	18,313	51.09%	441	1.23%	12	0.03%	18,554	52.55%	16,752	47.45%	11,373	48.26%	11,355	48.19%	820	3.48%	17	0.07%
13	11,186	27.90%	28,180	70.30%	711	1.77%	10	0.02%	13,096	33.28%	26,250	66.72%	18,332	63.57%	9,180	31.83%	1,201	4.16%	126	0.44%
14	8,602	35.58%	14,927	61.74%	643	2.66%	5	0.02%	10,111	42.64%	13,602	57.36%	8,982	59.61%	5,359	35.57%	704	4.67%	22	0.15%
15	5,745	31.82%	11,786	65.27%	520	2.88%	5	0.03%	6,792	38.70%	10,759	61.30%	7,085	63.75%	3,460	31.13%	548	4.93%	20	0.18%
16	15,315	41.05%	21,295	57.08%	692	1.85%	6	0.02%	17,254	47.21%	19,293	52.79%	12,611	51.55%	10,386	42.45%	1,421	5.81%	48	0.20%
17	13,028	30.49%	28,818	67.45%	874	2.05%	4	0.01%	16,102	38.50%	25,725	61.50%	18,597	58.14%	11,618	36.32%	1,730	5.41%	39	0.12%
18	19,993	56.18%	14,447	40.60%	1,136	3.19%	12	0.03%	21,986	63.19%	12,809	36.81%	6,879	33.33%	12,754	61.79%	968	4.69%	39	0.19%
19	13,581	34.41%	24,684	62.54%	1,193	3.02%	10	0.03%	16,131	42.05%	22,234	57.95%	14,029	52.05%	11,412	42.34%	1,465	5.44%	48	0.18%
20	13,683	33.44%	26,066	63.71%	1,152	2.82%	12	0.03%	16,044	40.45%	23,624	59.55%	14,896	53.87%	11,396	41.22%	1,311	4.74%	47	0.17%
21	19,613	57.51%	14,045	41.18%	434	1.27%	11	0.03%	20,805	61.90%	12,803	38.10%	8,557	40.29%	12,041	56.70%	612	2.88%	26	0.12%
22	15,714	43.90%	19,638	54.87%	434	1.21%	5	0.01%	17,535	49.93%	17,581	50.07%	12,817	51.78%	10,726	43.34%	1,158	4.68%	50	0.20%
23	24,490	62.22%	14,521	36.89%	350	0.89%	1	0.00%	25,919	66.94%	12,801	33.06%	8,825	34.89%	15,731	62.19%	722	2.85%	17	0.07%
24	20,058	51.71%	18,288	47.15%	436	1.12%	8	0.02%	21,144	55.44%	16,994	44.56%	11,750	45.62%	13,325	51.74%	657	2.55%	24	0.09%
25	21,049	51.78%	19,219	47.28%	375	0.92%	5	0.01%	22,227	55.32%	17,950	44.68%	13,321	46.35%	14,633	50.91%	764	2.66%	25	0.09%
26	13,521	33.02%	26,508	64.73%	910	2.22%	10	0.02%	15,493	38.60%	24,641	61.40%	16,047	59.39%	9,887	36.59%	1,036	3.83%	49	0.18%
27	23,878	65.27%	12,369	33.81%	331	0.90%	4	0.01%	25,041	69.33%	11,076	30.67%	8,198	34.09%	15,190	63.16%	647	2.69%	16	0.07%
28	10,971	32.32%	22,423	66.05%	544	1.60%	10	0.03%	12,723	38.23%	20,560	61.77%	13,561	62.04%	7,307	33.43%	943	4.31%	48	0.22%
29	35,463	77.32%	9,134	19.92%	1,242	2.71%	25	0.05%	37,229	82.66%	7,812	17.34%	4,020	14.49%	23,189	83.60%	503	1.81%	27	0.10%
30	29,080	61.95%	16,637	35.44%	1,215	2.59%	11	0.02%	31,249	67.84%	14,812	32.16%	9,863	30.23%	21,982	67.37%	753	2.31%	30	0.09%
31	31,088	76.24%	8,713	21.37%	943	2.31%	30	0.07%	32,663	81.05%	7,639	18.95%	4,068	16.31%	20,384	81.72%	452	1.81%	39	0.16%
32	24,908	63.00%	14,186	35.88%	438	1.11%	4	0.01%	26,603	68.44%	12,266	31.56%	8,903	33.82%	16,633	63.19%	755	2.87%	32	0.12%
33	25,445	66.50%	11,674	30.51%	1,141	2.98%	4	0.01%	27,554	73.40%	9,985	26.60%	5,471	23.58%	16,926	72.94%	767	3.31%	41	0.18%
34	24,282	50.25%	22,640	46.85%	1,397	2.89%	8	0.02%	27,111	57.30%	20,200	42.70%	13,177	38.96%	19,618	58.00%	973	2.88%	57	0.17%
35	16,375	37.09%	26,734	60.55%	1,029	2.33%	15	0.03%	18,534	42.76%	24,815	57.24%	16,257	53.08%	13,398	43.74%	913	2.98%	61	0.20%
36	16,512	34.84%	29,686	62.64%	1,187	2.50%	8	0.02%	19,356	41.76%	26,991	58.24%	18,484	54.29%	14,562	42.77%	934	2.74%	67	0.20%
37	16,190	36.99%	26,307	60.10%	1,263	2.89%	14	0.03%	18,508	43.32%	24,216	56.68%	16,228	53.28%	13,138	43.13%	1,025	3.37%	68	0.22%
38	27,623	71.36%	10,131	26.17%	944	2.44%	11	0.03%	29,459	77.11%	8,745	22.89%	5,219	22.03%	17,826	75.24%	611	2.58%	37	0.16%
39	26,440	64.76%	13,558	33.21%	822	2.01%	9	0.02%	28,552	70.78%	11,785	29.22%	7,175	27.51%	18,189	69.74%	680	2.61%	38	0.15%
40	17,767	35.02%	31,793	62.66%	1,159	2.28%	16	0.03%	20,489	41.22%	29,213	58.78%	20,170	53.02%	16,914	44.46%	905	2.38%	50	0.13%
41	18,631	44.80%	21,697	52.18%	1,245	2.99%	12	0.03%	21,117	52.18%	19,353	47.82%	12,130	43.17%	15,093	53.71%	826	2.94%	52	0.19%
42	17,657	70.31%	6,879	27.39%	570	2.27%	7	0.03%	18,581	74.83%	6,251	25.17%	3,360	24.76%	9,838	72.50%	356	2.62%	15	0.11%
43	22,155	68.80%	9,319	28.94%	716	2.22%	13	0.04%	23,447	73.52%	8,447	26.48%	5,177	28.30%	12,578	68.77%	504	2.76%	32	0.17%
44	16,575	50.29%	15,604	47.34%	777	2.36%	4	0.01%	18,236	56.47%	14,058	43.53%	9,371	46.34%	10,098	49.94%	724	3.58%	28	0.14%
45	14,293	40.30%	20,508	57.83%	654	1.84%	10	0.03%	16,061	46.10%	18,779	53.90%	12,902	55.12%	9,613	41.07%	862	3.68%	28	0.12%
46	13,148	49.59%	12,865	48.52%	494	1.86%	9	0.03%	14,692	56.79%	11,178	43.21%	8,263	51.41%	6,912	43.00%	864	5.38%	34	0.21%
47	17,474	65.03%	8,923	33.21%	463	1.72%	10	0.04%	19,029	72.21%	7,325	27.79%	6,020	38.81%	8,990	57.95%	483	3.11%	20	0.13%
48	17,506	57.00%	12,512	40.74%	683	2.22%	11	0.04%	18,833	62.60%	11,253	37.40%	8,168	39.86%	11,599	56.60%	702	3.43%	25	0.12%
49	23,039	48.85%	22,573	47.86%	1,529	3.24%	19	0.04%	25,948	56.50%	19,977	43.50%	12,523	38.78%	18,812	58.25%	915	2.83%	44	0.14%
50	22,427	51.96%	19,641	45.50%	1,079	2.50%	17	0.04%	24,273	57.34%	18,057	42.66%	11,936	39.20%	17,598	57.80%	884	2.90%	31	0.10%
51	13,347	41.90%	17,802	55.89%	695	2.18%	9	0.03%	14,890	47.81%	16,254	52.19%	10,309	51.33%	8,824	43.94%	912	4.54%	37	0.18%
52	13,223	32.47%	26,842	65.91%	647	1.59%	13	0.03%	14,727	36.95%	25,133	63.05%	18,117	61.71%	10,299	35.08%	918	3.13%	25	0.09%
53	12,066	36.20%	20,590	61.78%	654	1.96%	18	0.05%	13,884	42.31%	18,933	57.69%	12,290	57.33%	8,229	38.39%	881	4.11%	37	0.17%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-22.asc', modified 08/25/2017 04:53:18 PM

Printed 08/25/2017 {rptS03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections. Votes that could not be associated with a specific precinct were excluded. Reported statewide totals may therefore be marginally lower than official contest results.

HBK-22 Pittman Districts 82 and 83: Governor 2012, Lieutenant Governor 2012, US Senate 2014

	Governor 2012: Dalton-McCrory-Howe								Lieutenant Governor 2012: Coleman-Forest				US Senate 2014: Tillis-Hagan-Haugh							
District	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %
54	23,822	51.27%	21,500	46.27%	1,129	2.43%	13	0.03%	25,713	56.54%	19,767	43.46%	13,798	38.55%	20,947	58.53%	1,010	2.82%	33	0.09%
55	11,895	34.27%	22,352	64.40%	451	1.30%	9	0.03%	14,409	42.63%	19,392	57.37%	12,564	58.22%	8,132	37.68%	825	3.82%	59	0.27%
56	31,425	72.59%	10,387	23.99%	1,442	3.33%	35	0.08%	33,453	79.36%	8,702	20.64%	4,328	14.66%	24,548	83.15%	623	2.11%	25	0.08%
57	33,864	82.21%	6,380	15.49%	935	2.27%	15	0.04%	35,587	87.36%	5,148	12.64%	2,908	12.79%	19,345	85.07%	461	2.03%	27	0.12%
58	25,470	67.33%	11,477	30.34%	871	2.30%	12	0.03%	27,374	73.49%	9,877	26.51%	6,056	26.29%	16,414	71.26%	541	2.35%	23	0.10%
59	16,881	38.35%	26,270	59.68%	842	1.91%	22	0.05%	18,902	43.85%	24,202	56.15%	16,481	54.26%	13,076	43.05%	781	2.57%	38	0.13%
60	21,229	61.82%	12,382	36.06%	716	2.08%	14	0.04%	22,798	67.67%	10,893	32.33%	6,627	32.59%	13,173	64.78%	511	2.51%	23	0.11%
61	16,477	35.08%	29,436	62.67%	1,042	2.22%	13	0.03%	18,890	41.30%	26,843	58.70%	18,586	54.92%	14,369	42.46%	833	2.46%	54	0.16%
62	16,439	35.57%	28,715	62.13%	1,049	2.27%	16	0.03%	18,766	41.64%	26,301	58.36%	17,940	54.18%	14,342	43.32%	788	2.38%	39	0.12%
63	13,645	38.81%	20,703	58.88%	806	2.29%	8	0.02%	15,271	44.34%	19,170	55.66%	12,602	53.40%	9,988	42.32%	965	4.09%	44	0.19%
64	11,979	37.49%	19,341	60.53%	627	1.96%	4	0.01%	13,229	42.12%	18,180	57.88%	11,778	56.82%	8,157	39.35%	765	3.69%	29	0.14%
65	13,513	36.26%	23,056	61.87%	688	1.85%	8	0.02%	15,423	42.41%	20,945	57.59%	14,329	56.93%	9,480	37.67%	1,299	5.16%	61	0.24%
66	14,745	42.53%	19,327	55.75%	573	1.65%	22	0.06%	17,639	52.60%	15,896	47.40%	11,634	48.65%	10,906	45.60%	1,307	5.46%	69	0.29%
67	8,403	21.02%	30,987	77.50%	589	1.47%	3	0.01%	11,566	29.86%	27,172	70.14%	17,657	66.58%	7,224	27.24%	1,552	5.85%	88	0.33%
68	9,603	26.44%	26,124	71.94%	580	1.60%	8	0.02%	12,272	34.62%	23,173	65.38%	14,825	62.65%	8,035	33.95%	726	3.07%	78	0.33%
69	9,500	27.69%	24,180	70.48%	618	1.80%	12	0.03%	12,086	36.26%	21,244	63.74%	12,586	61.65%	7,039	34.48%	713	3.49%	76	0.37%
70	7,067	22.31%	23,955	75.61%	659	2.08%	2	0.01%	8,422	27.16%	22,587	72.84%	13,549	72.21%	4,376	23.32%	811	4.32%	27	0.14%
71	21,632	63.47%	11,608	34.06%	833	2.44%	11	0.03%	23,344	69.85%	10,074	30.15%	5,937	29.94%	13,286	67.01%	564	2.84%	41	0.21%
72	25,032	71.44%	9,442	26.95%	561	1.60%	4	0.01%	26,408	76.70%	8,021	23.30%	4,846	22.84%	15,910	75.00%	431	2.03%	27	0.13%
73	10,246	26.97%	26,893	70.79%	836	2.20%	13	0.03%	12,226	33.12%	24,693	66.88%	16,341	65.28%	7,672	30.65%	958	3.83%	60	0.24%
74	14,574	33.71%	27,740	64.17%	903	2.09%	14	0.03%	16,738	39.66%	25,462	60.34%	16,626	57.24%	11,474	39.50%	896	3.08%	52	0.18%
75	13,727	34.78%	24,886	63.06%	843	2.14%	8	0.02%	15,812	40.97%	22,784	59.03%	14,120	56.55%	10,022	40.14%	765	3.06%	60	0.24%
76	12,284	33.69%	23,538	64.56%	628	1.72%	9	0.02%	14,731	41.42%	20,837	58.58%	12,611	55.12%	8,946	39.10%	1,270	5.55%	51	0.22%
77	9,369	23.42%	29,955	74.88%	668	1.67%	11	0.03%	11,524	29.40%	27,678	70.60%	17,850	66.81%	7,521	28.15%	1,287	4.82%	59	0.22%
78	7,417	21.69%	26,189	76.58%	589	1.72%	2	0.01%	8,545	25.56%	24,890	74.44%	15,703	72.92%	4,853	22.54%	935	4.34%	44	0.20%
79	13,554	37.32%	22,193	61.10%	570	1.57%	4	0.01%	15,469	43.41%	20,162	56.59%	14,708	55.81%	10,339	39.23%	1,201	4.56%	104	0.39%
80	8,280	22.99%	27,024	75.04%	703	1.95%	6	0.02%	10,026	28.42%	25,253	71.58%	15,663	71.58%	5,384	24.61%	804	3.67%	30	0.14%
81	9,478	27.29%	24,476	70.48%	769	2.21%	5	0.01%	11,626	34.16%	22,403	65.84%	13,608	64.41%	6,478	30.66%	994	4.70%	48	0.23%
82	11,617	28.69%	28,127	69.46%	750	1.85%	0	0.00%	15,580	39.68%	23,682	60.32%	14,293	56.57%	9,912	39.23%	981	3.88%	82	0.32%
83	11,398	34.18%	21,333	63.97%	616	1.85%	0	0.00%	14,491	44.64%	17,969	55.36%	10,499	53.60%	8,056	41.13%	983	5.02%	49	0.25%
84	10,369	28.17%	25,834	70.19%	594	1.61%	8	0.02%	12,890	35.90%	23,016	64.10%	15,527	61.64%	8,043	31.93%	1,547	6.14%	72	0.29%
85	8,720	26.19%	23,735	71.30%	830	2.49%	4	0.01%	10,049	31.44%	21,909	68.56%	14,353	67.23%	5,803	27.18%	1,155	5.41%	37	0.17%
86	9,894	30.27%	22,179	67.86%	597	1.83%	14	0.04%	12,957	40.71%	18,868	59.29%	12,566	56.86%	8,134	36.81%	1,359	6.15%	39	0.18%
87	8,402	24.08%	25,771	73.84%	726	2.08%	0	0.00%	11,079	32.73%	22,771	67.27%	13,309	63.30%	6,258	29.76%	1,381	6.57%	78	0.37%
88	20,018	59.29%	13,068	38.71%	670	1.98%	6	0.02%	23,272	70.93%	9,539	29.07%	5,082	26.73%	13,373	70.35%	525	2.76%	30	0.16%
89	8,637	25.00%	25,338	73.34%	567	1.64%	8	0.02%	11,035	32.69%	22,717	67.31%	13,875	64.20%	6,526	30.20%	1,153	5.33%	58	0.27%
90	9,098	27.20%	23,610	70.57%	737	2.20%	9	0.03%	11,015	34.03%	21,358	65.97%	14,202	63.15%	6,909	30.72%	1,333	5.93%	45	0.20%
91	9,542	26.27%	25,983	71.53%	788	2.17%	12	0.03%	11,497	32.45%	23,938	67.55%	15,807	65.85%	6,654	27.72%	1,463	6.09%	82	0.34%
92	17,313	53.39%	14,448	44.55%	661	2.04%	6	0.02%	20,458	64.53%	11,246	35.47%	5,661	32.76%	10,988	63.60%	586	3.39%	43	0.25%
93	14,589	36.70%	23,616	59.41%	1,532	3.85%	11	0.03%	17,050	44.54%	21,230	55.46%	13,890	52.47%	11,056	41.76%	1,481	5.59%	47	0.18%
94	8,654	23.53%	27,494	74.76%	619	1.68%	7	0.02%	10,736	30.05%	24,993	69.95%	16,393	66.83%	6,491	26.46%	1,552	6.33%	92	0.38%
95	9,674	24.71%	28,753	73.44%	710	1.81%	15	0.04%	12,828	33.76%	25,174	66.24%	15,725	62.10%	8,257	32.61%	1,255	4.96%	84	0.33%
96	9,710	27.99%	24,383	70.28%	596	1.72%	7	0.02%	12,265	36.11%	21,704	63.89%	13,550	60.40%	7,757	34.58%	1,060	4.73%	65	0.29%
97	8,226	22.44%	27,842	75.96%	582	1.59%	5	0.01%	10,866	30.52%	24,732	69.48%	15,844	66.50%	6,685	28.06%	1,232	5.17%	66	0.28%
98	11,028	26.83%	29,295	71.27%	774	1.88%	7	0.02%	15,043	37.92%	24,623	62.08%	14,436	56.42%	10,325	40.35%	736	2.88%	89	0.35%
99	23,478	69.59%	9,686	28.71%	565	1.67%	7	0.02%	26,192	78.87%	7,017	21.13%	3,532	18.57%	15,086	79.31%	374	1.97%	29	0.15%
100	17,333	55.16%	13,474	42.88%	605	1.93%	12	0.04%	20,399	66.57%	10,245	33.43%	5,518	31.92%	11,202	64.79%	533	3.08%	36	0.21%
101	24,485	65.40%	12,341	32.96%	605	1.62%	7	0.02%	27,310	74.45%	9,370	25.55%	4,873	23.57%	15,262	73.83%	512	2.48%	25	0.12%
102	21,669	68.30%	9,269	29.22%	768	2.42%	18	0.06%	24,802	80.30%	6,085	19.70%	2,896	16.75%	13,858	80.17%	508	2.94%	23	0.13%
103	10,654	25.61%	30,288	72.80%	655	1.57%	9	0.02%	14,826	36.80%	25,459	63.20%	14,931	57.20%	10,396	39.82%	727	2.78%	51	0.20%
104	11,360	24.40%	34,544	74.20%	641	1.38%	13	0.03%	16,834	37.48%	28,079	62.52%	16,733	55.41%	12,697	42.04%	731	2.42%	39	0.13%
105	10,762	26.63%	29,029	71.84%	610	1.51%	6	0.01%	14,930	38.00%	24,356	62.00%	13,516	56.71%	9,683	40.63%	589	2.47%	44	0.18%
106	20,129	62.28%	11,537	35.70%	637	1.97%	17	0.05%	23,095	72.96%	8,561	27.04%	4,035	23.69%	12,601	73.99%	384	2.25%	10	0.06%

HBK-22 Pittman Districts 82 and 83: Governor 2012, Lieutenant Governor 2012, US Senate 2014

	Governor 2012: Dalton-McCrory-Howe								Lieutenant Governor 2012: Coleman-Forest				US Senate 2014: Tillis-Hagan-Haugh							
District	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Write-In**	**Write-In %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Write-In**	**Write-In %**
107	24,066	67.23%	11,223	31.35%	499	1.39%	11	0.03%	26,973	76.68%	8,203	23.32%	4,072	20.43%	15,400	77.28%	420	2.11%	35	0.18%
108	10,229	30.60%	22,641	67.73%	553	1.65%	6	0.02%	12,577	38.66%	19,954	61.34%	11,798	58.37%	7,436	36.79%	940	4.65%	37	0.18%
109	11,675	33.74%	22,419	64.79%	501	1.45%	9	0.03%	13,855	41.00%	19,937	59.00%	12,274	57.67%	8,147	38.28%	804	3.78%	59	0.28%
110	10,188	31.08%	22,150	67.56%	443	1.35%	4	0.01%	11,944	37.40%	19,996	62.60%	12,381	60.75%	6,988	34.29%	961	4.72%	49	0.24%
111	10,978	33.85%	21,002	64.75%	447	1.38%	9	0.03%	12,345	39.08%	19,245	60.92%	12,248	58.87%	7,466	35.89%	1,040	5.00%	50	0.24%
112	13,175	40.49%	18,798	57.78%	552	1.70%	10	0.03%	11,934	37.96%	19,505	62.04%	13,356	60.75%	7,327	33.33%	1,273	5.79%	30	0.14%
113	14,513	34.86%	26,056	62.58%	1,053	2.53%	14	0.03%	15,965	39.13%	24,832	60.87%	17,951	56.94%	12,220	38.76%	1,317	4.18%	39	0.12%
114	30,335	67.66%	12,627	28.17%	1,853	4.13%	17	0.04%	32,363	73.64%	11,584	26.36%	6,689	22.11%	22,389	74.02%	1,142	3.78%	29	0.10%
115	18,992	44.03%	22,839	52.94%	1,300	3.01%	8	0.02%	20,704	48.97%	21,574	51.03%	14,095	45.76%	15,408	50.02%	1,262	4.10%	39	0.13%
116	15,055	39.40%	22,073	57.77%	1,069	2.80%	10	0.03%	16,787	44.87%	20,623	55.13%	13,088	50.68%	11,658	45.14%	1,042	4.03%	38	0.15%
117	12,236	33.12%	23,695	64.13%	1,002	2.71%	14	0.04%	13,677	37.80%	22,505	62.20%	14,898	58.54%	9,518	37.40%	995	3.91%	37	0.15%
118	14,554	39.85%	21,033	57.59%	922	2.52%	13	0.04%	15,851	44.59%	19,698	55.41%	14,379	52.35%	11,489	41.83%	1,537	5.60%	61	0.22%
119	14,498	44.69%	16,886	52.05%	1,054	3.25%	2	0.01%	15,958	50.57%	15,600	49.43%	10,500	46.76%	10,697	47.64%	1,217	5.42%	40	0.18%
120	12,098	31.33%	25,139	65.11%	1,357	3.51%	18	0.05%	13,273	35.22%	24,408	64.78%	18,212	62.59%	9,371	32.21%	1,474	5.07%	40	0.14%
Totals:	**1,925,270**	**43.18%**	**2,437,224**	**54.67%**	**94,512**	**2.12%**	**1,191**	**0.03%**	**2,174,021**	**49.88%**	**2,184,891**	**50.12%**	**1,416,834**	**48.84%**	**1,370,303**	**47.23%**	**108,779**	**3.75%**	**5,251**	**0.18%**

HBK-22 Pittman Districts 82 and 83: President 2016, US Senate 2016, Governor 2016

	US President 2016: Trump-Clinton-Johnson								US Senate 2016: Burr-Ross-Haugh						Governor 2016: Cooper-McCrory-Cecil					
District	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %
1	18,589	51.78%	16,455	45.83%	630	1.75%	229	0.64%	18,358	52.14%	16,040	45.56%	811	2.30%	16,170	45.62%	18,855	53.20%	418	1.18%
2	21,687	56.45%	15,453	40.22%	893	2.32%	385	1.00%	21,503	56.54%	15,299	40.22%	1,232	3.24%	16,542	43.27%	21,035	55.02%	656	1.72%
3	19,500	57.51%	13,102	38.64%	958	2.83%	350	1.03%	19,722	58.75%	12,526	37.32%	1,320	3.93%	13,284	39.49%	19,645	58.40%	709	2.11%
4	19,316	63.27%	10,515	34.44%	536	1.76%	163	0.53%	18,844	62.77%	10,197	33.97%	978	3.26%	10,515	34.80%	19,240	63.67%	463	1.53%
5	14,071	42.89%	17,840	54.38%	677	2.06%	221	0.67%	13,942	43.33%	17,542	54.52%	690	2.14%	17,723	54.83%	14,115	43.67%	483	1.49%
6	26,166	63.13%	13,548	32.69%	1,322	3.19%	413	1.00%	25,754	63.45%	13,548	33.38%	1,290	3.18%	14,719	36.08%	25,069	61.45%	1,010	2.48%
7	21,956	56.91%	15,273	39.59%	939	2.43%	411	1.07%	21,764	56.74%	15,352	40.02%	1,242	3.24%	16,618	43.12%	21,215	55.05%	707	1.83%
8	11,251	32.48%	22,166	63.99%	878	2.53%	346	1.00%	11,920	34.87%	21,238	62.12%	1,030	3.01%	21,791	63.50%	11,949	34.82%	577	1.68%
9	20,103	53.26%	16,101	42.66%	1,112	2.95%	426	1.13%	20,913	55.89%	15,376	41.09%	1,129	3.02%	16,546	44.07%	20,375	54.27%	626	1.67%
10	24,292	66.90%	11,079	30.51%	680	1.87%	258	0.71%	24,011	66.82%	10,937	30.44%	984	2.74%	11,524	31.87%	24,183	66.89%	449	1.24%
11	13,097	31.16%	26,165	62.26%	1,893	4.50%	873	2.08%	14,675	35.17%	25,423	60.93%	1,628	3.90%	27,513	65.67%	13,139	31.36%	1,242	2.96%
12	17,784	51.92%	15,657	45.71%	569	1.66%	241	0.70%	17,668	52.25%	15,240	45.07%	906	2.68%	15,523	45.65%	18,084	53.18%	397	1.17%
13	29,527	68.85%	11,999	27.98%	967	2.25%	396	0.92%	29,080	68.53%	11,666	27.49%	1,685	3.97%	12,730	29.84%	29,076	68.17%	849	1.99%
14	16,391	60.55%	9,442	34.88%	949	3.51%	289	1.07%	16,089	60.41%	9,134	34.30%	1,410	5.29%	9,540	35.73%	16,350	61.23%	813	3.04%
15	13,635	66.87%	5,838	28.63%	701	3.44%	217	1.06%	13,255	66.19%	5,709	28.51%	1,061	5.30%	6,115	30.44%	13,366	66.54%	606	3.02%
16	24,723	60.82%	14,793	36.39%	868	2.14%	267	0.66%	24,021	60.12%	14,359	35.94%	1,578	3.95%	15,806	39.44%	23,414	58.42%	858	2.14%
17	33,539	64.40%	16,832	32.32%	1,227	2.36%	480	0.92%	32,987	64.27%	16,223	31.61%	2,112	4.12%	18,326	35.57%	32,038	62.18%	1,162	2.26%
18	14,960	39.11%	21,515	56.25%	1,247	3.26%	530	1.39%	15,065	40.15%	20,714	55.20%	1,747	4.66%	22,540	59.77%	14,028	37.20%	1,146	3.04%
19	24,349	55.45%	17,494	39.84%	1,461	3.33%	604	1.38%	24,444	56.44%	16,799	38.79%	2,068	4.77%	19,932	45.80%	22,351	51.36%	1,232	2.83%
20	25,197	54.81%	18,393	40.01%	1,731	3.77%	651	1.42%	25,753	56.83%	17,604	38.84%	1,962	4.33%	20,831	45.79%	23,400	51.43%	1,266	2.78%
21	12,919	40.43%	18,303	57.28%	495	1.55%	237	0.74%	13,027	41.30%	17,815	56.47%	703	2.23%	17,980	56.77%	13,288	41.96%	404	1.28%
22	20,939	58.30%	14,256	39.69%	523	1.46%	201	0.56%	20,588	58.10%	14,025	39.58%	820	2.31%	14,561	40.81%	20,720	58.07%	400	1.12%
23	14,143	38.43%	22,040	59.88%	449	1.22%	173	0.47%	14,165	38.89%	21,496	59.02%	760	2.09%	21,917	59.87%	14,389	39.30%	303	0.83%
24	17,531	45.97%	19,663	51.56%	667	1.75%	274	0.72%	17,641	46.58%	19,435	51.32%	794	2.10%	20,471	53.84%	17,161	45.13%	391	1.03%
25	17,731	44.94%	20,836	52.81%	588	1.49%	299	0.76%	17,965	45.70%	20,621	52.45%	729	1.85%	21,877	55.47%	17,171	43.54%	389	0.99%
26	28,405	59.94%	16,944	35.76%	1,499	3.16%	539	1.14%	28,505	60.58%	16,778	35.66%	1,767	3.76%	18,608	39.37%	27,716	58.63%	946	2.00%
27	12,504	36.17%	21,573	62.40%	373	1.08%	123	0.36%	12,390	36.15%	21,326	62.22%	557	1.63%	21,783	63.37%	12,336	35.89%	256	0.74%
28	24,454	65.87%	11,524	31.04%	860	2.32%	288	0.78%	24,026	65.28%	11,577	31.45%	1,202	3.27%	12,613	34.09%	23,768	64.24%	617	1.67%
29	5,172	10.88%	40,386	84.99%	1,171	2.46%	787	1.66%	7,072	15.00%	39,112	82.96%	964	2.04%	40,387	85.64%	6,009	12.74%	761	1.61%
30	13,282	26.62%	34,511	69.18%	1,265	2.54%	829	1.66%	14,956	30.09%	33,506	67.41%	1,242	2.50%	35,040	70.35%	13,947	28.00%	818	1.64%
31	7,429	16.37%	36,169	79.69%	1,136	2.50%	654	1.44%	8,466	18.76%	35,558	78.81%	1,092	2.42%	36,387	80.47%	8,063	17.83%	770	1.70%
32	13,636	35.53%	23,937	62.37%	563	1.47%	241	0.63%	13,731	36.10%	23,622	62.10%	683	1.80%	24,127	63.21%	13,643	35.74%	401	1.05%
33	9,320	22.99%	29,204	72.05%	1,399	3.45%	610	1.50%	10,337	25.71%	28,598	71.13%	1,272	3.16%	29,984	74.32%	9,429	23.37%	934	2.31%
34	16,734	33.58%	30,202	60.61%	1,879	3.77%	1,011	2.03%	19,537	39.31%	28,698	57.74%	1,464	2.95%	31,726	63.65%	17,066	34.24%	1,052	2.11%
35	25,508	49.09%	23,630	45.47%	1,744	3.36%	1,082	2.08%	27,262	52.81%	22,718	44.01%	1,638	3.17%	25,059	48.33%	25,740	49.64%	1,054	2.03%
36	25,495	49.78%	22,974	44.86%	1,903	3.72%	846	1.65%	27,500	53.89%	21,900	42.91%	1,632	3.20%	24,574	47.98%	25,611	50.00%	1,036	2.02%
37	26,427	49.66%	23,556	44.27%	2,295	4.31%	936	1.76%	28,468	53.86%	22,487	42.55%	1,896	3.59%	25,376	47.79%	26,351	49.63%	1,369	2.58%
38	7,962	20.17%	29,883	75.70%	1,056	2.67%	577	1.46%	8,744	22.30%	29,341	74.83%	1,126	2.87%	30,111	76.58%	8,383	21.32%	825	2.10%
39	11,720	27.17%	29,742	68.94%	1,134	2.63%	547	1.27%	12,360	28.82%	29,304	68.32%	1,230	2.87%	30,194	70.17%	12,076	28.06%	760	1.77%
40	25,414	46.70%	25,912	47.62%	2,113	3.88%	976	1.79%	28,593	52.66%	24,242	44.65%	1,463	2.69%	27,552	50.59%	25,895	47.55%	1,016	1.87%
41	17,367	35.18%	29,148	59.04%	1,982	4.01%	876	1.77%	20,218	41.31%	27,134	55.45%	1,585	3.24%	29,804	60.65%	18,119	36.87%	1,218	2.48%
42	6,364	25.50%	17,674	70.81%	647	2.59%	274	1.10%	6,643	26.97%	17,141	69.60%	845	3.43%	17,092	69.47%	6,886	27.99%	627	2.55%
43	8,099	26.20%	21,704	70.20%	798	2.58%	317	1.03%	8,364	27.40%	21,127	69.21%	1,035	3.39%	21,109	69.10%	8,700	28.48%	740	2.42%
44	14,477	44.27%	16,935	51.79%	961	2.94%	329	1.01%	14,728	45.60%	16,387	50.74%	1,184	3.67%	16,797	51.88%	14,827	45.80%	750	2.32%
45	22,325	57.35%	15,292	39.28%	967	2.48%	343	0.88%	22,167	57.66%	15,078	39.22%	1,202	3.13%	15,451	40.04%	22,349	57.91%	792	2.05%
46	16,046	61.47%	9,544	36.56%	396	1.52%	116	0.44%	15,195	59.76%	9,522	37.45%	708	2.78%	9,625	37.45%	15,778	61.39%	300	1.17%
47	11,779	46.41%	12,896	50.81%	520	2.05%	186	0.73%	11,277	45.82%	12,909	52.46%	423	1.72%	12,419	49.71%	12,346	49.42%	216	0.86%
48	14,016	43.58%	17,045	53.00%	831	2.58%	266	0.83%	13,782	43.73%	16,722	53.06%	1,010	3.20%	17,039	53.91%	13,890	43.94%	679	2.15%
49	17,038	32.50%	32,320	61.64%	2,062	3.93%	1,012	1.93%	20,095	38.54%	30,441	58.39%	1,600	3.07%	33,662	64.28%	17,547	33.51%	1,158	2.21%
50	18,683	40.92%	25,213	55.22%	1,226	2.69%	539	1.18%	19,535	43.06%	24,526	54.06%	1,309	2.89%	26,259	57.73%	18,414	40.49%	810	1.78%
51	18,556	54.99%	13,829	40.98%	1,027	3.04%	332	0.98%	18,319	54.87%	13,803	41.34%	1,264	3.79%	14,919	44.49%	17,772	53.00%	840	2.51%
52	26,508	61.46%	14,902	34.55%	1,240	2.87%	482	1.12%	26,850	62.67%	14,595	34.07%	1,396	3.26%	16,149	37.60%	25,907	60.32%	893	2.08%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-22.asc', modified 08/25/2017 04:53:18 PM

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections. Votes that could not be associated with a specific precinct were excluded. Reported statewide totals may therefore be marginally lower than official contest results.

HBK-22 Pittman Districts 82 and 83: President 2016, US Senate 2016, Governor 2016

	US President 2016: Trump-Clinton-Johnson								US Senate 2016: Burr-Ross-Haugh						Governor 2016: Cooper-McCrory-Cecil					
District	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %
53	21,436	60.85%	12,611	35.80%	852	2.42%	328	0.93%	21,212	60.60%	12,628	36.08%	1,164	3.33%	13,300	37.93%	21,064	60.08%	697	1.99%
54	19,492	37.13%	30,645	58.38%	1,545	2.94%	809	1.54%	21,169	40.48%	29,679	56.76%	1,444	2.76%	31,838	60.66%	19,672	37.48%	979	1.87%
55	22,840	63.50%	12,002	33.37%	788	2.19%	336	0.93%	22,508	63.37%	11,758	33.10%	1,252	3.52%	12,330	34.49%	22,863	63.95%	559	1.56%
56	5,901	12.36%	39,502	82.73%	1,392	2.92%	955	2.00%	8,341	17.60%	38,022	80.24%	1,021	2.15%	40,120	84.53%	6,502	13.70%	838	1.77%
57	4,869	12.13%	33,975	84.62%	785	1.96%	523	1.30%	5,571	14.07%	33,051	83.48%	968	2.45%	33,866	85.39%	5,062	12.76%	733	1.85%
58	8,963	23.57%	27,663	72.74%	918	2.41%	485	1.28%	9,437	25.12%	26,960	71.78%	1,164	3.10%	28,097	74.57%	8,759	23.25%	823	2.18%
59	25,507	54.53%	19,758	42.24%	1,056	2.26%	457	0.98%	25,592	55.15%	19,403	41.81%	1,411	3.04%	21,420	45.98%	24,237	52.03%	926	1.99%
60	10,484	30.27%	22,918	66.17%	880	2.54%	353	1.02%	10,935	32.03%	22,058	64.61%	1,148	3.36%	23,295	68.08%	10,105	29.53%	819	2.39%
61	24,185	49.68%	22,193	45.59%	1,552	3.19%	752	1.54%	25,701	53.16%	21,118	43.68%	1,528	3.16%	24,221	49.98%	23,168	47.80%	1,075	2.22%
62	23,811	49.23%	22,262	46.02%	1,540	3.18%	757	1.57%	25,865	53.72%	20,867	43.34%	1,417	2.94%	24,295	50.38%	22,926	47.54%	1,000	2.07%
63	19,745	52.91%	16,215	43.45%	964	2.58%	397	1.06%	20,099	54.24%	15,711	42.39%	1,249	3.37%	17,448	46.93%	19,042	51.22%	687	1.85%
64	19,070	56.36%	13,618	40.25%	831	2.46%	317	0.94%	19,281	57.45%	13,162	39.22%	1,119	3.33%	14,584	43.35%	18,459	54.87%	596	1.77%
65	23,874	63.29%	12,795	33.92%	751	1.99%	301	0.80%	23,327	62.41%	12,731	34.06%	1,321	3.53%	14,611	38.98%	22,135	59.06%	733	1.96%
66	20,232	57.61%	14,075	40.08%	619	1.76%	192	0.55%	19,128	55.40%	14,083	40.79%	1,316	3.81%	15,183	43.59%	19,075	54.76%	577	1.66%
67	31,950	73.24%	10,240	23.47%	1,051	2.41%	381	0.87%	30,799	71.22%	10,291	23.80%	2,154	4.98%	11,709	26.92%	30,872	70.99%	907	2.09%
68	25,357	58.90%	15,581	36.19%	1,519	3.53%	593	1.38%	26,537	62.36%	14,300	33.60%	1,717	4.03%	16,268	38.02%	25,525	59.65%	1,000	2.34%
69	23,008	61.78%	12,620	33.89%	1,151	3.09%	461	1.24%	23,224	63.20%	11,858	32.27%	1,667	4.54%	13,180	35.64%	22,857	61.81%	941	2.54%
70	25,245	74.51%	7,544	22.27%	779	2.30%	312	0.92%	24,601	73.23%	7,505	22.34%	1,490	4.44%	9,245	27.45%	23,609	70.11%	821	2.44%
71	9,228	26.65%	23,827	68.81%	1,064	3.07%	510	1.47%	10,380	30.23%	22,857	66.56%	1,102	3.21%	24,376	70.96%	9,143	26.62%	831	2.42%
72	6,795	19.73%	26,406	76.67%	805	2.34%	436	1.27%	8,321	24.36%	25,110	73.50%	730	2.14%	26,382	77.32%	7,107	20.83%	631	1.85%
73	25,744	64.55%	12,400	31.09%	1,183	2.97%	558	1.40%	26,690	67.24%	11,644	29.33%	1,362	3.43%	14,295	35.92%	24,646	61.93%	854	2.15%
74	25,112	56.02%	17,682	39.45%	1,399	3.12%	630	1.41%	26,414	59.14%	16,750	37.50%	1,499	3.36%	19,607	43.87%	24,064	53.84%	1,022	2.29%
75	22,992	54.52%	17,297	41.02%	1,322	3.13%	559	1.33%	23,918	57.09%	16,460	39.29%	1,518	3.62%	19,049	45.40%	21,902	52.20%	1,008	2.40%
76	23,064	61.73%	13,031	34.87%	877	2.35%	393	1.05%	22,286	60.33%	12,833	34.74%	1,819	4.92%	14,249	38.34%	21,950	59.07%	961	2.59%
77	30,333	72.00%	10,259	24.35%	1,103	2.62%	434	1.03%	29,715	71.11%	10,106	24.19%	1,965	4.70%	12,186	29.04%	28,782	68.58%	1,000	2.38%
78	28,166	77.69%	7,076	19.52%	739	2.04%	272	0.75%	27,319	76.13%	7,166	19.97%	1,402	3.91%	8,771	24.33%	26,543	73.63%	737	2.04%
79	22,774	61.50%	13,292	35.90%	678	1.83%	285	0.77%	22,332	61.14%	12,865	35.22%	1,328	3.64%	13,385	36.39%	22,891	62.23%	509	1.38%
80	28,033	74.04%	8,623	22.78%	918	2.42%	287	0.76%	27,677	73.76%	8,454	22.53%	1,394	3.71%	10,385	27.55%	26,519	70.35%	793	2.10%
81	26,284	71.05%	9,486	25.64%	941	2.54%	284	0.77%	25,858	70.60%	9,299	25.39%	1,469	4.01%	11,560	31.43%	24,341	66.17%	883	2.40%
82	26,018	55.68%	18,574	39.75%	1,523	3.26%	614	1.31%	26,332	56.93%	17,809	38.50%	2,113	4.57%	19,814	42.58%	25,485	54.77%	1,231	2.65%
83	20,110	57.07%	13,758	39.05%	961	2.73%	407	1.16%	19,661	56.39%	13,381	38.38%	1,827	5.24%	14,616	41.69%	19,454	55.49%	990	2.82%
84	25,864	67.41%	11,302	29.46%	842	2.19%	358	0.93%	24,946	65.81%	11,099	29.28%	1,862	4.91%	12,373	32.46%	24,857	65.22%	885	2.32%
85	27,148	74.95%	7,952	21.95%	700	1.93%	421	1.16%	25,691	72.23%	8,320	23.39%	1,555	4.37%	9,999	27.89%	24,896	69.44%	959	2.67%
86	23,049	66.31%	10,412	29.95%	895	2.57%	404	1.16%	22,151	64.58%	10,580	30.84%	1,571	4.58%	12,309	35.59%	21,505	62.18%	773	2.23%
87	26,621	73.29%	8,427	23.20%	849	2.34%	425	1.17%	25,537	71.08%	8,542	23.78%	1,847	5.14%	10,059	27.82%	25,176	69.62%	927	2.56%
88	8,920	23.83%	26,524	70.85%	1,470	3.93%	521	1.39%	10,746	29.20%	24,677	67.05%	1,383	3.76%	26,564	71.76%	9,507	25.68%	947	2.56%
89	25,622	70.69%	9,396	25.92%	904	2.49%	322	0.89%	24,664	68.94%	9,348	26.13%	1,762	4.93%	10,714	29.78%	24,387	67.78%	880	2.45%
90	26,756	73.64%	8,414	23.16%	812	2.23%	352	0.97%	25,983	72.41%	8,481	23.64%	1,418	3.95%	10,714	29.67%	24,677	68.34%	717	1.99%
91	28,820	75.03%	8,334	21.70%	925	2.41%	332	0.86%	28,090	73.57%	8,518	22.31%	1,573	4.12%	10,858	28.38%	26,538	69.37%	859	2.25%
92	11,487	31.37%	23,378	63.84%	1,245	3.40%	512	1.40%	12,363	34.22%	22,148	61.30%	1,621	4.49%	23,338	64.34%	11,852	32.67%	1,085	2.99%
93	23,108	53.24%	17,638	40.63%	1,667	3.84%	994	2.29%	23,511	54.86%	17,413	40.63%	1,936	4.52%	19,952	46.21%	21,906	50.74%	1,316	3.05%
94	29,477	75.08%	8,525	21.71%	899	2.29%	359	0.91%	28,311	72.90%	8,699	22.40%	1,828	4.71%	10,479	26.75%	27,879	71.16%	818	2.09%
95	28,890	65.36%	13,432	30.39%	1,343	3.04%	536	1.21%	28,179	64.55%	13,088	29.98%	2,386	5.47%	16,212	37.00%	26,066	59.50%	1,534	3.50%
96	22,685	62.88%	11,805	32.72%	1,069	2.96%	516	1.43%	22,549	63.28%	11,383	31.95%	1,699	4.77%	13,036	36.38%	21,866	61.02%	935	2.61%
97	28,804	71.97%	9,897	24.73%	971	2.43%	349	0.87%	27,868	70.41%	9,798	24.76%	1,913	4.83%	11,331	28.44%	27,557	69.16%	959	2.41%
98	24,388	51.54%	20,350	43.01%	1,862	3.94%	714	1.51%	26,049	55.74%	18,824	40.28%	1,864	3.99%	22,765	48.54%	22,553	48.09%	1,578	3.36%
99	6,628	19.07%	26,877	77.31%	830	2.39%	430	1.24%	7,073	20.60%	26,097	76.00%	1,169	3.40%	26,426	76.70%	7,280	21.13%	749	2.17%
100	9,065	29.00%	20,731	66.33%	994	3.18%	465	1.49%	9,754	31.61%	19,803	64.18%	1,297	4.20%	20,677	66.67%	9,505	30.65%	830	2.68%
101	8,930	22.86%	28,642	73.33%	994	2.54%	491	1.26%	9,615	24.91%	27,574	71.43%	1,414	3.66%	28,397	73.33%	9,359	24.17%	969	2.50%
102	5,292	16.06%	25,980	78.86%	1,162	3.53%	511	1.55%	6,327	19.52%	24,761	76.39%	1,328	4.10%	26,109	80.03%	5,584	17.12%	931	2.85%
103	22,701	52.01%	18,642	42.71%	1,539	3.53%	769	1.76%	24,458	56.51%	17,208	39.76%	1,617	3.74%	19,220	44.13%	23,328	53.56%	1,003	2.30%
104	20,925	43.85%	23,772	49.82%	1,932	4.05%	1,089	2.28%	25,905	54.36%	20,414	42.84%	1,332	2.80%	24,093	50.36%	22,791	47.64%	955	2.00%
105	20,052	47.27%	20,155	47.52%	1,504	3.55%	705	1.66%	22,414	53.33%	18,049	42.94%	1,569	3.73%	20,512	48.58%	20,692	49.00%	1,021	2.42%

HBK-22 Pittman Districts 82 and 83: President 2016, US Senate 2016, Governor 2016

	US President 2016: Trump-Clinton-Johnson								US Senate 2016: Burr-Ross-Haugh						Governor 2016: Cooper-McCrory-Cecil					
District	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Write-In**	**Write-In %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**
106	7,622	22.42%	24,886	73.20%	952	2.80%	539	1.59%	8,421	25.05%	24,052	71.55%	1,145	3.41%	24,815	73.54%	8,084	23.96%	846	2.51%
107	7,868	21.04%	28,142	75.25%	886	2.37%	500	1.34%	8,416	22.77%	27,293	73.84%	1,251	3.38%	27,988	75.41%	8,221	22.15%	903	2.43%
108	21,977	61.91%	12,155	34.24%	963	2.71%	405	1.14%	21,400	61.05%	11,934	34.04%	1,722	4.91%	13,133	37.22%	21,326	60.44%	824	2.34%
109	21,849	58.81%	13,856	37.29%	1,026	2.76%	424	1.14%	21,752	59.21%	13,385	36.43%	1,600	4.36%	14,614	39.57%	21,473	58.14%	845	2.29%
110	23,363	67.95%	10,064	29.27%	685	1.99%	272	0.79%	22,465	66.14%	10,103	29.74%	1,399	4.12%	11,006	32.21%	22,520	65.90%	648	1.90%
111	23,088	67.78%	10,066	29.55%	621	1.82%	290	0.85%	22,172	65.93%	10,185	30.29%	1,272	3.78%	11,069	32.68%	22,235	65.64%	569	1.68%
112	25,060	72.71%	8,351	24.23%	717	2.08%	339	0.98%	23,380	69.04%	9,131	26.96%	1,353	4.00%	10,575	31.07%	22,633	66.49%	831	2.44%
113	27,846	61.60%	15,495	34.27%	1,152	2.55%	715	1.58%	27,107	60.73%	15,907	35.64%	1,619	3.63%	17,776	39.74%	25,806	57.69%	1,150	2.57%
114	10,675	21.88%	35,226	72.20%	1,424	2.92%	1,464	3.00%	10,943	22.71%	35,335	73.32%	1,918	3.98%	36,921	76.30%	9,880	20.42%	1,589	3.28%
115	22,578	48.02%	21,856	46.49%	1,453	3.09%	1,127	2.40%	22,563	48.39%	22,221	47.66%	1,839	3.94%	24,377	52.10%	21,034	44.95%	1,382	2.95%
116	22,462	52.07%	18,367	42.57%	1,409	3.27%	903	2.09%	22,583	52.90%	18,335	42.95%	1,776	4.16%	20,574	48.00%	20,962	48.91%	1,323	3.09%
117	25,251	60.45%	14,625	35.01%	1,235	2.96%	660	1.58%	24,962	60.51%	14,605	35.40%	1,688	4.09%	16,583	40.08%	23,567	56.96%	1,227	2.97%
118	25,826	63.62%	13,002	32.03%	1,152	2.84%	616	1.52%	24,143	60.30%	14,050	35.09%	1,845	4.61%	16,169	40.08%	22,971	56.94%	1,202	2.98%
119	19,623	54.48%	14,434	40.08%	1,323	3.67%	637	1.77%	18,853	53.03%	15,016	42.24%	1,683	4.73%	17,194	48.15%	17,362	48.62%	1,156	3.24%
120	30,691	72.91%	9,871	23.45%	1,030	2.45%	501	1.19%	28,591	69.53%	10,931	26.58%	1,600	3.89%	12,825	31.06%	27,221	65.92%	1,249	3.02%
Totals:	**2,359,749**	**49.90%**	**2,180,316**	**46.10%**	**129,929**	**2.75%**	**59,397**	**1.26%**	**2,392,439**	**51.13%**	**2,119,696**	**45.30%**	**167,190**	**3.57%**	**2,300,381**	**48.95%**	**2,296,039**	**48.86%**	**102,729**	**2.19%**

HBK-22 Pittman Districts 82 and 83: Lieutenant Governor 2016, Attorney General 2016

	Lieutenant Governor 2016: Forest-Coleman-Cole						Attorney General 2016: Stein-Newton			
District	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %
1	17,778	51.12%	16,328	46.95%	671	1.93%	17,047	49.85%	17,149	50.15%
2	21,550	57.60%	15,020	40.15%	840	2.25%	17,015	46.07%	19,917	53.93%
3	19,362	58.56%	12,769	38.62%	932	2.82%	13,595	41.50%	19,163	58.50%
4	18,524	62.83%	10,278	34.86%	683	2.32%	11,259	38.68%	17,851	61.32%
5	13,598	42.70%	17,580	55.21%	665	2.09%	18,195	57.96%	13,195	42.04%
6	24,969	62.46%	13,748	34.39%	1,261	3.15%	14,523	36.89%	24,849	63.11%
7	21,930	57.78%	15,216	40.09%	806	2.12%	16,847	44.72%	20,823	55.28%
8	11,543	34.32%	21,250	63.17%	844	2.51%	22,114	66.21%	11,285	33.79%
9	20,567	55.82%	15,300	41.53%	978	2.65%	16,594	45.44%	19,925	54.56%
10	24,002	67.76%	10,809	30.52%	609	1.72%	12,118	34.50%	23,009	65.50%
11	14,610	35.67%	24,541	59.92%	1,805	4.41%	26,983	66.46%	13,616	33.54%
12	17,425	52.08%	15,430	46.12%	602	1.80%	16,317	49.26%	16,804	50.74%
13	28,811	68.95%	11,868	28.40%	1,107	2.65%	12,793	30.86%	28,667	69.14%
14	15,667	60.14%	9,239	35.46%	1,146	4.40%	10,094	39.18%	15,668	60.82%
15	13,102	66.99%	5,648	28.88%	809	4.14%	6,333	32.79%	12,978	67.21%
16	24,001	61.02%	14,369	36.53%	963	2.45%	16,456	42.25%	22,490	57.75%
17	33,147	65.60%	16,131	31.92%	1,254	2.48%	19,137	38.21%	30,944	61.79%
18	15,040	40.84%	20,340	55.23%	1,451	3.94%	22,453	61.46%	14,080	38.54%
19	24,414	57.61%	16,318	38.51%	1,644	3.88%	19,234	45.77%	22,791	54.23%
20	25,574	57.77%	17,001	38.41%	1,690	3.82%	19,782	45.08%	24,099	54.92%
21	12,799	41.18%	17,731	57.04%	553	1.78%	18,620	60.43%	12,192	39.57%
22	19,955	57.34%	14,263	40.98%	584	1.68%	15,485	44.90%	19,006	55.10%
23	13,735	38.22%	21,664	60.28%	537	1.49%	22,629	63.31%	13,112	36.69%
24	17,614	46.94%	19,307	51.45%	603	1.61%	20,220	53.88%	17,311	46.12%
25	17,898	45.87%	20,551	52.67%	567	1.45%	21,475	55.06%	17,527	44.94%
26	28,921	62.29%	16,198	34.89%	1,310	2.82%	18,501	40.21%	27,514	59.79%
27	12,111	35.73%	21,357	63.01%	427	1.26%	22,185	65.86%	11,500	34.14%
28	24,390	66.96%	11,178	30.69%	856	2.35%	13,012	36.07%	23,064	63.93%
29	6,887	14.85%	38,300	82.61%	1,175	2.53%	39,832	86.28%	6,334	13.72%
30	14,967	30.49%	32,969	67.17%	1,147	2.34%	34,972	71.69%	13,809	28.31%
31	8,325	18.63%	35,107	78.57%	1,251	2.80%	36,433	81.98%	8,009	18.02%
32	13,338	35.53%	23,613	62.89%	594	1.58%	24,809	66.54%	12,475	33.46%
33	10,371	26.19%	27,861	70.35%	1,374	3.47%	29,565	75.35%	9,670	24.65%
34	19,459	39.75%	27,910	57.01%	1,588	3.24%	31,124	64.08%	17,447	35.92%
35	27,844	54.51%	21,849	42.78%	1,385	2.71%	24,423	48.43%	26,006	51.57%
36	27,546	54.81%	21,270	42.32%	1,440	2.87%	23,809	47.79%	26,015	52.21%
37	28,328	54.54%	21,888	42.14%	1,726	3.32%	24,325	47.28%	27,127	52.72%
38	8,817	22.74%	28,787	74.25%	1,168	3.01%	30,185	78.67%	8,182	21.33%
39	12,285	28.91%	29,153	68.59%	1,063	2.50%	30,320	72.01%	11,788	27.99%
40	28,809	53.80%	23,287	43.49%	1,455	2.72%	26,404	49.83%	26,588	50.17%
41	19,854	41.44%	26,406	55.12%	1,645	3.43%	28,681	60.41%	18,799	39.59%
42	6,383	26.30%	16,996	70.03%	891	3.67%	17,644	73.09%	6,497	26.91%
43	8,192	27.18%	20,960	69.55%	985	3.27%	21,834	72.91%	8,112	27.09%
44	14,388	45.35%	16,265	51.27%	1,074	3.39%	17,572	55.64%	14,009	44.36%
45	21,770	57.53%	14,903	39.38%	1,170	3.09%	16,323	43.39%	21,299	56.61%
46	14,441	57.97%	9,982	40.07%	487	1.96%	11,292	45.85%	13,335	54.15%
47	9,967	41.61%	13,476	56.25%	513	2.14%	14,324	60.47%	9,364	39.53%
48	13,005	42.20%	16,855	54.69%	958	3.11%	17,475	57.21%	13,069	42.79%
49	19,852	38.75%	29,600	57.78%	1,780	3.47%	32,796	64.39%	18,138	35.61%
50	19,497	43.57%	24,182	54.04%	1,066	2.38%	26,089	58.72%	18,339	41.28%
51	18,400	55.76%	13,619	41.27%	982	2.98%	15,312	46.95%	17,303	53.05%
52	26,962	63.92%	14,147	33.54%	1,075	2.55%	15,745	37.70%	26,021	62.30%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-22.asc', modified 08/25/2017 04:53:18 PM

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections. Votes that could not be associated with a specific precinct were excluded. Reported statewide totals may therefore be marginally lower than official contest results.

HBK-22 Pittman Districts 82 and 83: Lieutenant Governor 2016, Attorney General 2016

	Lieutenant Governor 2016: Forest-Coleman-Cole						Attorney General 2016: Stein-Newton			
District	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %
53	21,328	61.54%	12,493	36.05%	835	2.41%	13,900	40.45%	20,460	59.55%
54	21,038	40.77%	29,281	56.74%	1,285	2.49%	31,512	61.45%	19,770	38.55%
55	22,921	65.35%	11,444	32.63%	707	2.02%	13,375	38.47%	21,391	61.53%
56	8,019	17.31%	36,854	79.55%	1,455	3.14%	38,609	83.76%	7,487	16.24%
57	5,185	13.28%	32,626	83.59%	1,221	3.13%	33,561	86.54%	5,219	13.46%
58	9,287	25.04%	26,651	71.86%	1,150	3.10%	27,954	75.69%	8,977	24.31%
59	25,437	55.49%	19,257	42.01%	1,150	2.51%	21,109	46.33%	24,449	53.67%
60	10,658	31.74%	21,827	65.01%	1,092	3.25%	23,010	68.91%	10,383	31.09%
61	25,459	53.65%	20,630	43.47%	1,366	2.88%	22,996	48.67%	24,252	51.33%
62	25,436	53.83%	20,543	43.48%	1,270	2.69%	22,809	48.55%	24,175	51.45%
63	20,032	54.75%	15,433	42.18%	1,125	3.07%	17,264	47.50%	19,085	52.50%
64	19,368	58.48%	12,814	38.69%	936	2.83%	14,428	43.87%	18,457	56.13%
65	22,925	62.41%	12,935	35.21%	874	2.38%	14,435	39.54%	22,070	60.46%
66	18,853	55.74%	14,153	41.85%	816	2.41%	15,907	47.40%	17,650	52.60%
67	31,697	74.44%	9,793	23.00%	1,092	2.56%	12,410	29.40%	29,801	70.60%
68	27,015	64.52%	13,606	32.49%	1,252	2.99%	15,674	37.79%	25,803	62.21%
69	23,744	65.63%	11,331	31.32%	1,104	3.05%	13,327	37.18%	22,517	62.82%
70	24,712	74.71%	7,488	22.64%	879	2.66%	8,822	26.83%	24,059	73.17%
71	9,831	29.19%	22,738	67.51%	1,114	3.31%	24,171	72.07%	9,367	27.93%
72	7,738	23.10%	24,959	74.51%	800	2.39%	26,121	78.27%	7,254	21.73%
73	26,437	67.76%	11,626	29.80%	951	2.44%	13,736	35.45%	25,011	64.55%
74	26,030	59.30%	16,599	37.82%	1,263	2.88%	19,028	43.58%	24,635	56.42%
75	23,675	57.44%	16,356	39.68%	1,189	2.88%	18,577	45.30%	22,428	54.70%
76	22,655	62.28%	12,646	34.76%	1,076	2.96%	14,921	41.29%	21,213	58.71%
77	30,027	73.04%	9,965	24.24%	1,120	2.72%	12,267	30.01%	28,609	69.99%
78	27,573	77.81%	7,048	19.89%	814	2.30%	8,576	24.38%	26,597	75.62%
79	22,124	61.39%	13,157	36.51%	760	2.11%	14,148	39.62%	21,559	60.38%
80	27,461	74.39%	8,544	23.14%	912	2.47%	9,959	27.05%	26,856	72.95%
81	25,744	71.35%	9,365	25.95%	974	2.70%	11,232	31.27%	24,684	68.73%
82	26,842	58.98%	17,179	37.75%	1,489	3.27%	19,500	43.26%	25,572	56.74%
83	20,179	58.58%	13,105	38.05%	1,160	3.37%	15,225	44.54%	18,961	55.46%
84	25,615	68.55%	10,772	28.83%	981	2.63%	12,983	35.05%	24,055	64.95%
85	25,753	73.78%	8,159	23.37%	995	2.85%	9,757	28.36%	24,643	71.64%
86	22,615	66.72%	10,457	30.85%	824	2.43%	12,699	37.72%	20,964	62.28%
87	26,540	74.72%	8,133	22.90%	848	2.39%	11,035	31.39%	24,120	68.61%
88	10,717	29.69%	23,935	66.30%	1,447	4.01%	25,771	71.73%	10,156	28.27%
89	25,345	71.91%	8,879	25.19%	1,023	2.90%	11,207	31.97%	23,846	68.03%
90	25,448	72.45%	8,865	25.24%	810	2.31%	10,667	30.51%	24,300	69.49%
91	27,570	73.67%	8,869	23.70%	983	2.63%	10,703	28.73%	26,555	71.27%
92	12,587	35.41%	21,535	60.57%	1,429	4.02%	23,404	66.33%	11,881	33.67%
93	23,009	55.17%	16,926	40.58%	1,774	4.25%	19,469	47.25%	21,733	52.75%
94	28,780	75.23%	8,557	22.37%	919	2.40%	11,073	29.23%	26,803	70.77%
95	28,982	67.70%	12,360	28.87%	1,470	3.43%	14,947	35.22%	27,490	64.78%
96	23,121	65.77%	10,946	31.14%	1,089	3.10%	13,281	38.01%	21,662	61.99%
97	28,690	73.47%	9,283	23.77%	1,078	2.76%	11,903	30.76%	26,797	69.24%
98	26,644	58.05%	17,734	38.63%	1,524	3.32%	20,452	45.00%	24,992	55.00%
99	7,163	21.09%	25,734	75.76%	1,073	3.16%	26,872	79.60%	6,888	20.40%
100	10,063	33.08%	19,181	63.06%	1,172	3.85%	20,835	69.05%	9,337	30.95%
101	9,666	25.39%	27,134	71.26%	1,276	3.35%	28,611	75.49%	9,289	24.51%
102	6,255	19.64%	24,161	75.87%	1,429	4.49%	25,604	80.91%	6,042	19.09%
103	25,117	58.86%	16,313	38.23%	1,242	2.91%	18,820	44.51%	23,460	55.49%
104	25,845	55.28%	19,567	41.85%	1,340	2.87%	22,699	48.98%	23,646	51.02%

HBK-22 Pittman Districts 82 and 83: Lieutenant Governor 2016, Attorney General 2016

	Lieutenant Governor 2016: Forest-Coleman-Cole						Attorney General 2016: Stein-Newton			
District	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %
105	22,913	55.44%	17,133	41.45%	1,287	3.11%	19,598	47.84%	21,369	52.16%
106	8,550	25.79%	23,420	70.66%	1,176	3.55%	24,690	75.03%	8,218	24.97%
107	8,546	23.39%	26,870	73.54%	1,124	3.08%	28,191	77.62%	8,126	22.38%
108	22,310	64.29%	11,377	32.79%	1,013	2.92%	13,450	39.21%	20,851	60.79%
109	22,545	62.11%	12,803	35.27%	950	2.62%	14,882	41.40%	21,065	58.60%
110	23,200	68.91%	9,752	28.97%	715	2.12%	11,596	34.80%	21,723	65.20%
111	22,768	68.36%	9,875	29.65%	661	1.98%	11,856	36.00%	21,073	64.00%
112	23,864	71.32%	8,660	25.88%	937	2.80%	9,906	29.88%	23,248	70.12%
113	27,273	61.90%	15,470	35.11%	1,314	2.98%	16,730	38.29%	26,962	61.71%
114	10,534	22.22%	34,662	73.10%	2,218	4.68%	36,615	77.84%	10,425	22.16%
115	22,047	48.06%	22,007	47.98%	1,816	3.96%	23,858	52.43%	21,647	47.57%
116	21,972	52.39%	18,326	43.70%	1,641	3.91%	19,951	47.93%	21,673	52.07%
117	25,457	62.47%	14,037	34.45%	1,255	3.08%	15,539	38.46%	24,861	61.54%
118	23,864	60.56%	14,093	35.76%	1,451	3.68%	15,949	40.83%	23,111	59.17%
119	18,801	53.70%	14,824	42.34%	1,385	3.96%	16,595	47.85%	18,084	52.15%
120	28,296	69.92%	10,903	26.94%	1,271	3.14%	11,790	29.51%	28,166	70.49%
Totals:	**2,390,619**	**51.88%**	**2,084,975**	**45.25%**	**132,360**	**2.87%**	**2,294,855**	**50.20%**	**2,276,276**	**49.80%**

EX. 27

H927-ABK-44-Wake County



Plan: HBK-23
Plan Type:

Administrator
User:

Districts & Their Incumbents

Monday, August 28, 2017 10:14 AM

District	Name	Party	Previous District
1	Steinburg	Republican	1
2	Yarborough	Republican	2
3	Speciale	Republican	3
4	Dixon	Republican	4
5	Hunter	Democratic	5
6	Boswell	Republican	6
7	Collins	Republican	25
8			
9	Murphy	Republican	9
10	J.Bell	Republican	10
11	Duane Hall, II	Democratic	11
12	G.Graham	Democratic	12
13	McElraft	Republican	13
14	Cleveland	Republican	14
15	Shepard	Republican	15
16	Millis	Republican	16
17	Iler	Republican	17
18	Butler	Democratic	18
19	Davis	Republican	19
20	Grange	Republican	20
21	L.Bell	Democratic	21
22	Brisson	Democratic	22
23	Willingham	Democratic	23
24	S.Martin	Republican	8
24	Farmer-Butterfield	Democratic	24
25	B.Richardson	Democratic	7

Plan: HBK-23 Administrator:
Type: User:

District	Name	Party	Previous District
26	White	Republican	26
27	Wray	Democratic	27
28	Strickland	Republican	28
29	Black	Democratic	29
30	Morey	Democratic	30
31	Michaux	Democratic	31
32	Garrison	Democratic	32
33	Gill	Democratic	33
34	G.Martin	Democratic	34
35	Malone	Republican	35
36	Dollar	Republican	36
37	Williams	Republican	37
38	Holley	Democratic	38
39	Jackson	Democratic	39
40	John	Democratic	40
41	Adcock	Democratic	41
42	Lucas	Democratic	42
43	Floyd	Democratic	43
44	W.Richardson	Democratic	44
45	Szoka	Republican	45
46	Brenden Jones	Republican	46
47	C.Graham	Democratic	47
48	Pierce	Democratic	48
49	Ball	Democrat	49
50	Meyer	Democratic	50
51	Sauls	Republican	51
52	Boles	Republican	52
53	Lewis	Republican	53
54	Reives	Democratic	54
55	Brody	Republican	55
56	Insko	Democratic	56

Plan: HBK-23 Administrator:
Type: User:

District	Name	Party	Previous District
57	Harrison	Democratic	57
58	Quick	Democratic	58
59			
60	Brockman	Democratic	60
61	Faircloth	Republican	61
61	Hardister	Republican	59
62	Blust	Republican	62
63	Ross	Republican	63
64	Riddell	Republican	64
65	Bert Jones	Republican	65
66	Goodman	Democratic	66
67	Burr	Republican	67
68	Horn	Republican	68
69	Arp	Republican	69
70	Hurley	Republican	70
71	Terry	Democratic	71
72	Hanes	Democratic	72
73	Zachary	Republican	73
74	Conrad	Republican	74
75	Lambeth	Republican	75
76	Warren	Republican	77
77	Howard	Republican	79
78	McNiell	Republican	78
79			
80	Watford	Republican	80
81	Potts	Republican	81
82	Johnson	Republican	83
83	Pittman	Republican	82
83	Ford	Republican	76
84	R.Turner	Republican	84
85	Dobson	Republican	85
86	Blackwell	Republican	86

Plan:	HBK-23	Administrator:	
Type:		User:	

District	Name	Party	Previous District
87	Destin Hall	Republican	87
88	Belk	Democratic	88
89	Setzer	Republican	89
90	Stevens	Republican	90
91	K.Hall	Republican	91
92	Beasley	Democratic	92
93	Jordan	Republican	93
94	Elmore	Republican	94
95	Fraley	Republican	95
96	Adams	Republican	96
97	Saine	Republican	97
98	Bradford	Republican	98
99	R.Moore	Democratic	99
100	Autry	Democratic	100
101	Earle	Democratic	101
102	Carney	Democratic	102
103	Brawley	Republican	103
104	Dulin	Republican	104
105	Stone	Republican	105
106	Cunningham	Democratic	106
107	Alexander	Democratic	107
108	Torbett	Republican	108
109	Bumgardner	Republican	109
110	Hastings	Republican	110
111	T.Moore	Republican	111
112	Rogers	Republican	112
113	Henson	Republican	113
114	Fisher	Democratic	114
115	Ager	Democratic	115
116	B.Turner	Democratic	116
117	McGrady	Republican	117
118	Presnell	Republican	118

Plan: HBK-23 Administrator:
Type: User:

District	Name	Party	Previous District
119	Clampitt	Republican	119
120	Corbin	Republican	120

Number of Incumbents in District with more than one Incumbent:	6	
Number of Districts with No Incumbent:	3	
Number of Districts with Incumbents of more than one party:	1	
Number of Districts with Paired Democrats:	0	
Number of Districts with Paired Republicans:	2	

Plan Name: HBK-23
Plan Type:
Date: 08/28/2017
Time: 10:15:55AM
Administrator:

Measures of Compactness

08/28/2017

Sum	N/A	N/A
Min	0.20	0.12
Max	0.70	0.71
Mean	0.41	0.32
Std. Dev.	0.09	0.11

DISTRICT	Reock	Polsby-Popper
1	0.49	0.18
2	0.43	0.49
3	0.37	0.33
4	0.44	0.37
5	0.25	0.27
6	0.33	0.24
7	0.50	0.35
8	0.51	0.39
9	0.40	0.27
10	0.36	0.23
11	0.41	0.34
12	0.36	0.34
13	0.24	0.22
14	0.39	0.28
15	0.55	0.37
16	0.31	0.22
17	0.48	0.30
18	0.51	0.33
19	0.20	0.28
20	0.36	0.20
21	0.29	0.12
22	0.48	0.20
23	0.35	0.24
24	0.53	0.71
25	0.52	0.32
26	0.39	0.27
27	0.52	0.40
28	0.38	0.22
29	0.39	0.34
30	0.40	0.39
31	0.50	0.37
32	0.53	0.51
33	0.45	0.29
34	0.34	0.29
35	0.32	0.33
36	0.31	0.21
37	0.44	0.48
38	0.32	0.30
39	0.43	0.40
40	0.52	0.38

Plan Name:	HBK-23	Administrator:	
Plan Type:		User:	

DISTRICT	Reock	Polsby-Popper
41	0.42	0.40
42	0.50	0.40
43	0.34	0.31
44	0.50	0.24
45	0.46	0.22
46	0.23	0.16
47	0.57	0.42
48	0.48	0.45
49	0.44	0.44
50	0.38	0.34
51	0.52	0.40
52	0.32	0.25
53	0.59	0.47
54	0.45	0.43
55	0.42	0.29
56	0.49	0.34
57	0.37	0.28
58	0.44	0.18
59	0.39	0.25
60	0.29	0.21
61	0.32	0.22
62	0.47	0.50
63	0.34	0.30
64	0.34	0.28
65	0.52	0.47
66	0.40	0.35
67	0.51	0.31
68	0.33	0.28
69	0.37	0.20
70	0.54	0.54
71	0.35	0.19
72	0.50	0.26
73	0.46	0.47
74	0.38	0.23
75	0.22	0.16
76	0.49	0.46
77	0.39	0.35
78	0.36	0.28
79	0.48	0.30
80	0.28	0.22
81	0.50	0.22
82	0.42	0.43
83	0.32	0.25
84	0.51	0.45
85	0.39	0.23
86	0.38	0.27
87	0.50	0.57
88	0.60	0.33
89	0.34	0.26
90	0.29	0.15
91	0.32	0.32
92	0.44	0.25
93	0.57	0.42
94	0.34	0.22
95	0.43	0.37
96	0.30	0.21

Plan Name:	HBK-23	Administrator:	
Plan Type:		User:	

DISTRICT	Reock	Polsby-Popper
97	0.33	0.52
98	0.70	0.64
99	0.43	0.42
100	0.43	0.35
101	0.51	0.34
102	0.64	0.43
103	0.27	0.32
104	0.49	0.35
105	0.49	0.37
106	0.43	0.44
107	0.38	0.20
108	0.44	0.32
109	0.46	0.47
110	0.36	0.26
111	0.40	0.28
112	0.39	0.30
113	0.24	0.21
114	0.39	0.13
115	0.38	0.19
116	0.35	0.23
117	0.40	0.28
118	0.36	0.15
119	0.36	0.20
120	0.40	0.37

HBK-23 Lewis - Wake County: County - District

County	District	Total County Pop	Total District Pop	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Alamance	63	151,131	75,550	75,550	49.99%	100.00%
	64	151,131	75,581	75,581	50.01%	100.00%
Alexander	94	37,198	83,358	37,198	100.00%	44.62%
Alleghany	90	11,155	82,779	11,155	100.00%	13.48%
Anson	55	26,948	75,792	26,948	100.00%	35.56%
Ashe	93	27,281	78,360	27,281	100.00%	34.81%
Avery	85	17,797	78,372	17,797	100.00%	22.71%
Beaufort	79	47,759	75,538	47,759	100.00%	63.23%
Bertie	1	21,282	77,143	21,282	100.00%	27.59%
Bladen	22	35,190	83,434	35,190	100.00%	42.18%
Brunswick	17	107,431	77,263	77,263	71.92%	100.00%
	18	107,431	77,681	30,168	28.08%	38.84%
Buncombe	114	238,318	82,902	82,902	34.79%	100.00%
	115	238,318	79,883	79,883	33.52%	100.00%
	116	238,318	75,533	75,533	31.69%	100.00%
Burke	86	90,912	79,175	79,175	87.09%	100.00%
	112	90,912	79,547	11,737	12.91%	14.75%
Cabarrus	67	178,011	82,583	30,593	17.19%	37.05%
	82	178,011	81,088	81,088	45.55%	100.00%
	83	178,011	81,172	66,330	37.26%	81.72%
Caldwell	87	83,029	83,029	83,029	100.00%	100.00%
Camden	1	9,980	77,143	9,980	100.00%	12.94%
Carteret	13	66,469	76,622	66,469	100.00%	86.75%
Caswell	50	23,719	80,866	23,719	100.00%	29.33%
Catawba	89	154,358	77,838	77,838	50.43%	100.00%
	96	154,358	76,520	76,520	49.57%	100.00%
Chatham	54	63,505	82,312	63,505	100.00%	77.15%
Cherokee	120	27,444	80,814	27,444	100.00%	33.96%
Chowan	1	14,793	77,143	14,793	100.00%	19.18%
Clay	120	10,587	80,814	10,587	100.00%	13.10%
Cleveland	110	98,078	75,573	21,930	22.36%	29.02%
	111	98,078	76,148	76,148	77.64%	100.00%
Columbus	16	58,098	81,425	29,208	50.27%	35.87%
	46	58,098	80,440	28,890	49.73%	35.91%
Craven	3	103,505	75,726	75,726	73.16%	100.00%
	79	103,505	75,538	27,779	26.84%	36.77%
Cumberland	42	319,431	81,439	81,439	25.50%	100.00%
	43	319,431	77,725	77,725	24.33%	100.00%
	44	319,431	80,973	80,973	25.35%	100.00%
	45	319,431	79,294	79,294	24.82%	100.00%
Currituck	6	23,547	76,421	23,547	100.00%	30.81%
Dare	6	33,920	76,421	33,920	100.00%	44.39%
Davidson	80	162,878	81,522	81,522	50.05%	100.00%
	81	162,878	81,356	81,356	49.95%	100.00%
Davie	77	41,240	82,918	41,240	100.00%	49.74%
Duplin	4	58,505	81,905	58,505	100.00%	71.43%
Durham	29	267,587	82,735	82,735	30.92%	100.00%
	30	267,587	83,272	83,272	31.12%	100.00%

HBK-23 Lewis - Wake County: County - District

County	District	Total County Pop	Total District Pop	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Durham	31	267,587	82,773	82,773	30.93%	100.00%
	54	267,587	82,312	18,807	7.03%	22.85%
Edgecombe	23	56,552	81,057	56,552	100.00%	69.77%
Forsyth	71	350,670	75,793	75,793	21.61%	100.00%
	72	350,670	76,245	76,245	21.74%	100.00%
	73	350,670	78,189	39,783	11.34%	50.88%
	74	350,670	79,963	79,963	22.80%	100.00%
	75	350,670	78,886	78,886	22.50%	100.00%
Franklin	25	60,619	78,432	60,619	100.00%	77.29%
Gaston	108	206,086	76,926	76,926	37.33%	100.00%
	109	206,086	75,517	75,517	36.64%	100.00%
	110	206,086	75,573	53,643	26.03%	70.98%
Gates	5	12,197	77,527	12,197	100.00%	15.73%
Graham	120	8,861	80,814	8,861	100.00%	10.96%
Granville	2	59,916	82,634	43,170	72.05%	52.24%
	32	59,916	83,140	16,746	27.95%	20.14%
Greene	10	21,362	83,434	21,362	100.00%	25.60%
Guilford	57	488,406	82,755	82,755	16.94%	100.00%
	58	488,406	82,137	82,137	16.82%	100.00%
	59	488,406	79,907	79,907	16.36%	100.00%
	60	488,406	81,856	81,856	16.76%	100.00%
	61	488,406	81,019	81,019	16.59%	100.00%
	62	488,406	80,732	80,732	16.53%	100.00%
Halifax	27	54,691	76,790	54,691	100.00%	71.22%
Harnett	28	114,678	83,431	5,681	4.95%	6.81%
	51	114,678	83,434	25,568	22.30%	30.64%
	53	114,678	83,429	83,429	72.75%	100.00%
Haywood	118	59,036	76,322	37,740	63.93%	49.45%
	119	59,036	75,548	21,296	36.07%	28.19%
Henderson	113	106,740	81,089	27,489	25.75%	33.90%
	117	106,740	79,251	79,251	74.25%	100.00%
Hertford	5	24,669	77,527	24,669	100.00%	31.82%
Hoke	48	46,952	83,109	46,952	100.00%	56.49%
Hyde	6	5,810	76,421	5,810	100.00%	7.60%
Iredell	84	159,437	77,282	77,282	48.47%	100.00%
	95	159,437	82,155	82,155	51.53%	100.00%
Jackson	119	40,271	75,548	40,271	100.00%	53.31%
Johnston	10	168,878	83,434	7,696	4.56%	9.22%
	26	168,878	83,432	83,432	49.40%	100.00%
	28	168,878	83,431	77,750	46.04%	93.19%
Jones	13	10,153	76,622	10,153	100.00%	13.25%
Lee	51	57,866	83,434	57,866	100.00%	69.36%
Lenoir	12	59,495	75,923	59,495	100.00%	78.36%
Lincoln	97	78,265	78,265	78,265	100.00%	100.00%
Macon	120	33,922	80,814	33,922	100.00%	41.98%
Madison	118	20,764	76,322	20,764	100.00%	27.21%
Martin	23	24,505	81,057	24,505	100.00%	30.23%
McDowell	85	44,996	78,372	44,996	100.00%	57.41%
Mecklenburg	88	919,628	76,022	76,022	8.27%	100.00%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-23.asc', modified 08/28/2017 10:19:32 AM

Data Source: 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File - North Carolina

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG01|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

HBK-23 Lewis - Wake County: County - District

County	District	Total County Pop	Total District Pop	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Mecklenburg	92	919,628	77,172	77,172	8.39%	100.00%
	98	919,628	75,602	75,602	8.22%	100.00%
	99	919,628	77,141	77,141	8.39%	100.00%
	100	919,628	75,589	75,589	8.22%	100.00%
	101	919,628	79,876	79,876	8.69%	100.00%
	102	919,628	77,391	77,391	8.42%	100.00%
	103	919,628	76,381	76,381	8.31%	100.00%
	104	919,628	76,869	76,869	8.36%	100.00%
	105	919,628	75,967	75,967	8.26%	100.00%
	106	919,628	75,762	75,762	8.24%	100.00%
	107	919,628	75,856	75,856	8.25%	100.00%
Mitchell	85	15,579	78,372	15,579	100.00%	19.88%
Montgomery	66	27,798	83,032	27,798	100.00%	33.48%
Moore	52	88,247	76,894	76,894	87.13%	100.00%
	78	88,247	76,980	11,353	12.87%	14.75%
Nash	7	95,840	78,027	78,027	81.41%	100.00%
	25	95,840	78,432	17,813	18.59%	22.71%
New Hanover	18	202,667	77,681	47,513	23.44%	61.16%
	19	202,667	76,666	76,666	37.83%	100.00%
	20	202,667	78,488	78,488	38.73%	100.00%
Northampton	27	22,099	76,790	22,099	100.00%	28.78%
Onslow	4	177,772	81,905	23,400	13.16%	28.57%
	14	177,772	77,065	77,065	43.35%	100.00%
	15	177,772	77,307	77,307	43.49%	100.00%
Orange	50	133,801	80,866	57,147	42.71%	70.67%
	56	133,801	76,654	76,654	57.29%	100.00%
Pamlico	6	13,144	76,421	13,144	100.00%	17.20%
Pasquotank	5	40,661	77,527	40,661	100.00%	52.45%
Pender	16	52,217	81,425	52,217	100.00%	64.13%
Perquimans	1	13,453	77,143	13,453	100.00%	17.44%
Person	2	39,464	82,634	39,464	100.00%	47.76%
Pitt	8	168,148	75,926	75,926	45.15%	100.00%
	9	168,148	75,794	75,794	45.08%	100.00%
	12	168,148	75,923	16,428	9.77%	21.64%
Polk	113	20,510	81,089	20,510	100.00%	25.29%
Randolph	70	141,752	76,125	76,125	53.70%	100.00%
	78	141,752	76,980	65,627	46.30%	85.25%
Richmond	66	46,639	83,032	46,639	100.00%	56.17%
Robeson	46	134,168	80,440	51,550	38.42%	64.09%
	47	134,168	82,618	82,618	61.58%	100.00%
Rockingham	65	93,643	83,430	83,430	89.09%	100.00%
	91	93,643	82,843	10,213	10.91%	12.33%
Rowan	76	138,428	81,908	81,908	59.17%	100.00%
	77	138,428	82,918	41,678	30.11%	50.26%
	83	138,428	81,172	14,842	10.72%	18.28%
Rutherford	112	67,810	79,547	67,810	100.00%	85.25%
Sampson	21	63,431	83,434	15,187	23.94%	18.20%
	22	63,431	83,434	48,244	76.06%	57.82%
Scotland	48	36,157	83,109	36,157	100.00%	43.51%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-23.asc', modified 08/28/2017 10:19:32 AM

Data Source: 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File - North Carolina

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG01|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

HBK-23 Lewis - Wake County: County - District

County	District	Total County Pop	Total District Pop	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Stanly	66	60,585	83,032	8,595	14.19%	10.35%
	67	60,585	82,583	51,990	85.81%	62.95%
Stokes	91	47,401	82,843	47,401	100.00%	57.22%
Surry	90	73,673	82,779	48,444	65.76%	58.52%
	91	73,673	82,843	25,229	34.24%	30.45%
Swain	119	13,981	75,548	13,981	100.00%	18.51%
Transylvania	113	33,090	81,089	33,090	100.00%	40.81%
Tyrrell	1	4,407	77,143	4,407	100.00%	5.71%
Union	55	201,292	75,792	48,844	24.27%	64.44%
	68	201,292	76,067	76,067	37.79%	100.00%
	69	201,292	76,381	76,381	37.95%	100.00%
Vance	32	45,422	83,140	45,422	100.00%	54.63%
Wake	11	900,993	83,266	83,266	9.24%	100.00%
	33	900,993	82,644	82,644	9.17%	100.00%
	34	900,993	77,948	77,948	8.65%	100.00%
	35	900,993	82,728	82,728	9.18%	100.00%
	36	900,993	81,926	81,926	9.09%	100.00%
	37	900,993	81,952	81,952	9.10%	100.00%
	38	900,993	83,061	83,061	9.22%	100.00%
	39	900,993	83,055	83,055	9.22%	100.00%
	40	900,993	80,675	80,675	8.95%	100.00%
	41	900,993	80,739	80,739	8.96%	100.00%
	49	900,993	82,999	82,999	9.21%	100.00%
Warren	32	20,972	83,140	20,972	100.00%	25.22%
Washington	1	13,228	77,143	13,228	100.00%	17.15%
Watauga	93	51,079	78,360	51,079	100.00%	65.19%
Wayne	10	122,623	83,434	54,376	44.34%	65.17%
	21	122,623	83,434	68,247	55.66%	81.80%
Wilkes	90	69,340	82,779	23,180	33.43%	28.00%
	94	69,340	83,358	46,160	66.57%	55.38%
Wilson	24	81,234	81,234	81,234	100.00%	100.00%
Yadkin	73	38,406	78,189	38,406	100.00%	49.12%
Yancey	118	17,818	76,322	17,818	100.00%	23.35%
			Total:	**9,535,483**		

HBK-23 Lewis - Wake County: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Aberdeen	52	6,350	76,894	6,350	100.00%	8.26%
Ahoskie	5	5,039	77,527	5,039	100.00%	6.50%
Alamance	64	951	75,581	951	100.00%	1.26%
Albemarle	66	15,903	83,032	2,814	17.69%	3.39%
	67	15,903	82,583	13,089	82.31%	15.85%
Alliance	6	776	76,421	776	100.00%	1.02%
Andrews	120	1,781	80,814	1,781	100.00%	2.20%
Angier (Harnett)	28	4,247	83,431	4,242	99.88%	5.08%
	53	4,247	83,429	5	0.12%	0.01%
Angier (Wake)	37	103	81,952	103	100.00%	0.13%
Ansonville	55	631	75,792	631	100.00%	0.83%
Apex	11	37,476	83,266	2	0.01%	0.00%
	36	37,476	81,926	7,166	19.12%	8.75%
	37	37,476	81,952	9,982	26.64%	12.18%
	41	37,476	80,739	20,326	54.24%	25.17%
Arapahoe	6	556	76,421	556	100.00%	0.73%
Archdale (Guilford)	59	333	79,907	217	65.17%	0.27%
	60	333	81,856	116	34.83%	0.14%
Archdale (Randolph)	70	11,082	76,125	11,082	100.00%	14.56%
Archer Lodge	26	4,292	83,432	4,292	100.00%	5.14%
Asheboro	70	25,012	76,125	21,327	85.27%	28.02%
	78	25,012	76,980	3,685	14.73%	4.79%
Asheville	114	83,393	82,902	66,182	79.36%	79.83%
	115	83,393	79,883	5,409	6.49%	6.77%
	116	83,393	75,533	11,802	14.15%	15.62%
Askewville	1	241	77,143	241	100.00%	0.31%
Atkinson	16	299	81,425	299	100.00%	0.37%
Atlantic Beach	13	1,495	76,622	1,495	100.00%	1.95%
Aulander	1	895	77,143	895	100.00%	1.16%
Aurora	79	520	75,538	520	100.00%	0.69%
Autryville	22	196	83,434	196	100.00%	0.23%
Ayden	12	4,932	75,923	4,932	100.00%	6.50%
Badin	66	1,974	83,032	1,974	100.00%	2.38%
Bailey	25	569	78,432	569	100.00%	0.73%
Bakersville	85	464	78,372	464	100.00%	0.59%
Bald Head Island	17	158	77,263	158	100.00%	0.20%
Banner Elk	85	1,028	78,372	1,028	100.00%	1.31%
Bath	79	249	75,538	249	100.00%	0.33%
Bayboro	6	1,263	76,421	1,263	100.00%	1.65%
Bear Grass	23	73	81,057	73	100.00%	0.09%
Beaufort	13	4,039	76,622	4,039	100.00%	5.27%
Beech Mountain (Avery)	85	24	78,372	24	100.00%	0.03%
Beech Mountain (Watauga)	93	296	78,360	296	100.00%	0.38%
Belhaven	79	1,688	75,538	1,688	100.00%	2.23%
Belmont	108	10,076	76,926	4,622	45.87%	6.01%
	109	10,076	75,517	5,454	54.13%	7.22%
Belville	18	1,936	77,681	1,936	100.00%	2.49%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-23.asc', modified 08/28/2017 10:19:32 AM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

HBK-23 Lewis - Wake County: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Belwood	111	950	76,148	950	100.00%	1.25%
Benson (Harnett)	53	0	83,429	0	0.00%	0.00%
Benson (Johnston)	28	3,311	83,431	3,311	100.00%	3.97%
Bermuda Run	77	1,725	82,918	1,725	100.00%	2.08%
Bessemer City	110	5,340	75,573	5,340	100.00%	7.07%
Bethania	74	328	79,963	328	100.00%	0.41%
Bethel	8	1,577	75,926	1,577	100.00%	2.08%
Beulaville	4	1,296	81,905	1,296	100.00%	1.58%
Biltmore Forest	116	1,343	75,533	1,343	100.00%	1.78%
Biscoe	66	1,700	83,032	1,700	100.00%	2.05%
Black Creek	24	769	81,234	769	100.00%	0.95%
Black Mountain	115	7,848	79,883	7,848	100.00%	9.82%
Bladenboro	22	1,750	83,434	1,750	100.00%	2.10%
Blowing Rock (Caldwell)	87	49	83,029	49	100.00%	0.06%
Blowing Rock (Watauga)	93	1,192	78,360	1,192	100.00%	1.52%
Boardman	46	157	80,440	157	100.00%	0.20%
Bogue	13	684	76,622	684	100.00%	0.89%
Boiling Spring Lakes	17	5,372	77,263	5,370	99.96%	6.95%
	18	5,372	77,681	2	0.04%	0.00%
Boiling Springs	111	4,647	76,148	4,647	100.00%	6.10%
Bolivia	18	143	77,681	143	100.00%	0.18%
Bolton	16	691	81,425	691	100.00%	0.85%
Boone	93	17,122	78,360	17,122	100.00%	21.85%
Boonville	73	1,222	78,189	1,222	100.00%	1.56%
Bostic	112	386	79,547	386	100.00%	0.49%
Brevard	113	7,609	81,089	7,609	100.00%	9.38%
Bridgeton	79	454	75,538	454	100.00%	0.60%
Broadway (Harnett)	53	25	83,429	25	100.00%	0.03%
Broadway (Lee)	51	1,204	83,434	1,204	100.00%	1.44%
Brookford	89	382	77,838	321	84.03%	0.41%
	96	382	76,520	61	15.97%	0.08%
Brunswick	16	1,119	81,425	1,119	100.00%	1.37%
Bryson City	119	1,424	75,548	1,424	100.00%	1.88%
Bunn	25	344	78,432	344	100.00%	0.44%
Burgaw	16	3,872	81,425	3,872	100.00%	4.76%
Burlington (Alamance)	63	49,308	75,550	23,248	47.15%	30.77%
	64	49,308	75,581	26,060	52.85%	34.48%
Burlington (Guilford)	59	655	79,907	655	100.00%	0.82%
Burnsville	118	1,693	76,322	1,693	100.00%	2.22%
Butner	2	7,591	82,634	7,591	100.00%	9.19%
Cajah's Mountain	87	2,823	83,029	2,823	100.00%	3.40%
Calabash	17	1,786	77,263	1,786	100.00%	2.31%
Calypso	4	538	81,905	538	100.00%	0.66%
Cameron	52	285	76,894	285	100.00%	0.37%
Candor	66	840	83,032	840	100.00%	1.01%
Canton	118	4,227	76,322	4,227	100.00%	5.54%
Cape Carteret	13	1,917	76,622	1,917	100.00%	2.50%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-23.asc', modified 08/28/2017 10:19:32 AM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

HBK-23 Lewis - Wake County: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Carolina Beach	19	5,706	76,666	5,706	100.00%	7.44%
Carolina Shores	17	3,048	77,263	3,048	100.00%	3.94%
Carrboro	50	19,582	80,866	81	0.41%	0.10%
	56	19,582	76,654	19,501	99.59%	25.44%
Carthage	52	2,205	76,894	6	0.27%	0.01%
	78	2,205	76,980	2,199	99.73%	2.86%
Cary (Chatham)	54	1,422	82,312	1,422	100.00%	1.73%
Cary (Wake)	11	133,812	83,266	44,038	32.91%	52.89%
	36	133,812	81,926	19,380	14.48%	23.66%
	37	133,812	81,952	2,024	1.51%	2.47%
	41	133,812	80,739	46,234	34.55%	57.26%
	49	133,812	82,999	22,136	16.54%	26.67%
Casar	111	297	76,148	297	100.00%	0.39%
Castalia	7	268	78,027	268	100.00%	0.34%
Caswell Beach	17	398	77,263	398	100.00%	0.52%
Catawba	89	603	77,838	603	100.00%	0.77%
Cedar Point	13	1,279	76,622	1,279	100.00%	1.67%
Cedar Rock	87	300	83,029	300	100.00%	0.36%
Centerville	25	89	78,432	89	100.00%	0.11%
Cerro Gordo	46	207	80,440	207	100.00%	0.26%
Chadbourn	46	1,856	80,440	1,856	100.00%	2.31%
Chapel Hill (Durham)	29	2,836	82,735	2,234	78.77%	2.70%
	54	2,836	82,312	602	21.23%	0.73%
Chapel Hill (Orange)	50	54,397	80,866	2,280	4.19%	2.82%
	56	54,397	76,654	52,117	95.81%	67.99%
Charlotte	88	731,424	76,022	72,044	9.85%	94.77%
	92	731,424	77,172	57,603	7.88%	74.64%
	98	731,424	75,602	0	0.00%	0.00%
	99	731,424	77,141	67,000	9.16%	86.85%
	100	731,424	75,589	64,757	8.85%	85.67%
	101	731,424	79,876	71,339	9.75%	89.31%
	102	731,424	77,391	77,391	10.58%	100.00%
	103	731,424	76,381	30,850	4.22%	40.39%
	104	731,424	76,869	76,869	10.51%	100.00%
	105	731,424	75,967	75,967	10.39%	100.00%
	106	731,424	75,762	74,391	10.17%	98.19%
	107	731,424	75,856	63,213	8.64%	83.33%
Cherryville	110	5,760	75,573	5,760	100.00%	7.62%
Chimney Rock Village	112	113	79,547	113	100.00%	0.14%
China Grove	83	3,563	81,172	3,563	100.00%	4.39%
Chocowinity	79	820	75,538	820	100.00%	1.09%
Claremont	89	1,352	77,838	1,352	100.00%	1.74%
Clarkton	22	837	83,434	837	100.00%	1.00%
Clayton (Johnston)	26	16,116	83,432	16,116	100.00%	19.32%
Clayton (Wake)	39	0	83,055	0	0.00%	0.00%
Clemmons	73	18,627	78,189	6,625	35.57%	8.47%
	75	18,627	78,886	12,002	64.43%	15.21%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-23.asc', modified 08/28/2017 10:19:32 AM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

HBK-23 Lewis - Wake County: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Cleveland	77	871	82,918	871	100.00%	1.05%
Clinton	21	8,639	83,434	4,242	49.10%	5.08%
	22	8,639	83,434	4,397	50.90%	5.27%
Clyde	118	1,223	76,322	1,223	100.00%	1.60%
Coats	53	2,112	83,429	2,112	100.00%	2.53%
Cofield	5	413	77,527	413	100.00%	0.53%
Colerain	1	204	77,143	204	100.00%	0.26%
Columbia	1	891	77,143	891	100.00%	1.15%
Columbus	113	999	81,089	999	100.00%	1.23%
Como	5	91	77,527	91	100.00%	0.12%
Concord	67	79,066	82,583	0	0.00%	0.00%
	82	79,066	81,088	40,818	51.63%	50.34%
	83	79,066	81,172	38,248	48.37%	47.12%
Conetoe	23	294	81,057	294	100.00%	0.36%
Connelly Springs	86	1,669	79,175	1,669	100.00%	2.11%
Conover	89	8,165	77,838	384	4.70%	0.49%
	96	8,165	76,520	7,781	95.30%	10.17%
Conway	27	836	76,790	836	100.00%	1.09%
Cooleemee	77	960	82,918	960	100.00%	1.16%
Cornelius	98	24,866	75,602	24,866	100.00%	32.89%
Cove City	79	399	75,538	399	100.00%	0.53%
Cramerton	108	4,165	76,926	1	0.02%	0.00%
	109	4,165	75,517	4,164	99.98%	5.51%
Creedmoor	2	4,124	82,634	4,124	100.00%	4.99%
Creswell	1	276	77,143	276	100.00%	0.36%
Crossnore	85	192	78,372	192	100.00%	0.24%
Dallas	110	4,488	75,573	4,488	100.00%	5.94%
Danbury	91	189	82,843	189	100.00%	0.23%
Davidson (Iredell)	95	294	82,155	294	100.00%	0.36%
Davidson (Mecklenburg)	98	10,650	75,602	10,650	100.00%	14.09%
Dellview	110	13	75,573	13	100.00%	0.02%
Denton	80	1,636	81,522	1,636	100.00%	2.01%
Dillsboro	119	232	75,548	232	100.00%	0.31%
Dobbins Heights	66	866	83,032	866	100.00%	1.04%
Dobson	90	1,586	82,779	1,436	90.54%	1.73%
	91	1,586	82,843	150	9.46%	0.18%
Dortches	7	935	78,027	935	100.00%	1.20%
Dover	79	401	75,538	401	100.00%	0.53%
Drexel	86	1,858	79,175	1,858	100.00%	2.35%
Dublin	22	338	83,434	338	100.00%	0.41%
Duck	6	369	76,421	369	100.00%	0.48%
Dunn	53	9,263	83,429	9,263	100.00%	11.10%
Durham (Durham)	29	228,300	82,735	79,803	34.96%	96.46%
	30	228,300	83,272	60,805	26.63%	73.02%
	31	228,300	82,773	71,653	31.39%	86.57%
	54	228,300	82,312	16,039	7.03%	19.49%
Durham (Orange)	50	30	80,866	30	100.00%	0.04%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-23.asc', modified 08/28/2017 10:19:32 AM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

HBK-23 Lewis - Wake County: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Durham (Wake)	41	0	80,739	0	0.00%	0.00%
Earl	111	260	76,148	260	100.00%	0.34%
East Arcadia	22	487	83,434	487	100.00%	0.58%
East Bend	73	612	78,189	612	100.00%	0.78%
East Laurinburg	48	300	83,109	300	100.00%	0.36%
East Spencer	76	1,534	81,908	1,534	100.00%	1.87%
Eastover	45	3,628	79,294	3,628	100.00%	4.58%
Eden	65	15,527	83,430	15,527	100.00%	18.61%
Edenton	1	5,004	77,143	5,004	100.00%	6.49%
Elizabeth City (Camden)	1	45	77,143	45	100.00%	0.06%
Elizabeth City (Pasquotank)	5	18,638	77,527	18,638	100.00%	24.04%
Elizabethtown	22	3,583	83,434	3,583	100.00%	4.29%
Elk Park	85	452	78,372	452	100.00%	0.58%
Elkin (Surry)	90	3,921	82,779	3,921	100.00%	4.74%
Elkin (Wilkes)	94	80	83,358	80	100.00%	0.10%
Ellenboro	112	873	79,547	873	100.00%	1.10%
Ellerbe	66	1,054	83,032	1,054	100.00%	1.27%
Elm City	24	1,298	81,234	1,298	100.00%	1.60%
Elon	64	9,419	75,581	9,419	100.00%	12.46%
Emerald Isle	13	3,655	76,622	3,655	100.00%	4.77%
Enfield	27	2,532	76,790	2,532	100.00%	3.30%
Erwin	53	4,405	83,429	4,405	100.00%	5.28%
Eureka	10	197	83,434	197	100.00%	0.24%
Everetts	23	164	81,057	164	100.00%	0.20%
Fair Bluff	46	951	80,440	951	100.00%	1.18%
Fairmont	47	2,663	82,618	2,663	100.00%	3.22%
Fairview	55	3,324	75,792	3,324	100.00%	4.39%
Faison (Duplin)	4	961	81,905	961	100.00%	1.17%
Faison (Sampson)	21	0	83,434	0	0.00%	0.00%
Faith	76	807	81,908	807	100.00%	0.99%
Falcon (Cumberland)	45	258	79,294	258	100.00%	0.33%
Falcon (Sampson)	22	0	83,434	0	0.00%	0.00%
Falkland	8	96	75,926	96	100.00%	0.13%
Fallston	111	607	76,148	607	100.00%	0.80%
Farmville	8	4,654	75,926	4,654	100.00%	6.13%
Fayetteville	42	200,564	81,439	67,394	33.60%	82.75%
	43	200,564	77,725	74,393	37.09%	95.71%
	44	200,564	80,973	51,354	25.60%	63.42%
	45	200,564	79,294	7,423	3.70%	9.36%
Flat Rock	113	3,114	81,089	3,114	100.00%	3.84%
Fletcher	117	7,187	79,251	7,187	100.00%	9.07%
Forest City	112	7,476	79,547	7,476	100.00%	9.40%
Forest Hills	119	365	75,548	365	100.00%	0.48%
Fountain	8	427	75,926	427	100.00%	0.56%
Four Oaks	28	1,921	83,431	1,921	100.00%	2.30%
Foxfire	52	902	76,894	902	100.00%	1.17%
Franklin	120	3,845	80,814	3,845	100.00%	4.76%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-23.asc', modified 08/28/2017 10:19:32 AM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

HBK-23 Lewis - Wake County: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Franklinton	25	2,023	78,432	2,023	100.00%	2.58%
Franklinville	78	1,164	76,980	1,164	100.00%	1.51%
Fremont	10	1,255	83,434	1,255	100.00%	1.50%
Fuquay-Varina	36	17,937	81,926	228	1.27%	0.28%
	37	17,937	81,952	17,709	98.73%	21.61%
Gamewell	87	4,051	83,029	4,051	100.00%	4.88%
Garland	22	625	83,434	625	100.00%	0.75%
Garner	33	25,745	82,644	21,922	85.15%	26.53%
	36	25,745	81,926	3,823	14.85%	4.67%
Garysburg	27	1,057	76,790	1,057	100.00%	1.38%
Gaston	27	1,152	76,790	1,152	100.00%	1.50%
Gastonia	108	71,741	76,926	26,870	37.45%	34.93%
	109	71,741	75,517	41,847	58.33%	55.41%
	110	71,741	75,573	3,024	4.22%	4.00%
Gatesville	5	321	77,527	321	100.00%	0.41%
Gibson	48	540	83,109	540	100.00%	0.65%
Gibsonville (Alamance)	64	3,148	75,581	3,148	100.00%	4.17%
Gibsonville (Guilford)	59	3,262	79,907	3,262	100.00%	4.08%
Glen Alpine	86	1,517	79,175	1,517	100.00%	1.92%
Godwin	45	139	79,294	139	100.00%	0.18%
Goldsboro	10	36,437	83,434	2,531	6.95%	3.03%
	21	36,437	83,434	33,906	93.05%	40.64%
Goldston	54	268	82,312	268	100.00%	0.33%
Graham	63	14,153	75,550	14,153	100.00%	18.73%
Grandfather	85	25	78,372	25	100.00%	0.03%
Granite Falls	87	4,722	83,029	4,722	100.00%	5.69%
Granite Quarry	76	2,930	81,908	2,930	100.00%	3.58%
Grantsboro	6	688	76,421	688	100.00%	0.90%
Green Level	63	2,100	75,550	2,100	100.00%	2.78%
Greenevers	4	634	81,905	634	100.00%	0.77%
Greensboro	57	269,666	82,755	80,164	29.73%	96.87%
	58	269,666	82,137	76,171	28.25%	92.74%
	59	269,666	79,907	11,283	4.18%	14.12%
	60	269,666	81,856	14,170	5.25%	17.31%
	61	269,666	81,019	36,131	13.40%	44.60%
	62	269,666	80,732	51,747	19.19%	64.10%
Greenville	8	84,554	75,926	48,780	57.69%	64.25%
	9	84,554	75,794	34,649	40.98%	45.71%
	12	84,554	75,923	1,125	1.33%	1.48%
Grifton (Lenoir)	12	186	75,923	186	100.00%	0.24%
Grifton (Pitt)	12	2,431	75,923	2,431	100.00%	3.20%
Grimesland	9	441	75,794	441	100.00%	0.58%
Grover	111	708	76,148	708	100.00%	0.93%
Halifax	27	234	76,790	234	100.00%	0.30%
Hamilton	23	408	81,057	408	100.00%	0.50%
Hamlet	66	6,495	83,032	6,495	100.00%	7.82%
Harmony	84	531	77,282	531	100.00%	0.69%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-23.asc', modified 08/28/2017 10:19:32 AM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

HBK-23 Lewis - Wake County: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Harrells (Duplin)	4	23	81,905	23	100.00%	0.03%
Harrells (Sampson)	22	179	83,434	179	100.00%	0.21%
Harrellsville	5	106	77,527	106	100.00%	0.14%
Harrisburg	67	11,526	82,583	3,156	27.38%	3.82%
	82	11,526	81,088	8,335	72.31%	10.28%
	83	11,526	81,172	35	0.30%	0.04%
Hassell	23	84	81,057	84	100.00%	0.10%
Havelock	3	20,735	75,726	20,735	100.00%	27.38%
Haw River	63	2,298	75,550	2,254	98.09%	2.98%
	64	2,298	75,581	44	1.91%	0.06%
Hayesville	120	311	80,814	311	100.00%	0.38%
Hemby Bridge	69	1,520	76,381	1,520	100.00%	1.99%
Henderson	32	15,368	83,140	15,368	100.00%	18.48%
Hendersonville	113	13,137	81,089	514	3.91%	0.63%
	117	13,137	79,251	12,623	96.09%	15.93%
Hertford	1	2,143	77,143	2,143	100.00%	2.78%
Hickory (Burke)	86	66	79,175	66	100.00%	0.08%
Hickory (Caldwell)	87	18	83,029	18	100.00%	0.02%
Hickory (Catawba)	89	39,926	77,838	5,448	13.65%	7.00%
	96	39,926	76,520	34,478	86.35%	45.06%
High Point (Davidson)	80	5,310	81,522	5,310	100.00%	6.51%
High Point (Forsyth)	75	8	78,886	8	100.00%	0.01%
High Point (Guilford)	59	99,042	79,907	33	0.03%	0.04%
	60	99,042	81,856	59,653	60.23%	72.88%
	61	99,042	81,019	39,356	39.74%	48.58%
High Point (Randolph)	70	11	76,125	11	100.00%	0.01%
High Shoals	110	696	75,573	696	100.00%	0.92%
Highlands (Jackson)	119	4	75,548	4	100.00%	0.01%
Highlands (Macon)	120	920	80,814	920	100.00%	1.14%
Hildebran	86	2,023	79,175	2,023	100.00%	2.56%
Hillsborough	50	6,087	80,866	6,087	100.00%	7.53%
Hobgood	27	348	76,790	348	100.00%	0.45%
Hoffman	66	588	83,032	588	100.00%	0.71%
Holden Beach	17	575	77,263	575	100.00%	0.74%
Holly Ridge	15	1,268	77,307	1,268	100.00%	1.64%
Holly Springs	37	24,661	81,952	24,661	100.00%	30.09%
Hookerton	10	409	83,434	409	100.00%	0.49%
Hope Mills	44	15,176	80,973	5,976	39.38%	7.38%
	45	15,176	79,294	9,200	60.62%	11.60%
Hot Springs	118	560	76,322	560	100.00%	0.73%
Hudson	87	3,776	83,029	3,776	100.00%	4.55%
Huntersville	98	46,773	75,602	36,997	79.10%	48.94%
	107	46,773	75,856	9,776	20.90%	12.89%
Indian Beach	13	112	76,622	112	100.00%	0.15%
Indian Trail	55	33,518	75,792	51	0.15%	0.07%
	68	33,518	76,067	7,845	23.41%	10.31%
	69	33,518	76,381	25,622	76.44%	33.54%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-23.asc', modified 08/28/2017 10:19:32 AM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

HBK-23 Lewis - Wake County: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Jackson	27	513	76,790	513	100.00%	0.67%
Jacksonville	14	70,145	77,065	27,897	39.77%	36.20%
	15	70,145	77,307	42,248	60.23%	54.65%
Jamestown	58	3,382	82,137	0	0.00%	0.00%
	59	3,382	79,907	4	0.12%	0.01%
	60	3,382	81,856	3,378	99.88%	4.13%
Jamesville	23	491	81,057	491	100.00%	0.61%
Jefferson	93	1,611	78,360	1,611	100.00%	2.06%
Jonesville	73	2,285	78,189	2,285	100.00%	2.92%
Kannapolis (Cabarrus)	82	33,194	81,088	20,175	60.78%	24.88%
	83	33,194	81,172	13,019	39.22%	16.04%
Kannapolis (Rowan)	77	9,431	82,918	5,529	58.63%	6.67%
	83	9,431	81,172	3,902	41.37%	4.81%
Kelford	1	251	77,143	251	100.00%	0.33%
Kenansville	4	855	81,905	855	100.00%	1.04%
Kenly (Johnston)	28	1,176	83,431	1,176	100.00%	1.41%
Kenly (Wilson)	24	163	81,234	163	100.00%	0.20%
Kernersville (Forsyth)	74	23,071	79,963	5,280	22.89%	6.60%
	75	23,071	78,886	17,791	77.11%	22.55%
Kernersville (Guilford)	61	52	81,019	52	100.00%	0.06%
Kill Devil Hills	6	6,683	76,421	6,683	100.00%	8.74%
King (Forsyth)	74	619	79,963	619	100.00%	0.77%
King (Stokes)	91	6,285	82,843	6,285	100.00%	7.59%
Kings Mountain (Cleveland)	110	9,242	75,573	0	0.00%	0.00%
	111	9,242	76,148	9,242	100.00%	12.14%
Kings Mountain (Gaston)	110	1,054	75,573	1,054	100.00%	1.39%
Kingstown	111	681	76,148	681	100.00%	0.89%
Kinston	12	21,677	75,923	21,677	100.00%	28.55%
Kittrell	32	467	83,140	467	100.00%	0.56%
Kitty Hawk	6	3,272	76,421	3,272	100.00%	4.28%
Knightdale	39	11,401	83,055	11,401	100.00%	13.73%
Kure Beach	19	2,012	76,666	2,012	100.00%	2.62%
La Grange	12	2,873	75,923	2,873	100.00%	3.78%
Lake Lure	112	1,192	79,547	1,192	100.00%	1.50%
Lake Park	69	3,422	76,381	3,422	100.00%	4.48%
Lake Santeetlah	120	45	80,814	45	100.00%	0.06%
Lake Waccamaw	16	1,480	81,425	1,480	100.00%	1.82%
Landis	77	3,109	82,918	1,773	57.03%	2.14%
	83	3,109	81,172	1,336	42.97%	1.65%
Lansing	93	158	78,360	158	100.00%	0.20%
Lasker	27	122	76,790	122	100.00%	0.16%
Lattimore	111	488	76,148	488	100.00%	0.64%
Laurel Park	113	2,180	81,089	2	0.09%	0.00%
	117	2,180	79,251	2,178	99.91%	2.75%
Laurinburg	48	15,962	83,109	15,962	100.00%	19.21%
Lawndale	111	606	76,148	606	100.00%	0.80%
Leggett	23	60	81,057	60	100.00%	0.07%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-23.asc', modified 08/28/2017 10:19:32 AM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

HBK-23 Lewis - Wake County: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Leland	17	13,527	77,263	2,631	19.45%	3.41%
	18	13,527	77,681	10,896	80.55%	14.03%
Lenoir	87	18,228	83,029	18,228	100.00%	21.95%
Lewiston Woodville	1	549	77,143	549	100.00%	0.71%
Lewisville	73	12,639	78,189	10,883	86.11%	13.92%
	74	12,639	79,963	1,756	13.89%	2.20%
Lexington	80	18,931	81,522	0	0.00%	0.00%
	81	18,931	81,356	18,931	100.00%	23.27%
Liberty	78	2,656	76,980	2,656	100.00%	3.45%
Lilesville	55	536	75,792	536	100.00%	0.71%
Lillington	53	3,194	83,429	3,194	100.00%	3.83%
Lincolnton	97	10,486	78,265	10,486	100.00%	13.40%
Linden	45	130	79,294	130	100.00%	0.16%
Littleton	27	674	76,790	674	100.00%	0.88%
Locust (Cabarrus)	67	215	82,583	215	100.00%	0.26%
Locust (Stanly)	67	2,715	82,583	2,715	100.00%	3.29%
Long View (Burke)	86	752	79,175	752	100.00%	0.95%
Long View (Catawba)	96	4,119	76,520	4,119	100.00%	5.38%
Louisburg	25	3,359	78,432	3,359	100.00%	4.28%
Love Valley	84	90	77,282	90	100.00%	0.12%
Lowell	108	3,526	76,926	3,526	100.00%	4.58%
Lucama	24	1,108	81,234	1,108	100.00%	1.36%
Lumber Bridge	46	94	80,440	94	100.00%	0.12%
Lumberton	46	21,542	80,440	5,785	26.85%	7.19%
	47	21,542	82,618	15,757	73.15%	19.07%
Macclesfield	23	471	81,057	471	100.00%	0.58%
Macon	32	119	83,140	119	100.00%	0.14%
Madison	91	2,246	82,843	2,246	100.00%	2.71%
Maggie Valley	118	1,150	76,322	1,039	90.35%	1.36%
	119	1,150	75,548	111	9.65%	0.15%
Magnolia	4	939	81,905	939	100.00%	1.15%
Maiden (Catawba)	89	3,308	77,838	3,308	100.00%	4.25%
Maiden (Lincoln)	97	2	78,265	2	100.00%	0.00%
Manteo	6	1,434	76,421	1,434	100.00%	1.88%
Marietta	46	175	80,440	175	100.00%	0.22%
Marion	85	7,838	78,372	7,838	100.00%	10.00%
Mars Hill	118	1,869	76,322	1,869	100.00%	2.45%
Marshall	118	872	76,322	872	100.00%	1.14%
Marshville	55	2,402	75,792	2,402	100.00%	3.17%
Marvin	68	5,579	76,067	5,579	100.00%	7.33%
Matthews	103	27,198	76,381	27,198	100.00%	35.61%
Maxton (Robeson)	47	2,230	82,618	2,230	100.00%	2.70%
Maxton (Scotland)	48	196	83,109	196	100.00%	0.24%
Mayodan	91	2,478	82,843	2,478	100.00%	2.99%
Maysville	13	1,019	76,622	1,019	100.00%	1.33%
McAdenville	108	651	76,926	651	100.00%	0.85%
McDonald	47	113	82,618	113	100.00%	0.14%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-23.asc', modified 08/28/2017 10:19:32 AM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

HBK-23 Lewis - Wake County: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
McFarlan	55	117	75,792	117	100.00%	0.15%
Mebane (Alamance)	63	9,600	75,550	9,600	100.00%	12.71%
Mebane (Orange)	50	1,793	80,866	1,793	100.00%	2.22%
Mesic	6	220	76,421	220	100.00%	0.29%
Micro	28	441	83,431	441	100.00%	0.53%
Middleburg	32	133	83,140	133	100.00%	0.16%
Middlesex	25	822	78,432	822	100.00%	1.05%
Midland (Cabarrus)	67	3,073	82,583	3,073	100.00%	3.72%
Midland (Mecklenburg)	103	0	76,381	0	0.00%	0.00%
Midway	80	4,679	81,522	3,504	74.89%	4.30%
	81	4,679	81,356	1,175	25.11%	1.44%
Mills River	113	6,802	81,089	300	4.41%	0.37%
	117	6,802	79,251	6,502	95.59%	8.20%
Milton	50	166	80,866	166	100.00%	0.21%
Mineral Springs	55	2,639	75,792	688	26.07%	0.91%
	68	2,639	76,067	1,951	73.93%	2.56%
Minnesott Beach	6	440	76,421	440	100.00%	0.58%
Mint Hill (Mecklenburg)	100	22,669	75,589	7,784	34.34%	10.30%
	103	22,669	76,381	14,885	65.66%	19.49%
Mint Hill (Union)	69	53	76,381	53	100.00%	0.07%
Misenheimer	67	728	82,583	728	100.00%	0.88%
Mocksville	77	5,051	82,918	5,051	100.00%	6.09%
Momeyer	7	224	78,027	224	100.00%	0.29%
Monroe	55	32,797	75,792	3,133	9.55%	4.13%
	68	32,797	76,067	13,278	40.49%	17.46%
	69	32,797	76,381	16,386	49.96%	21.45%
Montreat	115	723	79,883	723	100.00%	0.91%
Mooresboro	111	311	76,148	311	100.00%	0.41%
Mooresville	95	32,711	82,155	32,711	100.00%	39.82%
Morehead City	13	8,661	76,622	8,661	100.00%	11.30%
Morganton	86	16,918	79,175	16,918	100.00%	21.37%
Morrisville (Durham)	31	0	82,773	0	0.00%	0.00%
Morrisville (Wake)	41	18,576	80,739	11,226	60.43%	13.90%
	49	18,576	82,999	7,350	39.57%	8.86%
Morven	55	511	75,792	511	100.00%	0.67%
Mount Airy	90	10,388	82,779	10,388	100.00%	12.55%
Mount Gilead	66	1,181	83,032	1,181	100.00%	1.42%
Mount Holly	108	13,656	76,926	13,656	100.00%	17.75%
Mount Olive (Duplin)	4	51	81,905	51	100.00%	0.06%
Mount Olive (Wayne)	21	4,538	83,434	4,538	100.00%	5.44%
Mount Pleasant	67	1,652	82,583	1,652	100.00%	2.00%
Murfreesboro	5	2,835	77,527	2,835	100.00%	3.66%
Murphy	120	1,627	80,814	1,627	100.00%	2.01%
Nags Head	6	2,757	76,421	2,757	100.00%	3.61%
Nashville	7	5,352	78,027	5,352	100.00%	6.86%
Navassa	18	1,505	77,681	1,505	100.00%	1.94%
New Bern	3	29,524	75,726	27,063	91.66%	35.74%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-23.asc', modified 08/28/2017 10:19:32 AM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

HBK-23 Lewis - Wake County: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
New Bern	79	29,524	75,538	2,461	8.34%	3.26%
New London	67	600	82,583	600	100.00%	0.73%
Newland	85	698	78,372	698	100.00%	0.89%
Newport	13	4,150	76,622	4,150	100.00%	5.42%
Newton	89	12,968	77,838	12,968	100.00%	16.66%
	96	12,968	76,520	0	0.00%	0.00%
Newton Grove	22	569	83,434	569	100.00%	0.68%
Norlina	32	1,118	83,140	1,118	100.00%	1.34%
Norman	66	138	83,032	138	100.00%	0.17%
North Topsail Beach	15	743	77,307	743	100.00%	0.96%
North Wilkesboro	90	4,245	82,779	5	0.12%	0.01%
	94	4,245	83,358	4,240	99.88%	5.09%
Northwest	18	735	77,681	735	100.00%	0.95%
Norwood	67	2,379	82,583	2,379	100.00%	2.88%
Oak City	23	317	81,057	317	100.00%	0.39%
Oak Island	17	6,783	77,263	6,783	100.00%	8.78%
Oak Ridge	62	6,185	80,732	6,185	100.00%	7.66%
Oakboro	67	1,859	82,583	1,859	100.00%	2.25%
Ocean Isle Beach	17	550	77,263	550	100.00%	0.71%
Old Fort	85	908	78,372	908	100.00%	1.16%
Oriental	6	900	76,421	900	100.00%	1.18%
Orrum	46	91	80,440	91	100.00%	0.11%
Ossipee	64	543	75,581	543	100.00%	0.72%
Oxford	2	8,461	82,634	239	2.82%	0.29%
	32	8,461	83,140	8,222	97.18%	9.89%
Pantego	79	179	75,538	179	100.00%	0.24%
Parkton	46	436	80,440	436	100.00%	0.54%
Parmele	23	278	81,057	278	100.00%	0.34%
Patterson Springs	111	622	76,148	622	100.00%	0.82%
Peachland	55	437	75,792	437	100.00%	0.58%
Peletier	13	644	76,622	644	100.00%	0.84%
Pembroke	47	2,973	82,618	2,973	100.00%	3.60%
Pikeville	10	678	83,434	678	100.00%	0.81%
Pilot Mountain	91	1,477	82,843	1,477	100.00%	1.78%
Pine Knoll Shores	13	1,339	76,622	1,339	100.00%	1.75%
Pine Level	28	1,700	83,431	1,700	100.00%	2.04%
Pinebluff	52	1,337	76,894	1,337	100.00%	1.74%
Pinehurst	52	13,124	76,894	13,124	100.00%	17.07%
Pinetops	23	1,374	81,057	1,374	100.00%	1.70%
Pineville	92	7,479	77,172	7,479	100.00%	9.69%
	104	7,479	76,869	0	0.00%	0.00%
Pink Hill	12	552	75,923	552	100.00%	0.73%
Pittsboro	54	3,743	82,312	3,743	100.00%	4.55%
Pleasant Garden	59	4,489	79,907	4,489	100.00%	5.62%
Plymouth	1	3,878	77,143	3,878	100.00%	5.03%
Polkton	55	3,375	75,792	3,375	100.00%	4.45%
Polkville	111	545	76,148	545	100.00%	0.72%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-23.asc', modified 08/28/2017 10:19:32 AM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

HBK-23 Lewis - Wake County: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Pollocksville	13	311	76,622	311	100.00%	0.41%
Powellsville	1	276	77,143	276	100.00%	0.36%
Princeton	10	1,194	83,434	1,194	100.00%	1.43%
Princeville	23	2,082	81,057	2,082	100.00%	2.57%
Proctorville	46	117	80,440	117	100.00%	0.15%
Raeford	48	4,611	83,109	4,611	100.00%	5.55%
Raleigh (Durham)	31	1,067	82,773	1,067	100.00%	1.29%
Raleigh (Wake)	11	402,825	83,266	37,217	9.24%	44.70%
	33	402,825	82,644	54,577	13.55%	66.04%
	34	402,825	77,948	77,331	19.20%	99.21%
	35	402,825	82,728	27,414	6.81%	33.14%
	36	402,825	81,926	6	0.00%	0.01%
	38	402,825	83,061	81,167	20.15%	97.72%
	39	402,825	83,055	31,384	7.79%	37.79%
	40	402,825	80,675	42,647	10.59%	52.86%
	49	402,825	82,999	51,082	12.68%	61.55%
Ramseur	78	1,692	76,980	1,692	100.00%	2.20%
Randleman	70	4,113	76,125	4,113	100.00%	5.40%
Ranlo	108	3,434	76,926	3,434	100.00%	4.46%
	110	3,434	75,573	0	0.00%	0.00%
Raynham	47	72	82,618	72	100.00%	0.09%
Red Cross	67	742	82,583	742	100.00%	0.90%
Red Oak	7	3,430	78,027	3,430	100.00%	4.40%
Red Springs (Hoke)	48	0	83,109	0	0.00%	0.00%
Red Springs (Robeson)	47	3,428	82,618	3,428	100.00%	4.15%
Reidsville	65	14,520	83,430	14,520	100.00%	17.40%
Rennert	46	383	80,440	383	100.00%	0.48%
Rhodhiss (Burke)	86	700	79,175	700	100.00%	0.88%
Rhodhiss (Caldwell)	87	370	83,029	370	100.00%	0.45%
Rich Square	27	958	76,790	958	100.00%	1.25%
Richfield	67	613	82,583	613	100.00%	0.74%
Richlands	4	1,520	81,905	1,520	100.00%	1.86%
River Bend	3	3,119	75,726	3,119	100.00%	4.12%
Roanoke Rapids	27	15,754	76,790	15,754	100.00%	20.52%
Robbins	52	1,097	76,894	1,097	100.00%	1.43%
	78	1,097	76,980	0	0.00%	0.00%
Robbinsville	120	620	80,814	620	100.00%	0.77%
Robersonville	23	1,488	81,057	1,488	100.00%	1.84%
Rockingham	66	9,558	83,032	9,558	100.00%	11.51%
Rockwell	76	2,108	81,908	2,108	100.00%	2.57%
Rocky Mount (Edgecombe)	23	17,524	81,057	17,524	100.00%	21.62%
Rocky Mount (Nash)	7	39,953	78,027	39,953	100.00%	51.20%
Rolesville	35	3,786	82,728	3,786	100.00%	4.58%
Ronda	90	417	82,779	417	100.00%	0.50%
Roper	1	611	77,143	611	100.00%	0.79%
Rose Hill	4	1,626	81,905	1,626	100.00%	1.99%
Roseboro	22	1,191	83,434	1,191	100.00%	1.43%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-23.asc', modified 08/28/2017 10:19:32 AM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

HBK-23 Lewis - Wake County: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Rosman	113	576	81,089	576	100.00%	0.71%
Rowland	47	1,037	82,618	1,037	100.00%	1.26%
Roxboro	2	8,362	82,634	8,362	100.00%	10.12%
Roxobel	1	240	77,143	240	100.00%	0.31%
Rural Hall	74	2,937	79,963	2,937	100.00%	3.67%
Ruth	112	440	79,547	440	100.00%	0.55%
Rutherford College	86	1,341	79,175	1,341	100.00%	1.69%
Rutherfordton	112	4,213	79,547	4,213	100.00%	5.30%
Salemburg	22	435	83,434	435	100.00%	0.52%
Salisbury	76	33,662	81,908	31,445	93.41%	38.39%
	77	33,662	82,918	2,217	6.59%	2.67%
Saluda (Henderson)	113	12	81,089	12	100.00%	0.01%
Saluda (Polk)	113	701	81,089	701	100.00%	0.86%
Sandy Creek	18	260	77,681	260	100.00%	0.33%
Sandyfield	16	447	81,425	447	100.00%	0.55%
Sanford	51	28,094	83,434	28,094	100.00%	33.67%
Saratoga	24	408	81,234	408	100.00%	0.50%
Sawmills	87	5,240	83,029	5,240	100.00%	6.31%
Scotland Neck	27	2,059	76,790	2,059	100.00%	2.68%
Seaboard	27	632	76,790	632	100.00%	0.82%
Seagrove	78	228	76,980	228	100.00%	0.30%
Sedalia	59	623	79,907	623	100.00%	0.78%
Selma	28	6,073	83,431	6,073	100.00%	7.28%
Seven Devils (Avery)	85	28	78,372	28	100.00%	0.04%
Seven Devils (Watauga)	93	164	78,360	164	100.00%	0.21%
Seven Springs	10	110	83,434	110	100.00%	0.13%
Severn	27	276	76,790	276	100.00%	0.36%
Shallotte	17	3,675	77,263	3,675	100.00%	4.76%
Sharpsburg (Edgecombe)	23	209	81,057	209	100.00%	0.26%
Sharpsburg (Nash)	7	1,252	78,027	1,252	100.00%	1.60%
Sharpsburg (Wilson)	24	563	81,234	563	100.00%	0.69%
Shelby	110	20,323	75,573	11,240	55.31%	14.87%
	111	20,323	76,148	9,083	44.69%	11.93%
Siler City	54	7,887	82,312	7,887	100.00%	9.58%
Simpson	9	416	75,794	416	100.00%	0.55%
Sims	24	282	81,234	282	100.00%	0.35%
Smithfield	26	10,966	83,432	2,993	27.29%	3.59%
	28	10,966	83,431	7,973	72.71%	9.56%
Snow Hill	10	1,595	83,434	1,595	100.00%	1.91%
Southern Pines	52	12,334	76,894	12,334	100.00%	16.04%
Southern Shores	6	2,714	76,421	2,714	100.00%	3.55%
Southport	17	2,833	77,263	2,833	100.00%	3.67%
Sparta	90	1,770	82,779	1,770	100.00%	2.14%
Speed	23	80	81,057	80	100.00%	0.10%
Spencer	76	3,267	81,908	3,267	100.00%	3.99%
Spencer Mountain	108	37	76,926	37	100.00%	0.05%
Spindale	112	4,321	79,547	4,321	100.00%	5.43%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-23.asc', modified 08/28/2017 10:19:32 AM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

HBK-23 Lewis - Wake County: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Spring Hope	7	1,320	78,027	1,320	100.00%	1.69%
Spring Lake	42	11,964	81,439	11,964	100.00%	14.69%
Spruce Pine	85	2,175	78,372	2,175	100.00%	2.78%
St. Helena	16	389	81,425	389	100.00%	0.48%
St. James	17	3,165	77,263	3,165	100.00%	4.10%
St. Pauls	46	2,035	80,440	2,035	100.00%	2.53%
Staley	78	393	76,980	393	100.00%	0.51%
Stallings (Mecklenburg)	103	399	76,381	399	100.00%	0.52%
Stallings (Union)	68	13,432	76,067	0	0.00%	0.00%
	69	13,432	76,381	13,432	100.00%	17.59%
Stanfield	67	1,486	82,583	1,486	100.00%	1.80%
Stanley	108	3,556	76,926	3,550	99.83%	4.61%
	110	3,556	75,573	6	0.17%	0.01%
Stantonsburg	24	784	81,234	784	100.00%	0.97%
Star	66	876	83,032	876	100.00%	1.06%
Statesville	84	24,532	77,282	20,541	83.73%	26.58%
	95	24,532	82,155	3,991	16.27%	4.86%
Stedman	45	1,028	79,294	1,028	100.00%	1.30%
Stem	2	463	82,634	463	100.00%	0.56%
Stokesdale	62	5,047	80,732	5,047	100.00%	6.25%
Stoneville	65	1,056	83,430	1,056	100.00%	1.27%
Stonewall	6	281	76,421	281	100.00%	0.37%
Stovall	32	418	83,140	418	100.00%	0.50%
Sugar Mountain	85	198	78,372	198	100.00%	0.25%
Summerfield	62	10,232	80,732	10,232	100.00%	12.67%
Sunset Beach	17	3,572	77,263	3,572	100.00%	4.62%
Surf City (Onslow)	15	292	77,307	292	100.00%	0.38%
Surf City (Pender)	16	1,561	81,425	1,561	100.00%	1.92%
Swansboro	14	2,663	77,065	2,663	100.00%	3.46%
Swepsonville	63	1,154	75,550	1,154	100.00%	1.53%
Sylva	119	2,588	75,548	2,588	100.00%	3.43%
Tabor City	46	2,511	80,440	2,511	100.00%	3.12%
Tar Heel	22	117	83,434	117	100.00%	0.14%
Tarboro	23	11,415	81,057	11,415	100.00%	14.08%
Taylorsville	94	2,098	83,358	2,098	100.00%	2.52%
Taylortown	52	722	76,894	722	100.00%	0.94%
Teachey	4	376	81,905	376	100.00%	0.46%
Thomasville (Davidson)	80	26,493	81,522	25,474	96.15%	31.25%
	81	26,493	81,356	1,019	3.85%	1.25%
Thomasville (Randolph)	70	264	76,125	264	100.00%	0.35%
Tobaccoville (Forsyth)	74	2,441	79,963	2,441	100.00%	3.05%
Tobaccoville (Stokes)	91	0	82,843	0	0.00%	0.00%
Topsail Beach	16	368	81,425	368	100.00%	0.45%
Trent Woods	3	4,155	75,726	4,155	100.00%	5.49%
Trenton	13	287	76,622	287	100.00%	0.37%
Trinity	70	6,614	76,125	6,614	100.00%	8.69%
Troutman	84	2,383	77,282	2,169	91.02%	2.81%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-23.asc', modified 08/28/2017 10:19:32 AM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

HBK-23 Lewis - Wake County: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Troutman	95	2,383	82,155	214	8.98%	0.26%
Troy	66	3,189	83,032	3,189	100.00%	3.84%
Tryon	113	1,646	81,089	1,646	100.00%	2.03%
Turkey	21	292	83,434	292	100.00%	0.35%
Unionville	55	5,929	75,792	337	5.68%	0.44%
	69	5,929	76,381	5,592	94.32%	7.32%
Valdese	86	4,490	79,175	4,490	100.00%	5.67%
Vanceboro	79	1,005	75,538	1,005	100.00%	1.33%
Vandemere	6	254	76,421	254	100.00%	0.33%
Varnamtown	17	541	77,263	541	100.00%	0.70%
Vass	52	720	76,894	720	100.00%	0.94%
Waco	110	321	75,573	321	100.00%	0.42%
Wade	45	556	79,294	556	100.00%	0.70%
Wadesboro	55	5,813	75,792	5,813	100.00%	7.67%
Wagram	48	840	83,109	840	100.00%	1.01%
Wake Forest (Franklin)	25	899	78,432	899	100.00%	1.15%
Wake Forest (Wake)	35	29,218	82,728	29,218	100.00%	35.32%
Walkertown	72	4,675	76,245	1,018	21.78%	1.34%
	74	4,675	79,963	3,657	78.22%	4.57%
Wallace (Duplin)	4	3,880	81,905	3,880	100.00%	4.74%
Wallace (Pender)	16	0	81,425	0	0.00%	0.00%
Wallburg	80	3,047	81,522	3,047	100.00%	3.74%
Walnut Cove	91	1,425	82,843	1,425	100.00%	1.72%
Walnut Creek	10	835	83,434	835	100.00%	1.00%
Walstonburg	10	219	83,434	219	100.00%	0.26%
Warrenton	32	862	83,140	862	100.00%	1.04%
Warsaw	4	3,054	81,905	3,054	100.00%	3.73%
Washington	79	9,744	75,538	9,744	100.00%	12.90%
Washington Park	79	451	75,538	451	100.00%	0.60%
Watha	16	190	81,425	190	100.00%	0.23%
Waxhaw	55	9,859	75,792	1,604	16.27%	2.12%
	68	9,859	76,067	8,255	83.73%	10.85%
Waynesville	119	9,869	75,548	9,869	100.00%	13.06%
Weaverville	115	3,120	79,883	3,120	100.00%	3.91%
Webster	119	363	75,548	363	100.00%	0.48%
Weddington (Mecklenburg)	103	7	76,381	7	100.00%	0.01%
Weddington (Union)	68	9,452	76,067	8,933	94.51%	11.74%
	69	9,452	76,381	519	5.49%	0.68%
Weldon	27	1,655	76,790	1,655	100.00%	2.16%
Wendell	39	5,845	83,055	5,845	100.00%	7.04%
Wentworth	65	2,807	83,430	2,807	100.00%	3.36%
Wesley Chapel	68	7,463	76,067	6,877	92.15%	9.04%
	69	7,463	76,381	586	7.85%	0.77%
West Jefferson	93	1,299	78,360	1,299	100.00%	1.66%
Whispering Pines	52	2,928	76,894	2,928	100.00%	3.81%
Whitakers (Edgecombe)	23	402	81,057	402	100.00%	0.50%
Whitakers (Nash)	7	342	78,027	342	100.00%	0.44%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-23.asc', modified 08/28/2017 10:19:32 AM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

HBK-23 Lewis - Wake County: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
White Lake	22	802	83,434	802	100.00%	0.96%
Whiteville	16	5,394	81,425	5,394	100.00%	6.62%
Whitsett	59	590	79,907	590	100.00%	0.74%
Wilkesboro	90	3,413	82,779	3	0.09%	0.00%
	94	3,413	83,358	3,410	99.91%	4.09%
Williamston	23	5,511	81,057	5,511	100.00%	6.80%
Wilmington	18	106,476	77,681	41,563	39.04%	53.50%
	19	106,476	76,666	33,947	31.88%	44.28%
	20	106,476	78,488	30,966	29.08%	39.45%
Wilson	24	49,167	81,234	49,167	100.00%	60.53%
Wilson's Mills	26	2,277	83,432	0	0.00%	0.00%
	28	2,277	83,431	2,277	100.00%	2.73%
Windsor	1	3,630	77,143	3,630	100.00%	4.71%
Winfall	1	594	77,143	594	100.00%	0.77%
Wingate	55	3,491	75,792	349	10.00%	0.46%
	69	3,491	76,381	3,142	90.00%	4.11%
Winston-Salem	71	229,617	75,793	75,779	33.00%	99.98%
	72	229,617	76,245	73,464	31.99%	96.35%
	73	229,617	78,189	17,422	7.59%	22.28%
	74	229,617	79,963	30,077	13.10%	37.61%
	75	229,617	78,886	32,875	14.32%	41.67%
Winterville	8	9,269	75,926	0	0.00%	0.00%
	9	9,269	75,794	8,391	90.53%	11.07%
	12	9,269	75,923	878	9.47%	1.16%
Winton	5	769	77,527	769	100.00%	0.99%
Woodfin	114	6,123	82,902	2,563	41.86%	3.09%
	115	6,123	79,883	2,717	44.37%	3.40%
	116	6,123	75,533	843	13.77%	1.12%
Woodland	27	809	76,790	809	100.00%	1.05%
Wrightsville Beach	19	2,477	76,666	2,477	100.00%	3.23%
	20	2,477	78,488	0	0.00%	0.00%
Yadkinville	73	2,959	78,189	2,959	100.00%	3.78%
Yanceyville	50	2,039	80,866	2,039	100.00%	2.52%
Youngsville	25	1,157	78,432	1,157	100.00%	1.48%
Zebulon (Johnston)	26	0	83,432	0	0.00%	0.00%
Zebulon (Wake)	35	4,433	82,728	381	8.59%	0.46%
	39	4,433	83,055	4,052	91.41%	4.88%
			Total:	**5,250,071**		

District plan definition file: 'HBK-23.asc', modified 08/28/2017 10:19:32 AM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

HBK-23 Lewis - Wake County: Split VTD Detail

County	VTD	District	Total VTD Pop	VTD Pop in District	Percent of VTD Pop in District
Alamance	03C	63	2,814	2,491	88.52%
		64	2,814	323	11.48%
	063	63	4,940	4,090	82.79%
		64	4,940	850	17.21%
	06W	63	1,973	1,617	81.96%
		64	1,973	356	18.04%
Brunswick	04	17	13,819	3,644	26.37%
		18	13,819	10,175	73.63%
Buncombe	05.1	114	2,748	1,691	61.54%
		115	2,748	1,057	38.46%
	100.1	114	9,126	8,524	93.40%
		115	9,126	602	6.60%
	102.1	114	5,975	1,385	23.18%
		116	5,975	4,590	76.82%
	104.1	114	3,081	2,345	76.11%
		115	3,081	736	23.89%
	19.1	114	2,159	1,843	85.36%
		116	2,159	316	14.64%
	24.1	114	3,211	1,964	61.16%
		116	3,211	1,247	38.84%
	52.1	115	5,279	3,762	71.26%
		116	5,279	1,517	28.74%
	57.1	114	3,534	315	8.91%
		115	3,534	1,149	32.51%
		116	3,534	2,070	58.57%
	60.2	114	1,300	164	12.62%
		115	1,300	1,136	87.38%
	64.1	114	2,671	820	30.70%
		115	2,671	1,851	69.30%
	70.1	114	3,508	2,418	68.93%
		115	3,508	1,090	31.07%
Craven	N4	3	6,831	5,069	74.21%
		79	6,831	1,762	25.79%
Cumberland	G2	43	34,282	29,272	85.39%
		45	34,282	5,010	14.61%
Durham	34	29	11,492	9,457	82.29%
		31	11,492	2,035	17.71%
Gaston	05	109	4,767	4,132	86.68%
		110	4,767	635	13.32%
Harnett	PR07	51	17,943	14,553	81.11%
		53	17,943	3,390	18.89%
	PR08	28	10,373	5,681	54.77%
		53	10,373	4,692	45.23%
Haywood	IH	118	3,815	3,256	85.35%
		119	3,815	559	14.65%
Johnston	PR04	10	1,929	413	21.41%
		28	1,929	1,516	78.59%
	PR26	26	4,445	297	6.68%
		28	4,445	4,148	93.32%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-23.asc', modified 08/28/2017 10:19:32 AM

VTDs ('Voting Districts') derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG05|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

HBK-23 Lewis - Wake County: Split VTD Detail

County	VTD	District	Total VTD Pop	VTD Pop in District	Percent of VTD Pop in District
Mecklenburg	001	102	1,950	102	5.23%
		104	1,950	1,848	94.77%
	069	104	5,121	3,240	63.27%
		105	5,121	1,881	36.73%
	134	98	8,939	4,410	49.33%
		107	8,939	4,529	50.67%
Moore	RBN	52	2,923	2,593	88.71%
		78	2,923	330	11.29%
	WEM	52	2,982	1,806	60.56%
		78	2,982	1,176	39.44%
New Hanover	CF03	18	8,711	828	9.51%
		20	8,711	7,883	90.49%
	W24	18	7,784	3,543	45.52%
		20	7,784	4,241	54.48%
	WB	19	2,473	2,473	100.00%
		20	2,473	0	0.00%
Onslow	GB12	4	6,284	5,776	91.92%
		14	6,284	508	8.08%
	HM05	14	8,258	5,303	64.22%
		15	8,258	2,955	35.78%
Pitt	1403A	9	7,871	3,868	49.14%
		12	7,871	4,003	50.86%
	1507	8	6,628	5,623	84.84%
		9	6,628	1,005	15.16%
Rockingham	HU	65	6,052	5,815	96.08%
		91	6,052	237	3.92%
Sampson	ROWA	21	3,210	1,577	49.13%
		22	3,210	1,633	50.87%
Union	017A	68	4,593	1,595	34.73%
		69	4,593	2,998	65.27%
	019	55	5,806	1,105	19.03%
		68	5,806	4,701	80.97%
	029A	68	5,935	5,079	85.58%
		69	5,935	856	14.42%
	029C	68	2,942	1,576	53.57%
		69	2,942	1,366	46.43%
	032	55	4,095	1,820	44.44%
		69	4,095	2,275	55.56%
	040	68	4,926	1,122	22.78%
		69	4,926	3,804	77.22%
Wake	10-02	35	6,441	898	13.94%
		39	6,441	5,543	86.06%
	12-05	36	9,236	5,460	59.12%
		37	9,236	3,776	40.88%
	16-09	33	4,924	3,027	61.47%
		36	4,924	1,897	38.53%
	18-08	11	5,677	2,521	44.41%
		36	5,677	3,156	55.59%
Wayne	09	10	5,273	3,733	70.79%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-23.asc', modified 08/28/2017 10:19:32 AM

VTDs ('Voting Districts') derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG05|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

HBK-23 Lewis - Wake County: Split VTD Detail

County	VTD	District	Total VTD Pop	VTD Pop in District	Percent of VTD Pop in District
Wayne	09	21	5,273	1,540	29.21%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-23.asc', modified 08/28/2017 10:19:32 AM

VTDs ('Voting Districts') derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG05|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

HBK-23 Lewis - Wake County: County - District

County	District	Total County Pop	Total District Pop	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Alamance	63	151,131	75,550	75,550	49.99%	100.00%
	64	151,131	75,581	75,581	50.01%	100.00%
Alexander	94	37,198	83,358	37,198	100.00%	44.62%
Alleghany	90	11,155	82,779	11,155	100.00%	13.48%
Anson	55	26,948	75,792	26,948	100.00%	35.56%
Ashe	93	27,281	78,360	27,281	100.00%	34.81%
Avery	85	17,797	78,372	17,797	100.00%	22.71%
Beaufort	79	47,759	75,538	47,759	100.00%	63.23%
Bertie	1	21,282	77,143	21,282	100.00%	27.59%
Bladen	22	35,190	83,434	35,190	100.00%	42.18%
Brunswick	17	107,431	77,263	77,263	71.92%	100.00%
	18	107,431	77,681	30,168	28.08%	38.84%
Buncombe	114	238,318	82,902	82,902	34.79%	100.00%
	115	238,318	79,883	79,883	33.52%	100.00%
	116	238,318	75,533	75,533	31.69%	100.00%
Burke	86	90,912	79,175	79,175	87.09%	100.00%
	112	90,912	79,547	11,737	12.91%	14.75%
Cabarrus	67	178,011	82,583	30,593	17.19%	37.05%
	82	178,011	81,088	81,088	45.55%	100.00%
	83	178,011	81,172	66,330	37.26%	81.72%
Caldwell	87	83,029	83,029	83,029	100.00%	100.00%
Camden	1	9,980	77,143	9,980	100.00%	12.94%
Carteret	13	66,469	76,622	66,469	100.00%	86.75%
Caswell	50	23,719	80,866	23,719	100.00%	29.33%
Catawba	89	154,358	77,838	77,838	50.43%	100.00%
	96	154,358	76,520	76,520	49.57%	100.00%
Chatham	54	63,505	82,312	63,505	100.00%	77.15%
Cherokee	120	27,444	80,814	27,444	100.00%	33.96%
Chowan	1	14,793	77,143	14,793	100.00%	19.18%
Clay	120	10,587	80,814	10,587	100.00%	13.10%
Cleveland	110	98,078	75,573	21,930	22.36%	29.02%
	111	98,078	76,148	76,148	77.64%	100.00%
Columbus	16	58,098	81,425	29,208	50.27%	35.87%
	46	58,098	80,440	28,890	49.73%	35.91%
Craven	3	103,505	75,726	75,726	73.16%	100.00%
	79	103,505	75,538	27,779	26.84%	36.77%
Cumberland	42	319,431	81,439	81,439	25.50%	100.00%
	43	319,431	77,725	77,725	24.33%	100.00%
	44	319,431	80,973	80,973	25.35%	100.00%
	45	319,431	79,294	79,294	24.82%	100.00%
Currituck	6	23,547	76,421	23,547	100.00%	30.81%
Dare	6	33,920	76,421	33,920	100.00%	44.39%
Davidson	80	162,878	81,522	81,522	50.05%	100.00%
	81	162,878	81,356	81,356	49.95%	100.00%
Davie	77	41,240	82,918	41,240	100.00%	49.74%
Duplin	4	58,505	81,905	58,505	100.00%	71.43%
Durham	29	267,587	82,735	82,735	30.92%	100.00%
	30	267,587	83,272	83,272	31.12%	100.00%

HBK-23 Lewis - Wake County: County - District

County	District	Total County Pop	Total District Pop	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Durham	31	267,587	82,773	82,773	30.93%	100.00%
	54	267,587	82,312	18,807	7.03%	22.85%
Edgecombe	23	56,552	81,057	56,552	100.00%	69.77%
Forsyth	71	350,670	75,793	75,793	21.61%	100.00%
	72	350,670	76,245	76,245	21.74%	100.00%
	73	350,670	78,189	39,783	11.34%	50.88%
	74	350,670	79,963	79,963	22.80%	100.00%
	75	350,670	78,886	78,886	22.50%	100.00%
Franklin	25	60,619	78,432	60,619	100.00%	77.29%
Gaston	108	206,086	76,926	76,926	37.33%	100.00%
	109	206,086	75,517	75,517	36.64%	100.00%
	110	206,086	75,573	53,643	26.03%	70.98%
Gates	5	12,197	77,527	12,197	100.00%	15.73%
Graham	120	8,861	80,814	8,861	100.00%	10.96%
Granville	2	59,916	82,634	43,170	72.05%	52.24%
	32	59,916	83,140	16,746	27.95%	20.14%
Greene	10	21,362	83,434	21,362	100.00%	25.60%
Guilford	57	488,406	82,755	82,755	16.94%	100.00%
	58	488,406	82,137	82,137	16.82%	100.00%
	59	488,406	79,907	79,907	16.36%	100.00%
	60	488,406	81,856	81,856	16.76%	100.00%
	61	488,406	81,019	81,019	16.59%	100.00%
	62	488,406	80,732	80,732	16.53%	100.00%
Halifax	27	54,691	76,790	54,691	100.00%	71.22%
Harnett	28	114,678	83,431	5,681	4.95%	6.81%
	51	114,678	83,434	25,568	22.30%	30.64%
	53	114,678	83,429	83,429	72.75%	100.00%
Haywood	118	59,036	76,322	37,740	63.93%	49.45%
	119	59,036	75,548	21,296	36.07%	28.19%
Henderson	113	106,740	81,089	27,489	25.75%	33.90%
	117	106,740	79,251	79,251	74.25%	100.00%
Hertford	5	24,669	77,527	24,669	100.00%	31.82%
Hoke	48	46,952	83,109	46,952	100.00%	56.49%
Hyde	6	5,810	76,421	5,810	100.00%	7.60%
Iredell	84	159,437	77,282	77,282	48.47%	100.00%
	95	159,437	82,155	82,155	51.53%	100.00%
Jackson	119	40,271	75,548	40,271	100.00%	53.31%
Johnston	10	168,878	83,434	7,696	4.56%	9.22%
	26	168,878	83,432	83,432	49.40%	100.00%
	28	168,878	83,431	77,750	46.04%	93.19%
Jones	13	10,153	76,622	10,153	100.00%	13.25%
Lee	51	57,866	83,434	57,866	100.00%	69.36%
Lenoir	12	59,495	75,923	59,495	100.00%	78.36%
Lincoln	97	78,265	78,265	78,265	100.00%	100.00%
Macon	120	33,922	80,814	33,922	100.00%	41.98%
Madison	118	20,764	76,322	20,764	100.00%	27.21%
Martin	23	24,505	81,057	24,505	100.00%	30.23%
McDowell	85	44,996	78,372	44,996	100.00%	57.41%
Mecklenburg	88	919,628	76,022	76,022	8.27%	100.00%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-23.asc', modified 08/28/2017 10:19:32 AM

Data Source: 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File - North Carolina

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG01|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

HBK-23 Lewis - Wake County: County - District

County	District	Total County Pop	Total District Pop	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Mecklenburg	92	919,628	77,172	77,172	8.39%	100.00%
	98	919,628	75,602	75,602	8.22%	100.00%
	99	919,628	77,141	77,141	8.39%	100.00%
	100	919,628	75,589	75,589	8.22%	100.00%
	101	919,628	79,876	79,876	8.69%	100.00%
	102	919,628	77,391	77,391	8.42%	100.00%
	103	919,628	76,381	76,381	8.31%	100.00%
	104	919,628	76,869	76,869	8.36%	100.00%
	105	919,628	75,967	75,967	8.26%	100.00%
	106	919,628	75,762	75,762	8.24%	100.00%
	107	919,628	75,856	75,856	8.25%	100.00%
Mitchell	85	15,579	78,372	15,579	100.00%	19.88%
Montgomery	66	27,798	83,032	27,798	100.00%	33.48%
Moore	52	88,247	76,894	76,894	87.13%	100.00%
	78	88,247	76,980	11,353	12.87%	14.75%
Nash	7	95,840	78,027	78,027	81.41%	100.00%
	25	95,840	78,432	17,813	18.59%	22.71%
New Hanover	18	202,667	77,681	47,513	23.44%	61.16%
	19	202,667	76,666	76,666	37.83%	100.00%
	20	202,667	78,488	78,488	38.73%	100.00%
Northampton	27	22,099	76,790	22,099	100.00%	28.78%
Onslow	4	177,772	81,905	23,400	13.16%	28.57%
	14	177,772	77,065	77,065	43.35%	100.00%
	15	177,772	77,307	77,307	43.49%	100.00%
Orange	50	133,801	80,866	57,147	42.71%	70.67%
	56	133,801	76,654	76,654	57.29%	100.00%
Pamlico	6	13,144	76,421	13,144	100.00%	17.20%
Pasquotank	5	40,661	77,527	40,661	100.00%	52.45%
Pender	16	52,217	81,425	52,217	100.00%	64.13%
Perquimans	1	13,453	77,143	13,453	100.00%	17.44%
Person	2	39,464	82,634	39,464	100.00%	47.76%
Pitt	8	168,148	75,926	75,926	45.15%	100.00%
	9	168,148	75,794	75,794	45.08%	100.00%
	12	168,148	75,923	16,428	9.77%	21.64%
Polk	113	20,510	81,089	20,510	100.00%	25.29%
Randolph	70	141,752	76,125	76,125	53.70%	100.00%
	78	141,752	76,980	65,627	46.30%	85.25%
Richmond	66	46,639	83,032	46,639	100.00%	56.17%
Robeson	46	134,168	80,440	51,550	38.42%	64.09%
	47	134,168	82,618	82,618	61.58%	100.00%
Rockingham	65	93,643	83,430	83,430	89.09%	100.00%
	91	93,643	82,843	10,213	10.91%	12.33%
Rowan	76	138,428	81,908	81,908	59.17%	100.00%
	77	138,428	82,918	41,678	30.11%	50.26%
	83	138,428	81,172	14,842	10.72%	18.28%
Rutherford	112	67,810	79,547	67,810	100.00%	85.25%
Sampson	21	63,431	83,434	15,187	23.94%	18.20%
	22	63,431	83,434	48,244	76.06%	57.82%
Scotland	48	36,157	83,109	36,157	100.00%	43.51%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-23.asc', modified 08/28/2017 10:19:32 AM

Data Source: 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File - North Carolina

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG01|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

HBK-23 Lewis - Wake County: County - District

County	District	Total County Pop	Total District Pop	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Stanly	66	60,585	83,032	8,595	14.19%	10.35%
	67	60,585	82,583	51,990	85.81%	62.95%
Stokes	91	47,401	82,843	47,401	100.00%	57.22%
Surry	90	73,673	82,779	48,444	65.76%	58.52%
	91	73,673	82,843	25,229	34.24%	30.45%
Swain	119	13,981	75,548	13,981	100.00%	18.51%
Transylvania	113	33,090	81,089	33,090	100.00%	40.81%
Tyrrell	1	4,407	77,143	4,407	100.00%	5.71%
Union	55	201,292	75,792	48,844	24.27%	64.44%
	68	201,292	76,067	76,067	37.79%	100.00%
	69	201,292	76,381	76,381	37.95%	100.00%
Vance	32	45,422	83,140	45,422	100.00%	54.63%
Wake	11	900,993	83,266	83,266	9.24%	100.00%
	33	900,993	82,644	82,644	9.17%	100.00%
	34	900,993	77,948	77,948	8.65%	100.00%
	35	900,993	82,728	82,728	9.18%	100.00%
	36	900,993	81,926	81,926	9.09%	100.00%
	37	900,993	81,952	81,952	9.10%	100.00%
	38	900,993	83,061	83,061	9.22%	100.00%
	39	900,993	83,055	83,055	9.22%	100.00%
	40	900,993	80,675	80,675	8.95%	100.00%
	41	900,993	80,739	80,739	8.96%	100.00%
	49	900,993	82,999	82,999	9.21%	100.00%
Warren	32	20,972	83,140	20,972	100.00%	25.22%
Washington	1	13,228	77,143	13,228	100.00%	17.15%
Watauga	93	51,079	78,360	51,079	100.00%	65.19%
Wayne	10	122,623	83,434	54,376	44.34%	65.17%
	21	122,623	83,434	68,247	55.66%	81.80%
Wilkes	90	69,340	82,779	23,180	33.43%	28.00%
	94	69,340	83,358	46,160	66.57%	55.38%
Wilson	24	81,234	81,234	81,234	100.00%	100.00%
Yadkin	73	38,406	78,189	38,406	100.00%	49.12%
Yancey	118	17,818	76,322	17,818	100.00%	23.35%
			Total:	**9,535,483**		

HBK-23 Lewis - Wake County: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Aberdeen	52	6,350	76,894	6,350	100.00%	8.26%
Ahoskie	5	5,039	77,527	5,039	100.00%	6.50%
Alamance	64	951	75,581	951	100.00%	1.26%
Albemarle	66	15,903	83,032	2,814	17.69%	3.39%
	67	15,903	82,583	13,089	82.31%	15.85%
Alliance	6	776	76,421	776	100.00%	1.02%
Andrews	120	1,781	80,814	1,781	100.00%	2.20%
Angier (Harnett)	28	4,247	83,431	4,242	99.88%	5.08%
	53	4,247	83,429	5	0.12%	0.01%
Angier (Wake)	37	103	81,952	103	100.00%	0.13%
Ansonville	55	631	75,792	631	100.00%	0.83%
Apex	11	37,476	83,266	2	0.01%	0.00%
	36	37,476	81,926	7,166	19.12%	8.75%
	37	37,476	81,952	9,982	26.64%	12.18%
	41	37,476	80,739	20,326	54.24%	25.17%
Arapahoe	6	556	76,421	556	100.00%	0.73%
Archdale (Guilford)	59	333	79,907	217	65.17%	0.27%
	60	333	81,856	116	34.83%	0.14%
Archdale (Randolph)	70	11,082	76,125	11,082	100.00%	14.56%
Archer Lodge	26	4,292	83,432	4,292	100.00%	5.14%
Asheboro	70	25,012	76,125	21,327	85.27%	28.02%
	78	25,012	76,980	3,685	14.73%	4.79%
Asheville	114	83,393	82,902	66,182	79.36%	79.83%
	115	83,393	79,883	5,409	6.49%	6.77%
	116	83,393	75,533	11,802	14.15%	15.62%
Askewville	1	241	77,143	241	100.00%	0.31%
Atkinson	16	299	81,425	299	100.00%	0.37%
Atlantic Beach	13	1,495	76,622	1,495	100.00%	1.95%
Aulander	1	895	77,143	895	100.00%	1.16%
Aurora	79	520	75,538	520	100.00%	0.69%
Autryville	22	196	83,434	196	100.00%	0.23%
Ayden	12	4,932	75,923	4,932	100.00%	6.50%
Badin	66	1,974	83,032	1,974	100.00%	2.38%
Bailey	25	569	78,432	569	100.00%	0.73%
Bakersville	85	464	78,372	464	100.00%	0.59%
Bald Head Island	17	158	77,263	158	100.00%	0.20%
Banner Elk	85	1,028	78,372	1,028	100.00%	1.31%
Bath	79	249	75,538	249	100.00%	0.33%
Bayboro	6	1,263	76,421	1,263	100.00%	1.65%
Bear Grass	23	73	81,057	73	100.00%	0.09%
Beaufort	13	4,039	76,622	4,039	100.00%	5.27%
Beech Mountain (Avery)	85	24	78,372	24	100.00%	0.03%
Beech Mountain (Watauga)	93	296	78,360	296	100.00%	0.38%
Belhaven	79	1,688	75,538	1,688	100.00%	2.23%
Belmont	108	10,076	76,926	4,622	45.87%	6.01%
	109	10,076	75,517	5,454	54.13%	7.22%
Belville	18	1,936	77,681	1,936	100.00%	2.49%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-23.asc', modified 08/28/2017 10:19:32 AM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

HBK-23 Lewis - Wake County: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Belwood	111	950	76,148	950	100.00%	1.25%
Benson (Harnett)	53	0	83,429	0	0.00%	0.00%
Benson (Johnston)	28	3,311	83,431	3,311	100.00%	3.97%
Bermuda Run	77	1,725	82,918	1,725	100.00%	2.08%
Bessemer City	110	5,340	75,573	5,340	100.00%	7.07%
Bethania	74	328	79,963	328	100.00%	0.41%
Bethel	8	1,577	75,926	1,577	100.00%	2.08%
Beulaville	4	1,296	81,905	1,296	100.00%	1.58%
Biltmore Forest	116	1,343	75,533	1,343	100.00%	1.78%
Biscoe	66	1,700	83,032	1,700	100.00%	2.05%
Black Creek	24	769	81,234	769	100.00%	0.95%
Black Mountain	115	7,848	79,883	7,848	100.00%	9.82%
Bladenboro	22	1,750	83,434	1,750	100.00%	2.10%
Blowing Rock (Caldwell)	87	49	83,029	49	100.00%	0.06%
Blowing Rock (Watauga)	93	1,192	78,360	1,192	100.00%	1.52%
Boardman	46	157	80,440	157	100.00%	0.20%
Bogue	13	684	76,622	684	100.00%	0.89%
Boiling Spring Lakes	17	5,372	77,263	5,370	99.96%	6.95%
	18	5,372	77,681	2	0.04%	0.00%
Boiling Springs	111	4,647	76,148	4,647	100.00%	6.10%
Bolivia	18	143	77,681	143	100.00%	0.18%
Bolton	16	691	81,425	691	100.00%	0.85%
Boone	93	17,122	78,360	17,122	100.00%	21.85%
Boonville	73	1,222	78,189	1,222	100.00%	1.56%
Bostic	112	386	79,547	386	100.00%	0.49%
Brevard	113	7,609	81,089	7,609	100.00%	9.38%
Bridgeton	79	454	75,538	454	100.00%	0.60%
Broadway (Harnett)	53	25	83,429	25	100.00%	0.03%
Broadway (Lee)	51	1,204	83,434	1,204	100.00%	1.44%
Brookford	89	382	77,838	321	84.03%	0.41%
	96	382	76,520	61	15.97%	0.08%
Brunswick	16	1,119	81,425	1,119	100.00%	1.37%
Bryson City	119	1,424	75,548	1,424	100.00%	1.88%
Bunn	25	344	78,432	344	100.00%	0.44%
Burgaw	16	3,872	81,425	3,872	100.00%	4.76%
Burlington (Alamance)	63	49,308	75,550	23,248	47.15%	30.77%
	64	49,308	75,581	26,060	52.85%	34.48%
Burlington (Guilford)	59	655	79,907	655	100.00%	0.82%
Burnsville	118	1,693	76,322	1,693	100.00%	2.22%
Butner	2	7,591	82,634	7,591	100.00%	9.19%
Cajah's Mountain	87	2,823	83,029	2,823	100.00%	3.40%
Calabash	17	1,786	77,263	1,786	100.00%	2.31%
Calypso	4	538	81,905	538	100.00%	0.66%
Cameron	52	285	76,894	285	100.00%	0.37%
Candor	66	840	83,032	840	100.00%	1.01%
Canton	118	4,227	76,322	4,227	100.00%	5.54%
Cape Carteret	13	1,917	76,622	1,917	100.00%	2.50%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-23.asc', modified 08/28/2017 10:19:32 AM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

HBK-23 Lewis - Wake County: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Carolina Beach	19	5,706	76,666	5,706	100.00%	7.44%
Carolina Shores	17	3,048	77,263	3,048	100.00%	3.94%
Carrboro	50	19,582	80,866	81	0.41%	0.10%
	56	19,582	76,654	19,501	99.59%	25.44%
Carthage	52	2,205	76,894	6	0.27%	0.01%
	78	2,205	76,980	2,199	99.73%	2.86%
Cary (Chatham)	54	1,422	82,312	1,422	100.00%	1.73%
Cary (Wake)	11	133,812	83,266	44,038	32.91%	52.89%
	36	133,812	81,926	19,380	14.48%	23.66%
	37	133,812	81,952	2,024	1.51%	2.47%
	41	133,812	80,739	46,234	34.55%	57.26%
	49	133,812	82,999	22,136	16.54%	26.67%
Casar	111	297	76,148	297	100.00%	0.39%
Castalia	7	268	78,027	268	100.00%	0.34%
Caswell Beach	17	398	77,263	398	100.00%	0.52%
Catawba	89	603	77,838	603	100.00%	0.77%
Cedar Point	13	1,279	76,622	1,279	100.00%	1.67%
Cedar Rock	87	300	83,029	300	100.00%	0.36%
Centerville	25	89	78,432	89	100.00%	0.11%
Cerro Gordo	46	207	80,440	207	100.00%	0.26%
Chadbourn	46	1,856	80,440	1,856	100.00%	2.31%
Chapel Hill (Durham)	29	2,836	82,735	2,234	78.77%	2.70%
	54	2,836	82,312	602	21.23%	0.73%
Chapel Hill (Orange)	50	54,397	80,866	2,280	4.19%	2.82%
	56	54,397	76,654	52,117	95.81%	67.99%
Charlotte	88	731,424	76,022	72,044	9.85%	94.77%
	92	731,424	77,172	57,603	7.88%	74.64%
	98	731,424	75,602	0	0.00%	0.00%
	99	731,424	77,141	67,000	9.16%	86.85%
	100	731,424	75,589	64,757	8.85%	85.67%
	101	731,424	79,876	71,339	9.75%	89.31%
	102	731,424	77,391	77,391	10.58%	100.00%
	103	731,424	76,381	30,850	4.22%	40.39%
	104	731,424	76,869	76,869	10.51%	100.00%
	105	731,424	75,967	75,967	10.39%	100.00%
	106	731,424	75,762	74,391	10.17%	98.19%
	107	731,424	75,856	63,213	8.64%	83.33%
Cherryville	110	5,760	75,573	5,760	100.00%	7.62%
Chimney Rock Village	112	113	79,547	113	100.00%	0.14%
China Grove	83	3,563	81,172	3,563	100.00%	4.39%
Chocowinity	79	820	75,538	820	100.00%	1.09%
Claremont	89	1,352	77,838	1,352	100.00%	1.74%
Clarkton	22	837	83,434	837	100.00%	1.00%
Clayton (Johnston)	26	16,116	83,432	16,116	100.00%	19.32%
Clayton (Wake)	39	0	83,055	0	0.00%	0.00%
Clemmons	73	18,627	78,189	6,625	35.57%	8.47%
	75	18,627	78,886	12,002	64.43%	15.21%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-23.asc', modified 08/28/2017 10:19:32 AM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

HBK-23 Lewis - Wake County: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Cleveland	77	871	82,918	871	100.00%	1.05%
Clinton	21	8,639	83,434	4,242	49.10%	5.08%
	22	8,639	83,434	4,397	50.90%	5.27%
Clyde	118	1,223	76,322	1,223	100.00%	1.60%
Coats	53	2,112	83,429	2,112	100.00%	2.53%
Cofield	5	413	77,527	413	100.00%	0.53%
Colerain	1	204	77,143	204	100.00%	0.26%
Columbia	1	891	77,143	891	100.00%	1.15%
Columbus	113	999	81,089	999	100.00%	1.23%
Como	5	91	77,527	91	100.00%	0.12%
Concord	67	79,066	82,583	0	0.00%	0.00%
	82	79,066	81,088	40,818	51.63%	50.34%
	83	79,066	81,172	38,248	48.37%	47.12%
Conetoe	23	294	81,057	294	100.00%	0.36%
Connelly Springs	86	1,669	79,175	1,669	100.00%	2.11%
Conover	89	8,165	77,838	384	4.70%	0.49%
	96	8,165	76,520	7,781	95.30%	10.17%
Conway	27	836	76,790	836	100.00%	1.09%
Cooleemee	77	960	82,918	960	100.00%	1.16%
Cornelius	98	24,866	75,602	24,866	100.00%	32.89%
Cove City	79	399	75,538	399	100.00%	0.53%
Cramerton	108	4,165	76,926	1	0.02%	0.00%
	109	4,165	75,517	4,164	99.98%	5.51%
Creedmoor	2	4,124	82,634	4,124	100.00%	4.99%
Creswell	1	276	77,143	276	100.00%	0.36%
Crossnore	85	192	78,372	192	100.00%	0.24%
Dallas	110	4,488	75,573	4,488	100.00%	5.94%
Danbury	91	189	82,843	189	100.00%	0.23%
Davidson (Iredell)	95	294	82,155	294	100.00%	0.36%
Davidson (Mecklenburg)	98	10,650	75,602	10,650	100.00%	14.09%
Dellview	110	13	75,573	13	100.00%	0.02%
Denton	80	1,636	81,522	1,636	100.00%	2.01%
Dillsboro	119	232	75,548	232	100.00%	0.31%
Dobbins Heights	66	866	83,032	866	100.00%	1.04%
Dobson	90	1,586	82,779	1,436	90.54%	1.73%
	91	1,586	82,843	150	9.46%	0.18%
Dortches	7	935	78,027	935	100.00%	1.20%
Dover	79	401	75,538	401	100.00%	0.53%
Drexel	86	1,858	79,175	1,858	100.00%	2.35%
Dublin	22	338	83,434	338	100.00%	0.41%
Duck	6	369	76,421	369	100.00%	0.48%
Dunn	53	9,263	83,429	9,263	100.00%	11.10%
Durham (Durham)	29	228,300	82,735	79,803	34.96%	96.46%
	30	228,300	83,272	60,805	26.63%	73.02%
	31	228,300	82,773	71,653	31.39%	86.57%
	54	228,300	82,312	16,039	7.03%	19.49%
Durham (Orange)	50	30	80,866	30	100.00%	0.04%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-23.asc', modified 08/28/2017 10:19:32 AM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

HBK-23 Lewis - Wake County: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Durham (Wake)	41	0	80,739	0	0.00%	0.00%
Earl	111	260	76,148	260	100.00%	0.34%
East Arcadia	22	487	83,434	487	100.00%	0.58%
East Bend	73	612	78,189	612	100.00%	0.78%
East Laurinburg	48	300	83,109	300	100.00%	0.36%
East Spencer	76	1,534	81,908	1,534	100.00%	1.87%
Eastover	45	3,628	79,294	3,628	100.00%	4.58%
Eden	65	15,527	83,430	15,527	100.00%	18.61%
Edenton	1	5,004	77,143	5,004	100.00%	6.49%
Elizabeth City (Camden)	1	45	77,143	45	100.00%	0.06%
Elizabeth City (Pasquotank)	5	18,638	77,527	18,638	100.00%	24.04%
Elizabethtown	22	3,583	83,434	3,583	100.00%	4.29%
Elk Park	85	452	78,372	452	100.00%	0.58%
Elkin (Surry)	90	3,921	82,779	3,921	100.00%	4.74%
Elkin (Wilkes)	94	80	83,358	80	100.00%	0.10%
Ellenboro	112	873	79,547	873	100.00%	1.10%
Ellerbe	66	1,054	83,032	1,054	100.00%	1.27%
Elm City	24	1,298	81,234	1,298	100.00%	1.60%
Elon	64	9,419	75,581	9,419	100.00%	12.46%
Emerald Isle	13	3,655	76,622	3,655	100.00%	4.77%
Enfield	27	2,532	76,790	2,532	100.00%	3.30%
Erwin	53	4,405	83,429	4,405	100.00%	5.28%
Eureka	10	197	83,434	197	100.00%	0.24%
Everetts	23	164	81,057	164	100.00%	0.20%
Fair Bluff	46	951	80,440	951	100.00%	1.18%
Fairmont	47	2,663	82,618	2,663	100.00%	3.22%
Fairview	55	3,324	75,792	3,324	100.00%	4.39%
Faison (Duplin)	4	961	81,905	961	100.00%	1.17%
Faison (Sampson)	21	0	83,434	0	0.00%	0.00%
Faith	76	807	81,908	807	100.00%	0.99%
Falcon (Cumberland)	45	258	79,294	258	100.00%	0.33%
Falcon (Sampson)	22	0	83,434	0	0.00%	0.00%
Falkland	8	96	75,926	96	100.00%	0.13%
Fallston	111	607	76,148	607	100.00%	0.80%
Farmville	8	4,654	75,926	4,654	100.00%	6.13%
Fayetteville	42	200,564	81,439	67,394	33.60%	82.75%
	43	200,564	77,725	74,393	37.09%	95.71%
	44	200,564	80,973	51,354	25.60%	63.42%
	45	200,564	79,294	7,423	3.70%	9.36%
Flat Rock	113	3,114	81,089	3,114	100.00%	3.84%
Fletcher	117	7,187	79,251	7,187	100.00%	9.07%
Forest City	112	7,476	79,547	7,476	100.00%	9.40%
Forest Hills	119	365	75,548	365	100.00%	0.48%
Fountain	8	427	75,926	427	100.00%	0.56%
Four Oaks	28	1,921	83,431	1,921	100.00%	2.30%
Foxfire	52	902	76,894	902	100.00%	1.17%
Franklin	120	3,845	80,814	3,845	100.00%	4.76%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-23.asc', modified 08/28/2017 10:19:32 AM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

HBK-23 Lewis - Wake County: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Franklinton	25	2,023	78,432	2,023	100.00%	2.58%
Franklinville	78	1,164	76,980	1,164	100.00%	1.51%
Fremont	10	1,255	83,434	1,255	100.00%	1.50%
Fuquay-Varina	36	17,937	81,926	228	1.27%	0.28%
	37	17,937	81,952	17,709	98.73%	21.61%
Gamewell	87	4,051	83,029	4,051	100.00%	4.88%
Garland	22	625	83,434	625	100.00%	0.75%
Garner	33	25,745	82,644	21,922	85.15%	26.53%
	36	25,745	81,926	3,823	14.85%	4.67%
Garysburg	27	1,057	76,790	1,057	100.00%	1.38%
Gaston	27	1,152	76,790	1,152	100.00%	1.50%
Gastonia	108	71,741	76,926	26,870	37.45%	34.93%
	109	71,741	75,517	41,847	58.33%	55.41%
	110	71,741	75,573	3,024	4.22%	4.00%
Gatesville	5	321	77,527	321	100.00%	0.41%
Gibson	48	540	83,109	540	100.00%	0.65%
Gibsonville (Alamance)	64	3,148	75,581	3,148	100.00%	4.17%
Gibsonville (Guilford)	59	3,262	79,907	3,262	100.00%	4.08%
Glen Alpine	86	1,517	79,175	1,517	100.00%	1.92%
Godwin	45	139	79,294	139	100.00%	0.18%
Goldsboro	10	36,437	83,434	2,531	6.95%	3.03%
	21	36,437	83,434	33,906	93.05%	40.64%
Goldston	54	268	82,312	268	100.00%	0.33%
Graham	63	14,153	75,550	14,153	100.00%	18.73%
Grandfather	85	25	78,372	25	100.00%	0.03%
Granite Falls	87	4,722	83,029	4,722	100.00%	5.69%
Granite Quarry	76	2,930	81,908	2,930	100.00%	3.58%
Grantsboro	6	688	76,421	688	100.00%	0.90%
Green Level	63	2,100	75,550	2,100	100.00%	2.78%
Greenevers	4	634	81,905	634	100.00%	0.77%
Greensboro	57	269,666	82,755	80,164	29.73%	96.87%
	58	269,666	82,137	76,171	28.25%	92.74%
	59	269,666	79,907	11,283	4.18%	14.12%
	60	269,666	81,856	14,170	5.25%	17.31%
	61	269,666	81,019	36,131	13.40%	44.60%
	62	269,666	80,732	51,747	19.19%	64.10%
Greenville	8	84,554	75,926	48,780	57.69%	64.25%
	9	84,554	75,794	34,649	40.98%	45.71%
	12	84,554	75,923	1,125	1.33%	1.48%
Grifton (Lenoir)	12	186	75,923	186	100.00%	0.24%
Grifton (Pitt)	12	2,431	75,923	2,431	100.00%	3.20%
Grimesland	9	441	75,794	441	100.00%	0.58%
Grover	111	708	76,148	708	100.00%	0.93%
Halifax	27	234	76,790	234	100.00%	0.30%
Hamilton	23	408	81,057	408	100.00%	0.50%
Hamlet	66	6,495	83,032	6,495	100.00%	7.82%
Harmony	84	531	77,282	531	100.00%	0.69%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-23.asc', modified 08/28/2017 10:19:32 AM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

HBK-23 Lewis - Wake County: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Harrells (Duplin)	4	23	81,905	23	100.00%	0.03%
Harrells (Sampson)	22	179	83,434	179	100.00%	0.21%
Harrellsville	5	106	77,527	106	100.00%	0.14%
Harrisburg	67	11,526	82,583	3,156	27.38%	3.82%
	82	11,526	81,088	8,335	72.31%	10.28%
	83	11,526	81,172	35	0.30%	0.04%
Hassell	23	84	81,057	84	100.00%	0.10%
Havelock	3	20,735	75,726	20,735	100.00%	27.38%
Haw River	63	2,298	75,550	2,254	98.09%	2.98%
	64	2,298	75,581	44	1.91%	0.06%
Hayesville	120	311	80,814	311	100.00%	0.38%
Hemby Bridge	69	1,520	76,381	1,520	100.00%	1.99%
Henderson	32	15,368	83,140	15,368	100.00%	18.48%
Hendersonville	113	13,137	81,089	514	3.91%	0.63%
	117	13,137	79,251	12,623	96.09%	15.93%
Hertford	1	2,143	77,143	2,143	100.00%	2.78%
Hickory (Burke)	86	66	79,175	66	100.00%	0.08%
Hickory (Caldwell)	87	18	83,029	18	100.00%	0.02%
Hickory (Catawba)	89	39,926	77,838	5,448	13.65%	7.00%
	96	39,926	76,520	34,478	86.35%	45.06%
High Point (Davidson)	80	5,310	81,522	5,310	100.00%	6.51%
High Point (Forsyth)	75	8	78,886	8	100.00%	0.01%
High Point (Guilford)	59	99,042	79,907	33	0.03%	0.04%
	60	99,042	81,856	59,653	60.23%	72.88%
	61	99,042	81,019	39,356	39.74%	48.58%
High Point (Randolph)	70	11	76,125	11	100.00%	0.01%
High Shoals	110	696	75,573	696	100.00%	0.92%
Highlands (Jackson)	119	4	75,548	4	100.00%	0.01%
Highlands (Macon)	120	920	80,814	920	100.00%	1.14%
Hildebran	86	2,023	79,175	2,023	100.00%	2.56%
Hillsborough	50	6,087	80,866	6,087	100.00%	7.53%
Hobgood	27	348	76,790	348	100.00%	0.45%
Hoffman	66	588	83,032	588	100.00%	0.71%
Holden Beach	17	575	77,263	575	100.00%	0.74%
Holly Ridge	15	1,268	77,307	1,268	100.00%	1.64%
Holly Springs	37	24,661	81,952	24,661	100.00%	30.09%
Hookerton	10	409	83,434	409	100.00%	0.49%
Hope Mills	44	15,176	80,973	5,976	39.38%	7.38%
	45	15,176	79,294	9,200	60.62%	11.60%
Hot Springs	118	560	76,322	560	100.00%	0.73%
Hudson	87	3,776	83,029	3,776	100.00%	4.55%
Huntersville	98	46,773	75,602	36,997	79.10%	48.94%
	107	46,773	75,856	9,776	20.90%	12.89%
Indian Beach	13	112	76,622	112	100.00%	0.15%
Indian Trail	55	33,518	75,792	51	0.15%	0.07%
	68	33,518	76,067	7,845	23.41%	10.31%
	69	33,518	76,381	25,622	76.44%	33.54%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-23.asc', modified 08/28/2017 10:19:32 AM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

HBK-23 Lewis - Wake County: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Jackson	27	513	76,790	513	100.00%	0.67%
Jacksonville	14	70,145	77,065	27,897	39.77%	36.20%
	15	70,145	77,307	42,248	60.23%	54.65%
Jamestown	58	3,382	82,137	0	0.00%	0.00%
	59	3,382	79,907	4	0.12%	0.01%
	60	3,382	81,856	3,378	99.88%	4.13%
Jamesville	23	491	81,057	491	100.00%	0.61%
Jefferson	93	1,611	78,360	1,611	100.00%	2.06%
Jonesville	73	2,285	78,189	2,285	100.00%	2.92%
Kannapolis (Cabarrus)	82	33,194	81,088	20,175	60.78%	24.88%
	83	33,194	81,172	13,019	39.22%	16.04%
Kannapolis (Rowan)	77	9,431	82,918	5,529	58.63%	6.67%
	83	9,431	81,172	3,902	41.37%	4.81%
Kelford	1	251	77,143	251	100.00%	0.33%
Kenansville	4	855	81,905	855	100.00%	1.04%
Kenly (Johnston)	28	1,176	83,431	1,176	100.00%	1.41%
Kenly (Wilson)	24	163	81,234	163	100.00%	0.20%
Kernersville (Forsyth)	74	23,071	79,963	5,280	22.89%	6.60%
	75	23,071	78,886	17,791	77.11%	22.55%
Kernersville (Guilford)	61	52	81,019	52	100.00%	0.06%
Kill Devil Hills	6	6,683	76,421	6,683	100.00%	8.74%
King (Forsyth)	74	619	79,963	619	100.00%	0.77%
King (Stokes)	91	6,285	82,843	6,285	100.00%	7.59%
Kings Mountain (Cleveland)	110	9,242	75,573	0	0.00%	0.00%
	111	9,242	76,148	9,242	100.00%	12.14%
Kings Mountain (Gaston)	110	1,054	75,573	1,054	100.00%	1.39%
Kingstown	111	681	76,148	681	100.00%	0.89%
Kinston	12	21,677	75,923	21,677	100.00%	28.55%
Kittrell	32	467	83,140	467	100.00%	0.56%
Kitty Hawk	6	3,272	76,421	3,272	100.00%	4.28%
Knightdale	39	11,401	83,055	11,401	100.00%	13.73%
Kure Beach	19	2,012	76,666	2,012	100.00%	2.62%
La Grange	12	2,873	75,923	2,873	100.00%	3.78%
Lake Lure	112	1,192	79,547	1,192	100.00%	1.50%
Lake Park	69	3,422	76,381	3,422	100.00%	4.48%
Lake Santeetlah	120	45	80,814	45	100.00%	0.06%
Lake Waccamaw	16	1,480	81,425	1,480	100.00%	1.82%
Landis	77	3,109	82,918	1,773	57.03%	2.14%
	83	3,109	81,172	1,336	42.97%	1.65%
Lansing	93	158	78,360	158	100.00%	0.20%
Lasker	27	122	76,790	122	100.00%	0.16%
Lattimore	111	488	76,148	488	100.00%	0.64%
Laurel Park	113	2,180	81,089	2	0.09%	0.00%
	117	2,180	79,251	2,178	99.91%	2.75%
Laurinburg	48	15,962	83,109	15,962	100.00%	19.21%
Lawndale	111	606	76,148	606	100.00%	0.80%
Leggett	23	60	81,057	60	100.00%	0.07%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-23.asc', modified 08/28/2017 10:19:32 AM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

HBK-23 Lewis - Wake County: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Leland	17	13,527	77,263	2,631	19.45%	3.41%
	18	13,527	77,681	10,896	80.55%	14.03%
Lenoir	87	18,228	83,029	18,228	100.00%	21.95%
Lewiston Woodville	1	549	77,143	549	100.00%	0.71%
Lewisville	73	12,639	78,189	10,883	86.11%	13.92%
	74	12,639	79,963	1,756	13.89%	2.20%
Lexington	80	18,931	81,522	0	0.00%	0.00%
	81	18,931	81,356	18,931	100.00%	23.27%
Liberty	78	2,656	76,980	2,656	100.00%	3.45%
Lilesville	55	536	75,792	536	100.00%	0.71%
Lillington	53	3,194	83,429	3,194	100.00%	3.83%
Lincolnton	97	10,486	78,265	10,486	100.00%	13.40%
Linden	45	130	79,294	130	100.00%	0.16%
Littleton	27	674	76,790	674	100.00%	0.88%
Locust (Cabarrus)	67	215	82,583	215	100.00%	0.26%
Locust (Stanly)	67	2,715	82,583	2,715	100.00%	3.29%
Long View (Burke)	86	752	79,175	752	100.00%	0.95%
Long View (Catawba)	96	4,119	76,520	4,119	100.00%	5.38%
Louisburg	25	3,359	78,432	3,359	100.00%	4.28%
Love Valley	84	90	77,282	90	100.00%	0.12%
Lowell	108	3,526	76,926	3,526	100.00%	4.58%
Lucama	24	1,108	81,234	1,108	100.00%	1.36%
Lumber Bridge	46	94	80,440	94	100.00%	0.12%
Lumberton	46	21,542	80,440	5,785	26.85%	7.19%
	47	21,542	82,618	15,757	73.15%	19.07%
Macclesfield	23	471	81,057	471	100.00%	0.58%
Macon	32	119	83,140	119	100.00%	0.14%
Madison	91	2,246	82,843	2,246	100.00%	2.71%
Maggie Valley	118	1,150	76,322	1,039	90.35%	1.36%
	119	1,150	75,548	111	9.65%	0.15%
Magnolia	4	939	81,905	939	100.00%	1.15%
Maiden (Catawba)	89	3,308	77,838	3,308	100.00%	4.25%
Maiden (Lincoln)	97	2	78,265	2	100.00%	0.00%
Manteo	6	1,434	76,421	1,434	100.00%	1.88%
Marietta	46	175	80,440	175	100.00%	0.22%
Marion	85	7,838	78,372	7,838	100.00%	10.00%
Mars Hill	118	1,869	76,322	1,869	100.00%	2.45%
Marshall	118	872	76,322	872	100.00%	1.14%
Marshville	55	2,402	75,792	2,402	100.00%	3.17%
Marvin	68	5,579	76,067	5,579	100.00%	7.33%
Matthews	103	27,198	76,381	27,198	100.00%	35.61%
Maxton (Robeson)	47	2,230	82,618	2,230	100.00%	2.70%
Maxton (Scotland)	48	196	83,109	196	100.00%	0.24%
Mayodan	91	2,478	82,843	2,478	100.00%	2.99%
Maysville	13	1,019	76,622	1,019	100.00%	1.33%
McAdenville	108	651	76,926	651	100.00%	0.85%
McDonald	47	113	82,618	113	100.00%	0.14%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-23.asc', modified 08/28/2017 10:19:32 AM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

HBK-23 Lewis - Wake County: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
McFarlan	55	117	75,792	117	100.00%	0.15%
Mebane (Alamance)	63	9,600	75,550	9,600	100.00%	12.71%
Mebane (Orange)	50	1,793	80,866	1,793	100.00%	2.22%
Mesic	6	220	76,421	220	100.00%	0.29%
Micro	28	441	83,431	441	100.00%	0.53%
Middleburg	32	133	83,140	133	100.00%	0.16%
Middlesex	25	822	78,432	822	100.00%	1.05%
Midland (Cabarrus)	67	3,073	82,583	3,073	100.00%	3.72%
Midland (Mecklenburg)	103	0	76,381	0	0.00%	0.00%
Midway	80	4,679	81,522	3,504	74.89%	4.30%
	81	4,679	81,356	1,175	25.11%	1.44%
Mills River	113	6,802	81,089	300	4.41%	0.37%
	117	6,802	79,251	6,502	95.59%	8.20%
Milton	50	166	80,866	166	100.00%	0.21%
Mineral Springs	55	2,639	75,792	688	26.07%	0.91%
	68	2,639	76,067	1,951	73.93%	2.56%
Minnesott Beach	6	440	76,421	440	100.00%	0.58%
Mint Hill (Mecklenburg)	100	22,669	75,589	7,784	34.34%	10.30%
	103	22,669	76,381	14,885	65.66%	19.49%
Mint Hill (Union)	69	53	76,381	53	100.00%	0.07%
Misenheimer	67	728	82,583	728	100.00%	0.88%
Mocksville	77	5,051	82,918	5,051	100.00%	6.09%
Momeyer	7	224	78,027	224	100.00%	0.29%
Monroe	55	32,797	75,792	3,133	9.55%	4.13%
	68	32,797	76,067	13,278	40.49%	17.46%
	69	32,797	76,381	16,386	49.96%	21.45%
Montreat	115	723	79,883	723	100.00%	0.91%
Mooresboro	111	311	76,148	311	100.00%	0.41%
Mooresville	95	32,711	82,155	32,711	100.00%	39.82%
Morehead City	13	8,661	76,622	8,661	100.00%	11.30%
Morganton	86	16,918	79,175	16,918	100.00%	21.37%
Morrisville (Durham)	31	0	82,773	0	0.00%	0.00%
Morrisville (Wake)	41	18,576	80,739	11,226	60.43%	13.90%
	49	18,576	82,999	7,350	39.57%	8.86%
Morven	55	511	75,792	511	100.00%	0.67%
Mount Airy	90	10,388	82,779	10,388	100.00%	12.55%
Mount Gilead	66	1,181	83,032	1,181	100.00%	1.42%
Mount Holly	108	13,656	76,926	13,656	100.00%	17.75%
Mount Olive (Duplin)	4	51	81,905	51	100.00%	0.06%
Mount Olive (Wayne)	21	4,538	83,434	4,538	100.00%	5.44%
Mount Pleasant	67	1,652	82,583	1,652	100.00%	2.00%
Murfreesboro	5	2,835	77,527	2,835	100.00%	3.66%
Murphy	120	1,627	80,814	1,627	100.00%	2.01%
Nags Head	6	2,757	76,421	2,757	100.00%	3.61%
Nashville	7	5,352	78,027	5,352	100.00%	6.86%
Navassa	18	1,505	77,681	1,505	100.00%	1.94%
New Bern	3	29,524	75,726	27,063	91.66%	35.74%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-23.asc', modified 08/28/2017 10:19:32 AM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

HBK-23 Lewis - Wake County: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
New Bern	79	29,524	75,538	2,461	8.34%	3.26%
New London	67	600	82,583	600	100.00%	0.73%
Newland	85	698	78,372	698	100.00%	0.89%
Newport	13	4,150	76,622	4,150	100.00%	5.42%
Newton	89	12,968	77,838	12,968	100.00%	16.66%
	96	12,968	76,520	0	0.00%	0.00%
Newton Grove	22	569	83,434	569	100.00%	0.68%
Norlina	32	1,118	83,140	1,118	100.00%	1.34%
Norman	66	138	83,032	138	100.00%	0.17%
North Topsail Beach	15	743	77,307	743	100.00%	0.96%
North Wilkesboro	90	4,245	82,779	5	0.12%	0.01%
	94	4,245	83,358	4,240	99.88%	5.09%
Northwest	18	735	77,681	735	100.00%	0.95%
Norwood	67	2,379	82,583	2,379	100.00%	2.88%
Oak City	23	317	81,057	317	100.00%	0.39%
Oak Island	17	6,783	77,263	6,783	100.00%	8.78%
Oak Ridge	62	6,185	80,732	6,185	100.00%	7.66%
Oakboro	67	1,859	82,583	1,859	100.00%	2.25%
Ocean Isle Beach	17	550	77,263	550	100.00%	0.71%
Old Fort	85	908	78,372	908	100.00%	1.16%
Oriental	6	900	76,421	900	100.00%	1.18%
Orrum	46	91	80,440	91	100.00%	0.11%
Ossipee	64	543	75,581	543	100.00%	0.72%
Oxford	2	8,461	82,634	239	2.82%	0.29%
	32	8,461	83,140	8,222	97.18%	9.89%
Pantego	79	179	75,538	179	100.00%	0.24%
Parkton	46	436	80,440	436	100.00%	0.54%
Parmele	23	278	81,057	278	100.00%	0.34%
Patterson Springs	111	622	76,148	622	100.00%	0.82%
Peachland	55	437	75,792	437	100.00%	0.58%
Peletier	13	644	76,622	644	100.00%	0.84%
Pembroke	47	2,973	82,618	2,973	100.00%	3.60%
Pikeville	10	678	83,434	678	100.00%	0.81%
Pilot Mountain	91	1,477	82,843	1,477	100.00%	1.78%
Pine Knoll Shores	13	1,339	76,622	1,339	100.00%	1.75%
Pine Level	28	1,700	83,431	1,700	100.00%	2.04%
Pinebluff	52	1,337	76,894	1,337	100.00%	1.74%
Pinehurst	52	13,124	76,894	13,124	100.00%	17.07%
Pinetops	23	1,374	81,057	1,374	100.00%	1.70%
Pineville	92	7,479	77,172	7,479	100.00%	9.69%
	104	7,479	76,869	0	0.00%	0.00%
Pink Hill	12	552	75,923	552	100.00%	0.73%
Pittsboro	54	3,743	82,312	3,743	100.00%	4.55%
Pleasant Garden	59	4,489	79,907	4,489	100.00%	5.62%
Plymouth	1	3,878	77,143	3,878	100.00%	5.03%
Polkton	55	3,375	75,792	3,375	100.00%	4.45%
Polkville	111	545	76,148	545	100.00%	0.72%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-23.asc', modified 08/28/2017 10:19:32 AM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

HBK-23 Lewis - Wake County: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Pollocksville	13	311	76,622	311	100.00%	0.41%
Powellsville	1	276	77,143	276	100.00%	0.36%
Princeton	10	1,194	83,434	1,194	100.00%	1.43%
Princeville	23	2,082	81,057	2,082	100.00%	2.57%
Proctorville	46	117	80,440	117	100.00%	0.15%
Raeford	48	4,611	83,109	4,611	100.00%	5.55%
Raleigh (Durham)	31	1,067	82,773	1,067	100.00%	1.29%
Raleigh (Wake)	11	402,825	83,266	37,217	9.24%	44.70%
	33	402,825	82,644	54,577	13.55%	66.04%
	34	402,825	77,948	77,331	19.20%	99.21%
	35	402,825	82,728	27,414	6.81%	33.14%
	36	402,825	81,926	6	0.00%	0.01%
	38	402,825	83,061	81,167	20.15%	97.72%
	39	402,825	83,055	31,384	7.79%	37.79%
	40	402,825	80,675	42,647	10.59%	52.86%
	49	402,825	82,999	51,082	12.68%	61.55%
Ramseur	78	1,692	76,980	1,692	100.00%	2.20%
Randleman	70	4,113	76,125	4,113	100.00%	5.40%
Ranlo	108	3,434	76,926	3,434	100.00%	4.46%
	110	3,434	75,573	0	0.00%	0.00%
Raynham	47	72	82,618	72	100.00%	0.09%
Red Cross	67	742	82,583	742	100.00%	0.90%
Red Oak	7	3,430	78,027	3,430	100.00%	4.40%
Red Springs (Hoke)	48	0	83,109	0	0.00%	0.00%
Red Springs (Robeson)	47	3,428	82,618	3,428	100.00%	4.15%
Reidsville	65	14,520	83,430	14,520	100.00%	17.40%
Rennert	46	383	80,440	383	100.00%	0.48%
Rhodhiss (Burke)	86	700	79,175	700	100.00%	0.88%
Rhodhiss (Caldwell)	87	370	83,029	370	100.00%	0.45%
Rich Square	27	958	76,790	958	100.00%	1.25%
Richfield	67	613	82,583	613	100.00%	0.74%
Richlands	4	1,520	81,905	1,520	100.00%	1.86%
River Bend	3	3,119	75,726	3,119	100.00%	4.12%
Roanoke Rapids	27	15,754	76,790	15,754	100.00%	20.52%
Robbins	52	1,097	76,894	1,097	100.00%	1.43%
	78	1,097	76,980	0	0.00%	0.00%
Robbinsville	120	620	80,814	620	100.00%	0.77%
Robersonville	23	1,488	81,057	1,488	100.00%	1.84%
Rockingham	66	9,558	83,032	9,558	100.00%	11.51%
Rockwell	76	2,108	81,908	2,108	100.00%	2.57%
Rocky Mount (Edgecombe)	23	17,524	81,057	17,524	100.00%	21.62%
Rocky Mount (Nash)	7	39,953	78,027	39,953	100.00%	51.20%
Rolesville	35	3,786	82,728	3,786	100.00%	4.58%
Ronda	90	417	82,779	417	100.00%	0.50%
Roper	1	611	77,143	611	100.00%	0.79%
Rose Hill	4	1,626	81,905	1,626	100.00%	1.99%
Roseboro	22	1,191	83,434	1,191	100.00%	1.43%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-23.asc', modified 08/28/2017 10:19:32 AM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

HBK-23 Lewis - Wake County: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Rosman	113	576	81,089	576	100.00%	0.71%
Rowland	47	1,037	82,618	1,037	100.00%	1.26%
Roxboro	2	8,362	82,634	8,362	100.00%	10.12%
Roxobel	1	240	77,143	240	100.00%	0.31%
Rural Hall	74	2,937	79,963	2,937	100.00%	3.67%
Ruth	112	440	79,547	440	100.00%	0.55%
Rutherford College	86	1,341	79,175	1,341	100.00%	1.69%
Rutherfordton	112	4,213	79,547	4,213	100.00%	5.30%
Salemburg	22	435	83,434	435	100.00%	0.52%
Salisbury	76	33,662	81,908	31,445	93.41%	38.39%
	77	33,662	82,918	2,217	6.59%	2.67%
Saluda (Henderson)	113	12	81,089	12	100.00%	0.01%
Saluda (Polk)	113	701	81,089	701	100.00%	0.86%
Sandy Creek	18	260	77,681	260	100.00%	0.33%
Sandyfield	16	447	81,425	447	100.00%	0.55%
Sanford	51	28,094	83,434	28,094	100.00%	33.67%
Saratoga	24	408	81,234	408	100.00%	0.50%
Sawmills	87	5,240	83,029	5,240	100.00%	6.31%
Scotland Neck	27	2,059	76,790	2,059	100.00%	2.68%
Seaboard	27	632	76,790	632	100.00%	0.82%
Seagrove	78	228	76,980	228	100.00%	0.30%
Sedalia	59	623	79,907	623	100.00%	0.78%
Selma	28	6,073	83,431	6,073	100.00%	7.28%
Seven Devils (Avery)	85	28	78,372	28	100.00%	0.04%
Seven Devils (Watauga)	93	164	78,360	164	100.00%	0.21%
Seven Springs	10	110	83,434	110	100.00%	0.13%
Severn	27	276	76,790	276	100.00%	0.36%
Shallotte	17	3,675	77,263	3,675	100.00%	4.76%
Sharpsburg (Edgecombe)	23	209	81,057	209	100.00%	0.26%
Sharpsburg (Nash)	7	1,252	78,027	1,252	100.00%	1.60%
Sharpsburg (Wilson)	24	563	81,234	563	100.00%	0.69%
Shelby	110	20,323	75,573	11,240	55.31%	14.87%
	111	20,323	76,148	9,083	44.69%	11.93%
Siler City	54	7,887	82,312	7,887	100.00%	9.58%
Simpson	9	416	75,794	416	100.00%	0.55%
Sims	24	282	81,234	282	100.00%	0.35%
Smithfield	26	10,966	83,432	2,993	27.29%	3.59%
	28	10,966	83,431	7,973	72.71%	9.56%
Snow Hill	10	1,595	83,434	1,595	100.00%	1.91%
Southern Pines	52	12,334	76,894	12,334	100.00%	16.04%
Southern Shores	6	2,714	76,421	2,714	100.00%	3.55%
Southport	17	2,833	77,263	2,833	100.00%	3.67%
Sparta	90	1,770	82,779	1,770	100.00%	2.14%
Speed	23	80	81,057	80	100.00%	0.10%
Spencer	76	3,267	81,908	3,267	100.00%	3.99%
Spencer Mountain	108	37	76,926	37	100.00%	0.05%
Spindale	112	4,321	79,547	4,321	100.00%	5.43%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-23.asc', modified 08/28/2017 10:19:32 AM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

HBK-23 Lewis - Wake County: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Spring Hope	7	1,320	78,027	1,320	100.00%	1.69%
Spring Lake	42	11,964	81,439	11,964	100.00%	14.69%
Spruce Pine	85	2,175	78,372	2,175	100.00%	2.78%
St. Helena	16	389	81,425	389	100.00%	0.48%
St. James	17	3,165	77,263	3,165	100.00%	4.10%
St. Pauls	46	2,035	80,440	2,035	100.00%	2.53%
Staley	78	393	76,980	393	100.00%	0.51%
Stallings (Mecklenburg)	103	399	76,381	399	100.00%	0.52%
Stallings (Union)	68	13,432	76,067	0	0.00%	0.00%
	69	13,432	76,381	13,432	100.00%	17.59%
Stanfield	67	1,486	82,583	1,486	100.00%	1.80%
Stanley	108	3,556	76,926	3,550	99.83%	4.61%
	110	3,556	75,573	6	0.17%	0.01%
Stantonsburg	24	784	81,234	784	100.00%	0.97%
Star	66	876	83,032	876	100.00%	1.06%
Statesville	84	24,532	77,282	20,541	83.73%	26.58%
	95	24,532	82,155	3,991	16.27%	4.86%
Stedman	45	1,028	79,294	1,028	100.00%	1.30%
Stem	2	463	82,634	463	100.00%	0.56%
Stokesdale	62	5,047	80,732	5,047	100.00%	6.25%
Stoneville	65	1,056	83,430	1,056	100.00%	1.27%
Stonewall	6	281	76,421	281	100.00%	0.37%
Stovall	32	418	83,140	418	100.00%	0.50%
Sugar Mountain	85	198	78,372	198	100.00%	0.25%
Summerfield	62	10,232	80,732	10,232	100.00%	12.67%
Sunset Beach	17	3,572	77,263	3,572	100.00%	4.62%
Surf City (Onslow)	15	292	77,307	292	100.00%	0.38%
Surf City (Pender)	16	1,561	81,425	1,561	100.00%	1.92%
Swansboro	14	2,663	77,065	2,663	100.00%	3.46%
Swepsonville	63	1,154	75,550	1,154	100.00%	1.53%
Sylva	119	2,588	75,548	2,588	100.00%	3.43%
Tabor City	46	2,511	80,440	2,511	100.00%	3.12%
Tar Heel	22	117	83,434	117	100.00%	0.14%
Tarboro	23	11,415	81,057	11,415	100.00%	14.08%
Taylorsville	94	2,098	83,358	2,098	100.00%	2.52%
Taylortown	52	722	76,894	722	100.00%	0.94%
Teachey	4	376	81,905	376	100.00%	0.46%
Thomasville (Davidson)	80	26,493	81,522	25,474	96.15%	31.25%
	81	26,493	81,356	1,019	3.85%	1.25%
Thomasville (Randolph)	70	264	76,125	264	100.00%	0.35%
Tobaccoville (Forsyth)	74	2,441	79,963	2,441	100.00%	3.05%
Tobaccoville (Stokes)	91	0	82,843	0	0.00%	0.00%
Topsail Beach	16	368	81,425	368	100.00%	0.45%
Trent Woods	3	4,155	75,726	4,155	100.00%	5.49%
Trenton	13	287	76,622	287	100.00%	0.37%
Trinity	70	6,614	76,125	6,614	100.00%	8.69%
Troutman	84	2,383	77,282	2,169	91.02%	2.81%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-23.asc', modified 08/28/2017 10:19:32 AM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

HBK-23 Lewis - Wake County: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Troutman	95	2,383	82,155	214	8.98%	0.26%
Troy	66	3,189	83,032	3,189	100.00%	3.84%
Tryon	113	1,646	81,089	1,646	100.00%	2.03%
Turkey	21	292	83,434	292	100.00%	0.35%
Unionville	55	5,929	75,792	337	5.68%	0.44%
	69	5,929	76,381	5,592	94.32%	7.32%
Valdese	86	4,490	79,175	4,490	100.00%	5.67%
Vanceboro	79	1,005	75,538	1,005	100.00%	1.33%
Vandemere	6	254	76,421	254	100.00%	0.33%
Varnamtown	17	541	77,263	541	100.00%	0.70%
Vass	52	720	76,894	720	100.00%	0.94%
Waco	110	321	75,573	321	100.00%	0.42%
Wade	45	556	79,294	556	100.00%	0.70%
Wadesboro	55	5,813	75,792	5,813	100.00%	7.67%
Wagram	48	840	83,109	840	100.00%	1.01%
Wake Forest (Franklin)	25	899	78,432	899	100.00%	1.15%
Wake Forest (Wake)	35	29,218	82,728	29,218	100.00%	35.32%
Walkertown	72	4,675	76,245	1,018	21.78%	1.34%
	74	4,675	79,963	3,657	78.22%	4.57%
Wallace (Duplin)	4	3,880	81,905	3,880	100.00%	4.74%
Wallace (Pender)	16	0	81,425	0	0.00%	0.00%
Wallburg	80	3,047	81,522	3,047	100.00%	3.74%
Walnut Cove	91	1,425	82,843	1,425	100.00%	1.72%
Walnut Creek	10	835	83,434	835	100.00%	1.00%
Walstonburg	10	219	83,434	219	100.00%	0.26%
Warrenton	32	862	83,140	862	100.00%	1.04%
Warsaw	4	3,054	81,905	3,054	100.00%	3.73%
Washington	79	9,744	75,538	9,744	100.00%	12.90%
Washington Park	79	451	75,538	451	100.00%	0.60%
Watha	16	190	81,425	190	100.00%	0.23%
Waxhaw	55	9,859	75,792	1,604	16.27%	2.12%
	68	9,859	76,067	8,255	83.73%	10.85%
Waynesville	119	9,869	75,548	9,869	100.00%	13.06%
Weaverville	115	3,120	79,883	3,120	100.00%	3.91%
Webster	119	363	75,548	363	100.00%	0.48%
Weddington (Mecklenburg)	103	7	76,381	7	100.00%	0.01%
Weddington (Union)	68	9,452	76,067	8,933	94.51%	11.74%
	69	9,452	76,381	519	5.49%	0.68%
Weldon	27	1,655	76,790	1,655	100.00%	2.16%
Wendell	39	5,845	83,055	5,845	100.00%	7.04%
Wentworth	65	2,807	83,430	2,807	100.00%	3.36%
Wesley Chapel	68	7,463	76,067	6,877	92.15%	9.04%
	69	7,463	76,381	586	7.85%	0.77%
West Jefferson	93	1,299	78,360	1,299	100.00%	1.66%
Whispering Pines	52	2,928	76,894	2,928	100.00%	3.81%
Whitakers (Edgecombe)	23	402	81,057	402	100.00%	0.50%
Whitakers (Nash)	7	342	78,027	342	100.00%	0.44%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-23.asc', modified 08/28/2017 10:19:32 AM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

HBK-23 Lewis - Wake County: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
White Lake	22	802	83,434	802	100.00%	0.96%
Whiteville	16	5,394	81,425	5,394	100.00%	6.62%
Whitsett	59	590	79,907	590	100.00%	0.74%
Wilkesboro	90	3,413	82,779	3	0.09%	0.00%
	94	3,413	83,358	3,410	99.91%	4.09%
Williamston	23	5,511	81,057	5,511	100.00%	6.80%
Wilmington	18	106,476	77,681	41,563	39.04%	53.50%
	19	106,476	76,666	33,947	31.88%	44.28%
	20	106,476	78,488	30,966	29.08%	39.45%
Wilson	24	49,167	81,234	49,167	100.00%	60.53%
Wilson's Mills	26	2,277	83,432	0	0.00%	0.00%
	28	2,277	83,431	2,277	100.00%	2.73%
Windsor	1	3,630	77,143	3,630	100.00%	4.71%
Winfall	1	594	77,143	594	100.00%	0.77%
Wingate	55	3,491	75,792	349	10.00%	0.46%
	69	3,491	76,381	3,142	90.00%	4.11%
Winston-Salem	71	229,617	75,793	75,779	33.00%	99.98%
	72	229,617	76,245	73,464	31.99%	96.35%
	73	229,617	78,189	17,422	7.59%	22.28%
	74	229,617	79,963	30,077	13.10%	37.61%
	75	229,617	78,886	32,875	14.32%	41.67%
Winterville	8	9,269	75,926	0	0.00%	0.00%
	9	9,269	75,794	8,391	90.53%	11.07%
	12	9,269	75,923	878	9.47%	1.16%
Winton	5	769	77,527	769	100.00%	0.99%
Woodfin	114	6,123	82,902	2,563	41.86%	3.09%
	115	6,123	79,883	2,717	44.37%	3.40%
	116	6,123	75,533	843	13.77%	1.12%
Woodland	27	809	76,790	809	100.00%	1.05%
Wrightsville Beach	19	2,477	76,666	2,477	100.00%	3.23%
	20	2,477	78,488	0	0.00%	0.00%
Yadkinville	73	2,959	78,189	2,959	100.00%	3.78%
Yanceyville	50	2,039	80,866	2,039	100.00%	2.52%
Youngsville	25	1,157	78,432	1,157	100.00%	1.48%
Zebulon (Johnston)	26	0	83,432	0	0.00%	0.00%
Zebulon (Wake)	35	4,433	82,728	381	8.59%	0.46%
	39	4,433	83,055	4,052	91.41%	4.88%
			Total:	**5,250,071**		

District plan definition file: 'HBK-23.asc', modified 08/28/2017 10:19:32 AM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

HBK-23 Lewis - Wake County: Split VTD Detail

County	VTD	District	Total VTD Pop	VTD Pop in District	Percent of VTD Pop in District
Alamance	03C	63	2,814	2,491	88.52%
		64	2,814	323	11.48%
	063	63	4,940	4,090	82.79%
		64	4,940	850	17.21%
	06W	63	1,973	1,617	81.96%
		64	1,973	356	18.04%
Brunswick	04	17	13,819	3,644	26.37%
		18	13,819	10,175	73.63%
Buncombe	05.1	114	2,748	1,691	61.54%
		115	2,748	1,057	38.46%
	100.1	114	9,126	8,524	93.40%
		115	9,126	602	6.60%
	102.1	114	5,975	1,385	23.18%
		116	5,975	4,590	76.82%
	104.1	114	3,081	2,345	76.11%
		115	3,081	736	23.89%
	19.1	114	2,159	1,843	85.36%
		116	2,159	316	14.64%
	24.1	114	3,211	1,964	61.16%
		116	3,211	1,247	38.84%
	52.1	115	5,279	3,762	71.26%
		116	5,279	1,517	28.74%
	57.1	114	3,534	315	8.91%
		115	3,534	1,149	32.51%
		116	3,534	2,070	58.57%
	60.2	114	1,300	164	12.62%
		115	1,300	1,136	87.38%
	64.1	114	2,671	820	30.70%
		115	2,671	1,851	69.30%
	70.1	114	3,508	2,418	68.93%
		115	3,508	1,090	31.07%
Craven	N4	3	6,831	5,069	74.21%
		79	6,831	1,762	25.79%
Cumberland	G2	43	34,282	29,272	85.39%
		45	34,282	5,010	14.61%
Durham	34	29	11,492	9,457	82.29%
		31	11,492	2,035	17.71%
Gaston	05	109	4,767	4,132	86.68%
		110	4,767	635	13.32%
Harnett	PR07	51	17,943	14,553	81.11%
		53	17,943	3,390	18.89%
	PR08	28	10,373	5,681	54.77%
		53	10,373	4,692	45.23%
Haywood	IH	118	3,815	3,256	85.35%
		119	3,815	559	14.65%
Johnston	PR04	10	1,929	413	21.41%
		28	1,929	1,516	78.59%
	PR26	26	4,445	297	6.68%
		28	4,445	4,148	93.32%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-23.asc', modified 08/28/2017 10:19:32 AM

VTDs ('Voting Districts') derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG05|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

HBK-23 Lewis - Wake County: Split VTD Detail

County	VTD	District	Total VTD Pop	VTD Pop in District	Percent of VTD Pop in District
Mecklenburg	001	102	1,950	102	5.23%
		104	1,950	1,848	94.77%
	069	104	5,121	3,240	63.27%
		105	5,121	1,881	36.73%
	134	98	8,939	4,410	49.33%
		107	8,939	4,529	50.67%
Moore	RBN	52	2,923	2,593	88.71%
		78	2,923	330	11.29%
	WEM	52	2,982	1,806	60.56%
		78	2,982	1,176	39.44%
New Hanover	CF03	18	8,711	828	9.51%
		20	8,711	7,883	90.49%
	W24	18	7,784	3,543	45.52%
		20	7,784	4,241	54.48%
	WB	19	2,473	2,473	100.00%
		20	2,473	0	0.00%
Onslow	GB12	4	6,284	5,776	91.92%
		14	6,284	508	8.08%
	HM05	14	8,258	5,303	64.22%
		15	8,258	2,955	35.78%
Pitt	1403A	9	7,871	3,868	49.14%
		12	7,871	4,003	50.86%
	1507	8	6,628	5,623	84.84%
		9	6,628	1,005	15.16%
Rockingham	HU	65	6,052	5,815	96.08%
		91	6,052	237	3.92%
Sampson	ROWA	21	3,210	1,577	49.13%
		22	3,210	1,633	50.87%
Union	017A	68	4,593	1,595	34.73%
		69	4,593	2,998	65.27%
	019	55	5,806	1,105	19.03%
		68	5,806	4,701	80.97%
	029A	68	5,935	5,079	85.58%
		69	5,935	856	14.42%
	029C	68	2,942	1,576	53.57%
		69	2,942	1,366	46.43%
	032	55	4,095	1,820	44.44%
		69	4,095	2,275	55.56%
	040	68	4,926	1,122	22.78%
		69	4,926	3,804	77.22%
Wake	10-02	35	6,441	898	13.94%
		39	6,441	5,543	86.06%
	12-05	36	9,236	5,460	59.12%
		37	9,236	3,776	40.88%
	16-09	33	4,924	3,027	61.47%
		36	4,924	1,897	38.53%
	18-08	11	5,677	2,521	44.41%
		36	5,677	3,156	55.59%
Wayne	09	10	5,273	3,733	70.79%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-23.asc', modified 08/28/2017 10:19:32 AM

VTDs ('Voting Districts') derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG05|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

HBK-23 Lewis - Wake County: Split VTD Detail

County	VTD	District	Total VTD Pop	VTD Pop in District	Percent of VTD Pop in District
Wayne	09	21	5,273	1,540	29.21%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-23.asc', modified 08/28/2017 10:19:32 AM

VTDs ('Voting Districts') derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG05|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

HBK-23 Lewis - Wake County: Population Deviation

District	2010 Pop	Ideal Pop	Deviation	Deviation %
1	77,143	79,462	-2,319	-2.92%
2	82,634	79,462	3,172	3.99%
3	75,726	79,462	-3,736	-4.70%
4	81,905	79,462	2,443	3.07%
5	77,527	79,462	-1,935	-2.44%
6	76,421	79,462	-3,041	-3.83%
7	78,027	79,462	-1,435	-1.81%
8	75,926	79,462	-3,536	-4.45%
9	75,794	79,462	-3,668	-4.62%
10	83,434	79,462	3,972	5.00%
11	83,266	79,462	3,804	4.79%
12	75,923	79,462	-3,539	-4.45%
13	76,622	79,462	-2,840	-3.57%
14	77,065	79,462	-2,397	-3.02%
15	77,307	79,462	-2,155	-2.71%
16	81,425	79,462	1,963	2.47%
17	77,263	79,462	-2,199	-2.77%
18	77,681	79,462	-1,781	-2.24%
19	76,666	79,462	-2,796	-3.52%
20	78,488	79,462	-974	-1.23%
21	83,434	79,462	3,972	5.00%
22	83,434	79,462	3,972	5.00%
23	81,057	79,462	1,595	2.01%
24	81,234	79,462	1,772	2.23%
25	78,432	79,462	-1,030	-1.30%
26	83,432	79,462	3,970	5.00%
27	76,790	79,462	-2,672	-3.36%
28	83,431	79,462	3,969	4.99%
29	82,735	79,462	3,273	4.12%
30	83,272	79,462	3,810	4.79%
31	82,773	79,462	3,311	4.17%
32	83,140	79,462	3,678	4.63%
33	82,644	79,462	3,182	4.00%
34	77,948	79,462	-1,514	-1.91%
35	82,728	79,462	3,266	4.11%
36	81,926	79,462	2,464	3.10%
37	81,952	79,462	2,490	3.13%
38	83,061	79,462	3,599	4.53%
39	83,055	79,462	3,593	4.52%
40	80,675	79,462	1,213	1.53%
41	80,739	79,462	1,277	1.61%
42	81,439	79,462	1,977	2.49%
43	77,725	79,462	-1,737	-2.19%
44	80,973	79,462	1,511	1.90%
45	79,294	79,462	-168	-0.21%
46	80,440	79,462	978	1.23%
47	82,618	79,462	3,156	3.97%
48	83,109	79,462	3,647	4.59%
49	82,999	79,462	3,537	4.45%
50	80,866	79,462	1,404	1.77%
51	83,434	79,462	3,972	5.00%
52	76,894	79,462	-2,568	-3.23%
53	83,429	79,462	3,967	4.99%
54	82,312	79,462	2,850	3.59%
55	75,792	79,462	-3,670	-4.62%
56	76,654	79,462	-2,808	-3.53%
57	82,755	79,462	3,293	4.14%
58	82,137	79,462	2,675	3.37%
59	79,907	79,462	445	0.56%
60	81,856	79,462	2,394	3.01%
61	81,019	79,462	1,557	1.96%
62	80,732	79,462	1,270	1.60%
63	75,550	79,462	-3,912	-4.92%
64	75,581	79,462	-3,881	-4.88%
65	83,430	79,462	3,968	4.99%
66	83,032	79,462	3,570	4.49%
67	82,583	79,462	3,121	3.93%
68	76,067	79,462	-3,395	-4.27%
69	76,381	79,462	-3,081	-3.88%
70	76,125	79,462	-3,337	-4.20%
71	75,793	79,462	-3,669	-4.62%
72	76,245	79,462	-3,217	-4.05%
73	78,189	79,462	-1,273	-1.60%
74	79,963	79,462	501	0.63%
75	78,886	79,462	-576	-0.72%
76	81,908	79,462	2,446	3.08%
77	82,918	79,462	3,456	4.35%
78	76,980	79,462	-2,482	-3.12%
79	75,538	79,462	-3,924	-4.94%
80	81,522	79,462	2,060	2.59%
81	81,356	79,462	1,894	2.38%
82	81,088	79,462	1,626	2.05%

HBK-23 Lewis - Wake County: Population Deviation

District	2010 Pop	Ideal Pop	Deviation	Deviation %
83	81,172	79,462	1,710	2.15%
84	77,282	79,462	-2,180	-2.74%
85	78,372	79,462	-1,090	-1.37%
86	79,175	79,462	-287	-0.36%
87	83,029	79,462	3,567	4.49%
88	76,022	79,462	-3,440	-4.33%
89	77,838	79,462	-1,624	-2.04%
90	82,779	79,462	3,317	4.17%
91	82,843	79,462	3,381	4.25%
92	77,172	79,462	-2,290	-2.88%
93	78,360	79,462	-1,102	-1.39%
94	83,358	79,462	3,896	4.90%
95	82,155	79,462	2,693	3.39%
96	76,520	79,462	-2,942	-3.70%
97	78,265	79,462	-1,197	-1.51%
98	75,602	79,462	-3,860	-4.86%
99	77,141	79,462	-2,321	-2.92%
100	75,589	79,462	-3,873	-4.87%
101	79,876	79,462	414	0.52%
102	77,391	79,462	-2,071	-2.61%
103	76,381	79,462	-3,081	-3.88%
104	76,869	79,462	-2,593	-3.26%
105	75,967	79,462	-3,495	-4.40%
106	75,762	79,462	-3,700	-4.66%
107	75,856	79,462	-3,606	-4.54%
108	76,926	79,462	-2,536	-3.19%
109	75,517	79,462	-3,945	-4.96%
110	75,573	79,462	-3,889	-4.89%
111	76,148	79,462	-3,314	-4.17%
112	79,547	79,462	85	0.11%
113	81,089	79,462	1,627	2.05%
114	82,902	79,462	3,440	4.33%
115	79,883	79,462	421	0.53%
116	75,533	79,462	-3,929	-4.94%
117	79,251	79,462	-211	-0.27%
118	76,322	79,462	-3,140	-3.95%
119	75,548	79,462	-3,914	-4.93%
120	80,814	79,462	1,352	1.70%
Total:	**9,535,483**			

HBK-23 Lewis - Wake County: Population 2010, US Senate 2010, President 2012

	2010 Census		US Senate 2010: Marshall-Burr-Beitler								US President 2012: Obama-Romney-Johnson							
District	Total Pop	18+ Pop	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %
1	77,143	60,226	11,572	46.71%	12,798	51.66%	398	1.61%	6	0.02%	19,188	51.49%	17,761	47.66%	255	0.68%	62	0.17%
2	82,634	64,057	9,138	42.84%	11,711	54.90%	479	2.25%	4	0.02%	16,284	44.54%	19,862	54.33%	322	0.88%	89	0.24%
3	75,726	57,749	6,926	34.46%	12,772	63.55%	390	1.94%	11	0.05%	13,877	41.67%	19,044	57.18%	308	0.92%	77	0.23%
4	81,905	60,243	6,889	39.27%	10,357	59.03%	292	1.66%	6	0.03%	11,345	38.94%	17,541	60.21%	200	0.69%	45	0.15%
5	77,527	60,228	10,791	55.68%	8,307	42.86%	273	1.41%	11	0.06%	20,871	60.75%	13,179	38.36%	249	0.72%	57	0.17%
6	76,421	60,608	8,872	34.50%	16,174	62.90%	661	2.57%	7	0.03%	14,765	38.52%	22,988	59.97%	532	1.39%	50	0.13%
7	78,027	59,741	12,874	49.23%	12,965	49.58%	303	1.16%	8	0.03%	21,791	53.51%	18,673	45.85%	191	0.47%	67	0.16%
8	75,926	58,873	10,135	61.68%	6,095	37.09%	195	1.19%	7	0.04%	22,626	66.47%	11,119	32.66%	254	0.75%	42	0.12%
9	75,794	59,235	7,527	37.19%	12,496	61.74%	210	1.04%	7	0.03%	15,362	42.01%	20,876	57.09%	280	0.77%	50	0.14%
10	83,434	62,414	6,595	29.90%	15,171	68.78%	287	1.30%	3	0.01%	11,116	32.12%	23,262	67.22%	212	0.61%	17	0.05%
11	83,266	67,330	11,833	53.19%	9,697	43.59%	704	3.16%	13	0.06%	25,329	60.49%	15,536	37.10%	905	2.16%	106	0.25%
12	75,923	57,405	10,406	46.00%	11,921	52.70%	282	1.25%	13	0.06%	17,724	49.08%	18,140	50.23%	210	0.58%	40	0.11%
13	76,622	61,839	7,638	28.48%	18,590	69.32%	538	2.01%	52	0.19%	12,458	31.09%	27,181	67.84%	359	0.90%	68	0.17%
14	77,065	56,588	4,167	33.67%	7,902	63.84%	301	2.43%	7	0.06%	9,736	39.75%	14,437	58.94%	253	1.03%	70	0.29%
15	77,307	59,638	3,006	31.19%	6,343	65.81%	284	2.95%	5	0.05%	6,424	34.97%	11,670	63.53%	225	1.22%	50	0.27%
16	81,425	62,717	10,108	39.84%	14,778	58.24%	474	1.87%	14	0.06%	16,124	42.93%	21,036	56.00%	314	0.84%	88	0.23%
17	77,263	64,270	9,560	31.61%	20,050	66.30%	624	2.06%	8	0.03%	15,595	36.15%	27,141	62.91%	333	0.77%	74	0.17%
18	77,681	61,478	11,041	55.09%	8,555	42.68%	437	2.18%	10	0.05%	22,442	61.89%	13,304	36.69%	413	1.14%	100	0.28%
19	76,666	60,681	8,459	32.87%	16,677	64.80%	587	2.28%	14	0.05%	16,301	40.73%	23,121	57.77%	483	1.21%	119	0.30%
20	78,488	63,095	9,000	33.59%	17,209	64.23%	570	2.13%	12	0.04%	16,368	39.38%	24,562	59.09%	499	1.20%	135	0.32%
21	83,434	62,990	11,059	53.59%	9,325	45.19%	248	1.20%	4	0.02%	20,461	59.78%	13,589	39.70%	173	0.51%	5	0.01%
22	83,434	63,053	11,647	44.71%	14,036	53.88%	357	1.37%	9	0.03%	15,826	44.07%	19,774	55.06%	257	0.72%	56	0.16%
23	81,057	61,743	14,653	59.95%	9,513	38.92%	269	1.10%	8	0.03%	24,825	62.80%	14,515	36.72%	147	0.37%	43	0.11%
24	81,234	61,182	13,631	51.47%	12,420	46.90%	428	1.62%	3	0.01%	20,875	53.38%	17,954	45.91%	242	0.62%	38	0.10%
25	78,432	58,921	9,576	42.69%	12,410	55.32%	440	1.96%	8	0.04%	15,958	44.13%	19,772	54.68%	331	0.92%	98	0.27%
26	83,432	58,967	8,134	33.11%	15,900	64.72%	520	2.12%	12	0.05%	15,202	36.94%	25,391	61.70%	445	1.08%	113	0.27%
27	76,790	59,572	13,603	61.65%	8,196	37.14%	261	1.18%	6	0.03%	24,188	66.17%	12,189	33.34%	143	0.39%	35	0.10%
28	83,431	61,419	6,884	32.21%	14,114	66.03%	369	1.73%	8	0.04%	11,854	34.87%	21,776	64.05%	289	0.85%	80	0.24%
29	82,735	67,058	18,865	79.26%	4,545	19.10%	373	1.57%	17	0.07%	38,148	82.20%	7,753	16.71%	435	0.94%	70	0.15%
30	83,272	64,089	17,881	60.80%	11,040	37.54%	478	1.63%	11	0.04%	31,862	67.06%	15,158	31.90%	424	0.89%	70	0.15%
31	82,773	61,422	16,672	78.56%	4,267	20.11%	275	1.30%	8	0.04%	33,340	80.93%	7,466	18.12%	349	0.85%	43	0.10%
32	83,140	63,471	15,476	60.71%	9,595	37.64%	411	1.61%	8	0.03%	26,033	65.34%	13,608	34.16%	154	0.39%	45	0.11%
33	82,644	63,669	14,296	71.29%	5,421	27.03%	325	1.62%	10	0.05%	28,994	74.78%	9,266	23.90%	455	1.17%	58	0.15%
34	77,948	62,394	14,385	50.35%	13,551	47.43%	618	2.16%	18	0.06%	26,190	56.56%	19,408	41.91%	632	1.36%	75	0.16%
35	82,728	57,787	9,664	37.37%	15,571	60.21%	605	2.34%	20	0.08%	19,801	42.91%	25,771	55.84%	492	1.07%	86	0.19%
36	81,926	59,799	10,864	35.93%	18,694	61.83%	668	2.21%	8	0.03%	19,655	41.26%	27,387	57.49%	537	1.13%	58	0.12%
37	81,952	56,082	8,939	37.49%	14,256	59.79%	639	2.68%	11	0.05%	19,519	44.02%	24,145	54.46%	594	1.34%	80	0.18%
38	83,061	60,242	14,768	75.10%	4,569	23.23%	314	1.60%	14	0.07%	31,122	80.50%	7,137	18.46%	347	0.90%	56	0.14%
39	83,055	59,229	13,679	57.96%	9,434	39.98%	475	2.01%	11	0.05%	26,426	63.26%	14,861	35.58%	401	0.96%	83	0.20%
40	80,675	60,028	12,633	37.17%	20,533	60.41%	804	2.37%	20	0.06%	22,067	42.83%	28,781	55.86%	591	1.15%	83	0.16%
41	80,739	54,288	9,329	43.46%	11,499	53.57%	636	2.96%	3	0.01%	21,835	52.16%	19,425	46.40%	534	1.28%	66	0.16%
42	81,439	57,374	8,476	69.63%	3,542	29.10%	150	1.23%	5	0.04%	18,934	73.86%	6,486	25.30%	161	0.63%	55	0.21%
43	77,725	59,350	11,403	65.17%	5,813	33.22%	270	1.54%	11	0.06%	23,644	72.26%	8,782	26.84%	225	0.69%	69	0.21%
44	80,973	59,789	8,858	46.26%	9,916	51.78%	366	1.91%	9	0.05%	17,939	53.66%	15,149	45.31%	292	0.87%	52	0.16%
45	79,294	57,377	7,955	39.32%	11,934	58.98%	335	1.66%	10	0.05%	15,275	42.60%	20,249	56.48%	249	0.69%	80	0.22%
46	80,440	59,587	6,977	43.94%	8,611	54.23%	284	1.79%	7	0.04%	12,303	45.76%	14,327	53.29%	203	0.76%	51	0.19%
47	82,618	60,831	8,315	57.29%	6,015	41.44%	173	1.19%	11	0.08%	17,243	63.29%	9,705	35.62%	221	0.81%	77	0.28%
48	83,109	59,851	9,247	55.26%	7,197	43.01%	281	1.68%	9	0.05%	18,291	58.54%	12,650	40.49%	258	0.83%	46	0.15%
49	82,999	65,532	12,934	48.71%	12,907	48.61%	699	2.63%	11	0.04%	26,324	56.03%	19,879	42.31%	683	1.45%	93	0.20%
50	80,866	62,232	15,177	53.97%	12,277	43.66%	657	2.34%	11	0.04%	24,313	55.84%	18,630	42.79%	471	1.08%	123	0.28%
51	83,434	59,547	7,714	41.44%	10,529	56.56%	364	1.96%	8	0.04%	14,314	44.67%	17,331	54.08%	328	1.02%	72	0.22%
52	76,894	60,407	8,130	31.91%	16,852	66.14%	491	1.93%	7	0.03%	14,828	36.08%	25,925	63.08%	289	0.70%	58	0.14%
53	83,429	62,151	8,067	38.56%	12,447	59.50%	400	1.91%	6	0.03%	13,061	39.03%	20,001	59.78%	325	0.97%	73	0.22%

Populations values derive from the 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File. Election results were provided by the NC State Board of Elections. Votes that could not be associated with a specific precinct were excluded. Reported statewide totals may therefore be marginally lower than official contest results.

HBK-23 Lewis - Wake County: Population 2010, US Senate 2010, President 2012

	2010 Census		US Senate 2010: Marshall-Burr-Beitler								US President 2012: Obama-Romney-Johnson							
District	Total Pop	18+ Pop	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %
54	82,312	64,361	16,920	53.96%	13,730	43.79%	695	2.22%	10	0.03%	26,235	55.99%	20,057	42.81%	473	1.01%	89	0.19%
55	75,792	57,260	7,418	36.90%	12,345	61.41%	326	1.62%	12	0.06%	13,756	39.49%	20,716	59.48%	275	0.79%	84	0.24%
56	76,654	62,430	19,313	77.49%	5,073	20.35%	522	2.09%	15	0.06%	34,936	78.94%	8,503	19.21%	669	1.51%	151	0.34%
57	82,755	64,200	14,697	81.20%	3,148	17.39%	243	1.34%	11	0.06%	36,447	86.99%	5,069	12.10%	296	0.71%	84	0.20%
58	82,137	62,753	12,047	63.92%	6,487	34.42%	288	1.53%	25	0.13%	27,946	73.09%	9,912	25.92%	286	0.75%	93	0.24%
59	79,907	61,233	9,808	38.24%	15,356	59.87%	480	1.87%	7	0.03%	18,869	42.66%	24,892	56.27%	368	0.83%	106	0.24%
60	81,856	61,808	9,568	57.73%	6,682	40.31%	309	1.86%	16	0.10%	23,485	67.53%	10,974	31.55%	253	0.73%	67	0.19%
61	81,019	63,506	9,721	33.66%	18,550	64.22%	586	2.03%	27	0.09%	19,567	41.33%	27,191	57.44%	446	0.94%	136	0.29%
62	80,732	60,423	9,300	34.11%	17,363	63.68%	595	2.18%	10	0.04%	19,556	41.92%	26,542	56.89%	449	0.96%	107	0.23%
63	75,550	57,278	8,482	38.39%	13,031	58.99%	571	2.58%	8	0.04%	15,509	43.71%	19,573	55.17%	330	0.93%	68	0.19%
64	75,581	58,410	6,964	35.86%	11,981	61.69%	458	2.36%	17	0.09%	13,366	41.39%	18,597	57.58%	267	0.83%	66	0.20%
65	83,430	64,719	7,496	33.32%	14,282	63.48%	706	3.14%	16	0.07%	14,675	39.12%	22,455	59.86%	299	0.80%	84	0.22%
66	83,032	63,266	10,774	47.23%	11,598	50.84%	428	1.88%	11	0.05%	16,209	46.56%	18,293	52.54%	287	0.82%	26	0.07%
67	82,583	62,630	6,659	26.05%	18,384	71.93%	506	1.98%	10	0.04%	11,108	27.80%	28,389	71.05%	412	1.03%	47	0.12%
68	76,067	49,871	5,344	28.78%	12,791	68.88%	426	2.29%	9	0.05%	13,160	35.92%	23,097	63.04%	316	0.86%	66	0.18%
69	76,381	54,263	5,446	30.22%	12,148	67.40%	419	2.32%	11	0.06%	12,576	36.44%	21,460	62.18%	368	1.07%	110	0.32%
70	76,125	57,325	3,558	21.14%	12,749	75.74%	513	3.05%	13	0.08%	8,189	25.84%	23,113	72.94%	343	1.08%	44	0.14%
71	75,793	57,481	9,798	58.11%	6,782	40.22%	275	1.63%	7	0.04%	23,956	69.74%	10,090	29.38%	302	0.88%	0	0.00%
72	76,245	58,071	11,678	66.54%	5,620	32.02%	248	1.41%	5	0.03%	27,128	76.55%	8,076	22.79%	235	0.66%	0	0.00%
73	78,189	59,318	6,106	25.80%	17,032	71.95%	529	2.23%	4	0.02%	12,278	32.31%	25,229	66.40%	441	1.16%	47	0.12%
74	79,963	60,453	8,675	32.94%	17,137	65.07%	516	1.96%	8	0.03%	16,896	39.09%	25,912	59.95%	415	0.96%	0	0.00%
75	78,886	59,414	7,130	32.40%	14,427	65.57%	435	1.98%	11	0.05%	16,022	40.59%	23,039	58.37%	407	1.03%	0	0.00%
76	81,908	62,585	7,822	37.03%	12,787	60.53%	502	2.38%	13	0.06%	15,191	41.45%	20,960	57.20%	360	0.98%	135	0.37%
77	82,918	63,076	6,663	26.24%	18,105	71.29%	617	2.43%	11	0.04%	11,587	28.89%	28,014	69.84%	394	0.98%	117	0.29%
78	76,980	58,404	4,029	21.41%	14,213	75.51%	567	3.01%	13	0.07%	8,233	24.08%	25,560	74.77%	335	0.98%	58	0.17%
79	75,538	58,785	8,646	35.68%	15,108	62.35%	466	1.92%	12	0.05%	14,321	39.25%	21,861	59.92%	236	0.65%	66	0.18%
80	81,522	61,819	4,779	23.10%	15,452	74.68%	458	2.21%	3	0.01%	9,557	26.44%	26,120	72.27%	383	1.06%	81	0.22%
81	81,356	62,187	6,468	30.99%	13,884	66.51%	508	2.43%	14	0.07%	11,067	31.81%	23,263	66.86%	393	1.13%	71	0.20%
82	81,088	58,038	7,291	33.20%	14,207	64.70%	460	2.09%	0	0.00%	15,974	39.95%	23,599	59.03%	408	1.02%	0	0.00%
83	81,172	59,773	6,999	36.00%	11,962	61.52%	478	2.46%	4	0.02%	14,172	41.75%	19,323	56.92%	423	1.25%	29	0.09%
84	77,282	58,924	7,244	32.03%	14,736	65.16%	617	2.73%	18	0.08%	12,673	34.35%	23,733	64.33%	356	0.96%	131	0.36%
85	78,372	62,493	6,014	26.73%	15,873	70.54%	595	2.64%	20	0.09%	9,740	29.02%	23,328	69.50%	389	1.16%	110	0.33%
86	79,175	61,639	7,764	37.95%	12,242	59.83%	450	2.20%	5	0.02%	12,429	38.01%	19,756	60.42%	393	1.20%	119	0.36%
87	83,029	64,243	6,908	31.41%	14,382	65.39%	690	3.14%	15	0.07%	10,898	31.49%	23,229	67.12%	479	1.38%	0	0.00%
88	76,022	57,630	10,228	65.20%	5,122	32.65%	325	2.07%	12	0.08%	24,610	71.63%	9,328	27.15%	337	0.98%	84	0.24%
89	77,838	59,483	6,177	29.81%	13,998	67.55%	532	2.57%	15	0.07%	11,364	32.70%	22,869	65.82%	392	1.13%	122	0.35%
90	82,779	64,448	7,116	31.71%	14,796	65.92%	526	2.34%	6	0.03%	10,337	30.79%	22,726	67.68%	406	1.21%	109	0.32%
91	82,843	63,967	6,435	27.34%	16,505	70.13%	587	2.49%	9	0.04%	10,448	28.75%	25,325	69.69%	459	1.26%	107	0.29%
92	77,172	58,012	8,592	56.26%	6,372	41.72%	302	1.98%	7	0.05%	21,244	64.97%	11,011	33.68%	342	1.05%	100	0.31%
93	78,360	65,985	10,383	39.34%	15,262	57.83%	729	2.76%	18	0.07%	17,118	42.54%	22,103	54.93%	803	2.00%	213	0.53%
94	83,358	64,525	7,672	29.90%	17,245	67.21%	729	2.84%	11	0.04%	10,263	27.92%	25,882	70.40%	503	1.37%	117	0.32%
95	82,155	59,928	5,680	27.90%	14,174	69.63%	496	2.44%	6	0.03%	13,403	33.96%	25,566	64.77%	391	0.99%	112	0.28%
96	76,520	58,080	6,470	31.28%	13,705	66.27%	495	2.39%	11	0.05%	12,700	36.45%	21,665	62.18%	378	1.08%	102	0.29%
97	78,265	59,784	6,958	30.01%	15,653	67.51%	564	2.43%	11	0.05%	11,021	29.97%	25,266	68.71%	369	1.00%	115	0.31%
98	75,602	56,018	6,849	32.00%	14,098	65.88%	445	2.08%	8	0.04%	16,276	39.21%	24,750	59.62%	402	0.97%	83	0.20%
99	77,141	55,130	12,757	73.89%	4,259	24.67%	232	1.34%	16	0.09%	26,889	79.03%	6,836	20.09%	215	0.63%	83	0.24%
100	75,589	56,173	9,157	57.35%	6,485	40.62%	314	1.97%	10	0.06%	21,275	67.14%	10,017	31.61%	329	1.04%	67	0.21%
101	79,876	58,931	12,051	68.58%	5,219	29.70%	291	1.66%	11	0.06%	28,250	74.39%	9,386	24.72%	257	0.68%	82	0.22%
102	77,391	59,231	10,729	74.35%	3,424	23.73%	269	1.86%	8	0.06%	25,970	80.44%	5,905	18.29%	324	1.00%	84	0.26%
103	76,381	56,360	7,849	32.02%	16,157	65.92%	488	1.99%	16	0.07%	16,067	38.44%	25,182	60.25%	416	1.00%	132	0.32%
104	76,869	59,384	9,634	33.26%	18,842	65.05%	476	1.64%	13	0.04%	18,349	39.25%	27,916	59.71%	393	0.84%	95	0.20%
105	75,967	56,011	7,111	32.05%	14,618	65.88%	454	2.05%	5	0.02%	16,507	40.61%	23,709	58.33%	356	0.88%	73	0.18%
106	75,762	57,932	9,986	67.03%	4,694	31.51%	214	1.44%	3	0.02%	23,892	73.26%	8,334	25.55%	299	0.92%	89	0.27%

Populations values derive from the 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File. Election results were provided by the NC State Board of Elections. Votes that could not be associated with a specific precinct were excluded. Reported statewide totals may therefore be marginally lower than official contest results.

HBK-23 Lewis - Wake County: Population 2010, US Senate 2010, President 2012

	2010 Census		US Senate 2010: Marshall-Burr-Beitler								US President 2012: Obama-Romney-Johnson							
District	Total Pop	18+ Pop	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %
107	75,856	55,478	12,601	72.88%	4,477	25.89%	207	1.20%	6	0.03%	27,803	76.86%	8,081	22.34%	222	0.61%	67	0.19%
108	76,926	59,400	5,880	32.51%	11,794	65.21%	413	2.28%	0	0.00%	12,869	38.42%	20,266	60.50%	362	1.08%	0	0.00%
109	75,517	56,493	6,277	33.20%	12,209	64.58%	419	2.22%	0	0.00%	14,138	40.79%	20,201	58.28%	321	0.93%	0	0.00%
110	75,573	57,987	6,366	33.61%	12,134	64.06%	439	2.32%	2	0.01%	11,593	35.29%	20,921	63.69%	314	0.96%	20	0.06%
111	76,148	58,045	7,206	36.13%	12,341	61.87%	390	1.96%	9	0.05%	11,633	35.72%	20,543	63.07%	306	0.94%	89	0.27%
112	79,547	61,671	6,370	30.24%	14,175	67.30%	509	2.42%	9	0.04%	10,646	32.71%	21,465	65.95%	351	1.08%	87	0.27%
113	81,089	66,177	11,159	36.07%	19,015	61.47%	754	2.44%	8	0.03%	15,774	37.46%	25,726	61.09%	477	1.13%	132	0.31%
114	82,902	67,453	17,655	66.88%	8,010	30.34%	725	2.75%	8	0.03%	33,044	72.54%	11,524	25.30%	682	1.50%	300	0.66%
115	79,883	63,911	12,292	44.29%	14,665	52.84%	766	2.76%	31	0.11%	20,831	47.82%	21,945	50.38%	592	1.36%	195	0.45%
116	75,533	58,114	9,048	38.38%	13,930	59.09%	585	2.48%	12	0.05%	16,743	43.40%	21,230	55.04%	447	1.16%	154	0.40%
117	79,251	62,434	8,152	32.28%	16,500	65.33%	596	2.36%	9	0.04%	13,707	36.65%	23,138	61.86%	435	1.16%	123	0.33%
118	76,322	60,837	12,403	42.23%	16,191	55.12%	767	2.61%	12	0.04%	15,098	41.30%	20,729	56.71%	548	1.50%	180	0.49%
119	75,548	61,452	10,591	46.03%	11,788	51.23%	619	2.69%	12	0.05%	15,557	47.80%	16,410	50.42%	543	1.67%	39	0.12%
120	80,814	65,097	9,909	32.86%	19,081	63.28%	1,143	3.79%	18	0.06%	11,787	30.01%	26,800	68.23%	517	1.32%	176	0.45%
Totals:	**9,535,483**	**7,253,848**	**1,141,700**	**43.04%**	**1,454,082**	**54.82%**	**55,554**	**2.09%**	**1,263**	**0.05%**	**2,171,293**	**48.33%**	**2,267,353**	**50.47%**	**44,448**	**0.99%**	**9,519**	**0.21%**

Populations values derive from the 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File. Election results were provided by the NC State Board of Elections. Votes that could not be associated with a specific precinct were excluded. Reported statewide totals may therefore be marginally lower than official contest results.

HBK-23 Lewis - Wake County: Governor 2012, Lt Governor 2012, US Senate 2014

	Governor 2012: Dalton-McCrory-Howe								Lieutenant Governor 2012: Coleman-Forest				US Senate 2014: Tillis-Hagan-Haugh							
District	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %
1	19,104	52.09%	16,908	46.10%	653	1.78%	8	0.02%	20,570	57.32%	15,314	42.68%	11,858	47.79%	12,208	49.20%	729	2.94%	17	0.07%
2	14,964	41.36%	20,485	56.62%	721	1.99%	11	0.03%	16,970	48.44%	18,065	51.56%	12,193	52.00%	10,289	43.88%	921	3.93%	44	0.19%
3	12,556	38.05%	19,773	59.92%	658	1.99%	12	0.04%	14,086	43.44%	18,342	56.56%	12,612	56.92%	8,699	39.26%	804	3.63%	43	0.19%
4	11,015	38.19%	17,336	60.11%	481	1.67%	9	0.03%	12,235	43.31%	16,012	56.69%	10,607	58.61%	6,770	37.41%	701	3.87%	20	0.11%
5	20,700	61.40%	12,290	36.45%	721	2.14%	3	0.01%	21,685	65.17%	11,591	34.83%	7,987	40.13%	11,521	57.88%	382	1.92%	15	0.08%
6	13,800	36.70%	22,340	59.41%	1,446	3.85%	14	0.04%	15,559	42.25%	21,269	57.75%	16,135	58.33%	10,543	38.11%	962	3.48%	22	0.08%
7	21,049	51.78%	19,219	47.28%	375	0.92%	5	0.01%	22,227	55.32%	17,950	44.68%	13,321	46.35%	14,633	50.91%	764	2.66%	25	0.09%
8	21,272	62.86%	11,935	35.27%	624	1.84%	7	0.02%	22,701	68.07%	10,649	31.93%	6,095	33.50%	11,528	63.36%	540	2.97%	32	0.18%
9	13,954	38.44%	21,716	59.83%	624	1.72%	4	0.01%	15,785	44.22%	19,914	55.78%	12,511	56.57%	8,912	40.30%	654	2.96%	38	0.17%
10	10,584	30.70%	23,479	68.10%	406	1.18%	6	0.02%	11,878	35.06%	21,998	64.94%	15,412	64.62%	7,489	31.40%	918	3.85%	30	0.13%
11	21,999	53.26%	17,500	42.37%	1,792	4.34%	12	0.03%	24,648	61.28%	15,576	38.72%	8,940	34.77%	15,640	60.82%	1,079	4.20%	55	0.21%
12	17,079	47.65%	18,313	51.09%	441	1.23%	12	0.03%	18,554	52.55%	16,752	47.45%	11,373	48.26%	11,355	48.19%	820	3.48%	17	0.07%
13	11,186	27.90%	28,180	70.30%	711	1.77%	10	0.02%	13,096	33.28%	26,250	66.72%	18,332	63.57%	9,180	31.83%	1,201	4.16%	126	0.44%
14	8,602	35.58%	14,927	61.74%	643	2.66%	5	0.02%	10,111	42.64%	13,602	57.36%	8,982	59.61%	5,359	35.57%	704	4.67%	22	0.15%
15	5,745	31.82%	11,786	65.27%	520	2.88%	5	0.03%	6,792	38.70%	10,759	61.30%	7,085	63.75%	3,460	31.13%	548	4.93%	20	0.18%
16	15,315	41.05%	21,295	57.08%	692	1.85%	6	0.02%	17,254	47.21%	19,293	52.79%	12,611	51.55%	10,386	42.45%	1,421	5.81%	48	0.20%
17	13,028	30.49%	28,818	67.45%	874	2.05%	4	0.01%	16,102	38.50%	25,725	61.50%	18,597	58.14%	11,618	36.32%	1,730	5.41%	39	0.12%
18	19,993	56.18%	14,447	40.60%	1,136	3.19%	12	0.03%	21,986	63.19%	12,809	36.81%	6,879	33.33%	12,754	61.79%	968	4.69%	39	0.19%
19	13,581	34.41%	24,684	62.54%	1,193	3.02%	10	0.03%	16,131	42.05%	22,234	57.95%	14,029	52.05%	11,412	42.34%	1,465	5.44%	48	0.18%
20	13,683	33.44%	26,066	63.71%	1,152	2.82%	12	0.03%	16,044	40.45%	23,624	59.55%	14,896	53.87%	11,396	41.22%	1,311	4.74%	47	0.17%
21	19,613	57.51%	14,045	41.18%	434	1.27%	11	0.03%	20,805	61.90%	12,803	38.10%	8,557	40.29%	12,041	56.70%	612	2.88%	26	0.12%
22	15,714	43.90%	19,638	54.87%	434	1.21%	5	0.01%	17,535	49.93%	17,581	50.07%	12,817	51.78%	10,726	43.34%	1,158	4.68%	50	0.20%
23	24,490	62.22%	14,521	36.89%	350	0.89%	1	0.00%	25,919	66.94%	12,801	33.06%	8,825	34.89%	15,731	62.19%	722	2.85%	17	0.07%
24	20,058	51.71%	18,288	47.15%	436	1.12%	8	0.02%	21,144	55.44%	16,994	44.56%	11,750	45.62%	13,325	51.74%	657	2.55%	24	0.09%
25	14,682	40.75%	20,622	57.24%	713	1.98%	13	0.04%	16,471	46.60%	18,875	53.40%	13,313	52.56%	10,823	42.73%	1,140	4.50%	53	0.21%
26	13,521	33.02%	26,508	64.73%	910	2.22%	10	0.02%	15,493	38.60%	24,641	61.40%	16,047	59.39%	9,887	36.59%	1,036	3.83%	49	0.18%
27	23,878	65.27%	12,369	33.81%	331	0.90%	4	0.01%	25,041	69.33%	11,076	30.67%	8,198	34.09%	15,190	63.16%	647	2.69%	16	0.07%
28	10,971	32.32%	22,423	66.05%	544	1.60%	10	0.03%	12,723	38.23%	20,560	61.77%	13,561	62.04%	7,307	33.43%	943	4.31%	48	0.22%
29	35,463	77.32%	9,134	19.92%	1,242	2.71%	25	0.05%	37,229	82.66%	7,812	17.34%	4,020	14.49%	23,189	83.60%	503	1.81%	27	0.10%
30	29,080	61.95%	16,637	35.44%	1,215	2.59%	11	0.02%	31,249	67.84%	14,812	32.16%	9,863	30.23%	21,982	67.37%	753	2.31%	30	0.09%
31	31,088	76.24%	8,713	21.37%	943	2.31%	30	0.07%	32,663	81.05%	7,639	18.95%	4,068	16.31%	20,384	81.72%	452	1.81%	39	0.16%
32	24,908	63.00%	14,186	35.88%	438	1.11%	4	0.01%	26,603	68.44%	12,266	31.56%	8,903	33.82%	16,633	63.19%	755	2.87%	32	0.12%
33	26,671	69.27%	10,833	28.14%	996	2.59%	3	0.01%	28,733	75.79%	9,178	24.21%	5,274	22.15%	17,806	74.77%	693	2.91%	42	0.18%
34	23,053	50.18%	21,562	46.94%	1,318	2.87%	7	0.02%	25,739	57.30%	19,181	42.70%	12,441	38.80%	18,646	58.16%	917	2.86%	57	0.18%
35	16,938	36.94%	27,839	60.72%	1,057	2.31%	14	0.03%	19,155	42.56%	25,850	57.44%	16,824	52.58%	14,184	44.33%	926	2.89%	66	0.21%
36	16,512	34.84%	29,686	62.64%	1,187	2.50%	8	0.02%	19,356	41.76%	26,991	58.24%	18,484	54.29%	14,562	42.77%	934	2.74%	67	0.20%
37	16,581	37.68%	26,133	59.38%	1,280	2.91%	14	0.03%	18,944	44.10%	24,017	55.90%	16,120	52.84%	13,273	43.50%	1,049	3.44%	68	0.22%
38	28,927	75.25%	8,620	22.42%	883	2.30%	11	0.03%	30,685	80.78%	7,300	19.22%	4,250	18.20%	18,478	79.11%	594	2.54%	35	0.15%
39	24,094	57.85%	16,578	39.81%	963	2.31%	13	0.03%	26,404	64.35%	14,629	35.65%	9,143	33.82%	17,083	63.20%	766	2.83%	40	0.15%
40	18,258	35.73%	31,594	61.83%	1,235	2.42%	15	0.03%	21,010	41.98%	29,040	58.02%	20,016	52.51%	17,135	44.95%	923	2.42%	46	0.12%
41	18,240	44.11%	21,871	52.89%	1,228	2.97%	12	0.03%	20,681	51.40%	19,552	48.60%	12,238	43.63%	14,958	53.33%	802	2.86%	52	0.19%
42	17,657	70.31%	6,879	27.39%	570	2.27%	7	0.03%	18,581	74.83%	6,251	25.17%	3,360	24.76%	9,838	72.50%	356	2.62%	15	0.11%
43	22,155	68.80%	9,319	28.94%	716	2.22%	13	0.04%	23,447	73.52%	8,447	26.48%	5,177	28.30%	12,578	68.77%	504	2.76%	32	0.17%
44	16,575	50.29%	15,604	47.34%	777	2.36%	4	0.01%	18,236	56.47%	14,058	43.53%	9,371	46.34%	10,098	49.94%	724	3.58%	28	0.14%
45	14,293	40.30%	20,508	57.83%	654	1.84%	10	0.03%	16,061	46.10%	18,779	53.90%	12,902	55.12%	9,613	41.07%	862	3.68%	28	0.12%
46	13,148	49.59%	12,865	48.52%	494	1.86%	9	0.03%	14,692	56.79%	11,178	43.21%	8,263	51.41%	6,912	43.00%	864	5.38%	34	0.21%
47	17,474	65.03%	8,923	33.21%	463	1.72%	10	0.04%	19,029	72.21%	7,325	27.79%	6,020	38.81%	8,990	57.95%	483	3.11%	20	0.13%
48	17,506	57.00%	12,512	40.74%	683	2.22%	11	0.04%	18,833	62.60%	11,253	37.40%	8,168	39.86%	11,599	56.60%	702	3.43%	25	0.12%
49	22,549	48.54%	22,368	48.15%	1,520	3.27%	18	0.04%	25,418	56.16%	19,843	43.84%	12,506	39.43%	18,268	57.59%	905	2.85%	41	0.13%
50	22,427	51.96%	19,641	45.50%	1,079	2.50%	17	0.04%	24,273	57.34%	18,057	42.66%	11,936	39.20%	17,598	57.80%	884	2.90%	31	0.10%
51	13,347	41.90%	17,802	55.89%	695	2.18%	9	0.03%	14,890	47.81%	16,254	52.19%	10,309	51.33%	8,824	43.94%	912	4.54%	37	0.18%
52	13,223	32.47%	26,842	65.91%	647	1.59%	13	0.03%	14,727	36.95%	25,133	63.05%	18,117	61.71%	10,299	35.08%	918	3.13%	25	0.09%
53	12,066	36.20%	20,590	61.78%	654	1.96%	18	0.05%	13,884	42.31%	18,933	57.69%	12,290	57.33%	8,229	38.39%	881	4.11%	37	0.17%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-23.asc', modified 08/28/2017 10:19:32 AM

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptS03|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections. Votes that could not be associated with a specific precinct were excluded. Reported statewide totals may therefore be marginally lower than official contest results.

HBK-23 Lewis - Wake County: Governor 2012, Lt Governor 2012, US Senate 2014

	Governor 2012: Dalton-McCrory-Howe								Lieutenant Governor 2012: Coleman-Forest				US Senate 2014: Tillis-Hagan-Haugh							
District	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %
54	23,822	51.27%	21,500	46.27%	1,129	2.43%	13	0.03%	25,713	56.54%	19,767	43.46%	13,798	38.55%	20,947	58.53%	1,010	2.82%	33	0.09%
55	11,895	34.27%	22,352	64.40%	451	1.30%	9	0.03%	14,409	42.63%	19,392	57.37%	12,564	58.22%	8,132	37.68%	825	3.82%	59	0.27%
56	31,425	72.59%	10,387	23.99%	1,442	3.33%	35	0.08%	33,453	79.36%	8,702	20.64%	4,328	14.66%	24,548	83.15%	623	2.11%	25	0.08%
57	33,864	82.21%	6,380	15.49%	935	2.27%	15	0.04%	35,587	87.36%	5,148	12.64%	2,908	12.79%	19,345	85.07%	461	2.03%	27	0.12%
58	25,470	67.33%	11,477	30.34%	871	2.30%	12	0.03%	27,374	73.49%	9,877	26.51%	6,056	26.29%	16,414	71.26%	541	2.35%	23	0.10%
59	16,881	38.35%	26,270	59.68%	842	1.91%	22	0.05%	18,902	43.85%	24,202	56.15%	16,481	54.26%	13,076	43.05%	781	2.57%	38	0.13%
60	21,229	61.82%	12,382	36.06%	716	2.08%	14	0.04%	22,798	67.67%	10,893	32.33%	6,627	32.59%	13,173	64.78%	511	2.51%	23	0.11%
61	16,477	35.08%	29,436	62.67%	1,042	2.22%	13	0.03%	18,890	41.30%	26,843	58.70%	18,586	54.92%	14,369	42.46%	833	2.46%	54	0.16%
62	16,439	35.57%	28,715	62.13%	1,049	2.27%	16	0.03%	18,766	41.64%	26,301	58.36%	17,940	54.18%	14,342	43.32%	788	2.38%	39	0.12%
63	13,645	38.81%	20,703	58.88%	806	2.29%	8	0.02%	15,271	44.34%	19,170	55.66%	12,602	53.40%	9,988	42.32%	965	4.09%	44	0.19%
64	11,979	37.49%	19,341	60.53%	627	1.96%	4	0.01%	13,229	42.12%	18,180	57.88%	11,778	56.82%	8,157	39.35%	765	3.69%	29	0.14%
65	13,513	36.26%	23,056	61.87%	688	1.85%	8	0.02%	15,423	42.41%	20,945	57.59%	14,329	56.93%	9,480	37.67%	1,299	5.16%	61	0.24%
66	14,745	42.53%	19,327	55.75%	573	1.65%	22	0.06%	17,639	52.60%	15,896	47.40%	11,634	48.65%	10,906	45.60%	1,307	5.46%	69	0.29%
67	8,403	21.02%	30,987	77.50%	589	1.47%	3	0.01%	11,566	29.86%	27,172	70.14%	17,657	66.58%	7,224	27.24%	1,552	5.85%	88	0.33%
68	9,603	26.44%	26,124	71.94%	580	1.60%	8	0.02%	12,272	34.62%	23,173	65.38%	14,825	62.65%	8,035	33.95%	726	3.07%	78	0.33%
69	9,500	27.69%	24,180	70.48%	618	1.80%	12	0.03%	12,086	36.26%	21,244	63.74%	12,586	61.65%	7,039	34.48%	713	3.49%	76	0.37%
70	7,067	22.31%	23,955	75.61%	659	2.08%	2	0.01%	8,422	27.16%	22,587	72.84%	13,549	72.21%	4,376	23.32%	811	4.32%	27	0.14%
71	21,632	63.47%	11,608	34.06%	833	2.44%	11	0.03%	23,344	69.85%	10,074	30.15%	5,937	29.94%	13,286	67.01%	564	2.84%	41	0.21%
72	25,032	71.44%	9,442	26.95%	561	1.60%	4	0.01%	26,408	76.70%	8,021	23.30%	4,846	22.84%	15,910	75.00%	431	2.03%	27	0.13%
73	10,246	26.97%	26,893	70.79%	836	2.20%	13	0.03%	12,226	33.12%	24,693	66.88%	16,341	65.28%	7,672	30.65%	958	3.83%	60	0.24%
74	14,574	33.71%	27,740	64.17%	903	2.09%	14	0.03%	16,738	39.66%	25,462	60.34%	16,626	57.24%	11,474	39.50%	896	3.08%	52	0.18%
75	13,727	34.78%	24,886	63.06%	843	2.14%	8	0.02%	15,812	40.97%	22,784	59.03%	14,120	56.55%	10,022	40.14%	765	3.06%	60	0.24%
76	12,284	33.69%	23,538	64.56%	628	1.72%	9	0.02%	14,731	41.42%	20,837	58.58%	12,611	55.12%	8,946	39.10%	1,270	5.55%	51	0.22%
77	9,369	23.42%	29,955	74.88%	668	1.67%	11	0.03%	11,524	29.40%	27,678	70.60%	17,850	66.81%	7,521	28.15%	1,287	4.82%	59	0.22%
78	7,417	21.69%	26,189	76.58%	589	1.72%	2	0.01%	8,545	25.56%	24,890	74.44%	15,703	72.92%	4,853	22.54%	935	4.34%	44	0.20%
79	13,554	37.32%	22,193	61.10%	570	1.57%	4	0.01%	15,469	43.41%	20,162	56.59%	14,708	55.81%	10,339	39.23%	1,201	4.56%	104	0.39%
80	8,280	22.99%	27,024	75.04%	703	1.95%	6	0.02%	10,026	28.42%	25,253	71.58%	15,663	71.58%	5,384	24.61%	804	3.67%	30	0.14%
81	9,478	27.29%	24,476	70.48%	769	2.21%	5	0.01%	11,626	34.16%	22,403	65.84%	13,608	64.41%	6,478	30.66%	994	4.70%	48	0.23%
82	11,819	29.62%	27,372	68.60%	709	1.78%	0	0.00%	15,675	40.46%	23,071	59.54%	13,965	56.43%	9,795	39.58%	921	3.72%	66	0.27%
83	11,196	32.99%	22,088	65.08%	657	1.94%	0	0.00%	14,396	43.66%	18,580	56.34%	10,827	53.84%	8,173	40.65%	1,043	5.19%	65	0.32%
84	10,369	28.17%	25,834	70.19%	594	1.61%	8	0.02%	12,890	35.90%	23,016	64.10%	15,527	61.64%	8,043	31.93%	1,547	6.14%	72	0.29%
85	8,720	26.19%	23,735	71.30%	830	2.49%	4	0.01%	10,049	31.44%	21,909	68.56%	14,353	67.23%	5,803	27.18%	1,155	5.41%	37	0.17%
86	9,894	30.27%	22,179	67.86%	597	1.83%	14	0.04%	12,957	40.71%	18,868	59.29%	12,566	56.86%	8,134	36.81%	1,359	6.15%	39	0.18%
87	8,402	24.08%	25,771	73.84%	726	2.08%	0	0.00%	11,079	32.73%	22,771	67.27%	13,309	63.30%	6,258	29.76%	1,381	6.57%	78	0.37%
88	20,018	59.29%	13,068	38.71%	670	1.98%	6	0.02%	23,272	70.93%	9,539	29.07%	5,082	26.73%	13,373	70.35%	525	2.76%	30	0.16%
89	8,637	25.00%	25,338	73.34%	567	1.64%	8	0.02%	11,035	32.69%	22,717	67.31%	13,875	64.20%	6,526	30.20%	1,153	5.33%	58	0.27%
90	9,098	27.20%	23,610	70.57%	737	2.20%	9	0.03%	11,015	34.03%	21,358	65.97%	14,202	63.15%	6,909	30.72%	1,333	5.93%	45	0.20%
91	9,542	26.27%	25,983	71.53%	788	2.17%	12	0.03%	11,497	32.45%	23,938	67.55%	15,807	65.85%	6,654	27.72%	1,463	6.09%	82	0.34%
92	17,313	53.39%	14,448	44.55%	661	2.04%	6	0.02%	20,458	64.53%	11,246	35.47%	5,661	32.76%	10,988	63.60%	586	3.39%	43	0.25%
93	14,589	36.70%	23,616	59.41%	1,532	3.85%	11	0.03%	17,050	44.54%	21,230	55.46%	13,890	52.47%	11,056	41.76%	1,481	5.59%	47	0.18%
94	8,654	23.53%	27,494	74.76%	619	1.68%	7	0.02%	10,736	30.05%	24,993	69.95%	16,393	66.83%	6,491	26.46%	1,552	6.33%	92	0.38%
95	9,674	24.71%	28,753	73.44%	710	1.81%	15	0.04%	12,828	33.76%	25,174	66.24%	15,725	62.10%	8,257	32.61%	1,255	4.96%	84	0.33%
96	9,710	27.99%	24,383	70.28%	596	1.72%	7	0.02%	12,265	36.11%	21,704	63.89%	13,550	60.40%	7,757	34.58%	1,060	4.73%	65	0.29%
97	8,226	22.44%	27,842	75.96%	582	1.59%	5	0.01%	10,866	30.52%	24,732	69.48%	15,844	66.50%	6,685	28.06%	1,232	5.17%	66	0.28%
98	11,028	26.83%	29,295	71.27%	774	1.88%	7	0.02%	15,043	37.92%	24,623	62.08%	14,436	56.42%	10,325	40.35%	736	2.88%	89	0.35%
99	23,478	69.59%	9,686	28.71%	565	1.67%	7	0.02%	26,192	78.87%	7,017	21.13%	3,532	18.57%	15,086	79.31%	374	1.97%	29	0.15%
100	17,333	55.16%	13,474	42.88%	605	1.93%	12	0.04%	20,399	66.57%	10,245	33.43%	5,518	31.92%	11,202	64.79%	533	3.08%	36	0.21%
101	24,485	65.40%	12,341	32.96%	605	1.62%	7	0.02%	27,310	74.45%	9,370	25.55%	4,873	23.57%	15,262	73.83%	512	2.48%	25	0.12%
102	21,669	68.30%	9,269	29.22%	768	2.42%	18	0.06%	24,802	80.30%	6,085	19.70%	2,896	16.75%	13,858	80.17%	508	2.94%	23	0.13%
103	10,654	25.61%	30,288	72.80%	655	1.57%	9	0.02%	14,826	36.80%	25,459	63.20%	14,931	57.20%	10,396	39.82%	727	2.78%	51	0.20%
104	11,360	24.40%	34,544	74.20%	641	1.38%	13	0.03%	16,834	37.48%	28,079	62.52%	16,733	55.41%	12,697	42.04%	731	2.42%	39	0.13%
105	10,762	26.63%	29,029	71.84%	610	1.51%	6	0.01%	14,930	38.00%	24,356	62.00%	13,516	56.71%	9,683	40.63%	589	2.47%	44	0.18%
106	20,129	62.28%	11,537	35.70%	637	1.97%	17	0.05%	23,095	72.96%	8,561	27.04%	4,035	23.69%	12,601	73.99%	384	2.25%	10	0.06%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-23.asc', modified 08/28/2017 10:19:32 AM

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptS03|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections. Votes that could not be associated with a specific precinct were excluded. Reported statewide totals may therefore be marginally lower than official contest results.

HBK-23 Lewis - Wake County: Governor 2012, Lt Governor 2012, US Senate 2014

	Governor 2012: Dalton-McCrory-Howe								Lieutenant Governor 2012: Coleman-Forest				US Senate 2014: Tillis-Hagan-Haugh							
District	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Write-In**	**Write-In %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Write-In**	**Write-In %**
107	24,066	67.23%	11,223	31.35%	499	1.39%	11	0.03%	26,973	76.68%	8,203	23.32%	4,072	20.43%	15,400	77.28%	420	2.11%	35	0.18%
108	10,229	30.60%	22,641	67.73%	553	1.65%	6	0.02%	12,577	38.66%	19,954	61.34%	11,798	58.37%	7,436	36.79%	940	4.65%	37	0.18%
109	11,675	33.74%	22,419	64.79%	501	1.45%	9	0.03%	13,855	41.00%	19,937	59.00%	12,274	57.67%	8,147	38.28%	804	3.78%	59	0.28%
110	10,188	31.08%	22,150	67.56%	443	1.35%	4	0.01%	11,944	37.40%	19,996	62.60%	12,381	60.75%	6,988	34.29%	961	4.72%	49	0.24%
111	10,978	33.85%	21,002	64.75%	447	1.38%	9	0.03%	12,345	39.08%	19,245	60.92%	12,248	58.87%	7,466	35.89%	1,040	5.00%	50	0.24%
112	13,175	40.49%	18,798	57.78%	552	1.70%	10	0.03%	11,934	37.96%	19,505	62.04%	13,356	60.75%	7,327	33.33%	1,273	5.79%	30	0.14%
113	14,513	34.86%	26,056	62.58%	1,053	2.53%	14	0.03%	15,965	39.13%	24,832	60.87%	17,951	56.94%	12,220	38.76%	1,317	4.18%	39	0.12%
114	30,335	67.66%	12,627	28.17%	1,853	4.13%	17	0.04%	32,363	73.64%	11,584	26.36%	6,689	22.11%	22,389	74.02%	1,142	3.78%	29	0.10%
115	18,992	44.03%	22,839	52.94%	1,300	3.01%	8	0.02%	20,704	48.97%	21,574	51.03%	14,095	45.76%	15,408	50.02%	1,262	4.10%	39	0.13%
116	15,055	39.40%	22,073	57.77%	1,069	2.80%	10	0.03%	16,787	44.87%	20,623	55.13%	13,088	50.68%	11,658	45.14%	1,042	4.03%	38	0.15%
117	12,236	33.12%	23,695	64.13%	1,002	2.71%	14	0.04%	13,677	37.80%	22,505	62.20%	14,898	58.54%	9,518	37.40%	995	3.91%	37	0.15%
118	14,554	39.85%	21,033	57.59%	922	2.52%	13	0.04%	15,851	44.59%	19,698	55.41%	14,379	52.35%	11,489	41.83%	1,537	5.60%	61	0.22%
119	14,498	44.69%	16,886	52.05%	1,054	3.25%	2	0.01%	15,958	50.57%	15,600	49.43%	10,500	46.76%	10,697	47.64%	1,217	5.42%	40	0.18%
120	12,098	31.33%	25,139	65.11%	1,357	3.51%	18	0.05%	13,273	35.22%	24,408	64.78%	18,212	62.59%	9,371	32.21%	1,474	5.07%	40	0.14%
Totals:	**1,925,270**	**43.18%**	**2,437,224**	**54.67%**	**94,512**	**2.12%**	**1,191**	**0.03%**	**2,174,021**	**49.88%**	**2,184,891**	**50.12%**	**1,416,834**	**48.84%**	**1,370,303**	**47.23%**	**108,779**	**3.75%**	**5,251**	**0.18%**

HBK-23 Lewis - Wake County: President 2016, US Senate 2016, Governor 2016

	US President 2016: Trump-Clinton-Johnson								US Senate 2016: Burr-Ross-Haugh						Governor 2016: Cooper-McCrory-Cecil					
District	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %
1	18,589	51.78%	16,455	45.83%	630	1.75%	229	0.64%	18,358	52.14%	16,040	45.56%	811	2.30%	16,170	45.62%	18,855	53.20%	418	1.18%
2	21,687	56.45%	15,453	40.22%	893	2.32%	385	1.00%	21,503	56.54%	15,299	40.22%	1,232	3.24%	16,542	43.27%	21,035	55.02%	656	1.72%
3	19,500	57.51%	13,102	38.64%	958	2.83%	350	1.03%	19,722	58.75%	12,526	37.32%	1,320	3.93%	13,284	39.49%	19,645	58.40%	709	2.11%
4	19,316	63.27%	10,515	34.44%	536	1.76%	163	0.53%	18,844	62.77%	10,197	33.97%	978	3.26%	10,515	34.80%	19,240	63.67%	463	1.53%
5	14,071	42.89%	17,840	54.38%	677	2.06%	221	0.67%	13,942	43.33%	17,542	54.52%	690	2.14%	17,723	54.83%	14,115	43.67%	483	1.49%
6	26,166	63.13%	13,548	32.69%	1,322	3.19%	413	1.00%	25,754	63.45%	13,548	33.38%	1,290	3.18%	14,719	36.08%	25,069	61.45%	1,010	2.48%
7	17,731	44.94%	20,836	52.81%	588	1.49%	299	0.76%	17,965	45.70%	20,621	52.45%	729	1.85%	21,877	55.47%	17,171	43.54%	389	0.99%
8	11,251	32.48%	22,166	63.99%	878	2.53%	346	1.00%	11,920	34.87%	21,238	62.12%	1,030	3.01%	21,791	63.50%	11,949	34.82%	577	1.68%
9	20,103	53.26%	16,101	42.66%	1,112	2.95%	426	1.13%	20,913	55.89%	15,376	41.09%	1,129	3.02%	16,546	44.07%	20,375	54.27%	626	1.67%
10	24,292	66.90%	11,079	30.51%	680	1.87%	258	0.71%	24,011	66.82%	10,937	30.44%	984	2.74%	11,524	31.87%	24,183	66.89%	449	1.24%
11	12,772	30.14%	26,766	63.16%	1,949	4.60%	890	2.10%	14,335	34.09%	26,030	61.90%	1,690	4.02%	28,163	66.70%	12,781	30.27%	1,278	3.03%
12	17,784	51.92%	15,657	45.71%	569	1.66%	241	0.70%	17,668	52.25%	15,240	45.07%	906	2.68%	15,523	45.65%	18,084	53.18%	397	1.17%
13	29,527	68.85%	11,999	27.98%	967	2.25%	396	0.92%	29,080	68.53%	11,666	27.49%	1,685	3.97%	12,730	29.84%	29,076	68.17%	849	1.99%
14	16,391	60.55%	9,442	34.88%	949	3.51%	289	1.07%	16,089	60.41%	9,134	34.30%	1,410	5.29%	9,540	35.73%	16,350	61.23%	813	3.04%
15	13,635	66.87%	5,838	28.63%	701	3.44%	217	1.06%	13,255	66.19%	5,709	28.51%	1,061	5.30%	6,115	30.44%	13,366	66.54%	606	3.02%
16	24,723	60.82%	14,793	36.39%	868	2.14%	267	0.66%	24,021	60.12%	14,359	35.94%	1,578	3.95%	15,806	39.44%	23,414	58.42%	858	2.14%
17	33,539	64.40%	16,832	32.32%	1,227	2.36%	480	0.92%	32,987	64.27%	16,223	31.61%	2,112	4.12%	18,326	35.57%	32,038	62.18%	1,162	2.26%
18	14,960	39.11%	21,515	56.25%	1,247	3.26%	530	1.39%	15,065	40.15%	20,714	55.20%	1,747	4.66%	22,540	59.77%	14,028	37.20%	1,146	3.04%
19	24,349	55.45%	17,494	39.84%	1,461	3.33%	604	1.38%	24,444	56.44%	16,799	38.79%	2,068	4.77%	19,932	45.80%	22,351	51.36%	1,232	2.83%
20	25,197	54.81%	18,393	40.01%	1,731	3.77%	651	1.42%	25,753	56.83%	17,604	38.84%	1,962	4.33%	20,831	45.79%	23,400	51.43%	1,266	2.78%
21	12,919	40.43%	18,303	57.28%	495	1.55%	237	0.74%	13,027	41.30%	17,815	56.47%	703	2.23%	17,980	56.77%	13,288	41.96%	404	1.28%
22	20,939	58.30%	14,256	39.69%	523	1.46%	201	0.56%	20,588	58.10%	14,025	39.58%	820	2.31%	14,561	40.81%	20,720	58.07%	400	1.12%
23	14,143	38.43%	22,040	59.88%	449	1.22%	173	0.47%	14,165	38.89%	21,496	59.02%	760	2.09%	21,917	59.87%	14,389	39.30%	303	0.83%
24	17,531	45.97%	19,663	51.56%	667	1.75%	274	0.72%	17,641	46.58%	19,435	51.32%	794	2.10%	20,471	53.84%	17,161	45.13%	391	1.03%
25	21,956	56.91%	15,273	39.59%	939	2.43%	411	1.07%	21,764	56.74%	15,352	40.02%	1,242	3.24%	16,618	43.12%	21,215	55.05%	707	1.83%
26	28,405	59.94%	16,944	35.76%	1,499	3.16%	539	1.14%	28,505	60.58%	16,778	35.66%	1,767	3.76%	18,608	39.37%	27,716	58.63%	946	2.00%
27	12,504	36.17%	21,573	62.40%	373	1.08%	123	0.36%	12,390	36.15%	21,326	62.22%	557	1.63%	21,783	63.37%	12,336	35.89%	256	0.74%
28	24,454	65.87%	11,524	31.04%	860	2.32%	288	0.78%	24,026	65.28%	11,577	31.45%	1,202	3.27%	12,613	34.09%	23,768	64.24%	617	1.67%
29	5,172	10.88%	40,386	84.99%	1,171	2.46%	787	1.66%	7,072	15.00%	39,112	82.96%	964	2.04%	40,387	85.64%	6,009	12.74%	761	1.61%
30	13,282	26.62%	34,511	69.18%	1,265	2.54%	829	1.66%	14,956	30.09%	33,506	67.41%	1,242	2.50%	35,040	70.35%	13,947	28.00%	818	1.64%
31	7,429	16.37%	36,169	79.69%	1,136	2.50%	654	1.44%	8,466	18.76%	35,558	78.81%	1,092	2.42%	36,387	80.47%	8,063	17.83%	770	1.70%
32	13,636	35.53%	23,937	62.37%	563	1.47%	241	0.63%	13,731	36.10%	23,622	62.10%	683	1.80%	24,127	63.21%	13,643	35.74%	401	1.05%
33	8,767	21.69%	29,855	73.85%	1,231	3.05%	571	1.41%	9,581	23.88%	29,362	73.19%	1,176	2.93%	30,383	75.49%	9,009	22.38%	856	2.13%
34	15,899	33.19%	29,193	60.93%	1,853	3.87%	964	2.01%	18,725	39.20%	27,648	57.88%	1,394	2.92%	30,754	64.19%	16,172	33.75%	985	2.06%
35	25,820	48.23%	24,741	46.22%	1,856	3.47%	1,114	2.08%	27,825	52.32%	23,667	44.50%	1,691	3.18%	26,206	49.05%	26,119	48.89%	1,103	2.06%
36	25,495	49.78%	22,974	44.86%	1,903	3.72%	846	1.65%	27,500	53.89%	21,900	42.91%	1,632	3.20%	24,574	47.98%	25,611	50.00%	1,036	2.02%
37	26,551	49.29%	24,034	44.61%	2,353	4.37%	933	1.73%	28,537	53.33%	22,998	42.98%	1,977	3.69%	25,914	48.21%	26,430	49.17%	1,407	2.62%
38	6,506	16.91%	30,462	79.16%	973	2.53%	542	1.41%	7,268	19.02%	29,875	78.17%	1,077	2.82%	30,642	79.97%	6,895	17.99%	782	2.04%
39	14,772	32.83%	28,309	62.91%	1,293	2.87%	625	1.39%	15,518	34.68%	27,895	62.33%	1,339	2.99%	29,019	64.61%	15,061	33.53%	837	1.86%
40	25,292	46.24%	26,285	48.05%	2,113	3.86%	1,008	1.84%	28,467	52.13%	24,667	45.17%	1,474	2.70%	27,948	51.03%	25,775	47.06%	1,042	1.90%
41	17,243	35.39%	28,670	58.85%	1,924	3.95%	879	1.80%	20,149	41.74%	26,623	55.15%	1,504	3.12%	29,266	60.36%	18,040	37.21%	1,180	2.43%
42	6,364	25.50%	17,674	70.81%	647	2.59%	274	1.10%	6,643	26.97%	17,141	69.60%	845	3.43%	17,092	69.47%	6,886	27.99%	627	2.55%
43	8,099	26.20%	21,704	70.20%	798	2.58%	317	1.03%	8,364	27.40%	21,127	69.21%	1,035	3.39%	21,109	69.10%	8,700	28.48%	740	2.42%
44	14,477	44.27%	16,935	51.79%	961	2.94%	329	1.01%	14,728	45.60%	16,387	50.74%	1,184	3.67%	16,797	51.88%	14,827	45.80%	750	2.32%
45	22,325	57.35%	15,292	39.28%	967	2.48%	343	0.88%	22,167	57.66%	15,078	39.22%	1,202	3.13%	15,451	40.04%	22,349	57.91%	792	2.05%
46	16,046	61.47%	9,544	36.56%	396	1.52%	116	0.44%	15,195	59.76%	9,522	37.45%	708	2.78%	9,625	37.45%	15,778	61.39%	300	1.17%
47	11,779	46.41%	12,896	50.81%	520	2.05%	186	0.73%	11,277	45.82%	12,909	52.46%	423	1.72%	12,419	49.71%	12,346	49.42%	216	0.86%
48	14,016	43.58%	17,045	53.00%	831	2.58%	266	0.83%	13,782	43.73%	16,722	53.06%	1,010	3.20%	17,039	53.91%	13,890	43.94%	679	2.15%
49	16,965	33.01%	31,447	61.18%	2,012	3.91%	974	1.90%	19,884	38.92%	29,621	57.98%	1,580	3.09%	32,686	63.71%	17,463	34.04%	1,158	2.26%
50	18,683	40.92%	25,213	55.22%	1,226	2.69%	539	1.18%	19,535	43.06%	24,526	54.06%	1,309	2.89%	26,259	57.73%	18,414	40.49%	810	1.78%
51	18,556	54.99%	13,829	40.98%	1,027	3.04%	332	0.98%	18,319	54.87%	13,803	41.34%	1,264	3.79%	14,919	44.49%	17,772	53.00%	840	2.51%
52	26,508	61.46%	14,902	34.55%	1,240	2.87%	482	1.12%	26,850	62.67%	14,595	34.07%	1,396	3.26%	16,149	37.60%	25,907	60.32%	893	2.08%

HBK-23 Lewis - Wake County: President 2016, US Senate 2016, Governor 2016

	US President 2016: Trump-Clinton-Johnson								US Senate 2016: Burr-Ross-Haugh						Governor 2016: Cooper-McCrory-Cecil					
District	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %
53	21,436	60.85%	12,611	35.80%	852	2.42%	328	0.93%	21,212	60.60%	12,628	36.08%	1,164	3.33%	13,300	37.93%	21,064	60.08%	697	1.99%
54	19,492	37.13%	30,645	58.38%	1,545	2.94%	809	1.54%	21,169	40.48%	29,679	56.76%	1,444	2.76%	31,838	60.66%	19,672	37.48%	979	1.87%
55	22,840	63.50%	12,002	33.37%	788	2.19%	336	0.93%	22,508	63.37%	11,758	33.10%	1,252	3.52%	12,330	34.49%	22,863	63.95%	559	1.56%
56	5,901	12.36%	39,502	82.73%	1,392	2.92%	955	2.00%	8,341	17.60%	38,022	80.24%	1,021	2.15%	40,120	84.53%	6,502	13.70%	838	1.77%
57	4,869	12.13%	33,975	84.62%	785	1.96%	523	1.30%	5,571	14.07%	33,051	83.48%	968	2.45%	33,866	85.39%	5,062	12.76%	733	1.85%
58	8,963	23.57%	27,663	72.74%	918	2.41%	485	1.28%	9,437	25.12%	26,960	71.78%	1,164	3.10%	28,097	74.57%	8,759	23.25%	823	2.18%
59	25,507	54.53%	19,758	42.24%	1,056	2.26%	457	0.98%	25,592	55.15%	19,403	41.81%	1,411	3.04%	21,420	45.98%	24,237	52.03%	926	1.99%
60	10,484	30.27%	22,918	66.17%	880	2.54%	353	1.02%	10,935	32.03%	22,058	64.61%	1,148	3.36%	23,295	68.08%	10,105	29.53%	819	2.39%
61	24,185	49.68%	22,193	45.59%	1,552	3.19%	752	1.54%	25,701	53.16%	21,118	43.68%	1,528	3.16%	24,221	49.98%	23,168	47.80%	1,075	2.22%
62	23,811	49.23%	22,262	46.02%	1,540	3.18%	757	1.57%	25,865	53.72%	20,867	43.34%	1,417	2.94%	24,295	50.38%	22,926	47.54%	1,000	2.07%
63	19,745	52.91%	16,215	43.45%	964	2.58%	397	1.06%	20,099	54.24%	15,711	42.39%	1,249	3.37%	17,448	46.93%	19,042	51.22%	687	1.85%
64	19,070	56.36%	13,618	40.25%	831	2.46%	317	0.94%	19,281	57.45%	13,162	39.22%	1,119	3.33%	14,584	43.35%	18,459	54.87%	596	1.77%
65	23,874	63.29%	12,795	33.92%	751	1.99%	301	0.80%	23,327	62.41%	12,731	34.06%	1,321	3.53%	14,611	38.98%	22,135	59.06%	733	1.96%
66	20,232	57.61%	14,075	40.08%	619	1.76%	192	0.55%	19,128	55.40%	14,083	40.79%	1,316	3.81%	15,183	43.59%	19,075	54.76%	577	1.66%
67	31,950	73.24%	10,240	23.47%	1,051	2.41%	381	0.87%	30,799	71.22%	10,291	23.80%	2,154	4.98%	11,709	26.92%	30,872	70.99%	907	2.09%
68	25,357	58.90%	15,581	36.19%	1,519	3.53%	593	1.38%	26,537	62.36%	14,300	33.60%	1,717	4.03%	16,268	38.02%	25,525	59.65%	1,000	2.34%
69	23,008	61.78%	12,620	33.89%	1,151	3.09%	461	1.24%	23,224	63.20%	11,858	32.27%	1,667	4.54%	13,180	35.64%	22,857	61.81%	941	2.54%
70	25,245	74.51%	7,544	22.27%	779	2.30%	312	0.92%	24,601	73.23%	7,505	22.34%	1,490	4.44%	9,245	27.45%	23,609	70.11%	821	2.44%
71	9,228	26.65%	23,827	68.81%	1,064	3.07%	510	1.47%	10,380	30.23%	22,857	66.56%	1,102	3.21%	24,376	70.96%	9,143	26.62%	831	2.42%
72	6,795	19.73%	26,406	76.67%	805	2.34%	436	1.27%	8,321	24.36%	25,110	73.50%	730	2.14%	26,382	77.32%	7,107	20.83%	631	1.85%
73	25,744	64.55%	12,400	31.09%	1,183	2.97%	558	1.40%	26,690	67.24%	11,644	29.33%	1,362	3.43%	14,295	35.92%	24,646	61.93%	854	2.15%
74	25,112	56.02%	17,682	39.45%	1,399	3.12%	630	1.41%	26,414	59.14%	16,750	37.50%	1,499	3.36%	19,607	43.87%	24,064	53.84%	1,022	2.29%
75	22,992	54.52%	17,297	41.02%	1,322	3.13%	559	1.33%	23,918	57.09%	16,460	39.29%	1,518	3.62%	19,049	45.40%	21,902	52.20%	1,008	2.40%
76	23,064	61.73%	13,031	34.87%	877	2.35%	393	1.05%	22,286	60.33%	12,833	34.74%	1,819	4.92%	14,249	38.34%	21,950	59.07%	961	2.59%
77	30,333	72.00%	10,259	24.35%	1,103	2.62%	434	1.03%	29,715	71.11%	10,106	24.19%	1,965	4.70%	12,186	29.04%	28,782	68.58%	1,000	2.38%
78	28,166	77.69%	7,076	19.52%	739	2.04%	272	0.75%	27,319	76.13%	7,166	19.97%	1,402	3.91%	8,771	24.33%	26,543	73.63%	737	2.04%
79	22,774	61.50%	13,292	35.90%	678	1.83%	285	0.77%	22,332	61.14%	12,865	35.22%	1,328	3.64%	13,385	36.39%	22,891	62.23%	509	1.38%
80	28,033	74.04%	8,623	22.78%	918	2.42%	287	0.76%	27,677	73.76%	8,454	22.53%	1,394	3.71%	10,385	27.55%	26,519	70.35%	793	2.10%
81	26,284	71.05%	9,486	25.64%	941	2.54%	284	0.77%	25,858	70.60%	9,299	25.39%	1,469	4.01%	11,560	31.43%	24,341	66.17%	883	2.40%
82	25,226	55.52%	18,186	40.03%	1,438	3.16%	585	1.29%	25,508	56.72%	17,410	38.71%	2,053	4.57%	19,329	42.73%	24,713	54.63%	1,191	2.63%
83	20,902	57.22%	14,146	38.72%	1,046	2.86%	436	1.19%	20,485	56.66%	13,780	38.12%	1,887	5.22%	15,101	41.54%	20,226	55.63%	1,030	2.83%
84	25,864	67.41%	11,302	29.46%	842	2.19%	358	0.93%	24,946	65.81%	11,099	29.28%	1,862	4.91%	12,373	32.46%	24,857	65.22%	885	2.32%
85	27,148	74.95%	7,952	21.95%	700	1.93%	421	1.16%	25,691	72.23%	8,320	23.39%	1,555	4.37%	9,999	27.89%	24,896	69.44%	959	2.67%
86	23,049	66.31%	10,412	29.95%	895	2.57%	404	1.16%	22,151	64.58%	10,580	30.84%	1,571	4.58%	12,309	35.59%	21,505	62.18%	773	2.23%
87	26,621	73.29%	8,427	23.20%	849	2.34%	425	1.17%	25,537	71.08%	8,542	23.78%	1,847	5.14%	10,059	27.82%	25,176	69.62%	927	2.56%
88	8,920	23.83%	26,524	70.85%	1,470	3.93%	521	1.39%	10,746	29.20%	24,677	67.05%	1,383	3.76%	26,564	71.76%	9,507	25.68%	947	2.56%
89	25,622	70.69%	9,396	25.92%	904	2.49%	322	0.89%	24,664	68.94%	9,348	26.13%	1,762	4.93%	10,714	29.78%	24,387	67.78%	880	2.45%
90	26,756	73.64%	8,414	23.16%	812	2.23%	352	0.97%	25,983	72.41%	8,481	23.64%	1,418	3.95%	10,714	29.67%	24,677	68.34%	717	1.99%
91	28,820	75.03%	8,334	21.70%	925	2.41%	332	0.86%	28,090	73.57%	8,518	22.31%	1,573	4.12%	10,858	28.38%	26,538	69.37%	859	2.25%
92	11,487	31.37%	23,378	63.84%	1,245	3.40%	512	1.40%	12,363	34.22%	22,148	61.30%	1,621	4.49%	23,338	64.34%	11,852	32.67%	1,085	2.99%
93	23,108	53.24%	17,638	40.63%	1,667	3.84%	994	2.29%	23,511	54.86%	17,413	40.63%	1,936	4.52%	19,952	46.21%	21,906	50.74%	1,316	3.05%
94	29,477	75.08%	8,525	21.71%	899	2.29%	359	0.91%	28,311	72.90%	8,699	22.40%	1,828	4.71%	10,479	26.75%	27,879	71.16%	818	2.09%
95	28,890	65.36%	13,432	30.39%	1,343	3.04%	536	1.21%	28,179	64.55%	13,088	29.98%	2,386	5.47%	16,212	37.00%	26,066	59.50%	1,534	3.50%
96	22,685	62.88%	11,805	32.72%	1,069	2.96%	516	1.43%	22,549	63.28%	11,383	31.95%	1,699	4.77%	13,036	36.38%	21,866	61.02%	935	2.61%
97	28,804	71.97%	9,897	24.73%	971	2.43%	349	0.87%	27,868	70.41%	9,798	24.76%	1,913	4.83%	11,331	28.44%	27,557	69.16%	959	2.41%
98	24,388	51.54%	20,350	43.01%	1,862	3.94%	714	1.51%	26,049	55.74%	18,824	40.28%	1,864	3.99%	22,765	48.54%	22,553	48.09%	1,578	3.36%
99	6,628	19.07%	26,877	77.31%	830	2.39%	430	1.24%	7,073	20.60%	26,097	76.00%	1,169	3.40%	26,426	76.70%	7,280	21.13%	749	2.17%
100	9,065	29.00%	20,731	66.33%	994	3.18%	465	1.49%	9,754	31.61%	19,803	64.18%	1,297	4.20%	20,677	66.67%	9,505	30.65%	830	2.68%
101	8,930	22.86%	28,642	73.33%	994	2.54%	491	1.26%	9,615	24.91%	27,574	71.43%	1,414	3.66%	28,397	73.33%	9,359	24.17%	969	2.50%
102	5,292	16.06%	25,980	78.86%	1,162	3.53%	511	1.55%	6,327	19.52%	24,761	76.39%	1,328	4.10%	26,109	80.03%	5,584	17.12%	931	2.85%
103	22,701	52.01%	18,642	42.71%	1,539	3.53%	769	1.76%	24,458	56.51%	17,208	39.76%	1,617	3.74%	19,220	44.13%	23,328	53.56%	1,003	2.30%
104	20,925	43.85%	23,772	49.82%	1,932	4.05%	1,089	2.28%	25,905	54.36%	20,414	42.84%	1,332	2.80%	24,093	50.36%	22,791	47.64%	955	2.00%
105	20,052	47.27%	20,155	47.52%	1,504	3.55%	705	1.66%	22,414	53.33%	18,049	42.94%	1,569	3.73%	20,512	48.58%	20,692	49.00%	1,021	2.42%

HBK-23 Lewis - Wake County: President 2016, US Senate 2016, Governor 2016

	US President 2016: Trump-Clinton-Johnson								US Senate 2016: Burr-Ross-Haugh						Governor 2016: Cooper-McCrory-Cecil					
District	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Write-In**	**Write-In %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**
106	7,622	22.42%	24,886	73.20%	952	2.80%	539	1.59%	8,421	25.05%	24,052	71.55%	1,145	3.41%	24,815	73.54%	8,084	23.96%	846	2.51%
107	7,868	21.04%	28,142	75.25%	886	2.37%	500	1.34%	8,416	22.77%	27,293	73.84%	1,251	3.38%	27,988	75.41%	8,221	22.15%	903	2.43%
108	21,977	61.91%	12,155	34.24%	963	2.71%	405	1.14%	21,400	61.05%	11,934	34.04%	1,722	4.91%	13,133	37.22%	21,326	60.44%	824	2.34%
109	21,849	58.81%	13,856	37.29%	1,026	2.76%	424	1.14%	21,752	59.21%	13,385	36.43%	1,600	4.36%	14,614	39.57%	21,473	58.14%	845	2.29%
110	23,363	67.95%	10,064	29.27%	685	1.99%	272	0.79%	22,465	66.14%	10,103	29.74%	1,399	4.12%	11,006	32.21%	22,520	65.90%	648	1.90%
111	23,088	67.78%	10,066	29.55%	621	1.82%	290	0.85%	22,172	65.93%	10,185	30.29%	1,272	3.78%	11,069	32.68%	22,235	65.64%	569	1.68%
112	25,060	72.71%	8,351	24.23%	717	2.08%	339	0.98%	23,380	69.04%	9,131	26.96%	1,353	4.00%	10,575	31.07%	22,633	66.49%	831	2.44%
113	27,846	61.60%	15,495	34.27%	1,152	2.55%	715	1.58%	27,107	60.73%	15,907	35.64%	1,619	3.63%	17,776	39.74%	25,806	57.69%	1,150	2.57%
114	10,675	21.88%	35,226	72.20%	1,424	2.92%	1,464	3.00%	10,943	22.71%	35,335	73.32%	1,918	3.98%	36,921	76.30%	9,880	20.42%	1,589	3.28%
115	22,578	48.02%	21,856	46.49%	1,453	3.09%	1,127	2.40%	22,563	48.39%	22,221	47.66%	1,839	3.94%	24,377	52.10%	21,034	44.95%	1,382	2.95%
116	22,462	52.07%	18,367	42.57%	1,409	3.27%	903	2.09%	22,583	52.90%	18,335	42.95%	1,776	4.16%	20,574	48.00%	20,962	48.91%	1,323	3.09%
117	25,251	60.45%	14,625	35.01%	1,235	2.96%	660	1.58%	24,962	60.51%	14,605	35.40%	1,688	4.09%	16,583	40.08%	23,567	56.96%	1,227	2.97%
118	25,826	63.62%	13,002	32.03%	1,152	2.84%	616	1.52%	24,143	60.30%	14,050	35.09%	1,845	4.61%	16,169	40.08%	22,971	56.94%	1,202	2.98%
119	19,623	54.48%	14,434	40.08%	1,323	3.67%	637	1.77%	18,853	53.03%	15,016	42.24%	1,683	4.73%	17,194	48.15%	17,362	48.62%	1,156	3.24%
120	30,691	72.91%	9,871	23.45%	1,030	2.45%	501	1.19%	28,591	69.53%	10,931	26.58%	1,600	3.89%	12,825	31.06%	27,221	65.92%	1,249	3.02%
Totals:	**2,359,749**	**49.90%**	**2,180,316**	**46.10%**	**129,929**	**2.75%**	**59,397**	**1.26%**	**2,392,439**	**51.13%**	**2,119,696**	**45.30%**	**167,190**	**3.57%**	**2,300,381**	**48.95%**	**2,296,039**	**48.86%**	**102,729**	**2.19%**

HBK-23 Lewis - Wake County: Lieutenant Governor 2016, Attorney General 2016

	Lieutenant Governor 2016: Forest-Coleman-Cole						Attorney General 2016: Stein-Newton			
District	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %
1	17,778	51.12%	16,328	46.95%	671	1.93%	17,047	49.85%	17,149	50.15%
2	21,550	57.60%	15,020	40.15%	840	2.25%	17,015	46.07%	19,917	53.93%
3	19,362	58.56%	12,769	38.62%	932	2.82%	13,595	41.50%	19,163	58.50%
4	18,524	62.83%	10,278	34.86%	683	2.32%	11,259	38.68%	17,851	61.32%
5	13,598	42.70%	17,580	55.21%	665	2.09%	18,195	57.96%	13,195	42.04%
6	24,969	62.46%	13,748	34.39%	1,261	3.15%	14,523	36.89%	24,849	63.11%
7	17,898	45.87%	20,551	52.67%	567	1.45%	21,475	55.06%	17,527	44.94%
8	11,543	34.32%	21,250	63.17%	844	2.51%	22,114	66.21%	11,285	33.79%
9	20,567	55.82%	15,300	41.53%	978	2.65%	16,594	45.44%	19,925	54.56%
10	24,002	67.76%	10,809	30.52%	609	1.72%	12,118	34.50%	23,009	65.50%
11	14,274	34.59%	25,118	60.87%	1,876	4.55%	27,570	67.41%	13,329	32.59%
12	17,425	52.08%	15,430	46.12%	602	1.80%	16,317	49.26%	16,804	50.74%
13	28,811	68.95%	11,868	28.40%	1,107	2.65%	12,793	30.86%	28,667	69.14%
14	15,667	60.14%	9,239	35.46%	1,146	4.40%	10,094	39.18%	15,668	60.82%
15	13,102	66.99%	5,648	28.88%	809	4.14%	6,333	32.79%	12,978	67.21%
16	24,001	61.02%	14,369	36.53%	963	2.45%	16,456	42.25%	22,490	57.75%
17	33,147	65.60%	16,131	31.92%	1,254	2.48%	19,137	38.21%	30,944	61.79%
18	15,040	40.84%	20,340	55.23%	1,451	3.94%	22,453	61.46%	14,080	38.54%
19	24,414	57.61%	16,318	38.51%	1,644	3.88%	19,234	45.77%	22,791	54.23%
20	25,574	57.77%	17,001	38.41%	1,690	3.82%	19,782	45.08%	24,099	54.92%
21	12,799	41.18%	17,731	57.04%	553	1.78%	18,620	60.43%	12,192	39.57%
22	19,955	57.34%	14,263	40.98%	584	1.68%	15,485	44.90%	19,006	55.10%
23	13,735	38.22%	21,664	60.28%	537	1.49%	22,629	63.31%	13,112	36.69%
24	17,614	46.94%	19,307	51.45%	603	1.61%	20,220	53.88%	17,311	46.12%
25	21,930	57.78%	15,216	40.09%	806	2.12%	16,847	44.72%	20,823	55.28%
26	28,921	62.29%	16,198	34.89%	1,310	2.82%	18,501	40.21%	27,514	59.79%
27	12,111	35.73%	21,357	63.01%	427	1.26%	22,185	65.86%	11,500	34.14%
28	24,390	66.96%	11,178	30.69%	856	2.35%	13,012	36.07%	23,064	63.93%
29	6,887	14.85%	38,300	82.61%	1,175	2.53%	39,832	86.28%	6,334	13.72%
30	14,967	30.49%	32,969	67.17%	1,147	2.34%	34,972	71.69%	13,809	28.31%
31	8,325	18.63%	35,107	78.57%	1,251	2.80%	36,433	81.98%	8,009	18.02%
32	13,338	35.53%	23,613	62.89%	594	1.58%	24,809	66.54%	12,475	33.46%
33	9,598	24.23%	28,755	72.60%	1,252	3.16%	30,236	77.08%	8,990	22.92%
34	18,573	39.50%	26,912	57.23%	1,539	3.27%	30,038	64.36%	16,637	35.64%
35	28,435	54.03%	22,760	43.25%	1,431	2.72%	25,432	48.94%	26,536	51.06%
36	27,546	54.81%	21,270	42.32%	1,440	2.87%	23,809	47.79%	26,015	52.21%
37	28,417	54.03%	22,394	42.58%	1,780	3.38%	24,840	47.69%	27,241	52.31%
38	7,278	19.26%	29,353	77.68%	1,157	3.06%	30,708	82.05%	6,718	17.95%
39	15,526	35.03%	27,659	62.40%	1,137	2.57%	29,063	66.23%	14,821	33.77%
40	28,705	53.32%	23,652	43.93%	1,479	2.75%	26,879	50.45%	26,397	49.55%
41	19,765	41.83%	25,900	54.81%	1,591	3.37%	28,166	60.12%	18,685	39.88%
42	6,383	26.30%	16,996	70.03%	891	3.67%	17,644	73.09%	6,497	26.91%
43	8,192	27.18%	20,960	69.55%	985	3.27%	21,834	72.91%	8,112	27.09%
44	14,388	45.35%	16,265	51.27%	1,074	3.39%	17,572	55.64%	14,009	44.36%
45	21,770	57.53%	14,903	39.38%	1,170	3.09%	16,323	43.39%	21,299	56.61%
46	14,441	57.97%	9,982	40.07%	487	1.96%	11,292	45.85%	13,335	54.15%
47	9,967	41.61%	13,476	56.25%	513	2.14%	14,324	60.47%	9,364	39.53%
48	13,005	42.20%	16,855	54.69%	958	3.11%	17,475	57.21%	13,069	42.79%
49	19,658	39.17%	28,779	57.35%	1,747	3.48%	31,874	63.90%	18,007	36.10%
50	19,497	43.57%	24,182	54.04%	1,066	2.38%	26,089	58.72%	18,339	41.28%
51	18,400	55.76%	13,619	41.27%	982	2.98%	15,312	46.95%	17,303	53.05%
52	26,962	63.92%	14,147	33.54%	1,075	2.55%	15,745	37.70%	26,021	62.30%

HBK-23 Lewis - Wake County: Lieutenant Governor 2016, Attorney General 2016

	Lieutenant Governor 2016: Forest-Coleman-Cole						Attorney General 2016: Stein-Newton			
District	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %
53	21,328	61.54%	12,493	36.05%	835	2.41%	13,900	40.45%	20,460	59.55%
54	21,038	40.77%	29,281	56.74%	1,285	2.49%	31,512	61.45%	19,770	38.55%
55	22,921	65.35%	11,444	32.63%	707	2.02%	13,375	38.47%	21,391	61.53%
56	8,019	17.31%	36,854	79.55%	1,455	3.14%	38,609	83.76%	7,487	16.24%
57	5,185	13.28%	32,626	83.59%	1,221	3.13%	33,561	86.54%	5,219	13.46%
58	9,287	25.04%	26,651	71.86%	1,150	3.10%	27,954	75.69%	8,977	24.31%
59	25,437	55.49%	19,257	42.01%	1,150	2.51%	21,109	46.33%	24,449	53.67%
60	10,658	31.74%	21,827	65.01%	1,092	3.25%	23,010	68.91%	10,383	31.09%
61	25,459	53.65%	20,630	43.47%	1,366	2.88%	22,996	48.67%	24,252	51.33%
62	25,436	53.83%	20,543	43.48%	1,270	2.69%	22,809	48.55%	24,175	51.45%
63	20,032	54.75%	15,433	42.18%	1,125	3.07%	17,264	47.50%	19,085	52.50%
64	19,368	58.48%	12,814	38.69%	936	2.83%	14,428	43.87%	18,457	56.13%
65	22,925	62.41%	12,935	35.21%	874	2.38%	14,435	39.54%	22,070	60.46%
66	18,853	55.74%	14,153	41.85%	816	2.41%	15,907	47.40%	17,650	52.60%
67	31,697	74.44%	9,793	23.00%	1,092	2.56%	12,410	29.40%	29,801	70.60%
68	27,015	64.52%	13,606	32.49%	1,252	2.99%	15,674	37.79%	25,803	62.21%
69	23,744	65.63%	11,331	31.32%	1,104	3.05%	13,327	37.18%	22,517	62.82%
70	24,712	74.71%	7,488	22.64%	879	2.66%	8,822	26.83%	24,059	73.17%
71	9,831	29.19%	22,738	67.51%	1,114	3.31%	24,171	72.07%	9,367	27.93%
72	7,738	23.10%	24,959	74.51%	800	2.39%	26,121	78.27%	7,254	21.73%
73	26,437	67.76%	11,626	29.80%	951	2.44%	13,736	35.45%	25,011	64.55%
74	26,030	59.30%	16,599	37.82%	1,263	2.88%	19,028	43.58%	24,635	56.42%
75	23,675	57.44%	16,356	39.68%	1,189	2.88%	18,577	45.30%	22,428	54.70%
76	22,655	62.28%	12,646	34.76%	1,076	2.96%	14,921	41.29%	21,213	58.71%
77	30,027	73.04%	9,965	24.24%	1,120	2.72%	12,267	30.01%	28,609	69.99%
78	27,573	77.81%	7,048	19.89%	814	2.30%	8,576	24.38%	26,597	75.62%
79	22,124	61.39%	13,157	36.51%	760	2.11%	14,148	39.62%	21,559	60.38%
80	27,461	74.39%	8,544	23.14%	912	2.47%	9,959	27.05%	26,856	72.95%
81	25,744	71.35%	9,365	25.95%	974	2.70%	11,232	31.27%	24,684	68.73%
82	26,046	58.83%	16,802	37.95%	1,428	3.23%	19,140	43.65%	24,713	56.35%
83	20,975	58.79%	13,482	37.79%	1,221	3.42%	15,585	44.02%	19,820	55.98%
84	25,615	68.55%	10,772	28.83%	981	2.63%	12,983	35.05%	24,055	64.95%
85	25,753	73.78%	8,159	23.37%	995	2.85%	9,757	28.36%	24,643	71.64%
86	22,615	66.72%	10,457	30.85%	824	2.43%	12,699	37.72%	20,964	62.28%
87	26,540	74.72%	8,133	22.90%	848	2.39%	11,035	31.39%	24,120	68.61%
88	10,717	29.69%	23,935	66.30%	1,447	4.01%	25,771	71.73%	10,156	28.27%
89	25,345	71.91%	8,879	25.19%	1,023	2.90%	11,207	31.97%	23,846	68.03%
90	25,448	72.45%	8,865	25.24%	810	2.31%	10,667	30.51%	24,300	69.49%
91	27,570	73.67%	8,869	23.70%	983	2.63%	10,703	28.73%	26,555	71.27%
92	12,587	35.41%	21,535	60.57%	1,429	4.02%	23,404	66.33%	11,881	33.67%
93	23,009	55.17%	16,926	40.58%	1,774	4.25%	19,469	47.25%	21,733	52.75%
94	28,780	75.23%	8,557	22.37%	919	2.40%	11,073	29.23%	26,803	70.77%
95	28,982	67.70%	12,360	28.87%	1,470	3.43%	14,947	35.22%	27,490	64.78%
96	23,121	65.77%	10,946	31.14%	1,089	3.10%	13,281	38.01%	21,662	61.99%
97	28,690	73.47%	9,283	23.77%	1,078	2.76%	11,903	30.76%	26,797	69.24%
98	26,644	58.05%	17,734	38.63%	1,524	3.32%	20,452	45.00%	24,992	55.00%
99	7,163	21.09%	25,734	75.76%	1,073	3.16%	26,872	79.60%	6,888	20.40%
100	10,063	33.08%	19,181	63.06%	1,172	3.85%	20,835	69.05%	9,337	30.95%
101	9,666	25.39%	27,134	71.26%	1,276	3.35%	28,611	75.49%	9,289	24.51%
102	6,255	19.64%	24,161	75.87%	1,429	4.49%	25,604	80.91%	6,042	19.09%
103	25,117	58.86%	16,313	38.23%	1,242	2.91%	18,820	44.51%	23,460	55.49%
104	25,845	55.28%	19,567	41.85%	1,340	2.87%	22,699	48.98%	23,646	51.02%

HBK-23 Lewis - Wake County: Lieutenant Governor 2016, Attorney General 2016

	Lieutenant Governor 2016: Forest-Coleman-Cole						Attorney General 2016: Stein-Newton			
District	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %
105	22,913	55.44%	17,133	41.45%	1,287	3.11%	19,598	47.84%	21,369	52.16%
106	8,550	25.79%	23,420	70.66%	1,176	3.55%	24,690	75.03%	8,218	24.97%
107	8,546	23.39%	26,870	73.54%	1,124	3.08%	28,191	77.62%	8,126	22.38%
108	22,310	64.29%	11,377	32.79%	1,013	2.92%	13,450	39.21%	20,851	60.79%
109	22,545	62.11%	12,803	35.27%	950	2.62%	14,882	41.40%	21,065	58.60%
110	23,200	68.91%	9,752	28.97%	715	2.12%	11,596	34.80%	21,723	65.20%
111	22,768	68.36%	9,875	29.65%	661	1.98%	11,856	36.00%	21,073	64.00%
112	23,864	71.32%	8,660	25.88%	937	2.80%	9,906	29.88%	23,248	70.12%
113	27,273	61.90%	15,470	35.11%	1,314	2.98%	16,730	38.29%	26,962	61.71%
114	10,534	22.22%	34,662	73.10%	2,218	4.68%	36,615	77.84%	10,425	22.16%
115	22,047	48.06%	22,007	47.98%	1,816	3.96%	23,858	52.43%	21,647	47.57%
116	21,972	52.39%	18,326	43.70%	1,641	3.91%	19,951	47.93%	21,673	52.07%
117	25,457	62.47%	14,037	34.45%	1,255	3.08%	15,539	38.46%	24,861	61.54%
118	23,864	60.56%	14,093	35.76%	1,451	3.68%	15,949	40.83%	23,111	59.17%
119	18,801	53.70%	14,824	42.34%	1,385	3.96%	16,595	47.85%	18,084	52.15%
120	28,296	69.92%	10,903	26.94%	1,271	3.14%	11,790	29.51%	28,166	70.49%
Totals:	**2,390,619**	**51.88%**	**2,084,975**	**45.25%**	**132,360**	**2.87%**	**2,294,855**	**50.20%**	**2,276,276**	**49.80%**

EX. 28

Covington House 2017 Map



Legend

Groupings
Districts
Counties

Member by Party
Democratic
Republican

N
W E
S

0 25 50 100 150 200 Miles

Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State

Printed by the NC General Assembly, August 23, 2017.

Plan: Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State
Plan Type:

Administrator
User:

Districts & Their Incumbents

Wednesday, August 23, 2017 5:42 PM

District	Name	Party	Previous District
1	Boswell	Republican	6
2	Yarborough	Republican	2
3	Steinburg	Republican	1
4	Dixon	Republican	4
5	Hunter	Democratic	5
6			
7	B.Richardson	Democratic	7
8	S.Martin	Republican	8
8	Farmer-Butterfield	Democratic	24
9	Murphy	Republican	9
10	G.Graham	Democratic	12
11	Duane Hall	Democratic	11
12	Speciale	Republican	3
13	McElraft	Republican	13
14	Cleveland	Republican	14
15	Shepard	Republican	15
16	Brenden Jones	Republican	46
16	Millis	Republican	16
17	Iler	Republican	17
18	Butler	Democratic	18
19	Davis	Republican	19
20	Grange	Republican	20
21			
22	Brisson	Democratic	22
22	L.Bell	Democratic	21
23	Willingham	Democratic	23

Plan:	Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State	Administrator:	
Type:		User:	

District	Name	Party	Previous District
24			
25	Collins	Republican	25
26	White	Republican	26
27	Wray	Democratic	27
28	Strickland	Republican	28
29	Black	Democratic	29
29	Michaux	Democratic	31
30	Morey	Democratic	30
31			
32	Garrison	Democratic	32
33	Gill	Democratic	33
34	G.Martin	Democratic	34
35	Malone	Republican	35
36	Dollar	Republican	36
37	Williams	Republican	37
38	Holley	Democratic	38
39	Jackson	Democratic	39
40	John	Democratic	40
41	Adcock	Democratic	41
42	Lucas	Democratic	42
43	Floyd	Democratic	43
44	W.Richardson	Democratic	44
45	Szoka	Republican	45
46			
47	C.Graham	Democratic	47
48	Pierce	Democratic	48
49	Ball	Democrat	49
50	Meyer	Democratic	50
51	Sauls	Republican	51
51	Reives	Democratic	54
52	Boles	Republican	52
53	Lewis	Republican	53

Plan:	Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State	Administrator:	
Type:		User:	

District	Name	Party	Previous District
54			
55	Brody	Republican	55
56	Insko	Democratic	56
57	Harrison	Democratic	57
57	Hardister	Republican	59
58	Quick	Democratic	58
59			
60	Brockman	Democratic	60
61	Faircloth	Republican	61
62	Blust	Republican	62
63	Ross	Republican	63
64	Riddell	Republican	64
65	Bert Jones	Republican	65
66	Goodman	Democratic	66
67	Burr	Republican	67
68	Horn	Republican	68
69	Arp	Republican	69
70	Hurley	Republican	70
71	Lambeth	Republican	75
71	Terry	Democratic	71
72	Hanes	Democratic	72
73	Zachary	Republican	73
74	Conrad	Republican	74
75			
76	J.Bell	Republican	10
77	Ford	Republican	76
77	Warren	Republican	77
78	McNiell	Republican	78
79	Howard	Republican	79
80	Watford	Republican	80
81	Potts	Republican	81
82	Pittman	Republican	82

Plan:	Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State	Administrator:	
Type:		User:	

District	Name	Party	Previous District
83	Johnson	Republican	83
84	R.Turner	Republican	84
85	Dobson	Republican	85
86	Blackwell	Republican	86
87	Destin Hall	Republican	87
88	Belk	Democratic	88
89	Setzer	Republican	89
90	Stevens	Republican	90
91	K.Hall	Republican	91
92	Beasley	Democratic	92
93	Jordan	Republican	93
94	Elmore	Republican	94
95	Fraley	Republican	95
96	Adams	Republican	96
97	Saine	Republican	97
98	Bradford	Republican	98
99	R.Moore	Democratic	99
100	Autry	Democratic	100
101	Earle	Democratic	101
102	Dulin	Republican	104
102	Carney	Democratic	102
103	Brawley	Republican	103
104			
105	Stone	Republican	105
106	Cunningham	Democratic	106
107	Alexander	Democratic	107
108	Torbett	Republican	108
109	Bumgardner	Republican	109
110	Hastings	Republican	110
111	T.Moore	Republican	111
112	Rogers	Republican	112
113	Henson	Republican	113

Plan:	Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State	Administrator:	
Type:		User:	

District	Name	Party	Previous District
114	Fisher	Democratic	114
115	Ager	Democratic	115
116	B.Turner	Democratic	116
117	McGrady	Republican	117
118	Presnell	Republican	118
119	Clampitt	Republican	119
120	Corbin	Republican	120

Number of Incumbents in District with more than one Incumbent:	18	
Number of Districts with No Incumbent:	9	
Number of Districts with Incumbents of more than one party:	5	
Number of Districts with Paired Democrats:	2	
Number of Districts with Paired Republicans:	2	

Plan Name: Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State
Plan Type:
Date: 08/23/2017
Time: 05:38:13PM
Administrator:

Measures of Compactness

08/23/2017

Sum	N/A
Min	0.20
Max	0.70
Mean	0.42
Std. Dev.	0.10

DISTRICT	Reock
1	0.33
2	0.52
3	0.49
4	0.48
5	0.25
6	0.52
7	0.37
8	0.53
9	0.44
10	0.39
11	0.31
12	0.29
13	0.24
14	0.40
15	0.56
16	0.28
17	0.48
18	0.51
19	0.20
20	0.36
21	0.47
22	0.50
23	0.35
24	0.51
25	0.49
26	0.40
27	0.52
28	0.50
29	0.43
30	0.33
31	0.33
32	0.37
33	0.55
34	0.39
35	0.34
36	0.37
37	0.34
38	0.52
39	0.57
40	0.28

Plan Name:	Covington House 2017 Map	Administrator:	
Plan Type:		User:	

DISTRICT	Reock
41	0.28
42	0.30
43	0.39
44	0.39
45	0.29
46	0.53
47	0.53
48	0.48
49	0.38
50	0.37
51	0.60
52	0.32
53	0.51
54	0.45
55	0.42
56	0.36
57	0.48
58	0.64
59	0.49
60	0.40
61	0.30
62	0.52
63	0.34
64	0.34
65	0.52
66	0.39
67	0.52
68	0.33
69	0.37
70	0.54
71	0.39
72	0.52
73	0.42
74	0.54
75	0.70
76	0.29
77	0.60
78	0.36
79	0.37
80	0.28
81	0.50
82	0.59
83	0.53
84	0.51
85	0.39
86	0.38
87	0.50
88	0.34
89	0.34
90	0.41
91	0.32
92	0.48
93	0.57
94	0.53
95	0.43
96	0.30

Plan Name:	Covington House 2017 Map	Administrator:	
Plan Type:		User:	

DISTRICT	Reock
97	0.33
98	0.38
99	0.46
100	0.42
101	0.41
102	0.27
103	0.39
104	0.36
105	0.37
106	0.38
107	0.27
108	0.44
109	0.46
110	0.36
111	0.40
112	0.39
113	0.24
114	0.39
115	0.38
116	0.35
117	0.40
118	0.36
119	0.36
120	0.40

Plan Name: Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State
Plan Type:
Date: 08/23/2017
Time: 05:39:49PM
Administrator:

Measures of Compactness

08/23/2017

Sum	N/A
Min	0.13
Max	0.71
Mean	0.33
Std. Dev.	0.11

DISTRICT	Polsby-Popper
1	0.24
2	0.43
3	0.18
4	0.49
5	0.27
6	0.30
7	0.28
8	0.71
9	0.28
10	0.32
11	0.29
12	0.19
13	0.22
14	0.30
15	0.58
16	0.22
17	0.30
18	0.33
19	0.28
20	0.20
21	0.32
22	0.26
23	0.24
24	0.24
25	0.50
26	0.44
27	0.40
28	0.25
29	0.46
30	0.35
31	0.27
32	0.36
33	0.37
34	0.26
35	0.37
36	0.34
37	0.22
38	0.32
39	0.57
40	0.24

Plan Name:	Covington House 2017 Map	Administrator:	
Plan Type:		User:	

DISTRICT	Polsby-Popper
41	0.25
42	0.32
43	0.25
44	0.25
45	0.26
46	0.25
47	0.30
48	0.45
49	0.27
50	0.39
51	0.38
52	0.25
53	0.35
54	0.43
55	0.29
56	0.41
57	0.39
58	0.56
59	0.36
60	0.33
61	0.21
62	0.44
63	0.30
64	0.28
65	0.44
66	0.30
67	0.27
68	0.28
69	0.20
70	0.54
71	0.40
72	0.49
73	0.40
74	0.53
75	0.60
76	0.18
77	0.41
78	0.28
79	0.31
80	0.22
81	0.22
82	0.62
83	0.51
84	0.45
85	0.23
86	0.27
87	0.57
88	0.30
89	0.26
90	0.27
91	0.30
92	0.36
93	0.42
94	0.33
95	0.37
96	0.21

Plan Name:	Covington House 2017 Map	Administrator:	
Plan Type:		User:	

DISTRICT	Polsby-Popper
97	0.52
98	0.30
99	0.33
100	0.42
101	0.32
102	0.27
103	0.47
104	0.27
105	0.30
106	0.32
107	0.23
108	0.32
109	0.47
110	0.26
111	0.28
112	0.30
113	0.21
114	0.13
115	0.19
116	0.23
117	0.28
118	0.15
119	0.20
120	0.37

Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State: County-District

County	District	Total County Pop	Total District Pop	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Alamance	63	151,131	75,550	75,550	49.99%	100.00%
	64	151,131	75,581	75,581	50.01%	100.00%
Alexander	94	37,198	83,435	37,198	100.00%	44.58%
Alleghany	90	11,155	82,702	11,155	100.00%	13.49%
Anson	55	26,948	75,792	26,948	100.00%	35.56%
Ashe	93	27,281	78,360	27,281	100.00%	34.81%
Avery	85	17,797	78,372	17,797	100.00%	22.71%
Beaufort	6	47,759	75,544	47,759	100.00%	63.22%
Bertie	3	21,282	77,143	21,282	100.00%	27.59%
Bladen	22	35,190	83,428	35,190	100.00%	42.18%
Brunswick	17	107,431	77,263	77,263	71.92%	100.00%
	18	107,431	77,681	30,168	28.08%	38.84%
Buncombe	114	238,318	82,902	82,902	34.79%	100.00%
	115	238,318	79,883	79,883	33.52%	100.00%
	116	238,318	75,533	75,533	31.69%	100.00%
Burke	86	90,912	79,175	79,175	87.09%	100.00%
	112	90,912	79,547	11,737	12.91%	14.75%
Cabarrus	67	178,011	81,314	13,473	7.57%	16.57%
	82	178,011	81,563	81,563	45.82%	100.00%
	83	178,011	82,975	82,975	46.61%	100.00%
Caldwell	87	83,029	83,029	83,029	100.00%	100.00%
Camden	3	9,980	77,143	9,980	100.00%	12.94%
Carteret	13	66,469	76,622	66,469	100.00%	86.75%
Caswell	50	23,719	79,107	23,719	100.00%	29.98%
Catawba	89	154,358	77,838	77,838	50.43%	100.00%
	96	154,358	76,520	76,520	49.57%	100.00%
Chatham	54	63,505	82,312	63,505	100.00%	77.15%
Cherokee	120	27,444	80,814	27,444	100.00%	33.96%
Chowan	3	14,793	77,143	14,793	100.00%	19.18%
Clay	120	10,587	80,814	10,587	100.00%	13.10%
Cleveland	110	98,078	75,573	21,930	22.36%	29.02%
	111	98,078	76,148	76,148	77.64%	100.00%
Columbus	16	58,098	82,422	30,205	51.99%	36.65%
	46	58,098	81,643	27,893	48.01%	34.16%
Craven	6	103,505	75,544	27,785	26.84%	36.78%
	12	103,505	75,720	75,720	73.16%	100.00%
Cumberland	42	319,431	79,801	79,801	24.98%	100.00%
	43	319,431	76,858	76,858	24.06%	100.00%
	44	319,431	79,644	79,644	24.93%	100.00%
	45	319,431	83,128	83,128	26.02%	100.00%
Currituck	1	23,547	76,421	23,547	100.00%	30.81%
Dare	1	33,920	76,421	33,920	100.00%	44.39%
Davidson	80	162,878	81,522	81,522	50.05%	100.00%
	81	162,878	81,356	81,356	49.95%	100.00%
Davie	79	41,240	82,213	41,240	100.00%	50.16%
Duplin	4	58,505	76,858	58,505	100.00%	76.12%
Durham	29	267,587	82,725	82,725	30.92%	100.00%
	30	267,587	83,264	83,264	31.12%	100.00%

Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State: County-District

County	District	Total County Pop	Total District Pop	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Durham	31	267,587	82,791	82,791	30.94%	100.00%
	54	267,587	82,312	18,807	7.03%	22.85%
Edgecombe	23	56,552	81,057	56,552	100.00%	69.77%
Forsyth	71	350,670	78,227	78,227	22.31%	100.00%
	72	350,670	81,553	81,553	23.26%	100.00%
	73	350,670	77,321	38,915	11.10%	50.33%
	74	350,670	76,092	76,092	21.70%	100.00%
	75	350,670	75,883	75,883	21.64%	100.00%
Franklin	7	60,619	78,068	60,619	100.00%	77.65%
Gaston	108	206,086	76,926	76,926	37.33%	100.00%
	109	206,086	75,517	75,517	36.64%	100.00%
	110	206,086	75,573	53,643	26.03%	70.98%
Gates	5	12,197	77,527	12,197	100.00%	15.73%
Graham	120	8,861	80,814	8,861	100.00%	10.96%
Granville	2	59,916	82,891	43,427	72.48%	52.39%
	32	59,916	82,883	16,489	27.52%	19.89%
Greene	21	21,362	83,434	21,362	100.00%	25.60%
Guilford	57	488,406	83,226	83,226	17.04%	100.00%
	58	488,406	77,567	77,567	15.88%	100.00%
	59	488,406	81,528	81,528	16.69%	100.00%
	60	488,406	82,909	82,909	16.98%	100.00%
	61	488,406	81,135	81,135	16.61%	100.00%
	62	488,406	82,041	82,041	16.80%	100.00%
Halifax	27	54,691	76,790	54,691	100.00%	71.22%
Harnett	28	114,678	83,429	5,676	4.95%	6.80%
	51	114,678	83,434	25,568	22.30%	30.64%
	53	114,678	83,434	83,434	72.76%	100.00%
Haywood	118	59,036	76,322	37,740	63.93%	49.45%
	119	59,036	75,548	21,296	36.07%	28.19%
Henderson	113	106,740	81,089	27,489	25.75%	33.90%
	117	106,740	79,251	79,251	74.25%	100.00%
Hertford	5	24,669	77,527	24,669	100.00%	31.82%
Hoke	48	46,952	83,109	46,952	100.00%	56.49%
Hyde	1	5,810	76,421	5,810	100.00%	7.60%
Iredell	84	159,437	77,282	77,282	48.47%	100.00%
	95	159,437	82,155	82,155	51.53%	100.00%
Jackson	119	40,271	75,548	40,271	100.00%	53.31%
Johnston	26	168,878	83,434	83,434	49.40%	100.00%
	28	168,878	83,429	62,560	37.04%	74.99%
	76	168,878	83,435	22,884	13.55%	27.43%
Jones	13	10,153	76,622	10,153	100.00%	13.25%
Lee	51	57,866	83,434	57,866	100.00%	69.36%
Lenoir	10	59,495	76,487	59,495	100.00%	77.78%
Lincoln	97	78,265	78,265	78,265	100.00%	100.00%
Macon	120	33,922	80,814	33,922	100.00%	41.98%
Madison	118	20,764	76,322	20,764	100.00%	27.21%
Martin	23	24,505	81,057	24,505	100.00%	30.23%
McDowell	85	44,996	78,372	44,996	100.00%	57.41%
Mecklenburg	88	919,628	75,500	75,500	8.21%	100.00%

District plan definition file: 'Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State.asc', modified 08/23/2017 05:44:28 PM

Data Source: 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File - North Carolina

Printed 08/23/2017 {rptG01|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State: County-District

County	District	Total County Pop	Total District Pop	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Mecklenburg	92	919,628	77,927	77,927	8.47%	100.00%
	98	919,628	76,218	76,218	8.29%	100.00%
	99	919,628	76,192	76,192	8.29%	100.00%
	100	919,628	77,928	77,928	8.47%	100.00%
	101	919,628	75,680	75,680	8.23%	100.00%
	102	919,628	75,637	75,637	8.22%	100.00%
	103	919,628	76,107	76,107	8.28%	100.00%
	104	919,628	77,637	77,637	8.44%	100.00%
	105	919,628	75,712	75,712	8.23%	100.00%
	106	919,628	76,822	76,822	8.35%	100.00%
	107	919,628	78,268	78,268	8.51%	100.00%
Mitchell	85	15,579	78,372	15,579	100.00%	19.88%
Montgomery	66	27,798	81,734	27,798	100.00%	34.01%
Moore	52	88,247	76,894	76,894	87.13%	100.00%
	78	88,247	76,980	11,353	12.87%	14.75%
Nash	7	95,840	78,068	17,449	18.21%	22.35%
	25	95,840	78,391	78,391	81.79%	100.00%
New Hanover	18	202,667	77,681	47,513	23.44%	61.16%
	19	202,667	76,666	76,666	37.83%	100.00%
	20	202,667	78,488	78,488	38.73%	100.00%
Northampton	27	22,099	76,790	22,099	100.00%	28.78%
Onslow	4	177,772	76,858	18,353	10.32%	23.88%
	14	177,772	76,496	76,496	43.03%	100.00%
	15	177,772	82,923	82,923	46.65%	100.00%
Orange	50	133,801	79,107	55,388	41.40%	70.02%
	56	133,801	78,413	78,413	58.60%	100.00%
Pamlico	1	13,144	76,421	13,144	100.00%	17.20%
Pasquotank	5	40,661	77,527	40,661	100.00%	52.45%
Pender	16	52,217	82,422	52,217	100.00%	63.35%
Perquimans	3	13,453	77,143	13,453	100.00%	17.44%
Person	2	39,464	82,891	39,464	100.00%	47.61%
Pitt	9	168,148	75,617	75,617	44.97%	100.00%
	10	168,148	76,487	16,992	10.11%	22.22%
	24	168,148	75,539	75,539	44.92%	100.00%
Polk	113	20,510	81,089	20,510	100.00%	25.29%
Randolph	70	141,752	76,125	76,125	53.70%	100.00%
	78	141,752	76,980	65,627	46.30%	85.25%
Richmond	66	46,639	81,734	46,639	100.00%	57.06%
Robeson	46	134,168	81,643	53,750	40.06%	65.84%
	47	134,168	80,418	80,418	59.94%	100.00%
Rockingham	65	93,643	83,394	83,394	89.06%	100.00%
	91	93,643	82,879	10,249	10.94%	12.37%
Rowan	67	138,428	81,314	14,553	10.51%	17.90%
	77	138,428	82,902	82,902	59.89%	100.00%
	79	138,428	82,213	40,973	29.60%	49.84%
Rutherford	112	67,810	79,547	67,810	100.00%	85.25%
Sampson	22	63,431	83,428	48,238	76.05%	57.82%
	28	63,431	83,429	15,193	23.95%	18.21%
Scotland	48	36,157	83,109	36,157	100.00%	43.51%

District plan definition file: 'Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State.asc', modified 08/23/2017 05:44:28 PM

Data Source: 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File - North Carolina

Printed 08/23/2017 {rptG01|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State: County-District

County	District	Total County Pop	Total District Pop	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Stanly	66	60,585	81,734	7,297	12.04%	8.93%
	67	60,585	81,314	53,288	87.96%	65.53%
Stokes	91	47,401	82,879	47,401	100.00%	57.19%
Surry	90	73,673	82,702	48,444	65.76%	58.58%
	91	73,673	82,879	25,229	34.24%	30.44%
Swain	119	13,981	75,548	13,981	100.00%	18.51%
Transylvania	113	33,090	81,089	33,090	100.00%	40.81%
Tyrrell	3	4,407	77,143	4,407	100.00%	5.71%
Union	55	201,292	75,792	48,844	24.27%	64.44%
	68	201,292	76,067	76,067	37.79%	100.00%
	69	201,292	76,381	76,381	37.95%	100.00%
Vance	32	45,422	82,883	45,422	100.00%	54.80%
Wake	11	900,993	82,422	82,422	9.15%	100.00%
	33	900,993	83,261	83,261	9.24%	100.00%
	34	900,993	79,853	79,853	8.86%	100.00%
	35	900,993	82,809	82,809	9.19%	100.00%
	36	900,993	83,373	83,373	9.25%	100.00%
	37	900,993	83,318	83,318	9.25%	100.00%
	38	900,993	81,715	81,715	9.07%	100.00%
	39	900,993	83,299	83,299	9.25%	100.00%
	40	900,993	76,609	76,609	8.50%	100.00%
	41	900,993	82,866	82,866	9.20%	100.00%
	49	900,993	81,468	81,468	9.04%	100.00%
Warren	32	20,972	82,883	20,972	100.00%	25.30%
Washington	3	13,228	77,143	13,228	100.00%	17.15%
Watauga	93	51,079	78,360	51,079	100.00%	65.19%
Wayne	21	122,623	83,434	62,072	50.62%	74.40%
	76	122,623	83,435	60,551	49.38%	72.57%
Wilkes	90	69,340	82,702	23,103	33.32%	27.94%
	94	69,340	83,435	46,237	66.68%	55.42%
Wilson	8	81,234	81,234	81,234	100.00%	100.00%
Yadkin	73	38,406	77,321	38,406	100.00%	49.67%
Yancey	118	17,818	76,322	17,818	100.00%	23.35%
			Total:	**9,535,483**		

District plan definition file: 'Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State.asc', modified 08/23/2017 05:44:28 PM
Data Source: 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File - North Carolina
Printed 08/23/2017 {rptG01|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Aberdeen	52	6,350	76,894	6,350	100.00%	8.26%
Ahoskie	5	5,039	77,527	5,039	100.00%	6.50%
Alamance	64	951	75,581	951	100.00%	1.26%
Albemarle	66	15,903	81,734	5,861	36.85%	7.17%
	67	15,903	81,314	10,042	63.15%	12.35%
Alliance	1	776	76,421	776	100.00%	1.02%
Andrews	120	1,781	80,814	1,781	100.00%	2.20%
Angier (Harnett)	53	4,247	83,434	4,247	100.00%	5.09%
Angier (Wake)	37	103	83,318	103	100.00%	0.12%
Ansonville	55	631	75,792	631	100.00%	0.83%
Apex	36	37,476	83,373	7,343	19.59%	8.81%
	37	37,476	83,318	11,985	31.98%	14.38%
	41	37,476	82,866	18,148	48.43%	21.90%
Arapahoe	1	556	76,421	556	100.00%	0.73%
Archdale (Guilford)	60	333	82,909	333	100.00%	0.40%
Archdale (Randolph)	70	11,082	76,125	11,082	100.00%	14.56%
Archer Lodge	26	4,292	83,434	4,292	100.00%	5.14%
Asheboro	70	25,012	76,125	21,327	85.27%	28.02%
	78	25,012	76,980	3,685	14.73%	4.79%
Asheville	114	83,393	82,902	66,182	79.36%	79.83%
	115	83,393	79,883	5,409	6.49%	6.77%
	116	83,393	75,533	11,802	14.15%	15.62%
Askewville	3	241	77,143	241	100.00%	0.31%
Atkinson	16	299	82,422	299	100.00%	0.36%
Atlantic Beach	13	1,495	76,622	1,495	100.00%	1.95%
Aulander	3	895	77,143	895	100.00%	1.16%
Aurora	6	520	75,544	520	100.00%	0.69%
Autryville	22	196	83,428	196	100.00%	0.23%
Ayden	10	4,932	76,487	4,932	100.00%	6.45%
Badin	67	1,974	81,314	1,974	100.00%	2.43%
Bailey	25	569	78,391	569	100.00%	0.73%
Bakersville	85	464	78,372	464	100.00%	0.59%
Bald Head Island	17	158	77,263	158	100.00%	0.20%
Banner Elk	85	1,028	78,372	1,028	100.00%	1.31%
Bath	6	249	75,544	249	100.00%	0.33%
Bayboro	1	1,263	76,421	1,263	100.00%	1.65%
Bear Grass	23	73	81,057	73	100.00%	0.09%
Beaufort	13	4,039	76,622	4,039	100.00%	5.27%
Beech Mountain (Avery)	85	24	78,372	24	100.00%	0.03%
Beech Mountain (Watauga)	93	296	78,360	296	100.00%	0.38%
Belhaven	6	1,688	75,544	1,688	100.00%	2.23%
Belmont	108	10,076	76,926	4,622	45.87%	6.01%
	109	10,076	75,517	5,454	54.13%	7.22%
Belville	18	1,936	77,681	1,936	100.00%	2.49%
Belwood	111	950	76,148	950	100.00%	1.25%
Benson (Harnett)	53	0	83,434	0	0.00%	0.00%
Benson (Johnston)	28	3,311	83,429	3,311	100.00%	3.97%

District plan definition file: 'Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State.asc', modified 08/23/2017 05:44:28 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/23/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Bermuda Run	79	1,725	82,213	1,725	100.00%	2.10%
Bessemer City	110	5,340	75,573	5,340	100.00%	7.07%
Bethania	74	328	76,092	328	100.00%	0.43%
Bethel	24	1,577	75,539	1,577	100.00%	2.09%
Beulaville	4	1,296	76,858	1,296	100.00%	1.69%
Biltmore Forest	116	1,343	75,533	1,343	100.00%	1.78%
Biscoe	66	1,700	81,734	1,700	100.00%	2.08%
Black Creek	8	769	81,234	769	100.00%	0.95%
Black Mountain	115	7,848	79,883	7,848	100.00%	9.82%
Bladenboro	22	1,750	83,428	1,750	100.00%	2.10%
Blowing Rock (Caldwell)	87	49	83,029	49	100.00%	0.06%
Blowing Rock (Watauga)	93	1,192	78,360	1,192	100.00%	1.52%
Boardman	46	157	81,643	157	100.00%	0.19%
Bogue	13	684	76,622	684	100.00%	0.89%
Boiling Spring Lakes	17	5,372	77,263	5,370	99.96%	6.95%
	18	5,372	77,681	2	0.04%	0.00%
Boiling Springs	111	4,647	76,148	4,647	100.00%	6.10%
Bolivia	18	143	77,681	143	100.00%	0.18%
Bolton	16	691	82,422	691	100.00%	0.84%
Boone	93	17,122	78,360	17,122	100.00%	21.85%
Boonville	73	1,222	77,321	1,222	100.00%	1.58%
Bostic	112	386	79,547	386	100.00%	0.49%
Brevard	113	7,609	81,089	7,609	100.00%	9.38%
Bridgeton	6	454	75,544	454	100.00%	0.60%
	12	454	75,720	0	0.00%	0.00%
Broadway (Harnett)	51	25	83,434	25	100.00%	0.03%
Broadway (Lee)	51	1,204	83,434	1,204	100.00%	1.44%
Brookford	89	382	77,838	321	84.03%	0.41%
	96	382	76,520	61	15.97%	0.08%
Brunswick	16	1,119	82,422	691	61.75%	0.84%
	46	1,119	81,643	428	38.25%	0.52%
Bryson City	119	1,424	75,548	1,424	100.00%	1.88%
Bunn	7	344	78,068	344	100.00%	0.44%
Burgaw	16	3,872	82,422	3,872	100.00%	4.70%
Burlington (Alamance)	63	49,308	75,550	23,248	47.15%	30.77%
	64	49,308	75,581	26,060	52.85%	34.48%
Burlington (Guilford)	58	655	77,567	655	100.00%	0.84%
Burnsville	118	1,693	76,322	1,693	100.00%	2.22%
Butner	2	7,591	82,891	7,591	100.00%	9.16%
Cajah's Mountain	87	2,823	83,029	2,823	100.00%	3.40%
Calabash	17	1,786	77,263	1,786	100.00%	2.31%
Calypso	4	538	76,858	538	100.00%	0.70%
Cameron	52	285	76,894	285	100.00%	0.37%
Candor	66	840	81,734	840	100.00%	1.03%
Canton	118	4,227	76,322	4,227	100.00%	5.54%
Cape Carteret	13	1,917	76,622	1,917	100.00%	2.50%
Carolina Beach	19	5,706	76,666	5,706	100.00%	7.44%

District plan definition file: 'Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State.asc', modified 08/23/2017 05:44:28 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/23/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Carolina Shores	17	3,048	77,263	3,048	100.00%	3.94%
Carrboro	50	19,582	79,107	2,679	13.68%	3.39%
	56	19,582	78,413	16,903	86.32%	21.56%
Carthage	52	2,205	76,894	6	0.27%	0.01%
	78	2,205	76,980	2,199	99.73%	2.86%
Cary (Chatham)	54	1,422	82,312	1,422	100.00%	1.73%
Cary (Wake)	11	133,812	82,422	27,964	20.90%	33.93%
	36	133,812	83,373	39,430	29.47%	47.29%
	40	133,812	76,609	2,808	2.10%	3.67%
	41	133,812	82,866	49,443	36.95%	59.67%
	49	133,812	81,468	14,167	10.59%	17.39%
Casar	111	297	76,148	297	100.00%	0.39%
Castalia	7	268	78,068	268	100.00%	0.34%
Caswell Beach	17	398	77,263	398	100.00%	0.52%
Catawba	89	603	77,838	603	100.00%	0.77%
Cedar Point	13	1,279	76,622	1,279	100.00%	1.67%
Cedar Rock	87	300	83,029	300	100.00%	0.36%
Centerville	7	89	78,068	89	100.00%	0.11%
Cerro Gordo	46	207	81,643	207	100.00%	0.25%
Chadbourn	46	1,856	81,643	1,856	100.00%	2.27%
Chapel Hill (Durham)	29	2,836	82,725	2,234	78.77%	2.70%
	54	2,836	82,312	602	21.23%	0.73%
Chapel Hill (Orange)	50	54,397	79,107	0	0.00%	0.00%
	56	54,397	78,413	54,397	100.00%	69.37%
Charlotte	88	731,424	75,500	75,500	10.32%	100.00%
	92	731,424	77,927	65,662	8.98%	84.26%
	98	731,424	76,218	22,414	3.06%	29.41%
	99	731,424	76,192	74,383	10.17%	97.63%
	100	731,424	77,928	54,812	7.49%	70.34%
	101	731,424	75,680	70,430	9.63%	93.06%
	102	731,424	75,637	75,637	10.34%	100.00%
	103	731,424	76,107	47,239	6.46%	62.07%
	104	731,424	77,637	64,639	8.84%	83.26%
	105	731,424	75,712	64,266	8.79%	84.88%
	106	731,424	76,822	76,822	10.50%	100.00%
	107	731,424	78,268	39,620	5.42%	50.62%
Cherryville	110	5,760	75,573	5,760	100.00%	7.62%
Chimney Rock Village	112	113	79,547	113	100.00%	0.14%
China Grove	77	3,563	82,902	3,563	100.00%	4.30%
Chocowinity	6	820	75,544	820	100.00%	1.09%
Claremont	89	1,352	77,838	1,352	100.00%	1.74%
Clarkton	22	837	83,428	837	100.00%	1.00%
Clayton (Johnston)	26	16,116	83,434	16,116	100.00%	19.32%
Clayton (Wake)	39	0	83,299	0	0.00%	0.00%
Clemmons	73	18,627	77,321	18,627	100.00%	24.09%
Cleveland	79	871	82,213	871	100.00%	1.06%
Clinton	22	8,639	83,428	8,639	100.00%	10.36%

District plan definition file: 'Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State.asc', modified 08/23/2017 05:44:28 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Clyde	118	1,223	76,322	1,223	100.00%	1.60%
Coats	53	2,112	83,434	2,112	100.00%	2.53%
Cofield	5	413	77,527	413	100.00%	0.53%
Colerain	3	204	77,143	204	100.00%	0.26%
Columbia	3	891	77,143	891	100.00%	1.15%
Columbus	113	999	81,089	999	100.00%	1.23%
Como	5	91	77,527	91	100.00%	0.12%
Concord	67	79,066	81,314	4	0.01%	0.00%
	82	79,066	81,563	39,016	49.35%	47.84%
	83	79,066	82,975	40,046	50.65%	48.26%
Conetoe	23	294	81,057	294	100.00%	0.36%
Connelly Springs	86	1,669	79,175	1,669	100.00%	2.11%
Conover	89	8,165	77,838	384	4.70%	0.49%
	96	8,165	76,520	7,781	95.30%	10.17%
Conway	27	836	76,790	836	100.00%	1.09%
Cooleemee	79	960	82,213	960	100.00%	1.17%
Cornelius	98	24,866	76,218	21,525	86.56%	28.24%
	107	24,866	78,268	3,341	13.44%	4.27%
Cove City	12	399	75,720	399	100.00%	0.53%
Cramerton	108	4,165	76,926	1	0.02%	0.00%
	109	4,165	75,517	4,164	99.98%	5.51%
Creedmoor	2	4,124	82,891	2,493	60.45%	3.01%
	32	4,124	82,883	1,631	39.55%	1.97%
Creswell	3	276	77,143	276	100.00%	0.36%
Crossnore	85	192	78,372	192	100.00%	0.24%
Dallas	110	4,488	75,573	4,488	100.00%	5.94%
Danbury	91	189	82,879	189	100.00%	0.23%
Davidson (Iredell)	95	294	82,155	294	100.00%	0.36%
Davidson (Mecklenburg)	98	10,650	76,218	10,650	100.00%	13.97%
Dellview	110	13	75,573	13	100.00%	0.02%
Denton	80	1,636	81,522	1,636	100.00%	2.01%
Dillsboro	119	232	75,548	232	100.00%	0.31%
Dobbins Heights	66	866	81,734	866	100.00%	1.06%
Dobson	90	1,586	82,702	1,436	90.54%	1.74%
	91	1,586	82,879	150	9.46%	0.18%
Dortches	7	935	78,068	3	0.32%	0.00%
	25	935	78,391	932	99.68%	1.19%
Dover	12	401	75,720	401	100.00%	0.53%
Drexel	86	1,858	79,175	1,858	100.00%	2.35%
Dublin	22	338	83,428	338	100.00%	0.41%
Duck	1	369	76,421	369	100.00%	0.48%
Dunn	28	9,263	83,429	3,515	37.95%	4.21%
	53	9,263	83,434	5,748	62.05%	6.89%
Durham (Durham)	29	228,300	82,725	79,793	34.95%	96.46%
	30	228,300	83,264	69,895	30.62%	83.94%
	31	228,300	82,791	62,573	27.41%	75.58%
	54	228,300	82,312	16,039	7.03%	19.49%

District plan definition file: 'Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State.asc', modified 08/23/2017 05:44:28 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/23/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Durham (Orange)	50	30	79,107	24	80.00%	0.03%
	56	30	78,413	6	20.00%	0.01%
Durham (Wake)	40	0	76,609	0	0.00%	0.00%
Earl	111	260	76,148	260	100.00%	0.34%
East Arcadia	22	487	83,428	487	100.00%	0.58%
East Bend	73	612	77,321	612	100.00%	0.79%
East Laurinburg	48	300	83,109	300	100.00%	0.36%
East Spencer	77	1,534	82,902	1,534	100.00%	1.85%
Eastover	43	3,628	76,858	3,628	100.00%	4.72%
Eden	65	15,527	83,394	15,527	100.00%	18.62%
Edenton	3	5,004	77,143	5,004	100.00%	6.49%
Elizabeth City (Camden)	3	45	77,143	45	100.00%	0.06%
Elizabeth City (Pasquotank)	5	18,638	77,527	18,638	100.00%	24.04%
Elizabethtown	22	3,583	83,428	3,583	100.00%	4.29%
Elk Park	85	452	78,372	452	100.00%	0.58%
Elkin (Surry)	90	3,921	82,702	3,921	100.00%	4.74%
Elkin (Wilkes)	90	80	82,702	80	100.00%	0.10%
Ellenboro	112	873	79,547	873	100.00%	1.10%
Ellerbe	66	1,054	81,734	1,054	100.00%	1.29%
Elm City	8	1,298	81,234	1,298	100.00%	1.60%
Elon	64	9,419	75,581	9,419	100.00%	12.46%
Emerald Isle	13	3,655	76,622	3,655	100.00%	4.77%
Enfield	27	2,532	76,790	2,532	100.00%	3.30%
Erwin	53	4,405	83,434	4,405	100.00%	5.28%
Eureka	21	197	83,434	197	100.00%	0.24%
Everetts	23	164	81,057	164	100.00%	0.20%
Fair Bluff	46	951	81,643	951	100.00%	1.16%
Fairmont	46	2,663	81,643	2,663	100.00%	3.26%
Fairview	55	3,324	75,792	3,324	100.00%	4.39%
Faison (Duplin)	4	961	76,858	961	100.00%	1.25%
Faison (Sampson)	22	0	83,428	0	0.00%	0.00%
Faith	77	807	82,902	807	100.00%	0.97%
Falcon (Cumberland)	43	258	76,858	258	100.00%	0.34%
Falcon (Sampson)	28	0	83,429	0	0.00%	0.00%
Falkland	24	96	75,539	96	100.00%	0.13%
Fallston	111	607	76,148	607	100.00%	0.80%
Farmville	24	4,654	75,539	4,654	100.00%	6.16%
Fayetteville	42	200,564	79,801	54,690	27.27%	68.53%
	43	200,564	76,858	45,759	22.82%	59.54%
	44	200,564	79,644	62,059	30.94%	77.92%
	45	200,564	83,128	38,056	18.97%	45.78%
Flat Rock	113	3,114	81,089	3,114	100.00%	3.84%
Fletcher	117	7,187	79,251	7,187	100.00%	9.07%
Forest City	112	7,476	79,547	7,476	100.00%	9.40%
Forest Hills	119	365	75,548	365	100.00%	0.48%
Fountain	24	427	75,539	427	100.00%	0.57%
Four Oaks	28	1,921	83,429	1,921	100.00%	2.30%

District plan definition file: 'Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State.asc', modified 08/23/2017 05:44:28 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Foxfire	52	902	76,894	902	100.00%	1.17%
Franklin	120	3,845	80,814	3,845	100.00%	4.76%
Franklinton	7	2,023	78,068	2,023	100.00%	2.59%
Franklinville	78	1,164	76,980	1,164	100.00%	1.51%
Fremont	21	1,255	83,434	0	0.00%	0.00%
	76	1,255	83,435	1,255	100.00%	1.50%
Fuquay-Varina	36	17,937	83,373	228	1.27%	0.27%
	37	17,937	83,318	17,709	98.73%	21.25%
Gamewell	87	4,051	83,029	4,051	100.00%	4.88%
Garland	22	625	83,428	625	100.00%	0.75%
Garner	33	25,745	83,261	23,941	92.99%	28.75%
	36	25,745	83,373	1,804	7.01%	2.16%
Garysburg	27	1,057	76,790	1,057	100.00%	1.38%
Gaston	27	1,152	76,790	1,152	100.00%	1.50%
Gastonia	108	71,741	76,926	26,870	37.45%	34.93%
	109	71,741	75,517	41,847	58.33%	55.41%
	110	71,741	75,573	3,024	4.22%	4.00%
Gatesville	5	321	77,527	321	100.00%	0.41%
Gibson	48	540	83,109	540	100.00%	0.65%
Gibsonville (Alamance)	64	3,148	75,581	3,148	100.00%	4.17%
Gibsonville (Guilford)	58	3,262	77,567	3,262	100.00%	4.21%
Glen Alpine	86	1,517	79,175	1,517	100.00%	1.92%
Godwin	43	139	76,858	139	100.00%	0.18%
Goldsboro	21	36,437	83,434	34,806	95.52%	41.72%
	76	36,437	83,435	1,631	4.48%	1.95%
Goldston	54	268	82,312	268	100.00%	0.33%
Graham	63	14,153	75,550	14,153	100.00%	18.73%
Grandfather	85	25	78,372	25	100.00%	0.03%
Granite Falls	87	4,722	83,029	4,722	100.00%	5.69%
Granite Quarry	77	2,930	82,902	2,930	100.00%	3.53%
Grantsboro	1	688	76,421	688	100.00%	0.90%
Green Level	63	2,100	75,550	2,100	100.00%	2.78%
Greenevers	4	634	76,858	634	100.00%	0.82%
Greensboro	57	269,666	83,226	83,226	30.86%	100.00%
	58	269,666	77,567	32,637	12.10%	42.08%
	59	269,666	81,528	54,911	20.36%	67.35%
	60	269,666	82,909	20,254	7.51%	24.43%
	61	269,666	81,135	32,254	11.96%	39.75%
	62	269,666	82,041	46,384	17.20%	56.54%
Greenville	9	84,554	75,617	59,682	70.58%	78.93%
	24	84,554	75,539	24,872	29.42%	32.93%
Grifton (Lenoir)	10	186	76,487	186	100.00%	0.24%
Grifton (Pitt)	10	2,431	76,487	2,431	100.00%	3.18%
Grimesland	24	441	75,539	441	100.00%	0.58%
Grover	111	708	76,148	708	100.00%	0.93%
Halifax	27	234	76,790	234	100.00%	0.30%
Hamilton	23	408	81,057	408	100.00%	0.50%

District plan definition file: 'Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State.asc', modified 08/23/2017 05:44:28 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/23/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Hamlet	66	6,495	81,734	6,495	100.00%	7.95%
Harmony	84	531	77,282	531	100.00%	0.69%
Harrells (Duplin)	4	23	76,858	23	100.00%	0.03%
Harrells (Sampson)	22	179	83,428	179	100.00%	0.21%
Harrellsville	5	106	77,527	106	100.00%	0.14%
Harrisburg	82	11,526	81,563	11,526	100.00%	14.13%
Hassell	23	84	81,057	84	100.00%	0.10%
Havelock	12	20,735	75,720	20,735	100.00%	27.38%
Haw River	63	2,298	75,550	2,254	98.09%	2.98%
	64	2,298	75,581	44	1.91%	0.06%
Hayesville	120	311	80,814	311	100.00%	0.38%
Hemby Bridge	69	1,520	76,381	1,520	100.00%	1.99%
Henderson	32	15,368	82,883	15,368	100.00%	18.54%
Hendersonville	113	13,137	81,089	514	3.91%	0.63%
	117	13,137	79,251	12,623	96.09%	15.93%
Hertford	3	2,143	77,143	2,143	100.00%	2.78%
Hickory (Burke)	86	66	79,175	66	100.00%	0.08%
Hickory (Caldwell)	87	18	83,029	18	100.00%	0.02%
Hickory (Catawba)	89	39,926	77,838	5,448	13.65%	7.00%
	96	39,926	76,520	34,478	86.35%	45.06%
High Point (Davidson)	80	5,310	81,522	5,310	100.00%	6.51%
High Point (Forsyth)	71	8	78,227	8	100.00%	0.01%
High Point (Guilford)	60	99,042	82,909	51,123	51.62%	61.66%
	61	99,042	81,135	39,284	39.66%	48.42%
	62	99,042	82,041	8,635	8.72%	10.53%
High Point (Randolph)	70	11	76,125	11	100.00%	0.01%
High Shoals	110	696	75,573	696	100.00%	0.92%
Highlands (Jackson)	119	4	75,548	4	100.00%	0.01%
Highlands (Macon)	120	920	80,814	920	100.00%	1.14%
Hildebran	86	2,023	79,175	2,023	100.00%	2.56%
Hillsborough	50	6,087	79,107	6,087	100.00%	7.69%
Hobgood	27	348	76,790	348	100.00%	0.45%
Hoffman	66	588	81,734	588	100.00%	0.72%
Holden Beach	17	575	77,263	575	100.00%	0.74%
Holly Ridge	15	1,268	82,923	1,268	100.00%	1.53%
Holly Springs	36	24,661	83,373	3,277	13.29%	3.93%
	37	24,661	83,318	21,382	86.70%	25.66%
	41	24,661	82,866	2	0.01%	0.00%
Hookerton	21	409	83,434	409	100.00%	0.49%
Hope Mills	44	15,176	79,644	0	0.00%	0.00%
	45	15,176	83,128	15,176	100.00%	18.26%
Hot Springs	118	560	76,322	560	100.00%	0.73%
Hudson	87	3,776	83,029	3,776	100.00%	4.55%
Huntersville	98	46,773	76,218	17,864	38.19%	23.44%
	107	46,773	78,268	28,909	61.81%	36.94%
Indian Beach	13	112	76,622	112	100.00%	0.15%
Indian Trail	55	33,518	75,792	51	0.15%	0.07%

District plan definition file: 'Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State.asc', modified 08/23/2017 05:44:28 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/23/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Indian Trail	68	33,518	76,067	7,845	23.41%	10.31%
	69	33,518	76,381	25,622	76.44%	33.54%
Jackson	27	513	76,790	513	100.00%	0.67%
Jacksonville	14	70,145	76,496	38,937	55.51%	50.90%
	15	70,145	82,923	31,208	44.49%	37.63%
Jamestown	60	3,382	82,909	4	0.12%	0.00%
	61	3,382	81,135	3,378	99.88%	4.16%
Jamesville	23	491	81,057	491	100.00%	0.61%
Jefferson	93	1,611	78,360	1,611	100.00%	2.06%
Jonesville	73	2,285	77,321	2,285	100.00%	2.96%
Kannapolis (Cabarrus)	67	33,194	81,314	765	2.30%	0.94%
	83	33,194	82,975	32,429	97.70%	39.08%
Kannapolis (Rowan)	79	9,431	82,213	9,431	100.00%	11.47%
Kelford	3	251	77,143	251	100.00%	0.33%
Kenansville	4	855	76,858	855	100.00%	1.11%
Kenly (Johnston)	76	1,176	83,435	1,176	100.00%	1.41%
Kenly (Wilson)	8	163	81,234	163	100.00%	0.20%
Kernersville (Forsyth)	71	23,071	78,227	11,125	48.22%	14.22%
	72	23,071	81,553	11,946	51.78%	14.65%
Kernersville (Guilford)	62	52	82,041	52	100.00%	0.06%
Kill Devil Hills	1	6,683	76,421	6,683	100.00%	8.74%
King (Forsyth)	74	619	76,092	619	100.00%	0.81%
King (Stokes)	91	6,285	82,879	6,285	100.00%	7.58%
Kings Mountain (Cleveland)	110	9,242	75,573	0	0.00%	0.00%
	111	9,242	76,148	9,242	100.00%	12.14%
Kings Mountain (Gaston)	110	1,054	75,573	1,054	100.00%	1.39%
Kingstown	111	681	76,148	681	100.00%	0.89%
Kinston	10	21,677	76,487	21,677	100.00%	28.34%
Kittrell	32	467	82,883	467	100.00%	0.56%
Kitty Hawk	1	3,272	76,421	3,272	100.00%	4.28%
Knightdale	39	11,401	83,299	11,401	100.00%	13.69%
Kure Beach	19	2,012	76,666	2,012	100.00%	2.62%
La Grange	10	2,873	76,487	2,873	100.00%	3.76%
Lake Lure	112	1,192	79,547	1,192	100.00%	1.50%
Lake Park	69	3,422	76,381	3,422	100.00%	4.48%
Lake Santeetlah	120	45	80,814	45	100.00%	0.06%
Lake Waccamaw	16	1,480	82,422	1,480	100.00%	1.80%
Landis	79	3,109	82,213	3,109	100.00%	3.78%
Lansing	93	158	78,360	158	100.00%	0.20%
Lasker	27	122	76,790	122	100.00%	0.16%
Lattimore	111	488	76,148	488	100.00%	0.64%
Laurel Park	113	2,180	81,089	2	0.09%	0.00%
	117	2,180	79,251	2,178	99.91%	2.75%
Laurinburg	48	15,962	83,109	15,962	100.00%	19.21%
Lawndale	111	606	76,148	606	100.00%	0.80%
Leggett	23	60	81,057	60	100.00%	0.07%
Leland	17	13,527	77,263	2,631	19.45%	3.41%

District plan definition file: 'Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State.asc', modified 08/23/2017 05:44:28 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Leland	18	13,527	77,681	10,896	80.55%	14.03%
Lenoir	87	18,228	83,029	18,228	100.00%	21.95%
Lewiston Woodville	3	549	77,143	549	100.00%	0.71%
Lewisville	73	12,639	77,321	7,043	55.72%	9.11%
	74	12,639	76,092	5,596	44.28%	7.35%
Lexington	80	18,931	81,522	0	0.00%	0.00%
	81	18,931	81,356	18,931	100.00%	23.27%
Liberty	78	2,656	76,980	2,656	100.00%	3.45%
Lilesville	55	536	75,792	536	100.00%	0.71%
Lillington	51	3,194	83,434	0	0.00%	0.00%
	53	3,194	83,434	3,194	100.00%	3.83%
Lincolnton	97	10,486	78,265	10,486	100.00%	13.40%
Linden	42	130	79,801	130	100.00%	0.16%
Littleton	27	674	76,790	674	100.00%	0.88%
Locust (Cabarrus)	82	215	81,563	215	100.00%	0.26%
Locust (Stanly)	67	2,715	81,314	2,715	100.00%	3.34%
Long View (Burke)	86	752	79,175	752	100.00%	0.95%
Long View (Catawba)	96	4,119	76,520	4,119	100.00%	5.38%
Louisburg	7	3,359	78,068	3,359	100.00%	4.30%
Love Valley	84	90	77,282	90	100.00%	0.12%
Lowell	108	3,526	76,926	3,526	100.00%	4.58%
Lucama	8	1,108	81,234	1,108	100.00%	1.36%
Lumber Bridge	47	94	80,418	94	100.00%	0.12%
Lumberton	46	21,542	81,643	17,744	82.37%	21.73%
	47	21,542	80,418	3,798	17.63%	4.72%
Macclesfield	23	471	81,057	471	100.00%	0.58%
Macon	32	119	82,883	119	100.00%	0.14%
Madison	91	2,246	82,879	2,246	100.00%	2.71%
Maggie Valley	118	1,150	76,322	1,039	90.35%	1.36%
	119	1,150	75,548	111	9.65%	0.15%
Magnolia	4	939	76,858	939	100.00%	1.22%
Maiden (Catawba)	89	3,308	77,838	3,308	100.00%	4.25%
Maiden (Lincoln)	97	2	78,265	2	100.00%	0.00%
Manteo	1	1,434	76,421	1,434	100.00%	1.88%
Marietta	46	175	81,643	175	100.00%	0.21%
Marion	85	7,838	78,372	7,838	100.00%	10.00%
Mars Hill	118	1,869	76,322	1,869	100.00%	2.45%
Marshall	118	872	76,322	872	100.00%	1.14%
Marshville	55	2,402	75,792	2,402	100.00%	3.17%
Marvin	68	5,579	76,067	5,579	100.00%	7.33%
Matthews	103	27,198	76,107	14,200	52.21%	18.66%
	104	27,198	77,637	12,998	47.79%	16.74%
Maxton (Robeson)	47	2,230	80,418	2,230	100.00%	2.77%
Maxton (Scotland)	48	196	83,109	196	100.00%	0.24%
Mayodan	91	2,478	82,879	2,478	100.00%	2.99%
Maysville	13	1,019	76,622	1,019	100.00%	1.33%
McAdenville	108	651	76,926	651	100.00%	0.85%

District plan definition file: 'Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State.asc', modified 08/23/2017 05:44:28 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
McDonald	47	113	80,418	113	100.00%	0.14%
McFarlan	55	117	75,792	117	100.00%	0.15%
Mebane (Alamance)	63	9,600	75,550	9,600	100.00%	12.71%
Mebane (Orange)	50	1,793	79,107	1,793	100.00%	2.27%
Mesic	1	220	76,421	220	100.00%	0.29%
Micro	76	441	83,435	441	100.00%	0.53%
Middleburg	32	133	82,883	133	100.00%	0.16%
Middlesex	25	822	78,391	822	100.00%	1.05%
Midland (Cabarrus)	82	3,073	81,563	3,073	100.00%	3.77%
Midland (Mecklenburg)	100	0	77,928	0	0.00%	0.00%
Midway	80	4,679	81,522	3,504	74.89%	4.30%
	81	4,679	81,356	1,175	25.11%	1.44%
Mills River	113	6,802	81,089	300	4.41%	0.37%
	117	6,802	79,251	6,502	95.59%	8.20%
Milton	50	166	79,107	166	100.00%	0.21%
Mineral Springs	55	2,639	75,792	688	26.07%	0.91%
	68	2,639	76,067	1,951	73.93%	2.56%
Minnesott Beach	1	440	76,421	440	100.00%	0.58%
Mint Hill (Mecklenburg)	100	22,669	77,928	10,504	46.34%	13.48%
	103	22,669	76,107	12,165	53.66%	15.98%
Mint Hill (Union)	69	53	76,381	53	100.00%	0.07%
Misenheimer	67	728	81,314	728	100.00%	0.90%
Mocksville	79	5,051	82,213	5,051	100.00%	6.14%
Momeyer	25	224	78,391	224	100.00%	0.29%
Monroe	55	32,797	75,792	3,133	9.55%	4.13%
	68	32,797	76,067	13,278	40.49%	17.46%
	69	32,797	76,381	16,386	49.96%	21.45%
Montreat	115	723	79,883	723	100.00%	0.91%
Mooresboro	111	311	76,148	311	100.00%	0.41%
Mooresville	95	32,711	82,155	32,711	100.00%	39.82%
Morehead City	13	8,661	76,622	8,661	100.00%	11.30%
Morganton	86	16,918	79,175	16,918	100.00%	21.37%
Morrisville (Durham)	31	0	82,791	0	0.00%	0.00%
Morrisville (Wake)	40	18,576	76,609	7,728	41.60%	10.09%
	41	18,576	82,866	10,848	58.40%	13.09%
Morven	55	511	75,792	511	100.00%	0.67%
Mount Airy	90	10,388	82,702	10,388	100.00%	12.56%
Mount Gilead	66	1,181	81,734	1,181	100.00%	1.44%
Mount Holly	108	13,656	76,926	13,656	100.00%	17.75%
Mount Olive (Duplin)	4	51	76,858	51	100.00%	0.07%
Mount Olive (Wayne)	76	4,538	83,435	4,538	100.00%	5.44%
Mount Pleasant	67	1,652	81,314	1,652	100.00%	2.03%
	82	1,652	81,563	0	0.00%	0.00%
Murfreesboro	5	2,835	77,527	2,835	100.00%	3.66%
Murphy	120	1,627	80,814	1,627	100.00%	2.01%
Nags Head	1	2,757	76,421	2,757	100.00%	3.61%
Nashville	25	5,352	78,391	5,352	100.00%	6.83%

District plan definition file: 'Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State.asc', modified 08/23/2017 05:44:28 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/23/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Navassa	18	1,505	77,681	1,505	100.00%	1.94%
New Bern	6	29,524	75,544	20,526	69.52%	27.17%
	12	29,524	75,720	8,998	30.48%	11.88%
New London	67	600	81,314	600	100.00%	0.74%
Newland	85	698	78,372	698	100.00%	0.89%
Newport	13	4,150	76,622	4,150	100.00%	5.42%
Newton	89	12,968	77,838	12,968	100.00%	16.66%
	96	12,968	76,520	0	0.00%	0.00%
Newton Grove	28	569	83,429	569	100.00%	0.68%
Norlina	32	1,118	82,883	1,118	100.00%	1.35%
Norman	66	138	81,734	138	100.00%	0.17%
North Topsail Beach	15	743	82,923	743	100.00%	0.90%
North Wilkesboro	90	4,245	82,702	5	0.12%	0.01%
	94	4,245	83,435	4,240	99.88%	5.08%
Northwest	18	735	77,681	735	100.00%	0.95%
Norwood	67	2,379	81,314	2,379	100.00%	2.93%
Oak City	23	317	81,057	317	100.00%	0.39%
Oak Island	17	6,783	77,263	6,783	100.00%	8.78%
Oak Ridge	62	6,185	82,041	6,185	100.00%	7.54%
Oakboro	67	1,859	81,314	1,859	100.00%	2.29%
Ocean Isle Beach	17	550	77,263	550	100.00%	0.71%
Old Fort	85	908	78,372	908	100.00%	1.16%
Oriental	1	900	76,421	900	100.00%	1.18%
Orrum	46	91	81,643	91	100.00%	0.11%
Ossipee	64	543	75,581	543	100.00%	0.72%
Oxford	2	8,461	82,891	8,206	96.99%	9.90%
	32	8,461	82,883	255	3.01%	0.31%
Pantego	6	179	75,544	179	100.00%	0.24%
Parkton	47	436	80,418	436	100.00%	0.54%
Parmele	23	278	81,057	278	100.00%	0.34%
Patterson Springs	111	622	76,148	622	100.00%	0.82%
Peachland	55	437	75,792	437	100.00%	0.58%
Peletier	13	644	76,622	644	100.00%	0.84%
Pembroke	47	2,973	80,418	2,973	100.00%	3.70%
Pikeville	76	678	83,435	678	100.00%	0.81%
Pilot Mountain	91	1,477	82,879	1,477	100.00%	1.78%
Pine Knoll Shores	13	1,339	76,622	1,339	100.00%	1.75%
Pine Level	28	1,700	83,429	1,700	100.00%	2.04%
Pinebluff	52	1,337	76,894	1,337	100.00%	1.74%
Pinehurst	52	13,124	76,894	13,124	100.00%	17.07%
Pinetops	23	1,374	81,057	1,374	100.00%	1.70%
Pineville	92	7,479	77,927	479	6.40%	0.61%
	105	7,479	75,712	7,000	93.60%	9.25%
Pink Hill	10	552	76,487	552	100.00%	0.72%
Pittsboro	54	3,743	82,312	3,743	100.00%	4.55%
Pleasant Garden	58	4,489	77,567	4,489	100.00%	5.79%
	60	4,489	82,909	0	0.00%	0.00%

District plan definition file: 'Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State.asc', modified 08/23/2017 05:44:28 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/23/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Plymouth	3	3,878	77,143	3,878	100.00%	5.03%
Polkton	55	3,375	75,792	3,375	100.00%	4.45%
Polkville	111	545	76,148	545	100.00%	0.72%
Pollocksville	13	311	76,622	311	100.00%	0.41%
Powellsville	3	276	77,143	276	100.00%	0.36%
Princeton	28	1,194	83,429	330	27.64%	0.40%
	76	1,194	83,435	864	72.36%	1.04%
Princeville	23	2,082	81,057	2,082	100.00%	2.57%
Proctorville	46	117	81,643	117	100.00%	0.14%
Raeford	48	4,611	83,109	4,611	100.00%	5.55%
Raleigh (Durham)	31	1,067	82,791	1,067	100.00%	1.29%
Raleigh (Wake)	11	402,825	82,422	52,449	13.02%	63.63%
	33	402,825	83,261	39,351	9.77%	47.26%
	34	402,825	79,853	70,378	17.47%	88.13%
	35	402,825	82,809	50,715	12.59%	61.24%
	38	402,825	81,715	78,960	19.60%	96.63%
	39	402,825	83,299	17,986	4.46%	21.59%
	40	402,825	76,609	29,498	7.32%	38.50%
	49	402,825	81,468	63,488	15.76%	77.93%
Ramseur	78	1,692	76,980	1,692	100.00%	2.20%
Randleman	70	4,113	76,125	4,113	100.00%	5.40%
Ranlo	108	3,434	76,926	3,434	100.00%	4.46%
	110	3,434	75,573	0	0.00%	0.00%
Raynham	47	72	80,418	72	100.00%	0.09%
Red Cross	67	742	81,314	742	100.00%	0.91%
Red Oak	7	3,430	78,068	19	0.55%	0.02%
	25	3,430	78,391	3,411	99.45%	4.35%
Red Springs (Hoke)	48	0	83,109	0	0.00%	0.00%
Red Springs (Robeson)	47	3,428	80,418	3,428	100.00%	4.26%
Reidsville	65	14,520	83,394	14,520	100.00%	17.41%
Rennert	47	383	80,418	383	100.00%	0.48%
Rhodhiss (Burke)	86	700	79,175	700	100.00%	0.88%
Rhodhiss (Caldwell)	87	370	83,029	370	100.00%	0.45%
Rich Square	27	958	76,790	958	100.00%	1.25%
Richfield	67	613	81,314	613	100.00%	0.75%
Richlands	4	1,520	76,858	1,520	100.00%	1.98%
River Bend	12	3,119	75,720	3,119	100.00%	4.12%
Roanoke Rapids	27	15,754	76,790	15,754	100.00%	20.52%
Robbins	52	1,097	76,894	1,097	100.00%	1.43%
	78	1,097	76,980	0	0.00%	0.00%
Robbinsville	120	620	80,814	620	100.00%	0.77%
Robersonville	23	1,488	81,057	1,488	100.00%	1.84%
Rockingham	66	9,558	81,734	9,558	100.00%	11.69%
Rockwell	67	2,108	81,314	2,108	100.00%	2.59%
Rocky Mount (Edgecombe)	23	17,524	81,057	17,524	100.00%	21.62%
Rocky Mount (Nash)	7	39,953	78,068	8,928	22.35%	11.44%
	25	39,953	78,391	31,025	77.65%	39.58%

District plan definition file: 'Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State.asc', modified 08/23/2017 05:44:28 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/23/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Rolesville	35	3,786	82,809	1,404	37.08%	1.70%
	39	3,786	83,299	2,382	62.92%	2.86%
Ronda	90	417	82,702	417	100.00%	0.50%
Roper	3	611	77,143	611	100.00%	0.79%
Rose Hill	4	1,626	76,858	1,626	100.00%	2.12%
Roseboro	22	1,191	83,428	1,191	100.00%	1.43%
Rosman	113	576	81,089	576	100.00%	0.71%
Rowland	47	1,037	80,418	1,037	100.00%	1.29%
Roxboro	2	8,362	82,891	8,362	100.00%	10.09%
Roxobel	3	240	77,143	240	100.00%	0.31%
Rural Hall	74	2,937	76,092	2,937	100.00%	3.86%
Ruth	112	440	79,547	440	100.00%	0.55%
Rutherford College	86	1,341	79,175	1,341	100.00%	1.69%
Rutherfordton	112	4,213	79,547	4,213	100.00%	5.30%
Salemburg	22	435	83,428	435	100.00%	0.52%
Salisbury	77	33,662	82,902	33,662	100.00%	40.60%
Saluda (Henderson)	113	12	81,089	12	100.00%	0.01%
Saluda (Polk)	113	701	81,089	701	100.00%	0.86%
Sandy Creek	18	260	77,681	260	100.00%	0.33%
Sandyfield	16	447	82,422	447	100.00%	0.54%
Sanford	51	28,094	83,434	28,094	100.00%	33.67%
Saratoga	8	408	81,234	408	100.00%	0.50%
Sawmills	87	5,240	83,029	5,240	100.00%	6.31%
Scotland Neck	27	2,059	76,790	2,059	100.00%	2.68%
Seaboard	27	632	76,790	632	100.00%	0.82%
Seagrove	78	228	76,980	228	100.00%	0.30%
Sedalia	58	623	77,567	623	100.00%	0.80%
Selma	28	6,073	83,429	6,073	100.00%	7.28%
Seven Devils (Avery)	85	28	78,372	28	100.00%	0.04%
Seven Devils (Watauga)	93	164	78,360	164	100.00%	0.21%
Seven Springs	76	110	83,435	110	100.00%	0.13%
Severn	27	276	76,790	276	100.00%	0.36%
Shallotte	17	3,675	77,263	3,675	100.00%	4.76%
Sharpsburg (Edgecombe)	23	209	81,057	209	100.00%	0.26%
Sharpsburg (Nash)	25	1,252	78,391	1,252	100.00%	1.60%
Sharpsburg (Wilson)	8	563	81,234	563	100.00%	0.69%
Shelby	110	20,323	75,573	11,240	55.31%	14.87%
	111	20,323	76,148	9,083	44.69%	11.93%
Siler City	54	7,887	82,312	7,887	100.00%	9.58%
Simpson	24	416	75,539	416	100.00%	0.55%
Sims	8	282	81,234	282	100.00%	0.35%
Smithfield	28	10,966	83,429	10,966	100.00%	13.14%
Snow Hill	21	1,595	83,434	1,595	100.00%	1.91%
Southern Pines	52	12,334	76,894	12,334	100.00%	16.04%
Southern Shores	1	2,714	76,421	2,714	100.00%	3.55%
Southport	17	2,833	77,263	2,833	100.00%	3.67%
Sparta	90	1,770	82,702	1,770	100.00%	2.14%

District plan definition file: 'Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State.asc', modified 08/23/2017 05:44:28 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/23/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Speed	23	80	81,057	80	100.00%	0.10%
Spencer	77	3,267	82,902	3,267	100.00%	3.94%
Spencer Mountain	108	37	76,926	37	100.00%	0.05%
Spindale	112	4,321	79,547	4,321	100.00%	5.43%
Spring Hope	25	1,320	78,391	1,320	100.00%	1.68%
Spring Lake	42	11,964	79,801	11,964	100.00%	14.99%
Spruce Pine	85	2,175	78,372	2,175	100.00%	2.78%
St. Helena	16	389	82,422	389	100.00%	0.47%
St. James	17	3,165	77,263	3,165	100.00%	4.10%
St. Pauls	47	2,035	80,418	2,035	100.00%	2.53%
Staley	78	393	76,980	393	100.00%	0.51%
Stallings (Mecklenburg)	103	399	76,107	399	100.00%	0.52%
Stallings (Union)	68	13,432	76,067	0	0.00%	0.00%
	69	13,432	76,381	13,432	100.00%	17.59%
Stanfield	67	1,486	81,314	1,486	100.00%	1.83%
Stanley	108	3,556	76,926	3,550	99.83%	4.61%
	110	3,556	75,573	6	0.17%	0.01%
Stantonsburg	8	784	81,234	784	100.00%	0.97%
Star	66	876	81,734	876	100.00%	1.07%
Statesville	84	24,532	77,282	20,541	83.73%	26.58%
	95	24,532	82,155	3,991	16.27%	4.86%
Stedman	43	1,028	76,858	1,028	100.00%	1.34%
Stem	2	463	82,891	463	100.00%	0.56%
Stokesdale	62	5,047	82,041	5,047	100.00%	6.15%
Stoneville	65	1,056	83,394	1,056	100.00%	1.27%
Stonewall	1	281	76,421	281	100.00%	0.37%
Stovall	2	418	82,891	418	100.00%	0.50%
Sugar Mountain	85	198	78,372	198	100.00%	0.25%
Summerfield	59	10,232	81,528	2,422	23.67%	2.97%
	62	10,232	82,041	7,810	76.33%	9.52%
Sunset Beach	17	3,572	77,263	3,572	100.00%	4.62%
Surf City (Onslow)	15	292	82,923	292	100.00%	0.35%
Surf City (Pender)	16	1,561	82,422	1,561	100.00%	1.89%
Swansboro	15	2,663	82,923	2,663	100.00%	3.21%
Swepsonville	63	1,154	75,550	1,154	100.00%	1.53%
Sylva	119	2,588	75,548	2,588	100.00%	3.43%
Tabor City	16	2,511	82,422	2,511	100.00%	3.05%
Tar Heel	22	117	83,428	117	100.00%	0.14%
Tarboro	23	11,415	81,057	11,415	100.00%	14.08%
Taylorsville	94	2,098	83,435	2,098	100.00%	2.51%
Taylortown	52	722	76,894	722	100.00%	0.94%
Teachey	4	376	76,858	376	100.00%	0.49%
Thomasville (Davidson)	80	26,493	81,522	25,474	96.15%	31.25%
	81	26,493	81,356	1,019	3.85%	1.25%
Thomasville (Randolph)	70	264	76,125	264	100.00%	0.35%
Tobaccoville (Forsyth)	74	2,441	76,092	2,441	100.00%	3.21%
Tobaccoville (Stokes)	91	0	82,879	0	0.00%	0.00%

District plan definition file: 'Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State.asc', modified 08/23/2017 05:44:28 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/23/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Topsail Beach	16	368	82,422	368	100.00%	0.45%
Trent Woods	12	4,155	75,720	4,155	100.00%	5.49%
Trenton	13	287	76,622	287	100.00%	0.37%
Trinity	70	6,614	76,125	6,614	100.00%	8.69%
Troutman	84	2,383	77,282	2,169	91.02%	2.81%
	95	2,383	82,155	214	8.98%	0.26%
Troy	66	3,189	81,734	3,189	100.00%	3.90%
Tryon	113	1,646	81,089	1,646	100.00%	2.03%
Turkey	22	292	83,428	292	100.00%	0.35%
Unionville	55	5,929	75,792	337	5.68%	0.44%
	69	5,929	76,381	5,592	94.32%	7.32%
Valdese	86	4,490	79,175	4,490	100.00%	5.67%
Vanceboro	12	1,005	75,720	1,005	100.00%	1.33%
Vandemere	1	254	76,421	254	100.00%	0.33%
Varnamtown	17	541	77,263	541	100.00%	0.70%
Vass	52	720	76,894	720	100.00%	0.94%
Waco	110	321	75,573	321	100.00%	0.42%
Wade	43	556	76,858	556	100.00%	0.72%
Wadesboro	55	5,813	75,792	5,813	100.00%	7.67%
Wagram	48	840	83,109	840	100.00%	1.01%
Wake Forest (Franklin)	7	899	78,068	899	100.00%	1.15%
Wake Forest (Wake)	35	29,218	82,809	23,128	79.16%	27.93%
	40	29,218	76,609	6,090	20.84%	7.95%
Walkertown	72	4,675	81,553	4,675	100.00%	5.73%
Wallace (Duplin)	4	3,880	76,858	3,880	100.00%	5.05%
Wallace (Pender)	16	0	82,422	0	0.00%	0.00%
Wallburg	80	3,047	81,522	3,047	100.00%	3.74%
Walnut Cove	91	1,425	82,879	1,425	100.00%	1.72%
Walnut Creek	76	835	83,435	835	100.00%	1.00%
Walstonburg	21	219	83,434	219	100.00%	0.26%
Warrenton	32	862	82,883	862	100.00%	1.04%
Warsaw	4	3,054	76,858	3,054	100.00%	3.97%
Washington	6	9,744	75,544	9,744	100.00%	12.90%
Washington Park	6	451	75,544	451	100.00%	0.60%
Watha	16	190	82,422	190	100.00%	0.23%
Waxhaw	55	9,859	75,792	1,604	16.27%	2.12%
	68	9,859	76,067	8,255	83.73%	10.85%
Waynesville	119	9,869	75,548	9,869	100.00%	13.06%
Weaverville	115	3,120	79,883	3,120	100.00%	3.91%
Webster	119	363	75,548	363	100.00%	0.48%
Weddington (Mecklenburg)	105	7	75,712	7	100.00%	0.01%
Weddington (Union)	68	9,452	76,067	8,933	94.51%	11.74%
	69	9,452	76,381	519	5.49%	0.68%
Weldon	27	1,655	76,790	1,655	100.00%	2.16%
Wendell	39	5,845	83,299	5,845	100.00%	7.02%
Wentworth	65	2,807	83,394	2,807	100.00%	3.37%
Wesley Chapel	68	7,463	76,067	6,877	92.15%	9.04%

District plan definition file: 'Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State.asc', modified 08/23/2017 05:44:28 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/23/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Wesley Chapel	69	7,463	76,381	586	7.85%	0.77%
West Jefferson	93	1,299	78,360	1,299	100.00%	1.66%
Whispering Pines	52	2,928	76,894	2,928	100.00%	3.81%
Whitakers (Edgecombe)	23	402	81,057	402	100.00%	0.50%
Whitakers (Nash)	7	342	78,068	342	100.00%	0.44%
White Lake	22	802	83,428	802	100.00%	0.96%
Whiteville	46	5,394	81,643	5,394	100.00%	6.61%
Whitsett	58	590	77,567	590	100.00%	0.76%
Wilkesboro	94	3,413	83,435	3,413	100.00%	4.09%
Williamston	23	5,511	81,057	5,511	100.00%	6.80%
Wilmington	18	106,476	77,681	41,563	39.04%	53.50%
	19	106,476	76,666	33,947	31.88%	44.28%
	20	106,476	78,488	30,966	29.08%	39.45%
Wilson	8	49,167	81,234	49,167	100.00%	60.53%
Wilson's Mills	26	2,277	83,434	0	0.00%	0.00%
	28	2,277	83,429	2,277	100.00%	2.73%
Windsor	3	3,630	77,143	3,630	100.00%	4.71%
Winfall	3	594	77,143	594	100.00%	0.77%
Wingate	55	3,491	75,792	349	10.00%	0.46%
	69	3,491	76,381	3,142	90.00%	4.11%
Winston-Salem	71	229,617	78,227	56,243	24.49%	71.90%
	72	229,617	81,553	42,279	18.41%	51.84%
	73	229,617	77,321	6,281	2.74%	8.12%
	74	229,617	76,092	51,264	22.33%	67.37%
	75	229,617	75,883	73,550	32.03%	96.93%
Winterville	9	9,269	75,617	6,172	66.59%	8.16%
	10	9,269	76,487	2,219	23.94%	2.90%
	24	9,269	75,539	878	9.47%	1.16%
Winton	5	769	77,527	769	100.00%	0.99%
Woodfin	114	6,123	82,902	2,563	41.86%	3.09%
	115	6,123	79,883	2,717	44.37%	3.40%
	116	6,123	75,533	843	13.77%	1.12%
Woodland	27	809	76,790	809	100.00%	1.05%
Wrightsville Beach	19	2,477	76,666	2,477	100.00%	3.23%
	20	2,477	78,488	0	0.00%	0.00%
Yadkinville	73	2,959	77,321	2,959	100.00%	3.83%
Yanceyville	50	2,039	79,107	2,039	100.00%	2.58%
Youngsville	7	1,157	78,068	1,157	100.00%	1.48%
Zebulon (Johnston)	76	0	83,435	0	0.00%	0.00%
Zebulon (Wake)	39	4,433	83,299	4,433	100.00%	5.32%
			Total:	**5,250,071**		

District plan definition file: 'Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State.asc', modified 08/23/2017 05:44:28 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/23/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State: Split VTD Detail

County	VTD	District	Total VTD Pop	VTD Pop in District	Percent of VTD Pop in District
Alamance	03C	63	2,814	2,491	88.52%
		64	2,814	323	11.48%
	063	63	4,940	4,090	82.79%
		64	4,940	850	17.21%
	06W	63	1,973	1,617	81.96%
		64	1,973	356	18.04%
Brunswick	04	17	13,819	3,644	26.37%
		18	13,819	10,175	73.63%
Buncombe	05.1	114	2,748	1,691	61.54%
		115	2,748	1,057	38.46%
	100.1	114	9,126	8,524	93.40%
		115	9,126	602	6.60%
	102.1	114	5,975	1,385	23.18%
		116	5,975	4,590	76.82%
	104.1	114	3,081	2,345	76.11%
		115	3,081	736	23.89%
	19.1	114	2,159	1,843	85.36%
		116	2,159	316	14.64%
	24.1	114	3,211	1,964	61.16%
		116	3,211	1,247	38.84%
	52.1	115	5,279	3,762	71.26%
		116	5,279	1,517	28.74%
	57.1	114	3,534	315	8.91%
		115	3,534	1,149	32.51%
		116	3,534	2,070	58.57%
	60.2	114	1,300	164	12.62%
		115	1,300	1,136	87.38%
	64.1	114	2,671	820	30.70%
		115	2,671	1,851	69.30%
	70.1	114	3,508	2,418	68.93%
		115	3,508	1,090	31.07%
Craven	06	6	1,808	1,754	97.01%
		12	1,808	54	2.99%
	07	6	3,396	12	0.35%
		12	3,396	3,384	99.65%
Cumberland	G2	42	34,282	16,072	46.88%
		43	34,282	18,210	53.12%
	G5	44	20,447	8,917	43.61%
		45	20,447	11,530	56.39%
Durham	22	30	7,535	1,516	20.12%
		31	7,535	6,019	79.88%
Gaston	05	109	4,767	4,132	86.68%
		110	4,767	635	13.32%
Granville	ANTI	2	1,350	604	44.74%
		32	1,350	746	55.26%
Harnett	PR07	51	17,943	5,724	31.90%
		53	17,943	12,219	68.10%
	PR25	28	5,689	5,676	99.77%
		53	5,689	13	0.23%

District plan definition file: 'Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State.asc', modified 08/23/2017 05:44:28 PM
VTDs ('Voting Districts') derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.
Printed 08/23/2017 {rptG05|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State: Split VTD Detail

County	VTD	District	Total VTD Pop	VTD Pop in District	Percent of VTD Pop in District
Haywood	IH	118	3,815	3,256	85.35%
		119	3,815	559	14.65%
Johnston	PR07	28	4,216	1,141	27.06%
		76	4,216	3,075	72.94%
	PR14	26	3,061	529	17.28%
		28	3,061	2,532	82.72%
Mecklenburg	087	104	4,248	2,093	49.27%
		105	4,248	2,155	50.73%
	088	104	4,301	3,949	91.82%
		105	4,301	352	8.18%
	091	104	5,864	4,125	70.34%
		105	5,864	1,739	29.66%
	121	104	4,633	1,614	34.84%
		105	4,633	3,019	65.16%
	129	92	2,756	0	0.00%
		105	2,756	2,756	100.00%
	132	99	4,003	3,678	91.88%
		102	4,003	325	8.12%
	205	99	4,489	323	7.20%
		100	4,489	4,166	92.80%
	209	101	6,263	572	9.13%
		107	6,263	5,691	90.87%
	225	92	2,274	481	21.15%
		105	2,274	1,793	78.85%
	227	104	7,842	2,604	33.21%
		105	7,842	5,238	66.79%
Moore	RBN	52	2,923	2,593	88.71%
		78	2,923	330	11.29%
	WEM	52	2,982	1,806	60.56%
		78	2,982	1,176	39.44%
New Hanover	CF03	18	8,711	828	9.51%
		20	8,711	7,883	90.49%
	W24	18	7,784	3,543	45.52%
		20	7,784	4,241	54.48%
	WB	19	2,473	2,473	100.00%
		20	2,473	0	0.00%
Pitt	1403A	9	7,871	970	12.32%
		10	7,871	2,898	36.82%
		24	7,871	4,003	50.86%
	1508A	9	2,321	1,703	73.37%
		24	2,321	618	26.63%
Robeson	11	46	7,504	3,077	41.00%
		47	7,504	4,427	59.00%
Rockingham	MA	65	6,293	6,020	95.66%
		91	6,293	273	4.34%
Sampson	GIDD	22	2,601	2,513	96.62%
		28	2,601	88	3.38%
	KEEN	22	2,180	254	11.65%
		28	2,180	1,926	88.35%

Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State: Split VTD Detail

County	VTD	District	Total VTD Pop	VTD Pop in District	Percent of VTD Pop in District
Sampson	NGRV	22	2,596	163	6.28%
		28	2,596	2,433	93.72%
Union	017A	68	4,593	1,595	34.73%
		69	4,593	2,998	65.27%
	019	55	5,806	1,105	19.03%
		68	5,806	4,701	80.97%
	029A	68	5,935	5,079	85.58%
		69	5,935	856	14.42%
	029C	68	2,942	1,576	53.57%
		69	2,942	1,366	46.43%
	032	55	4,095	1,820	44.44%
		69	4,095	2,275	55.56%
	040	68	4,926	1,122	22.78%
		69	4,926	3,804	77.22%
Wake	03-00	37	3,251	313	9.63%
		41	3,251	2,938	90.37%
	04-08	41	3,361	0	0.00%
		49	3,361	3,361	100.00%
	04-16	11	2,779	108	3.89%
		36	2,779	2,671	96.11%
	04-18	41	3,720	1,007	27.07%
		49	3,720	2,713	72.93%
	04-19	36	2,456	1,952	79.48%
		41	2,456	504	20.52%
	05-04	40	14,643	10,614	72.49%
		41	14,643	4,029	27.51%
	07-03	34	2,041	188	9.21%
		49	2,041	1,853	90.79%
	07-10	40	6,941	2,755	39.69%
		49	6,941	4,186	60.31%
	08-02	40	5,481	3,545	64.68%
		49	5,481	1,936	35.32%
	08-10	40	3,746	946	25.25%
		49	3,746	2,800	74.75%
	13-01	35	9,027	8,217	91.03%
		39	9,027	810	8.97%
	15-01	33	6,241	1,263	20.24%
		37	6,241	4,978	79.76%
	15-02	33	8,319	2,853	34.29%
		36	8,319	5,466	65.71%
	18-04	33	5,689	2,867	50.40%
		36	5,689	2,822	49.60%
	18-08	11	5,677	2,521	44.41%
		36	5,677	3,156	55.59%
	20-06	37	10,994	3,940	35.84%
		41	10,994	7,054	64.16%
	20-08	37	6,757	5,039	74.57%
		41	6,757	1,718	25.43%
Wayne	27	21	3,075	3,072	99.90%

District plan definition file: 'Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State.asc', modified 08/23/2017 05:44:28 PM
VTDs ('Voting Districts') derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.
Printed 08/23/2017 {rptG05|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State: Split VTD Detail

County	VTD	District	Total VTD Pop	VTD Pop in District	Percent of VTD Pop in District
Wayne	27	76	3,075	3	0.10%
	28	21	7,582	1,732	22.84%
		76	7,582	5,850	77.16%

Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State: Population Deviation

District	2010 Pop	Ideal Pop	Deviation	Deviation %
1	76,421	79,462	-3,041	-3.83%
2	82,891	79,462	3,429	4.32%
3	77,143	79,462	-2,319	-2.92%
4	76,858	79,462	-2,604	-3.28%
5	77,527	79,462	-1,935	-2.44%
6	75,544	79,462	-3,918	-4.93%
7	78,068	79,462	-1,394	-1.75%
8	81,234	79,462	1,772	2.23%
9	75,617	79,462	-3,845	-4.84%
10	76,487	79,462	-2,975	-3.74%
11	82,422	79,462	2,960	3.73%
12	75,720	79,462	-3,742	-4.71%
13	76,622	79,462	-2,840	-3.57%
14	76,496	79,462	-2,966	-3.73%
15	82,923	79,462	3,461	4.36%
16	82,422	79,462	2,960	3.73%
17	77,263	79,462	-2,199	-2.77%
18	77,681	79,462	-1,781	-2.24%
19	76,666	79,462	-2,796	-3.52%
20	78,488	79,462	-974	-1.23%
21	83,434	79,462	3,972	5.00%
22	83,428	79,462	3,966	4.99%
23	81,057	79,462	1,595	2.01%
24	75,539	79,462	-3,923	-4.94%
25	78,391	79,462	-1,071	-1.35%
26	83,434	79,462	3,972	5.00%
27	76,790	79,462	-2,672	-3.36%
28	83,429	79,462	3,967	4.99%
29	82,725	79,462	3,263	4.11%
30	83,264	79,462	3,802	4.78%
31	82,791	79,462	3,329	4.19%
32	82,883	79,462	3,421	4.31%
33	83,261	79,462	3,799	4.78%
34	79,853	79,462	391	0.49%
35	82,809	79,462	3,347	4.21%
36	83,373	79,462	3,911	4.92%
37	83,318	79,462	3,856	4.85%
38	81,715	79,462	2,253	2.84%
39	83,299	79,462	3,837	4.83%
40	76,609	79,462	-2,853	-3.59%
41	82,866	79,462	3,404	4.28%
42	79,801	79,462	339	0.43%
43	76,858	79,462	-2,604	-3.28%
44	79,644	79,462	182	0.23%
45	83,128	79,462	3,666	4.61%
46	81,643	79,462	2,181	2.74%
47	80,418	79,462	956	1.20%
48	83,109	79,462	3,647	4.59%
49	81,468	79,462	2,006	2.52%
50	79,107	79,462	-355	-0.45%
51	83,434	79,462	3,972	5.00%
52	76,894	79,462	-2,568	-3.23%
53	83,434	79,462	3,972	5.00%
54	82,312	79,462	2,850	3.59%
55	75,792	79,462	-3,670	-4.62%
56	78,413	79,462	-1,049	-1.32%
57	83,226	79,462	3,764	4.74%
58	77,567	79,462	-1,895	-2.38%
59	81,528	79,462	2,066	2.60%
60	82,909	79,462	3,447	4.34%
61	81,135	79,462	1,673	2.11%
62	82,041	79,462	2,579	3.25%
63	75,550	79,462	-3,912	-4.92%
64	75,581	79,462	-3,881	-4.88%
65	83,394	79,462	3,932	4.95%
66	81,734	79,462	2,272	2.86%
67	81,314	79,462	1,852	2.33%
68	76,067	79,462	-3,395	-4.27%
69	76,381	79,462	-3,081	-3.88%
70	76,125	79,462	-3,337	-4.20%
71	78,227	79,462	-1,235	-1.55%
72	81,553	79,462	2,091	2.63%
73	77,321	79,462	-2,141	-2.69%
74	76,092	79,462	-3,370	-4.24%
75	75,883	79,462	-3,579	-4.50%
76	83,435	79,462	3,973	5.00%
77	82,902	79,462	3,440	4.33%
78	76,980	79,462	-2,482	-3.12%
79	82,213	79,462	2,751	3.46%
80	81,522	79,462	2,060	2.59%
81	81,356	79,462	1,894	2.38%
82	81,563	79,462	2,101	2.64%

Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State: Population Deviation

District	2010 Pop	Ideal Pop	Deviation	Deviation %
83	82,975	79,462	3,513	4.42%
84	77,282	79,462	-2,180	-2.74%
85	78,372	79,462	-1,090	-1.37%
86	79,175	79,462	-287	-0.36%
87	83,029	79,462	3,567	4.49%
88	75,500	79,462	-3,962	-4.99%
89	77,838	79,462	-1,624	-2.04%
90	82,702	79,462	3,240	4.08%
91	82,879	79,462	3,417	4.30%
92	77,927	79,462	-1,535	-1.93%
93	78,360	79,462	-1,102	-1.39%
94	83,435	79,462	3,973	5.00%
95	82,155	79,462	2,693	3.39%
96	76,520	79,462	-2,942	-3.70%
97	78,265	79,462	-1,197	-1.51%
98	76,218	79,462	-3,244	-4.08%
99	76,192	79,462	-3,270	-4.12%
100	77,928	79,462	-1,534	-1.93%
101	75,680	79,462	-3,782	-4.76%
102	75,637	79,462	-3,825	-4.81%
103	76,107	79,462	-3,355	-4.22%
104	77,637	79,462	-1,825	-2.30%
105	75,712	79,462	-3,750	-4.72%
106	76,822	79,462	-2,640	-3.32%
107	78,268	79,462	-1,194	-1.50%
108	76,926	79,462	-2,536	-3.19%
109	75,517	79,462	-3,945	-4.96%
110	75,573	79,462	-3,889	-4.89%
111	76,148	79,462	-3,314	-4.17%
112	79,547	79,462	85	0.11%
113	81,089	79,462	1,627	2.05%
114	82,902	79,462	3,440	4.33%
115	79,883	79,462	421	0.53%
116	75,533	79,462	-3,929	-4.94%
117	79,251	79,462	-211	-0.27%
118	76,322	79,462	-3,140	-3.95%
119	75,548	79,462	-3,914	-4.93%
120	80,814	79,462	1,352	1.70%
Total:	**9,535,483**			

Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State: Population 2010, US Senate 2010, President 2012

	2010 Census		US Senate 2010: Marshall-Burr-Beitler								US President 2012: Obama-Romney-Johnson							
District	Total Pop	18+ Pop	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %
1	76,421	60,608	8,872	34.50%	16,174	62.90%	661	2.57%	7	0.03%	14,765	38.52%	22,988	59.97%	532	1.39%	50	0.13%
2	82,891	64,778	10,460	47.76%	11,004	50.24%	435	1.99%	3	0.01%	18,581	49.90%	18,314	49.18%	275	0.74%	68	0.18%
3	77,143	60,226	11,572	46.71%	12,798	51.66%	398	1.61%	6	0.02%	19,188	51.49%	17,761	47.66%	255	0.68%	62	0.17%
4	76,858	56,575	6,685	40.27%	9,640	58.08%	268	1.61%	6	0.04%	10,892	40.01%	16,107	59.17%	185	0.68%	37	0.14%
5	77,527	60,228	10,791	55.68%	8,307	42.86%	273	1.41%	11	0.06%	20,871	60.75%	13,179	38.36%	249	0.72%	57	0.17%
6	75,544	58,428	8,882	38.82%	13,517	59.07%	467	2.04%	16	0.07%	16,067	44.76%	19,504	54.33%	255	0.71%	72	0.20%
7	78,068	59,172	11,388	49.46%	11,207	48.67%	422	1.83%	9	0.04%	18,994	51.14%	17,728	47.73%	323	0.87%	96	0.26%
8	81,234	61,182	13,631	51.47%	12,420	46.90%	428	1.62%	3	0.01%	20,875	53.38%	17,954	45.91%	242	0.62%	38	0.10%
9	75,617	60,766	8,468	45.56%	9,897	53.25%	213	1.15%	8	0.04%	18,962	51.97%	17,138	46.97%	325	0.89%	59	0.16%
10	76,487	57,910	10,333	45.80%	11,962	53.02%	252	1.12%	13	0.06%	17,602	48.76%	18,279	50.63%	182	0.50%	38	0.11%
11	82,422	69,269	10,041	57.89%	6,729	38.79%	564	3.25%	12	0.07%	24,202	63.89%	12,697	33.52%	894	2.36%	89	0.23%
12	75,720	58,106	6,690	31.19%	14,363	66.96%	389	1.81%	7	0.03%	12,131	35.79%	21,401	63.14%	289	0.85%	71	0.21%
13	76,622	61,839	7,638	28.48%	18,590	69.32%	538	2.01%	52	0.19%	12,458	31.09%	27,181	67.84%	359	0.90%	68	0.17%
14	76,496	55,951	4,887	38.38%	7,537	59.20%	299	2.35%	9	0.07%	11,091	44.24%	13,654	54.47%	252	1.01%	72	0.29%
15	82,923	63,943	2,490	24.34%	7,425	72.59%	310	3.03%	3	0.03%	5,522	28.02%	13,887	70.47%	241	1.22%	56	0.28%
16	82,422	63,610	9,325	37.83%	14,831	60.16%	486	1.97%	10	0.04%	14,432	39.64%	21,570	59.25%	318	0.87%	86	0.24%
17	77,263	64,270	9,560	31.61%	20,050	66.30%	624	2.06%	8	0.03%	15,595	36.15%	27,141	62.91%	333	0.77%	74	0.17%
18	77,681	61,478	11,041	55.09%	8,555	42.68%	437	2.18%	10	0.05%	22,442	61.89%	13,304	36.69%	413	1.14%	100	0.28%
19	76,666	60,681	8,459	32.87%	16,677	64.80%	587	2.28%	14	0.05%	16,301	40.73%	23,121	57.77%	483	1.21%	119	0.30%
20	78,488	63,095	9,000	33.59%	17,209	64.23%	570	2.13%	12	0.04%	16,368	39.38%	24,562	59.09%	499	1.20%	135	0.32%
21	83,434	63,103	10,826	49.14%	10,923	49.58%	277	1.26%	5	0.02%	19,289	53.98%	16,234	45.43%	203	0.57%	7	0.02%
22	83,428	63,057	12,830	49.65%	12,643	48.92%	362	1.40%	8	0.03%	17,983	50.04%	17,684	49.21%	225	0.63%	44	0.12%
23	81,057	61,743	14,653	59.95%	9,513	38.92%	269	1.10%	8	0.03%	24,825	62.80%	14,515	36.72%	147	0.37%	43	0.11%
24	75,539	56,837	9,267	51.06%	8,653	47.68%	222	1.22%	6	0.03%	19,148	56.09%	14,718	43.11%	237	0.69%	35	0.10%
25	78,391	59,490	11,062	43.28%	14,168	55.43%	321	1.26%	7	0.03%	18,755	47.19%	20,717	52.13%	199	0.50%	69	0.17%
26	83,434	58,646	7,839	31.87%	16,201	65.87%	541	2.20%	15	0.06%	14,905	35.69%	26,252	62.87%	482	1.15%	120	0.29%
27	76,790	59,572	13,603	61.65%	8,196	37.14%	261	1.18%	6	0.03%	24,188	66.17%	12,189	33.34%	143	0.39%	35	0.10%
28	83,429	61,771	7,595	34.59%	14,038	63.93%	321	1.46%	6	0.03%	12,261	36.60%	20,888	62.36%	264	0.79%	85	0.25%
29	82,725	65,549	21,069	80.08%	4,838	18.39%	386	1.47%	16	0.06%	40,060	82.30%	8,087	16.61%	459	0.94%	67	0.14%
30	83,264	65,948	16,535	63.92%	8,907	34.43%	418	1.62%	10	0.04%	31,778	70.90%	12,561	28.03%	408	0.91%	72	0.16%
31	82,791	61,072	15,814	71.06%	6,107	27.44%	322	1.45%	10	0.04%	31,512	75.70%	9,729	23.37%	341	0.82%	44	0.11%
32	82,883	62,750	14,154	56.80%	10,302	41.34%	455	1.83%	9	0.04%	23,736	60.61%	15,156	38.70%	201	0.51%	66	0.17%
33	83,261	61,139	15,072	64.20%	8,037	34.23%	361	1.54%	7	0.03%	28,423	69.77%	11,902	29.22%	356	0.87%	58	0.14%
34	79,853	62,001	14,253	44.67%	16,976	53.20%	659	2.07%	22	0.07%	25,257	51.15%	23,453	47.49%	597	1.21%	74	0.15%
35	82,809	56,976	10,156	46.53%	11,179	51.22%	468	2.14%	23	0.11%	22,556	53.51%	19,097	45.30%	425	1.01%	76	0.18%
36	83,373	60,452	11,979	38.61%	18,268	58.89%	765	2.47%	11	0.04%	22,127	44.76%	26,623	53.85%	612	1.24%	76	0.15%
37	83,318	58,264	9,264	36.55%	15,412	60.81%	659	2.60%	10	0.04%	19,754	42.89%	25,621	55.63%	612	1.33%	69	0.15%
38	81,715	61,210	16,904	73.06%	5,857	25.31%	367	1.59%	10	0.04%	32,300	77.25%	9,076	21.71%	376	0.90%	59	0.14%
39	83,299	59,968	12,043	49.35%	11,810	48.40%	538	2.20%	10	0.04%	23,626	55.50%	18,420	43.27%	440	1.03%	81	0.19%
40	76,609	55,500	9,391	37.86%	14,693	59.23%	711	2.87%	10	0.04%	19,759	45.92%	22,668	52.68%	536	1.25%	70	0.16%
41	82,866	55,814	9,681	41.60%	12,937	55.59%	648	2.78%	5	0.02%	21,885	50.00%	21,220	48.48%	585	1.34%	84	0.19%
42	79,801	57,048	7,456	60.33%	4,657	37.68%	237	1.92%	8	0.06%	16,222	66.45%	7,865	32.22%	249	1.02%	78	0.32%
43	76,858	58,430	10,846	54.71%	8,730	44.04%	237	1.20%	10	0.05%	21,599	60.45%	13,913	38.94%	178	0.50%	39	0.11%
44	79,644	60,333	9,481	48.25%	9,768	49.71%	392	1.99%	9	0.05%	18,810	55.96%	14,463	43.02%	277	0.82%	66	0.20%
45	83,128	58,079	8,909	51.73%	8,050	46.74%	255	1.48%	8	0.05%	19,161	56.55%	14,425	42.57%	223	0.66%	73	0.22%
46	81,643	60,773	9,261	49.84%	9,048	48.69%	261	1.40%	11	0.06%	17,122	54.53%	14,047	44.74%	176	0.56%	54	0.17%
47	80,418	58,752	6,814	54.36%	5,525	44.08%	184	1.47%	11	0.09%	14,116	59.09%	9,451	39.57%	244	1.02%	76	0.32%
48	83,109	59,851	9,247	55.26%	7,197	43.01%	281	1.68%	9	0.05%	18,291	58.54%	12,650	40.49%	258	0.83%	46	0.15%
49	81,468	65,787	14,540	49.22%	14,234	48.19%	747	2.53%	19	0.06%	27,373	55.82%	20,819	42.45%	738	1.50%	108	0.22%
50	79,107	60,643	14,838	53.96%	12,005	43.66%	648	2.36%	6	0.02%	23,933	56.01%	18,207	42.61%	472	1.10%	116	0.27%
51	83,434	60,484	8,009	41.76%	10,823	56.43%	341	1.78%	6	0.03%	14,377	44.23%	17,749	54.60%	312	0.96%	69	0.21%
52	76,894	60,407	8,130	31.91%	16,852	66.14%	491	1.93%	7	0.03%	14,828	36.08%	25,925	63.08%	289	0.70%	58	0.14%
53	83,434	61,063	7,336	36.86%	12,153	61.06%	406	2.04%	8	0.04%	12,414	38.11%	19,760	60.67%	329	1.01%	69	0.21%

Populations values derive from the 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File. Election results were provided by the NC State Board of Elections. Votes that could not be associated with a specific precinct were excluded. Reported statewide totals may therefore be marginally lower than official contest results.

Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State: Population 2010, US Senate 2010, President 2012

	2010 Census		US Senate 2010: Marshall-Burr-Beitler								US President 2012: Obama-Romney-Johnson							
District	Total Pop	18+ Pop	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %
54	82,312	64,361	16,920	53.96%	13,730	43.79%	695	2.22%	10	0.03%	26,235	55.99%	20,057	42.81%	473	1.01%	89	0.19%
55	75,792	57,260	7,418	36.90%	12,345	61.41%	326	1.62%	12	0.06%	13,756	39.49%	20,716	59.48%	275	0.79%	84	0.24%
56	78,413	64,019	19,652	76.92%	5,345	20.92%	531	2.08%	20	0.08%	35,316	78.36%	8,926	19.81%	668	1.48%	158	0.35%
57	83,226	67,386	12,629	47.51%	13,354	50.24%	575	2.16%	21	0.08%	27,826	58.77%	18,809	39.73%	562	1.19%	147	0.31%
58	77,567	59,171	13,328	56.69%	9,816	41.75%	355	1.51%	11	0.05%	26,934	62.37%	15,890	36.80%	282	0.65%	77	0.18%
59	81,528	60,372	11,484	55.53%	8,835	42.72%	358	1.73%	4	0.02%	26,735	64.26%	14,522	34.91%	265	0.64%	81	0.19%
60	82,909	61,880	10,255	57.53%	7,283	40.86%	261	1.46%	25	0.14%	23,955	67.32%	11,345	31.88%	215	0.60%	70	0.20%
61	81,135	62,440	8,961	41.55%	12,149	56.34%	430	1.99%	25	0.12%	21,225	52.47%	18,760	46.37%	364	0.90%	105	0.26%
62	82,041	62,674	8,484	33.71%	16,149	64.17%	522	2.07%	10	0.04%	19,195	42.68%	25,254	56.15%	410	0.91%	113	0.25%
63	75,550	57,278	8,482	38.39%	13,031	58.99%	571	2.58%	8	0.04%	15,509	43.71%	19,573	55.17%	330	0.93%	68	0.19%
64	75,581	58,410	6,964	35.86%	11,981	61.69%	458	2.36%	17	0.09%	13,366	41.39%	18,597	57.58%	267	0.83%	66	0.20%
65	83,394	64,685	7,483	33.29%	14,271	63.50%	705	3.14%	16	0.07%	14,654	39.09%	22,451	59.89%	299	0.80%	84	0.22%
66	81,734	61,899	10,739	48.79%	10,854	49.31%	407	1.85%	11	0.05%	16,562	48.45%	17,323	50.67%	274	0.80%	27	0.08%
67	81,314	62,635	5,907	24.14%	18,048	73.75%	505	2.06%	11	0.04%	9,182	24.19%	28,285	74.53%	404	1.06%	79	0.21%
68	76,067	49,871	5,344	28.78%	12,791	68.88%	426	2.29%	9	0.05%	13,160	35.92%	23,097	63.04%	316	0.86%	66	0.18%
69	76,381	54,263	5,446	30.22%	12,148	67.40%	419	2.32%	11	0.06%	12,576	36.44%	21,460	62.18%	368	1.07%	110	0.32%
70	76,125	57,325	3,558	21.14%	12,749	75.74%	513	3.05%	13	0.08%	8,189	25.84%	23,113	72.94%	343	1.08%	44	0.14%
71	78,227	57,294	7,887	50.13%	7,531	47.87%	308	1.96%	6	0.04%	20,359	60.15%	13,202	39.01%	284	0.84%	0	0.00%
72	81,553	61,832	10,622	49.90%	10,287	48.33%	370	1.74%	6	0.03%	23,738	58.45%	16,545	40.74%	332	0.82%	0	0.00%
73	77,321	58,545	6,137	24.42%	18,456	73.42%	535	2.13%	8	0.03%	11,627	30.01%	26,623	68.72%	446	1.15%	47	0.12%
74	76,092	58,140	8,869	39.31%	13,272	58.82%	416	1.84%	7	0.03%	18,784	48.42%	19,652	50.66%	359	0.93%	0	0.00%
75	75,883	58,926	9,872	45.48%	11,452	52.76%	374	1.72%	8	0.04%	21,772	56.59%	16,324	42.43%	379	0.99%	0	0.00%
76	83,435	62,417	5,665	27.36%	14,741	71.20%	297	1.43%	2	0.01%	10,605	31.75%	22,557	67.54%	214	0.64%	22	0.07%
77	82,902	63,420	8,656	39.10%	12,915	58.34%	553	2.50%	14	0.06%	16,599	43.69%	20,855	54.89%	400	1.05%	139	0.37%
78	76,980	58,404	4,029	21.41%	14,213	75.51%	567	3.01%	13	0.07%	8,233	24.08%	25,560	74.77%	335	0.98%	58	0.17%
79	82,213	62,513	5,963	24.58%	17,723	73.06%	559	2.30%	13	0.05%	10,536	27.31%	27,551	71.41%	388	1.01%	109	0.28%
80	81,522	61,819	4,779	23.10%	15,452	74.68%	458	2.21%	3	0.01%	9,557	26.44%	26,120	72.27%	383	1.06%	81	0.22%
81	81,356	62,187	6,468	30.99%	13,884	66.51%	508	2.43%	14	0.07%	11,067	31.81%	23,263	66.86%	393	1.13%	71	0.20%
82	81,563	58,963	7,226	30.21%	16,152	67.53%	542	2.27%	0	0.00%	14,247	35.53%	25,414	63.39%	432	1.08%	0	0.00%
83	82,975	59,938	7,717	39.59%	11,351	58.23%	425	2.18%	0	0.00%	17,115	46.70%	19,150	52.25%	386	1.05%	0	0.00%
84	77,282	58,924	7,244	32.03%	14,736	65.16%	617	2.73%	18	0.08%	12,673	34.35%	23,733	64.33%	356	0.96%	131	0.36%
85	78,372	62,493	6,014	26.73%	15,873	70.54%	595	2.64%	20	0.09%	9,740	29.02%	23,328	69.50%	389	1.16%	110	0.33%
86	79,175	61,639	7,764	37.95%	12,242	59.83%	450	2.20%	5	0.02%	12,429	38.01%	19,756	60.42%	393	1.20%	119	0.36%
87	83,029	64,243	6,908	31.41%	14,382	65.39%	690	3.14%	15	0.07%	10,898	31.49%	23,229	67.12%	479	1.38%	0	0.00%
88	75,500	59,728	9,939	50.97%	9,138	46.86%	411	2.11%	11	0.06%	22,652	59.12%	15,144	39.52%	424	1.11%	97	0.25%
89	77,838	59,483	6,177	29.81%	13,998	67.55%	532	2.57%	15	0.07%	11,364	32.70%	22,869	65.82%	392	1.13%	122	0.35%
90	82,702	64,422	6,874	30.83%	14,897	66.81%	523	2.35%	5	0.02%	10,114	30.14%	22,950	68.38%	398	1.19%	98	0.29%
91	82,879	64,001	6,448	27.37%	16,516	70.10%	588	2.50%	9	0.04%	10,469	28.79%	25,329	69.65%	459	1.26%	107	0.29%
92	77,927	57,404	9,215	57.34%	6,546	40.73%	302	1.88%	8	0.05%	22,168	65.91%	11,066	32.90%	305	0.91%	95	0.28%
93	78,360	65,985	10,383	39.34%	15,262	57.83%	729	2.76%	18	0.07%	17,118	42.54%	22,103	54.93%	803	2.00%	213	0.53%
94	83,435	64,551	7,914	30.67%	17,144	66.44%	732	2.84%	12	0.05%	10,486	28.51%	25,658	69.76%	511	1.39%	128	0.35%
95	82,155	59,928	5,680	27.90%	14,174	69.63%	496	2.44%	6	0.03%	13,403	33.96%	25,566	64.77%	391	0.99%	112	0.28%
96	76,520	58,080	6,470	31.28%	13,705	66.27%	495	2.39%	11	0.05%	12,700	36.45%	21,665	62.18%	378	1.08%	102	0.29%
97	78,265	59,784	6,958	30.01%	15,653	67.51%	564	2.43%	11	0.05%	11,021	29.97%	25,266	68.71%	369	1.00%	115	0.31%
98	76,218	56,003	8,451	40.27%	12,140	57.85%	389	1.85%	7	0.03%	19,287	46.96%	21,312	51.90%	383	0.93%	85	0.21%
99	76,192	58,381	10,568	74.08%	3,482	24.41%	207	1.45%	8	0.06%	25,292	78.57%	6,526	20.27%	278	0.86%	93	0.29%
100	77,928	56,057	10,092	60.49%	6,333	37.96%	246	1.47%	12	0.07%	22,186	68.14%	10,046	30.85%	263	0.81%	65	0.20%
101	75,680	57,674	10,271	65.56%	5,091	32.50%	292	1.86%	12	0.08%	25,284	72.57%	9,197	26.40%	281	0.81%	80	0.23%
102	75,637	56,470	10,005	53.19%	8,515	45.27%	280	1.49%	11	0.06%	21,481	61.59%	13,062	37.45%	256	0.73%	77	0.22%
103	76,107	57,260	9,213	44.60%	11,038	53.43%	394	1.91%	14	0.07%	19,728	53.58%	16,606	45.10%	373	1.01%	114	0.31%
104	77,637	58,214	8,538	32.96%	16,838	65.01%	518	2.00%	8	0.03%	17,531	40.57%	25,154	58.20%	422	0.98%	110	0.25%
105	75,712	54,649	6,779	33.12%	13,266	64.81%	413	2.02%	12	0.06%	16,545	42.09%	22,370	56.92%	324	0.82%	65	0.17%
106	76,822	58,033	12,442	75.47%	3,766	22.84%	272	1.65%	7	0.04%	28,723	80.48%	6,550	18.35%	326	0.91%	89	0.25%

Populations values derive from the 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File. Election results were provided by the NC State Board of Elections. Votes that could not be associated with a specific precinct were excluded. Reported statewide totals may therefore be marginally lower than official contest results.

Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State: Population 2010, US Senate 2010, President 2012

	2010 Census		US Senate 2010: Marshall-Burr-Beitler								US President 2012: Obama-Romney-Johnson							
District	Total Pop	18+ Pop	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %
107	78,268	56,417	12,031	60.33%	7,614	38.18%	293	1.47%	5	0.03%	26,255	65.63%	13,422	33.55%	257	0.64%	69	0.17%
108	76,926	59,400	5,880	32.51%	11,794	65.21%	413	2.28%	0	0.00%	12,869	38.42%	20,266	60.50%	362	1.08%	0	0.00%
109	75,517	56,493	6,277	33.20%	12,209	64.58%	419	2.22%	0	0.00%	14,138	40.79%	20,201	58.28%	321	0.93%	0	0.00%
110	75,573	57,987	6,366	33.61%	12,134	64.06%	439	2.32%	2	0.01%	11,593	35.29%	20,921	63.69%	314	0.96%	20	0.06%
111	76,148	58,045	7,206	36.13%	12,341	61.87%	390	1.96%	9	0.05%	11,633	35.72%	20,543	63.07%	306	0.94%	89	0.27%
112	79,547	61,671	6,370	30.24%	14,175	67.30%	509	2.42%	9	0.04%	10,646	32.71%	21,465	65.95%	351	1.08%	87	0.27%
113	81,089	66,177	11,159	36.07%	19,015	61.47%	754	2.44%	8	0.03%	15,774	37.46%	25,726	61.09%	477	1.13%	132	0.31%
114	82,902	67,453	17,655	66.88%	8,010	30.34%	725	2.75%	8	0.03%	33,044	72.54%	11,524	25.30%	682	1.50%	300	0.66%
115	79,883	63,911	12,292	44.29%	14,665	52.84%	766	2.76%	31	0.11%	20,831	47.82%	21,945	50.38%	592	1.36%	195	0.45%
116	75,533	58,114	9,048	38.38%	13,930	59.09%	585	2.48%	12	0.05%	16,743	43.40%	21,230	55.04%	447	1.16%	154	0.40%
117	79,251	62,434	8,152	32.28%	16,500	65.33%	596	2.36%	9	0.04%	13,707	36.65%	23,138	61.86%	435	1.16%	123	0.33%
118	76,322	60,837	12,403	42.23%	16,191	55.12%	767	2.61%	12	0.04%	15,098	41.30%	20,729	56.71%	548	1.50%	180	0.49%
119	75,548	61,452	10,591	46.03%	11,788	51.23%	619	2.69%	12	0.05%	15,557	47.80%	16,410	50.42%	543	1.67%	39	0.12%
120	80,814	65,097	9,909	32.86%	19,081	63.28%	1,143	3.79%	18	0.06%	11,787	30.01%	26,800	68.23%	517	1.32%	176	0.45%
Totals:	**9,535,483**	**7,253,848**	**1,141,700**	**43.04%**	**1,454,082**	**54.82%**	**55,554**	**2.09%**	**1,263**	**0.05%**	**2,171,293**	**48.33%**	**2,267,353**	**50.47%**	**44,448**	**0.99%**	**9,519**	**0.21%**

Populations values derive from the 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File. Election results were provided by the NC State Board of Elections. Votes that could not be associated with a specific precinct were excluded. Reported statewide totals may therefore be marginally lower than official contest results.

Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State: Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State: Governor 2012, Lieutenant Governor 2012, US Senate 2014

	Governor 2012: Dalton-McCrory-Howe								Lieutenant Governor 2012: Coleman-Forest				US Senate 2014: Tillis-Hagan-Haugh							
District	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %
1	13,800	36.70%	22,340	59.41%	1,446	3.85%	14	0.04%	15,559	42.25%	21,269	57.75%	16,135	58.33%	10,543	38.11%	962	3.48%	22	0.08%
2	17,286	46.85%	18,924	51.29%	675	1.83%	9	0.02%	19,304	54.04%	16,420	45.96%	11,285	46.98%	11,770	49.00%	927	3.86%	38	0.16%
3	19,104	52.09%	16,908	46.10%	653	1.78%	8	0.02%	20,570	57.32%	15,314	42.68%	11,858	47.79%	12,208	49.20%	729	2.94%	17	0.07%
4	10,590	39.29%	15,936	59.12%	421	1.56%	8	0.03%	11,706	44.23%	14,761	55.77%	9,788	57.55%	6,546	38.49%	654	3.85%	19	0.11%
5	20,700	61.40%	12,290	36.45%	721	2.14%	3	0.01%	21,685	65.17%	11,591	34.83%	7,987	40.13%	11,521	57.88%	382	1.92%	15	0.08%
6	15,205	42.49%	19,958	55.77%	621	1.74%	4	0.01%	17,010	48.54%	18,035	51.46%	13,109	52.06%	10,785	42.83%	1,189	4.72%	99	0.39%
7	17,605	47.57%	18,683	50.48%	707	1.91%	15	0.04%	19,352	53.14%	17,062	46.86%	11,920	46.08%	12,831	49.60%	1,071	4.14%	47	0.18%
8	20,058	51.71%	18,288	47.15%	436	1.12%	8	0.02%	21,144	55.44%	16,994	44.56%	11,750	45.62%	13,325	51.74%	657	2.55%	24	0.09%
9	17,088	47.23%	18,295	50.57%	789	2.18%	7	0.02%	18,996	53.45%	16,542	46.55%	9,887	48.14%	10,017	48.77%	600	2.92%	36	0.18%
10	16,946	47.31%	18,452	51.51%	410	1.14%	11	0.03%	18,437	52.21%	16,877	47.79%	11,517	48.61%	11,343	47.87%	817	3.45%	16	0.07%
11	21,012	56.38%	14,485	38.87%	1,758	4.72%	14	0.04%	23,407	64.75%	12,745	35.25%	6,380	30.53%	13,565	64.91%	904	4.33%	48	0.23%
12	10,905	32.52%	22,008	65.63%	607	1.81%	12	0.04%	12,545	38.00%	20,469	62.00%	14,211	60.92%	8,253	35.38%	816	3.50%	48	0.21%
13	11,186	27.90%	28,180	70.30%	711	1.77%	10	0.02%	13,096	33.28%	26,250	66.72%	18,332	63.57%	9,180	31.83%	1,201	4.16%	126	0.44%
14	9,993	40.41%	14,099	57.01%	633	2.56%	7	0.03%	11,383	47.03%	12,820	52.97%	8,426	55.78%	6,017	39.83%	643	4.26%	21	0.14%
15	4,779	24.65%	14,014	72.29%	590	3.04%	4	0.02%	6,049	32.11%	12,792	67.89%	8,460	69.55%	3,026	24.88%	656	5.39%	22	0.18%
16	14,007	38.77%	21,391	59.21%	722	2.00%	7	0.02%	15,811	44.70%	19,557	55.30%	12,889	54.15%	9,372	39.37%	1,487	6.25%	54	0.23%
17	13,028	30.49%	28,818	67.45%	874	2.05%	4	0.01%	16,102	38.50%	25,725	61.50%	18,597	58.14%	11,618	36.32%	1,730	5.41%	39	0.12%
18	19,993	56.18%	14,447	40.60%	1,136	3.19%	12	0.03%	21,986	63.19%	12,809	36.81%	6,879	33.33%	12,754	61.79%	968	4.69%	39	0.19%
19	13,581	34.41%	24,684	62.54%	1,193	3.02%	10	0.03%	16,131	42.05%	22,234	57.95%	14,029	52.05%	11,412	42.34%	1,465	5.44%	48	0.18%
20	13,683	33.44%	26,066	63.71%	1,152	2.82%	12	0.03%	16,044	40.45%	23,624	59.55%	14,896	53.87%	11,396	41.22%	1,311	4.74%	47	0.17%
21	18,488	51.99%	16,619	46.73%	448	1.26%	8	0.02%	19,732	56.30%	15,317	43.70%	10,664	45.58%	12,026	51.40%	679	2.90%	26	0.11%
22	17,826	49.83%	17,547	49.05%	396	1.11%	4	0.01%	19,518	55.61%	15,580	44.39%	11,369	46.27%	12,027	48.95%	1,127	4.59%	47	0.19%
23	24,490	62.22%	14,521	36.89%	350	0.89%	1	0.00%	25,919	66.94%	12,801	33.06%	8,825	34.89%	15,731	62.19%	722	2.85%	17	0.07%
24	18,271	53.77%	15,217	44.78%	490	1.44%	5	0.01%	19,607	58.52%	13,896	41.48%	8,575	43.66%	10,435	53.13%	597	3.04%	35	0.18%
25	18,126	45.69%	21,158	53.34%	381	0.96%	3	0.01%	19,346	49.47%	19,763	50.53%	14,714	52.17%	12,625	44.76%	833	2.95%	31	0.11%
26	13,090	31.49%	27,503	66.17%	965	2.32%	9	0.02%	15,187	37.27%	25,559	62.73%	16,575	60.53%	9,714	35.47%	1,047	3.82%	48	0.18%
27	23,878	65.27%	12,369	33.81%	331	0.90%	4	0.01%	25,041	69.33%	11,076	30.67%	8,198	34.09%	15,190	63.16%	647	2.69%	16	0.07%
28	11,533	34.51%	21,409	64.06%	465	1.39%	15	0.04%	13,178	40.24%	19,574	59.76%	13,336	60.68%	7,662	34.87%	932	4.24%	46	0.21%
29	37,029	76.91%	9,824	20.41%	1,269	2.64%	22	0.05%	39,124	82.66%	8,206	17.34%	4,311	14.24%	25,411	83.95%	517	1.71%	32	0.11%
30	29,164	65.97%	13,809	31.24%	1,216	2.75%	20	0.05%	31,072	71.65%	12,293	28.35%	7,868	26.98%	20,608	70.68%	657	2.25%	24	0.08%
31	29,438	71.40%	10,851	26.32%	915	2.22%	24	0.06%	30,945	76.02%	9,764	23.98%	5,772	22.30%	19,536	75.48%	534	2.06%	40	0.15%
32	22,586	58.18%	15,747	40.56%	484	1.25%	6	0.02%	24,269	63.56%	13,911	36.44%	9,811	38.10%	15,152	58.84%	749	2.91%	38	0.15%
33	26,257	64.63%	13,515	33.27%	856	2.11%	0	0.00%	28,443	70.85%	11,704	29.15%	7,578	28.56%	18,180	68.52%	729	2.75%	45	0.17%
34	22,017	44.94%	25,700	52.45%	1,268	2.59%	10	0.02%	24,668	51.37%	23,348	48.63%	15,679	44.33%	18,712	52.90%	934	2.64%	45	0.13%
35	19,759	47.23%	21,069	50.36%	998	2.39%	14	0.03%	21,755	52.92%	19,354	47.08%	12,290	44.21%	14,705	52.90%	752	2.71%	50	0.18%
36	18,550	37.82%	29,123	59.37%	1,367	2.79%	12	0.02%	21,409	44.70%	26,484	55.30%	18,018	50.34%	16,688	46.63%	1,025	2.86%	60	0.17%
37	16,734	36.60%	27,676	60.53%	1,305	2.85%	11	0.02%	19,352	43.30%	25,337	56.70%	17,041	53.94%	13,340	42.22%	1,128	3.57%	86	0.27%
38	29,879	71.87%	10,724	25.79%	963	2.32%	10	0.02%	31,919	77.93%	9,041	22.07%	5,637	20.69%	20,875	76.61%	689	2.53%	46	0.17%
39	21,341	50.28%	20,145	47.47%	941	2.22%	14	0.03%	23,690	56.70%	18,094	43.30%	11,596	41.65%	15,331	55.06%	868	3.12%	49	0.18%
40	16,398	38.46%	25,043	58.74%	1,174	2.75%	16	0.04%	18,758	44.95%	22,977	55.05%	15,332	50.42%	14,230	46.80%	811	2.67%	36	0.12%
41	18,306	42.31%	23,677	54.72%	1,271	2.94%	13	0.03%	20,806	49.40%	21,308	50.60%	13,672	45.74%	15,335	51.31%	832	2.78%	49	0.16%
42	15,097	62.88%	8,218	34.23%	680	2.83%	14	0.06%	16,097	68.11%	7,537	31.89%	4,478	32.97%	8,679	63.91%	403	2.97%	21	0.15%
43	20,359	57.78%	14,300	40.58%	571	1.62%	7	0.02%	21,908	62.86%	12,942	37.14%	8,798	41.05%	11,918	55.61%	689	3.22%	25	0.12%
44	17,466	52.67%	14,906	44.95%	785	2.37%	6	0.02%	19,033	58.59%	13,453	41.41%	9,066	44.30%	10,674	52.15%	696	3.40%	31	0.15%
45	17,758	53.28%	14,886	44.66%	681	2.04%	7	0.02%	19,287	58.64%	13,603	41.36%	8,468	42.32%	10,856	54.26%	658	3.29%	26	0.13%
46	17,575	56.77%	12,912	41.71%	457	1.48%	12	0.04%	19,336	63.78%	10,982	36.22%	7,857	43.00%	9,589	52.48%	800	4.38%	25	0.14%
47	14,355	60.80%	8,780	37.19%	470	1.99%	6	0.03%	15,828	68.56%	7,257	31.44%	6,148	43.98%	7,327	52.41%	481	3.44%	23	0.16%
48	17,506	57.00%	12,512	40.74%	683	2.22%	11	0.04%	18,833	62.60%	11,253	37.40%	8,168	39.86%	11,599	56.60%	702	3.43%	25	0.12%
49	23,569	48.53%	23,427	48.24%	1,558	3.21%	13	0.03%	26,566	56.13%	20,765	43.87%	13,013	39.37%	19,072	57.70%	916	2.77%	55	0.17%
50	22,070	52.09%	19,193	45.30%	1,087	2.57%	17	0.04%	23,884	57.48%	17,670	42.52%	11,661	38.80%	17,470	58.12%	892	2.97%	34	0.11%
51	13,406	41.48%	18,255	56.49%	648	2.01%	9	0.03%	15,071	47.66%	16,551	52.34%	10,575	51.23%	9,060	43.89%	972	4.71%	37	0.18%
52	13,223	32.47%	26,842	65.91%	647	1.59%	13	0.03%	14,727	36.95%	25,133	63.05%	18,117	61.71%	10,299	35.08%	918	3.13%	25	0.09%
53	11,439	35.24%	20,320	62.59%	690	2.13%	14	0.04%	13,175	41.24%	18,775	58.76%	12,045	58.76%	7,582	36.99%	831	4.05%	39	0.19%

District plan definition file: 'Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State.asc', modified 08/23/2017 05:44:28 PM

Printed 08/23/2017 {rptS03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections. Votes that could not be associated with a specific precinct were excluded. Reported statewide totals may therefore be marginally lower than official contest results.

Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State: Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State: Governor 2012, Lieutenant Governor 2012, US Senate 2014

	Governor 2012: Dalton-McCrory-Howe								Lieutenant Governor 2012: Coleman-Forest				US Senate 2014: Tillis-Hagan-Haugh							
District	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %
54	23,822	51.27%	21,500	46.27%	1,129	2.43%	13	0.03%	25,713	56.54%	19,767	43.46%	13,798	38.55%	20,947	58.53%	1,010	2.82%	33	0.09%
55	11,895	34.27%	22,352	64.40%	451	1.30%	9	0.03%	14,409	42.63%	19,392	57.37%	12,564	58.22%	8,132	37.68%	825	3.82%	59	0.27%
56	31,782	72.09%	10,835	24.58%	1,434	3.25%	35	0.08%	33,842	78.83%	9,089	21.17%	4,603	15.39%	24,676	82.48%	615	2.06%	22	0.07%
57	24,103	51.56%	21,298	45.56%	1,329	2.84%	21	0.04%	26,786	58.79%	18,778	41.21%	12,284	38.69%	18,674	58.81%	755	2.38%	38	0.12%
58	24,929	58.22%	17,139	40.03%	731	1.71%	17	0.04%	26,596	63.09%	15,560	36.91%	10,406	37.12%	16,959	60.49%	639	2.28%	32	0.11%
59	24,558	59.66%	15,831	38.46%	759	1.84%	15	0.04%	26,345	64.97%	14,203	35.03%	9,485	36.93%	15,590	60.69%	579	2.25%	33	0.13%
60	22,082	62.75%	12,464	35.42%	636	1.81%	10	0.03%	23,491	67.88%	11,118	32.12%	7,162	33.57%	13,682	64.12%	474	2.22%	19	0.09%
61	18,490	46.11%	20,671	51.54%	930	2.32%	13	0.03%	20,635	52.59%	18,602	47.41%	12,105	46.69%	13,068	50.40%	719	2.77%	37	0.14%
62	16,198	36.37%	27,257	61.20%	1,070	2.40%	16	0.04%	18,464	42.48%	25,003	57.52%	17,156	55.89%	12,746	41.52%	749	2.44%	45	0.15%
63	13,645	38.81%	20,703	58.88%	806	2.29%	8	0.02%	15,271	44.34%	19,170	55.66%	12,602	53.40%	9,988	42.32%	965	4.09%	44	0.19%
64	11,979	37.49%	19,341	60.53%	627	1.96%	4	0.01%	13,229	42.12%	18,180	57.88%	11,778	56.82%	8,157	39.35%	765	3.69%	29	0.14%
65	13,493	36.23%	23,054	61.90%	687	1.84%	8	0.02%	15,401	42.37%	20,944	57.63%	14,332	56.97%	9,467	37.63%	1,296	5.15%	61	0.24%
66	15,152	44.52%	18,316	53.82%	542	1.59%	23	0.07%	17,953	54.53%	14,968	45.47%	10,973	47.11%	10,984	47.16%	1,263	5.42%	71	0.30%
67	6,837	18.03%	30,494	80.40%	594	1.57%	2	0.01%	9,655	26.24%	27,140	73.76%	17,412	69.55%	5,922	23.66%	1,622	6.48%	78	0.31%
68	9,603	26.44%	26,124	71.94%	580	1.60%	8	0.02%	12,272	34.62%	23,173	65.38%	14,825	62.65%	8,035	33.95%	726	3.07%	78	0.33%
69	9,500	27.69%	24,180	70.48%	618	1.80%	12	0.03%	12,086	36.26%	21,244	63.74%	12,586	61.65%	7,039	34.48%	713	3.49%	76	0.37%
70	7,067	22.31%	23,955	75.61%	659	2.08%	2	0.01%	8,422	27.16%	22,587	72.84%	13,549	72.21%	4,376	23.32%	811	4.32%	27	0.14%
71	18,665	55.39%	14,350	42.59%	674	2.00%	7	0.02%	20,070	60.57%	13,066	39.43%	7,647	40.06%	10,864	56.92%	543	2.84%	34	0.18%
72	21,674	53.70%	17,905	44.36%	772	1.91%	10	0.02%	23,374	58.99%	16,248	41.01%	10,119	40.37%	14,239	56.81%	667	2.66%	39	0.16%
73	9,505	24.55%	28,397	73.35%	803	2.07%	12	0.03%	11,465	30.46%	26,169	69.54%	17,531	67.09%	7,530	28.82%	1,006	3.85%	65	0.25%
74	16,418	42.40%	21,522	55.58%	776	2.00%	8	0.02%	18,401	48.68%	19,399	51.32%	12,557	49.26%	12,172	47.75%	717	2.81%	47	0.18%
75	18,949	49.46%	18,395	48.02%	951	2.48%	13	0.03%	21,218	56.78%	16,152	43.22%	10,016	41.20%	13,559	55.77%	681	2.80%	55	0.23%
76	10,034	30.10%	22,832	68.48%	465	1.39%	10	0.03%	11,347	34.64%	21,414	65.36%	14,429	66.29%	6,432	29.55%	872	4.01%	34	0.16%
77	13,611	36.01%	23,553	62.31%	622	1.65%	12	0.03%	16,157	43.75%	20,773	56.25%	12,656	52.88%	9,931	41.50%	1,291	5.39%	55	0.23%
78	7,417	21.69%	26,189	76.58%	589	1.72%	2	0.01%	8,545	25.56%	24,890	74.44%	15,703	72.92%	4,853	22.54%	935	4.34%	44	0.20%
79	8,469	21.99%	29,407	76.35%	634	1.65%	8	0.02%	10,587	28.06%	27,137	71.94%	17,217	68.42%	6,676	26.53%	1,213	4.82%	57	0.23%
80	8,280	22.99%	27,024	75.04%	703	1.95%	6	0.02%	10,026	28.42%	25,253	71.58%	15,663	71.58%	5,384	24.61%	804	3.67%	30	0.14%
81	9,478	27.29%	24,476	70.48%	769	2.21%	5	0.01%	11,626	34.16%	22,403	65.84%	13,608	64.41%	6,478	30.66%	994	4.70%	48	0.23%
82	10,137	25.28%	29,222	72.86%	747	1.86%	0	0.00%	14,084	36.34%	24,669	63.66%	15,125	59.08%	9,247	36.12%	1,140	4.45%	88	0.34%
83	13,610	37.22%	22,275	60.91%	685	1.87%	0	0.00%	17,095	47.96%	18,547	52.04%	11,161	51.04%	9,805	44.84%	851	3.89%	49	0.22%
84	10,369	28.17%	25,834	70.19%	594	1.61%	8	0.02%	12,890	35.90%	23,016	64.10%	15,527	61.64%	8,043	31.93%	1,547	6.14%	72	0.29%
85	8,720	26.19%	23,735	71.30%	830	2.49%	4	0.01%	10,049	31.44%	21,909	68.56%	14,353	67.23%	5,803	27.18%	1,155	5.41%	37	0.17%
86	9,894	30.27%	22,179	67.86%	597	1.83%	14	0.04%	12,957	40.71%	18,868	59.29%	12,566	56.86%	8,134	36.81%	1,359	6.15%	39	0.18%
87	8,402	24.08%	25,771	73.84%	726	2.08%	0	0.00%	11,079	32.73%	22,771	67.27%	13,309	63.30%	6,258	29.76%	1,381	6.57%	78	0.37%
88	16,818	44.46%	20,248	53.53%	750	1.98%	9	0.02%	21,056	57.67%	15,456	42.33%	8,438	38.08%	13,058	58.94%	626	2.83%	34	0.15%
89	8,637	25.00%	25,338	73.34%	567	1.64%	8	0.02%	11,035	32.69%	22,717	67.31%	13,875	64.20%	6,526	30.20%	1,153	5.33%	58	0.27%
90	8,957	26.79%	23,740	71.00%	729	2.18%	9	0.03%	10,835	33.49%	21,521	66.51%	14,508	64.11%	6,740	29.78%	1,331	5.88%	51	0.23%
91	9,562	26.31%	25,985	71.49%	789	2.17%	12	0.03%	11,519	32.49%	23,939	67.51%	15,804	65.80%	6,667	27.76%	1,466	6.10%	82	0.34%
92	18,297	54.92%	14,391	43.20%	622	1.87%	6	0.02%	21,316	65.42%	11,267	34.58%	6,027	32.50%	11,916	64.25%	566	3.05%	37	0.20%
93	14,589	36.70%	23,616	59.41%	1,532	3.85%	11	0.03%	17,050	44.54%	21,230	55.46%	13,890	52.47%	11,056	41.76%	1,481	5.59%	47	0.18%
94	8,795	23.90%	27,364	74.37%	627	1.70%	7	0.02%	10,916	30.54%	24,830	69.46%	16,087	65.97%	6,660	27.31%	1,554	6.37%	86	0.35%
95	9,674	24.71%	28,753	73.44%	710	1.81%	15	0.04%	12,828	33.76%	25,174	66.24%	15,725	62.10%	8,257	32.61%	1,255	4.96%	84	0.33%
96	9,710	27.99%	24,383	70.28%	596	1.72%	7	0.02%	12,265	36.11%	21,704	63.89%	13,550	60.40%	7,757	34.58%	1,060	4.73%	65	0.29%
97	8,226	22.44%	27,842	75.96%	582	1.59%	5	0.01%	10,866	30.52%	24,732	69.48%	15,844	66.50%	6,685	28.06%	1,232	5.17%	66	0.28%
98	13,952	34.27%	26,026	63.93%	721	1.77%	10	0.02%	18,109	45.97%	21,286	54.03%	12,109	48.68%	12,026	48.35%	661	2.66%	79	0.32%
99	21,774	68.34%	9,411	29.54%	661	2.07%	14	0.04%	24,524	78.36%	6,773	21.64%	2,988	17.88%	13,345	79.86%	362	2.17%	16	0.10%
100	18,780	58.13%	12,965	40.13%	556	1.72%	7	0.02%	21,571	68.08%	10,114	31.92%	5,411	30.04%	12,081	67.08%	475	2.64%	44	0.24%
101	21,604	62.98%	12,086	35.23%	607	1.77%	6	0.02%	24,362	72.63%	9,179	27.37%	4,708	25.39%	13,314	71.80%	490	2.64%	30	0.16%
102	17,138	49.60%	16,850	48.76%	551	1.59%	15	0.04%	20,525	61.13%	13,052	38.87%	7,647	37.36%	12,309	60.13%	494	2.41%	20	0.10%
103	15,163	41.42%	20,780	56.76%	654	1.79%	11	0.03%	18,717	52.63%	16,844	47.37%	9,778	44.54%	11,480	52.29%	650	2.96%	46	0.21%
104	11,337	26.36%	30,974	72.03%	681	1.58%	10	0.02%	15,972	38.34%	25,682	61.66%	14,947	56.07%	10,987	41.21%	683	2.56%	41	0.15%
105	11,010	28.18%	27,492	70.36%	569	1.46%	4	0.01%	15,126	39.77%	22,912	60.23%	12,478	55.05%	9,546	42.12%	600	2.65%	42	0.19%
106	24,309	68.97%	10,177	28.87%	742	2.11%	19	0.05%	27,682	80.41%	6,744	19.59%	3,188	16.36%	15,825	81.22%	451	2.31%	20	0.10%

Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State: Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State: Governor 2012, Lieutenant Governor 2012, US Senate 2014

	Governor 2012: Dalton-McCrory-Howe								Lieutenant Governor 2012: Coleman-Forest				US Senate 2014: Tillis-Hagan-Haugh							
District	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Write-In**	**Write-In %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Write-In**	**Write-In %**
107	22,113	55.98%	16,802	42.54%	576	1.46%	8	0.02%	25,174	65.14%	13,474	34.86%	7,566	32.67%	14,984	64.69%	567	2.45%	45	0.19%
108	10,229	30.60%	22,641	67.73%	553	1.65%	6	0.02%	12,577	38.66%	19,954	61.34%	11,798	58.37%	7,436	36.79%	940	4.65%	37	0.18%
109	11,675	33.74%	22,419	64.79%	501	1.45%	9	0.03%	13,855	41.00%	19,937	59.00%	12,274	57.67%	8,147	38.28%	804	3.78%	59	0.28%
110	10,188	31.08%	22,150	67.56%	443	1.35%	4	0.01%	11,944	37.40%	19,996	62.60%	12,381	60.75%	6,988	34.29%	961	4.72%	49	0.24%
111	10,978	33.85%	21,002	64.75%	447	1.38%	9	0.03%	12,345	39.08%	19,245	60.92%	12,248	58.87%	7,466	35.89%	1,040	5.00%	50	0.24%
112	13,175	40.49%	18,798	57.78%	552	1.70%	10	0.03%	11,934	37.96%	19,505	62.04%	13,356	60.75%	7,327	33.33%	1,273	5.79%	30	0.14%
113	14,513	34.86%	26,056	62.58%	1,053	2.53%	14	0.03%	15,965	39.13%	24,832	60.87%	17,951	56.94%	12,220	38.76%	1,317	4.18%	39	0.12%
114	30,335	67.66%	12,627	28.17%	1,853	4.13%	17	0.04%	32,363	73.64%	11,584	26.36%	6,689	22.11%	22,389	74.02%	1,142	3.78%	29	0.10%
115	18,992	44.03%	22,839	52.94%	1,300	3.01%	8	0.02%	20,704	48.97%	21,574	51.03%	14,095	45.76%	15,408	50.02%	1,262	4.10%	39	0.13%
116	15,055	39.40%	22,073	57.77%	1,069	2.80%	10	0.03%	16,787	44.87%	20,623	55.13%	13,088	50.68%	11,658	45.14%	1,042	4.03%	38	0.15%
117	12,236	33.12%	23,695	64.13%	1,002	2.71%	14	0.04%	13,677	37.80%	22,505	62.20%	14,898	58.54%	9,518	37.40%	995	3.91%	37	0.15%
118	14,554	39.85%	21,033	57.59%	922	2.52%	13	0.04%	15,851	44.59%	19,698	55.41%	14,379	52.35%	11,489	41.83%	1,537	5.60%	61	0.22%
119	14,498	44.69%	16,886	52.05%	1,054	3.25%	2	0.01%	15,958	50.57%	15,600	49.43%	10,500	46.76%	10,697	47.64%	1,217	5.42%	40	0.18%
120	12,098	31.33%	25,139	65.11%	1,357	3.51%	18	0.05%	13,273	35.22%	24,408	64.78%	18,212	62.59%	9,371	32.21%	1,474	5.07%	40	0.14%
Totals:	**1,925,270**	**43.18%**	**2,437,224**	**54.67%**	**94,512**	**2.12%**	**1,191**	**0.03%**	**2,174,021**	**49.88%**	**2,184,891**	**50.12%**	**1,416,834**	**48.84%**	**1,370,303**	**47.23%**	**108,779**	**3.75%**	**5,251**	**0.18%**

Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State: President 2016, US Senate 2016, Governor 2016

	US President 2016: Trump-Clinton-Johnson								US Senate 2016: Burr-Ross-Haugh						Governor 2016: Cooper-McCrory-Cecil					
District	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %
1	26,166	63.13%	13,548	32.69%	1,322	3.19%	413	1.00%	25,754	63.45%	13,548	33.38%	1,290	3.18%	14,719	36.08%	25,069	61.45%	1,010	2.48%
2	19,553	51.46%	17,364	45.70%	769	2.02%	313	0.82%	19,385	51.54%	17,169	45.65%	1,060	2.82%	18,270	48.33%	18,957	50.15%	572	1.51%
3	18,589	51.78%	16,455	45.83%	630	1.75%	229	0.64%	18,358	52.14%	16,040	45.56%	811	2.30%	16,170	45.62%	18,855	53.20%	418	1.18%
4	17,762	62.23%	10,151	35.56%	486	1.70%	144	0.50%	17,382	61.84%	9,833	34.98%	894	3.18%	10,143	35.87%	17,736	62.72%	399	1.41%
5	14,071	42.89%	17,840	54.38%	677	2.06%	221	0.67%	13,942	43.33%	17,542	54.52%	690	2.14%	17,723	54.83%	14,115	43.67%	483	1.49%
6	20,227	56.26%	14,693	40.87%	720	2.00%	313	0.87%	19,968	56.34%	14,137	39.89%	1,337	3.77%	14,676	41.13%	20,463	57.35%	541	1.52%
7	19,418	49.98%	18,135	46.68%	887	2.28%	413	1.06%	19,323	50.00%	18,108	46.85%	1,218	3.15%	19,275	49.66%	18,869	48.61%	672	1.73%
8	17,531	45.97%	19,663	51.56%	667	1.75%	274	0.72%	17,641	46.58%	19,435	51.32%	794	2.10%	20,471	53.84%	17,161	45.13%	391	1.03%
9	16,399	43.10%	19,933	52.39%	1,240	3.26%	474	1.25%	17,504	46.46%	18,984	50.38%	1,190	3.16%	20,307	53.74%	16,779	44.40%	705	1.87%
10	17,931	51.92%	15,791	45.72%	570	1.65%	247	0.72%	17,800	52.22%	15,361	45.06%	926	2.72%	15,656	45.66%	18,231	53.17%	401	1.17%
11	10,478	26.91%	25,755	66.15%	1,852	4.76%	848	2.18%	11,919	30.89%	25,082	65.00%	1,586	4.11%	27,072	69.85%	10,435	26.92%	1,250	3.23%
12	22,047	63.02%	11,701	33.44%	916	2.62%	322	0.92%	22,086	63.74%	11,254	32.48%	1,311	3.78%	11,993	34.52%	22,073	63.53%	677	1.95%
13	29,527	68.85%	11,999	27.98%	967	2.25%	396	0.92%	29,080	68.53%	11,666	27.49%	1,685	3.97%	12,730	29.84%	29,076	68.17%	849	1.99%
14	14,902	56.33%	10,415	39.37%	862	3.26%	278	1.05%	14,737	56.62%	10,012	38.46%	1,280	4.92%	10,438	39.99%	14,935	57.22%	728	2.79%
15	16,678	72.54%	5,229	22.74%	838	3.64%	247	1.07%	16,069	71.29%	5,195	23.05%	1,275	5.66%	5,589	24.70%	16,285	71.97%	755	3.34%
16	25,478	63.98%	13,238	33.24%	859	2.16%	248	0.62%	24,571	62.85%	12,953	33.13%	1,571	4.02%	14,322	36.50%	24,065	61.33%	853	2.17%
17	33,539	64.40%	16,832	32.32%	1,227	2.36%	480	0.92%	32,987	64.27%	16,223	31.61%	2,112	4.12%	18,326	35.57%	32,038	62.18%	1,162	2.26%
18	14,960	39.11%	21,515	56.25%	1,247	3.26%	530	1.39%	15,065	40.15%	20,714	55.20%	1,747	4.66%	22,540	59.77%	14,028	37.20%	1,146	3.04%
19	24,349	55.45%	17,494	39.84%	1,461	3.33%	604	1.38%	24,444	56.44%	16,799	38.79%	2,068	4.77%	19,932	45.80%	22,351	51.36%	1,232	2.83%
20	25,197	54.81%	18,393	40.01%	1,731	3.77%	651	1.42%	25,753	56.83%	17,604	38.84%	1,962	4.33%	20,831	45.79%	23,400	51.43%	1,266	2.78%
21	15,884	45.84%	17,954	51.82%	555	1.60%	257	0.74%	15,924	46.50%	17,482	51.05%	837	2.44%	17,741	51.55%	16,206	47.09%	465	1.35%
22	18,724	52.68%	16,142	45.41%	486	1.37%	192	0.54%	18,421	52.64%	15,813	45.19%	758	2.17%	16,261	46.15%	18,596	52.78%	379	1.08%
23	14,143	38.43%	22,040	59.88%	449	1.22%	173	0.47%	14,165	38.89%	21,496	59.02%	760	2.09%	21,917	59.87%	14,389	39.30%	303	0.83%
24	14,808	43.49%	18,200	53.45%	749	2.20%	292	0.86%	15,197	45.16%	17,509	52.02%	949	2.82%	17,897	52.97%	15,398	45.57%	494	1.46%
25	20,269	51.73%	17,974	45.88%	640	1.63%	297	0.76%	20,406	52.29%	17,865	45.78%	753	1.93%	19,220	49.08%	19,517	49.84%	424	1.08%
26	29,759	61.06%	16,850	34.57%	1,565	3.21%	561	1.15%	29,832	61.64%	16,736	34.58%	1,830	3.78%	18,664	38.41%	28,962	59.60%	970	2.00%
27	12,504	36.17%	21,573	62.40%	373	1.08%	123	0.36%	12,390	36.15%	21,326	62.22%	557	1.63%	21,783	63.37%	12,336	35.89%	256	0.74%
28	22,938	64.82%	11,488	32.46%	716	2.02%	245	0.69%	22,642	64.44%	11,449	32.59%	1,043	2.97%	12,317	34.87%	22,495	63.68%	513	1.45%
29	5,509	11.11%	42,101	84.89%	1,191	2.40%	791	1.60%	7,315	14.82%	41,040	83.15%	1,000	2.03%	42,314	85.66%	6,328	12.81%	758	1.53%
30	10,474	22.13%	34,760	73.45%	1,267	2.68%	825	1.74%	12,373	26.33%	33,469	71.22%	1,150	2.45%	34,935	74.26%	11,283	23.98%	824	1.75%
31	9,900	21.58%	34,205	74.56%	1,114	2.43%	654	1.43%	10,806	23.69%	33,667	73.80%	1,148	2.52%	34,565	75.57%	10,408	22.75%	767	1.68%
32	15,770	40.65%	22,026	56.77%	687	1.77%	313	0.81%	15,849	41.21%	21,752	56.56%	855	2.22%	22,399	58.02%	15,721	40.72%	485	1.26%
33	11,445	27.39%	28,609	68.46%	1,208	2.89%	529	1.27%	12,023	28.95%	28,311	68.17%	1,199	2.89%	29,213	70.13%	11,637	27.94%	807	1.94%
34	19,185	38.43%	27,905	55.90%	1,906	3.82%	925	1.85%	22,002	44.17%	26,387	52.98%	1,418	2.85%	29,373	58.81%	19,579	39.20%	994	1.99%
35	19,070	39.48%	26,755	55.40%	1,602	3.32%	871	1.80%	20,767	43.30%	25,714	53.62%	1,478	3.08%	27,655	57.47%	19,426	40.37%	1,043	2.17%
36	23,934	45.04%	26,200	49.31%	2,063	3.88%	937	1.76%	26,466	50.03%	24,702	46.69%	1,733	3.28%	27,726	52.22%	24,204	45.59%	1,160	2.18%
37	27,546	50.19%	24,032	43.79%	2,338	4.26%	970	1.77%	29,421	53.94%	23,110	42.37%	2,011	3.69%	25,921	47.33%	27,466	50.15%	1,382	2.52%
38	8,228	19.19%	32,872	76.68%	1,127	2.63%	642	1.50%	9,544	22.38%	32,024	75.08%	1,084	2.54%	33,391	78.08%	8,607	20.13%	765	1.79%
39	18,871	40.27%	25,892	55.25%	1,419	3.03%	679	1.45%	19,613	42.10%	25,494	54.72%	1,484	3.19%	26,880	57.44%	19,020	40.64%	899	1.92%
40	21,021	42.71%	25,264	51.33%	1,929	3.92%	1,002	2.04%	23,623	48.27%	23,777	48.59%	1,535	3.14%	26,613	54.15%	21,445	43.64%	1,088	2.21%
41	19,304	38.04%	28,542	56.24%	1,994	3.93%	912	1.80%	22,379	44.47%	26,450	52.56%	1,491	2.96%	29,340	58.05%	20,008	39.59%	1,194	2.36%
42	8,449	34.48%	14,980	61.14%	777	3.17%	295	1.20%	8,691	35.87%	14,657	60.49%	883	3.64%	14,750	60.94%	8,808	36.39%	646	2.67%
43	14,056	40.47%	19,632	56.52%	743	2.14%	304	0.88%	14,084	41.08%	19,233	56.09%	971	2.83%	19,247	56.00%	14,472	42.11%	651	1.89%
44	13,221	40.63%	18,084	55.58%	908	2.79%	325	1.00%	13,488	42.00%	17,465	54.38%	1,161	3.62%	17,877	55.52%	13,568	42.14%	752	2.34%
45	15,539	43.49%	18,909	52.92%	945	2.64%	339	0.95%	15,639	44.34%	18,378	52.11%	1,251	3.55%	18,575	52.55%	15,914	45.02%	860	2.43%
46	14,802	51.62%	13,346	46.54%	386	1.35%	141	0.49%	14,219	50.86%	13,070	46.75%	669	2.39%	13,163	46.67%	14,740	52.27%	299	1.06%
47	12,268	51.90%	10,649	45.05%	539	2.28%	180	0.76%	11,703	51.02%	10,767	46.94%	469	2.04%	10,365	44.45%	12,733	54.60%	222	0.95%
48	14,016	43.58%	17,045	53.00%	831	2.58%	266	0.83%	13,782	43.73%	16,722	53.06%	1,010	3.20%	17,039	53.91%	13,890	43.94%	679	2.15%
49	17,000	33.36%	30,910	60.65%	2,022	3.97%	1,031	2.02%	20,032	39.45%	29,235	57.57%	1,515	2.98%	32,371	63.49%	17,529	34.38%	1,082	2.12%
50	18,304	40.61%	25,018	55.50%	1,207	2.68%	547	1.21%	19,154	42.76%	24,338	54.33%	1,302	2.91%	26,044	58.01%	18,041	40.18%	814	1.81%
51	18,866	55.80%	13,663	40.41%	972	2.87%	311	0.92%	18,563	55.47%	13,660	40.82%	1,241	3.71%	14,805	44.04%	18,018	53.59%	797	2.37%
52	26,508	61.46%	14,902	34.55%	1,240	2.87%	482	1.12%	26,850	62.67%	14,595	34.07%	1,396	3.26%	16,149	37.60%	25,907	60.32%	893	2.08%

Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State: President 2016, US Senate 2016, Governor 2016

	US President 2016: Trump-Clinton-Johnson								US Senate 2016: Burr-Ross-Haugh						Governor 2016: Cooper-McCrory-Cecil					
District	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %
53	21,247	60.80%	12,407	35.50%	933	2.67%	358	1.02%	21,052	60.67%	12,435	35.83%	1,215	3.50%	13,074	37.62%	20,917	60.19%	762	2.19%
54	19,492	37.13%	30,645	58.38%	1,545	2.94%	809	1.54%	21,169	40.48%	29,679	56.76%	1,444	2.76%	31,838	60.66%	19,672	37.48%	979	1.87%
55	22,840	63.50%	12,002	33.37%	788	2.19%	336	0.93%	22,508	63.37%	11,758	33.10%	1,252	3.52%	12,330	34.49%	22,863	63.95%	559	1.56%
56	6,280	12.99%	39,697	82.13%	1,411	2.92%	947	1.96%	8,722	18.19%	38,210	79.67%	1,028	2.14%	40,335	83.95%	6,875	14.31%	834	1.74%
57	15,339	31.88%	30,307	63.00%	1,561	3.24%	901	1.87%	17,404	36.40%	28,994	60.64%	1,415	2.96%	31,958	66.71%	14,911	31.12%	1,039	2.17%
58	16,410	37.72%	25,779	59.25%	903	2.08%	417	0.96%	16,673	38.67%	25,300	58.68%	1,143	2.65%	26,619	61.56%	15,831	36.61%	794	1.84%
59	14,037	33.81%	26,129	62.93%	868	2.09%	486	1.17%	14,710	35.83%	25,249	61.50%	1,098	2.67%	26,736	64.96%	13,662	33.19%	759	1.84%
60	10,889	31.31%	22,909	65.86%	669	1.92%	316	0.91%	11,095	32.36%	22,137	64.57%	1,053	3.07%	23,107	67.17%	10,584	30.77%	709	2.06%
61	17,273	41.56%	22,439	53.99%	1,305	3.14%	544	1.31%	17,970	43.73%	21,659	52.71%	1,463	3.56%	23,652	57.40%	16,555	40.17%	1,002	2.43%
62	23,871	50.61%	21,206	44.96%	1,425	3.02%	663	1.41%	25,249	53.92%	20,118	42.96%	1,464	3.13%	23,122	49.29%	22,714	48.42%	1,073	2.29%
63	19,745	52.91%	16,215	43.45%	964	2.58%	397	1.06%	20,099	54.24%	15,711	42.39%	1,249	3.37%	17,448	46.93%	19,042	51.22%	687	1.85%
64	19,070	56.36%	13,618	40.25%	831	2.46%	317	0.94%	19,281	57.45%	13,162	39.22%	1,119	3.33%	14,584	43.35%	18,459	54.87%	596	1.77%
65	23,874	63.31%	12,783	33.90%	750	1.99%	301	0.80%	23,327	62.43%	12,716	34.03%	1,320	3.53%	14,599	38.96%	22,137	59.08%	731	1.95%
66	19,182	55.82%	14,374	41.83%	618	1.80%	190	0.55%	18,159	53.79%	14,329	42.44%	1,271	3.76%	15,373	45.12%	18,132	53.22%	563	1.65%
67	31,774	78.70%	7,458	18.47%	858	2.13%	285	0.71%	30,272	75.65%	7,691	19.22%	2,055	5.14%	9,136	22.71%	30,251	75.21%	837	2.08%
68	25,357	58.90%	15,581	36.19%	1,519	3.53%	593	1.38%	26,537	62.36%	14,300	33.60%	1,717	4.03%	16,268	38.02%	25,525	59.65%	1,000	2.34%
69	23,008	61.78%	12,620	33.89%	1,151	3.09%	461	1.24%	23,224	63.20%	11,858	32.27%	1,667	4.54%	13,180	35.64%	22,857	61.81%	941	2.54%
70	25,245	74.51%	7,544	22.27%	779	2.30%	312	0.92%	24,601	73.23%	7,505	22.34%	1,490	4.44%	9,245	27.45%	23,609	70.11%	821	2.44%
71	13,635	39.93%	19,302	56.52%	887	2.60%	325	0.95%	13,947	41.27%	18,729	55.42%	1,120	3.31%	20,117	59.42%	12,923	38.17%	814	2.40%
72	16,536	40.42%	22,931	56.06%	1,023	2.50%	416	1.02%	17,265	42.56%	22,120	54.53%	1,179	2.91%	23,780	58.62%	15,900	39.20%	883	2.18%
73	27,145	66.61%	11,873	29.13%	1,193	2.93%	544	1.33%	28,098	69.22%	11,133	27.43%	1,360	3.35%	13,855	34.07%	26,001	63.93%	813	2.00%
74	18,083	45.29%	19,890	49.82%	1,290	3.23%	660	1.65%	19,935	50.12%	18,608	46.79%	1,229	3.09%	21,232	53.36%	17,694	44.47%	867	2.18%
75	14,472	35.99%	23,616	58.72%	1,380	3.43%	748	1.86%	16,478	41.16%	22,231	55.53%	1,323	3.30%	24,725	61.75%	14,344	35.83%	969	2.42%
76	23,583	68.17%	10,042	29.03%	709	2.05%	259	0.75%	23,254	67.95%	9,988	29.19%	980	2.86%	10,643	30.91%	23,317	67.73%	467	1.36%
77	22,653	58.76%	14,526	37.68%	942	2.44%	430	1.12%	21,992	57.68%	14,286	37.47%	1,849	4.85%	15,680	40.87%	21,678	56.51%	1,003	2.61%
78	28,166	77.69%	7,076	19.52%	739	2.04%	272	0.75%	27,319	76.13%	7,166	19.97%	1,402	3.91%	8,771	24.33%	26,543	73.63%	737	2.04%
79	29,942	73.53%	9,286	22.80%	1,072	2.63%	423	1.04%	29,302	72.54%	9,165	22.69%	1,930	4.78%	11,170	27.53%	28,433	70.08%	972	2.40%
80	28,033	74.04%	8,623	22.78%	918	2.42%	287	0.76%	27,677	73.76%	8,454	22.53%	1,394	3.71%	10,385	27.55%	26,519	70.35%	793	2.10%
81	26,284	71.05%	9,486	25.64%	941	2.54%	284	0.77%	25,858	70.60%	9,299	25.39%	1,469	4.01%	11,560	31.43%	24,341	66.17%	883	2.40%
82	27,357	60.06%	16,132	35.42%	1,481	3.25%	580	1.27%	27,389	60.67%	15,634	34.63%	2,123	4.70%	17,469	38.47%	26,795	59.01%	1,144	2.52%
83	20,799	51.18%	18,161	44.69%	1,163	2.86%	513	1.26%	20,807	51.80%	17,398	43.31%	1,966	4.89%	18,929	46.85%	20,329	50.31%	1,147	2.84%
84	25,864	67.41%	11,302	29.46%	842	2.19%	358	0.93%	24,946	65.81%	11,099	29.28%	1,862	4.91%	12,373	32.46%	24,857	65.22%	885	2.32%
85	27,148	74.95%	7,952	21.95%	700	1.93%	421	1.16%	25,691	72.23%	8,320	23.39%	1,555	4.37%	9,999	27.89%	24,896	69.44%	959	2.67%
86	23,049	66.31%	10,412	29.95%	895	2.57%	404	1.16%	22,151	64.58%	10,580	30.84%	1,571	4.58%	12,309	35.59%	21,505	62.18%	773	2.23%
87	26,621	73.29%	8,427	23.20%	849	2.34%	425	1.17%	25,537	71.08%	8,542	23.78%	1,847	5.14%	10,059	27.82%	25,176	69.62%	927	2.56%
88	12,827	31.62%	25,221	62.17%	1,765	4.35%	755	1.86%	15,657	39.06%	22,959	57.28%	1,467	3.66%	25,756	63.87%	13,520	33.53%	1,049	2.60%
89	25,622	70.69%	9,396	25.92%	904	2.49%	322	0.89%	24,664	68.94%	9,348	26.13%	1,762	4.93%	10,714	29.78%	24,387	67.78%	880	2.45%
90	27,166	74.32%	8,211	22.46%	816	2.23%	360	0.98%	26,388	73.10%	8,275	22.92%	1,434	3.97%	10,487	28.88%	25,104	69.13%	725	2.00%
91	28,820	75.01%	8,346	21.72%	926	2.41%	332	0.86%	28,090	73.54%	8,533	22.34%	1,574	4.12%	10,870	28.41%	26,536	69.34%	861	2.25%
92	11,525	30.09%	25,014	65.31%	1,272	3.32%	490	1.28%	12,471	33.03%	23,695	62.75%	1,592	4.22%	24,819	65.44%	12,044	31.76%	1,062	2.80%
93	23,108	53.24%	17,638	40.63%	1,667	3.84%	994	2.29%	23,511	54.86%	17,413	40.63%	1,936	4.52%	19,952	46.21%	21,906	50.74%	1,316	3.05%
94	29,067	74.45%	8,728	22.36%	895	2.29%	351	0.90%	27,906	72.25%	8,905	23.06%	1,812	4.69%	10,706	27.47%	27,452	70.45%	810	2.08%
95	28,890	65.36%	13,432	30.39%	1,343	3.04%	536	1.21%	28,179	64.55%	13,088	29.98%	2,386	5.47%	16,212	37.00%	26,066	59.50%	1,534	3.50%
96	22,685	62.88%	11,805	32.72%	1,069	2.96%	516	1.43%	22,549	63.28%	11,383	31.95%	1,699	4.77%	13,036	36.38%	21,866	61.02%	935	2.61%
97	28,804	71.97%	9,897	24.73%	971	2.43%	349	0.87%	27,868	70.41%	9,798	24.76%	1,913	4.83%	11,331	28.44%	27,557	69.16%	959	2.41%
98	20,952	44.97%	23,199	49.80%	1,711	3.67%	725	1.56%	22,463	48.72%	21,868	47.43%	1,774	3.85%	24,921	53.88%	19,921	43.07%	1,415	3.06%
99	6,322	18.41%	26,597	77.43%	914	2.66%	516	1.50%	6,906	20.36%	25,850	76.22%	1,157	3.41%	26,395	77.56%	6,776	19.91%	860	2.53%
100	9,922	30.07%	21,781	66.01%	868	2.63%	428	1.30%	10,283	31.56%	21,030	64.55%	1,266	3.89%	21,613	66.05%	10,354	31.64%	757	2.31%
101	8,761	24.34%	25,744	71.53%	1,034	2.87%	452	1.26%	9,545	26.88%	24,625	69.35%	1,338	3.77%	25,666	72.02%	9,042	25.37%	931	2.61%
102	9,880	28.47%	22,962	66.16%	1,193	3.44%	674	1.94%	12,487	36.27%	20,856	60.58%	1,086	3.15%	22,731	65.78%	11,053	31.99%	772	2.23%
103	15,073	40.39%	20,415	54.71%	1,231	3.30%	599	1.61%	16,109	43.57%	19,381	52.42%	1,485	4.02%	20,677	55.59%	15,594	41.92%	925	2.49%
104	20,547	46.95%	20,629	47.14%	1,693	3.87%	896	2.05%	23,408	53.82%	18,581	42.72%	1,504	3.46%	21,135	48.38%	21,575	49.39%	975	2.23%
105	19,128	46.32%	20,137	48.76%	1,408	3.41%	625	1.51%	21,375	52.27%	18,006	44.03%	1,510	3.69%	20,301	49.41%	19,784	48.15%	1,000	2.43%

Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State: President 2016, US Senate 2016, Governor 2016

	US President 2016: Trump-Clinton-Johnson								US Senate 2016: Burr-Ross-Haugh						Governor 2016: Cooper-McCrory-Cecil					
District	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Write-In**	**Write-In %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**
106	5,853	15.99%	29,102	79.50%	1,120	3.06%	531	1.45%	6,878	19.04%	27,928	77.33%	1,311	3.63%	29,087	80.09%	6,309	17.37%	923	2.54%
107	13,088	31.10%	27,278	64.82%	1,161	2.76%	555	1.32%	13,959	33.57%	26,121	62.82%	1,500	3.61%	27,803	66.62%	12,784	30.63%	1,148	2.75%
108	21,977	61.91%	12,155	34.24%	963	2.71%	405	1.14%	21,400	61.05%	11,934	34.04%	1,722	4.91%	13,133	37.22%	21,326	60.44%	824	2.34%
109	21,849	58.81%	13,856	37.29%	1,026	2.76%	424	1.14%	21,752	59.21%	13,385	36.43%	1,600	4.36%	14,614	39.57%	21,473	58.14%	845	2.29%
110	23,363	67.95%	10,064	29.27%	685	1.99%	272	0.79%	22,465	66.14%	10,103	29.74%	1,399	4.12%	11,006	32.21%	22,520	65.90%	648	1.90%
111	23,088	67.78%	10,066	29.55%	621	1.82%	290	0.85%	22,172	65.93%	10,185	30.29%	1,272	3.78%	11,069	32.68%	22,235	65.64%	569	1.68%
112	25,060	72.71%	8,351	24.23%	717	2.08%	339	0.98%	23,380	69.04%	9,131	26.96%	1,353	4.00%	10,575	31.07%	22,633	66.49%	831	2.44%
113	27,846	61.60%	15,495	34.27%	1,152	2.55%	715	1.58%	27,107	60.73%	15,907	35.64%	1,619	3.63%	17,776	39.74%	25,806	57.69%	1,150	2.57%
114	10,675	21.88%	35,226	72.20%	1,424	2.92%	1,464	3.00%	10,943	22.71%	35,335	73.32%	1,918	3.98%	36,921	76.30%	9,880	20.42%	1,589	3.28%
115	22,578	48.02%	21,856	46.49%	1,453	3.09%	1,127	2.40%	22,563	48.39%	22,221	47.66%	1,839	3.94%	24,377	52.10%	21,034	44.95%	1,382	2.95%
116	22,462	52.07%	18,367	42.57%	1,409	3.27%	903	2.09%	22,583	52.90%	18,335	42.95%	1,776	4.16%	20,574	48.00%	20,962	48.91%	1,323	3.09%
117	25,251	60.45%	14,625	35.01%	1,235	2.96%	660	1.58%	24,962	60.51%	14,605	35.40%	1,688	4.09%	16,583	40.08%	23,567	56.96%	1,227	2.97%
118	25,826	63.62%	13,002	32.03%	1,152	2.84%	616	1.52%	24,143	60.30%	14,050	35.09%	1,845	4.61%	16,169	40.08%	22,971	56.94%	1,202	2.98%
119	19,623	54.48%	14,434	40.08%	1,323	3.67%	637	1.77%	18,853	53.03%	15,016	42.24%	1,683	4.73%	17,194	48.15%	17,362	48.62%	1,156	3.24%
120	30,691	72.91%	9,871	23.45%	1,030	2.45%	501	1.19%	28,591	69.53%	10,931	26.58%	1,600	3.89%	12,825	31.06%	27,221	65.92%	1,249	3.02%
Totals:	**2,359,749**	**49.90%**	**2,180,316**	**46.10%**	**129,929**	**2.75%**	**59,397**	**1.26%**	**2,392,439**	**51.13%**	**2,119,696**	**45.30%**	**167,190**	**3.57%**	**2,300,381**	**48.95%**	**2,296,039**	**48.86%**	**102,729**	**2.19%**

Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State: Lieutenant Governor 2016, Attorney General 2016

	Lieutenant Governor 2016: Forest-Coleman-Cole						Attorney General 2016: Stein-Newton			
District	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %
1	24,969	62.46%	13,748	34.39%	1,261	3.15%	14,523	36.89%	24,849	63.11%
2	19,216	51.97%	16,973	45.91%	784	2.12%	18,822	51.49%	17,733	48.51%
3	17,778	51.12%	16,328	46.95%	671	1.93%	17,047	49.85%	17,149	50.15%
4	17,089	61.86%	9,924	35.92%	613	2.22%	10,852	39.77%	16,434	60.23%
5	13,598	42.70%	17,580	55.21%	665	2.09%	18,195	57.96%	13,195	42.04%
6	19,717	56.38%	14,450	41.32%	804	2.30%	15,359	44.32%	19,298	55.68%
7	19,438	50.77%	18,041	47.12%	807	2.11%	19,561	51.47%	18,443	48.53%
8	17,614	46.94%	19,307	51.45%	603	1.61%	20,220	53.88%	17,311	46.12%
9	17,140	46.39%	18,709	50.63%	1,100	2.98%	20,069	54.74%	16,595	45.26%
10	17,540	52.00%	15,567	46.15%	622	1.84%	16,476	49.37%	16,898	50.63%
11	11,890	31.48%	24,063	63.70%	1,820	4.82%	26,310	70.28%	11,124	29.72%
12	21,769	63.78%	11,476	33.62%	888	2.60%	12,384	36.63%	21,424	63.37%
13	28,811	68.95%	11,868	28.40%	1,107	2.65%	12,793	30.86%	28,667	69.14%
14	14,266	56.00%	10,158	39.87%	1,052	4.13%	10,920	43.36%	14,266	56.64%
15	15,938	72.47%	5,083	23.11%	973	4.42%	5,914	27.24%	15,797	72.76%
16	24,606	63.95%	12,937	33.62%	933	2.42%	15,072	39.60%	22,990	60.40%
17	33,147	65.60%	16,131	31.92%	1,254	2.48%	19,137	38.21%	30,944	61.79%
18	15,040	40.84%	20,340	55.23%	1,451	3.94%	22,453	61.46%	14,080	38.54%
19	24,414	57.61%	16,318	38.51%	1,644	3.88%	19,234	45.77%	22,791	54.23%
20	25,574	57.77%	17,001	38.41%	1,690	3.82%	19,782	45.08%	24,099	54.92%
21	15,757	46.66%	17,383	51.47%	633	1.87%	18,361	54.85%	15,115	45.15%
22	17,728	51.62%	16,063	46.77%	551	1.60%	17,227	50.58%	16,832	49.42%
23	13,735	38.22%	21,664	60.28%	537	1.49%	22,629	63.31%	13,112	36.69%
24	14,855	44.66%	17,704	53.23%	702	2.11%	18,480	56.00%	14,521	44.00%
25	20,390	52.71%	17,726	45.82%	566	1.46%	18,761	48.52%	19,907	51.48%
26	30,238	63.26%	16,187	33.87%	1,372	2.87%	18,464	38.98%	28,907	61.02%
27	12,111	35.73%	21,357	63.01%	427	1.26%	22,185	65.86%	11,500	34.14%
28	22,836	65.80%	11,124	32.05%	745	2.15%	12,775	37.20%	21,563	62.80%
29	7,145	14.65%	40,458	82.98%	1,156	2.37%	41,977	86.48%	6,561	13.52%
30	12,291	26.61%	32,680	70.76%	1,216	2.63%	34,602	75.34%	11,323	24.66%
31	10,743	23.78%	33,238	73.56%	1,201	2.66%	34,658	77.14%	10,268	22.86%
32	15,672	41.26%	21,660	57.03%	650	1.71%	23,002	61.08%	14,659	38.92%
33	12,096	29.41%	27,892	67.81%	1,145	2.78%	29,354	72.03%	11,400	27.97%
34	22,115	44.99%	25,590	52.06%	1,446	2.94%	28,783	59.08%	19,935	40.92%
35	21,222	44.76%	24,817	52.34%	1,372	2.89%	27,089	57.84%	19,748	42.16%
36	26,350	50.67%	24,015	46.18%	1,643	3.16%	26,733	51.84%	24,839	48.16%
37	29,430	54.89%	22,391	41.76%	1,798	3.35%	24,945	47.01%	28,117	52.99%
38	9,450	22.45%	31,445	74.72%	1,190	2.83%	33,201	79.48%	8,574	20.52%
39	19,712	42.71%	25,245	54.69%	1,200	2.60%	26,928	58.97%	18,735	41.03%
40	23,707	49.23%	22,896	47.54%	1,554	3.23%	25,469	53.43%	22,198	46.57%
41	21,959	44.57%	25,747	52.26%	1,561	3.17%	28,145	57.58%	20,734	42.42%
42	8,512	35.65%	14,515	60.79%	851	3.56%	15,264	64.32%	8,469	35.68%
43	13,865	41.06%	18,974	56.19%	931	2.76%	20,082	59.91%	13,440	40.09%
44	13,157	41.65%	17,378	55.02%	1,051	3.33%	18,598	59.14%	12,852	40.86%
45	15,199	43.75%	18,257	52.55%	1,287	3.70%	19,429	56.18%	15,156	43.82%
46	13,342	48.62%	13,591	49.53%	508	1.85%	14,737	54.22%	12,444	45.78%
47	10,461	46.95%	11,299	50.71%	522	2.34%	12,263	55.70%	9,755	44.30%
48	13,005	42.20%	16,855	54.69%	958	3.11%	17,475	57.21%	13,069	42.79%
49	19,844	39.69%	28,451	56.91%	1,700	3.40%	31,658	63.79%	17,972	36.21%
50	19,122	43.28%	23,986	54.29%	1,070	2.42%	25,858	58.98%	17,981	41.02%
51	18,642	56.37%	13,518	40.87%	912	2.76%	15,229	46.62%	17,439	53.38%
52	26,962	63.92%	14,147	33.54%	1,075	2.55%	15,745	37.70%	26,021	62.30%

Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State: Lieutenant Governor 2016, Attorney General 2016

	Lieutenant Governor 2016: Forest-Coleman-Cole						Attorney General 2016: Stein-Newton			
District	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %
53	21,216	61.71%	12,252	35.64%	913	2.66%	13,668	40.07%	20,445	59.93%
54	21,038	40.77%	29,281	56.74%	1,285	2.49%	31,512	61.45%	19,770	38.55%
55	22,921	65.35%	11,444	32.63%	707	2.02%	13,375	38.47%	21,391	61.53%
56	8,394	17.90%	37,050	79.01%	1,451	3.09%	38,840	83.20%	7,845	16.80%
57	16,927	36.07%	28,409	60.54%	1,587	3.38%	30,740	65.91%	15,902	34.09%
58	16,481	38.64%	25,164	59.00%	1,008	2.36%	26,491	62.44%	15,934	37.56%
59	14,415	35.59%	25,054	61.86%	1,030	2.54%	26,274	65.29%	13,971	34.71%
60	10,856	32.13%	22,000	65.11%	934	2.76%	23,046	68.52%	10,590	31.48%
61	17,817	44.08%	21,264	52.61%	1,340	3.32%	23,115	57.48%	17,098	42.52%
62	24,966	54.32%	19,643	42.74%	1,350	2.94%	21,773	47.61%	23,960	52.39%
63	20,032	54.75%	15,433	42.18%	1,125	3.07%	17,264	47.50%	19,085	52.50%
64	19,368	58.48%	12,814	38.69%	936	2.83%	14,428	43.87%	18,457	56.13%
65	22,926	62.43%	12,921	35.19%	873	2.38%	14,424	39.52%	22,071	60.48%
66	17,823	53.87%	14,459	43.70%	803	2.43%	16,102	49.02%	16,748	50.98%
67	31,133	79.07%	7,250	18.41%	992	2.52%	9,904	25.38%	29,119	74.62%
68	27,015	64.52%	13,606	32.49%	1,252	2.99%	15,674	37.79%	25,803	62.21%
69	23,744	65.63%	11,331	31.32%	1,104	3.05%	13,327	37.18%	22,517	62.82%
70	24,712	74.71%	7,488	22.64%	879	2.66%	8,822	26.83%	24,059	73.17%
71	13,720	41.22%	18,648	56.03%	914	2.75%	19,985	60.36%	13,127	39.64%
72	16,958	42.57%	21,814	54.76%	1,063	2.67%	23,363	58.96%	16,262	41.04%
73	27,910	69.94%	11,033	27.65%	960	2.41%	13,276	33.52%	26,333	66.48%
74	19,410	49.68%	18,562	47.51%	1,098	2.81%	20,718	53.25%	18,189	46.75%
75	15,713	40.07%	22,221	56.66%	1,282	3.27%	24,291	62.17%	14,784	37.83%
76	23,378	69.28%	9,764	28.93%	603	1.79%	11,224	33.53%	22,247	66.47%
77	22,462	59.73%	14,031	37.31%	1,111	2.95%	16,416	43.96%	20,925	56.04%
78	27,573	77.81%	7,048	19.89%	814	2.30%	8,576	24.38%	26,597	75.62%
79	29,605	74.48%	9,051	22.77%	1,094	2.75%	11,261	28.49%	28,265	71.51%
80	27,461	74.39%	8,544	23.14%	912	2.47%	9,959	27.05%	26,856	72.95%
81	25,744	71.35%	9,365	25.95%	974	2.70%	11,232	31.27%	24,684	68.73%
82	28,012	63.03%	15,070	33.91%	1,360	3.06%	17,394	39.51%	26,629	60.49%
83	21,218	53.59%	16,980	42.89%	1,393	3.52%	19,153	48.77%	20,120	51.23%
84	25,615	68.55%	10,772	28.83%	981	2.63%	12,983	35.05%	24,055	64.95%
85	25,753	73.78%	8,159	23.37%	995	2.85%	9,757	28.36%	24,643	71.64%
86	22,615	66.72%	10,457	30.85%	824	2.43%	12,699	37.72%	20,964	62.28%
87	26,540	74.72%	8,133	22.90%	848	2.39%	11,035	31.39%	24,120	68.61%
88	15,721	40.06%	22,011	56.09%	1,508	3.84%	24,346	62.46%	14,632	37.54%
89	25,345	71.91%	8,879	25.19%	1,023	2.90%	11,207	31.97%	23,846	68.03%
90	25,889	73.23%	8,636	24.43%	827	2.34%	10,435	29.66%	24,749	70.34%
91	27,569	73.64%	8,883	23.73%	984	2.63%	10,714	28.75%	26,554	71.25%
92	12,634	33.97%	23,087	62.08%	1,467	3.94%	24,927	67.47%	12,016	32.53%
93	23,009	55.17%	16,926	40.58%	1,774	4.25%	19,469	47.25%	21,733	52.75%
94	28,339	74.52%	8,786	23.10%	902	2.37%	11,305	30.02%	26,354	69.98%
95	28,982	67.70%	12,360	28.87%	1,470	3.43%	14,947	35.22%	27,490	64.78%
96	23,121	65.77%	10,946	31.14%	1,089	3.10%	13,281	38.01%	21,662	61.99%
97	28,690	73.47%	9,283	23.77%	1,078	2.76%	11,903	30.76%	26,797	69.24%
98	22,994	50.76%	20,803	45.92%	1,504	3.32%	23,259	51.83%	21,618	48.17%
99	6,988	20.88%	25,282	75.55%	1,194	3.57%	26,477	79.59%	6,790	20.41%
100	10,507	32.61%	20,671	64.16%	1,040	3.23%	22,000	68.82%	9,969	31.18%
101	9,551	27.30%	24,127	68.96%	1,307	3.74%	25,631	73.64%	9,173	26.36%
102	12,268	36.30%	20,418	60.41%	1,112	3.29%	22,189	66.14%	11,359	33.86%
103	16,620	45.57%	18,583	50.95%	1,271	3.48%	20,751	57.41%	15,395	42.59%
104	23,974	56.01%	17,590	41.10%	1,239	2.89%	20,359	48.00%	22,058	52.00%

Covington House 2017 Map - Entire State: Lieutenant Governor 2016, Attorney General 2016

	Lieutenant Governor 2016: Forest-Coleman-Cole						Attorney General 2016: Stein-Newton			
District	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**
105	21,748	54.12%	17,155	42.69%	1,280	3.19%	19,476	48.88%	20,369	51.12%
106	6,857	19.25%	27,408	76.95%	1,355	3.80%	28,825	81.41%	6,583	18.59%
107	14,204	34.62%	25,582	62.35%	1,242	3.03%	27,307	67.01%	13,442	32.99%
108	22,310	64.29%	11,377	32.79%	1,013	2.92%	13,450	39.21%	20,851	60.79%
109	22,545	62.11%	12,803	35.27%	950	2.62%	14,882	41.40%	21,065	58.60%
110	23,200	68.91%	9,752	28.97%	715	2.12%	11,596	34.80%	21,723	65.20%
111	22,768	68.36%	9,875	29.65%	661	1.98%	11,856	36.00%	21,073	64.00%
112	23,864	71.32%	8,660	25.88%	937	2.80%	9,906	29.88%	23,248	70.12%
113	27,273	61.90%	15,470	35.11%	1,314	2.98%	16,730	38.29%	26,962	61.71%
114	10,534	22.22%	34,662	73.10%	2,218	4.68%	36,615	77.84%	10,425	22.16%
115	22,047	48.06%	22,007	47.98%	1,816	3.96%	23,858	52.43%	21,647	47.57%
116	21,972	52.39%	18,326	43.70%	1,641	3.91%	19,951	47.93%	21,673	52.07%
117	25,457	62.47%	14,037	34.45%	1,255	3.08%	15,539	38.46%	24,861	61.54%
118	23,864	60.56%	14,093	35.76%	1,451	3.68%	15,949	40.83%	23,111	59.17%
119	18,801	53.70%	14,824	42.34%	1,385	3.96%	16,595	47.85%	18,084	52.15%
120	28,296	69.92%	10,903	26.94%	1,271	3.14%	11,790	29.51%	28,166	70.49%
Totals:	**2,390,619**	**51.88%**	**2,084,975**	**45.25%**	**132,360**	**2.87%**	**2,294,855**	**50.20%**	**2,276,276**	**49.80%**

EX. 29

NORTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY
AMENDMENT
Senate Bill 691

AMENDMENT NO. _____
(to be filled in by
Principal Clerk)

S691-AMT-34 [v.1]

Amends Title [NO]
S691-PCS45492-ST-39

Date _____,2017

Senator Clark

moves to amend the PCS on page 4, line 23, through page 8, line 13, by rewriting the lines to read:

"**District 19**: Cumberland County: VTD AL51, VTD CC04, VTD CC06, VTD CC07, VTD CC08, VTD CC10, VTD CC12, VTD CC14, VTD CC15, VTD CC18, VTD CC24, VTD CC34, VTD CU02, VTD EO61-1, VTD EO61-2, VTD G1: Block(s) 0510014001003, 0510014001004, 0510014001005, 0510014001006, 0510014001007, 0510014001008, 0510014001009, 0510014001010, 0510014001011, 0510014001012, 0510014001013, 0510014001014, 0510014001015, 0510014001016, 0510014001017, 0510014001018, 0510014001019, 0510014001020, 0510014001021, 0510014001022, 0510014001024, 0510014001025, 0510014001026, 0510014001027, 0510014001028, 0510014001029, 0510014001030, 0510014001031, 0510014001032, 0510014001033, 0510014001034, 0510014001035, 0510014001036, 0510014001037, 0510014001038, 0510014001039, 0510014001040, 0510014001041, 0510014001042, 0510014001043, 0510014001044, 0510014002000, 0510014002001, 0510014002002, 0510014002003, 0510014002004, 0510014002005, 0510014002006, 0510014002007, 0510014002009, 0510014002031, 0510014002032, 0510014002033, 0510014002034, 0510014002035, 0510014002039, 0510014002040, 0510014002044, 0510014002045, 0510014002046, 0510014002047, 0510014002053, 0510014002054, 0510014002055, 0510014002056, 0510014002057, 0510014002058, 0510014002059, 0510014002060, 0510014002061, 0510014002062, 0510014002063, 0510014002064, 0510014002065, 0510014002066, 0510014002067, 0510014002068, 0510014002069, 0510014003021, 0510014003022, 0510014003023, 0510014004011, 0510014004012, 0510014004013, 0510014004017, 0510014004018, 0510014004019, 0510014004020, 0510014004021, 0510014004022, 0510014004023, 0510014004024, 0510014004025, 0510014004026, 0510014004027, 0510014004028, 0510014004029, 0510014004030, 0510014004031, 0510014004032, 0510014004033, 0510014004034, 0510014004035, 0510014004036, 0510014004037, 0510014004038, 0510014004039, 0510014004040, 0510014004041, 0510014004042, 0510014004043, 0510014004044, 0510014004045, 0510014004046, 0510014004047, 0510014004048, 0510014004049, 0510014004050, 0510014004051, 0510014004052, 0510014004053, 0510014005000, 0510014005001, 0510014005002, 0510014005003, 0510014005004, 0510014005005, 0510014005006, 0510014005007, 0510014005008, 0510014005009,

0510014005010, 0510014005011, 0510014005012, 0510014005013, 0510014005014, 0510014005015, 0510014005016, 0510014005017, 0510014005018, 0510014005019, 0510014005020, 0510014005021, 0510014005022, 0510014005023, 0510014005024, 0510014005025, 0510014005026, 0510014005027, 0510014005028, 0510014005029, 0510014005030, 0510014005031, 0510014005032, 0510014005033, 0510014005034, 0510014005035, 0510014005036, 0510014005037, 0510014005038, 0510014005039, 0510014005040, 0510014005041, 0510014005042, 0510014005046, 0510014005047, 0510014005048, 0510026002092, 0510026002098, 0510026002099, 0510026002100, 0510026002101, 0510026002102, 0510026002103, 0510026002113, 0510027003016, 0510027003018, 0510027003019, 0510027003020, 0510027003021, 0510027003022, 0510027003023, 0510027003024, 0510027003025, 0510027003026, 0510027003027, 0510027003028, 0510027003029, 0510027003030, 0510027003031, 0510027003032, 0510027003033, 0510027003034, 0510027003035, 0510027003036, 0510027003037, 0510027003038, 0510028002005, 0510028002015, 0510028002016, 0510028002022, 0510028002023; VTD G10, VTD G11: Block(s) 0510025041000, 0510034011000, 0510034011001, 0510034011002, 0510034011003, 0510034011004, 0510034011005, 0510034011006, 0510034011007, 0510034011008, 0510034011009, 0510034011010, 0510034011011, 0510034011012, 0510034011013, 0510034011014, 0510034011015, 0510034011016, 0510034011017, 0510034011018, 0510034011019, 0510034011020, 0510034011021, 0510034011022, 0510034011023, 0510034011024, 0510034011025, 0510034011026, 0510034011027, 0510034011028, 0510034011029, 0510034011030, 0510034011031, 0510034011032, 0510034011033, 0510034011034, 0510034011035, 0510034011036, 0510034011037, 0510034011038, 0510034011039, 0510034011040, 0510034012000, 0510034012001, 0510034012002, 0510034012003, 0510034012004, 0510034012005, 0510034012006, 0510034012007, 0510034012008, 0510034012009, 0510034012010, 0510034012011, 0510034012012, 0510034012013, 0510034012014, 0510034012015, 0510034012016, 0510034012017, 0510034012018, 0510034012019, 0510034012020, 0510034012021, 0510034012022, 0510034012023, 0510034012024, 0510034012025, 0510034012026, 0510034012027, 0510034012028, 0510034012029, 0510034012030, 0510034012031, 0510034012032, 0510034012033, 0510034012034, 0510034012035, 0510034012036, 0510034012037, 0510034012038, 0510034012039, 0510034012040, 0510034012041, 0510034012042, 0510034012043, 0510034012044, 0510034012045, 0510034012046, 0510034012047, 0510034012048, 0510034012049, 0510034012050, 0510034012051, 0510034012052, 0510034012053, 0510034012054, 0510034012055, 0510034012056, 0510034012057, 0510034012058, 0510034012059, 0510034012060, 0510034012061, 0510034012062, 0510034012063, 0510034012064, 0510034012065, 0510034012066, 0510034012067, 0510034012068, 0510034012069, 0510034021001, 0510034021002, 0510034021003, 0510034021004, 0510034021005, 0510034021006, 0510034021007, 0510034021008, 0510034021009, 0510034021010, 0510034021011, 0510034021012, 0510034021013, 0510034021014, 0510034021015, 0510034021017, 0510034021019, 0510034021020, 0510034021021, 0510034021022, 0510034021023, 0510034021024, 0510034021025, 0510034021026, 0510034021027, 0510034021028, 0510034021029, 0510034021030, 0510034021031, 0510034022000,

0510034022001, 0510034022002, 0510034022003, 0510034031000, 0510034031001,
0510034031002, 0510034031003, 0510034031004, 0510034031005, 0510034031006,
0510034031007, 0510034031008, 0510034031009, 0510034031010, 0510034031011,
0510034031012, 0510034031013, 0510034032000, 0510034032001, 0510034032002,
0510034032003, 0510034032004, 0510034032005, 0510034032006, 0510034032007,
0510034032008, 0510034032009, 0510034032010, 0510034032011, 0510034032012,
0510034032013, 0510034032014, 0510034032015, 0510034041000, 0510034041001,
0510034041003, 0510034041004, 0510034041005, 0510034041007, 0510034041008,
0510034041009, 0510034042000, 0510034042001, 0510034042002, 0510034042003,
0510034042004, 0510034042005, 0510034042006, 0510034042007, 0510034042008,
0510034042009, 0510034042010, 0510034042011, 0510034042012, 0510034042013,
0510034042014, 0510034042015, 0510034042016, 0510034042017, 0510034042018,
0510034042019, 0510034051000, 0510034051001, 0510034051002, 0510034051003,
0510034051004, 0510034051005, 0510034051006, 0510034051007, 0510034051008,
0510034051009, 0510034051010, 0510034051011, 0510034051012, 0510034051013,
0510034051014, 0510034051015, 0510034051016, 0510034051017, 0510034051018,
0510034051019, 0510034051020, 0510034051021, 0510034051022, 0510034051023,
0510034051024, 0510034051025, 0510034051026, 0510034051027, 0510034051028,
0510034051029, 0510034051030, 0510034051031, 0510034051032, 0510034061000,
0510034061001, 0510034061002, 0510034061003, 0510034061004, 0510034061005,
0510034061006, 0510034061007, 0510034061008, 0510034061009, 0510034061010,
0510034061011, 0510034061012, 0510034061013, 0510034061014, 0510034061015,
0510034061016, 0510034061017, 0510034061018, 0510034061019, 0510034061020,
0510034061021, 0510034061022, 0510034061023, 0510034061024, 0510034061025,
0510034061026, 0510034061027, 0510034061028, 0510034061029, 0510034061030,
0510034061031, 0510034061032, 0510034061033, 0510034061034, 0510034061035,
0510034061036, 0510034061037, 0510034061038, 0510034061039, 0510034061040,
0510034061041, 0510034061042, 0510034061043, 0510034061044, 0510034061045,
0510034061046, 0510034061047, 0510034061048, 0510034061049, 0510034061050,
0510034061051, 0510034061052, 0510034061053, 0510034061054, 0510034061055,
0510034061056, 0510034061057, 0510034061058, 0510034061059, 0510034061060,
0510034061061, 0510034061062, 0510034061063, 0510034061064, 0510034061065,
0510034061066, 0510034061067, 0510034061068, 0510034061069, 0510034061070,
0510034061071, 0510034061072, 0510034061073, 0510034061074, 0510034061075,
0510034061076, 0510034061077, 0510034061078, 0510034061079, 0510034061080,
0510034061081, 0510034061082, 0510034061083, 0510034061084, 0510034061085,
0510034061086, 0510034061087, 0510034061088, 0510034061089, 0510034061090,
0510034061091, 0510034061092, 0510034061093, 0510034061094, 0510034061095,
0510034061096, 0510034061097, 0510034061098, 0510034061099, 0510034061100,
0510034061101, 0510034061102, 0510034061103, 0510034061104, 0510034061105,
0510034061106, 0510034061107, 0510034061108, 0510034061109, 0510034071000,
0510034071001, 0510034071002, 0510034071003, 0510034071004, 0510034071005,
0510034071006, 0510034071007, 0510034071008, 0510034071009, 0510034071010,

0510034071011, 0510034071012, 0510034071013, 0510034071014, 0510034071015,
0510034071016, 0510034071017, 0510034071018, 0510034072000, 0510034072001,
0510034072002, 0510034072003, 0510034072004, 0510034072005, 0510034072006,
0510034072007, 0510034072008, 0510034072009, 0510034072010, 0510034072011,
0510034081000, 0510034081001, 0510034081002, 0510034081003, 0510034081004,
0510034081005, 0510034081006, 0510034081007, 0510034081008, 0510034081009,
0510034081010, 0510034081011, 0510034081012, 0510034081013, 0510034081014,
0510034081015, 0510034081016, 0510034081017, 0510034081018, 0510034081019,
0510034081020, 0510034081021, 0510034081022, 0510034081023, 0510034081024,
0510034081025, 0510034081026, 0510034081027, 0510034081028, 0510034081029,
0510034081030, 0510034081031, 0510034081032, 0510034081033, 0510034081034,
0510034081035, 0510034081036, 0510034081037, 0510034081038, 0510034081039,
0510034081040, 0510034081041, 0510034081042, 0510034081043, 0510034081044,
0510034081045, 0510034081046, 0510034082000, 0510034082001, 0510034082002,
0510034082003, 0510034082004, 0510034082005, 0510034082006, 0510034082007,
0510034082008, 0510034082009, 0510034082010, 0510034082011, 0510034082012,
0510034082013, 0510034082014, 0510034082015, 0510034082016, 0510034082017,
0510034082018, 0510034082019, 0510034082020, 0510034082021, 0510034082022,
0510034082023, 0510034082024, 0510034082025, 0510034082026, 0510034082027,
0510034082028, 0510034082029, 0510034082030, 0510034082031, 0510034082032,
0510034082033, 0510034082034, 0510034082035, 0510034082036, 0510034082037,
0510034082038, 0510034082039, 0510034082040, 0510034082041, 0510034082042,
0510034082043, 0510034082044, 0510034082045, 0510034082046, 0510034082047,
0510034082048, 0510034082049, 0510034082050, 0510034082051, 0510034082052,
0510034082053, 0510034082054, 0510034082055, 0510034082056, 0510034082057,
0510034082058, 0510034082059, 0510034082060, 0510034082061, 0510034082062,
0510034082063, 0510034082064, 0510034082065, 0510034082066, 0510034082067,
0510034082068, 0510034082069, 0510034082070, 0510034082071, 0510034082072,
0510034082073, 0510034082074, 0510035001000, 0510035001001, 0510035001002,
0510035001003, 0510035001004, 0510035001005, 0510035001006, 0510035001007,
0510035001008, 0510035001009, 0510035001010, 0510035001011, 0510035001012,
0510035001013, 0510035001014, 0510035001015, 0510035001016, 0510035001017,
0510035001018, 0510035001019, 0510035001020, 0510035001021, 0510035001022,
0510035001023, 0510035001024, 0510035001025, 0510035001026, 0510035001027,
0510035001028, 0510035001029, 0510035001030, 0510035002000, 0510035002001,
0510035002002, 0510035002003, 0510035002004, 0510035002005, 0510035002006,
0510035002007, 0510035002008, 0510035002009, 0510035002010, 0510035002011,
0510035002012, 0510035002013, 0510035002014, 0510035002015, 0510035002016,
0510035002017, 0510035002018, 0510035002019, 0510035002020, 0510035002021,
0510035002022, 0510035002023, 0510035002024, 0510035002025, 0510035002026,
0510035002027, 0510035002028, 0510035002029, 0510035003000, 0510035003001,
0510035003002, 0510035003003, 0510035003004, 0510035003005, 0510035003006,
0510035003007, 0510035003008, 0510035003009, 0510035003010, 0510035003011,

0510035003012, 0510035003013, 0510035003014, 0510035003015, 0510035003016,
0510035003017, 0510035003018, 0510035003019, 0510035003020, 0510035003021,
0510035003022, 0510035003023, 0510035003024, 0510035003025, 0510035003026,
0510035003027, 0510035003028, 0510035003029, 0510035003030, 0510035003031,
0510035003032, 0510035003033, 0510035003034, 0510035003035, 0510035003036,
0510035003037, 0510035004000, 0510035004001, 0510035004002, 0510035004003,
0510035004004, 0510035004005, 0510035004006, 0510035004007, 0510035004008,
0510035004009, 0510035004010, 0510035004011, 0510035004012, 0510035004013,
0510035004014, 0510035004015, 0510035004016, 0510035004017, 0510035004018,
0510035004019, 0510035004020, 0510035004021, 0510035004022, 0510035004023,
0510035004024, 0510035004025, 0510035004026, 0510035004027, 0510035004028,
0510035004029, 0510036001000, 0510036001001, 0510036001002, 0510036001003,
0510036001004, 0510036001005, 0510036001006, 0510036001007, 0510036001008,
0510036001009, 0510036001010, 0510036001011, 0510036001012, 0510036001013,
0510036001014, 0510036001015, 0510036001016, 0510036001017, 0510036001018,
0510036001019, 0510036001020, 0510036001021, 0510036001022, 0510036001023,
0510036001024, 0510036001025, 0510036001026, 0510036001027, 0510036001028,
0510036001029, 0510036001030, 0510036001031, 0510036001032, 0510036001033,
0510036001034, 0510036001035, 0510036001036, 0510036001037, 0510036001038,
0510036001039, 0510036001040, 0510036001041, 0510036001042, 0510036001043,
0510036001044, 0510036001045, 0510036001046, 0510036001047, 0510036001048,
0510036001049, 0510036001050, 0510036001051, 0510036001052, 0510036001053,
0510036001054, 0510036001055, 0510036001056, 0510036001057, 0510036001058,
0510036001059, 0510036001060, 0510036002000, 0510036002001, 0510036002002,
0510036002003, 0510036002004, 0510036002005, 0510036002006, 0510036002007,
0510036002008, 0510036002009, 0510036002010, 0510036002011, 0510036002012,
0510036003000, 0510036003001, 0510036003002, 0510036003003, 0510036003004,
0510036003005, 0510036003006, 0510036003007, 0510036003008, 0510036003009,
0510036003010, 0510036003011, 0510036003012, 0510036003013, 0510036003014,
0510036003015, 0510036003016, 0510036003017, 0510036003018, 0510036003019,
0510036003020, 0510036003021, 0510036003022, 0510036003023, 0510036003024,
0510036003025, 0510036003026, 0510036003027, 0510036003028, 0510036003029,
0510036003030, 0510036003031, 0510036003032, 0510036003033, 0510036003034,
0510036003035, 0510036003036, 0510036003037, 0510036003038, 0510036003039,
0510036003040, 0510036003041, 0510036003042, 0510036003043, 0510036003044,
0510036003045, 0510036003046, 0510036003047, 0510036003048, 0510036003049,
0510036003050, 0510036003051, 0510036004000, 0510036004001, 0510036004002,
0510036004003, 0510036004004, 0510036004005, 0510036004006, 0510036004007,
0510036004008, 0510036004009, 0510036004010, 0510036004011, 0510036004012,
0510036004013, 0510036004014, 0510036004015, 0510036004016, 0510036004017,
0510036004018, 0510036004019, 0510036004020, 0510036004021, 0510036004022,
0510036004023, 0510036004024, 0510036004025, 0510036004026, 0510036004027,
0510036004028, 0510036004029, 0510036004030, 0510036004031, 0510036004032,

0510036004033, 0510036004034, 0510036004035, 0510036004036, 0510036004037, 0510036004038, 0510036004039, 0510036004040, 0510036004041, 0510036004042, 0510036004043, 0510036004044, 0510036004045, 0510036004046, 0510036004047, 0510036004048, 0510036004049, 0510036004050, 0510036004051, 0510036004052, 0510036004053, 0510036004054, 0510036004055, 0510036004056, 0510036004057, 0510036004058, 0510036004059, 0510037001003, 0510037001007, 0510037001008, 0510037001009, 0510037001023, 0510037001024, 0519802001000, 0519802001001, 0519802001002, 0519802001003, 0519802001004, 0519802001005, 0519802001006, 0519802001007, 0519802001008, 0519802001009, 0519802001010, 0519802001011, 0519802001012, 0519802001013, 0519802001014, 0519802001015, 0519802001016, 0519802001017, 0519802001018, 0519802001019, 0519802001020, 0519802001021, 0519802001022, 0519802001023, 0519802001024, 0519802001025, 0519802001026, 0519802001028, 0519802001029, 0519802001030, 0519802001031, 0519802001032, 0519802001033, 0519802001034, 0519802001035, 0519802001036, 0519802001037, 0519802001038, 0519802001039, 0519802001040, 0519802001041, 0519802001042, 0519802001043, 0519802001044, 0519802001045; VTD G2: Block(s) 0510025021000, 0510025021001, 0510025021002, 0510025021003, 0510025021004, 0510025021005, 0510025021006, 0510025021007, 0510025021008, 0510025021009, 0510025021010, 0510025021011, 0510025021012, 0510025021067, 0510025043000, 0510025043001, 0510025043002, 0510025043003, 0510025043004, 0510025043005, 0510025043006, 0510025043007, 0510025043008, 0510025043009, 0510025043010, 0510025043011, 0510025043012, 0510025043013, 0510025043014, 0510025043015, 0510025043016, 0510025043017, 0510025043018, 0510025043019, 0510025043020, 0510025043021, 0510025043022, 0510025043023, 0510025043024, 0510025043025, 0510025043026, 0510025043027, 0510025043028, 0510025043029, 0510025043030, 0510025043031, 0510025043032, 0510025043033, 0510025043034, 0510025043035, 0510025043036, 0510025043037, 0510025043038, 0510037001001, 0510037001002, 0510037001004, 0510037001005, 0510037001006, 0510037001010, 0510037001011, 0510037001012, 0510037001013, 0510037001014, 0510037001015, 0510037001016, 0510037001017, 0510037001018, 0510037001019, 0510037001020, 0510037001021, 0510037001022, 0510037001025, 0510037001026, 0510037003088, 0510037003089, 0510037003090, 0510037003098, 0510037003099, 0510037003100, 0510037003101, 0510037003104, 0510037003105, 0510037003106, 0510037003107, 0510037003114; VTD G3, VTD G4, VTD G6, VTD G7, VTD G8, VTD G9, VTD LI65, VTD SH77."; and

on page 8, line 19, through page 10, line 43, by rewriting the lines to read:

"**District 21**: Cumberland County: VTD AH49, VTD CC01, VTD CC03, VTD CC05, VTD CC13, VTD CC16, VTD CC17, VTD CC19, VTD CC21, VTD CC25, VTD CC26, VTD CC27, VTD CC29, VTD CC31, VTD CC32, VTD CC33, VTD CL57, VTD G1: Block(s) 0510014001000, 0510014001001, 0510014001002, 0510014001023, 0510014002022, 0510014002023, 0510014002024, 0510014002025, 0510014002026, 0510014002036, 0510014002037, 0510014002038, 0510014002041, 0510014002042, 0510014002043,

0510014002048, 0510014002049, 0510014002050, 0510014002051, 0510014002052, 0510014003025, 0510014003026, 0510014003027, 0510014003028, 0510014003029, 0510014003030, 0510014003031, 0510014003032, 0510014003033, 0510014003034, 0510014003036, 0510014003037, 0510014003039, 0510014004000, 0510014004001, 0510014004002, 0510014004003, 0510014004004, 0510014004005, 0510014004006, 0510014004007, 0510014004008, 0510014004009, 0510014004010, 0510014004014, 0510014004015, 0510014004016, 0510027004046, 0510027004047, 0510027004048, 0510027004049, 0510027004050, 0510027004051, 0510027004052, 0510027004053, 0510027004054; VTD G11: Block(s) 0510033132008, 0510034011041, 0510034011042, 0510034011043, 0510034021000, 0510034021016, 0510034021018, 0510034041002, 0510034041006, 0519801001000, 0519801001001, 0519801001002, 0519801001003, 0519801001004, 0519801001005, 0519801001006, 0519801001007, 0519801001008, 0519801001009, 0519801001010, 0519801001011, 0519801001012, 0519801001013, 0519801001014, 0519801001015, 0519801001016, 0519801001017, 0519801001018, 0519801001019, 0519801001020, 0519801001021, 0519801001022, 0519801001023, 0519801001024, 0519801001025, 0519801001026, 0519801001027, 0519801001028, 0519801001029, 0519801001030, 0519801001031, 0519801001032, 0519801001033, 0519801001034, 0519801001035, 0519801001036, 0519801001037, 0519801001038, 0519801001039, 0519801001040, 0519801001041, 0519801001042, 0519801001043, 0519801001044, 0519801001045, 0519801001046, 0519801001047, 0519801001048, 0519801001049, 0519801001051, 0519801001052, 0519801001053, 0519801001054, 0519801001055, 0519801001056, 0519801001057, 0519801001058, 0519801001059, 0519801001060, 0519801001061, 0519801001062, 0519801001063, 0519801001064, 0519801001065, 0519801001066, 0519801001067, 0519801001068; VTD G2: Block(s) 0510012001000, 0510012001001, 0510012001002, 0510012001003, 0510012001004, 0510012001005, 0510012001006, 0510012001007, 0510012001008, 0510012001009, 0510012001010, 0510012004001, 0510012004002, 0510012004003, 0510012004004, 0510012004021, 0510012004022, 0510012004023, 0510012004024, 0510012004025, 0510012004026, 0510012004027, 0510012004028, 0510024011000, 0510024011001, 0510024011002, 0510024011003, 0510024011004, 0510024011005, 0510024011006, 0510024011007, 0510024011008, 0510024011009, 0510024011010, 0510024011011, 0510024011013, 0510024011014, 0510024011015, 0510024011016, 0510024011017, 0510024011018, 0510024011019, 0510024011022, 0510024011024, 0510024011025, 0510024011026, 0510024011027, 0510024011028, 0510024011029, 0510024011030, 0510024011034, 0510024011035, 0510024011036, 0510024011038, 0510024011041, 0510024011042, 0510024011043, 0510024012004, 0510024012007, 0510024012025, 0510024021000, 0510024021005, 0510024022000, 0510024022001, 0510024022002, 0510024022003, 0510024022004, 0510024022005, 0510024022006, 0510024022007, 0510024023000, 0510024023001, 0510024023002, 0510024023003, 0510024023004, 0510024023005, 0510024023006, 0510024023007, 0510024023008, 0510024023009, 0510024023011, 0510024023012, 0510024023013, 0510025011000, 0510025011001, 0510025011002, 0510025011003, 0510025011004, 0510025011005, 0510025011006, 0510025011007, 0510025011008, 0510025011009, 0510025011010, 0510025011011,

0510025011012, 0510025011013, 0510025011014, 0510025011015, 0510025011016,
0510025011017, 0510025011018, 0510025011019, 0510025011020, 0510025011021,
0510025011022, 0510025011023, 0510025012000, 0510025012001, 0510025012002,
0510025012003, 0510025012004, 0510025012005, 0510025012006, 0510025012007,
0510025012008, 0510025012009, 0510025012010, 0510025012011, 0510025012012,
0510025012013, 0510025012014, 0510025013000, 0510025013001, 0510025013002,
0510025013003, 0510025013004, 0510025013005, 0510025013006, 0510025013007,
0510025013008, 0510025013009, 0510025013010, 0510025013011, 0510025013012,
0510025013013, 0510025013014, 0510025013015, 0510025013016, 0510025013017,
0510025013018, 0510025013019, 0510025013020, 0510025013021, 0510025013022,
0510025013023, 0510025013024, 0510025013025, 0510025013026, 0510025013027,
0510025013028, 0510025013029, 0510025013030, 0510025013031, 0510025013032,
0510025013033, 0510025013034, 0510025013035, 0510025013036, 0510025013037,
0510025013038, 0510025013039, 0510025013040, 0510025013041, 0510025013042,
0510025013043, 0510025013044, 0510025013045, 0510025013046, 0510025013047,
0510025013048, 0510025013049, 0510025013050, 0510025013051, 0510025013052,
0510025013053, 0510025013054, 0510025013055, 0510025013056, 0510025013057,
0510025013058, 0510025013059, 0510025013060, 0510025013061, 0510025013062,
0510025013063, 0510025013064, 0510025013065, 0510025013066, 0510025013067,
0510025013068, 0510025013069, 0510025013070, 0510025013071, 0510025013072,
0510025013073, 0510025013074, 0510025013075, 0510025013076, 0510025013077,
0510025013078, 0510025013079, 0510025013080, 0510025013081, 0510025021013,
0510025021014, 0510025021015, 0510025021016, 0510025021017, 0510025021018,
0510025021019, 0510025021020, 0510025021021, 0510025021022, 0510025021023,
0510025021024, 0510025021025, 0510025021026, 0510025021027, 0510025021028,
0510025021029, 0510025021030, 0510025021031, 0510025021032, 0510025021033,
0510025021034, 0510025021035, 0510025021036, 0510025021037, 0510025021038,
0510025021039, 0510025021040, 0510025021041, 0510025021042, 0510025021043,
0510025021044, 0510025021045, 0510025021046, 0510025021047, 0510025021048,
0510025021049, 0510025021050, 0510025021051, 0510025021052, 0510025021053,
0510025021054, 0510025021055, 0510025021056, 0510025021057, 0510025021058,
0510025021059, 0510025021060, 0510025021061, 0510025021062, 0510025021063,
0510025021064, 0510025021065, 0510025021066, 0510025022000, 0510025022001,
0510025022002, 0510025022003, 0510025022004, 0510025022005, 0510025022006,
0510025022007, 0510025022008, 0510025022009, 0510025022010, 0510025022011,
0510025022012, 0510025022013, 0510025022014, 0510025022015, 0510025022016,
0510025022017, 0510025022018, 0510025022019, 0510025022020, 0510025022021,
0510025022022, 0510025022023, 0510025022024, 0510025022025, 0510025022026,
0510025022027, 0510025022028, 0510025022029, 0510025022030, 0510025022031,
0510025022032, 0510025022033, 0510025022034, 0510025022035, 0510025022036,
0510025022037, 0510025022038, 0510025022039, 0510025022040, 0510025022041,
0510025022042, 0510025022043, 0510025022044, 0510025022045, 0510025022046,
0510025022047, 0510025022048, 0510025022049, 0510025022050, 0510025022051,

0510025022052, 0510025022053, 0510025022054, 0510025022055, 0510025022056,
0510025022057, 0510025022058, 0510025022059, 0510025022060, 0510025022061,
0510025022062, 0510025022063, 0510025022064, 0510025022065, 0510025022066,
0510025022067, 0510025022068, 0510025022069, 0510025022070, 0510025022071,
0510025022072, 0510025022073, 0510025022074, 0510025022075, 0510025022076,
0510025022077, 0510025022078, 0510025022079, 0510025022080, 0510025022081,
0510025022082, 0510025022083, 0510025022084, 0510025023000, 0510025023001,
0510025023002, 0510025023003, 0510025023004, 0510025023005, 0510025023006,
0510025023007, 0510025023008, 0510025023009, 0510025023010, 0510025023011,
0510025023012, 0510025023013, 0510025023014, 0510025023015, 0510025023016,
0510025023017, 0510025023018, 0510025023019, 0510025023020, 0510025023021,
0510025023022, 0510025023023, 0510025023024, 0510025023025, 0510025023026,
0510025023027, 0510025023028, 0510025023029, 0510025023030, 0510025023031,
0510025023032, 0510025023033, 0510025023034, 0510025023035, 0510025023036,
0510025031000, 0510025031001, 0510025031002, 0510025031003, 0510025031004,
0510025031005, 0510025031006, 0510025031007, 0510025031008, 0510025031009,
0510025031010, 0510025031011, 0510025031012, 0510025031013, 0510025031014,
0510025031015, 0510025031016, 0510025031017, 0510025031018, 0510025031019,
0510025031020, 0510025031021, 0510025031022, 0510025031023, 0510025031024,
0510025031025, 0510025032000, 0510025032001, 0510025032002, 0510025032003,
0510025032004, 0510025032005, 0510025032006, 0510025032007, 0510025032008,
0510025032009, 0510025033000, 0510025033001, 0510025033002, 0510025033003,
0510025033004, 0510025033005, 0510025033006, 0510025033007, 0510025033008,
0510025033009, 0510025033010, 0510025033011, 0510025033012, 0510025033013,
0510025033014, 0510025033015, 0510025033016, 0510025033017, 0510025033018,
0510025033019, 0510025033020, 0510025033021, 0510025033022, 0510025033023,
0510025033024, 0510025033025, 0510025033026, 0510025033027, 0510025033028,
0510025033029, 0510025033030, 0510025033031, 0510025033032, 0510025033033,
0510025033034, 0510025033035, 0510025041001, 0510025041002, 0510025041003,
0510025041004, 0510025041005, 0510025041006, 0510025041007, 0510025041008,
0510025041009, 0510025041010, 0510025041011, 0510025041012, 0510025041013,
0510025041014, 0510025041015, 0510025041016, 0510025041017, 0510025041018,
0510025041019, 0510025041020, 0510025041021, 0510025041022, 0510025041023,
0510025041024, 0510025041025, 0510025041026, 0510025041027, 0510025041028,
0510025041029, 0510025041030, 0510025042000, 0510025042001, 0510025042002,
0510025042003, 0510025042004, 0510025042005, 0510025042006, 0510025042007,
0510025042008, 0510025042009, 0510025042010, 0510025042011, 0510025042012,
0510025042013, 0510025042014, 0510025042015, 0510025042016, 0510025042017,
0510025042018, 0510025042019, 0510025042020, 0510025042021, 0510025042022,
0510025042023, 0510025042024, 0510025042025, 0510025042026, 0510025042027,
0510025042028, 0510025042029, 0510025042030, 0510025042031, 0510025042032,
0510025042033, 0510025042034, 0510025042035, 0510025042036, 0510025042037,
0510025042038, 0510025042039, 0510025042040, 0510025042041, 0510025042042,

0510025042043, 0510025042044, 0510025042045, 0510025042046, 0510025042047, 0510026002016, 0510037003103, 0510037003110, 0510037003111, 0510037003112, 0510037003113, 0519802001027; VTD G5, VTD LR63, VTD MB62, VTD MR02; Hoke County.".

SIGNED _____
Amendment Sponsor

SIGNED _____
Committee Chair if Senate Committee Amendment

ADOPTED _____ FAILED _____ TABLED _____

S691-AMT-34-Districts 19 and 21



N
W E
S

0 3.25 6.5 13 19.5 26 Miles

S691-AMT-34-Districts19and21

Printed by the NC General Assembly, August 24, 2017.

Plan Name: S691-AMT-34-Districts19and21
Plan Type:
Date: 08/24/2017
Time: 03:39:46PM
Administrator:

Measures of Compactness

08/24/2017

Sum	N/A	N/A
Min	0.19	0.13
Max	0.62	0.61
Mean	0.42	0.34
Std. Dev.	0.10	0.12

DISTRICT	Reock	Polsby-Popper
1	0.46	0.46
2	0.48	0.42
3	0.23	0.15
4	0.45	0.31
5	0.62	0.44
6	0.52	0.55
7	0.46	0.35
8	0.41	0.18
9	0.24	0.27
10	0.48	0.29
11	0.22	0.24
12	0.46	0.40
13	0.41	0.33
14	0.38	0.32
15	0.47	0.22
16	0.50	0.48
17	0.39	0.34
18	0.41	0.28
19	0.45	0.20
20	0.44	0.49
21	0.42	0.25
22	0.58	0.54
23	0.39	0.37
24	0.58	0.61
25	0.46	0.28
26	0.56	0.55
27	0.43	0.15
28	0.40	0.17
29	0.58	0.23
30	0.27	0.40
31	0.32	0.14
32	0.27	0.27
33	0.32	0.30
34	0.33	0.34
35	0.49	0.56
36	0.44	0.39
37	0.42	0.27
38	0.42	0.42
39	0.33	0.24
40	0.47	0.36

Plan Name:	S691-AMT-34-Districts19an	Administrator:	
Plan Type:		User:	

DISTRICT	Reock	Polsby-Popper
41	0.19	0.13
42	0.45	0.48
43	0.43	0.50
44	0.38	0.32
45	0.44	0.41
46	0.54	0.45
47	0.42	0.24
48	0.40	0.32
49	0.39	0.30
50	0.42	0.46

S691-AMT-34-Districts19and21 - Clark: County-District

County	District	Total County Pop	Total District Pop	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Alamance	24	151,131	192,673	151,131	100.00%	78.44%
Alexander	42	37,198	191,556	37,198	100.00%	19.42%
Alleghany	45	11,155	198,833	11,155	100.00%	5.61%
Anson	25	26,948	197,991	26,948	100.00%	13.61%
Ashe	45	27,281	198,833	27,281	100.00%	13.72%
Avery	46	17,797	191,738	17,797	100.00%	9.28%
Beaufort	3	47,759	182,039	47,759	100.00%	26.24%
Bertie	3	21,282	182,039	21,282	100.00%	11.69%
Bladen	8	35,190	200,133	35,190	100.00%	17.58%
Brunswick	8	107,431	200,133	107,431	100.00%	53.68%
Buncombe	48	238,318	184,866	45,036	18.90%	24.36%
	49	238,318	193,282	193,282	81.10%	100.00%
Burke	46	90,912	191,738	90,912	100.00%	47.41%
Cabarrus	36	178,011	189,509	178,011	100.00%	93.93%
Caldwell	46	83,029	191,738	83,029	100.00%	43.30%
Camden	1	9,980	196,665	9,980	100.00%	5.07%
Carteret	2	66,469	183,118	66,469	100.00%	36.30%
Caswell	30	23,719	198,458	23,719	100.00%	11.95%
Catawba	42	154,358	191,556	154,358	100.00%	80.58%
Chatham	23	63,505	197,306	63,505	100.00%	32.19%
Cherokee	50	27,444	194,102	27,444	100.00%	14.14%
Chowan	1	14,793	196,665	14,793	100.00%	7.52%
Clay	50	10,587	194,102	10,587	100.00%	5.45%
Cleveland	44	98,078	185,394	98,078	100.00%	52.90%
Columbus	13	58,098	192,266	58,098	100.00%	30.22%
Craven	2	103,505	183,118	103,505	100.00%	56.52%
Cumberland	19	319,431	182,067	182,067	57.00%	100.00%
	21	319,431	184,316	137,364	43.00%	74.53%
Currituck	1	23,547	196,665	23,547	100.00%	11.97%
Dare	1	33,920	196,665	33,920	100.00%	17.25%
Davidson	32	162,878	190,676	162,878	100.00%	85.42%
Davie	31	41,240	197,532	41,240	100.00%	20.88%
Duplin	10	58,505	183,566	58,505	100.00%	31.87%
Durham	20	267,587	184,237	184,237	68.85%	100.00%
	22	267,587	182,730	83,350	31.15%	45.61%
Edgecombe	4	56,552	192,477	56,552	100.00%	29.38%
Forsyth	29	350,670	194,378	194,378	55.43%	100.00%
	31	350,670	197,532	156,292	44.57%	79.12%
Franklin	18	60,619	192,915	60,619	100.00%	31.42%
Gaston	43	206,086	197,035	197,035	95.61%	100.00%
	44	206,086	185,394	9,051	4.39%	4.88%
Gates	1	12,197	196,665	12,197	100.00%	6.20%
Graham	50	8,861	194,102	8,861	100.00%	4.57%
Granville	22	59,916	182,730	59,916	100.00%	32.79%
Greene	5	21,362	189,510	21,362	100.00%	11.27%
Guilford	24	488,406	192,673	41,542	8.51%	21.56%
	26	488,406	196,115	54,363	11.13%	27.72%
	27	488,406	195,363	195,363	40.00%	100.00%

S691-AMT-34-Districts19and21 - Clark: County-District

County	District	Total County Pop	Total District Pop	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Guilford	28	488,406	197,138	197,138	40.36%	100.00%
Halifax	4	54,691	192,477	54,691	100.00%	28.41%
Harnett	12	114,678	182,438	114,678	100.00%	62.86%
Haywood	50	59,036	194,102	59,036	100.00%	30.41%
Henderson	48	106,740	184,866	106,740	100.00%	57.74%
Hertford	1	24,669	196,665	24,669	100.00%	12.54%
Hoke	21	46,952	184,316	46,952	100.00%	25.47%
Hyde	1	5,810	196,665	5,810	100.00%	2.95%
Iredell	34	159,437	197,843	159,437	100.00%	80.59%
Jackson	50	40,271	194,102	40,271	100.00%	20.75%
Johnston	10	168,878	183,566	61,630	36.49%	33.57%
	11	168,878	193,194	97,354	57.65%	50.39%
	12	168,878	182,438	9,894	5.86%	5.42%
Jones	6	10,153	187,925	10,153	100.00%	5.40%
Lee	12	57,866	182,438	57,866	100.00%	31.72%
Lenoir	7	59,495	182,118	59,495	100.00%	32.67%
Lincoln	44	78,265	185,394	78,265	100.00%	42.22%
Macon	50	33,922	194,102	33,922	100.00%	17.48%
Madison	47	20,764	187,477	20,764	100.00%	11.08%
Martin	3	24,505	182,039	24,505	100.00%	13.46%
McDowell	47	44,996	187,477	44,996	100.00%	24.00%
Mecklenburg	37	919,628	185,257	185,257	20.14%	100.00%
	38	919,628	182,674	182,674	19.86%	100.00%
	39	919,628	184,099	184,099	20.02%	100.00%
	40	919,628	183,426	183,426	19.95%	100.00%
	41	919,628	184,172	184,172	20.03%	100.00%
Mitchell	47	15,579	187,477	15,579	100.00%	8.31%
Montgomery	32	27,798	190,676	27,798	100.00%	14.58%
Moore	25	88,247	197,991	88,247	100.00%	44.57%
Nash	11	95,840	193,194	95,840	100.00%	49.61%
New Hanover	8	202,667	200,133	5,295	2.61%	2.65%
	9	202,667	197,372	197,372	97.39%	100.00%
Northampton	3	22,099	182,039	22,099	100.00%	12.14%
Onslow	6	177,772	187,925	177,772	100.00%	94.60%
Orange	23	133,801	197,306	133,801	100.00%	67.81%
Pamlico	2	13,144	183,118	13,144	100.00%	7.18%
Pasquotank	1	40,661	196,665	40,661	100.00%	20.68%
Pender	8	52,217	200,133	52,217	100.00%	26.09%
Perquimans	1	13,453	196,665	13,453	100.00%	6.84%
Person	22	39,464	182,730	39,464	100.00%	21.60%
Pitt	5	168,148	189,510	168,148	100.00%	88.73%
Polk	47	20,510	187,477	20,510	100.00%	10.94%
Randolph	26	141,752	196,115	141,752	100.00%	72.28%
Richmond	25	46,639	197,991	46,639	100.00%	23.56%
Robeson	13	134,168	192,266	134,168	100.00%	69.78%
Rockingham	30	93,643	198,458	93,643	100.00%	47.19%
Rowan	33	138,428	199,013	138,428	100.00%	69.56%
Rutherford	47	67,810	187,477	67,810	100.00%	36.17%
Sampson	10	63,431	183,566	63,431	100.00%	34.55%

District plan definition file: 'S691-AMT-34-Districts19and21.asc', modified 08/24/2017 03:42:44 PM

Data Source: 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File - North Carolina

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG01|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

S691-AMT-34-Districts19and21 - Clark: County-District

County	District	Total County Pop	Total District Pop	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Scotland	25	36,157	197,991	36,157	100.00%	18.26%
Stanly	33	60,585	199,013	60,585	100.00%	30.44%
Stokes	30	47,401	198,458	47,401	100.00%	23.88%
Surry	30	73,673	198,458	33,695	45.74%	16.98%
	45	73,673	198,833	39,978	54.26%	20.11%
Swain	50	13,981	194,102	13,981	100.00%	7.20%
Transylvania	48	33,090	184,866	33,090	100.00%	17.90%
Tyrrell	1	4,407	196,665	4,407	100.00%	2.24%
Union	35	201,292	189,794	189,794	94.29%	100.00%
	36	201,292	189,509	11,498	5.71%	6.07%
Vance	3	45,422	182,039	45,422	100.00%	24.95%
Wake	14	900,993	195,280	195,280	21.67%	100.00%
	15	900,993	193,810	193,810	21.51%	100.00%
	16	900,993	197,303	197,303	21.90%	100.00%
	17	900,993	182,304	182,304	20.23%	100.00%
	18	900,993	192,915	132,296	14.68%	68.58%
Warren	3	20,972	182,039	20,972	100.00%	11.52%
Washington	1	13,228	196,665	13,228	100.00%	6.73%
Watauga	45	51,079	198,833	51,079	100.00%	25.69%
Wayne	7	122,623	182,118	122,623	100.00%	67.33%
Wilkes	45	69,340	198,833	69,340	100.00%	34.87%
Wilson	4	81,234	192,477	81,234	100.00%	42.20%
Yadkin	34	38,406	197,843	38,406	100.00%	19.41%
Yancey	47	17,818	187,477	17,818	100.00%	9.50%
			Total:	**9,535,483**		

S691-AMT-34-Districts19and21 - Clark: Split VTD Detail

County	VTD	District	Total VTD Pop	VTD Pop in District	Percent of VTD Pop in District
Cumberland	G1	19	9,054	7,999	88.35%
		21	9,054	1,055	11.65%
	G11	19	31,242	31,242	100.00%
		21	31,242	0	0.00%
	G2	19	34,282	5,010	14.61%
		21	34,282	29,272	85.39%
Guilford	HP	27	9,926	6,647	66.97%
		28	9,926	3,279	33.03%
	JEF2	24	3,363	3,363	100.00%
		28	3,363	0	0.00%
Mecklenburg	223.1	38	8,790	827	9.41%
		41	8,790	7,963	90.59%
	230	37	9,345	715	7.65%
		41	9,345	8,630	92.35%
New Hanover	W03	8	2,640	1,764	66.82%
		9	2,640	876	33.18%
	W29	8	4,956	3,531	71.25%
		9	4,956	1,425	28.75%
Wake	16-09	15	4,924	3,027	61.47%
		17	4,924	1,897	38.53%

S691-AMT-34-Districts19and21 - Clark: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Aberdeen	25	6,350	197,991	6,350	100.00%	3.21%
Ahoskie	1	5,039	196,665	5,039	100.00%	2.56%
Alamance	24	951	192,673	951	100.00%	0.49%
Albemarle	33	15,903	199,013	15,903	100.00%	7.99%
Alliance	2	776	183,118	776	100.00%	0.42%
Andrews	50	1,781	194,102	1,781	100.00%	0.92%
Angier (Harnett)	12	4,247	182,438	4,247	100.00%	2.33%
Angier (Wake)	17	103	182,304	103	100.00%	0.06%
Ansonville	25	631	197,991	631	100.00%	0.32%
Apex	16	37,476	197,303	230	0.61%	0.12%
	17	37,476	182,304	37,246	99.39%	20.43%
Arapahoe	2	556	183,118	556	100.00%	0.30%
Archdale (Guilford)	26	333	196,115	116	34.83%	0.06%
	27	333	195,363	217	65.17%	0.11%
Archdale (Randolph)	26	11,082	196,115	11,082	100.00%	5.65%
Archer Lodge	11	4,292	193,194	4,292	100.00%	2.22%
Asheboro	26	25,012	196,115	25,012	100.00%	12.75%
Asheville	48	83,393	184,866	12,335	14.79%	6.67%
	49	83,393	193,282	71,058	85.21%	36.76%
Askewville	3	241	182,039	241	100.00%	0.13%
Atkinson	8	299	200,133	299	100.00%	0.15%
Atlantic Beach	2	1,495	183,118	1,495	100.00%	0.82%
Aulander	3	895	182,039	895	100.00%	0.49%
Aurora	3	520	182,039	520	100.00%	0.29%
Autryville	10	196	183,566	196	100.00%	0.11%
Ayden	5	4,932	189,510	4,932	100.00%	2.60%
Badin	33	1,974	199,013	1,974	100.00%	0.99%
Bailey	11	569	193,194	569	100.00%	0.29%
Bakersville	47	464	187,477	464	100.00%	0.25%
Bald Head Island	8	158	200,133	158	100.00%	0.08%
Banner Elk	46	1,028	191,738	1,028	100.00%	0.54%
Bath	3	249	182,039	249	100.00%	0.14%
Bayboro	2	1,263	183,118	1,263	100.00%	0.69%
Bear Grass	3	73	182,039	73	100.00%	0.04%
Beaufort	2	4,039	183,118	4,039	100.00%	2.21%
Beech Mountain (Avery)	46	24	191,738	24	100.00%	0.01%
Beech Mountain (Watauga)	45	296	198,833	296	100.00%	0.15%
Belhaven	3	1,688	182,039	1,688	100.00%	0.93%
Belmont	43	10,076	197,035	10,076	100.00%	5.11%
Belville	8	1,936	200,133	1,936	100.00%	0.97%
Belwood	44	950	185,394	950	100.00%	0.51%
Benson (Harnett)	12	0	182,438	0	0.00%	0.00%
Benson (Johnston)	12	3,311	182,438	3,311	100.00%	1.81%
Bermuda Run	31	1,725	197,532	1,725	100.00%	0.87%
Bessemer City	43	5,340	197,035	5,340	100.00%	2.71%
Bethania	29	328	194,378	328	100.00%	0.17%
	31	328	197,532	0	0.00%	0.00%

District plan definition file: 'S691-AMT-34-Districts19and21.asc', modified 08/24/2017 03:42:44 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

S691-AMT-34-Districts19and21 - Clark: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Bethel	5	1,577	189,510	1,577	100.00%	0.83%
Beulaville	10	1,296	183,566	1,296	100.00%	0.71%
Biltmore Forest	48	1,343	184,866	0	0.00%	0.00%
	49	1,343	193,282	1,343	100.00%	0.69%
Biscoe	32	1,700	190,676	1,700	100.00%	0.89%
Black Creek	4	769	192,477	769	100.00%	0.40%
Black Mountain	49	7,848	193,282	7,848	100.00%	4.06%
Bladenboro	8	1,750	200,133	1,750	100.00%	0.87%
Blowing Rock (Caldwell)	46	49	191,738	49	100.00%	0.03%
Blowing Rock (Watauga)	45	1,192	198,833	1,192	100.00%	0.60%
Boardman	13	157	192,266	157	100.00%	0.08%
Bogue	2	684	183,118	684	100.00%	0.37%
Boiling Spring Lakes	8	5,372	200,133	5,372	100.00%	2.68%
Boiling Springs	44	4,647	185,394	4,647	100.00%	2.51%
Bolivia	8	143	200,133	143	100.00%	0.07%
Bolton	13	691	192,266	691	100.00%	0.36%
Boone	45	17,122	198,833	17,122	100.00%	8.61%
Boonville	34	1,222	197,843	1,222	100.00%	0.62%
Bostic	47	386	187,477	386	100.00%	0.21%
Brevard	48	7,609	184,866	7,609	100.00%	4.12%
Bridgeton	2	454	183,118	454	100.00%	0.25%
Broadway (Harnett)	12	25	182,438	25	100.00%	0.01%
Broadway (Lee)	12	1,204	182,438	1,204	100.00%	0.66%
Brookford	42	382	191,556	382	100.00%	0.20%
Brunswick	13	1,119	192,266	1,119	100.00%	0.58%
Bryson City	50	1,424	194,102	1,424	100.00%	0.73%
Bunn	18	344	192,915	344	100.00%	0.18%
Burgaw	8	3,872	200,133	3,872	100.00%	1.93%
Burlington (Alamance)	24	49,308	192,673	49,308	100.00%	25.59%
Burlington (Guilford)	24	655	192,673	655	100.00%	0.34%
Burnsville	47	1,693	187,477	1,693	100.00%	0.90%
Butner	22	7,591	182,730	7,591	100.00%	4.15%
Cajah's Mountain	46	2,823	191,738	2,823	100.00%	1.47%
Calabash	8	1,786	200,133	1,786	100.00%	0.89%
Calypso	10	538	183,566	538	100.00%	0.29%
Cameron	25	285	197,991	285	100.00%	0.14%
Candor	32	840	190,676	840	100.00%	0.44%
Canton	50	4,227	194,102	4,227	100.00%	2.18%
Cape Carteret	2	1,917	183,118	1,917	100.00%	1.05%
Carolina Beach	9	5,706	197,372	5,706	100.00%	2.89%
Carolina Shores	8	3,048	200,133	3,048	100.00%	1.52%
Carrboro	23	19,582	197,306	19,582	100.00%	9.92%
Carthage	25	2,205	197,991	2,205	100.00%	1.11%
Cary (Chatham)	23	1,422	197,306	1,422	100.00%	0.72%
Cary (Wake)	15	133,812	193,810	15,939	11.91%	8.22%
	16	133,812	197,303	99,176	74.12%	50.27%
	17	133,812	182,304	18,697	13.97%	10.26%

District plan definition file: 'S691-AMT-34-Districts19and21.asc', modified 08/24/2017 03:42:44 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

S691-AMT-34-Districts19and21 - Clark: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Casar	44	297	185,394	297	100.00%	0.16%
Castalia	11	268	193,194	268	100.00%	0.14%
Caswell Beach	8	398	200,133	398	100.00%	0.20%
Catawba	42	603	191,556	603	100.00%	0.31%
Cedar Point	2	1,279	183,118	1,279	100.00%	0.70%
Cedar Rock	46	300	191,738	300	100.00%	0.16%
Centerville	18	89	192,915	89	100.00%	0.05%
Cerro Gordo	13	207	192,266	207	100.00%	0.11%
Chadbourn	13	1,856	192,266	1,856	100.00%	0.97%
Chapel Hill (Durham)	20	2,836	184,237	2,836	100.00%	1.54%
Chapel Hill (Orange)	23	54,397	197,306	54,397	100.00%	27.57%
Charlotte	37	731,424	185,257	183,353	25.07%	98.97%
	38	731,424	182,674	173,878	23.77%	95.18%
	39	731,424	184,099	138,568	18.94%	75.27%
	40	731,424	183,426	162,819	22.26%	88.77%
	41	731,424	184,172	72,806	9.95%	39.53%
Cherryville	43	5,760	197,035	5,760	100.00%	2.92%
Chimney Rock Village	47	113	187,477	113	100.00%	0.06%
China Grove	33	3,563	199,013	3,563	100.00%	1.79%
Chocowinity	3	820	182,039	820	100.00%	0.45%
Claremont	42	1,352	191,556	1,352	100.00%	0.71%
Clarkton	8	837	200,133	837	100.00%	0.42%
Clayton (Johnston)	11	16,116	193,194	16,116	100.00%	8.34%
Clayton (Wake)	14	0	195,280	0	0.00%	0.00%
Clemmons	31	18,627	197,532	18,627	100.00%	9.43%
Cleveland	33	871	199,013	871	100.00%	0.44%
Clinton	10	8,639	183,566	8,639	100.00%	4.71%
Clyde	50	1,223	194,102	1,223	100.00%	0.63%
Coats	12	2,112	182,438	2,112	100.00%	1.16%
Cofield	1	413	196,665	413	100.00%	0.21%
Colerain	3	204	182,039	204	100.00%	0.11%
Columbia	1	891	196,665	891	100.00%	0.45%
Columbus	47	999	187,477	999	100.00%	0.53%
Como	1	91	196,665	91	100.00%	0.05%
Concord	36	79,066	189,509	79,066	100.00%	41.72%
Conetoe	4	294	192,477	294	100.00%	0.15%
Connelly Springs	46	1,669	191,738	1,669	100.00%	0.87%
Conover	42	8,165	191,556	8,165	100.00%	4.26%
Conway	3	836	182,039	836	100.00%	0.46%
Cooleemee	31	960	197,532	960	100.00%	0.49%
Cornelius	41	24,866	184,172	24,866	100.00%	13.50%
Cove City	2	399	183,118	399	100.00%	0.22%
Cramerton	43	4,165	197,035	4,165	100.00%	2.11%
Creedmoor	22	4,124	182,730	4,124	100.00%	2.26%
Creswell	1	276	196,665	276	100.00%	0.14%
Crossnore	46	192	191,738	192	100.00%	0.10%
Dallas	43	4,488	197,035	4,488	100.00%	2.28%

S691-AMT-34-Districts19and21 - Clark: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Danbury	30	189	198,458	189	100.00%	0.10%
Davidson (Iredell)	34	294	197,843	294	100.00%	0.15%
Davidson (Mecklenburg)	41	10,650	184,172	10,650	100.00%	5.78%
Dellview	43	13	197,035	13	100.00%	0.01%
Denton	32	1,636	190,676	1,636	100.00%	0.86%
Dillsboro	50	232	194,102	232	100.00%	0.12%
Dobbins Heights	25	866	197,991	866	100.00%	0.44%
Dobson	45	1,586	198,833	1,586	100.00%	0.80%
Dortches	11	935	193,194	935	100.00%	0.48%
Dover	2	401	183,118	401	100.00%	0.22%
Drexel	46	1,858	191,738	1,858	100.00%	0.97%
Dublin	8	338	200,133	338	100.00%	0.17%
Duck	1	369	196,665	369	100.00%	0.19%
Dunn	12	9,263	182,438	9,263	100.00%	5.08%
Durham (Durham)	20	228,300	184,237	166,605	72.98%	90.43%
	22	228,300	182,730	61,695	27.02%	33.76%
Durham (Orange)	23	30	197,306	30	100.00%	0.02%
Durham (Wake)	16	0	197,303	0	0.00%	0.00%
Earl	44	260	185,394	260	100.00%	0.14%
East Arcadia	8	487	200,133	487	100.00%	0.24%
East Bend	34	612	197,843	612	100.00%	0.31%
East Laurinburg	25	300	197,991	300	100.00%	0.15%
East Spencer	33	1,534	199,013	1,534	100.00%	0.77%
Eastover	19	3,628	182,067	3,628	100.00%	1.99%
Eden	30	15,527	198,458	15,527	100.00%	7.82%
Edenton	1	5,004	196,665	5,004	100.00%	2.54%
Elizabeth City (Camden)	1	45	196,665	45	100.00%	0.02%
Elizabeth City (Pasquotank)	1	18,638	196,665	18,638	100.00%	9.48%
Elizabethtown	8	3,583	200,133	3,583	100.00%	1.79%
Elk Park	46	452	191,738	452	100.00%	0.24%
Elkin (Surry)	45	3,921	198,833	3,921	100.00%	1.97%
Elkin (Wilkes)	45	80	198,833	80	100.00%	0.04%
Ellenboro	47	873	187,477	873	100.00%	0.47%
Ellerbe	25	1,054	197,991	1,054	100.00%	0.53%
Elm City	4	1,298	192,477	1,298	100.00%	0.67%
Elon	24	9,419	192,673	9,419	100.00%	4.89%
Emerald Isle	2	3,655	183,118	3,655	100.00%	2.00%
Enfield	4	2,532	192,477	2,532	100.00%	1.32%
Erwin	12	4,405	182,438	4,405	100.00%	2.41%
Eureka	7	197	182,118	197	100.00%	0.11%
Everetts	3	164	182,039	164	100.00%	0.09%
Fair Bluff	13	951	192,266	951	100.00%	0.49%
Fairmont	13	2,663	192,266	2,663	100.00%	1.39%
Fairview	36	3,324	189,509	3,324	100.00%	1.75%
Faison (Duplin)	10	961	183,566	961	100.00%	0.52%
Faison (Sampson)	10	0	183,566	0	0.00%	0.00%
Faith	33	807	199,013	807	100.00%	0.41%

District plan definition file: 'S691-AMT-34-Districts19and21.asc', modified 08/24/2017 03:42:44 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

S691-AMT-34-Districts19and21 - Clark: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Falcon (Cumberland)	19	258	182,067	258	100.00%	0.14%
Falcon (Sampson)	10	0	183,566	0	0.00%	0.00%
Falkland	5	96	189,510	96	100.00%	0.05%
Fallston	44	607	185,394	607	100.00%	0.33%
Farmville	5	4,654	189,510	4,654	100.00%	2.46%
Fayetteville	19	200,564	182,067	67,434	33.62%	37.04%
	21	200,564	184,316	133,130	66.38%	72.23%
Flat Rock	48	3,114	184,866	3,114	100.00%	1.68%
Fletcher	48	7,187	184,866	7,187	100.00%	3.89%
Forest City	47	7,476	187,477	7,476	100.00%	3.99%
Forest Hills	50	365	194,102	365	100.00%	0.19%
Fountain	5	427	189,510	427	100.00%	0.23%
Four Oaks	10	1,921	183,566	1,921	100.00%	1.05%
Foxfire	25	902	197,991	902	100.00%	0.46%
Franklin	50	3,845	194,102	3,845	100.00%	1.98%
Franklinton	18	2,023	192,915	2,023	100.00%	1.05%
Franklinville	26	1,164	196,115	1,164	100.00%	0.59%
Fremont	7	1,255	182,118	1,255	100.00%	0.69%
Fuquay-Varina	17	17,937	182,304	17,937	100.00%	9.84%
Gamewell	46	4,051	191,738	4,051	100.00%	2.11%
Garland	10	625	183,566	625	100.00%	0.34%
Garner	15	25,745	193,810	21,922	85.15%	11.31%
	17	25,745	182,304	3,823	14.85%	2.10%
Garysburg	3	1,057	182,039	1,057	100.00%	0.58%
Gaston	3	1,152	182,039	1,152	100.00%	0.63%
Gastonia	43	71,741	197,035	71,741	100.00%	36.41%
Gatesville	1	321	196,665	321	100.00%	0.16%
Gibson	25	540	197,991	540	100.00%	0.27%
Gibsonville (Alamance)	24	3,148	192,673	3,148	100.00%	1.63%
Gibsonville (Guilford)	24	3,262	192,673	3,262	100.00%	1.69%
Glen Alpine	46	1,517	191,738	1,517	100.00%	0.79%
Godwin	19	139	182,067	139	100.00%	0.08%
Goldsboro	7	36,437	182,118	36,437	100.00%	20.01%
Goldston	23	268	197,306	268	100.00%	0.14%
Graham	24	14,153	192,673	14,153	100.00%	7.35%
Grandfather	46	25	191,738	25	100.00%	0.01%
Granite Falls	46	4,722	191,738	4,722	100.00%	2.46%
Granite Quarry	33	2,930	199,013	2,930	100.00%	1.47%
Grantsboro	2	688	183,118	688	100.00%	0.38%
Green Level	24	2,100	192,673	2,100	100.00%	1.09%
Greenevers	10	634	183,566	634	100.00%	0.35%
Greensboro	24	269,666	192,673	3,810	1.41%	1.98%
	27	269,666	195,363	84,432	31.31%	43.22%
	28	269,666	197,138	181,424	67.28%	92.03%
Greenville	5	84,554	189,510	84,554	100.00%	44.62%
Grifton (Lenoir)	7	186	182,118	186	100.00%	0.10%
Grifton (Pitt)	5	2,431	189,510	2,431	100.00%	1.28%

District plan definition file: 'S691-AMT-34-Districts19and21.asc', modified 08/24/2017 03:42:44 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

S691-AMT-34-Districts19and21 - Clark: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Grimesland	5	441	189,510	441	100.00%	0.23%
Grover	44	708	185,394	708	100.00%	0.38%
Halifax	4	234	192,477	234	100.00%	0.12%
Hamilton	3	408	182,039	408	100.00%	0.22%
Hamlet	25	6,495	197,991	6,495	100.00%	3.28%
Harmony	34	531	197,843	531	100.00%	0.27%
Harrells (Duplin)	10	23	183,566	23	100.00%	0.01%
Harrells (Sampson)	10	179	183,566	179	100.00%	0.10%
Harrellsville	1	106	196,665	106	100.00%	0.05%
Harrisburg	36	11,526	189,509	11,526	100.00%	6.08%
Hassell	3	84	182,039	84	100.00%	0.05%
Havelock	2	20,735	183,118	20,735	100.00%	11.32%
Haw River	24	2,298	192,673	2,298	100.00%	1.19%
Hayesville	50	311	194,102	311	100.00%	0.16%
Hemby Bridge	35	1,520	189,794	1,509	99.28%	0.80%
	36	1,520	189,509	11	0.72%	0.01%
Henderson	3	15,368	182,039	15,368	100.00%	8.44%
Hendersonville	48	13,137	184,866	13,137	100.00%	7.11%
Hertford	1	2,143	196,665	2,143	100.00%	1.09%
Hickory (Burke)	46	66	191,738	66	100.00%	0.03%
Hickory (Caldwell)	46	18	191,738	18	100.00%	0.01%
Hickory (Catawba)	42	39,926	191,556	39,926	100.00%	20.84%
High Point (Davidson)	32	5,310	190,676	5,310	100.00%	2.78%
High Point (Forsyth)	31	8	197,532	8	100.00%	0.00%
High Point (Guilford)	26	99,042	196,115	53,625	54.14%	27.34%
	27	99,042	195,363	42,257	42.67%	21.63%
	28	99,042	197,138	3,160	3.19%	1.60%
High Point (Randolph)	26	11	196,115	11	100.00%	0.01%
High Shoals	43	696	197,035	696	100.00%	0.35%
Highlands (Jackson)	50	4	194,102	4	100.00%	0.00%
Highlands (Macon)	50	920	194,102	920	100.00%	0.47%
Hildebran	46	2,023	191,738	2,023	100.00%	1.06%
Hillsborough	23	6,087	197,306	6,087	100.00%	3.09%
Hobgood	4	348	192,477	348	100.00%	0.18%
Hoffman	25	588	197,991	588	100.00%	0.30%
Holden Beach	8	575	200,133	575	100.00%	0.29%
Holly Ridge	6	1,268	187,925	1,268	100.00%	0.67%
Holly Springs	17	24,661	182,304	24,661	100.00%	13.53%
Hookerton	5	409	189,510	409	100.00%	0.22%
Hope Mills	19	15,176	182,067	15,176	100.00%	8.34%
Hot Springs	47	560	187,477	560	100.00%	0.30%
Hudson	46	3,776	191,738	3,776	100.00%	1.97%
Huntersville	41	46,773	184,172	46,773	100.00%	25.40%
Indian Beach	2	112	183,118	112	100.00%	0.06%
Indian Trail	35	33,518	189,794	33,456	99.82%	17.63%
	36	33,518	189,509	62	0.18%	0.03%
Jackson	3	513	182,039	513	100.00%	0.28%

District plan definition file: 'S691-AMT-34-Districts19and21.asc', modified 08/24/2017 03:42:44 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

S691-AMT-34-Districts19and21 - Clark: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Jacksonville	6	70,145	187,925	70,145	100.00%	37.33%
Jamestown	26	3,382	196,115	0	0.00%	0.00%
	27	3,382	195,363	3,382	100.00%	1.73%
Jamesville	3	491	182,039	491	100.00%	0.27%
Jefferson	45	1,611	198,833	1,611	100.00%	0.81%
Jonesville	34	2,285	197,843	2,285	100.00%	1.15%
Kannapolis (Cabarrus)	36	33,194	189,509	33,194	100.00%	17.52%
Kannapolis (Rowan)	33	9,431	199,013	9,431	100.00%	4.74%
Kelford	3	251	182,039	251	100.00%	0.14%
Kenansville	10	855	183,566	855	100.00%	0.47%
Kenly (Johnston)	10	1,176	183,566	763	64.88%	0.42%
	11	1,176	193,194	413	35.12%	0.21%
Kenly (Wilson)	4	163	192,477	163	100.00%	0.08%
Kernersville (Forsyth)	29	23,071	194,378	4	0.02%	0.00%
	31	23,071	197,532	23,067	99.98%	11.68%
Kernersville (Guilford)	27	52	195,363	52	100.00%	0.03%
Kill Devil Hills	1	6,683	196,665	6,683	100.00%	3.40%
King (Forsyth)	31	619	197,532	619	100.00%	0.31%
King (Stokes)	30	6,285	198,458	6,285	100.00%	3.17%
Kings Mountain (Cleveland)	44	9,242	185,394	9,242	100.00%	4.99%
Kings Mountain (Gaston)	43	1,054	197,035	1,054	100.00%	0.53%
Kingstown	44	681	185,394	681	100.00%	0.37%
Kinston	7	21,677	182,118	21,677	100.00%	11.90%
Kittrell	3	467	182,039	467	100.00%	0.26%
Kitty Hawk	1	3,272	196,665	3,272	100.00%	1.66%
Knightdale	14	11,401	195,280	11,401	100.00%	5.84%
Kure Beach	9	2,012	197,372	2,012	100.00%	1.02%
La Grange	7	2,873	182,118	2,873	100.00%	1.58%
Lake Lure	47	1,192	187,477	1,192	100.00%	0.64%
Lake Park	35	3,422	189,794	3,422	100.00%	1.80%
Lake Santeetlah	50	45	194,102	45	100.00%	0.02%
Lake Waccamaw	13	1,480	192,266	1,480	100.00%	0.77%
Landis	33	3,109	199,013	3,109	100.00%	1.56%
Lansing	45	158	198,833	158	100.00%	0.08%
Lasker	3	122	182,039	122	100.00%	0.07%
Lattimore	44	488	185,394	488	100.00%	0.26%
Laurel Park	48	2,180	184,866	2,180	100.00%	1.18%
Laurinburg	25	15,962	197,991	15,962	100.00%	8.06%
Lawndale	44	606	185,394	606	100.00%	0.33%
Leggett	4	60	192,477	60	100.00%	0.03%
Leland	8	13,527	200,133	13,527	100.00%	6.76%
Lenoir	46	18,228	191,738	18,228	100.00%	9.51%
Lewiston Woodville	3	549	182,039	549	100.00%	0.30%
Lewisville	31	12,639	197,532	12,639	100.00%	6.40%
Lexington	32	18,931	190,676	18,931	100.00%	9.93%
Liberty	26	2,656	196,115	2,656	100.00%	1.35%
Lilesville	25	536	197,991	536	100.00%	0.27%

District plan definition file: 'S691-AMT-34-Districts19and21.asc', modified 08/24/2017 03:42:44 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

S691-AMT-34-Districts19and21 - Clark: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Lillington	12	3,194	182,438	3,194	100.00%	1.75%
Lincolnton	44	10,486	185,394	10,486	100.00%	5.66%
Linden	19	130	182,067	130	100.00%	0.07%
Littleton	4	674	192,477	674	100.00%	0.35%
Locust (Cabarrus)	36	215	189,509	215	100.00%	0.11%
Locust (Stanly)	33	2,715	199,013	2,715	100.00%	1.36%
Long View (Burke)	46	752	191,738	752	100.00%	0.39%
Long View (Catawba)	42	4,119	191,556	4,119	100.00%	2.15%
Louisburg	18	3,359	192,915	3,359	100.00%	1.74%
Love Valley	34	90	197,843	90	100.00%	0.05%
Lowell	43	3,526	197,035	3,526	100.00%	1.79%
Lucama	4	1,108	192,477	1,108	100.00%	0.58%
Lumber Bridge	13	94	192,266	94	100.00%	0.05%
Lumberton	13	21,542	192,266	21,542	100.00%	11.20%
Macclesfield	4	471	192,477	471	100.00%	0.24%
Macon	3	119	182,039	119	100.00%	0.07%
Madison	30	2,246	198,458	2,246	100.00%	1.13%
Maggie Valley	50	1,150	194,102	1,150	100.00%	0.59%
Magnolia	10	939	183,566	939	100.00%	0.51%
Maiden (Catawba)	42	3,308	191,556	3,308	100.00%	1.73%
Maiden (Lincoln)	44	2	185,394	2	100.00%	0.00%
Manteo	1	1,434	196,665	1,434	100.00%	0.73%
Marietta	13	175	192,266	175	100.00%	0.09%
Marion	47	7,838	187,477	7,838	100.00%	4.18%
Mars Hill	47	1,869	187,477	1,869	100.00%	1.00%
Marshall	47	872	187,477	872	100.00%	0.47%
Marshville	35	2,402	189,794	2,402	100.00%	1.27%
Marvin	35	5,579	189,794	5,579	100.00%	2.94%
Matthews	39	27,198	184,099	27,198	100.00%	14.77%
Maxton (Robeson)	13	2,230	192,266	2,230	100.00%	1.16%
Maxton (Scotland)	25	196	197,991	196	100.00%	0.10%
Mayodan	30	2,478	198,458	2,478	100.00%	1.25%
Maysville	6	1,019	187,925	1,019	100.00%	0.54%
McAdenville	43	651	197,035	651	100.00%	0.33%
McDonald	13	113	192,266	113	100.00%	0.06%
McFarlan	25	117	197,991	117	100.00%	0.06%
Mebane (Alamance)	24	9,600	192,673	9,600	100.00%	4.98%
Mebane (Orange)	23	1,793	197,306	1,793	100.00%	0.91%
Mesic	2	220	183,118	220	100.00%	0.12%
Micro	10	441	183,566	441	100.00%	0.24%
Middleburg	3	133	182,039	133	100.00%	0.07%
Middlesex	11	822	193,194	822	100.00%	0.43%
Midland (Cabarrus)	36	3,073	189,509	3,073	100.00%	1.62%
Midland (Mecklenburg)	39	0	184,099	0	0.00%	0.00%
Midway	32	4,679	190,676	4,679	100.00%	2.45%
Mills River	48	6,802	184,866	6,802	100.00%	3.68%
Milton	30	166	198,458	166	100.00%	0.08%

S691-AMT-34-Districts19and21 - Clark: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Mineral Springs	35	2,639	189,794	2,639	100.00%	1.39%
Minnesott Beach	2	440	183,118	440	100.00%	0.24%
Mint Hill (Mecklenburg)	39	22,669	184,099	14,885	65.66%	8.09%
	40	22,669	183,426	7,784	34.34%	4.24%
Mint Hill (Union)	36	53	189,509	53	100.00%	0.03%
Misenheimer	33	728	199,013	728	100.00%	0.37%
Mocksville	31	5,051	197,532	5,051	100.00%	2.56%
Momeyer	11	224	193,194	224	100.00%	0.12%
Monroe	35	32,797	189,794	32,797	100.00%	17.28%
Montreat	49	723	193,282	723	100.00%	0.37%
Mooresboro	44	311	185,394	311	100.00%	0.17%
Mooresville	34	32,711	197,843	32,711	100.00%	16.53%
Morehead City	2	8,661	183,118	8,661	100.00%	4.73%
Morganton	46	16,918	191,738	16,918	100.00%	8.82%
Morrisville (Durham)	20	0	184,237	0	0.00%	0.00%
Morrisville (Wake)	16	18,576	197,303	18,576	100.00%	9.41%
Morven	25	511	197,991	511	100.00%	0.26%
Mount Airy	30	10,388	198,458	9,838	94.71%	4.96%
	45	10,388	198,833	550	5.29%	0.28%
Mount Gilead	32	1,181	190,676	1,181	100.00%	0.62%
Mount Holly	43	13,656	197,035	11,715	85.79%	5.95%
	44	13,656	185,394	1,941	14.21%	1.05%
Mount Olive (Duplin)	10	51	183,566	51	100.00%	0.03%
Mount Olive (Wayne)	7	4,538	182,118	4,538	100.00%	2.49%
Mount Pleasant	36	1,652	189,509	1,652	100.00%	0.87%
Murfreesboro	1	2,835	196,665	2,835	100.00%	1.44%
Murphy	50	1,627	194,102	1,627	100.00%	0.84%
Nags Head	1	2,757	196,665	2,757	100.00%	1.40%
Nashville	11	5,352	193,194	5,352	100.00%	2.77%
Navassa	8	1,505	200,133	1,505	100.00%	0.75%
New Bern	2	29,524	183,118	29,524	100.00%	16.12%
New London	33	600	199,013	600	100.00%	0.30%
Newland	46	698	191,738	698	100.00%	0.36%
Newport	2	4,150	183,118	4,150	100.00%	2.27%
Newton	42	12,968	191,556	12,968	100.00%	6.77%
Newton Grove	10	569	183,566	569	100.00%	0.31%
Norlina	3	1,118	182,039	1,118	100.00%	0.61%
Norman	25	138	197,991	138	100.00%	0.07%
North Topsail Beach	6	743	187,925	743	100.00%	0.40%
North Wilkesboro	45	4,245	198,833	4,245	100.00%	2.13%
Northwest	8	735	200,133	735	100.00%	0.37%
Norwood	33	2,379	199,013	2,379	100.00%	1.20%
Oak City	3	317	182,039	317	100.00%	0.17%
Oak Island	8	6,783	200,133	6,783	100.00%	3.39%
Oak Ridge	27	6,185	195,363	6,185	100.00%	3.17%
Oakboro	33	1,859	199,013	1,859	100.00%	0.93%
Ocean Isle Beach	8	550	200,133	550	100.00%	0.27%

S691-AMT-34-Districts19and21 - Clark: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Old Fort	47	908	187,477	908	100.00%	0.48%
Oriental	2	900	183,118	900	100.00%	0.49%
Orrum	13	91	192,266	91	100.00%	0.05%
Ossipee	24	543	192,673	543	100.00%	0.28%
Oxford	22	8,461	182,730	8,461	100.00%	4.63%
Pantego	3	179	182,039	179	100.00%	0.10%
Parkton	13	436	192,266	436	100.00%	0.23%
Parmele	3	278	182,039	278	100.00%	0.15%
Patterson Springs	44	622	185,394	622	100.00%	0.34%
Peachland	25	437	197,991	437	100.00%	0.22%
Peletier	2	644	183,118	644	100.00%	0.35%
Pembroke	13	2,973	192,266	2,973	100.00%	1.55%
Pikeville	7	678	182,118	678	100.00%	0.37%
Pilot Mountain	30	1,477	198,458	1,477	100.00%	0.74%
Pine Knoll Shores	2	1,339	183,118	1,339	100.00%	0.73%
Pine Level	10	1,700	183,566	1,700	100.00%	0.93%
Pinebluff	25	1,337	197,991	1,337	100.00%	0.68%
Pinehurst	25	13,124	197,991	13,124	100.00%	6.63%
Pinetops	4	1,374	192,477	1,374	100.00%	0.71%
Pineville	39	7,479	184,099	0	0.00%	0.00%
	41	7,479	184,172	7,479	100.00%	4.06%
Pink Hill	7	552	182,118	552	100.00%	0.30%
Pittsboro	23	3,743	197,306	3,743	100.00%	1.90%
Pleasant Garden	27	4,489	195,363	4,489	100.00%	2.30%
Plymouth	1	3,878	196,665	3,878	100.00%	1.97%
Polkton	25	3,375	197,991	3,375	100.00%	1.70%
Polkville	44	545	185,394	545	100.00%	0.29%
Pollocksville	6	311	187,925	311	100.00%	0.17%
Powellsville	3	276	182,039	276	100.00%	0.15%
Princeton	10	1,194	183,566	1,194	100.00%	0.65%
Princeville	4	2,082	192,477	2,082	100.00%	1.08%
Proctorville	13	117	192,266	117	100.00%	0.06%
Raeford	21	4,611	184,316	4,611	100.00%	2.50%
Raleigh (Durham)	20	1,067	184,237	1,067	100.00%	0.58%
Raleigh (Wake)	14	402,825	195,280	138,224	34.31%	70.78%
	15	402,825	193,810	147,345	36.58%	76.03%
	16	402,825	197,303	69,134	17.16%	35.04%
	17	402,825	182,304	6	0.00%	0.00%
	18	402,825	192,915	48,116	11.94%	24.94%
Ramseur	26	1,692	196,115	1,692	100.00%	0.86%
Randleman	26	4,113	196,115	4,113	100.00%	2.10%
Ranlo	43	3,434	197,035	3,434	100.00%	1.74%
Raynham	13	72	192,266	72	100.00%	0.04%
Red Cross	33	742	199,013	742	100.00%	0.37%
Red Oak	11	3,430	193,194	3,430	100.00%	1.78%
Red Springs (Hoke)	21	0	184,316	0	0.00%	0.00%
Red Springs (Robeson)	13	3,428	192,266	3,428	100.00%	1.78%

District plan definition file: 'S691-AMT-34-Districts19and21.asc', modified 08/24/2017 03:42:44 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

S691-AMT-34-Districts19and21 - Clark: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Reidsville	30	14,520	198,458	14,520	100.00%	7.32%
Rennert	13	383	192,266	383	100.00%	0.20%
Rhodhiss (Burke)	46	700	191,738	700	100.00%	0.37%
Rhodhiss (Caldwell)	46	370	191,738	370	100.00%	0.19%
Rich Square	3	958	182,039	958	100.00%	0.53%
Richfield	33	613	199,013	613	100.00%	0.31%
Richlands	6	1,520	187,925	1,520	100.00%	0.81%
River Bend	2	3,119	183,118	3,119	100.00%	1.70%
Roanoke Rapids	4	15,754	192,477	15,754	100.00%	8.18%
Robbins	25	1,097	197,991	1,097	100.00%	0.55%
Robbinsville	50	620	194,102	620	100.00%	0.32%
Robersonville	3	1,488	182,039	1,488	100.00%	0.82%
Rockingham	25	9,558	197,991	9,558	100.00%	4.83%
Rockwell	33	2,108	199,013	2,108	100.00%	1.06%
Rocky Mount (Edgecombe)	4	17,524	192,477	17,524	100.00%	9.10%
Rocky Mount (Nash)	11	39,953	193,194	39,953	100.00%	20.68%
Rolesville	14	3,786	195,280	0	0.00%	0.00%
	18	3,786	192,915	3,786	100.00%	1.96%
Ronda	45	417	198,833	417	100.00%	0.21%
Roper	1	611	196,665	611	100.00%	0.31%
Rose Hill	10	1,626	183,566	1,626	100.00%	0.89%
Roseboro	10	1,191	183,566	1,191	100.00%	0.65%
Rosman	48	576	184,866	576	100.00%	0.31%
Rowland	13	1,037	192,266	1,037	100.00%	0.54%
Roxboro	22	8,362	182,730	8,362	100.00%	4.58%
Roxobel	3	240	182,039	240	100.00%	0.13%
Rural Hall	31	2,937	197,532	2,937	100.00%	1.49%
Ruth	47	440	187,477	440	100.00%	0.23%
Rutherford College	46	1,341	191,738	1,341	100.00%	0.70%
Rutherfordton	47	4,213	187,477	4,213	100.00%	2.25%
Salemburg	10	435	183,566	435	100.00%	0.24%
Salisbury	33	33,662	199,013	33,662	100.00%	16.91%
Saluda (Henderson)	48	12	184,866	12	100.00%	0.01%
Saluda (Polk)	47	701	187,477	701	100.00%	0.37%
Sandy Creek	8	260	200,133	260	100.00%	0.13%
Sandyfield	13	447	192,266	447	100.00%	0.23%
Sanford	12	28,094	182,438	28,094	100.00%	15.40%
Saratoga	4	408	192,477	408	100.00%	0.21%
Sawmills	46	5,240	191,738	5,240	100.00%	2.73%
Scotland Neck	4	2,059	192,477	2,059	100.00%	1.07%
Seaboard	3	632	182,039	632	100.00%	0.35%
Seagrove	26	228	196,115	228	100.00%	0.12%
Sedalia	24	623	192,673	623	100.00%	0.32%
Selma	10	6,073	183,566	6,073	100.00%	3.31%
Seven Devils (Avery)	46	28	191,738	28	100.00%	0.01%
Seven Devils (Watauga)	45	164	198,833	164	100.00%	0.08%
Seven Springs	7	110	182,118	110	100.00%	0.06%

District plan definition file: 'S691-AMT-34-Districts19and21.asc', modified 08/24/2017 03:42:44 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

S691-AMT-34-Districts19and21 - Clark: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Severn	3	276	182,039	276	100.00%	0.15%
Shallotte	8	3,675	200,133	3,675	100.00%	1.84%
Sharpsburg (Edgecombe)	4	209	192,477	209	100.00%	0.11%
Sharpsburg (Nash)	11	1,252	193,194	1,252	100.00%	0.65%
Sharpsburg (Wilson)	4	563	192,477	563	100.00%	0.29%
Shelby	44	20,323	185,394	20,323	100.00%	10.96%
Siler City	23	7,887	197,306	7,887	100.00%	4.00%
Simpson	5	416	189,510	416	100.00%	0.22%
Sims	4	282	192,477	282	100.00%	0.15%
Smithfield	10	10,966	183,566	10,966	100.00%	5.97%
Snow Hill	5	1,595	189,510	1,595	100.00%	0.84%
Southern Pines	25	12,334	197,991	12,334	100.00%	6.23%
Southern Shores	1	2,714	196,665	2,714	100.00%	1.38%
Southport	8	2,833	200,133	2,833	100.00%	1.42%
Sparta	45	1,770	198,833	1,770	100.00%	0.89%
Speed	4	80	192,477	80	100.00%	0.04%
Spencer	33	3,267	199,013	3,267	100.00%	1.64%
Spencer Mountain	43	37	197,035	37	100.00%	0.02%
Spindale	47	4,321	187,477	4,321	100.00%	2.30%
Spring Hope	11	1,320	193,194	1,320	100.00%	0.68%
Spring Lake	19	11,964	182,067	11,964	100.00%	6.57%
	21	11,964	184,316	0	0.00%	0.00%
Spruce Pine	47	2,175	187,477	2,175	100.00%	1.16%
St. Helena	8	389	200,133	389	100.00%	0.19%
St. James	8	3,165	200,133	3,165	100.00%	1.58%
St. Pauls	13	2,035	192,266	2,035	100.00%	1.06%
Staley	26	393	196,115	393	100.00%	0.20%
Stallings (Mecklenburg)	39	399	184,099	399	100.00%	0.22%
Stallings (Union)	35	13,432	189,794	7,778	57.91%	4.10%
	36	13,432	189,509	5,654	42.09%	2.98%
Stanfield	33	1,486	199,013	1,486	100.00%	0.75%
Stanley	43	3,556	197,035	2,790	78.46%	1.42%
	44	3,556	185,394	766	21.54%	0.41%
Stantonsburg	4	784	192,477	784	100.00%	0.41%
Star	32	876	190,676	876	100.00%	0.46%
Statesville	34	24,532	197,843	24,532	100.00%	12.40%
Stedman	19	1,028	182,067	1,028	100.00%	0.56%
Stem	22	463	182,730	463	100.00%	0.25%
Stokesdale	27	5,047	195,363	5,047	100.00%	2.58%
Stoneville	30	1,056	198,458	1,056	100.00%	0.53%
Stonewall	2	281	183,118	281	100.00%	0.15%
Stovall	22	418	182,730	418	100.00%	0.23%
Sugar Mountain	46	198	191,738	198	100.00%	0.10%
Summerfield	27	10,232	195,363	10,232	100.00%	5.24%
Sunset Beach	8	3,572	200,133	3,572	100.00%	1.78%
Surf City (Onslow)	6	292	187,925	292	100.00%	0.16%
Surf City (Pender)	8	1,561	200,133	1,561	100.00%	0.78%

District plan definition file: 'S691-AMT-34-Districts19and21.asc', modified 08/24/2017 03:42:44 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

S691-AMT-34-Districts19and21 - Clark: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Swansboro	6	2,663	187,925	2,663	100.00%	1.42%
Swepsonville	24	1,154	192,673	1,154	100.00%	0.60%
Sylva	50	2,588	194,102	2,588	100.00%	1.33%
Tabor City	13	2,511	192,266	2,511	100.00%	1.31%
Tar Heel	8	117	200,133	117	100.00%	0.06%
Tarboro	4	11,415	192,477	11,415	100.00%	5.93%
Taylorsville	42	2,098	191,556	2,098	100.00%	1.10%
Taylortown	25	722	197,991	722	100.00%	0.36%
Teachey	10	376	183,566	376	100.00%	0.20%
Thomasville (Davidson)	32	26,493	190,676	26,493	100.00%	13.89%
Thomasville (Randolph)	26	264	196,115	264	100.00%	0.13%
Tobaccoville (Forsyth)	31	2,441	197,532	2,441	100.00%	1.24%
Tobaccoville (Stokes)	30	0	198,458	0	0.00%	0.00%
Topsail Beach	8	368	200,133	368	100.00%	0.18%
Trent Woods	2	4,155	183,118	4,155	100.00%	2.27%
Trenton	6	287	187,925	287	100.00%	0.15%
Trinity	26	6,614	196,115	6,614	100.00%	3.37%
Troutman	34	2,383	197,843	2,383	100.00%	1.20%
Troy	32	3,189	190,676	3,189	100.00%	1.67%
Tryon	47	1,646	187,477	1,646	100.00%	0.88%
Turkey	10	292	183,566	292	100.00%	0.16%
Unionville	35	5,929	189,794	5,843	98.55%	3.08%
	36	5,929	189,509	86	1.45%	0.05%
Valdese	46	4,490	191,738	4,490	100.00%	2.34%
Vanceboro	2	1,005	183,118	1,005	100.00%	0.55%
Vandemere	2	254	183,118	254	100.00%	0.14%
Varnamtown	8	541	200,133	541	100.00%	0.27%
Vass	25	720	197,991	720	100.00%	0.36%
Waco	44	321	185,394	321	100.00%	0.17%
Wade	19	556	182,067	556	100.00%	0.31%
Wadesboro	25	5,813	197,991	5,813	100.00%	2.94%
Wagram	25	840	197,991	840	100.00%	0.42%
Wake Forest (Franklin)	18	899	192,915	899	100.00%	0.47%
Wake Forest (Wake)	18	29,218	192,915	29,218	100.00%	15.15%
Walkertown	29	4,675	194,378	3,055	65.35%	1.57%
	31	4,675	197,532	1,620	34.65%	0.82%
Wallace (Duplin)	10	3,880	183,566	3,880	100.00%	2.11%
Wallace (Pender)	8	0	200,133	0	0.00%	0.00%
Wallburg	32	3,047	190,676	3,047	100.00%	1.60%
Walnut Cove	30	1,425	198,458	1,425	100.00%	0.72%
Walnut Creek	7	835	182,118	835	100.00%	0.46%
Walstonburg	5	219	189,510	219	100.00%	0.12%
Warrenton	3	862	182,039	862	100.00%	0.47%
Warsaw	10	3,054	183,566	3,054	100.00%	1.66%
Washington	3	9,744	182,039	9,744	100.00%	5.35%
Washington Park	3	451	182,039	451	100.00%	0.25%
Watha	8	190	200,133	190	100.00%	0.09%

District plan definition file: 'S691-AMT-34-Districts19and21.asc', modified 08/24/2017 03:42:44 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

S691-AMT-34-Districts19and21 - Clark: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Waxhaw	35	9,859	189,794	9,859	100.00%	5.19%
Waynesville	50	9,869	194,102	9,869	100.00%	5.08%
Weaverville	49	3,120	193,282	3,120	100.00%	1.61%
Webster	50	363	194,102	363	100.00%	0.19%
Weddington (Mecklenburg)	39	7	184,099	7	100.00%	0.00%
Weddington (Union)	35	9,452	189,794	9,452	100.00%	4.98%
Weldon	4	1,655	192,477	1,655	100.00%	0.86%
Wendell	14	5,845	195,280	5,845	100.00%	2.99%
Wentworth	30	2,807	198,458	2,807	100.00%	1.41%
Wesley Chapel	35	7,463	189,794	7,463	100.00%	3.93%
West Jefferson	45	1,299	198,833	1,299	100.00%	0.65%
Whispering Pines	25	2,928	197,991	2,928	100.00%	1.48%
Whitakers (Edgecombe)	4	402	192,477	402	100.00%	0.21%
Whitakers (Nash)	11	342	193,194	342	100.00%	0.18%
White Lake	8	802	200,133	802	100.00%	0.40%
Whiteville	13	5,394	192,266	5,394	100.00%	2.81%
Whitsett	24	590	192,673	590	100.00%	0.31%
Wilkesboro	45	3,413	198,833	3,413	100.00%	1.72%
Williamston	3	5,511	182,039	5,511	100.00%	3.03%
Wilmington	8	106,476	200,133	5,295	4.97%	2.65%
	9	106,476	197,372	101,181	95.03%	51.26%
Wilson	4	49,167	192,477	49,167	100.00%	25.54%
Wilson's Mills	10	2,277	183,566	2,277	100.00%	1.24%
	11	2,277	193,194	0	0.00%	0.00%
Windsor	3	3,630	182,039	3,630	100.00%	1.99%
Winfall	1	594	196,665	594	100.00%	0.30%
Wingate	35	3,491	189,794	3,491	100.00%	1.84%
Winston-Salem	29	229,617	194,378	183,735	80.02%	94.52%
	31	229,617	197,532	45,882	19.98%	23.23%
Winterville	5	9,269	189,510	9,269	100.00%	4.89%
Winton	1	769	196,665	769	100.00%	0.39%
Woodfin	49	6,123	193,282	6,123	100.00%	3.17%
Woodland	3	809	182,039	809	100.00%	0.44%
Wrightsville Beach	9	2,477	197,372	2,477	100.00%	1.25%
Yadkinville	34	2,959	197,843	2,959	100.00%	1.50%
Yanceyville	30	2,039	198,458	2,039	100.00%	1.03%
Youngsville	18	1,157	192,915	1,157	100.00%	0.60%
Zebulon (Johnston)	11	0	193,194	0	0.00%	0.00%
Zebulon (Wake)	14	4,433	195,280	4,052	91.41%	2.07%
	18	4,433	192,915	381	8.59%	0.20%
			Total:	**5,250,071**		

District plan definition file: 'S691-AMT-34-Districts19and21.asc', modified 08/24/2017 03:42:44 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

S691-AMT-34-Districts19and21 - Clark: Population Deviation

District	2010 Pop	Ideal Pop	Deviation	Deviation %
1	196,665	190,710	5,955	3.12%
2	183,118	190,710	-7,592	-3.98%
3	182,039	190,710	-8,671	-4.55%
4	192,477	190,710	1,767	0.93%
5	189,510	190,710	-1,200	-0.63%
6	187,925	190,710	-2,785	-1.46%
7	182,118	190,710	-8,592	-4.51%
8	200,133	190,710	9,423	4.94%
9	197,372	190,710	6,662	3.49%
10	183,566	190,710	-7,144	-3.75%
11	193,194	190,710	2,484	1.30%
12	182,438	190,710	-8,272	-4.34%
13	192,266	190,710	1,556	0.82%
14	195,280	190,710	4,570	2.40%
15	193,810	190,710	3,100	1.63%
16	197,303	190,710	6,593	3.46%
17	182,304	190,710	-8,406	-4.41%
18	192,915	190,710	2,205	1.16%
19	182,067	190,710	-8,643	-4.53%
20	184,237	190,710	-6,473	-3.39%
21	184,316	190,710	-6,394	-3.35%
22	182,730	190,710	-7,980	-4.18%
23	197,306	190,710	6,596	3.46%
24	192,673	190,710	1,963	1.03%
25	197,991	190,710	7,281	3.82%
26	196,115	190,710	5,405	2.83%
27	195,363	190,710	4,653	2.44%
28	197,138	190,710	6,428	3.37%
29	194,378	190,710	3,668	1.92%
30	198,458	190,710	7,748	4.06%
31	197,532	190,710	6,822	3.58%
32	190,676	190,710	-34	-0.02%
33	199,013	190,710	8,303	4.35%
34	197,843	190,710	7,133	3.74%
35	189,794	190,710	-916	-0.48%
36	189,509	190,710	-1,201	-0.63%
37	185,257	190,710	-5,453	-2.86%
38	182,674	190,710	-8,036	-4.21%
39	184,099	190,710	-6,611	-3.47%
40	183,426	190,710	-7,284	-3.82%
41	184,172	190,710	-6,538	-3.43%
42	191,556	190,710	846	0.44%
43	197,035	190,710	6,325	3.32%
44	185,394	190,710	-5,316	-2.79%
45	198,833	190,710	8,123	4.26%
46	191,738	190,710	1,028	0.54%
47	187,477	190,710	-3,233	-1.70%
48	184,866	190,710	-5,844	-3.06%
49	193,282	190,710	2,572	1.35%
50	194,102	190,710	3,392	1.78%
Total:	**9,535,483**			

S691-AMT-34-Districts19and21 - Clark: Population 2010, US Senate 2010, President 2012

	2010 Census		US Senate 2010: Marshall-Burr-Beitler								US President 2012: Obama-Romney-Johnson							
District	Total Pop	18+ Pop	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %
1	196,665	153,426	25,606	43.60%	31,904	54.33%	1,196	2.04%	19	0.03%	45,482	48.87%	46,490	49.95%	950	1.02%	150	0.16%
2	183,118	143,986	17,393	31.26%	37,109	66.70%	1,070	1.92%	63	0.11%	31,516	35.91%	55,323	63.03%	761	0.87%	168	0.19%
3	182,039	141,242	31,118	52.62%	27,064	45.76%	926	1.57%	30	0.05%	50,170	56.97%	37,383	42.45%	406	0.46%	104	0.12%
4	192,477	145,928	32,883	57.59%	23,457	41.08%	750	1.31%	10	0.02%	56,149	61.10%	35,208	38.32%	433	0.47%	100	0.11%
5	189,510	146,760	22,397	47.49%	24,190	51.29%	556	1.18%	20	0.04%	45,546	52.42%	40,573	46.70%	648	0.75%	117	0.13%
6	187,925	140,779	10,015	33.20%	19,362	64.19%	769	2.55%	16	0.05%	20,842	36.78%	35,080	61.91%	588	1.04%	155	0.27%
7	182,118	137,302	20,490	42.11%	27,572	56.66%	583	1.20%	14	0.03%	37,221	46.96%	41,578	52.46%	434	0.55%	22	0.03%
8	200,133	158,646	26,597	38.48%	41,161	59.54%	1,344	1.94%	25	0.04%	42,274	42.05%	57,243	56.94%	821	0.82%	202	0.20%
9	197,372	158,279	23,736	38.00%	37,303	59.72%	1,394	2.23%	32	0.05%	46,065	45.68%	53,212	52.77%	1,246	1.24%	312	0.31%
10	183,566	136,365	18,810	40.24%	27,283	58.36%	647	1.38%	10	0.02%	29,823	41.92%	40,745	57.27%	468	0.66%	107	0.15%
11	193,194	141,728	23,256	39.26%	34,955	59.02%	994	1.68%	24	0.04%	41,040	42.70%	54,070	56.26%	783	0.81%	221	0.23%
12	182,438	133,366	16,935	38.82%	25,854	59.27%	817	1.87%	16	0.04%	29,243	40.66%	41,830	58.16%	695	0.97%	157	0.22%
13	192,266	142,807	19,514	49.67%	19,146	48.73%	605	1.54%	25	0.06%	36,038	53.66%	30,451	45.34%	520	0.77%	156	0.23%
14	195,280	142,054	30,951	56.56%	22,580	41.26%	1,153	2.11%	36	0.07%	61,220	63.08%	34,617	35.67%	1,040	1.07%	176	0.18%
15	193,810	154,154	34,326	67.17%	15,735	30.79%	1,015	1.99%	25	0.05%	69,916	71.46%	26,343	26.92%	1,425	1.46%	160	0.16%
16	197,303	146,752	27,789	46.71%	29,992	50.41%	1,690	2.84%	24	0.04%	59,269	54.76%	47,171	43.58%	1,575	1.46%	225	0.21%
17	182,304	127,938	22,007	36.88%	36,146	60.58%	1,492	2.50%	20	0.03%	43,729	42.94%	56,687	55.66%	1,280	1.26%	153	0.15%
18	192,915	141,239	26,298	38.31%	40,810	59.45%	1,499	2.18%	41	0.06%	46,564	42.61%	61,381	56.17%	1,119	1.02%	212	0.19%
19	182,067	131,993	16,551	42.14%	22,006	56.03%	697	1.77%	19	0.05%	33,383	47.48%	36,221	51.51%	570	0.81%	142	0.20%
20	184,237	142,941	40,914	76.58%	11,670	21.84%	815	1.53%	26	0.05%	79,586	79.30%	19,709	19.64%	942	0.94%	125	0.12%
21	184,316	134,664	24,791	64.97%	12,787	33.51%	560	1.47%	21	0.06%	52,485	70.53%	21,264	28.58%	524	0.70%	141	0.19%
22	182,730	141,258	29,403	54.21%	23,800	43.88%	1,018	1.88%	15	0.03%	53,654	58.60%	36,961	40.37%	774	0.85%	168	0.18%
23	197,306	155,496	43,402	61.53%	25,502	36.15%	1,599	2.27%	35	0.05%	72,262	64.41%	38,204	34.05%	1,386	1.24%	339	0.30%
24	192,673	147,633	19,692	36.36%	33,126	61.16%	1,313	2.42%	29	0.05%	37,586	41.57%	51,828	57.32%	814	0.90%	187	0.21%
25	197,991	152,423	24,146	43.32%	30,550	54.81%	1,018	1.83%	23	0.04%	41,643	45.66%	48,824	53.53%	631	0.69%	110	0.12%
26	196,115	147,126	12,742	30.20%	28,243	66.95%	1,165	2.76%	36	0.09%	30,042	36.90%	50,505	62.03%	749	0.92%	124	0.15%
27	195,363	149,849	22,624	33.08%	44,339	64.82%	1,395	2.04%	43	0.06%	45,643	40.21%	66,503	58.59%	1,063	0.94%	289	0.25%
28	197,138	152,041	32,175	71.88%	11,898	26.58%	652	1.46%	37	0.08%	76,219	79.28%	19,017	19.78%	694	0.72%	214	0.22%
29	194,378	146,637	26,071	60.42%	16,353	37.90%	705	1.63%	18	0.04%	61,949	70.29%	25,484	28.92%	700	0.79%	0	0.00%
30	198,458	154,651	18,011	32.71%	35,585	64.63%	1,442	2.62%	24	0.04%	32,115	36.33%	55,203	62.45%	866	0.98%	208	0.24%
31	197,532	150,121	18,305	27.87%	46,061	70.13%	1,292	1.97%	21	0.03%	36,109	34.00%	68,971	64.95%	1,068	1.01%	49	0.05%
32	190,676	145,058	14,509	29.44%	33,627	68.24%	1,119	2.27%	20	0.04%	25,330	30.83%	55,787	67.90%	876	1.07%	173	0.21%
33	199,013	152,338	17,207	31.47%	36,147	66.12%	1,285	2.35%	32	0.06%	31,078	34.17%	58,644	64.47%	953	1.05%	284	0.31%
34	197,843	148,320	15,298	28.04%	37,834	69.35%	1,397	2.56%	26	0.05%	30,033	32.23%	61,877	66.41%	978	1.05%	290	0.31%
35	189,794	132,039	13,415	29.02%	31,743	68.68%	1,034	2.24%	30	0.06%	30,954	35.05%	56,278	63.72%	854	0.97%	228	0.26%
36	189,509	137,603	16,691	32.42%	33,671	65.41%	1,115	2.17%	0	0.00%	34,337	38.31%	54,340	60.63%	939	1.05%	14	0.02%
37	185,257	143,412	25,673	70.58%	9,978	27.43%	703	1.93%	20	0.05%	62,709	76.14%	18,651	22.65%	794	0.96%	207	0.25%
38	182,674	134,933	28,643	71.61%	10,769	26.93%	569	1.42%	15	0.04%	65,195	76.92%	18,683	22.04%	666	0.79%	214	0.25%
39	184,099	138,352	20,085	31.61%	42,253	66.50%	1,164	1.83%	32	0.05%	40,182	38.03%	64,289	60.85%	942	0.89%	235	0.22%
40	183,426	134,379	25,370	64.51%	13,288	33.79%	638	1.62%	30	0.08%	55,925	72.56%	20,350	26.40%	622	0.81%	178	0.23%
41	184,172	135,214	17,773	38.46%	27,479	59.46%	943	2.04%	18	0.04%	43,121	46.53%	48,482	52.31%	868	0.94%	205	0.22%
42	191,556	146,308	16,533	30.70%	35,956	66.76%	1,337	2.48%	33	0.06%	28,675	33.04%	56,787	65.43%	1,033	1.19%	293	0.34%
43	197,035	149,991	14,895	31.63%	31,082	66.01%	1,113	2.36%	0	0.00%	31,879	37.10%	53,179	61.89%	869	1.01%	0	0.00%
44	185,394	141,718	17,792	34.23%	33,049	63.59%	1,112	2.14%	22	0.04%	29,375	34.80%	54,018	63.99%	803	0.95%	224	0.27%
45	198,833	159,078	20,603	34.28%	37,811	62.92%	1,655	2.75%	29	0.05%	31,463	35.00%	56,629	63.00%	1,425	1.59%	366	0.41%
46	191,738	149,705	16,531	33.18%	31,940	64.11%	1,325	2.66%	23	0.05%	26,481	33.57%	51,262	64.98%	1,012	1.28%	132	0.17%
47	187,477	147,841	21,314	34.98%	38,045	62.44%	1,540	2.53%	33	0.05%	29,486	35.14%	53,113	63.30%	1,022	1.22%	282	0.34%
48	184,866	147,107	22,200	34.84%	39,941	62.68%	1,558	2.45%	21	0.03%	36,540	39.02%	55,677	59.45%	1,092	1.17%	344	0.37%
49	193,282	154,410	33,055	52.87%	27,761	44.40%	1,664	2.66%	44	0.07%	59,546	57.71%	41,650	40.36%	1,433	1.39%	560	0.54%
50	194,102	156,458	25,165	38.43%	38,165	58.28%	2,112	3.23%	38	0.06%	34,201	38.27%	53,578	59.95%	1,294	1.45%	297	0.33%
Totals:	**9,535,483**	**7,253,848**	**1,141,700**	**43.04%**	**1,454,082**	**54.82%**	**55,554**	**2.09%**	**1,263**	**0.05%**	**2,171,293**	**48.33%**	**2,267,353**	**50.47%**	**44,448**	**0.99%**	**9,519**	**0.21%**

Populations values derive from the 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File. Election results were provided by the NC State Board of Elections. Votes that could not be associated with a specific precinct were excluded. Reported statewide totals may therefore be marginally lower than official contest results.

S691-AMT-34-Districts19and21 - Clark: Governor 2012, Lieutenant Governor 2012, US Senate 2014

	Governor 2012: Dalton-McCrory-Howe								Lieutenant Governor 2012: Coleman-Forest				US Senate 2014: Tillis-Hagan-Haugh							
District	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %
1	44,567	48.84%	44,051	48.28%	2,609	2.86%	20	0.02%	48,060	53.59%	41,627	46.41%	30,750	50.80%	28,027	46.30%	1,702	2.81%	48	0.08%
2	28,530	32.65%	57,217	65.47%	1,615	1.85%	26	0.03%	32,786	38.21%	53,018	61.79%	36,899	60.46%	21,609	35.41%	2,340	3.83%	182	0.30%
3	48,711	55.68%	37,737	43.14%	1,024	1.17%	10	0.01%	52,590	61.35%	33,128	38.65%	24,793	41.50%	32,737	54.80%	2,084	3.49%	128	0.21%
4	54,777	59.84%	35,877	39.20%	869	0.95%	10	0.01%	57,424	63.60%	32,867	36.40%	22,999	38.20%	35,596	59.12%	1,565	2.60%	45	0.07%
5	42,553	49.27%	42,332	49.02%	1,463	1.69%	16	0.02%	46,467	54.65%	38,559	45.35%	24,088	47.07%	25,389	49.62%	1,612	3.15%	81	0.16%
6	18,744	33.55%	35,659	63.82%	1,459	2.61%	13	0.02%	22,010	40.37%	32,513	59.63%	21,858	61.65%	11,859	33.45%	1,681	4.74%	59	0.17%
7	35,570	45.13%	42,240	53.59%	988	1.25%	24	0.03%	38,551	49.66%	39,078	50.34%	26,667	51.80%	23,095	44.86%	1,663	3.23%	55	0.11%
8	37,873	38.02%	59,764	59.99%	1,972	1.98%	15	0.02%	44,067	45.14%	53,565	54.86%	37,130	53.02%	28,989	41.40%	3,786	5.41%	125	0.18%
9	39,195	39.52%	56,871	57.34%	3,086	3.11%	30	0.03%	45,150	46.86%	51,202	53.14%	31,405	48.37%	30,133	46.41%	3,278	5.05%	109	0.17%
10	28,848	40.68%	41,165	58.06%	879	1.24%	14	0.02%	31,760	45.62%	37,856	54.38%	25,555	55.54%	18,517	40.24%	1,855	4.03%	85	0.18%
11	38,275	39.95%	55,989	58.43%	1,536	1.60%	16	0.02%	42,124	44.69%	52,143	55.31%	35,971	54.98%	27,183	41.55%	2,180	3.33%	88	0.13%
12	27,109	37.87%	43,004	60.08%	1,437	2.01%	32	0.04%	30,845	43.91%	39,400	56.09%	25,363	55.53%	18,263	39.99%	1,965	4.30%	81	0.18%
13	37,211	56.10%	27,970	42.17%	1,133	1.71%	20	0.03%	41,068	63.31%	23,805	36.69%	17,801	44.87%	19,985	50.38%	1,822	4.59%	64	0.16%
14	55,308	57.28%	38,781	40.16%	2,446	2.53%	24	0.02%	60,507	63.68%	34,516	36.32%	21,533	34.39%	39,179	62.57%	1,804	2.88%	96	0.15%
15	63,431	65.44%	30,467	31.43%	3,010	3.11%	18	0.02%	68,853	72.50%	26,114	27.50%	14,980	24.46%	44,292	72.33%	1,847	3.02%	114	0.19%
16	50,214	46.93%	53,318	49.83%	3,431	3.21%	29	0.03%	56,759	54.38%	47,610	45.62%	29,618	41.04%	40,216	55.72%	2,223	3.08%	119	0.16%
17	36,898	36.47%	61,457	60.74%	2,795	2.76%	27	0.03%	42,704	43.23%	56,086	56.77%	37,808	53.25%	30,870	43.48%	2,175	3.06%	151	0.21%
18	40,253	37.06%	65,931	60.70%	2,390	2.20%	41	0.04%	45,684	42.88%	60,851	57.12%	42,062	53.07%	34,607	43.66%	2,464	3.11%	130	0.16%
19	30,963	44.61%	36,944	53.23%	1,479	2.13%	15	0.02%	34,446	50.59%	33,642	49.41%	22,411	51.75%	19,246	44.44%	1,595	3.68%	58	0.13%
20	73,527	74.12%	23,053	23.24%	2,558	2.58%	56	0.06%	77,591	79.52%	19,983	20.48%	10,716	17.15%	50,551	80.89%	1,148	1.84%	81	0.13%
21	49,230	67.25%	22,322	30.49%	1,629	2.23%	23	0.03%	52,102	72.03%	20,227	27.97%	12,414	29.17%	28,851	67.79%	1,235	2.90%	58	0.14%
22	49,395	54.52%	39,138	43.20%	2,049	2.26%	25	0.03%	53,909	60.96%	34,519	39.04%	23,144	38.59%	34,913	58.22%	1,839	3.07%	73	0.12%
23	65,604	59.22%	42,009	37.92%	3,103	2.80%	63	0.06%	70,358	64.96%	37,947	35.04%	24,700	30.65%	53,699	66.63%	2,120	2.63%	72	0.09%
24	33,361	37.22%	54,353	60.64%	1,899	2.12%	25	0.03%	37,312	42.46%	50,562	57.54%	33,277	55.76%	24,156	40.47%	2,156	3.61%	94	0.16%
25	38,495	42.60%	50,372	55.74%	1,458	1.61%	44	0.05%	43,394	49.27%	44,680	50.73%	32,665	52.10%	27,623	44.06%	2,319	3.70%	87	0.14%
26	27,007	33.28%	52,574	64.79%	1,553	1.91%	14	0.02%	30,150	37.93%	49,336	62.07%	30,068	62.15%	16,341	33.77%	1,894	3.91%	80	0.17%
27	38,429	34.12%	71,796	63.74%	2,379	2.11%	31	0.03%	44,058	40.13%	65,723	59.87%	45,334	55.88%	33,720	41.56%	1,979	2.44%	101	0.12%
28	70,102	73.90%	22,507	23.73%	2,210	2.33%	37	0.04%	74,547	79.67%	19,022	20.33%	11,198	20.24%	42,845	77.44%	1,216	2.20%	70	0.13%
29	56,426	64.53%	29,125	33.31%	1,865	2.13%	23	0.03%	60,504	70.43%	25,402	29.57%	14,750	28.49%	35,624	68.81%	1,315	2.54%	85	0.16%
30	29,519	33.57%	56,635	64.40%	1,761	2.00%	21	0.02%	34,035	39.65%	51,802	60.35%	34,563	59.33%	20,515	35.22%	3,032	5.20%	144	0.25%
31	30,238	28.46%	73,840	69.50%	2,146	2.02%	27	0.03%	35,556	34.29%	68,123	65.71%	44,330	62.51%	24,129	34.02%	2,308	3.25%	149	0.21%
32	22,078	26.93%	58,230	71.04%	1,648	2.01%	14	0.02%	26,730	33.30%	53,543	66.70%	33,575	65.72%	15,182	29.72%	2,234	4.37%	98	0.19%
33	24,785	27.34%	64,437	71.09%	1,406	1.55%	17	0.02%	31,147	35.25%	57,223	64.75%	35,720	61.30%	18,960	32.54%	3,436	5.90%	156	0.27%
34	23,382	25.22%	67,657	72.97%	1,652	1.78%	30	0.03%	29,848	33.11%	60,303	66.89%	39,563	64.03%	18,656	30.19%	3,385	5.48%	187	0.30%
35	23,416	26.70%	62,790	71.60%	1,463	1.67%	22	0.03%	29,912	35.04%	55,458	64.96%	34,426	63.13%	18,044	33.09%	1,864	3.42%	196	0.36%
36	25,791	28.80%	62,144	69.39%	1,621	1.81%	2	0.00%	34,159	39.33%	52,691	60.67%	32,506	57.95%	21,038	37.51%	2,379	4.24%	167	0.30%
37	51,818	64.06%	27,303	33.76%	1,742	2.15%	22	0.03%	59,561	75.67%	19,152	24.33%	9,453	21.56%	33,142	75.58%	1,198	2.73%	58	0.13%
38	56,519	67.34%	25,968	30.94%	1,406	1.68%	34	0.04%	63,329	76.88%	19,045	23.12%	9,325	20.38%	35,376	77.33%	988	2.16%	58	0.13%
39	25,507	24.25%	78,167	74.31%	1,487	1.41%	25	0.02%	36,685	36.04%	65,104	63.96%	38,383	57.57%	26,513	39.77%	1,665	2.50%	111	0.17%
40	47,247	61.83%	27,759	36.32%	1,390	1.82%	23	0.03%	54,059	72.25%	20,761	27.75%	11,035	25.82%	30,532	71.45%	1,089	2.55%	74	0.17%
41	31,204	33.96%	59,005	64.21%	1,665	1.81%	15	0.02%	40,500	45.39%	48,721	54.61%	27,089	49.95%	25,308	46.66%	1,685	3.11%	153	0.28%
42	22,115	25.57%	62,937	72.78%	1,402	1.62%	19	0.02%	28,289	33.50%	56,166	66.50%	35,350	63.19%	17,371	31.05%	3,046	5.44%	176	0.31%
43	25,879	30.15%	58,602	68.27%	1,337	1.56%	18	0.02%	31,620	37.82%	51,992	62.18%	31,406	60.24%	18,283	35.07%	2,321	4.45%	123	0.24%
44	25,417	30.23%	57,452	68.34%	1,189	1.41%	15	0.02%	29,967	36.62%	51,872	63.38%	33,139	60.95%	18,439	33.91%	2,656	4.88%	138	0.25%
45	27,277	30.55%	59,444	66.57%	2,558	2.86%	22	0.02%	32,247	37.36%	54,077	62.64%	35,618	59.70%	20,428	34.24%	3,477	5.83%	137	0.23%
46	20,724	26.21%	56,753	71.77%	1,579	2.00%	18	0.02%	27,156	35.42%	49,516	64.58%	31,230	61.54%	16,228	31.98%	3,151	6.21%	136	0.27%
47	31,588	37.71%	50,318	60.07%	1,840	2.20%	17	0.02%	31,802	39.23%	49,272	60.77%	34,520	58.39%	21,336	36.09%	3,184	5.39%	80	0.14%
48	32,660	35.31%	57,355	62.00%	2,456	2.66%	30	0.03%	36,359	40.13%	54,243	59.87%	36,913	55.81%	26,545	40.13%	2,601	3.93%	87	0.13%
49	54,517	53.45%	43,870	43.01%	3,574	3.50%	32	0.03%	58,927	58.95%	41,030	41.05%	25,653	36.55%	41,569	59.23%	2,875	4.10%	89	0.13%
50	32,983	37.31%	52,535	59.42%	2,866	3.24%	27	0.03%	36,353	42.19%	49,816	57.81%	35,080	55.57%	24,594	38.96%	3,343	5.30%	115	0.18%
Totals:	**1,925,270**	**43.18%**	**2,437,224**	**54.67%**	**94,512**	**2.12%**	**1,191**	**0.03%**	**2,174,021**	**49.88%**	**2,184,891**	**50.12%**	**1,416,834**	**48.84%**	**1,370,303**	**47.23%**	**108,779**	**3.75%**	**5,251**	**0.18%**

S691-AMT-34-Districts19and21 - Clark: President 2016, US Senate 2016, Governor 2016

	US President 2016: Trump-Clinton-Johnson								US Senate 2016: Burr-Ross-Haugh						Governor 2016: Cooper-McCrory-Cecil					
District	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %
1	51,124	54.37%	39,690	42.21%	2,437	2.59%	781	0.83%	50,422	54.75%	39,232	42.60%	2,441	2.65%	40,704	43.98%	50,100	54.13%	1,749	1.89%
2	58,542	63.89%	30,012	32.76%	2,242	2.45%	829	0.90%	58,109	64.13%	28,994	32.00%	3,512	3.88%	30,960	34.02%	58,265	64.02%	1,788	1.96%
3	37,998	44.82%	45,070	53.16%	1,193	1.41%	523	0.62%	37,690	45.00%	44,065	52.61%	2,002	2.39%	44,887	53.29%	38,505	45.71%	842	1.00%
4	34,714	39.56%	51,323	58.49%	1,231	1.40%	485	0.55%	34,873	40.05%	50,550	58.06%	1,648	1.89%	52,322	59.88%	34,269	39.22%	793	0.91%
5	40,021	45.23%	45,333	51.24%	2,245	2.54%	881	1.00%	41,386	47.29%	43,487	49.70%	2,634	3.01%	45,427	51.71%	41,041	46.71%	1,389	1.58%
6	40,099	64.39%	19,577	31.44%	1,985	3.19%	610	0.98%	39,097	63.90%	19,028	31.10%	3,064	5.01%	20,040	32.62%	39,685	64.59%	1,718	2.80%
7	41,031	53.33%	33,966	44.15%	1,362	1.77%	579	0.75%	40,925	53.84%	33,171	43.64%	1,921	2.53%	33,894	44.35%	41,571	54.40%	958	1.25%
8	69,138	60.31%	41,895	36.54%	2,660	2.32%	948	0.83%	67,784	60.07%	40,579	35.96%	4,470	3.96%	44,922	39.64%	65,885	58.14%	2,506	2.21%
9	55,097	50.39%	48,749	44.58%	3,901	3.57%	1,602	1.47%	55,887	51.89%	46,846	43.49%	4,974	4.62%	54,155	50.05%	50,866	47.01%	3,173	2.93%
10	43,565	59.90%	27,558	37.89%	1,169	1.61%	439	0.60%	43,032	59.87%	27,012	37.58%	1,835	2.55%	28,135	38.91%	43,298	59.88%	879	1.22%
11	57,543	55.97%	41,835	40.69%	2,470	2.40%	968	0.94%	57,652	56.39%	41,591	40.68%	2,987	2.92%	45,263	44.10%	55,757	54.33%	1,612	1.57%
12	44,964	59.19%	28,240	37.18%	2,047	2.69%	709	0.93%	44,404	58.94%	28,264	37.51%	2,673	3.55%	30,211	39.98%	43,695	57.83%	1,656	2.19%
13	34,909	54.33%	27,879	43.39%	1,101	1.71%	361	0.56%	33,313	53.25%	27,703	44.28%	1,548	2.47%	27,663	43.72%	34,916	55.19%	690	1.09%
14	32,006	31.57%	64,548	63.67%	3,213	3.17%	1,606	1.58%	34,484	34.21%	63,184	62.68%	3,139	3.11%	66,497	65.73%	32,566	32.19%	2,097	2.07%
15	22,704	22.56%	72,800	72.34%	3,476	3.45%	1,649	1.64%	26,112	26.12%	70,814	70.84%	3,042	3.04%	74,761	74.54%	23,285	23.22%	2,249	2.24%
16	40,924	34.26%	71,524	59.88%	4,721	3.95%	2,268	1.90%	47,090	39.70%	67,617	57.00%	3,913	3.30%	74,271	62.34%	41,984	35.24%	2,880	2.42%
17	56,562	48.80%	52,520	45.32%	4,792	4.13%	2,020	1.74%	61,244	53.15%	50,014	43.40%	3,971	3.45%	56,237	48.60%	56,738	49.03%	2,745	2.37%
18	60,254	49.94%	54,218	44.93%	4,035	3.34%	2,152	1.78%	65,138	54.20%	51,537	42.88%	3,507	2.92%	57,638	47.79%	60,683	50.32%	2,283	1.89%
19	37,569	51.71%	32,312	44.48%	2,044	2.81%	723	1.00%	37,683	52.49%	31,575	43.98%	2,528	3.52%	32,430	45.06%	37,879	52.63%	1,660	2.31%
20	15,723	14.64%	87,146	81.16%	2,761	2.57%	1,745	1.63%	19,607	18.37%	84,748	79.40%	2,382	2.23%	87,566	81.92%	17,525	16.39%	1,802	1.69%
21	21,456	29.36%	49,019	67.07%	1,906	2.61%	707	0.97%	21,888	30.37%	47,719	66.21%	2,461	3.41%	47,707	66.14%	22,682	31.45%	1,739	2.41%
22	37,322	39.28%	54,243	57.08%	2,241	2.36%	1,220	1.28%	38,620	40.93%	53,100	56.28%	2,628	2.79%	55,918	59.07%	37,192	39.29%	1,560	1.65%
23	35,663	29.19%	80,987	66.28%	3,534	2.89%	2,005	1.64%	39,933	32.86%	78,407	64.52%	3,177	2.61%	83,440	68.47%	36,205	29.71%	2,211	1.81%
24	53,036	55.49%	39,216	41.03%	2,381	2.49%	945	0.99%	53,644	56.54%	38,083	40.14%	3,145	3.31%	42,372	44.53%	50,986	53.58%	1,795	1.89%
25	51,626	55.82%	38,014	41.10%	2,073	2.24%	779	0.84%	50,943	55.86%	37,449	41.07%	2,798	3.07%	39,947	43.57%	50,130	54.68%	1,603	1.75%
26	54,446	64.64%	27,269	32.37%	1,788	2.12%	729	0.87%	53,193	63.86%	26,713	32.07%	3,384	4.06%	30,384	36.36%	51,246	61.33%	1,928	2.31%
27	60,891	51.72%	51,460	43.71%	3,690	3.13%	1,695	1.44%	64,651	55.25%	48,752	41.66%	3,607	3.08%	56,361	48.05%	58,431	49.81%	2,511	2.14%
28	17,691	18.66%	73,851	77.88%	2,070	2.18%	1,220	1.29%	19,041	20.34%	71,990	76.89%	2,600	2.78%	74,483	79.38%	17,465	18.61%	1,885	2.01%
29	24,035	26.97%	61,506	69.02%	2,410	2.70%	1,161	1.30%	26,595	30.11%	59,121	66.94%	2,601	2.95%	62,623	70.89%	23,752	26.89%	1,959	2.22%
30	60,630	66.76%	27,458	30.23%	1,981	2.18%	748	0.82%	59,336	65.92%	27,371	30.41%	3,299	3.67%	32,270	35.77%	56,074	62.16%	1,869	2.07%
31	67,558	60.88%	38,216	34.44%	3,596	3.24%	1,599	1.44%	70,992	64.24%	35,655	32.26%	3,871	3.50%	43,491	39.30%	64,639	58.41%	2,539	2.29%
32	61,447	71.12%	22,259	25.76%	2,062	2.39%	628	0.73%	60,373	70.54%	21,959	25.66%	3,259	3.81%	26,603	30.94%	57,516	66.90%	1,851	2.15%
33	64,774	68.70%	26,494	28.10%	2,181	2.31%	837	0.89%	62,061	66.50%	26,482	28.38%	4,782	5.12%	29,794	31.73%	61,866	65.89%	2,231	2.38%
34	68,634	68.50%	27,894	27.84%	2,583	2.58%	1,080	1.08%	66,829	67.44%	27,349	27.60%	4,916	4.96%	32,618	32.78%	64,115	64.43%	2,775	2.79%
35	61,627	62.37%	32,773	33.17%	3,156	3.19%	1,249	1.26%	62,768	64.34%	30,646	31.41%	4,148	4.25%	34,249	34.89%	61,659	62.80%	2,268	2.31%
36	58,898	58.78%	37,086	37.01%	2,957	2.95%	1,253	1.25%	58,847	59.32%	35,738	36.02%	4,620	4.66%	39,591	39.69%	57,611	57.75%	2,561	2.57%
37	17,060	19.75%	64,797	75.01%	3,224	3.73%	1,303	1.51%	20,986	24.67%	60,840	71.53%	3,229	3.80%	65,025	76.04%	18,122	21.19%	2,365	2.77%
38	17,399	20.08%	66,052	76.22%	2,040	2.35%	1,171	1.35%	18,697	21.82%	64,114	74.82%	2,877	3.36%	65,258	75.88%	18,759	21.81%	1,986	2.31%
39	53,290	48.86%	49,607	45.48%	4,029	3.69%	2,147	1.97%	60,928	56.18%	43,928	40.51%	3,591	3.31%	50,569	46.40%	56,080	51.46%	2,335	2.14%
40	18,662	24.20%	55,240	71.64%	2,109	2.74%	1,100	1.43%	20,031	26.30%	53,262	69.92%	2,880	3.78%	54,730	71.54%	19,904	26.02%	1,868	2.44%
41	47,467	45.06%	52,383	49.73%	3,968	3.77%	1,525	1.45%	50,899	48.91%	48,756	46.85%	4,413	4.24%	55,322	52.95%	45,891	43.92%	3,263	3.12%
42	62,200	68.66%	24,968	27.56%	2,410	2.66%	1,012	1.12%	60,484	67.58%	24,627	27.52%	4,390	4.90%	28,398	31.52%	59,501	66.04%	2,202	2.44%
43	58,532	63.77%	29,967	32.65%	2,319	2.53%	961	1.05%	57,121	63.01%	29,387	32.41%	4,151	4.58%	32,375	35.49%	56,833	62.29%	2,025	2.22%
44	60,549	67.77%	26,071	29.18%	1,947	2.18%	779	0.87%	58,536	66.29%	26,018	29.46%	3,755	4.25%	28,778	32.38%	58,278	65.57%	1,820	2.05%
45	63,539	65.43%	29,273	30.14%	2,850	2.93%	1,454	1.50%	62,607	65.23%	29,246	30.47%	4,123	4.30%	34,731	35.93%	59,576	61.64%	2,343	2.42%
46	59,157	70.85%	21,367	25.59%	2,003	2.40%	965	1.16%	56,771	68.88%	21,718	26.35%	3,937	4.78%	25,410	30.59%	55,667	67.01%	1,991	2.40%
47	62,657	69.28%	24,632	27.24%	2,027	2.24%	1,125	1.24%	58,592	65.91%	26,662	29.99%	3,648	4.10%	30,561	34.14%	56,662	63.29%	2,298	2.57%
48	59,387	57.55%	38,942	37.74%	3,068	2.97%	1,791	1.74%	59,206	58.02%	38,853	38.08%	3,980	3.90%	43,781	42.79%	55,594	54.34%	2,935	2.87%
49	42,657	38.15%	62,892	56.25%	3,333	2.98%	2,919	2.61%	42,590	38.49%	63,580	57.46%	4,477	4.05%	68,148	61.36%	39,430	35.50%	3,485	3.14%
50	62,972	64.60%	30,185	30.97%	2,908	2.98%	1,412	1.45%	59,345	61.97%	32,160	33.59%	4,252	4.44%	37,461	38.95%	55,660	57.87%	3,059	3.18%
Totals:	**2,359,749**	**49.90%**	**2,180,316**	**46.10%**	**129,929**	**2.75%**	**59,397**	**1.26%**	**2,392,439**	**51.13%**	**2,119,696**	**45.30%**	**167,190**	**3.57%**	**2,300,381**	**48.95%**	**2,296,039**	**48.86%**	**102,729**	**2.19%**

S691-AMT-34-Districts19and21 - Clark: Lieutenant Governor 2016, Attorney General 2016

	Lieutenant Governor 2016: Forest-Coleman-Cole						Attorney General 2016: Stein-Newton			
District	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %
1	48,887	53.74%	39,694	43.63%	2,389	2.63%	41,583	46.48%	47,878	53.52%
2	57,464	64.37%	29,461	33.00%	2,347	2.63%	31,586	35.67%	56,959	64.33%
3	36,795	44.57%	44,483	53.88%	1,277	1.55%	46,645	56.99%	35,203	43.01%
4	34,410	39.91%	50,529	58.61%	1,273	1.48%	52,643	61.20%	33,369	38.80%
5	40,621	47.11%	43,512	50.47%	2,085	2.42%	46,133	53.94%	39,399	46.06%
6	38,286	63.97%	19,181	32.05%	2,380	3.98%	21,095	35.69%	38,018	64.31%
7	40,568	54.08%	33,075	44.09%	1,368	1.82%	35,414	47.66%	38,891	52.34%
8	67,778	61.04%	40,423	36.40%	2,836	2.55%	46,574	42.31%	63,502	57.69%
9	55,658	52.85%	45,433	43.14%	4,230	4.02%	52,224	50.00%	52,214	50.00%
10	42,788	60.42%	26,733	37.75%	1,292	1.82%	29,456	42.04%	40,606	57.96%
11	58,079	57.42%	40,863	40.40%	2,206	2.18%	44,650	44.36%	55,998	55.64%
12	44,688	59.95%	27,889	37.41%	1,970	2.64%	31,338	42.46%	42,472	57.54%
13	31,027	50.72%	28,932	47.29%	1,215	1.99%	31,776	52.53%	28,714	47.47%
14	34,714	34.82%	62,062	62.25%	2,922	2.93%	66,249	67.14%	32,429	32.86%
15	25,955	26.37%	69,065	70.16%	3,414	3.47%	73,788	75.54%	23,888	24.46%
16	46,657	40.05%	65,661	56.36%	4,187	3.59%	72,088	62.40%	43,435	37.60%
17	61,118	53.95%	48,551	42.86%	3,610	3.19%	54,056	48.17%	58,173	51.83%
18	65,737	55.37%	50,017	42.13%	2,978	2.51%	56,598	48.17%	60,903	51.83%
19	36,907	52.31%	31,248	44.29%	2,396	3.40%	34,037	48.49%	36,152	51.51%
20	19,185	18.22%	83,359	79.15%	2,779	2.64%	86,851	82.88%	17,944	17.12%
21	21,160	29.80%	47,450	66.83%	2,392	3.37%	49,389	70.04%	21,127	29.96%
22	38,606	41.51%	52,229	56.16%	2,172	2.34%	56,476	61.26%	35,710	38.74%
23	39,577	33.12%	76,646	64.14%	3,271	2.74%	81,625	68.71%	37,164	31.29%
24	53,605	57.24%	37,361	39.90%	2,682	2.86%	41,879	45.02%	51,134	54.98%
25	50,305	56.16%	37,163	41.49%	2,105	2.35%	40,658	45.81%	48,086	54.19%
26	53,344	64.97%	26,615	32.42%	2,143	2.61%	29,789	36.51%	51,795	63.49%
27	63,938	55.63%	47,827	41.61%	3,173	2.76%	53,395	46.69%	60,970	53.31%
28	18,391	19.91%	71,106	76.98%	2,870	3.11%	73,859	80.42%	17,984	19.58%
29	25,455	29.35%	58,737	67.72%	2,546	2.94%	62,056	71.84%	24,322	28.16%
30	58,294	65.99%	27,915	31.60%	2,133	2.41%	31,805	36.19%	56,074	63.81%
31	70,063	64.57%	35,450	32.67%	3,001	2.77%	41,687	38.62%	66,260	61.38%
32	60,028	71.22%	22,140	26.27%	2,123	2.52%	25,906	30.85%	58,069	69.15%
33	63,686	69.23%	25,779	28.02%	2,523	2.74%	31,643	34.65%	59,668	65.35%
34	68,327	70.14%	26,276	26.97%	2,819	2.89%	31,963	33.10%	64,604	66.90%
35	64,009	66.65%	29,246	30.45%	2,778	2.89%	34,286	36.04%	60,858	63.96%
36	60,075	61.47%	34,586	35.39%	3,075	3.15%	39,935	41.23%	56,928	58.77%
37	20,798	24.91%	59,245	70.95%	3,458	4.14%	63,054	75.94%	19,972	24.06%
38	18,972	22.41%	63,018	74.44%	2,671	3.15%	66,011	78.42%	18,160	21.58%
39	61,873	58.01%	41,777	39.17%	3,014	2.83%	48,508	45.88%	57,227	54.12%
40	20,511	27.27%	52,044	69.20%	2,649	3.52%	55,415	74.24%	19,225	25.76%
41	51,912	50.76%	46,633	45.60%	3,727	3.64%	52,559	51.84%	48,820	48.16%
42	62,124	70.39%	23,616	26.76%	2,521	2.86%	29,767	33.94%	57,931	66.06%
43	59,203	66.00%	28,144	31.38%	2,351	2.62%	33,269	37.48%	55,502	62.52%
44	60,310	69.07%	24,946	28.57%	2,066	2.37%	30,418	35.20%	56,007	64.80%
45	61,715	65.78%	29,124	31.04%	2,988	3.18%	34,295	36.91%	58,628	63.09%
46	58,375	71.73%	21,046	25.86%	1,958	2.41%	26,887	33.35%	53,722	66.65%
47	58,679	67.02%	26,179	29.90%	2,697	3.08%	29,406	33.95%	57,204	66.05%
48	59,503	59.12%	37,910	37.67%	3,237	3.22%	41,434	41.50%	58,406	58.50%
49	41,430	38.08%	62,703	57.63%	4,673	4.29%	67,209	62.26%	40,747	37.74%
50	59,029	62.59%	31,893	33.82%	3,390	3.59%	35,488	38.03%	57,825	61.97%
Totals:	**2,390,619**	**51.88%**	**2,084,975**	**45.25%**	**132,360**	**2.87%**	**2,294,855**	**50.20%**	**2,276,276**	**49.80%**

EX. 30

NORTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY
AMENDMENT
Senate Bill 691

AMENDMENT NO. _____
(to be filled in by
Principal Clerk)

S691-AMT-30 [v.3]

Amends Title [NO]
S691-PCS45492-ST-39

Date _____,2017

Senator Blue

moves to amend the PCS on page 3, lines 27 through 51, by rewriting the lines to read:

"**District 14**: Wake County: VTD 01-19, VTD 01-22, VTD 01-38, VTD 01-40, VTD 01-43, VTD 01-44, VTD 01-46, VTD 01-51, VTD 09-02, VTD 10-01, VTD 10-02, VTD 10-03, VTD 10-04, VTD 13-01, VTD 13-02, VTD 13-05, VTD 13-06, VTD 13-07, VTD 13-08, VTD 13-09, VTD 13-10, VTD 16-08, VTD 17-01, VTD 17-02, VTD 17-03, VTD 17-04, VTD 17-05, VTD 17-06, VTD 17-07, VTD 17-08, VTD 17-09, VTD 17-10, VTD 17-11, VTD 19-16, VTD 19-17.

District 15: Wake County: VTD 01-01, VTD 01-02, VTD 01-04, VTD 01-05, VTD 01-06, VTD 01-07, VTD 01-09, VTD 01-10, VTD 01-12, VTD 01-13, VTD 01-14, VTD 01-15, VTD 01-16, VTD 01-18, VTD 01-20, VTD 01-21, VTD 01-23, VTD 01-25, VTD 01-26, VTD 01-27, VTD 01-28, VTD 01-31, VTD 01-32, VTD 01-33, VTD 01-34, VTD 01-35, VTD 01-37, VTD 01-39, VTD 01-41, VTD 01-45, VTD 01-48, VTD 01-49, VTD 01-50, VTD 04-03, VTD 04-06, VTD 04-12, VTD 07-04, VTD 07-05, VTD 07-13, VTD 16-02, VTD 16-03, VTD 16-04, VTD 16-05, VTD 16-06, VTD 16-07, VTD 16-09: Block(s) 1830528082000, 1830528082001, 1830528082002, 1830528082017, 1830528082018, 1830528082019, 1830528082020, 1830528082021, 1830528082022, 1830528082023, 1830528082024, 1830528082025, 1830528082026, 1830528082027, 1830528082028, 1830528082029, 1830528082031, 1830528082032, 1830528082033, 1830528082034, 1830528082035, 1830528082036, 1830528082037, 1830528082038, 1830528082039, 1830528082040, 1830528082041, 1830528082042, 1830528082043, 1830528082044, 1830528082045, 1830528082046, 1830528082047, 1830528082048, 1830528082049, 1830528082050, 1830528082051, 1830528082052, 1830528082053, 1830528082054, 1830528082055, 1830528082056, 1830528082057, 1830528082058, 1830528084026, 1830528084027, 1830528084028, 1830528084029, 1830528084030, 1830528084031, 1830528084032, 1830528084033, 1830528084034, 1830528084035, 1830528084037, 1830528084038, 1830528084039, 1830528084040, 1830528084051, 1830528084052, 1830528084053; VTD 18-01, VTD 18-06, VTD 18-08.".

NORTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY
AMENDMENT
Senate Bill 691

AMENDMENT NO. _____
(to be filled in by
Principal Clerk)

S691-AMT-30 [v.3]

SIGNED _____
Amendment Sponsor

SIGNED _____
Committee Chair if Senate Committee Amendment

ADOPTED _____ FAILED _____ TABLED _____

S691-AMT-30-Districts14 and 15



N
W E
S

S691-AMT-30-Districts14and15

0 4 8 16 24 32 Miles

Printed by the NC General Assembly, August 23, 2017.

Plan Name: SMT-1
Plan Type:
Date: 08/23/2017
Time: 08:42:45PM
Administrator:

Measures of Compactness

08/23/2017

Sum	N/A	N/A
Min	0.19	0.13
Max	0.62	0.61
Mean	0.42	0.34
Std. Dev.	0.10	0.12

DISTRICT	Reock	Polsby-Popper
1	0.46	0.46
2	0.48	0.42
3	0.23	0.15
4	0.45	0.31
5	0.62	0.44
6	0.52	0.55
7	0.46	0.35
8	0.41	0.18
9	0.24	0.27
10	0.48	0.29
11	0.22	0.24
12	0.46	0.40
13	0.41	0.33
14	0.45	0.29
15	0.34	0.13
16	0.50	0.48
17	0.39	0.34
18	0.41	0.28
19	0.46	0.23
20	0.44	0.49
21	0.47	0.28
22	0.58	0.54
23	0.39	0.37
24	0.58	0.61
25	0.46	0.28
26	0.56	0.55
27	0.43	0.15
28	0.40	0.17
29	0.58	0.23
30	0.27	0.40
31	0.32	0.14
32	0.27	0.27
33	0.32	0.30
34	0.33	0.34
35	0.49	0.56
36	0.44	0.39
37	0.42	0.27
38	0.42	0.42
39	0.33	0.24
40	0.47	0.36

Plan Name:	SMT-1	Administrator:	
Plan Type:		User:	

DISTRICT	Reock	Polsby-Popper
41	0.19	0.13
42	0.45	0.48
43	0.43	0.50
44	0.38	0.32
45	0.44	0.41
46	0.54	0.45
47	0.42	0.24
48	0.40	0.32
49	0.39	0.30
50	0.42	0.46

S691-AMT-30-Districts14and15: Population Deviation

District	2010 Pop	Ideal Pop	Deviation	Deviation %
1	196,665	190,710	5,955	3.12%
2	183,118	190,710	-7,592	-3.98%
3	182,039	190,710	-8,671	-4.55%
4	192,477	190,710	1,767	0.93%
5	189,510	190,710	-1,200	-0.63%
6	187,925	190,710	-2,785	-1.46%
7	182,118	190,710	-8,592	-4.51%
8	200,133	190,710	9,423	4.94%
9	197,372	190,710	6,662	3.49%
10	183,566	190,710	-7,144	-3.75%
11	193,194	190,710	2,484	1.30%
12	182,438	190,710	-8,272	-4.34%
13	192,266	190,710	1,556	0.82%
14	195,478	190,710	4,768	2.50%
15	193,612	190,710	2,902	1.52%
16	197,303	190,710	6,593	3.46%
17	182,304	190,710	-8,406	-4.41%
18	192,915	190,710	2,205	1.16%
19	183,122	190,710	-7,588	-3.98%
20	184,237	190,710	-6,473	-3.39%
21	183,261	190,710	-7,449	-3.91%
22	182,730	190,710	-7,980	-4.18%
23	197,306	190,710	6,596	3.46%
24	192,673	190,710	1,963	1.03%
25	197,991	190,710	7,281	3.82%
26	196,115	190,710	5,405	2.83%
27	195,363	190,710	4,653	2.44%
28	197,138	190,710	6,428	3.37%
29	194,378	190,710	3,668	1.92%
30	198,458	190,710	7,748	4.06%
31	197,532	190,710	6,822	3.58%
32	190,676	190,710	-34	-0.02%
33	199,013	190,710	8,303	4.35%
34	197,843	190,710	7,133	3.74%
35	189,794	190,710	-916	-0.48%
36	189,509	190,710	-1,201	-0.63%
37	185,257	190,710	-5,453	-2.86%
38	182,674	190,710	-8,036	-4.21%
39	184,099	190,710	-6,611	-3.47%
40	183,426	190,710	-7,284	-3.82%
41	184,172	190,710	-6,538	-3.43%
42	191,556	190,710	846	0.44%
43	197,035	190,710	6,325	3.32%
44	185,394	190,710	-5,316	-2.79%
45	198,833	190,710	8,123	4.26%
46	191,738	190,710	1,028	0.54%
47	187,477	190,710	-3,233	-1.70%
48	184,866	190,710	-5,844	-3.06%
49	193,282	190,710	2,572	1.35%
50	194,102	190,710	3,392	1.78%
Total:	**9,535,483**			

S691-AMT-30-Districts14and15: Population 2010, US Senate 2010, President 2012

	2010 Census		US Senate 2010: Marshall-Burr-Beitler								US President 2012: Obama-Romney-Johnson							
District	Total Pop	18+ Pop	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %
1	196,665	153,426	25,606	43.60%	31,904	54.33%	1,196	2.04%	19	0.03%	45,482	48.87%	46,490	49.95%	950	1.02%	150	0.16%
2	183,118	143,986	17,393	31.26%	37,109	66.70%	1,070	1.92%	63	0.11%	31,516	35.91%	55,323	63.03%	761	0.87%	168	0.19%
3	182,039	141,242	31,118	52.62%	27,064	45.76%	926	1.57%	30	0.05%	50,170	56.97%	37,383	42.45%	406	0.46%	104	0.12%
4	192,477	145,928	32,883	57.59%	23,457	41.08%	750	1.31%	10	0.02%	56,149	61.10%	35,208	38.32%	433	0.47%	100	0.11%
5	189,510	146,760	22,397	47.49%	24,190	51.29%	556	1.18%	20	0.04%	45,546	52.42%	40,573	46.70%	648	0.75%	117	0.13%
6	187,925	140,779	10,015	33.20%	19,362	64.19%	769	2.55%	16	0.05%	20,842	36.78%	35,080	61.91%	588	1.04%	155	0.27%
7	182,118	137,302	20,490	42.11%	27,572	56.66%	583	1.20%	14	0.03%	37,221	46.96%	41,578	52.46%	434	0.55%	22	0.03%
8	200,133	158,646	26,597	38.48%	41,161	59.54%	1,344	1.94%	25	0.04%	42,274	42.05%	57,243	56.94%	821	0.82%	202	0.20%
9	197,372	158,279	23,736	38.00%	37,303	59.72%	1,394	2.23%	32	0.05%	46,065	45.68%	53,212	52.77%	1,246	1.24%	312	0.31%
10	183,566	136,365	18,810	40.24%	27,283	58.36%	647	1.38%	10	0.02%	29,823	41.92%	40,745	57.27%	468	0.66%	107	0.15%
11	193,194	141,728	23,256	39.26%	34,955	59.02%	994	1.68%	24	0.04%	41,040	42.70%	54,070	56.26%	783	0.81%	221	0.23%
12	182,438	133,366	16,935	38.82%	25,854	59.27%	817	1.87%	16	0.04%	29,243	40.66%	41,830	58.16%	695	0.97%	157	0.22%
13	192,266	142,807	19,514	49.67%	19,146	48.73%	605	1.54%	25	0.06%	36,038	53.66%	30,451	45.34%	520	0.77%	156	0.23%
14	195,478	139,171	32,311	62.00%	18,795	36.06%	978	1.88%	32	0.06%	64,581	68.06%	29,270	30.85%	873	0.92%	161	0.17%
15	193,612	157,037	32,966	61.38%	19,520	36.35%	1,190	2.22%	29	0.05%	66,555	66.55%	31,690	31.69%	1,592	1.59%	175	0.17%
16	197,303	146,752	27,789	46.71%	29,992	50.41%	1,690	2.84%	24	0.04%	59,269	54.76%	47,171	43.58%	1,575	1.46%	225	0.21%
17	182,304	127,938	22,007	36.88%	36,146	60.58%	1,492	2.50%	20	0.03%	43,729	42.94%	56,687	55.66%	1,280	1.26%	153	0.15%
18	192,915	141,239	26,298	38.31%	40,810	59.45%	1,499	2.18%	41	0.06%	46,564	42.61%	61,381	56.17%	1,119	1.02%	212	0.19%
19	183,122	132,805	16,676	42.18%	22,143	56.01%	697	1.76%	19	0.05%	33,645	47.52%	36,446	51.48%	570	0.81%	142	0.20%
20	184,237	142,941	40,914	76.58%	11,670	21.84%	815	1.53%	26	0.05%	79,586	79.30%	19,709	19.64%	942	0.94%	125	0.12%
21	183,261	133,852	24,666	65.09%	12,650	33.38%	560	1.48%	21	0.06%	52,223	70.64%	21,039	28.46%	524	0.71%	141	0.19%
22	182,730	141,258	29,403	54.21%	23,800	43.88%	1,018	1.88%	15	0.03%	53,654	58.60%	36,961	40.37%	774	0.85%	168	0.18%
23	197,306	155,496	43,402	61.53%	25,502	36.15%	1,599	2.27%	35	0.05%	72,262	64.41%	38,204	34.05%	1,386	1.24%	339	0.30%
24	192,673	147,633	19,692	36.36%	33,126	61.16%	1,313	2.42%	29	0.05%	37,586	41.57%	51,828	57.32%	814	0.90%	187	0.21%
25	197,991	152,423	24,146	43.32%	30,550	54.81%	1,018	1.83%	23	0.04%	41,643	45.66%	48,824	53.53%	631	0.69%	110	0.12%
26	196,115	147,126	12,742	30.20%	28,243	66.95%	1,165	2.76%	36	0.09%	30,042	36.90%	50,505	62.03%	749	0.92%	124	0.15%
27	195,363	149,849	22,624	33.08%	44,339	64.82%	1,395	2.04%	43	0.06%	45,643	40.21%	66,503	58.59%	1,063	0.94%	289	0.25%
28	197,138	152,041	32,175	71.88%	11,898	26.58%	652	1.46%	37	0.08%	76,219	79.28%	19,017	19.78%	694	0.72%	214	0.22%
29	194,378	146,637	26,071	60.42%	16,353	37.90%	705	1.63%	18	0.04%	61,949	70.29%	25,484	28.92%	700	0.79%	0	0.00%
30	198,458	154,651	18,011	32.71%	35,585	64.63%	1,442	2.62%	24	0.04%	32,115	36.33%	55,203	62.45%	866	0.98%	208	0.24%
31	197,532	150,121	18,305	27.87%	46,061	70.13%	1,292	1.97%	21	0.03%	36,109	34.00%	68,971	64.95%	1,068	1.01%	49	0.05%
32	190,676	145,058	14,509	29.44%	33,627	68.24%	1,119	2.27%	20	0.04%	25,330	30.83%	55,787	67.90%	876	1.07%	173	0.21%
33	199,013	152,338	17,207	31.47%	36,147	66.12%	1,285	2.35%	32	0.06%	31,078	34.17%	58,644	64.47%	953	1.05%	284	0.31%
34	197,843	148,320	15,298	28.04%	37,834	69.35%	1,397	2.56%	26	0.05%	30,033	32.23%	61,877	66.41%	978	1.05%	290	0.31%
35	189,794	132,039	13,415	29.02%	31,743	68.68%	1,034	2.24%	30	0.06%	30,954	35.05%	56,278	63.72%	854	0.97%	228	0.26%
36	189,509	137,603	16,691	32.42%	33,671	65.41%	1,115	2.17%	0	0.00%	34,337	38.31%	54,340	60.63%	939	1.05%	14	0.02%
37	185,257	143,412	25,673	70.58%	9,978	27.43%	703	1.93%	20	0.05%	62,709	76.14%	18,651	22.65%	794	0.96%	207	0.25%
38	182,674	134,933	28,643	71.61%	10,769	26.93%	569	1.42%	15	0.04%	65,195	76.92%	18,683	22.04%	666	0.79%	214	0.25%
39	184,099	138,352	20,085	31.61%	42,253	66.50%	1,164	1.83%	32	0.05%	40,182	38.03%	64,289	60.85%	942	0.89%	235	0.22%
40	183,426	134,379	25,370	64.51%	13,288	33.79%	638	1.62%	30	0.08%	55,925	72.56%	20,350	26.40%	622	0.81%	178	0.23%
41	184,172	135,214	17,773	38.46%	27,479	59.46%	943	2.04%	18	0.04%	43,121	46.53%	48,482	52.31%	868	0.94%	205	0.22%
42	191,556	146,308	16,533	30.70%	35,956	66.76%	1,337	2.48%	33	0.06%	28,675	33.04%	56,787	65.43%	1,033	1.19%	293	0.34%
43	197,035	149,991	14,895	31.63%	31,082	66.01%	1,113	2.36%	0	0.00%	31,879	37.10%	53,179	61.89%	869	1.01%	0	0.00%
44	185,394	141,718	17,792	34.23%	33,049	63.59%	1,112	2.14%	22	0.04%	29,375	34.80%	54,018	63.99%	803	0.95%	224	0.27%
45	198,833	159,078	20,603	34.28%	37,811	62.92%	1,655	2.75%	29	0.05%	31,463	35.00%	56,629	63.00%	1,425	1.59%	366	0.41%
46	191,738	149,705	16,531	33.18%	31,940	64.11%	1,325	2.66%	23	0.05%	26,481	33.57%	51,262	64.98%	1,012	1.28%	132	0.17%
47	187,477	147,841	21,314	34.98%	38,045	62.44%	1,540	2.53%	33	0.05%	29,486	35.14%	53,113	63.30%	1,022	1.22%	282	0.34%
48	184,866	147,107	22,200	34.84%	39,941	62.68%	1,558	2.45%	21	0.03%	36,540	39.02%	55,677	59.45%	1,092	1.17%	344	0.37%
49	193,282	154,410	33,055	52.87%	27,761	44.40%	1,664	2.66%	44	0.07%	59,546	57.71%	41,650	40.36%	1,433	1.39%	560	0.54%
50	194,102	156,458	25,165	38.43%	38,165	58.28%	2,112	3.23%	38	0.06%	34,201	38.27%	53,578	59.95%	1,294	1.45%	297	0.33%
Totals:	**9,535,483**	**7,253,848**	**1,141,700**	**43.04%**	**1,454,082**	**54.82%**	**55,554**	**2.09%**	**1,263**	**0.05%**	**2,171,293**	**48.33%**	**2,267,353**	**50.47%**	**44,448**	**0.99%**	**9,519**	**0.21%**

Populations values derive from the 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File. Election results were provided by the NC State Board of Elections. Votes that could not be associated with a specific precinct were excluded. Reported statewide totals may therefore be marginally lower than official contest results.

S691-AMT-30-Districts14and15: Governor 2012, Lieutenant Governor 2012, US Senate 2014

	Governor 2012: Dalton-McCrory-Howe								Lieutenant Governor 2012: Coleman-Forest				US Senate 2014: Tillis-Hagan-Haugh							
District	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %
1	44,567	48.84%	44,051	48.28%	2,609	2.86%	20	0.02%	48,060	53.59%	41,627	46.41%	30,750	50.80%	28,027	46.30%	1,702	2.81%	48	0.08%
2	28,530	32.65%	57,217	65.47%	1,615	1.85%	26	0.03%	32,786	38.21%	53,018	61.79%	36,899	60.46%	21,609	35.41%	2,340	3.83%	182	0.30%
3	48,711	55.68%	37,737	43.14%	1,024	1.17%	10	0.01%	52,590	61.35%	33,128	38.65%	24,793	41.50%	32,737	54.80%	2,084	3.49%	128	0.21%
4	54,777	59.84%	35,877	39.20%	869	0.95%	10	0.01%	57,424	63.60%	32,867	36.40%	22,999	38.20%	35,596	59.12%	1,565	2.60%	45	0.07%
5	42,553	49.27%	42,332	49.02%	1,463	1.69%	16	0.02%	46,467	54.65%	38,559	45.35%	24,088	47.07%	25,389	49.62%	1,612	3.15%	81	0.16%
6	18,744	33.55%	35,659	63.82%	1,459	2.61%	13	0.02%	22,010	40.37%	32,513	59.63%	21,858	61.65%	11,859	33.45%	1,681	4.74%	59	0.17%
7	35,570	45.13%	42,240	53.59%	988	1.25%	24	0.03%	38,551	49.66%	39,078	50.34%	26,667	51.80%	23,095	44.86%	1,663	3.23%	55	0.11%
8	37,873	38.02%	59,764	59.99%	1,972	1.98%	15	0.02%	44,067	45.14%	53,565	54.86%	37,130	53.02%	28,989	41.40%	3,786	5.41%	125	0.18%
9	39,195	39.52%	56,871	57.34%	3,086	3.11%	30	0.03%	45,150	46.86%	51,202	53.14%	31,405	48.37%	30,133	46.41%	3,278	5.05%	109	0.17%
10	28,848	40.68%	41,165	58.06%	879	1.24%	14	0.02%	31,760	45.62%	37,856	54.38%	25,555	55.54%	18,517	40.24%	1,855	4.03%	85	0.18%
11	38,275	39.95%	55,989	58.43%	1,536	1.60%	16	0.02%	42,124	44.69%	52,143	55.31%	35,971	54.98%	27,183	41.55%	2,180	3.33%	88	0.13%
12	27,109	37.87%	43,004	60.08%	1,437	2.01%	32	0.04%	30,845	43.91%	39,400	56.09%	25,363	55.53%	18,263	39.99%	1,965	4.30%	81	0.18%
13	37,211	56.10%	27,970	42.17%	1,133	1.71%	20	0.03%	41,068	63.31%	23,805	36.69%	17,801	44.87%	19,985	50.38%	1,822	4.59%	64	0.16%
14	59,150	62.61%	33,192	35.13%	2,110	2.23%	23	0.02%	63,992	68.66%	29,203	31.34%	18,068	29.89%	40,709	67.35%	1,582	2.62%	88	0.15%
15	59,589	60.18%	36,056	36.42%	3,346	3.38%	19	0.02%	65,368	67.53%	31,427	32.47%	18,445	29.09%	42,762	67.45%	2,069	3.26%	122	0.19%
16	50,214	46.93%	53,318	49.83%	3,431	3.21%	29	0.03%	56,759	54.38%	47,610	45.62%	29,618	41.04%	40,216	55.72%	2,223	3.08%	119	0.16%
17	36,898	36.47%	61,457	60.74%	2,795	2.76%	27	0.03%	42,704	43.23%	56,086	56.77%	37,808	53.25%	30,870	43.48%	2,175	3.06%	151	0.21%
18	40,253	37.06%	65,931	60.70%	2,390	2.20%	41	0.04%	45,684	42.88%	60,851	57.12%	42,062	53.07%	34,607	43.66%	2,464	3.11%	130	0.16%
19	31,206	44.66%	37,176	53.20%	1,480	2.12%	15	0.02%	34,715	50.63%	33,851	49.37%	22,578	51.71%	19,417	44.47%	1,607	3.68%	58	0.13%
20	73,527	74.12%	23,053	23.24%	2,558	2.58%	56	0.06%	77,591	79.52%	19,983	20.48%	10,716	17.15%	50,551	80.89%	1,148	1.84%	81	0.13%
21	48,987	67.36%	22,090	30.37%	1,628	2.24%	23	0.03%	51,833	72.14%	20,018	27.86%	12,247	29.02%	28,680	67.95%	1,223	2.90%	58	0.14%
22	49,395	54.52%	39,138	43.20%	2,049	2.26%	25	0.03%	53,909	60.96%	34,519	39.04%	23,144	38.59%	34,913	58.22%	1,839	3.07%	73	0.12%
23	65,604	59.22%	42,009	37.92%	3,103	2.80%	63	0.06%	70,358	64.96%	37,947	35.04%	24,700	30.65%	53,699	66.63%	2,120	2.63%	72	0.09%
24	33,361	37.22%	54,353	60.64%	1,899	2.12%	25	0.03%	37,312	42.46%	50,562	57.54%	33,277	55.76%	24,156	40.47%	2,156	3.61%	94	0.16%
25	38,495	42.60%	50,372	55.74%	1,458	1.61%	44	0.05%	43,394	49.27%	44,680	50.73%	32,665	52.10%	27,623	44.06%	2,319	3.70%	87	0.14%
26	27,007	33.28%	52,574	64.79%	1,553	1.91%	14	0.02%	30,150	37.93%	49,336	62.07%	30,068	62.15%	16,341	33.77%	1,894	3.91%	80	0.17%
27	38,429	34.12%	71,796	63.74%	2,379	2.11%	31	0.03%	44,058	40.13%	65,723	59.87%	45,334	55.88%	33,720	41.56%	1,979	2.44%	101	0.12%
28	70,102	73.90%	22,507	23.73%	2,210	2.33%	37	0.04%	74,547	79.67%	19,022	20.33%	11,198	20.24%	42,845	77.44%	1,216	2.20%	70	0.13%
29	56,426	64.53%	29,125	33.31%	1,865	2.13%	23	0.03%	60,504	70.43%	25,402	29.57%	14,750	28.49%	35,624	68.81%	1,315	2.54%	85	0.16%
30	29,519	33.57%	56,635	64.40%	1,761	2.00%	21	0.02%	34,035	39.65%	51,802	60.35%	34,563	59.33%	20,515	35.22%	3,032	5.20%	144	0.25%
31	30,238	28.46%	73,840	69.50%	2,146	2.02%	27	0.03%	35,556	34.29%	68,123	65.71%	44,330	62.51%	24,129	34.02%	2,308	3.25%	149	0.21%
32	22,078	26.93%	58,230	71.04%	1,648	2.01%	14	0.02%	26,730	33.30%	53,543	66.70%	33,575	65.72%	15,182	29.72%	2,234	4.37%	98	0.19%
33	24,785	27.34%	64,437	71.09%	1,406	1.55%	17	0.02%	31,147	35.25%	57,223	64.75%	35,720	61.30%	18,960	32.54%	3,436	5.90%	156	0.27%
34	23,382	25.22%	67,657	72.97%	1,652	1.78%	30	0.03%	29,848	33.11%	60,303	66.89%	39,563	64.03%	18,656	30.19%	3,385	5.48%	187	0.30%
35	23,416	26.70%	62,790	71.60%	1,463	1.67%	22	0.03%	29,912	35.04%	55,458	64.96%	34,426	63.13%	18,044	33.09%	1,864	3.42%	196	0.36%
36	25,791	28.80%	62,144	69.39%	1,621	1.81%	2	0.00%	34,159	39.33%	52,691	60.67%	32,506	57.95%	21,038	37.51%	2,379	4.24%	167	0.30%
37	51,818	64.06%	27,303	33.76%	1,742	2.15%	22	0.03%	59,561	75.67%	19,152	24.33%	9,453	21.56%	33,142	75.58%	1,198	2.73%	58	0.13%
38	56,519	67.34%	25,968	30.94%	1,406	1.68%	34	0.04%	63,329	76.88%	19,045	23.12%	9,325	20.38%	35,376	77.33%	988	2.16%	58	0.13%
39	25,507	24.25%	78,167	74.31%	1,487	1.41%	25	0.02%	36,685	36.04%	65,104	63.96%	38,383	57.57%	26,513	39.77%	1,665	2.50%	111	0.17%
40	47,247	61.83%	27,759	36.32%	1,390	1.82%	23	0.03%	54,059	72.25%	20,761	27.75%	11,035	25.82%	30,532	71.45%	1,089	2.55%	74	0.17%
41	31,204	33.96%	59,005	64.21%	1,665	1.81%	15	0.02%	40,500	45.39%	48,721	54.61%	27,089	49.95%	25,308	46.66%	1,685	3.11%	153	0.28%
42	22,115	25.57%	62,937	72.78%	1,402	1.62%	19	0.02%	28,289	33.50%	56,166	66.50%	35,350	63.19%	17,371	31.05%	3,046	5.44%	176	0.31%
43	25,879	30.15%	58,602	68.27%	1,337	1.56%	18	0.02%	31,620	37.82%	51,992	62.18%	31,406	60.24%	18,283	35.07%	2,321	4.45%	123	0.24%
44	25,417	30.23%	57,452	68.34%	1,189	1.41%	15	0.02%	29,967	36.62%	51,872	63.38%	33,139	60.95%	18,439	33.91%	2,656	4.88%	138	0.25%
45	27,277	30.55%	59,444	66.57%	2,558	2.86%	22	0.02%	32,247	37.36%	54,077	62.64%	35,618	59.70%	20,428	34.24%	3,477	5.83%	137	0.23%
46	20,724	26.21%	56,753	71.77%	1,579	2.00%	18	0.02%	27,156	35.42%	49,516	64.58%	31,230	61.54%	16,228	31.98%	3,151	6.21%	136	0.27%
47	31,588	37.71%	50,318	60.07%	1,840	2.20%	17	0.02%	31,802	39.23%	49,272	60.77%	34,520	58.39%	21,336	36.09%	3,184	5.39%	80	0.14%
48	32,660	35.31%	57,355	62.00%	2,456	2.66%	30	0.03%	36,359	40.13%	54,243	59.87%	36,913	55.81%	26,545	40.13%	2,601	3.93%	87	0.13%
49	54,517	53.45%	43,870	43.01%	3,574	3.50%	32	0.03%	58,927	58.95%	41,030	41.05%	25,653	36.55%	41,569	59.23%	2,875	4.10%	89	0.13%
50	32,983	37.31%	52,535	59.42%	2,866	3.24%	27	0.03%	36,353	42.19%	49,816	57.81%	35,080	55.57%	24,594	38.96%	3,343	5.30%	115	0.18%
Totals:	**1,925,270**	**43.18%**	**2,437,224**	**54.67%**	**94,512**	**2.12%**	**1,191**	**0.03%**	**2,174,021**	**49.88%**	**2,184,891**	**50.12%**	**1,416,834**	**48.84%**	**1,370,303**	**47.23%**	**108,779**	**3.75%**	**5,251**	**0.18%**

S691-AMT-30-Districts14and15: S691-AMT-30-Districts14and15: President 2016, US Senate 2016, Governor 2016

	US President 2016: Trump-Clinton-Johnson								US Senate 2016: Burr-Ross-Haugh						Governor 2016: Cooper-McCrory-Cecil					
District	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %
1	51,124	54.37%	39,690	42.21%	2,437	2.59%	781	0.83%	50,422	54.75%	39,232	42.60%	2,441	2.65%	40,704	43.98%	50,100	54.13%	1,749	1.89%
2	58,542	63.89%	30,012	32.76%	2,242	2.45%	829	0.90%	58,109	64.13%	28,994	32.00%	3,512	3.88%	30,960	34.02%	58,265	64.02%	1,788	1.96%
3	37,998	44.82%	45,070	53.16%	1,193	1.41%	523	0.62%	37,690	45.00%	44,065	52.61%	2,002	2.39%	44,887	53.29%	38,505	45.71%	842	1.00%
4	34,714	39.56%	51,323	58.49%	1,231	1.40%	485	0.55%	34,873	40.05%	50,550	58.06%	1,648	1.89%	52,322	59.88%	34,269	39.22%	793	0.91%
5	40,021	45.23%	45,333	51.24%	2,245	2.54%	881	1.00%	41,386	47.29%	43,487	49.70%	2,634	3.01%	45,427	51.71%	41,041	46.71%	1,389	1.58%
6	40,099	64.39%	19,577	31.44%	1,985	3.19%	610	0.98%	39,097	63.90%	19,028	31.10%	3,064	5.01%	20,040	32.62%	39,685	64.59%	1,718	2.80%
7	41,031	53.33%	33,966	44.15%	1,362	1.77%	579	0.75%	40,925	53.84%	33,171	43.64%	1,921	2.53%	33,894	44.35%	41,571	54.40%	958	1.25%
8	69,138	60.31%	41,895	36.54%	2,660	2.32%	948	0.83%	67,784	60.07%	40,579	35.96%	4,470	3.96%	44,922	39.64%	65,885	58.14%	2,506	2.21%
9	55,097	50.39%	48,749	44.58%	3,901	3.57%	1,602	1.47%	55,887	51.89%	46,846	43.49%	4,974	4.62%	54,155	50.05%	50,866	47.01%	3,173	2.93%
10	43,565	59.90%	27,558	37.89%	1,169	1.61%	439	0.60%	43,032	59.87%	27,012	37.58%	1,835	2.55%	28,135	38.91%	43,298	59.88%	879	1.22%
11	57,543	55.97%	41,835	40.69%	2,470	2.40%	968	0.94%	57,652	56.39%	41,591	40.68%	2,987	2.92%	45,263	44.10%	55,757	54.33%	1,612	1.57%
12	44,964	59.19%	28,240	37.18%	2,047	2.69%	709	0.93%	44,404	58.94%	28,264	37.51%	2,673	3.55%	30,211	39.98%	43,695	57.83%	1,656	2.19%
13	34,909	54.33%	27,879	43.39%	1,101	1.71%	361	0.56%	33,313	53.25%	27,703	44.28%	1,548	2.47%	27,663	43.72%	34,916	55.19%	690	1.09%
14	27,597	27.95%	67,015	67.87%	2,742	2.78%	1,393	1.41%	29,518	30.08%	65,764	67.01%	2,864	2.92%	68,223	69.29%	28,336	28.78%	1,895	1.92%
15	27,113	26.26%	70,333	68.12%	3,947	3.82%	1,862	1.80%	31,078	30.28%	68,234	66.49%	3,317	3.23%	73,035	70.91%	27,515	26.71%	2,451	2.38%
16	40,924	34.26%	71,524	59.88%	4,721	3.95%	2,268	1.90%	47,090	39.70%	67,617	57.00%	3,913	3.30%	74,271	62.34%	41,984	35.24%	2,880	2.42%
17	56,562	48.80%	52,520	45.32%	4,792	4.13%	2,020	1.74%	61,244	53.15%	50,014	43.40%	3,971	3.45%	56,237	48.60%	56,738	49.03%	2,745	2.37%
18	60,254	49.94%	54,218	44.93%	4,035	3.34%	2,152	1.78%	65,138	54.20%	51,537	42.88%	3,507	2.92%	57,638	47.79%	60,683	50.32%	2,283	1.89%
19	37,888	51.74%	32,555	44.45%	2,059	2.81%	730	1.00%	38,002	52.52%	31,815	43.97%	2,540	3.51%	32,673	45.04%	38,202	52.66%	1,671	2.30%
20	15,723	14.64%	87,146	81.16%	2,761	2.57%	1,745	1.63%	19,607	18.37%	84,748	79.40%	2,382	2.23%	87,566	81.92%	17,525	16.39%	1,802	1.69%
21	21,137	29.15%	48,776	67.27%	1,891	2.61%	700	0.97%	21,569	30.17%	47,479	66.41%	2,449	3.43%	47,464	66.34%	22,359	31.25%	1,728	2.42%
22	37,322	39.28%	54,243	57.08%	2,241	2.36%	1,220	1.28%	38,620	40.93%	53,100	56.28%	2,628	2.79%	55,918	59.07%	37,192	39.29%	1,560	1.65%
23	35,663	29.19%	80,987	66.28%	3,534	2.89%	2,005	1.64%	39,933	32.86%	78,407	64.52%	3,177	2.61%	83,440	68.47%	36,205	29.71%	2,211	1.81%
24	53,036	55.49%	39,216	41.03%	2,381	2.49%	945	0.99%	53,644	56.54%	38,083	40.14%	3,145	3.31%	42,372	44.53%	50,986	53.58%	1,795	1.89%
25	51,626	55.82%	38,014	41.10%	2,073	2.24%	779	0.84%	50,943	55.86%	37,449	41.07%	2,798	3.07%	39,947	43.57%	50,130	54.68%	1,603	1.75%
26	54,446	64.64%	27,269	32.37%	1,788	2.12%	729	0.87%	53,193	63.86%	26,713	32.07%	3,384	4.06%	30,384	36.36%	51,246	61.33%	1,928	2.31%
27	60,891	51.72%	51,460	43.71%	3,690	3.13%	1,695	1.44%	64,651	55.25%	48,752	41.66%	3,607	3.08%	56,361	48.05%	58,431	49.81%	2,511	2.14%
28	17,691	18.66%	73,851	77.88%	2,070	2.18%	1,220	1.29%	19,041	20.34%	71,990	76.89%	2,600	2.78%	74,483	79.38%	17,465	18.61%	1,885	2.01%
29	24,035	26.97%	61,506	69.02%	2,410	2.70%	1,161	1.30%	26,595	30.11%	59,121	66.94%	2,601	2.95%	62,623	70.89%	23,752	26.89%	1,959	2.22%
30	60,630	66.76%	27,458	30.23%	1,981	2.18%	748	0.82%	59,336	65.92%	27,371	30.41%	3,299	3.67%	32,270	35.77%	56,074	62.16%	1,869	2.07%
31	67,558	60.88%	38,216	34.44%	3,596	3.24%	1,599	1.44%	70,992	64.24%	35,655	32.26%	3,871	3.50%	43,491	39.30%	64,639	58.41%	2,539	2.29%
32	61,447	71.12%	22,259	25.76%	2,062	2.39%	628	0.73%	60,373	70.54%	21,959	25.66%	3,259	3.81%	26,603	30.94%	57,516	66.90%	1,851	2.15%
33	64,774	68.70%	26,494	28.10%	2,181	2.31%	837	0.89%	62,061	66.50%	26,482	28.38%	4,782	5.12%	29,794	31.73%	61,866	65.89%	2,231	2.38%
34	68,634	68.50%	27,894	27.84%	2,583	2.58%	1,080	1.08%	66,829	67.44%	27,349	27.60%	4,916	4.96%	32,618	32.78%	64,115	64.43%	2,775	2.79%
35	61,627	62.37%	32,773	33.17%	3,156	3.19%	1,249	1.26%	62,768	64.34%	30,646	31.41%	4,148	4.25%	34,249	34.89%	61,659	62.80%	2,268	2.31%
36	58,898	58.78%	37,086	37.01%	2,957	2.95%	1,253	1.25%	58,847	59.32%	35,738	36.02%	4,620	4.66%	39,591	39.69%	57,611	57.75%	2,561	2.57%
37	17,060	19.75%	64,797	75.01%	3,224	3.73%	1,303	1.51%	20,986	24.67%	60,840	71.53%	3,229	3.80%	65,025	76.04%	18,122	21.19%	2,365	2.77%
38	17,399	20.08%	66,052	76.22%	2,040	2.35%	1,171	1.35%	18,697	21.82%	64,114	74.82%	2,877	3.36%	65,258	75.88%	18,759	21.81%	1,986	2.31%
39	53,290	48.86%	49,607	45.48%	4,029	3.69%	2,147	1.97%	60,928	56.18%	43,928	40.51%	3,591	3.31%	50,569	46.40%	56,080	51.46%	2,335	2.14%
40	18,662	24.20%	55,240	71.64%	2,109	2.74%	1,100	1.43%	20,031	26.30%	53,262	69.92%	2,880	3.78%	54,730	71.54%	19,904	26.02%	1,868	2.44%
41	47,467	45.06%	52,383	49.73%	3,968	3.77%	1,525	1.45%	50,899	48.91%	48,756	46.85%	4,413	4.24%	55,322	52.95%	45,891	43.92%	3,263	3.12%
42	62,200	68.66%	24,968	27.56%	2,410	2.66%	1,012	1.12%	60,484	67.58%	24,627	27.52%	4,390	4.90%	28,398	31.52%	59,501	66.04%	2,202	2.44%
43	58,532	63.77%	29,967	32.65%	2,319	2.53%	961	1.05%	57,121	63.01%	29,387	32.41%	4,151	4.58%	32,375	35.49%	56,833	62.29%	2,025	2.22%
44	60,549	67.77%	26,071	29.18%	1,947	2.18%	779	0.87%	58,536	66.29%	26,018	29.46%	3,755	4.25%	28,778	32.38%	58,278	65.57%	1,820	2.05%
45	63,539	65.43%	29,273	30.14%	2,850	2.93%	1,454	1.50%	62,607	65.23%	29,246	30.47%	4,123	4.30%	34,731	35.93%	59,576	61.64%	2,343	2.42%
46	59,157	70.85%	21,367	25.59%	2,003	2.40%	965	1.16%	56,771	68.88%	21,718	26.35%	3,937	4.78%	25,410	30.59%	55,667	67.01%	1,991	2.40%
47	62,657	69.28%	24,632	27.24%	2,027	2.24%	1,125	1.24%	58,592	65.91%	26,662	29.99%	3,648	4.10%	30,561	34.14%	56,662	63.29%	2,298	2.57%
48	59,387	57.55%	38,942	37.74%	3,068	2.97%	1,791	1.74%	59,206	58.02%	38,853	38.08%	3,980	3.90%	43,781	42.79%	55,594	54.34%	2,935	2.87%
49	42,657	38.15%	62,892	56.25%	3,333	2.98%	2,919	2.61%	42,590	38.49%	63,580	57.46%	4,477	4.05%	68,148	61.36%	39,430	35.50%	3,485	3.14%
50	62,972	64.60%	30,185	30.97%	2,908	2.98%	1,412	1.45%	59,345	61.97%	32,160	33.59%	4,252	4.44%	37,461	38.95%	55,660	57.87%	3,059	3.18%
Totals:	**2,359,749**	**49.90%**	**2,180,316**	**46.10%**	**129,929**	**2.75%**	**59,397**	**1.26%**	**2,392,439**	**51.13%**	**2,119,696**	**45.30%**	**167,190**	**3.57%**	**2,300,381**	**48.95%**	**2,296,039**	**48.86%**	**102,729**	**2.19%**

S691-AMT-30-Districts14and15: Lieutenant Governor 2016, Attorney General 2016

	Lieutenant Governor 2016: Forest-Coleman-Cole						Attorney General 2016: Stein-Newton			
District	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %
1	48,887	53.74%	39,694	43.63%	2,389	2.63%	41,583	46.48%	47,878	53.52%
2	57,464	64.37%	29,461	33.00%	2,347	2.63%	31,586	35.67%	56,959	64.33%
3	36,795	44.57%	44,483	53.88%	1,277	1.55%	46,645	56.99%	35,203	43.01%
4	34,410	39.91%	50,529	58.61%	1,273	1.48%	52,643	61.20%	33,369	38.80%
5	40,621	47.11%	43,512	50.47%	2,085	2.42%	46,133	53.94%	39,399	46.06%
6	38,286	63.97%	19,181	32.05%	2,380	3.98%	21,095	35.69%	38,018	64.31%
7	40,568	54.08%	33,075	44.09%	1,368	1.82%	35,414	47.66%	38,891	52.34%
8	67,778	61.04%	40,423	36.40%	2,836	2.55%	46,574	42.31%	63,502	57.69%
9	55,658	52.85%	45,433	43.14%	4,230	4.02%	52,224	50.00%	52,214	50.00%
10	42,788	60.42%	26,733	37.75%	1,292	1.82%	29,456	42.04%	40,606	57.96%
11	58,079	57.42%	40,863	40.40%	2,206	2.18%	44,650	44.36%	55,998	55.64%
12	44,688	59.95%	27,889	37.41%	1,970	2.64%	31,338	42.46%	42,472	57.54%
13	31,027	50.72%	28,932	47.29%	1,215	1.99%	31,776	52.53%	28,714	47.47%
14	29,593	30.45%	64,913	66.80%	2,669	2.75%	68,325	71.03%	27,870	28.97%
15	31,076	30.78%	66,214	65.59%	3,667	3.63%	71,712	71.60%	28,447	28.40%
16	46,657	40.05%	65,661	56.36%	4,187	3.59%	72,088	62.40%	43,435	37.60%
17	61,118	53.95%	48,551	42.86%	3,610	3.19%	54,056	48.17%	58,173	51.83%
18	65,737	55.37%	50,017	42.13%	2,978	2.51%	56,598	48.17%	60,903	51.83%
19	37,218	52.33%	31,486	44.27%	2,414	3.39%	34,292	48.47%	36,453	51.53%
20	19,185	18.22%	83,359	79.15%	2,779	2.64%	86,851	82.88%	17,944	17.12%
21	20,849	29.60%	47,212	67.03%	2,374	3.37%	49,134	70.23%	20,826	29.77%
22	38,606	41.51%	52,229	56.16%	2,172	2.34%	56,476	61.26%	35,710	38.74%
23	39,577	33.12%	76,646	64.14%	3,271	2.74%	81,625	68.71%	37,164	31.29%
24	53,605	57.24%	37,361	39.90%	2,682	2.86%	41,879	45.02%	51,134	54.98%
25	50,305	56.16%	37,163	41.49%	2,105	2.35%	40,658	45.81%	48,086	54.19%
26	53,344	64.97%	26,615	32.42%	2,143	2.61%	29,789	36.51%	51,795	63.49%
27	63,938	55.63%	47,827	41.61%	3,173	2.76%	53,395	46.69%	60,970	53.31%
28	18,391	19.91%	71,106	76.98%	2,870	3.11%	73,859	80.42%	17,984	19.58%
29	25,455	29.35%	58,737	67.72%	2,546	2.94%	62,056	71.84%	24,322	28.16%
30	58,294	65.99%	27,915	31.60%	2,133	2.41%	31,805	36.19%	56,074	63.81%
31	70,063	64.57%	35,450	32.67%	3,001	2.77%	41,687	38.62%	66,260	61.38%
32	60,028	71.22%	22,140	26.27%	2,123	2.52%	25,906	30.85%	58,069	69.15%
33	63,686	69.23%	25,779	28.02%	2,523	2.74%	31,643	34.65%	59,668	65.35%
34	68,327	70.14%	26,276	26.97%	2,819	2.89%	31,963	33.10%	64,604	66.90%
35	64,009	66.65%	29,246	30.45%	2,778	2.89%	34,286	36.04%	60,858	63.96%
36	60,075	61.47%	34,586	35.39%	3,075	3.15%	39,935	41.23%	56,928	58.77%
37	20,798	24.91%	59,245	70.95%	3,458	4.14%	63,054	75.94%	19,972	24.06%
38	18,972	22.41%	63,018	74.44%	2,671	3.15%	66,011	78.42%	18,160	21.58%
39	61,873	58.01%	41,777	39.17%	3,014	2.83%	48,508	45.88%	57,227	54.12%
40	20,511	27.27%	52,044	69.20%	2,649	3.52%	55,415	74.24%	19,225	25.76%
41	51,912	50.76%	46,633	45.60%	3,727	3.64%	52,559	51.84%	48,820	48.16%
42	62,124	70.39%	23,616	26.76%	2,521	2.86%	29,767	33.94%	57,931	66.06%
43	59,203	66.00%	28,144	31.38%	2,351	2.62%	33,269	37.48%	55,502	62.52%
44	60,310	69.07%	24,946	28.57%	2,066	2.37%	30,418	35.20%	56,007	64.80%
45	61,715	65.78%	29,124	31.04%	2,988	3.18%	34,295	36.91%	58,628	63.09%
46	58,375	71.73%	21,046	25.86%	1,958	2.41%	26,887	33.35%	53,722	66.65%
47	58,679	67.02%	26,179	29.90%	2,697	3.08%	29,406	33.95%	57,204	66.05%
48	59,503	59.12%	37,910	37.67%	3,237	3.22%	41,434	41.50%	58,406	58.50%
49	41,430	38.08%	62,703	57.63%	4,673	4.29%	67,209	62.26%	40,747	37.74%
50	59,029	62.59%	31,893	33.82%	3,390	3.59%	35,488	38.03%	57,825	61.97%
Totals:	**2,390,619**	**51.88%**	**2,084,975**	**45.25%**	**132,360**	**2.87%**	**2,294,855**	**50.20%**	**2,276,276**	**49.80%**

District plan definition file: 'S691-AMT-30-Districts14and15.asc', modified 08/23/2017 05:16:22 PM

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections. Votes that could not be associated with a specific precinct were excluded. Reported statewide totals may therefore be marginally lower than official contest results.

EX. 31

S691-ATC-122 - Blue – Districts 14 and 15



N
W E
S

SMT-5

0 4 8 16 24 32 Miles

Printed by the NC General Assembly, August 24, 2017.

Plan: SMT-5
Plan Type:

Administrator
User:

Districts & Their Incumbents

Thursday, August 24, 2017 10:19 PM

District	Name	Party	Previous District
1			
2	Sanderson	Republican	2
3	Smith-Ingram	Democratic	3
3	Cook	Republican	1
4	Horner	Republican	11
5	D.Davis	Democratic	5
6	Brown	Republican	6
7	Pate	Republican	7
8	Rabon	Republican	8
9	Lee	Republican	9
10	B.Jackson	Republican	10
11	Bryant	Democratic	4
12	Rabin	Republican	12
13	Britt	Republican	13
14	Blue	Democratic	14
15	Chaudhuri	Democratic	16
16			
17	Barringer	Republican	17
18	Alexander	Republican	15
18	Barefoot	Republican	18
19	Meredith	Republican	19
20	McKissick	Democratic	20
21	Clark	Democratic	21
22	Woodard	Democratic	22
23	Foushee	Democratic	23
24	Gunn	Republican	24

Plan:	SMT-5	Administrator:	
Type:		User:	

District	Name	Party	Previous District
25	McInnis	Republican	25
26	Tillman	Republican	29
27	Wade	Republican	27
28	Robinson	Democratic	28
29	Lowe	Democratic	32
30	Berger	Republican	26
31	Barrett	Republican	34
31	Krawiec	Republican	31
32	Dunn	Republican	33
33			
34			
35	Tucker	Republican	35
36	Newton	Republican	36
37	J.Jackson	Democratic	37
38	Ford	Democratic	38
39	Bishop	Republican	39
40	Waddell	Democratic	40
41	Tarte	Republican	41
42	Wells	Republican	42
43	Harrington	Republican	43
44	Curtis	Republican	44
45	Ballard	Republican	45
45	Randleman	Republican	30
46	Daniel	Republican	46
47	Hise	Republican	47
48	Edwards	Republican	48
49	Van Duyn	Democratic	49
50	J.Davis	Republican	50

Number of Incumbents in District with more than one Incumbent:	8
Number of Districts with No Incumbent:	4
Number of Districts with Incumbents of more than one party:	1
Number of Districts with Paired Democrats:	0

Plan:	SMT-5	Administrator:	
Type:		User:	

District	Name	Party	Previous District
Number of Districts with Paired Republicans:		3	

S691-ATC-122 - Blue -Districts 14 and 15: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Aberdeen	25	6,350	197,991	6,350	100.00%	3.21%
Ahoskie	1	5,039	196,665	5,039	100.00%	2.56%
Alamance	24	951	192,673	951	100.00%	0.49%
Albemarle	33	15,903	199,013	15,903	100.00%	7.99%
Alliance	2	776	183,118	776	100.00%	0.42%
Andrews	50	1,781	194,102	1,781	100.00%	0.92%
Angier (Harnett)	12	4,247	182,438	4,247	100.00%	2.33%
Angier (Wake)	17	103	182,304	103	100.00%	0.06%
Ansonville	25	631	197,991	631	100.00%	0.32%
Apex	16	37,476	197,303	230	0.61%	0.12%
	17	37,476	182,304	37,246	99.39%	20.43%
Arapahoe	2	556	183,118	556	100.00%	0.30%
Archdale (Guilford)	26	333	196,115	116	34.83%	0.06%
	27	333	195,363	217	65.17%	0.11%
Archdale (Randolph)	26	11,082	196,115	11,082	100.00%	5.65%
Archer Lodge	11	4,292	193,194	4,292	100.00%	2.22%
Asheboro	26	25,012	196,115	25,012	100.00%	12.75%
Asheville	48	83,393	184,866	12,335	14.79%	6.67%
	49	83,393	193,282	71,058	85.21%	36.76%
Askewville	3	241	182,039	241	100.00%	0.13%
Atkinson	8	299	200,133	299	100.00%	0.15%
Atlantic Beach	2	1,495	183,118	1,495	100.00%	0.82%
Aulander	3	895	182,039	895	100.00%	0.49%
Aurora	3	520	182,039	520	100.00%	0.29%
Autryville	10	196	183,566	196	100.00%	0.11%
Ayden	5	4,932	189,510	4,932	100.00%	2.60%
Badin	33	1,974	199,013	1,974	100.00%	0.99%
Bailey	11	569	193,194	569	100.00%	0.29%
Bakersville	47	464	187,477	464	100.00%	0.25%
Bald Head Island	8	158	200,133	158	100.00%	0.08%
Banner Elk	46	1,028	191,738	1,028	100.00%	0.54%
Bath	3	249	182,039	249	100.00%	0.14%
Bayboro	2	1,263	183,118	1,263	100.00%	0.69%
Bear Grass	3	73	182,039	73	100.00%	0.04%
Beaufort	2	4,039	183,118	4,039	100.00%	2.21%
Beech Mountain (Avery)	46	24	191,738	24	100.00%	0.01%
Beech Mountain (Watauga)	45	296	198,833	296	100.00%	0.15%
Belhaven	3	1,688	182,039	1,688	100.00%	0.93%
Belmont	43	10,076	197,035	10,076	100.00%	5.11%
Belville	8	1,936	200,133	1,936	100.00%	0.97%
Belwood	44	950	185,394	950	100.00%	0.51%
Benson (Harnett)	12	0	182,438	0	0.00%	0.00%
Benson (Johnston)	12	3,311	182,438	3,311	100.00%	1.81%
Bermuda Run	31	1,725	197,532	1,725	100.00%	0.87%
Bessemer City	43	5,340	197,035	5,340	100.00%	2.71%
Bethania	29	328	194,378	328	100.00%	0.17%
	31	328	197,532	0	0.00%	0.00%
Bethel	5	1,577	189,510	1,577	100.00%	0.83%

District plan definition file: 'SMT-5.asc', modified 08/24/2017 10:23:49 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

S691-ATC-122 - Blue -Districts 14 and 15: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Beulaville	10	1,296	183,566	1,296	100.00%	0.71%
Biltmore Forest	48	1,343	184,866	0	0.00%	0.00%
	49	1,343	193,282	1,343	100.00%	0.69%
Biscoe	32	1,700	190,676	1,700	100.00%	0.89%
Black Creek	4	769	192,477	769	100.00%	0.40%
Black Mountain	49	7,848	193,282	7,848	100.00%	4.06%
Bladenboro	8	1,750	200,133	1,750	100.00%	0.87%
Blowing Rock (Caldwell)	46	49	191,738	49	100.00%	0.03%
Blowing Rock (Watauga)	45	1,192	198,833	1,192	100.00%	0.60%
Boardman	13	157	192,266	157	100.00%	0.08%
Bogue	2	684	183,118	684	100.00%	0.37%
Boiling Spring Lakes	8	5,372	200,133	5,372	100.00%	2.68%
Boiling Springs	44	4,647	185,394	4,647	100.00%	2.51%
Bolivia	8	143	200,133	143	100.00%	0.07%
Bolton	13	691	192,266	691	100.00%	0.36%
Boone	45	17,122	198,833	17,122	100.00%	8.61%
Boonville	34	1,222	197,843	1,222	100.00%	0.62%
Bostic	47	386	187,477	386	100.00%	0.21%
Brevard	48	7,609	184,866	7,609	100.00%	4.12%
Bridgeton	2	454	183,118	454	100.00%	0.25%
Broadway (Harnett)	12	25	182,438	25	100.00%	0.01%
Broadway (Lee)	12	1,204	182,438	1,204	100.00%	0.66%
Brookford	42	382	191,556	382	100.00%	0.20%
Brunswick	13	1,119	192,266	1,119	100.00%	0.58%
Bryson City	50	1,424	194,102	1,424	100.00%	0.73%
Bunn	18	344	192,915	344	100.00%	0.18%
Burgaw	8	3,872	200,133	3,872	100.00%	1.93%
Burlington (Alamance)	24	49,308	192,673	49,308	100.00%	25.59%
Burlington (Guilford)	24	655	192,673	655	100.00%	0.34%
Burnsville	47	1,693	187,477	1,693	100.00%	0.90%
Butner	22	7,591	182,730	7,591	100.00%	4.15%
Cajah's Mountain	46	2,823	191,738	2,823	100.00%	1.47%
Calabash	8	1,786	200,133	1,786	100.00%	0.89%
Calypso	10	538	183,566	538	100.00%	0.29%
Cameron	25	285	197,991	285	100.00%	0.14%
Candor	32	840	190,676	840	100.00%	0.44%
Canton	50	4,227	194,102	4,227	100.00%	2.18%
Cape Carteret	2	1,917	183,118	1,917	100.00%	1.05%
Carolina Beach	9	5,706	197,372	5,706	100.00%	2.89%
Carolina Shores	8	3,048	200,133	3,048	100.00%	1.52%
Carrboro	23	19,582	197,306	19,582	100.00%	9.92%
Carthage	25	2,205	197,991	2,205	100.00%	1.11%
Cary (Chatham)	23	1,422	197,306	1,422	100.00%	0.72%
Cary (Wake)	15	133,812	195,003	15,939	11.91%	8.17%
	16	133,812	197,303	99,176	74.12%	50.27%
	17	133,812	182,304	18,697	13.97%	10.26%
Casar	44	297	185,394	297	100.00%	0.16%
Castalia	11	268	193,194	268	100.00%	0.14%

District plan definition file: 'SMT-5.asc', modified 08/24/2017 10:23:49 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

S691-ATC-122 - Blue -Districts 14 and 15: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Caswell Beach	8	398	200,133	398	100.00%	0.20%
Catawba	42	603	191,556	603	100.00%	0.31%
Cedar Point	2	1,279	183,118	1,279	100.00%	0.70%
Cedar Rock	46	300	191,738	300	100.00%	0.16%
Centerville	18	89	192,915	89	100.00%	0.05%
Cerro Gordo	13	207	192,266	207	100.00%	0.11%
Chadbourn	13	1,856	192,266	1,856	100.00%	0.97%
Chapel Hill (Durham)	20	2,836	184,237	2,836	100.00%	1.54%
Chapel Hill (Orange)	23	54,397	197,306	54,397	100.00%	27.57%
Charlotte	37	731,424	185,257	183,353	25.07%	98.97%
	38	731,424	182,674	173,878	23.77%	95.18%
	39	731,424	184,099	138,568	18.94%	75.27%
	40	731,424	183,426	162,819	22.26%	88.77%
	41	731,424	184,172	72,806	9.95%	39.53%
Cherryville	43	5,760	197,035	5,760	100.00%	2.92%
Chimney Rock Village	47	113	187,477	113	100.00%	0.06%
China Grove	33	3,563	199,013	3,563	100.00%	1.79%
Chocowinity	3	820	182,039	820	100.00%	0.45%
Claremont	42	1,352	191,556	1,352	100.00%	0.71%
Clarkton	8	837	200,133	837	100.00%	0.42%
Clayton (Johnston)	11	16,116	193,194	16,116	100.00%	8.34%
Clayton (Wake)	14	0	194,087	0	0.00%	0.00%
Clemmons	31	18,627	197,532	18,627	100.00%	9.43%
Cleveland	33	871	199,013	871	100.00%	0.44%
Clinton	10	8,639	183,566	8,639	100.00%	4.71%
Clyde	50	1,223	194,102	1,223	100.00%	0.63%
Coats	12	2,112	182,438	2,112	100.00%	1.16%
Cofield	1	413	196,665	413	100.00%	0.21%
Colerain	3	204	182,039	204	100.00%	0.11%
Columbia	1	891	196,665	891	100.00%	0.45%
Columbus	47	999	187,477	999	100.00%	0.53%
Como	1	91	196,665	91	100.00%	0.05%
Concord	36	79,066	189,509	79,066	100.00%	41.72%
Conetoe	4	294	192,477	294	100.00%	0.15%
Connelly Springs	46	1,669	191,738	1,669	100.00%	0.87%
Conover	42	8,165	191,556	8,165	100.00%	4.26%
Conway	3	836	182,039	836	100.00%	0.46%
Cooleemee	31	960	197,532	960	100.00%	0.49%
Cornelius	41	24,866	184,172	24,866	100.00%	13.50%
Cove City	2	399	183,118	399	100.00%	0.22%
Cramerton	43	4,165	197,035	4,165	100.00%	2.11%
Creedmoor	22	4,124	182,730	4,124	100.00%	2.26%
Creswell	1	276	196,665	276	100.00%	0.14%
Crossnore	46	192	191,738	192	100.00%	0.10%
Dallas	43	4,488	197,035	4,488	100.00%	2.28%
Danbury	30	189	198,458	189	100.00%	0.10%
Davidson (Iredell)	34	294	197,843	294	100.00%	0.15%
Davidson (Mecklenburg)	41	10,650	184,172	10,650	100.00%	5.78%

District plan definition file: 'SMT-5.asc', modified 08/24/2017 10:23:49 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

S691-ATC-122 - Blue -Districts 14 and 15: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Dellview	43	13	197,035	13	100.00%	0.01%
Denton	32	1,636	190,676	1,636	100.00%	0.86%
Dillsboro	50	232	194,102	232	100.00%	0.12%
Dobbins Heights	25	866	197,991	866	100.00%	0.44%
Dobson	45	1,586	198,833	1,586	100.00%	0.80%
Dortches	11	935	193,194	935	100.00%	0.48%
Dover	2	401	183,118	401	100.00%	0.22%
Drexel	46	1,858	191,738	1,858	100.00%	0.97%
Dublin	8	338	200,133	338	100.00%	0.17%
Duck	1	369	196,665	369	100.00%	0.19%
Dunn	12	9,263	182,438	9,263	100.00%	5.08%
Durham (Durham)	20	228,300	184,237	166,605	72.98%	90.43%
	22	228,300	182,730	61,695	27.02%	33.76%
Durham (Orange)	23	30	197,306	30	100.00%	0.02%
Durham (Wake)	16	0	197,303	0	0.00%	0.00%
Earl	44	260	185,394	260	100.00%	0.14%
East Arcadia	8	487	200,133	487	100.00%	0.24%
East Bend	34	612	197,843	612	100.00%	0.31%
East Laurinburg	25	300	197,991	300	100.00%	0.15%
East Spencer	33	1,534	199,013	1,534	100.00%	0.77%
Eastover	19	3,628	183,122	3,628	100.00%	1.98%
Eden	30	15,527	198,458	15,527	100.00%	7.82%
Edenton	1	5,004	196,665	5,004	100.00%	2.54%
Elizabeth City (Camden)	1	45	196,665	45	100.00%	0.02%
Elizabeth City (Pasquotank)	1	18,638	196,665	18,638	100.00%	9.48%
Elizabethtown	8	3,583	200,133	3,583	100.00%	1.79%
Elk Park	46	452	191,738	452	100.00%	0.24%
Elkin (Surry)	45	3,921	198,833	3,921	100.00%	1.97%
Elkin (Wilkes)	45	80	198,833	80	100.00%	0.04%
Ellenboro	47	873	187,477	873	100.00%	0.47%
Ellerbe	25	1,054	197,991	1,054	100.00%	0.53%
Elm City	4	1,298	192,477	1,298	100.00%	0.67%
Elon	24	9,419	192,673	9,419	100.00%	4.89%
Emerald Isle	2	3,655	183,118	3,655	100.00%	2.00%
Enfield	4	2,532	192,477	2,532	100.00%	1.32%
Erwin	12	4,405	182,438	4,405	100.00%	2.41%
Eureka	7	197	182,118	197	100.00%	0.11%
Everetts	3	164	182,039	164	100.00%	0.09%
Fair Bluff	13	951	192,266	951	100.00%	0.49%
Fairmont	13	2,663	192,266	2,663	100.00%	1.39%
Fairview	36	3,324	189,509	3,324	100.00%	1.75%
Faison (Duplin)	10	961	183,566	961	100.00%	0.52%
Faison (Sampson)	10	0	183,566	0	0.00%	0.00%
Faith	33	807	199,013	807	100.00%	0.41%
Falcon (Cumberland)	19	258	183,122	258	100.00%	0.14%
Falcon (Sampson)	10	0	183,566	0	0.00%	0.00%
Falkland	5	96	189,510	96	100.00%	0.05%
Fallston	44	607	185,394	607	100.00%	0.33%

District plan definition file: 'SMT-5.asc', modified 08/24/2017 10:23:49 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

S691-ATC-122 - Blue -Districts 14 and 15: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Farmville	5	4,654	189,510	4,654	100.00%	2.46%
Fayetteville	19	200,564	183,122	67,587	33.70%	36.91%
	21	200,564	183,261	132,977	66.30%	72.56%
Flat Rock	48	3,114	184,866	3,114	100.00%	1.68%
Fletcher	48	7,187	184,866	7,187	100.00%	3.89%
Forest City	47	7,476	187,477	7,476	100.00%	3.99%
Forest Hills	50	365	194,102	365	100.00%	0.19%
Fountain	5	427	189,510	427	100.00%	0.23%
Four Oaks	10	1,921	183,566	1,921	100.00%	1.05%
Foxfire	25	902	197,991	902	100.00%	0.46%
Franklin	50	3,845	194,102	3,845	100.00%	1.98%
Franklinton	18	2,023	192,915	2,023	100.00%	1.05%
Franklinville	26	1,164	196,115	1,164	100.00%	0.59%
Fremont	7	1,255	182,118	1,255	100.00%	0.69%
Fuquay-Varina	17	17,937	182,304	17,937	100.00%	9.84%
Gamewell	46	4,051	191,738	4,051	100.00%	2.11%
Garland	10	625	183,566	625	100.00%	0.34%
Garner	15	25,745	195,003	21,922	85.15%	11.24%
	17	25,745	182,304	3,823	14.85%	2.10%
Garysburg	3	1,057	182,039	1,057	100.00%	0.58%
Gaston	3	1,152	182,039	1,152	100.00%	0.63%
Gastonia	43	71,741	197,035	71,741	100.00%	36.41%
Gatesville	1	321	196,665	321	100.00%	0.16%
Gibson	25	540	197,991	540	100.00%	0.27%
Gibsonville (Alamance)	24	3,148	192,673	3,148	100.00%	1.63%
Gibsonville (Guilford)	24	3,262	192,673	3,262	100.00%	1.69%
Glen Alpine	46	1,517	191,738	1,517	100.00%	0.79%
Godwin	19	139	183,122	139	100.00%	0.08%
Goldsboro	7	36,437	182,118	36,437	100.00%	20.01%
Goldston	23	268	197,306	268	100.00%	0.14%
Graham	24	14,153	192,673	14,153	100.00%	7.35%
Grandfather	46	25	191,738	25	100.00%	0.01%
Granite Falls	46	4,722	191,738	4,722	100.00%	2.46%
Granite Quarry	33	2,930	199,013	2,930	100.00%	1.47%
Grantsboro	2	688	183,118	688	100.00%	0.38%
Green Level	24	2,100	192,673	2,100	100.00%	1.09%
Greenevers	10	634	183,566	634	100.00%	0.35%
Greensboro	24	269,666	192,673	3,810	1.41%	1.98%
	27	269,666	195,363	84,432	31.31%	43.22%
	28	269,666	197,138	181,424	67.28%	92.03%
Greenville	5	84,554	189,510	84,554	100.00%	44.62%
Grifton (Lenoir)	7	186	182,118	186	100.00%	0.10%
Grifton (Pitt)	5	2,431	189,510	2,431	100.00%	1.28%
Grimesland	5	441	189,510	441	100.00%	0.23%
Grover	44	708	185,394	708	100.00%	0.38%
Halifax	4	234	192,477	234	100.00%	0.12%
Hamilton	3	408	182,039	408	100.00%	0.22%
Hamlet	25	6,495	197,991	6,495	100.00%	3.28%

District plan definition file: 'SMT-5.asc', modified 08/24/2017 10:23:49 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

S691-ATC-122 - Blue -Districts 14 and 15: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Harmony	34	531	197,843	531	100.00%	0.27%
Harrells (Duplin)	10	23	183,566	23	100.00%	0.01%
Harrells (Sampson)	10	179	183,566	179	100.00%	0.10%
Harrellsville	1	106	196,665	106	100.00%	0.05%
Harrisburg	36	11,526	189,509	11,526	100.00%	6.08%
Hassell	3	84	182,039	84	100.00%	0.05%
Havelock	2	20,735	183,118	20,735	100.00%	11.32%
Haw River	24	2,298	192,673	2,298	100.00%	1.19%
Hayesville	50	311	194,102	311	100.00%	0.16%
Hemby Bridge	35	1,520	189,794	1,509	99.28%	0.80%
	36	1,520	189,509	11	0.72%	0.01%
Henderson	3	15,368	182,039	15,368	100.00%	8.44%
Hendersonville	48	13,137	184,866	13,137	100.00%	7.11%
Hertford	1	2,143	196,665	2,143	100.00%	1.09%
Hickory (Burke)	46	66	191,738	66	100.00%	0.03%
Hickory (Caldwell)	46	18	191,738	18	100.00%	0.01%
Hickory (Catawba)	42	39,926	191,556	39,926	100.00%	20.84%
High Point (Davidson)	32	5,310	190,676	5,310	100.00%	2.78%
High Point (Forsyth)	31	8	197,532	8	100.00%	0.00%
High Point (Guilford)	26	99,042	196,115	53,625	54.14%	27.34%
	27	99,042	195,363	42,257	42.67%	21.63%
	28	99,042	197,138	3,160	3.19%	1.60%
High Point (Randolph)	26	11	196,115	11	100.00%	0.01%
High Shoals	43	696	197,035	696	100.00%	0.35%
Highlands (Jackson)	50	4	194,102	4	100.00%	0.00%
Highlands (Macon)	50	920	194,102	920	100.00%	0.47%
Hildebran	46	2,023	191,738	2,023	100.00%	1.06%
Hillsborough	23	6,087	197,306	6,087	100.00%	3.09%
Hobgood	4	348	192,477	348	100.00%	0.18%
Hoffman	25	588	197,991	588	100.00%	0.30%
Holden Beach	8	575	200,133	575	100.00%	0.29%
Holly Ridge	6	1,268	187,925	1,268	100.00%	0.67%
Holly Springs	17	24,661	182,304	24,661	100.00%	13.53%
Hookerton	5	409	189,510	409	100.00%	0.22%
Hope Mills	19	15,176	183,122	15,176	100.00%	8.29%
Hot Springs	47	560	187,477	560	100.00%	0.30%
Hudson	46	3,776	191,738	3,776	100.00%	1.97%
Huntersville	41	46,773	184,172	46,773	100.00%	25.40%
Indian Beach	2	112	183,118	112	100.00%	0.06%
Indian Trail	35	33,518	189,794	33,456	99.82%	17.63%
	36	33,518	189,509	62	0.18%	0.03%
Jackson	3	513	182,039	513	100.00%	0.28%
Jacksonville	6	70,145	187,925	70,145	100.00%	37.33%
Jamestown	26	3,382	196,115	0	0.00%	0.00%
	27	3,382	195,363	3,382	100.00%	1.73%
Jamesville	3	491	182,039	491	100.00%	0.27%
Jefferson	45	1,611	198,833	1,611	100.00%	0.81%
Jonesville	34	2,285	197,843	2,285	100.00%	1.15%

District plan definition file: 'SMT-5.asc', modified 08/24/2017 10:23:49 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

S691-ATC-122 - Blue -Districts 14 and 15: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Kannapolis (Cabarrus)	36	33,194	189,509	33,194	100.00%	17.52%
Kannapolis (Rowan)	33	9,431	199,013	9,431	100.00%	4.74%
Kelford	3	251	182,039	251	100.00%	0.14%
Kenansville	10	855	183,566	855	100.00%	0.47%
Kenly (Johnston)	10	1,176	183,566	763	64.88%	0.42%
	11	1,176	193,194	413	35.12%	0.21%
Kenly (Wilson)	4	163	192,477	163	100.00%	0.08%
Kernersville (Forsyth)	29	23,071	194,378	4	0.02%	0.00%
	31	23,071	197,532	23,067	99.98%	11.68%
Kernersville (Guilford)	27	52	195,363	52	100.00%	0.03%
Kill Devil Hills	1	6,683	196,665	6,683	100.00%	3.40%
King (Forsyth)	31	619	197,532	619	100.00%	0.31%
King (Stokes)	30	6,285	198,458	6,285	100.00%	3.17%
Kings Mountain (Cleveland)	44	9,242	185,394	9,242	100.00%	4.99%
Kings Mountain (Gaston)	43	1,054	197,035	1,054	100.00%	0.53%
Kingstown	44	681	185,394	681	100.00%	0.37%
Kinston	7	21,677	182,118	21,677	100.00%	11.90%
Kittrell	3	467	182,039	467	100.00%	0.26%
Kitty Hawk	1	3,272	196,665	3,272	100.00%	1.66%
Knightdale	14	11,401	194,087	11,401	100.00%	5.87%
Kure Beach	9	2,012	197,372	2,012	100.00%	1.02%
La Grange	7	2,873	182,118	2,873	100.00%	1.58%
Lake Lure	47	1,192	187,477	1,192	100.00%	0.64%
Lake Park	35	3,422	189,794	3,422	100.00%	1.80%
Lake Santeetlah	50	45	194,102	45	100.00%	0.02%
Lake Waccamaw	13	1,480	192,266	1,480	100.00%	0.77%
Landis	33	3,109	199,013	3,109	100.00%	1.56%
Lansing	45	158	198,833	158	100.00%	0.08%
Lasker	3	122	182,039	122	100.00%	0.07%
Lattimore	44	488	185,394	488	100.00%	0.26%
Laurel Park	48	2,180	184,866	2,180	100.00%	1.18%
Laurinburg	25	15,962	197,991	15,962	100.00%	8.06%
Lawndale	44	606	185,394	606	100.00%	0.33%
Leggett	4	60	192,477	60	100.00%	0.03%
Leland	8	13,527	200,133	13,527	100.00%	6.76%
Lenoir	46	18,228	191,738	18,228	100.00%	9.51%
Lewiston Woodville	3	549	182,039	549	100.00%	0.30%
Lewisville	31	12,639	197,532	12,639	100.00%	6.40%
Lexington	32	18,931	190,676	18,931	100.00%	9.93%
Liberty	26	2,656	196,115	2,656	100.00%	1.35%
Lilesville	25	536	197,991	536	100.00%	0.27%
Lillington	12	3,194	182,438	3,194	100.00%	1.75%
Lincolnton	44	10,486	185,394	10,486	100.00%	5.66%
Linden	19	130	183,122	130	100.00%	0.07%
Littleton	4	674	192,477	674	100.00%	0.35%
Locust (Cabarrus)	36	215	189,509	215	100.00%	0.11%
Locust (Stanly)	33	2,715	199,013	2,715	100.00%	1.36%
Long View (Burke)	46	752	191,738	752	100.00%	0.39%

District plan definition file: 'SMT-5.asc', modified 08/24/2017 10:23:49 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

S691-ATC-122 - Blue -Districts 14 and 15: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Long View (Catawba)	42	4,119	191,556	4,119	100.00%	2.15%
Louisburg	18	3,359	192,915	3,359	100.00%	1.74%
Love Valley	34	90	197,843	90	100.00%	0.05%
Lowell	43	3,526	197,035	3,526	100.00%	1.79%
Lucama	4	1,108	192,477	1,108	100.00%	0.58%
Lumber Bridge	13	94	192,266	94	100.00%	0.05%
Lumberton	13	21,542	192,266	21,542	100.00%	11.20%
Macclesfield	4	471	192,477	471	100.00%	0.24%
Macon	3	119	182,039	119	100.00%	0.07%
Madison	30	2,246	198,458	2,246	100.00%	1.13%
Maggie Valley	50	1,150	194,102	1,150	100.00%	0.59%
Magnolia	10	939	183,566	939	100.00%	0.51%
Maiden (Catawba)	42	3,308	191,556	3,308	100.00%	1.73%
Maiden (Lincoln)	44	2	185,394	2	100.00%	0.00%
Manteo	1	1,434	196,665	1,434	100.00%	0.73%
Marietta	13	175	192,266	175	100.00%	0.09%
Marion	47	7,838	187,477	7,838	100.00%	4.18%
Mars Hill	47	1,869	187,477	1,869	100.00%	1.00%
Marshall	47	872	187,477	872	100.00%	0.47%
Marshville	35	2,402	189,794	2,402	100.00%	1.27%
Marvin	35	5,579	189,794	5,579	100.00%	2.94%
Matthews	39	27,198	184,099	27,198	100.00%	14.77%
Maxton (Robeson)	13	2,230	192,266	2,230	100.00%	1.16%
Maxton (Scotland)	25	196	197,991	196	100.00%	0.10%
Mayodan	30	2,478	198,458	2,478	100.00%	1.25%
Maysville	6	1,019	187,925	1,019	100.00%	0.54%
McAdenville	43	651	197,035	651	100.00%	0.33%
McDonald	13	113	192,266	113	100.00%	0.06%
McFarlan	25	117	197,991	117	100.00%	0.06%
Mebane (Alamance)	24	9,600	192,673	9,600	100.00%	4.98%
Mebane (Orange)	23	1,793	197,306	1,793	100.00%	0.91%
Mesic	2	220	183,118	220	100.00%	0.12%
Micro	10	441	183,566	441	100.00%	0.24%
Middleburg	3	133	182,039	133	100.00%	0.07%
Middlesex	11	822	193,194	822	100.00%	0.43%
Midland (Cabarrus)	36	3,073	189,509	3,073	100.00%	1.62%
Midland (Mecklenburg)	39	0	184,099	0	0.00%	0.00%
Midway	32	4,679	190,676	4,679	100.00%	2.45%
Mills River	48	6,802	184,866	6,802	100.00%	3.68%
Milton	30	166	198,458	166	100.00%	0.08%
Mineral Springs	35	2,639	189,794	2,639	100.00%	1.39%
Minnesott Beach	2	440	183,118	440	100.00%	0.24%
Mint Hill (Mecklenburg)	39	22,669	184,099	14,885	65.66%	8.09%
	40	22,669	183,426	7,784	34.34%	4.24%
Mint Hill (Union)	36	53	189,509	53	100.00%	0.03%
Misenheimer	33	728	199,013	728	100.00%	0.37%
Mocksville	31	5,051	197,532	5,051	100.00%	2.56%
Momeyer	11	224	193,194	224	100.00%	0.12%

District plan definition file: 'SMT-5.asc', modified 08/24/2017 10:23:49 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

S691-ATC-122 - Blue -Districts 14 and 15: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Monroe	35	32,797	189,794	32,797	100.00%	17.28%
Montreat	49	723	193,282	723	100.00%	0.37%
Mooresboro	44	311	185,394	311	100.00%	0.17%
Mooresville	34	32,711	197,843	32,711	100.00%	16.53%
Morehead City	2	8,661	183,118	8,661	100.00%	4.73%
Morganton	46	16,918	191,738	16,918	100.00%	8.82%
Morrisville (Durham)	20	0	184,237	0	0.00%	0.00%
Morrisville (Wake)	16	18,576	197,303	18,576	100.00%	9.41%
Morven	25	511	197,991	511	100.00%	0.26%
Mount Airy	30	10,388	198,458	9,838	94.71%	4.96%
	45	10,388	198,833	550	5.29%	0.28%
Mount Gilead	32	1,181	190,676	1,181	100.00%	0.62%
Mount Holly	43	13,656	197,035	11,715	85.79%	5.95%
	44	13,656	185,394	1,941	14.21%	1.05%
Mount Olive (Duplin)	10	51	183,566	51	100.00%	0.03%
Mount Olive (Wayne)	7	4,538	182,118	4,538	100.00%	2.49%
Mount Pleasant	36	1,652	189,509	1,652	100.00%	0.87%
Murfreesboro	1	2,835	196,665	2,835	100.00%	1.44%
Murphy	50	1,627	194,102	1,627	100.00%	0.84%
Nags Head	1	2,757	196,665	2,757	100.00%	1.40%
Nashville	11	5,352	193,194	5,352	100.00%	2.77%
Navassa	8	1,505	200,133	1,505	100.00%	0.75%
New Bern	2	29,524	183,118	29,524	100.00%	16.12%
New London	33	600	199,013	600	100.00%	0.30%
Newland	46	698	191,738	698	100.00%	0.36%
Newport	2	4,150	183,118	4,150	100.00%	2.27%
Newton	42	12,968	191,556	12,968	100.00%	6.77%
Newton Grove	10	569	183,566	569	100.00%	0.31%
Norlina	3	1,118	182,039	1,118	100.00%	0.61%
Norman	25	138	197,991	138	100.00%	0.07%
North Topsail Beach	6	743	187,925	743	100.00%	0.40%
North Wilkesboro	45	4,245	198,833	4,245	100.00%	2.13%
Northwest	8	735	200,133	735	100.00%	0.37%
Norwood	33	2,379	199,013	2,379	100.00%	1.20%
Oak City	3	317	182,039	317	100.00%	0.17%
Oak Island	8	6,783	200,133	6,783	100.00%	3.39%
Oak Ridge	27	6,185	195,363	6,185	100.00%	3.17%
Oakboro	33	1,859	199,013	1,859	100.00%	0.93%
Ocean Isle Beach	8	550	200,133	550	100.00%	0.27%
Old Fort	47	908	187,477	908	100.00%	0.48%
Oriental	2	900	183,118	900	100.00%	0.49%
Orrum	13	91	192,266	91	100.00%	0.05%
Ossipee	24	543	192,673	543	100.00%	0.28%
Oxford	22	8,461	182,730	8,461	100.00%	4.63%
Pantego	3	179	182,039	179	100.00%	0.10%
Parkton	13	436	192,266	436	100.00%	0.23%
Parmele	3	278	182,039	278	100.00%	0.15%
Patterson Springs	44	622	185,394	622	100.00%	0.34%

District plan definition file: 'SMT-5.asc', modified 08/24/2017 10:23:49 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

S691-ATC-122 - Blue -Districts 14 and 15: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Peachland	25	437	197,991	437	100.00%	0.22%
Peletier	2	644	183,118	644	100.00%	0.35%
Pembroke	13	2,973	192,266	2,973	100.00%	1.55%
Pikeville	7	678	182,118	678	100.00%	0.37%
Pilot Mountain	30	1,477	198,458	1,477	100.00%	0.74%
Pine Knoll Shores	2	1,339	183,118	1,339	100.00%	0.73%
Pine Level	10	1,700	183,566	1,700	100.00%	0.93%
Pinebluff	25	1,337	197,991	1,337	100.00%	0.68%
Pinehurst	25	13,124	197,991	13,124	100.00%	6.63%
Pinetops	4	1,374	192,477	1,374	100.00%	0.71%
Pineville	39	7,479	184,099	0	0.00%	0.00%
	41	7,479	184,172	7,479	100.00%	4.06%
Pink Hill	7	552	182,118	552	100.00%	0.30%
Pittsboro	23	3,743	197,306	3,743	100.00%	1.90%
Pleasant Garden	27	4,489	195,363	4,489	100.00%	2.30%
Plymouth	1	3,878	196,665	3,878	100.00%	1.97%
Polkton	25	3,375	197,991	3,375	100.00%	1.70%
Polkville	44	545	185,394	545	100.00%	0.29%
Pollocksville	6	311	187,925	311	100.00%	0.17%
Powellsville	3	276	182,039	276	100.00%	0.15%
Princeton	10	1,194	183,566	1,194	100.00%	0.65%
Princeville	4	2,082	192,477	2,082	100.00%	1.08%
Proctorville	13	117	192,266	117	100.00%	0.06%
Raeford	21	4,611	183,261	4,611	100.00%	2.52%
Raleigh (Durham)	20	1,067	184,237	1,067	100.00%	0.58%
Raleigh (Wake)	14	402,825	194,087	137,563	34.15%	70.88%
	15	402,825	195,003	148,006	36.74%	75.90%
	16	402,825	197,303	69,134	17.16%	35.04%
	17	402,825	182,304	6	0.00%	0.00%
	18	402,825	192,915	48,116	11.94%	24.94%
Ramseur	26	1,692	196,115	1,692	100.00%	0.86%
Randleman	26	4,113	196,115	4,113	100.00%	2.10%
Ranlo	43	3,434	197,035	3,434	100.00%	1.74%
Raynham	13	72	192,266	72	100.00%	0.04%
Red Cross	33	742	199,013	742	100.00%	0.37%
Red Oak	11	3,430	193,194	3,430	100.00%	1.78%
Red Springs (Hoke)	21	0	183,261	0	0.00%	0.00%
Red Springs (Robeson)	13	3,428	192,266	3,428	100.00%	1.78%
Reidsville	30	14,520	198,458	14,520	100.00%	7.32%
Rennert	13	383	192,266	383	100.00%	0.20%
Rhodhiss (Burke)	46	700	191,738	700	100.00%	0.37%
Rhodhiss (Caldwell)	46	370	191,738	370	100.00%	0.19%
Rich Square	3	958	182,039	958	100.00%	0.53%
Richfield	33	613	199,013	613	100.00%	0.31%
Richlands	6	1,520	187,925	1,520	100.00%	0.81%
River Bend	2	3,119	183,118	3,119	100.00%	1.70%
Roanoke Rapids	4	15,754	192,477	15,754	100.00%	8.18%
Robbins	25	1,097	197,991	1,097	100.00%	0.55%

District plan definition file: 'SMT-5.asc', modified 08/24/2017 10:23:49 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

S691-ATC-122 - Blue -Districts 14 and 15: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Robbinsville	50	620	194,102	620	100.00%	0.32%
Robersonville	3	1,488	182,039	1,488	100.00%	0.82%
Rockingham	25	9,558	197,991	9,558	100.00%	4.83%
Rockwell	33	2,108	199,013	2,108	100.00%	1.06%
Rocky Mount (Edgecombe)	4	17,524	192,477	17,524	100.00%	9.10%
Rocky Mount (Nash)	11	39,953	193,194	39,953	100.00%	20.68%
Rolesville	14	3,786	194,087	0	0.00%	0.00%
	18	3,786	192,915	3,786	100.00%	1.96%
Ronda	45	417	198,833	417	100.00%	0.21%
Roper	1	611	196,665	611	100.00%	0.31%
Rose Hill	10	1,626	183,566	1,626	100.00%	0.89%
Roseboro	10	1,191	183,566	1,191	100.00%	0.65%
Rosman	48	576	184,866	576	100.00%	0.31%
Rowland	13	1,037	192,266	1,037	100.00%	0.54%
Roxboro	22	8,362	182,730	8,362	100.00%	4.58%
Roxobel	3	240	182,039	240	100.00%	0.13%
Rural Hall	31	2,937	197,532	2,937	100.00%	1.49%
Ruth	47	440	187,477	440	100.00%	0.23%
Rutherford College	46	1,341	191,738	1,341	100.00%	0.70%
Rutherfordton	47	4,213	187,477	4,213	100.00%	2.25%
Salemburg	10	435	183,566	435	100.00%	0.24%
Salisbury	33	33,662	199,013	33,662	100.00%	16.91%
Saluda (Henderson)	48	12	184,866	12	100.00%	0.01%
Saluda (Polk)	47	701	187,477	701	100.00%	0.37%
Sandy Creek	8	260	200,133	260	100.00%	0.13%
Sandyfield	13	447	192,266	447	100.00%	0.23%
Sanford	12	28,094	182,438	28,094	100.00%	15.40%
Saratoga	4	408	192,477	408	100.00%	0.21%
Sawmills	46	5,240	191,738	5,240	100.00%	2.73%
Scotland Neck	4	2,059	192,477	2,059	100.00%	1.07%
Seaboard	3	632	182,039	632	100.00%	0.35%
Seagrove	26	228	196,115	228	100.00%	0.12%
Sedalia	24	623	192,673	623	100.00%	0.32%
Selma	10	6,073	183,566	6,073	100.00%	3.31%
Seven Devils (Avery)	46	28	191,738	28	100.00%	0.01%
Seven Devils (Watauga)	45	164	198,833	164	100.00%	0.08%
Seven Springs	7	110	182,118	110	100.00%	0.06%
Severn	3	276	182,039	276	100.00%	0.15%
Shallotte	8	3,675	200,133	3,675	100.00%	1.84%
Sharpsburg (Edgecombe)	4	209	192,477	209	100.00%	0.11%
Sharpsburg (Nash)	11	1,252	193,194	1,252	100.00%	0.65%
Sharpsburg (Wilson)	4	563	192,477	563	100.00%	0.29%
Shelby	44	20,323	185,394	20,323	100.00%	10.96%
Siler City	23	7,887	197,306	7,887	100.00%	4.00%
Simpson	5	416	189,510	416	100.00%	0.22%
Sims	4	282	192,477	282	100.00%	0.15%
Smithfield	10	10,966	183,566	10,966	100.00%	5.97%
Snow Hill	5	1,595	189,510	1,595	100.00%	0.84%

District plan definition file: 'SMT-5.asc', modified 08/24/2017 10:23:49 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

S691-ATC-122 - Blue -Districts 14 and 15: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Southern Pines	25	12,334	197,991	12,334	100.00%	6.23%
Southern Shores	1	2,714	196,665	2,714	100.00%	1.38%
Southport	8	2,833	200,133	2,833	100.00%	1.42%
Sparta	45	1,770	198,833	1,770	100.00%	0.89%
Speed	4	80	192,477	80	100.00%	0.04%
Spencer	33	3,267	199,013	3,267	100.00%	1.64%
Spencer Mountain	43	37	197,035	37	100.00%	0.02%
Spindale	47	4,321	187,477	4,321	100.00%	2.30%
Spring Hope	11	1,320	193,194	1,320	100.00%	0.68%
Spring Lake	19	11,964	183,122	11,964	100.00%	6.53%
	21	11,964	183,261	0	0.00%	0.00%
Spruce Pine	47	2,175	187,477	2,175	100.00%	1.16%
St. Helena	8	389	200,133	389	100.00%	0.19%
St. James	8	3,165	200,133	3,165	100.00%	1.58%
St. Pauls	13	2,035	192,266	2,035	100.00%	1.06%
Staley	26	393	196,115	393	100.00%	0.20%
Stallings (Mecklenburg)	39	399	184,099	399	100.00%	0.22%
Stallings (Union)	35	13,432	189,794	7,778	57.91%	4.10%
	36	13,432	189,509	5,654	42.09%	2.98%
Stanfield	33	1,486	199,013	1,486	100.00%	0.75%
Stanley	43	3,556	197,035	2,790	78.46%	1.42%
	44	3,556	185,394	766	21.54%	0.41%
Stantonsburg	4	784	192,477	784	100.00%	0.41%
Star	32	876	190,676	876	100.00%	0.46%
Statesville	34	24,532	197,843	24,532	100.00%	12.40%
Stedman	19	1,028	183,122	1,028	100.00%	0.56%
Stem	22	463	182,730	463	100.00%	0.25%
Stokesdale	27	5,047	195,363	5,047	100.00%	2.58%
Stoneville	30	1,056	198,458	1,056	100.00%	0.53%
Stonewall	2	281	183,118	281	100.00%	0.15%
Stovall	22	418	182,730	418	100.00%	0.23%
Sugar Mountain	46	198	191,738	198	100.00%	0.10%
Summerfield	27	10,232	195,363	10,232	100.00%	5.24%
Sunset Beach	8	3,572	200,133	3,572	100.00%	1.78%
Surf City (Onslow)	6	292	187,925	292	100.00%	0.16%
Surf City (Pender)	8	1,561	200,133	1,561	100.00%	0.78%
Swansboro	6	2,663	187,925	2,663	100.00%	1.42%
Swepsonville	24	1,154	192,673	1,154	100.00%	0.60%
Sylva	50	2,588	194,102	2,588	100.00%	1.33%
Tabor City	13	2,511	192,266	2,511	100.00%	1.31%
Tar Heel	8	117	200,133	117	100.00%	0.06%
Tarboro	4	11,415	192,477	11,415	100.00%	5.93%
Taylorsville	42	2,098	191,556	2,098	100.00%	1.10%
Taylortown	25	722	197,991	722	100.00%	0.36%
Teachey	10	376	183,566	376	100.00%	0.20%
Thomasville (Davidson)	32	26,493	190,676	26,493	100.00%	13.89%
Thomasville (Randolph)	26	264	196,115	264	100.00%	0.13%
Tobaccoville (Forsyth)	31	2,441	197,532	2,441	100.00%	1.24%

District plan definition file: 'SMT-5.asc', modified 08/24/2017 10:23:49 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

S691-ATC-122 - Blue -Districts 14 and 15: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Tobaccoville (Stokes)	30	0	198,458	0	0.00%	0.00%
Topsail Beach	8	368	200,133	368	100.00%	0.18%
Trent Woods	2	4,155	183,118	4,155	100.00%	2.27%
Trenton	6	287	187,925	287	100.00%	0.15%
Trinity	26	6,614	196,115	6,614	100.00%	3.37%
Troutman	34	2,383	197,843	2,383	100.00%	1.20%
Troy	32	3,189	190,676	3,189	100.00%	1.67%
Tryon	47	1,646	187,477	1,646	100.00%	0.88%
Turkey	10	292	183,566	292	100.00%	0.16%
Unionville	35	5,929	189,794	5,843	98.55%	3.08%
	36	5,929	189,509	86	1.45%	0.05%
Valdese	46	4,490	191,738	4,490	100.00%	2.34%
Vanceboro	2	1,005	183,118	1,005	100.00%	0.55%
Vandemere	2	254	183,118	254	100.00%	0.14%
Varnamtown	8	541	200,133	541	100.00%	0.27%
Vass	25	720	197,991	720	100.00%	0.36%
Waco	44	321	185,394	321	100.00%	0.17%
Wade	19	556	183,122	556	100.00%	0.30%
Wadesboro	25	5,813	197,991	5,813	100.00%	2.94%
Wagram	25	840	197,991	840	100.00%	0.42%
Wake Forest (Franklin)	18	899	192,915	899	100.00%	0.47%
Wake Forest (Wake)	18	29,218	192,915	29,218	100.00%	15.15%
Walkertown	29	4,675	194,378	3,055	65.35%	1.57%
	31	4,675	197,532	1,620	34.65%	0.82%
Wallace (Duplin)	10	3,880	183,566	3,880	100.00%	2.11%
Wallace (Pender)	8	0	200,133	0	0.00%	0.00%
Wallburg	32	3,047	190,676	3,047	100.00%	1.60%
Walnut Cove	30	1,425	198,458	1,425	100.00%	0.72%
Walnut Creek	7	835	182,118	835	100.00%	0.46%
Walstonburg	5	219	189,510	219	100.00%	0.12%
Warrenton	3	862	182,039	862	100.00%	0.47%
Warsaw	10	3,054	183,566	3,054	100.00%	1.66%
Washington	3	9,744	182,039	9,744	100.00%	5.35%
Washington Park	3	451	182,039	451	100.00%	0.25%
Watha	8	190	200,133	190	100.00%	0.09%
Waxhaw	35	9,859	189,794	9,859	100.00%	5.19%
Waynesville	50	9,869	194,102	9,869	100.00%	5.08%
Weaverville	49	3,120	193,282	3,120	100.00%	1.61%
Webster	50	363	194,102	363	100.00%	0.19%
Weddington (Mecklenburg)	39	7	184,099	7	100.00%	0.00%
Weddington (Union)	35	9,452	189,794	9,452	100.00%	4.98%
Weldon	4	1,655	192,477	1,655	100.00%	0.86%
Wendell	14	5,845	194,087	5,845	100.00%	3.01%
Wentworth	30	2,807	198,458	2,807	100.00%	1.41%
Wesley Chapel	35	7,463	189,794	7,463	100.00%	3.93%
West Jefferson	45	1,299	198,833	1,299	100.00%	0.65%
Whispering Pines	25	2,928	197,991	2,928	100.00%	1.48%
Whitakers (Edgecombe)	4	402	192,477	402	100.00%	0.21%

District plan definition file: 'SMT-5.asc', modified 08/24/2017 10:23:49 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

S691-ATC-122 - Blue -Districts 14 and 15: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Whitakers (Nash)	11	342	193,194	342	100.00%	0.18%
White Lake	8	802	200,133	802	100.00%	0.40%
Whiteville	13	5,394	192,266	5,394	100.00%	2.81%
Whitsett	24	590	192,673	590	100.00%	0.31%
Wilkesboro	45	3,413	198,833	3,413	100.00%	1.72%
Williamston	3	5,511	182,039	5,511	100.00%	3.03%
Wilmington	8	106,476	200,133	5,295	4.97%	2.65%
	9	106,476	197,372	101,181	95.03%	51.26%
Wilson	4	49,167	192,477	49,167	100.00%	25.54%
Wilson's Mills	10	2,277	183,566	2,277	100.00%	1.24%
	11	2,277	193,194	0	0.00%	0.00%
Windsor	3	3,630	182,039	3,630	100.00%	1.99%
Winfall	1	594	196,665	594	100.00%	0.30%
Wingate	35	3,491	189,794	3,491	100.00%	1.84%
Winston-Salem	29	229,617	194,378	183,735	80.02%	94.52%
	31	229,617	197,532	45,882	19.98%	23.23%
Winterville	5	9,269	189,510	9,269	100.00%	4.89%
Winton	1	769	196,665	769	100.00%	0.39%
Woodfin	49	6,123	193,282	6,123	100.00%	3.17%
Woodland	3	809	182,039	809	100.00%	0.44%
Wrightsville Beach	9	2,477	197,372	2,477	100.00%	1.25%
Yadkinville	34	2,959	197,843	2,959	100.00%	1.50%
Yanceyville	30	2,039	198,458	2,039	100.00%	1.03%
Youngsville	18	1,157	192,915	1,157	100.00%	0.60%
Zebulon (Johnston)	11	0	193,194	0	0.00%	0.00%
Zebulon (Wake)	14	4,433	194,087	4,052	91.41%	2.09%
	18	4,433	192,915	381	8.59%	0.20%
			Total:	**5,250,071**		

District plan definition file: 'SMT-5.asc', modified 08/24/2017 10:23:49 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

S691-ATC-122 - Blue -Districts 14 and 15: Split VTD Detail

County	VTD	District	Total VTD Pop	VTD Pop in District	Percent of VTD Pop in District
Cumberland	G11	19	31,242	31,242	100.00%
		21	31,242	0	0.00%
	G2	19	34,282	5,010	14.61%
		21	34,282	29,272	85.39%
Guilford	HP	27	9,926	6,647	66.97%
		28	9,926	3,279	33.03%
	JEF2	24	3,363	3,363	100.00%
		28	3,363	0	0.00%
Mecklenburg	223.1	38	8,790	827	9.41%
		41	8,790	7,963	90.59%
	230	37	9,345	715	7.65%
		41	9,345	8,630	92.35%
New Hanover	W03	8	2,640	1,764	66.82%
		9	2,640	876	33.18%
	W29	8	4,956	3,531	71.25%
		9	4,956	1,425	28.75%
Wake	16-09	15	4,924	3,027	61.47%
		17	4,924	1,897	38.53%

District plan definition file: 'SMT-5.asc', modified 08/24/2017 10:23:49 PM

VTDs ('Voting Districts') derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG05|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

Plan Name: SMT-5
Plan Type:
Date: 08/24/2017
Time: 10:20:47PM
Administrator:

Measures of Compactness

08/24/2017

Sum	N/A
Min	0.11
Max	0.61
Mean	0.34
Std. Dev.	0.13

DISTRICT	Polsby-Popper
1	0.46
2	0.42
3	0.15
4	0.31
5	0.44
6	0.55
7	0.35
8	0.18
9	0.27
10	0.29
11	0.24
12	0.40
13	0.33
14	0.27
15	0.11
16	0.48
17	0.34
18	0.28
19	0.23
20	0.49
21	0.28
22	0.54
23	0.37
24	0.61
25	0.28
26	0.55
27	0.15
28	0.17
29	0.23
30	0.40
31	0.14
32	0.27
33	0.30
34	0.34
35	0.56
36	0.39
37	0.27
38	0.42
39	0.24
40	0.36

Plan Name:	SMT-5	Administrator:	
Plan Type:		User:	

DISTRICT	Polsby-Popper
41	0.13
42	0.48
43	0.50
44	0.32
45	0.41
46	0.45
47	0.24
48	0.32
49	0.30
50	0.46

Plan Name: SMT-5
Plan Type:
Date: 08/24/2017
Time: 10:20:42PM
Administrator:

Measures of Compactness

08/24/2017

Sum	N/A
Min	0.19
Max	0.62
Mean	0.42
Std. Dev.	0.10

DISTRICT	Reock
1	0.46
2	0.48
3	0.23
4	0.45
5	0.62
6	0.52
7	0.46
8	0.41
9	0.24
10	0.48
11	0.22
12	0.46
13	0.41
14	0.41
15	0.38
16	0.50
17	0.39
18	0.41
19	0.46
20	0.44
21	0.47
22	0.58
23	0.39
24	0.58
25	0.46
26	0.56
27	0.43
28	0.40
29	0.58
30	0.27
31	0.32
32	0.27
33	0.32
34	0.33
35	0.49
36	0.44
37	0.42
38	0.42
39	0.33
40	0.47

Plan Name:	SMT-5	Administrator:	
Plan Type:		User:	

DISTRICT	Reock
41	0.19
42	0.45
43	0.43
44	0.38
45	0.44
46	0.54
47	0.42
48	0.40
49	0.39
50	0.42

S691-ATC-122 - Blue -Districts 14 and 15: Population Deviation

District	2010 Pop	Ideal Pop	Deviation	Deviation %
1	196,665	190,710	5,955	3.12%
2	183,118	190,710	-7,592	-3.98%
3	182,039	190,710	-8,671	-4.55%
4	192,477	190,710	1,767	0.93%
5	189,510	190,710	-1,200	-0.63%
6	187,925	190,710	-2,785	-1.46%
7	182,118	190,710	-8,592	-4.51%
8	200,133	190,710	9,423	4.94%
9	197,372	190,710	6,662	3.49%
10	183,566	190,710	-7,144	-3.75%
11	193,194	190,710	2,484	1.30%
12	182,438	190,710	-8,272	-4.34%
13	192,266	190,710	1,556	0.82%
14	194,087	190,710	3,377	1.77%
15	195,003	190,710	4,293	2.25%
16	197,303	190,710	6,593	3.46%
17	182,304	190,710	-8,406	-4.41%
18	192,915	190,710	2,205	1.16%
19	183,122	190,710	-7,588	-3.98%
20	184,237	190,710	-6,473	-3.39%
21	183,261	190,710	-7,449	-3.91%
22	182,730	190,710	-7,980	-4.18%
23	197,306	190,710	6,596	3.46%
24	192,673	190,710	1,963	1.03%
25	197,991	190,710	7,281	3.82%
26	196,115	190,710	5,405	2.83%
27	195,363	190,710	4,653	2.44%
28	197,138	190,710	6,428	3.37%
29	194,378	190,710	3,668	1.92%
30	198,458	190,710	7,748	4.06%
31	197,532	190,710	6,822	3.58%
32	190,676	190,710	-34	-0.02%
33	199,013	190,710	8,303	4.35%
34	197,843	190,710	7,133	3.74%
35	189,794	190,710	-916	-0.48%
36	189,509	190,710	-1,201	-0.63%
37	185,257	190,710	-5,453	-2.86%
38	182,674	190,710	-8,036	-4.21%
39	184,099	190,710	-6,611	-3.47%
40	183,426	190,710	-7,284	-3.82%
41	184,172	190,710	-6,538	-3.43%
42	191,556	190,710	846	0.44%
43	197,035	190,710	6,325	3.32%
44	185,394	190,710	-5,316	-2.79%
45	198,833	190,710	8,123	4.26%
46	191,738	190,710	1,028	0.54%
47	187,477	190,710	-3,233	-1.70%
48	184,866	190,710	-5,844	-3.06%
49	193,282	190,710	2,572	1.35%
50	194,102	190,710	3,392	1.78%
Total:	**9,535,483**			

S691-ATC-122 - Blue -Districts 14 and 15: Population 2010, US Senate 2010, President 2012

	2010 Census		US Senate 2010: Marshall-Burr-Beitler								US President 2012: Obama-Romney-Johnson							
District	Total Pop	18+ Pop	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %
1	196,665	153,426	25,606	43.60%	31,904	54.33%	1,196	2.04%	19	0.03%	45,482	48.87%	46,490	49.95%	950	1.02%	150	0.16%
2	183,118	143,986	17,393	31.26%	37,109	66.70%	1,070	1.92%	63	0.11%	31,516	35.91%	55,323	63.03%	761	0.87%	168	0.19%
3	182,039	141,242	31,118	52.62%	27,064	45.76%	926	1.57%	30	0.05%	50,170	56.97%	37,383	42.45%	406	0.46%	104	0.12%
4	192,477	145,928	32,883	57.59%	23,457	41.08%	750	1.31%	10	0.02%	56,149	61.10%	35,208	38.32%	433	0.47%	100	0.11%
5	189,510	146,760	22,397	47.49%	24,190	51.29%	556	1.18%	20	0.04%	45,546	52.42%	40,573	46.70%	648	0.75%	117	0.13%
6	187,925	140,779	10,015	33.20%	19,362	64.19%	769	2.55%	16	0.05%	20,842	36.78%	35,080	61.91%	588	1.04%	155	0.27%
7	182,118	137,302	20,490	42.11%	27,572	56.66%	583	1.20%	14	0.03%	37,221	46.96%	41,578	52.46%	434	0.55%	22	0.03%
8	200,133	158,646	26,597	38.48%	41,161	59.54%	1,344	1.94%	25	0.04%	42,274	42.05%	57,243	56.94%	821	0.82%	202	0.20%
9	197,372	158,279	23,736	38.00%	37,303	59.72%	1,394	2.23%	32	0.05%	46,065	45.68%	53,212	52.77%	1,246	1.24%	312	0.31%
10	183,566	136,365	18,810	40.24%	27,283	58.36%	647	1.38%	10	0.02%	29,823	41.92%	40,745	57.27%	468	0.66%	107	0.15%
11	193,194	141,728	23,256	39.26%	34,955	59.02%	994	1.68%	24	0.04%	41,040	42.70%	54,070	56.26%	783	0.81%	221	0.23%
12	182,438	133,366	16,935	38.82%	25,854	59.27%	817	1.87%	16	0.04%	29,243	40.66%	41,830	58.16%	695	0.97%	157	0.22%
13	192,266	142,807	19,514	49.67%	19,146	48.73%	605	1.54%	25	0.06%	36,038	53.66%	30,451	45.34%	520	0.77%	156	0.23%
14	194,087	140,836	31,356	61.63%	18,506	36.38%	980	1.93%	33	0.06%	64,173	68.04%	29,080	30.83%	911	0.97%	153	0.16%
15	195,003	155,372	33,921	61.74%	19,809	36.05%	1,188	2.16%	28	0.05%	66,963	66.58%	31,880	31.70%	1,554	1.55%	183	0.18%
16	197,303	146,752	27,789	46.71%	29,992	50.41%	1,690	2.84%	24	0.04%	59,269	54.76%	47,171	43.58%	1,575	1.46%	225	0.21%
17	182,304	127,938	22,007	36.88%	36,146	60.58%	1,492	2.50%	20	0.03%	43,729	42.94%	56,687	55.66%	1,280	1.26%	153	0.15%
18	192,915	141,239	26,298	38.31%	40,810	59.45%	1,499	2.18%	41	0.06%	46,564	42.61%	61,381	56.17%	1,119	1.02%	212	0.19%
19	183,122	132,805	16,676	42.18%	22,143	56.01%	697	1.76%	19	0.05%	33,645	47.52%	36,446	51.48%	570	0.81%	142	0.20%
20	184,237	142,941	40,914	76.58%	11,670	21.84%	815	1.53%	26	0.05%	79,586	79.30%	19,709	19.64%	942	0.94%	125	0.12%
21	183,261	133,852	24,666	65.09%	12,650	33.38%	560	1.48%	21	0.06%	52,223	70.64%	21,039	28.46%	524	0.71%	141	0.19%
22	182,730	141,258	29,403	54.21%	23,800	43.88%	1,018	1.88%	15	0.03%	53,654	58.60%	36,961	40.37%	774	0.85%	168	0.18%
23	197,306	155,496	43,402	61.53%	25,502	36.15%	1,599	2.27%	35	0.05%	72,262	64.41%	38,204	34.05%	1,386	1.24%	339	0.30%
24	192,673	147,633	19,692	36.36%	33,126	61.16%	1,313	2.42%	29	0.05%	37,586	41.57%	51,828	57.32%	814	0.90%	187	0.21%
25	197,991	152,423	24,146	43.32%	30,550	54.81%	1,018	1.83%	23	0.04%	41,643	45.66%	48,824	53.53%	631	0.69%	110	0.12%
26	196,115	147,126	12,742	30.20%	28,243	66.95%	1,165	2.76%	36	0.09%	30,042	36.90%	50,505	62.03%	749	0.92%	124	0.15%
27	195,363	149,849	22,624	33.08%	44,339	64.82%	1,395	2.04%	43	0.06%	45,643	40.21%	66,503	58.59%	1,063	0.94%	289	0.25%
28	197,138	152,041	32,175	71.88%	11,898	26.58%	652	1.46%	37	0.08%	76,219	79.28%	19,017	19.78%	694	0.72%	214	0.22%
29	194,378	146,637	26,071	60.42%	16,353	37.90%	705	1.63%	18	0.04%	61,949	70.29%	25,484	28.92%	700	0.79%	0	0.00%
30	198,458	154,651	18,011	32.71%	35,585	64.63%	1,442	2.62%	24	0.04%	32,115	36.33%	55,203	62.45%	866	0.98%	208	0.24%
31	197,532	150,121	18,305	27.87%	46,061	70.13%	1,292	1.97%	21	0.03%	36,109	34.00%	68,971	64.95%	1,068	1.01%	49	0.05%
32	190,676	145,058	14,509	29.44%	33,627	68.24%	1,119	2.27%	20	0.04%	25,330	30.83%	55,787	67.90%	876	1.07%	173	0.21%
33	199,013	152,338	17,207	31.47%	36,147	66.12%	1,285	2.35%	32	0.06%	31,078	34.17%	58,644	64.47%	953	1.05%	284	0.31%
34	197,843	148,320	15,298	28.04%	37,834	69.35%	1,397	2.56%	26	0.05%	30,033	32.23%	61,877	66.41%	978	1.05%	290	0.31%
35	189,794	132,039	13,415	29.02%	31,743	68.68%	1,034	2.24%	30	0.06%	30,954	35.05%	56,278	63.72%	854	0.97%	228	0.26%
36	189,509	137,603	16,691	32.42%	33,671	65.41%	1,115	2.17%	0	0.00%	34,337	38.31%	54,340	60.63%	939	1.05%	14	0.02%
37	185,257	143,412	25,673	70.58%	9,978	27.43%	703	1.93%	20	0.05%	62,709	76.14%	18,651	22.65%	794	0.96%	207	0.25%
38	182,674	134,933	28,643	71.61%	10,769	26.93%	569	1.42%	15	0.04%	65,195	76.92%	18,683	22.04%	666	0.79%	214	0.25%
39	184,099	138,352	20,085	31.61%	42,253	66.50%	1,164	1.83%	32	0.05%	40,182	38.03%	64,289	60.85%	942	0.89%	235	0.22%
40	183,426	134,379	25,370	64.51%	13,288	33.79%	638	1.62%	30	0.08%	55,925	72.56%	20,350	26.40%	622	0.81%	178	0.23%
41	184,172	135,214	17,773	38.46%	27,479	59.46%	943	2.04%	18	0.04%	43,121	46.53%	48,482	52.31%	868	0.94%	205	0.22%
42	191,556	146,308	16,533	30.70%	35,956	66.76%	1,337	2.48%	33	0.06%	28,675	33.04%	56,787	65.43%	1,033	1.19%	293	0.34%
43	197,035	149,991	14,895	31.63%	31,082	66.01%	1,113	2.36%	0	0.00%	31,879	37.10%	53,179	61.89%	869	1.01%	0	0.00%
44	185,394	141,718	17,792	34.23%	33,049	63.59%	1,112	2.14%	22	0.04%	29,375	34.80%	54,018	63.99%	803	0.95%	224	0.27%
45	198,833	159,078	20,603	34.28%	37,811	62.92%	1,655	2.75%	29	0.05%	31,463	35.00%	56,629	63.00%	1,425	1.59%	366	0.41%
46	191,738	149,705	16,531	33.18%	31,940	64.11%	1,325	2.66%	23	0.05%	26,481	33.57%	51,262	64.98%	1,012	1.28%	132	0.17%
47	187,477	147,841	21,314	34.98%	38,045	62.44%	1,540	2.53%	33	0.05%	29,486	35.14%	53,113	63.30%	1,022	1.22%	282	0.34%
48	184,866	147,107	22,200	34.84%	39,941	62.68%	1,558	2.45%	21	0.03%	36,540	39.02%	55,677	59.45%	1,092	1.17%	344	0.37%
49	193,282	154,410	33,055	52.87%	27,761	44.40%	1,664	2.66%	44	0.07%	59,546	57.71%	41,650	40.36%	1,433	1.39%	560	0.54%
50	194,102	156,458	25,165	38.43%	38,165	58.28%	2,112	3.23%	38	0.06%	34,201	38.27%	53,578	59.95%	1,294	1.45%	297	0.33%
Totals:	**9,535,483**	**7,253,848**	**1,141,700**	**43.04%**	**1,454,082**	**54.82%**	**55,554**	**2.09%**	**1,263**	**0.05%**	**2,171,293**	**48.33%**	**2,267,353**	**50.47%**	**44,448**	**0.99%**	**9,519**	**0.21%**

Populations values derive from the 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File. Election results were provided by the NC State Board of Elections. Votes that could not be associated with a specific precinct were excluded. Reported statewide totals may therefore be marginally lower than official contest results.

S691-ATC-122 - Blue -Districts 14 and 15: Governor 2012, Lieutenant Governor 2012, US Senate 2014

	Governor 2012: Dalton-McCrory-Howe								Lieutenant Governor 2012: Coleman-Forest				US Senate 2014: Tillis-Hagan-Haugh							
District	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %
1	44,567	48.84%	44,051	48.28%	2,609	2.86%	20	0.02%	48,060	53.59%	41,627	46.41%	30,750	50.80%	28,027	46.30%	1,702	2.81%	48	0.08%
2	28,530	32.65%	57,217	65.47%	1,615	1.85%	26	0.03%	32,786	38.21%	53,018	61.79%	36,899	60.46%	21,609	35.41%	2,340	3.83%	182	0.30%
3	48,711	55.68%	37,737	43.14%	1,024	1.17%	10	0.01%	52,590	61.35%	33,128	38.65%	24,793	41.50%	32,737	54.80%	2,084	3.49%	128	0.21%
4	54,777	59.84%	35,877	39.20%	869	0.95%	10	0.01%	57,424	63.60%	32,867	36.40%	22,999	38.20%	35,596	59.12%	1,565	2.60%	45	0.07%
5	42,553	49.27%	42,332	49.02%	1,463	1.69%	16	0.02%	46,467	54.65%	38,559	45.35%	24,088	47.07%	25,389	49.62%	1,612	3.15%	81	0.16%
6	18,744	33.55%	35,659	63.82%	1,459	2.61%	13	0.02%	22,010	40.37%	32,513	59.63%	21,858	61.65%	11,859	33.45%	1,681	4.74%	59	0.17%
7	35,570	45.13%	42,240	53.59%	988	1.25%	24	0.03%	38,551	49.66%	39,078	50.34%	26,667	51.80%	23,095	44.86%	1,663	3.23%	55	0.11%
8	37,873	38.02%	59,764	59.99%	1,972	1.98%	15	0.02%	44,067	45.14%	53,565	54.86%	37,130	53.02%	28,989	41.40%	3,786	5.41%	125	0.18%
9	39,195	39.52%	56,871	57.34%	3,086	3.11%	30	0.03%	45,150	46.86%	51,202	53.14%	31,405	48.37%	30,133	46.41%	3,278	5.05%	109	0.17%
10	28,848	40.68%	41,165	58.06%	879	1.24%	14	0.02%	31,760	45.62%	37,856	54.38%	25,555	55.54%	18,517	40.24%	1,855	4.03%	85	0.18%
11	38,275	39.95%	55,989	58.43%	1,536	1.60%	16	0.02%	42,124	44.69%	52,143	55.31%	35,971	54.98%	27,183	41.55%	2,180	3.33%	88	0.13%
12	27,109	37.87%	43,004	60.08%	1,437	2.01%	32	0.04%	30,845	43.91%	39,400	56.09%	25,363	55.53%	18,263	39.99%	1,965	4.30%	81	0.18%
13	37,211	56.10%	27,970	42.17%	1,133	1.71%	20	0.03%	41,068	63.31%	23,805	36.69%	17,801	44.87%	19,985	50.38%	1,822	4.59%	64	0.16%
14	58,672	62.53%	32,941	35.11%	2,194	2.34%	25	0.03%	63,510	68.66%	28,991	31.34%	17,819	30.19%	39,531	66.97%	1,595	2.70%	85	0.14%
15	60,067	60.28%	36,307	36.43%	3,262	3.27%	17	0.02%	65,850	67.55%	31,639	32.45%	18,694	28.84%	43,940	67.79%	2,056	3.17%	125	0.19%
16	50,214	46.93%	53,318	49.83%	3,431	3.21%	29	0.03%	56,759	54.38%	47,610	45.62%	29,618	41.04%	40,216	55.72%	2,223	3.08%	119	0.16%
17	36,898	36.47%	61,457	60.74%	2,795	2.76%	27	0.03%	42,704	43.23%	56,086	56.77%	37,808	53.25%	30,870	43.48%	2,175	3.06%	151	0.21%
18	40,253	37.06%	65,931	60.70%	2,390	2.20%	41	0.04%	45,684	42.88%	60,851	57.12%	42,062	53.07%	34,607	43.66%	2,464	3.11%	130	0.16%
19	31,206	44.66%	37,176	53.20%	1,480	2.12%	15	0.02%	34,715	50.63%	33,851	49.37%	22,578	51.71%	19,417	44.47%	1,607	3.68%	58	0.13%
20	73,527	74.12%	23,053	23.24%	2,558	2.58%	56	0.06%	77,591	79.52%	19,983	20.48%	10,716	17.15%	50,551	80.89%	1,148	1.84%	81	0.13%
21	48,987	67.36%	22,090	30.37%	1,628	2.24%	23	0.03%	51,833	72.14%	20,018	27.86%	12,247	29.02%	28,680	67.95%	1,223	2.90%	58	0.14%
22	49,395	54.52%	39,138	43.20%	2,049	2.26%	25	0.03%	53,909	60.96%	34,519	39.04%	23,144	38.59%	34,913	58.22%	1,839	3.07%	73	0.12%
23	65,604	59.22%	42,009	37.92%	3,103	2.80%	63	0.06%	70,358	64.96%	37,947	35.04%	24,700	30.65%	53,699	66.63%	2,120	2.63%	72	0.09%
24	33,361	37.22%	54,353	60.64%	1,899	2.12%	25	0.03%	37,312	42.46%	50,562	57.54%	33,277	55.76%	24,156	40.47%	2,156	3.61%	94	0.16%
25	38,495	42.60%	50,372	55.74%	1,458	1.61%	44	0.05%	43,394	49.27%	44,680	50.73%	32,665	52.10%	27,623	44.06%	2,319	3.70%	87	0.14%
26	27,007	33.28%	52,574	64.79%	1,553	1.91%	14	0.02%	30,150	37.93%	49,336	62.07%	30,068	62.15%	16,341	33.77%	1,894	3.91%	80	0.17%
27	38,429	34.12%	71,796	63.74%	2,379	2.11%	31	0.03%	44,058	40.13%	65,723	59.87%	45,334	55.88%	33,720	41.56%	1,979	2.44%	101	0.12%
28	70,102	73.90%	22,507	23.73%	2,210	2.33%	37	0.04%	74,547	79.67%	19,022	20.33%	11,198	20.24%	42,845	77.44%	1,216	2.20%	70	0.13%
29	56,426	64.53%	29,125	33.31%	1,865	2.13%	23	0.03%	60,504	70.43%	25,402	29.57%	14,750	28.49%	35,624	68.81%	1,315	2.54%	85	0.16%
30	29,519	33.57%	56,635	64.40%	1,761	2.00%	21	0.02%	34,035	39.65%	51,802	60.35%	34,563	59.33%	20,515	35.22%	3,032	5.20%	144	0.25%
31	30,238	28.46%	73,840	69.50%	2,146	2.02%	27	0.03%	35,556	34.29%	68,123	65.71%	44,330	62.51%	24,129	34.02%	2,308	3.25%	149	0.21%
32	22,078	26.93%	58,230	71.04%	1,648	2.01%	14	0.02%	26,730	33.30%	53,543	66.70%	33,575	65.72%	15,182	29.72%	2,234	4.37%	98	0.19%
33	24,785	27.34%	64,437	71.09%	1,406	1.55%	17	0.02%	31,147	35.25%	57,223	64.75%	35,720	61.30%	18,960	32.54%	3,436	5.90%	156	0.27%
34	23,382	25.22%	67,657	72.97%	1,652	1.78%	30	0.03%	29,848	33.11%	60,303	66.89%	39,563	64.03%	18,656	30.19%	3,385	5.48%	187	0.30%
35	23,416	26.70%	62,790	71.60%	1,463	1.67%	22	0.03%	29,912	35.04%	55,458	64.96%	34,426	63.13%	18,044	33.09%	1,864	3.42%	196	0.36%
36	25,791	28.80%	62,144	69.39%	1,621	1.81%	2	0.00%	34,159	39.33%	52,691	60.67%	32,506	57.95%	21,038	37.51%	2,379	4.24%	167	0.30%
37	51,818	64.06%	27,303	33.76%	1,742	2.15%	22	0.03%	59,561	75.67%	19,152	24.33%	9,453	21.56%	33,142	75.58%	1,198	2.73%	58	0.13%
38	56,519	67.34%	25,968	30.94%	1,406	1.68%	34	0.04%	63,329	76.88%	19,045	23.12%	9,325	20.38%	35,376	77.33%	988	2.16%	58	0.13%
39	25,507	24.25%	78,167	74.31%	1,487	1.41%	25	0.02%	36,685	36.04%	65,104	63.96%	38,383	57.57%	26,513	39.77%	1,665	2.50%	111	0.17%
40	47,247	61.83%	27,759	36.32%	1,390	1.82%	23	0.03%	54,059	72.25%	20,761	27.75%	11,035	25.82%	30,532	71.45%	1,089	2.55%	74	0.17%
41	31,204	33.96%	59,005	64.21%	1,665	1.81%	15	0.02%	40,500	45.39%	48,721	54.61%	27,089	49.95%	25,308	46.66%	1,685	3.11%	153	0.28%
42	22,115	25.57%	62,937	72.78%	1,402	1.62%	19	0.02%	28,289	33.50%	56,166	66.50%	35,350	63.19%	17,371	31.05%	3,046	5.44%	176	0.31%
43	25,879	30.15%	58,602	68.27%	1,337	1.56%	18	0.02%	31,620	37.82%	51,992	62.18%	31,406	60.24%	18,283	35.07%	2,321	4.45%	123	0.24%
44	25,417	30.23%	57,452	68.34%	1,189	1.41%	15	0.02%	29,967	36.62%	51,872	63.38%	33,139	60.95%	18,439	33.91%	2,656	4.88%	138	0.25%
45	27,277	30.55%	59,444	66.57%	2,558	2.86%	22	0.02%	32,247	37.36%	54,077	62.64%	35,618	59.70%	20,428	34.24%	3,477	5.83%	137	0.23%
46	20,724	26.21%	56,753	71.77%	1,579	2.00%	18	0.02%	27,156	35.42%	49,516	64.58%	31,230	61.54%	16,228	31.98%	3,151	6.21%	136	0.27%
47	31,588	37.71%	50,318	60.07%	1,840	2.20%	17	0.02%	31,802	39.23%	49,272	60.77%	34,520	58.39%	21,336	36.09%	3,184	5.39%	80	0.14%
48	32,660	35.31%	57,355	62.00%	2,456	2.66%	30	0.03%	36,359	40.13%	54,243	59.87%	36,913	55.81%	26,545	40.13%	2,601	3.93%	87	0.13%
49	54,517	53.45%	43,870	43.01%	3,574	3.50%	32	0.03%	58,927	58.95%	41,030	41.05%	25,653	36.55%	41,569	59.23%	2,875	4.10%	89	0.13%
50	32,983	37.31%	52,535	59.42%	2,866	3.24%	27	0.03%	36,353	42.19%	49,816	57.81%	35,080	55.57%	24,594	38.96%	3,343	5.30%	115	0.18%
Totals:	**1,925,270**	**43.18%**	**2,437,224**	**54.67%**	**94,512**	**2.12%**	**1,191**	**0.03%**	**2,174,021**	**49.88%**	**2,184,891**	**50.12%**	**1,416,834**	**48.84%**	**1,370,303**	**47.23%**	**108,779**	**3.75%**	**5,251**	**0.18%**

S691-ATC-122 - Blue -Districts 14 and 15: President 2016, US Senate 2016, Governor 2016

	US President 2016: Trump-Clinton-Johnson								US Senate 2016: Burr-Ross-Haugh						Governor 2016: Cooper-McCrory-Cecil					
District	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Write-In**	**Write-In %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**
1	51,124	54.37%	39,690	42.21%	2,437	2.59%	781	0.83%	50,422	54.75%	39,232	42.60%	2,441	2.65%	40,704	43.98%	50,100	54.13%	1,749	1.89%
2	58,542	63.89%	30,012	32.76%	2,242	2.45%	829	0.90%	58,109	64.13%	28,994	32.00%	3,512	3.88%	30,960	34.02%	58,265	64.02%	1,788	1.96%
3	37,998	44.82%	45,070	53.16%	1,193	1.41%	523	0.62%	37,690	45.00%	44,065	52.61%	2,002	2.39%	44,887	53.29%	38,505	45.71%	842	1.00%
4	34,714	39.56%	51,323	58.49%	1,231	1.40%	485	0.55%	34,873	40.05%	50,550	58.06%	1,648	1.89%	52,322	59.88%	34,269	39.22%	793	0.91%
5	40,021	45.23%	45,333	51.24%	2,245	2.54%	881	1.00%	41,386	47.29%	43,487	49.70%	2,634	3.01%	45,427	51.71%	41,041	46.71%	1,389	1.58%
6	40,099	64.39%	19,577	31.44%	1,985	3.19%	610	0.98%	39,097	63.90%	19,028	31.10%	3,064	5.01%	20,040	32.62%	39,685	64.59%	1,718	2.80%
7	41,031	53.33%	33,966	44.15%	1,362	1.77%	579	0.75%	40,925	53.84%	33,171	43.64%	1,921	2.53%	33,894	44.35%	41,571	54.40%	958	1.25%
8	69,138	60.31%	41,895	36.54%	2,660	2.32%	948	0.83%	67,784	60.07%	40,579	35.96%	4,470	3.96%	44,922	39.64%	65,885	58.14%	2,506	2.21%
9	55,097	50.39%	48,749	44.58%	3,901	3.57%	1,602	1.47%	55,887	51.89%	46,846	43.49%	4,974	4.62%	54,155	50.05%	50,866	47.01%	3,173	2.93%
10	43,565	59.90%	27,558	37.89%	1,169	1.61%	439	0.60%	43,032	59.87%	27,012	37.58%	1,835	2.55%	28,135	38.91%	43,298	59.88%	879	1.22%
11	57,543	55.97%	41,835	40.69%	2,470	2.40%	968	0.94%	57,652	56.39%	41,591	40.68%	2,987	2.92%	45,263	44.10%	55,757	54.33%	1,612	1.57%
12	44,964	59.19%	28,240	37.18%	2,047	2.69%	709	0.93%	44,404	58.94%	28,264	37.51%	2,673	3.55%	30,211	39.98%	43,695	57.83%	1,656	2.19%
13	34,909	54.33%	27,879	43.39%	1,101	1.71%	361	0.56%	33,313	53.25%	27,703	44.28%	1,548	2.47%	27,663	43.72%	34,916	55.19%	690	1.09%
14	27,353	28.07%	65,857	67.58%	2,784	2.86%	1,450	1.49%	29,490	30.45%	64,478	66.57%	2,890	2.98%	67,188	69.13%	28,058	28.87%	1,940	2.00%
15	27,357	26.16%	71,491	68.37%	3,905	3.73%	1,805	1.73%	31,106	29.93%	69,520	66.90%	3,291	3.17%	74,070	71.04%	27,793	26.66%	2,406	2.31%
16	40,924	34.26%	71,524	59.88%	4,721	3.95%	2,268	1.90%	47,090	39.70%	67,617	57.00%	3,913	3.30%	74,271	62.34%	41,984	35.24%	2,880	2.42%
17	56,562	48.80%	52,520	45.32%	4,792	4.13%	2,020	1.74%	61,244	53.15%	50,014	43.40%	3,971	3.45%	56,237	48.60%	56,738	49.03%	2,745	2.37%
18	60,254	49.94%	54,218	44.93%	4,035	3.34%	2,152	1.78%	65,138	54.20%	51,537	42.88%	3,507	2.92%	57,638	47.79%	60,683	50.32%	2,283	1.89%
19	37,888	51.74%	32,555	44.45%	2,059	2.81%	730	1.00%	38,002	52.52%	31,815	43.97%	2,540	3.51%	32,673	45.04%	38,202	52.66%	1,671	2.30%
20	15,723	14.64%	87,146	81.16%	2,761	2.57%	1,745	1.63%	19,607	18.37%	84,748	79.40%	2,382	2.23%	87,566	81.92%	17,525	16.39%	1,802	1.69%
21	21,137	29.15%	48,776	67.27%	1,891	2.61%	700	0.97%	21,569	30.17%	47,479	66.41%	2,449	3.43%	47,464	66.34%	22,359	31.25%	1,728	2.42%
22	37,322	39.28%	54,243	57.08%	2,241	2.36%	1,220	1.28%	38,620	40.93%	53,100	56.28%	2,628	2.79%	55,918	59.07%	37,192	39.29%	1,560	1.65%
23	35,663	29.19%	80,987	66.28%	3,534	2.89%	2,005	1.64%	39,933	32.86%	78,407	64.52%	3,177	2.61%	83,440	68.47%	36,205	29.71%	2,211	1.81%
24	53,036	55.49%	39,216	41.03%	2,381	2.49%	945	0.99%	53,644	56.54%	38,083	40.14%	3,145	3.31%	42,372	44.53%	50,986	53.58%	1,795	1.89%
25	51,626	55.82%	38,014	41.10%	2,073	2.24%	779	0.84%	50,943	55.86%	37,449	41.07%	2,798	3.07%	39,947	43.57%	50,130	54.68%	1,603	1.75%
26	54,446	64.64%	27,269	32.37%	1,788	2.12%	729	0.87%	53,193	63.86%	26,713	32.07%	3,384	4.06%	30,384	36.36%	51,246	61.33%	1,928	2.31%
27	60,891	51.72%	51,460	43.71%	3,690	3.13%	1,695	1.44%	64,651	55.25%	48,752	41.66%	3,607	3.08%	56,361	48.05%	58,431	49.81%	2,511	2.14%
28	17,691	18.66%	73,851	77.88%	2,070	2.18%	1,220	1.29%	19,041	20.34%	71,990	76.89%	2,600	2.78%	74,483	79.38%	17,465	18.61%	1,885	2.01%
29	24,035	26.97%	61,506	69.02%	2,410	2.70%	1,161	1.30%	26,595	30.11%	59,121	66.94%	2,601	2.95%	62,623	70.89%	23,752	26.89%	1,959	2.22%
30	60,630	66.76%	27,458	30.23%	1,981	2.18%	748	0.82%	59,336	65.92%	27,371	30.41%	3,299	3.67%	32,270	35.77%	56,074	62.16%	1,869	2.07%
31	67,558	60.88%	38,216	34.44%	3,596	3.24%	1,599	1.44%	70,992	64.24%	35,655	32.26%	3,871	3.50%	43,491	39.30%	64,639	58.41%	2,539	2.29%
32	61,447	71.12%	22,259	25.76%	2,062	2.39%	628	0.73%	60,373	70.54%	21,959	25.66%	3,259	3.81%	26,603	30.94%	57,516	66.90%	1,851	2.15%
33	64,774	68.70%	26,494	28.10%	2,181	2.31%	837	0.89%	62,061	66.50%	26,482	28.38%	4,782	5.12%	29,794	31.73%	61,866	65.89%	2,231	2.38%
34	68,634	68.50%	27,894	27.84%	2,583	2.58%	1,080	1.08%	66,829	67.44%	27,349	27.60%	4,916	4.96%	32,618	32.78%	64,115	64.43%	2,775	2.79%
35	61,627	62.37%	32,773	33.17%	3,156	3.19%	1,249	1.26%	62,768	64.34%	30,646	31.41%	4,148	4.25%	34,249	34.89%	61,659	62.80%	2,268	2.31%
36	58,898	58.78%	37,086	37.01%	2,957	2.95%	1,253	1.25%	58,847	59.32%	35,738	36.02%	4,620	4.66%	39,591	39.69%	57,611	57.75%	2,561	2.57%
37	17,060	19.75%	64,797	75.01%	3,224	3.73%	1,303	1.51%	20,986	24.67%	60,840	71.53%	3,229	3.80%	65,025	76.04%	18,122	21.19%	2,365	2.77%
38	17,399	20.08%	66,052	76.22%	2,040	2.35%	1,171	1.35%	18,697	21.82%	64,114	74.82%	2,877	3.36%	65,258	75.88%	18,759	21.81%	1,986	2.31%
39	53,290	48.86%	49,607	45.48%	4,029	3.69%	2,147	1.97%	60,928	56.18%	43,928	40.51%	3,591	3.31%	50,569	46.40%	56,080	51.46%	2,335	2.14%
40	18,662	24.20%	55,240	71.64%	2,109	2.74%	1,100	1.43%	20,031	26.30%	53,262	69.92%	2,880	3.78%	54,730	71.54%	19,904	26.02%	1,868	2.44%
41	47,467	45.06%	52,383	49.73%	3,968	3.77%	1,525	1.45%	50,899	48.91%	48,756	46.85%	4,413	4.24%	55,322	52.95%	45,891	43.92%	3,263	3.12%
42	62,200	68.66%	24,968	27.56%	2,410	2.66%	1,012	1.12%	60,484	67.58%	24,627	27.52%	4,390	4.90%	28,398	31.52%	59,501	66.04%	2,202	2.44%
43	58,532	63.77%	29,967	32.65%	2,319	2.53%	961	1.05%	57,121	63.01%	29,387	32.41%	4,151	4.58%	32,375	35.49%	56,833	62.29%	2,025	2.22%
44	60,549	67.77%	26,071	29.18%	1,947	2.18%	779	0.87%	58,536	66.29%	26,018	29.46%	3,755	4.25%	28,778	32.38%	58,278	65.57%	1,820	2.05%
45	63,539	65.43%	29,273	30.14%	2,850	2.93%	1,454	1.50%	62,607	65.23%	29,246	30.47%	4,123	4.30%	34,731	35.93%	59,576	61.64%	2,343	2.42%
46	59,157	70.85%	21,367	25.59%	2,003	2.40%	965	1.16%	56,771	68.88%	21,718	26.35%	3,937	4.78%	25,410	30.59%	55,667	67.01%	1,991	2.40%
47	62,657	69.28%	24,632	27.24%	2,027	2.24%	1,125	1.24%	58,592	65.91%	26,662	29.99%	3,648	4.10%	30,561	34.14%	56,662	63.29%	2,298	2.57%
48	59,387	57.55%	38,942	37.74%	3,068	2.97%	1,791	1.74%	59,206	58.02%	38,853	38.08%	3,980	3.90%	43,781	42.79%	55,594	54.34%	2,935	2.87%
49	42,657	38.15%	62,892	56.25%	3,333	2.98%	2,919	2.61%	42,590	38.49%	63,580	57.46%	4,477	4.05%	68,148	61.36%	39,430	35.50%	3,485	3.14%
50	62,972	64.60%	30,185	30.97%	2,908	2.98%	1,412	1.45%	59,345	61.97%	32,160	33.59%	4,252	4.44%	37,461	38.95%	55,660	57.87%	3,059	3.18%
Totals:	**2,359,749**	**49.90%**	**2,180,316**	**46.10%**	**129,929**	**2.75%**	**59,397**	**1.26%**	**2,392,439**	**51.13%**	**2,119,696**	**45.30%**	**167,190**	**3.57%**	**2,300,381**	**48.95%**	**2,296,039**	**48.86%**	**102,729**	**2.19%**

S691-ATC-122 - Blue -Districts 14 and 15: Lieutenant Governor 2016, Attorney General 2016

	Lieutenant Governor 2016: Forest-Coleman-Cole						Attorney General 2016: Stein-Newton			
District	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %
1	48,887	53.74%	39,694	43.63%	2,389	2.63%	41,583	46.48%	47,878	53.52%
2	57,464	64.37%	29,461	33.00%	2,347	2.63%	31,586	35.67%	56,959	64.33%
3	36,795	44.57%	44,483	53.88%	1,277	1.55%	46,645	56.99%	35,203	43.01%
4	34,410	39.91%	50,529	58.61%	1,273	1.48%	52,643	61.20%	33,369	38.80%
5	40,621	47.11%	43,512	50.47%	2,085	2.42%	46,133	53.94%	39,399	46.06%
6	38,286	63.97%	19,181	32.05%	2,380	3.98%	21,095	35.69%	38,018	64.31%
7	40,568	54.08%	33,075	44.09%	1,368	1.82%	35,414	47.66%	38,891	52.34%
8	67,778	61.04%	40,423	36.40%	2,836	2.55%	46,574	42.31%	63,502	57.69%
9	55,658	52.85%	45,433	43.14%	4,230	4.02%	52,224	50.00%	52,214	50.00%
10	42,788	60.42%	26,733	37.75%	1,292	1.82%	29,456	42.04%	40,606	57.96%
11	58,079	57.42%	40,863	40.40%	2,206	2.18%	44,650	44.36%	55,998	55.64%
12	44,688	59.95%	27,889	37.41%	1,970	2.64%	31,338	42.46%	42,472	57.54%
13	31,027	50.72%	28,932	47.29%	1,215	1.99%	31,776	52.53%	28,714	47.47%
14	29,615	30.90%	63,499	66.25%	2,733	2.85%	67,070	70.69%	27,808	29.31%
15	31,054	30.36%	67,628	66.12%	3,603	3.52%	72,967	71.91%	28,509	28.09%
16	46,657	40.05%	65,661	56.36%	4,187	3.59%	72,088	62.40%	43,435	37.60%
17	61,118	53.95%	48,551	42.86%	3,610	3.19%	54,056	48.17%	58,173	51.83%
18	65,737	55.37%	50,017	42.13%	2,978	2.51%	56,598	48.17%	60,903	51.83%
19	37,218	52.33%	31,486	44.27%	2,414	3.39%	34,292	48.47%	36,453	51.53%
20	19,185	18.22%	83,359	79.15%	2,779	2.64%	86,851	82.88%	17,944	17.12%
21	20,849	29.60%	47,212	67.03%	2,374	3.37%	49,134	70.23%	20,826	29.77%
22	38,606	41.51%	52,229	56.16%	2,172	2.34%	56,476	61.26%	35,710	38.74%
23	39,577	33.12%	76,646	64.14%	3,271	2.74%	81,625	68.71%	37,164	31.29%
24	53,605	57.24%	37,361	39.90%	2,682	2.86%	41,879	45.02%	51,134	54.98%
25	50,305	56.16%	37,163	41.49%	2,105	2.35%	40,658	45.81%	48,086	54.19%
26	53,344	64.97%	26,615	32.42%	2,143	2.61%	29,789	36.51%	51,795	63.49%
27	63,938	55.63%	47,827	41.61%	3,173	2.76%	53,395	46.69%	60,970	53.31%
28	18,391	19.91%	71,106	76.98%	2,870	3.11%	73,859	80.42%	17,984	19.58%
29	25,455	29.35%	58,737	67.72%	2,546	2.94%	62,056	71.84%	24,322	28.16%
30	58,294	65.99%	27,915	31.60%	2,133	2.41%	31,805	36.19%	56,074	63.81%
31	70,063	64.57%	35,450	32.67%	3,001	2.77%	41,687	38.62%	66,260	61.38%
32	60,028	71.22%	22,140	26.27%	2,123	2.52%	25,906	30.85%	58,069	69.15%
33	63,686	69.23%	25,779	28.02%	2,523	2.74%	31,643	34.65%	59,668	65.35%
34	68,327	70.14%	26,276	26.97%	2,819	2.89%	31,963	33.10%	64,604	66.90%
35	64,009	66.65%	29,246	30.45%	2,778	2.89%	34,286	36.04%	60,858	63.96%
36	60,075	61.47%	34,586	35.39%	3,075	3.15%	39,935	41.23%	56,928	58.77%
37	20,798	24.91%	59,245	70.95%	3,458	4.14%	63,054	75.94%	19,972	24.06%
38	18,972	22.41%	63,018	74.44%	2,671	3.15%	66,011	78.42%	18,160	21.58%
39	61,873	58.01%	41,777	39.17%	3,014	2.83%	48,508	45.88%	57,227	54.12%
40	20,511	27.27%	52,044	69.20%	2,649	3.52%	55,415	74.24%	19,225	25.76%
41	51,912	50.76%	46,633	45.60%	3,727	3.64%	52,559	51.84%	48,820	48.16%
42	62,124	70.39%	23,616	26.76%	2,521	2.86%	29,767	33.94%	57,931	66.06%
43	59,203	66.00%	28,144	31.38%	2,351	2.62%	33,269	37.48%	55,502	62.52%
44	60,310	69.07%	24,946	28.57%	2,066	2.37%	30,418	35.20%	56,007	64.80%
45	61,715	65.78%	29,124	31.04%	2,988	3.18%	34,295	36.91%	58,628	63.09%
46	58,375	71.73%	21,046	25.86%	1,958	2.41%	26,887	33.35%	53,722	66.65%
47	58,679	67.02%	26,179	29.90%	2,697	3.08%	29,406	33.95%	57,204	66.05%
48	59,503	59.12%	37,910	37.67%	3,237	3.22%	41,434	41.50%	58,406	58.50%
49	41,430	38.08%	62,703	57.63%	4,673	4.29%	67,209	62.26%	40,747	37.74%
50	59,029	62.59%	31,893	33.82%	3,390	3.59%	35,488	38.03%	57,825	61.97%
Totals:	**2,390,619**	**51.88%**	**2,084,975**	**45.25%**	**132,360**	**2.87%**	**2,294,855**	**50.20%**	**2,276,276**	**49.80%**

District plan definition file: 'SMT-5.asc', modified 08/24/2017 10:23:49 PM

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections. Votes that could not be associated with a specific precinct were excluded. Reported statewide totals may therefore be marginally lower than official contest results.

EX. 32

S691-ATV-33-Guilford Floor Amendment



N
W E
S

0 5 10 20 30 40 50 Miles

S691-ATV-33-Guilford Floor Amendment

Printed by the NC General Assembly, August 24, 2017.

Plan: SRN-1
Plan Type:

Administrator
User:

Districts & Their Incumbents

Thursday, August 24, 2017 10:06 PM

District	Name	Party	Previous District
-	J.Davis	Republican	50
-	Edwards	Republican	48
-	Van Duyn	Democratic	49
-	Hise	Republican	47
-	Harrington	Republican	43
-	Curtis	Republican	44
-	Ford	Democratic	38
-	Bishop	Republican	39
-	J.Jackson	Democratic	37
-	Tarte	Republican	41
-	Tucker	Republican	35
-	Waddell	Democratic	40
-	Newton	Republican	36
-	Dunn	Republican	33
-	McInnis	Republican	25
-	Daniel	Republican	46
-	Ballard	Republican	45
-	Wells	Republican	42
-	Randleman	Republican	30
-	Barrett	Republican	34
-	Lowe	Democratic	32
-	Krawiec	Republican	31
-	Berger	Republican	26
-	Britt	Republican	13
-	Clark	Democratic	21
-	Meredith	Republican	19
-	Rabin	Republican	12
-	Rabon	Republican	8

Plan:	SRN-1	Administrator:	
Type:		User:	

District	Name	Party	Previous District
-	Lee	Republican	9
-	B.Jackson	Republican	10
-	Pate	Republican	7
-	McKissick	Democratic	20
-	Foushee	Democratic	23
-	Woodard	Democratic	22
-	Barringer	Republican	17
-	Alexander	Republican	15
-	Chaudhuri	Democratic	16
-	Blue	Democratic	14
-	Barefoot	Republican	18
-	Horner	Republican	11
-	Bryant	Democratic	4
-	Smith-Ingram	Democratic	3
-	Brown	Republican	6
-	D.Davis	Democratic	5
-	Sanderson	Republican	2
-	Cook	Republican	1
24	Gunn	Republican	24
26	Tillman	Republican	29
27	Wade	Republican	27
28	Robinson	Democratic	28

Number of Incumbents in District with more than one Incumbent:	46	
Number of Districts with No Incumbent:	0	
Number of Districts with Incumbents of more than one party:	1	
Number of Districts with Paired Democrats:	0	
Number of Districts with Paired Republicans:	0	

S691-ATV-33-Guilford Floor Amendment: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Aberdeen	Unassigned	6,350	8,754,194	6,350	100.00%	0.07%
Ahoskie	Unassigned	5,039	8,754,194	5,039	100.00%	0.06%
Alamance	24	951	198,142	951	100.00%	0.48%
Albemarle	Unassigned	15,903	8,754,194	15,903	100.00%	0.18%
Alliance	Unassigned	776	8,754,194	776	100.00%	0.01%
Andrews	Unassigned	1,781	8,754,194	1,781	100.00%	0.02%
Angier (Harnett)	Unassigned	4,247	8,754,194	4,247	100.00%	0.05%
Angier (Wake)	Unassigned	103	8,754,194	103	100.00%	0.00%
Ansonville	Unassigned	631	8,754,194	631	100.00%	0.01%
Apex	Unassigned	37,476	8,754,194	37,476	100.00%	0.43%
Arapahoe	Unassigned	556	8,754,194	556	100.00%	0.01%
Archdale (Guilford)	26	333	194,450	333	100.00%	0.17%
Archdale (Randolph)	26	11,082	194,450	11,082	100.00%	5.70%
Archer Lodge	Unassigned	4,292	8,754,194	4,292	100.00%	0.05%
Asheboro	26	25,012	194,450	25,012	100.00%	12.86%
Asheville	Unassigned	83,393	8,754,194	83,393	100.00%	0.95%
Askewville	Unassigned	241	8,754,194	241	100.00%	0.00%
Atkinson	Unassigned	299	8,754,194	299	100.00%	0.00%
Atlantic Beach	Unassigned	1,495	8,754,194	1,495	100.00%	0.02%
Aulander	Unassigned	895	8,754,194	895	100.00%	0.01%
Aurora	Unassigned	520	8,754,194	520	100.00%	0.01%
Autryville	Unassigned	196	8,754,194	196	100.00%	0.00%
Ayden	Unassigned	4,932	8,754,194	4,932	100.00%	0.06%
Badin	Unassigned	1,974	8,754,194	1,974	100.00%	0.02%
Bailey	Unassigned	569	8,754,194	569	100.00%	0.01%
Bakersville	Unassigned	464	8,754,194	464	100.00%	0.01%
Bald Head Island	Unassigned	158	8,754,194	158	100.00%	0.00%
Banner Elk	Unassigned	1,028	8,754,194	1,028	100.00%	0.01%
Bath	Unassigned	249	8,754,194	249	100.00%	0.00%
Bayboro	Unassigned	1,263	8,754,194	1,263	100.00%	0.01%
Bear Grass	Unassigned	73	8,754,194	73	100.00%	0.00%
Beaufort	Unassigned	4,039	8,754,194	4,039	100.00%	0.05%
Beech Mountain (Avery)	Unassigned	24	8,754,194	24	100.00%	0.00%
Beech Mountain (Watauga)	Unassigned	296	8,754,194	296	100.00%	0.00%
Belhaven	Unassigned	1,688	8,754,194	1,688	100.00%	0.02%
Belmont	Unassigned	10,076	8,754,194	10,076	100.00%	0.12%
Belville	Unassigned	1,936	8,754,194	1,936	100.00%	0.02%
Belwood	Unassigned	950	8,754,194	950	100.00%	0.01%
Benson (Harnett)	Unassigned	0	8,754,194	0	0.00%	0.00%
Benson (Johnston)	Unassigned	3,311	8,754,194	3,311	100.00%	0.04%
Bermuda Run	Unassigned	1,725	8,754,194	1,725	100.00%	0.02%
Bessemer City	Unassigned	5,340	8,754,194	5,340	100.00%	0.06%
Bethania	Unassigned	328	8,754,194	328	100.00%	0.00%
Bethel	Unassigned	1,577	8,754,194	1,577	100.00%	0.02%
Beulaville	Unassigned	1,296	8,754,194	1,296	100.00%	0.01%
Biltmore Forest	Unassigned	1,343	8,754,194	1,343	100.00%	0.02%
Biscoe	Unassigned	1,700	8,754,194	1,700	100.00%	0.02%

District plan definition file: 'SRN-1.asc', modified 08/24/2017 11:36:03 AM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

S691-ATV-33-Guilford Floor Amendment: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Black Creek	Unassigned	769	8,754,194	769	100.00%	0.01%
Black Mountain	Unassigned	7,848	8,754,194	7,848	100.00%	0.09%
Bladenboro	Unassigned	1,750	8,754,194	1,750	100.00%	0.02%
Blowing Rock (Caldwell)	Unassigned	49	8,754,194	49	100.00%	0.00%
Blowing Rock (Watauga)	Unassigned	1,192	8,754,194	1,192	100.00%	0.01%
Boardman	Unassigned	157	8,754,194	157	100.00%	0.00%
Bogue	Unassigned	684	8,754,194	684	100.00%	0.01%
Boiling Spring Lakes	Unassigned	5,372	8,754,194	5,372	100.00%	0.06%
Boiling Springs	Unassigned	4,647	8,754,194	4,647	100.00%	0.05%
Bolivia	Unassigned	143	8,754,194	143	100.00%	0.00%
Bolton	Unassigned	691	8,754,194	691	100.00%	0.01%
Boone	Unassigned	17,122	8,754,194	17,122	100.00%	0.20%
Boonville	Unassigned	1,222	8,754,194	1,222	100.00%	0.01%
Bostic	Unassigned	386	8,754,194	386	100.00%	0.00%
Brevard	Unassigned	7,609	8,754,194	7,609	100.00%	0.09%
Bridgeton	Unassigned	454	8,754,194	454	100.00%	0.01%
Broadway (Harnett)	Unassigned	25	8,754,194	25	100.00%	0.00%
Broadway (Lee)	Unassigned	1,204	8,754,194	1,204	100.00%	0.01%
Brookford	Unassigned	382	8,754,194	382	100.00%	0.00%
Brunswick	Unassigned	1,119	8,754,194	1,119	100.00%	0.01%
Bryson City	Unassigned	1,424	8,754,194	1,424	100.00%	0.02%
Bunn	Unassigned	344	8,754,194	344	100.00%	0.00%
Burgaw	Unassigned	3,872	8,754,194	3,872	100.00%	0.04%
Burlington (Alamance)	24	49,308	198,142	49,308	100.00%	24.89%
Burlington (Guilford)	24	655	198,142	655	100.00%	0.33%
Burnsville	Unassigned	1,693	8,754,194	1,693	100.00%	0.02%
Butner	Unassigned	7,591	8,754,194	7,591	100.00%	0.09%
Cajah's Mountain	Unassigned	2,823	8,754,194	2,823	100.00%	0.03%
Calabash	Unassigned	1,786	8,754,194	1,786	100.00%	0.02%
Calypso	Unassigned	538	8,754,194	538	100.00%	0.01%
Cameron	Unassigned	285	8,754,194	285	100.00%	0.00%
Candor	Unassigned	840	8,754,194	840	100.00%	0.01%
Canton	Unassigned	4,227	8,754,194	4,227	100.00%	0.05%
Cape Carteret	Unassigned	1,917	8,754,194	1,917	100.00%	0.02%
Carolina Beach	Unassigned	5,706	8,754,194	5,706	100.00%	0.07%
Carolina Shores	Unassigned	3,048	8,754,194	3,048	100.00%	0.03%
Carrboro	Unassigned	19,582	8,754,194	19,582	100.00%	0.22%
Carthage	Unassigned	2,205	8,754,194	2,205	100.00%	0.03%
Cary (Chatham)	Unassigned	1,422	8,754,194	1,422	100.00%	0.02%
Cary (Wake)	Unassigned	133,812	8,754,194	133,812	100.00%	1.53%
Casar	Unassigned	297	8,754,194	297	100.00%	0.00%
Castalia	Unassigned	268	8,754,194	268	100.00%	0.00%
Caswell Beach	Unassigned	398	8,754,194	398	100.00%	0.00%
Catawba	Unassigned	603	8,754,194	603	100.00%	0.01%
Cedar Point	Unassigned	1,279	8,754,194	1,279	100.00%	0.01%
Cedar Rock	Unassigned	300	8,754,194	300	100.00%	0.00%
Centerville	Unassigned	89	8,754,194	89	100.00%	0.00%

District plan definition file: 'SRN-1.asc', modified 08/24/2017 11:36:03 AM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

S691-ATV-33-Guilford Floor Amendment: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Cerro Gordo	Unassigned	207	8,754,194	207	100.00%	0.00%
Chadbourn	Unassigned	1,856	8,754,194	1,856	100.00%	0.02%
Chapel Hill (Durham)	Unassigned	2,836	8,754,194	2,836	100.00%	0.03%
Chapel Hill (Orange)	Unassigned	54,397	8,754,194	54,397	100.00%	0.62%
Charlotte	Unassigned	731,424	8,754,194	731,424	100.00%	8.36%
Cherryville	Unassigned	5,760	8,754,194	5,760	100.00%	0.07%
Chimney Rock Village	Unassigned	113	8,754,194	113	100.00%	0.00%
China Grove	Unassigned	3,563	8,754,194	3,563	100.00%	0.04%
Chocowinity	Unassigned	820	8,754,194	820	100.00%	0.01%
Claremont	Unassigned	1,352	8,754,194	1,352	100.00%	0.02%
Clarkton	Unassigned	837	8,754,194	837	100.00%	0.01%
Clayton (Johnston)	Unassigned	16,116	8,754,194	16,116	100.00%	0.18%
Clayton (Wake)	Unassigned	0	8,754,194	0	0.00%	0.00%
Clemmons	Unassigned	18,627	8,754,194	18,627	100.00%	0.21%
Cleveland	Unassigned	871	8,754,194	871	100.00%	0.01%
Clinton	Unassigned	8,639	8,754,194	8,639	100.00%	0.10%
Clyde	Unassigned	1,223	8,754,194	1,223	100.00%	0.01%
Coats	Unassigned	2,112	8,754,194	2,112	100.00%	0.02%
Cofield	Unassigned	413	8,754,194	413	100.00%	0.00%
Colerain	Unassigned	204	8,754,194	204	100.00%	0.00%
Columbia	Unassigned	891	8,754,194	891	100.00%	0.01%
Columbus	Unassigned	999	8,754,194	999	100.00%	0.01%
Como	Unassigned	91	8,754,194	91	100.00%	0.00%
Concord	Unassigned	79,066	8,754,194	79,066	100.00%	0.90%
Conetoe	Unassigned	294	8,754,194	294	100.00%	0.00%
Connelly Springs	Unassigned	1,669	8,754,194	1,669	100.00%	0.02%
Conover	Unassigned	8,165	8,754,194	8,165	100.00%	0.09%
Conway	Unassigned	836	8,754,194	836	100.00%	0.01%
Cooleemee	Unassigned	960	8,754,194	960	100.00%	0.01%
Cornelius	Unassigned	24,866	8,754,194	24,866	100.00%	0.28%
Cove City	Unassigned	399	8,754,194	399	100.00%	0.00%
Cramerton	Unassigned	4,165	8,754,194	4,165	100.00%	0.05%
Creedmoor	Unassigned	4,124	8,754,194	4,124	100.00%	0.05%
Creswell	Unassigned	276	8,754,194	276	100.00%	0.00%
Crossnore	Unassigned	192	8,754,194	192	100.00%	0.00%
Dallas	Unassigned	4,488	8,754,194	4,488	100.00%	0.05%
Danbury	Unassigned	189	8,754,194	189	100.00%	0.00%
Davidson (Iredell)	Unassigned	294	8,754,194	294	100.00%	0.00%
Davidson (Mecklenburg)	Unassigned	10,650	8,754,194	10,650	100.00%	0.12%
Dellview	Unassigned	13	8,754,194	13	100.00%	0.00%
Denton	Unassigned	1,636	8,754,194	1,636	100.00%	0.02%
Dillsboro	Unassigned	232	8,754,194	232	100.00%	0.00%
Dobbins Heights	Unassigned	866	8,754,194	866	100.00%	0.01%
Dobson	Unassigned	1,586	8,754,194	1,586	100.00%	0.02%
Dortches	Unassigned	935	8,754,194	935	100.00%	0.01%
Dover	Unassigned	401	8,754,194	401	100.00%	0.00%
Drexel	Unassigned	1,858	8,754,194	1,858	100.00%	0.02%

S691-ATV-33-Guilford Floor Amendment: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Dublin	Unassigned	338	8,754,194	338	100.00%	0.00%
Duck	Unassigned	369	8,754,194	369	100.00%	0.00%
Dunn	Unassigned	9,263	8,754,194	9,263	100.00%	0.11%
Durham (Durham)	Unassigned	228,300	8,754,194	228,300	100.00%	2.61%
Durham (Orange)	Unassigned	30	8,754,194	30	100.00%	0.00%
Durham (Wake)	Unassigned	0	8,754,194	0	0.00%	0.00%
Earl	Unassigned	260	8,754,194	260	100.00%	0.00%
East Arcadia	Unassigned	487	8,754,194	487	100.00%	0.01%
East Bend	Unassigned	612	8,754,194	612	100.00%	0.01%
East Laurinburg	Unassigned	300	8,754,194	300	100.00%	0.00%
East Spencer	Unassigned	1,534	8,754,194	1,534	100.00%	0.02%
Eastover	Unassigned	3,628	8,754,194	3,628	100.00%	0.04%
Eden	Unassigned	15,527	8,754,194	15,527	100.00%	0.18%
Edenton	Unassigned	5,004	8,754,194	5,004	100.00%	0.06%
Elizabeth City (Camden)	Unassigned	45	8,754,194	45	100.00%	0.00%
Elizabeth City (Pasquotank)	Unassigned	18,638	8,754,194	18,638	100.00%	0.21%
Elizabethtown	Unassigned	3,583	8,754,194	3,583	100.00%	0.04%
Elk Park	Unassigned	452	8,754,194	452	100.00%	0.01%
Elkin (Surry)	Unassigned	3,921	8,754,194	3,921	100.00%	0.04%
Elkin (Wilkes)	Unassigned	80	8,754,194	80	100.00%	0.00%
Ellenboro	Unassigned	873	8,754,194	873	100.00%	0.01%
Ellerbe	Unassigned	1,054	8,754,194	1,054	100.00%	0.01%
Elm City	Unassigned	1,298	8,754,194	1,298	100.00%	0.01%
Elon	24	9,419	198,142	9,419	100.00%	4.75%
Emerald Isle	Unassigned	3,655	8,754,194	3,655	100.00%	0.04%
Enfield	Unassigned	2,532	8,754,194	2,532	100.00%	0.03%
Erwin	Unassigned	4,405	8,754,194	4,405	100.00%	0.05%
Eureka	Unassigned	197	8,754,194	197	100.00%	0.00%
Everetts	Unassigned	164	8,754,194	164	100.00%	0.00%
Fair Bluff	Unassigned	951	8,754,194	951	100.00%	0.01%
Fairmont	Unassigned	2,663	8,754,194	2,663	100.00%	0.03%
Fairview	Unassigned	3,324	8,754,194	3,324	100.00%	0.04%
Faison (Duplin)	Unassigned	961	8,754,194	961	100.00%	0.01%
Faison (Sampson)	Unassigned	0	8,754,194	0	0.00%	0.00%
Faith	Unassigned	807	8,754,194	807	100.00%	0.01%
Falcon (Cumberland)	Unassigned	258	8,754,194	258	100.00%	0.00%
Falcon (Sampson)	Unassigned	0	8,754,194	0	0.00%	0.00%
Falkland	Unassigned	96	8,754,194	96	100.00%	0.00%
Fallston	Unassigned	607	8,754,194	607	100.00%	0.01%
Farmville	Unassigned	4,654	8,754,194	4,654	100.00%	0.05%
Fayetteville	Unassigned	200,564	8,754,194	200,564	100.00%	2.29%
Flat Rock	Unassigned	3,114	8,754,194	3,114	100.00%	0.04%
Fletcher	Unassigned	7,187	8,754,194	7,187	100.00%	0.08%
Forest City	Unassigned	7,476	8,754,194	7,476	100.00%	0.09%
Forest Hills	Unassigned	365	8,754,194	365	100.00%	0.00%
Fountain	Unassigned	427	8,754,194	427	100.00%	0.00%
Four Oaks	Unassigned	1,921	8,754,194	1,921	100.00%	0.02%

District plan definition file: 'SRN-1.asc', modified 08/24/2017 11:36:03 AM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

S691-ATV-33-Guilford Floor Amendment: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Foxfire	Unassigned	902	8,754,194	902	100.00%	0.01%
Franklin	Unassigned	3,845	8,754,194	3,845	100.00%	0.04%
Franklinton	Unassigned	2,023	8,754,194	2,023	100.00%	0.02%
Franklinville	26	1,164	194,450	1,164	100.00%	0.60%
Fremont	Unassigned	1,255	8,754,194	1,255	100.00%	0.01%
Fuquay-Varina	Unassigned	17,937	8,754,194	17,937	100.00%	0.20%
Gamewell	Unassigned	4,051	8,754,194	4,051	100.00%	0.05%
Garland	Unassigned	625	8,754,194	625	100.00%	0.01%
Garner	Unassigned	25,745	8,754,194	25,745	100.00%	0.29%
Garysburg	Unassigned	1,057	8,754,194	1,057	100.00%	0.01%
Gaston	Unassigned	1,152	8,754,194	1,152	100.00%	0.01%
Gastonia	Unassigned	71,741	8,754,194	71,741	100.00%	0.82%
Gatesville	Unassigned	321	8,754,194	321	100.00%	0.00%
Gibson	Unassigned	540	8,754,194	540	100.00%	0.01%
Gibsonville (Alamance)	24	3,148	198,142	3,148	100.00%	1.59%
Gibsonville (Guilford)	24	3,262	198,142	3,262	100.00%	1.65%
Glen Alpine	Unassigned	1,517	8,754,194	1,517	100.00%	0.02%
Godwin	Unassigned	139	8,754,194	139	100.00%	0.00%
Goldsboro	Unassigned	36,437	8,754,194	36,437	100.00%	0.42%
Goldston	Unassigned	268	8,754,194	268	100.00%	0.00%
Graham	24	14,153	198,142	14,153	100.00%	7.14%
Grandfather	Unassigned	25	8,754,194	25	100.00%	0.00%
Granite Falls	Unassigned	4,722	8,754,194	4,722	100.00%	0.05%
Granite Quarry	Unassigned	2,930	8,754,194	2,930	100.00%	0.03%
Grantsboro	Unassigned	688	8,754,194	688	100.00%	0.01%
Green Level	24	2,100	198,142	2,100	100.00%	1.06%
Greenevers	Unassigned	634	8,754,194	634	100.00%	0.01%
Greensboro	24	269,666	198,142	7,023	2.60%	3.54%
	26	269,666	194,450	4,724	1.75%	2.43%
	27	269,666	193,307	83,404	30.93%	43.15%
	28	269,666	195,390	174,515	64.72%	89.32%
Greenville	Unassigned	84,554	8,754,194	84,554	100.00%	0.97%
Grifton (Lenoir)	Unassigned	186	8,754,194	186	100.00%	0.00%
Grifton (Pitt)	Unassigned	2,431	8,754,194	2,431	100.00%	0.03%
Grimesland	Unassigned	441	8,754,194	441	100.00%	0.01%
Grover	Unassigned	708	8,754,194	708	100.00%	0.01%
Halifax	Unassigned	234	8,754,194	234	100.00%	0.00%
Hamilton	Unassigned	408	8,754,194	408	100.00%	0.00%
Hamlet	Unassigned	6,495	8,754,194	6,495	100.00%	0.07%
Harmony	Unassigned	531	8,754,194	531	100.00%	0.01%
Harrells (Duplin)	Unassigned	23	8,754,194	23	100.00%	0.00%
Harrells (Sampson)	Unassigned	179	8,754,194	179	100.00%	0.00%
Harrellsville	Unassigned	106	8,754,194	106	100.00%	0.00%
Harrisburg	Unassigned	11,526	8,754,194	11,526	100.00%	0.13%
Hassell	Unassigned	84	8,754,194	84	100.00%	0.00%
Havelock	Unassigned	20,735	8,754,194	20,735	100.00%	0.24%
Haw River	24	2,298	198,142	2,298	100.00%	1.16%

District plan definition file: 'SRN-1.asc', modified 08/24/2017 11:36:03 AM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

S691-ATV-33-Guilford Floor Amendment: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Hayesville	Unassigned	311	8,754,194	311	100.00%	0.00%
Hemby Bridge	Unassigned	1,520	8,754,194	1,520	100.00%	0.02%
Henderson	Unassigned	15,368	8,754,194	15,368	100.00%	0.18%
Hendersonville	Unassigned	13,137	8,754,194	13,137	100.00%	0.15%
Hertford	Unassigned	2,143	8,754,194	2,143	100.00%	0.02%
Hickory (Burke)	Unassigned	66	8,754,194	66	100.00%	0.00%
Hickory (Caldwell)	Unassigned	18	8,754,194	18	100.00%	0.00%
Hickory (Catawba)	Unassigned	39,926	8,754,194	39,926	100.00%	0.46%
High Point (Davidson)	Unassigned	5,310	8,754,194	5,310	100.00%	0.06%
High Point (Forsyth)	Unassigned	8	8,754,194	8	100.00%	0.00%
High Point (Guilford)	26	99,042	194,450	13,140	13.27%	6.76%
	27	99,042	193,307	74,266	74.98%	38.42%
	28	99,042	195,390	11,636	11.75%	5.96%
High Point (Randolph)	26	11	194,450	11	100.00%	0.01%
High Shoals	Unassigned	696	8,754,194	696	100.00%	0.01%
Highlands (Jackson)	Unassigned	4	8,754,194	4	100.00%	0.00%
Highlands (Macon)	Unassigned	920	8,754,194	920	100.00%	0.01%
Hildebran	Unassigned	2,023	8,754,194	2,023	100.00%	0.02%
Hillsborough	Unassigned	6,087	8,754,194	6,087	100.00%	0.07%
Hobgood	Unassigned	348	8,754,194	348	100.00%	0.00%
Hoffman	Unassigned	588	8,754,194	588	100.00%	0.01%
Holden Beach	Unassigned	575	8,754,194	575	100.00%	0.01%
Holly Ridge	Unassigned	1,268	8,754,194	1,268	100.00%	0.01%
Holly Springs	Unassigned	24,661	8,754,194	24,661	100.00%	0.28%
Hookerton	Unassigned	409	8,754,194	409	100.00%	0.00%
Hope Mills	Unassigned	15,176	8,754,194	15,176	100.00%	0.17%
Hot Springs	Unassigned	560	8,754,194	560	100.00%	0.01%
Hudson	Unassigned	3,776	8,754,194	3,776	100.00%	0.04%
Huntersville	Unassigned	46,773	8,754,194	46,773	100.00%	0.53%
Indian Beach	Unassigned	112	8,754,194	112	100.00%	0.00%
Indian Trail	Unassigned	33,518	8,754,194	33,518	100.00%	0.38%
Jackson	Unassigned	513	8,754,194	513	100.00%	0.01%
Jacksonville	Unassigned	70,145	8,754,194	70,145	100.00%	0.80%
Jamestown	27	3,382	193,307	3,374	99.76%	1.75%
	28	3,382	195,390	8	0.24%	0.00%
Jamesville	Unassigned	491	8,754,194	491	100.00%	0.01%
Jefferson	Unassigned	1,611	8,754,194	1,611	100.00%	0.02%
Jonesville	Unassigned	2,285	8,754,194	2,285	100.00%	0.03%
Kannapolis (Cabarrus)	Unassigned	33,194	8,754,194	33,194	100.00%	0.38%
Kannapolis (Rowan)	Unassigned	9,431	8,754,194	9,431	100.00%	0.11%
Kelford	Unassigned	251	8,754,194	251	100.00%	0.00%
Kenansville	Unassigned	855	8,754,194	855	100.00%	0.01%
Kenly (Johnston)	Unassigned	1,176	8,754,194	1,176	100.00%	0.01%
Kenly (Wilson)	Unassigned	163	8,754,194	163	100.00%	0.00%
Kernersville (Forsyth)	Unassigned	23,071	8,754,194	23,071	100.00%	0.26%
Kernersville (Guilford)	27	52	193,307	52	100.00%	0.03%
Kill Devil Hills	Unassigned	6,683	8,754,194	6,683	100.00%	0.08%

District plan definition file: 'SRN-1.asc', modified 08/24/2017 11:36:03 AM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

S691-ATV-33-Guilford Floor Amendment: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
King (Forsyth)	Unassigned	619	8,754,194	619	100.00%	0.01%
King (Stokes)	Unassigned	6,285	8,754,194	6,285	100.00%	0.07%
Kings Mountain (Cleveland)	Unassigned	9,242	8,754,194	9,242	100.00%	0.11%
Kings Mountain (Gaston)	Unassigned	1,054	8,754,194	1,054	100.00%	0.01%
Kingstown	Unassigned	681	8,754,194	681	100.00%	0.01%
Kinston	Unassigned	21,677	8,754,194	21,677	100.00%	0.25%
Kittrell	Unassigned	467	8,754,194	467	100.00%	0.01%
Kitty Hawk	Unassigned	3,272	8,754,194	3,272	100.00%	0.04%
Knightdale	Unassigned	11,401	8,754,194	11,401	100.00%	0.13%
Kure Beach	Unassigned	2,012	8,754,194	2,012	100.00%	0.02%
La Grange	Unassigned	2,873	8,754,194	2,873	100.00%	0.03%
Lake Lure	Unassigned	1,192	8,754,194	1,192	100.00%	0.01%
Lake Park	Unassigned	3,422	8,754,194	3,422	100.00%	0.04%
Lake Santeetlah	Unassigned	45	8,754,194	45	100.00%	0.00%
Lake Waccamaw	Unassigned	1,480	8,754,194	1,480	100.00%	0.02%
Landis	Unassigned	3,109	8,754,194	3,109	100.00%	0.04%
Lansing	Unassigned	158	8,754,194	158	100.00%	0.00%
Lasker	Unassigned	122	8,754,194	122	100.00%	0.00%
Lattimore	Unassigned	488	8,754,194	488	100.00%	0.01%
Laurel Park	Unassigned	2,180	8,754,194	2,180	100.00%	0.02%
Laurinburg	Unassigned	15,962	8,754,194	15,962	100.00%	0.18%
Lawndale	Unassigned	606	8,754,194	606	100.00%	0.01%
Leggett	Unassigned	60	8,754,194	60	100.00%	0.00%
Leland	Unassigned	13,527	8,754,194	13,527	100.00%	0.15%
Lenoir	Unassigned	18,228	8,754,194	18,228	100.00%	0.21%
Lewiston Woodville	Unassigned	549	8,754,194	549	100.00%	0.01%
Lewisville	Unassigned	12,639	8,754,194	12,639	100.00%	0.14%
Lexington	Unassigned	18,931	8,754,194	18,931	100.00%	0.22%
Liberty	26	2,656	194,450	2,656	100.00%	1.37%
Lilesville	Unassigned	536	8,754,194	536	100.00%	0.01%
Lillington	Unassigned	3,194	8,754,194	3,194	100.00%	0.04%
Lincolnton	Unassigned	10,486	8,754,194	10,486	100.00%	0.12%
Linden	Unassigned	130	8,754,194	130	100.00%	0.00%
Littleton	Unassigned	674	8,754,194	674	100.00%	0.01%
Locust (Cabarrus)	Unassigned	215	8,754,194	215	100.00%	0.00%
Locust (Stanly)	Unassigned	2,715	8,754,194	2,715	100.00%	0.03%
Long View (Burke)	Unassigned	752	8,754,194	752	100.00%	0.01%
Long View (Catawba)	Unassigned	4,119	8,754,194	4,119	100.00%	0.05%
Louisburg	Unassigned	3,359	8,754,194	3,359	100.00%	0.04%
Love Valley	Unassigned	90	8,754,194	90	100.00%	0.00%
Lowell	Unassigned	3,526	8,754,194	3,526	100.00%	0.04%
Lucama	Unassigned	1,108	8,754,194	1,108	100.00%	0.01%
Lumber Bridge	Unassigned	94	8,754,194	94	100.00%	0.00%
Lumberton	Unassigned	21,542	8,754,194	21,542	100.00%	0.25%
Macclesfield	Unassigned	471	8,754,194	471	100.00%	0.01%
Macon	Unassigned	119	8,754,194	119	100.00%	0.00%
Madison	Unassigned	2,246	8,754,194	2,246	100.00%	0.03%

District plan definition file: 'SRN-1.asc', modified 08/24/2017 11:36:03 AM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

S691-ATV-33-Guilford Floor Amendment: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Maggie Valley	Unassigned	1,150	8,754,194	1,150	100.00%	0.01%
Magnolia	Unassigned	939	8,754,194	939	100.00%	0.01%
Maiden (Catawba)	Unassigned	3,308	8,754,194	3,308	100.00%	0.04%
Maiden (Lincoln)	Unassigned	2	8,754,194	2	100.00%	0.00%
Manteo	Unassigned	1,434	8,754,194	1,434	100.00%	0.02%
Marietta	Unassigned	175	8,754,194	175	100.00%	0.00%
Marion	Unassigned	7,838	8,754,194	7,838	100.00%	0.09%
Mars Hill	Unassigned	1,869	8,754,194	1,869	100.00%	0.02%
Marshall	Unassigned	872	8,754,194	872	100.00%	0.01%
Marshville	Unassigned	2,402	8,754,194	2,402	100.00%	0.03%
Marvin	Unassigned	5,579	8,754,194	5,579	100.00%	0.06%
Matthews	Unassigned	27,198	8,754,194	27,198	100.00%	0.31%
Maxton (Robeson)	Unassigned	2,230	8,754,194	2,230	100.00%	0.03%
Maxton (Scotland)	Unassigned	196	8,754,194	196	100.00%	0.00%
Mayodan	Unassigned	2,478	8,754,194	2,478	100.00%	0.03%
Maysville	Unassigned	1,019	8,754,194	1,019	100.00%	0.01%
McAdenville	Unassigned	651	8,754,194	651	100.00%	0.01%
McDonald	Unassigned	113	8,754,194	113	100.00%	0.00%
McFarlan	Unassigned	117	8,754,194	117	100.00%	0.00%
Mebane (Alamance)	24	9,600	198,142	9,600	100.00%	4.85%
Mebane (Orange)	Unassigned	1,793	8,754,194	1,793	100.00%	0.02%
Mesic	Unassigned	220	8,754,194	220	100.00%	0.00%
Micro	Unassigned	441	8,754,194	441	100.00%	0.01%
Middleburg	Unassigned	133	8,754,194	133	100.00%	0.00%
Middlesex	Unassigned	822	8,754,194	822	100.00%	0.01%
Midland (Cabarrus)	Unassigned	3,073	8,754,194	3,073	100.00%	0.04%
Midland (Mecklenburg)	Unassigned	0	8,754,194	0	0.00%	0.00%
Midway	Unassigned	4,679	8,754,194	4,679	100.00%	0.05%
Mills River	Unassigned	6,802	8,754,194	6,802	100.00%	0.08%
Milton	Unassigned	166	8,754,194	166	100.00%	0.00%
Mineral Springs	Unassigned	2,639	8,754,194	2,639	100.00%	0.03%
Minnesott Beach	Unassigned	440	8,754,194	440	100.00%	0.01%
Mint Hill (Mecklenburg)	Unassigned	22,669	8,754,194	22,669	100.00%	0.26%
Mint Hill (Union)	Unassigned	53	8,754,194	53	100.00%	0.00%
Misenheimer	Unassigned	728	8,754,194	728	100.00%	0.01%
Mocksville	Unassigned	5,051	8,754,194	5,051	100.00%	0.06%
Momeyer	Unassigned	224	8,754,194	224	100.00%	0.00%
Monroe	Unassigned	32,797	8,754,194	32,797	100.00%	0.37%
Montreat	Unassigned	723	8,754,194	723	100.00%	0.01%
Mooresboro	Unassigned	311	8,754,194	311	100.00%	0.00%
Mooresville	Unassigned	32,711	8,754,194	32,711	100.00%	0.37%
Morehead City	Unassigned	8,661	8,754,194	8,661	100.00%	0.10%
Morganton	Unassigned	16,918	8,754,194	16,918	100.00%	0.19%
Morrisville (Durham)	Unassigned	0	8,754,194	0	0.00%	0.00%
Morrisville (Wake)	Unassigned	18,576	8,754,194	18,576	100.00%	0.21%
Morven	Unassigned	511	8,754,194	511	100.00%	0.01%
Mount Airy	Unassigned	10,388	8,754,194	10,388	100.00%	0.12%

District plan definition file: 'SRN-1.asc', modified 08/24/2017 11:36:03 AM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

S691-ATV-33-Guilford Floor Amendment: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Mount Gilead	Unassigned	1,181	8,754,194	1,181	100.00%	0.01%
Mount Holly	Unassigned	13,656	8,754,194	13,656	100.00%	0.16%
Mount Olive (Duplin)	Unassigned	51	8,754,194	51	100.00%	0.00%
Mount Olive (Wayne)	Unassigned	4,538	8,754,194	4,538	100.00%	0.05%
Mount Pleasant	Unassigned	1,652	8,754,194	1,652	100.00%	0.02%
Murfreesboro	Unassigned	2,835	8,754,194	2,835	100.00%	0.03%
Murphy	Unassigned	1,627	8,754,194	1,627	100.00%	0.02%
Nags Head	Unassigned	2,757	8,754,194	2,757	100.00%	0.03%
Nashville	Unassigned	5,352	8,754,194	5,352	100.00%	0.06%
Navassa	Unassigned	1,505	8,754,194	1,505	100.00%	0.02%
New Bern	Unassigned	29,524	8,754,194	29,524	100.00%	0.34%
New London	Unassigned	600	8,754,194	600	100.00%	0.01%
Newland	Unassigned	698	8,754,194	698	100.00%	0.01%
Newport	Unassigned	4,150	8,754,194	4,150	100.00%	0.05%
Newton	Unassigned	12,968	8,754,194	12,968	100.00%	0.15%
Newton Grove	Unassigned	569	8,754,194	569	100.00%	0.01%
Norlina	Unassigned	1,118	8,754,194	1,118	100.00%	0.01%
Norman	Unassigned	138	8,754,194	138	100.00%	0.00%
North Topsail Beach	Unassigned	743	8,754,194	743	100.00%	0.01%
North Wilkesboro	Unassigned	4,245	8,754,194	4,245	100.00%	0.05%
Northwest	Unassigned	735	8,754,194	735	100.00%	0.01%
Norwood	Unassigned	2,379	8,754,194	2,379	100.00%	0.03%
Oak City	Unassigned	317	8,754,194	317	100.00%	0.00%
Oak Island	Unassigned	6,783	8,754,194	6,783	100.00%	0.08%
Oak Ridge	27	6,185	193,307	6,185	100.00%	3.20%
Oakboro	Unassigned	1,859	8,754,194	1,859	100.00%	0.02%
Ocean Isle Beach	Unassigned	550	8,754,194	550	100.00%	0.01%
Old Fort	Unassigned	908	8,754,194	908	100.00%	0.01%
Oriental	Unassigned	900	8,754,194	900	100.00%	0.01%
Orrum	Unassigned	91	8,754,194	91	100.00%	0.00%
Ossipee	24	543	198,142	543	100.00%	0.27%
Oxford	Unassigned	8,461	8,754,194	8,461	100.00%	0.10%
Pantego	Unassigned	179	8,754,194	179	100.00%	0.00%
Parkton	Unassigned	436	8,754,194	436	100.00%	0.00%
Parmele	Unassigned	278	8,754,194	278	100.00%	0.00%
Patterson Springs	Unassigned	622	8,754,194	622	100.00%	0.01%
Peachland	Unassigned	437	8,754,194	437	100.00%	0.00%
Peletier	Unassigned	644	8,754,194	644	100.00%	0.01%
Pembroke	Unassigned	2,973	8,754,194	2,973	100.00%	0.03%
Pikeville	Unassigned	678	8,754,194	678	100.00%	0.01%
Pilot Mountain	Unassigned	1,477	8,754,194	1,477	100.00%	0.02%
Pine Knoll Shores	Unassigned	1,339	8,754,194	1,339	100.00%	0.02%
Pine Level	Unassigned	1,700	8,754,194	1,700	100.00%	0.02%
Pinebluff	Unassigned	1,337	8,754,194	1,337	100.00%	0.02%
Pinehurst	Unassigned	13,124	8,754,194	13,124	100.00%	0.15%
Pinetops	Unassigned	1,374	8,754,194	1,374	100.00%	0.02%
Pineville	Unassigned	7,479	8,754,194	7,479	100.00%	0.09%

District plan definition file: 'SRN-1.asc', modified 08/24/2017 11:36:03 AM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

S691-ATV-33-Guilford Floor Amendment: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Pink Hill	Unassigned	552	8,754,194	552	100.00%	0.01%
Pittsboro	Unassigned	3,743	8,754,194	3,743	100.00%	0.04%
Pleasant Garden	26	4,489	194,450	4,489	100.00%	2.31%
Plymouth	Unassigned	3,878	8,754,194	3,878	100.00%	0.04%
Polkton	Unassigned	3,375	8,754,194	3,375	100.00%	0.04%
Polkville	Unassigned	545	8,754,194	545	100.00%	0.01%
Pollocksville	Unassigned	311	8,754,194	311	100.00%	0.00%
Powellsville	Unassigned	276	8,754,194	276	100.00%	0.00%
Princeton	Unassigned	1,194	8,754,194	1,194	100.00%	0.01%
Princeville	Unassigned	2,082	8,754,194	2,082	100.00%	0.02%
Proctorville	Unassigned	117	8,754,194	117	100.00%	0.00%
Raeford	Unassigned	4,611	8,754,194	4,611	100.00%	0.05%
Raleigh (Durham)	Unassigned	1,067	8,754,194	1,067	100.00%	0.01%
Raleigh (Wake)	Unassigned	402,825	8,754,194	402,825	100.00%	4.60%
Ramseur	26	1,692	194,450	1,692	100.00%	0.87%
Randleman	26	4,113	194,450	4,113	100.00%	2.12%
Ranlo	Unassigned	3,434	8,754,194	3,434	100.00%	0.04%
Raynham	Unassigned	72	8,754,194	72	100.00%	0.00%
Red Cross	Unassigned	742	8,754,194	742	100.00%	0.01%
Red Oak	Unassigned	3,430	8,754,194	3,430	100.00%	0.04%
Red Springs (Hoke)	Unassigned	0	8,754,194	0	0.00%	0.00%
Red Springs (Robeson)	Unassigned	3,428	8,754,194	3,428	100.00%	0.04%
Reidsville	Unassigned	14,520	8,754,194	14,520	100.00%	0.17%
Rennert	Unassigned	383	8,754,194	383	100.00%	0.00%
Rhodhiss (Burke)	Unassigned	700	8,754,194	700	100.00%	0.01%
Rhodhiss (Caldwell)	Unassigned	370	8,754,194	370	100.00%	0.00%
Rich Square	Unassigned	958	8,754,194	958	100.00%	0.01%
Richfield	Unassigned	613	8,754,194	613	100.00%	0.01%
Richlands	Unassigned	1,520	8,754,194	1,520	100.00%	0.02%
River Bend	Unassigned	3,119	8,754,194	3,119	100.00%	0.04%
Roanoke Rapids	Unassigned	15,754	8,754,194	15,754	100.00%	0.18%
Robbins	Unassigned	1,097	8,754,194	1,097	100.00%	0.01%
Robbinsville	Unassigned	620	8,754,194	620	100.00%	0.01%
Robersonville	Unassigned	1,488	8,754,194	1,488	100.00%	0.02%
Rockingham	Unassigned	9,558	8,754,194	9,558	100.00%	0.11%
Rockwell	Unassigned	2,108	8,754,194	2,108	100.00%	0.02%
Rocky Mount (Edgecombe)	Unassigned	17,524	8,754,194	17,524	100.00%	0.20%
Rocky Mount (Nash)	Unassigned	39,953	8,754,194	39,953	100.00%	0.46%
Rolesville	Unassigned	3,786	8,754,194	3,786	100.00%	0.04%
Ronda	Unassigned	417	8,754,194	417	100.00%	0.00%
Roper	Unassigned	611	8,754,194	611	100.00%	0.01%
Rose Hill	Unassigned	1,626	8,754,194	1,626	100.00%	0.02%
Roseboro	Unassigned	1,191	8,754,194	1,191	100.00%	0.01%
Rosman	Unassigned	576	8,754,194	576	100.00%	0.01%
Rowland	Unassigned	1,037	8,754,194	1,037	100.00%	0.01%
Roxboro	Unassigned	8,362	8,754,194	8,362	100.00%	0.10%
Roxobel	Unassigned	240	8,754,194	240	100.00%	0.00%

District plan definition file: 'SRN-1.asc', modified 08/24/2017 11:36:03 AM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

S691-ATV-33-Guilford Floor Amendment: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Rural Hall	Unassigned	2,937	8,754,194	2,937	100.00%	0.03%
Ruth	Unassigned	440	8,754,194	440	100.00%	0.01%
Rutherford College	Unassigned	1,341	8,754,194	1,341	100.00%	0.02%
Rutherfordton	Unassigned	4,213	8,754,194	4,213	100.00%	0.05%
Salemburg	Unassigned	435	8,754,194	435	100.00%	0.00%
Salisbury	Unassigned	33,662	8,754,194	33,662	100.00%	0.38%
Saluda (Henderson)	Unassigned	12	8,754,194	12	100.00%	0.00%
Saluda (Polk)	Unassigned	701	8,754,194	701	100.00%	0.01%
Sandy Creek	Unassigned	260	8,754,194	260	100.00%	0.00%
Sandyfield	Unassigned	447	8,754,194	447	100.00%	0.01%
Sanford	Unassigned	28,094	8,754,194	28,094	100.00%	0.32%
Saratoga	Unassigned	408	8,754,194	408	100.00%	0.00%
Sawmills	Unassigned	5,240	8,754,194	5,240	100.00%	0.06%
Scotland Neck	Unassigned	2,059	8,754,194	2,059	100.00%	0.02%
Seaboard	Unassigned	632	8,754,194	632	100.00%	0.01%
Seagrove	26	228	194,450	228	100.00%	0.12%
Sedalia	24	623	198,142	623	100.00%	0.31%
Selma	Unassigned	6,073	8,754,194	6,073	100.00%	0.07%
Seven Devils (Avery)	Unassigned	28	8,754,194	28	100.00%	0.00%
Seven Devils (Watauga)	Unassigned	164	8,754,194	164	100.00%	0.00%
Seven Springs	Unassigned	110	8,754,194	110	100.00%	0.00%
Severn	Unassigned	276	8,754,194	276	100.00%	0.00%
Shallotte	Unassigned	3,675	8,754,194	3,675	100.00%	0.04%
Sharpsburg (Edgecombe)	Unassigned	209	8,754,194	209	100.00%	0.00%
Sharpsburg (Nash)	Unassigned	1,252	8,754,194	1,252	100.00%	0.01%
Sharpsburg (Wilson)	Unassigned	563	8,754,194	563	100.00%	0.01%
Shelby	Unassigned	20,323	8,754,194	20,323	100.00%	0.23%
Siler City	Unassigned	7,887	8,754,194	7,887	100.00%	0.09%
Simpson	Unassigned	416	8,754,194	416	100.00%	0.00%
Sims	Unassigned	282	8,754,194	282	100.00%	0.00%
Smithfield	Unassigned	10,966	8,754,194	10,966	100.00%	0.13%
Snow Hill	Unassigned	1,595	8,754,194	1,595	100.00%	0.02%
Southern Pines	Unassigned	12,334	8,754,194	12,334	100.00%	0.14%
Southern Shores	Unassigned	2,714	8,754,194	2,714	100.00%	0.03%
Southport	Unassigned	2,833	8,754,194	2,833	100.00%	0.03%
Sparta	Unassigned	1,770	8,754,194	1,770	100.00%	0.02%
Speed	Unassigned	80	8,754,194	80	100.00%	0.00%
Spencer	Unassigned	3,267	8,754,194	3,267	100.00%	0.04%
Spencer Mountain	Unassigned	37	8,754,194	37	100.00%	0.00%
Spindale	Unassigned	4,321	8,754,194	4,321	100.00%	0.05%
Spring Hope	Unassigned	1,320	8,754,194	1,320	100.00%	0.02%
Spring Lake	Unassigned	11,964	8,754,194	11,964	100.00%	0.14%
Spruce Pine	Unassigned	2,175	8,754,194	2,175	100.00%	0.02%
St. Helena	Unassigned	389	8,754,194	389	100.00%	0.00%
St. James	Unassigned	3,165	8,754,194	3,165	100.00%	0.04%
St. Pauls	Unassigned	2,035	8,754,194	2,035	100.00%	0.02%
Staley	26	393	194,450	393	100.00%	0.20%

District plan definition file: 'SRN-1.asc', modified 08/24/2017 11:36:03 AM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

S691-ATV-33-Guilford Floor Amendment: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Stallings (Mecklenburg)	Unassigned	399	8,754,194	399	100.00%	0.00%
Stallings (Union)	Unassigned	13,432	8,754,194	13,432	100.00%	0.15%
Stanfield	Unassigned	1,486	8,754,194	1,486	100.00%	0.02%
Stanley	Unassigned	3,556	8,754,194	3,556	100.00%	0.04%
Stantonsburg	Unassigned	784	8,754,194	784	100.00%	0.01%
Star	Unassigned	876	8,754,194	876	100.00%	0.01%
Statesville	Unassigned	24,532	8,754,194	24,532	100.00%	0.28%
Stedman	Unassigned	1,028	8,754,194	1,028	100.00%	0.01%
Stem	Unassigned	463	8,754,194	463	100.00%	0.01%
Stokesdale	27	5,047	193,307	5,047	100.00%	2.61%
Stoneville	Unassigned	1,056	8,754,194	1,056	100.00%	0.01%
Stonewall	Unassigned	281	8,754,194	281	100.00%	0.00%
Stovall	Unassigned	418	8,754,194	418	100.00%	0.00%
Sugar Mountain	Unassigned	198	8,754,194	198	100.00%	0.00%
Summerfield	24	10,232	198,142	2,422	23.67%	1.22%
	27	10,232	193,307	7,810	76.33%	4.04%
Sunset Beach	Unassigned	3,572	8,754,194	3,572	100.00%	0.04%
Surf City (Onslow)	Unassigned	292	8,754,194	292	100.00%	0.00%
Surf City (Pender)	Unassigned	1,561	8,754,194	1,561	100.00%	0.02%
Swansboro	Unassigned	2,663	8,754,194	2,663	100.00%	0.03%
Swepsonville	24	1,154	198,142	1,154	100.00%	0.58%
Sylva	Unassigned	2,588	8,754,194	2,588	100.00%	0.03%
Tabor City	Unassigned	2,511	8,754,194	2,511	100.00%	0.03%
Tar Heel	Unassigned	117	8,754,194	117	100.00%	0.00%
Tarboro	Unassigned	11,415	8,754,194	11,415	100.00%	0.13%
Taylorsville	Unassigned	2,098	8,754,194	2,098	100.00%	0.02%
Taylortown	Unassigned	722	8,754,194	722	100.00%	0.01%
Teachey	Unassigned	376	8,754,194	376	100.00%	0.00%
Thomasville (Davidson)	Unassigned	26,493	8,754,194	26,493	100.00%	0.30%
Thomasville (Randolph)	26	264	194,450	264	100.00%	0.14%
Tobaccoville (Forsyth)	Unassigned	2,441	8,754,194	2,441	100.00%	0.03%
Tobaccoville (Stokes)	Unassigned	0	8,754,194	0	0.00%	0.00%
Topsail Beach	Unassigned	368	8,754,194	368	100.00%	0.00%
Trent Woods	Unassigned	4,155	8,754,194	4,155	100.00%	0.05%
Trenton	Unassigned	287	8,754,194	287	100.00%	0.00%
Trinity	26	6,614	194,450	6,614	100.00%	3.40%
Troutman	Unassigned	2,383	8,754,194	2,383	100.00%	0.03%
Troy	Unassigned	3,189	8,754,194	3,189	100.00%	0.04%
Tryon	Unassigned	1,646	8,754,194	1,646	100.00%	0.02%
Turkey	Unassigned	292	8,754,194	292	100.00%	0.00%
Unionville	Unassigned	5,929	8,754,194	5,929	100.00%	0.07%
Valdese	Unassigned	4,490	8,754,194	4,490	100.00%	0.05%
Vanceboro	Unassigned	1,005	8,754,194	1,005	100.00%	0.01%
Vandemere	Unassigned	254	8,754,194	254	100.00%	0.00%
Varnamtown	Unassigned	541	8,754,194	541	100.00%	0.01%
Vass	Unassigned	720	8,754,194	720	100.00%	0.01%
Waco	Unassigned	321	8,754,194	321	100.00%	0.00%

District plan definition file: 'SRN-1.asc', modified 08/24/2017 11:36:03 AM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

S691-ATV-33-Guilford Floor Amendment: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Wade	Unassigned	556	8,754,194	556	100.00%	0.01%
Wadesboro	Unassigned	5,813	8,754,194	5,813	100.00%	0.07%
Wagram	Unassigned	840	8,754,194	840	100.00%	0.01%
Wake Forest (Franklin)	Unassigned	899	8,754,194	899	100.00%	0.01%
Wake Forest (Wake)	Unassigned	29,218	8,754,194	29,218	100.00%	0.33%
Walkertown	Unassigned	4,675	8,754,194	4,675	100.00%	0.05%
Wallace (Duplin)	Unassigned	3,880	8,754,194	3,880	100.00%	0.04%
Wallace (Pender)	Unassigned	0	8,754,194	0	0.00%	0.00%
Wallburg	Unassigned	3,047	8,754,194	3,047	100.00%	0.03%
Walnut Cove	Unassigned	1,425	8,754,194	1,425	100.00%	0.02%
Walnut Creek	Unassigned	835	8,754,194	835	100.00%	0.01%
Walstonburg	Unassigned	219	8,754,194	219	100.00%	0.00%
Warrenton	Unassigned	862	8,754,194	862	100.00%	0.01%
Warsaw	Unassigned	3,054	8,754,194	3,054	100.00%	0.03%
Washington	Unassigned	9,744	8,754,194	9,744	100.00%	0.11%
Washington Park	Unassigned	451	8,754,194	451	100.00%	0.01%
Watha	Unassigned	190	8,754,194	190	100.00%	0.00%
Waxhaw	Unassigned	9,859	8,754,194	9,859	100.00%	0.11%
Waynesville	Unassigned	9,869	8,754,194	9,869	100.00%	0.11%
Weaverville	Unassigned	3,120	8,754,194	3,120	100.00%	0.04%
Webster	Unassigned	363	8,754,194	363	100.00%	0.00%
Weddington (Mecklenburg)	Unassigned	7	8,754,194	7	100.00%	0.00%
Weddington (Union)	Unassigned	9,452	8,754,194	9,452	100.00%	0.11%
Weldon	Unassigned	1,655	8,754,194	1,655	100.00%	0.02%
Wendell	Unassigned	5,845	8,754,194	5,845	100.00%	0.07%
Wentworth	Unassigned	2,807	8,754,194	2,807	100.00%	0.03%
Wesley Chapel	Unassigned	7,463	8,754,194	7,463	100.00%	0.09%
West Jefferson	Unassigned	1,299	8,754,194	1,299	100.00%	0.01%
Whispering Pines	Unassigned	2,928	8,754,194	2,928	100.00%	0.03%
Whitakers (Edgecombe)	Unassigned	402	8,754,194	402	100.00%	0.00%
Whitakers (Nash)	Unassigned	342	8,754,194	342	100.00%	0.00%
White Lake	Unassigned	802	8,754,194	802	100.00%	0.01%
Whiteville	Unassigned	5,394	8,754,194	5,394	100.00%	0.06%
Whitsett	24	590	198,142	590	100.00%	0.30%
Wilkesboro	Unassigned	3,413	8,754,194	3,413	100.00%	0.04%
Williamston	Unassigned	5,511	8,754,194	5,511	100.00%	0.06%
Wilmington	Unassigned	106,476	8,754,194	106,476	100.00%	1.22%
Wilson	Unassigned	49,167	8,754,194	49,167	100.00%	0.56%
Wilson's Mills	Unassigned	2,277	8,754,194	2,277	100.00%	0.03%
Windsor	Unassigned	3,630	8,754,194	3,630	100.00%	0.04%
Winfall	Unassigned	594	8,754,194	594	100.00%	0.01%
Wingate	Unassigned	3,491	8,754,194	3,491	100.00%	0.04%
Winston-Salem	Unassigned	229,617	8,754,194	229,617	100.00%	2.62%
Winterville	Unassigned	9,269	8,754,194	9,269	100.00%	0.11%
Winton	Unassigned	769	8,754,194	769	100.00%	0.01%
Woodfin	Unassigned	6,123	8,754,194	6,123	100.00%	0.07%
Woodland	Unassigned	809	8,754,194	809	100.00%	0.01%

District plan definition file: 'SRN-1.asc', modified 08/24/2017 11:36:03 AM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

S691-ATV-33-Guilford Floor Amendment: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Wrightsville Beach	Unassigned	2,477	8,754,194	2,477	100.00%	0.03%
Yadkinville	Unassigned	2,959	8,754,194	2,959	100.00%	0.03%
Yanceyville	Unassigned	2,039	8,754,194	2,039	100.00%	0.02%
Youngsville	Unassigned	1,157	8,754,194	1,157	100.00%	0.01%
Zebulon (Johnston)	Unassigned	0	8,754,194	0	0.00%	0.00%
Zebulon (Wake)	Unassigned	4,433	8,754,194	4,433	100.00%	0.05%
			Total:	**5,250,071**		

District plan definition file: 'SRN-1.asc', modified 08/24/2017 11:36:03 AM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

Plan Name: SRN-1
Plan Type:
Date: 08/24/2017
Time: 11:32:30AM
Administrator:

Measures of Compactness

08/24/2017

Sum	N/A
Min	0.26
Max	0.59
Mean	0.41
Std. Dev.	0.13

DISTRICT	Reock
	0.26
24	0.40
26	0.59
27	0.47
28	0.31

S691-ATV-33-Guilford Floor Amendment: Split VTD Detail

County	VTD	District	Total VTD Pop	VTD Pop in District	Percent of VTD Pop in District

District plan definition file: 'SRN-1.asc', modified 08/24/2017 11:36:03 AM

VTDs ('Voting Districts') derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG05|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

Plan Name: SRN-1
Plan Type:
Date: 08/24/2017
Time: 11:32:59AM
Administrator:

Measures of Compactness

08/24/2017

Sum	N/A
Min	0.17
Max	0.60
Mean	0.33
Std. Dev.	0.17

DISTRICT	Polsby-Popper
	0.27
24	0.40
26	0.60
27	0.22
28	0.17

S691-ATV-33-Guilford Floor Amendment: Population Deviation

District	2010 Pop	Ideal Pop	Deviation	Deviation %
24	198,142	190,710	7,432	3.90%
26	194,450	190,710	3,740	1.96%
27	193,307	190,710	2,597	1.36%
28	195,390	190,710	4,680	2.45%
Unassigned	8,754,194	190,710	8,563,484	4490.32%
Total:	**9,535,483**			

S691-ATV-33-Guilford Floor Amendment: Population 2010, US Senate 2010, President 2012

	2010 Census		US Senate 2010: Marshall-Burr-Beitler								US President 2012: Obama-Romney-Johnson							
District	**Total Pop**	**18+ Pop**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Write-In**	**Write-In %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Write-In**	**Write-In %**
24	198,142	150,541	20,632	37.37%	33,214	60.16%	1,336	2.42%	25	0.05%	39,733	42.80%	52,106	56.12%	812	0.87%	189	0.20%
26	194,450	147,058	12,767	26.70%	33,767	70.62%	1,250	2.61%	34	0.07%	26,756	30.79%	59,158	68.07%	841	0.97%	151	0.17%
27	193,307	148,617	23,295	39.87%	33,934	58.08%	1,153	1.97%	44	0.08%	51,146	49.53%	50,969	49.36%	887	0.86%	263	0.25%
28	195,390	150,433	30,539	63.55%	16,691	34.73%	786	1.64%	42	0.09%	71,855	72.97%	25,620	26.02%	780	0.79%	211	0.21%
Unassigned	8,754,194	6,657,199	1,054,467	43.16%	1,336,476	54.70%	51,029	2.09%	1,118	0.05%	1,981,803	48.21%	2,079,500	50.58%	41,128	1.00%	8,705	0.21%
Totals:	**9,535,483**	**7,253,848**	**1,141,700**	**43.04%**	**1,454,082**	**54.82%**	**55,554**	**2.09%**	**1,263**	**0.05%**	**2,171,293**	**48.33%**	**2,267,353**	**50.47%**	**44,448**	**0.99%**	**9,519**	**0.21%**

Populations values derive from the 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File. Election results were provided by the NC State Board of Elections. Votes that could not be associated with a specific precinct were excluded. Reported statewide totals may therefore be marginally lower than official contest results.

S691-ATV-33-Guilford Floor Amendment: Governor 2012, Lieutenant Governor 2012, US Senate 2014

	Governor 2012: Dalton-McCrory-Howe								Lieutenant Governor 2012: Coleman-Forest				US Senate 2014: Tillis-Hagan-Haugh							
District	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Write-In**	**Write-In %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Write-In**	**Write-In %**
24	35,325	38.38%	54,753	59.50%	1,925	2.09%	26	0.03%	39,348	43.61%	50,870	56.39%	33,608	54.59%	25,657	41.68%	2,203	3.58%	96	0.16%
26	23,770	27.39%	61,350	70.69%	1,649	1.90%	15	0.02%	27,258	32.09%	57,678	67.91%	36,023	66.52%	15,977	29.51%	2,064	3.81%	86	0.16%
27	44,312	43.32%	55,659	54.42%	2,276	2.23%	33	0.03%	49,378	49.42%	50,529	50.58%	34,308	49.24%	33,634	48.27%	1,639	2.35%	92	0.13%
28	65,492	67.39%	29,468	30.32%	2,191	2.25%	33	0.03%	70,083	73.27%	25,566	26.73%	15,938	26.95%	41,794	70.67%	1,339	2.26%	71	0.12%
Unassigned	1,756,371	43.05%	2,235,994	54.80%	86,471	2.12%	1,084	0.03%	1,987,954	49.85%	2,000,248	50.15%	1,296,957	48.82%	1,253,241	47.17%	101,534	3.82%	4,906	0.18%
Totals:	**1,925,270**	**43.18%**	**2,437,224**	**54.67%**	**94,512**	**2.12%**	**1,191**	**0.03%**	**2,174,021**	**49.88%**	**2,184,891**	**50.12%**	**1,416,834**	**48.84%**	**1,370,303**	**47.23%**	**108,779**	**3.75%**	**5,251**	**0.18%**

S691-ATV-33-Guilford Floor Amendment: President 2016, US Senate 2016, Governor 2016

	US President 2016: Trump-Clinton-Johnson								US Senate 2016: Burr-Ross-Haugh						Governor 2016: Cooper-McCrory-Cecil					
District	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Write-In**	**Write-In %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**
24	53,161	53.97%	41,847	42.48%	2,484	2.52%	1,011	1.03%	53,955	55.20%	40,591	41.53%	3,201	3.27%	44,966	45.87%	51,219	52.25%	1,850	1.89%
26	63,595	69.47%	25,178	27.50%	1,963	2.14%	807	0.88%	62,240	68.61%	24,921	27.47%	3,551	3.91%	29,217	32.09%	59,827	65.71%	2,005	2.20%
27	46,577	44.39%	53,902	51.37%	3,037	2.89%	1,410	1.34%	49,238	47.34%	51,489	49.50%	3,288	3.16%	57,285	54.95%	44,652	42.83%	2,311	2.22%
28	22,731	23.34%	70,869	72.76%	2,445	2.51%	1,361	1.40%	25,096	26.05%	68,537	71.15%	2,696	2.80%	72,132	74.74%	22,430	23.24%	1,953	2.02%
Unassigned	2,173,685	50.12%	1,988,520	45.85%	120,000	2.77%	54,808	1.26%	2,201,910	51.32%	1,934,158	45.08%	154,454	3.60%	2,096,781	48.66%	2,117,911	49.15%	94,610	2.20%
Totals:	**2,359,749**	**49.90%**	**2,180,316**	**46.10%**	**129,929**	**2.75%**	**59,397**	**1.26%**	**2,392,439**	**51.13%**	**2,119,696**	**45.30%**	**167,190**	**3.57%**	**2,300,381**	**48.95%**	**2,296,039**	**48.86%**	**102,729**	**2.19%**

S691-ATV-33-Guilford Floor Amendment: Lieutenant Governor 2016, Attorney General 2016

	Lieutenant Governor 2016: Forest-Coleman-Cole						Attorney General 2016: Stein-Newton			
District	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**
24	53,900	55.86%	39,826	41.27%	2,764	2.86%	44,356	46.28%	51,483	53.72%
26	62,445	69.78%	24,800	27.71%	2,238	2.50%	28,475	32.03%	60,432	67.97%
27	48,683	47.62%	50,541	49.44%	3,002	2.94%	55,168	54.23%	46,567	45.77%
28	24,250	25.57%	67,742	71.42%	2,864	3.02%	70,923	75.19%	23,401	24.81%
Unassigned	2,201,341	52.10%	1,902,066	45.02%	121,492	2.88%	2,095,933	50.02%	2,094,393	49.98%
Totals:	**2,390,619**	**51.88%**	**2,084,975**	**45.25%**	**132,360**	**2.87%**	**2,294,855**	**50.20%**	**2,276,276**	**49.80%**

EX. 33

S691-ATV-32- Mecklenburg Floor Amendment



N
W E
S

0 5 10 15 20 25 Miles

S691-ATV-32- Mecklenburg Floor Amendment

Printed by the NC General Assembly, August 24, 2017.

Plan: S691-AMT-33-Mecklenburg
Plan Type:

Administrator
User:

Districts & Their Incumbents

Thursday, August 24, 2017 10:25 PM

District	Name	Party	Previous District
-	J.Davis	Republican	50
-	Edwards	Republican	48
-	Van Duyn	Democratic	49
-	Hise	Republican	47
-	Harrington	Republican	43
-	Curtis	Republican	44
-	Tucker	Republican	35
-	Newton	Republican	36
-	Dunn	Republican	33
-	McInnis	Republican	25
-	Daniel	Republican	46
-	Ballard	Republican	45
-	Wells	Republican	42
-	Randleman	Republican	30
-	Barrett	Republican	34
-	Lowe	Democratic	32
-	Krawiec	Republican	31
-	Tillman	Republican	29
-	Robinson	Democratic	28
-	Wade	Republican	27
-	Berger	Republican	26
-	Britt	Republican	13
-	Clark	Democratic	21
-	Meredith	Republican	19
-	Rabin	Republican	12
-	Rabon	Republican	8
-	Lee	Republican	9
-	B.Jackson	Republican	10

Plan:	S691-AMT-33-Mecklenburg	Administrator:	
Type:		User:	

District	Name	Party	Previous District
-	Pate	Republican	7
-	Gunn	Republican	24
-	McKissick	Democratic	20
-	Foushee	Democratic	23
-	Woodard	Democratic	22
-	Barringer	Republican	17
-	Alexander	Republican	15
-	Chaudhuri	Democratic	16
-	Blue	Democratic	14
-	Barefoot	Republican	18
-	Horner	Republican	11
-	Bryant	Democratic	4
-	Smith-Ingram	Democratic	3
-	Brown	Republican	6
-	D.Davis	Democratic	5
-	Sanderson	Republican	2
-	Cook	Republican	1
37	J.Jackson	Democratic	37
38	Ford	Democratic	38
39	Bishop	Republican	39
40	Waddell	Democratic	40
41	Tarte	Republican	41

Number of Incumbents in District with more than one Incumbent:	45	
Number of Districts with No Incumbent:	0	
Number of Districts with Incumbents of more than one party:	1	
Number of Districts with Paired Democrats:	0	
Number of Districts with Paired Republicans:	0	

S691-ATV-32-Mecklenburg Floor Amendment: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Aberdeen	Unassigned	6,350	8,615,855	6,350	100.00%	0.07%
Ahoskie	Unassigned	5,039	8,615,855	5,039	100.00%	0.06%
Alamance	Unassigned	951	8,615,855	951	100.00%	0.01%
Albemarle	Unassigned	15,903	8,615,855	15,903	100.00%	0.18%
Alliance	Unassigned	776	8,615,855	776	100.00%	0.01%
Andrews	Unassigned	1,781	8,615,855	1,781	100.00%	0.02%
Angier (Harnett)	Unassigned	4,247	8,615,855	4,247	100.00%	0.05%
Angier (Wake)	Unassigned	103	8,615,855	103	100.00%	0.00%
Ansonville	Unassigned	631	8,615,855	631	100.00%	0.01%
Apex	Unassigned	37,476	8,615,855	37,476	100.00%	0.43%
Arapahoe	Unassigned	556	8,615,855	556	100.00%	0.01%
Archdale (Guilford)	Unassigned	333	8,615,855	333	100.00%	0.00%
Archdale (Randolph)	Unassigned	11,082	8,615,855	11,082	100.00%	0.13%
Archer Lodge	Unassigned	4,292	8,615,855	4,292	100.00%	0.05%
Asheboro	Unassigned	25,012	8,615,855	25,012	100.00%	0.29%
Asheville	Unassigned	83,393	8,615,855	83,393	100.00%	0.97%
Askewville	Unassigned	241	8,615,855	241	100.00%	0.00%
Atkinson	Unassigned	299	8,615,855	299	100.00%	0.00%
Atlantic Beach	Unassigned	1,495	8,615,855	1,495	100.00%	0.02%
Aulander	Unassigned	895	8,615,855	895	100.00%	0.01%
Aurora	Unassigned	520	8,615,855	520	100.00%	0.01%
Autryville	Unassigned	196	8,615,855	196	100.00%	0.00%
Ayden	Unassigned	4,932	8,615,855	4,932	100.00%	0.06%
Badin	Unassigned	1,974	8,615,855	1,974	100.00%	0.02%
Bailey	Unassigned	569	8,615,855	569	100.00%	0.01%
Bakersville	Unassigned	464	8,615,855	464	100.00%	0.01%
Bald Head Island	Unassigned	158	8,615,855	158	100.00%	0.00%
Banner Elk	Unassigned	1,028	8,615,855	1,028	100.00%	0.01%
Bath	Unassigned	249	8,615,855	249	100.00%	0.00%
Bayboro	Unassigned	1,263	8,615,855	1,263	100.00%	0.01%
Bear Grass	Unassigned	73	8,615,855	73	100.00%	0.00%
Beaufort	Unassigned	4,039	8,615,855	4,039	100.00%	0.05%
Beech Mountain (Avery)	Unassigned	24	8,615,855	24	100.00%	0.00%
Beech Mountain (Watauga)	Unassigned	296	8,615,855	296	100.00%	0.00%
Belhaven	Unassigned	1,688	8,615,855	1,688	100.00%	0.02%
Belmont	Unassigned	10,076	8,615,855	10,076	100.00%	0.12%
Belville	Unassigned	1,936	8,615,855	1,936	100.00%	0.02%
Belwood	Unassigned	950	8,615,855	950	100.00%	0.01%
Benson (Harnett)	Unassigned	0	8,615,855	0	0.00%	0.00%
Benson (Johnston)	Unassigned	3,311	8,615,855	3,311	100.00%	0.04%
Bermuda Run	Unassigned	1,725	8,615,855	1,725	100.00%	0.02%
Bessemer City	Unassigned	5,340	8,615,855	5,340	100.00%	0.06%
Bethania	Unassigned	328	8,615,855	328	100.00%	0.00%
Bethel	Unassigned	1,577	8,615,855	1,577	100.00%	0.02%
Beulaville	Unassigned	1,296	8,615,855	1,296	100.00%	0.02%
Biltmore Forest	Unassigned	1,343	8,615,855	1,343	100.00%	0.02%
Biscoe	Unassigned	1,700	8,615,855	1,700	100.00%	0.02%

District plan definition file: 'S691-AMT-33-Mecklenburg.asc', modified 08/24/2017 11:45:14 AM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

S691-ATV-32-Mecklenburg Floor Amendment: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Black Creek	Unassigned	769	8,615,855	769	100.00%	0.01%
Black Mountain	Unassigned	7,848	8,615,855	7,848	100.00%	0.09%
Bladenboro	Unassigned	1,750	8,615,855	1,750	100.00%	0.02%
Blowing Rock (Caldwell)	Unassigned	49	8,615,855	49	100.00%	0.00%
Blowing Rock (Watauga)	Unassigned	1,192	8,615,855	1,192	100.00%	0.01%
Boardman	Unassigned	157	8,615,855	157	100.00%	0.00%
Bogue	Unassigned	684	8,615,855	684	100.00%	0.01%
Boiling Spring Lakes	Unassigned	5,372	8,615,855	5,372	100.00%	0.06%
Boiling Springs	Unassigned	4,647	8,615,855	4,647	100.00%	0.05%
Bolivia	Unassigned	143	8,615,855	143	100.00%	0.00%
Bolton	Unassigned	691	8,615,855	691	100.00%	0.01%
Boone	Unassigned	17,122	8,615,855	17,122	100.00%	0.20%
Boonville	Unassigned	1,222	8,615,855	1,222	100.00%	0.01%
Bostic	Unassigned	386	8,615,855	386	100.00%	0.00%
Brevard	Unassigned	7,609	8,615,855	7,609	100.00%	0.09%
Bridgeton	Unassigned	454	8,615,855	454	100.00%	0.01%
Broadway (Harnett)	Unassigned	25	8,615,855	25	100.00%	0.00%
Broadway (Lee)	Unassigned	1,204	8,615,855	1,204	100.00%	0.01%
Brookford	Unassigned	382	8,615,855	382	100.00%	0.00%
Brunswick	Unassigned	1,119	8,615,855	1,119	100.00%	0.01%
Bryson City	Unassigned	1,424	8,615,855	1,424	100.00%	0.02%
Bunn	Unassigned	344	8,615,855	344	100.00%	0.00%
Burgaw	Unassigned	3,872	8,615,855	3,872	100.00%	0.04%
Burlington (Alamance)	Unassigned	49,308	8,615,855	49,308	100.00%	0.57%
Burlington (Guilford)	Unassigned	655	8,615,855	655	100.00%	0.01%
Burnsville	Unassigned	1,693	8,615,855	1,693	100.00%	0.02%
Butner	Unassigned	7,591	8,615,855	7,591	100.00%	0.09%
Cajah's Mountain	Unassigned	2,823	8,615,855	2,823	100.00%	0.03%
Calabash	Unassigned	1,786	8,615,855	1,786	100.00%	0.02%
Calypso	Unassigned	538	8,615,855	538	100.00%	0.01%
Cameron	Unassigned	285	8,615,855	285	100.00%	0.00%
Candor	Unassigned	840	8,615,855	840	100.00%	0.01%
Canton	Unassigned	4,227	8,615,855	4,227	100.00%	0.05%
Cape Carteret	Unassigned	1,917	8,615,855	1,917	100.00%	0.02%
Carolina Beach	Unassigned	5,706	8,615,855	5,706	100.00%	0.07%
Carolina Shores	Unassigned	3,048	8,615,855	3,048	100.00%	0.04%
Carrboro	Unassigned	19,582	8,615,855	19,582	100.00%	0.23%
Carthage	Unassigned	2,205	8,615,855	2,205	100.00%	0.03%
Cary (Chatham)	Unassigned	1,422	8,615,855	1,422	100.00%	0.02%
Cary (Wake)	Unassigned	133,812	8,615,855	133,812	100.00%	1.55%
Casar	Unassigned	297	8,615,855	297	100.00%	0.00%
Castalia	Unassigned	268	8,615,855	268	100.00%	0.00%
Caswell Beach	Unassigned	398	8,615,855	398	100.00%	0.00%
Catawba	Unassigned	603	8,615,855	603	100.00%	0.01%
Cedar Point	Unassigned	1,279	8,615,855	1,279	100.00%	0.01%
Cedar Rock	Unassigned	300	8,615,855	300	100.00%	0.00%
Centerville	Unassigned	89	8,615,855	89	100.00%	0.00%

S691-ATV-32-Mecklenburg Floor Amendment: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Cerro Gordo	Unassigned	207	8,615,855	207	100.00%	0.00%
Chadbourn	Unassigned	1,856	8,615,855	1,856	100.00%	0.02%
Chapel Hill (Durham)	Unassigned	2,836	8,615,855	2,836	100.00%	0.03%
Chapel Hill (Orange)	Unassigned	54,397	8,615,855	54,397	100.00%	0.63%
Charlotte	37	731,424	183,957	147,368	20.15%	80.11%
	38	731,424	184,368	163,379	22.34%	88.62%
	39	731,424	182,098	170,606	23.33%	93.69%
	40	731,424	184,252	154,703	21.15%	83.96%
	41	731,424	184,953	95,368	13.04%	51.56%
Cherryville	Unassigned	5,760	8,615,855	5,760	100.00%	0.07%
Chimney Rock Village	Unassigned	113	8,615,855	113	100.00%	0.00%
China Grove	Unassigned	3,563	8,615,855	3,563	100.00%	0.04%
Chocowinity	Unassigned	820	8,615,855	820	100.00%	0.01%
Claremont	Unassigned	1,352	8,615,855	1,352	100.00%	0.02%
Clarkton	Unassigned	837	8,615,855	837	100.00%	0.01%
Clayton (Johnston)	Unassigned	16,116	8,615,855	16,116	100.00%	0.19%
Clayton (Wake)	Unassigned	0	8,615,855	0	0.00%	0.00%
Clemmons	Unassigned	18,627	8,615,855	18,627	100.00%	0.22%
Cleveland	Unassigned	871	8,615,855	871	100.00%	0.01%
Clinton	Unassigned	8,639	8,615,855	8,639	100.00%	0.10%
Clyde	Unassigned	1,223	8,615,855	1,223	100.00%	0.01%
Coats	Unassigned	2,112	8,615,855	2,112	100.00%	0.02%
Cofield	Unassigned	413	8,615,855	413	100.00%	0.00%
Colerain	Unassigned	204	8,615,855	204	100.00%	0.00%
Columbia	Unassigned	891	8,615,855	891	100.00%	0.01%
Columbus	Unassigned	999	8,615,855	999	100.00%	0.01%
Como	Unassigned	91	8,615,855	91	100.00%	0.00%
Concord	Unassigned	79,066	8,615,855	79,066	100.00%	0.92%
Conetoe	Unassigned	294	8,615,855	294	100.00%	0.00%
Connelly Springs	Unassigned	1,669	8,615,855	1,669	100.00%	0.02%
Conover	Unassigned	8,165	8,615,855	8,165	100.00%	0.09%
Conway	Unassigned	836	8,615,855	836	100.00%	0.01%
Cooleemee	Unassigned	960	8,615,855	960	100.00%	0.01%
Cornelius	41	24,866	184,953	24,866	100.00%	13.44%
Cove City	Unassigned	399	8,615,855	399	100.00%	0.00%
Cramerton	Unassigned	4,165	8,615,855	4,165	100.00%	0.05%
Creedmoor	Unassigned	4,124	8,615,855	4,124	100.00%	0.05%
Creswell	Unassigned	276	8,615,855	276	100.00%	0.00%
Crossnore	Unassigned	192	8,615,855	192	100.00%	0.00%
Dallas	Unassigned	4,488	8,615,855	4,488	100.00%	0.05%
Danbury	Unassigned	189	8,615,855	189	100.00%	0.00%
Davidson (Iredell)	Unassigned	294	8,615,855	294	100.00%	0.00%
Davidson (Mecklenburg)	41	10,650	184,953	10,650	100.00%	5.76%
Dellview	Unassigned	13	8,615,855	13	100.00%	0.00%
Denton	Unassigned	1,636	8,615,855	1,636	100.00%	0.02%
Dillsboro	Unassigned	232	8,615,855	232	100.00%	0.00%
Dobbins Heights	Unassigned	866	8,615,855	866	100.00%	0.01%

S691-ATV-32-Mecklenburg Floor Amendment: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Dobson	Unassigned	1,586	8,615,855	1,586	100.00%	0.02%
Dortches	Unassigned	935	8,615,855	935	100.00%	0.01%
Dover	Unassigned	401	8,615,855	401	100.00%	0.00%
Drexel	Unassigned	1,858	8,615,855	1,858	100.00%	0.02%
Dublin	Unassigned	338	8,615,855	338	100.00%	0.00%
Duck	Unassigned	369	8,615,855	369	100.00%	0.00%
Dunn	Unassigned	9,263	8,615,855	9,263	100.00%	0.11%
Durham (Durham)	Unassigned	228,300	8,615,855	228,300	100.00%	2.65%
Durham (Orange)	Unassigned	30	8,615,855	30	100.00%	0.00%
Durham (Wake)	Unassigned	0	8,615,855	0	0.00%	0.00%
Earl	Unassigned	260	8,615,855	260	100.00%	0.00%
East Arcadia	Unassigned	487	8,615,855	487	100.00%	0.01%
East Bend	Unassigned	612	8,615,855	612	100.00%	0.01%
East Laurinburg	Unassigned	300	8,615,855	300	100.00%	0.00%
East Spencer	Unassigned	1,534	8,615,855	1,534	100.00%	0.02%
Eastover	Unassigned	3,628	8,615,855	3,628	100.00%	0.04%
Eden	Unassigned	15,527	8,615,855	15,527	100.00%	0.18%
Edenton	Unassigned	5,004	8,615,855	5,004	100.00%	0.06%
Elizabeth City (Camden)	Unassigned	45	8,615,855	45	100.00%	0.00%
Elizabeth City (Pasquotank)	Unassigned	18,638	8,615,855	18,638	100.00%	0.22%
Elizabethtown	Unassigned	3,583	8,615,855	3,583	100.00%	0.04%
Elk Park	Unassigned	452	8,615,855	452	100.00%	0.01%
Elkin (Surry)	Unassigned	3,921	8,615,855	3,921	100.00%	0.05%
Elkin (Wilkes)	Unassigned	80	8,615,855	80	100.00%	0.00%
Ellenboro	Unassigned	873	8,615,855	873	100.00%	0.01%
Ellerbe	Unassigned	1,054	8,615,855	1,054	100.00%	0.01%
Elm City	Unassigned	1,298	8,615,855	1,298	100.00%	0.02%
Elon	Unassigned	9,419	8,615,855	9,419	100.00%	0.11%
Emerald Isle	Unassigned	3,655	8,615,855	3,655	100.00%	0.04%
Enfield	Unassigned	2,532	8,615,855	2,532	100.00%	0.03%
Erwin	Unassigned	4,405	8,615,855	4,405	100.00%	0.05%
Eureka	Unassigned	197	8,615,855	197	100.00%	0.00%
Everetts	Unassigned	164	8,615,855	164	100.00%	0.00%
Fair Bluff	Unassigned	951	8,615,855	951	100.00%	0.01%
Fairmont	Unassigned	2,663	8,615,855	2,663	100.00%	0.03%
Fairview	Unassigned	3,324	8,615,855	3,324	100.00%	0.04%
Faison (Duplin)	Unassigned	961	8,615,855	961	100.00%	0.01%
Faison (Sampson)	Unassigned	0	8,615,855	0	0.00%	0.00%
Faith	Unassigned	807	8,615,855	807	100.00%	0.01%
Falcon (Cumberland)	Unassigned	258	8,615,855	258	100.00%	0.00%
Falcon (Sampson)	Unassigned	0	8,615,855	0	0.00%	0.00%
Falkland	Unassigned	96	8,615,855	96	100.00%	0.00%
Fallston	Unassigned	607	8,615,855	607	100.00%	0.01%
Farmville	Unassigned	4,654	8,615,855	4,654	100.00%	0.05%
Fayetteville	Unassigned	200,564	8,615,855	200,564	100.00%	2.33%
Flat Rock	Unassigned	3,114	8,615,855	3,114	100.00%	0.04%
Fletcher	Unassigned	7,187	8,615,855	7,187	100.00%	0.08%

S691-ATV-32-Mecklenburg Floor Amendment: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Forest City	Unassigned	7,476	8,615,855	7,476	100.00%	0.09%
Forest Hills	Unassigned	365	8,615,855	365	100.00%	0.00%
Fountain	Unassigned	427	8,615,855	427	100.00%	0.00%
Four Oaks	Unassigned	1,921	8,615,855	1,921	100.00%	0.02%
Foxfire	Unassigned	902	8,615,855	902	100.00%	0.01%
Franklin	Unassigned	3,845	8,615,855	3,845	100.00%	0.04%
Franklinton	Unassigned	2,023	8,615,855	2,023	100.00%	0.02%
Franklinville	Unassigned	1,164	8,615,855	1,164	100.00%	0.01%
Fremont	Unassigned	1,255	8,615,855	1,255	100.00%	0.01%
Fuquay-Varina	Unassigned	17,937	8,615,855	17,937	100.00%	0.21%
Gamewell	Unassigned	4,051	8,615,855	4,051	100.00%	0.05%
Garland	Unassigned	625	8,615,855	625	100.00%	0.01%
Garner	Unassigned	25,745	8,615,855	25,745	100.00%	0.30%
Garysburg	Unassigned	1,057	8,615,855	1,057	100.00%	0.01%
Gaston	Unassigned	1,152	8,615,855	1,152	100.00%	0.01%
Gastonia	Unassigned	71,741	8,615,855	71,741	100.00%	0.83%
Gatesville	Unassigned	321	8,615,855	321	100.00%	0.00%
Gibson	Unassigned	540	8,615,855	540	100.00%	0.01%
Gibsonville (Alamance)	Unassigned	3,148	8,615,855	3,148	100.00%	0.04%
Gibsonville (Guilford)	Unassigned	3,262	8,615,855	3,262	100.00%	0.04%
Glen Alpine	Unassigned	1,517	8,615,855	1,517	100.00%	0.02%
Godwin	Unassigned	139	8,615,855	139	100.00%	0.00%
Goldsboro	Unassigned	36,437	8,615,855	36,437	100.00%	0.42%
Goldston	Unassigned	268	8,615,855	268	100.00%	0.00%
Graham	Unassigned	14,153	8,615,855	14,153	100.00%	0.16%
Grandfather	Unassigned	25	8,615,855	25	100.00%	0.00%
Granite Falls	Unassigned	4,722	8,615,855	4,722	100.00%	0.05%
Granite Quarry	Unassigned	2,930	8,615,855	2,930	100.00%	0.03%
Grantsboro	Unassigned	688	8,615,855	688	100.00%	0.01%
Green Level	Unassigned	2,100	8,615,855	2,100	100.00%	0.02%
Greenevers	Unassigned	634	8,615,855	634	100.00%	0.01%
Greensboro	Unassigned	269,666	8,615,855	269,666	100.00%	3.13%
Greenville	Unassigned	84,554	8,615,855	84,554	100.00%	0.98%
Grifton (Lenoir)	Unassigned	186	8,615,855	186	100.00%	0.00%
Grifton (Pitt)	Unassigned	2,431	8,615,855	2,431	100.00%	0.03%
Grimesland	Unassigned	441	8,615,855	441	100.00%	0.01%
Grover	Unassigned	708	8,615,855	708	100.00%	0.01%
Halifax	Unassigned	234	8,615,855	234	100.00%	0.00%
Hamilton	Unassigned	408	8,615,855	408	100.00%	0.00%
Hamlet	Unassigned	6,495	8,615,855	6,495	100.00%	0.08%
Harmony	Unassigned	531	8,615,855	531	100.00%	0.01%
Harrells (Duplin)	Unassigned	23	8,615,855	23	100.00%	0.00%
Harrells (Sampson)	Unassigned	179	8,615,855	179	100.00%	0.00%
Harrellsville	Unassigned	106	8,615,855	106	100.00%	0.00%
Harrisburg	Unassigned	11,526	8,615,855	11,526	100.00%	0.13%
Hassell	Unassigned	84	8,615,855	84	100.00%	0.00%
Havelock	Unassigned	20,735	8,615,855	20,735	100.00%	0.24%

District plan definition file: 'S691-AMT-33-Mecklenburg.asc', modified 08/24/2017 11:45:14 AM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

S691-ATV-32-Mecklenburg Floor Amendment: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Haw River	Unassigned	2,298	8,615,855	2,298	100.00%	0.03%
Hayesville	Unassigned	311	8,615,855	311	100.00%	0.00%
Hemby Bridge	Unassigned	1,520	8,615,855	1,520	100.00%	0.02%
Henderson	Unassigned	15,368	8,615,855	15,368	100.00%	0.18%
Hendersonville	Unassigned	13,137	8,615,855	13,137	100.00%	0.15%
Hertford	Unassigned	2,143	8,615,855	2,143	100.00%	0.02%
Hickory (Burke)	Unassigned	66	8,615,855	66	100.00%	0.00%
Hickory (Caldwell)	Unassigned	18	8,615,855	18	100.00%	0.00%
Hickory (Catawba)	Unassigned	39,926	8,615,855	39,926	100.00%	0.46%
High Point (Davidson)	Unassigned	5,310	8,615,855	5,310	100.00%	0.06%
High Point (Forsyth)	Unassigned	8	8,615,855	8	100.00%	0.00%
High Point (Guilford)	Unassigned	99,042	8,615,855	99,042	100.00%	1.15%
High Point (Randolph)	Unassigned	11	8,615,855	11	100.00%	0.00%
High Shoals	Unassigned	696	8,615,855	696	100.00%	0.01%
Highlands (Jackson)	Unassigned	4	8,615,855	4	100.00%	0.00%
Highlands (Macon)	Unassigned	920	8,615,855	920	100.00%	0.01%
Hildebran	Unassigned	2,023	8,615,855	2,023	100.00%	0.02%
Hillsborough	Unassigned	6,087	8,615,855	6,087	100.00%	0.07%
Hobgood	Unassigned	348	8,615,855	348	100.00%	0.00%
Hoffman	Unassigned	588	8,615,855	588	100.00%	0.01%
Holden Beach	Unassigned	575	8,615,855	575	100.00%	0.01%
Holly Ridge	Unassigned	1,268	8,615,855	1,268	100.00%	0.01%
Holly Springs	Unassigned	24,661	8,615,855	24,661	100.00%	0.29%
Hookerton	Unassigned	409	8,615,855	409	100.00%	0.00%
Hope Mills	Unassigned	15,176	8,615,855	15,176	100.00%	0.18%
Hot Springs	Unassigned	560	8,615,855	560	100.00%	0.01%
Hudson	Unassigned	3,776	8,615,855	3,776	100.00%	0.04%
Huntersville	41	46,773	184,953	46,773	100.00%	25.29%
Indian Beach	Unassigned	112	8,615,855	112	100.00%	0.00%
Indian Trail	Unassigned	33,518	8,615,855	33,518	100.00%	0.39%
Jackson	Unassigned	513	8,615,855	513	100.00%	0.01%
Jacksonville	Unassigned	70,145	8,615,855	70,145	100.00%	0.81%
Jamestown	Unassigned	3,382	8,615,855	3,382	100.00%	0.04%
Jamesville	Unassigned	491	8,615,855	491	100.00%	0.01%
Jefferson	Unassigned	1,611	8,615,855	1,611	100.00%	0.02%
Jonesville	Unassigned	2,285	8,615,855	2,285	100.00%	0.03%
Kannapolis (Cabarrus)	Unassigned	33,194	8,615,855	33,194	100.00%	0.39%
Kannapolis (Rowan)	Unassigned	9,431	8,615,855	9,431	100.00%	0.11%
Kelford	Unassigned	251	8,615,855	251	100.00%	0.00%
Kenansville	Unassigned	855	8,615,855	855	100.00%	0.01%
Kenly (Johnston)	Unassigned	1,176	8,615,855	1,176	100.00%	0.01%
Kenly (Wilson)	Unassigned	163	8,615,855	163	100.00%	0.00%
Kernersville (Forsyth)	Unassigned	23,071	8,615,855	23,071	100.00%	0.27%
Kernersville (Guilford)	Unassigned	52	8,615,855	52	100.00%	0.00%
Kill Devil Hills	Unassigned	6,683	8,615,855	6,683	100.00%	0.08%
King (Forsyth)	Unassigned	619	8,615,855	619	100.00%	0.01%
King (Stokes)	Unassigned	6,285	8,615,855	6,285	100.00%	0.07%

District plan definition file: 'S691-AMT-33-Mecklenburg.asc', modified 08/24/2017 11:45:14 AM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

S691-ATV-32-Mecklenburg Floor Amendment: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Kings Mountain (Cleveland)	Unassigned	9,242	8,615,855	9,242	100.00%	0.11%
Kings Mountain (Gaston)	Unassigned	1,054	8,615,855	1,054	100.00%	0.01%
Kingstown	Unassigned	681	8,615,855	681	100.00%	0.01%
Kinston	Unassigned	21,677	8,615,855	21,677	100.00%	0.25%
Kittrell	Unassigned	467	8,615,855	467	100.00%	0.01%
Kitty Hawk	Unassigned	3,272	8,615,855	3,272	100.00%	0.04%
Knightdale	Unassigned	11,401	8,615,855	11,401	100.00%	0.13%
Kure Beach	Unassigned	2,012	8,615,855	2,012	100.00%	0.02%
La Grange	Unassigned	2,873	8,615,855	2,873	100.00%	0.03%
Lake Lure	Unassigned	1,192	8,615,855	1,192	100.00%	0.01%
Lake Park	Unassigned	3,422	8,615,855	3,422	100.00%	0.04%
Lake Santeetlah	Unassigned	45	8,615,855	45	100.00%	0.00%
Lake Waccamaw	Unassigned	1,480	8,615,855	1,480	100.00%	0.02%
Landis	Unassigned	3,109	8,615,855	3,109	100.00%	0.04%
Lansing	Unassigned	158	8,615,855	158	100.00%	0.00%
Lasker	Unassigned	122	8,615,855	122	100.00%	0.00%
Lattimore	Unassigned	488	8,615,855	488	100.00%	0.01%
Laurel Park	Unassigned	2,180	8,615,855	2,180	100.00%	0.03%
Laurinburg	Unassigned	15,962	8,615,855	15,962	100.00%	0.19%
Lawndale	Unassigned	606	8,615,855	606	100.00%	0.01%
Leggett	Unassigned	60	8,615,855	60	100.00%	0.00%
Leland	Unassigned	13,527	8,615,855	13,527	100.00%	0.16%
Lenoir	Unassigned	18,228	8,615,855	18,228	100.00%	0.21%
Lewiston Woodville	Unassigned	549	8,615,855	549	100.00%	0.01%
Lewisville	Unassigned	12,639	8,615,855	12,639	100.00%	0.15%
Lexington	Unassigned	18,931	8,615,855	18,931	100.00%	0.22%
Liberty	Unassigned	2,656	8,615,855	2,656	100.00%	0.03%
Lilesville	Unassigned	536	8,615,855	536	100.00%	0.01%
Lillington	Unassigned	3,194	8,615,855	3,194	100.00%	0.04%
Lincolnton	Unassigned	10,486	8,615,855	10,486	100.00%	0.12%
Linden	Unassigned	130	8,615,855	130	100.00%	0.00%
Littleton	Unassigned	674	8,615,855	674	100.00%	0.01%
Locust (Cabarrus)	Unassigned	215	8,615,855	215	100.00%	0.00%
Locust (Stanly)	Unassigned	2,715	8,615,855	2,715	100.00%	0.03%
Long View (Burke)	Unassigned	752	8,615,855	752	100.00%	0.01%
Long View (Catawba)	Unassigned	4,119	8,615,855	4,119	100.00%	0.05%
Louisburg	Unassigned	3,359	8,615,855	3,359	100.00%	0.04%
Love Valley	Unassigned	90	8,615,855	90	100.00%	0.00%
Lowell	Unassigned	3,526	8,615,855	3,526	100.00%	0.04%
Lucama	Unassigned	1,108	8,615,855	1,108	100.00%	0.01%
Lumber Bridge	Unassigned	94	8,615,855	94	100.00%	0.00%
Lumberton	Unassigned	21,542	8,615,855	21,542	100.00%	0.25%
Macclesfield	Unassigned	471	8,615,855	471	100.00%	0.01%
Macon	Unassigned	119	8,615,855	119	100.00%	0.00%
Madison	Unassigned	2,246	8,615,855	2,246	100.00%	0.03%
Maggie Valley	Unassigned	1,150	8,615,855	1,150	100.00%	0.01%
Magnolia	Unassigned	939	8,615,855	939	100.00%	0.01%

District plan definition file: 'S691-AMT-33-Mecklenburg.asc', modified 08/24/2017 11:45:14 AM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

S691-ATV-32-Mecklenburg Floor Amendment: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Maiden (Catawba)	Unassigned	3,308	8,615,855	3,308	100.00%	0.04%
Maiden (Lincoln)	Unassigned	2	8,615,855	2	100.00%	0.00%
Manteo	Unassigned	1,434	8,615,855	1,434	100.00%	0.02%
Marietta	Unassigned	175	8,615,855	175	100.00%	0.00%
Marion	Unassigned	7,838	8,615,855	7,838	100.00%	0.09%
Mars Hill	Unassigned	1,869	8,615,855	1,869	100.00%	0.02%
Marshall	Unassigned	872	8,615,855	872	100.00%	0.01%
Marshville	Unassigned	2,402	8,615,855	2,402	100.00%	0.03%
Marvin	Unassigned	5,579	8,615,855	5,579	100.00%	0.06%
Matthews	37	27,198	183,957	27,198	100.00%	14.78%
Maxton (Robeson)	Unassigned	2,230	8,615,855	2,230	100.00%	0.03%
Maxton (Scotland)	Unassigned	196	8,615,855	196	100.00%	0.00%
Mayodan	Unassigned	2,478	8,615,855	2,478	100.00%	0.03%
Maysville	Unassigned	1,019	8,615,855	1,019	100.00%	0.01%
McAdenville	Unassigned	651	8,615,855	651	100.00%	0.01%
McDonald	Unassigned	113	8,615,855	113	100.00%	0.00%
McFarlan	Unassigned	117	8,615,855	117	100.00%	0.00%
Mebane (Alamance)	Unassigned	9,600	8,615,855	9,600	100.00%	0.11%
Mebane (Orange)	Unassigned	1,793	8,615,855	1,793	100.00%	0.02%
Mesic	Unassigned	220	8,615,855	220	100.00%	0.00%
Micro	Unassigned	441	8,615,855	441	100.00%	0.01%
Middleburg	Unassigned	133	8,615,855	133	100.00%	0.00%
Middlesex	Unassigned	822	8,615,855	822	100.00%	0.01%
Midland (Cabarrus)	Unassigned	3,073	8,615,855	3,073	100.00%	0.04%
Midland (Mecklenburg)	40	0	184,252	0	0.00%	0.00%
Midway	Unassigned	4,679	8,615,855	4,679	100.00%	0.05%
Mills River	Unassigned	6,802	8,615,855	6,802	100.00%	0.08%
Milton	Unassigned	166	8,615,855	166	100.00%	0.00%
Mineral Springs	Unassigned	2,639	8,615,855	2,639	100.00%	0.03%
Minnesott Beach	Unassigned	440	8,615,855	440	100.00%	0.01%
Mint Hill (Mecklenburg)	37	22,669	183,957	7,153	31.55%	3.89%
	40	22,669	184,252	15,516	68.45%	8.42%
Mint Hill (Union)	Unassigned	53	8,615,855	53	100.00%	0.00%
Misenheimer	Unassigned	728	8,615,855	728	100.00%	0.01%
Mocksville	Unassigned	5,051	8,615,855	5,051	100.00%	0.06%
Momeyer	Unassigned	224	8,615,855	224	100.00%	0.00%
Monroe	Unassigned	32,797	8,615,855	32,797	100.00%	0.38%
Montreat	Unassigned	723	8,615,855	723	100.00%	0.01%
Mooresboro	Unassigned	311	8,615,855	311	100.00%	0.00%
Mooresville	Unassigned	32,711	8,615,855	32,711	100.00%	0.38%
Morehead City	Unassigned	8,661	8,615,855	8,661	100.00%	0.10%
Morganton	Unassigned	16,918	8,615,855	16,918	100.00%	0.20%
Morrisville (Durham)	Unassigned	0	8,615,855	0	0.00%	0.00%
Morrisville (Wake)	Unassigned	18,576	8,615,855	18,576	100.00%	0.22%
Morven	Unassigned	511	8,615,855	511	100.00%	0.01%
Mount Airy	Unassigned	10,388	8,615,855	10,388	100.00%	0.12%
Mount Gilead	Unassigned	1,181	8,615,855	1,181	100.00%	0.01%

District plan definition file: 'S691-AMT-33-Mecklenburg.asc', modified 08/24/2017 11:45:14 AM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

S691-ATV-32-Mecklenburg Floor Amendment: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Mount Holly	Unassigned	13,656	8,615,855	13,656	100.00%	0.16%
Mount Olive (Duplin)	Unassigned	51	8,615,855	51	100.00%	0.00%
Mount Olive (Wayne)	Unassigned	4,538	8,615,855	4,538	100.00%	0.05%
Mount Pleasant	Unassigned	1,652	8,615,855	1,652	100.00%	0.02%
Murfreesboro	Unassigned	2,835	8,615,855	2,835	100.00%	0.03%
Murphy	Unassigned	1,627	8,615,855	1,627	100.00%	0.02%
Nags Head	Unassigned	2,757	8,615,855	2,757	100.00%	0.03%
Nashville	Unassigned	5,352	8,615,855	5,352	100.00%	0.06%
Navassa	Unassigned	1,505	8,615,855	1,505	100.00%	0.02%
New Bern	Unassigned	29,524	8,615,855	29,524	100.00%	0.34%
New London	Unassigned	600	8,615,855	600	100.00%	0.01%
Newland	Unassigned	698	8,615,855	698	100.00%	0.01%
Newport	Unassigned	4,150	8,615,855	4,150	100.00%	0.05%
Newton	Unassigned	12,968	8,615,855	12,968	100.00%	0.15%
Newton Grove	Unassigned	569	8,615,855	569	100.00%	0.01%
Norlina	Unassigned	1,118	8,615,855	1,118	100.00%	0.01%
Norman	Unassigned	138	8,615,855	138	100.00%	0.00%
North Topsail Beach	Unassigned	743	8,615,855	743	100.00%	0.01%
North Wilkesboro	Unassigned	4,245	8,615,855	4,245	100.00%	0.05%
Northwest	Unassigned	735	8,615,855	735	100.00%	0.01%
Norwood	Unassigned	2,379	8,615,855	2,379	100.00%	0.03%
Oak City	Unassigned	317	8,615,855	317	100.00%	0.00%
Oak Island	Unassigned	6,783	8,615,855	6,783	100.00%	0.08%
Oak Ridge	Unassigned	6,185	8,615,855	6,185	100.00%	0.07%
Oakboro	Unassigned	1,859	8,615,855	1,859	100.00%	0.02%
Ocean Isle Beach	Unassigned	550	8,615,855	550	100.00%	0.01%
Old Fort	Unassigned	908	8,615,855	908	100.00%	0.01%
Oriental	Unassigned	900	8,615,855	900	100.00%	0.01%
Orrum	Unassigned	91	8,615,855	91	100.00%	0.00%
Ossipee	Unassigned	543	8,615,855	543	100.00%	0.01%
Oxford	Unassigned	8,461	8,615,855	8,461	100.00%	0.10%
Pantego	Unassigned	179	8,615,855	179	100.00%	0.00%
Parkton	Unassigned	436	8,615,855	436	100.00%	0.01%
Parmele	Unassigned	278	8,615,855	278	100.00%	0.00%
Patterson Springs	Unassigned	622	8,615,855	622	100.00%	0.01%
Peachland	Unassigned	437	8,615,855	437	100.00%	0.01%
Peletier	Unassigned	644	8,615,855	644	100.00%	0.01%
Pembroke	Unassigned	2,973	8,615,855	2,973	100.00%	0.03%
Pikeville	Unassigned	678	8,615,855	678	100.00%	0.01%
Pilot Mountain	Unassigned	1,477	8,615,855	1,477	100.00%	0.02%
Pine Knoll Shores	Unassigned	1,339	8,615,855	1,339	100.00%	0.02%
Pine Level	Unassigned	1,700	8,615,855	1,700	100.00%	0.02%
Pinebluff	Unassigned	1,337	8,615,855	1,337	100.00%	0.02%
Pinehurst	Unassigned	13,124	8,615,855	13,124	100.00%	0.15%
Pinetops	Unassigned	1,374	8,615,855	1,374	100.00%	0.02%
Pineville	39	7,479	182,098	7,479	100.00%	4.11%
Pink Hill	Unassigned	552	8,615,855	552	100.00%	0.01%

District plan definition file: 'S691-AMT-33-Mecklenburg.asc', modified 08/24/2017 11:45:14 AM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

S691-ATV-32-Mecklenburg Floor Amendment: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Pittsboro	Unassigned	3,743	8,615,855	3,743	100.00%	0.04%
Pleasant Garden	Unassigned	4,489	8,615,855	4,489	100.00%	0.05%
Plymouth	Unassigned	3,878	8,615,855	3,878	100.00%	0.05%
Polkton	Unassigned	3,375	8,615,855	3,375	100.00%	0.04%
Polkville	Unassigned	545	8,615,855	545	100.00%	0.01%
Pollocksville	Unassigned	311	8,615,855	311	100.00%	0.00%
Powellsville	Unassigned	276	8,615,855	276	100.00%	0.00%
Princeton	Unassigned	1,194	8,615,855	1,194	100.00%	0.01%
Princeville	Unassigned	2,082	8,615,855	2,082	100.00%	0.02%
Proctorville	Unassigned	117	8,615,855	117	100.00%	0.00%
Raeford	Unassigned	4,611	8,615,855	4,611	100.00%	0.05%
Raleigh (Durham)	Unassigned	1,067	8,615,855	1,067	100.00%	0.01%
Raleigh (Wake)	Unassigned	402,825	8,615,855	402,825	100.00%	4.68%
Ramseur	Unassigned	1,692	8,615,855	1,692	100.00%	0.02%
Randleman	Unassigned	4,113	8,615,855	4,113	100.00%	0.05%
Ranlo	Unassigned	3,434	8,615,855	3,434	100.00%	0.04%
Raynham	Unassigned	72	8,615,855	72	100.00%	0.00%
Red Cross	Unassigned	742	8,615,855	742	100.00%	0.01%
Red Oak	Unassigned	3,430	8,615,855	3,430	100.00%	0.04%
Red Springs (Hoke)	Unassigned	0	8,615,855	0	0.00%	0.00%
Red Springs (Robeson)	Unassigned	3,428	8,615,855	3,428	100.00%	0.04%
Reidsville	Unassigned	14,520	8,615,855	14,520	100.00%	0.17%
Rennert	Unassigned	383	8,615,855	383	100.00%	0.00%
Rhodhiss (Burke)	Unassigned	700	8,615,855	700	100.00%	0.01%
Rhodhiss (Caldwell)	Unassigned	370	8,615,855	370	100.00%	0.00%
Rich Square	Unassigned	958	8,615,855	958	100.00%	0.01%
Richfield	Unassigned	613	8,615,855	613	100.00%	0.01%
Richlands	Unassigned	1,520	8,615,855	1,520	100.00%	0.02%
River Bend	Unassigned	3,119	8,615,855	3,119	100.00%	0.04%
Roanoke Rapids	Unassigned	15,754	8,615,855	15,754	100.00%	0.18%
Robbins	Unassigned	1,097	8,615,855	1,097	100.00%	0.01%
Robbinsville	Unassigned	620	8,615,855	620	100.00%	0.01%
Robersonville	Unassigned	1,488	8,615,855	1,488	100.00%	0.02%
Rockingham	Unassigned	9,558	8,615,855	9,558	100.00%	0.11%
Rockwell	Unassigned	2,108	8,615,855	2,108	100.00%	0.02%
Rocky Mount (Edgecombe)	Unassigned	17,524	8,615,855	17,524	100.00%	0.20%
Rocky Mount (Nash)	Unassigned	39,953	8,615,855	39,953	100.00%	0.46%
Rolesville	Unassigned	3,786	8,615,855	3,786	100.00%	0.04%
Ronda	Unassigned	417	8,615,855	417	100.00%	0.00%
Roper	Unassigned	611	8,615,855	611	100.00%	0.01%
Rose Hill	Unassigned	1,626	8,615,855	1,626	100.00%	0.02%
Roseboro	Unassigned	1,191	8,615,855	1,191	100.00%	0.01%
Rosman	Unassigned	576	8,615,855	576	100.00%	0.01%
Rowland	Unassigned	1,037	8,615,855	1,037	100.00%	0.01%
Roxboro	Unassigned	8,362	8,615,855	8,362	100.00%	0.10%
Roxobel	Unassigned	240	8,615,855	240	100.00%	0.00%
Rural Hall	Unassigned	2,937	8,615,855	2,937	100.00%	0.03%

District plan definition file: 'S691-AMT-33-Mecklenburg.asc', modified 08/24/2017 11:45:14 AM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

S691-ATV-32-Mecklenburg Floor Amendment: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Ruth	Unassigned	440	8,615,855	440	100.00%	0.01%
Rutherford College	Unassigned	1,341	8,615,855	1,341	100.00%	0.02%
Rutherfordton	Unassigned	4,213	8,615,855	4,213	100.00%	0.05%
Salemburg	Unassigned	435	8,615,855	435	100.00%	0.01%
Salisbury	Unassigned	33,662	8,615,855	33,662	100.00%	0.39%
Saluda (Henderson)	Unassigned	12	8,615,855	12	100.00%	0.00%
Saluda (Polk)	Unassigned	701	8,615,855	701	100.00%	0.01%
Sandy Creek	Unassigned	260	8,615,855	260	100.00%	0.00%
Sandyfield	Unassigned	447	8,615,855	447	100.00%	0.01%
Sanford	Unassigned	28,094	8,615,855	28,094	100.00%	0.33%
Saratoga	Unassigned	408	8,615,855	408	100.00%	0.00%
Sawmills	Unassigned	5,240	8,615,855	5,240	100.00%	0.06%
Scotland Neck	Unassigned	2,059	8,615,855	2,059	100.00%	0.02%
Seaboard	Unassigned	632	8,615,855	632	100.00%	0.01%
Seagrove	Unassigned	228	8,615,855	228	100.00%	0.00%
Sedalia	Unassigned	623	8,615,855	623	100.00%	0.01%
Selma	Unassigned	6,073	8,615,855	6,073	100.00%	0.07%
Seven Devils (Avery)	Unassigned	28	8,615,855	28	100.00%	0.00%
Seven Devils (Watauga)	Unassigned	164	8,615,855	164	100.00%	0.00%
Seven Springs	Unassigned	110	8,615,855	110	100.00%	0.00%
Severn	Unassigned	276	8,615,855	276	100.00%	0.00%
Shallotte	Unassigned	3,675	8,615,855	3,675	100.00%	0.04%
Sharpsburg (Edgecombe)	Unassigned	209	8,615,855	209	100.00%	0.00%
Sharpsburg (Nash)	Unassigned	1,252	8,615,855	1,252	100.00%	0.01%
Sharpsburg (Wilson)	Unassigned	563	8,615,855	563	100.00%	0.01%
Shelby	Unassigned	20,323	8,615,855	20,323	100.00%	0.24%
Siler City	Unassigned	7,887	8,615,855	7,887	100.00%	0.09%
Simpson	Unassigned	416	8,615,855	416	100.00%	0.00%
Sims	Unassigned	282	8,615,855	282	100.00%	0.00%
Smithfield	Unassigned	10,966	8,615,855	10,966	100.00%	0.13%
Snow Hill	Unassigned	1,595	8,615,855	1,595	100.00%	0.02%
Southern Pines	Unassigned	12,334	8,615,855	12,334	100.00%	0.14%
Southern Shores	Unassigned	2,714	8,615,855	2,714	100.00%	0.03%
Southport	Unassigned	2,833	8,615,855	2,833	100.00%	0.03%
Sparta	Unassigned	1,770	8,615,855	1,770	100.00%	0.02%
Speed	Unassigned	80	8,615,855	80	100.00%	0.00%
Spencer	Unassigned	3,267	8,615,855	3,267	100.00%	0.04%
Spencer Mountain	Unassigned	37	8,615,855	37	100.00%	0.00%
Spindale	Unassigned	4,321	8,615,855	4,321	100.00%	0.05%
Spring Hope	Unassigned	1,320	8,615,855	1,320	100.00%	0.02%
Spring Lake	Unassigned	11,964	8,615,855	11,964	100.00%	0.14%
Spruce Pine	Unassigned	2,175	8,615,855	2,175	100.00%	0.03%
St. Helena	Unassigned	389	8,615,855	389	100.00%	0.00%
St. James	Unassigned	3,165	8,615,855	3,165	100.00%	0.04%
St. Pauls	Unassigned	2,035	8,615,855	2,035	100.00%	0.02%
Staley	Unassigned	393	8,615,855	393	100.00%	0.00%
Stallings (Mecklenburg)	40	399	184,252	399	100.00%	0.22%

District plan definition file: 'S691-AMT-33-Mecklenburg.asc', modified 08/24/2017 11:45:14 AM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

S691-ATV-32-Mecklenburg Floor Amendment: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Stallings (Union)	Unassigned	13,432	8,615,855	13,432	100.00%	0.16%
Stanfield	Unassigned	1,486	8,615,855	1,486	100.00%	0.02%
Stanley	Unassigned	3,556	8,615,855	3,556	100.00%	0.04%
Stantonsburg	Unassigned	784	8,615,855	784	100.00%	0.01%
Star	Unassigned	876	8,615,855	876	100.00%	0.01%
Statesville	Unassigned	24,532	8,615,855	24,532	100.00%	0.28%
Stedman	Unassigned	1,028	8,615,855	1,028	100.00%	0.01%
Stem	Unassigned	463	8,615,855	463	100.00%	0.01%
Stokesdale	Unassigned	5,047	8,615,855	5,047	100.00%	0.06%
Stoneville	Unassigned	1,056	8,615,855	1,056	100.00%	0.01%
Stonewall	Unassigned	281	8,615,855	281	100.00%	0.00%
Stovall	Unassigned	418	8,615,855	418	100.00%	0.00%
Sugar Mountain	Unassigned	198	8,615,855	198	100.00%	0.00%
Summerfield	Unassigned	10,232	8,615,855	10,232	100.00%	0.12%
Sunset Beach	Unassigned	3,572	8,615,855	3,572	100.00%	0.04%
Surf City (Onslow)	Unassigned	292	8,615,855	292	100.00%	0.00%
Surf City (Pender)	Unassigned	1,561	8,615,855	1,561	100.00%	0.02%
Swansboro	Unassigned	2,663	8,615,855	2,663	100.00%	0.03%
Swepsonville	Unassigned	1,154	8,615,855	1,154	100.00%	0.01%
Sylva	Unassigned	2,588	8,615,855	2,588	100.00%	0.03%
Tabor City	Unassigned	2,511	8,615,855	2,511	100.00%	0.03%
Tar Heel	Unassigned	117	8,615,855	117	100.00%	0.00%
Tarboro	Unassigned	11,415	8,615,855	11,415	100.00%	0.13%
Taylorsville	Unassigned	2,098	8,615,855	2,098	100.00%	0.02%
Taylortown	Unassigned	722	8,615,855	722	100.00%	0.01%
Teachey	Unassigned	376	8,615,855	376	100.00%	0.00%
Thomasville (Davidson)	Unassigned	26,493	8,615,855	26,493	100.00%	0.31%
Thomasville (Randolph)	Unassigned	264	8,615,855	264	100.00%	0.00%
Tobaccoville (Forsyth)	Unassigned	2,441	8,615,855	2,441	100.00%	0.03%
Tobaccoville (Stokes)	Unassigned	0	8,615,855	0	0.00%	0.00%
Topsail Beach	Unassigned	368	8,615,855	368	100.00%	0.00%
Trent Woods	Unassigned	4,155	8,615,855	4,155	100.00%	0.05%
Trenton	Unassigned	287	8,615,855	287	100.00%	0.00%
Trinity	Unassigned	6,614	8,615,855	6,614	100.00%	0.08%
Troutman	Unassigned	2,383	8,615,855	2,383	100.00%	0.03%
Troy	Unassigned	3,189	8,615,855	3,189	100.00%	0.04%
Tryon	Unassigned	1,646	8,615,855	1,646	100.00%	0.02%
Turkey	Unassigned	292	8,615,855	292	100.00%	0.00%
Unionville	Unassigned	5,929	8,615,855	5,929	100.00%	0.07%
Valdese	Unassigned	4,490	8,615,855	4,490	100.00%	0.05%
Vanceboro	Unassigned	1,005	8,615,855	1,005	100.00%	0.01%
Vandemere	Unassigned	254	8,615,855	254	100.00%	0.00%
Varnamtown	Unassigned	541	8,615,855	541	100.00%	0.01%
Vass	Unassigned	720	8,615,855	720	100.00%	0.01%
Waco	Unassigned	321	8,615,855	321	100.00%	0.00%
Wade	Unassigned	556	8,615,855	556	100.00%	0.01%
Wadesboro	Unassigned	5,813	8,615,855	5,813	100.00%	0.07%

District plan definition file: 'S691-AMT-33-Mecklenburg.asc', modified 08/24/2017 11:45:14 AM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

S691-ATV-32-Mecklenburg Floor Amendment: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Wagram	Unassigned	840	8,615,855	840	100.00%	0.01%
Wake Forest (Franklin)	Unassigned	899	8,615,855	899	100.00%	0.01%
Wake Forest (Wake)	Unassigned	29,218	8,615,855	29,218	100.00%	0.34%
Walkertown	Unassigned	4,675	8,615,855	4,675	100.00%	0.05%
Wallace (Duplin)	Unassigned	3,880	8,615,855	3,880	100.00%	0.05%
Wallace (Pender)	Unassigned	0	8,615,855	0	0.00%	0.00%
Wallburg	Unassigned	3,047	8,615,855	3,047	100.00%	0.04%
Walnut Cove	Unassigned	1,425	8,615,855	1,425	100.00%	0.02%
Walnut Creek	Unassigned	835	8,615,855	835	100.00%	0.01%
Walstonburg	Unassigned	219	8,615,855	219	100.00%	0.00%
Warrenton	Unassigned	862	8,615,855	862	100.00%	0.01%
Warsaw	Unassigned	3,054	8,615,855	3,054	100.00%	0.04%
Washington	Unassigned	9,744	8,615,855	9,744	100.00%	0.11%
Washington Park	Unassigned	451	8,615,855	451	100.00%	0.01%
Watha	Unassigned	190	8,615,855	190	100.00%	0.00%
Waxhaw	Unassigned	9,859	8,615,855	9,859	100.00%	0.11%
Waynesville	Unassigned	9,869	8,615,855	9,869	100.00%	0.11%
Weaverville	Unassigned	3,120	8,615,855	3,120	100.00%	0.04%
Webster	Unassigned	363	8,615,855	363	100.00%	0.00%
Weddington (Mecklenburg)	37	7	183,957	7	100.00%	0.00%
Weddington (Union)	Unassigned	9,452	8,615,855	9,452	100.00%	0.11%
Weldon	Unassigned	1,655	8,615,855	1,655	100.00%	0.02%
Wendell	Unassigned	5,845	8,615,855	5,845	100.00%	0.07%
Wentworth	Unassigned	2,807	8,615,855	2,807	100.00%	0.03%
Wesley Chapel	Unassigned	7,463	8,615,855	7,463	100.00%	0.09%
West Jefferson	Unassigned	1,299	8,615,855	1,299	100.00%	0.02%
Whispering Pines	Unassigned	2,928	8,615,855	2,928	100.00%	0.03%
Whitakers (Edgecombe)	Unassigned	402	8,615,855	402	100.00%	0.00%
Whitakers (Nash)	Unassigned	342	8,615,855	342	100.00%	0.00%
White Lake	Unassigned	802	8,615,855	802	100.00%	0.01%
Whiteville	Unassigned	5,394	8,615,855	5,394	100.00%	0.06%
Whitsett	Unassigned	590	8,615,855	590	100.00%	0.01%
Wilkesboro	Unassigned	3,413	8,615,855	3,413	100.00%	0.04%
Williamston	Unassigned	5,511	8,615,855	5,511	100.00%	0.06%
Wilmington	Unassigned	106,476	8,615,855	106,476	100.00%	1.24%
Wilson	Unassigned	49,167	8,615,855	49,167	100.00%	0.57%
Wilson's Mills	Unassigned	2,277	8,615,855	2,277	100.00%	0.03%
Windsor	Unassigned	3,630	8,615,855	3,630	100.00%	0.04%
Winfall	Unassigned	594	8,615,855	594	100.00%	0.01%
Wingate	Unassigned	3,491	8,615,855	3,491	100.00%	0.04%
Winston-Salem	Unassigned	229,617	8,615,855	229,617	100.00%	2.67%
Winterville	Unassigned	9,269	8,615,855	9,269	100.00%	0.11%
Winton	Unassigned	769	8,615,855	769	100.00%	0.01%
Woodfin	Unassigned	6,123	8,615,855	6,123	100.00%	0.07%
Woodland	Unassigned	809	8,615,855	809	100.00%	0.01%
Wrightsville Beach	Unassigned	2,477	8,615,855	2,477	100.00%	0.03%
Yadkinville	Unassigned	2,959	8,615,855	2,959	100.00%	0.03%

District plan definition file: 'S691-AMT-33-Mecklenburg.asc', modified 08/24/2017 11:45:14 AM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

S691-ATV-32-Mecklenburg Floor Amendment: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Yanceyville	Unassigned	2,039	8,615,855	2,039	100.00%	0.02%
Youngsville	Unassigned	1,157	8,615,855	1,157	100.00%	0.01%
Zebulon (Johnston)	Unassigned	0	8,615,855	0	0.00%	0.00%
Zebulon (Wake)	Unassigned	4,433	8,615,855	4,433	100.00%	0.05%
			Total:	**5,250,071**		

District plan definition file: 'S691-AMT-33-Mecklenburg.asc', modified 08/24/2017 11:45:14 AM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

Plan Name: S691-AMT-33-Mecklenburg
Plan Type:
Date: 08/24/2017
Time: 11:51:03AM
Administrator:

Measures of Compactness

08/24/2017

Sum	N/A	N/A
Min	0.36	0.39
Max	0.53	0.60
Mean	0.43	0.45
Std. Dev.	0.07	0.09

DISTRICT	Reock	Polsby-Popper
37	0.38	0.39
38	0.36	0.40
39	0.47	0.60
40	0.40	0.40
41	0.53	0.47

S691-ATV-32-Mecklenburg Floor Amendment: Split VTD Detail

County	VTD	District	Total VTD Pop	VTD Pop in District	Percent of VTD Pop in District

District plan definition file: 'S691-AMT-33-Mecklenburg.asc', modified 08/24/2017 11:45:14 AM
VTDs ('Voting Districts') derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.
Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG05|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

S691-ATV-32-Mecklenburg Floor Amendment: Population Deviation

District	2010 Pop	Ideal Pop	Deviation	Deviation %
37	183,957	190,710	-6,753	-3.54%
38	184,368	190,710	-6,342	-3.33%
39	182,098	190,710	-8,612	-4.52%
40	184,252	190,710	-6,458	-3.39%
41	184,953	190,710	-5,757	-3.02%
Unassigned	8,615,855	190,710	8,425,145	4417.78%
Total:	**9,535,483**			

S691-ATV-32-Mecklenburg Floor Amendment: Population 2010, US Senate 2010, President 2012

	2010 Census		US Senate 2010: Marshall-Burr-Beitler								US President 2012: Obama-Romney-Johnson							
District	**Total Pop**	**18+ Pop**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Write-In**	**Write-In %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Write-In**	**Write-In %**
37	183,957	140,417	22,709	47.12%	24,459	50.75%	993	2.06%	31	0.06%	50,502	55.71%	38,940	42.96%	941	1.04%	266	0.29%
38	184,368	135,739	26,963	66.81%	12,679	31.42%	693	1.72%	23	0.06%	62,959	73.12%	22,264	25.86%	671	0.78%	205	0.24%
39	182,098	137,602	19,056	35.85%	33,081	62.23%	1,002	1.88%	21	0.04%	42,379	44.55%	51,671	54.32%	882	0.93%	186	0.20%
40	184,252	134,061	27,390	69.99%	11,186	28.58%	531	1.36%	27	0.07%	60,107	76.54%	17,713	22.56%	537	0.68%	171	0.22%
41	184,953	138,471	21,426	48.04%	22,362	50.14%	798	1.79%	13	0.03%	51,185	55.56%	39,867	43.28%	861	0.93%	211	0.23%
Unassigned	8,615,855	6,567,558	1,024,156	42.20%	1,350,315	55.63%	51,537	2.12%	1,148	0.05%	1,904,161	47.02%	2,096,898	51.77%	40,556	1.00%	8,480	0.21%
Totals:	**9,535,483**	**7,253,848**	**1,141,700**	**43.04%**	**1,454,082**	**54.82%**	**55,554**	**2.09%**	**1,263**	**0.05%**	**2,171,293**	**48.33%**	**2,267,353**	**50.47%**	**44,448**	**0.99%**	**9,519**	**0.21%**

Populations values derive from the 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File. Election results were provided by the NC State Board of Elections. Votes that could not be associated with a specific precinct were excluded. Reported statewide totals may therefore be marginally lower than official contest results.

S691-ATV-32-Mecklenburg Floor Amendment: Governor 2012, Lieutenant Governor 2012, US Senate 2014

	Governor 2012: Dalton-McCrory-Howe								Lieutenant Governor 2012: Coleman-Forest				US Senate 2014: Tillis-Hagan-Haugh							
District	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Write-In**	**Write-In %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Write-In**	**Write-In %**
37	37,914	42.21%	50,106	55.78%	1,782	1.98%	29	0.03%	47,465	54.56%	39,533	45.44%	22,077	41.70%	29,266	55.28%	1,511	2.85%	88	0.17%
38	53,640	63.17%	29,831	35.13%	1,429	1.68%	14	0.02%	60,570	72.90%	22,520	27.10%	11,851	25.01%	34,219	72.23%	1,233	2.60%	74	0.16%
39	28,693	30.35%	64,357	68.07%	1,479	1.56%	20	0.02%	39,026	42.55%	52,691	57.45%	29,977	52.78%	25,219	44.40%	1,511	2.66%	94	0.17%
40	52,271	67.31%	24,071	30.99%	1,295	1.67%	24	0.03%	58,318	76.45%	17,969	23.55%	9,529	21.86%	33,018	75.74%	979	2.25%	68	0.16%
41	39,777	43.54%	49,837	54.56%	1,705	1.87%	32	0.04%	48,755	54.89%	40,070	45.11%	21,851	41.60%	29,149	55.50%	1,391	2.65%	130	0.25%
Unassigned	1,712,975	42.61%	2,219,022	55.20%	86,822	2.16%	1,072	0.03%	1,919,887	48.83%	2,012,108	51.17%	1,321,549	49.91%	1,219,432	46.05%	102,154	3.86%	4,797	0.18%
Totals:	**1,925,270**	**43.18%**	**2,437,224**	**54.67%**	**94,512**	**2.12%**	**1,191**	**0.03%**	**2,174,021**	**49.88%**	**2,184,891**	**50.12%**	**1,416,834**	**48.84%**	**1,370,303**	**47.23%**	**108,779**	**3.75%**	**5,251**	**0.18%**

S691-ATV-32-Mecklenburg Floor Amendment: President 2016, US Senate 2016, Governor 2016

	US President 2016: Trump-Clinton-Johnson								US Senate 2016: Burr-Ross-Haugh						Governor 2016: Cooper-McCrory-Cecil					
District	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Write-In**	**Write-In %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**
37	33,163	35.25%	55,727	59.23%	3,550	3.77%	1,643	1.75%	37,945	40.74%	51,649	55.46%	3,537	3.80%	56,570	60.40%	34,630	36.97%	2,461	2.63%
38	22,122	24.20%	65,371	71.52%	2,733	2.99%	1,173	1.28%	24,429	27.10%	62,334	69.15%	3,385	3.75%	64,815	71.60%	23,462	25.92%	2,247	2.48%
39	42,618	43.34%	50,176	51.03%	3,686	3.75%	1,849	1.88%	49,401	50.61%	44,760	45.85%	3,455	3.54%	50,786	51.81%	44,940	45.84%	2,307	2.35%
40	17,528	22.22%	58,429	74.08%	1,921	2.44%	993	1.26%	18,494	23.76%	56,570	72.66%	2,789	3.58%	57,732	73.83%	18,655	23.86%	1,811	2.32%
41	38,447	37.73%	58,376	57.29%	3,480	3.42%	1,588	1.56%	41,272	40.99%	55,587	55.21%	3,824	3.80%	61,001	60.36%	37,069	36.68%	2,991	2.96%
Unassigned	2,205,871	51.72%	1,892,237	44.37%	114,559	2.69%	52,151	1.22%	2,220,898	52.63%	1,848,796	43.81%	150,200	3.56%	2,009,477	47.42%	2,137,283	50.44%	90,912	2.15%
Totals:	**2,359,749**	**49.90%**	**2,180,316**	**46.10%**	**129,929**	**2.75%**	**59,397**	**1.26%**	**2,392,439**	**51.13%**	**2,119,696**	**45.30%**	**167,190**	**3.57%**	**2,300,381**	**48.95%**	**2,296,039**	**48.86%**	**102,729**	**2.19%**

S691-ATV-32-Mecklenburg Floor Amendment: Lieutenant Governor 2016, Attorney General 2016

	Lieutenant Governor 2016: Forest-Coleman-Cole						Attorney General 2016: Stein-Newton			
District	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**
37	38,474	42.01%	49,743	54.32%	3,357	3.67%	54,965	60.50%	35,879	39.50%
38	24,598	27.71%	61,008	68.73%	3,154	3.55%	64,852	73.44%	23,451	26.56%
39	50,099	52.23%	42,736	44.56%	3,076	3.21%	48,786	51.30%	46,309	48.70%
40	18,760	24.38%	55,674	72.36%	2,510	3.26%	58,377	76.39%	18,041	23.61%
41	42,135	42.51%	53,556	54.04%	3,422	3.45%	58,567	59.59%	39,724	40.41%
Unassigned	2,216,553	53.34%	1,822,258	43.85%	116,841	2.81%	2,009,308	48.74%	2,112,872	51.26%
Totals:	**2,390,619**	**51.88%**	**2,084,975**	**45.25%**	**132,360**	**2.87%**	**2,294,855**	**50.20%**	**2,276,276**	**49.80%**

EX. 34

STV-1-Blue-Fair, Legal and Competitive Senate Districts



Plan: STV-1
Plan Type:

Administrator
User:

Districts & Their Incumbents

Thursday, August 24, 2017 9:57 PM

District	Name	Party	Previous District
1			
2	Sanderson	Republican	2
3	Smith-Ingram	Democratic	3
3	Cook	Republican	1
4	Horner	Republican	11
5	D.Davis	Democratic	5
6	Brown	Republican	6
7	Pate	Republican	7
8	Rabon	Republican	8
9	Lee	Republican	9
10	B.Jackson	Republican	10
11	Bryant	Democratic	4
12	Rabin	Republican	12
13	Britt	Republican	13
14	Blue	Democratic	14
15	Alexander	Republican	15
16	Barringer	Republican	17
16	Chaudhuri	Democratic	16
17			
18	Barefoot	Republican	18
19	Meredith	Republican	19
20	McKissick	Democratic	20
21	Clark	Democratic	21
22	Woodard	Democratic	22
23	Foushee	Democratic	23
24	Gunn	Republican	24

Plan:	STV-1	Administrator:	
Type:		User:	

District	Name	Party	Previous District
25	McInnis	Republican	25
26	Berger	Republican	26
27			
28	Robinson	Democratic	28
28	Wade	Republican	27
29	Tillman	Republican	29
30			
31	Barrett	Republican	34
31	Krawiec	Republican	31
32	Lowe	Democratic	32
33	Dunn	Republican	33
34			
35	Tucker	Republican	35
36	Newton	Republican	36
37	Bishop	Republican	39
37	J.Jackson	Democratic	37
38	Ford	Democratic	38
39			
40	Waddell	Democratic	40
41	Tarte	Republican	41
42	Wells	Republican	42
43	Harrington	Republican	43
44	Curtis	Republican	44
45	Ballard	Republican	45
45	Randleman	Republican	30
46	Daniel	Republican	46
47	Hise	Republican	47
48	Edwards	Republican	48
49	Van Duyn	Democratic	49
50	J.Davis	Republican	50

Number of Incumbents in District with more than one Incumbent: 12

Plan:	STV-1	Administrator:	
Type:		User:	

District	Name	Party	Previous District
Number of Districts with No Incumbent:		6	
Number of Districts with Incumbents of more than one party:		4	
Number of Districts with Paired Democrats:		0	
Number of Districts with Paired Republicans:		2	

STV-1-Blue-Fair, Legal and Competitve Senate Districts: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Aberdeen	25	6,350	197,991	6,350	100.00%	3.21%
Ahoskie	1	5,039	196,665	5,039	100.00%	2.56%
Alamance	24	951	196,935	951	100.00%	0.48%
Albemarle	34	15,903	199,013	15,903	100.00%	7.99%
Alliance	2	776	183,118	776	100.00%	0.42%
Andrews	50	1,781	194,102	1,781	100.00%	0.92%
Angier (Harnett)	12	4,247	187,221	4,247	100.00%	2.27%
Angier (Wake)	17	103	200,136	103	100.00%	0.05%
Ansonville	25	631	197,991	631	100.00%	0.32%
Apex	16	37,476	197,324	13,030	34.77%	6.60%
	17	37,476	200,136	24,446	65.23%	12.21%
Arapahoe	2	556	183,118	556	100.00%	0.30%
Archdale (Guilford)	29	333	200,216	333	100.00%	0.17%
Archdale (Randolph)	29	11,082	200,216	11,082	100.00%	5.54%
Archer Lodge	11	4,292	183,829	4,292	100.00%	2.33%
Asheboro	29	25,012	200,216	25,012	100.00%	12.49%
Asheville	48	83,393	184,866	12,335	14.79%	6.67%
	49	83,393	193,282	71,058	85.21%	36.76%
Askewville	3	241	182,039	241	100.00%	0.13%
Atkinson	8	299	200,134	299	100.00%	0.15%
Atlantic Beach	2	1,495	183,118	1,495	100.00%	0.82%
Aulander	3	895	182,039	895	100.00%	0.49%
Aurora	3	520	182,039	520	100.00%	0.29%
Autryville	10	196	188,148	196	100.00%	0.10%
Ayden	5	4,932	189,510	4,932	100.00%	2.60%
Badin	34	1,974	199,013	1,974	100.00%	0.99%
Bailey	11	569	183,829	569	100.00%	0.31%
Bakersville	47	464	187,477	464	100.00%	0.25%
Bald Head Island	8	158	200,134	158	100.00%	0.08%
Banner Elk	46	1,028	191,738	1,028	100.00%	0.54%
Bath	3	249	182,039	249	100.00%	0.14%
Bayboro	2	1,263	183,118	1,263	100.00%	0.69%
Bear Grass	3	73	182,039	73	100.00%	0.04%
Beaufort	2	4,039	183,118	4,039	100.00%	2.21%
Beech Mountain (Avery)	46	24	191,738	24	100.00%	0.01%
Beech Mountain (Watauga)	45	296	197,691	296	100.00%	0.15%
Belhaven	3	1,688	182,039	1,688	100.00%	0.93%
Belmont	43	10,076	197,035	10,076	100.00%	5.11%
Belville	8	1,936	200,134	1,936	100.00%	0.97%
Belwood	44	950	185,394	950	100.00%	0.51%
Benson (Harnett)	12	0	187,221	0	0.00%	0.00%
Benson (Johnston)	10	3,311	188,148	3,311	100.00%	1.76%
Bermuda Run	31	1,725	193,985	1,725	100.00%	0.89%
Bessemer City	43	5,340	197,035	5,340	100.00%	2.71%
Bethania	31	328	193,985	0	0.00%	0.00%
	32	328	197,925	328	100.00%	0.17%
Bethel	5	1,577	189,510	1,577	100.00%	0.83%

District plan definition file: 'STV-1.asc', modified 08/23/2017 04:50:36 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/23/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

STV-1-Blue-Fair, Legal and Competitve Senate Districts: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Beulaville	10	1,296	188,148	1,296	100.00%	0.69%
Biltmore Forest	48	1,343	184,866	0	0.00%	0.00%
	49	1,343	193,282	1,343	100.00%	0.69%
Biscoe	33	1,700	190,676	1,700	100.00%	0.89%
Black Creek	4	769	192,477	769	100.00%	0.40%
Black Mountain	49	7,848	193,282	7,848	100.00%	4.06%
Bladenboro	8	1,750	200,134	1,750	100.00%	0.87%
Blowing Rock (Caldwell)	46	49	191,738	49	100.00%	0.03%
Blowing Rock (Watauga)	45	1,192	197,691	1,192	100.00%	0.60%
Boardman	13	157	192,266	157	100.00%	0.08%
Bogue	2	684	183,118	684	100.00%	0.37%
Boiling Spring Lakes	8	5,372	200,134	5,372	100.00%	2.68%
Boiling Springs	44	4,647	185,394	4,647	100.00%	2.51%
Bolivia	8	143	200,134	143	100.00%	0.07%
Bolton	13	691	192,266	691	100.00%	0.36%
Boone	45	17,122	197,691	17,122	100.00%	8.66%
Boonville	30	1,222	197,843	1,222	100.00%	0.62%
Bostic	47	386	187,477	386	100.00%	0.21%
Brevard	48	7,609	184,866	7,609	100.00%	4.12%
Bridgeton	2	454	183,118	454	100.00%	0.25%
Broadway (Harnett)	12	25	187,221	25	100.00%	0.01%
Broadway (Lee)	12	1,204	187,221	1,204	100.00%	0.64%
Brookford	42	382	191,556	382	100.00%	0.20%
Brunswick	13	1,119	192,266	1,119	100.00%	0.58%
Bryson City	50	1,424	194,102	1,424	100.00%	0.73%
Bunn	18	344	195,290	344	100.00%	0.18%
Burgaw	8	3,872	200,134	3,872	100.00%	1.93%
Burlington (Alamance)	24	49,308	196,935	49,308	100.00%	25.04%
Burlington (Guilford)	24	655	196,935	0	0.00%	0.00%
	29	655	200,216	655	100.00%	0.33%
Burnsville	47	1,693	187,477	1,693	100.00%	0.90%
Butner	22	7,591	184,780	7,591	100.00%	4.11%
Cajah's Mountain	46	2,823	191,738	2,823	100.00%	1.47%
Calabash	8	1,786	200,134	1,786	100.00%	0.89%
Calypso	10	538	188,148	538	100.00%	0.29%
Cameron	25	285	197,991	285	100.00%	0.14%
Candor	33	840	190,676	840	100.00%	0.44%
Canton	50	4,227	194,102	4,227	100.00%	2.18%
Cape Carteret	2	1,917	183,118	1,917	100.00%	1.05%
Carolina Beach	9	5,706	197,371	5,706	100.00%	2.89%
Carolina Shores	8	3,048	200,134	3,048	100.00%	1.52%
Carrboro	23	19,582	197,306	19,582	100.00%	9.92%
Carthage	25	2,205	197,991	2,205	100.00%	1.11%
Cary (Chatham)	23	1,422	197,306	1,422	100.00%	0.72%
Cary (Wake)	15	133,812	184,611	15,179	11.34%	8.22%
	16	133,812	197,324	105,865	79.11%	53.65%
	17	133,812	200,136	12,768	9.54%	6.38%

District plan definition file: 'STV-1.asc', modified 08/23/2017 04:50:36 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/23/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

STV-1-Blue-Fair, Legal and Competitve Senate Districts: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Casar	44	297	185,394	297	100.00%	0.16%
Castalia	11	268	183,829	268	100.00%	0.15%
Caswell Beach	8	398	200,134	398	100.00%	0.20%
Catawba	42	603	191,556	603	100.00%	0.31%
Cedar Point	2	1,279	183,118	1,279	100.00%	0.70%
Cedar Rock	46	300	191,738	300	100.00%	0.16%
Centerville	18	89	195,290	89	100.00%	0.05%
Cerro Gordo	13	207	192,266	207	100.00%	0.11%
Chadbourn	13	1,856	192,266	1,856	100.00%	0.97%
Chapel Hill (Durham)	20	2,836	182,187	2,836	100.00%	1.56%
Chapel Hill (Orange)	23	54,397	197,306	54,397	100.00%	27.57%
Charlotte	37	731,424	182,443	182,443	24.94%	100.00%
	38	731,424	182,430	160,882	22.00%	88.19%
	39	731,424	185,074	173,407	23.71%	93.70%
	40	731,424	184,666	122,636	16.77%	66.41%
	41	731,424	185,015	92,056	12.59%	49.76%
Cherryville	43	5,760	197,035	5,760	100.00%	2.92%
Chimney Rock Village	47	113	187,477	113	100.00%	0.06%
China Grove	34	3,563	199,013	3,563	100.00%	1.79%
Chocowinity	3	820	182,039	820	100.00%	0.45%
Claremont	42	1,352	191,556	1,352	100.00%	0.71%
Clarkton	8	837	200,134	837	100.00%	0.42%
Clayton (Johnston)	11	16,116	183,829	16,116	100.00%	8.77%
Clayton (Wake)	14	0	184,251	0	0.00%	0.00%
Clemmons	31	18,627	193,985	18,627	100.00%	9.60%
Cleveland	34	871	199,013	871	100.00%	0.44%
Clinton	10	8,639	188,148	8,639	100.00%	4.59%
Clyde	50	1,223	194,102	1,223	100.00%	0.63%
Coats	12	2,112	187,221	2,112	100.00%	1.13%
Cofield	1	413	196,665	413	100.00%	0.21%
Colerain	3	204	182,039	204	100.00%	0.11%
Columbia	1	891	196,665	891	100.00%	0.45%
Columbus	47	999	187,477	999	100.00%	0.53%
Como	1	91	196,665	91	100.00%	0.05%
Concord	36	79,066	189,509	79,066	100.00%	41.72%
Conetoe	4	294	192,477	294	100.00%	0.15%
Connelly Springs	46	1,669	191,738	1,669	100.00%	0.87%
Conover	42	8,165	191,556	8,165	100.00%	4.26%
Conway	3	836	182,039	836	100.00%	0.46%
Cooleemee	31	960	193,985	960	100.00%	0.49%
Cornelius	41	24,866	185,015	24,866	100.00%	13.44%
Cove City	2	399	183,118	399	100.00%	0.22%
Cramerton	43	4,165	197,035	4,165	100.00%	2.11%
Creedmoor	22	4,124	184,780	4,124	100.00%	2.23%
Creswell	1	276	196,665	276	100.00%	0.14%
Crossnore	46	192	191,738	192	100.00%	0.10%
Dallas	43	4,488	197,035	4,488	100.00%	2.28%

District plan definition file: 'STV-1.asc', modified 08/23/2017 04:50:36 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

STV-1-Blue-Fair, Legal and Competitve Senate Districts: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Danbury	26	189	199,600	189	100.00%	0.09%
Davidson (Iredell)	30	294	197,843	294	100.00%	0.15%
Davidson (Mecklenburg)	41	10,650	185,015	10,650	100.00%	5.76%
Dellview	43	13	197,035	13	100.00%	0.01%
Denton	33	1,636	190,676	1,636	100.00%	0.86%
Dillsboro	50	232	194,102	232	100.00%	0.12%
Dobbins Heights	25	866	197,991	866	100.00%	0.44%
Dobson	45	1,586	197,691	1,586	100.00%	0.80%
Dortches	11	935	183,829	935	100.00%	0.51%
Dover	2	401	183,118	401	100.00%	0.22%
Drexel	46	1,858	191,738	1,858	100.00%	0.97%
Dublin	8	338	200,134	338	100.00%	0.17%
Duck	1	369	196,665	369	100.00%	0.19%
Dunn	12	9,263	187,221	9,263	100.00%	4.95%
Durham (Durham)	20	228,300	182,187	160,522	70.31%	88.11%
	22	228,300	184,780	67,778	29.69%	36.68%
Durham (Orange)	23	30	197,306	30	100.00%	0.02%
Durham (Wake)	16	0	197,324	0	0.00%	0.00%
Earl	44	260	185,394	260	100.00%	0.14%
East Arcadia	8	487	200,134	487	100.00%	0.24%
East Bend	30	612	197,843	612	100.00%	0.31%
East Laurinburg	25	300	197,991	300	100.00%	0.15%
East Spencer	34	1,534	199,013	1,534	100.00%	0.77%
Eastover	19	3,628	182,681	3,628	100.00%	1.99%
Eden	26	15,527	199,600	15,527	100.00%	7.78%
Edenton	1	5,004	196,665	5,004	100.00%	2.54%
Elizabeth City (Camden)	1	45	196,665	45	100.00%	0.02%
Elizabeth City (Pasquotank)	1	18,638	196,665	18,638	100.00%	9.48%
Elizabethtown	8	3,583	200,134	3,583	100.00%	1.79%
Elk Park	46	452	191,738	452	100.00%	0.24%
Elkin (Surry)	45	3,921	197,691	3,921	100.00%	1.98%
Elkin (Wilkes)	45	80	197,691	80	100.00%	0.04%
Ellenboro	47	873	187,477	873	100.00%	0.47%
Ellerbe	25	1,054	197,991	1,054	100.00%	0.53%
Elm City	4	1,298	192,477	1,298	100.00%	0.67%
Elon	24	9,419	196,935	9,419	100.00%	4.78%
Emerald Isle	2	3,655	183,118	3,655	100.00%	2.00%
Enfield	4	2,532	192,477	2,532	100.00%	1.32%
Erwin	12	4,405	187,221	4,405	100.00%	2.35%
Eureka	7	197	182,118	197	100.00%	0.11%
Everetts	3	164	182,039	164	100.00%	0.09%
Fair Bluff	13	951	192,266	951	100.00%	0.49%
Fairmont	13	2,663	192,266	2,663	100.00%	1.39%
Fairview	36	3,324	189,509	3,324	100.00%	1.75%
Faison (Duplin)	10	961	188,148	961	100.00%	0.51%
Faison (Sampson)	10	0	188,148	0	0.00%	0.00%
Faith	34	807	199,013	807	100.00%	0.41%

District plan definition file: 'STV-1.asc', modified 08/23/2017 04:50:36 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

STV-1-Blue-Fair, Legal and Competitve Senate Districts: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Falcon (Cumberland)	19	258	182,681	258	100.00%	0.14%
Falcon (Sampson)	10	0	188,148	0	0.00%	0.00%
Falkland	5	96	189,510	96	100.00%	0.05%
Fallston	44	607	185,394	607	100.00%	0.33%
Farmville	5	4,654	189,510	4,654	100.00%	2.46%
Fayetteville	19	200,564	182,681	85,236	42.50%	46.66%
	21	200,564	183,702	115,328	57.50%	62.78%
Flat Rock	48	3,114	184,866	3,114	100.00%	1.68%
Fletcher	48	7,187	184,866	7,187	100.00%	3.89%
Forest City	47	7,476	187,477	7,476	100.00%	3.99%
Forest Hills	50	365	194,102	365	100.00%	0.19%
Fountain	5	427	189,510	427	100.00%	0.23%
Four Oaks	10	1,921	188,148	1,921	100.00%	1.02%
Foxfire	25	902	197,991	902	100.00%	0.46%
Franklin	50	3,845	194,102	3,845	100.00%	1.98%
Franklinton	18	2,023	195,290	2,023	100.00%	1.04%
Franklinville	29	1,164	200,216	1,164	100.00%	0.58%
Fremont	7	1,255	182,118	1,255	100.00%	0.69%
Fuquay-Varina	17	17,937	200,136	17,937	100.00%	8.96%
Gamewell	46	4,051	191,738	4,051	100.00%	2.11%
Garland	10	625	188,148	625	100.00%	0.33%
Garner	14	25,745	184,251	7,544	29.30%	4.09%
	17	25,745	200,136	18,201	70.70%	9.09%
Garysburg	3	1,057	182,039	1,057	100.00%	0.58%
Gaston	3	1,152	182,039	1,152	100.00%	0.63%
Gastonia	43	71,741	197,035	71,741	100.00%	36.41%
Gatesville	1	321	196,665	321	100.00%	0.16%
Gibson	25	540	197,991	540	100.00%	0.27%
Gibsonville (Alamance)	24	3,148	196,935	3,148	100.00%	1.60%
Gibsonville (Guilford)	24	3,262	196,935	2,779	85.19%	1.41%
	29	3,262	200,216	483	14.81%	0.24%
Glen Alpine	46	1,517	191,738	1,517	100.00%	0.79%
Godwin	19	139	182,681	139	100.00%	0.08%
Goldsboro	7	36,437	182,118	36,437	100.00%	20.01%
Goldston	23	268	197,306	268	100.00%	0.14%
Graham	24	14,153	196,935	14,153	100.00%	7.19%
Grandfather	46	25	191,738	25	100.00%	0.01%
Granite Falls	46	4,722	191,738	4,722	100.00%	2.46%
Granite Quarry	34	2,930	199,013	2,930	100.00%	1.47%
Grantsboro	2	688	183,118	688	100.00%	0.38%
Green Level	24	2,100	196,935	2,100	100.00%	1.07%
Greenevers	10	634	188,148	634	100.00%	0.34%
Greensboro	24	269,666	196,935	1,105	0.41%	0.56%
	27	269,666	198,164	188,131	69.76%	94.94%
	28	269,666	185,974	80,430	29.83%	43.25%
	29	269,666	200,216	0	0.00%	0.00%
Greenville	5	84,554	189,510	84,554	100.00%	44.62%

District plan definition file: 'STV-1.asc', modified 08/23/2017 04:50:36 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/23/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

STV-1-Blue-Fair, Legal and Competitve Senate Districts: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Grifton (Lenoir)	7	186	182,118	186	100.00%	0.10%
Grifton (Pitt)	5	2,431	189,510	2,431	100.00%	1.28%
Grimesland	5	441	189,510	441	100.00%	0.23%
Grover	44	708	185,394	708	100.00%	0.38%
Halifax	4	234	192,477	234	100.00%	0.12%
Hamilton	3	408	182,039	408	100.00%	0.22%
Hamlet	25	6,495	197,991	6,495	100.00%	3.28%
Harmony	30	531	197,843	531	100.00%	0.27%
Harrells (Duplin)	10	23	188,148	23	100.00%	0.01%
Harrells (Sampson)	10	179	188,148	179	100.00%	0.10%
Harrellsville	1	106	196,665	106	100.00%	0.05%
Harrisburg	36	11,526	189,509	11,526	100.00%	6.08%
Hassell	3	84	182,039	84	100.00%	0.05%
Havelock	2	20,735	183,118	20,735	100.00%	11.32%
Haw River	24	2,298	196,935	2,298	100.00%	1.17%
Hayesville	50	311	194,102	311	100.00%	0.16%
Hemby Bridge	35	1,520	189,794	1,509	99.28%	0.80%
	36	1,520	189,509	11	0.72%	0.01%
Henderson	3	15,368	182,039	15,368	100.00%	8.44%
Hendersonville	48	13,137	184,866	13,137	100.00%	7.11%
Hertford	1	2,143	196,665	2,143	100.00%	1.09%
Hickory (Burke)	46	66	191,738	66	100.00%	0.03%
Hickory (Caldwell)	46	18	191,738	18	100.00%	0.01%
Hickory (Catawba)	42	39,926	191,556	39,926	100.00%	20.84%
High Point (Davidson)	33	5,310	190,676	5,310	100.00%	2.78%
High Point (Forsyth)	31	8	193,985	8	100.00%	0.00%
High Point (Guilford)	28	99,042	185,974	62,208	62.81%	33.45%
	29	99,042	200,216	36,834	37.19%	18.40%
High Point (Randolph)	29	11	200,216	11	100.00%	0.01%
High Shoals	43	696	197,035	696	100.00%	0.35%
Highlands (Jackson)	50	4	194,102	4	100.00%	0.00%
Highlands (Macon)	50	920	194,102	920	100.00%	0.47%
Hildebran	46	2,023	191,738	2,023	100.00%	1.06%
Hillsborough	23	6,087	197,306	6,087	100.00%	3.09%
Hobgood	4	348	192,477	348	100.00%	0.18%
Hoffman	25	588	197,991	588	100.00%	0.30%
Holden Beach	8	575	200,134	575	100.00%	0.29%
Holly Ridge	6	1,268	187,925	1,268	100.00%	0.67%
Holly Springs	17	24,661	200,136	24,661	100.00%	12.32%
Hookerton	5	409	189,510	409	100.00%	0.22%
Hope Mills	19	15,176	182,681	15,176	100.00%	8.31%
Hot Springs	47	560	187,477	560	100.00%	0.30%
Hudson	46	3,776	191,738	3,776	100.00%	1.97%
Huntersville	41	46,773	185,015	46,773	100.00%	25.28%
Indian Beach	2	112	183,118	112	100.00%	0.06%
Indian Trail	35	33,518	189,794	33,456	99.82%	17.63%
	36	33,518	189,509	62	0.18%	0.03%

District plan definition file: 'STV-1.asc', modified 08/23/2017 04:50:36 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/23/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

STV-1-Blue-Fair, Legal and Competitve Senate Districts: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Jackson	3	513	182,039	513	100.00%	0.28%
Jacksonville	6	70,145	187,925	70,145	100.00%	37.33%
Jamestown	28	3,382	185,974	3,382	100.00%	1.82%
Jamesville	3	491	182,039	491	100.00%	0.27%
Jefferson	45	1,611	197,691	1,611	100.00%	0.81%
Jonesville	30	2,285	197,843	2,285	100.00%	1.15%
Kannapolis (Cabarrus)	36	33,194	189,509	33,194	100.00%	17.52%
Kannapolis (Rowan)	34	9,431	199,013	9,431	100.00%	4.74%
Kelford	3	251	182,039	251	100.00%	0.14%
Kenansville	10	855	188,148	855	100.00%	0.45%
Kenly (Johnston)	10	1,176	188,148	1,176	100.00%	0.63%
Kenly (Wilson)	4	163	192,477	163	100.00%	0.08%
Kernersville (Forsyth)	31	23,071	193,985	23,067	99.98%	11.89%
	32	23,071	197,925	4	0.02%	0.00%
Kernersville (Guilford)	24	52	196,935	52	100.00%	0.03%
	29	52	200,216	0	0.00%	0.00%
Kill Devil Hills	1	6,683	196,665	6,683	100.00%	3.40%
King (Forsyth)	31	619	193,985	619	100.00%	0.32%
King (Stokes)	26	6,285	199,600	6,285	100.00%	3.15%
Kings Mountain (Cleveland)	44	9,242	185,394	9,242	100.00%	4.99%
Kings Mountain (Gaston)	43	1,054	197,035	1,054	100.00%	0.53%
Kingstown	44	681	185,394	681	100.00%	0.37%
Kinston	7	21,677	182,118	21,677	100.00%	11.90%
Kittrell	3	467	182,039	467	100.00%	0.26%
Kitty Hawk	1	3,272	196,665	3,272	100.00%	1.66%
Knightdale	14	11,401	184,251	11,401	100.00%	6.19%
Kure Beach	9	2,012	197,371	2,012	100.00%	1.02%
La Grange	7	2,873	182,118	2,873	100.00%	1.58%
Lake Lure	47	1,192	187,477	1,192	100.00%	0.64%
Lake Park	35	3,422	189,794	3,422	100.00%	1.80%
Lake Santeetlah	50	45	194,102	45	100.00%	0.02%
Lake Waccamaw	13	1,480	192,266	1,480	100.00%	0.77%
Landis	34	3,109	199,013	3,109	100.00%	1.56%
Lansing	45	158	197,691	158	100.00%	0.08%
Lasker	3	122	182,039	122	100.00%	0.07%
Lattimore	44	488	185,394	488	100.00%	0.26%
Laurel Park	48	2,180	184,866	2,180	100.00%	1.18%
Laurinburg	25	15,962	197,991	15,962	100.00%	8.06%
Lawndale	44	606	185,394	606	100.00%	0.33%
Leggett	4	60	192,477	60	100.00%	0.03%
Leland	8	13,527	200,134	13,527	100.00%	6.76%
Lenoir	46	18,228	191,738	18,228	100.00%	9.51%
Lewiston Woodville	3	549	182,039	549	100.00%	0.30%
Lewisville	31	12,639	193,985	12,639	100.00%	6.52%
Lexington	33	18,931	190,676	18,931	100.00%	9.93%
Liberty	29	2,656	200,216	2,656	100.00%	1.33%
Lilesville	25	536	197,991	536	100.00%	0.27%

District plan definition file: 'STV-1.asc', modified 08/23/2017 04:50:36 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/23/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

STV-1-Blue-Fair, Legal and Competitve Senate Districts: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Lillington	12	3,194	187,221	3,194	100.00%	1.71%
Lincolnton	44	10,486	185,394	10,486	100.00%	5.66%
Linden	19	130	182,681	130	100.00%	0.07%
Littleton	4	674	192,477	674	100.00%	0.35%
Locust (Cabarrus)	36	215	189,509	215	100.00%	0.11%
Locust (Stanly)	34	2,715	199,013	2,715	100.00%	1.36%
Long View (Burke)	46	752	191,738	752	100.00%	0.39%
Long View (Catawba)	42	4,119	191,556	4,119	100.00%	2.15%
Louisburg	18	3,359	195,290	3,359	100.00%	1.72%
Love Valley	30	90	197,843	90	100.00%	0.05%
Lowell	43	3,526	197,035	3,526	100.00%	1.79%
Lucama	4	1,108	192,477	1,108	100.00%	0.58%
Lumber Bridge	13	94	192,266	94	100.00%	0.05%
Lumberton	13	21,542	192,266	21,542	100.00%	11.20%
Macclesfield	4	471	192,477	471	100.00%	0.24%
Macon	3	119	182,039	119	100.00%	0.07%
Madison	26	2,246	199,600	2,246	100.00%	1.13%
Maggie Valley	50	1,150	194,102	1,150	100.00%	0.59%
Magnolia	10	939	188,148	939	100.00%	0.50%
Maiden (Catawba)	42	3,308	191,556	3,308	100.00%	1.73%
Maiden (Lincoln)	44	2	185,394	2	100.00%	0.00%
Manteo	1	1,434	196,665	1,434	100.00%	0.73%
Marietta	13	175	192,266	175	100.00%	0.09%
Marion	47	7,838	187,477	7,838	100.00%	4.18%
Mars Hill	47	1,869	187,477	1,869	100.00%	1.00%
Marshall	47	872	187,477	872	100.00%	0.47%
Marshville	35	2,402	189,794	2,402	100.00%	1.27%
Marvin	35	5,579	189,794	5,579	100.00%	2.94%
Matthews	40	27,198	184,666	27,198	100.00%	14.73%
Maxton (Robeson)	13	2,230	192,266	2,230	100.00%	1.16%
Maxton (Scotland)	25	196	197,991	196	100.00%	0.10%
Mayodan	26	2,478	199,600	2,478	100.00%	1.24%
Maysville	6	1,019	187,925	1,019	100.00%	0.54%
McAdenville	43	651	197,035	651	100.00%	0.33%
McDonald	13	113	192,266	113	100.00%	0.06%
McFarlan	25	117	197,991	117	100.00%	0.06%
Mebane (Alamance)	24	9,600	196,935	9,600	100.00%	4.87%
Mebane (Orange)	23	1,793	197,306	1,793	100.00%	0.91%
Mesic	2	220	183,118	220	100.00%	0.12%
Micro	10	441	188,148	441	100.00%	0.23%
Middleburg	3	133	182,039	133	100.00%	0.07%
Middlesex	11	822	183,829	822	100.00%	0.45%
Midland (Cabarrus)	36	3,073	189,509	3,073	100.00%	1.62%
Midland (Mecklenburg)	40	0	184,666	0	0.00%	0.00%
Midway	33	4,679	190,676	4,679	100.00%	2.45%
Mills River	48	6,802	184,866	6,802	100.00%	3.68%
Milton	26	166	199,600	166	100.00%	0.08%

STV-1-Blue-Fair, Legal and Competitve Senate Districts: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Mineral Springs	35	2,639	189,794	2,639	100.00%	1.39%
Minnesott Beach	2	440	183,118	440	100.00%	0.24%
Mint Hill (Mecklenburg)	39	22,669	185,074	3,389	14.95%	1.83%
	40	22,669	184,666	19,280	85.05%	10.44%
Mint Hill (Union)	36	53	189,509	53	100.00%	0.03%
Misenheimer	34	728	199,013	728	100.00%	0.37%
Mocksville	31	5,051	193,985	5,051	100.00%	2.60%
Momeyer	11	224	183,829	224	100.00%	0.12%
Monroe	35	32,797	189,794	32,797	100.00%	17.28%
Montreat	49	723	193,282	723	100.00%	0.37%
Mooresboro	44	311	185,394	311	100.00%	0.17%
Mooresville	30	32,711	197,843	32,711	100.00%	16.53%
Morehead City	2	8,661	183,118	8,661	100.00%	4.73%
Morganton	46	16,918	191,738	16,918	100.00%	8.82%
Morrisville (Durham)	20	0	182,187	0	0.00%	0.00%
Morrisville (Wake)	16	18,576	197,324	18,576	100.00%	9.41%
Morven	25	511	197,991	511	100.00%	0.26%
Mount Airy	26	10,388	199,600	10,388	100.00%	5.20%
Mount Gilead	33	1,181	190,676	1,181	100.00%	0.62%
Mount Holly	43	13,656	197,035	11,715	85.79%	5.95%
	44	13,656	185,394	1,941	14.21%	1.05%
Mount Olive (Duplin)	10	51	188,148	51	100.00%	0.03%
Mount Olive (Wayne)	7	4,538	182,118	4,538	100.00%	2.49%
Mount Pleasant	36	1,652	189,509	1,652	100.00%	0.87%
Murfreesboro	1	2,835	196,665	2,835	100.00%	1.44%
Murphy	50	1,627	194,102	1,627	100.00%	0.84%
Nags Head	1	2,757	196,665	2,757	100.00%	1.40%
Nashville	11	5,352	183,829	5,352	100.00%	2.91%
Navassa	8	1,505	200,134	1,505	100.00%	0.75%
New Bern	2	29,524	183,118	29,524	100.00%	16.12%
New London	34	600	199,013	600	100.00%	0.30%
Newland	46	698	191,738	698	100.00%	0.36%
Newport	2	4,150	183,118	4,150	100.00%	2.27%
Newton	42	12,968	191,556	12,968	100.00%	6.77%
Newton Grove	10	569	188,148	569	100.00%	0.30%
Norlina	3	1,118	182,039	1,118	100.00%	0.61%
Norman	25	138	197,991	138	100.00%	0.07%
North Topsail Beach	6	743	187,925	743	100.00%	0.40%
North Wilkesboro	45	4,245	197,691	4,245	100.00%	2.15%
Northwest	8	735	200,134	735	100.00%	0.37%
Norwood	34	2,379	199,013	2,379	100.00%	1.20%
Oak City	3	317	182,039	317	100.00%	0.17%
Oak Island	8	6,783	200,134	6,783	100.00%	3.39%
Oak Ridge	24	6,185	196,935	6,185	100.00%	3.14%
Oakboro	34	1,859	199,013	1,859	100.00%	0.93%
Ocean Isle Beach	8	550	200,134	550	100.00%	0.27%
Old Fort	47	908	187,477	908	100.00%	0.48%

District plan definition file: 'STV-1.asc', modified 08/23/2017 04:50:36 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

STV-1-Blue-Fair, Legal and Competitve Senate Districts: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Oriental	2	900	183,118	900	100.00%	0.49%
Orrum	13	91	192,266	91	100.00%	0.05%
Ossipee	24	543	196,935	543	100.00%	0.28%
Oxford	22	8,461	184,780	8,461	100.00%	4.58%
Pantego	3	179	182,039	179	100.00%	0.10%
Parkton	13	436	192,266	436	100.00%	0.23%
Parmele	3	278	182,039	278	100.00%	0.15%
Patterson Springs	44	622	185,394	622	100.00%	0.34%
Peachland	25	437	197,991	437	100.00%	0.22%
Peletier	2	644	183,118	644	100.00%	0.35%
Pembroke	13	2,973	192,266	2,973	100.00%	1.55%
Pikeville	7	678	182,118	678	100.00%	0.37%
Pilot Mountain	26	1,477	199,600	1,477	100.00%	0.74%
Pine Knoll Shores	2	1,339	183,118	1,339	100.00%	0.73%
Pine Level	10	1,700	188,148	1,700	100.00%	0.90%
Pinebluff	25	1,337	197,991	1,337	100.00%	0.68%
Pinehurst	25	13,124	197,991	13,124	100.00%	6.63%
Pinetops	4	1,374	192,477	1,374	100.00%	0.71%
Pineville	38	7,479	182,430	5,019	67.11%	2.75%
	39	7,479	185,074	2,460	32.89%	1.33%
Pink Hill	7	552	182,118	552	100.00%	0.30%
Pittsboro	23	3,743	197,306	3,743	100.00%	1.90%
Pleasant Garden	28	4,489	185,974	2,244	49.99%	1.21%
	29	4,489	200,216	2,245	50.01%	1.12%
Plymouth	1	3,878	196,665	3,878	100.00%	1.97%
Polkton	25	3,375	197,991	3,375	100.00%	1.70%
Polkville	44	545	185,394	545	100.00%	0.29%
Pollocksville	6	311	187,925	311	100.00%	0.17%
Powellsville	3	276	182,039	276	100.00%	0.15%
Princeton	10	1,194	188,148	1,194	100.00%	0.63%
Princeville	4	2,082	192,477	2,082	100.00%	1.08%
Proctorville	13	117	192,266	117	100.00%	0.06%
Raeford	21	4,611	183,702	4,611	100.00%	2.51%
Raleigh (Durham)	20	1,067	182,187	1,067	100.00%	0.59%
Raleigh (Wake)	14	402,825	184,251	106,275	26.38%	57.68%
	15	402,825	184,611	162,870	40.43%	88.22%
	16	402,825	197,324	54,525	13.54%	27.63%
	17	402,825	200,136	33,860	8.41%	16.92%
	18	402,825	195,290	45,295	11.24%	23.19%
Ramseur	29	1,692	200,216	1,692	100.00%	0.85%
Randleman	29	4,113	200,216	4,113	100.00%	2.05%
Ranlo	43	3,434	197,035	3,434	100.00%	1.74%
Raynham	13	72	192,266	72	100.00%	0.04%
Red Cross	34	742	199,013	742	100.00%	0.37%
Red Oak	11	3,430	183,829	3,430	100.00%	1.87%
Red Springs (Hoke)	21	0	183,702	0	0.00%	0.00%
Red Springs (Robeson)	13	3,428	192,266	3,428	100.00%	1.78%

District plan definition file: 'STV-1.asc', modified 08/23/2017 04:50:36 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/23/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

STV-1-Blue-Fair, Legal and Competitve Senate Districts: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Reidsville	26	14,520	199,600	14,520	100.00%	7.27%
Rennert	13	383	192,266	383	100.00%	0.20%
Rhodhiss (Burke)	46	700	191,738	700	100.00%	0.37%
Rhodhiss (Caldwell)	46	370	191,738	370	100.00%	0.19%
Rich Square	3	958	182,039	958	100.00%	0.53%
Richfield	34	613	199,013	613	100.00%	0.31%
Richlands	6	1,520	187,925	1,520	100.00%	0.81%
River Bend	2	3,119	183,118	3,119	100.00%	1.70%
Roanoke Rapids	4	15,754	192,477	15,754	100.00%	8.18%
Robbins	25	1,097	197,991	1,097	100.00%	0.55%
Robbinsville	50	620	194,102	620	100.00%	0.32%
Robersonville	3	1,488	182,039	1,488	100.00%	0.82%
Rockingham	25	9,558	197,991	9,558	100.00%	4.83%
Rockwell	34	2,108	199,013	2,108	100.00%	1.06%
Rocky Mount (Edgecombe)	4	17,524	192,477	17,524	100.00%	9.10%
Rocky Mount (Nash)	11	39,953	183,829	39,953	100.00%	21.73%
Rolesville	18	3,786	195,290	3,786	100.00%	1.94%
Ronda	45	417	197,691	417	100.00%	0.21%
Roper	1	611	196,665	611	100.00%	0.31%
Rose Hill	10	1,626	188,148	1,626	100.00%	0.86%
Roseboro	10	1,191	188,148	1,191	100.00%	0.63%
Rosman	48	576	184,866	576	100.00%	0.31%
Rowland	13	1,037	192,266	1,037	100.00%	0.54%
Roxboro	22	8,362	184,780	8,362	100.00%	4.53%
Roxobel	3	240	182,039	240	100.00%	0.13%
Rural Hall	31	2,937	193,985	2,937	100.00%	1.51%
Ruth	47	440	187,477	440	100.00%	0.23%
Rutherford College	46	1,341	191,738	1,341	100.00%	0.70%
Rutherfordton	47	4,213	187,477	4,213	100.00%	2.25%
Salemburg	10	435	188,148	435	100.00%	0.23%
Salisbury	34	33,662	199,013	33,662	100.00%	16.91%
Saluda (Henderson)	48	12	184,866	12	100.00%	0.01%
Saluda (Polk)	47	701	187,477	701	100.00%	0.37%
Sandy Creek	8	260	200,134	260	100.00%	0.13%
Sandyfield	13	447	192,266	447	100.00%	0.23%
Sanford	12	28,094	187,221	28,094	100.00%	15.01%
Saratoga	4	408	192,477	408	100.00%	0.21%
Sawmills	46	5,240	191,738	5,240	100.00%	2.73%
Scotland Neck	4	2,059	192,477	2,059	100.00%	1.07%
Seaboard	3	632	182,039	632	100.00%	0.35%
Seagrove	29	228	200,216	228	100.00%	0.11%
Sedalia	28	623	185,974	623	100.00%	0.33%
	29	623	200,216	0	0.00%	0.00%
Selma	10	6,073	188,148	366	6.03%	0.19%
	11	6,073	183,829	5,707	93.97%	3.10%
Seven Devils (Avery)	46	28	191,738	28	100.00%	0.01%
Seven Devils (Watauga)	45	164	197,691	164	100.00%	0.08%

District plan definition file: 'STV-1.asc', modified 08/23/2017 04:50:36 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/23/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

STV-1-Blue-Fair, Legal and Competitve Senate Districts: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Seven Springs	7	110	182,118	110	100.00%	0.06%
Severn	3	276	182,039	276	100.00%	0.15%
Shallotte	8	3,675	200,134	3,675	100.00%	1.84%
Sharpsburg (Edgecombe)	4	209	192,477	209	100.00%	0.11%
Sharpsburg (Nash)	11	1,252	183,829	1,252	100.00%	0.68%
Sharpsburg (Wilson)	4	563	192,477	563	100.00%	0.29%
Shelby	44	20,323	185,394	20,323	100.00%	10.96%
Siler City	23	7,887	197,306	7,887	100.00%	4.00%
Simpson	5	416	189,510	416	100.00%	0.22%
Sims	4	282	192,477	282	100.00%	0.15%
Smithfield	10	10,966	188,148	10,965	99.99%	5.83%
	11	10,966	183,829	1	0.01%	0.00%
Snow Hill	5	1,595	189,510	1,595	100.00%	0.84%
Southern Pines	25	12,334	197,991	12,334	100.00%	6.23%
Southern Shores	1	2,714	196,665	2,714	100.00%	1.38%
Southport	8	2,833	200,134	2,833	100.00%	1.42%
Sparta	45	1,770	197,691	1,770	100.00%	0.90%
Speed	4	80	192,477	80	100.00%	0.04%
Spencer	34	3,267	199,013	3,267	100.00%	1.64%
Spencer Mountain	43	37	197,035	37	100.00%	0.02%
Spindale	47	4,321	187,477	4,321	100.00%	2.30%
Spring Hope	11	1,320	183,829	1,320	100.00%	0.72%
Spring Lake	21	11,964	183,702	11,964	100.00%	6.51%
Spruce Pine	47	2,175	187,477	2,175	100.00%	1.16%
St. Helena	8	389	200,134	389	100.00%	0.19%
St. James	8	3,165	200,134	3,165	100.00%	1.58%
St. Pauls	13	2,035	192,266	2,035	100.00%	1.06%
Staley	29	393	200,216	393	100.00%	0.20%
Stallings (Mecklenburg)	40	399	184,666	399	100.00%	0.22%
Stallings (Union)	35	13,432	189,794	7,778	57.91%	4.10%
	36	13,432	189,509	5,654	42.09%	2.98%
Stanfield	34	1,486	199,013	1,486	100.00%	0.75%
Stanley	43	3,556	197,035	2,790	78.46%	1.42%
	44	3,556	185,394	766	21.54%	0.41%
Stantonsburg	4	784	192,477	784	100.00%	0.41%
Star	33	876	190,676	876	100.00%	0.46%
Statesville	30	24,532	197,843	24,532	100.00%	12.40%
Stedman	19	1,028	182,681	1,028	100.00%	0.56%
Stem	22	463	184,780	463	100.00%	0.25%
Stokesdale	24	5,047	196,935	5,047	100.00%	2.56%
Stoneville	26	1,056	199,600	1,056	100.00%	0.53%
Stonewall	2	281	183,118	281	100.00%	0.15%
Stovall	22	418	184,780	418	100.00%	0.23%
Sugar Mountain	46	198	191,738	198	100.00%	0.10%
Summerfield	24	10,232	196,935	8,143	79.58%	4.13%
	27	10,232	198,164	2,089	20.42%	1.05%
Sunset Beach	8	3,572	200,134	3,572	100.00%	1.78%

District plan definition file: 'STV-1.asc', modified 08/23/2017 04:50:36 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/23/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

STV-1-Blue-Fair, Legal and Competitve Senate Districts: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Surf City (Onslow)	6	292	187,925	292	100.00%	0.16%
Surf City (Pender)	8	1,561	200,134	1,561	100.00%	0.78%
Swansboro	6	2,663	187,925	2,663	100.00%	1.42%
Swepsonville	24	1,154	196,935	1,154	100.00%	0.59%
Sylva	50	2,588	194,102	2,588	100.00%	1.33%
Tabor City	13	2,511	192,266	2,511	100.00%	1.31%
Tar Heel	8	117	200,134	117	100.00%	0.06%
Tarboro	4	11,415	192,477	11,415	100.00%	5.93%
Taylorsville	42	2,098	191,556	2,098	100.00%	1.10%
Taylortown	25	722	197,991	722	100.00%	0.36%
Teachey	10	376	188,148	376	100.00%	0.20%
Thomasville (Davidson)	33	26,493	190,676	26,493	100.00%	13.89%
Thomasville (Randolph)	29	264	200,216	264	100.00%	0.13%
Tobaccoville (Forsyth)	31	2,441	193,985	2,441	100.00%	1.26%
Tobaccoville (Stokes)	26	0	199,600	0	0.00%	0.00%
Topsail Beach	8	368	200,134	368	100.00%	0.18%
Trent Woods	2	4,155	183,118	4,155	100.00%	2.27%
Trenton	6	287	187,925	287	100.00%	0.15%
Trinity	29	6,614	200,216	6,614	100.00%	3.30%
Troutman	30	2,383	197,843	2,383	100.00%	1.20%
Troy	33	3,189	190,676	3,189	100.00%	1.67%
Tryon	47	1,646	187,477	1,646	100.00%	0.88%
Turkey	10	292	188,148	292	100.00%	0.16%
Unionville	35	5,929	189,794	5,843	98.55%	3.08%
	36	5,929	189,509	86	1.45%	0.05%
Valdese	46	4,490	191,738	4,490	100.00%	2.34%
Vanceboro	2	1,005	183,118	1,005	100.00%	0.55%
Vandemere	2	254	183,118	254	100.00%	0.14%
Varnamtown	8	541	200,134	541	100.00%	0.27%
Vass	25	720	197,991	720	100.00%	0.36%
Waco	44	321	185,394	321	100.00%	0.17%
Wade	19	556	182,681	556	100.00%	0.30%
Wadesboro	25	5,813	197,991	5,813	100.00%	2.94%
Wagram	25	840	197,991	840	100.00%	0.42%
Wake Forest (Franklin)	18	899	195,290	899	100.00%	0.46%
Wake Forest (Wake)	18	29,218	195,290	29,218	100.00%	14.96%
Walkertown	31	4,675	193,985	1,620	34.65%	0.84%
	32	4,675	197,925	3,055	65.35%	1.54%
Wallace (Duplin)	10	3,880	188,148	3,880	100.00%	2.06%
Wallace (Pender)	8	0	200,134	0	0.00%	0.00%
Wallburg	33	3,047	190,676	3,047	100.00%	1.60%
Walnut Cove	26	1,425	199,600	1,425	100.00%	0.71%
Walnut Creek	7	835	182,118	835	100.00%	0.46%
Walstonburg	5	219	189,510	219	100.00%	0.12%
Warrenton	3	862	182,039	862	100.00%	0.47%
Warsaw	10	3,054	188,148	3,054	100.00%	1.62%
Washington	3	9,744	182,039	9,744	100.00%	5.35%

District plan definition file: 'STV-1.asc', modified 08/23/2017 04:50:36 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/23/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

STV-1-Blue-Fair, Legal and Competitve Senate Districts: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Washington Park	3	451	182,039	451	100.00%	0.25%
Watha	8	190	200,134	190	100.00%	0.09%
Waxhaw	35	9,859	189,794	9,859	100.00%	5.19%
Waynesville	50	9,869	194,102	9,869	100.00%	5.08%
Weaverville	49	3,120	193,282	3,120	100.00%	1.61%
Webster	50	363	194,102	363	100.00%	0.19%
Weddington (Mecklenburg)	40	7	184,666	7	100.00%	0.00%
Weddington (Union)	35	9,452	189,794	9,452	100.00%	4.98%
Weldon	4	1,655	192,477	1,655	100.00%	0.86%
Wendell	14	5,845	184,251	5,845	100.00%	3.17%
Wentworth	26	2,807	199,600	2,807	100.00%	1.41%
Wesley Chapel	35	7,463	189,794	7,463	100.00%	3.93%
West Jefferson	45	1,299	197,691	1,299	100.00%	0.66%
Whispering Pines	25	2,928	197,991	2,928	100.00%	1.48%
Whitakers (Edgecombe)	4	402	192,477	402	100.00%	0.21%
Whitakers (Nash)	11	342	183,829	342	100.00%	0.19%
White Lake	8	802	200,134	802	100.00%	0.40%
Whiteville	13	5,394	192,266	5,394	100.00%	2.81%
Whitsett	28	590	185,974	1	0.17%	0.00%
	29	590	200,216	589	99.83%	0.29%
Wilkesboro	45	3,413	197,691	3,413	100.00%	1.73%
Williamston	3	5,511	182,039	5,511	100.00%	3.03%
Wilmington	8	106,476	200,134	5,296	4.97%	2.65%
	9	106,476	197,371	101,180	95.03%	51.26%
Wilson	4	49,167	192,477	49,167	100.00%	25.54%
Wilson's Mills	10	2,277	188,148	0	0.00%	0.00%
	11	2,277	183,829	2,277	100.00%	1.24%
Windsor	3	3,630	182,039	3,630	100.00%	1.99%
Winfall	1	594	196,665	594	100.00%	0.30%
Wingate	35	3,491	189,794	3,491	100.00%	1.84%
Winston-Salem	31	229,617	193,985	42,342	18.44%	21.83%
	32	229,617	197,925	187,275	81.56%	94.62%
Winterville	5	9,269	189,510	9,269	100.00%	4.89%
Winton	1	769	196,665	769	100.00%	0.39%
Woodfin	49	6,123	193,282	6,123	100.00%	3.17%
Woodland	3	809	182,039	809	100.00%	0.44%
Wrightsville Beach	9	2,477	197,371	2,477	100.00%	1.25%
Yadkinville	30	2,959	197,843	2,959	100.00%	1.50%
Yanceyville	26	2,039	199,600	2,039	100.00%	1.02%
Youngsville	18	1,157	195,290	1,157	100.00%	0.59%
Zebulon (Johnston)	11	0	183,829	0	0.00%	0.00%
Zebulon (Wake)	14	4,433	184,251	4,052	91.41%	2.20%
	18	4,433	195,290	381	8.59%	0.20%
			Total:	**5,250,071**		

District plan definition file: 'STV-1.asc', modified 08/23/2017 04:50:36 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/23/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

STV-1-Blue-Fair, Legal and Competitve Senate Districts: Split VTD Detail

County	VTD	District	Total VTD Pop	VTD Pop in District	Percent of VTD Pop in District
New Hanover	W03	8	2,640	1,765	66.86%
		9	2,640	875	33.14%
	W29	8	4,956	3,531	71.25%
		9	4,956	1,425	28.75%

District plan definition file: 'STV-1.asc', modified 08/23/2017 04:50:36 PM

VTDs ('Voting Districts') derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Printed 08/23/2017 {rptG05|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

Plan Name: STV-1
Plan Type:
Date: 08/24/2017
Time: 09:48:47AM
Administrator:

Measures of Compactness

08/24/2017

Sum	N/A
Min	0.23
Max	0.62
Mean	0.42
Std. Dev.	0.10

DISTRICT	Reock
1	0.46
2	0.48
3	0.23
4	0.45
5	0.62
6	0.52
7	0.46
8	0.41
9	0.24
10	0.48
11	0.23
12	0.50
13	0.41
14	0.34
15	0.59
16	0.40
17	0.48
18	0.43
19	0.48
20	0.48
21	0.48
22	0.51
23	0.39
24	0.29
25	0.46
26	0.27
27	0.51
28	0.29
29	0.49
30	0.33
31	0.32
32	0.59
33	0.27
34	0.32
35	0.49
36	0.44
37	0.42
38	0.39
39	0.35
40	0.29

Plan Name:	STV-1	Administrator:	
Plan Type:		User:	

DISTRICT	Reock
41	0.56
42	0.45
43	0.43
44	0.38
45	0.41
46	0.54
47	0.42
48	0.40
49	0.39
50	0.42

Plan Name: STV-1
Plan Type:
Date: 08/24/2017
Time: 09:50:43AM
Administrator:

Measures of Compactness

08/24/2017

Sum	N/A
Min	0.15
Max	0.56
Mean	0.35
Std. Dev.	0.10

DISTRICT	Polsby-Popper
1	0.46
2	0.42
3	0.15
4	0.31
5	0.44
6	0.55
7	0.35
8	0.18
9	0.27
10	0.26
11	0.26
12	0.39
13	0.33
14	0.31
15	0.45
16	0.32
17	0.44
18	0.42
19	0.32
20	0.45
21	0.37
22	0.46
23	0.37
24	0.28
25	0.28
26	0.43
27	0.45
28	0.21
29	0.36
30	0.34
31	0.16
32	0.33
33	0.27
34	0.30
35	0.56
36	0.39
37	0.33
38	0.30
39	0.27
40	0.25

Plan Name:	STV-1	Administrator:	
Plan Type:		User:	

DISTRICT	Polsby-Popper
41	0.45
42	0.48
43	0.50
44	0.32
45	0.38
46	0.45
47	0.24
48	0.32
49	0.30
50	0.46

STV-1-Blue-Fair, Legal and Competitve Senate Districts: Population Deviation

District	2010 Pop	Ideal Pop	Deviation	Deviation %
1	196,665	190,710	5,955	3.12%
2	183,118	190,710	-7,592	-3.98%
3	182,039	190,710	-8,671	-4.55%
4	192,477	190,710	1,767	0.93%
5	189,510	190,710	-1,200	-0.63%
6	187,925	190,710	-2,785	-1.46%
7	182,118	190,710	-8,592	-4.51%
8	200,134	190,710	9,424	4.94%
9	197,371	190,710	6,661	3.49%
10	188,148	190,710	-2,562	-1.34%
11	183,829	190,710	-6,881	-3.61%
12	187,221	190,710	-3,489	-1.83%
13	192,266	190,710	1,556	0.82%
14	184,251	190,710	-6,459	-3.39%
15	184,611	190,710	-6,099	-3.20%
16	197,324	190,710	6,614	3.47%
17	200,136	190,710	9,426	4.94%
18	195,290	190,710	4,580	2.40%
19	182,681	190,710	-8,029	-4.21%
20	182,187	190,710	-8,523	-4.47%
21	183,702	190,710	-7,008	-3.67%
22	184,780	190,710	-5,930	-3.11%
23	197,306	190,710	6,596	3.46%
24	196,935	190,710	6,225	3.26%
25	197,991	190,710	7,281	3.82%
26	199,600	190,710	8,890	4.66%
27	198,164	190,710	7,454	3.91%
28	185,974	190,710	-4,736	-2.48%
29	200,216	190,710	9,506	4.98%
30	197,843	190,710	7,133	3.74%
31	193,985	190,710	3,275	1.72%
32	197,925	190,710	7,215	3.78%
33	190,676	190,710	-34	-0.02%
34	199,013	190,710	8,303	4.35%
35	189,794	190,710	-916	-0.48%
36	189,509	190,710	-1,201	-0.63%
37	182,443	190,710	-8,267	-4.33%
38	182,430	190,710	-8,280	-4.34%
39	185,074	190,710	-5,636	-2.96%
40	184,666	190,710	-6,044	-3.17%
41	185,015	190,710	-5,695	-2.99%
42	191,556	190,710	846	0.44%
43	197,035	190,710	6,325	3.32%
44	185,394	190,710	-5,316	-2.79%
45	197,691	190,710	6,981	3.66%
46	191,738	190,710	1,028	0.54%
47	187,477	190,710	-3,233	-1.70%
48	184,866	190,710	-5,844	-3.06%
49	193,282	190,710	2,572	1.35%
50	194,102	190,710	3,392	1.78%
Total:	**9,535,483**			

STV-1-Blue-Fair, Legal and Competitve Senate Districts: Population 2010, US Senate 2010, President 2012

	2010 Census		US Senate 2010: Marshall-Burr-Beitler								US President 2012: Obama-Romney-Johnson							
District	Total Pop	18+ Pop	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %
1	196,665	153,426	25,606	43.60%	31,904	54.33%	1,196	2.04%	19	0.03%	45,482	48.87%	46,490	49.95%	950	1.02%	150	0.16%
2	183,118	143,986	17,393	31.26%	37,109	66.70%	1,070	1.92%	63	0.11%	31,516	35.91%	55,323	63.03%	761	0.87%	168	0.19%
3	182,039	141,242	31,118	52.62%	27,064	45.76%	926	1.57%	30	0.05%	50,170	56.97%	37,383	42.45%	406	0.46%	104	0.12%
4	192,477	145,928	32,883	57.59%	23,457	41.08%	750	1.31%	10	0.02%	56,149	61.10%	35,208	38.32%	433	0.47%	100	0.11%
5	189,510	146,760	22,397	47.49%	24,190	51.29%	556	1.18%	20	0.04%	45,546	52.42%	40,573	46.70%	648	0.75%	117	0.13%
6	187,925	140,779	10,015	33.20%	19,362	64.19%	769	2.55%	16	0.05%	20,842	36.78%	35,080	61.91%	588	1.04%	155	0.27%
7	182,118	137,302	20,490	42.11%	27,572	56.66%	583	1.20%	14	0.03%	37,221	46.96%	41,578	52.46%	434	0.55%	22	0.03%
8	200,134	158,647	26,597	38.48%	41,161	59.54%	1,344	1.94%	25	0.04%	42,274	42.05%	57,243	56.94%	821	0.82%	202	0.20%
9	197,371	158,278	23,736	38.00%	37,303	59.72%	1,394	2.23%	32	0.05%	46,065	45.68%	53,212	52.77%	1,246	1.24%	312	0.31%
10	188,148	140,059	18,831	38.35%	29,583	60.25%	677	1.38%	11	0.02%	29,519	39.62%	44,352	59.53%	512	0.69%	120	0.16%
11	183,829	135,099	22,969	41.14%	31,907	57.15%	930	1.67%	22	0.04%	40,589	44.93%	48,851	54.08%	698	0.77%	194	0.21%
12	187,221	136,301	17,201	38.51%	26,602	59.55%	851	1.91%	17	0.04%	29,998	40.35%	43,442	58.43%	736	0.99%	171	0.23%
13	192,266	142,807	19,514	49.67%	19,146	48.73%	605	1.54%	25	0.06%	36,038	53.66%	30,451	45.34%	520	0.77%	156	0.23%
14	184,251	132,553	30,509	62.25%	17,586	35.88%	892	1.82%	20	0.04%	61,232	68.41%	27,299	30.50%	819	0.92%	154	0.17%
15	184,611	146,610	32,504	48.92%	32,357	48.70%	1,531	2.30%	45	0.07%	60,624	55.44%	47,022	43.00%	1,497	1.37%	205	0.19%
16	197,324	151,342	25,727	48.25%	26,011	48.79%	1,558	2.92%	20	0.04%	57,435	55.96%	43,230	42.12%	1,775	1.73%	200	0.19%
17	200,136	141,635	27,227	44.75%	32,199	52.92%	1,391	2.29%	24	0.04%	54,323	51.06%	50,679	47.64%	1,228	1.15%	158	0.15%
18	195,290	139,997	25,404	39.68%	37,110	57.96%	1,477	2.31%	37	0.06%	47,084	44.26%	57,969	54.49%	1,120	1.05%	209	0.20%
19	182,681	132,465	20,255	47.06%	22,052	51.23%	720	1.67%	18	0.04%	41,054	52.66%	36,181	46.41%	566	0.73%	161	0.21%
20	182,187	139,409	41,285	77.02%	11,481	21.42%	811	1.51%	27	0.05%	79,311	79.69%	19,181	19.27%	912	0.92%	117	0.12%
21	183,702	134,192	21,087	61.32%	12,741	37.05%	537	1.56%	22	0.06%	44,814	67.12%	21,304	31.91%	528	0.79%	122	0.18%
22	184,780	144,790	29,032	53.71%	23,989	44.38%	1,022	1.89%	14	0.03%	53,929	58.37%	37,489	40.57%	804	0.87%	176	0.19%
23	197,306	155,496	43,402	61.53%	25,502	36.15%	1,599	2.27%	35	0.05%	72,262	64.41%	38,204	34.05%	1,386	1.24%	339	0.30%
24	196,935	149,166	19,208	34.15%	35,635	63.35%	1,383	2.46%	26	0.05%	36,684	39.25%	55,790	59.69%	806	0.86%	181	0.19%
25	197,991	152,423	24,146	43.32%	30,550	54.81%	1,018	1.83%	23	0.04%	41,643	45.66%	48,824	53.53%	631	0.69%	110	0.12%
26	199,600	155,552	18,076	32.70%	35,727	64.63%	1,451	2.62%	24	0.04%	32,234	36.31%	55,470	62.48%	873	0.98%	205	0.23%
27	198,164	155,398	28,168	50.49%	26,480	47.47%	1,099	1.97%	37	0.07%	65,509	61.88%	39,060	36.89%	1,011	0.95%	289	0.27%
28	185,974	140,137	28,383	59.14%	18,869	39.32%	704	1.47%	38	0.08%	61,954	67.24%	29,415	31.93%	578	0.63%	187	0.20%
29	200,216	151,948	11,474	23.19%	36,622	74.02%	1,339	2.71%	44	0.09%	25,343	28.15%	63,588	70.64%	925	1.03%	157	0.17%
30	197,843	148,320	15,298	28.04%	37,834	69.35%	1,397	2.56%	26	0.05%	30,033	32.23%	61,877	66.41%	978	1.05%	290	0.31%
31	193,985	147,279	18,171	28.50%	44,276	69.44%	1,293	2.03%	22	0.03%	35,750	34.47%	66,844	64.45%	1,068	1.03%	49	0.05%
32	197,925	149,479	26,205	58.15%	18,138	40.25%	704	1.56%	17	0.04%	62,308	68.76%	27,611	30.47%	700	0.77%	0	0.00%
33	190,676	145,058	14,509	29.44%	33,627	68.24%	1,119	2.27%	20	0.04%	25,330	30.83%	55,787	67.90%	876	1.07%	173	0.21%
34	199,013	152,338	17,207	31.47%	36,147	66.12%	1,285	2.35%	32	0.06%	31,078	34.17%	58,644	64.47%	953	1.05%	284	0.31%
35	189,794	132,039	13,415	29.02%	31,743	68.68%	1,034	2.24%	30	0.06%	30,954	35.05%	56,278	63.72%	854	0.97%	228	0.26%
36	189,509	137,603	16,691	32.42%	33,671	65.41%	1,115	2.17%	0	0.00%	34,337	38.31%	54,340	60.63%	939	1.05%	14	0.02%
37	182,443	142,726	25,058	55.21%	19,432	42.81%	876	1.93%	24	0.05%	55,069	62.72%	31,612	36.00%	900	1.03%	221	0.25%
38	182,430	134,060	24,368	66.35%	11,716	31.90%	619	1.69%	21	0.06%	59,400	73.97%	20,118	25.05%	605	0.75%	183	0.23%
39	185,074	137,484	20,229	39.23%	30,306	58.78%	1,000	1.94%	25	0.05%	45,247	48.42%	47,153	50.46%	846	0.91%	198	0.21%
40	184,666	137,253	23,086	52.66%	19,992	45.60%	734	1.67%	31	0.07%	52,140	60.73%	32,690	38.08%	782	0.91%	243	0.28%
41	185,015	134,767	24,803	51.75%	22,321	46.57%	788	1.64%	14	0.03%	55,276	58.12%	38,882	40.88%	759	0.80%	194	0.20%
42	191,556	146,308	16,533	30.70%	35,956	66.76%	1,337	2.48%	33	0.06%	28,675	33.04%	56,787	65.43%	1,033	1.19%	293	0.34%
43	197,035	149,991	14,895	31.63%	31,082	66.01%	1,113	2.36%	0	0.00%	31,879	37.10%	53,179	61.89%	869	1.01%	0	0.00%
44	185,394	141,718	17,792	34.23%	33,049	63.59%	1,112	2.14%	22	0.04%	29,375	34.80%	54,018	63.99%	803	0.95%	224	0.27%
45	197,691	158,177	20,538	34.30%	37,669	62.91%	1,646	2.75%	29	0.05%	31,344	35.02%	56,362	62.98%	1,418	1.58%	369	0.41%
46	191,738	149,705	16,531	33.18%	31,940	64.11%	1,325	2.66%	23	0.05%	26,481	33.57%	51,262	64.98%	1,012	1.28%	132	0.17%
47	187,477	147,841	21,314	34.98%	38,045	62.44%	1,540	2.53%	33	0.05%	29,486	35.14%	53,113	63.30%	1,022	1.22%	282	0.34%
48	184,866	147,107	22,200	34.84%	39,941	62.68%	1,558	2.45%	21	0.03%	36,540	39.02%	55,677	59.45%	1,092	1.17%	344	0.37%
49	193,282	154,410	33,055	52.87%	27,761	44.40%	1,664	2.66%	44	0.07%	59,546	57.71%	41,650	40.36%	1,433	1.39%	560	0.54%
50	194,102	156,458	25,165	38.43%	38,165	58.28%	2,112	3.23%	38	0.06%	34,201	38.27%	53,578	59.95%	1,294	1.45%	297	0.33%
Totals:	**9,535,483**	**7,253,848**	**1,141,700**	**43.04%**	**1,454,082**	**54.82%**	**55,554**	**2.09%**	**1,263**	**0.05%**	**2,171,293**	**48.33%**	**2,267,353**	**50.47%**	**44,448**	**0.99%**	**9,519**	**0.21%**

Populations values derive from the 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File. Election results were provided by the NC State Board of Elections. Votes that could not be associated with a specific precinct were excluded. Reported statewide totals may therefore be marginally lower than official contest results.

STV-1-Blue-Fair, Legal and Competitve Senate Districts: Governor 2012, Lieutenant Governor 2012, US Senate 2014

	Governor 2012: Dalton-McCrory-Howe								Lieutenant Governor 2012: Coleman-Forest				US Senate 2014: Tillis-Hagan-Haugh							
District	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %
1	44,567	48.84%	44,051	48.28%	2,609	2.86%	20	0.02%	48,060	53.59%	41,627	46.41%	30,750	50.80%	28,027	46.30%	1,702	2.81%	48	0.08%
2	28,530	32.65%	57,217	65.47%	1,615	1.85%	26	0.03%	32,786	38.21%	53,018	61.79%	36,899	60.46%	21,609	35.41%	2,340	3.83%	182	0.30%
3	48,711	55.68%	37,737	43.14%	1,024	1.17%	10	0.01%	52,590	61.35%	33,128	38.65%	24,793	41.50%	32,737	54.80%	2,084	3.49%	128	0.21%
4	54,777	59.84%	35,877	39.20%	869	0.95%	10	0.01%	57,424	63.60%	32,867	36.40%	22,999	38.20%	35,596	59.12%	1,565	2.60%	45	0.07%
5	42,553	49.27%	42,332	49.02%	1,463	1.69%	16	0.02%	46,467	54.65%	38,559	45.35%	24,088	47.07%	25,389	49.62%	1,612	3.15%	81	0.16%
6	18,744	33.55%	35,659	63.82%	1,459	2.61%	13	0.02%	22,010	40.37%	32,513	59.63%	21,858	61.65%	11,859	33.45%	1,681	4.74%	59	0.17%
7	35,570	45.13%	42,240	53.59%	988	1.25%	24	0.03%	38,551	49.66%	39,078	50.34%	26,667	51.80%	23,095	44.86%	1,663	3.23%	55	0.11%
8	37,873	38.02%	59,764	59.99%	1,972	1.98%	15	0.02%	44,067	45.14%	53,565	54.86%	37,130	53.02%	28,989	41.40%	3,786	5.41%	125	0.18%
9	39,195	39.52%	56,871	57.34%	3,086	3.11%	30	0.03%	45,150	46.86%	51,202	53.14%	31,405	48.37%	30,133	46.41%	3,278	5.05%	109	0.17%
10	28,473	38.35%	44,818	60.36%	943	1.27%	17	0.02%	31,631	43.40%	41,252	56.60%	27,885	57.54%	18,550	38.28%	1,938	4.00%	91	0.19%
11	38,003	42.21%	50,626	56.23%	1,394	1.55%	18	0.02%	41,506	46.84%	47,097	53.16%	32,616	53.09%	26,689	43.44%	2,052	3.34%	81	0.13%
12	27,756	37.50%	44,714	60.41%	1,515	2.05%	27	0.04%	31,592	43.49%	41,050	56.51%	26,388	55.90%	18,724	39.67%	2,010	4.26%	82	0.17%
13	37,211	56.10%	27,970	42.17%	1,133	1.71%	20	0.03%	41,068	63.31%	23,805	36.69%	17,801	44.87%	19,985	50.38%	1,822	4.59%	64	0.16%
14	56,372	63.23%	30,777	34.52%	1,990	2.23%	19	0.02%	61,046	69.36%	26,962	30.64%	16,887	29.93%	37,923	67.22%	1,517	2.69%	90	0.16%
15	52,598	48.55%	52,506	48.47%	3,196	2.95%	28	0.03%	59,004	55.73%	46,870	44.27%	30,367	39.87%	43,560	57.19%	2,129	2.79%	117	0.15%
16	48,937	48.30%	48,647	48.02%	3,698	3.65%	30	0.03%	55,096	55.90%	43,461	44.10%	26,082	39.66%	37,333	56.77%	2,217	3.37%	131	0.20%
17	47,488	44.92%	55,428	52.43%	2,776	2.63%	23	0.02%	53,335	51.53%	50,159	48.47%	33,628	46.25%	36,712	50.49%	2,237	3.08%	138	0.19%
18	40,709	38.49%	62,596	59.19%	2,412	2.28%	39	0.04%	46,026	44.36%	57,725	55.64%	39,037	51.90%	33,636	44.72%	2,413	3.21%	134	0.18%
19	38,279	49.75%	37,028	48.12%	1,618	2.10%	18	0.02%	41,891	55.41%	33,709	44.59%	22,312	46.87%	23,574	49.53%	1,655	3.48%	58	0.12%
20	73,387	74.54%	22,542	22.90%	2,471	2.51%	48	0.05%	77,499	79.96%	19,420	20.04%	10,518	16.86%	50,628	81.15%	1,169	1.87%	77	0.12%
21	41,914	63.83%	22,238	33.87%	1,490	2.27%	20	0.03%	44,657	68.90%	20,160	31.10%	12,513	32.70%	24,523	64.08%	1,175	3.07%	58	0.15%
22	49,535	54.22%	39,649	43.40%	2,136	2.34%	33	0.04%	54,001	60.62%	35,082	39.38%	23,342	38.86%	34,836	57.99%	1,818	3.03%	77	0.13%
23	65,604	59.22%	42,009	37.92%	3,103	2.80%	63	0.06%	70,358	64.96%	37,947	35.04%	24,700	30.65%	53,699	66.63%	2,120	2.63%	72	0.09%
24	32,250	34.83%	58,404	63.07%	1,921	2.07%	20	0.02%	36,177	39.90%	54,499	60.10%	36,513	58.39%	23,702	37.90%	2,230	3.57%	91	0.15%
25	38,495	42.60%	50,372	55.74%	1,458	1.61%	44	0.05%	43,394	49.27%	44,680	50.73%	32,665	52.10%	27,623	44.06%	2,319	3.70%	87	0.14%
26	29,604	33.52%	56,922	64.45%	1,772	2.01%	20	0.02%	34,148	39.62%	52,042	60.38%	34,687	59.30%	20,600	35.21%	3,067	5.24%	145	0.25%
27	57,747	55.20%	44,105	42.16%	2,726	2.61%	44	0.04%	63,422	61.95%	38,961	38.05%	25,284	37.21%	40,986	60.32%	1,584	2.33%	96	0.14%
28	56,826	62.31%	32,715	35.87%	1,623	1.78%	32	0.04%	60,684	67.58%	29,114	32.42%	18,907	32.87%	37,287	64.82%	1,264	2.20%	64	0.11%
29	22,076	24.57%	66,006	73.45%	1,771	1.97%	11	0.01%	25,784	29.35%	62,069	70.65%	39,173	69.31%	15,087	26.69%	2,167	3.83%	94	0.17%
30	23,382	25.22%	67,657	72.97%	1,652	1.78%	30	0.03%	29,848	33.11%	60,303	66.89%	39,563	64.03%	18,656	30.19%	3,385	5.48%	187	0.30%
31	29,981	28.89%	71,624	69.02%	2,136	2.06%	28	0.03%	35,209	34.75%	66,104	65.25%	42,705	61.88%	23,879	34.60%	2,283	3.31%	141	0.20%
32	56,683	63.04%	31,341	34.85%	1,875	2.09%	22	0.02%	60,851	68.94%	27,421	31.06%	16,375	30.50%	35,874	66.83%	1,340	2.50%	93	0.17%
33	22,078	26.93%	58,230	71.04%	1,648	2.01%	14	0.02%	26,730	33.30%	53,543	66.70%	33,575	65.72%	15,182	29.72%	2,234	4.37%	98	0.19%
34	24,785	27.34%	64,437	71.09%	1,406	1.55%	17	0.02%	31,147	35.25%	57,223	64.75%	35,720	61.30%	18,960	32.54%	3,436	5.90%	156	0.27%
35	23,416	26.70%	62,790	71.60%	1,463	1.67%	22	0.03%	29,912	35.04%	55,458	64.96%	34,426	63.13%	18,044	33.09%	1,864	3.42%	196	0.36%
36	25,791	28.80%	62,144	69.39%	1,621	1.81%	2	0.00%	34,159	39.33%	52,691	60.67%	32,506	57.95%	21,038	37.51%	2,379	4.24%	167	0.30%
37	42,296	48.74%	42,669	49.17%	1,776	2.05%	31	0.04%	51,891	61.84%	32,016	38.16%	17,460	34.25%	32,058	62.88%	1,401	2.75%	63	0.12%
38	51,070	64.52%	26,750	33.80%	1,320	1.67%	13	0.02%	57,243	73.76%	20,361	26.24%	10,828	25.10%	31,074	72.04%	1,162	2.69%	71	0.16%
39	32,397	34.87%	58,981	63.49%	1,495	1.61%	22	0.02%	42,092	46.59%	48,250	53.41%	27,147	49.60%	26,020	47.54%	1,465	2.68%	103	0.19%
40	42,359	49.70%	41,263	48.41%	1,589	1.86%	26	0.03%	50,126	60.16%	33,190	39.84%	18,040	37.17%	29,179	60.13%	1,223	2.52%	88	0.18%
41	44,173	46.87%	48,539	51.50%	1,510	1.60%	27	0.03%	52,782	57.53%	38,966	42.47%	21,810	39.05%	32,540	58.26%	1,374	2.46%	129	0.23%
42	22,115	25.57%	62,937	72.78%	1,402	1.62%	19	0.02%	28,289	33.50%	56,166	66.50%	35,350	63.19%	17,371	31.05%	3,046	5.44%	176	0.31%
43	25,879	30.15%	58,602	68.27%	1,337	1.56%	18	0.02%	31,620	37.82%	51,992	62.18%	31,406	60.24%	18,283	35.07%	2,321	4.45%	123	0.24%
44	25,417	30.23%	57,452	68.34%	1,189	1.41%	15	0.02%	29,967	36.62%	51,872	63.38%	33,139	60.95%	18,439	33.91%	2,656	4.88%	138	0.25%
45	27,192	30.58%	59,157	66.53%	2,547	2.86%	23	0.03%	32,134	37.38%	53,837	62.62%	35,494	59.74%	20,343	34.24%	3,442	5.79%	136	0.23%
46	20,724	26.21%	56,753	71.77%	1,579	2.00%	18	0.02%	27,156	35.42%	49,516	64.58%	31,230	61.54%	16,228	31.98%	3,151	6.21%	136	0.27%
47	31,588	37.71%	50,318	60.07%	1,840	2.20%	17	0.02%	31,802	39.23%	49,272	60.77%	34,520	58.39%	21,336	36.09%	3,184	5.39%	80	0.14%
48	32,660	35.31%	57,355	62.00%	2,456	2.66%	30	0.03%	36,359	40.13%	54,243	59.87%	36,913	55.81%	26,545	40.13%	2,601	3.93%	87	0.13%
49	54,517	53.45%	43,870	43.01%	3,574	3.50%	32	0.03%	58,927	58.95%	41,030	41.05%	25,653	36.55%	41,569	59.23%	2,875	4.10%	89	0.13%
50	32,983	37.31%	52,535	59.42%	2,866	3.24%	27	0.03%	36,353	42.19%	49,816	57.81%	35,080	55.57%	24,594	38.96%	3,343	5.30%	115	0.18%
Totals:	**1,925,270**	**43.18%**	**2,437,224**	**54.67%**	**94,512**	**2.12%**	**1,191**	**0.03%**	**2,174,021**	**49.88%**	**2,184,891**	**50.12%**	**1,416,834**	**48.84%**	**1,370,303**	**47.23%**	**108,779**	**3.75%**	**5,251**	**0.18%**

District plan definition file: 'STV-1.asc', modified 08/23/2017 04:50:36 PM

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections. Votes that could not be associated with a specific precinct were excluded. Reported statewide totals may therefore be marginally lower than official contest results.

STV-1-Blue-Fair, Legal and Competitve Senate Districts: President 2016, US Senate 2016, Governor 2016

	US President 2016: Trump-Clinton-Johnson								US Senate 2016: Burr-Ross-Haugh						Governor 2016: Cooper-McCrory-Cecil					
District	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %
1	51,124	54.37%	39,690	42.21%	2,437	2.59%	781	0.83%	50,422	54.75%	39,232	42.60%	2,441	2.65%	40,704	43.98%	50,100	54.13%	1,749	1.89%
2	58,542	63.89%	30,012	32.76%	2,242	2.45%	829	0.90%	58,109	64.13%	28,994	32.00%	3,512	3.88%	30,960	34.02%	58,265	64.02%	1,788	1.96%
3	37,998	44.82%	45,070	53.16%	1,193	1.41%	523	0.62%	37,690	45.00%	44,065	52.61%	2,002	2.39%	44,887	53.29%	38,505	45.71%	842	1.00%
4	34,714	39.56%	51,323	58.49%	1,231	1.40%	485	0.55%	34,873	40.05%	50,550	58.06%	1,648	1.89%	52,322	59.88%	34,269	39.22%	793	0.91%
5	40,021	45.23%	45,333	51.24%	2,245	2.54%	881	1.00%	41,386	47.29%	43,487	49.70%	2,634	3.01%	45,427	51.71%	41,041	46.71%	1,389	1.58%
6	40,099	64.39%	19,577	31.44%	1,985	3.19%	610	0.98%	39,097	63.90%	19,028	31.10%	3,064	5.01%	20,040	32.62%	39,685	64.59%	1,718	2.80%
7	41,031	53.33%	33,966	44.15%	1,362	1.77%	579	0.75%	40,925	53.84%	33,171	43.64%	1,921	2.53%	33,894	44.35%	41,571	54.40%	958	1.25%
8	69,138	60.31%	41,895	36.54%	2,660	2.32%	948	0.83%	67,784	60.07%	40,579	35.96%	4,470	3.96%	44,922	39.64%	65,885	58.14%	2,506	2.21%
9	55,097	50.39%	48,749	44.58%	3,901	3.57%	1,602	1.47%	55,887	51.89%	46,846	43.49%	4,974	4.62%	54,155	50.05%	50,866	47.01%	3,173	2.93%
10	47,702	62.24%	27,203	35.49%	1,273	1.66%	463	0.60%	47,147	62.21%	26,654	35.17%	1,984	2.62%	28,008	36.74%	47,284	62.03%	936	1.23%
11	51,518	53.73%	41,248	43.02%	2,225	2.32%	897	0.94%	51,624	54.15%	40,987	42.99%	2,723	2.86%	44,233	46.22%	50,017	52.26%	1,460	1.53%
12	46,852	59.32%	29,182	36.95%	2,188	2.77%	756	0.96%	46,317	59.13%	29,226	37.31%	2,788	3.56%	31,368	39.92%	45,449	57.85%	1,751	2.23%
13	34,909	54.33%	27,879	43.39%	1,101	1.71%	361	0.56%	33,313	53.25%	27,703	44.28%	1,548	2.47%	27,663	43.72%	34,916	55.19%	690	1.09%
14	26,574	28.68%	62,312	67.24%	2,559	2.76%	1,227	1.32%	27,986	30.39%	61,364	66.63%	2,751	2.99%	63,576	68.81%	27,053	29.28%	1,759	1.90%
15	39,391	34.02%	69,627	60.13%	4,485	3.87%	2,294	1.98%	45,951	39.83%	65,966	57.17%	3,465	3.00%	72,997	63.02%	40,371	34.86%	2,455	2.12%
16	37,083	33.13%	68,044	60.79%	4,670	4.17%	2,130	1.90%	42,725	38.47%	64,542	58.11%	3,793	3.42%	70,628	63.35%	37,938	34.03%	2,918	2.62%
17	51,168	42.87%	61,588	51.60%	4,600	3.85%	2,001	1.68%	55,373	46.67%	59,311	49.99%	3,955	3.33%	64,928	54.51%	51,415	43.17%	2,767	2.32%
18	58,234	49.25%	54,039	45.70%	3,923	3.32%	2,043	1.73%	62,033	52.74%	51,983	44.19%	3,608	3.07%	57,275	48.49%	58,479	49.51%	2,355	1.99%
19	37,167	46.63%	39,794	49.93%	2,027	2.54%	719	0.90%	37,307	47.42%	38,746	49.25%	2,613	3.32%	39,370	49.91%	37,786	47.90%	1,731	2.19%
20	15,777	14.92%	85,681	81.02%	2,641	2.50%	1,648	1.56%	19,147	18.20%	83,660	79.52%	2,399	2.28%	86,282	81.87%	17,383	16.49%	1,729	1.64%
21	21,858	33.10%	41,537	62.91%	1,923	2.91%	711	1.08%	22,264	34.15%	40,548	62.20%	2,376	3.64%	40,767	62.52%	22,775	34.93%	1,668	2.56%
22	37,268	38.56%	55,708	57.64%	2,361	2.44%	1,317	1.36%	39,080	40.76%	54,188	56.52%	2,611	2.72%	57,202	59.48%	37,334	38.82%	1,633	1.70%
23	35,663	29.19%	80,987	66.28%	3,534	2.89%	2,005	1.64%	39,933	32.86%	78,407	64.52%	3,177	2.61%	83,440	68.47%	36,205	29.71%	2,211	1.81%
24	56,615	57.26%	38,600	39.04%	2,591	2.62%	1,071	1.08%	57,758	58.84%	37,167	37.86%	3,233	3.29%	42,034	42.70%	54,556	55.42%	1,843	1.87%
25	51,626	55.82%	38,014	41.10%	2,073	2.24%	779	0.84%	50,943	55.86%	37,449	41.07%	2,798	3.07%	39,947	43.57%	50,130	54.68%	1,603	1.75%
26	60,988	66.81%	27,555	30.19%	1,986	2.18%	751	0.82%	59,681	65.99%	27,452	30.35%	3,312	3.66%	32,364	35.70%	56,417	62.23%	1,885	2.08%
27	33,546	31.51%	68,214	64.08%	3,017	2.83%	1,670	1.57%	36,886	34.96%	65,531	62.10%	3,105	2.94%	71,078	67.23%	32,370	30.62%	2,274	2.15%
28	28,554	31.17%	60,052	65.55%	2,031	2.22%	971	1.06%	29,493	32.58%	58,403	64.52%	2,617	2.89%	61,328	67.55%	27,609	30.41%	1,851	2.04%
29	67,349	70.56%	24,930	26.12%	2,290	2.40%	877	0.92%	66,392	70.17%	24,437	25.83%	3,781	4.00%	29,160	30.73%	63,593	67.01%	2,151	2.27%
30	68,634	68.50%	27,894	27.84%	2,583	2.58%	1,080	1.08%	66,829	67.44%	27,349	27.60%	4,916	4.96%	32,618	32.78%	64,115	64.43%	2,775	2.79%
31	65,896	60.73%	37,577	34.63%	3,524	3.25%	1,511	1.39%	68,778	63.68%	35,372	32.75%	3,856	3.57%	42,785	39.55%	62,861	58.11%	2,527	2.34%
32	25,697	28.06%	62,145	67.86%	2,482	2.71%	1,249	1.36%	28,809	31.72%	59,404	65.40%	2,616	2.88%	63,329	69.72%	25,530	28.11%	1,971	2.17%
33	61,447	71.12%	22,259	25.76%	2,062	2.39%	628	0.73%	60,373	70.54%	21,959	25.66%	3,259	3.81%	26,603	30.94%	57,516	66.90%	1,851	2.15%
34	64,774	68.70%	26,494	28.10%	2,181	2.31%	837	0.89%	62,061	66.50%	26,482	28.38%	4,782	5.12%	29,794	31.73%	61,866	65.89%	2,231	2.38%
35	61,627	62.37%	32,773	33.17%	3,156	3.19%	1,249	1.26%	62,768	64.34%	30,646	31.41%	4,148	4.25%	34,249	34.89%	61,659	62.80%	2,268	2.31%
36	58,898	58.78%	37,086	37.01%	2,957	2.95%	1,253	1.25%	58,847	59.32%	35,738	36.02%	4,620	4.66%	39,591	39.69%	57,611	57.75%	2,561	2.57%
37	25,125	27.56%	60,712	66.60%	3,691	4.05%	1,637	1.80%	31,346	34.73%	55,626	61.63%	3,282	3.64%	61,322	67.58%	27,014	29.77%	2,410	2.66%
38	20,889	24.64%	60,423	71.28%	2,409	2.84%	1,048	1.24%	22,680	27.16%	57,641	69.02%	3,195	3.83%	59,747	71.25%	21,985	26.22%	2,120	2.53%
39	39,788	41.73%	50,543	53.01%	3,344	3.51%	1,663	1.74%	44,653	47.25%	46,356	49.06%	3,486	3.69%	51,130	53.85%	41,554	43.76%	2,265	2.39%
40	30,464	33.86%	55,459	61.63%	2,647	2.94%	1,413	1.57%	32,603	36.64%	53,099	59.68%	3,268	3.67%	55,565	62.16%	31,707	35.47%	2,114	2.37%
41	37,612	36.40%	60,942	58.98%	3,279	3.17%	1,485	1.44%	40,259	39.39%	58,178	56.93%	3,759	3.68%	63,140	61.57%	36,496	35.59%	2,908	2.84%
42	62,200	68.66%	24,968	27.56%	2,410	2.66%	1,012	1.12%	60,484	67.58%	24,627	27.52%	4,390	4.90%	28,398	31.52%	59,501	66.04%	2,202	2.44%
43	58,532	63.77%	29,967	32.65%	2,319	2.53%	961	1.05%	57,121	63.01%	29,387	32.41%	4,151	4.58%	32,375	35.49%	56,833	62.29%	2,025	2.22%
44	60,549	67.77%	26,071	29.18%	1,947	2.18%	779	0.87%	58,536	66.29%	26,018	29.46%	3,755	4.25%	28,778	32.38%	58,278	65.57%	1,820	2.05%
45	63,181	65.37%	29,176	30.19%	2,845	2.94%	1,451	1.50%	62,262	65.17%	29,165	30.53%	4,110	4.30%	34,637	36.01%	59,233	61.57%	2,327	2.42%
46	59,157	70.85%	21,367	25.59%	2,003	2.40%	965	1.16%	56,771	68.88%	21,718	26.35%	3,937	4.78%	25,410	30.59%	55,667	67.01%	1,991	2.40%
47	62,657	69.28%	24,632	27.24%	2,027	2.24%	1,125	1.24%	58,592	65.91%	26,662	29.99%	3,648	4.10%	30,561	34.14%	56,662	63.29%	2,298	2.57%
48	59,387	57.55%	38,942	37.74%	3,068	2.97%	1,791	1.74%	59,206	58.02%	38,853	38.08%	3,980	3.90%	43,781	42.79%	55,594	54.34%	2,935	2.87%
49	42,657	38.15%	62,892	56.25%	3,333	2.98%	2,919	2.61%	42,590	38.49%	63,580	57.46%	4,477	4.05%	68,148	61.36%	39,430	35.50%	3,485	3.14%
50	62,972	64.60%	30,185	30.97%	2,908	2.98%	1,412	1.45%	59,345	61.97%	32,160	33.59%	4,252	4.44%	37,461	38.95%	55,660	57.87%	3,059	3.18%
Totals:	**2,359,749**	**49.90%**	**2,180,316**	**46.10%**	**129,929**	**2.75%**	**59,397**	**1.26%**	**2,392,439**	**51.13%**	**2,119,696**	**45.30%**	**167,190**	**3.57%**	**2,300,381**	**48.95%**	**2,296,039**	**48.86%**	**102,729**	**2.19%**

STV-1-Blue-Fair, Legal and Competitve Senate Districts: Lieutenant Governor 2016, Attorney General 2016

	Lieutenant Governor 2016: Forest-Coleman-Cole						Attorney General 2016: Stein-Newton			
District	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %
1	48,887	53.74%	39,694	43.63%	2,389	2.63%	41,583	46.48%	47,878	53.52%
2	57,464	64.37%	29,461	33.00%	2,347	2.63%	31,586	35.67%	56,959	64.33%
3	36,795	44.57%	44,483	53.88%	1,277	1.55%	46,645	56.99%	35,203	43.01%
4	34,410	39.91%	50,529	58.61%	1,273	1.48%	52,643	61.20%	33,369	38.80%
5	40,621	47.11%	43,512	50.47%	2,085	2.42%	46,133	53.94%	39,399	46.06%
6	38,286	63.97%	19,181	32.05%	2,380	3.98%	21,095	35.69%	38,018	64.31%
7	40,568	54.08%	33,075	44.09%	1,368	1.82%	35,414	47.66%	38,891	52.34%
8	67,778	61.04%	40,423	36.40%	2,836	2.55%	46,574	42.31%	63,502	57.69%
9	55,658	52.85%	45,433	43.14%	4,230	4.02%	52,224	50.00%	52,214	50.00%
10	46,933	62.83%	26,404	35.34%	1,367	1.83%	29,358	39.71%	44,564	60.29%
11	52,037	55.19%	40,239	42.67%	2,017	2.14%	43,676	46.53%	50,190	53.47%
12	46,585	60.10%	28,842	37.21%	2,084	2.69%	32,410	42.24%	44,322	57.76%
13	31,027	50.72%	28,932	47.29%	1,215	1.99%	31,776	52.53%	28,714	47.47%
14	28,031	30.74%	60,680	66.55%	2,465	2.70%	63,706	70.54%	26,604	29.46%
15	45,751	40.28%	64,068	56.40%	3,772	3.32%	71,293	63.24%	41,442	36.76%
16	42,225	38.80%	62,422	57.37%	4,168	3.83%	68,455	63.43%	39,460	36.57%
17	55,232	47.29%	57,859	49.54%	3,693	3.16%	63,090	54.53%	52,612	45.47%
18	62,942	54.13%	50,327	43.28%	3,013	2.59%	56,235	48.92%	58,710	51.08%
19	36,464	47.10%	38,411	49.62%	2,539	3.28%	41,278	53.58%	35,759	46.42%
20	18,790	18.06%	82,542	79.35%	2,689	2.59%	85,906	83.00%	17,600	17.00%
21	21,603	33.68%	40,287	62.81%	2,249	3.51%	42,148	66.20%	21,520	33.80%
22	39,001	41.35%	53,046	56.25%	2,262	2.40%	57,421	61.43%	36,054	38.57%
23	39,577	33.12%	76,646	64.14%	3,271	2.74%	81,625	68.71%	37,164	31.29%
24	57,615	59.53%	36,393	37.60%	2,775	2.87%	41,011	42.66%	55,113	57.34%
25	50,305	56.16%	37,163	41.49%	2,105	2.35%	40,658	45.81%	48,086	54.19%
26	58,619	66.04%	27,995	31.54%	2,147	2.42%	31,896	36.12%	56,400	63.88%
27	36,033	34.74%	64,454	62.14%	3,241	3.12%	68,969	66.84%	34,214	33.16%
28	29,033	32.50%	57,859	64.76%	2,447	2.74%	60,721	68.34%	28,136	31.66%
29	66,597	71.45%	24,203	25.97%	2,405	2.58%	28,221	30.46%	64,420	69.54%
30	68,327	70.14%	26,276	26.97%	2,819	2.89%	31,963	33.10%	64,604	66.90%
31	68,100	64.19%	34,971	32.96%	3,015	2.84%	41,064	38.92%	64,445	61.08%
32	27,418	30.75%	59,216	66.41%	2,532	2.84%	62,679	70.57%	26,137	29.43%
33	60,028	71.22%	22,140	26.27%	2,123	2.52%	25,906	30.85%	58,069	69.15%
34	63,686	69.23%	25,779	28.02%	2,523	2.74%	31,643	34.65%	59,668	65.35%
35	64,009	66.65%	29,246	30.45%	2,778	2.89%	34,286	36.04%	60,858	63.96%
36	60,075	61.47%	34,586	35.39%	3,075	3.15%	39,935	41.23%	56,928	58.77%
37	31,081	35.12%	53,922	60.92%	3,503	3.96%	58,945	67.06%	28,956	32.94%
38	22,878	27.80%	56,477	68.63%	2,941	3.57%	59,986	73.32%	21,827	26.68%
39	45,681	49.13%	44,296	47.64%	3,005	3.23%	49,880	54.11%	42,301	45.89%
40	33,294	37.91%	51,671	58.83%	2,866	3.26%	55,628	63.82%	31,540	36.18%
41	41,132	40.85%	56,351	55.97%	3,204	3.18%	61,108	61.18%	38,780	38.82%
42	62,124	70.39%	23,616	26.76%	2,521	2.86%	29,767	33.94%	57,931	66.06%
43	59,203	66.00%	28,144	31.38%	2,351	2.62%	33,269	37.48%	55,502	62.52%
44	60,310	69.07%	24,946	28.57%	2,066	2.37%	30,418	35.20%	56,007	64.80%
45	61,390	65.72%	29,044	31.09%	2,974	3.18%	34,204	36.97%	58,302	63.03%
46	58,375	71.73%	21,046	25.86%	1,958	2.41%	26,887	33.35%	53,722	66.65%
47	58,679	67.02%	26,179	29.90%	2,697	3.08%	29,406	33.95%	57,204	66.05%
48	59,503	59.12%	37,910	37.67%	3,237	3.22%	41,434	41.50%	58,406	58.50%
49	41,430	38.08%	62,703	57.63%	4,673	4.29%	67,209	62.26%	40,747	37.74%
50	59,029	62.59%	31,893	33.82%	3,390	3.59%	35,488	38.03%	57,825	61.97%
Totals:	**2,390,619**	**51.88%**	**2,084,975**	**45.25%**	**132,360**	**2.87%**	**2,294,855**	**50.20%**	**2,276,276**	**49.80%**

District plan definition file: 'STV-1.asc', modified 08/23/2017 04:50:36 PM

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections. Votes that could not be associated with a specific precinct were excluded. Reported statewide totals may therefore be marginally lower than official contest results.

EX. 35

SRN-2



N
W E
S

Guil_Alam_Rand_Shapefile_2_2

0 5 10 20 30 40 Miles

Printed by the NC General Assembly, August 28, 2017.

Plan: SRN-2
Plan Type:

Administrator
User:

Districts & Their Incumbents

Monday, August 28, 2017 3:53 PM

District	Name	Party	Previous District
-	J.Davis	Republican	50
-	Edwards	Republican	48
-	Van Duyn	Democratic	49
-	Hise	Republican	47
-	Harrington	Republican	43
-	Curtis	Republican	44
-	Ford	Democratic	38
-	Bishop	Republican	39
-	J.Jackson	Democratic	37
-	Tarte	Republican	41
-	Tucker	Republican	35
-	Waddell	Democratic	40
-	Newton	Republican	36
-	Dunn	Republican	33
-	McInnis	Republican	25
-	Daniel	Republican	46
-	Ballard	Republican	45
-	Wells	Republican	42
-	Randleman	Republican	30
-	Barrett	Republican	34
-	Lowe	Democratic	32
-	Krawiec	Republican	31
-	Berger	Republican	26
-	Britt	Republican	13
-	Clark	Democratic	21
-	Meredith	Republican	19
-	Rabin	Republican	12
-	Rabon	Republican	8

Plan:	SRN-2	Administrator:	
Type:		User:	

District	Name	Party	Previous District
-	Lee	Republican	9
-	B.Jackson	Republican	10
-	Pate	Republican	7
-	McKissick	Democratic	20
-	Foushee	Democratic	23
-	Woodard	Democratic	22
-	Barringer	Republican	17
-	Alexander	Republican	15
-	Chaudhuri	Democratic	16
-	Blue	Democratic	14
-	Barefoot	Republican	18
-	Horner	Republican	11
-	Bryant	Democratic	4
-	Smith-Ingram	Democratic	3
-	Brown	Republican	6
-	D.Davis	Democratic	5
-	Sanderson	Republican	2
-	Cook	Republican	1
24	Gunn	Republican	24
26	Tillman	Republican	29
27	Wade	Republican	27
28	Robinson	Democratic	28

Number of Incumbents in District with more than one Incumbent:	46	
Number of Districts with No Incumbent:	0	
Number of Districts with Incumbents of more than one party:	1	
Number of Districts with Paired Democrats:	0	
Number of Districts with Paired Republicans:	0	

Plan Name: SRN-2
Plan Type:
Date: 08/28/2017
Time: 03:55:05PM
Administrator:

Measures of Compactness

08/28/2017

Sum	N/A
Min	0.26
Max	0.58
Mean	0.41
Std. Dev.	0.12

DISTRICT	Reock
	0.26
24	0.39
26	0.58
27	0.47
28	0.34

Plan Name: SRN-2
Plan Type:
Date: 08/28/2017
Time: 03:56:00PM
Administrator:

Measures of Compactness

08/28/2017

Sum	N/A
Min	0.16
Max	0.56
Mean	0.31
Std. Dev.	0.16

DISTRICT	Polsby-Popper
	0.27
24	0.35
26	0.56
27	0.22
28	0.16

SRN-2 Guilford Amend 3rd Read: County - District

County	District	Total County Pop	Total District Pop	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Alamance	24	151,131	198,086	151,075	99.96%	76.27%
	Unassigned	151,131	8,754,250	56	0.04%	0.00%
Alexander	Unassigned	37,198	8,754,250	37,198	100.00%	0.42%
Alleghany	Unassigned	11,155	8,754,250	11,155	100.00%	0.13%
Anson	Unassigned	26,948	8,754,250	26,948	100.00%	0.31%
Ashe	Unassigned	27,281	8,754,250	27,281	100.00%	0.31%
Avery	Unassigned	17,797	8,754,250	17,797	100.00%	0.20%
Beaufort	Unassigned	47,759	8,754,250	47,759	100.00%	0.55%
Bertie	Unassigned	21,282	8,754,250	21,282	100.00%	0.24%
Bladen	Unassigned	35,190	8,754,250	35,190	100.00%	0.40%
Brunswick	Unassigned	107,431	8,754,250	107,431	100.00%	1.23%
Buncombe	Unassigned	238,318	8,754,250	238,318	100.00%	2.72%
Burke	Unassigned	90,912	8,754,250	90,912	100.00%	1.04%
Cabarrus	Unassigned	178,011	8,754,250	178,011	100.00%	2.03%
Caldwell	Unassigned	83,029	8,754,250	83,029	100.00%	0.95%
Camden	Unassigned	9,980	8,754,250	9,980	100.00%	0.11%
Carteret	Unassigned	66,469	8,754,250	66,469	100.00%	0.76%
Caswell	Unassigned	23,719	8,754,250	23,719	100.00%	0.27%
Catawba	Unassigned	154,358	8,754,250	154,358	100.00%	1.76%
Chatham	Unassigned	63,505	8,754,250	63,505	100.00%	0.73%
Cherokee	Unassigned	27,444	8,754,250	27,444	100.00%	0.31%
Chowan	Unassigned	14,793	8,754,250	14,793	100.00%	0.17%
Clay	Unassigned	10,587	8,754,250	10,587	100.00%	0.12%
Cleveland	Unassigned	98,078	8,754,250	98,078	100.00%	1.12%
Columbus	Unassigned	58,098	8,754,250	58,098	100.00%	0.66%
Craven	Unassigned	103,505	8,754,250	103,505	100.00%	1.18%
Cumberland	Unassigned	319,431	8,754,250	319,431	100.00%	3.65%
Currituck	Unassigned	23,547	8,754,250	23,547	100.00%	0.27%
Dare	Unassigned	33,920	8,754,250	33,920	100.00%	0.39%
Davidson	Unassigned	162,878	8,754,250	162,878	100.00%	1.86%
Davie	Unassigned	41,240	8,754,250	41,240	100.00%	0.47%
Duplin	Unassigned	58,505	8,754,250	58,505	100.00%	0.67%
Durham	Unassigned	267,587	8,754,250	267,587	100.00%	3.06%
Edgecombe	Unassigned	56,552	8,754,250	56,552	100.00%	0.65%
Forsyth	Unassigned	350,670	8,754,250	350,670	100.00%	4.01%
Franklin	Unassigned	60,619	8,754,250	60,619	100.00%	0.69%
Gaston	Unassigned	206,086	8,754,250	206,086	100.00%	2.35%
Gates	Unassigned	12,197	8,754,250	12,197	100.00%	0.14%
Graham	Unassigned	8,861	8,754,250	8,861	100.00%	0.10%
Granville	Unassigned	59,916	8,754,250	59,916	100.00%	0.68%
Greene	Unassigned	21,362	8,754,250	21,362	100.00%	0.24%
Guilford	24	488,406	198,086	47,011	9.63%	23.73%
	26	488,406	194,235	52,483	10.75%	27.02%
	27	488,406	193,307	193,307	39.58%	100.00%
	28	488,406	195,605	195,605	40.05%	100.00%
	Unassigned	488,406	8,754,250	0	0.00%	0.00%
Halifax	Unassigned	54,691	8,754,250	54,691	100.00%	0.62%
Harnett	Unassigned	114,678	8,754,250	114,678	100.00%	1.31%

District plan definition file: 'SRN-2.asc', modified 08/28/2017 04:00:00 PM
Data Source: 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File - North Carolina
Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG01|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

SRN-2 Guilford Amend 3rd Read: County - District

County	District	Total County Pop	Total District Pop	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Haywood	Unassigned	59,036	8,754,250	59,036	100.00%	0.67%
Henderson	Unassigned	106,740	8,754,250	106,740	100.00%	1.22%
Hertford	Unassigned	24,669	8,754,250	24,669	100.00%	0.28%
Hoke	Unassigned	46,952	8,754,250	46,952	100.00%	0.54%
Hyde	Unassigned	5,810	8,754,250	5,810	100.00%	0.07%
Iredell	Unassigned	159,437	8,754,250	159,437	100.00%	1.82%
Jackson	Unassigned	40,271	8,754,250	40,271	100.00%	0.46%
Johnston	Unassigned	168,878	8,754,250	168,878	100.00%	1.93%
Jones	Unassigned	10,153	8,754,250	10,153	100.00%	0.12%
Lee	Unassigned	57,866	8,754,250	57,866	100.00%	0.66%
Lenoir	Unassigned	59,495	8,754,250	59,495	100.00%	0.68%
Lincoln	Unassigned	78,265	8,754,250	78,265	100.00%	0.89%
Macon	Unassigned	33,922	8,754,250	33,922	100.00%	0.39%
Madison	Unassigned	20,764	8,754,250	20,764	100.00%	0.24%
Martin	Unassigned	24,505	8,754,250	24,505	100.00%	0.28%
McDowell	Unassigned	44,996	8,754,250	44,996	100.00%	0.51%
Mecklenburg	Unassigned	919,628	8,754,250	919,628	100.00%	10.50%
Mitchell	Unassigned	15,579	8,754,250	15,579	100.00%	0.18%
Montgomery	Unassigned	27,798	8,754,250	27,798	100.00%	0.32%
Moore	Unassigned	88,247	8,754,250	88,247	100.00%	1.01%
Nash	Unassigned	95,840	8,754,250	95,840	100.00%	1.09%
New Hanover	Unassigned	202,667	8,754,250	202,667	100.00%	2.32%
Northampton	Unassigned	22,099	8,754,250	22,099	100.00%	0.25%
Onslow	Unassigned	177,772	8,754,250	177,772	100.00%	2.03%
Orange	Unassigned	133,801	8,754,250	133,801	100.00%	1.53%
Pamlico	Unassigned	13,144	8,754,250	13,144	100.00%	0.15%
Pasquotank	Unassigned	40,661	8,754,250	40,661	100.00%	0.46%
Pender	Unassigned	52,217	8,754,250	52,217	100.00%	0.60%
Perquimans	Unassigned	13,453	8,754,250	13,453	100.00%	0.15%
Person	Unassigned	39,464	8,754,250	39,464	100.00%	0.45%
Pitt	Unassigned	168,148	8,754,250	168,148	100.00%	1.92%
Polk	Unassigned	20,510	8,754,250	20,510	100.00%	0.23%
Randolph	26	141,752	194,235	141,752	100.00%	72.98%
Richmond	Unassigned	46,639	8,754,250	46,639	100.00%	0.53%
Robeson	Unassigned	134,168	8,754,250	134,168	100.00%	1.53%
Rockingham	Unassigned	93,643	8,754,250	93,643	100.00%	1.07%
Rowan	Unassigned	138,428	8,754,250	138,428	100.00%	1.58%
Rutherford	Unassigned	67,810	8,754,250	67,810	100.00%	0.77%
Sampson	Unassigned	63,431	8,754,250	63,431	100.00%	0.72%
Scotland	Unassigned	36,157	8,754,250	36,157	100.00%	0.41%
Stanly	Unassigned	60,585	8,754,250	60,585	100.00%	0.69%
Stokes	Unassigned	47,401	8,754,250	47,401	100.00%	0.54%
Surry	Unassigned	73,673	8,754,250	73,673	100.00%	0.84%
Swain	Unassigned	13,981	8,754,250	13,981	100.00%	0.16%
Transylvania	Unassigned	33,090	8,754,250	33,090	100.00%	0.38%
Tyrrell	Unassigned	4,407	8,754,250	4,407	100.00%	0.05%
Union	Unassigned	201,292	8,754,250	201,292	100.00%	2.30%
Vance	Unassigned	45,422	8,754,250	45,422	100.00%	0.52%
Wake	Unassigned	900,993	8,754,250	900,993	100.00%	10.29%

District plan definition file: 'SRN-2.asc', modified 08/28/2017 04:00:00 PM

Data Source: 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File - North Carolina

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG01|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

SRN-2 Guilford Amend 3rd Read: County - District

County	District	Total County Pop	Total District Pop	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Warren	Unassigned	20,972	8,754,250	20,972	100.00%	0.24%
Washington	Unassigned	13,228	8,754,250	13,228	100.00%	0.15%
Watauga	Unassigned	51,079	8,754,250	51,079	100.00%	0.58%
Wayne	Unassigned	122,623	8,754,250	122,623	100.00%	1.40%
Wilkes	Unassigned	69,340	8,754,250	69,340	100.00%	0.79%
Wilson	Unassigned	81,234	8,754,250	81,234	100.00%	0.93%
Yadkin	Unassigned	38,406	8,754,250	38,406	100.00%	0.44%
Yancey	Unassigned	17,818	8,754,250	17,818	100.00%	0.20%
			Total:	**9,535,483**		

SRN-2 Guilford Amend 3rd Read: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Aberdeen	Unassigned	6,350	8,754,250	6,350	100.00%	0.07%
Ahoskie	Unassigned	5,039	8,754,250	5,039	100.00%	0.06%
Alamance	24	951	198,086	951	100.00%	0.48%
Albemarle	Unassigned	15,903	8,754,250	15,903	100.00%	0.18%
Alliance	Unassigned	776	8,754,250	776	100.00%	0.01%
Andrews	Unassigned	1,781	8,754,250	1,781	100.00%	0.02%
Angier (Harnett)	Unassigned	4,247	8,754,250	4,247	100.00%	0.05%
Angier (Wake)	Unassigned	103	8,754,250	103	100.00%	0.00%
Ansonville	Unassigned	631	8,754,250	631	100.00%	0.01%
Apex	Unassigned	37,476	8,754,250	37,476	100.00%	0.43%
Arapahoe	Unassigned	556	8,754,250	556	100.00%	0.01%
Archdale (Guilford)	26	333	194,235	333	100.00%	0.17%
Archdale (Randolph)	26	11,082	194,235	11,082	100.00%	5.71%
Archer Lodge	Unassigned	4,292	8,754,250	4,292	100.00%	0.05%
Asheboro	26	25,012	194,235	25,012	100.00%	12.88%
Asheville	Unassigned	83,393	8,754,250	83,393	100.00%	0.95%
Askewville	Unassigned	241	8,754,250	241	100.00%	0.00%
Atkinson	Unassigned	299	8,754,250	299	100.00%	0.00%
Atlantic Beach	Unassigned	1,495	8,754,250	1,495	100.00%	0.02%
Aulander	Unassigned	895	8,754,250	895	100.00%	0.01%
Aurora	Unassigned	520	8,754,250	520	100.00%	0.01%
Autryville	Unassigned	196	8,754,250	196	100.00%	0.00%
Ayden	Unassigned	4,932	8,754,250	4,932	100.00%	0.06%
Badin	Unassigned	1,974	8,754,250	1,974	100.00%	0.02%
Bailey	Unassigned	569	8,754,250	569	100.00%	0.01%
Bakersville	Unassigned	464	8,754,250	464	100.00%	0.01%
Bald Head Island	Unassigned	158	8,754,250	158	100.00%	0.00%
Banner Elk	Unassigned	1,028	8,754,250	1,028	100.00%	0.01%
Bath	Unassigned	249	8,754,250	249	100.00%	0.00%
Bayboro	Unassigned	1,263	8,754,250	1,263	100.00%	0.01%
Bear Grass	Unassigned	73	8,754,250	73	100.00%	0.00%
Beaufort	Unassigned	4,039	8,754,250	4,039	100.00%	0.05%
Beech Mountain (Avery)	Unassigned	24	8,754,250	24	100.00%	0.00%
Beech Mountain (Watauga)	Unassigned	296	8,754,250	296	100.00%	0.00%
Belhaven	Unassigned	1,688	8,754,250	1,688	100.00%	0.02%
Belmont	Unassigned	10,076	8,754,250	10,076	100.00%	0.12%
Belville	Unassigned	1,936	8,754,250	1,936	100.00%	0.02%
Belwood	Unassigned	950	8,754,250	950	100.00%	0.01%
Benson (Harnett)	Unassigned	0	8,754,250	0	0.00%	0.00%
Benson (Johnston)	Unassigned	3,311	8,754,250	3,311	100.00%	0.04%
Bermuda Run	Unassigned	1,725	8,754,250	1,725	100.00%	0.02%
Bessemer City	Unassigned	5,340	8,754,250	5,340	100.00%	0.06%
Bethania	Unassigned	328	8,754,250	328	100.00%	0.00%
Bethel	Unassigned	1,577	8,754,250	1,577	100.00%	0.02%
Beulaville	Unassigned	1,296	8,754,250	1,296	100.00%	0.01%
Biltmore Forest	Unassigned	1,343	8,754,250	1,343	100.00%	0.02%
Biscoe	Unassigned	1,700	8,754,250	1,700	100.00%	0.02%

District plan definition file: 'SRN-2.asc', modified 08/28/2017 04:00:00 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

SRN-2 Guilford Amend 3rd Read: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Black Creek	Unassigned	769	8,754,250	769	100.00%	0.01%
Black Mountain	Unassigned	7,848	8,754,250	7,848	100.00%	0.09%
Bladenboro	Unassigned	1,750	8,754,250	1,750	100.00%	0.02%
Blowing Rock (Caldwell)	Unassigned	49	8,754,250	49	100.00%	0.00%
Blowing Rock (Watauga)	Unassigned	1,192	8,754,250	1,192	100.00%	0.01%
Boardman	Unassigned	157	8,754,250	157	100.00%	0.00%
Bogue	Unassigned	684	8,754,250	684	100.00%	0.01%
Boiling Spring Lakes	Unassigned	5,372	8,754,250	5,372	100.00%	0.06%
Boiling Springs	Unassigned	4,647	8,754,250	4,647	100.00%	0.05%
Bolivia	Unassigned	143	8,754,250	143	100.00%	0.00%
Bolton	Unassigned	691	8,754,250	691	100.00%	0.01%
Boone	Unassigned	17,122	8,754,250	17,122	100.00%	0.20%
Boonville	Unassigned	1,222	8,754,250	1,222	100.00%	0.01%
Bostic	Unassigned	386	8,754,250	386	100.00%	0.00%
Brevard	Unassigned	7,609	8,754,250	7,609	100.00%	0.09%
Bridgeton	Unassigned	454	8,754,250	454	100.00%	0.01%
Broadway (Harnett)	Unassigned	25	8,754,250	25	100.00%	0.00%
Broadway (Lee)	Unassigned	1,204	8,754,250	1,204	100.00%	0.01%
Brookford	Unassigned	382	8,754,250	382	100.00%	0.00%
Brunswick	Unassigned	1,119	8,754,250	1,119	100.00%	0.01%
Bryson City	Unassigned	1,424	8,754,250	1,424	100.00%	0.02%
Bunn	Unassigned	344	8,754,250	344	100.00%	0.00%
Burgaw	Unassigned	3,872	8,754,250	3,872	100.00%	0.04%
Burlington (Alamance)	24	49,308	198,086	49,308	100.00%	24.89%
Burlington (Guilford)	24	655	198,086	655	100.00%	0.33%
Burnsville	Unassigned	1,693	8,754,250	1,693	100.00%	0.02%
Butner	Unassigned	7,591	8,754,250	7,591	100.00%	0.09%
Cajah's Mountain	Unassigned	2,823	8,754,250	2,823	100.00%	0.03%
Calabash	Unassigned	1,786	8,754,250	1,786	100.00%	0.02%
Calypso	Unassigned	538	8,754,250	538	100.00%	0.01%
Cameron	Unassigned	285	8,754,250	285	100.00%	0.00%
Candor	Unassigned	840	8,754,250	840	100.00%	0.01%
Canton	Unassigned	4,227	8,754,250	4,227	100.00%	0.05%
Cape Carteret	Unassigned	1,917	8,754,250	1,917	100.00%	0.02%
Carolina Beach	Unassigned	5,706	8,754,250	5,706	100.00%	0.07%
Carolina Shores	Unassigned	3,048	8,754,250	3,048	100.00%	0.03%
Carrboro	Unassigned	19,582	8,754,250	19,582	100.00%	0.22%
Carthage	Unassigned	2,205	8,754,250	2,205	100.00%	0.03%
Cary (Chatham)	Unassigned	1,422	8,754,250	1,422	100.00%	0.02%
Cary (Wake)	Unassigned	133,812	8,754,250	133,812	100.00%	1.53%
Casar	Unassigned	297	8,754,250	297	100.00%	0.00%
Castalia	Unassigned	268	8,754,250	268	100.00%	0.00%
Caswell Beach	Unassigned	398	8,754,250	398	100.00%	0.00%
Catawba	Unassigned	603	8,754,250	603	100.00%	0.01%
Cedar Point	Unassigned	1,279	8,754,250	1,279	100.00%	0.01%
Cedar Rock	Unassigned	300	8,754,250	300	100.00%	0.00%
Centerville	Unassigned	89	8,754,250	89	100.00%	0.00%

District plan definition file: 'SRN-2.asc', modified 08/28/2017 04:00:00 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

SRN-2 Guilford Amend 3rd Read: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Cerro Gordo	Unassigned	207	8,754,250	207	100.00%	0.00%
Chadbourn	Unassigned	1,856	8,754,250	1,856	100.00%	0.02%
Chapel Hill (Durham)	Unassigned	2,836	8,754,250	2,836	100.00%	0.03%
Chapel Hill (Orange)	Unassigned	54,397	8,754,250	54,397	100.00%	0.62%
Charlotte	Unassigned	731,424	8,754,250	731,424	100.00%	8.36%
Cherryville	Unassigned	5,760	8,754,250	5,760	100.00%	0.07%
Chimney Rock Village	Unassigned	113	8,754,250	113	100.00%	0.00%
China Grove	Unassigned	3,563	8,754,250	3,563	100.00%	0.04%
Chocowinity	Unassigned	820	8,754,250	820	100.00%	0.01%
Claremont	Unassigned	1,352	8,754,250	1,352	100.00%	0.02%
Clarkton	Unassigned	837	8,754,250	837	100.00%	0.01%
Clayton (Johnston)	Unassigned	16,116	8,754,250	16,116	100.00%	0.18%
Clayton (Wake)	Unassigned	0	8,754,250	0	0.00%	0.00%
Clemmons	Unassigned	18,627	8,754,250	18,627	100.00%	0.21%
Cleveland	Unassigned	871	8,754,250	871	100.00%	0.01%
Clinton	Unassigned	8,639	8,754,250	8,639	100.00%	0.10%
Clyde	Unassigned	1,223	8,754,250	1,223	100.00%	0.01%
Coats	Unassigned	2,112	8,754,250	2,112	100.00%	0.02%
Cofield	Unassigned	413	8,754,250	413	100.00%	0.00%
Colerain	Unassigned	204	8,754,250	204	100.00%	0.00%
Columbia	Unassigned	891	8,754,250	891	100.00%	0.01%
Columbus	Unassigned	999	8,754,250	999	100.00%	0.01%
Como	Unassigned	91	8,754,250	91	100.00%	0.00%
Concord	Unassigned	79,066	8,754,250	79,066	100.00%	0.90%
Conetoe	Unassigned	294	8,754,250	294	100.00%	0.00%
Connelly Springs	Unassigned	1,669	8,754,250	1,669	100.00%	0.02%
Conover	Unassigned	8,165	8,754,250	8,165	100.00%	0.09%
Conway	Unassigned	836	8,754,250	836	100.00%	0.01%
Cooleemee	Unassigned	960	8,754,250	960	100.00%	0.01%
Cornelius	Unassigned	24,866	8,754,250	24,866	100.00%	0.28%
Cove City	Unassigned	399	8,754,250	399	100.00%	0.00%
Cramerton	Unassigned	4,165	8,754,250	4,165	100.00%	0.05%
Creedmoor	Unassigned	4,124	8,754,250	4,124	100.00%	0.05%
Creswell	Unassigned	276	8,754,250	276	100.00%	0.00%
Crossnore	Unassigned	192	8,754,250	192	100.00%	0.00%
Dallas	Unassigned	4,488	8,754,250	4,488	100.00%	0.05%
Danbury	Unassigned	189	8,754,250	189	100.00%	0.00%
Davidson (Iredell)	Unassigned	294	8,754,250	294	100.00%	0.00%
Davidson (Mecklenburg)	Unassigned	10,650	8,754,250	10,650	100.00%	0.12%
Dellview	Unassigned	13	8,754,250	13	100.00%	0.00%
Denton	Unassigned	1,636	8,754,250	1,636	100.00%	0.02%
Dillsboro	Unassigned	232	8,754,250	232	100.00%	0.00%
Dobbins Heights	Unassigned	866	8,754,250	866	100.00%	0.01%
Dobson	Unassigned	1,586	8,754,250	1,586	100.00%	0.02%
Dortches	Unassigned	935	8,754,250	935	100.00%	0.01%
Dover	Unassigned	401	8,754,250	401	100.00%	0.00%
Drexel	Unassigned	1,858	8,754,250	1,858	100.00%	0.02%

SRN-2 Guilford Amend 3rd Read: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Dublin	Unassigned	338	8,754,250	338	100.00%	0.00%
Duck	Unassigned	369	8,754,250	369	100.00%	0.00%
Dunn	Unassigned	9,263	8,754,250	9,263	100.00%	0.11%
Durham (Durham)	Unassigned	228,300	8,754,250	228,300	100.00%	2.61%
Durham (Orange)	Unassigned	30	8,754,250	30	100.00%	0.00%
Durham (Wake)	Unassigned	0	8,754,250	0	0.00%	0.00%
Earl	Unassigned	260	8,754,250	260	100.00%	0.00%
East Arcadia	Unassigned	487	8,754,250	487	100.00%	0.01%
East Bend	Unassigned	612	8,754,250	612	100.00%	0.01%
East Laurinburg	Unassigned	300	8,754,250	300	100.00%	0.00%
East Spencer	Unassigned	1,534	8,754,250	1,534	100.00%	0.02%
Eastover	Unassigned	3,628	8,754,250	3,628	100.00%	0.04%
Eden	Unassigned	15,527	8,754,250	15,527	100.00%	0.18%
Edenton	Unassigned	5,004	8,754,250	5,004	100.00%	0.06%
Elizabeth City (Camden)	Unassigned	45	8,754,250	45	100.00%	0.00%
Elizabeth City (Pasquotank)	Unassigned	18,638	8,754,250	18,638	100.00%	0.21%
Elizabethtown	Unassigned	3,583	8,754,250	3,583	100.00%	0.04%
Elk Park	Unassigned	452	8,754,250	452	100.00%	0.01%
Elkin (Surry)	Unassigned	3,921	8,754,250	3,921	100.00%	0.04%
Elkin (Wilkes)	Unassigned	80	8,754,250	80	100.00%	0.00%
Ellenboro	Unassigned	873	8,754,250	873	100.00%	0.01%
Ellerbe	Unassigned	1,054	8,754,250	1,054	100.00%	0.01%
Elm City	Unassigned	1,298	8,754,250	1,298	100.00%	0.01%
Elon	24	9,419	198,086	9,419	100.00%	4.76%
Emerald Isle	Unassigned	3,655	8,754,250	3,655	100.00%	0.04%
Enfield	Unassigned	2,532	8,754,250	2,532	100.00%	0.03%
Erwin	Unassigned	4,405	8,754,250	4,405	100.00%	0.05%
Eureka	Unassigned	197	8,754,250	197	100.00%	0.00%
Everetts	Unassigned	164	8,754,250	164	100.00%	0.00%
Fair Bluff	Unassigned	951	8,754,250	951	100.00%	0.01%
Fairmont	Unassigned	2,663	8,754,250	2,663	100.00%	0.03%
Fairview	Unassigned	3,324	8,754,250	3,324	100.00%	0.04%
Faison (Duplin)	Unassigned	961	8,754,250	961	100.00%	0.01%
Faison (Sampson)	Unassigned	0	8,754,250	0	0.00%	0.00%
Faith	Unassigned	807	8,754,250	807	100.00%	0.01%
Falcon (Cumberland)	Unassigned	258	8,754,250	258	100.00%	0.00%
Falcon (Sampson)	Unassigned	0	8,754,250	0	0.00%	0.00%
Falkland	Unassigned	96	8,754,250	96	100.00%	0.00%
Fallston	Unassigned	607	8,754,250	607	100.00%	0.01%
Farmville	Unassigned	4,654	8,754,250	4,654	100.00%	0.05%
Fayetteville	Unassigned	200,564	8,754,250	200,564	100.00%	2.29%
Flat Rock	Unassigned	3,114	8,754,250	3,114	100.00%	0.04%
Fletcher	Unassigned	7,187	8,754,250	7,187	100.00%	0.08%
Forest City	Unassigned	7,476	8,754,250	7,476	100.00%	0.09%
Forest Hills	Unassigned	365	8,754,250	365	100.00%	0.00%
Fountain	Unassigned	427	8,754,250	427	100.00%	0.00%
Four Oaks	Unassigned	1,921	8,754,250	1,921	100.00%	0.02%

District plan definition file: 'SRN-2.asc', modified 08/28/2017 04:00:00 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

SRN-2 Guilford Amend 3rd Read: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Foxfire	Unassigned	902	8,754,250	902	100.00%	0.01%
Franklin	Unassigned	3,845	8,754,250	3,845	100.00%	0.04%
Franklinton	Unassigned	2,023	8,754,250	2,023	100.00%	0.02%
Franklinville	26	1,164	194,235	1,164	100.00%	0.60%
Fremont	Unassigned	1,255	8,754,250	1,255	100.00%	0.01%
Fuquay-Varina	Unassigned	17,937	8,754,250	17,937	100.00%	0.20%
Gamewell	Unassigned	4,051	8,754,250	4,051	100.00%	0.05%
Garland	Unassigned	625	8,754,250	625	100.00%	0.01%
Garner	Unassigned	25,745	8,754,250	25,745	100.00%	0.29%
Garysburg	Unassigned	1,057	8,754,250	1,057	100.00%	0.01%
Gaston	Unassigned	1,152	8,754,250	1,152	100.00%	0.01%
Gastonia	Unassigned	71,741	8,754,250	71,741	100.00%	0.82%
Gatesville	Unassigned	321	8,754,250	321	100.00%	0.00%
Gibson	Unassigned	540	8,754,250	540	100.00%	0.01%
Gibsonville (Alamance)	24	3,148	198,086	3,148	100.00%	1.59%
Gibsonville (Guilford)	24	3,262	198,086	3,262	100.00%	1.65%
Glen Alpine	Unassigned	1,517	8,754,250	1,517	100.00%	0.02%
Godwin	Unassigned	139	8,754,250	139	100.00%	0.00%
Goldsboro	Unassigned	36,437	8,754,250	36,437	100.00%	0.42%
Goldston	Unassigned	268	8,754,250	268	100.00%	0.00%
Graham	24	14,153	198,086	14,153	100.00%	7.14%
Grandfather	Unassigned	25	8,754,250	25	100.00%	0.00%
Granite Falls	Unassigned	4,722	8,754,250	4,722	100.00%	0.05%
Granite Quarry	Unassigned	2,930	8,754,250	2,930	100.00%	0.03%
Grantsboro	Unassigned	688	8,754,250	688	100.00%	0.01%
Green Level	24	2,100	198,086	2,100	100.00%	1.06%
Greenevers	Unassigned	634	8,754,250	634	100.00%	0.01%
Greensboro	24	269,666	198,086	7,023	2.60%	3.55%
	26	269,666	194,235	10,637	3.94%	5.48%
	27	269,666	193,307	83,404	30.93%	43.15%
	28	269,666	195,605	168,602	62.52%	86.20%
Greenville	Unassigned	84,554	8,754,250	84,554	100.00%	0.97%
Grifton (Lenoir)	Unassigned	186	8,754,250	186	100.00%	0.00%
Grifton (Pitt)	Unassigned	2,431	8,754,250	2,431	100.00%	0.03%
Grimesland	Unassigned	441	8,754,250	441	100.00%	0.01%
Grover	Unassigned	708	8,754,250	708	100.00%	0.01%
Halifax	Unassigned	234	8,754,250	234	100.00%	0.00%
Hamilton	Unassigned	408	8,754,250	408	100.00%	0.00%
Hamlet	Unassigned	6,495	8,754,250	6,495	100.00%	0.07%
Harmony	Unassigned	531	8,754,250	531	100.00%	0.01%
Harrells (Duplin)	Unassigned	23	8,754,250	23	100.00%	0.00%
Harrells (Sampson)	Unassigned	179	8,754,250	179	100.00%	0.00%
Harrellsville	Unassigned	106	8,754,250	106	100.00%	0.00%
Harrisburg	Unassigned	11,526	8,754,250	11,526	100.00%	0.13%
Hassell	Unassigned	84	8,754,250	84	100.00%	0.00%
Havelock	Unassigned	20,735	8,754,250	20,735	100.00%	0.24%
Haw River	24	2,298	198,086	2,298	100.00%	1.16%

District plan definition file: 'SRN-2.asc', modified 08/28/2017 04:00:00 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

SRN-2 Guilford Amend 3rd Read: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Hayesville	Unassigned	311	8,754,250	311	100.00%	0.00%
Hemby Bridge	Unassigned	1,520	8,754,250	1,520	100.00%	0.02%
Henderson	Unassigned	15,368	8,754,250	15,368	100.00%	0.18%
Hendersonville	Unassigned	13,137	8,754,250	13,137	100.00%	0.15%
Hertford	Unassigned	2,143	8,754,250	2,143	100.00%	0.02%
Hickory (Burke)	Unassigned	66	8,754,250	66	100.00%	0.00%
Hickory (Caldwell)	Unassigned	18	8,754,250	18	100.00%	0.00%
Hickory (Catawba)	Unassigned	39,926	8,754,250	39,926	100.00%	0.46%
High Point (Davidson)	Unassigned	5,310	8,754,250	5,310	100.00%	0.06%
High Point (Forsyth)	Unassigned	8	8,754,250	8	100.00%	0.00%
High Point (Guilford)	26	99,042	194,235	13,140	13.27%	6.77%
	27	99,042	193,307	74,266	74.98%	38.42%
	28	99,042	195,605	11,636	11.75%	5.95%
High Point (Randolph)	26	11	194,235	11	100.00%	0.01%
High Shoals	Unassigned	696	8,754,250	696	100.00%	0.01%
Highlands (Jackson)	Unassigned	4	8,754,250	4	100.00%	0.00%
Highlands (Macon)	Unassigned	920	8,754,250	920	100.00%	0.01%
Hildebran	Unassigned	2,023	8,754,250	2,023	100.00%	0.02%
Hillsborough	Unassigned	6,087	8,754,250	6,087	100.00%	0.07%
Hobgood	Unassigned	348	8,754,250	348	100.00%	0.00%
Hoffman	Unassigned	588	8,754,250	588	100.00%	0.01%
Holden Beach	Unassigned	575	8,754,250	575	100.00%	0.01%
Holly Ridge	Unassigned	1,268	8,754,250	1,268	100.00%	0.01%
Holly Springs	Unassigned	24,661	8,754,250	24,661	100.00%	0.28%
Hookerton	Unassigned	409	8,754,250	409	100.00%	0.00%
Hope Mills	Unassigned	15,176	8,754,250	15,176	100.00%	0.17%
Hot Springs	Unassigned	560	8,754,250	560	100.00%	0.01%
Hudson	Unassigned	3,776	8,754,250	3,776	100.00%	0.04%
Huntersville	Unassigned	46,773	8,754,250	46,773	100.00%	0.53%
Indian Beach	Unassigned	112	8,754,250	112	100.00%	0.00%
Indian Trail	Unassigned	33,518	8,754,250	33,518	100.00%	0.38%
Jackson	Unassigned	513	8,754,250	513	100.00%	0.01%
Jacksonville	Unassigned	70,145	8,754,250	70,145	100.00%	0.80%
Jamestown	27	3,382	193,307	3,374	99.76%	1.75%
	28	3,382	195,605	8	0.24%	0.00%
Jamesville	Unassigned	491	8,754,250	491	100.00%	0.01%
Jefferson	Unassigned	1,611	8,754,250	1,611	100.00%	0.02%
Jonesville	Unassigned	2,285	8,754,250	2,285	100.00%	0.03%
Kannapolis (Cabarrus)	Unassigned	33,194	8,754,250	33,194	100.00%	0.38%
Kannapolis (Rowan)	Unassigned	9,431	8,754,250	9,431	100.00%	0.11%
Kelford	Unassigned	251	8,754,250	251	100.00%	0.00%
Kenansville	Unassigned	855	8,754,250	855	100.00%	0.01%
Kenly (Johnston)	Unassigned	1,176	8,754,250	1,176	100.00%	0.01%
Kenly (Wilson)	Unassigned	163	8,754,250	163	100.00%	0.00%
Kernersville (Forsyth)	Unassigned	23,071	8,754,250	23,071	100.00%	0.26%
Kernersville (Guilford)	27	52	193,307	52	100.00%	0.03%
Kill Devil Hills	Unassigned	6,683	8,754,250	6,683	100.00%	0.08%

District plan definition file: 'SRN-2.asc', modified 08/28/2017 04:00:00 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

SRN-2 Guilford Amend 3rd Read: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
King (Forsyth)	Unassigned	619	8,754,250	619	100.00%	0.01%
King (Stokes)	Unassigned	6,285	8,754,250	6,285	100.00%	0.07%
Kings Mountain (Cleveland)	Unassigned	9,242	8,754,250	9,242	100.00%	0.11%
Kings Mountain (Gaston)	Unassigned	1,054	8,754,250	1,054	100.00%	0.01%
Kingstown	Unassigned	681	8,754,250	681	100.00%	0.01%
Kinston	Unassigned	21,677	8,754,250	21,677	100.00%	0.25%
Kittrell	Unassigned	467	8,754,250	467	100.00%	0.01%
Kitty Hawk	Unassigned	3,272	8,754,250	3,272	100.00%	0.04%
Knightdale	Unassigned	11,401	8,754,250	11,401	100.00%	0.13%
Kure Beach	Unassigned	2,012	8,754,250	2,012	100.00%	0.02%
La Grange	Unassigned	2,873	8,754,250	2,873	100.00%	0.03%
Lake Lure	Unassigned	1,192	8,754,250	1,192	100.00%	0.01%
Lake Park	Unassigned	3,422	8,754,250	3,422	100.00%	0.04%
Lake Santeetlah	Unassigned	45	8,754,250	45	100.00%	0.00%
Lake Waccamaw	Unassigned	1,480	8,754,250	1,480	100.00%	0.02%
Landis	Unassigned	3,109	8,754,250	3,109	100.00%	0.04%
Lansing	Unassigned	158	8,754,250	158	100.00%	0.00%
Lasker	Unassigned	122	8,754,250	122	100.00%	0.00%
Lattimore	Unassigned	488	8,754,250	488	100.00%	0.01%
Laurel Park	Unassigned	2,180	8,754,250	2,180	100.00%	0.02%
Laurinburg	Unassigned	15,962	8,754,250	15,962	100.00%	0.18%
Lawndale	Unassigned	606	8,754,250	606	100.00%	0.01%
Leggett	Unassigned	60	8,754,250	60	100.00%	0.00%
Leland	Unassigned	13,527	8,754,250	13,527	100.00%	0.15%
Lenoir	Unassigned	18,228	8,754,250	18,228	100.00%	0.21%
Lewiston Woodville	Unassigned	549	8,754,250	549	100.00%	0.01%
Lewisville	Unassigned	12,639	8,754,250	12,639	100.00%	0.14%
Lexington	Unassigned	18,931	8,754,250	18,931	100.00%	0.22%
Liberty	26	2,656	194,235	2,656	100.00%	1.37%
Lilesville	Unassigned	536	8,754,250	536	100.00%	0.01%
Lillington	Unassigned	3,194	8,754,250	3,194	100.00%	0.04%
Lincolnton	Unassigned	10,486	8,754,250	10,486	100.00%	0.12%
Linden	Unassigned	130	8,754,250	130	100.00%	0.00%
Littleton	Unassigned	674	8,754,250	674	100.00%	0.01%
Locust (Cabarrus)	Unassigned	215	8,754,250	215	100.00%	0.00%
Locust (Stanly)	Unassigned	2,715	8,754,250	2,715	100.00%	0.03%
Long View (Burke)	Unassigned	752	8,754,250	752	100.00%	0.01%
Long View (Catawba)	Unassigned	4,119	8,754,250	4,119	100.00%	0.05%
Louisburg	Unassigned	3,359	8,754,250	3,359	100.00%	0.04%
Love Valley	Unassigned	90	8,754,250	90	100.00%	0.00%
Lowell	Unassigned	3,526	8,754,250	3,526	100.00%	0.04%
Lucama	Unassigned	1,108	8,754,250	1,108	100.00%	0.01%
Lumber Bridge	Unassigned	94	8,754,250	94	100.00%	0.00%
Lumberton	Unassigned	21,542	8,754,250	21,542	100.00%	0.25%
Macclesfield	Unassigned	471	8,754,250	471	100.00%	0.01%
Macon	Unassigned	119	8,754,250	119	100.00%	0.00%
Madison	Unassigned	2,246	8,754,250	2,246	100.00%	0.03%

District plan definition file: 'SRN-2.asc', modified 08/28/2017 04:00:00 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

SRN-2 Guilford Amend 3rd Read: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Maggie Valley	Unassigned	1,150	8,754,250	1,150	100.00%	0.01%
Magnolia	Unassigned	939	8,754,250	939	100.00%	0.01%
Maiden (Catawba)	Unassigned	3,308	8,754,250	3,308	100.00%	0.04%
Maiden (Lincoln)	Unassigned	2	8,754,250	2	100.00%	0.00%
Manteo	Unassigned	1,434	8,754,250	1,434	100.00%	0.02%
Marietta	Unassigned	175	8,754,250	175	100.00%	0.00%
Marion	Unassigned	7,838	8,754,250	7,838	100.00%	0.09%
Mars Hill	Unassigned	1,869	8,754,250	1,869	100.00%	0.02%
Marshall	Unassigned	872	8,754,250	872	100.00%	0.01%
Marshville	Unassigned	2,402	8,754,250	2,402	100.00%	0.03%
Marvin	Unassigned	5,579	8,754,250	5,579	100.00%	0.06%
Matthews	Unassigned	27,198	8,754,250	27,198	100.00%	0.31%
Maxton (Robeson)	Unassigned	2,230	8,754,250	2,230	100.00%	0.03%
Maxton (Scotland)	Unassigned	196	8,754,250	196	100.00%	0.00%
Mayodan	Unassigned	2,478	8,754,250	2,478	100.00%	0.03%
Maysville	Unassigned	1,019	8,754,250	1,019	100.00%	0.01%
McAdenville	Unassigned	651	8,754,250	651	100.00%	0.01%
McDonald	Unassigned	113	8,754,250	113	100.00%	0.00%
McFarlan	Unassigned	117	8,754,250	117	100.00%	0.00%
Mebane (Alamance)	24	9,600	198,086	9,600	100.00%	4.85%
	Unassigned	9,600	8,754,250	0	0.00%	0.00%
Mebane (Orange)	Unassigned	1,793	8,754,250	1,793	100.00%	0.02%
Mesic	Unassigned	220	8,754,250	220	100.00%	0.00%
Micro	Unassigned	441	8,754,250	441	100.00%	0.01%
Middleburg	Unassigned	133	8,754,250	133	100.00%	0.00%
Middlesex	Unassigned	822	8,754,250	822	100.00%	0.01%
Midland (Cabarrus)	Unassigned	3,073	8,754,250	3,073	100.00%	0.04%
Midland (Mecklenburg)	Unassigned	0	8,754,250	0	0.00%	0.00%
Midway	Unassigned	4,679	8,754,250	4,679	100.00%	0.05%
Mills River	Unassigned	6,802	8,754,250	6,802	100.00%	0.08%
Milton	Unassigned	166	8,754,250	166	100.00%	0.00%
Mineral Springs	Unassigned	2,639	8,754,250	2,639	100.00%	0.03%
Minnesott Beach	Unassigned	440	8,754,250	440	100.00%	0.01%
Mint Hill (Mecklenburg)	Unassigned	22,669	8,754,250	22,669	100.00%	0.26%
Mint Hill (Union)	Unassigned	53	8,754,250	53	100.00%	0.00%
Misenheimer	Unassigned	728	8,754,250	728	100.00%	0.01%
Mocksville	Unassigned	5,051	8,754,250	5,051	100.00%	0.06%
Momeyer	Unassigned	224	8,754,250	224	100.00%	0.00%
Monroe	Unassigned	32,797	8,754,250	32,797	100.00%	0.37%
Montreat	Unassigned	723	8,754,250	723	100.00%	0.01%
Mooresboro	Unassigned	311	8,754,250	311	100.00%	0.00%
Mooresville	Unassigned	32,711	8,754,250	32,711	100.00%	0.37%
Morehead City	Unassigned	8,661	8,754,250	8,661	100.00%	0.10%
Morganton	Unassigned	16,918	8,754,250	16,918	100.00%	0.19%
Morrisville (Durham)	Unassigned	0	8,754,250	0	0.00%	0.00%
Morrisville (Wake)	Unassigned	18,576	8,754,250	18,576	100.00%	0.21%
Morven	Unassigned	511	8,754,250	511	100.00%	0.01%

District plan definition file: 'SRN-2.asc', modified 08/28/2017 04:00:00 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

SRN-2 Guilford Amend 3rd Read: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Mount Airy	Unassigned	10,388	8,754,250	10,388	100.00%	0.12%
Mount Gilead	Unassigned	1,181	8,754,250	1,181	100.00%	0.01%
Mount Holly	Unassigned	13,656	8,754,250	13,656	100.00%	0.16%
Mount Olive (Duplin)	Unassigned	51	8,754,250	51	100.00%	0.00%
Mount Olive (Wayne)	Unassigned	4,538	8,754,250	4,538	100.00%	0.05%
Mount Pleasant	Unassigned	1,652	8,754,250	1,652	100.00%	0.02%
Murfreesboro	Unassigned	2,835	8,754,250	2,835	100.00%	0.03%
Murphy	Unassigned	1,627	8,754,250	1,627	100.00%	0.02%
Nags Head	Unassigned	2,757	8,754,250	2,757	100.00%	0.03%
Nashville	Unassigned	5,352	8,754,250	5,352	100.00%	0.06%
Navassa	Unassigned	1,505	8,754,250	1,505	100.00%	0.02%
New Bern	Unassigned	29,524	8,754,250	29,524	100.00%	0.34%
New London	Unassigned	600	8,754,250	600	100.00%	0.01%
Newland	Unassigned	698	8,754,250	698	100.00%	0.01%
Newport	Unassigned	4,150	8,754,250	4,150	100.00%	0.05%
Newton	Unassigned	12,968	8,754,250	12,968	100.00%	0.15%
Newton Grove	Unassigned	569	8,754,250	569	100.00%	0.01%
Norlina	Unassigned	1,118	8,754,250	1,118	100.00%	0.01%
Norman	Unassigned	138	8,754,250	138	100.00%	0.00%
North Topsail Beach	Unassigned	743	8,754,250	743	100.00%	0.01%
North Wilkesboro	Unassigned	4,245	8,754,250	4,245	100.00%	0.05%
Northwest	Unassigned	735	8,754,250	735	100.00%	0.01%
Norwood	Unassigned	2,379	8,754,250	2,379	100.00%	0.03%
Oak City	Unassigned	317	8,754,250	317	100.00%	0.00%
Oak Island	Unassigned	6,783	8,754,250	6,783	100.00%	0.08%
Oak Ridge	27	6,185	193,307	6,185	100.00%	3.20%
Oakboro	Unassigned	1,859	8,754,250	1,859	100.00%	0.02%
Ocean Isle Beach	Unassigned	550	8,754,250	550	100.00%	0.01%
Old Fort	Unassigned	908	8,754,250	908	100.00%	0.01%
Oriental	Unassigned	900	8,754,250	900	100.00%	0.01%
Orrum	Unassigned	91	8,754,250	91	100.00%	0.00%
Ossipee	24	543	198,086	543	100.00%	0.27%
Oxford	Unassigned	8,461	8,754,250	8,461	100.00%	0.10%
Pantego	Unassigned	179	8,754,250	179	100.00%	0.00%
Parkton	Unassigned	436	8,754,250	436	100.00%	0.00%
Parmele	Unassigned	278	8,754,250	278	100.00%	0.00%
Patterson Springs	Unassigned	622	8,754,250	622	100.00%	0.01%
Peachland	Unassigned	437	8,754,250	437	100.00%	0.00%
Peletier	Unassigned	644	8,754,250	644	100.00%	0.01%
Pembroke	Unassigned	2,973	8,754,250	2,973	100.00%	0.03%
Pikeville	Unassigned	678	8,754,250	678	100.00%	0.01%
Pilot Mountain	Unassigned	1,477	8,754,250	1,477	100.00%	0.02%
Pine Knoll Shores	Unassigned	1,339	8,754,250	1,339	100.00%	0.02%
Pine Level	Unassigned	1,700	8,754,250	1,700	100.00%	0.02%
Pinebluff	Unassigned	1,337	8,754,250	1,337	100.00%	0.02%
Pinehurst	Unassigned	13,124	8,754,250	13,124	100.00%	0.15%
Pinetops	Unassigned	1,374	8,754,250	1,374	100.00%	0.02%

District plan definition file: 'SRN-2.asc', modified 08/28/2017 04:00:00 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

SRN-2 Guilford Amend 3rd Read: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Pineville	Unassigned	7,479	8,754,250	7,479	100.00%	0.09%
Pink Hill	Unassigned	552	8,754,250	552	100.00%	0.01%
Pittsboro	Unassigned	3,743	8,754,250	3,743	100.00%	0.04%
Pleasant Garden	26	4,489	194,235	4,489	100.00%	2.31%
Plymouth	Unassigned	3,878	8,754,250	3,878	100.00%	0.04%
Polkton	Unassigned	3,375	8,754,250	3,375	100.00%	0.04%
Polkville	Unassigned	545	8,754,250	545	100.00%	0.01%
Pollocksville	Unassigned	311	8,754,250	311	100.00%	0.00%
Powellsville	Unassigned	276	8,754,250	276	100.00%	0.00%
Princeton	Unassigned	1,194	8,754,250	1,194	100.00%	0.01%
Princeville	Unassigned	2,082	8,754,250	2,082	100.00%	0.02%
Proctorville	Unassigned	117	8,754,250	117	100.00%	0.00%
Raeford	Unassigned	4,611	8,754,250	4,611	100.00%	0.05%
Raleigh (Durham)	Unassigned	1,067	8,754,250	1,067	100.00%	0.01%
Raleigh (Wake)	Unassigned	402,825	8,754,250	402,825	100.00%	4.60%
Ramseur	26	1,692	194,235	1,692	100.00%	0.87%
Randleman	26	4,113	194,235	4,113	100.00%	2.12%
Ranlo	Unassigned	3,434	8,754,250	3,434	100.00%	0.04%
Raynham	Unassigned	72	8,754,250	72	100.00%	0.00%
Red Cross	Unassigned	742	8,754,250	742	100.00%	0.01%
Red Oak	Unassigned	3,430	8,754,250	3,430	100.00%	0.04%
Red Springs (Hoke)	Unassigned	0	8,754,250	0	0.00%	0.00%
Red Springs (Robeson)	Unassigned	3,428	8,754,250	3,428	100.00%	0.04%
Reidsville	Unassigned	14,520	8,754,250	14,520	100.00%	0.17%
Rennert	Unassigned	383	8,754,250	383	100.00%	0.00%
Rhodhiss (Burke)	Unassigned	700	8,754,250	700	100.00%	0.01%
Rhodhiss (Caldwell)	Unassigned	370	8,754,250	370	100.00%	0.00%
Rich Square	Unassigned	958	8,754,250	958	100.00%	0.01%
Richfield	Unassigned	613	8,754,250	613	100.00%	0.01%
Richlands	Unassigned	1,520	8,754,250	1,520	100.00%	0.02%
River Bend	Unassigned	3,119	8,754,250	3,119	100.00%	0.04%
Roanoke Rapids	Unassigned	15,754	8,754,250	15,754	100.00%	0.18%
Robbins	Unassigned	1,097	8,754,250	1,097	100.00%	0.01%
Robbinsville	Unassigned	620	8,754,250	620	100.00%	0.01%
Robersonville	Unassigned	1,488	8,754,250	1,488	100.00%	0.02%
Rockingham	Unassigned	9,558	8,754,250	9,558	100.00%	0.11%
Rockwell	Unassigned	2,108	8,754,250	2,108	100.00%	0.02%
Rocky Mount (Edgecombe)	Unassigned	17,524	8,754,250	17,524	100.00%	0.20%
Rocky Mount (Nash)	Unassigned	39,953	8,754,250	39,953	100.00%	0.46%
Rolesville	Unassigned	3,786	8,754,250	3,786	100.00%	0.04%
Ronda	Unassigned	417	8,754,250	417	100.00%	0.00%
Roper	Unassigned	611	8,754,250	611	100.00%	0.01%
Rose Hill	Unassigned	1,626	8,754,250	1,626	100.00%	0.02%
Roseboro	Unassigned	1,191	8,754,250	1,191	100.00%	0.01%
Rosman	Unassigned	576	8,754,250	576	100.00%	0.01%
Rowland	Unassigned	1,037	8,754,250	1,037	100.00%	0.01%
Roxboro	Unassigned	8,362	8,754,250	8,362	100.00%	0.10%

District plan definition file: 'SRN-2.asc', modified 08/28/2017 04:00:00 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

SRN-2 Guilford Amend 3rd Read: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Roxobel	Unassigned	240	8,754,250	240	100.00%	0.00%
Rural Hall	Unassigned	2,937	8,754,250	2,937	100.00%	0.03%
Ruth	Unassigned	440	8,754,250	440	100.00%	0.01%
Rutherford College	Unassigned	1,341	8,754,250	1,341	100.00%	0.02%
Rutherfordton	Unassigned	4,213	8,754,250	4,213	100.00%	0.05%
Salemburg	Unassigned	435	8,754,250	435	100.00%	0.00%
Salisbury	Unassigned	33,662	8,754,250	33,662	100.00%	0.38%
Saluda (Henderson)	Unassigned	12	8,754,250	12	100.00%	0.00%
Saluda (Polk)	Unassigned	701	8,754,250	701	100.00%	0.01%
Sandy Creek	Unassigned	260	8,754,250	260	100.00%	0.00%
Sandyfield	Unassigned	447	8,754,250	447	100.00%	0.01%
Sanford	Unassigned	28,094	8,754,250	28,094	100.00%	0.32%
Saratoga	Unassigned	408	8,754,250	408	100.00%	0.00%
Sawmills	Unassigned	5,240	8,754,250	5,240	100.00%	0.06%
Scotland Neck	Unassigned	2,059	8,754,250	2,059	100.00%	0.02%
Seaboard	Unassigned	632	8,754,250	632	100.00%	0.01%
Seagrove	26	228	194,235	228	100.00%	0.12%
Sedalia	24	623	198,086	623	100.00%	0.31%
Selma	Unassigned	6,073	8,754,250	6,073	100.00%	0.07%
Seven Devils (Avery)	Unassigned	28	8,754,250	28	100.00%	0.00%
Seven Devils (Watauga)	Unassigned	164	8,754,250	164	100.00%	0.00%
Seven Springs	Unassigned	110	8,754,250	110	100.00%	0.00%
Severn	Unassigned	276	8,754,250	276	100.00%	0.00%
Shallotte	Unassigned	3,675	8,754,250	3,675	100.00%	0.04%
Sharpsburg (Edgecombe)	Unassigned	209	8,754,250	209	100.00%	0.00%
Sharpsburg (Nash)	Unassigned	1,252	8,754,250	1,252	100.00%	0.01%
Sharpsburg (Wilson)	Unassigned	563	8,754,250	563	100.00%	0.01%
Shelby	Unassigned	20,323	8,754,250	20,323	100.00%	0.23%
Siler City	Unassigned	7,887	8,754,250	7,887	100.00%	0.09%
Simpson	Unassigned	416	8,754,250	416	100.00%	0.00%
Sims	Unassigned	282	8,754,250	282	100.00%	0.00%
Smithfield	Unassigned	10,966	8,754,250	10,966	100.00%	0.13%
Snow Hill	Unassigned	1,595	8,754,250	1,595	100.00%	0.02%
Southern Pines	Unassigned	12,334	8,754,250	12,334	100.00%	0.14%
Southern Shores	Unassigned	2,714	8,754,250	2,714	100.00%	0.03%
Southport	Unassigned	2,833	8,754,250	2,833	100.00%	0.03%
Sparta	Unassigned	1,770	8,754,250	1,770	100.00%	0.02%
Speed	Unassigned	80	8,754,250	80	100.00%	0.00%
Spencer	Unassigned	3,267	8,754,250	3,267	100.00%	0.04%
Spencer Mountain	Unassigned	37	8,754,250	37	100.00%	0.00%
Spindale	Unassigned	4,321	8,754,250	4,321	100.00%	0.05%
Spring Hope	Unassigned	1,320	8,754,250	1,320	100.00%	0.02%
Spring Lake	Unassigned	11,964	8,754,250	11,964	100.00%	0.14%
Spruce Pine	Unassigned	2,175	8,754,250	2,175	100.00%	0.02%
St. Helena	Unassigned	389	8,754,250	389	100.00%	0.00%
St. James	Unassigned	3,165	8,754,250	3,165	100.00%	0.04%
St. Pauls	Unassigned	2,035	8,754,250	2,035	100.00%	0.02%

District plan definition file: 'SRN-2.asc', modified 08/28/2017 04:00:00 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

SRN-2 Guilford Amend 3rd Read: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Staley	26	393	194,235	393	100.00%	0.20%
Stallings (Mecklenburg)	Unassigned	399	8,754,250	399	100.00%	0.00%
Stallings (Union)	Unassigned	13,432	8,754,250	13,432	100.00%	0.15%
Stanfield	Unassigned	1,486	8,754,250	1,486	100.00%	0.02%
Stanley	Unassigned	3,556	8,754,250	3,556	100.00%	0.04%
Stantonsburg	Unassigned	784	8,754,250	784	100.00%	0.01%
Star	Unassigned	876	8,754,250	876	100.00%	0.01%
Statesville	Unassigned	24,532	8,754,250	24,532	100.00%	0.28%
Stedman	Unassigned	1,028	8,754,250	1,028	100.00%	0.01%
Stem	Unassigned	463	8,754,250	463	100.00%	0.01%
Stokesdale	27	5,047	193,307	5,047	100.00%	2.61%
Stoneville	Unassigned	1,056	8,754,250	1,056	100.00%	0.01%
Stonewall	Unassigned	281	8,754,250	281	100.00%	0.00%
Stovall	Unassigned	418	8,754,250	418	100.00%	0.00%
Sugar Mountain	Unassigned	198	8,754,250	198	100.00%	0.00%
Summerfield	24	10,232	198,086	2,422	23.67%	1.22%
	27	10,232	193,307	7,810	76.33%	4.04%
Sunset Beach	Unassigned	3,572	8,754,250	3,572	100.00%	0.04%
Surf City (Onslow)	Unassigned	292	8,754,250	292	100.00%	0.00%
Surf City (Pender)	Unassigned	1,561	8,754,250	1,561	100.00%	0.02%
Swansboro	Unassigned	2,663	8,754,250	2,663	100.00%	0.03%
Swepsonville	24	1,154	198,086	1,154	100.00%	0.58%
Sylva	Unassigned	2,588	8,754,250	2,588	100.00%	0.03%
Tabor City	Unassigned	2,511	8,754,250	2,511	100.00%	0.03%
Tar Heel	Unassigned	117	8,754,250	117	100.00%	0.00%
Tarboro	Unassigned	11,415	8,754,250	11,415	100.00%	0.13%
Taylorsville	Unassigned	2,098	8,754,250	2,098	100.00%	0.02%
Taylortown	Unassigned	722	8,754,250	722	100.00%	0.01%
Teachey	Unassigned	376	8,754,250	376	100.00%	0.00%
Thomasville (Davidson)	Unassigned	26,493	8,754,250	26,493	100.00%	0.30%
Thomasville (Randolph)	26	264	194,235	264	100.00%	0.14%
Tobaccoville (Forsyth)	Unassigned	2,441	8,754,250	2,441	100.00%	0.03%
Tobaccoville (Stokes)	Unassigned	0	8,754,250	0	0.00%	0.00%
Topsail Beach	Unassigned	368	8,754,250	368	100.00%	0.00%
Trent Woods	Unassigned	4,155	8,754,250	4,155	100.00%	0.05%
Trenton	Unassigned	287	8,754,250	287	100.00%	0.00%
Trinity	26	6,614	194,235	6,614	100.00%	3.41%
Troutman	Unassigned	2,383	8,754,250	2,383	100.00%	0.03%
Troy	Unassigned	3,189	8,754,250	3,189	100.00%	0.04%
Tryon	Unassigned	1,646	8,754,250	1,646	100.00%	0.02%
Turkey	Unassigned	292	8,754,250	292	100.00%	0.00%
Unionville	Unassigned	5,929	8,754,250	5,929	100.00%	0.07%
Valdese	Unassigned	4,490	8,754,250	4,490	100.00%	0.05%
Vanceboro	Unassigned	1,005	8,754,250	1,005	100.00%	0.01%
Vandemere	Unassigned	254	8,754,250	254	100.00%	0.00%
Varnamtown	Unassigned	541	8,754,250	541	100.00%	0.01%
Vass	Unassigned	720	8,754,250	720	100.00%	0.01%

District plan definition file: 'SRN-2.asc', modified 08/28/2017 04:00:00 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

SRN-2 Guilford Amend 3rd Read: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Waco	Unassigned	321	8,754,250	321	100.00%	0.00%
Wade	Unassigned	556	8,754,250	556	100.00%	0.01%
Wadesboro	Unassigned	5,813	8,754,250	5,813	100.00%	0.07%
Wagram	Unassigned	840	8,754,250	840	100.00%	0.01%
Wake Forest (Franklin)	Unassigned	899	8,754,250	899	100.00%	0.01%
Wake Forest (Wake)	Unassigned	29,218	8,754,250	29,218	100.00%	0.33%
Walkertown	Unassigned	4,675	8,754,250	4,675	100.00%	0.05%
Wallace (Duplin)	Unassigned	3,880	8,754,250	3,880	100.00%	0.04%
Wallace (Pender)	Unassigned	0	8,754,250	0	0.00%	0.00%
Wallburg	Unassigned	3,047	8,754,250	3,047	100.00%	0.03%
Walnut Cove	Unassigned	1,425	8,754,250	1,425	100.00%	0.02%
Walnut Creek	Unassigned	835	8,754,250	835	100.00%	0.01%
Walstonburg	Unassigned	219	8,754,250	219	100.00%	0.00%
Warrenton	Unassigned	862	8,754,250	862	100.00%	0.01%
Warsaw	Unassigned	3,054	8,754,250	3,054	100.00%	0.03%
Washington	Unassigned	9,744	8,754,250	9,744	100.00%	0.11%
Washington Park	Unassigned	451	8,754,250	451	100.00%	0.01%
Watha	Unassigned	190	8,754,250	190	100.00%	0.00%
Waxhaw	Unassigned	9,859	8,754,250	9,859	100.00%	0.11%
Waynesville	Unassigned	9,869	8,754,250	9,869	100.00%	0.11%
Weaverville	Unassigned	3,120	8,754,250	3,120	100.00%	0.04%
Webster	Unassigned	363	8,754,250	363	100.00%	0.00%
Weddington (Mecklenburg)	Unassigned	7	8,754,250	7	100.00%	0.00%
Weddington (Union)	Unassigned	9,452	8,754,250	9,452	100.00%	0.11%
Weldon	Unassigned	1,655	8,754,250	1,655	100.00%	0.02%
Wendell	Unassigned	5,845	8,754,250	5,845	100.00%	0.07%
Wentworth	Unassigned	2,807	8,754,250	2,807	100.00%	0.03%
Wesley Chapel	Unassigned	7,463	8,754,250	7,463	100.00%	0.09%
West Jefferson	Unassigned	1,299	8,754,250	1,299	100.00%	0.01%
Whispering Pines	Unassigned	2,928	8,754,250	2,928	100.00%	0.03%
Whitakers (Edgecombe)	Unassigned	402	8,754,250	402	100.00%	0.00%
Whitakers (Nash)	Unassigned	342	8,754,250	342	100.00%	0.00%
White Lake	Unassigned	802	8,754,250	802	100.00%	0.01%
Whiteville	Unassigned	5,394	8,754,250	5,394	100.00%	0.06%
Whitsett	24	590	198,086	590	100.00%	0.30%
Wilkesboro	Unassigned	3,413	8,754,250	3,413	100.00%	0.04%
Williamston	Unassigned	5,511	8,754,250	5,511	100.00%	0.06%
Wilmington	Unassigned	106,476	8,754,250	106,476	100.00%	1.22%
Wilson	Unassigned	49,167	8,754,250	49,167	100.00%	0.56%
Wilson's Mills	Unassigned	2,277	8,754,250	2,277	100.00%	0.03%
Windsor	Unassigned	3,630	8,754,250	3,630	100.00%	0.04%
Winfall	Unassigned	594	8,754,250	594	100.00%	0.01%
Wingate	Unassigned	3,491	8,754,250	3,491	100.00%	0.04%
Winston-Salem	Unassigned	229,617	8,754,250	229,617	100.00%	2.62%
Winterville	Unassigned	9,269	8,754,250	9,269	100.00%	0.11%
Winton	Unassigned	769	8,754,250	769	100.00%	0.01%
Woodfin	Unassigned	6,123	8,754,250	6,123	100.00%	0.07%

District plan definition file: 'SRN-2.asc', modified 08/28/2017 04:00:00 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

SRN-2 Guilford Amend 3rd Read: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Woodland	Unassigned	809	8,754,250	809	100.00%	0.01%
Wrightsville Beach	Unassigned	2,477	8,754,250	2,477	100.00%	0.03%
Yadkinville	Unassigned	2,959	8,754,250	2,959	100.00%	0.03%
Yanceyville	Unassigned	2,039	8,754,250	2,039	100.00%	0.02%
Youngsville	Unassigned	1,157	8,754,250	1,157	100.00%	0.01%
Zebulon (Johnston)	Unassigned	0	8,754,250	0	0.00%	0.00%
Zebulon (Wake)	Unassigned	4,433	8,754,250	4,433	100.00%	0.05%
			Total:	**5,250,071**		

District plan definition file: 'SRN-2.asc', modified 08/28/2017 04:00:00 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

SRN-2 Guilford Amend 3rd Read: Split VTD Detail

County	VTD	District	Total VTD Pop	VTD Pop in District	Percent of VTD Pop in District
Alamance	09S	24	6,217	6,206	99.82%
		Unassigned	6,217	11	0.18%
	10N	24	4,386	4,386	100.00%
		Unassigned	4,386	0	0.00%
	10S	24	8,086	8,086	100.00%
		Unassigned	8,086	0	0.00%
	11	24	4,575	4,530	99.02%
		Unassigned	4,575	45	0.98%
Guilford	H24	27	3,047	3,047	100.00%
		Unassigned	3,047	0	0.00%
	SDRI	27	4,946	4,946	100.00%
		28	4,946	0	0.00%

District plan definition file: 'SRN-2.asc', modified 08/28/2017 04:00:00 PM

VTDs ('Voting Districts') derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG05|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

SRN-2 Guilford Amend 3rd Read: Population Deviation

District	2010 Pop	Ideal Pop	Deviation	Deviation %
24	198,086	190,710	7,376	3.87%
26	194,235	190,710	3,525	1.85%
27	193,307	190,710	2,597	1.36%
28	195,605	190,710	4,895	2.57%
Unassigned	8,754,250	190,710	8,563,540	4490.35%
Total:	**9,535,483**			

SRN-2 Guilford Amend 3rd Read: Population 2010, US Senate 2010, President 2012

	2010 Census		US Senate 2010: Marshall-Burr-Beitler								US President 2012: Obama-Romney-Johnson							
District	**Total Pop**	**18+ Pop**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Write-In**	**Write-In %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Write-In**	**Write-In %**
24	198,086	150,498	20,624	37.37%	33,208	60.17%	1,336	2.42%	25	0.05%	39,719	42.79%	52,095	56.13%	812	0.87%	189	0.20%
26	194,235	146,721	11,907	25.66%	33,213	71.59%	1,238	2.67%	36	0.08%	26,121	30.61%	58,244	68.25%	833	0.98%	139	0.16%
27	193,307	148,617	23,295	39.87%	33,934	58.08%	1,153	1.97%	44	0.08%	51,146	49.53%	50,969	49.36%	887	0.86%	263	0.25%
28	195,605	150,770	31,399	63.46%	17,245	34.85%	798	1.61%	40	0.08%	72,490	72.46%	26,534	26.52%	788	0.79%	223	0.22%
Unassigned	8,754,250	6,657,242	1,054,475	43.16%	1,336,482	54.70%	51,029	2.09%	1,118	0.05%	1,981,817	48.21%	2,079,511	50.58%	41,128	1.00%	8,705	0.21%
Totals:	**9,535,483**	**7,253,848**	**1,141,700**	**43.04%**	**1,454,082**	**54.82%**	**55,554**	**2.09%**	**1,263**	**0.05%**	**2,171,293**	**48.33%**	**2,267,353**	**50.47%**	**44,448**	**0.99%**	**9,519**	**0.21%**

Populations values derive from the 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File. Election results were provided by the NC State Board of Elections. Votes that could not be associated with a specific precinct were excluded. Reported statewide totals may therefore be marginally lower than official contest results.

SRN-2 Guilford Amend 3rd Read: Governor 2012, Lt Governor 2012, US Senate 2014

	Governor 2012: Dalton-McCrory-Howe								Lieutenant Governor 2012: Coleman-Forest				US Senate 2014: Tillis-Hagan-Haugh							
District	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Write-In**	**Write-In %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Write-In**	**Write-In %**
24	35,312	38.38%	54,742	59.50%	1,925	2.09%	26	0.03%	39,335	43.61%	50,859	56.39%	33,602	54.59%	25,649	41.67%	2,203	3.58%	96	0.16%
26	23,194	27.22%	60,384	70.86%	1,617	1.90%	15	0.02%	26,602	31.89%	56,808	68.11%	35,451	67.24%	15,164	28.76%	2,025	3.84%	85	0.16%
27	44,312	43.32%	55,659	54.42%	2,276	2.23%	33	0.03%	49,378	49.42%	50,529	50.58%	34,308	49.24%	33,634	48.27%	1,639	2.35%	92	0.13%
28	66,068	66.90%	30,434	30.82%	2,223	2.25%	33	0.03%	70,739	72.80%	26,436	27.20%	16,510	27.26%	42,607	70.35%	1,378	2.28%	72	0.12%
Unassigned	1,756,384	43.05%	2,236,005	54.80%	86,471	2.12%	1,084	0.03%	1,987,967	49.85%	2,000,259	50.15%	1,296,963	48.82%	1,253,249	47.17%	101,534	3.82%	4,906	0.18%
Totals:	**1,925,270**	**43.18%**	**2,437,224**	**54.67%**	**94,512**	**2.12%**	**1,191**	**0.03%**	**2,174,021**	**49.88%**	**2,184,891**	**50.12%**	**1,416,834**	**48.84%**	**1,370,303**	**47.23%**	**108,779**	**3.75%**	**5,251**	**0.18%**

SRN-2 Guilford Amend 3rd Read: President 2016, US Senate 2016, Governor 2016

	US President 2016: Trump-Clinton-Johnson								US Senate 2016: Burr-Ross-Haugh						Governor 2016: Cooper-McCrory-Cecil					
District	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Write-In**	**Write-In %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**
24	53,148	53.97%	41,834	42.48%	2,484	2.52%	1,011	1.03%	53,942	55.20%	40,578	41.52%	3,200	3.27%	44,953	45.87%	51,206	52.25%	1,850	1.89%
26	62,678	69.78%	24,430	27.20%	1,927	2.15%	781	0.87%	61,325	68.90%	24,160	27.15%	3,517	3.95%	28,354	31.74%	58,996	66.05%	1,974	2.21%
27	46,577	44.39%	53,902	51.37%	3,037	2.89%	1,410	1.34%	49,238	47.34%	51,489	49.50%	3,288	3.16%	57,285	54.95%	44,652	42.83%	2,311	2.22%
28	23,648	23.85%	71,617	72.24%	2,481	2.50%	1,387	1.40%	26,011	26.53%	69,298	70.68%	2,730	2.78%	72,995	74.30%	23,261	23.68%	1,984	2.02%
Unassigned	2,173,698	50.12%	1,988,533	45.85%	120,000	2.77%	54,808	1.26%	2,201,923	51.32%	1,934,171	45.08%	154,455	3.60%	2,096,794	48.66%	2,117,924	49.15%	94,610	2.20%
Totals:	**2,359,749**	**49.90%**	**2,180,316**	**46.10%**	**129,929**	**2.75%**	**59,397**	**1.26%**	**2,392,439**	**51.13%**	**2,119,696**	**45.30%**	**167,190**	**3.57%**	**2,300,381**	**48.95%**	**2,296,039**	**48.86%**	**102,729**	**2.19%**

SRN-2 Guilford Amend 3rd Read: Lieutenant Governor 2016, Attorney General 2016

	Lieutenant Governor 2016: Forest-Coleman-Cole						Attorney General 2016: Stein-Newton			
District	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**
24	53,887	55.86%	39,813	41.27%	2,763	2.86%	44,343	46.28%	51,471	53.72%
26	61,536	70.10%	24,045	27.39%	2,199	2.51%	27,634	31.68%	59,592	68.32%
27	48,683	47.62%	50,541	49.44%	3,002	2.94%	55,168	54.23%	46,567	45.77%
28	25,159	26.06%	68,497	70.94%	2,903	3.01%	71,764	74.75%	24,241	25.25%
Unassigned	2,201,354	52.10%	1,902,079	45.02%	121,493	2.88%	2,095,946	50.02%	2,094,405	49.98%
Totals:	**2,390,619**	**51.88%**	**2,084,975**	**45.25%**	**132,360**	**2.87%**	**2,294,855**	**50.20%**	**2,276,276**	**49.80%**

EX. 36

STC-1 – Cumberland Amendment 3rd Reading

Legend

Groupings
Districts
Counties

Member by Party
Democratic
Republican

Harnett
Sampson
Moore
Richmond
Hoke
Scotland
Robeson
Cumberland
Bladen
21
19

N
W E
S

0 5 10 15 20 25 Miles

STC-1

Printed by the NC General Assembly, August 28, 2017.

Plan: STC-1
Plan Type:

Administrator
User:

Districts & Their Incumbents

Monday, August 28, 2017 3:15 PM

District	Name	Party	Previous District
-	J.Davis	Republican	50
-	Edwards	Republican	48
-	Van Duyn	Democratic	49
-	Hise	Republican	47
-	Harrington	Republican	43
-	Curtis	Republican	44
-	Ford	Democratic	38
-	Bishop	Republican	39
-	J.Jackson	Democratic	37
-	Tarte	Republican	41
-	Tucker	Republican	35
-	Waddell	Democratic	40
-	Newton	Republican	36
-	Dunn	Republican	33
-	McInnis	Republican	25
-	Daniel	Republican	46
-	Ballard	Republican	45
-	Wells	Republican	42
-	Randleman	Republican	30
-	Barrett	Republican	34
-	Lowe	Democratic	32
-	Krawiec	Republican	31
-	Tillman	Republican	29
-	Robinson	Democratic	28
-	Wade	Republican	27
-	Berger	Republican	26
-	Britt	Republican	13
-	Rabin	Republican	12

Plan:	STC-1	Administrator:	
Type:		User:	

District	Name	Party	Previous District
-	Rabon	Republican	8
-	Lee	Republican	9
-	B.Jackson	Republican	10
-	Pate	Republican	7
-	Gunn	Republican	24
-	McKissick	Democratic	20
-	Foushee	Democratic	23
-	Woodard	Democratic	22
-	Barringer	Republican	17
-	Alexander	Republican	15
-	Chaudhuri	Democratic	16
-	Blue	Democratic	14
-	Barefoot	Republican	18
-	Horner	Republican	11
-	Bryant	Democratic	4
-	Smith-Ingram	Democratic	3
-	Brown	Republican	6
-	D.Davis	Democratic	5
-	Sanderson	Republican	2
-	Cook	Republican	1
19	Meredith	Republican	19
21	Clark	Democratic	21

Number of Incumbents in District with more than one Incumbent:	48
Number of Districts with No Incumbent:	0
Number of Districts with Incumbents of more than one party:	1
Number of Districts with Paired Democrats:	0
Number of Districts with Paired Republicans:	0

Plan Name: STC-1
Plan Type:
Date: 08/28/2017
Time: 03:16:50PM
Administrator:

Measures of Compactness

08/28/2017

Sum	N/A	N/A
Min	0.26	0.21
Max	0.42	0.29
Mean	0.36	0.26
Std. Dev.	0.09	0.04

DISTRICT	Reock	Polsby-Popper
	0.26	0.28
19	0.42	0.21
21	0.41	0.29

STC-1 - Cumberland Amendment 3rd Reading: County - District

County	District	Total County Pop	Total District Pop	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Alamance	Unassigned	151,131	9,169,100	151,131	100.00%	1.65%
Alexander	Unassigned	37,198	9,169,100	37,198	100.00%	0.41%
Alleghany	Unassigned	11,155	9,169,100	11,155	100.00%	0.12%
Anson	Unassigned	26,948	9,169,100	26,948	100.00%	0.29%
Ashe	Unassigned	27,281	9,169,100	27,281	100.00%	0.30%
Avery	Unassigned	17,797	9,169,100	17,797	100.00%	0.19%
Beaufort	Unassigned	47,759	9,169,100	47,759	100.00%	0.52%
Bertie	Unassigned	21,282	9,169,100	21,282	100.00%	0.23%
Bladen	Unassigned	35,190	9,169,100	35,190	100.00%	0.38%
Brunswick	Unassigned	107,431	9,169,100	107,431	100.00%	1.17%
Buncombe	Unassigned	238,318	9,169,100	238,318	100.00%	2.60%
Burke	Unassigned	90,912	9,169,100	90,912	100.00%	0.99%
Cabarrus	Unassigned	178,011	9,169,100	178,011	100.00%	1.94%
Caldwell	Unassigned	83,029	9,169,100	83,029	100.00%	0.91%
Camden	Unassigned	9,980	9,169,100	9,980	100.00%	0.11%
Carteret	Unassigned	66,469	9,169,100	66,469	100.00%	0.72%
Caswell	Unassigned	23,719	9,169,100	23,719	100.00%	0.26%
Catawba	Unassigned	154,358	9,169,100	154,358	100.00%	1.68%
Chatham	Unassigned	63,505	9,169,100	63,505	100.00%	0.69%
Cherokee	Unassigned	27,444	9,169,100	27,444	100.00%	0.30%
Chowan	Unassigned	14,793	9,169,100	14,793	100.00%	0.16%
Clay	Unassigned	10,587	9,169,100	10,587	100.00%	0.12%
Cleveland	Unassigned	98,078	9,169,100	98,078	100.00%	1.07%
Columbus	Unassigned	58,098	9,169,100	58,098	100.00%	0.63%
Craven	Unassigned	103,505	9,169,100	103,505	100.00%	1.13%
Cumberland	19	319,431	182,897	182,897	57.26%	100.00%
	21	319,431	183,486	136,534	42.74%	74.41%
	Unassigned	319,431	9,169,100	0	0.00%	0.00%
Currituck	Unassigned	23,547	9,169,100	23,547	100.00%	0.26%
Dare	Unassigned	33,920	9,169,100	33,920	100.00%	0.37%
Davidson	Unassigned	162,878	9,169,100	162,878	100.00%	1.78%
Davie	Unassigned	41,240	9,169,100	41,240	100.00%	0.45%
Duplin	Unassigned	58,505	9,169,100	58,505	100.00%	0.64%
Durham	Unassigned	267,587	9,169,100	267,587	100.00%	2.92%
Edgecombe	Unassigned	56,552	9,169,100	56,552	100.00%	0.62%
Forsyth	Unassigned	350,670	9,169,100	350,670	100.00%	3.82%
Franklin	Unassigned	60,619	9,169,100	60,619	100.00%	0.66%
Gaston	Unassigned	206,086	9,169,100	206,086	100.00%	2.25%
Gates	Unassigned	12,197	9,169,100	12,197	100.00%	0.13%
Graham	Unassigned	8,861	9,169,100	8,861	100.00%	0.10%
Granville	Unassigned	59,916	9,169,100	59,916	100.00%	0.65%
Greene	Unassigned	21,362	9,169,100	21,362	100.00%	0.23%
Guilford	Unassigned	488,406	9,169,100	488,406	100.00%	5.33%
Halifax	Unassigned	54,691	9,169,100	54,691	100.00%	0.60%
Harnett	Unassigned	114,678	9,169,100	114,678	100.00%	1.25%
Haywood	Unassigned	59,036	9,169,100	59,036	100.00%	0.64%
Henderson	Unassigned	106,740	9,169,100	106,740	100.00%	1.16%
Hertford	Unassigned	24,669	9,169,100	24,669	100.00%	0.27%

District plan definition file: 'STC-1.asc', modified 08/28/2017 03:19:02 PM
Data Source: 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File - North Carolina
Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG01|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

STC-1 - Cumberland Amendment 3rd Reading: County - District

County	District	Total County Pop	Total District Pop	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Hoke	21	46,952	183,486	46,952	100.00%	25.59%
Hyde	Unassigned	5,810	9,169,100	5,810	100.00%	0.06%
Iredell	Unassigned	159,437	9,169,100	159,437	100.00%	1.74%
Jackson	Unassigned	40,271	9,169,100	40,271	100.00%	0.44%
Johnston	Unassigned	168,878	9,169,100	168,878	100.00%	1.84%
Jones	Unassigned	10,153	9,169,100	10,153	100.00%	0.11%
Lee	Unassigned	57,866	9,169,100	57,866	100.00%	0.63%
Lenoir	Unassigned	59,495	9,169,100	59,495	100.00%	0.65%
Lincoln	Unassigned	78,265	9,169,100	78,265	100.00%	0.85%
Macon	Unassigned	33,922	9,169,100	33,922	100.00%	0.37%
Madison	Unassigned	20,764	9,169,100	20,764	100.00%	0.23%
Martin	Unassigned	24,505	9,169,100	24,505	100.00%	0.27%
McDowell	Unassigned	44,996	9,169,100	44,996	100.00%	0.49%
Mecklenburg	Unassigned	919,628	9,169,100	919,628	100.00%	10.03%
Mitchell	Unassigned	15,579	9,169,100	15,579	100.00%	0.17%
Montgomery	Unassigned	27,798	9,169,100	27,798	100.00%	0.30%
Moore	Unassigned	88,247	9,169,100	88,247	100.00%	0.96%
Nash	Unassigned	95,840	9,169,100	95,840	100.00%	1.05%
New Hanover	Unassigned	202,667	9,169,100	202,667	100.00%	2.21%
Northampton	Unassigned	22,099	9,169,100	22,099	100.00%	0.24%
Onslow	Unassigned	177,772	9,169,100	177,772	100.00%	1.94%
Orange	Unassigned	133,801	9,169,100	133,801	100.00%	1.46%
Pamlico	Unassigned	13,144	9,169,100	13,144	100.00%	0.14%
Pasquotank	Unassigned	40,661	9,169,100	40,661	100.00%	0.44%
Pender	Unassigned	52,217	9,169,100	52,217	100.00%	0.57%
Perquimans	Unassigned	13,453	9,169,100	13,453	100.00%	0.15%
Person	Unassigned	39,464	9,169,100	39,464	100.00%	0.43%
Pitt	Unassigned	168,148	9,169,100	168,148	100.00%	1.83%
Polk	Unassigned	20,510	9,169,100	20,510	100.00%	0.22%
Randolph	Unassigned	141,752	9,169,100	141,752	100.00%	1.55%
Richmond	Unassigned	46,639	9,169,100	46,639	100.00%	0.51%
Robeson	Unassigned	134,168	9,169,100	134,168	100.00%	1.46%
Rockingham	Unassigned	93,643	9,169,100	93,643	100.00%	1.02%
Rowan	Unassigned	138,428	9,169,100	138,428	100.00%	1.51%
Rutherford	Unassigned	67,810	9,169,100	67,810	100.00%	0.74%
Sampson	Unassigned	63,431	9,169,100	63,431	100.00%	0.69%
Scotland	Unassigned	36,157	9,169,100	36,157	100.00%	0.39%
Stanly	Unassigned	60,585	9,169,100	60,585	100.00%	0.66%
Stokes	Unassigned	47,401	9,169,100	47,401	100.00%	0.52%
Surry	Unassigned	73,673	9,169,100	73,673	100.00%	0.80%
Swain	Unassigned	13,981	9,169,100	13,981	100.00%	0.15%
Transylvania	Unassigned	33,090	9,169,100	33,090	100.00%	0.36%
Tyrrell	Unassigned	4,407	9,169,100	4,407	100.00%	0.05%
Union	Unassigned	201,292	9,169,100	201,292	100.00%	2.20%
Vance	Unassigned	45,422	9,169,100	45,422	100.00%	0.50%
Wake	Unassigned	900,993	9,169,100	900,993	100.00%	9.83%
Warren	Unassigned	20,972	9,169,100	20,972	100.00%	0.23%
Washington	Unassigned	13,228	9,169,100	13,228	100.00%	0.14%
Watauga	Unassigned	51,079	9,169,100	51,079	100.00%	0.56%

District plan definition file: 'STC-1.asc', modified 08/28/2017 03:19:02 PM

Data Source: 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File - North Carolina

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG01|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

STC-1 - Cumberland Amendment 3rd Reading: County - District

County	District	Total County Pop	Total District Pop	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Wayne	Unassigned	122,623	9,169,100	122,623	100.00%	1.34%
Wilkes	Unassigned	69,340	9,169,100	69,340	100.00%	0.76%
Wilson	Unassigned	81,234	9,169,100	81,234	100.00%	0.89%
Yadkin	Unassigned	38,406	9,169,100	38,406	100.00%	0.42%
Yancey	Unassigned	17,818	9,169,100	17,818	100.00%	0.19%
			Total:	**9,535,483**		

STC-1 - Cumberland Amendment 3rd Reading: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Aberdeen	Unassigned	6,350	9,169,100	6,350	100.00%	0.07%
Ahoskie	Unassigned	5,039	9,169,100	5,039	100.00%	0.05%
Alamance	Unassigned	951	9,169,100	951	100.00%	0.01%
Albemarle	Unassigned	15,903	9,169,100	15,903	100.00%	0.17%
Alliance	Unassigned	776	9,169,100	776	100.00%	0.01%
Andrews	Unassigned	1,781	9,169,100	1,781	100.00%	0.02%
Angier (Harnett)	Unassigned	4,247	9,169,100	4,247	100.00%	0.05%
Angier (Wake)	Unassigned	103	9,169,100	103	100.00%	0.00%
Ansonville	Unassigned	631	9,169,100	631	100.00%	0.01%
Apex	Unassigned	37,476	9,169,100	37,476	100.00%	0.41%
Arapahoe	Unassigned	556	9,169,100	556	100.00%	0.01%
Archdale (Guilford)	Unassigned	333	9,169,100	333	100.00%	0.00%
Archdale (Randolph)	Unassigned	11,082	9,169,100	11,082	100.00%	0.12%
Archer Lodge	Unassigned	4,292	9,169,100	4,292	100.00%	0.05%
Asheboro	Unassigned	25,012	9,169,100	25,012	100.00%	0.27%
Asheville	Unassigned	83,393	9,169,100	83,393	100.00%	0.91%
Askewville	Unassigned	241	9,169,100	241	100.00%	0.00%
Atkinson	Unassigned	299	9,169,100	299	100.00%	0.00%
Atlantic Beach	Unassigned	1,495	9,169,100	1,495	100.00%	0.02%
Aulander	Unassigned	895	9,169,100	895	100.00%	0.01%
Aurora	Unassigned	520	9,169,100	520	100.00%	0.01%
Autryville	Unassigned	196	9,169,100	196	100.00%	0.00%
Ayden	Unassigned	4,932	9,169,100	4,932	100.00%	0.05%
Badin	Unassigned	1,974	9,169,100	1,974	100.00%	0.02%
Bailey	Unassigned	569	9,169,100	569	100.00%	0.01%
Bakersville	Unassigned	464	9,169,100	464	100.00%	0.01%
Bald Head Island	Unassigned	158	9,169,100	158	100.00%	0.00%
Banner Elk	Unassigned	1,028	9,169,100	1,028	100.00%	0.01%
Bath	Unassigned	249	9,169,100	249	100.00%	0.00%
Bayboro	Unassigned	1,263	9,169,100	1,263	100.00%	0.01%
Bear Grass	Unassigned	73	9,169,100	73	100.00%	0.00%
Beaufort	Unassigned	4,039	9,169,100	4,039	100.00%	0.04%
Beech Mountain (Avery)	Unassigned	24	9,169,100	24	100.00%	0.00%
Beech Mountain (Watauga)	Unassigned	296	9,169,100	296	100.00%	0.00%
Belhaven	Unassigned	1,688	9,169,100	1,688	100.00%	0.02%
Belmont	Unassigned	10,076	9,169,100	10,076	100.00%	0.11%
Belville	Unassigned	1,936	9,169,100	1,936	100.00%	0.02%
Belwood	Unassigned	950	9,169,100	950	100.00%	0.01%
Benson (Harnett)	Unassigned	0	9,169,100	0	0.00%	0.00%
Benson (Johnston)	Unassigned	3,311	9,169,100	3,311	100.00%	0.04%
Bermuda Run	Unassigned	1,725	9,169,100	1,725	100.00%	0.02%
Bessemer City	Unassigned	5,340	9,169,100	5,340	100.00%	0.06%
Bethania	Unassigned	328	9,169,100	328	100.00%	0.00%
Bethel	Unassigned	1,577	9,169,100	1,577	100.00%	0.02%
Beulaville	Unassigned	1,296	9,169,100	1,296	100.00%	0.01%
Biltmore Forest	Unassigned	1,343	9,169,100	1,343	100.00%	0.01%
Biscoe	Unassigned	1,700	9,169,100	1,700	100.00%	0.02%

District plan definition file: 'STC-1.asc', modified 08/28/2017 03:19:02 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

STC-1 - Cumberland Amendment 3rd Reading: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Black Creek	Unassigned	769	9,169,100	769	100.00%	0.01%
Black Mountain	Unassigned	7,848	9,169,100	7,848	100.00%	0.09%
Bladenboro	Unassigned	1,750	9,169,100	1,750	100.00%	0.02%
Blowing Rock (Caldwell)	Unassigned	49	9,169,100	49	100.00%	0.00%
Blowing Rock (Watauga)	Unassigned	1,192	9,169,100	1,192	100.00%	0.01%
Boardman	Unassigned	157	9,169,100	157	100.00%	0.00%
Bogue	Unassigned	684	9,169,100	684	100.00%	0.01%
Boiling Spring Lakes	Unassigned	5,372	9,169,100	5,372	100.00%	0.06%
Boiling Springs	Unassigned	4,647	9,169,100	4,647	100.00%	0.05%
Bolivia	Unassigned	143	9,169,100	143	100.00%	0.00%
Bolton	Unassigned	691	9,169,100	691	100.00%	0.01%
Boone	Unassigned	17,122	9,169,100	17,122	100.00%	0.19%
Boonville	Unassigned	1,222	9,169,100	1,222	100.00%	0.01%
Bostic	Unassigned	386	9,169,100	386	100.00%	0.00%
Brevard	Unassigned	7,609	9,169,100	7,609	100.00%	0.08%
Bridgeton	Unassigned	454	9,169,100	454	100.00%	0.00%
Broadway (Harnett)	Unassigned	25	9,169,100	25	100.00%	0.00%
Broadway (Lee)	Unassigned	1,204	9,169,100	1,204	100.00%	0.01%
Brookford	Unassigned	382	9,169,100	382	100.00%	0.00%
Brunswick	Unassigned	1,119	9,169,100	1,119	100.00%	0.01%
Bryson City	Unassigned	1,424	9,169,100	1,424	100.00%	0.02%
Bunn	Unassigned	344	9,169,100	344	100.00%	0.00%
Burgaw	Unassigned	3,872	9,169,100	3,872	100.00%	0.04%
Burlington (Alamance)	Unassigned	49,308	9,169,100	49,308	100.00%	0.54%
Burlington (Guilford)	Unassigned	655	9,169,100	655	100.00%	0.01%
Burnsville	Unassigned	1,693	9,169,100	1,693	100.00%	0.02%
Butner	Unassigned	7,591	9,169,100	7,591	100.00%	0.08%
Cajah's Mountain	Unassigned	2,823	9,169,100	2,823	100.00%	0.03%
Calabash	Unassigned	1,786	9,169,100	1,786	100.00%	0.02%
Calypso	Unassigned	538	9,169,100	538	100.00%	0.01%
Cameron	Unassigned	285	9,169,100	285	100.00%	0.00%
Candor	Unassigned	840	9,169,100	840	100.00%	0.01%
Canton	Unassigned	4,227	9,169,100	4,227	100.00%	0.05%
Cape Carteret	Unassigned	1,917	9,169,100	1,917	100.00%	0.02%
Carolina Beach	Unassigned	5,706	9,169,100	5,706	100.00%	0.06%
Carolina Shores	Unassigned	3,048	9,169,100	3,048	100.00%	0.03%
Carrboro	Unassigned	19,582	9,169,100	19,582	100.00%	0.21%
Carthage	Unassigned	2,205	9,169,100	2,205	100.00%	0.02%
Cary (Chatham)	Unassigned	1,422	9,169,100	1,422	100.00%	0.02%
Cary (Wake)	Unassigned	133,812	9,169,100	133,812	100.00%	1.46%
Casar	Unassigned	297	9,169,100	297	100.00%	0.00%
Castalia	Unassigned	268	9,169,100	268	100.00%	0.00%
Caswell Beach	Unassigned	398	9,169,100	398	100.00%	0.00%
Catawba	Unassigned	603	9,169,100	603	100.00%	0.01%
Cedar Point	Unassigned	1,279	9,169,100	1,279	100.00%	0.01%
Cedar Rock	Unassigned	300	9,169,100	300	100.00%	0.00%
Centerville	Unassigned	89	9,169,100	89	100.00%	0.00%

STC-1 - Cumberland Amendment 3rd Reading: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Cerro Gordo	Unassigned	207	9,169,100	207	100.00%	0.00%
Chadbourn	Unassigned	1,856	9,169,100	1,856	100.00%	0.02%
Chapel Hill (Durham)	Unassigned	2,836	9,169,100	2,836	100.00%	0.03%
Chapel Hill (Orange)	Unassigned	54,397	9,169,100	54,397	100.00%	0.59%
Charlotte	Unassigned	731,424	9,169,100	731,424	100.00%	7.98%
Cherryville	Unassigned	5,760	9,169,100	5,760	100.00%	0.06%
Chimney Rock Village	Unassigned	113	9,169,100	113	100.00%	0.00%
China Grove	Unassigned	3,563	9,169,100	3,563	100.00%	0.04%
Chocowinity	Unassigned	820	9,169,100	820	100.00%	0.01%
Claremont	Unassigned	1,352	9,169,100	1,352	100.00%	0.01%
Clarkton	Unassigned	837	9,169,100	837	100.00%	0.01%
Clayton (Johnston)	Unassigned	16,116	9,169,100	16,116	100.00%	0.18%
Clayton (Wake)	Unassigned	0	9,169,100	0	0.00%	0.00%
Clemmons	Unassigned	18,627	9,169,100	18,627	100.00%	0.20%
Cleveland	Unassigned	871	9,169,100	871	100.00%	0.01%
Clinton	Unassigned	8,639	9,169,100	8,639	100.00%	0.09%
Clyde	Unassigned	1,223	9,169,100	1,223	100.00%	0.01%
Coats	Unassigned	2,112	9,169,100	2,112	100.00%	0.02%
Cofield	Unassigned	413	9,169,100	413	100.00%	0.00%
Colerain	Unassigned	204	9,169,100	204	100.00%	0.00%
Columbia	Unassigned	891	9,169,100	891	100.00%	0.01%
Columbus	Unassigned	999	9,169,100	999	100.00%	0.01%
Como	Unassigned	91	9,169,100	91	100.00%	0.00%
Concord	Unassigned	79,066	9,169,100	79,066	100.00%	0.86%
Conetoe	Unassigned	294	9,169,100	294	100.00%	0.00%
Connelly Springs	Unassigned	1,669	9,169,100	1,669	100.00%	0.02%
Conover	Unassigned	8,165	9,169,100	8,165	100.00%	0.09%
Conway	Unassigned	836	9,169,100	836	100.00%	0.01%
Cooleemee	Unassigned	960	9,169,100	960	100.00%	0.01%
Cornelius	Unassigned	24,866	9,169,100	24,866	100.00%	0.27%
Cove City	Unassigned	399	9,169,100	399	100.00%	0.00%
Cramerton	Unassigned	4,165	9,169,100	4,165	100.00%	0.05%
Creedmoor	Unassigned	4,124	9,169,100	4,124	100.00%	0.04%
Creswell	Unassigned	276	9,169,100	276	100.00%	0.00%
Crossnore	Unassigned	192	9,169,100	192	100.00%	0.00%
Dallas	Unassigned	4,488	9,169,100	4,488	100.00%	0.05%
Danbury	Unassigned	189	9,169,100	189	100.00%	0.00%
Davidson (Iredell)	Unassigned	294	9,169,100	294	100.00%	0.00%
Davidson (Mecklenburg)	Unassigned	10,650	9,169,100	10,650	100.00%	0.12%
Dellview	Unassigned	13	9,169,100	13	100.00%	0.00%
Denton	Unassigned	1,636	9,169,100	1,636	100.00%	0.02%
Dillsboro	Unassigned	232	9,169,100	232	100.00%	0.00%
Dobbins Heights	Unassigned	866	9,169,100	866	100.00%	0.01%
Dobson	Unassigned	1,586	9,169,100	1,586	100.00%	0.02%
Dortches	Unassigned	935	9,169,100	935	100.00%	0.01%
Dover	Unassigned	401	9,169,100	401	100.00%	0.00%
Drexel	Unassigned	1,858	9,169,100	1,858	100.00%	0.02%

STC-1 - Cumberland Amendment 3rd Reading: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Dublin	Unassigned	338	9,169,100	338	100.00%	0.00%
Duck	Unassigned	369	9,169,100	369	100.00%	0.00%
Dunn	Unassigned	9,263	9,169,100	9,263	100.00%	0.10%
Durham (Durham)	Unassigned	228,300	9,169,100	228,300	100.00%	2.49%
Durham (Orange)	Unassigned	30	9,169,100	30	100.00%	0.00%
Durham (Wake)	Unassigned	0	9,169,100	0	0.00%	0.00%
Earl	Unassigned	260	9,169,100	260	100.00%	0.00%
East Arcadia	Unassigned	487	9,169,100	487	100.00%	0.01%
East Bend	Unassigned	612	9,169,100	612	100.00%	0.01%
East Laurinburg	Unassigned	300	9,169,100	300	100.00%	0.00%
East Spencer	Unassigned	1,534	9,169,100	1,534	100.00%	0.02%
Eastover	19	3,628	182,897	3,628	100.00%	1.98%
Eden	Unassigned	15,527	9,169,100	15,527	100.00%	0.17%
Edenton	Unassigned	5,004	9,169,100	5,004	100.00%	0.05%
Elizabeth City (Camden)	Unassigned	45	9,169,100	45	100.00%	0.00%
Elizabeth City (Pasquotank)	Unassigned	18,638	9,169,100	18,638	100.00%	0.20%
Elizabethtown	Unassigned	3,583	9,169,100	3,583	100.00%	0.04%
Elk Park	Unassigned	452	9,169,100	452	100.00%	0.00%
Elkin (Surry)	Unassigned	3,921	9,169,100	3,921	100.00%	0.04%
Elkin (Wilkes)	Unassigned	80	9,169,100	80	100.00%	0.00%
Ellenboro	Unassigned	873	9,169,100	873	100.00%	0.01%
Ellerbe	Unassigned	1,054	9,169,100	1,054	100.00%	0.01%
Elm City	Unassigned	1,298	9,169,100	1,298	100.00%	0.01%
Elon	Unassigned	9,419	9,169,100	9,419	100.00%	0.10%
Emerald Isle	Unassigned	3,655	9,169,100	3,655	100.00%	0.04%
Enfield	Unassigned	2,532	9,169,100	2,532	100.00%	0.03%
Erwin	Unassigned	4,405	9,169,100	4,405	100.00%	0.05%
Eureka	Unassigned	197	9,169,100	197	100.00%	0.00%
Everetts	Unassigned	164	9,169,100	164	100.00%	0.00%
Fair Bluff	Unassigned	951	9,169,100	951	100.00%	0.01%
Fairmont	Unassigned	2,663	9,169,100	2,663	100.00%	0.03%
Fairview	Unassigned	3,324	9,169,100	3,324	100.00%	0.04%
Faison (Duplin)	Unassigned	961	9,169,100	961	100.00%	0.01%
Faison (Sampson)	Unassigned	0	9,169,100	0	0.00%	0.00%
Faith	Unassigned	807	9,169,100	807	100.00%	0.01%
Falcon (Cumberland)	19	258	182,897	258	100.00%	0.14%
Falcon (Sampson)	Unassigned	0	9,169,100	0	0.00%	0.00%
Falkland	Unassigned	96	9,169,100	96	100.00%	0.00%
Fallston	Unassigned	607	9,169,100	607	100.00%	0.01%
Farmville	Unassigned	4,654	9,169,100	4,654	100.00%	0.05%
Fayetteville	19	200,564	182,897	66,046	32.93%	36.11%
	21	200,564	183,486	134,518	67.07%	73.31%
Flat Rock	Unassigned	3,114	9,169,100	3,114	100.00%	0.03%
Fletcher	Unassigned	7,187	9,169,100	7,187	100.00%	0.08%
Forest City	Unassigned	7,476	9,169,100	7,476	100.00%	0.08%
Forest Hills	Unassigned	365	9,169,100	365	100.00%	0.00%
Fountain	Unassigned	427	9,169,100	427	100.00%	0.00%

District plan definition file: 'STC-1.asc', modified 08/28/2017 03:19:02 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

STC-1 - Cumberland Amendment 3rd Reading: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Four Oaks	Unassigned	1,921	9,169,100	1,921	100.00%	0.02%
Foxfire	Unassigned	902	9,169,100	902	100.00%	0.01%
Franklin	Unassigned	3,845	9,169,100	3,845	100.00%	0.04%
Franklinton	Unassigned	2,023	9,169,100	2,023	100.00%	0.02%
Franklinville	Unassigned	1,164	9,169,100	1,164	100.00%	0.01%
Fremont	Unassigned	1,255	9,169,100	1,255	100.00%	0.01%
Fuquay-Varina	Unassigned	17,937	9,169,100	17,937	100.00%	0.20%
Gamewell	Unassigned	4,051	9,169,100	4,051	100.00%	0.04%
Garland	Unassigned	625	9,169,100	625	100.00%	0.01%
Garner	Unassigned	25,745	9,169,100	25,745	100.00%	0.28%
Garysburg	Unassigned	1,057	9,169,100	1,057	100.00%	0.01%
Gaston	Unassigned	1,152	9,169,100	1,152	100.00%	0.01%
Gastonia	Unassigned	71,741	9,169,100	71,741	100.00%	0.78%
Gatesville	Unassigned	321	9,169,100	321	100.00%	0.00%
Gibson	Unassigned	540	9,169,100	540	100.00%	0.01%
Gibsonville (Alamance)	Unassigned	3,148	9,169,100	3,148	100.00%	0.03%
Gibsonville (Guilford)	Unassigned	3,262	9,169,100	3,262	100.00%	0.04%
Glen Alpine	Unassigned	1,517	9,169,100	1,517	100.00%	0.02%
Godwin	19	139	182,897	139	100.00%	0.08%
Goldsboro	Unassigned	36,437	9,169,100	36,437	100.00%	0.40%
Goldston	Unassigned	268	9,169,100	268	100.00%	0.00%
Graham	Unassigned	14,153	9,169,100	14,153	100.00%	0.15%
Grandfather	Unassigned	25	9,169,100	25	100.00%	0.00%
Granite Falls	Unassigned	4,722	9,169,100	4,722	100.00%	0.05%
Granite Quarry	Unassigned	2,930	9,169,100	2,930	100.00%	0.03%
Grantsboro	Unassigned	688	9,169,100	688	100.00%	0.01%
Green Level	Unassigned	2,100	9,169,100	2,100	100.00%	0.02%
Greenevers	Unassigned	634	9,169,100	634	100.00%	0.01%
Greensboro	Unassigned	269,666	9,169,100	269,666	100.00%	2.94%
Greenville	Unassigned	84,554	9,169,100	84,554	100.00%	0.92%
Grifton (Lenoir)	Unassigned	186	9,169,100	186	100.00%	0.00%
Grifton (Pitt)	Unassigned	2,431	9,169,100	2,431	100.00%	0.03%
Grimesland	Unassigned	441	9,169,100	441	100.00%	0.00%
Grover	Unassigned	708	9,169,100	708	100.00%	0.01%
Halifax	Unassigned	234	9,169,100	234	100.00%	0.00%
Hamilton	Unassigned	408	9,169,100	408	100.00%	0.00%
Hamlet	Unassigned	6,495	9,169,100	6,495	100.00%	0.07%
Harmony	Unassigned	531	9,169,100	531	100.00%	0.01%
Harrells (Duplin)	Unassigned	23	9,169,100	23	100.00%	0.00%
Harrells (Sampson)	Unassigned	179	9,169,100	179	100.00%	0.00%
Harrellsville	Unassigned	106	9,169,100	106	100.00%	0.00%
Harrisburg	Unassigned	11,526	9,169,100	11,526	100.00%	0.13%
Hassell	Unassigned	84	9,169,100	84	100.00%	0.00%
Havelock	Unassigned	20,735	9,169,100	20,735	100.00%	0.23%
Haw River	Unassigned	2,298	9,169,100	2,298	100.00%	0.03%
Hayesville	Unassigned	311	9,169,100	311	100.00%	0.00%
Hemby Bridge	Unassigned	1,520	9,169,100	1,520	100.00%	0.02%

STC-1 - Cumberland Amendment 3rd Reading: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Henderson	Unassigned	15,368	9,169,100	15,368	100.00%	0.17%
Hendersonville	Unassigned	13,137	9,169,100	13,137	100.00%	0.14%
Hertford	Unassigned	2,143	9,169,100	2,143	100.00%	0.02%
Hickory (Burke)	Unassigned	66	9,169,100	66	100.00%	0.00%
Hickory (Caldwell)	Unassigned	18	9,169,100	18	100.00%	0.00%
Hickory (Catawba)	Unassigned	39,926	9,169,100	39,926	100.00%	0.44%
High Point (Davidson)	Unassigned	5,310	9,169,100	5,310	100.00%	0.06%
High Point (Forsyth)	Unassigned	8	9,169,100	8	100.00%	0.00%
High Point (Guilford)	Unassigned	99,042	9,169,100	99,042	100.00%	1.08%
High Point (Randolph)	Unassigned	11	9,169,100	11	100.00%	0.00%
High Shoals	Unassigned	696	9,169,100	696	100.00%	0.01%
Highlands (Jackson)	Unassigned	4	9,169,100	4	100.00%	0.00%
Highlands (Macon)	Unassigned	920	9,169,100	920	100.00%	0.01%
Hildebran	Unassigned	2,023	9,169,100	2,023	100.00%	0.02%
Hillsborough	Unassigned	6,087	9,169,100	6,087	100.00%	0.07%
Hobgood	Unassigned	348	9,169,100	348	100.00%	0.00%
Hoffman	Unassigned	588	9,169,100	588	100.00%	0.01%
Holden Beach	Unassigned	575	9,169,100	575	100.00%	0.01%
Holly Ridge	Unassigned	1,268	9,169,100	1,268	100.00%	0.01%
Holly Springs	Unassigned	24,661	9,169,100	24,661	100.00%	0.27%
Hookerton	Unassigned	409	9,169,100	409	100.00%	0.00%
Hope Mills	19	15,176	182,897	15,176	100.00%	8.30%
Hot Springs	Unassigned	560	9,169,100	560	100.00%	0.01%
Hudson	Unassigned	3,776	9,169,100	3,776	100.00%	0.04%
Huntersville	Unassigned	46,773	9,169,100	46,773	100.00%	0.51%
Indian Beach	Unassigned	112	9,169,100	112	100.00%	0.00%
Indian Trail	Unassigned	33,518	9,169,100	33,518	100.00%	0.37%
Jackson	Unassigned	513	9,169,100	513	100.00%	0.01%
Jacksonville	Unassigned	70,145	9,169,100	70,145	100.00%	0.77%
Jamestown	Unassigned	3,382	9,169,100	3,382	100.00%	0.04%
Jamesville	Unassigned	491	9,169,100	491	100.00%	0.01%
Jefferson	Unassigned	1,611	9,169,100	1,611	100.00%	0.02%
Jonesville	Unassigned	2,285	9,169,100	2,285	100.00%	0.02%
Kannapolis (Cabarrus)	Unassigned	33,194	9,169,100	33,194	100.00%	0.36%
Kannapolis (Rowan)	Unassigned	9,431	9,169,100	9,431	100.00%	0.10%
Kelford	Unassigned	251	9,169,100	251	100.00%	0.00%
Kenansville	Unassigned	855	9,169,100	855	100.00%	0.01%
Kenly (Johnston)	Unassigned	1,176	9,169,100	1,176	100.00%	0.01%
Kenly (Wilson)	Unassigned	163	9,169,100	163	100.00%	0.00%
Kernersville (Forsyth)	Unassigned	23,071	9,169,100	23,071	100.00%	0.25%
Kernersville (Guilford)	Unassigned	52	9,169,100	52	100.00%	0.00%
Kill Devil Hills	Unassigned	6,683	9,169,100	6,683	100.00%	0.07%
King (Forsyth)	Unassigned	619	9,169,100	619	100.00%	0.01%
King (Stokes)	Unassigned	6,285	9,169,100	6,285	100.00%	0.07%
Kings Mountain (Cleveland)	Unassigned	9,242	9,169,100	9,242	100.00%	0.10%
Kings Mountain (Gaston)	Unassigned	1,054	9,169,100	1,054	100.00%	0.01%
Kingstown	Unassigned	681	9,169,100	681	100.00%	0.01%

District plan definition file: 'STC-1.asc', modified 08/28/2017 03:19:02 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

STC-1 - Cumberland Amendment 3rd Reading: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Kinston	Unassigned	21,677	9,169,100	21,677	100.00%	0.24%
Kittrell	Unassigned	467	9,169,100	467	100.00%	0.01%
Kitty Hawk	Unassigned	3,272	9,169,100	3,272	100.00%	0.04%
Knightdale	Unassigned	11,401	9,169,100	11,401	100.00%	0.12%
Kure Beach	Unassigned	2,012	9,169,100	2,012	100.00%	0.02%
La Grange	Unassigned	2,873	9,169,100	2,873	100.00%	0.03%
Lake Lure	Unassigned	1,192	9,169,100	1,192	100.00%	0.01%
Lake Park	Unassigned	3,422	9,169,100	3,422	100.00%	0.04%
Lake Santeetlah	Unassigned	45	9,169,100	45	100.00%	0.00%
Lake Waccamaw	Unassigned	1,480	9,169,100	1,480	100.00%	0.02%
Landis	Unassigned	3,109	9,169,100	3,109	100.00%	0.03%
Lansing	Unassigned	158	9,169,100	158	100.00%	0.00%
Lasker	Unassigned	122	9,169,100	122	100.00%	0.00%
Lattimore	Unassigned	488	9,169,100	488	100.00%	0.01%
Laurel Park	Unassigned	2,180	9,169,100	2,180	100.00%	0.02%
Laurinburg	Unassigned	15,962	9,169,100	15,962	100.00%	0.17%
Lawndale	Unassigned	606	9,169,100	606	100.00%	0.01%
Leggett	Unassigned	60	9,169,100	60	100.00%	0.00%
Leland	Unassigned	13,527	9,169,100	13,527	100.00%	0.15%
Lenoir	Unassigned	18,228	9,169,100	18,228	100.00%	0.20%
Lewiston Woodville	Unassigned	549	9,169,100	549	100.00%	0.01%
Lewisville	Unassigned	12,639	9,169,100	12,639	100.00%	0.14%
Lexington	Unassigned	18,931	9,169,100	18,931	100.00%	0.21%
Liberty	Unassigned	2,656	9,169,100	2,656	100.00%	0.03%
Lilesville	Unassigned	536	9,169,100	536	100.00%	0.01%
Lillington	Unassigned	3,194	9,169,100	3,194	100.00%	0.03%
Lincolnton	Unassigned	10,486	9,169,100	10,486	100.00%	0.11%
Linden	19	130	182,897	130	100.00%	0.07%
Littleton	Unassigned	674	9,169,100	674	100.00%	0.01%
Locust (Cabarrus)	Unassigned	215	9,169,100	215	100.00%	0.00%
Locust (Stanly)	Unassigned	2,715	9,169,100	2,715	100.00%	0.03%
Long View (Burke)	Unassigned	752	9,169,100	752	100.00%	0.01%
Long View (Catawba)	Unassigned	4,119	9,169,100	4,119	100.00%	0.04%
Louisburg	Unassigned	3,359	9,169,100	3,359	100.00%	0.04%
Love Valley	Unassigned	90	9,169,100	90	100.00%	0.00%
Lowell	Unassigned	3,526	9,169,100	3,526	100.00%	0.04%
Lucama	Unassigned	1,108	9,169,100	1,108	100.00%	0.01%
Lumber Bridge	Unassigned	94	9,169,100	94	100.00%	0.00%
Lumberton	Unassigned	21,542	9,169,100	21,542	100.00%	0.23%
Macclesfield	Unassigned	471	9,169,100	471	100.00%	0.01%
Macon	Unassigned	119	9,169,100	119	100.00%	0.00%
Madison	Unassigned	2,246	9,169,100	2,246	100.00%	0.02%
Maggie Valley	Unassigned	1,150	9,169,100	1,150	100.00%	0.01%
Magnolia	Unassigned	939	9,169,100	939	100.00%	0.01%
Maiden (Catawba)	Unassigned	3,308	9,169,100	3,308	100.00%	0.04%
Maiden (Lincoln)	Unassigned	2	9,169,100	2	100.00%	0.00%
Manteo	Unassigned	1,434	9,169,100	1,434	100.00%	0.02%

District plan definition file: 'STC-1.asc', modified 08/28/2017 03:19:02 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

STC-1 - Cumberland Amendment 3rd Reading: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Marietta	Unassigned	175	9,169,100	175	100.00%	0.00%
Marion	Unassigned	7,838	9,169,100	7,838	100.00%	0.09%
Mars Hill	Unassigned	1,869	9,169,100	1,869	100.00%	0.02%
Marshall	Unassigned	872	9,169,100	872	100.00%	0.01%
Marshville	Unassigned	2,402	9,169,100	2,402	100.00%	0.03%
Marvin	Unassigned	5,579	9,169,100	5,579	100.00%	0.06%
Matthews	Unassigned	27,198	9,169,100	27,198	100.00%	0.30%
Maxton (Robeson)	Unassigned	2,230	9,169,100	2,230	100.00%	0.02%
Maxton (Scotland)	Unassigned	196	9,169,100	196	100.00%	0.00%
Mayodan	Unassigned	2,478	9,169,100	2,478	100.00%	0.03%
Maysville	Unassigned	1,019	9,169,100	1,019	100.00%	0.01%
McAdenville	Unassigned	651	9,169,100	651	100.00%	0.01%
McDonald	Unassigned	113	9,169,100	113	100.00%	0.00%
McFarlan	Unassigned	117	9,169,100	117	100.00%	0.00%
Mebane (Alamance)	Unassigned	9,600	9,169,100	9,600	100.00%	0.10%
Mebane (Orange)	Unassigned	1,793	9,169,100	1,793	100.00%	0.02%
Mesic	Unassigned	220	9,169,100	220	100.00%	0.00%
Micro	Unassigned	441	9,169,100	441	100.00%	0.00%
Middleburg	Unassigned	133	9,169,100	133	100.00%	0.00%
Middlesex	Unassigned	822	9,169,100	822	100.00%	0.01%
Midland (Cabarrus)	Unassigned	3,073	9,169,100	3,073	100.00%	0.03%
Midland (Mecklenburg)	Unassigned	0	9,169,100	0	0.00%	0.00%
Midway	Unassigned	4,679	9,169,100	4,679	100.00%	0.05%
Mills River	Unassigned	6,802	9,169,100	6,802	100.00%	0.07%
Milton	Unassigned	166	9,169,100	166	100.00%	0.00%
Mineral Springs	Unassigned	2,639	9,169,100	2,639	100.00%	0.03%
Minnesott Beach	Unassigned	440	9,169,100	440	100.00%	0.00%
Mint Hill (Mecklenburg)	Unassigned	22,669	9,169,100	22,669	100.00%	0.25%
Mint Hill (Union)	Unassigned	53	9,169,100	53	100.00%	0.00%
Misenheimer	Unassigned	728	9,169,100	728	100.00%	0.01%
Mocksville	Unassigned	5,051	9,169,100	5,051	100.00%	0.06%
Momeyer	Unassigned	224	9,169,100	224	100.00%	0.00%
Monroe	Unassigned	32,797	9,169,100	32,797	100.00%	0.36%
Montreat	Unassigned	723	9,169,100	723	100.00%	0.01%
Mooresboro	Unassigned	311	9,169,100	311	100.00%	0.00%
Mooresville	Unassigned	32,711	9,169,100	32,711	100.00%	0.36%
Morehead City	Unassigned	8,661	9,169,100	8,661	100.00%	0.09%
Morganton	Unassigned	16,918	9,169,100	16,918	100.00%	0.18%
Morrisville (Durham)	Unassigned	0	9,169,100	0	0.00%	0.00%
Morrisville (Wake)	Unassigned	18,576	9,169,100	18,576	100.00%	0.20%
Morven	Unassigned	511	9,169,100	511	100.00%	0.01%
Mount Airy	Unassigned	10,388	9,169,100	10,388	100.00%	0.11%
Mount Gilead	Unassigned	1,181	9,169,100	1,181	100.00%	0.01%
Mount Holly	Unassigned	13,656	9,169,100	13,656	100.00%	0.15%
Mount Olive (Duplin)	Unassigned	51	9,169,100	51	100.00%	0.00%
Mount Olive (Wayne)	Unassigned	4,538	9,169,100	4,538	100.00%	0.05%
Mount Pleasant	Unassigned	1,652	9,169,100	1,652	100.00%	0.02%

District plan definition file: 'STC-1.asc', modified 08/28/2017 03:19:02 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

STC-1 - Cumberland Amendment 3rd Reading: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Murfreesboro	Unassigned	2,835	9,169,100	2,835	100.00%	0.03%
Murphy	Unassigned	1,627	9,169,100	1,627	100.00%	0.02%
Nags Head	Unassigned	2,757	9,169,100	2,757	100.00%	0.03%
Nashville	Unassigned	5,352	9,169,100	5,352	100.00%	0.06%
Navassa	Unassigned	1,505	9,169,100	1,505	100.00%	0.02%
New Bern	Unassigned	29,524	9,169,100	29,524	100.00%	0.32%
New London	Unassigned	600	9,169,100	600	100.00%	0.01%
Newland	Unassigned	698	9,169,100	698	100.00%	0.01%
Newport	Unassigned	4,150	9,169,100	4,150	100.00%	0.05%
Newton	Unassigned	12,968	9,169,100	12,968	100.00%	0.14%
Newton Grove	Unassigned	569	9,169,100	569	100.00%	0.01%
Norlina	Unassigned	1,118	9,169,100	1,118	100.00%	0.01%
Norman	Unassigned	138	9,169,100	138	100.00%	0.00%
North Topsail Beach	Unassigned	743	9,169,100	743	100.00%	0.01%
North Wilkesboro	Unassigned	4,245	9,169,100	4,245	100.00%	0.05%
Northwest	Unassigned	735	9,169,100	735	100.00%	0.01%
Norwood	Unassigned	2,379	9,169,100	2,379	100.00%	0.03%
Oak City	Unassigned	317	9,169,100	317	100.00%	0.00%
Oak Island	Unassigned	6,783	9,169,100	6,783	100.00%	0.07%
Oak Ridge	Unassigned	6,185	9,169,100	6,185	100.00%	0.07%
Oakboro	Unassigned	1,859	9,169,100	1,859	100.00%	0.02%
Ocean Isle Beach	Unassigned	550	9,169,100	550	100.00%	0.01%
Old Fort	Unassigned	908	9,169,100	908	100.00%	0.01%
Oriental	Unassigned	900	9,169,100	900	100.00%	0.01%
Orrum	Unassigned	91	9,169,100	91	100.00%	0.00%
Ossipee	Unassigned	543	9,169,100	543	100.00%	0.01%
Oxford	Unassigned	8,461	9,169,100	8,461	100.00%	0.09%
Pantego	Unassigned	179	9,169,100	179	100.00%	0.00%
Parkton	Unassigned	436	9,169,100	436	100.00%	0.00%
Parmele	Unassigned	278	9,169,100	278	100.00%	0.00%
Patterson Springs	Unassigned	622	9,169,100	622	100.00%	0.01%
Peachland	Unassigned	437	9,169,100	437	100.00%	0.00%
Peletier	Unassigned	644	9,169,100	644	100.00%	0.01%
Pembroke	Unassigned	2,973	9,169,100	2,973	100.00%	0.03%
Pikeville	Unassigned	678	9,169,100	678	100.00%	0.01%
Pilot Mountain	Unassigned	1,477	9,169,100	1,477	100.00%	0.02%
Pine Knoll Shores	Unassigned	1,339	9,169,100	1,339	100.00%	0.01%
Pine Level	Unassigned	1,700	9,169,100	1,700	100.00%	0.02%
Pinebluff	Unassigned	1,337	9,169,100	1,337	100.00%	0.01%
Pinehurst	Unassigned	13,124	9,169,100	13,124	100.00%	0.14%
Pinetops	Unassigned	1,374	9,169,100	1,374	100.00%	0.01%
Pineville	Unassigned	7,479	9,169,100	7,479	100.00%	0.08%
Pink Hill	Unassigned	552	9,169,100	552	100.00%	0.01%
Pittsboro	Unassigned	3,743	9,169,100	3,743	100.00%	0.04%
Pleasant Garden	Unassigned	4,489	9,169,100	4,489	100.00%	0.05%
Plymouth	Unassigned	3,878	9,169,100	3,878	100.00%	0.04%
Polkton	Unassigned	3,375	9,169,100	3,375	100.00%	0.04%

District plan definition file: 'STC-1.asc', modified 08/28/2017 03:19:02 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

STC-1 - Cumberland Amendment 3rd Reading: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Polkville	Unassigned	545	9,169,100	545	100.00%	0.01%
Pollocksville	Unassigned	311	9,169,100	311	100.00%	0.00%
Powellsville	Unassigned	276	9,169,100	276	100.00%	0.00%
Princeton	Unassigned	1,194	9,169,100	1,194	100.00%	0.01%
Princeville	Unassigned	2,082	9,169,100	2,082	100.00%	0.02%
Proctorville	Unassigned	117	9,169,100	117	100.00%	0.00%
Raeford	21	4,611	183,486	4,611	100.00%	2.51%
Raleigh (Durham)	Unassigned	1,067	9,169,100	1,067	100.00%	0.01%
Raleigh (Wake)	Unassigned	402,825	9,169,100	402,825	100.00%	4.39%
Ramseur	Unassigned	1,692	9,169,100	1,692	100.00%	0.02%
Randleman	Unassigned	4,113	9,169,100	4,113	100.00%	0.04%
Ranlo	Unassigned	3,434	9,169,100	3,434	100.00%	0.04%
Raynham	Unassigned	72	9,169,100	72	100.00%	0.00%
Red Cross	Unassigned	742	9,169,100	742	100.00%	0.01%
Red Oak	Unassigned	3,430	9,169,100	3,430	100.00%	0.04%
Red Springs (Hoke)	21	0	183,486	0	0.00%	0.00%
Red Springs (Robeson)	Unassigned	3,428	9,169,100	3,428	100.00%	0.04%
Reidsville	Unassigned	14,520	9,169,100	14,520	100.00%	0.16%
Rennert	Unassigned	383	9,169,100	383	100.00%	0.00%
Rhodhiss (Burke)	Unassigned	700	9,169,100	700	100.00%	0.01%
Rhodhiss (Caldwell)	Unassigned	370	9,169,100	370	100.00%	0.00%
Rich Square	Unassigned	958	9,169,100	958	100.00%	0.01%
Richfield	Unassigned	613	9,169,100	613	100.00%	0.01%
Richlands	Unassigned	1,520	9,169,100	1,520	100.00%	0.02%
River Bend	Unassigned	3,119	9,169,100	3,119	100.00%	0.03%
Roanoke Rapids	Unassigned	15,754	9,169,100	15,754	100.00%	0.17%
Robbins	Unassigned	1,097	9,169,100	1,097	100.00%	0.01%
Robbinsville	Unassigned	620	9,169,100	620	100.00%	0.01%
Robersonville	Unassigned	1,488	9,169,100	1,488	100.00%	0.02%
Rockingham	Unassigned	9,558	9,169,100	9,558	100.00%	0.10%
Rockwell	Unassigned	2,108	9,169,100	2,108	100.00%	0.02%
Rocky Mount (Edgecombe)	Unassigned	17,524	9,169,100	17,524	100.00%	0.19%
Rocky Mount (Nash)	Unassigned	39,953	9,169,100	39,953	100.00%	0.44%
Rolesville	Unassigned	3,786	9,169,100	3,786	100.00%	0.04%
Ronda	Unassigned	417	9,169,100	417	100.00%	0.00%
Roper	Unassigned	611	9,169,100	611	100.00%	0.01%
Rose Hill	Unassigned	1,626	9,169,100	1,626	100.00%	0.02%
Roseboro	Unassigned	1,191	9,169,100	1,191	100.00%	0.01%
Rosman	Unassigned	576	9,169,100	576	100.00%	0.01%
Rowland	Unassigned	1,037	9,169,100	1,037	100.00%	0.01%
Roxboro	Unassigned	8,362	9,169,100	8,362	100.00%	0.09%
Roxobel	Unassigned	240	9,169,100	240	100.00%	0.00%
Rural Hall	Unassigned	2,937	9,169,100	2,937	100.00%	0.03%
Ruth	Unassigned	440	9,169,100	440	100.00%	0.00%
Rutherford College	Unassigned	1,341	9,169,100	1,341	100.00%	0.01%
Rutherfordton	Unassigned	4,213	9,169,100	4,213	100.00%	0.05%
Salemburg	Unassigned	435	9,169,100	435	100.00%	0.00%

District plan definition file: 'STC-1.asc', modified 08/28/2017 03:19:02 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

STC-1 - Cumberland Amendment 3rd Reading: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Salisbury	Unassigned	33,662	9,169,100	33,662	100.00%	0.37%
Saluda (Henderson)	Unassigned	12	9,169,100	12	100.00%	0.00%
Saluda (Polk)	Unassigned	701	9,169,100	701	100.00%	0.01%
Sandy Creek	Unassigned	260	9,169,100	260	100.00%	0.00%
Sandyfield	Unassigned	447	9,169,100	447	100.00%	0.00%
Sanford	Unassigned	28,094	9,169,100	28,094	100.00%	0.31%
Saratoga	Unassigned	408	9,169,100	408	100.00%	0.00%
Sawmills	Unassigned	5,240	9,169,100	5,240	100.00%	0.06%
Scotland Neck	Unassigned	2,059	9,169,100	2,059	100.00%	0.02%
Seaboard	Unassigned	632	9,169,100	632	100.00%	0.01%
Seagrove	Unassigned	228	9,169,100	228	100.00%	0.00%
Sedalia	Unassigned	623	9,169,100	623	100.00%	0.01%
Selma	Unassigned	6,073	9,169,100	6,073	100.00%	0.07%
Seven Devils (Avery)	Unassigned	28	9,169,100	28	100.00%	0.00%
Seven Devils (Watauga)	Unassigned	164	9,169,100	164	100.00%	0.00%
Seven Springs	Unassigned	110	9,169,100	110	100.00%	0.00%
Severn	Unassigned	276	9,169,100	276	100.00%	0.00%
Shallotte	Unassigned	3,675	9,169,100	3,675	100.00%	0.04%
Sharpsburg (Edgecombe)	Unassigned	209	9,169,100	209	100.00%	0.00%
Sharpsburg (Nash)	Unassigned	1,252	9,169,100	1,252	100.00%	0.01%
Sharpsburg (Wilson)	Unassigned	563	9,169,100	563	100.00%	0.01%
Shelby	Unassigned	20,323	9,169,100	20,323	100.00%	0.22%
Siler City	Unassigned	7,887	9,169,100	7,887	100.00%	0.09%
Simpson	Unassigned	416	9,169,100	416	100.00%	0.00%
Sims	Unassigned	282	9,169,100	282	100.00%	0.00%
Smithfield	Unassigned	10,966	9,169,100	10,966	100.00%	0.12%
Snow Hill	Unassigned	1,595	9,169,100	1,595	100.00%	0.02%
Southern Pines	Unassigned	12,334	9,169,100	12,334	100.00%	0.13%
Southern Shores	Unassigned	2,714	9,169,100	2,714	100.00%	0.03%
Southport	Unassigned	2,833	9,169,100	2,833	100.00%	0.03%
Sparta	Unassigned	1,770	9,169,100	1,770	100.00%	0.02%
Speed	Unassigned	80	9,169,100	80	100.00%	0.00%
Spencer	Unassigned	3,267	9,169,100	3,267	100.00%	0.04%
Spencer Mountain	Unassigned	37	9,169,100	37	100.00%	0.00%
Spindale	Unassigned	4,321	9,169,100	4,321	100.00%	0.05%
Spring Hope	Unassigned	1,320	9,169,100	1,320	100.00%	0.01%
Spring Lake	19	11,964	182,897	11,964	100.00%	6.54%
	21	11,964	183,486	0	0.00%	0.00%
	Unassigned	11,964	9,169,100	0	0.00%	0.00%
Spruce Pine	Unassigned	2,175	9,169,100	2,175	100.00%	0.02%
St. Helena	Unassigned	389	9,169,100	389	100.00%	0.00%
St. James	Unassigned	3,165	9,169,100	3,165	100.00%	0.03%
St. Pauls	Unassigned	2,035	9,169,100	2,035	100.00%	0.02%
Staley	Unassigned	393	9,169,100	393	100.00%	0.00%
Stallings (Mecklenburg)	Unassigned	399	9,169,100	399	100.00%	0.00%
Stallings (Union)	Unassigned	13,432	9,169,100	13,432	100.00%	0.15%
Stanfield	Unassigned	1,486	9,169,100	1,486	100.00%	0.02%

District plan definition file: 'STC-1.asc', modified 08/28/2017 03:19:02 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

STC-1 - Cumberland Amendment 3rd Reading: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Stanley	Unassigned	3,556	9,169,100	3,556	100.00%	0.04%
Stantonsburg	Unassigned	784	9,169,100	784	100.00%	0.01%
Star	Unassigned	876	9,169,100	876	100.00%	0.01%
Statesville	Unassigned	24,532	9,169,100	24,532	100.00%	0.27%
Stedman	19	1,028	182,897	1,028	100.00%	0.56%
Stem	Unassigned	463	9,169,100	463	100.00%	0.01%
Stokesdale	Unassigned	5,047	9,169,100	5,047	100.00%	0.06%
Stoneville	Unassigned	1,056	9,169,100	1,056	100.00%	0.01%
Stonewall	Unassigned	281	9,169,100	281	100.00%	0.00%
Stovall	Unassigned	418	9,169,100	418	100.00%	0.00%
Sugar Mountain	Unassigned	198	9,169,100	198	100.00%	0.00%
Summerfield	Unassigned	10,232	9,169,100	10,232	100.00%	0.11%
Sunset Beach	Unassigned	3,572	9,169,100	3,572	100.00%	0.04%
Surf City (Onslow)	Unassigned	292	9,169,100	292	100.00%	0.00%
Surf City (Pender)	Unassigned	1,561	9,169,100	1,561	100.00%	0.02%
Swansboro	Unassigned	2,663	9,169,100	2,663	100.00%	0.03%
Swepsonville	Unassigned	1,154	9,169,100	1,154	100.00%	0.01%
Sylva	Unassigned	2,588	9,169,100	2,588	100.00%	0.03%
Tabor City	Unassigned	2,511	9,169,100	2,511	100.00%	0.03%
Tar Heel	Unassigned	117	9,169,100	117	100.00%	0.00%
Tarboro	Unassigned	11,415	9,169,100	11,415	100.00%	0.12%
Taylorsville	Unassigned	2,098	9,169,100	2,098	100.00%	0.02%
Taylortown	Unassigned	722	9,169,100	722	100.00%	0.01%
Teachey	Unassigned	376	9,169,100	376	100.00%	0.00%
Thomasville (Davidson)	Unassigned	26,493	9,169,100	26,493	100.00%	0.29%
Thomasville (Randolph)	Unassigned	264	9,169,100	264	100.00%	0.00%
Tobaccoville (Forsyth)	Unassigned	2,441	9,169,100	2,441	100.00%	0.03%
Tobaccoville (Stokes)	Unassigned	0	9,169,100	0	0.00%	0.00%
Topsail Beach	Unassigned	368	9,169,100	368	100.00%	0.00%
Trent Woods	Unassigned	4,155	9,169,100	4,155	100.00%	0.05%
Trenton	Unassigned	287	9,169,100	287	100.00%	0.00%
Trinity	Unassigned	6,614	9,169,100	6,614	100.00%	0.07%
Troutman	Unassigned	2,383	9,169,100	2,383	100.00%	0.03%
Troy	Unassigned	3,189	9,169,100	3,189	100.00%	0.03%
Tryon	Unassigned	1,646	9,169,100	1,646	100.00%	0.02%
Turkey	Unassigned	292	9,169,100	292	100.00%	0.00%
Unionville	Unassigned	5,929	9,169,100	5,929	100.00%	0.06%
Valdese	Unassigned	4,490	9,169,100	4,490	100.00%	0.05%
Vanceboro	Unassigned	1,005	9,169,100	1,005	100.00%	0.01%
Vandemere	Unassigned	254	9,169,100	254	100.00%	0.00%
Varnamtown	Unassigned	541	9,169,100	541	100.00%	0.01%
Vass	Unassigned	720	9,169,100	720	100.00%	0.01%
Waco	Unassigned	321	9,169,100	321	100.00%	0.00%
Wade	19	556	182,897	556	100.00%	0.30%
Wadesboro	Unassigned	5,813	9,169,100	5,813	100.00%	0.06%
Wagram	Unassigned	840	9,169,100	840	100.00%	0.01%
Wake Forest (Franklin)	Unassigned	899	9,169,100	899	100.00%	0.01%

District plan definition file: 'STC-1.asc', modified 08/28/2017 03:19:02 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

STC-1 - Cumberland Amendment 3rd Reading: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Wake Forest (Wake)	Unassigned	29,218	9,169,100	29,218	100.00%	0.32%
Walkertown	Unassigned	4,675	9,169,100	4,675	100.00%	0.05%
Wallace (Duplin)	Unassigned	3,880	9,169,100	3,880	100.00%	0.04%
Wallace (Pender)	Unassigned	0	9,169,100	0	0.00%	0.00%
Wallburg	Unassigned	3,047	9,169,100	3,047	100.00%	0.03%
Walnut Cove	Unassigned	1,425	9,169,100	1,425	100.00%	0.02%
Walnut Creek	Unassigned	835	9,169,100	835	100.00%	0.01%
Walstonburg	Unassigned	219	9,169,100	219	100.00%	0.00%
Warrenton	Unassigned	862	9,169,100	862	100.00%	0.01%
Warsaw	Unassigned	3,054	9,169,100	3,054	100.00%	0.03%
Washington	Unassigned	9,744	9,169,100	9,744	100.00%	0.11%
Washington Park	Unassigned	451	9,169,100	451	100.00%	0.00%
Watha	Unassigned	190	9,169,100	190	100.00%	0.00%
Waxhaw	Unassigned	9,859	9,169,100	9,859	100.00%	0.11%
Waynesville	Unassigned	9,869	9,169,100	9,869	100.00%	0.11%
Weaverville	Unassigned	3,120	9,169,100	3,120	100.00%	0.03%
Webster	Unassigned	363	9,169,100	363	100.00%	0.00%
Weddington (Mecklenburg)	Unassigned	7	9,169,100	7	100.00%	0.00%
Weddington (Union)	Unassigned	9,452	9,169,100	9,452	100.00%	0.10%
Weldon	Unassigned	1,655	9,169,100	1,655	100.00%	0.02%
Wendell	Unassigned	5,845	9,169,100	5,845	100.00%	0.06%
Wentworth	Unassigned	2,807	9,169,100	2,807	100.00%	0.03%
Wesley Chapel	Unassigned	7,463	9,169,100	7,463	100.00%	0.08%
West Jefferson	Unassigned	1,299	9,169,100	1,299	100.00%	0.01%
Whispering Pines	Unassigned	2,928	9,169,100	2,928	100.00%	0.03%
Whitakers (Edgecombe)	Unassigned	402	9,169,100	402	100.00%	0.00%
Whitakers (Nash)	Unassigned	342	9,169,100	342	100.00%	0.00%
White Lake	Unassigned	802	9,169,100	802	100.00%	0.01%
Whiteville	Unassigned	5,394	9,169,100	5,394	100.00%	0.06%
Whitsett	Unassigned	590	9,169,100	590	100.00%	0.01%
Wilkesboro	Unassigned	3,413	9,169,100	3,413	100.00%	0.04%
Williamston	Unassigned	5,511	9,169,100	5,511	100.00%	0.06%
Wilmington	Unassigned	106,476	9,169,100	106,476	100.00%	1.16%
Wilson	Unassigned	49,167	9,169,100	49,167	100.00%	0.54%
Wilson's Mills	Unassigned	2,277	9,169,100	2,277	100.00%	0.02%
Windsor	Unassigned	3,630	9,169,100	3,630	100.00%	0.04%
Winfall	Unassigned	594	9,169,100	594	100.00%	0.01%
Wingate	Unassigned	3,491	9,169,100	3,491	100.00%	0.04%
Winston-Salem	Unassigned	229,617	9,169,100	229,617	100.00%	2.50%
Winterville	Unassigned	9,269	9,169,100	9,269	100.00%	0.10%
Winton	Unassigned	769	9,169,100	769	100.00%	0.01%
Woodfin	Unassigned	6,123	9,169,100	6,123	100.00%	0.07%
Woodland	Unassigned	809	9,169,100	809	100.00%	0.01%
Wrightsville Beach	Unassigned	2,477	9,169,100	2,477	100.00%	0.03%
Yadkinville	Unassigned	2,959	9,169,100	2,959	100.00%	0.03%
Yanceyville	Unassigned	2,039	9,169,100	2,039	100.00%	0.02%
Youngsville	Unassigned	1,157	9,169,100	1,157	100.00%	0.01%

District plan definition file: 'STC-1.asc', modified 08/28/2017 03:19:02 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

STC-1 - Cumberland Amendment 3rd Reading: Municipality - District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Zebulon (Johnston)	Unassigned	0	9,169,100	0	0.00%	0.00%
Zebulon (Wake)	Unassigned	4,433	9,169,100	4,433	100.00%	0.05%
			Total:	**5,250,071**		

District plan definition file: 'STC-1.asc', modified 08/28/2017 03:19:02 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

STC-1 - Cumberland Amendment 3rd Reading: Split VTD Detail

County	VTD	District	Total VTD Pop	VTD Pop in District	Percent of VTD Pop in District
Cumberland	G1	19	9,054	5,935	65.55%
		21	9,054	3,119	34.45%
	G11	19	31,242	16,616	53.18%
		21	31,242	14,626	46.82%
		Unassigned	31,242	0	0.00%

District plan definition file: 'STC-1.asc', modified 08/28/2017 03:19:02 PM

VTDs ('Voting Districts') derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Printed 08/28/2017 {rptG05|dc2017HS|re1.4.0}

STC-1 - Cumberland Amendment 3rd Reading: Population Deviation

District	2010 Pop	Ideal Pop	Deviation	Deviation %
19	182,897	190,710	-7,813	-4.10%
21	183,486	190,710	-7,224	-3.79%
Unassigned	9,169,100	190,710	8,978,390	4707.88%
Total:	**9,535,483**			

STC-1 - Cumberland Amendment 3rd Reading: Population 2010, US Senate 2010, President 2012

	2010 Census		US Senate 2010: Marshall-Burr-Beitler								US President 2012: Obama-Romney-Johnson							
District	**Total Pop**	**18+ Pop**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Write-In**	**Write-In %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Write-In**	**Write-In %**
19	182,897	133,637	18,960	47.00%	20,650	51.18%	715	1.77%	19	0.05%	38,382	51.91%	34,777	47.03%	612	0.83%	173	0.23%
21	183,486	133,020	22,382	60.35%	14,143	38.13%	542	1.46%	21	0.06%	47,486	67.08%	22,708	32.08%	482	0.68%	110	0.16%
Unassigned	9,169,100	6,987,191	1,100,358	42.73%	1,419,289	55.11%	54,297	2.11%	1,223	0.05%	2,085,425	47.96%	2,209,868	50.83%	43,354	1.00%	9,236	0.21%
Totals:	**9,535,483**	**7,253,848**	**1,141,700**	**43.04%**	**1,454,082**	**54.82%**	**55,554**	**2.09%**	**1,263**	**0.05%**	**2,171,293**	**48.33%**	**2,267,353**	**50.47%**	**44,448**	**0.99%**	**9,519**	**0.21%**

Populations values derive from the 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File. Election results were provided by the NC State Board of Elections. Votes that could not be associated with a specific precinct were excluded. Reported statewide totals may therefore be marginally lower than official contest results.

STC-1 - Cumberland Amendment 3rd Reading: Governor 2012, Lt Governor 2012, US Senate 2014

	Governor 2012: Dalton-McCrory-Howe								Lieutenant Governor 2012: Coleman-Forest				US Senate 2014: Tillis-Hagan-Haugh							
District	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Write-In**	**Write-In %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Write-In**	**Write-In %**
19	35,752	48.97%	35,564	48.71%	1,670	2.29%	24	0.03%	39,343	54.82%	32,426	45.18%	21,178	46.68%	22,488	49.56%	1,642	3.62%	64	0.14%
21	44,441	63.86%	23,702	34.06%	1,438	2.07%	14	0.02%	47,205	68.76%	21,443	31.24%	13,647	33.70%	25,609	63.24%	1,188	2.93%	52	0.13%
Unassigned	1,845,077	42.75%	2,377,958	55.10%	91,404	2.12%	1,153	0.03%	2,087,473	49.48%	2,131,022	50.52%	1,382,009	49.09%	1,322,206	46.97%	105,949	3.76%	5,135	0.18%
Totals:	**1,925,270**	**43.18%**	**2,437,224**	**54.67%**	**94,512**	**2.12%**	**1,191**	**0.03%**	**2,174,021**	**49.88%**	**2,184,891**	**50.12%**	**1,416,834**	**48.84%**	**1,370,303**	**47.23%**	**108,779**	**3.75%**	**5,251**	**0.18%**

STC-1 - Cumberland Amendment 3rd Reading: President 2016, US Senate 2016, Governor 2016

	US President 2016: Trump-Clinton-Johnson								US Senate 2016: Burr-Ross-Haugh						Governor 2016: Cooper-McCrory-Cecil					
District	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Write-In**	**Write-In %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**
19	36,280	47.17%	37,831	49.18%	2,068	2.69%	740	0.96%	36,244	47.70%	37,096	48.83%	2,636	3.47%	37,620	49.40%	36,796	48.32%	1,736	2.28%
21	22,745	33.05%	43,500	63.21%	1,882	2.73%	690	1.00%	23,327	34.37%	42,198	62.17%	2,353	3.47%	42,517	62.58%	23,765	34.98%	1,663	2.45%
Unassigned	2,300,724	50.19%	2,098,985	45.79%	125,979	2.75%	57,967	1.26%	2,332,868	51.44%	2,040,402	44.99%	162,201	3.58%	2,220,244	48.74%	2,235,478	49.08%	99,330	2.18%
Totals:	**2,359,749**	**49.90%**	**2,180,316**	**46.10%**	**129,929**	**2.75%**	**59,397**	**1.26%**	**2,392,439**	**51.13%**	**2,119,696**	**45.30%**	**167,190**	**3.57%**	**2,300,381**	**48.95%**	**2,296,039**	**48.86%**	**102,729**	**2.19%**

STC-1 - Cumberland Amendment 3rd Reading: Lieutenant Governor 2016, Attorney General 2016

	Lieutenant Governor 2016: Forest-Coleman-Cole						Attorney General 2016: Stein-Newton			
District	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**
19	35,569	47.55%	36,741	49.12%	2,486	3.32%	39,478	53.05%	34,932	46.95%
21	22,498	33.70%	41,957	62.85%	2,302	3.45%	43,948	66.29%	22,347	33.71%
Unassigned	2,332,552	52.22%	2,006,277	44.92%	127,572	2.86%	2,211,429	49.91%	2,218,997	50.09%
Totals:	**2,390,619**	**51.88%**	**2,084,975**	**45.25%**	**132,360**	**2.87%**	**2,294,855**	**50.20%**	**2,276,276**	**49.80%**

EX. 37

2017 HOUSE AND SENATE PLANS CRITERIA

Equal Population. The Committees shall use the 2010 federal decennial census data as the sole basis of population for drawing legislative districts in the 2017 House and Senate plans. The number of persons in each legislative district shall comply with the +/- 5 percent population deviation standard established by *Stephenson v. Bartlett*, 355 N.C. 354, 562 S.E. 2d 377 (2002).

Contiguity. Legislative districts shall be comprised of contiguous territory. Contiguity by water is sufficient.

County Groupings and Traversals. The Committees shall draw legislative districts within county groupings as required by *Stephenson v. Bartlett*, 355 N.C. 354, 562 S.E. 2d 377 (2002) (*Stephenson I*), *Stephenson v. Bartlett*, 357 N.C. 301, 582 S.E.2d 247 (2003) (*Stephenson II*), *Dickson v. Rucho*, 367 N.C. 542, 766 S.E.2d 238 (2014) (*Dickson I*) and *Dickson v. Rucho*, 368 N.C. 481, 781 S.E.2d 460 (2015) (*Dickson II*). Within county groupings, county lines shall not be traversed except as authorized by *Stephenson I*, *Stephenson II*, *Dickson I*, and *Dickson II*.

Compactness. The Committees shall make reasonable efforts to draw legislative districts in the 2017 House and Senate plans that improve the compactness of the current districts. In doing so, the Committees may use as a guide the minimum Reock ("dispersion") and Polsby-Popper ("perimeter") scores identified by Richard H. Pildes and Richard G. Neimi in *Expressive Harms, "Bizarre Districts," and Voting Rights: Evaluating Election-District Appearances After Shaw v. Reno*, 92 Mich. L. Rev. 483 (1993).

Fewer Split Precincts. The Committees shall make reasonable efforts to draw legislative districts in the 2017 House and Senate plans that split fewer precincts than the current legislative redistricting plans.

Municipal Boundaries. The Committees may consider municipal boundaries when drawing legislative districts in the 2017 House and Senate plans.

Incumbency Protection. Reasonable efforts and political considerations may be used to avoid pairing incumbent members of the House or Senate with another incumbent in legislative districts drawn in the 2017 House and Senate plans. The Committees may make reasonable efforts to ensure voters have a reasonable opportunity to elect non-paired incumbents of either party to a district in the 2017 House and Senate plans.

Election Data. Political considerations and election results data may be used in the drawing of legislative districts in the 2017 House and Senate plans.

No Consideration of Racial Data. Data identifying the race of individuals or voters shall not be used in the drawing of legislative districts in the 2017 House and Senate plans.

EX. 38

H927-ABK-42-Districts 82 and 83



N
W E
S

0 5 10 15 20 Miles

H927-ABK-42-Districts 82 and 83

Printed by the NC General Assembly, August 24, 2017.

NORTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY
AMENDMENT
House Bill 927

AMENDMENT NO. _____
(to be filled in by
Principal Clerk)

H927-ABK-42 [v.1]

Amends Title [NO]
H927-CSBK-31

Date _____,2017

Representative Speciale

moves to amend the bill on page 23, lines 19-25, by deleting those lines and substituting the following:

"**District 82**: Cabarrus County: VTD 01-06, VTD 01-08, VTD 01-09, VTD 01-10, VTD 02-01, VTD 02-02, VTD 02-03, VTD 02-05, VTD 02-06, VTD 02-07, VTD 02-08, VTD 02-09, VTD 03-00, VTD 04-08, VTD 04-09, VTD 04-10, VTD 12-09, VTD 12-12.
District 83: Cabarrus County: VTD 04-01, VTD 04-02, VTD 04-03, VTD 04-04, VTD 04-05, VTD 04-06, VTD 04-07, VTD 05-00, VTD 11-01, VTD 11-02, VTD 12-01, VTD 12-02, VTD 12-03, VTD 12-04, VTD 12-05, VTD 12-06, VTD 12-07, VTD 12-08, VTD 12-10, VTD 12-11; Rowan County: VTD 05, VTD 06, VTD 17, VTD 20, VTD 33.".

SIGNED _____
Amendment Sponsor

SIGNED _____
Committee Chair if Senate Committee Amendment

ADOPTED _____ FAILED _____ TABLED _____

HBK-20 Speciale - Districts 82 and 83: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Aberdeen	52	6,350	76,894	6,350	100.00%	8.26%
Ahoskie	5	5,039	77,527	5,039	100.00%	6.50%
Alamance	64	951	75,581	951	100.00%	1.26%
Albemarle	66	15,903	82,854	0	0.00%	0.00%
	67	15,903	82,761	15,903	100.00%	19.22%
Alliance	6	776	76,421	776	100.00%	1.02%
Andrews	120	1,781	80,814	1,781	100.00%	2.20%
Angier (Harnett)	28	4,247	83,432	4,242	99.88%	5.08%
	53	4,247	83,429	5	0.12%	0.01%
Angier (Wake)	37	103	80,332	103	100.00%	0.13%
Ansonville	55	631	75,792	631	100.00%	0.83%
Apex	11	37,476	81,539	2	0.01%	0.00%
	36	37,476	81,926	7,166	19.12%	8.75%
	37	37,476	80,332	9,305	24.83%	11.58%
	41	37,476	82,359	21,003	56.04%	25.50%
Arapahoe	6	556	76,421	556	100.00%	0.73%
Archdale (Guilford)	59	333	79,907	217	65.17%	0.27%
	60	333	81,856	116	34.83%	0.14%
Archdale (Randolph)	70	11,082	76,125	11,082	100.00%	14.56%
Archer Lodge	26	4,292	83,431	4,292	100.00%	5.14%
Asheboro	70	25,012	76,125	21,327	85.27%	28.02%
	78	25,012	76,980	3,685	14.73%	4.79%
Asheville	114	83,393	82,902	66,182	79.36%	79.83%
	115	83,393	79,883	5,409	6.49%	6.77%
	116	83,393	75,533	11,802	14.15%	15.62%
Askewville	1	241	77,143	241	100.00%	0.31%
Atkinson	16	299	81,425	299	100.00%	0.37%
Atlantic Beach	13	1,495	76,622	1,495	100.00%	1.95%
Aulander	1	895	77,143	895	100.00%	1.16%
Aurora	79	520	75,538	520	100.00%	0.69%
Autryville	22	196	83,434	196	100.00%	0.23%
Ayden	12	4,932	75,923	4,932	100.00%	6.50%
Badin	66	1,974	82,854	1,974	100.00%	2.38%
Bailey	25	569	78,432	569	100.00%	0.73%
Bakersville	85	464	78,372	464	100.00%	0.59%
Bald Head Island	17	158	77,263	158	100.00%	0.20%
Banner Elk	85	1,028	78,372	1,028	100.00%	1.31%
Bath	79	249	75,538	249	100.00%	0.33%
Bayboro	6	1,263	76,421	1,263	100.00%	1.65%
Bear Grass	23	73	81,057	73	100.00%	0.09%
Beaufort	13	4,039	76,622	4,039	100.00%	5.27%
Beech Mountain (Avery)	85	24	78,372	24	100.00%	0.03%
Beech Mountain (Watauga)	93	296	78,360	296	100.00%	0.38%
Belhaven	79	1,688	75,538	1,688	100.00%	2.23%
Belmont	108	10,076	76,926	4,622	45.87%	6.01%
	109	10,076	75,517	5,454	54.13%	7.22%
Belville	18	1,936	77,681	1,936	100.00%	2.49%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-20.asc', modified 08/24/2017 11:02:00 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

HBK-20 Speciale - Districts 82 and 83: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Belwood	111	950	76,148	950	100.00%	1.25%
Benson (Harnett)	53	0	83,429	0	0.00%	0.00%
Benson (Johnston)	28	3,311	83,432	3,311	100.00%	3.97%
Bermuda Run	77	1,725	82,918	1,725	100.00%	2.08%
Bessemer City	110	5,340	75,573	5,340	100.00%	7.07%
Bethania	75	328	79,963	328	100.00%	0.41%
Bethel	8	1,577	75,926	1,577	100.00%	2.08%
Beulaville	4	1,296	81,905	1,296	100.00%	1.58%
Biltmore Forest	116	1,343	75,533	1,343	100.00%	1.78%
Biscoe	66	1,700	82,854	1,700	100.00%	2.05%
Black Creek	24	769	81,234	769	100.00%	0.95%
Black Mountain	115	7,848	79,883	7,848	100.00%	9.82%
Bladenboro	22	1,750	83,434	1,750	100.00%	2.10%
Blowing Rock (Caldwell)	87	49	83,029	49	100.00%	0.06%
Blowing Rock (Watauga)	93	1,192	78,360	1,192	100.00%	1.52%
Boardman	46	157	80,440	157	100.00%	0.20%
Bogue	13	684	76,622	684	100.00%	0.89%
Boiling Spring Lakes	17	5,372	77,263	5,370	99.96%	6.95%
	18	5,372	77,681	2	0.04%	0.00%
Boiling Springs	111	4,647	76,148	4,647	100.00%	6.10%
Bolivia	18	143	77,681	143	100.00%	0.18%
Bolton	16	691	81,425	691	100.00%	0.85%
Boone	93	17,122	78,360	17,122	100.00%	21.85%
Boonville	73	1,222	78,189	1,222	100.00%	1.56%
Bostic	112	386	79,547	386	100.00%	0.49%
Brevard	113	7,609	81,089	7,609	100.00%	9.38%
Bridgeton	79	454	75,538	454	100.00%	0.60%
Broadway (Harnett)	53	25	83,429	25	100.00%	0.03%
Broadway (Lee)	51	1,204	83,434	1,204	100.00%	1.44%
Brookford	89	382	77,838	321	84.03%	0.41%
	96	382	76,520	61	15.97%	0.08%
Brunswick	16	1,119	81,425	1,119	100.00%	1.37%
Bryson City	119	1,424	75,548	1,424	100.00%	1.88%
Bunn	25	344	78,432	344	100.00%	0.44%
Burgaw	16	3,872	81,425	3,872	100.00%	4.76%
Burlington (Alamance)	63	49,308	75,550	23,248	47.15%	30.77%
	64	49,308	75,581	26,060	52.85%	34.48%
Burlington (Guilford)	59	655	79,907	655	100.00%	0.82%
Burnsville	118	1,693	76,322	1,693	100.00%	2.22%
Butner	2	7,591	82,634	7,591	100.00%	9.19%
Cajah's Mountain	87	2,823	83,029	2,823	100.00%	3.40%
Calabash	17	1,786	77,263	1,786	100.00%	2.31%
Calypso	4	538	81,905	538	100.00%	0.66%
Cameron	52	285	76,894	285	100.00%	0.37%
Candor	66	840	82,854	840	100.00%	1.01%
Canton	118	4,227	76,322	4,227	100.00%	5.54%
Cape Carteret	13	1,917	76,622	1,917	100.00%	2.50%

HBK-20 Speciale - Districts 82 and 83: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Carolina Beach	19	5,706	76,666	5,706	100.00%	7.44%
Carolina Shores	17	3,048	77,263	3,048	100.00%	3.94%
Carrboro	50	19,582	80,866	81	0.41%	0.10%
	56	19,582	76,654	19,501	99.59%	25.44%
Carthage	52	2,205	76,894	6	0.27%	0.01%
	78	2,205	76,980	2,199	99.73%	2.86%
Cary (Chatham)	54	1,422	82,312	1,422	100.00%	1.73%
Cary (Wake)	11	133,812	81,539	51,109	38.19%	62.68%
	36	133,812	81,926	19,380	14.48%	23.66%
	37	133,812	80,332	2,024	1.51%	2.52%
	41	133,812	82,359	46,234	34.55%	56.14%
	49	133,812	82,621	15,065	11.26%	18.23%
Casar	111	297	76,148	297	100.00%	0.39%
Castalia	7	268	78,027	268	100.00%	0.34%
Caswell Beach	17	398	77,263	398	100.00%	0.52%
Catawba	89	603	77,838	603	100.00%	0.77%
Cedar Point	13	1,279	76,622	1,279	100.00%	1.67%
Cedar Rock	87	300	83,029	300	100.00%	0.36%
Centerville	25	89	78,432	89	100.00%	0.11%
Cerro Gordo	46	207	80,440	207	100.00%	0.26%
Chadbourn	46	1,856	80,440	1,856	100.00%	2.31%
Chapel Hill (Durham)	29	2,836	82,735	2,234	78.77%	2.70%
	54	2,836	82,312	602	21.23%	0.73%
Chapel Hill (Orange)	50	54,397	80,866	2,280	4.19%	2.82%
	56	54,397	76,654	52,117	95.81%	67.99%
Charlotte	88	731,424	77,172	57,603	7.88%	74.64%
	92	731,424	76,022	72,044	9.85%	94.77%
	98	731,424	75,602	0	0.00%	0.00%
	99	731,424	77,141	67,000	9.16%	86.85%
	100	731,424	75,589	64,757	8.85%	85.67%
	101	731,424	79,876	71,339	9.75%	89.31%
	102	731,424	77,391	77,391	10.58%	100.00%
	103	731,424	76,381	30,850	4.22%	40.39%
	104	731,424	76,869	76,869	10.51%	100.00%
	105	731,424	75,967	75,967	10.39%	100.00%
	106	731,424	75,762	74,391	10.17%	98.19%
	107	731,424	75,856	63,213	8.64%	83.33%
Cherryville	110	5,760	75,573	5,760	100.00%	7.62%
Chimney Rock Village	112	113	79,547	113	100.00%	0.14%
China Grove	83	3,563	81,381	3,563	100.00%	4.38%
Chocowinity	79	820	75,538	820	100.00%	1.09%
Claremont	89	1,352	77,838	1,352	100.00%	1.74%
Clarkton	22	837	83,434	837	100.00%	1.00%
Clayton (Johnston)	26	16,116	83,431	16,116	100.00%	19.32%
Clayton (Wake)	39	0	82,181	0	0.00%	0.00%
Clemmons	73	18,627	78,189	6,625	35.57%	8.47%
	74	18,627	78,886	12,002	64.43%	15.21%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-20.asc', modified 08/24/2017 11:02:00 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

HBK-20 Speciale - Districts 82 and 83: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Cleveland	77	871	82,918	871	100.00%	1.05%
Clinton	21	8,639	83,434	6,682	77.35%	8.01%
	22	8,639	83,434	1,957	22.65%	2.35%
Clyde	118	1,223	76,322	1,223	100.00%	1.60%
Coats	53	2,112	83,429	2,112	100.00%	2.53%
Cofield	5	413	77,527	413	100.00%	0.53%
Colerain	1	204	77,143	204	100.00%	0.26%
Columbia	1	891	77,143	891	100.00%	1.15%
Columbus	113	999	81,089	999	100.00%	1.23%
Como	5	91	77,527	91	100.00%	0.12%
Concord	67	79,066	82,761	0	0.00%	0.00%
	82	79,066	80,879	48,154	60.90%	59.54%
	83	79,066	81,381	30,912	39.10%	37.98%
Conetoe	23	294	81,057	294	100.00%	0.36%
Connelly Springs	86	1,669	79,175	1,669	100.00%	2.11%
Conover	89	8,165	77,838	384	4.70%	0.49%
	96	8,165	76,520	7,781	95.30%	10.17%
Conway	27	836	76,790	836	100.00%	1.09%
Cooleemee	77	960	82,918	960	100.00%	1.16%
Cornelius	98	24,866	75,602	24,866	100.00%	32.89%
Cove City	79	399	75,538	399	100.00%	0.53%
Cramerton	108	4,165	76,926	1	0.02%	0.00%
	109	4,165	75,517	4,164	99.98%	5.51%
Creedmoor	2	4,124	82,634	4,124	100.00%	4.99%
Creswell	1	276	77,143	276	100.00%	0.36%
Crossnore	85	192	78,372	192	100.00%	0.24%
Dallas	110	4,488	75,573	4,488	100.00%	5.94%
Danbury	91	189	83,388	189	100.00%	0.23%
Davidson (Iredell)	95	294	82,155	294	100.00%	0.36%
Davidson (Mecklenburg)	98	10,650	75,602	10,650	100.00%	14.09%
Dellview	110	13	75,573	13	100.00%	0.02%
Denton	80	1,636	81,522	1,636	100.00%	2.01%
Dillsboro	119	232	75,548	232	100.00%	0.31%
Dobbins Heights	66	866	82,854	866	100.00%	1.05%
Dobson	90	1,586	82,608	1,586	100.00%	1.92%
Dortches	7	935	78,027	935	100.00%	1.20%
Dover	79	401	75,538	401	100.00%	0.53%
Drexel	86	1,858	79,175	1,858	100.00%	2.35%
Dublin	22	338	83,434	338	100.00%	0.41%
Duck	6	369	76,421	369	100.00%	0.48%
Dunn	53	9,263	83,429	9,263	100.00%	11.10%
Durham (Durham)	29	228,300	82,735	79,803	34.96%	96.46%
	30	228,300	83,272	60,805	26.63%	73.02%
	31	228,300	82,773	71,653	31.39%	86.57%
	54	228,300	82,312	16,039	7.03%	19.49%
Durham (Orange)	50	30	80,866	30	100.00%	0.04%
Durham (Wake)	41	0	82,359	0	0.00%	0.00%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-20.asc', modified 08/24/2017 11:02:00 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

HBK-20 Speciale - Districts 82 and 83: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Earl	111	260	76,148	260	100.00%	0.34%
East Arcadia	22	487	83,434	487	100.00%	0.58%
East Bend	73	612	78,189	612	100.00%	0.78%
East Laurinburg	48	300	83,109	300	100.00%	0.36%
East Spencer	76	1,534	81,908	1,534	100.00%	1.87%
Eastover	45	3,628	79,294	3,628	100.00%	4.58%
Eden	65	15,527	83,430	15,527	100.00%	18.61%
Edenton	1	5,004	77,143	5,004	100.00%	6.49%
Elizabeth City (Camden)	1	45	77,143	45	100.00%	0.06%
Elizabeth City (Pasquotank)	5	18,638	77,527	18,638	100.00%	24.04%
Elizabethtown	22	3,583	83,434	3,583	100.00%	4.29%
Elk Park	85	452	78,372	452	100.00%	0.58%
Elkin (Surry)	90	3,921	82,608	3,921	100.00%	4.75%
Elkin (Wilkes)	94	80	82,984	80	100.00%	0.10%
Ellenboro	112	873	79,547	873	100.00%	1.10%
Ellerbe	66	1,054	82,854	1,054	100.00%	1.27%
Elm City	24	1,298	81,234	1,298	100.00%	1.60%
Elon	64	9,419	75,581	9,419	100.00%	12.46%
Emerald Isle	13	3,655	76,622	3,655	100.00%	4.77%
Enfield	27	2,532	76,790	2,532	100.00%	3.30%
Erwin	53	4,405	83,429	4,405	100.00%	5.28%
Eureka	10	197	83,434	197	100.00%	0.24%
Everetts	23	164	81,057	164	100.00%	0.20%
Fair Bluff	46	951	80,440	951	100.00%	1.18%
Fairmont	47	2,663	82,618	2,663	100.00%	3.22%
Fairview	55	3,324	75,792	3,324	100.00%	4.39%
Faison (Duplin)	4	961	81,905	961	100.00%	1.17%
Faison (Sampson)	21	0	83,434	0	0.00%	0.00%
Faith	76	807	81,908	807	100.00%	0.99%
Falcon (Cumberland)	45	258	79,294	258	100.00%	0.33%
Falcon (Sampson)	22	0	83,434	0	0.00%	0.00%
Falkland	8	96	75,926	96	100.00%	0.13%
Fallston	111	607	76,148	607	100.00%	0.80%
Farmville	8	4,654	75,926	4,654	100.00%	6.13%
Fayetteville	42	200,564	81,439	67,394	33.60%	82.75%
	43	200,564	77,725	74,393	37.09%	95.71%
	44	200,564	80,973	51,354	25.60%	63.42%
	45	200,564	79,294	7,423	3.70%	9.36%
Flat Rock	113	3,114	81,089	3,114	100.00%	3.84%
Fletcher	117	7,187	79,251	7,187	100.00%	9.07%
Forest City	112	7,476	79,547	7,476	100.00%	9.40%
Forest Hills	119	365	75,548	365	100.00%	0.48%
Fountain	8	427	75,926	427	100.00%	0.56%
Four Oaks	28	1,921	83,432	1,921	100.00%	2.30%
Foxfire	52	902	76,894	902	100.00%	1.17%
Franklin	120	3,845	80,814	3,845	100.00%	4.76%
Franklinton	25	2,023	78,432	2,023	100.00%	2.58%

HBK-20 Speciale - Districts 82 and 83: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Franklinville	78	1,164	76,980	1,164	100.00%	1.51%
Fremont	10	1,255	83,434	1,255	100.00%	1.50%
Fuquay-Varina	36	17,937	81,926	228	1.27%	0.28%
	37	17,937	80,332	17,709	98.73%	22.04%
Gamewell	87	4,051	83,029	4,051	100.00%	4.88%
Garland	22	625	83,434	625	100.00%	0.75%
Garner	33	25,745	82,642	21,767	84.55%	26.34%
	36	25,745	81,926	3,823	14.85%	4.67%
	39	25,745	82,181	155	0.60%	0.19%
Garysburg	27	1,057	76,790	1,057	100.00%	1.38%
Gaston	27	1,152	76,790	1,152	100.00%	1.50%
Gastonia	108	71,741	76,926	26,870	37.45%	34.93%
	109	71,741	75,517	41,847	58.33%	55.41%
	110	71,741	75,573	3,024	4.22%	4.00%
Gatesville	5	321	77,527	321	100.00%	0.41%
Gibson	48	540	83,109	540	100.00%	0.65%
Gibsonville (Alamance)	64	3,148	75,581	3,148	100.00%	4.17%
Gibsonville (Guilford)	59	3,262	79,907	3,262	100.00%	4.08%
Glen Alpine	86	1,517	79,175	1,517	100.00%	1.92%
Godwin	45	139	79,294	139	100.00%	0.18%
Goldsboro	10	36,437	83,434	2,531	6.95%	3.03%
	21	36,437	83,434	33,906	93.05%	40.64%
Goldston	54	268	82,312	268	100.00%	0.33%
Graham	63	14,153	75,550	14,153	100.00%	18.73%
Grandfather	85	25	78,372	25	100.00%	0.03%
Granite Falls	87	4,722	83,029	4,722	100.00%	5.69%
Granite Quarry	76	2,930	81,908	2,930	100.00%	3.58%
Grantsboro	6	688	76,421	688	100.00%	0.90%
Green Level	63	2,100	75,550	2,100	100.00%	2.78%
Greenevers	4	634	81,905	634	100.00%	0.77%
Greensboro	57	269,666	82,755	80,164	29.73%	96.87%
	58	269,666	82,137	76,171	28.25%	92.74%
	59	269,666	79,907	11,283	4.18%	14.12%
	60	269,666	81,856	14,170	5.25%	17.31%
	61	269,666	81,019	36,131	13.40%	44.60%
	62	269,666	80,732	51,747	19.19%	64.10%
Greenville	8	84,554	75,926	48,780	57.69%	64.25%
	9	84,554	75,794	34,649	40.98%	45.71%
	12	84,554	75,923	1,125	1.33%	1.48%
Grifton (Lenoir)	12	186	75,923	186	100.00%	0.24%
Grifton (Pitt)	12	2,431	75,923	2,431	100.00%	3.20%
Grimesland	9	441	75,794	441	100.00%	0.58%
Grover	111	708	76,148	708	100.00%	0.93%
Halifax	27	234	76,790	234	100.00%	0.30%
Hamilton	23	408	81,057	408	100.00%	0.50%
Hamlet	66	6,495	82,854	6,495	100.00%	7.84%
Harmony	84	531	77,282	531	100.00%	0.69%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-20.asc', modified 08/24/2017 11:02:00 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

HBK-20 Speciale - Districts 82 and 83: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Harrells (Duplin)	4	23	81,905	23	100.00%	0.03%
Harrells (Sampson)	22	179	83,434	179	100.00%	0.21%
Harrellsville	5	106	77,527	106	100.00%	0.14%
Harrisburg	67	11,526	82,761	3,156	27.38%	3.81%
	82	11,526	80,879	8,370	72.62%	10.35%
Hassell	23	84	81,057	84	100.00%	0.10%
Havelock	3	20,735	75,726	20,735	100.00%	27.38%
Haw River	63	2,298	75,550	2,254	98.09%	2.98%
	64	2,298	75,581	44	1.91%	0.06%
Hayesville	120	311	80,814	311	100.00%	0.38%
Hemby Bridge	69	1,520	76,381	1,520	100.00%	1.99%
Henderson	32	15,368	83,140	15,368	100.00%	18.48%
Hendersonville	113	13,137	81,089	514	3.91%	0.63%
	117	13,137	79,251	12,623	96.09%	15.93%
Hertford	1	2,143	77,143	2,143	100.00%	2.78%
Hickory (Burke)	86	66	79,175	66	100.00%	0.08%
Hickory (Caldwell)	87	18	83,029	18	100.00%	0.02%
Hickory (Catawba)	89	39,926	77,838	5,448	13.65%	7.00%
	96	39,926	76,520	34,478	86.35%	45.06%
High Point (Davidson)	80	5,310	81,522	5,310	100.00%	6.51%
High Point (Forsyth)	74	8	78,886	8	100.00%	0.01%
High Point (Guilford)	59	99,042	79,907	33	0.03%	0.04%
	60	99,042	81,856	59,653	60.23%	72.88%
	61	99,042	81,019	39,356	39.74%	48.58%
High Point (Randolph)	70	11	76,125	11	100.00%	0.01%
High Shoals	110	696	75,573	696	100.00%	0.92%
Highlands (Jackson)	119	4	75,548	4	100.00%	0.01%
Highlands (Macon)	120	920	80,814	920	100.00%	1.14%
Hildebran	86	2,023	79,175	2,023	100.00%	2.56%
Hillsborough	50	6,087	80,866	6,087	100.00%	7.53%
Hobgood	27	348	76,790	348	100.00%	0.45%
Hoffman	66	588	82,854	588	100.00%	0.71%
Holden Beach	17	575	77,263	575	100.00%	0.74%
Holly Ridge	15	1,268	77,307	1,268	100.00%	1.64%
Holly Springs	37	24,661	80,332	24,661	100.00%	30.70%
Hookerton	10	409	83,434	409	100.00%	0.49%
Hope Mills	44	15,176	80,973	5,976	39.38%	7.38%
	45	15,176	79,294	9,200	60.62%	11.60%
Hot Springs	118	560	76,322	560	100.00%	0.73%
Hudson	87	3,776	83,029	3,776	100.00%	4.55%
Huntersville	98	46,773	75,602	36,997	79.10%	48.94%
	107	46,773	75,856	9,776	20.90%	12.89%
Indian Beach	13	112	76,622	112	100.00%	0.15%
Indian Trail	55	33,518	75,792	51	0.15%	0.07%
	68	33,518	76,067	7,845	23.41%	10.31%
	69	33,518	76,381	25,622	76.44%	33.54%
Jackson	27	513	76,790	513	100.00%	0.67%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-20.asc', modified 08/24/2017 11:02:00 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

HBK-20 Speciale - Districts 82 and 83: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Jacksonville	14	70,145	77,065	27,897	39.77%	36.20%
	15	70,145	77,307	42,248	60.23%	54.65%
Jamestown	58	3,382	82,137	0	0.00%	0.00%
	59	3,382	79,907	4	0.12%	0.01%
	60	3,382	81,856	3,378	99.88%	4.13%
Jamesville	23	491	81,057	491	100.00%	0.61%
Jefferson	93	1,611	78,360	1,611	100.00%	2.06%
Jonesville	73	2,285	78,189	2,285	100.00%	2.92%
Kannapolis (Cabarrus)	82	33,194	80,879	9,248	27.86%	11.43%
	83	33,194	81,381	23,946	72.14%	29.42%
Kannapolis (Rowan)	77	9,431	82,918	5,529	58.63%	6.67%
	83	9,431	81,381	3,902	41.37%	4.79%
Kelford	1	251	77,143	251	100.00%	0.33%
Kenansville	4	855	81,905	855	100.00%	1.04%
Kenly (Johnston)	28	1,176	83,432	1,176	100.00%	1.41%
Kenly (Wilson)	24	163	81,234	163	100.00%	0.20%
Kernersville (Forsyth)	74	23,071	78,886	17,791	77.11%	22.55%
	75	23,071	79,963	5,280	22.89%	6.60%
Kernersville (Guilford)	61	52	81,019	52	100.00%	0.06%
Kill Devil Hills	6	6,683	76,421	6,683	100.00%	8.74%
King (Forsyth)	75	619	79,963	619	100.00%	0.77%
King (Stokes)	91	6,285	83,388	6,285	100.00%	7.54%
Kings Mountain (Cleveland)	110	9,242	75,573	0	0.00%	0.00%
	111	9,242	76,148	9,242	100.00%	12.14%
Kings Mountain (Gaston)	110	1,054	75,573	1,054	100.00%	1.39%
Kingstown	111	681	76,148	681	100.00%	0.89%
Kinston	12	21,677	75,923	21,677	100.00%	28.55%
Kittrell	32	467	83,140	467	100.00%	0.56%
Kitty Hawk	6	3,272	76,421	3,272	100.00%	4.28%
Knightdale	35	11,401	81,862	0	0.00%	0.00%
	39	11,401	82,181	11,401	100.00%	13.87%
Kure Beach	19	2,012	76,666	2,012	100.00%	2.62%
La Grange	12	2,873	75,923	2,873	100.00%	3.78%
Lake Lure	112	1,192	79,547	1,192	100.00%	1.50%
Lake Park	69	3,422	76,381	3,422	100.00%	4.48%
Lake Santeetlah	120	45	80,814	45	100.00%	0.06%
Lake Waccamaw	16	1,480	81,425	1,480	100.00%	1.82%
Landis	77	3,109	82,918	1,773	57.03%	2.14%
	83	3,109	81,381	1,336	42.97%	1.64%
Lansing	93	158	78,360	158	100.00%	0.20%
Lasker	27	122	76,790	122	100.00%	0.16%
Lattimore	111	488	76,148	488	100.00%	0.64%
Laurel Park	113	2,180	81,089	2	0.09%	0.00%
	117	2,180	79,251	2,178	99.91%	2.75%
Laurinburg	48	15,962	83,109	15,962	100.00%	19.21%
Lawndale	111	606	76,148	606	100.00%	0.80%
Leggett	23	60	81,057	60	100.00%	0.07%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-20.asc', modified 08/24/2017 11:02:00 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

HBK-20 Speciale - Districts 82 and 83: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Leland	17	13,527	77,263	2,631	19.45%	3.41%
	18	13,527	77,681	10,896	80.55%	14.03%
Lenoir	87	18,228	83,029	18,228	100.00%	21.95%
Lewiston Woodville	1	549	77,143	549	100.00%	0.71%
Lewisville	73	12,639	78,189	10,883	86.11%	13.92%
	75	12,639	79,963	1,756	13.89%	2.20%
Lexington	80	18,931	81,522	0	0.00%	0.00%
	81	18,931	81,356	18,931	100.00%	23.27%
Liberty	78	2,656	76,980	2,656	100.00%	3.45%
Lilesville	55	536	75,792	536	100.00%	0.71%
Lillington	53	3,194	83,429	3,194	100.00%	3.83%
Lincolnton	97	10,486	78,265	10,486	100.00%	13.40%
Linden	45	130	79,294	130	100.00%	0.16%
Littleton	27	674	76,790	674	100.00%	0.88%
Locust (Cabarrus)	67	215	82,761	215	100.00%	0.26%
Locust (Stanly)	67	2,715	82,761	2,715	100.00%	3.28%
Long View (Burke)	86	752	79,175	752	100.00%	0.95%
Long View (Catawba)	96	4,119	76,520	4,119	100.00%	5.38%
Louisburg	25	3,359	78,432	3,359	100.00%	4.28%
Love Valley	84	90	77,282	90	100.00%	0.12%
Lowell	108	3,526	76,926	3,526	100.00%	4.58%
Lucama	24	1,108	81,234	1,108	100.00%	1.36%
Lumber Bridge	46	94	80,440	94	100.00%	0.12%
Lumberton	46	21,542	80,440	5,785	26.85%	7.19%
	47	21,542	82,618	15,757	73.15%	19.07%
Macclesfield	23	471	81,057	471	100.00%	0.58%
Macon	32	119	83,140	119	100.00%	0.14%
Madison	91	2,246	83,388	2,246	100.00%	2.69%
Maggie Valley	118	1,150	76,322	1,039	90.35%	1.36%
	119	1,150	75,548	111	9.65%	0.15%
Magnolia	4	939	81,905	939	100.00%	1.15%
Maiden (Catawba)	89	3,308	77,838	3,308	100.00%	4.25%
Maiden (Lincoln)	97	2	78,265	2	100.00%	0.00%
Manteo	6	1,434	76,421	1,434	100.00%	1.88%
Marietta	46	175	80,440	175	100.00%	0.22%
Marion	85	7,838	78,372	7,838	100.00%	10.00%
Mars Hill	118	1,869	76,322	1,869	100.00%	2.45%
Marshall	118	872	76,322	872	100.00%	1.14%
Marshville	55	2,402	75,792	2,402	100.00%	3.17%
Marvin	68	5,579	76,067	5,579	100.00%	7.33%
Matthews	103	27,198	76,381	27,198	100.00%	35.61%
Maxton (Robeson)	47	2,230	82,618	2,230	100.00%	2.70%
Maxton (Scotland)	48	196	83,109	196	100.00%	0.24%
Mayodan	91	2,478	83,388	2,478	100.00%	2.97%
Maysville	13	1,019	76,622	1,019	100.00%	1.33%
McAdenville	108	651	76,926	651	100.00%	0.85%
McDonald	47	113	82,618	113	100.00%	0.14%

HBK-20 Speciale - Districts 82 and 83: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
McFarlan	55	117	75,792	117	100.00%	0.15%
Mebane (Alamance)	63	9,600	75,550	9,600	100.00%	12.71%
Mebane (Orange)	50	1,793	80,866	1,793	100.00%	2.22%
Mesic	6	220	76,421	220	100.00%	0.29%
Micro	28	441	83,432	441	100.00%	0.53%
Middleburg	32	133	83,140	133	100.00%	0.16%
Middlesex	25	822	78,432	822	100.00%	1.05%
Midland (Cabarrus)	67	3,073	82,761	3,073	100.00%	3.71%
Midland (Mecklenburg)	103	0	76,381	0	0.00%	0.00%
Midway	80	4,679	81,522	3,504	74.89%	4.30%
	81	4,679	81,356	1,175	25.11%	1.44%
Mills River	113	6,802	81,089	300	4.41%	0.37%
	117	6,802	79,251	6,502	95.59%	8.20%
Milton	50	166	80,866	166	100.00%	0.21%
Mineral Springs	55	2,639	75,792	688	26.07%	0.91%
	68	2,639	76,067	1,951	73.93%	2.56%
Minnesott Beach	6	440	76,421	440	100.00%	0.58%
Mint Hill (Mecklenburg)	100	22,669	75,589	7,784	34.34%	10.30%
	103	22,669	76,381	14,885	65.66%	19.49%
Mint Hill (Union)	69	53	76,381	53	100.00%	0.07%
Misenheimer	67	728	82,761	728	100.00%	0.88%
Mocksville	77	5,051	82,918	5,051	100.00%	6.09%
Momeyer	7	224	78,027	224	100.00%	0.29%
Monroe	55	32,797	75,792	3,133	9.55%	4.13%
	68	32,797	76,067	13,278	40.49%	17.46%
	69	32,797	76,381	16,386	49.96%	21.45%
Montreat	115	723	79,883	723	100.00%	0.91%
Mooresboro	111	311	76,148	311	100.00%	0.41%
Mooresville	95	32,711	82,155	32,711	100.00%	39.82%
Morehead City	13	8,661	76,622	8,661	100.00%	11.30%
Morganton	86	16,918	79,175	16,918	100.00%	21.37%
Morrisville (Durham)	31	0	82,773	0	0.00%	0.00%
Morrisville (Wake)	11	18,576	81,539	0	0.00%	0.00%
	41	18,576	82,359	11,226	60.43%	13.63%
	49	18,576	82,621	7,350	39.57%	8.90%
Morven	55	511	75,792	511	100.00%	0.67%
Mount Airy	90	10,388	82,608	9,164	88.22%	11.09%
	91	10,388	83,388	1,224	11.78%	1.47%
Mount Gilead	66	1,181	82,854	1,181	100.00%	1.43%
Mount Holly	108	13,656	76,926	13,656	100.00%	17.75%
Mount Olive (Duplin)	4	51	81,905	51	100.00%	0.06%
Mount Olive (Wayne)	21	4,538	83,434	4,538	100.00%	5.44%
Mount Pleasant	67	1,652	82,761	1,652	100.00%	2.00%
Murfreesboro	5	2,835	77,527	2,835	100.00%	3.66%
Murphy	120	1,627	80,814	1,627	100.00%	2.01%
Nags Head	6	2,757	76,421	2,757	100.00%	3.61%
Nashville	7	5,352	78,027	5,352	100.00%	6.86%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-20.asc', modified 08/24/2017 11:02:00 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

HBK-20 Speciale - Districts 82 and 83: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Navassa	18	1,505	77,681	1,505	100.00%	1.94%
New Bern	3	29,524	75,726	27,063	91.66%	35.74%
	79	29,524	75,538	2,461	8.34%	3.26%
New London	66	600	82,854	600	100.00%	0.72%
	67	600	82,761	0	0.00%	0.00%
Newland	85	698	78,372	698	100.00%	0.89%
Newport	13	4,150	76,622	4,150	100.00%	5.42%
Newton	89	12,968	77,838	12,968	100.00%	16.66%
	96	12,968	76,520	0	0.00%	0.00%
Newton Grove	22	569	83,434	569	100.00%	0.68%
Norlina	32	1,118	83,140	1,118	100.00%	1.34%
Norman	66	138	82,854	138	100.00%	0.17%
North Topsail Beach	15	743	77,307	743	100.00%	0.96%
North Wilkesboro	90	4,245	82,608	5	0.12%	0.01%
	94	4,245	82,984	4,240	99.88%	5.11%
Northwest	18	735	77,681	735	100.00%	0.95%
Norwood	67	2,379	82,761	2,379	100.00%	2.87%
Oak City	23	317	81,057	317	100.00%	0.39%
Oak Island	17	6,783	77,263	6,783	100.00%	8.78%
Oak Ridge	62	6,185	80,732	6,185	100.00%	7.66%
Oakboro	67	1,859	82,761	1,859	100.00%	2.25%
Ocean Isle Beach	17	550	77,263	550	100.00%	0.71%
Old Fort	85	908	78,372	908	100.00%	1.16%
Oriental	6	900	76,421	900	100.00%	1.18%
Orrum	46	91	80,440	91	100.00%	0.11%
Ossipee	64	543	75,581	543	100.00%	0.72%
Oxford	2	8,461	82,634	239	2.82%	0.29%
	32	8,461	83,140	8,222	97.18%	9.89%
Pantego	79	179	75,538	179	100.00%	0.24%
Parkton	46	436	80,440	436	100.00%	0.54%
Parmele	23	278	81,057	278	100.00%	0.34%
Patterson Springs	111	622	76,148	622	100.00%	0.82%
Peachland	55	437	75,792	437	100.00%	0.58%
Peletier	13	644	76,622	644	100.00%	0.84%
Pembroke	47	2,973	82,618	2,973	100.00%	3.60%
Pikeville	10	678	83,434	678	100.00%	0.81%
Pilot Mountain	91	1,477	83,388	1,477	100.00%	1.77%
Pine Knoll Shores	13	1,339	76,622	1,339	100.00%	1.75%
Pine Level	28	1,700	83,432	1,700	100.00%	2.04%
Pinebluff	52	1,337	76,894	1,337	100.00%	1.74%
Pinehurst	52	13,124	76,894	13,124	100.00%	17.07%
Pinetops	23	1,374	81,057	1,374	100.00%	1.70%
Pineville	88	7,479	77,172	7,479	100.00%	9.69%
	104	7,479	76,869	0	0.00%	0.00%
Pink Hill	12	552	75,923	552	100.00%	0.73%
Pittsboro	54	3,743	82,312	3,743	100.00%	4.55%
Pleasant Garden	59	4,489	79,907	4,489	100.00%	5.62%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-20.asc', modified 08/24/2017 11:02:00 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

HBK-20 Speciale - Districts 82 and 83: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Plymouth	1	3,878	77,143	3,878	100.00%	5.03%
Polkton	55	3,375	75,792	3,375	100.00%	4.45%
Polkville	111	545	76,148	545	100.00%	0.72%
Pollocksville	13	311	76,622	311	100.00%	0.41%
Powellsville	1	276	77,143	276	100.00%	0.36%
Princeton	10	1,194	83,434	1,194	100.00%	1.43%
Princeville	23	2,082	81,057	2,082	100.00%	2.57%
Proctorville	46	117	80,440	117	100.00%	0.15%
Raeford	48	4,611	83,109	4,611	100.00%	5.55%
Raleigh (Durham)	31	1,067	82,773	1,067	100.00%	1.29%
Raleigh (Wake)	11	402,825	81,539	28,950	7.19%	35.50%
	33	402,825	82,642	56,483	14.02%	68.35%
	34	402,825	81,525	81,282	20.18%	99.70%
	35	402,825	81,862	19,326	4.80%	23.61%
	36	402,825	81,926	6	0.00%	0.01%
	38	402,825	83,094	80,183	19.91%	96.50%
	39	402,825	82,181	36,700	9.11%	44.66%
	40	402,825	80,912	42,537	10.56%	52.57%
	49	402,825	82,621	57,358	14.24%	69.42%
Ramseur	78	1,692	76,980	1,692	100.00%	2.20%
Randleman	70	4,113	76,125	4,113	100.00%	5.40%
Ranlo	108	3,434	76,926	3,434	100.00%	4.46%
	110	3,434	75,573	0	0.00%	0.00%
Raynham	47	72	82,618	72	100.00%	0.09%
Red Cross	67	742	82,761	742	100.00%	0.90%
Red Oak	7	3,430	78,027	3,430	100.00%	4.40%
Red Springs (Hoke)	48	0	83,109	0	0.00%	0.00%
Red Springs (Robeson)	47	3,428	82,618	3,428	100.00%	4.15%
Reidsville	65	14,520	83,430	14,520	100.00%	17.40%
Rennert	46	383	80,440	383	100.00%	0.48%
Rhodhiss (Burke)	86	700	79,175	700	100.00%	0.88%
Rhodhiss (Caldwell)	87	370	83,029	370	100.00%	0.45%
Rich Square	27	958	76,790	958	100.00%	1.25%
Richfield	67	613	82,761	613	100.00%	0.74%
Richlands	4	1,520	81,905	1,520	100.00%	1.86%
River Bend	3	3,119	75,726	3,119	100.00%	4.12%
Roanoke Rapids	27	15,754	76,790	15,754	100.00%	20.52%
Robbins	52	1,097	76,894	1,097	100.00%	1.43%
	78	1,097	76,980	0	0.00%	0.00%
Robbinsville	120	620	80,814	620	100.00%	0.77%
Robersonville	23	1,488	81,057	1,488	100.00%	1.84%
Rockingham	66	9,558	82,854	9,558	100.00%	11.54%
Rockwell	76	2,108	81,908	2,108	100.00%	2.57%
Rocky Mount (Edgecombe)	23	17,524	81,057	17,524	100.00%	21.62%
Rocky Mount (Nash)	7	39,953	78,027	39,953	100.00%	51.20%
Rolesville	35	3,786	81,862	3,786	100.00%	4.62%
Ronda	94	417	82,984	417	100.00%	0.50%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-20.asc', modified 08/24/2017 11:02:00 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

HBK-20 Speciale - Districts 82 and 83: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Roper	1	611	77,143	611	100.00%	0.79%
Rose Hill	4	1,626	81,905	1,626	100.00%	1.99%
Roseboro	22	1,191	83,434	1,191	100.00%	1.43%
Rosman	113	576	81,089	576	100.00%	0.71%
Rowland	47	1,037	82,618	1,037	100.00%	1.26%
Roxboro	2	8,362	82,634	8,362	100.00%	10.12%
Roxobel	1	240	77,143	240	100.00%	0.31%
Rural Hall	75	2,937	79,963	2,937	100.00%	3.67%
Ruth	112	440	79,547	440	100.00%	0.55%
Rutherford College	86	1,341	79,175	1,341	100.00%	1.69%
Rutherfordton	112	4,213	79,547	4,213	100.00%	5.30%
Salemburg	22	435	83,434	435	100.00%	0.52%
Salisbury	76	33,662	81,908	31,445	93.41%	38.39%
	77	33,662	82,918	2,217	6.59%	2.67%
Saluda (Henderson)	113	12	81,089	12	100.00%	0.01%
Saluda (Polk)	113	701	81,089	701	100.00%	0.86%
Sandy Creek	18	260	77,681	260	100.00%	0.33%
Sandyfield	16	447	81,425	447	100.00%	0.55%
Sanford	51	28,094	83,434	28,094	100.00%	33.67%
Saratoga	24	408	81,234	408	100.00%	0.50%
Sawmills	87	5,240	83,029	5,240	100.00%	6.31%
Scotland Neck	27	2,059	76,790	2,059	100.00%	2.68%
Seaboard	27	632	76,790	632	100.00%	0.82%
Seagrove	78	228	76,980	228	100.00%	0.30%
Sedalia	59	623	79,907	623	100.00%	0.78%
Selma	26	6,073	83,431	5	0.08%	0.01%
	28	6,073	83,432	6,068	99.92%	7.27%
Seven Devils (Avery)	85	28	78,372	28	100.00%	0.04%
Seven Devils (Watauga)	93	164	78,360	164	100.00%	0.21%
Seven Springs	10	110	83,434	110	100.00%	0.13%
Severn	27	276	76,790	276	100.00%	0.36%
Shallotte	17	3,675	77,263	3,675	100.00%	4.76%
Sharpsburg (Edgecombe)	23	209	81,057	209	100.00%	0.26%
Sharpsburg (Nash)	7	1,252	78,027	1,252	100.00%	1.60%
Sharpsburg (Wilson)	24	563	81,234	563	100.00%	0.69%
Shelby	110	20,323	75,573	11,240	55.31%	14.87%
	111	20,323	76,148	9,083	44.69%	11.93%
Siler City	54	7,887	82,312	7,887	100.00%	9.58%
Simpson	9	416	75,794	416	100.00%	0.55%
Sims	24	282	81,234	282	100.00%	0.35%
Smithfield	26	10,966	83,431	127	1.16%	0.15%
	28	10,966	83,432	10,839	98.84%	12.99%
Snow Hill	10	1,595	83,434	1,595	100.00%	1.91%
Southern Pines	52	12,334	76,894	12,334	100.00%	16.04%
Southern Shores	6	2,714	76,421	2,714	100.00%	3.55%
Southport	17	2,833	77,263	2,833	100.00%	3.67%
Sparta	90	1,770	82,608	1,770	100.00%	2.14%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-20.asc', modified 08/24/2017 11:02:00 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

HBK-20 Speciale - Districts 82 and 83: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Speed	23	80	81,057	80	100.00%	0.10%
Spencer	76	3,267	81,908	3,267	100.00%	3.99%
Spencer Mountain	108	37	76,926	37	100.00%	0.05%
Spindale	112	4,321	79,547	4,321	100.00%	5.43%
Spring Hope	7	1,320	78,027	1,320	100.00%	1.69%
Spring Lake	42	11,964	81,439	11,964	100.00%	14.69%
Spruce Pine	85	2,175	78,372	2,175	100.00%	2.78%
St. Helena	16	389	81,425	389	100.00%	0.48%
St. James	17	3,165	77,263	3,165	100.00%	4.10%
St. Pauls	46	2,035	80,440	2,035	100.00%	2.53%
Staley	78	393	76,980	393	100.00%	0.51%
Stallings (Mecklenburg)	103	399	76,381	399	100.00%	0.52%
Stallings (Union)	68	13,432	76,067	0	0.00%	0.00%
	69	13,432	76,381	13,432	100.00%	17.59%
Stanfield	67	1,486	82,761	1,486	100.00%	1.80%
Stanley	108	3,556	76,926	3,550	99.83%	4.61%
	110	3,556	75,573	6	0.17%	0.01%
Stantonsburg	24	784	81,234	784	100.00%	0.97%
Star	66	876	82,854	876	100.00%	1.06%
Statesville	84	24,532	77,282	20,541	83.73%	26.58%
	95	24,532	82,155	3,991	16.27%	4.86%
Stedman	45	1,028	79,294	1,028	100.00%	1.30%
Stem	2	463	82,634	463	100.00%	0.56%
Stokesdale	62	5,047	80,732	5,047	100.00%	6.25%
Stoneville	65	1,056	83,430	1,056	100.00%	1.27%
Stonewall	6	281	76,421	281	100.00%	0.37%
Stovall	32	418	83,140	418	100.00%	0.50%
Sugar Mountain	85	198	78,372	198	100.00%	0.25%
Summerfield	62	10,232	80,732	10,232	100.00%	12.67%
Sunset Beach	17	3,572	77,263	3,572	100.00%	4.62%
Surf City (Onslow)	15	292	77,307	292	100.00%	0.38%
Surf City (Pender)	16	1,561	81,425	1,561	100.00%	1.92%
Swansboro	14	2,663	77,065	2,663	100.00%	3.46%
Swepsonville	63	1,154	75,550	1,154	100.00%	1.53%
Sylva	119	2,588	75,548	2,588	100.00%	3.43%
Tabor City	46	2,511	80,440	2,511	100.00%	3.12%
Tar Heel	22	117	83,434	117	100.00%	0.14%
Tarboro	23	11,415	81,057	11,415	100.00%	14.08%
Taylorsville	94	2,098	82,984	2,098	100.00%	2.53%
Taylortown	52	722	76,894	722	100.00%	0.94%
Teachey	4	376	81,905	376	100.00%	0.46%
Thomasville (Davidson)	80	26,493	81,522	25,474	96.15%	31.25%
	81	26,493	81,356	1,019	3.85%	1.25%
Thomasville (Randolph)	70	264	76,125	264	100.00%	0.35%
Tobaccoville (Forsyth)	75	2,441	79,963	2,441	100.00%	3.05%
Tobaccoville (Stokes)	91	0	83,388	0	0.00%	0.00%
Topsail Beach	16	368	81,425	368	100.00%	0.45%

HBK-20 Speciale - Districts 82 and 83: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Trent Woods	3	4,155	75,726	4,155	100.00%	5.49%
Trenton	13	287	76,622	287	100.00%	0.37%
Trinity	70	6,614	76,125	6,614	100.00%	8.69%
Troutman	84	2,383	77,282	2,169	91.02%	2.81%
	95	2,383	82,155	214	8.98%	0.26%
Troy	66	3,189	82,854	3,189	100.00%	3.85%
Tryon	113	1,646	81,089	1,646	100.00%	2.03%
Turkey	21	292	83,434	292	100.00%	0.35%
Unionville	55	5,929	75,792	337	5.68%	0.44%
	69	5,929	76,381	5,592	94.32%	7.32%
Valdese	86	4,490	79,175	4,490	100.00%	5.67%
Vanceboro	79	1,005	75,538	1,005	100.00%	1.33%
Vandemere	6	254	76,421	254	100.00%	0.33%
Varnamtown	17	541	77,263	541	100.00%	0.70%
Vass	52	720	76,894	720	100.00%	0.94%
Waco	110	321	75,573	321	100.00%	0.42%
Wade	45	556	79,294	556	100.00%	0.70%
Wadesboro	55	5,813	75,792	5,813	100.00%	7.67%
Wagram	48	840	83,109	840	100.00%	1.01%
Wake Forest (Franklin)	25	899	78,432	899	100.00%	1.15%
Wake Forest (Wake)	35	29,218	81,862	29,218	100.00%	35.69%
Walkertown	72	4,675	76,245	1,018	21.78%	1.34%
	75	4,675	79,963	3,657	78.22%	4.57%
Wallace (Duplin)	4	3,880	81,905	3,880	100.00%	4.74%
Wallace (Pender)	16	0	81,425	0	0.00%	0.00%
Wallburg	80	3,047	81,522	3,047	100.00%	3.74%
Walnut Cove	91	1,425	83,388	1,425	100.00%	1.71%
Walnut Creek	10	835	83,434	835	100.00%	1.00%
Walstonburg	10	219	83,434	219	100.00%	0.26%
Warrenton	32	862	83,140	862	100.00%	1.04%
Warsaw	4	3,054	81,905	3,054	100.00%	3.73%
Washington	79	9,744	75,538	9,744	100.00%	12.90%
Washington Park	79	451	75,538	451	100.00%	0.60%
Watha	16	190	81,425	190	100.00%	0.23%
Waxhaw	55	9,859	75,792	1,604	16.27%	2.12%
	68	9,859	76,067	8,255	83.73%	10.85%
Waynesville	119	9,869	75,548	9,869	100.00%	13.06%
Weaverville	115	3,120	79,883	3,120	100.00%	3.91%
Webster	119	363	75,548	363	100.00%	0.48%
Weddington (Mecklenburg)	103	7	76,381	7	100.00%	0.01%
Weddington (Union)	68	9,452	76,067	8,933	94.51%	11.74%
	69	9,452	76,381	519	5.49%	0.68%
Weldon	27	1,655	76,790	1,655	100.00%	2.16%
Wendell	35	5,845	81,862	2,091	35.77%	2.55%
	39	5,845	82,181	3,754	64.23%	4.57%
Wentworth	65	2,807	83,430	2,807	100.00%	3.36%
Wesley Chapel	68	7,463	76,067	6,877	92.15%	9.04%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-20.asc', modified 08/24/2017 11:02:00 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

HBK-20 Speciale - Districts 82 and 83: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Wesley Chapel	69	7,463	76,381	586	7.85%	0.77%
West Jefferson	93	1,299	78,360	1,299	100.00%	1.66%
Whispering Pines	52	2,928	76,894	2,928	100.00%	3.81%
Whitakers (Edgecombe)	23	402	81,057	402	100.00%	0.50%
Whitakers (Nash)	7	342	78,027	342	100.00%	0.44%
White Lake	22	802	83,434	802	100.00%	0.96%
Whiteville	16	5,394	81,425	5,394	100.00%	6.62%
Whitsett	59	590	79,907	590	100.00%	0.74%
Wilkesboro	90	3,413	82,608	3	0.09%	0.00%
	94	3,413	82,984	3,410	99.91%	4.11%
Williamston	23	5,511	81,057	5,511	100.00%	6.80%
Wilmington	18	106,476	77,681	41,563	39.04%	53.50%
	19	106,476	76,666	33,947	31.88%	44.28%
	20	106,476	78,488	30,966	29.08%	39.45%
Wilson	24	49,167	81,234	49,167	100.00%	60.53%
Wilson's Mills	26	2,277	83,431	2,277	100.00%	2.73%
	28	2,277	83,432	0	0.00%	0.00%
Windsor	1	3,630	77,143	3,630	100.00%	4.71%
Winfall	1	594	77,143	594	100.00%	0.77%
Wingate	55	3,491	75,792	349	10.00%	0.46%
	69	3,491	76,381	3,142	90.00%	4.11%
Winston-Salem	71	229,617	75,793	75,779	33.00%	99.98%
	72	229,617	76,245	73,464	31.99%	96.35%
	73	229,617	78,189	17,422	7.59%	22.28%
	74	229,617	78,886	32,875	14.32%	41.67%
	75	229,617	79,963	30,077	13.10%	37.61%
Winterville	8	9,269	75,926	0	0.00%	0.00%
	9	9,269	75,794	8,391	90.53%	11.07%
	12	9,269	75,923	878	9.47%	1.16%
Winton	5	769	77,527	769	100.00%	0.99%
Woodfin	114	6,123	82,902	2,563	41.86%	3.09%
	115	6,123	79,883	2,717	44.37%	3.40%
	116	6,123	75,533	843	13.77%	1.12%
Woodland	27	809	76,790	809	100.00%	1.05%
Wrightsville Beach	19	2,477	76,666	2,477	100.00%	3.23%
	20	2,477	78,488	0	0.00%	0.00%
Yadkinville	73	2,959	78,189	2,959	100.00%	3.78%
Yanceyville	50	2,039	80,866	2,039	100.00%	2.52%
Youngsville	25	1,157	78,432	1,157	100.00%	1.48%
Zebulon (Johnston)	26	0	83,431	0	0.00%	0.00%
Zebulon (Wake)	35	4,433	81,862	381	8.59%	0.47%
	39	4,433	82,181	4,052	91.41%	4.93%
			Total:	**5,250,071**		

District plan definition file: 'HBK-20.asc', modified 08/24/2017 11:02:00 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

HBK-20 Speciale - Districts 82 and 83: Split VTD Detail

County	VTD	District	Total VTD Pop	VTD Pop in District	Percent of VTD Pop in District
Alamance	03C	63	2,814	2,491	88.52%
		64	2,814	323	11.48%
	063	63	4,940	4,090	82.79%
		64	4,940	850	17.21%
	06W	63	1,973	1,617	81.96%
		64	1,973	356	18.04%
Brunswick	04	17	13,819	3,644	26.37%
		18	13,819	10,175	73.63%
Buncombe	05.1	114	2,748	1,691	61.54%
		115	2,748	1,057	38.46%
	100.1	114	9,126	8,524	93.40%
		115	9,126	602	6.60%
	102.1	114	5,975	1,385	23.18%
		116	5,975	4,590	76.82%
	104.1	114	3,081	2,345	76.11%
		115	3,081	736	23.89%
	19.1	114	2,159	1,843	85.36%
		116	2,159	316	14.64%
	24.1	114	3,211	1,964	61.16%
		116	3,211	1,247	38.84%
	52.1	115	5,279	3,762	71.26%
		116	5,279	1,517	28.74%
	57.1	114	3,534	315	8.91%
		115	3,534	1,149	32.51%
		116	3,534	2,070	58.57%
	60.2	114	1,300	164	12.62%
		115	1,300	1,136	87.38%
	64.1	114	2,671	820	30.70%
		115	2,671	1,851	69.30%
	70.1	114	3,508	2,418	68.93%
		115	3,508	1,090	31.07%
Craven	N4	3	6,831	5,069	74.21%
		79	6,831	1,762	25.79%
Cumberland	G2	43	34,282	29,272	85.39%
		45	34,282	5,010	14.61%
Durham	34	29	11,492	9,457	82.29%
		31	11,492	2,035	17.71%
Gaston	05	109	4,767	4,132	86.68%
		110	4,767	635	13.32%
Harnett	PR07	51	17,943	14,553	81.11%
		53	17,943	3,390	18.89%
	PR08	28	10,373	5,681	54.77%
		53	10,373	4,692	45.23%
Haywood	IH	118	3,815	3,256	85.35%
		119	3,815	559	14.65%
Johnston	PR04	10	1,929	413	21.41%
		28	1,929	1,516	78.59%
	PR27	26	7,226	585	8.10%
		28	7,226	6,641	91.90%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-20.asc', modified 08/24/2017 11:02:00 PM

VTDs ('Voting Districts') derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG05|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

HBK-20 Speciale - Districts 82 and 83: Split VTD Detail

County	VTD	District	Total VTD Pop	VTD Pop in District	Percent of VTD Pop in District
Mecklenburg	001	102	1,950	102	5.23%
		104	1,950	1,848	94.77%
	069	104	5,121	3,240	63.27%
		105	5,121	1,881	36.73%
	134	98	8,939	4,410	49.33%
		107	8,939	4,529	50.67%
Moore	RBN	52	2,923	2,593	88.71%
		78	2,923	330	11.29%
	WEM	52	2,982	1,806	60.56%
		78	2,982	1,176	39.44%
New Hanover	CF03	18	8,711	828	9.51%
		20	8,711	7,883	90.49%
	W24	18	7,784	3,543	45.52%
		20	7,784	4,241	54.48%
	WB	19	2,473	2,473	100.00%
		20	2,473	0	0.00%
Onslow	GB12	4	6,284	5,776	91.92%
		14	6,284	508	8.08%
	HM05	14	8,258	5,303	64.22%
		15	8,258	2,955	35.78%
Pitt	1403A	9	7,871	3,868	49.14%
		12	7,871	4,003	50.86%
	1507	8	6,628	5,623	84.84%
		9	6,628	1,005	15.16%
Rockingham	HU	65	6,052	5,815	96.08%
		91	6,052	237	3.92%
Sampson	CLSW	21	2,899	1,433	49.43%
		22	2,899	1,466	50.57%
	ROWA	21	3,210	12	0.37%
		22	3,210	3,198	99.63%
Union	017A	68	4,593	1,595	34.73%
		69	4,593	2,998	65.27%
	019	55	5,806	1,105	19.03%
		68	5,806	4,701	80.97%
	029A	68	5,935	5,079	85.58%
		69	5,935	856	14.42%
	029C	68	2,942	1,576	53.57%
		69	2,942	1,366	46.43%
	032	55	4,095	1,820	44.44%
		69	4,095	2,275	55.56%
	040	68	4,926	1,122	22.78%
		69	4,926	3,804	77.22%
Wake	08-02	34	5,481	1,936	35.32%
		40	5,481	3,545	64.68%
	12-05	36	9,236	5,460	59.12%
		37	9,236	3,776	40.88%
	16-09	33	4,924	3,027	61.47%
		36	4,924	1,897	38.53%
	18-08	11	5,677	2,521	44.41%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-20.asc', modified 08/24/2017 11:02:00 PM

VTDs ('Voting Districts') derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG05|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

HBK-20 Speciale - Districts 82 and 83: Split VTD Detail

County	VTD	District	Total VTD Pop	VTD Pop in District	Percent of VTD Pop in District
Wake	18-08	36	5,677	3,156	55.59%
Wayne	09	10	5,273	3,733	70.79%
		21	5,273	1,540	29.21%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-20.asc', modified 08/24/2017 11:02:00 PM
VTDs ('Voting Districts') derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.
Printed 08/24/2017 {rptG05|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

HBK-20 Speciale - Districts 82 and 83: Population Deviation

District	2010 Pop	Ideal Pop	Deviation	Deviation %
1	77,143	79,462	-2,319	-2.92%
2	82,634	79,462	3,172	3.99%
3	75,726	79,462	-3,736	-4.70%
4	81,905	79,462	2,443	3.07%
5	77,527	79,462	-1,935	-2.44%
6	76,421	79,462	-3,041	-3.83%
7	78,027	79,462	-1,435	-1.81%
8	75,926	79,462	-3,536	-4.45%
9	75,794	79,462	-3,668	-4.62%
10	83,434	79,462	3,972	5.00%
11	81,539	79,462	2,077	2.61%
12	75,923	79,462	-3,539	-4.45%
13	76,622	79,462	-2,840	-3.57%
14	77,065	79,462	-2,397	-3.02%
15	77,307	79,462	-2,155	-2.71%
16	81,425	79,462	1,963	2.47%
17	77,263	79,462	-2,199	-2.77%
18	77,681	79,462	-1,781	-2.24%
19	76,666	79,462	-2,796	-3.52%
20	78,488	79,462	-974	-1.23%
21	83,434	79,462	3,972	5.00%
22	83,434	79,462	3,972	5.00%
23	81,057	79,462	1,595	2.01%
24	81,234	79,462	1,772	2.23%
25	78,432	79,462	-1,030	-1.30%
26	83,431	79,462	3,969	4.99%
27	76,790	79,462	-2,672	-3.36%
28	83,432	79,462	3,970	5.00%
29	82,735	79,462	3,273	4.12%
30	83,272	79,462	3,810	4.79%
31	82,773	79,462	3,311	4.17%
32	83,140	79,462	3,678	4.63%
33	82,642	79,462	3,180	4.00%
34	81,525	79,462	2,063	2.60%
35	81,862	79,462	2,400	3.02%
36	81,926	79,462	2,464	3.10%
37	80,332	79,462	870	1.09%
38	83,094	79,462	3,632	4.57%
39	82,181	79,462	2,719	3.42%
40	80,912	79,462	1,450	1.82%
41	82,359	79,462	2,897	3.65%
42	81,439	79,462	1,977	2.49%
43	77,725	79,462	-1,737	-2.19%
44	80,973	79,462	1,511	1.90%
45	79,294	79,462	-168	-0.21%
46	80,440	79,462	978	1.23%
47	82,618	79,462	3,156	3.97%
48	83,109	79,462	3,647	4.59%
49	82,621	79,462	3,159	3.98%
50	80,866	79,462	1,404	1.77%
51	83,434	79,462	3,972	5.00%
52	76,894	79,462	-2,568	-3.23%
53	83,429	79,462	3,967	4.99%
54	82,312	79,462	2,850	3.59%
55	75,792	79,462	-3,670	-4.62%
56	76,654	79,462	-2,808	-3.53%
57	82,755	79,462	3,293	4.14%
58	82,137	79,462	2,675	3.37%
59	79,907	79,462	445	0.56%
60	81,856	79,462	2,394	3.01%
61	81,019	79,462	1,557	1.96%
62	80,732	79,462	1,270	1.60%
63	75,550	79,462	-3,912	-4.92%
64	75,581	79,462	-3,881	-4.88%
65	83,430	79,462	3,968	4.99%
66	82,854	79,462	3,392	4.27%
67	82,761	79,462	3,299	4.15%
68	76,067	79,462	-3,395	-4.27%
69	76,381	79,462	-3,081	-3.88%
70	76,125	79,462	-3,337	-4.20%
71	75,793	79,462	-3,669	-4.62%
72	76,245	79,462	-3,217	-4.05%
73	78,189	79,462	-1,273	-1.60%
74	78,886	79,462	-576	-0.72%
75	79,963	79,462	501	0.63%
76	81,908	79,462	2,446	3.08%
77	82,918	79,462	3,456	4.35%
78	76,980	79,462	-2,482	-3.12%
79	75,538	79,462	-3,924	-4.94%
80	81,522	79,462	2,060	2.59%
81	81,356	79,462	1,894	2.38%
82	80,879	79,462	1,417	1.78%

HBK-20 Speciale - Districts 82 and 83: Population Deviation

District	2010 Pop	Ideal Pop	Deviation	Deviation %
83	81,381	79,462	1,919	2.41%
84	77,282	79,462	-2,180	-2.74%
85	78,372	79,462	-1,090	-1.37%
86	79,175	79,462	-287	-0.36%
87	83,029	79,462	3,567	4.49%
88	77,172	79,462	-2,290	-2.88%
89	77,838	79,462	-1,624	-2.04%
90	82,608	79,462	3,146	3.96%
91	83,388	79,462	3,926	4.94%
92	76,022	79,462	-3,440	-4.33%
93	78,360	79,462	-1,102	-1.39%
94	82,984	79,462	3,522	4.43%
95	82,155	79,462	2,693	3.39%
96	76,520	79,462	-2,942	-3.70%
97	78,265	79,462	-1,197	-1.51%
98	75,602	79,462	-3,860	-4.86%
99	77,141	79,462	-2,321	-2.92%
100	75,589	79,462	-3,873	-4.87%
101	79,876	79,462	414	0.52%
102	77,391	79,462	-2,071	-2.61%
103	76,381	79,462	-3,081	-3.88%
104	76,869	79,462	-2,593	-3.26%
105	75,967	79,462	-3,495	-4.40%
106	75,762	79,462	-3,700	-4.66%
107	75,856	79,462	-3,606	-4.54%
108	76,926	79,462	-2,536	-3.19%
109	75,517	79,462	-3,945	-4.96%
110	75,573	79,462	-3,889	-4.89%
111	76,148	79,462	-3,314	-4.17%
112	79,547	79,462	85	0.11%
113	81,089	79,462	1,627	2.05%
114	82,902	79,462	3,440	4.33%
115	79,883	79,462	421	0.53%
116	75,533	79,462	-3,929	-4.94%
117	79,251	79,462	-211	-0.27%
118	76,322	79,462	-3,140	-3.95%
119	75,548	79,462	-3,914	-4.93%
120	80,814	79,462	1,352	1.70%
Total:	**9,535,483**			

HBK-20 Speciale - Districts 82 and 83: Population 2010, US Senate 2010, President 2012

	2010 Census		US Senate 2010: Marshall-Burr-Beitler								US President 2012: Obama-Romney-Johnson							
District	Total Pop	18+ Pop	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %
1	77,143	60,226	11,572	46.71%	12,798	51.66%	398	1.61%	6	0.02%	19,188	51.49%	17,761	47.66%	255	0.68%	62	0.17%
2	82,634	64,057	9,138	42.84%	11,711	54.90%	479	2.25%	4	0.02%	16,284	44.54%	19,862	54.33%	322	0.88%	89	0.24%
3	75,726	57,749	6,926	34.46%	12,772	63.55%	390	1.94%	11	0.05%	13,877	41.67%	19,044	57.18%	308	0.92%	77	0.23%
4	81,905	60,243	6,889	39.27%	10,357	59.03%	292	1.66%	6	0.03%	11,345	38.94%	17,541	60.21%	200	0.69%	45	0.15%
5	77,527	60,228	10,791	55.68%	8,307	42.86%	273	1.41%	11	0.06%	20,871	60.75%	13,179	38.36%	249	0.72%	57	0.17%
6	76,421	60,608	8,872	34.50%	16,174	62.90%	661	2.57%	7	0.03%	14,765	38.52%	22,988	59.97%	532	1.39%	50	0.13%
7	78,027	59,741	12,874	49.23%	12,965	49.58%	303	1.16%	8	0.03%	21,791	53.51%	18,673	45.85%	191	0.47%	67	0.16%
8	75,926	58,873	10,135	61.68%	6,095	37.09%	195	1.19%	7	0.04%	22,626	66.47%	11,119	32.66%	254	0.75%	42	0.12%
9	75,794	59,235	7,527	37.19%	12,496	61.74%	210	1.04%	7	0.03%	15,362	42.01%	20,876	57.09%	280	0.77%	50	0.14%
10	83,434	62,414	6,595	29.90%	15,171	68.78%	287	1.30%	3	0.01%	11,116	32.12%	23,262	67.22%	212	0.61%	17	0.05%
11	81,539	64,508	11,704	51.72%	10,205	45.10%	709	3.13%	10	0.04%	24,808	59.62%	15,841	38.07%	856	2.06%	106	0.25%
12	75,923	57,405	10,406	46.00%	11,921	52.70%	282	1.25%	13	0.06%	17,724	49.08%	18,140	50.23%	210	0.58%	40	0.11%
13	76,622	61,839	7,638	28.48%	18,590	69.32%	538	2.01%	52	0.19%	12,458	31.09%	27,181	67.84%	359	0.90%	68	0.17%
14	77,065	56,588	4,167	33.67%	7,902	63.84%	301	2.43%	7	0.06%	9,736	39.75%	14,437	58.94%	253	1.03%	70	0.29%
15	77,307	59,638	3,006	31.19%	6,343	65.81%	284	2.95%	5	0.05%	6,424	34.97%	11,670	63.53%	225	1.22%	50	0.27%
16	81,425	62,717	10,108	39.84%	14,778	58.24%	474	1.87%	14	0.06%	16,124	42.93%	21,036	56.00%	314	0.84%	88	0.23%
17	77,263	64,270	9,560	31.61%	20,050	66.30%	624	2.06%	8	0.03%	15,595	36.15%	27,141	62.91%	333	0.77%	74	0.17%
18	77,681	61,478	11,041	55.09%	8,555	42.68%	437	2.18%	10	0.05%	22,442	61.89%	13,304	36.69%	413	1.14%	100	0.28%
19	76,666	60,681	8,459	32.87%	16,677	64.80%	587	2.28%	14	0.05%	16,301	40.73%	23,121	57.77%	483	1.21%	119	0.30%
20	78,488	63,095	9,000	33.59%	17,209	64.23%	570	2.13%	12	0.04%	16,368	39.38%	24,562	59.09%	499	1.20%	135	0.32%
21	83,434	63,200	11,191	53.12%	9,613	45.63%	259	1.23%	5	0.02%	20,596	59.23%	13,983	40.22%	185	0.53%	6	0.02%
22	83,434	62,843	11,515	44.95%	13,748	53.67%	346	1.35%	8	0.03%	15,691	44.36%	19,380	54.79%	245	0.69%	55	0.16%
23	81,057	61,743	14,653	59.95%	9,513	38.92%	269	1.10%	8	0.03%	24,825	62.80%	14,515	36.72%	147	0.37%	43	0.11%
24	81,234	61,182	13,631	51.47%	12,420	46.90%	428	1.62%	3	0.01%	20,875	53.38%	17,954	45.91%	242	0.62%	38	0.10%
25	78,432	58,921	9,576	42.69%	12,410	55.32%	440	1.96%	8	0.04%	15,958	44.13%	19,772	54.68%	331	0.92%	98	0.27%
26	83,431	58,878	8,065	33.32%	15,596	64.44%	530	2.19%	12	0.05%	15,201	37.28%	25,030	61.38%	437	1.07%	111	0.27%
27	76,790	59,572	13,603	61.65%	8,196	37.14%	261	1.18%	6	0.03%	24,188	66.17%	12,189	33.34%	143	0.39%	35	0.10%
28	83,432	61,508	6,953	31.99%	14,418	66.33%	359	1.65%	8	0.04%	11,855	34.49%	22,137	64.41%	297	0.86%	82	0.24%
29	82,735	67,058	18,865	79.26%	4,545	19.10%	373	1.57%	17	0.07%	38,148	82.20%	7,753	16.71%	435	0.94%	70	0.15%
30	83,272	64,089	17,881	60.80%	11,040	37.54%	478	1.63%	11	0.04%	31,862	67.06%	15,158	31.90%	424	0.89%	70	0.15%
31	82,773	61,422	16,672	78.56%	4,267	20.11%	275	1.30%	8	0.04%	33,340	80.93%	7,466	18.12%	349	0.85%	43	0.10%
32	83,140	63,471	15,476	60.71%	9,595	37.64%	411	1.61%	8	0.03%	26,033	65.34%	13,608	34.16%	154	0.39%	45	0.11%
33	82,642	66,254	13,483	69.46%	5,564	28.67%	351	1.81%	12	0.06%	27,937	72.34%	10,079	26.10%	543	1.41%	61	0.16%
34	81,525	64,976	15,394	50.33%	14,527	47.50%	642	2.10%	23	0.08%	27,560	56.56%	20,389	41.85%	680	1.40%	95	0.19%
35	81,862	57,121	9,236	37.21%	14,998	60.43%	565	2.28%	20	0.08%	19,055	42.91%	24,775	55.80%	480	1.08%	93	0.21%
36	81,926	59,799	10,864	35.93%	18,694	61.83%	668	2.21%	8	0.03%	19,655	41.26%	27,387	57.49%	537	1.13%	58	0.12%
37	80,332	54,852	8,827	36.88%	14,457	60.40%	639	2.67%	12	0.05%	19,102	43.33%	24,319	55.16%	587	1.33%	82	0.19%
38	83,094	59,601	14,163	70.94%	5,433	27.21%	354	1.77%	14	0.07%	29,904	76.88%	8,572	22.04%	358	0.92%	62	0.16%
39	82,181	58,177	14,627	64.63%	7,594	33.55%	402	1.78%	9	0.04%	28,601	69.83%	11,938	29.15%	347	0.85%	72	0.18%
40	80,912	59,480	12,203	36.45%	20,451	61.08%	811	2.42%	18	0.05%	21,540	42.12%	28,992	56.69%	547	1.07%	63	0.12%
41	82,359	55,518	9,441	44.16%	11,298	52.85%	636	2.98%	2	0.01%	22,252	52.85%	19,251	45.72%	541	1.28%	64	0.15%
42	81,439	57,374	8,476	69.63%	3,542	29.10%	150	1.23%	5	0.04%	18,934	73.86%	6,486	25.30%	161	0.63%	55	0.21%
43	77,725	59,350	11,403	65.17%	5,813	33.22%	270	1.54%	11	0.06%	23,644	72.26%	8,782	26.84%	225	0.69%	69	0.21%
44	80,973	59,789	8,858	46.26%	9,916	51.78%	366	1.91%	9	0.05%	17,939	53.66%	15,149	45.31%	292	0.87%	52	0.16%
45	79,294	57,377	7,955	39.32%	11,934	58.98%	335	1.66%	10	0.05%	15,275	42.60%	20,249	56.48%	249	0.69%	80	0.22%
46	80,440	59,587	6,977	43.94%	8,611	54.23%	284	1.79%	7	0.04%	12,303	45.76%	14,327	53.29%	203	0.76%	51	0.19%
47	82,618	60,831	8,315	57.29%	6,015	41.44%	173	1.19%	11	0.08%	17,243	63.29%	9,705	35.62%	221	0.81%	77	0.28%
48	83,109	59,851	9,247	55.26%	7,197	43.01%	281	1.68%	9	0.05%	18,291	58.54%	12,650	40.49%	258	0.83%	46	0.15%
49	82,621	66,094	13,382	49.54%	12,911	47.79%	710	2.63%	11	0.04%	26,848	56.30%	20,053	42.05%	695	1.46%	88	0.18%
50	80,866	62,232	15,177	53.97%	12,277	43.66%	657	2.34%	11	0.04%	24,313	55.84%	18,630	42.79%	471	1.08%	123	0.28%
51	83,434	59,547	7,714	41.44%	10,529	56.56%	364	1.96%	8	0.04%	14,314	44.67%	17,331	54.08%	328	1.02%	72	0.22%
52	76,894	60,407	8,130	31.91%	16,852	66.14%	491	1.93%	7	0.03%	14,828	36.08%	25,925	63.08%	289	0.70%	58	0.14%
53	83,429	62,151	8,067	38.56%	12,447	59.50%	400	1.91%	6	0.03%	13,061	39.03%	20,001	59.78%	325	0.97%	73	0.22%

Populations values derive from the 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File. Election results were provided by the NC State Board of Elections. Votes that could not be associated with a specific precinct were excluded. Reported statewide totals may therefore be marginally lower than official contest results.

HBK-20 Speciale - Districts 82 and 83: Population 2010, US Senate 2010, President 2012

	2010 Census		US Senate 2010: Marshall-Burr-Beitler								US President 2012: Obama-Romney-Johnson							
District	Total Pop	18+ Pop	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %
54	82,312	64,361	16,920	53.96%	13,730	43.79%	695	2.22%	10	0.03%	26,235	55.99%	20,057	42.81%	473	1.01%	89	0.19%
55	75,792	57,260	7,418	36.90%	12,345	61.41%	326	1.62%	12	0.06%	13,756	39.49%	20,716	59.48%	275	0.79%	84	0.24%
56	76,654	62,430	19,313	77.49%	5,073	20.35%	522	2.09%	15	0.06%	34,936	78.94%	8,503	19.21%	669	1.51%	151	0.34%
57	82,755	64,200	14,697	81.20%	3,148	17.39%	243	1.34%	11	0.06%	36,447	86.99%	5,069	12.10%	296	0.71%	84	0.20%
58	82,137	62,753	12,047	63.92%	6,487	34.42%	288	1.53%	25	0.13%	27,946	73.09%	9,912	25.92%	286	0.75%	93	0.24%
59	79,907	61,233	9,808	38.24%	15,356	59.87%	480	1.87%	7	0.03%	18,869	42.66%	24,892	56.27%	368	0.83%	106	0.24%
60	81,856	61,808	9,568	57.73%	6,682	40.31%	309	1.86%	16	0.10%	23,485	67.53%	10,974	31.55%	253	0.73%	67	0.19%
61	81,019	63,506	9,721	33.66%	18,550	64.22%	586	2.03%	27	0.09%	19,567	41.33%	27,191	57.44%	446	0.94%	136	0.29%
62	80,732	60,423	9,300	34.11%	17,363	63.68%	595	2.18%	10	0.04%	19,556	41.92%	26,542	56.89%	449	0.96%	107	0.23%
63	75,550	57,278	8,482	38.39%	13,031	58.99%	571	2.58%	8	0.04%	15,509	43.71%	19,573	55.17%	330	0.93%	68	0.19%
64	75,581	58,410	6,964	35.86%	11,981	61.69%	458	2.36%	17	0.09%	13,366	41.39%	18,597	57.58%	267	0.83%	66	0.20%
65	83,430	64,719	7,496	33.32%	14,282	63.48%	706	3.14%	16	0.07%	14,675	39.12%	22,455	59.86%	299	0.80%	84	0.22%
66	82,854	63,058	10,560	46.75%	11,582	51.28%	433	1.92%	11	0.05%	15,910	45.99%	18,384	53.14%	277	0.80%	25	0.07%
67	82,761	62,838	6,873	26.66%	18,400	71.36%	501	1.94%	10	0.04%	11,407	28.39%	28,298	70.44%	422	1.05%	48	0.12%
68	76,067	49,871	5,344	28.78%	12,791	68.88%	426	2.29%	9	0.05%	13,160	35.92%	23,097	63.04%	316	0.86%	66	0.18%
69	76,381	54,263	5,446	30.22%	12,148	67.40%	419	2.32%	11	0.06%	12,576	36.44%	21,460	62.18%	368	1.07%	110	0.32%
70	76,125	57,325	3,558	21.14%	12,749	75.74%	513	3.05%	13	0.08%	8,189	25.84%	23,113	72.94%	343	1.08%	44	0.14%
71	75,793	57,481	9,798	58.11%	6,782	40.22%	275	1.63%	7	0.04%	23,956	69.74%	10,090	29.38%	302	0.88%	0	0.00%
72	76,245	58,071	11,678	66.54%	5,620	32.02%	248	1.41%	5	0.03%	27,128	76.55%	8,076	22.79%	235	0.66%	0	0.00%
73	78,189	59,318	6,106	25.80%	17,032	71.95%	529	2.23%	4	0.02%	12,278	32.31%	25,229	66.40%	441	1.16%	47	0.12%
74	78,886	59,414	7,130	32.40%	14,427	65.57%	435	1.98%	11	0.05%	16,022	40.59%	23,039	58.37%	407	1.03%	0	0.00%
75	79,963	60,453	8,675	32.94%	17,137	65.07%	516	1.96%	8	0.03%	16,896	39.09%	25,912	59.95%	415	0.96%	0	0.00%
76	81,908	62,585	7,822	37.03%	12,787	60.53%	502	2.38%	13	0.06%	15,191	41.45%	20,960	57.20%	360	0.98%	135	0.37%
77	82,918	63,076	6,663	26.24%	18,105	71.29%	617	2.43%	11	0.04%	11,587	28.89%	28,014	69.84%	394	0.98%	117	0.29%
78	76,980	58,404	4,029	21.41%	14,213	75.51%	567	3.01%	13	0.07%	8,233	24.08%	25,560	74.77%	335	0.98%	58	0.17%
79	75,538	58,785	8,646	35.68%	15,108	62.35%	466	1.92%	12	0.05%	14,321	39.25%	21,861	59.92%	236	0.65%	66	0.18%
80	81,522	61,819	4,779	23.10%	15,452	74.68%	458	2.21%	3	0.01%	9,557	26.44%	26,120	72.27%	383	1.06%	81	0.22%
81	81,356	62,187	6,468	30.99%	13,884	66.51%	508	2.43%	14	0.07%	11,067	31.81%	23,263	66.86%	393	1.13%	71	0.20%
82	80,879	57,548	7,263	32.63%	14,500	65.15%	493	2.22%	0	0.00%	15,936	39.26%	24,220	59.67%	433	1.07%	0	0.00%
83	81,381	60,263	7,027	36.70%	11,669	60.95%	445	2.32%	4	0.02%	14,210	42.62%	18,702	56.10%	398	1.19%	29	0.09%
84	77,282	58,924	7,244	32.03%	14,736	65.16%	617	2.73%	18	0.08%	12,673	34.35%	23,733	64.33%	356	0.96%	131	0.36%
85	78,372	62,493	6,014	26.73%	15,873	70.54%	595	2.64%	20	0.09%	9,740	29.02%	23,328	69.50%	389	1.16%	110	0.33%
86	79,175	61,639	7,764	37.95%	12,242	59.83%	450	2.20%	5	0.02%	12,429	38.01%	19,756	60.42%	393	1.20%	119	0.36%
87	83,029	64,243	6,908	31.41%	14,382	65.39%	690	3.14%	15	0.07%	10,898	31.49%	23,229	67.12%	479	1.38%	0	0.00%
88	77,172	58,012	8,592	56.26%	6,372	41.72%	302	1.98%	7	0.05%	21,244	64.97%	11,011	33.68%	342	1.05%	100	0.31%
89	77,838	59,483	6,177	29.81%	13,998	67.55%	532	2.57%	15	0.07%	11,364	32.70%	22,869	65.82%	392	1.13%	122	0.35%
90	82,608	63,899	7,033	31.36%	14,822	66.09%	566	2.52%	6	0.03%	9,925	29.88%	22,762	68.53%	413	1.24%	114	0.34%
91	83,388	64,721	6,313	26.71%	16,743	70.84%	572	2.42%	8	0.03%	10,619	28.87%	25,609	69.62%	456	1.24%	99	0.27%
92	76,022	57,630	10,228	65.20%	5,122	32.65%	325	2.07%	12	0.08%	24,610	71.63%	9,328	27.15%	337	0.98%	84	0.24%
93	78,360	65,985	10,383	39.34%	15,262	57.83%	729	2.76%	18	0.07%	17,118	42.54%	22,103	54.93%	803	2.00%	213	0.53%
94	82,984	64,320	7,877	30.80%	16,981	66.40%	704	2.75%	12	0.05%	10,504	28.63%	25,562	69.68%	499	1.36%	120	0.33%
95	82,155	59,928	5,680	27.90%	14,174	69.63%	496	2.44%	6	0.03%	13,403	33.96%	25,566	64.77%	391	0.99%	112	0.28%
96	76,520	58,080	6,470	31.28%	13,705	66.27%	495	2.39%	11	0.05%	12,700	36.45%	21,665	62.18%	378	1.08%	102	0.29%
97	78,265	59,784	6,958	30.01%	15,653	67.51%	564	2.43%	11	0.05%	11,021	29.97%	25,266	68.71%	369	1.00%	115	0.31%
98	75,602	56,018	6,849	32.00%	14,098	65.88%	445	2.08%	8	0.04%	16,276	39.21%	24,750	59.62%	402	0.97%	83	0.20%
99	77,141	55,130	12,757	73.89%	4,259	24.67%	232	1.34%	16	0.09%	26,889	79.03%	6,836	20.09%	215	0.63%	83	0.24%
100	75,589	56,173	9,157	57.35%	6,485	40.62%	314	1.97%	10	0.06%	21,275	67.14%	10,017	31.61%	329	1.04%	67	0.21%
101	79,876	58,931	12,051	68.58%	5,219	29.70%	291	1.66%	11	0.06%	28,250	74.39%	9,386	24.72%	257	0.68%	82	0.22%
102	77,391	59,231	10,729	74.35%	3,424	23.73%	269	1.86%	8	0.06%	25,970	80.44%	5,905	18.29%	324	1.00%	84	0.26%
103	76,381	56,360	7,849	32.02%	16,157	65.92%	488	1.99%	16	0.07%	16,067	38.44%	25,182	60.25%	416	1.00%	132	0.32%
104	76,869	59,384	9,634	33.26%	18,842	65.05%	476	1.64%	13	0.04%	18,349	39.25%	27,916	59.71%	393	0.84%	95	0.20%
105	75,967	56,011	7,111	32.05%	14,618	65.88%	454	2.05%	5	0.02%	16,507	40.61%	23,709	58.33%	356	0.88%	73	0.18%
106	75,762	57,932	9,986	67.03%	4,694	31.51%	214	1.44%	3	0.02%	23,892	73.26%	8,334	25.55%	299	0.92%	89	0.27%

Populations values derive from the 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File. Election results were provided by the NC State Board of Elections. Votes that could not be associated with a specific precinct were excluded. Reported statewide totals may therefore be marginally lower than official contest results.

HBK-20 Speciale - Districts 82 and 83: Population 2010, US Senate 2010, President 2012

	2010 Census		US Senate 2010: Marshall-Burr-Beitler								US President 2012: Obama-Romney-Johnson							
District	Total Pop	18+ Pop	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %
107	75,856	55,478	12,601	72.88%	4,477	25.89%	207	1.20%	6	0.03%	27,803	76.86%	8,081	22.34%	222	0.61%	67	0.19%
108	76,926	59,400	5,880	32.51%	11,794	65.21%	413	2.28%	0	0.00%	12,869	38.42%	20,266	60.50%	362	1.08%	0	0.00%
109	75,517	56,493	6,277	33.20%	12,209	64.58%	419	2.22%	0	0.00%	14,138	40.79%	20,201	58.28%	321	0.93%	0	0.00%
110	75,573	57,987	6,366	33.61%	12,134	64.06%	439	2.32%	2	0.01%	11,593	35.29%	20,921	63.69%	314	0.96%	20	0.06%
111	76,148	58,045	7,206	36.13%	12,341	61.87%	390	1.96%	9	0.05%	11,633	35.72%	20,543	63.07%	306	0.94%	89	0.27%
112	79,547	61,671	6,370	30.24%	14,175	67.30%	509	2.42%	9	0.04%	10,646	32.71%	21,465	65.95%	351	1.08%	87	0.27%
113	81,089	66,177	11,159	36.07%	19,015	61.47%	754	2.44%	8	0.03%	15,774	37.46%	25,726	61.09%	477	1.13%	132	0.31%
114	82,902	67,453	17,655	66.88%	8,010	30.34%	725	2.75%	8	0.03%	33,044	72.54%	11,524	25.30%	682	1.50%	300	0.66%
115	79,883	63,911	12,292	44.29%	14,665	52.84%	766	2.76%	31	0.11%	20,831	47.82%	21,945	50.38%	592	1.36%	195	0.45%
116	75,533	58,114	9,048	38.38%	13,930	59.09%	585	2.48%	12	0.05%	16,743	43.40%	21,230	55.04%	447	1.16%	154	0.40%
117	79,251	62,434	8,152	32.28%	16,500	65.33%	596	2.36%	9	0.04%	13,707	36.65%	23,138	61.86%	435	1.16%	123	0.33%
118	76,322	60,837	12,403	42.23%	16,191	55.12%	767	2.61%	12	0.04%	15,098	41.30%	20,729	56.71%	548	1.50%	180	0.49%
119	75,548	61,452	10,591	46.03%	11,788	51.23%	619	2.69%	12	0.05%	15,557	47.80%	16,410	50.42%	543	1.67%	39	0.12%
120	80,814	65,097	9,909	32.86%	19,081	63.28%	1,143	3.79%	18	0.06%	11,787	30.01%	26,800	68.23%	517	1.32%	176	0.45%
Totals:	**9,535,483**	**7,253,848**	**1,141,700**	**43.04%**	**1,454,082**	**54.82%**	**55,554**	**2.09%**	**1,263**	**0.05%**	**2,171,293**	**48.33%**	**2,267,353**	**50.47%**	**44,448**	**0.99%**	**9,519**	**0.21%**

Populations values derive from the 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File. Election results were provided by the NC State Board of Elections. Votes that could not be associated with a specific precinct were excluded. Reported statewide totals may therefore be marginally lower than official contest results.

HBK-20 Speciale - Districts 82 and 83: Governor 2012, Lieutenant Governor 2012, US Senate 2014

	Governor 2012: Dalton-McCrory-Howe								Lieutenant Governor 2012: Coleman-Forest				US Senate 2014: Tillis-Hagan-Haugh							
District	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %
1	19,104	52.09%	16,908	46.10%	653	1.78%	8	0.02%	20,570	57.32%	15,314	42.68%	11,858	47.79%	12,208	49.20%	729	2.94%	17	0.07%
2	14,964	41.36%	20,485	56.62%	721	1.99%	11	0.03%	16,970	48.44%	18,065	51.56%	12,193	52.00%	10,289	43.88%	921	3.93%	44	0.19%
3	12,556	38.05%	19,773	59.92%	658	1.99%	12	0.04%	14,086	43.44%	18,342	56.56%	12,612	56.92%	8,699	39.26%	804	3.63%	43	0.19%
4	11,015	38.19%	17,336	60.11%	481	1.67%	9	0.03%	12,235	43.31%	16,012	56.69%	10,607	58.61%	6,770	37.41%	701	3.87%	20	0.11%
5	20,700	61.40%	12,290	36.45%	721	2.14%	3	0.01%	21,685	65.17%	11,591	34.83%	7,987	40.13%	11,521	57.88%	382	1.92%	15	0.08%
6	13,800	36.70%	22,340	59.41%	1,446	3.85%	14	0.04%	15,559	42.25%	21,269	57.75%	16,135	58.33%	10,543	38.11%	962	3.48%	22	0.08%
7	21,049	51.78%	19,219	47.28%	375	0.92%	5	0.01%	22,227	55.32%	17,950	44.68%	13,321	46.35%	14,633	50.91%	764	2.66%	25	0.09%
8	21,272	62.86%	11,935	35.27%	624	1.84%	7	0.02%	22,701	68.07%	10,649	31.93%	6,095	33.50%	11,528	63.36%	540	2.97%	32	0.18%
9	13,954	38.44%	21,716	59.83%	624	1.72%	4	0.01%	15,785	44.22%	19,914	55.78%	12,511	56.57%	8,912	40.30%	654	2.96%	38	0.17%
10	10,584	30.70%	23,479	68.10%	406	1.18%	6	0.02%	11,878	35.06%	21,998	64.94%	15,412	64.62%	7,489	31.40%	918	3.85%	30	0.13%
11	21,518	52.40%	17,791	43.33%	1,743	4.24%	11	0.03%	24,145	60.33%	15,877	39.67%	9,402	36.09%	15,557	59.72%	1,039	3.99%	54	0.21%
12	17,079	47.65%	18,313	51.09%	441	1.23%	12	0.03%	18,554	52.55%	16,752	47.45%	11,373	48.26%	11,355	48.19%	820	3.48%	17	0.07%
13	11,186	27.90%	28,180	70.30%	711	1.77%	10	0.02%	13,096	33.28%	26,250	66.72%	18,332	63.57%	9,180	31.83%	1,201	4.16%	126	0.44%
14	8,602	35.58%	14,927	61.74%	643	2.66%	5	0.02%	10,111	42.64%	13,602	57.36%	8,982	59.61%	5,359	35.57%	704	4.67%	22	0.15%
15	5,745	31.82%	11,786	65.27%	520	2.88%	5	0.03%	6,792	38.70%	10,759	61.30%	7,085	63.75%	3,460	31.13%	548	4.93%	20	0.18%
16	15,315	41.05%	21,295	57.08%	692	1.85%	6	0.02%	17,254	47.21%	19,293	52.79%	12,611	51.55%	10,386	42.45%	1,421	5.81%	48	0.20%
17	13,028	30.49%	28,818	67.45%	874	2.05%	4	0.01%	16,102	38.50%	25,725	61.50%	18,597	58.14%	11,618	36.32%	1,730	5.41%	39	0.12%
18	19,993	56.18%	14,447	40.60%	1,136	3.19%	12	0.03%	21,986	63.19%	12,809	36.81%	6,879	33.33%	12,754	61.79%	968	4.69%	39	0.19%
19	13,581	34.41%	24,684	62.54%	1,193	3.02%	10	0.03%	16,131	42.05%	22,234	57.95%	14,029	52.05%	11,412	42.34%	1,465	5.44%	48	0.18%
20	13,683	33.44%	26,066	63.71%	1,152	2.82%	12	0.03%	16,044	40.45%	23,624	59.55%	14,896	53.87%	11,396	41.22%	1,311	4.74%	47	0.17%
21	19,745	56.96%	14,454	41.70%	452	1.30%	11	0.03%	20,965	61.42%	13,169	38.58%	8,748	40.67%	12,105	56.28%	628	2.92%	27	0.13%
22	15,582	44.23%	19,229	54.58%	416	1.18%	5	0.01%	17,375	50.23%	17,215	49.77%	12,626	51.58%	10,662	43.56%	1,142	4.67%	49	0.20%
23	24,490	62.22%	14,521	36.89%	350	0.89%	1	0.00%	25,919	66.94%	12,801	33.06%	8,825	34.89%	15,731	62.19%	722	2.85%	17	0.07%
24	20,058	51.71%	18,288	47.15%	436	1.12%	8	0.02%	21,144	55.44%	16,994	44.56%	11,750	45.62%	13,325	51.74%	657	2.55%	24	0.09%
25	14,682	40.75%	20,622	57.24%	713	1.98%	13	0.04%	16,471	46.60%	18,875	53.40%	13,313	52.56%	10,823	42.73%	1,140	4.50%	53	0.21%
26	13,500	33.28%	26,142	64.45%	911	2.25%	10	0.02%	15,454	38.85%	24,322	61.15%	15,810	59.12%	9,838	36.79%	1,051	3.93%	41	0.15%
27	23,878	65.27%	12,369	33.81%	331	0.90%	4	0.01%	25,041	69.33%	11,076	30.67%	8,198	34.09%	15,190	63.16%	647	2.69%	16	0.07%
28	10,992	32.01%	22,789	66.37%	543	1.58%	10	0.03%	12,762	37.94%	20,879	62.06%	13,798	62.33%	7,356	33.23%	928	4.19%	56	0.25%
29	35,463	77.32%	9,134	19.92%	1,242	2.71%	25	0.05%	37,229	82.66%	7,812	17.34%	4,020	14.49%	23,189	83.60%	503	1.81%	27	0.10%
30	29,080	61.95%	16,637	35.44%	1,215	2.59%	11	0.02%	31,249	67.84%	14,812	32.16%	9,863	30.23%	21,982	67.37%	753	2.31%	30	0.09%
31	31,088	76.24%	8,713	21.37%	943	2.31%	30	0.07%	32,663	81.05%	7,639	18.95%	4,068	16.31%	20,384	81.72%	452	1.81%	39	0.16%
32	24,908	63.00%	14,186	35.88%	438	1.11%	4	0.01%	26,603	68.44%	12,266	31.56%	8,903	33.82%	16,633	63.19%	755	2.87%	32	0.12%
33	25,445	66.50%	11,674	30.51%	1,141	2.98%	4	0.01%	27,554	73.40%	9,985	26.60%	5,471	23.58%	16,926	72.94%	767	3.31%	41	0.18%
34	24,282	50.25%	22,640	46.85%	1,397	2.89%	8	0.02%	27,111	57.30%	20,200	42.70%	13,177	38.96%	19,618	58.00%	973	2.88%	57	0.17%
35	16,375	37.09%	26,734	60.55%	1,029	2.33%	15	0.03%	18,534	42.76%	24,815	57.24%	16,257	53.08%	13,398	43.74%	913	2.98%	61	0.20%
36	16,512	34.84%	29,686	62.64%	1,187	2.50%	8	0.02%	19,356	41.76%	26,991	58.24%	18,484	54.29%	14,562	42.77%	934	2.74%	67	0.20%
37	16,190	36.99%	26,307	60.10%	1,263	2.89%	14	0.03%	18,508	43.32%	24,216	56.68%	16,228	53.28%	13,138	43.13%	1,025	3.37%	68	0.22%
38	27,623	71.36%	10,131	26.17%	944	2.44%	11	0.03%	29,459	77.11%	8,745	22.89%	5,219	22.03%	17,826	75.24%	611	2.58%	37	0.16%
39	26,440	64.76%	13,558	33.21%	822	2.01%	9	0.02%	28,552	70.78%	11,785	29.22%	7,175	27.51%	18,189	69.74%	680	2.61%	38	0.15%
40	17,767	35.02%	31,793	62.66%	1,159	2.28%	16	0.03%	20,489	41.22%	29,213	58.78%	20,170	53.02%	16,914	44.46%	905	2.38%	50	0.13%
41	18,631	44.80%	21,697	52.18%	1,245	2.99%	12	0.03%	21,117	52.18%	19,353	47.82%	12,130	43.17%	15,093	53.71%	826	2.94%	52	0.19%
42	17,657	70.31%	6,879	27.39%	570	2.27%	7	0.03%	18,581	74.83%	6,251	25.17%	3,360	24.76%	9,838	72.50%	356	2.62%	15	0.11%
43	22,155	68.80%	9,319	28.94%	716	2.22%	13	0.04%	23,447	73.52%	8,447	26.48%	5,177	28.30%	12,578	68.77%	504	2.76%	32	0.17%
44	16,575	50.29%	15,604	47.34%	777	2.36%	4	0.01%	18,236	56.47%	14,058	43.53%	9,371	46.34%	10,098	49.94%	724	3.58%	28	0.14%
45	14,293	40.30%	20,508	57.83%	654	1.84%	10	0.03%	16,061	46.10%	18,779	53.90%	12,902	55.12%	9,613	41.07%	862	3.68%	28	0.12%
46	13,148	49.59%	12,865	48.52%	494	1.86%	9	0.03%	14,692	56.79%	11,178	43.21%	8,263	51.41%	6,912	43.00%	864	5.38%	34	0.21%
47	17,474	65.03%	8,923	33.21%	463	1.72%	10	0.04%	19,029	72.21%	7,325	27.79%	6,020	38.81%	8,990	57.95%	483	3.11%	20	0.13%
48	17,506	57.00%	12,512	40.74%	683	2.22%	11	0.04%	18,833	62.60%	11,253	37.40%	8,168	39.86%	11,599	56.60%	702	3.43%	25	0.12%
49	23,039	48.85%	22,573	47.86%	1,529	3.24%	19	0.04%	25,948	56.50%	19,977	43.50%	12,523	38.78%	18,812	58.25%	915	2.83%	44	0.14%
50	22,427	51.96%	19,641	45.50%	1,079	2.50%	17	0.04%	24,273	57.34%	18,057	42.66%	11,936	39.20%	17,598	57.80%	884	2.90%	31	0.10%
51	13,347	41.90%	17,802	55.89%	695	2.18%	9	0.03%	14,890	47.81%	16,254	52.19%	10,309	51.33%	8,824	43.94%	912	4.54%	37	0.18%
52	13,223	32.47%	26,842	65.91%	647	1.59%	13	0.03%	14,727	36.95%	25,133	63.05%	18,117	61.71%	10,299	35.08%	918	3.13%	25	0.09%
53	12,066	36.20%	20,590	61.78%	654	1.96%	18	0.05%	13,884	42.31%	18,933	57.69%	12,290	57.33%	8,229	38.39%	881	4.11%	37	0.17%

District plan definition file: 'HBK-20.asc', modified 08/24/2017 11:02:00 PM

Printed 08/24/2017 {rptS03|dc2017HS|re1.3.1}

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections. Votes that could not be associated with a specific precinct were excluded. Reported statewide totals may therefore be marginally lower than official contest results.

HBK-20 Speciale - Districts 82 and 83: Governor 2012, Lieutenant Governor 2012, US Senate 2014

	Governor 2012: Dalton-McCrory-Howe								Lieutenant Governor 2012: Coleman-Forest				US Senate 2014: Tillis-Hagan-Haugh							
District	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %
54	23,822	51.27%	21,500	46.27%	1,129	2.43%	13	0.03%	25,713	56.54%	19,767	43.46%	13,798	38.55%	20,947	58.53%	1,010	2.82%	33	0.09%
55	11,895	34.27%	22,352	64.40%	451	1.30%	9	0.03%	14,409	42.63%	19,392	57.37%	12,564	58.22%	8,132	37.68%	825	3.82%	59	0.27%
56	31,425	72.59%	10,387	23.99%	1,442	3.33%	35	0.08%	33,453	79.36%	8,702	20.64%	4,328	14.66%	24,548	83.15%	623	2.11%	25	0.08%
57	33,864	82.21%	6,380	15.49%	935	2.27%	15	0.04%	35,587	87.36%	5,148	12.64%	2,908	12.79%	19,345	85.07%	461	2.03%	27	0.12%
58	25,470	67.33%	11,477	30.34%	871	2.30%	12	0.03%	27,374	73.49%	9,877	26.51%	6,056	26.29%	16,414	71.26%	541	2.35%	23	0.10%
59	16,881	38.35%	26,270	59.68%	842	1.91%	22	0.05%	18,902	43.85%	24,202	56.15%	16,481	54.26%	13,076	43.05%	781	2.57%	38	0.13%
60	21,229	61.82%	12,382	36.06%	716	2.08%	14	0.04%	22,798	67.67%	10,893	32.33%	6,627	32.59%	13,173	64.78%	511	2.51%	23	0.11%
61	16,477	35.08%	29,436	62.67%	1,042	2.22%	13	0.03%	18,890	41.30%	26,843	58.70%	18,586	54.92%	14,369	42.46%	833	2.46%	54	0.16%
62	16,439	35.57%	28,715	62.13%	1,049	2.27%	16	0.03%	18,766	41.64%	26,301	58.36%	17,940	54.18%	14,342	43.32%	788	2.38%	39	0.12%
63	13,645	38.81%	20,703	58.88%	806	2.29%	8	0.02%	15,271	44.34%	19,170	55.66%	12,602	53.40%	9,988	42.32%	965	4.09%	44	0.19%
64	11,979	37.49%	19,341	60.53%	627	1.96%	4	0.01%	13,229	42.12%	18,180	57.88%	11,778	56.82%	8,157	39.35%	765	3.69%	29	0.14%
65	13,513	36.26%	23,056	61.87%	688	1.85%	8	0.02%	15,423	42.41%	20,945	57.59%	14,329	56.93%	9,480	37.67%	1,299	5.16%	61	0.24%
66	14,522	42.14%	19,358	56.17%	559	1.62%	22	0.06%	17,355	52.08%	15,967	47.92%	11,703	49.19%	10,681	44.89%	1,339	5.63%	69	0.29%
67	8,626	21.46%	30,956	77.03%	603	1.50%	3	0.01%	11,850	30.42%	27,101	69.58%	17,588	66.01%	7,449	27.96%	1,520	5.70%	88	0.33%
68	9,603	26.44%	26,124	71.94%	580	1.60%	8	0.02%	12,272	34.62%	23,173	65.38%	14,825	62.65%	8,035	33.95%	726	3.07%	78	0.33%
69	9,500	27.69%	24,180	70.48%	618	1.80%	12	0.03%	12,086	36.26%	21,244	63.74%	12,586	61.65%	7,039	34.48%	713	3.49%	76	0.37%
70	7,067	22.31%	23,955	75.61%	659	2.08%	2	0.01%	8,422	27.16%	22,587	72.84%	13,549	72.21%	4,376	23.32%	811	4.32%	27	0.14%
71	21,632	63.47%	11,608	34.06%	833	2.44%	11	0.03%	23,344	69.85%	10,074	30.15%	5,937	29.94%	13,286	67.01%	564	2.84%	41	0.21%
72	25,032	71.44%	9,442	26.95%	561	1.60%	4	0.01%	26,408	76.70%	8,021	23.30%	4,846	22.84%	15,910	75.00%	431	2.03%	27	0.13%
73	10,246	26.97%	26,893	70.79%	836	2.20%	13	0.03%	12,226	33.12%	24,693	66.88%	16,341	65.28%	7,672	30.65%	958	3.83%	60	0.24%
74	13,727	34.78%	24,886	63.06%	843	2.14%	8	0.02%	15,812	40.97%	22,784	59.03%	14,120	56.55%	10,022	40.14%	765	3.06%	60	0.24%
75	14,574	33.71%	27,740	64.17%	903	2.09%	14	0.03%	16,738	39.66%	25,462	60.34%	16,626	57.24%	11,474	39.50%	896	3.08%	52	0.18%
76	12,284	33.69%	23,538	64.56%	628	1.72%	9	0.02%	14,731	41.42%	20,837	58.58%	12,611	55.12%	8,946	39.10%	1,270	5.55%	51	0.22%
77	9,369	23.42%	29,955	74.88%	668	1.67%	11	0.03%	11,524	29.40%	27,678	70.60%	17,850	66.81%	7,521	28.15%	1,287	4.82%	59	0.22%
78	7,417	21.69%	26,189	76.58%	589	1.72%	2	0.01%	8,545	25.56%	24,890	74.44%	15,703	72.92%	4,853	22.54%	935	4.34%	44	0.20%
79	13,554	37.32%	22,193	61.10%	570	1.57%	4	0.01%	15,469	43.41%	20,162	56.59%	14,708	55.81%	10,339	39.23%	1,201	4.56%	104	0.39%
80	8,280	22.99%	27,024	75.04%	703	1.95%	6	0.02%	10,026	28.42%	25,253	71.58%	15,663	71.58%	5,384	24.61%	804	3.67%	30	0.14%
81	9,478	27.29%	24,476	70.48%	769	2.21%	5	0.01%	11,626	34.16%	22,403	65.84%	13,608	64.41%	6,478	30.66%	994	4.70%	48	0.23%
82	11,617	28.69%	28,127	69.46%	750	1.85%	0	0.00%	15,580	39.68%	23,682	60.32%	14,293	56.57%	9,912	39.23%	981	3.88%	82	0.32%
83	11,398	34.18%	21,333	63.97%	616	1.85%	0	0.00%	14,491	44.64%	17,969	55.36%	10,499	53.60%	8,056	41.13%	983	5.02%	49	0.25%
84	10,369	28.17%	25,834	70.19%	594	1.61%	8	0.02%	12,890	35.90%	23,016	64.10%	15,527	61.64%	8,043	31.93%	1,547	6.14%	72	0.29%
85	8,720	26.19%	23,735	71.30%	830	2.49%	4	0.01%	10,049	31.44%	21,909	68.56%	14,353	67.23%	5,803	27.18%	1,155	5.41%	37	0.17%
86	9,894	30.27%	22,179	67.86%	597	1.83%	14	0.04%	12,957	40.71%	18,868	59.29%	12,566	56.86%	8,134	36.81%	1,359	6.15%	39	0.18%
87	8,402	24.08%	25,771	73.84%	726	2.08%	0	0.00%	11,079	32.73%	22,771	67.27%	13,309	63.30%	6,258	29.76%	1,381	6.57%	78	0.37%
88	17,313	53.39%	14,448	44.55%	661	2.04%	6	0.02%	20,458	64.53%	11,246	35.47%	5,661	32.76%	10,988	63.60%	586	3.39%	43	0.25%
89	8,637	25.00%	25,338	73.34%	567	1.64%	8	0.02%	11,035	32.69%	22,717	67.31%	13,875	64.20%	6,526	30.20%	1,153	5.33%	58	0.27%
90	8,837	26.68%	23,568	71.16%	708	2.14%	8	0.02%	10,670	33.28%	21,396	66.72%	14,220	63.55%	6,751	30.17%	1,349	6.03%	56	0.25%
91	9,566	26.04%	26,356	71.75%	798	2.17%	13	0.04%	11,568	32.30%	24,245	67.70%	15,886	66.06%	6,657	27.68%	1,432	5.95%	74	0.31%
92	20,018	59.29%	13,068	38.71%	670	1.98%	6	0.02%	23,272	70.93%	9,539	29.07%	5,082	26.73%	13,373	70.35%	525	2.76%	30	0.16%
93	14,589	36.70%	23,616	59.41%	1,532	3.85%	11	0.03%	17,050	44.54%	21,230	55.46%	13,890	52.47%	11,056	41.76%	1,481	5.59%	47	0.18%
94	8,891	24.23%	27,163	74.02%	638	1.74%	7	0.02%	11,010	30.88%	24,648	69.12%	16,296	66.25%	6,646	27.02%	1,567	6.37%	89	0.36%
95	9,674	24.71%	28,753	73.44%	710	1.81%	15	0.04%	12,828	33.76%	25,174	66.24%	15,725	62.10%	8,257	32.61%	1,255	4.96%	84	0.33%
96	9,710	27.99%	24,383	70.28%	596	1.72%	7	0.02%	12,265	36.11%	21,704	63.89%	13,550	60.40%	7,757	34.58%	1,060	4.73%	65	0.29%
97	8,226	22.44%	27,842	75.96%	582	1.59%	5	0.01%	10,866	30.52%	24,732	69.48%	15,844	66.50%	6,685	28.06%	1,232	5.17%	66	0.28%
98	11,028	26.83%	29,295	71.27%	774	1.88%	7	0.02%	15,043	37.92%	24,623	62.08%	14,436	56.42%	10,325	40.35%	736	2.88%	89	0.35%
99	23,478	69.59%	9,686	28.71%	565	1.67%	7	0.02%	26,192	78.87%	7,017	21.13%	3,532	18.57%	15,086	79.31%	374	1.97%	29	0.15%
100	17,333	55.16%	13,474	42.88%	605	1.93%	12	0.04%	20,399	66.57%	10,245	33.43%	5,518	31.92%	11,202	64.79%	533	3.08%	36	0.21%
101	24,485	65.40%	12,341	32.96%	605	1.62%	7	0.02%	27,310	74.45%	9,370	25.55%	4,873	23.57%	15,262	73.83%	512	2.48%	25	0.12%
102	21,669	68.30%	9,269	29.22%	768	2.42%	18	0.06%	24,802	80.30%	6,085	19.70%	2,896	16.75%	13,858	80.17%	508	2.94%	23	0.13%
103	10,654	25.61%	30,288	72.80%	655	1.57%	9	0.02%	14,826	36.80%	25,459	63.20%	14,931	57.20%	10,396	39.82%	727	2.78%	51	0.20%
104	11,360	24.40%	34,544	74.20%	641	1.38%	13	0.03%	16,834	37.48%	28,079	62.52%	16,733	55.41%	12,697	42.04%	731	2.42%	39	0.13%
105	10,762	26.63%	29,029	71.84%	610	1.51%	6	0.01%	14,930	38.00%	24,356	62.00%	13,516	56.71%	9,683	40.63%	589	2.47%	44	0.18%
106	20,129	62.28%	11,537	35.70%	637	1.97%	17	0.05%	23,095	72.96%	8,561	27.04%	4,035	23.69%	12,601	73.99%	384	2.25%	10	0.06%

HBK-20 Speciale - Districts 82 and 83: Governor 2012, Lieutenant Governor 2012, US Senate 2014

	Governor 2012: Dalton-McCrory-Howe								Lieutenant Governor 2012: Coleman-Forest				US Senate 2014: Tillis-Hagan-Haugh							
District	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Write-In**	**Write-In %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Write-In**	**Write-In %**
107	24,066	67.23%	11,223	31.35%	499	1.39%	11	0.03%	26,973	76.68%	8,203	23.32%	4,072	20.43%	15,400	77.28%	420	2.11%	35	0.18%
108	10,229	30.60%	22,641	67.73%	553	1.65%	6	0.02%	12,577	38.66%	19,954	61.34%	11,798	58.37%	7,436	36.79%	940	4.65%	37	0.18%
109	11,675	33.74%	22,419	64.79%	501	1.45%	9	0.03%	13,855	41.00%	19,937	59.00%	12,274	57.67%	8,147	38.28%	804	3.78%	59	0.28%
110	10,188	31.08%	22,150	67.56%	443	1.35%	4	0.01%	11,944	37.40%	19,996	62.60%	12,381	60.75%	6,988	34.29%	961	4.72%	49	0.24%
111	10,978	33.85%	21,002	64.75%	447	1.38%	9	0.03%	12,345	39.08%	19,245	60.92%	12,248	58.87%	7,466	35.89%	1,040	5.00%	50	0.24%
112	13,175	40.49%	18,798	57.78%	552	1.70%	10	0.03%	11,934	37.96%	19,505	62.04%	13,356	60.75%	7,327	33.33%	1,273	5.79%	30	0.14%
113	14,513	34.86%	26,056	62.58%	1,053	2.53%	14	0.03%	15,965	39.13%	24,832	60.87%	17,951	56.94%	12,220	38.76%	1,317	4.18%	39	0.12%
114	30,335	67.66%	12,627	28.17%	1,853	4.13%	17	0.04%	32,363	73.64%	11,584	26.36%	6,689	22.11%	22,389	74.02%	1,142	3.78%	29	0.10%
115	18,992	44.03%	22,839	52.94%	1,300	3.01%	8	0.02%	20,704	48.97%	21,574	51.03%	14,095	45.76%	15,408	50.02%	1,262	4.10%	39	0.13%
116	15,055	39.40%	22,073	57.77%	1,069	2.80%	10	0.03%	16,787	44.87%	20,623	55.13%	13,088	50.68%	11,658	45.14%	1,042	4.03%	38	0.15%
117	12,236	33.12%	23,695	64.13%	1,002	2.71%	14	0.04%	13,677	37.80%	22,505	62.20%	14,898	58.54%	9,518	37.40%	995	3.91%	37	0.15%
118	14,554	39.85%	21,033	57.59%	922	2.52%	13	0.04%	15,851	44.59%	19,698	55.41%	14,379	52.35%	11,489	41.83%	1,537	5.60%	61	0.22%
119	14,498	44.69%	16,886	52.05%	1,054	3.25%	2	0.01%	15,958	50.57%	15,600	49.43%	10,500	46.76%	10,697	47.64%	1,217	5.42%	40	0.18%
120	12,098	31.33%	25,139	65.11%	1,357	3.51%	18	0.05%	13,273	35.22%	24,408	64.78%	18,212	62.59%	9,371	32.21%	1,474	5.07%	40	0.14%
Totals:	**1,925,270**	**43.18%**	**2,437,224**	**54.67%**	**94,512**	**2.12%**	**1,191**	**0.03%**	**2,174,021**	**49.88%**	**2,184,891**	**50.12%**	**1,416,834**	**48.84%**	**1,370,303**	**47.23%**	**108,779**	**3.75%**	**5,251**	**0.18%**

HBK-20 Speciale - Districts 82 and 83: President 2016, US Senate 2016, Governor 2016

	US President 2016: Trump-Clinton-Johnson								US Senate 2016: Burr-Ross-Haugh						Governor 2016: Cooper-McCrory-Cecil					
District	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %
1	18,589	51.78%	16,455	45.83%	630	1.75%	229	0.64%	18,358	52.14%	16,040	45.56%	811	2.30%	16,170	45.62%	18,855	53.20%	418	1.18%
2	21,687	56.45%	15,453	40.22%	893	2.32%	385	1.00%	21,503	56.54%	15,299	40.22%	1,232	3.24%	16,542	43.27%	21,035	55.02%	656	1.72%
3	19,500	57.51%	13,102	38.64%	958	2.83%	350	1.03%	19,722	58.75%	12,526	37.32%	1,320	3.93%	13,284	39.49%	19,645	58.40%	709	2.11%
4	19,316	63.27%	10,515	34.44%	536	1.76%	163	0.53%	18,844	62.77%	10,197	33.97%	978	3.26%	10,515	34.80%	19,240	63.67%	463	1.53%
5	14,071	42.89%	17,840	54.38%	677	2.06%	221	0.67%	13,942	43.33%	17,542	54.52%	690	2.14%	17,723	54.83%	14,115	43.67%	483	1.49%
6	26,166	63.13%	13,548	32.69%	1,322	3.19%	413	1.00%	25,754	63.45%	13,548	33.38%	1,290	3.18%	14,719	36.08%	25,069	61.45%	1,010	2.48%
7	17,731	44.94%	20,836	52.81%	588	1.49%	299	0.76%	17,965	45.70%	20,621	52.45%	729	1.85%	21,877	55.47%	17,171	43.54%	389	0.99%
8	11,251	32.48%	22,166	63.99%	878	2.53%	346	1.00%	11,920	34.87%	21,238	62.12%	1,030	3.01%	21,791	63.50%	11,949	34.82%	577	1.68%
9	20,103	53.26%	16,101	42.66%	1,112	2.95%	426	1.13%	20,913	55.89%	15,376	41.09%	1,129	3.02%	16,546	44.07%	20,375	54.27%	626	1.67%
10	24,292	66.90%	11,079	30.51%	680	1.87%	258	0.71%	24,011	66.82%	10,937	30.44%	984	2.74%	11,524	31.87%	24,183	66.89%	449	1.24%
11	13,097	31.16%	26,165	62.26%	1,893	4.50%	873	2.08%	14,675	35.17%	25,423	60.93%	1,628	3.90%	27,513	65.67%	13,139	31.36%	1,242	2.96%
12	17,784	51.92%	15,657	45.71%	569	1.66%	241	0.70%	17,668	52.25%	15,240	45.07%	906	2.68%	15,523	45.65%	18,084	53.18%	397	1.17%
13	29,527	68.85%	11,999	27.98%	967	2.25%	396	0.92%	29,080	68.53%	11,666	27.49%	1,685	3.97%	12,730	29.84%	29,076	68.17%	849	1.99%
14	16,391	60.55%	9,442	34.88%	949	3.51%	289	1.07%	16,089	60.41%	9,134	34.30%	1,410	5.29%	9,540	35.73%	16,350	61.23%	813	3.04%
15	13,635	66.87%	5,838	28.63%	701	3.44%	217	1.06%	13,255	66.19%	5,709	28.51%	1,061	5.30%	6,115	30.44%	13,366	66.54%	606	3.02%
16	24,723	60.82%	14,793	36.39%	868	2.14%	267	0.66%	24,021	60.12%	14,359	35.94%	1,578	3.95%	15,806	39.44%	23,414	58.42%	858	2.14%
17	33,539	64.40%	16,832	32.32%	1,227	2.36%	480	0.92%	32,987	64.27%	16,223	31.61%	2,112	4.12%	18,326	35.57%	32,038	62.18%	1,162	2.26%
18	14,960	39.11%	21,515	56.25%	1,247	3.26%	530	1.39%	15,065	40.15%	20,714	55.20%	1,747	4.66%	22,540	59.77%	14,028	37.20%	1,146	3.04%
19	24,349	55.45%	17,494	39.84%	1,461	3.33%	604	1.38%	24,444	56.44%	16,799	38.79%	2,068	4.77%	19,932	45.80%	22,351	51.36%	1,232	2.83%
20	25,197	54.81%	18,393	40.01%	1,731	3.77%	651	1.42%	25,753	56.83%	17,604	38.84%	1,962	4.33%	20,831	45.79%	23,400	51.43%	1,266	2.78%
21	13,185	40.91%	18,296	56.77%	504	1.56%	241	0.75%	13,302	41.79%	17,819	55.99%	706	2.22%	18,015	56.37%	13,529	42.34%	412	1.29%
22	20,673	57.99%	14,263	40.01%	514	1.44%	197	0.55%	20,313	57.79%	14,021	39.89%	817	2.32%	14,526	41.04%	20,479	57.86%	392	1.11%
23	14,143	38.43%	22,040	59.88%	449	1.22%	173	0.47%	14,165	38.89%	21,496	59.02%	760	2.09%	21,917	59.87%	14,389	39.30%	303	0.83%
24	17,531	45.97%	19,663	51.56%	667	1.75%	274	0.72%	17,641	46.58%	19,435	51.32%	794	2.10%	20,471	53.84%	17,161	45.13%	391	1.03%
25	21,956	56.91%	15,273	39.59%	939	2.43%	411	1.07%	21,764	56.74%	15,352	40.02%	1,242	3.24%	16,618	43.12%	21,215	55.05%	707	1.83%
26	28,331	59.78%	17,038	35.95%	1,483	3.13%	543	1.15%	28,339	60.24%	16,928	35.98%	1,777	3.78%	18,695	39.57%	27,607	58.43%	947	2.00%
27	12,504	36.17%	21,573	62.40%	373	1.08%	123	0.36%	12,390	36.15%	21,326	62.22%	557	1.63%	21,783	63.37%	12,336	35.89%	256	0.74%
28	24,528	66.08%	11,430	30.79%	876	2.36%	284	0.77%	24,192	65.72%	11,427	31.04%	1,192	3.24%	12,526	33.84%	23,877	64.50%	616	1.66%
29	5,172	10.88%	40,386	84.99%	1,171	2.46%	787	1.66%	7,072	15.00%	39,112	82.96%	964	2.04%	40,387	85.64%	6,009	12.74%	761	1.61%
30	13,282	26.62%	34,511	69.18%	1,265	2.54%	829	1.66%	14,956	30.09%	33,506	67.41%	1,242	2.50%	35,040	70.35%	13,947	28.00%	818	1.64%
31	7,429	16.37%	36,169	79.69%	1,136	2.50%	654	1.44%	8,466	18.76%	35,558	78.81%	1,092	2.42%	36,387	80.47%	8,063	17.83%	770	1.70%
32	13,636	35.53%	23,937	62.37%	563	1.47%	241	0.63%	13,731	36.10%	23,622	62.10%	683	1.80%	24,127	63.21%	13,643	35.74%	401	1.05%
33	9,320	22.99%	29,204	72.05%	1,399	3.45%	610	1.50%	10,337	25.71%	28,598	71.13%	1,272	3.16%	29,984	74.32%	9,429	23.37%	934	2.31%
34	16,734	33.58%	30,202	60.61%	1,879	3.77%	1,011	2.03%	19,537	39.31%	28,698	57.74%	1,464	2.95%	31,726	63.65%	17,066	34.24%	1,052	2.11%
35	25,508	49.09%	23,630	45.47%	1,744	3.36%	1,082	2.08%	27,262	52.81%	22,718	44.01%	1,638	3.17%	25,059	48.33%	25,740	49.64%	1,054	2.03%
36	25,495	49.78%	22,974	44.86%	1,903	3.72%	846	1.65%	27,500	53.89%	21,900	42.91%	1,632	3.20%	24,574	47.98%	25,611	50.00%	1,036	2.02%
37	26,427	49.66%	23,556	44.27%	2,295	4.31%	936	1.76%	28,468	53.86%	22,487	42.55%	1,896	3.59%	25,376	47.79%	26,351	49.63%	1,369	2.58%
38	7,962	20.17%	29,883	75.70%	1,056	2.67%	577	1.46%	8,744	22.30%	29,341	74.83%	1,126	2.87%	30,111	76.58%	8,383	21.32%	825	2.10%
39	11,720	27.17%	29,742	68.94%	1,134	2.63%	547	1.27%	12,360	28.82%	29,304	68.32%	1,230	2.87%	30,194	70.17%	12,076	28.06%	760	1.77%
40	25,414	46.70%	25,912	47.62%	2,113	3.88%	976	1.79%	28,593	52.66%	24,242	44.65%	1,463	2.69%	27,552	50.59%	25,895	47.55%	1,016	1.87%
41	17,367	35.18%	29,148	59.04%	1,982	4.01%	876	1.77%	20,218	41.31%	27,134	55.45%	1,585	3.24%	29,804	60.65%	18,119	36.87%	1,218	2.48%
42	6,364	25.50%	17,674	70.81%	647	2.59%	274	1.10%	6,643	26.97%	17,141	69.60%	845	3.43%	17,092	69.47%	6,886	27.99%	627	2.55%
43	8,099	26.20%	21,704	70.20%	798	2.58%	317	1.03%	8,364	27.40%	21,127	69.21%	1,035	3.39%	21,109	69.10%	8,700	28.48%	740	2.42%
44	14,477	44.27%	16,935	51.79%	961	2.94%	329	1.01%	14,728	45.60%	16,387	50.74%	1,184	3.67%	16,797	51.88%	14,827	45.80%	750	2.32%
45	22,325	57.35%	15,292	39.28%	967	2.48%	343	0.88%	22,167	57.66%	15,078	39.22%	1,202	3.13%	15,451	40.04%	22,349	57.91%	792	2.05%
46	16,046	61.47%	9,544	36.56%	396	1.52%	116	0.44%	15,195	59.76%	9,522	37.45%	708	2.78%	9,625	37.45%	15,778	61.39%	300	1.17%
47	11,779	46.41%	12,896	50.81%	520	2.05%	186	0.73%	11,277	45.82%	12,909	52.46%	423	1.72%	12,419	49.71%	12,346	49.42%	216	0.86%
48	14,016	43.58%	17,045	53.00%	831	2.58%	266	0.83%	13,782	43.73%	16,722	53.06%	1,010	3.20%	17,039	53.91%	13,890	43.94%	679	2.15%
49	17,038	32.50%	32,320	61.64%	2,062	3.93%	1,012	1.93%	20,095	38.54%	30,441	58.39%	1,600	3.07%	33,662	64.28%	17,547	33.51%	1,158	2.21%
50	18,683	40.92%	25,213	55.22%	1,226	2.69%	539	1.18%	19,535	43.06%	24,526	54.06%	1,309	2.89%	26,259	57.73%	18,414	40.49%	810	1.78%
51	18,556	54.99%	13,829	40.98%	1,027	3.04%	332	0.98%	18,319	54.87%	13,803	41.34%	1,264	3.79%	14,919	44.49%	17,772	53.00%	840	2.51%
52	26,508	61.46%	14,902	34.55%	1,240	2.87%	482	1.12%	26,850	62.67%	14,595	34.07%	1,396	3.26%	16,149	37.60%	25,907	60.32%	893	2.08%

HBK-20 Speciale - Districts 82 and 83: President 2016, US Senate 2016, Governor 2016

	US President 2016: Trump-Clinton-Johnson								US Senate 2016: Burr-Ross-Haugh						Governor 2016: Cooper-McCrory-Cecil					
District	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %
53	21,436	60.85%	12,611	35.80%	852	2.42%	328	0.93%	21,212	60.60%	12,628	36.08%	1,164	3.33%	13,300	37.93%	21,064	60.08%	697	1.99%
54	19,492	37.13%	30,645	58.38%	1,545	2.94%	809	1.54%	21,169	40.48%	29,679	56.76%	1,444	2.76%	31,838	60.66%	19,672	37.48%	979	1.87%
55	22,840	63.50%	12,002	33.37%	788	2.19%	336	0.93%	22,508	63.37%	11,758	33.10%	1,252	3.52%	12,330	34.49%	22,863	63.95%	559	1.56%
56	5,901	12.36%	39,502	82.73%	1,392	2.92%	955	2.00%	8,341	17.60%	38,022	80.24%	1,021	2.15%	40,120	84.53%	6,502	13.70%	838	1.77%
57	4,869	12.13%	33,975	84.62%	785	1.96%	523	1.30%	5,571	14.07%	33,051	83.48%	968	2.45%	33,866	85.39%	5,062	12.76%	733	1.85%
58	8,963	23.57%	27,663	72.74%	918	2.41%	485	1.28%	9,437	25.12%	26,960	71.78%	1,164	3.10%	28,097	74.57%	8,759	23.25%	823	2.18%
59	25,507	54.53%	19,758	42.24%	1,056	2.26%	457	0.98%	25,592	55.15%	19,403	41.81%	1,411	3.04%	21,420	45.98%	24,237	52.03%	926	1.99%
60	10,484	30.27%	22,918	66.17%	880	2.54%	353	1.02%	10,935	32.03%	22,058	64.61%	1,148	3.36%	23,295	68.08%	10,105	29.53%	819	2.39%
61	24,185	49.68%	22,193	45.59%	1,552	3.19%	752	1.54%	25,701	53.16%	21,118	43.68%	1,528	3.16%	24,221	49.98%	23,168	47.80%	1,075	2.22%
62	23,811	49.23%	22,262	46.02%	1,540	3.18%	757	1.57%	25,865	53.72%	20,867	43.34%	1,417	2.94%	24,295	50.38%	22,926	47.54%	1,000	2.07%
63	19,745	52.91%	16,215	43.45%	964	2.58%	397	1.06%	20,099	54.24%	15,711	42.39%	1,249	3.37%	17,448	46.93%	19,042	51.22%	687	1.85%
64	19,070	56.36%	13,618	40.25%	831	2.46%	317	0.94%	19,281	57.45%	13,162	39.22%	1,119	3.33%	14,584	43.35%	18,459	54.87%	596	1.77%
65	23,874	63.29%	12,795	33.92%	751	1.99%	301	0.80%	23,327	62.41%	12,731	34.06%	1,321	3.53%	14,611	38.98%	22,135	59.06%	733	1.96%
66	20,464	58.60%	13,653	39.10%	620	1.78%	185	0.53%	19,321	56.30%	13,692	39.90%	1,306	3.81%	14,777	42.68%	19,284	55.70%	563	1.63%
67	31,718	72.39%	10,662	24.33%	1,050	2.40%	388	0.89%	30,606	70.44%	10,682	24.58%	2,164	4.98%	12,115	27.72%	30,663	70.17%	921	2.11%
68	25,357	58.90%	15,581	36.19%	1,519	3.53%	593	1.38%	26,537	62.36%	14,300	33.60%	1,717	4.03%	16,268	38.02%	25,525	59.65%	1,000	2.34%
69	23,008	61.78%	12,620	33.89%	1,151	3.09%	461	1.24%	23,224	63.20%	11,858	32.27%	1,667	4.54%	13,180	35.64%	22,857	61.81%	941	2.54%
70	25,245	74.51%	7,544	22.27%	779	2.30%	312	0.92%	24,601	73.23%	7,505	22.34%	1,490	4.44%	9,245	27.45%	23,609	70.11%	821	2.44%
71	9,228	26.65%	23,827	68.81%	1,064	3.07%	510	1.47%	10,380	30.23%	22,857	66.56%	1,102	3.21%	24,376	70.96%	9,143	26.62%	831	2.42%
72	6,795	19.73%	26,406	76.67%	805	2.34%	436	1.27%	8,321	24.36%	25,110	73.50%	730	2.14%	26,382	77.32%	7,107	20.83%	631	1.85%
73	25,744	64.55%	12,400	31.09%	1,183	2.97%	558	1.40%	26,690	67.24%	11,644	29.33%	1,362	3.43%	14,295	35.92%	24,646	61.93%	854	2.15%
74	22,992	54.52%	17,297	41.02%	1,322	3.13%	559	1.33%	23,918	57.09%	16,460	39.29%	1,518	3.62%	19,049	45.40%	21,902	52.20%	1,008	2.40%
75	25,112	56.02%	17,682	39.45%	1,399	3.12%	630	1.41%	26,414	59.14%	16,750	37.50%	1,499	3.36%	19,607	43.87%	24,064	53.84%	1,022	2.29%
76	23,064	61.73%	13,031	34.87%	877	2.35%	393	1.05%	22,286	60.33%	12,833	34.74%	1,819	4.92%	14,249	38.34%	21,950	59.07%	961	2.59%
77	30,333	72.00%	10,259	24.35%	1,103	2.62%	434	1.03%	29,715	71.11%	10,106	24.19%	1,965	4.70%	12,186	29.04%	28,782	68.58%	1,000	2.38%
78	28,166	77.69%	7,076	19.52%	739	2.04%	272	0.75%	27,319	76.13%	7,166	19.97%	1,402	3.91%	8,771	24.33%	26,543	73.63%	737	2.04%
79	22,774	61.50%	13,292	35.90%	678	1.83%	285	0.77%	22,332	61.14%	12,865	35.22%	1,328	3.64%	13,385	36.39%	22,891	62.23%	509	1.38%
80	28,033	74.04%	8,623	22.78%	918	2.42%	287	0.76%	27,677	73.76%	8,454	22.53%	1,394	3.71%	10,385	27.55%	26,519	70.35%	793	2.10%
81	26,284	71.05%	9,486	25.64%	941	2.54%	284	0.77%	25,858	70.60%	9,299	25.39%	1,469	4.01%	11,560	31.43%	24,341	66.17%	883	2.40%
82	26,018	55.68%	18,574	39.75%	1,523	3.26%	614	1.31%	26,332	56.93%	17,809	38.50%	2,113	4.57%	19,814	42.58%	25,485	54.77%	1,231	2.65%
83	20,110	57.07%	13,758	39.05%	961	2.73%	407	1.16%	19,661	56.39%	13,381	38.38%	1,827	5.24%	14,616	41.69%	19,454	55.49%	990	2.82%
84	25,864	67.41%	11,302	29.46%	842	2.19%	358	0.93%	24,946	65.81%	11,099	29.28%	1,862	4.91%	12,373	32.46%	24,857	65.22%	885	2.32%
85	27,148	74.95%	7,952	21.95%	700	1.93%	421	1.16%	25,691	72.23%	8,320	23.39%	1,555	4.37%	9,999	27.89%	24,896	69.44%	959	2.67%
86	23,049	66.31%	10,412	29.95%	895	2.57%	404	1.16%	22,151	64.58%	10,580	30.84%	1,571	4.58%	12,309	35.59%	21,505	62.18%	773	2.23%
87	26,621	73.29%	8,427	23.20%	849	2.34%	425	1.17%	25,537	71.08%	8,542	23.78%	1,847	5.14%	10,059	27.82%	25,176	69.62%	927	2.56%
88	11,487	31.37%	23,378	63.84%	1,245	3.40%	512	1.40%	12,363	34.22%	22,148	61.30%	1,621	4.49%	23,338	64.34%	11,852	32.67%	1,085	2.99%
89	25,622	70.69%	9,396	25.92%	904	2.49%	322	0.89%	24,664	68.94%	9,348	26.13%	1,762	4.93%	10,714	29.78%	24,387	67.78%	880	2.45%
90	26,850	74.48%	8,079	22.41%	799	2.22%	322	0.89%	26,027	73.03%	8,190	22.98%	1,420	3.98%	10,364	28.89%	24,799	69.14%	706	1.97%
91	29,074	74.71%	8,544	21.95%	943	2.42%	357	0.92%	28,358	73.39%	8,684	22.48%	1,596	4.13%	11,102	28.68%	26,734	69.05%	879	2.27%
92	8,920	23.83%	26,524	70.85%	1,470	3.93%	521	1.39%	10,746	29.20%	24,677	67.05%	1,383	3.76%	26,564	71.76%	9,507	25.68%	947	2.56%
93	23,108	53.24%	17,638	40.63%	1,667	3.84%	994	2.29%	23,511	54.86%	17,413	40.63%	1,936	4.52%	19,952	46.21%	21,906	50.74%	1,316	3.05%
94	29,129	74.62%	8,650	22.16%	894	2.29%	364	0.93%	27,999	72.49%	8,824	22.84%	1,803	4.67%	10,585	27.17%	27,561	70.75%	809	2.08%
95	28,890	65.36%	13,432	30.39%	1,343	3.04%	536	1.21%	28,179	64.55%	13,088	29.98%	2,386	5.47%	16,212	37.00%	26,066	59.50%	1,534	3.50%
96	22,685	62.88%	11,805	32.72%	1,069	2.96%	516	1.43%	22,549	63.28%	11,383	31.95%	1,699	4.77%	13,036	36.38%	21,866	61.02%	935	2.61%
97	28,804	71.97%	9,897	24.73%	971	2.43%	349	0.87%	27,868	70.41%	9,798	24.76%	1,913	4.83%	11,331	28.44%	27,557	69.16%	959	2.41%
98	24,388	51.54%	20,350	43.01%	1,862	3.94%	714	1.51%	26,049	55.74%	18,824	40.28%	1,864	3.99%	22,765	48.54%	22,553	48.09%	1,578	3.36%
99	6,628	19.07%	26,877	77.31%	830	2.39%	430	1.24%	7,073	20.60%	26,097	76.00%	1,169	3.40%	26,426	76.70%	7,280	21.13%	749	2.17%
100	9,065	29.00%	20,731	66.33%	994	3.18%	465	1.49%	9,754	31.61%	19,803	64.18%	1,297	4.20%	20,677	66.67%	9,505	30.65%	830	2.68%
101	8,930	22.86%	28,642	73.33%	994	2.54%	491	1.26%	9,615	24.91%	27,574	71.43%	1,414	3.66%	28,397	73.33%	9,359	24.17%	969	2.50%
102	5,292	16.06%	25,980	78.86%	1,162	3.53%	511	1.55%	6,327	19.52%	24,761	76.39%	1,328	4.10%	26,109	80.03%	5,584	17.12%	931	2.85%
103	22,701	52.01%	18,642	42.71%	1,539	3.53%	769	1.76%	24,458	56.51%	17,208	39.76%	1,617	3.74%	19,220	44.13%	23,328	53.56%	1,003	2.30%
104	20,925	43.85%	23,772	49.82%	1,932	4.05%	1,089	2.28%	25,905	54.36%	20,414	42.84%	1,332	2.80%	24,093	50.36%	22,791	47.64%	955	2.00%
105	20,052	47.27%	20,155	47.52%	1,504	3.55%	705	1.66%	22,414	53.33%	18,049	42.94%	1,569	3.73%	20,512	48.58%	20,692	49.00%	1,021	2.42%

HBK-20 Speciale - Districts 82 and 83: President 2016, US Senate 2016, Governor 2016

	US President 2016: Trump-Clinton-Johnson								US Senate 2016: Burr-Ross-Haugh						Governor 2016: Cooper-McCrory-Cecil					
District	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Write-In**	**Write-In %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**
106	7,622	22.42%	24,886	73.20%	952	2.80%	539	1.59%	8,421	25.05%	24,052	71.55%	1,145	3.41%	24,815	73.54%	8,084	23.96%	846	2.51%
107	7,868	21.04%	28,142	75.25%	886	2.37%	500	1.34%	8,416	22.77%	27,293	73.84%	1,251	3.38%	27,988	75.41%	8,221	22.15%	903	2.43%
108	21,977	61.91%	12,155	34.24%	963	2.71%	405	1.14%	21,400	61.05%	11,934	34.04%	1,722	4.91%	13,133	37.22%	21,326	60.44%	824	2.34%
109	21,849	58.81%	13,856	37.29%	1,026	2.76%	424	1.14%	21,752	59.21%	13,385	36.43%	1,600	4.36%	14,614	39.57%	21,473	58.14%	845	2.29%
110	23,363	67.95%	10,064	29.27%	685	1.99%	272	0.79%	22,465	66.14%	10,103	29.74%	1,399	4.12%	11,006	32.21%	22,520	65.90%	648	1.90%
111	23,088	67.78%	10,066	29.55%	621	1.82%	290	0.85%	22,172	65.93%	10,185	30.29%	1,272	3.78%	11,069	32.68%	22,235	65.64%	569	1.68%
112	25,060	72.71%	8,351	24.23%	717	2.08%	339	0.98%	23,380	69.04%	9,131	26.96%	1,353	4.00%	10,575	31.07%	22,633	66.49%	831	2.44%
113	27,846	61.60%	15,495	34.27%	1,152	2.55%	715	1.58%	27,107	60.73%	15,907	35.64%	1,619	3.63%	17,776	39.74%	25,806	57.69%	1,150	2.57%
114	10,675	21.88%	35,226	72.20%	1,424	2.92%	1,464	3.00%	10,943	22.71%	35,335	73.32%	1,918	3.98%	36,921	76.30%	9,880	20.42%	1,589	3.28%
115	22,578	48.02%	21,856	46.49%	1,453	3.09%	1,127	2.40%	22,563	48.39%	22,221	47.66%	1,839	3.94%	24,377	52.10%	21,034	44.95%	1,382	2.95%
116	22,462	52.07%	18,367	42.57%	1,409	3.27%	903	2.09%	22,583	52.90%	18,335	42.95%	1,776	4.16%	20,574	48.00%	20,962	48.91%	1,323	3.09%
117	25,251	60.45%	14,625	35.01%	1,235	2.96%	660	1.58%	24,962	60.51%	14,605	35.40%	1,688	4.09%	16,583	40.08%	23,567	56.96%	1,227	2.97%
118	25,826	63.62%	13,002	32.03%	1,152	2.84%	616	1.52%	24,143	60.30%	14,050	35.09%	1,845	4.61%	16,169	40.08%	22,971	56.94%	1,202	2.98%
119	19,623	54.48%	14,434	40.08%	1,323	3.67%	637	1.77%	18,853	53.03%	15,016	42.24%	1,683	4.73%	17,194	48.15%	17,362	48.62%	1,156	3.24%
120	30,691	72.91%	9,871	23.45%	1,030	2.45%	501	1.19%	28,591	69.53%	10,931	26.58%	1,600	3.89%	12,825	31.06%	27,221	65.92%	1,249	3.02%
Totals:	**2,359,749**	**49.90%**	**2,180,316**	**46.10%**	**129,929**	**2.75%**	**59,397**	**1.26%**	**2,392,439**	**51.13%**	**2,119,696**	**45.30%**	**167,190**	**3.57%**	**2,300,381**	**48.95%**	**2,296,039**	**48.86%**	**102,729**	**2.19%**

HBK-20 Speciale - Districts 82 and 83: Lieutenant Governor 2016, Attorney General 2016

	Lieutenant Governor 2016: Forest-Coleman-Cole						Attorney General 2016: Stein-Newton			
District	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %
1	17,778	51.12%	16,328	46.95%	671	1.93%	17,047	49.85%	17,149	50.15%
2	21,550	57.60%	15,020	40.15%	840	2.25%	17,015	46.07%	19,917	53.93%
3	19,362	58.56%	12,769	38.62%	932	2.82%	13,595	41.50%	19,163	58.50%
4	18,524	62.83%	10,278	34.86%	683	2.32%	11,259	38.68%	17,851	61.32%
5	13,598	42.70%	17,580	55.21%	665	2.09%	18,195	57.96%	13,195	42.04%
6	24,969	62.46%	13,748	34.39%	1,261	3.15%	14,523	36.89%	24,849	63.11%
7	17,898	45.87%	20,551	52.67%	567	1.45%	21,475	55.06%	17,527	44.94%
8	11,543	34.32%	21,250	63.17%	844	2.51%	22,114	66.21%	11,285	33.79%
9	20,567	55.82%	15,300	41.53%	978	2.65%	16,594	45.44%	19,925	54.56%
10	24,002	67.76%	10,809	30.52%	609	1.72%	12,118	34.50%	23,009	65.50%
11	14,610	35.67%	24,541	59.92%	1,805	4.41%	26,983	66.46%	13,616	33.54%
12	17,425	52.08%	15,430	46.12%	602	1.80%	16,317	49.26%	16,804	50.74%
13	28,811	68.95%	11,868	28.40%	1,107	2.65%	12,793	30.86%	28,667	69.14%
14	15,667	60.14%	9,239	35.46%	1,146	4.40%	10,094	39.18%	15,668	60.82%
15	13,102	66.99%	5,648	28.88%	809	4.14%	6,333	32.79%	12,978	67.21%
16	24,001	61.02%	14,369	36.53%	963	2.45%	16,456	42.25%	22,490	57.75%
17	33,147	65.60%	16,131	31.92%	1,254	2.48%	19,137	38.21%	30,944	61.79%
18	15,040	40.84%	20,340	55.23%	1,451	3.94%	22,453	61.46%	14,080	38.54%
19	24,414	57.61%	16,318	38.51%	1,644	3.88%	19,234	45.77%	22,791	54.23%
20	25,574	57.77%	17,001	38.41%	1,690	3.82%	19,782	45.08%	24,099	54.92%
21	13,077	41.70%	17,726	56.53%	555	1.77%	18,648	60.01%	12,425	39.99%
22	19,677	56.99%	14,268	41.32%	582	1.69%	15,457	45.16%	18,773	54.84%
23	13,735	38.22%	21,664	60.28%	537	1.49%	22,629	63.31%	13,112	36.69%
24	17,614	46.94%	19,307	51.45%	603	1.61%	20,220	53.88%	17,311	46.12%
25	21,930	57.78%	15,216	40.09%	806	2.12%	16,847	44.72%	20,823	55.28%
26	28,746	61.91%	16,368	35.25%	1,320	2.84%	18,588	40.38%	27,446	59.62%
27	12,111	35.73%	21,357	63.01%	427	1.26%	22,185	65.86%	11,500	34.14%
28	24,565	67.45%	11,008	30.23%	846	2.32%	12,925	35.85%	23,132	64.15%
29	6,887	14.85%	38,300	82.61%	1,175	2.53%	39,832	86.28%	6,334	13.72%
30	14,967	30.49%	32,969	67.17%	1,147	2.34%	34,972	71.69%	13,809	28.31%
31	8,325	18.63%	35,107	78.57%	1,251	2.80%	36,433	81.98%	8,009	18.02%
32	13,338	35.53%	23,613	62.89%	594	1.58%	24,809	66.54%	12,475	33.46%
33	10,371	26.19%	27,861	70.35%	1,374	3.47%	29,565	75.35%	9,670	24.65%
34	19,459	39.75%	27,910	57.01%	1,588	3.24%	31,124	64.08%	17,447	35.92%
35	27,844	54.51%	21,849	42.78%	1,385	2.71%	24,423	48.43%	26,006	51.57%
36	27,546	54.81%	21,270	42.32%	1,440	2.87%	23,809	47.79%	26,015	52.21%
37	28,328	54.54%	21,888	42.14%	1,726	3.32%	24,325	47.28%	27,127	52.72%
38	8,817	22.74%	28,787	74.25%	1,168	3.01%	30,185	78.67%	8,182	21.33%
39	12,285	28.91%	29,153	68.59%	1,063	2.50%	30,320	72.01%	11,788	27.99%
40	28,809	53.80%	23,287	43.49%	1,455	2.72%	26,404	49.83%	26,588	50.17%
41	19,854	41.44%	26,406	55.12%	1,645	3.43%	28,681	60.41%	18,799	39.59%
42	6,383	26.30%	16,996	70.03%	891	3.67%	17,644	73.09%	6,497	26.91%
43	8,192	27.18%	20,960	69.55%	985	3.27%	21,834	72.91%	8,112	27.09%
44	14,388	45.35%	16,265	51.27%	1,074	3.39%	17,572	55.64%	14,009	44.36%
45	21,770	57.53%	14,903	39.38%	1,170	3.09%	16,323	43.39%	21,299	56.61%
46	14,441	57.97%	9,982	40.07%	487	1.96%	11,292	45.85%	13,335	54.15%
47	9,967	41.61%	13,476	56.25%	513	2.14%	14,324	60.47%	9,364	39.53%
48	13,005	42.20%	16,855	54.69%	958	3.11%	17,475	57.21%	13,069	42.79%
49	19,852	38.75%	29,600	57.78%	1,780	3.47%	32,796	64.39%	18,138	35.61%
50	19,497	43.57%	24,182	54.04%	1,066	2.38%	26,089	58.72%	18,339	41.28%
51	18,400	55.76%	13,619	41.27%	982	2.98%	15,312	46.95%	17,303	53.05%
52	26,962	63.92%	14,147	33.54%	1,075	2.55%	15,745	37.70%	26,021	62.30%

HBK-20 Speciale - Districts 82 and 83: Lieutenant Governor 2016, Attorney General 2016

	Lieutenant Governor 2016: Forest-Coleman-Cole						Attorney General 2016: Stein-Newton			
District	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %
53	21,328	61.54%	12,493	36.05%	835	2.41%	13,900	40.45%	20,460	59.55%
54	21,038	40.77%	29,281	56.74%	1,285	2.49%	31,512	61.45%	19,770	38.55%
55	22,921	65.35%	11,444	32.63%	707	2.02%	13,375	38.47%	21,391	61.53%
56	8,019	17.31%	36,854	79.55%	1,455	3.14%	38,609	83.76%	7,487	16.24%
57	5,185	13.28%	32,626	83.59%	1,221	3.13%	33,561	86.54%	5,219	13.46%
58	9,287	25.04%	26,651	71.86%	1,150	3.10%	27,954	75.69%	8,977	24.31%
59	25,437	55.49%	19,257	42.01%	1,150	2.51%	21,109	46.33%	24,449	53.67%
60	10,658	31.74%	21,827	65.01%	1,092	3.25%	23,010	68.91%	10,383	31.09%
61	25,459	53.65%	20,630	43.47%	1,366	2.88%	22,996	48.67%	24,252	51.33%
62	25,436	53.83%	20,543	43.48%	1,270	2.69%	22,809	48.55%	24,175	51.45%
63	20,032	54.75%	15,433	42.18%	1,125	3.07%	17,264	47.50%	19,085	52.50%
64	19,368	58.48%	12,814	38.69%	936	2.83%	14,428	43.87%	18,457	56.13%
65	22,925	62.41%	12,935	35.21%	874	2.38%	14,435	39.54%	22,070	60.46%
66	19,049	56.66%	13,778	40.98%	794	2.36%	15,495	46.44%	17,870	53.56%
67	31,501	73.63%	10,168	23.77%	1,114	2.60%	12,822	30.24%	29,581	69.76%
68	27,015	64.52%	13,606	32.49%	1,252	2.99%	15,674	37.79%	25,803	62.21%
69	23,744	65.63%	11,331	31.32%	1,104	3.05%	13,327	37.18%	22,517	62.82%
70	24,712	74.71%	7,488	22.64%	879	2.66%	8,822	26.83%	24,059	73.17%
71	9,831	29.19%	22,738	67.51%	1,114	3.31%	24,171	72.07%	9,367	27.93%
72	7,738	23.10%	24,959	74.51%	800	2.39%	26,121	78.27%	7,254	21.73%
73	26,437	67.76%	11,626	29.80%	951	2.44%	13,736	35.45%	25,011	64.55%
74	23,675	57.44%	16,356	39.68%	1,189	2.88%	18,577	45.30%	22,428	54.70%
75	26,030	59.30%	16,599	37.82%	1,263	2.88%	19,028	43.58%	24,635	56.42%
76	22,655	62.28%	12,646	34.76%	1,076	2.96%	14,921	41.29%	21,213	58.71%
77	30,027	73.04%	9,965	24.24%	1,120	2.72%	12,267	30.01%	28,609	69.99%
78	27,573	77.81%	7,048	19.89%	814	2.30%	8,576	24.38%	26,597	75.62%
79	22,124	61.39%	13,157	36.51%	760	2.11%	14,148	39.62%	21,559	60.38%
80	27,461	74.39%	8,544	23.14%	912	2.47%	9,959	27.05%	26,856	72.95%
81	25,744	71.35%	9,365	25.95%	974	2.70%	11,232	31.27%	24,684	68.73%
82	26,842	58.98%	17,179	37.75%	1,489	3.27%	19,500	43.26%	25,572	56.74%
83	20,179	58.58%	13,105	38.05%	1,160	3.37%	15,225	44.54%	18,961	55.46%
84	25,615	68.55%	10,772	28.83%	981	2.63%	12,983	35.05%	24,055	64.95%
85	25,753	73.78%	8,159	23.37%	995	2.85%	9,757	28.36%	24,643	71.64%
86	22,615	66.72%	10,457	30.85%	824	2.43%	12,699	37.72%	20,964	62.28%
87	26,540	74.72%	8,133	22.90%	848	2.39%	11,035	31.39%	24,120	68.61%
88	12,587	35.41%	21,535	60.57%	1,429	4.02%	23,404	66.33%	11,881	33.67%
89	25,345	71.91%	8,879	25.19%	1,023	2.90%	11,207	31.97%	23,846	68.03%
90	25,549	73.16%	8,601	24.63%	773	2.21%	10,369	29.84%	24,378	70.16%
91	27,844	73.57%	8,993	23.76%	1,010	2.67%	10,866	28.83%	26,826	71.17%
92	10,717	29.69%	23,935	66.30%	1,447	4.01%	25,771	71.73%	10,156	28.27%
93	23,009	55.17%	16,926	40.58%	1,774	4.25%	19,469	47.25%	21,733	52.75%
94	28,405	74.69%	8,697	22.87%	929	2.44%	11,208	29.76%	26,454	70.24%
95	28,982	67.70%	12,360	28.87%	1,470	3.43%	14,947	35.22%	27,490	64.78%
96	23,121	65.77%	10,946	31.14%	1,089	3.10%	13,281	38.01%	21,662	61.99%
97	28,690	73.47%	9,283	23.77%	1,078	2.76%	11,903	30.76%	26,797	69.24%
98	26,644	58.05%	17,734	38.63%	1,524	3.32%	20,452	45.00%	24,992	55.00%
99	7,163	21.09%	25,734	75.76%	1,073	3.16%	26,872	79.60%	6,888	20.40%
100	10,063	33.08%	19,181	63.06%	1,172	3.85%	20,835	69.05%	9,337	30.95%
101	9,666	25.39%	27,134	71.26%	1,276	3.35%	28,611	75.49%	9,289	24.51%
102	6,255	19.64%	24,161	75.87%	1,429	4.49%	25,604	80.91%	6,042	19.09%
103	25,117	58.86%	16,313	38.23%	1,242	2.91%	18,820	44.51%	23,460	55.49%
104	25,845	55.28%	19,567	41.85%	1,340	2.87%	22,699	48.98%	23,646	51.02%

HBK-20 Speciale - Districts 82 and 83: Lieutenant Governor 2016, Attorney General 2016

	Lieutenant Governor 2016: Forest-Coleman-Cole						Attorney General 2016: Stein-Newton			
District	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %
105	22,913	55.44%	17,133	41.45%	1,287	3.11%	19,598	47.84%	21,369	52.16%
106	8,550	25.79%	23,420	70.66%	1,176	3.55%	24,690	75.03%	8,218	24.97%
107	8,546	23.39%	26,870	73.54%	1,124	3.08%	28,191	77.62%	8,126	22.38%
108	22,310	64.29%	11,377	32.79%	1,013	2.92%	13,450	39.21%	20,851	60.79%
109	22,545	62.11%	12,803	35.27%	950	2.62%	14,882	41.40%	21,065	58.60%
110	23,200	68.91%	9,752	28.97%	715	2.12%	11,596	34.80%	21,723	65.20%
111	22,768	68.36%	9,875	29.65%	661	1.98%	11,856	36.00%	21,073	64.00%
112	23,864	71.32%	8,660	25.88%	937	2.80%	9,906	29.88%	23,248	70.12%
113	27,273	61.90%	15,470	35.11%	1,314	2.98%	16,730	38.29%	26,962	61.71%
114	10,534	22.22%	34,662	73.10%	2,218	4.68%	36,615	77.84%	10,425	22.16%
115	22,047	48.06%	22,007	47.98%	1,816	3.96%	23,858	52.43%	21,647	47.57%
116	21,972	52.39%	18,326	43.70%	1,641	3.91%	19,951	47.93%	21,673	52.07%
117	25,457	62.47%	14,037	34.45%	1,255	3.08%	15,539	38.46%	24,861	61.54%
118	23,864	60.56%	14,093	35.76%	1,451	3.68%	15,949	40.83%	23,111	59.17%
119	18,801	53.70%	14,824	42.34%	1,385	3.96%	16,595	47.85%	18,084	52.15%
120	28,296	69.92%	10,903	26.94%	1,271	3.14%	11,790	29.51%	28,166	70.49%
Totals:	**2,390,619**	**51.88%**	**2,084,975**	**45.25%**	**132,360**	**2.87%**	**2,294,855**	**50.20%**	**2,276,276**	**49.80%**

Plan Name: HBK-20
Plan Type:
Date: 08/24/2017
Time: 11:00:15PM
Administrator:

Measures of Compactness

08/24/2017

Sum	N/A	N/A
Min	0.20	0.13
Max	0.70	0.71
Mean	0.41	0.32
Std. Dev.	0.09	0.11

DISTRICT	Reock	Polsby-Popper
1	0.49	0.18
2	0.43	0.49
3	0.37	0.33
4	0.44	0.37
5	0.25	0.27
6	0.33	0.24
7	0.50	0.35
8	0.51	0.39
9	0.40	0.27
10	0.36	0.23
11	0.36	0.30
12	0.36	0.34
13	0.24	0.22
14	0.39	0.28
15	0.55	0.37
16	0.31	0.22
17	0.48	0.30
18	0.51	0.33
19	0.20	0.28
20	0.36	0.20
21	0.32	0.14
22	0.49	0.23
23	0.35	0.24
24	0.53	0.71
25	0.52	0.32
26	0.39	0.31
27	0.52	0.40
28	0.38	0.24
29	0.39	0.34
30	0.40	0.39
31	0.50	0.37
32	0.53	0.51
33	0.42	0.31
34	0.44	0.33
35	0.37	0.31
36	0.31	0.21
37	0.40	0.38
38	0.31	0.25
39	0.33	0.26
40	0.52	0.35

Plan Name:	HBK-20	Administrator:	
Plan Type:		User:	

DISTRICT	Reock	Polsby-Popper
41	0.33	0.25
42	0.50	0.40
43	0.34	0.31
44	0.50	0.24
45	0.46	0.22
46	0.23	0.16
47	0.57	0.42
48	0.48	0.45
49	0.40	0.35
50	0.38	0.34
51	0.52	0.40
52	0.32	0.25
53	0.59	0.47
54	0.45	0.43
55	0.42	0.29
56	0.49	0.34
57	0.37	0.28
58	0.44	0.18
59	0.39	0.25
60	0.29	0.21
61	0.32	0.22
62	0.47	0.50
63	0.34	0.30
64	0.34	0.28
65	0.52	0.47
66	0.40	0.36
67	0.49	0.30
68	0.33	0.28
69	0.37	0.20
70	0.54	0.54
71	0.35	0.19
72	0.50	0.26
73	0.46	0.47
74	0.22	0.16
75	0.38	0.23
76	0.49	0.46
77	0.39	0.35
78	0.36	0.28
79	0.48	0.30
80	0.28	0.22
81	0.50	0.22
82	0.41	0.39
83	0.31	0.27
84	0.51	0.45
85	0.39	0.23
86	0.38	0.27
87	0.50	0.57
88	0.44	0.25
89	0.34	0.26
90	0.39	0.17
91	0.40	0.36
92	0.60	0.33
93	0.57	0.42
94	0.42	0.23
95	0.43	0.37
96	0.30	0.21

Plan Name:	HBK-20	Administrator:	
Plan Type:		User:	

DISTRICT	Reock	Polsby-Popper
97	0.33	0.52
98	0.70	0.64
99	0.43	0.42
100	0.43	0.35
101	0.51	0.34
102	0.64	0.43
103	0.27	0.32
104	0.49	0.35
105	0.49	0.37
106	0.43	0.44
107	0.38	0.20
108	0.44	0.32
109	0.46	0.47
110	0.36	0.26
111	0.40	0.28
112	0.39	0.30
113	0.24	0.21
114	0.39	0.13
115	0.38	0.19
116	0.35	0.23
117	0.40	0.28
118	0.36	0.15
119	0.36	0.20
120	0.40	0.37

Plan: HBK-20
Plan Type:

Administrator
User:

Districts & Their Incumbents

Thursday, August 24, 2017 10:57 PM

District	Name	Party	Previous District
1	Steinburg	Republican	1
2	Yarborough	Republican	2
3	Speciale	Republican	3
4	Dixon	Republican	4
5	Hunter	Democratic	5
6	Boswell	Republican	6
7	Collins	Republican	25
8			
9	Murphy	Republican	9
10	J.Bell	Republican	10
11	Duane Hall	Democratic	11
12	G.Graham	Democratic	12
13	McElraft	Republican	13
14	Cleveland	Republican	14
15	Shepard	Republican	15
16	Millis	Republican	16
17	Iler	Republican	17
18	Butler	Democratic	18
19	Davis	Republican	19
20	Grange	Republican	20
21	L.Bell	Democratic	21
22	Brisson	Democratic	22
23	Willingham	Democratic	23
24	S.Martin	Republican	8
24	Farmer-Butterfield	Democratic	24
25	B.Richardson	Democratic	7

Plan: HBK-20 Administrator:
Type: User:

District	Name	Party	Previous District
26	White	Republican	26
27	Wray	Democratic	27
28	Strickland	Republican	28
29	Black	Democratic	29
30	Morey	Democratic	30
31	Michaux	Democratic	31
32	Garrison	Democratic	32
33	Gill	Democratic	33
34	G.Martin	Democratic	34
35	Malone	Republican	35
36	Dollar	Republican	36
37	Williams	Republican	37
38	Holley	Democratic	38
39	Jackson	Democratic	39
40	John	Democratic	40
41	Adcock	Democratic	41
42	Lucas	Democratic	42
43	Floyd	Democratic	43
44	W.Richardson	Democratic	44
45	Szoka	Republican	45
46	Brenden Jones	Republican	46
47	C.Graham	Democratic	47
48	Pierce	Democratic	48
49	Ball	Democrat	49
50	Meyer	Democratic	50
51	Sauls	Republican	51
51	Reives	Democratic	54
52	Boles	Republican	52
53	Lewis	Republican	53
54			
55	Brody	Republican	55

Plan: HBK-20 Administrator:
Type: User:

District	Name	Party	Previous District
56	Insko	Democratic	56
57	Harrison	Democratic	57
58	Quick	Democratic	58
59			
60	Brockman	Democratic	60
61	Faircloth	Republican	61
61	Hardister	Republican	59
62	Blust	Republican	62
63	Ross	Republican	63
64	Riddell	Republican	64
65	Bert Jones	Republican	65
66	Goodman	Democratic	66
67	Burr	Republican	67
68	Horn	Republican	68
69	Arp	Republican	69
70	Hurley	Republican	70
71	Terry	Democratic	71
72	Hanes	Democratic	72
73	Zachary	Republican	73
74	Lambeth	Republican	75
75	Conrad	Republican	74
76	Warren	Republican	77
77	Howard	Republican	79
78	McNiell	Republican	78
79			
80	Watford	Republican	80
81	Potts	Republican	81
82	Pittman	Republican	82
83	Johnson	Republican	83
83	Ford	Republican	76
84	R.Turner	Republican	84
85	Dobson	Republican	85

Plan:	HBK-20	Administrator:	
Type:		User:	

District	Name	Party	Previous District
86	Blackwell	Republican	86
87	Destin Hall	Republican	87
88	Beasley	Democratic	92
89	Setzer	Republican	89
90	Stevens	Republican	90
91	K.Hall	Republican	91
92	Belk	Democratic	88
93	Jordan	Republican	93
94	Elmore	Republican	94
95	Fraley	Republican	95
96	Adams	Republican	96
97	Saine	Republican	97
98	Bradford	Republican	98
99	R.Moore	Democratic	99
100	Autry	Democratic	100
101	Earle	Democratic	101
102	Carney	Democratic	102
103	Brawley	Republican	103
104	Dulin	Republican	104
105	Stone	Republican	105
106	Cunningham	Democratic	106
107	Alexander	Democratic	107
108	Torbett	Republican	108
109	Bumgardner	Republican	109
110	Hastings	Republican	110
111	T.Moore	Republican	111
112	Rogers	Republican	112
113	Henson	Republican	113
114	Fisher	Democratic	114
115	Ager	Democratic	115
116	B.Turner	Democratic	116
117	McGrady	Republican	117

Plan:	HBK-20	Administrator:	
Type:		User:	

District	Name	Party	Previous District
118	Presnell	Republican	118
119	Clampitt	Republican	119
120	Corbin	Republican	120

Number of Incumbents in District with more than one Incumbent:	8	
Number of Districts with No Incumbent:	4	
Number of Districts with Incumbents of more than one party:	2	
Number of Districts with Paired Democrats:	0	
Number of Districts with Paired Republicans:	2	

EX. 39

H927-ABK-41 – Districts 1 and 5



H927-ABK-41 – Districts 1 and 5

Printed by the NC General Assembly, August 24, 2017.

NORTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY
AMENDMENT
House Bill 927

AMENDMENT NO. _____
(to be filled in by
Principal Clerk)

H927-ABK-41 [v.1]

Amends Title [NO]
H927-CSBK-31

Date _____,2017

Representative Hunter

moves to amend the bill on page 1, lines 9-10, by deleting those lines and substituting the following:

"**District 1**: Camden County, Chowan County, Pasquotank County, Perquimans County.";

and on page 2, line 8, by deleting the line and substituting the following:

"**District 5**: Bertie County, Gates County, Hertford County, Tyrrell County, Washington County.".

SIGNED _____
Amendment Sponsor

SIGNED _____
Committee Chair if Senate Committee Amendment

ADOPTED _____ FAILED _____ TABLED _____

HST-1: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Aberdeen	52	6,350	76,894	6,350	100.00%	8.26%
Ahoskie	5	5,039	75,783	5,039	100.00%	6.65%
Alamance	64	951	75,581	951	100.00%	1.26%
Albemarle	66	15,903	82,854	0	0.00%	0.00%
	67	15,903	82,761	15,903	100.00%	19.22%
Alliance	6	776	76,421	776	100.00%	1.02%
Andrews	120	1,781	80,814	1,781	100.00%	2.20%
Angier (Harnett)	28	4,247	83,432	4,242	99.88%	5.08%
	53	4,247	83,429	5	0.12%	0.01%
Angier (Wake)	37	103	80,332	103	100.00%	0.13%
Ansonville	55	631	75,792	631	100.00%	0.83%
Apex	11	37,476	81,539	2	0.01%	0.00%
	36	37,476	81,926	7,166	19.12%	8.75%
	37	37,476	80,332	9,305	24.83%	11.58%
	41	37,476	82,359	21,003	56.04%	25.50%
Arapahoe	6	556	76,421	556	100.00%	0.73%
Archdale (Guilford)	59	333	79,907	217	65.17%	0.27%
	60	333	81,856	116	34.83%	0.14%
Archdale (Randolph)	70	11,082	76,125	11,082	100.00%	14.56%
Archer Lodge	26	4,292	83,431	4,292	100.00%	5.14%
Asheboro	70	25,012	76,125	21,327	85.27%	28.02%
	78	25,012	76,980	3,685	14.73%	4.79%
Asheville	114	83,393	82,902	66,182	79.36%	79.83%
	115	83,393	79,883	5,409	6.49%	6.77%
	116	83,393	75,533	11,802	14.15%	15.62%
Askewville	5	241	75,783	241	100.00%	0.32%
Atkinson	16	299	81,425	299	100.00%	0.37%
Atlantic Beach	13	1,495	76,622	1,495	100.00%	1.95%
Aulander	5	895	75,783	895	100.00%	1.18%
Aurora	79	520	75,538	520	100.00%	0.69%
Autryville	22	196	83,434	196	100.00%	0.23%
Ayden	12	4,932	75,923	4,932	100.00%	6.50%
Badin	66	1,974	82,854	1,974	100.00%	2.38%
Bailey	25	569	78,432	569	100.00%	0.73%
Bakersville	85	464	78,372	464	100.00%	0.59%
Bald Head Island	17	158	77,263	158	100.00%	0.20%
Banner Elk	85	1,028	78,372	1,028	100.00%	1.31%
Bath	79	249	75,538	249	100.00%	0.33%
Bayboro	6	1,263	76,421	1,263	100.00%	1.65%
Bear Grass	23	73	81,057	73	100.00%	0.09%
Beaufort	13	4,039	76,622	4,039	100.00%	5.27%
Beech Mountain (Avery)	85	24	78,372	24	100.00%	0.03%
Beech Mountain (Watauga)	93	296	78,360	296	100.00%	0.38%
Belhaven	79	1,688	75,538	1,688	100.00%	2.23%
Belmont	108	10,076	76,926	4,622	45.87%	6.01%
	109	10,076	75,517	5,454	54.13%	7.22%
Belville	18	1,936	77,681	1,936	100.00%	2.49%

District plan definition file: 'HST-1.asc', modified 08/22/2017 08:19:30 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

HST-1: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Belwood	111	950	76,148	950	100.00%	1.25%
Benson (Harnett)	53	0	83,429	0	0.00%	0.00%
Benson (Johnston)	28	3,311	83,432	3,311	100.00%	3.97%
Bermuda Run	77	1,725	82,918	1,725	100.00%	2.08%
Bessemer City	110	5,340	75,573	5,340	100.00%	7.07%
Bethania	75	328	79,963	328	100.00%	0.41%
Bethel	8	1,577	75,926	1,577	100.00%	2.08%
Beulaville	4	1,296	81,905	1,296	100.00%	1.58%
Biltmore Forest	116	1,343	75,533	1,343	100.00%	1.78%
Biscoe	66	1,700	82,854	1,700	100.00%	2.05%
Black Creek	24	769	81,234	769	100.00%	0.95%
Black Mountain	115	7,848	79,883	7,848	100.00%	9.82%
Bladenboro	22	1,750	83,434	1,750	100.00%	2.10%
Blowing Rock (Caldwell)	87	49	83,029	49	100.00%	0.06%
Blowing Rock (Watauga)	93	1,192	78,360	1,192	100.00%	1.52%
Boardman	46	157	80,440	157	100.00%	0.20%
Bogue	13	684	76,622	684	100.00%	0.89%
Boiling Spring Lakes	17	5,372	77,263	5,370	99.96%	6.95%
	18	5,372	77,681	2	0.04%	0.00%
Boiling Springs	111	4,647	76,148	4,647	100.00%	6.10%
Bolivia	18	143	77,681	143	100.00%	0.18%
Bolton	16	691	81,425	691	100.00%	0.85%
Boone	93	17,122	78,360	17,122	100.00%	21.85%
Boonville	73	1,222	78,189	1,222	100.00%	1.56%
Bostic	112	386	79,547	386	100.00%	0.49%
Brevard	113	7,609	81,089	7,609	100.00%	9.38%
Bridgeton	79	454	75,538	454	100.00%	0.60%
Broadway (Harnett)	53	25	83,429	25	100.00%	0.03%
Broadway (Lee)	51	1,204	83,434	1,204	100.00%	1.44%
Brookford	89	382	77,838	321	84.03%	0.41%
	96	382	76,520	61	15.97%	0.08%
Brunswick	16	1,119	81,425	1,119	100.00%	1.37%
Bryson City	119	1,424	75,548	1,424	100.00%	1.88%
Bunn	25	344	78,432	344	100.00%	0.44%
Burgaw	16	3,872	81,425	3,872	100.00%	4.76%
Burlington (Alamance)	63	49,308	75,550	23,248	47.15%	30.77%
	64	49,308	75,581	26,060	52.85%	34.48%
Burlington (Guilford)	59	655	79,907	655	100.00%	0.82%
Burnsville	118	1,693	76,322	1,693	100.00%	2.22%
Butner	2	7,591	82,634	7,591	100.00%	9.19%
Cajah's Mountain	87	2,823	83,029	2,823	100.00%	3.40%
Calabash	17	1,786	77,263	1,786	100.00%	2.31%
Calypso	4	538	81,905	538	100.00%	0.66%
Cameron	52	285	76,894	285	100.00%	0.37%
Candor	66	840	82,854	840	100.00%	1.01%
Canton	118	4,227	76,322	4,227	100.00%	5.54%
Cape Carteret	13	1,917	76,622	1,917	100.00%	2.50%

District plan definition file: 'HST-1.asc', modified 08/22/2017 08:19:30 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/22/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.0}

HST-1: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Carolina Beach	19	5,706	76,666	5,706	100.00%	7.44%
Carolina Shores	17	3,048	77,263	3,048	100.00%	3.94%
Carrboro	50	19,582	80,866	81	0.41%	0.10%
	56	19,582	76,654	19,501	99.59%	25.44%
Carthage	52	2,205	76,894	6	0.27%	0.01%
	78	2,205	76,980	2,199	99.73%	2.86%
Cary (Chatham)	54	1,422	82,312	1,422	100.00%	1.73%
Cary (Wake)	11	133,812	81,539	51,109	38.19%	62.68%
	36	133,812	81,926	19,380	14.48%	23.66%
	37	133,812	80,332	2,024	1.51%	2.52%
	41	133,812	82,359	46,234	34.55%	56.14%
	49	133,812	82,621	15,065	11.26%	18.23%
Casar	111	297	76,148	297	100.00%	0.39%
Castalia	7	268	78,027	268	100.00%	0.34%
Caswell Beach	17	398	77,263	398	100.00%	0.52%
Catawba	89	603	77,838	603	100.00%	0.77%
Cedar Point	13	1,279	76,622	1,279	100.00%	1.67%
Cedar Rock	87	300	83,029	300	100.00%	0.36%
Centerville	25	89	78,432	89	100.00%	0.11%
Cerro Gordo	46	207	80,440	207	100.00%	0.26%
Chadbourn	46	1,856	80,440	1,856	100.00%	2.31%
Chapel Hill (Durham)	29	2,836	82,735	2,234	78.77%	2.70%
	54	2,836	82,312	602	21.23%	0.73%
Chapel Hill (Orange)	50	54,397	80,866	2,280	4.19%	2.82%
	56	54,397	76,654	52,117	95.81%	67.99%
Charlotte	88	731,424	77,172	57,603	7.88%	74.64%
	92	731,424	76,022	72,044	9.85%	94.77%
	98	731,424	75,602	0	0.00%	0.00%
	99	731,424	77,141	67,000	9.16%	86.85%
	100	731,424	75,589	64,757	8.85%	85.67%
	101	731,424	79,876	71,339	9.75%	89.31%
	102	731,424	77,391	77,391	10.58%	100.00%
	103	731,424	76,381	30,850	4.22%	40.39%
	104	731,424	76,869	76,869	10.51%	100.00%
	105	731,424	75,967	75,967	10.39%	100.00%
	106	731,424	75,762	74,391	10.17%	98.19%
	107	731,424	75,856	63,213	8.64%	83.33%
Cherryville	110	5,760	75,573	5,760	100.00%	7.62%
Chimney Rock Village	112	113	79,547	113	100.00%	0.14%
China Grove	83	3,563	81,172	3,563	100.00%	4.39%
Chocowinity	79	820	75,538	820	100.00%	1.09%
Claremont	89	1,352	77,838	1,352	100.00%	1.74%
Clarkton	22	837	83,434	837	100.00%	1.00%
Clayton (Johnston)	26	16,116	83,431	16,116	100.00%	19.32%
Clayton (Wake)	39	0	82,181	0	0.00%	0.00%
Clemmons	73	18,627	78,189	6,625	35.57%	8.47%
	74	18,627	78,886	12,002	64.43%	15.21%

District plan definition file: 'HST-1.asc', modified 08/22/2017 08:19:30 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

HST-1: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Cleveland	77	871	82,918	871	100.00%	1.05%
Clinton	21	8,639	83,434	6,682	77.35%	8.01%
	22	8,639	83,434	1,957	22.65%	2.35%
Clyde	118	1,223	76,322	1,223	100.00%	1.60%
Coats	53	2,112	83,429	2,112	100.00%	2.53%
Cofield	5	413	75,783	413	100.00%	0.54%
Colerain	5	204	75,783	204	100.00%	0.27%
Columbia	5	891	75,783	891	100.00%	1.18%
Columbus	113	999	81,089	999	100.00%	1.23%
Como	5	91	75,783	91	100.00%	0.12%
Concord	67	79,066	82,761	0	0.00%	0.00%
	82	79,066	81,088	40,818	51.63%	50.34%
	83	79,066	81,172	38,248	48.37%	47.12%
Conetoe	23	294	81,057	294	100.00%	0.36%
Connelly Springs	86	1,669	79,175	1,669	100.00%	2.11%
Conover	89	8,165	77,838	384	4.70%	0.49%
	96	8,165	76,520	7,781	95.30%	10.17%
Conway	27	836	76,790	836	100.00%	1.09%
Cooleemee	77	960	82,918	960	100.00%	1.16%
Cornelius	98	24,866	75,602	24,866	100.00%	32.89%
Cove City	79	399	75,538	399	100.00%	0.53%
Cramerton	108	4,165	76,926	1	0.02%	0.00%
	109	4,165	75,517	4,164	99.98%	5.51%
Creedmoor	2	4,124	82,634	4,124	100.00%	4.99%
Creswell	5	276	75,783	276	100.00%	0.36%
Crossnore	85	192	78,372	192	100.00%	0.24%
Dallas	110	4,488	75,573	4,488	100.00%	5.94%
Danbury	91	189	83,388	189	100.00%	0.23%
Davidson (Iredell)	95	294	82,155	294	100.00%	0.36%
Davidson (Mecklenburg)	98	10,650	75,602	10,650	100.00%	14.09%
Dellview	110	13	75,573	13	100.00%	0.02%
Denton	80	1,636	81,522	1,636	100.00%	2.01%
Dillsboro	119	232	75,548	232	100.00%	0.31%
Dobbins Heights	66	866	82,854	866	100.00%	1.05%
Dobson	90	1,586	82,608	1,586	100.00%	1.92%
Dortches	7	935	78,027	935	100.00%	1.20%
Dover	79	401	75,538	401	100.00%	0.53%
Drexel	86	1,858	79,175	1,858	100.00%	2.35%
Dublin	22	338	83,434	338	100.00%	0.41%
Duck	6	369	76,421	369	100.00%	0.48%
Dunn	53	9,263	83,429	9,263	100.00%	11.10%
Durham (Durham)	29	228,300	82,735	79,803	34.96%	96.46%
	30	228,300	83,272	60,805	26.63%	73.02%
	31	228,300	82,773	71,653	31.39%	86.57%
	54	228,300	82,312	16,039	7.03%	19.49%
Durham (Orange)	50	30	80,866	30	100.00%	0.04%
Durham (Wake)	41	0	82,359	0	0.00%	0.00%

District plan definition file: 'HST-1.asc', modified 08/22/2017 08:19:30 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/22/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.0}

HST-1: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Earl	111	260	76,148	260	100.00%	0.34%
East Arcadia	22	487	83,434	487	100.00%	0.58%
East Bend	73	612	78,189	612	100.00%	0.78%
East Laurinburg	48	300	83,109	300	100.00%	0.36%
East Spencer	76	1,534	81,908	1,534	100.00%	1.87%
Eastover	45	3,628	79,294	3,628	100.00%	4.58%
Eden	65	15,527	83,430	15,527	100.00%	18.61%
Edenton	1	5,004	78,887	5,004	100.00%	6.34%
Elizabeth City (Camden)	1	45	78,887	45	100.00%	0.06%
Elizabeth City (Pasquotank)	1	18,638	78,887	18,638	100.00%	23.63%
Elizabethtown	22	3,583	83,434	3,583	100.00%	4.29%
Elk Park	85	452	78,372	452	100.00%	0.58%
Elkin (Surry)	90	3,921	82,608	3,921	100.00%	4.75%
Elkin (Wilkes)	94	80	82,984	80	100.00%	0.10%
Ellenboro	112	873	79,547	873	100.00%	1.10%
Ellerbe	66	1,054	82,854	1,054	100.00%	1.27%
Elm City	24	1,298	81,234	1,298	100.00%	1.60%
Elon	64	9,419	75,581	9,419	100.00%	12.46%
Emerald Isle	13	3,655	76,622	3,655	100.00%	4.77%
Enfield	27	2,532	76,790	2,532	100.00%	3.30%
Erwin	53	4,405	83,429	4,405	100.00%	5.28%
Eureka	10	197	83,434	197	100.00%	0.24%
Everetts	23	164	81,057	164	100.00%	0.20%
Fair Bluff	46	951	80,440	951	100.00%	1.18%
Fairmont	47	2,663	82,618	2,663	100.00%	3.22%
Fairview	55	3,324	75,792	3,324	100.00%	4.39%
Faison (Duplin)	4	961	81,905	961	100.00%	1.17%
Faison (Sampson)	21	0	83,434	0	0.00%	0.00%
Faith	76	807	81,908	807	100.00%	0.99%
Falcon (Cumberland)	45	258	79,294	258	100.00%	0.33%
Falcon (Sampson)	22	0	83,434	0	0.00%	0.00%
Falkland	8	96	75,926	96	100.00%	0.13%
Fallston	111	607	76,148	607	100.00%	0.80%
Farmville	8	4,654	75,926	4,654	100.00%	6.13%
Fayetteville	42	200,564	81,439	67,394	33.60%	82.75%
	43	200,564	77,725	74,393	37.09%	95.71%
	44	200,564	80,973	51,354	25.60%	63.42%
	45	200,564	79,294	7,423	3.70%	9.36%
Flat Rock	113	3,114	81,089	3,114	100.00%	3.84%
Fletcher	117	7,187	79,251	7,187	100.00%	9.07%
Forest City	112	7,476	79,547	7,476	100.00%	9.40%
Forest Hills	119	365	75,548	365	100.00%	0.48%
Fountain	8	427	75,926	427	100.00%	0.56%
Four Oaks	28	1,921	83,432	1,921	100.00%	2.30%
Foxfire	52	902	76,894	902	100.00%	1.17%
Franklin	120	3,845	80,814	3,845	100.00%	4.76%
Franklinton	25	2,023	78,432	2,023	100.00%	2.58%

HST-1: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Franklinville	78	1,164	76,980	1,164	100.00%	1.51%
Fremont	10	1,255	83,434	1,255	100.00%	1.50%
Fuquay-Varina	36	17,937	81,926	228	1.27%	0.28%
	37	17,937	80,332	17,709	98.73%	22.04%
Gamewell	87	4,051	83,029	4,051	100.00%	4.88%
Garland	22	625	83,434	625	100.00%	0.75%
Garner	33	25,745	82,642	21,767	84.55%	26.34%
	36	25,745	81,926	3,823	14.85%	4.67%
	39	25,745	82,181	155	0.60%	0.19%
Garysburg	27	1,057	76,790	1,057	100.00%	1.38%
Gaston	27	1,152	76,790	1,152	100.00%	1.50%
Gastonia	108	71,741	76,926	26,870	37.45%	34.93%
	109	71,741	75,517	41,847	58.33%	55.41%
	110	71,741	75,573	3,024	4.22%	4.00%
Gatesville	5	321	75,783	321	100.00%	0.42%
Gibson	48	540	83,109	540	100.00%	0.65%
Gibsonville (Alamance)	64	3,148	75,581	3,148	100.00%	4.17%
Gibsonville (Guilford)	59	3,262	79,907	3,262	100.00%	4.08%
Glen Alpine	86	1,517	79,175	1,517	100.00%	1.92%
Godwin	45	139	79,294	139	100.00%	0.18%
Goldsboro	10	36,437	83,434	2,531	6.95%	3.03%
	21	36,437	83,434	33,906	93.05%	40.64%
Goldston	54	268	82,312	268	100.00%	0.33%
Graham	63	14,153	75,550	14,153	100.00%	18.73%
Grandfather	85	25	78,372	25	100.00%	0.03%
Granite Falls	87	4,722	83,029	4,722	100.00%	5.69%
Granite Quarry	76	2,930	81,908	2,930	100.00%	3.58%
Grantsboro	6	688	76,421	688	100.00%	0.90%
Green Level	63	2,100	75,550	2,100	100.00%	2.78%
Greenevers	4	634	81,905	634	100.00%	0.77%
Greensboro	57	269,666	82,755	80,164	29.73%	96.87%
	58	269,666	82,137	76,171	28.25%	92.74%
	59	269,666	79,907	11,283	4.18%	14.12%
	60	269,666	81,856	14,170	5.25%	17.31%
	61	269,666	81,019	36,131	13.40%	44.60%
	62	269,666	80,732	51,747	19.19%	64.10%
Greenville	8	84,554	75,926	48,780	57.69%	64.25%
	9	84,554	75,794	34,649	40.98%	45.71%
	12	84,554	75,923	1,125	1.33%	1.48%
Grifton (Lenoir)	12	186	75,923	186	100.00%	0.24%
Grifton (Pitt)	12	2,431	75,923	2,431	100.00%	3.20%
Grimesland	9	441	75,794	441	100.00%	0.58%
Grover	111	708	76,148	708	100.00%	0.93%
Halifax	27	234	76,790	234	100.00%	0.30%
Hamilton	23	408	81,057	408	100.00%	0.50%
Hamlet	66	6,495	82,854	6,495	100.00%	7.84%
Harmony	84	531	77,282	531	100.00%	0.69%

District plan definition file: 'HST-1.asc', modified 08/22/2017 08:19:30 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/22/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.0}

HST-1: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Harrells (Duplin)	4	23	81,905	23	100.00%	0.03%
Harrells (Sampson)	22	179	83,434	179	100.00%	0.21%
Harrellsville	5	106	75,783	106	100.00%	0.14%
Harrisburg	67	11,526	82,761	3,156	27.38%	3.81%
	82	11,526	81,088	8,335	72.31%	10.28%
	83	11,526	81,172	35	0.30%	0.04%
Hassell	23	84	81,057	84	100.00%	0.10%
Havelock	3	20,735	75,726	20,735	100.00%	27.38%
Haw River	63	2,298	75,550	2,254	98.09%	2.98%
	64	2,298	75,581	44	1.91%	0.06%
Hayesville	120	311	80,814	311	100.00%	0.38%
Hemby Bridge	69	1,520	76,381	1,520	100.00%	1.99%
Henderson	32	15,368	83,140	15,368	100.00%	18.48%
Hendersonville	113	13,137	81,089	514	3.91%	0.63%
	117	13,137	79,251	12,623	96.09%	15.93%
Hertford	1	2,143	78,887	2,143	100.00%	2.72%
Hickory (Burke)	86	66	79,175	66	100.00%	0.08%
Hickory (Caldwell)	87	18	83,029	18	100.00%	0.02%
Hickory (Catawba)	89	39,926	77,838	5,448	13.65%	7.00%
	96	39,926	76,520	34,478	86.35%	45.06%
High Point (Davidson)	80	5,310	81,522	5,310	100.00%	6.51%
High Point (Forsyth)	74	8	78,886	8	100.00%	0.01%
High Point (Guilford)	59	99,042	79,907	33	0.03%	0.04%
	60	99,042	81,856	59,653	60.23%	72.88%
	61	99,042	81,019	39,356	39.74%	48.58%
High Point (Randolph)	70	11	76,125	11	100.00%	0.01%
High Shoals	110	696	75,573	696	100.00%	0.92%
Highlands (Jackson)	119	4	75,548	4	100.00%	0.01%
Highlands (Macon)	120	920	80,814	920	100.00%	1.14%
Hildebran	86	2,023	79,175	2,023	100.00%	2.56%
Hillsborough	50	6,087	80,866	6,087	100.00%	7.53%
Hobgood	27	348	76,790	348	100.00%	0.45%
Hoffman	66	588	82,854	588	100.00%	0.71%
Holden Beach	17	575	77,263	575	100.00%	0.74%
Holly Ridge	15	1,268	77,307	1,268	100.00%	1.64%
Holly Springs	37	24,661	80,332	24,661	100.00%	30.70%
Hookerton	10	409	83,434	409	100.00%	0.49%
Hope Mills	44	15,176	80,973	5,976	39.38%	7.38%
	45	15,176	79,294	9,200	60.62%	11.60%
Hot Springs	118	560	76,322	560	100.00%	0.73%
Hudson	87	3,776	83,029	3,776	100.00%	4.55%
Huntersville	98	46,773	75,602	36,997	79.10%	48.94%
	107	46,773	75,856	9,776	20.90%	12.89%
Indian Beach	13	112	76,622	112	100.00%	0.15%
Indian Trail	55	33,518	75,792	51	0.15%	0.07%
	68	33,518	76,067	7,845	23.41%	10.31%
	69	33,518	76,381	25,622	76.44%	33.54%

District plan definition file: 'HST-1.asc', modified 08/22/2017 08:19:30 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/22/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.0}

HST-1: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Jackson	27	513	76,790	513	100.00%	0.67%
Jacksonville	14	70,145	77,065	27,897	39.77%	36.20%
	15	70,145	77,307	42,248	60.23%	54.65%
Jamestown	58	3,382	82,137	0	0.00%	0.00%
	59	3,382	79,907	4	0.12%	0.01%
	60	3,382	81,856	3,378	99.88%	4.13%
Jamesville	23	491	81,057	491	100.00%	0.61%
Jefferson	93	1,611	78,360	1,611	100.00%	2.06%
Jonesville	73	2,285	78,189	2,285	100.00%	2.92%
Kannapolis (Cabarrus)	82	33,194	81,088	20,175	60.78%	24.88%
	83	33,194	81,172	13,019	39.22%	16.04%
Kannapolis (Rowan)	77	9,431	82,918	5,529	58.63%	6.67%
	83	9,431	81,172	3,902	41.37%	4.81%
Kelford	5	251	75,783	251	100.00%	0.33%
Kenansville	4	855	81,905	855	100.00%	1.04%
Kenly (Johnston)	28	1,176	83,432	1,176	100.00%	1.41%
Kenly (Wilson)	24	163	81,234	163	100.00%	0.20%
Kernersville (Forsyth)	74	23,071	78,886	17,791	77.11%	22.55%
	75	23,071	79,963	5,280	22.89%	6.60%
Kernersville (Guilford)	61	52	81,019	52	100.00%	0.06%
Kill Devil Hills	6	6,683	76,421	6,683	100.00%	8.74%
King (Forsyth)	75	619	79,963	619	100.00%	0.77%
King (Stokes)	91	6,285	83,388	6,285	100.00%	7.54%
Kings Mountain (Cleveland)	110	9,242	75,573	0	0.00%	0.00%
	111	9,242	76,148	9,242	100.00%	12.14%
Kings Mountain (Gaston)	110	1,054	75,573	1,054	100.00%	1.39%
Kingstown	111	681	76,148	681	100.00%	0.89%
Kinston	12	21,677	75,923	21,677	100.00%	28.55%
Kittrell	32	467	83,140	467	100.00%	0.56%
Kitty Hawk	6	3,272	76,421	3,272	100.00%	4.28%
Knightdale	35	11,401	81,862	0	0.00%	0.00%
	39	11,401	82,181	11,401	100.00%	13.87%
Kure Beach	19	2,012	76,666	2,012	100.00%	2.62%
La Grange	12	2,873	75,923	2,873	100.00%	3.78%
Lake Lure	112	1,192	79,547	1,192	100.00%	1.50%
Lake Park	69	3,422	76,381	3,422	100.00%	4.48%
Lake Santeetlah	120	45	80,814	45	100.00%	0.06%
Lake Waccamaw	16	1,480	81,425	1,480	100.00%	1.82%
Landis	77	3,109	82,918	1,773	57.03%	2.14%
	83	3,109	81,172	1,336	42.97%	1.65%
Lansing	93	158	78,360	158	100.00%	0.20%
Lasker	27	122	76,790	122	100.00%	0.16%
Lattimore	111	488	76,148	488	100.00%	0.64%
Laurel Park	113	2,180	81,089	2	0.09%	0.00%
	117	2,180	79,251	2,178	99.91%	2.75%
Laurinburg	48	15,962	83,109	15,962	100.00%	19.21%
Lawndale	111	606	76,148	606	100.00%	0.80%

District plan definition file: 'HST-1.asc', modified 08/22/2017 08:19:30 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

HST-1: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Leggett	23	60	81,057	60	100.00%	0.07%
Leland	17	13,527	77,263	2,631	19.45%	3.41%
	18	13,527	77,681	10,896	80.55%	14.03%
Lenoir	87	18,228	83,029	18,228	100.00%	21.95%
Lewiston Woodville	5	549	75,783	549	100.00%	0.72%
Lewisville	73	12,639	78,189	10,883	86.11%	13.92%
	75	12,639	79,963	1,756	13.89%	2.20%
Lexington	80	18,931	81,522	0	0.00%	0.00%
	81	18,931	81,356	18,931	100.00%	23.27%
Liberty	78	2,656	76,980	2,656	100.00%	3.45%
Lilesville	55	536	75,792	536	100.00%	0.71%
Lillington	53	3,194	83,429	3,194	100.00%	3.83%
Lincolnton	97	10,486	78,265	10,486	100.00%	13.40%
Linden	45	130	79,294	130	100.00%	0.16%
Littleton	27	674	76,790	674	100.00%	0.88%
Locust (Cabarrus)	67	215	82,761	215	100.00%	0.26%
Locust (Stanly)	67	2,715	82,761	2,715	100.00%	3.28%
Long View (Burke)	86	752	79,175	752	100.00%	0.95%
Long View (Catawba)	96	4,119	76,520	4,119	100.00%	5.38%
Louisburg	25	3,359	78,432	3,359	100.00%	4.28%
Love Valley	84	90	77,282	90	100.00%	0.12%
Lowell	108	3,526	76,926	3,526	100.00%	4.58%
Lucama	24	1,108	81,234	1,108	100.00%	1.36%
Lumber Bridge	46	94	80,440	94	100.00%	0.12%
Lumberton	46	21,542	80,440	5,785	26.85%	7.19%
	47	21,542	82,618	15,757	73.15%	19.07%
Macclesfield	23	471	81,057	471	100.00%	0.58%
Macon	32	119	83,140	119	100.00%	0.14%
Madison	91	2,246	83,388	2,246	100.00%	2.69%
Maggie Valley	118	1,150	76,322	1,039	90.35%	1.36%
	119	1,150	75,548	111	9.65%	0.15%
Magnolia	4	939	81,905	939	100.00%	1.15%
Maiden (Catawba)	89	3,308	77,838	3,308	100.00%	4.25%
Maiden (Lincoln)	97	2	78,265	2	100.00%	0.00%
Manteo	6	1,434	76,421	1,434	100.00%	1.88%
Marietta	46	175	80,440	175	100.00%	0.22%
Marion	85	7,838	78,372	7,838	100.00%	10.00%
Mars Hill	118	1,869	76,322	1,869	100.00%	2.45%
Marshall	118	872	76,322	872	100.00%	1.14%
Marshville	55	2,402	75,792	2,402	100.00%	3.17%
Marvin	68	5,579	76,067	5,579	100.00%	7.33%
Matthews	103	27,198	76,381	27,198	100.00%	35.61%
Maxton (Robeson)	47	2,230	82,618	2,230	100.00%	2.70%
Maxton (Scotland)	48	196	83,109	196	100.00%	0.24%
Mayodan	91	2,478	83,388	2,478	100.00%	2.97%
Maysville	13	1,019	76,622	1,019	100.00%	1.33%
McAdenville	108	651	76,926	651	100.00%	0.85%

District plan definition file: 'HST-1.asc', modified 08/22/2017 08:19:30 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

HST-1: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
McDonald	47	113	82,618	113	100.00%	0.14%
McFarlan	55	117	75,792	117	100.00%	0.15%
Mebane (Alamance)	63	9,600	75,550	9,600	100.00%	12.71%
Mebane (Orange)	50	1,793	80,866	1,793	100.00%	2.22%
Mesic	6	220	76,421	220	100.00%	0.29%
Micro	28	441	83,432	441	100.00%	0.53%
Middleburg	32	133	83,140	133	100.00%	0.16%
Middlesex	25	822	78,432	822	100.00%	1.05%
Midland (Cabarrus)	67	3,073	82,761	3,073	100.00%	3.71%
Midland (Mecklenburg)	103	0	76,381	0	0.00%	0.00%
Midway	80	4,679	81,522	3,504	74.89%	4.30%
	81	4,679	81,356	1,175	25.11%	1.44%
Mills River	113	6,802	81,089	300	4.41%	0.37%
	117	6,802	79,251	6,502	95.59%	8.20%
Milton	50	166	80,866	166	100.00%	0.21%
Mineral Springs	55	2,639	75,792	688	26.07%	0.91%
	68	2,639	76,067	1,951	73.93%	2.56%
Minnesott Beach	6	440	76,421	440	100.00%	0.58%
Mint Hill (Mecklenburg)	100	22,669	75,589	7,784	34.34%	10.30%
	103	22,669	76,381	14,885	65.66%	19.49%
Mint Hill (Union)	69	53	76,381	53	100.00%	0.07%
Misenheimer	67	728	82,761	728	100.00%	0.88%
Mocksville	77	5,051	82,918	5,051	100.00%	6.09%
Momeyer	7	224	78,027	224	100.00%	0.29%
Monroe	55	32,797	75,792	3,133	9.55%	4.13%
	68	32,797	76,067	13,278	40.49%	17.46%
	69	32,797	76,381	16,386	49.96%	21.45%
Montreat	115	723	79,883	723	100.00%	0.91%
Mooresboro	111	311	76,148	311	100.00%	0.41%
Mooresville	95	32,711	82,155	32,711	100.00%	39.82%
Morehead City	13	8,661	76,622	8,661	100.00%	11.30%
Morganton	86	16,918	79,175	16,918	100.00%	21.37%
Morrisville (Durham)	31	0	82,773	0	0.00%	0.00%
Morrisville (Wake)	11	18,576	81,539	0	0.00%	0.00%
	41	18,576	82,359	11,226	60.43%	13.63%
	49	18,576	82,621	7,350	39.57%	8.90%
Morven	55	511	75,792	511	100.00%	0.67%
Mount Airy	90	10,388	82,608	9,164	88.22%	11.09%
	91	10,388	83,388	1,224	11.78%	1.47%
Mount Gilead	66	1,181	82,854	1,181	100.00%	1.43%
Mount Holly	108	13,656	76,926	13,656	100.00%	17.75%
Mount Olive (Duplin)	4	51	81,905	51	100.00%	0.06%
Mount Olive (Wayne)	21	4,538	83,434	4,538	100.00%	5.44%
Mount Pleasant	67	1,652	82,761	1,652	100.00%	2.00%
Murfreesboro	5	2,835	75,783	2,835	100.00%	3.74%
Murphy	120	1,627	80,814	1,627	100.00%	2.01%
Nags Head	6	2,757	76,421	2,757	100.00%	3.61%

District plan definition file: 'HST-1.asc', modified 08/22/2017 08:19:30 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/22/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.0}

HST-1: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Nashville	7	5,352	78,027	5,352	100.00%	6.86%
Navassa	18	1,505	77,681	1,505	100.00%	1.94%
New Bern	3	29,524	75,726	27,063	91.66%	35.74%
	79	29,524	75,538	2,461	8.34%	3.26%
New London	66	600	82,854	600	100.00%	0.72%
	67	600	82,761	0	0.00%	0.00%
Newland	85	698	78,372	698	100.00%	0.89%
Newport	13	4,150	76,622	4,150	100.00%	5.42%
Newton	89	12,968	77,838	12,968	100.00%	16.66%
	96	12,968	76,520	0	0.00%	0.00%
Newton Grove	22	569	83,434	569	100.00%	0.68%
Norlina	32	1,118	83,140	1,118	100.00%	1.34%
Norman	66	138	82,854	138	100.00%	0.17%
North Topsail Beach	15	743	77,307	743	100.00%	0.96%
North Wilkesboro	90	4,245	82,608	5	0.12%	0.01%
	94	4,245	82,984	4,240	99.88%	5.11%
Northwest	18	735	77,681	735	100.00%	0.95%
Norwood	67	2,379	82,761	2,379	100.00%	2.87%
Oak City	23	317	81,057	317	100.00%	0.39%
Oak Island	17	6,783	77,263	6,783	100.00%	8.78%
Oak Ridge	62	6,185	80,732	6,185	100.00%	7.66%
Oakboro	67	1,859	82,761	1,859	100.00%	2.25%
Ocean Isle Beach	17	550	77,263	550	100.00%	0.71%
Old Fort	85	908	78,372	908	100.00%	1.16%
Oriental	6	900	76,421	900	100.00%	1.18%
Orrum	46	91	80,440	91	100.00%	0.11%
Ossipee	64	543	75,581	543	100.00%	0.72%
Oxford	2	8,461	82,634	239	2.82%	0.29%
	32	8,461	83,140	8,222	97.18%	9.89%
Pantego	79	179	75,538	179	100.00%	0.24%
Parkton	46	436	80,440	436	100.00%	0.54%
Parmele	23	278	81,057	278	100.00%	0.34%
Patterson Springs	111	622	76,148	622	100.00%	0.82%
Peachland	55	437	75,792	437	100.00%	0.58%
Peletier	13	644	76,622	644	100.00%	0.84%
Pembroke	47	2,973	82,618	2,973	100.00%	3.60%
Pikeville	10	678	83,434	678	100.00%	0.81%
Pilot Mountain	91	1,477	83,388	1,477	100.00%	1.77%
Pine Knoll Shores	13	1,339	76,622	1,339	100.00%	1.75%
Pine Level	28	1,700	83,432	1,700	100.00%	2.04%
Pinebluff	52	1,337	76,894	1,337	100.00%	1.74%
Pinehurst	52	13,124	76,894	13,124	100.00%	17.07%
Pinetops	23	1,374	81,057	1,374	100.00%	1.70%
Pineville	88	7,479	77,172	7,479	100.00%	9.69%
	104	7,479	76,869	0	0.00%	0.00%
Pink Hill	12	552	75,923	552	100.00%	0.73%
Pittsboro	54	3,743	82,312	3,743	100.00%	4.55%

District plan definition file: 'HST-1.asc', modified 08/22/2017 08:19:30 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

HST-1: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Pleasant Garden	59	4,489	79,907	4,489	100.00%	5.62%
Plymouth	5	3,878	75,783	3,878	100.00%	5.12%
Polkton	55	3,375	75,792	3,375	100.00%	4.45%
Polkville	111	545	76,148	545	100.00%	0.72%
Pollocksville	13	311	76,622	311	100.00%	0.41%
Powellsville	5	276	75,783	276	100.00%	0.36%
Princeton	10	1,194	83,434	1,194	100.00%	1.43%
Princeville	23	2,082	81,057	2,082	100.00%	2.57%
Proctorville	46	117	80,440	117	100.00%	0.15%
Raeford	48	4,611	83,109	4,611	100.00%	5.55%
Raleigh (Durham)	31	1,067	82,773	1,067	100.00%	1.29%
Raleigh (Wake)	11	402,825	81,539	28,950	7.19%	35.50%
	33	402,825	82,642	56,483	14.02%	68.35%
	34	402,825	81,525	81,282	20.18%	99.70%
	35	402,825	81,862	19,326	4.80%	23.61%
	36	402,825	81,926	6	0.00%	0.01%
	38	402,825	83,094	80,183	19.91%	96.50%
	39	402,825	82,181	36,700	9.11%	44.66%
	40	402,825	80,912	42,537	10.56%	52.57%
	49	402,825	82,621	57,358	14.24%	69.42%
Ramseur	78	1,692	76,980	1,692	100.00%	2.20%
Randleman	70	4,113	76,125	4,113	100.00%	5.40%
Ranlo	108	3,434	76,926	3,434	100.00%	4.46%
	110	3,434	75,573	0	0.00%	0.00%
Raynham	47	72	82,618	72	100.00%	0.09%
Red Cross	67	742	82,761	742	100.00%	0.90%
Red Oak	7	3,430	78,027	3,430	100.00%	4.40%
Red Springs (Hoke)	48	0	83,109	0	0.00%	0.00%
Red Springs (Robeson)	47	3,428	82,618	3,428	100.00%	4.15%
Reidsville	65	14,520	83,430	14,520	100.00%	17.40%
Rennert	46	383	80,440	383	100.00%	0.48%
Rhodhiss (Burke)	86	700	79,175	700	100.00%	0.88%
Rhodhiss (Caldwell)	87	370	83,029	370	100.00%	0.45%
Rich Square	27	958	76,790	958	100.00%	1.25%
Richfield	67	613	82,761	613	100.00%	0.74%
Richlands	4	1,520	81,905	1,520	100.00%	1.86%
River Bend	3	3,119	75,726	3,119	100.00%	4.12%
Roanoke Rapids	27	15,754	76,790	15,754	100.00%	20.52%
Robbins	52	1,097	76,894	1,097	100.00%	1.43%
	78	1,097	76,980	0	0.00%	0.00%
Robbinsville	120	620	80,814	620	100.00%	0.77%
Robersonville	23	1,488	81,057	1,488	100.00%	1.84%
Rockingham	66	9,558	82,854	9,558	100.00%	11.54%
Rockwell	76	2,108	81,908	2,108	100.00%	2.57%
Rocky Mount (Edgecombe)	23	17,524	81,057	17,524	100.00%	21.62%
Rocky Mount (Nash)	7	39,953	78,027	39,953	100.00%	51.20%
Rolesville	35	3,786	81,862	3,786	100.00%	4.62%

District plan definition file: 'HST-1.asc', modified 08/22/2017 08:19:30 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/22/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.0}

HST-1: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Ronda	94	417	82,984	417	100.00%	0.50%
Roper	5	611	75,783	611	100.00%	0.81%
Rose Hill	4	1,626	81,905	1,626	100.00%	1.99%
Roseboro	22	1,191	83,434	1,191	100.00%	1.43%
Rosman	113	576	81,089	576	100.00%	0.71%
Rowland	47	1,037	82,618	1,037	100.00%	1.26%
Roxboro	2	8,362	82,634	8,362	100.00%	10.12%
Roxobel	5	240	75,783	240	100.00%	0.32%
Rural Hall	75	2,937	79,963	2,937	100.00%	3.67%
Ruth	112	440	79,547	440	100.00%	0.55%
Rutherford College	86	1,341	79,175	1,341	100.00%	1.69%
Rutherfordton	112	4,213	79,547	4,213	100.00%	5.30%
Salemburg	22	435	83,434	435	100.00%	0.52%
Salisbury	76	33,662	81,908	31,445	93.41%	38.39%
	77	33,662	82,918	2,217	6.59%	2.67%
Saluda (Henderson)	113	12	81,089	12	100.00%	0.01%
Saluda (Polk)	113	701	81,089	701	100.00%	0.86%
Sandy Creek	18	260	77,681	260	100.00%	0.33%
Sandyfield	16	447	81,425	447	100.00%	0.55%
Sanford	51	28,094	83,434	28,094	100.00%	33.67%
Saratoga	24	408	81,234	408	100.00%	0.50%
Sawmills	87	5,240	83,029	5,240	100.00%	6.31%
Scotland Neck	27	2,059	76,790	2,059	100.00%	2.68%
Seaboard	27	632	76,790	632	100.00%	0.82%
Seagrove	78	228	76,980	228	100.00%	0.30%
Sedalia	59	623	79,907	623	100.00%	0.78%
Selma	26	6,073	83,431	5	0.08%	0.01%
	28	6,073	83,432	6,068	99.92%	7.27%
Seven Devils (Avery)	85	28	78,372	28	100.00%	0.04%
Seven Devils (Watauga)	93	164	78,360	164	100.00%	0.21%
Seven Springs	10	110	83,434	110	100.00%	0.13%
Severn	27	276	76,790	276	100.00%	0.36%
Shallotte	17	3,675	77,263	3,675	100.00%	4.76%
Sharpsburg (Edgecombe)	23	209	81,057	209	100.00%	0.26%
Sharpsburg (Nash)	7	1,252	78,027	1,252	100.00%	1.60%
Sharpsburg (Wilson)	24	563	81,234	563	100.00%	0.69%
Shelby	110	20,323	75,573	11,240	55.31%	14.87%
	111	20,323	76,148	9,083	44.69%	11.93%
Siler City	54	7,887	82,312	7,887	100.00%	9.58%
Simpson	9	416	75,794	416	100.00%	0.55%
Sims	24	282	81,234	282	100.00%	0.35%
Smithfield	26	10,966	83,431	127	1.16%	0.15%
	28	10,966	83,432	10,839	98.84%	12.99%
Snow Hill	10	1,595	83,434	1,595	100.00%	1.91%
Southern Pines	52	12,334	76,894	12,334	100.00%	16.04%
Southern Shores	6	2,714	76,421	2,714	100.00%	3.55%
Southport	17	2,833	77,263	2,833	100.00%	3.67%

District plan definition file: 'HST-1.asc', modified 08/22/2017 08:19:30 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/22/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.0}

HST-1: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Sparta	90	1,770	82,608	1,770	100.00%	2.14%
Speed	23	80	81,057	80	100.00%	0.10%
Spencer	76	3,267	81,908	3,267	100.00%	3.99%
Spencer Mountain	108	37	76,926	37	100.00%	0.05%
Spindale	112	4,321	79,547	4,321	100.00%	5.43%
Spring Hope	7	1,320	78,027	1,320	100.00%	1.69%
Spring Lake	42	11,964	81,439	11,964	100.00%	14.69%
Spruce Pine	85	2,175	78,372	2,175	100.00%	2.78%
St. Helena	16	389	81,425	389	100.00%	0.48%
St. James	17	3,165	77,263	3,165	100.00%	4.10%
St. Pauls	46	2,035	80,440	2,035	100.00%	2.53%
Staley	78	393	76,980	393	100.00%	0.51%
Stallings (Mecklenburg)	103	399	76,381	399	100.00%	0.52%
Stallings (Union)	68	13,432	76,067	0	0.00%	0.00%
	69	13,432	76,381	13,432	100.00%	17.59%
Stanfield	67	1,486	82,761	1,486	100.00%	1.80%
Stanley	108	3,556	76,926	3,550	99.83%	4.61%
	110	3,556	75,573	6	0.17%	0.01%
Stantonsburg	24	784	81,234	784	100.00%	0.97%
Star	66	876	82,854	876	100.00%	1.06%
Statesville	84	24,532	77,282	20,541	83.73%	26.58%
	95	24,532	82,155	3,991	16.27%	4.86%
Stedman	45	1,028	79,294	1,028	100.00%	1.30%
Stem	2	463	82,634	463	100.00%	0.56%
Stokesdale	62	5,047	80,732	5,047	100.00%	6.25%
Stoneville	65	1,056	83,430	1,056	100.00%	1.27%
Stonewall	6	281	76,421	281	100.00%	0.37%
Stovall	32	418	83,140	418	100.00%	0.50%
Sugar Mountain	85	198	78,372	198	100.00%	0.25%
Summerfield	62	10,232	80,732	10,232	100.00%	12.67%
Sunset Beach	17	3,572	77,263	3,572	100.00%	4.62%
Surf City (Onslow)	15	292	77,307	292	100.00%	0.38%
Surf City (Pender)	16	1,561	81,425	1,561	100.00%	1.92%
Swansboro	14	2,663	77,065	2,663	100.00%	3.46%
Swepsonville	63	1,154	75,550	1,154	100.00%	1.53%
Sylva	119	2,588	75,548	2,588	100.00%	3.43%
Tabor City	46	2,511	80,440	2,511	100.00%	3.12%
Tar Heel	22	117	83,434	117	100.00%	0.14%
Tarboro	23	11,415	81,057	11,415	100.00%	14.08%
Taylorsville	94	2,098	82,984	2,098	100.00%	2.53%
Taylortown	52	722	76,894	722	100.00%	0.94%
Teachey	4	376	81,905	376	100.00%	0.46%
Thomasville (Davidson)	80	26,493	81,522	25,474	96.15%	31.25%
	81	26,493	81,356	1,019	3.85%	1.25%
Thomasville (Randolph)	70	264	76,125	264	100.00%	0.35%
Tobaccoville (Forsyth)	75	2,441	79,963	2,441	100.00%	3.05%
Tobaccoville (Stokes)	91	0	83,388	0	0.00%	0.00%

District plan definition file: 'HST-1.asc', modified 08/22/2017 08:19:30 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/22/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.0}

HST-1: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Topsail Beach	16	368	81,425	368	100.00%	0.45%
Trent Woods	3	4,155	75,726	4,155	100.00%	5.49%
Trenton	13	287	76,622	287	100.00%	0.37%
Trinity	70	6,614	76,125	6,614	100.00%	8.69%
Troutman	84	2,383	77,282	2,169	91.02%	2.81%
	95	2,383	82,155	214	8.98%	0.26%
Troy	66	3,189	82,854	3,189	100.00%	3.85%
Tryon	113	1,646	81,089	1,646	100.00%	2.03%
Turkey	21	292	83,434	292	100.00%	0.35%
Unionville	55	5,929	75,792	337	5.68%	0.44%
	69	5,929	76,381	5,592	94.32%	7.32%
Valdese	86	4,490	79,175	4,490	100.00%	5.67%
Vanceboro	79	1,005	75,538	1,005	100.00%	1.33%
Vandemere	6	254	76,421	254	100.00%	0.33%
Varnamtown	17	541	77,263	541	100.00%	0.70%
Vass	52	720	76,894	720	100.00%	0.94%
Waco	110	321	75,573	321	100.00%	0.42%
Wade	45	556	79,294	556	100.00%	0.70%
Wadesboro	55	5,813	75,792	5,813	100.00%	7.67%
Wagram	48	840	83,109	840	100.00%	1.01%
Wake Forest (Franklin)	25	899	78,432	899	100.00%	1.15%
Wake Forest (Wake)	35	29,218	81,862	29,218	100.00%	35.69%
Walkertown	72	4,675	76,245	1,018	21.78%	1.34%
	75	4,675	79,963	3,657	78.22%	4.57%
Wallace (Duplin)	4	3,880	81,905	3,880	100.00%	4.74%
Wallace (Pender)	16	0	81,425	0	0.00%	0.00%
Wallburg	80	3,047	81,522	3,047	100.00%	3.74%
Walnut Cove	91	1,425	83,388	1,425	100.00%	1.71%
Walnut Creek	10	835	83,434	835	100.00%	1.00%
Walstonburg	10	219	83,434	219	100.00%	0.26%
Warrenton	32	862	83,140	862	100.00%	1.04%
Warsaw	4	3,054	81,905	3,054	100.00%	3.73%
Washington	79	9,744	75,538	9,744	100.00%	12.90%
Washington Park	79	451	75,538	451	100.00%	0.60%
Watha	16	190	81,425	190	100.00%	0.23%
Waxhaw	55	9,859	75,792	1,604	16.27%	2.12%
	68	9,859	76,067	8,255	83.73%	10.85%
Waynesville	119	9,869	75,548	9,869	100.00%	13.06%
Weaverville	115	3,120	79,883	3,120	100.00%	3.91%
Webster	119	363	75,548	363	100.00%	0.48%
Weddington (Mecklenburg)	103	7	76,381	7	100.00%	0.01%
Weddington (Union)	68	9,452	76,067	8,933	94.51%	11.74%
	69	9,452	76,381	519	5.49%	0.68%
Weldon	27	1,655	76,790	1,655	100.00%	2.16%
Wendell	35	5,845	81,862	2,091	35.77%	2.55%
	39	5,845	82,181	3,754	64.23%	4.57%
Wentworth	65	2,807	83,430	2,807	100.00%	3.36%

District plan definition file: 'HST-1.asc', modified 08/22/2017 08:19:30 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/22/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.0}

HST-1: Municipality-District

Municipality	District	Total Muni Pop	Total District Pop	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Wesley Chapel	68	7,463	76,067	6,877	92.15%	9.04%
	69	7,463	76,381	586	7.85%	0.77%
West Jefferson	93	1,299	78,360	1,299	100.00%	1.66%
Whispering Pines	52	2,928	76,894	2,928	100.00%	3.81%
Whitakers (Edgecombe)	23	402	81,057	402	100.00%	0.50%
Whitakers (Nash)	7	342	78,027	342	100.00%	0.44%
White Lake	22	802	83,434	802	100.00%	0.96%
Whiteville	16	5,394	81,425	5,394	100.00%	6.62%
Whitsett	59	590	79,907	590	100.00%	0.74%
Wilkesboro	90	3,413	82,608	3	0.09%	0.00%
	94	3,413	82,984	3,410	99.91%	4.11%
Williamston	23	5,511	81,057	5,511	100.00%	6.80%
Wilmington	18	106,476	77,681	41,563	39.04%	53.50%
	19	106,476	76,666	33,947	31.88%	44.28%
	20	106,476	78,488	30,966	29.08%	39.45%
Wilson	24	49,167	81,234	49,167	100.00%	60.53%
Wilson's Mills	26	2,277	83,431	2,277	100.00%	2.73%
	28	2,277	83,432	0	0.00%	0.00%
Windsor	5	3,630	75,783	3,630	100.00%	4.79%
Winfall	1	594	78,887	594	100.00%	0.75%
Wingate	55	3,491	75,792	349	10.00%	0.46%
	69	3,491	76,381	3,142	90.00%	4.11%
Winston-Salem	71	229,617	75,793	75,779	33.00%	99.98%
	72	229,617	76,245	73,464	31.99%	96.35%
	73	229,617	78,189	17,422	7.59%	22.28%
	74	229,617	78,886	32,875	14.32%	41.67%
	75	229,617	79,963	30,077	13.10%	37.61%
Winterville	8	9,269	75,926	0	0.00%	0.00%
	9	9,269	75,794	8,391	90.53%	11.07%
	12	9,269	75,923	878	9.47%	1.16%
Winton	5	769	75,783	769	100.00%	1.01%
Woodfin	114	6,123	82,902	2,563	41.86%	3.09%
	115	6,123	79,883	2,717	44.37%	3.40%
	116	6,123	75,533	843	13.77%	1.12%
Woodland	27	809	76,790	809	100.00%	1.05%
Wrightsville Beach	19	2,477	76,666	2,477	100.00%	3.23%
	20	2,477	78,488	0	0.00%	0.00%
Yadkinville	73	2,959	78,189	2,959	100.00%	3.78%
Yanceyville	50	2,039	80,866	2,039	100.00%	2.52%
Youngsville	25	1,157	78,432	1,157	100.00%	1.48%
Zebulon (Johnston)	26	0	83,431	0	0.00%	0.00%
Zebulon (Wake)	35	4,433	81,862	381	8.59%	0.47%
	39	4,433	82,181	4,052	91.41%	4.93%
			Total:	**5,250,071**		

District plan definition file: 'HST-1.asc', modified 08/22/2017 08:19:30 PM

Municipalities derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Printed 08/22/2017 {rptG03|dc2017HS|re1.3.0}

HST-1: Split VTD Detail

County	VTD	District	Total VTD Pop	VTD Pop in District	Percent of VTD Pop in District
Alamance	03C	63	2,814	2,491	88.52%
		64	2,814	323	11.48%
	063	63	4,940	4,090	82.79%
		64	4,940	850	17.21%
	06W	63	1,973	1,617	81.96%
		64	1,973	356	18.04%
Brunswick	04	17	13,819	3,644	26.37%
		18	13,819	10,175	73.63%
Buncombe	05.1	114	2,748	1,691	61.54%
		115	2,748	1,057	38.46%
	100.1	114	9,126	8,524	93.40%
		115	9,126	602	6.60%
	102.1	114	5,975	1,385	23.18%
		116	5,975	4,590	76.82%
	104.1	114	3,081	2,345	76.11%
		115	3,081	736	23.89%
	19.1	114	2,159	1,843	85.36%
		116	2,159	316	14.64%
	24.1	114	3,211	1,964	61.16%
		116	3,211	1,247	38.84%
	52.1	115	5,279	3,762	71.26%
		116	5,279	1,517	28.74%
	57.1	114	3,534	315	8.91%
		115	3,534	1,149	32.51%
		116	3,534	2,070	58.57%
	60.2	114	1,300	164	12.62%
		115	1,300	1,136	87.38%
	64.1	114	2,671	820	30.70%
		115	2,671	1,851	69.30%
	70.1	114	3,508	2,418	68.93%
		115	3,508	1,090	31.07%
Craven	N4	3	6,831	5,069	74.21%
		79	6,831	1,762	25.79%
Cumberland	G2	43	34,282	29,272	85.39%
		45	34,282	5,010	14.61%
Durham	34	29	11,492	9,457	82.29%
		31	11,492	2,035	17.71%
Gaston	05	109	4,767	4,132	86.68%
		110	4,767	635	13.32%
Harnett	PR07	51	17,943	14,553	81.11%
		53	17,943	3,390	18.89%
	PR08	28	10,373	5,681	54.77%
		53	10,373	4,692	45.23%
Haywood	IH	118	3,815	3,256	85.35%
		119	3,815	559	14.65%
Johnston	PR04	10	1,929	413	21.41%
		28	1,929	1,516	78.59%
	PR27	26	7,226	585	8.10%
		28	7,226	6,641	91.90%

District plan definition file: 'HST-1.asc', modified 08/22/2017 08:19:30 PM

VTDs ('Voting Districts') derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Printed 08/22/2017 {rptG05|dc2017HS|re1.3.0}

HST-1: Split VTD Detail

County	VTD	District	Total VTD Pop	VTD Pop in District	Percent of VTD Pop in District
Mecklenburg	001	102	1,950	102	5.23%
		104	1,950	1,848	94.77%
	069	104	5,121	3,240	63.27%
		105	5,121	1,881	36.73%
	134	98	8,939	4,410	49.33%
		107	8,939	4,529	50.67%
Moore	RBN	52	2,923	2,593	88.71%
		78	2,923	330	11.29%
	WEM	52	2,982	1,806	60.56%
		78	2,982	1,176	39.44%
New Hanover	CF03	18	8,711	828	9.51%
		20	8,711	7,883	90.49%
	W24	18	7,784	3,543	45.52%
		20	7,784	4,241	54.48%
	WB	19	2,473	2,473	100.00%
		20	2,473	0	0.00%
Onslow	GB12	4	6,284	5,776	91.92%
		14	6,284	508	8.08%
	HM05	14	8,258	5,303	64.22%
		15	8,258	2,955	35.78%
Pitt	1403A	9	7,871	3,868	49.14%
		12	7,871	4,003	50.86%
	1507	8	6,628	5,623	84.84%
		9	6,628	1,005	15.16%
Rockingham	HU	65	6,052	5,815	96.08%
		91	6,052	237	3.92%
Sampson	CLSW	21	2,899	1,433	49.43%
		22	2,899	1,466	50.57%
	ROWA	21	3,210	12	0.37%
		22	3,210	3,198	99.63%
Union	017A	68	4,593	1,595	34.73%
		69	4,593	2,998	65.27%
	019	55	5,806	1,105	19.03%
		68	5,806	4,701	80.97%
	029A	68	5,935	5,079	85.58%
		69	5,935	856	14.42%
	029C	68	2,942	1,576	53.57%
		69	2,942	1,366	46.43%
	032	55	4,095	1,820	44.44%
		69	4,095	2,275	55.56%
	040	68	4,926	1,122	22.78%
		69	4,926	3,804	77.22%
Wake	08-02	34	5,481	1,936	35.32%
		40	5,481	3,545	64.68%
	12-05	36	9,236	5,460	59.12%
		37	9,236	3,776	40.88%
	16-09	33	4,924	3,027	61.47%
		36	4,924	1,897	38.53%
	18-08	11	5,677	2,521	44.41%

District plan definition file: 'HST-1.asc', modified 08/22/2017 08:19:30 PM

VTDs ('Voting Districts') derive from the Census Bureau's 2010 Redistricting Data Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Printed 08/22/2017 {rptG05|dc2017HS|re1.3.0}

HST-1: Split VTD Detail

County	VTD	District	Total VTD Pop	VTD Pop in District	Percent of VTD Pop in District
Wake	18-08	36	5,677	3,156	55.59%
Wayne	09	10	5,273	3,733	70.79%
		21	5,273	1,540	29.21%

HST-1: Population Deviation

District	2010 Pop	Ideal Pop	Deviation	Deviation %
1	78,887	79,462	-575	-0.72%
2	82,634	79,462	3,172	3.99%
3	75,726	79,462	-3,736	-4.70%
4	81,905	79,462	2,443	3.07%
5	75,783	79,462	-3,679	-4.63%
6	76,421	79,462	-3,041	-3.83%
7	78,027	79,462	-1,435	-1.81%
8	75,926	79,462	-3,536	-4.45%
9	75,794	79,462	-3,668	-4.62%
10	83,434	79,462	3,972	5.00%
11	81,539	79,462	2,077	2.61%
12	75,923	79,462	-3,539	-4.45%
13	76,622	79,462	-2,840	-3.57%
14	77,065	79,462	-2,397	-3.02%
15	77,307	79,462	-2,155	-2.71%
16	81,425	79,462	1,963	2.47%
17	77,263	79,462	-2,199	-2.77%
18	77,681	79,462	-1,781	-2.24%
19	76,666	79,462	-2,796	-3.52%
20	78,488	79,462	-974	-1.23%
21	83,434	79,462	3,972	5.00%
22	83,434	79,462	3,972	5.00%
23	81,057	79,462	1,595	2.01%
24	81,234	79,462	1,772	2.23%
25	78,432	79,462	-1,030	-1.30%
26	83,431	79,462	3,969	4.99%
27	76,790	79,462	-2,672	-3.36%
28	83,432	79,462	3,970	5.00%
29	82,735	79,462	3,273	4.12%
30	83,272	79,462	3,810	4.79%
31	82,773	79,462	3,311	4.17%
32	83,140	79,462	3,678	4.63%
33	82,642	79,462	3,180	4.00%
34	81,525	79,462	2,063	2.60%
35	81,862	79,462	2,400	3.02%
36	81,926	79,462	2,464	3.10%
37	80,332	79,462	870	1.09%
38	83,094	79,462	3,632	4.57%
39	82,181	79,462	2,719	3.42%
40	80,912	79,462	1,450	1.82%
41	82,359	79,462	2,897	3.65%
42	81,439	79,462	1,977	2.49%
43	77,725	79,462	-1,737	-2.19%
44	80,973	79,462	1,511	1.90%
45	79,294	79,462	-168	-0.21%
46	80,440	79,462	978	1.23%
47	82,618	79,462	3,156	3.97%
48	83,109	79,462	3,647	4.59%
49	82,621	79,462	3,159	3.98%
50	80,866	79,462	1,404	1.77%
51	83,434	79,462	3,972	5.00%
52	76,894	79,462	-2,568	-3.23%
53	83,429	79,462	3,967	4.99%
54	82,312	79,462	2,850	3.59%
55	75,792	79,462	-3,670	-4.62%
56	76,654	79,462	-2,808	-3.53%
57	82,755	79,462	3,293	4.14%
58	82,137	79,462	2,675	3.37%
59	79,907	79,462	445	0.56%
60	81,856	79,462	2,394	3.01%
61	81,019	79,462	1,557	1.96%
62	80,732	79,462	1,270	1.60%
63	75,550	79,462	-3,912	-4.92%
64	75,581	79,462	-3,881	-4.88%
65	83,430	79,462	3,968	4.99%
66	82,854	79,462	3,392	4.27%
67	82,761	79,462	3,299	4.15%
68	76,067	79,462	-3,395	-4.27%
69	76,381	79,462	-3,081	-3.88%
70	76,125	79,462	-3,337	-4.20%
71	75,793	79,462	-3,669	-4.62%
72	76,245	79,462	-3,217	-4.05%
73	78,189	79,462	-1,273	-1.60%
74	78,886	79,462	-576	-0.72%
75	79,963	79,462	501	0.63%
76	81,908	79,462	2,446	3.08%
77	82,918	79,462	3,456	4.35%
78	76,980	79,462	-2,482	-3.12%
79	75,538	79,462	-3,924	-4.94%
80	81,522	79,462	2,060	2.59%
81	81,356	79,462	1,894	2.38%
82	81,088	79,462	1,626	2.05%

HST-1: Population Deviation

District	2010 Pop	Ideal Pop	Deviation	Deviation %
83	81,172	79,462	1,710	2.15%
84	77,282	79,462	-2,180	-2.74%
85	78,372	79,462	-1,090	-1.37%
86	79,175	79,462	-287	-0.36%
87	83,029	79,462	3,567	4.49%
88	77,172	79,462	-2,290	-2.88%
89	77,838	79,462	-1,624	-2.04%
90	82,608	79,462	3,146	3.96%
91	83,388	79,462	3,926	4.94%
92	76,022	79,462	-3,440	-4.33%
93	78,360	79,462	-1,102	-1.39%
94	82,984	79,462	3,522	4.43%
95	82,155	79,462	2,693	3.39%
96	76,520	79,462	-2,942	-3.70%
97	78,265	79,462	-1,197	-1.51%
98	75,602	79,462	-3,860	-4.86%
99	77,141	79,462	-2,321	-2.92%
100	75,589	79,462	-3,873	-4.87%
101	79,876	79,462	414	0.52%
102	77,391	79,462	-2,071	-2.61%
103	76,381	79,462	-3,081	-3.88%
104	76,869	79,462	-2,593	-3.26%
105	75,967	79,462	-3,495	-4.40%
106	75,762	79,462	-3,700	-4.66%
107	75,856	79,462	-3,606	-4.54%
108	76,926	79,462	-2,536	-3.19%
109	75,517	79,462	-3,945	-4.96%
110	75,573	79,462	-3,889	-4.89%
111	76,148	79,462	-3,314	-4.17%
112	79,547	79,462	85	0.11%
113	81,089	79,462	1,627	2.05%
114	82,902	79,462	3,440	4.33%
115	79,883	79,462	421	0.53%
116	75,533	79,462	-3,929	-4.94%
117	79,251	79,462	-211	-0.27%
118	76,322	79,462	-3,140	-3.95%
119	75,548	79,462	-3,914	-4.93%
120	80,814	79,462	1,352	1.70%
Total:	**9,535,483**			

HST-1: 2017 House Redistricting Plan: Population 2010, US Senate 2010, President 2012

	2010 Census		US Senate 2010: Marshall-Burr-Beitler								US President 2012: Obama-Romney-Johnson							
District	Total Pop	18+ Pop	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %
1	78,887	61,045	9,493	43.03%	12,139	55.03%	417	1.89%	10	0.05%	18,105	48.97%	18,455	49.92%	337	0.91%	71	0.19%
2	82,634	64,057	9,138	42.84%	11,711	54.90%	479	2.25%	4	0.02%	16,284	44.54%	19,862	54.33%	322	0.88%	89	0.24%
3	75,726	57,749	6,926	34.46%	12,772	63.55%	390	1.94%	11	0.05%	13,877	41.67%	19,044	57.18%	308	0.92%	77	0.23%
4	81,905	60,243	6,889	39.27%	10,357	59.03%	292	1.66%	6	0.03%	11,345	38.94%	17,541	60.21%	200	0.69%	45	0.15%
5	75,783	59,409	12,870	58.24%	8,966	40.58%	254	1.15%	7	0.03%	21,954	63.35%	12,485	36.03%	167	0.48%	48	0.14%
6	76,421	60,608	8,872	34.50%	16,174	62.90%	661	2.57%	7	0.03%	14,765	38.52%	22,988	59.97%	532	1.39%	50	0.13%
7	78,027	59,741	12,874	49.23%	12,965	49.58%	303	1.16%	8	0.03%	21,791	53.51%	18,673	45.85%	191	0.47%	67	0.16%
8	75,926	58,873	10,135	61.68%	6,095	37.09%	195	1.19%	7	0.04%	22,626	66.47%	11,119	32.66%	254	0.75%	42	0.12%
9	75,794	59,235	7,527	37.19%	12,496	61.74%	210	1.04%	7	0.03%	15,362	42.01%	20,876	57.09%	280	0.77%	50	0.14%
10	83,434	62,414	6,595	29.90%	15,171	68.78%	287	1.30%	3	0.01%	11,116	32.12%	23,262	67.22%	212	0.61%	17	0.05%
11	81,539	64,508	11,704	51.72%	10,205	45.10%	709	3.13%	10	0.04%	24,808	59.62%	15,841	38.07%	856	2.06%	106	0.25%
12	75,923	57,405	10,406	46.00%	11,921	52.70%	282	1.25%	13	0.06%	17,724	49.08%	18,140	50.23%	210	0.58%	40	0.11%
13	76,622	61,839	7,638	28.48%	18,590	69.32%	538	2.01%	52	0.19%	12,458	31.09%	27,181	67.84%	359	0.90%	68	0.17%
14	77,065	56,588	4,167	33.67%	7,902	63.84%	301	2.43%	7	0.06%	9,736	39.75%	14,437	58.94%	253	1.03%	70	0.29%
15	77,307	59,638	3,006	31.19%	6,343	65.81%	284	2.95%	5	0.05%	6,424	34.97%	11,670	63.53%	225	1.22%	50	0.27%
16	81,425	62,717	10,108	39.84%	14,778	58.24%	474	1.87%	14	0.06%	16,124	42.93%	21,036	56.00%	314	0.84%	88	0.23%
17	77,263	64,270	9,560	31.61%	20,050	66.30%	624	2.06%	8	0.03%	15,595	36.15%	27,141	62.91%	333	0.77%	74	0.17%
18	77,681	61,478	11,041	55.09%	8,555	42.68%	437	2.18%	10	0.05%	22,442	61.89%	13,304	36.69%	413	1.14%	100	0.28%
19	76,666	60,681	8,459	32.87%	16,677	64.80%	587	2.28%	14	0.05%	16,301	40.73%	23,121	57.77%	483	1.21%	119	0.30%
20	78,488	63,095	9,000	33.59%	17,209	64.23%	570	2.13%	12	0.04%	16,368	39.38%	24,562	59.09%	499	1.20%	135	0.32%
21	83,434	63,200	11,191	53.12%	9,613	45.63%	259	1.23%	5	0.02%	20,596	59.23%	13,983	40.22%	185	0.53%	6	0.02%
22	83,434	62,843	11,515	44.95%	13,748	53.67%	346	1.35%	8	0.03%	15,691	44.36%	19,380	54.79%	245	0.69%	55	0.16%
23	81,057	61,743	14,653	59.95%	9,513	38.92%	269	1.10%	8	0.03%	24,825	62.80%	14,515	36.72%	147	0.37%	43	0.11%
24	81,234	61,182	13,631	51.47%	12,420	46.90%	428	1.62%	3	0.01%	20,875	53.38%	17,954	45.91%	242	0.62%	38	0.10%
25	78,432	58,921	9,576	42.69%	12,410	55.32%	440	1.96%	8	0.04%	15,958	44.13%	19,772	54.68%	331	0.92%	98	0.27%
26	83,431	58,878	8,065	33.32%	15,596	64.44%	530	2.19%	12	0.05%	15,201	37.28%	25,030	61.38%	437	1.07%	111	0.27%
27	76,790	59,572	13,603	61.65%	8,196	37.14%	261	1.18%	6	0.03%	24,188	66.17%	12,189	33.34%	143	0.39%	35	0.10%
28	83,432	61,508	6,953	31.99%	14,418	66.33%	359	1.65%	8	0.04%	11,855	34.49%	22,137	64.41%	297	0.86%	82	0.24%
29	82,735	67,058	18,865	79.26%	4,545	19.10%	373	1.57%	17	0.07%	38,148	82.20%	7,753	16.71%	435	0.94%	70	0.15%
30	83,272	64,089	17,881	60.80%	11,040	37.54%	478	1.63%	11	0.04%	31,862	67.06%	15,158	31.90%	424	0.89%	70	0.15%
31	82,773	61,422	16,672	78.56%	4,267	20.11%	275	1.30%	8	0.04%	33,340	80.93%	7,466	18.12%	349	0.85%	43	0.10%
32	83,140	63,471	15,476	60.71%	9,595	37.64%	411	1.61%	8	0.03%	26,033	65.34%	13,608	34.16%	154	0.39%	45	0.11%
33	82,642	66,254	13,483	69.46%	5,564	28.67%	351	1.81%	12	0.06%	27,937	72.34%	10,079	26.10%	543	1.41%	61	0.16%
34	81,525	64,976	15,394	50.33%	14,527	47.50%	642	2.10%	23	0.08%	27,560	56.56%	20,389	41.85%	680	1.40%	95	0.19%
35	81,862	57,121	9,236	37.21%	14,998	60.43%	565	2.28%	20	0.08%	19,055	42.91%	24,775	55.80%	480	1.08%	93	0.21%
36	81,926	59,799	10,864	35.93%	18,694	61.83%	668	2.21%	8	0.03%	19,655	41.26%	27,387	57.49%	537	1.13%	58	0.12%
37	80,332	54,852	8,827	36.88%	14,457	60.40%	639	2.67%	12	0.05%	19,102	43.33%	24,319	55.16%	587	1.33%	82	0.19%
38	83,094	59,601	14,163	70.94%	5,433	27.21%	354	1.77%	14	0.07%	29,904	76.88%	8,572	22.04%	358	0.92%	62	0.16%
39	82,181	58,177	14,627	64.63%	7,594	33.55%	402	1.78%	9	0.04%	28,601	69.83%	11,938	29.15%	347	0.85%	72	0.18%
40	80,912	59,480	12,203	36.45%	20,451	61.08%	811	2.42%	18	0.05%	21,540	42.12%	28,992	56.69%	547	1.07%	63	0.12%
41	82,359	55,518	9,441	44.16%	11,298	52.85%	636	2.98%	2	0.01%	22,252	52.85%	19,251	45.72%	541	1.28%	64	0.15%
42	81,439	57,374	8,476	69.63%	3,542	29.10%	150	1.23%	5	0.04%	18,934	73.86%	6,486	25.30%	161	0.63%	55	0.21%
43	77,725	59,350	11,403	65.17%	5,813	33.22%	270	1.54%	11	0.06%	23,644	72.26%	8,782	26.84%	225	0.69%	69	0.21%
44	80,973	59,789	8,858	46.26%	9,916	51.78%	366	1.91%	9	0.05%	17,939	53.66%	15,149	45.31%	292	0.87%	52	0.16%
45	79,294	57,377	7,955	39.32%	11,934	58.98%	335	1.66%	10	0.05%	15,275	42.60%	20,249	56.48%	249	0.69%	80	0.22%
46	80,440	59,587	6,977	43.94%	8,611	54.23%	284	1.79%	7	0.04%	12,303	45.76%	14,327	53.29%	203	0.76%	51	0.19%
47	82,618	60,831	8,315	57.29%	6,015	41.44%	173	1.19%	11	0.08%	17,243	63.29%	9,705	35.62%	221	0.81%	77	0.28%
48	83,109	59,851	9,247	55.26%	7,197	43.01%	281	1.68%	9	0.05%	18,291	58.54%	12,650	40.49%	258	0.83%	46	0.15%
49	82,621	66,094	13,382	49.54%	12,911	47.79%	710	2.63%	11	0.04%	26,848	56.30%	20,053	42.05%	695	1.46%	88	0.18%
50	80,866	62,232	15,177	53.97%	12,277	43.66%	657	2.34%	11	0.04%	24,313	55.84%	18,630	42.79%	471	1.08%	123	0.28%
51	83,434	59,547	7,714	41.44%	10,529	56.56%	364	1.96%	8	0.04%	14,314	44.67%	17,331	54.08%	328	1.02%	72	0.22%
52	76,894	60,407	8,130	31.91%	16,852	66.14%	491	1.93%	7	0.03%	14,828	36.08%	25,925	63.08%	289	0.70%	58	0.14%
53	83,429	62,151	8,067	38.56%	12,447	59.50%	400	1.91%	6	0.03%	13,061	39.03%	20,001	59.78%	325	0.97%	73	0.22%

District plan definition file: 'HST-1.asc', modified 08/22/2017 08:19:30 PM

Printed 08/22/2017 {rptS02|dc2017HS|re1.3.0}

Populations values derive from the 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File. Election results were provided by the NC State Board of Elections. Votes that could not be associated with a specific precinct were excluded. Reported statewide totals may therefore be marginally lower than official contest results.

HST-1: 2017 House Redistricting Plan: Population 2010, US Senate 2010, President 2012

	2010 Census		US Senate 2010: Marshall-Burr-Beitler								US President 2012: Obama-Romney-Johnson							
District	Total Pop	18+ Pop	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %
54	82,312	64,361	16,920	53.96%	13,730	43.79%	695	2.22%	10	0.03%	26,235	55.99%	20,057	42.81%	473	1.01%	89	0.19%
55	75,792	57,260	7,418	36.90%	12,345	61.41%	326	1.62%	12	0.06%	13,756	39.49%	20,716	59.48%	275	0.79%	84	0.24%
56	76,654	62,430	19,313	77.49%	5,073	20.35%	522	2.09%	15	0.06%	34,936	78.94%	8,503	19.21%	669	1.51%	151	0.34%
57	82,755	64,200	14,697	81.20%	3,148	17.39%	243	1.34%	11	0.06%	36,447	86.99%	5,069	12.10%	296	0.71%	84	0.20%
58	82,137	62,753	12,047	63.92%	6,487	34.42%	288	1.53%	25	0.13%	27,946	73.09%	9,912	25.92%	286	0.75%	93	0.24%
59	79,907	61,233	9,808	38.24%	15,356	59.87%	480	1.87%	7	0.03%	18,869	42.66%	24,892	56.27%	368	0.83%	106	0.24%
60	81,856	61,808	9,568	57.73%	6,682	40.31%	309	1.86%	16	0.10%	23,485	67.53%	10,974	31.55%	253	0.73%	67	0.19%
61	81,019	63,506	9,721	33.66%	18,550	64.22%	586	2.03%	27	0.09%	19,567	41.33%	27,191	57.44%	446	0.94%	136	0.29%
62	80,732	60,423	9,300	34.11%	17,363	63.68%	595	2.18%	10	0.04%	19,556	41.92%	26,542	56.89%	449	0.96%	107	0.23%
63	75,550	57,278	8,482	38.39%	13,031	58.99%	571	2.58%	8	0.04%	15,509	43.71%	19,573	55.17%	330	0.93%	68	0.19%
64	75,581	58,410	6,964	35.86%	11,981	61.69%	458	2.36%	17	0.09%	13,366	41.39%	18,597	57.58%	267	0.83%	66	0.20%
65	83,430	64,719	7,496	33.32%	14,282	63.48%	706	3.14%	16	0.07%	14,675	39.12%	22,455	59.86%	299	0.80%	84	0.22%
66	82,854	63,058	10,560	46.75%	11,582	51.28%	433	1.92%	11	0.05%	15,910	45.99%	18,384	53.14%	277	0.80%	25	0.07%
67	82,761	62,838	6,873	26.66%	18,400	71.36%	501	1.94%	10	0.04%	11,407	28.39%	28,298	70.44%	422	1.05%	48	0.12%
68	76,067	49,871	5,344	28.78%	12,791	68.88%	426	2.29%	9	0.05%	13,160	35.92%	23,097	63.04%	316	0.86%	66	0.18%
69	76,381	54,263	5,446	30.22%	12,148	67.40%	419	2.32%	11	0.06%	12,576	36.44%	21,460	62.18%	368	1.07%	110	0.32%
70	76,125	57,325	3,558	21.14%	12,749	75.74%	513	3.05%	13	0.08%	8,189	25.84%	23,113	72.94%	343	1.08%	44	0.14%
71	75,793	57,481	9,798	58.11%	6,782	40.22%	275	1.63%	7	0.04%	23,956	69.74%	10,090	29.38%	302	0.88%	0	0.00%
72	76,245	58,071	11,678	66.54%	5,620	32.02%	248	1.41%	5	0.03%	27,128	76.55%	8,076	22.79%	235	0.66%	0	0.00%
73	78,189	59,318	6,106	25.80%	17,032	71.95%	529	2.23%	4	0.02%	12,278	32.31%	25,229	66.40%	441	1.16%	47	0.12%
74	78,886	59,414	7,130	32.40%	14,427	65.57%	435	1.98%	11	0.05%	16,022	40.59%	23,039	58.37%	407	1.03%	0	0.00%
75	79,963	60,453	8,675	32.94%	17,137	65.07%	516	1.96%	8	0.03%	16,896	39.09%	25,912	59.95%	415	0.96%	0	0.00%
76	81,908	62,585	7,822	37.03%	12,787	60.53%	502	2.38%	13	0.06%	15,191	41.45%	20,960	57.20%	360	0.98%	135	0.37%
77	82,918	63,076	6,663	26.24%	18,105	71.29%	617	2.43%	11	0.04%	11,587	28.89%	28,014	69.84%	394	0.98%	117	0.29%
78	76,980	58,404	4,029	21.41%	14,213	75.51%	567	3.01%	13	0.07%	8,233	24.08%	25,560	74.77%	335	0.98%	58	0.17%
79	75,538	58,785	8,646	35.68%	15,108	62.35%	466	1.92%	12	0.05%	14,321	39.25%	21,861	59.92%	236	0.65%	66	0.18%
80	81,522	61,819	4,779	23.10%	15,452	74.68%	458	2.21%	3	0.01%	9,557	26.44%	26,120	72.27%	383	1.06%	81	0.22%
81	81,356	62,187	6,468	30.99%	13,884	66.51%	508	2.43%	14	0.07%	11,067	31.81%	23,263	66.86%	393	1.13%	71	0.20%
82	81,088	58,038	7,291	33.20%	14,207	64.70%	460	2.09%	0	0.00%	15,974	39.95%	23,599	59.03%	408	1.02%	0	0.00%
83	81,172	59,773	6,999	36.00%	11,962	61.52%	478	2.46%	4	0.02%	14,172	41.75%	19,323	56.92%	423	1.25%	29	0.09%
84	77,282	58,924	7,244	32.03%	14,736	65.16%	617	2.73%	18	0.08%	12,673	34.35%	23,733	64.33%	356	0.96%	131	0.36%
85	78,372	62,493	6,014	26.73%	15,873	70.54%	595	2.64%	20	0.09%	9,740	29.02%	23,328	69.50%	389	1.16%	110	0.33%
86	79,175	61,639	7,764	37.95%	12,242	59.83%	450	2.20%	5	0.02%	12,429	38.01%	19,756	60.42%	393	1.20%	119	0.36%
87	83,029	64,243	6,908	31.41%	14,382	65.39%	690	3.14%	15	0.07%	10,898	31.49%	23,229	67.12%	479	1.38%	0	0.00%
88	77,172	58,012	8,592	56.26%	6,372	41.72%	302	1.98%	7	0.05%	21,244	64.97%	11,011	33.68%	342	1.05%	100	0.31%
89	77,838	59,483	6,177	29.81%	13,998	67.55%	532	2.57%	15	0.07%	11,364	32.70%	22,869	65.82%	392	1.13%	122	0.35%
90	82,608	63,899	7,033	31.36%	14,822	66.09%	566	2.52%	6	0.03%	9,925	29.88%	22,762	68.53%	413	1.24%	114	0.34%
91	83,388	64,721	6,313	26.71%	16,743	70.84%	572	2.42%	8	0.03%	10,619	28.87%	25,609	69.62%	456	1.24%	99	0.27%
92	76,022	57,630	10,228	65.20%	5,122	32.65%	325	2.07%	12	0.08%	24,610	71.63%	9,328	27.15%	337	0.98%	84	0.24%
93	78,360	65,985	10,383	39.34%	15,262	57.83%	729	2.76%	18	0.07%	17,118	42.54%	22,103	54.93%	803	2.00%	213	0.53%
94	82,984	64,320	7,877	30.80%	16,981	66.40%	704	2.75%	12	0.05%	10,504	28.63%	25,562	69.68%	499	1.36%	120	0.33%
95	82,155	59,928	5,680	27.90%	14,174	69.63%	496	2.44%	6	0.03%	13,403	33.96%	25,566	64.77%	391	0.99%	112	0.28%
96	76,520	58,080	6,470	31.28%	13,705	66.27%	495	2.39%	11	0.05%	12,700	36.45%	21,665	62.18%	378	1.08%	102	0.29%
97	78,265	59,784	6,958	30.01%	15,653	67.51%	564	2.43%	11	0.05%	11,021	29.97%	25,266	68.71%	369	1.00%	115	0.31%
98	75,602	56,018	6,849	32.00%	14,098	65.88%	445	2.08%	8	0.04%	16,276	39.21%	24,750	59.62%	402	0.97%	83	0.20%
99	77,141	55,130	12,757	73.89%	4,259	24.67%	232	1.34%	16	0.09%	26,889	79.03%	6,836	20.09%	215	0.63%	83	0.24%
100	75,589	56,173	9,157	57.35%	6,485	40.62%	314	1.97%	10	0.06%	21,275	67.14%	10,017	31.61%	329	1.04%	67	0.21%
101	79,876	58,931	12,051	68.58%	5,219	29.70%	291	1.66%	11	0.06%	28,250	74.39%	9,386	24.72%	257	0.68%	82	0.22%
102	77,391	59,231	10,729	74.35%	3,424	23.73%	269	1.86%	8	0.06%	25,970	80.44%	5,905	18.29%	324	1.00%	84	0.26%
103	76,381	56,360	7,849	32.02%	16,157	65.92%	488	1.99%	16	0.07%	16,067	38.44%	25,182	60.25%	416	1.00%	132	0.32%
104	76,869	59,384	9,634	33.26%	18,842	65.05%	476	1.64%	13	0.04%	18,349	39.25%	27,916	59.71%	393	0.84%	95	0.20%
105	75,967	56,011	7,111	32.05%	14,618	65.88%	454	2.05%	5	0.02%	16,507	40.61%	23,709	58.33%	356	0.88%	73	0.18%
106	75,762	57,932	9,986	67.03%	4,694	31.51%	214	1.44%	3	0.02%	23,892	73.26%	8,334	25.55%	299	0.92%	89	0.27%

District plan definition file: 'HST-1.asc', modified 08/22/2017 08:19:30 PM

Printed 08/22/2017 {rptS02|dc2017HS|re1.3.0}

Populations values derive from the 2010 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File. Election results were provided by the NC State Board of Elections. Votes that could not be associated with a specific precinct were excluded. Reported statewide totals may therefore be marginally lower than official contest results.

HST-1: 2017 House Redistricting Plan: Population 2010, US Senate 2010, President 2012

	2010 Census		US Senate 2010: Marshall-Burr-Beitler								US President 2012: Obama-Romney-Johnson							
District	Total Pop	18+ Pop	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %
107	75,856	55,478	12,601	72.88%	4,477	25.89%	207	1.20%	6	0.03%	27,803	76.86%	8,081	22.34%	222	0.61%	67	0.19%
108	76,926	59,400	5,880	32.51%	11,794	65.21%	413	2.28%	0	0.00%	12,869	38.42%	20,266	60.50%	362	1.08%	0	0.00%
109	75,517	56,493	6,277	33.20%	12,209	64.58%	419	2.22%	0	0.00%	14,138	40.79%	20,201	58.28%	321	0.93%	0	0.00%
110	75,573	57,987	6,366	33.61%	12,134	64.06%	439	2.32%	2	0.01%	11,593	35.29%	20,921	63.69%	314	0.96%	20	0.06%
111	76,148	58,045	7,206	36.13%	12,341	61.87%	390	1.96%	9	0.05%	11,633	35.72%	20,543	63.07%	306	0.94%	89	0.27%
112	79,547	61,671	6,370	30.24%	14,175	67.30%	509	2.42%	9	0.04%	10,646	32.71%	21,465	65.95%	351	1.08%	87	0.27%
113	81,089	66,177	11,159	36.07%	19,015	61.47%	754	2.44%	8	0.03%	15,774	37.46%	25,726	61.09%	477	1.13%	132	0.31%
114	82,902	67,453	17,655	66.88%	8,010	30.34%	725	2.75%	8	0.03%	33,044	72.54%	11,524	25.30%	682	1.50%	300	0.66%
115	79,883	63,911	12,292	44.29%	14,665	52.84%	766	2.76%	31	0.11%	20,831	47.82%	21,945	50.38%	592	1.36%	195	0.45%
116	75,533	58,114	9,048	38.38%	13,930	59.09%	585	2.48%	12	0.05%	16,743	43.40%	21,230	55.04%	447	1.16%	154	0.40%
117	79,251	62,434	8,152	32.28%	16,500	65.33%	596	2.36%	9	0.04%	13,707	36.65%	23,138	61.86%	435	1.16%	123	0.33%
118	76,322	60,837	12,403	42.23%	16,191	55.12%	767	2.61%	12	0.04%	15,098	41.30%	20,729	56.71%	548	1.50%	180	0.49%
119	75,548	61,452	10,591	46.03%	11,788	51.23%	619	2.69%	12	0.05%	15,557	47.80%	16,410	50.42%	543	1.67%	39	0.12%
120	80,814	65,097	9,909	32.86%	19,081	63.28%	1,143	3.79%	18	0.06%	11,787	30.01%	26,800	68.23%	517	1.32%	176	0.45%
Totals:	**9,535,483**	**7,253,848**	**1,141,700**	**43.04%**	**1,454,082**	**54.82%**	**55,554**	**2.09%**	**1,263**	**0.05%**	**2,171,293**	**48.33%**	**2,267,353**	**50.47%**	**44,448**	**0.99%**	**9,519**	**0.21%**

HST-1: Governor 2012, Lieutenant Governor 2012, US Senate 2014

	Governor 2012: Dalton-McCrory-Howe								Lieutenant Governor 2012: Coleman-Forest				US Senate 2014: Tillis-Hagan-Haugh							
District	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %
1	17,964	49.76%	17,172	47.57%	960	2.66%	3	0.01%	19,208	54.05%	16,327	45.95%	11,776	51.83%	10,424	45.88%	507	2.23%	14	0.06%
2	14,964	41.36%	20,485	56.62%	721	1.99%	11	0.03%	16,970	48.44%	18,065	51.56%	12,193	52.00%	10,289	43.88%	921	3.93%	44	0.19%
3	12,556	38.05%	19,773	59.92%	658	1.99%	12	0.04%	14,086	43.44%	18,342	56.56%	12,612	56.92%	8,699	39.26%	804	3.63%	43	0.19%
4	11,015	38.19%	17,336	60.11%	481	1.67%	9	0.03%	12,235	43.31%	16,012	56.69%	10,607	58.61%	6,770	37.41%	701	3.87%	20	0.11%
5	21,840	63.70%	12,026	35.07%	414	1.21%	8	0.02%	23,047	68.54%	10,578	31.46%	8,069	36.68%	13,305	60.49%	604	2.75%	18	0.08%
6	13,800	36.70%	22,340	59.41%	1,446	3.85%	14	0.04%	15,559	42.25%	21,269	57.75%	16,135	58.33%	10,543	38.11%	962	3.48%	22	0.08%
7	21,049	51.78%	19,219	47.28%	375	0.92%	5	0.01%	22,227	55.32%	17,950	44.68%	13,321	46.35%	14,633	50.91%	764	2.66%	25	0.09%
8	21,272	62.86%	11,935	35.27%	624	1.84%	7	0.02%	22,701	68.07%	10,649	31.93%	6,095	33.50%	11,528	63.36%	540	2.97%	32	0.18%
9	13,954	38.44%	21,716	59.83%	624	1.72%	4	0.01%	15,785	44.22%	19,914	55.78%	12,511	56.57%	8,912	40.30%	654	2.96%	38	0.17%
10	10,584	30.70%	23,479	68.10%	406	1.18%	6	0.02%	11,878	35.06%	21,998	64.94%	15,412	64.62%	7,489	31.40%	918	3.85%	30	0.13%
11	21,518	52.40%	17,791	43.33%	1,743	4.24%	11	0.03%	24,145	60.33%	15,877	39.67%	9,402	36.09%	15,557	59.72%	1,039	3.99%	54	0.21%
12	17,079	47.65%	18,313	51.09%	441	1.23%	12	0.03%	18,554	52.55%	16,752	47.45%	11,373	48.26%	11,355	48.19%	820	3.48%	17	0.07%
13	11,186	27.90%	28,180	70.30%	711	1.77%	10	0.02%	13,096	33.28%	26,250	66.72%	18,332	63.57%	9,180	31.83%	1,201	4.16%	126	0.44%
14	8,602	35.58%	14,927	61.74%	643	2.66%	5	0.02%	10,111	42.64%	13,602	57.36%	8,982	59.61%	5,359	35.57%	704	4.67%	22	0.15%
15	5,745	31.82%	11,786	65.27%	520	2.88%	5	0.03%	6,792	38.70%	10,759	61.30%	7,085	63.75%	3,460	31.13%	548	4.93%	20	0.18%
16	15,315	41.05%	21,295	57.08%	692	1.85%	6	0.02%	17,254	47.21%	19,293	52.79%	12,611	51.55%	10,386	42.45%	1,421	5.81%	48	0.20%
17	13,028	30.49%	28,818	67.45%	874	2.05%	4	0.01%	16,102	38.50%	25,725	61.50%	18,597	58.14%	11,618	36.32%	1,730	5.41%	39	0.12%
18	19,993	56.18%	14,447	40.60%	1,136	3.19%	12	0.03%	21,986	63.19%	12,809	36.81%	6,879	33.33%	12,754	61.79%	968	4.69%	39	0.19%
19	13,581	34.41%	24,684	62.54%	1,193	3.02%	10	0.03%	16,131	42.05%	22,234	57.95%	14,029	52.05%	11,412	42.34%	1,465	5.44%	48	0.18%
20	13,683	33.44%	26,066	63.71%	1,152	2.82%	12	0.03%	16,044	40.45%	23,624	59.55%	14,896	53.87%	11,396	41.22%	1,311	4.74%	47	0.17%
21	19,745	56.96%	14,454	41.70%	452	1.30%	11	0.03%	20,965	61.42%	13,169	38.58%	8,748	40.67%	12,105	56.28%	628	2.92%	27	0.13%
22	15,582	44.23%	19,229	54.58%	416	1.18%	5	0.01%	17,375	50.23%	17,215	49.77%	12,626	51.58%	10,662	43.56%	1,142	4.67%	49	0.20%
23	24,490	62.22%	14,521	36.89%	350	0.89%	1	0.00%	25,919	66.94%	12,801	33.06%	8,825	34.89%	15,731	62.19%	722	2.85%	17	0.07%
24	20,058	51.71%	18,288	47.15%	436	1.12%	8	0.02%	21,144	55.44%	16,994	44.56%	11,750	45.62%	13,325	51.74%	657	2.55%	24	0.09%
25	14,682	40.75%	20,622	57.24%	713	1.98%	13	0.04%	16,471	46.60%	18,875	53.40%	13,313	52.56%	10,823	42.73%	1,140	4.50%	53	0.21%
26	13,500	33.28%	26,142	64.45%	911	2.25%	10	0.02%	15,454	38.85%	24,322	61.15%	15,810	59.12%	9,838	36.79%	1,051	3.93%	41	0.15%
27	23,878	65.27%	12,369	33.81%	331	0.90%	4	0.01%	25,041	69.33%	11,076	30.67%	8,198	34.09%	15,190	63.16%	647	2.69%	16	0.07%
28	10,992	32.01%	22,789	66.37%	543	1.58%	10	0.03%	12,762	37.94%	20,879	62.06%	13,798	62.33%	7,356	33.23%	928	4.19%	56	0.25%
29	35,463	77.32%	9,134	19.92%	1,242	2.71%	25	0.05%	37,229	82.66%	7,812	17.34%	4,020	14.49%	23,189	83.60%	503	1.81%	27	0.10%
30	29,080	61.95%	16,637	35.44%	1,215	2.59%	11	0.02%	31,249	67.84%	14,812	32.16%	9,863	30.23%	21,982	67.37%	753	2.31%	30	0.09%
31	31,088	76.24%	8,713	21.37%	943	2.31%	30	0.07%	32,663	81.05%	7,639	18.95%	4,068	16.31%	20,384	81.72%	452	1.81%	39	0.16%
32	24,908	63.00%	14,186	35.88%	438	1.11%	4	0.01%	26,603	68.44%	12,266	31.56%	8,903	33.82%	16,633	63.19%	755	2.87%	32	0.12%
33	25,445	66.50%	11,674	30.51%	1,141	2.98%	4	0.01%	27,554	73.40%	9,985	26.60%	5,471	23.58%	16,926	72.94%	767	3.31%	41	0.18%
34	24,282	50.25%	22,640	46.85%	1,397	2.89%	8	0.02%	27,111	57.30%	20,200	42.70%	13,177	38.96%	19,618	58.00%	973	2.88%	57	0.17%
35	16,375	37.09%	26,734	60.55%	1,029	2.33%	15	0.03%	18,534	42.76%	24,815	57.24%	16,257	53.08%	13,398	43.74%	913	2.98%	61	0.20%
36	16,512	34.84%	29,686	62.64%	1,187	2.50%	8	0.02%	19,356	41.76%	26,991	58.24%	18,484	54.29%	14,562	42.77%	934	2.74%	67	0.20%
37	16,190	36.99%	26,307	60.10%	1,263	2.89%	14	0.03%	18,508	43.32%	24,216	56.68%	16,228	53.28%	13,138	43.13%	1,025	3.37%	68	0.22%
38	27,623	71.36%	10,131	26.17%	944	2.44%	11	0.03%	29,459	77.11%	8,745	22.89%	5,219	22.03%	17,826	75.24%	611	2.58%	37	0.16%
39	26,440	64.76%	13,558	33.21%	822	2.01%	9	0.02%	28,552	70.78%	11,785	29.22%	7,175	27.51%	18,189	69.74%	680	2.61%	38	0.15%
40	17,767	35.02%	31,793	62.66%	1,159	2.28%	16	0.03%	20,489	41.22%	29,213	58.78%	20,170	53.02%	16,914	44.46%	905	2.38%	50	0.13%
41	18,631	44.80%	21,697	52.18%	1,245	2.99%	12	0.03%	21,117	52.18%	19,353	47.82%	12,130	43.17%	15,093	53.71%	826	2.94%	52	0.19%
42	17,657	70.31%	6,879	27.39%	570	2.27%	7	0.03%	18,581	74.83%	6,251	25.17%	3,360	24.76%	9,838	72.50%	356	2.62%	15	0.11%
43	22,155	68.80%	9,319	28.94%	716	2.22%	13	0.04%	23,447	73.52%	8,447	26.48%	5,177	28.30%	12,578	68.77%	504	2.76%	32	0.17%
44	16,575	50.29%	15,604	47.34%	777	2.36%	4	0.01%	18,236	56.47%	14,058	43.53%	9,371	46.34%	10,098	49.94%	724	3.58%	28	0.14%
45	14,293	40.30%	20,508	57.83%	654	1.84%	10	0.03%	16,061	46.10%	18,779	53.90%	12,902	55.12%	9,613	41.07%	862	3.68%	28	0.12%
46	13,148	49.59%	12,865	48.52%	494	1.86%	9	0.03%	14,692	56.79%	11,178	43.21%	8,263	51.41%	6,912	43.00%	864	5.38%	34	0.21%
47	17,474	65.03%	8,923	33.21%	463	1.72%	10	0.04%	19,029	72.21%	7,325	27.79%	6,020	38.81%	8,990	57.95%	483	3.11%	20	0.13%
48	17,506	57.00%	12,512	40.74%	683	2.22%	11	0.04%	18,833	62.60%	11,253	37.40%	8,168	39.86%	11,599	56.60%	702	3.43%	25	0.12%
49	23,039	48.85%	22,573	47.86%	1,529	3.24%	19	0.04%	25,948	56.50%	19,977	43.50%	12,523	38.78%	18,812	58.25%	915	2.83%	44	0.14%
50	22,427	51.96%	19,641	45.50%	1,079	2.50%	17	0.04%	24,273	57.34%	18,057	42.66%	11,936	39.20%	17,598	57.80%	884	2.90%	31	0.10%
51	13,347	41.90%	17,802	55.89%	695	2.18%	9	0.03%	14,890	47.81%	16,254	52.19%	10,309	51.33%	8,824	43.94%	912	4.54%	37	0.18%
52	13,223	32.47%	26,842	65.91%	647	1.59%	13	0.03%	14,727	36.95%	25,133	63.05%	18,117	61.71%	10,299	35.08%	918	3.13%	25	0.09%
53	12,066	36.20%	20,590	61.78%	654	1.96%	18	0.05%	13,884	42.31%	18,933	57.69%	12,290	57.33%	8,229	38.39%	881	4.11%	37	0.17%

District plan definition file: 'HST-1.asc', modified 08/22/2017 08:19:30 PM

Printed 08/22/2017 {rptS03|dc2017HS|re1.3.0}

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections. Votes that could not be associated with a specific precinct were excluded. Reported statewide totals may therefore be marginally lower than official contest results.

HST-1: Governor 2012, Lieutenant Governor 2012, US Senate 2014

	Governor 2012: Dalton-McCrory-Howe								Lieutenant Governor 2012: Coleman-Forest				US Senate 2014: Tillis-Hagan-Haugh							
District	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %
54	23,822	51.27%	21,500	46.27%	1,129	2.43%	13	0.03%	25,713	56.54%	19,767	43.46%	13,798	38.55%	20,947	58.53%	1,010	2.82%	33	0.09%
55	11,895	34.27%	22,352	64.40%	451	1.30%	9	0.03%	14,409	42.63%	19,392	57.37%	12,564	58.22%	8,132	37.68%	825	3.82%	59	0.27%
56	31,425	72.59%	10,387	23.99%	1,442	3.33%	35	0.08%	33,453	79.36%	8,702	20.64%	4,328	14.66%	24,548	83.15%	623	2.11%	25	0.08%
57	33,864	82.21%	6,380	15.49%	935	2.27%	15	0.04%	35,587	87.36%	5,148	12.64%	2,908	12.79%	19,345	85.07%	461	2.03%	27	0.12%
58	25,470	67.33%	11,477	30.34%	871	2.30%	12	0.03%	27,374	73.49%	9,877	26.51%	6,056	26.29%	16,414	71.26%	541	2.35%	23	0.10%
59	16,881	38.35%	26,270	59.68%	842	1.91%	22	0.05%	18,902	43.85%	24,202	56.15%	16,481	54.26%	13,076	43.05%	781	2.57%	38	0.13%
60	21,229	61.82%	12,382	36.06%	716	2.08%	14	0.04%	22,798	67.67%	10,893	32.33%	6,627	32.59%	13,173	64.78%	511	2.51%	23	0.11%
61	16,477	35.08%	29,436	62.67%	1,042	2.22%	13	0.03%	18,890	41.30%	26,843	58.70%	18,586	54.92%	14,369	42.46%	833	2.46%	54	0.16%
62	16,439	35.57%	28,715	62.13%	1,049	2.27%	16	0.03%	18,766	41.64%	26,301	58.36%	17,940	54.18%	14,342	43.32%	788	2.38%	39	0.12%
63	13,645	38.81%	20,703	58.88%	806	2.29%	8	0.02%	15,271	44.34%	19,170	55.66%	12,602	53.40%	9,988	42.32%	965	4.09%	44	0.19%
64	11,979	37.49%	19,341	60.53%	627	1.96%	4	0.01%	13,229	42.12%	18,180	57.88%	11,778	56.82%	8,157	39.35%	765	3.69%	29	0.14%
65	13,513	36.26%	23,056	61.87%	688	1.85%	8	0.02%	15,423	42.41%	20,945	57.59%	14,329	56.93%	9,480	37.67%	1,299	5.16%	61	0.24%
66	14,522	42.14%	19,358	56.17%	559	1.62%	22	0.06%	17,355	52.08%	15,967	47.92%	11,703	49.19%	10,681	44.89%	1,339	5.63%	69	0.29%
67	8,626	21.46%	30,956	77.03%	603	1.50%	3	0.01%	11,850	30.42%	27,101	69.58%	17,588	66.01%	7,449	27.96%	1,520	5.70%	88	0.33%
68	9,603	26.44%	26,124	71.94%	580	1.60%	8	0.02%	12,272	34.62%	23,173	65.38%	14,825	62.65%	8,035	33.95%	726	3.07%	78	0.33%
69	9,500	27.69%	24,180	70.48%	618	1.80%	12	0.03%	12,086	36.26%	21,244	63.74%	12,586	61.65%	7,039	34.48%	713	3.49%	76	0.37%
70	7,067	22.31%	23,955	75.61%	659	2.08%	2	0.01%	8,422	27.16%	22,587	72.84%	13,549	72.21%	4,376	23.32%	811	4.32%	27	0.14%
71	21,632	63.47%	11,608	34.06%	833	2.44%	11	0.03%	23,344	69.85%	10,074	30.15%	5,937	29.94%	13,286	67.01%	564	2.84%	41	0.21%
72	25,032	71.44%	9,442	26.95%	561	1.60%	4	0.01%	26,408	76.70%	8,021	23.30%	4,846	22.84%	15,910	75.00%	431	2.03%	27	0.13%
73	10,246	26.97%	26,893	70.79%	836	2.20%	13	0.03%	12,226	33.12%	24,693	66.88%	16,341	65.28%	7,672	30.65%	958	3.83%	60	0.24%
74	13,727	34.78%	24,886	63.06%	843	2.14%	8	0.02%	15,812	40.97%	22,784	59.03%	14,120	56.55%	10,022	40.14%	765	3.06%	60	0.24%
75	14,574	33.71%	27,740	64.17%	903	2.09%	14	0.03%	16,738	39.66%	25,462	60.34%	16,626	57.24%	11,474	39.50%	896	3.08%	52	0.18%
76	12,284	33.69%	23,538	64.56%	628	1.72%	9	0.02%	14,731	41.42%	20,837	58.58%	12,611	55.12%	8,946	39.10%	1,270	5.55%	51	0.22%
77	9,369	23.42%	29,955	74.88%	668	1.67%	11	0.03%	11,524	29.40%	27,678	70.60%	17,850	66.81%	7,521	28.15%	1,287	4.82%	59	0.22%
78	7,417	21.69%	26,189	76.58%	589	1.72%	2	0.01%	8,545	25.56%	24,890	74.44%	15,703	72.92%	4,853	22.54%	935	4.34%	44	0.20%
79	13,554	37.32%	22,193	61.10%	570	1.57%	4	0.01%	15,469	43.41%	20,162	56.59%	14,708	55.81%	10,339	39.23%	1,201	4.56%	104	0.39%
80	8,280	22.99%	27,024	75.04%	703	1.95%	6	0.02%	10,026	28.42%	25,253	71.58%	15,663	71.58%	5,384	24.61%	804	3.67%	30	0.14%
81	9,478	27.29%	24,476	70.48%	769	2.21%	5	0.01%	11,626	34.16%	22,403	65.84%	13,608	64.41%	6,478	30.66%	994	4.70%	48	0.23%
82	11,819	29.62%	27,372	68.60%	709	1.78%	0	0.00%	15,675	40.46%	23,071	59.54%	13,965	56.43%	9,795	39.58%	921	3.72%	66	0.27%
83	11,196	32.99%	22,088	65.08%	657	1.94%	0	0.00%	14,396	43.66%	18,580	56.34%	10,827	53.84%	8,173	40.65%	1,043	5.19%	65	0.32%
84	10,369	28.17%	25,834	70.19%	594	1.61%	8	0.02%	12,890	35.90%	23,016	64.10%	15,527	61.64%	8,043	31.93%	1,547	6.14%	72	0.29%
85	8,720	26.19%	23,735	71.30%	830	2.49%	4	0.01%	10,049	31.44%	21,909	68.56%	14,353	67.23%	5,803	27.18%	1,155	5.41%	37	0.17%
86	9,894	30.27%	22,179	67.86%	597	1.83%	14	0.04%	12,957	40.71%	18,868	59.29%	12,566	56.86%	8,134	36.81%	1,359	6.15%	39	0.18%
87	8,402	24.08%	25,771	73.84%	726	2.08%	0	0.00%	11,079	32.73%	22,771	67.27%	13,309	63.30%	6,258	29.76%	1,381	6.57%	78	0.37%
88	17,313	53.39%	14,448	44.55%	661	2.04%	6	0.02%	20,458	64.53%	11,246	35.47%	5,661	32.76%	10,988	63.60%	586	3.39%	43	0.25%
89	8,637	25.00%	25,338	73.34%	567	1.64%	8	0.02%	11,035	32.69%	22,717	67.31%	13,875	64.20%	6,526	30.20%	1,153	5.33%	58	0.27%
90	8,837	26.68%	23,568	71.16%	708	2.14%	8	0.02%	10,670	33.28%	21,396	66.72%	14,220	63.55%	6,751	30.17%	1,349	6.03%	56	0.25%
91	9,566	26.04%	26,356	71.75%	798	2.17%	13	0.04%	11,568	32.30%	24,245	67.70%	15,886	66.06%	6,657	27.68%	1,432	5.95%	74	0.31%
92	20,018	59.29%	13,068	38.71%	670	1.98%	6	0.02%	23,272	70.93%	9,539	29.07%	5,082	26.73%	13,373	70.35%	525	2.76%	30	0.16%
93	14,589	36.70%	23,616	59.41%	1,532	3.85%	11	0.03%	17,050	44.54%	21,230	55.46%	13,890	52.47%	11,056	41.76%	1,481	5.59%	47	0.18%
94	8,891	24.23%	27,163	74.02%	638	1.74%	7	0.02%	11,010	30.88%	24,648	69.12%	16,296	66.25%	6,646	27.02%	1,567	6.37%	89	0.36%
95	9,674	24.71%	28,753	73.44%	710	1.81%	15	0.04%	12,828	33.76%	25,174	66.24%	15,725	62.10%	8,257	32.61%	1,255	4.96%	84	0.33%
96	9,710	27.99%	24,383	70.28%	596	1.72%	7	0.02%	12,265	36.11%	21,704	63.89%	13,550	60.40%	7,757	34.58%	1,060	4.73%	65	0.29%
97	8,226	22.44%	27,842	75.96%	582	1.59%	5	0.01%	10,866	30.52%	24,732	69.48%	15,844	66.50%	6,685	28.06%	1,232	5.17%	66	0.28%
98	11,028	26.83%	29,295	71.27%	774	1.88%	7	0.02%	15,043	37.92%	24,623	62.08%	14,436	56.42%	10,325	40.35%	736	2.88%	89	0.35%
99	23,478	69.59%	9,686	28.71%	565	1.67%	7	0.02%	26,192	78.87%	7,017	21.13%	3,532	18.57%	15,086	79.31%	374	1.97%	29	0.15%
100	17,333	55.16%	13,474	42.88%	605	1.93%	12	0.04%	20,399	66.57%	10,245	33.43%	5,518	31.92%	11,202	64.79%	533	3.08%	36	0.21%
101	24,485	65.40%	12,341	32.96%	605	1.62%	7	0.02%	27,310	74.45%	9,370	25.55%	4,873	23.57%	15,262	73.83%	512	2.48%	25	0.12%
102	21,669	68.30%	9,269	29.22%	768	2.42%	18	0.06%	24,802	80.30%	6,085	19.70%	2,896	16.75%	13,858	80.17%	508	2.94%	23	0.13%
103	10,654	25.61%	30,288	72.80%	655	1.57%	9	0.02%	14,826	36.80%	25,459	63.20%	14,931	57.20%	10,396	39.82%	727	2.78%	51	0.20%
104	11,360	24.40%	34,544	74.20%	641	1.38%	13	0.03%	16,834	37.48%	28,079	62.52%	16,733	55.41%	12,697	42.04%	731	2.42%	39	0.13%
105	10,762	26.63%	29,029	71.84%	610	1.51%	6	0.01%	14,930	38.00%	24,356	62.00%	13,516	56.71%	9,683	40.63%	589	2.47%	44	0.18%
106	20,129	62.28%	11,537	35.70%	637	1.97%	17	0.05%	23,095	72.96%	8,561	27.04%	4,035	23.69%	12,601	73.99%	384	2.25%	10	0.06%

District plan definition file: 'HST-1.asc', modified 08/22/2017 08:19:30 PM

Printed 08/22/2017 {rptS03|dc2017HS|re1.3.0}

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections. Votes that could not be associated with a specific precinct were excluded. Reported statewide totals may therefore be marginally lower than official contest results.

HST-1: Governor 2012, Lieutenant Governor 2012, US Senate 2014

	Governor 2012: Dalton-McCrory-Howe								Lieutenant Governor 2012: Coleman-Forest				US Senate 2014: Tillis-Hagan-Haugh							
District	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Write-In**	**Write-In %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Write-In**	**Write-In %**
107	24,066	67.23%	11,223	31.35%	499	1.39%	11	0.03%	26,973	76.68%	8,203	23.32%	4,072	20.43%	15,400	77.28%	420	2.11%	35	0.18%
108	10,229	30.60%	22,641	67.73%	553	1.65%	6	0.02%	12,577	38.66%	19,954	61.34%	11,798	58.37%	7,436	36.79%	940	4.65%	37	0.18%
109	11,675	33.74%	22,419	64.79%	501	1.45%	9	0.03%	13,855	41.00%	19,937	59.00%	12,274	57.67%	8,147	38.28%	804	3.78%	59	0.28%
110	10,188	31.08%	22,150	67.56%	443	1.35%	4	0.01%	11,944	37.40%	19,996	62.60%	12,381	60.75%	6,988	34.29%	961	4.72%	49	0.24%
111	10,978	33.85%	21,002	64.75%	447	1.38%	9	0.03%	12,345	39.08%	19,245	60.92%	12,248	58.87%	7,466	35.89%	1,040	5.00%	50	0.24%
112	13,175	40.49%	18,798	57.78%	552	1.70%	10	0.03%	11,934	37.96%	19,505	62.04%	13,356	60.75%	7,327	33.33%	1,273	5.79%	30	0.14%
113	14,513	34.86%	26,056	62.58%	1,053	2.53%	14	0.03%	15,965	39.13%	24,832	60.87%	17,951	56.94%	12,220	38.76%	1,317	4.18%	39	0.12%
114	30,335	67.66%	12,627	28.17%	1,853	4.13%	17	0.04%	32,363	73.64%	11,584	26.36%	6,689	22.11%	22,389	74.02%	1,142	3.78%	29	0.10%
115	18,992	44.03%	22,839	52.94%	1,300	3.01%	8	0.02%	20,704	48.97%	21,574	51.03%	14,095	45.76%	15,408	50.02%	1,262	4.10%	39	0.13%
116	15,055	39.40%	22,073	57.77%	1,069	2.80%	10	0.03%	16,787	44.87%	20,623	55.13%	13,088	50.68%	11,658	45.14%	1,042	4.03%	38	0.15%
117	12,236	33.12%	23,695	64.13%	1,002	2.71%	14	0.04%	13,677	37.80%	22,505	62.20%	14,898	58.54%	9,518	37.40%	995	3.91%	37	0.15%
118	14,554	39.85%	21,033	57.59%	922	2.52%	13	0.04%	15,851	44.59%	19,698	55.41%	14,379	52.35%	11,489	41.83%	1,537	5.60%	61	0.22%
119	14,498	44.69%	16,886	52.05%	1,054	3.25%	2	0.01%	15,958	50.57%	15,600	49.43%	10,500	46.76%	10,697	47.64%	1,217	5.42%	40	0.18%
120	12,098	31.33%	25,139	65.11%	1,357	3.51%	18	0.05%	13,273	35.22%	24,408	64.78%	18,212	62.59%	9,371	32.21%	1,474	5.07%	40	0.14%
Totals:	**1,925,270**	**43.18%**	**2,437,224**	**54.67%**	**94,512**	**2.12%**	**1,191**	**0.03%**	**2,174,021**	**49.88%**	**2,184,891**	**50.12%**	**1,416,834**	**48.84%**	**1,370,303**	**47.23%**	**108,779**	**3.75%**	**5,251**	**0.18%**

HST-1: President 2016, US Senate 2016, Governor 2016

	US President 2016: Trump-Clinton-Johnson								US Senate 2016: Burr-Ross-Haugh						Governor 2016: Cooper-McCrory-Cecil					
District	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %
1	19,786	54.76%	15,136	41.89%	911	2.52%	299	0.83%	19,533	55.14%	15,008	42.37%	884	2.50%	15,413	43.27%	19,593	55.01%	613	1.72%
2	21,687	56.45%	15,453	40.22%	893	2.32%	385	1.00%	21,503	56.54%	15,299	40.22%	1,232	3.24%	16,542	43.27%	21,035	55.02%	656	1.72%
3	19,500	57.51%	13,102	38.64%	958	2.83%	350	1.03%	19,722	58.75%	12,526	37.32%	1,320	3.93%	13,284	39.49%	19,645	58.40%	709	2.11%
4	19,316	63.27%	10,515	34.44%	536	1.76%	163	0.53%	18,844	62.77%	10,197	33.97%	978	3.26%	10,515	34.80%	19,240	63.67%	463	1.53%
5	12,874	39.52%	19,159	58.81%	396	1.22%	151	0.46%	12,767	39.95%	18,574	58.12%	617	1.93%	18,480	57.49%	13,377	41.61%	288	0.90%
6	26,166	63.13%	13,548	32.69%	1,322	3.19%	413	1.00%	25,754	63.45%	13,548	33.38%	1,290	3.18%	14,719	36.08%	25,069	61.45%	1,010	2.48%
7	17,731	44.94%	20,836	52.81%	588	1.49%	299	0.76%	17,965	45.70%	20,621	52.45%	729	1.85%	21,877	55.47%	17,171	43.54%	389	0.99%
8	11,251	32.48%	22,166	63.99%	878	2.53%	346	1.00%	11,920	34.87%	21,238	62.12%	1,030	3.01%	21,791	63.50%	11,949	34.82%	577	1.68%
9	20,103	53.26%	16,101	42.66%	1,112	2.95%	426	1.13%	20,913	55.89%	15,376	41.09%	1,129	3.02%	16,546	44.07%	20,375	54.27%	626	1.67%
10	24,292	66.90%	11,079	30.51%	680	1.87%	258	0.71%	24,011	66.82%	10,937	30.44%	984	2.74%	11,524	31.87%	24,183	66.89%	449	1.24%
11	13,097	31.16%	26,165	62.26%	1,893	4.50%	873	2.08%	14,675	35.17%	25,423	60.93%	1,628	3.90%	27,513	65.67%	13,139	31.36%	1,242	2.96%
12	17,784	51.92%	15,657	45.71%	569	1.66%	241	0.70%	17,668	52.25%	15,240	45.07%	906	2.68%	15,523	45.65%	18,084	53.18%	397	1.17%
13	29,527	68.85%	11,999	27.98%	967	2.25%	396	0.92%	29,080	68.53%	11,666	27.49%	1,685	3.97%	12,730	29.84%	29,076	68.17%	849	1.99%
14	16,391	60.55%	9,442	34.88%	949	3.51%	289	1.07%	16,089	60.41%	9,134	34.30%	1,410	5.29%	9,540	35.73%	16,350	61.23%	813	3.04%
15	13,635	66.87%	5,838	28.63%	701	3.44%	217	1.06%	13,255	66.19%	5,709	28.51%	1,061	5.30%	6,115	30.44%	13,366	66.54%	606	3.02%
16	24,723	60.82%	14,793	36.39%	868	2.14%	267	0.66%	24,021	60.12%	14,359	35.94%	1,578	3.95%	15,806	39.44%	23,414	58.42%	858	2.14%
17	33,539	64.40%	16,832	32.32%	1,227	2.36%	480	0.92%	32,987	64.27%	16,223	31.61%	2,112	4.12%	18,326	35.57%	32,038	62.18%	1,162	2.26%
18	14,960	39.11%	21,515	56.25%	1,247	3.26%	530	1.39%	15,065	40.15%	20,714	55.20%	1,747	4.66%	22,540	59.77%	14,028	37.20%	1,146	3.04%
19	24,349	55.45%	17,494	39.84%	1,461	3.33%	604	1.38%	24,444	56.44%	16,799	38.79%	2,068	4.77%	19,932	45.80%	22,351	51.36%	1,232	2.83%
20	25,197	54.81%	18,393	40.01%	1,731	3.77%	651	1.42%	25,753	56.83%	17,604	38.84%	1,962	4.33%	20,831	45.79%	23,400	51.43%	1,266	2.78%
21	13,185	40.91%	18,296	56.77%	504	1.56%	241	0.75%	13,302	41.79%	17,819	55.99%	706	2.22%	18,015	56.37%	13,529	42.34%	412	1.29%
22	20,673	57.99%	14,263	40.01%	514	1.44%	197	0.55%	20,313	57.79%	14,021	39.89%	817	2.32%	14,526	41.04%	20,479	57.86%	392	1.11%
23	14,143	38.43%	22,040	59.88%	449	1.22%	173	0.47%	14,165	38.89%	21,496	59.02%	760	2.09%	21,917	59.87%	14,389	39.30%	303	0.83%
24	17,531	45.97%	19,663	51.56%	667	1.75%	274	0.72%	17,641	46.58%	19,435	51.32%	794	2.10%	20,471	53.84%	17,161	45.13%	391	1.03%
25	21,956	56.91%	15,273	39.59%	939	2.43%	411	1.07%	21,764	56.74%	15,352	40.02%	1,242	3.24%	16,618	43.12%	21,215	55.05%	707	1.83%
26	28,331	59.78%	17,038	35.95%	1,483	3.13%	543	1.15%	28,339	60.24%	16,928	35.98%	1,777	3.78%	18,695	39.57%	27,607	58.43%	947	2.00%
27	12,504	36.17%	21,573	62.40%	373	1.08%	123	0.36%	12,390	36.15%	21,326	62.22%	557	1.63%	21,783	63.37%	12,336	35.89%	256	0.74%
28	24,528	66.08%	11,430	30.79%	876	2.36%	284	0.77%	24,192	65.72%	11,427	31.04%	1,192	3.24%	12,526	33.84%	23,877	64.50%	616	1.66%
29	5,172	10.88%	40,386	84.99%	1,171	2.46%	787	1.66%	7,072	15.00%	39,112	82.96%	964	2.04%	40,387	85.64%	6,009	12.74%	761	1.61%
30	13,282	26.62%	34,511	69.18%	1,265	2.54%	829	1.66%	14,956	30.09%	33,506	67.41%	1,242	2.50%	35,040	70.35%	13,947	28.00%	818	1.64%
31	7,429	16.37%	36,169	79.69%	1,136	2.50%	654	1.44%	8,466	18.76%	35,558	78.81%	1,092	2.42%	36,387	80.47%	8,063	17.83%	770	1.70%
32	13,636	35.53%	23,937	62.37%	563	1.47%	241	0.63%	13,731	36.10%	23,622	62.10%	683	1.80%	24,127	63.21%	13,643	35.74%	401	1.05%
33	9,320	22.99%	29,204	72.05%	1,399	3.45%	610	1.50%	10,337	25.71%	28,598	71.13%	1,272	3.16%	29,984	74.32%	9,429	23.37%	934	2.31%
34	16,734	33.58%	30,202	60.61%	1,879	3.77%	1,011	2.03%	19,537	39.31%	28,698	57.74%	1,464	2.95%	31,726	63.65%	17,066	34.24%	1,052	2.11%
35	25,508	49.09%	23,630	45.47%	1,744	3.36%	1,082	2.08%	27,262	52.81%	22,718	44.01%	1,638	3.17%	25,059	48.33%	25,740	49.64%	1,054	2.03%
36	25,495	49.78%	22,974	44.86%	1,903	3.72%	846	1.65%	27,500	53.89%	21,900	42.91%	1,632	3.20%	24,574	47.98%	25,611	50.00%	1,036	2.02%
37	26,427	49.66%	23,556	44.27%	2,295	4.31%	936	1.76%	28,468	53.86%	22,487	42.55%	1,896	3.59%	25,376	47.79%	26,351	49.63%	1,369	2.58%
38	7,962	20.17%	29,883	75.70%	1,056	2.67%	577	1.46%	8,744	22.30%	29,341	74.83%	1,126	2.87%	30,111	76.58%	8,383	21.32%	825	2.10%
39	11,720	27.17%	29,742	68.94%	1,134	2.63%	547	1.27%	12,360	28.82%	29,304	68.32%	1,230	2.87%	30,194	70.17%	12,076	28.06%	760	1.77%
40	25,414	46.70%	25,912	47.62%	2,113	3.88%	976	1.79%	28,593	52.66%	24,242	44.65%	1,463	2.69%	27,552	50.59%	25,895	47.55%	1,016	1.87%
41	17,367	35.18%	29,148	59.04%	1,982	4.01%	876	1.77%	20,218	41.31%	27,134	55.45%	1,585	3.24%	29,804	60.65%	18,119	36.87%	1,218	2.48%
42	6,364	25.50%	17,674	70.81%	647	2.59%	274	1.10%	6,643	26.97%	17,141	69.60%	845	3.43%	17,092	69.47%	6,886	27.99%	627	2.55%
43	8,099	26.20%	21,704	70.20%	798	2.58%	317	1.03%	8,364	27.40%	21,127	69.21%	1,035	3.39%	21,109	69.10%	8,700	28.48%	740	2.42%
44	14,477	44.27%	16,935	51.79%	961	2.94%	329	1.01%	14,728	45.60%	16,387	50.74%	1,184	3.67%	16,797	51.88%	14,827	45.80%	750	2.32%
45	22,325	57.35%	15,292	39.28%	967	2.48%	343	0.88%	22,167	57.66%	15,078	39.22%	1,202	3.13%	15,451	40.04%	22,349	57.91%	792	2.05%
46	16,046	61.47%	9,544	36.56%	396	1.52%	116	0.44%	15,195	59.76%	9,522	37.45%	708	2.78%	9,625	37.45%	15,778	61.39%	300	1.17%
47	11,779	46.41%	12,896	50.81%	520	2.05%	186	0.73%	11,277	45.82%	12,909	52.46%	423	1.72%	12,419	49.71%	12,346	49.42%	216	0.86%
48	14,016	43.58%	17,045	53.00%	831	2.58%	266	0.83%	13,782	43.73%	16,722	53.06%	1,010	3.20%	17,039	53.91%	13,890	43.94%	679	2.15%
49	17,038	32.50%	32,320	61.64%	2,062	3.93%	1,012	1.93%	20,095	38.54%	30,441	58.39%	1,600	3.07%	33,662	64.28%	17,547	33.51%	1,158	2.21%
50	18,683	40.92%	25,213	55.22%	1,226	2.69%	539	1.18%	19,535	43.06%	24,526	54.06%	1,309	2.89%	26,259	57.73%	18,414	40.49%	810	1.78%
51	18,556	54.99%	13,829	40.98%	1,027	3.04%	332	0.98%	18,319	54.87%	13,803	41.34%	1,264	3.79%	14,919	44.49%	17,772	53.00%	840	2.51%
52	26,508	61.46%	14,902	34.55%	1,240	2.87%	482	1.12%	26,850	62.67%	14,595	34.07%	1,396	3.26%	16,149	37.60%	25,907	60.32%	893	2.08%

HST-1: President 2016, US Senate 2016, Governor 2016

	US President 2016: Trump-Clinton-Johnson								US Senate 2016: Burr-Ross-Haugh						Governor 2016: Cooper-McCrory-Cecil					
District	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Write-In	Write-In %	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %	Lib	Lib %
53	21,436	60.85%	12,611	35.80%	852	2.42%	328	0.93%	21,212	60.60%	12,628	36.08%	1,164	3.33%	13,300	37.93%	21,064	60.08%	697	1.99%
54	19,492	37.13%	30,645	58.38%	1,545	2.94%	809	1.54%	21,169	40.48%	29,679	56.76%	1,444	2.76%	31,838	60.66%	19,672	37.48%	979	1.87%
55	22,840	63.50%	12,002	33.37%	788	2.19%	336	0.93%	22,508	63.37%	11,758	33.10%	1,252	3.52%	12,330	34.49%	22,863	63.95%	559	1.56%
56	5,901	12.36%	39,502	82.73%	1,392	2.92%	955	2.00%	8,341	17.60%	38,022	80.24%	1,021	2.15%	40,120	84.53%	6,502	13.70%	838	1.77%
57	4,869	12.13%	33,975	84.62%	785	1.96%	523	1.30%	5,571	14.07%	33,051	83.48%	968	2.45%	33,866	85.39%	5,062	12.76%	733	1.85%
58	8,963	23.57%	27,663	72.74%	918	2.41%	485	1.28%	9,437	25.12%	26,960	71.78%	1,164	3.10%	28,097	74.57%	8,759	23.25%	823	2.18%
59	25,507	54.53%	19,758	42.24%	1,056	2.26%	457	0.98%	25,592	55.15%	19,403	41.81%	1,411	3.04%	21,420	45.98%	24,237	52.03%	926	1.99%
60	10,484	30.27%	22,918	66.17%	880	2.54%	353	1.02%	10,935	32.03%	22,058	64.61%	1,148	3.36%	23,295	68.08%	10,105	29.53%	819	2.39%
61	24,185	49.68%	22,193	45.59%	1,552	3.19%	752	1.54%	25,701	53.16%	21,118	43.68%	1,528	3.16%	24,221	49.98%	23,168	47.80%	1,075	2.22%
62	23,811	49.23%	22,262	46.02%	1,540	3.18%	757	1.57%	25,865	53.72%	20,867	43.34%	1,417	2.94%	24,295	50.38%	22,926	47.54%	1,000	2.07%
63	19,745	52.91%	16,215	43.45%	964	2.58%	397	1.06%	20,099	54.24%	15,711	42.39%	1,249	3.37%	17,448	46.93%	19,042	51.22%	687	1.85%
64	19,070	56.36%	13,618	40.25%	831	2.46%	317	0.94%	19,281	57.45%	13,162	39.22%	1,119	3.33%	14,584	43.35%	18,459	54.87%	596	1.77%
65	23,874	63.29%	12,795	33.92%	751	1.99%	301	0.80%	23,327	62.41%	12,731	34.06%	1,321	3.53%	14,611	38.98%	22,135	59.06%	733	1.96%
66	20,464	58.60%	13,653	39.10%	620	1.78%	185	0.53%	19,321	56.30%	13,692	39.90%	1,306	3.81%	14,777	42.68%	19,284	55.70%	563	1.63%
67	31,718	72.39%	10,662	24.33%	1,050	2.40%	388	0.89%	30,606	70.44%	10,682	24.58%	2,164	4.98%	12,115	27.72%	30,663	70.17%	921	2.11%
68	25,357	58.90%	15,581	36.19%	1,519	3.53%	593	1.38%	26,537	62.36%	14,300	33.60%	1,717	4.03%	16,268	38.02%	25,525	59.65%	1,000	2.34%
69	23,008	61.78%	12,620	33.89%	1,151	3.09%	461	1.24%	23,224	63.20%	11,858	32.27%	1,667	4.54%	13,180	35.64%	22,857	61.81%	941	2.54%
70	25,245	74.51%	7,544	22.27%	779	2.30%	312	0.92%	24,601	73.23%	7,505	22.34%	1,490	4.44%	9,245	27.45%	23,609	70.11%	821	2.44%
71	9,228	26.65%	23,827	68.81%	1,064	3.07%	510	1.47%	10,380	30.23%	22,857	66.56%	1,102	3.21%	24,376	70.96%	9,143	26.62%	831	2.42%
72	6,795	19.73%	26,406	76.67%	805	2.34%	436	1.27%	8,321	24.36%	25,110	73.50%	730	2.14%	26,382	77.32%	7,107	20.83%	631	1.85%
73	25,744	64.55%	12,400	31.09%	1,183	2.97%	558	1.40%	26,690	67.24%	11,644	29.33%	1,362	3.43%	14,295	35.92%	24,646	61.93%	854	2.15%
74	22,992	54.52%	17,297	41.02%	1,322	3.13%	559	1.33%	23,918	57.09%	16,460	39.29%	1,518	3.62%	19,049	45.40%	21,902	52.20%	1,008	2.40%
75	25,112	56.02%	17,682	39.45%	1,399	3.12%	630	1.41%	26,414	59.14%	16,750	37.50%	1,499	3.36%	19,607	43.87%	24,064	53.84%	1,022	2.29%
76	23,064	61.73%	13,031	34.87%	877	2.35%	393	1.05%	22,286	60.33%	12,833	34.74%	1,819	4.92%	14,249	38.34%	21,950	59.07%	961	2.59%
77	30,333	72.00%	10,259	24.35%	1,103	2.62%	434	1.03%	29,715	71.11%	10,106	24.19%	1,965	4.70%	12,186	29.04%	28,782	68.58%	1,000	2.38%
78	28,166	77.69%	7,076	19.52%	739	2.04%	272	0.75%	27,319	76.13%	7,166	19.97%	1,402	3.91%	8,771	24.33%	26,543	73.63%	737	2.04%
79	22,774	61.50%	13,292	35.90%	678	1.83%	285	0.77%	22,332	61.14%	12,865	35.22%	1,328	3.64%	13,385	36.39%	22,891	62.23%	509	1.38%
80	28,033	74.04%	8,623	22.78%	918	2.42%	287	0.76%	27,677	73.76%	8,454	22.53%	1,394	3.71%	10,385	27.55%	26,519	70.35%	793	2.10%
81	26,284	71.05%	9,486	25.64%	941	2.54%	284	0.77%	25,858	70.60%	9,299	25.39%	1,469	4.01%	11,560	31.43%	24,341	66.17%	883	2.40%
82	25,226	55.52%	18,186	40.03%	1,438	3.16%	585	1.29%	25,508	56.72%	17,410	38.71%	2,053	4.57%	19,329	42.73%	24,713	54.63%	1,191	2.63%
83	20,902	57.22%	14,146	38.72%	1,046	2.86%	436	1.19%	20,485	56.66%	13,780	38.12%	1,887	5.22%	15,101	41.54%	20,226	55.63%	1,030	2.83%
84	25,864	67.41%	11,302	29.46%	842	2.19%	358	0.93%	24,946	65.81%	11,099	29.28%	1,862	4.91%	12,373	32.46%	24,857	65.22%	885	2.32%
85	27,148	74.95%	7,952	21.95%	700	1.93%	421	1.16%	25,691	72.23%	8,320	23.39%	1,555	4.37%	9,999	27.89%	24,896	69.44%	959	2.67%
86	23,049	66.31%	10,412	29.95%	895	2.57%	404	1.16%	22,151	64.58%	10,580	30.84%	1,571	4.58%	12,309	35.59%	21,505	62.18%	773	2.23%
87	26,621	73.29%	8,427	23.20%	849	2.34%	425	1.17%	25,537	71.08%	8,542	23.78%	1,847	5.14%	10,059	27.82%	25,176	69.62%	927	2.56%
88	11,487	31.37%	23,378	63.84%	1,245	3.40%	512	1.40%	12,363	34.22%	22,148	61.30%	1,621	4.49%	23,338	64.34%	11,852	32.67%	1,085	2.99%
89	25,622	70.69%	9,396	25.92%	904	2.49%	322	0.89%	24,664	68.94%	9,348	26.13%	1,762	4.93%	10,714	29.78%	24,387	67.78%	880	2.45%
90	26,850	74.48%	8,079	22.41%	799	2.22%	322	0.89%	26,027	73.03%	8,190	22.98%	1,420	3.98%	10,364	28.89%	24,799	69.14%	706	1.97%
91	29,074	74.71%	8,544	21.95%	943	2.42%	357	0.92%	28,358	73.39%	8,684	22.48%	1,596	4.13%	11,102	28.68%	26,734	69.05%	879	2.27%
92	8,920	23.83%	26,524	70.85%	1,470	3.93%	521	1.39%	10,746	29.20%	24,677	67.05%	1,383	3.76%	26,564	71.76%	9,507	25.68%	947	2.56%
93	23,108	53.24%	17,638	40.63%	1,667	3.84%	994	2.29%	23,511	54.86%	17,413	40.63%	1,936	4.52%	19,952	46.21%	21,906	50.74%	1,316	3.05%
94	29,129	74.62%	8,650	22.16%	894	2.29%	364	0.93%	27,999	72.49%	8,824	22.84%	1,803	4.67%	10,585	27.17%	27,561	70.75%	809	2.08%
95	28,890	65.36%	13,432	30.39%	1,343	3.04%	536	1.21%	28,179	64.55%	13,088	29.98%	2,386	5.47%	16,212	37.00%	26,066	59.50%	1,534	3.50%
96	22,685	62.88%	11,805	32.72%	1,069	2.96%	516	1.43%	22,549	63.28%	11,383	31.95%	1,699	4.77%	13,036	36.38%	21,866	61.02%	935	2.61%
97	28,804	71.97%	9,897	24.73%	971	2.43%	349	0.87%	27,868	70.41%	9,798	24.76%	1,913	4.83%	11,331	28.44%	27,557	69.16%	959	2.41%
98	24,388	51.54%	20,350	43.01%	1,862	3.94%	714	1.51%	26,049	55.74%	18,824	40.28%	1,864	3.99%	22,765	48.54%	22,553	48.09%	1,578	3.36%
99	6,628	19.07%	26,877	77.31%	830	2.39%	430	1.24%	7,073	20.60%	26,097	76.00%	1,169	3.40%	26,426	76.70%	7,280	21.13%	749	2.17%
100	9,065	29.00%	20,731	66.33%	994	3.18%	465	1.49%	9,754	31.61%	19,803	64.18%	1,297	4.20%	20,677	66.67%	9,505	30.65%	830	2.68%
101	8,930	22.86%	28,642	73.33%	994	2.54%	491	1.26%	9,615	24.91%	27,574	71.43%	1,414	3.66%	28,397	73.33%	9,359	24.17%	969	2.50%
102	5,292	16.06%	25,980	78.86%	1,162	3.53%	511	1.55%	6,327	19.52%	24,761	76.39%	1,328	4.10%	26,109	80.03%	5,584	17.12%	931	2.85%
103	22,701	52.01%	18,642	42.71%	1,539	3.53%	769	1.76%	24,458	56.51%	17,208	39.76%	1,617	3.74%	19,220	44.13%	23,328	53.56%	1,003	2.30%
104	20,925	43.85%	23,772	49.82%	1,932	4.05%	1,089	2.28%	25,905	54.36%	20,414	42.84%	1,332	2.80%	24,093	50.36%	22,791	47.64%	955	2.00%
105	20,052	47.27%	20,155	47.52%	1,504	3.55%	705	1.66%	22,414	53.33%	18,049	42.94%	1,569	3.73%	20,512	48.58%	20,692	49.00%	1,021	2.42%

District plan definition file: 'HST-1.asc', modified 08/22/2017 08:19:30 PM

Printed 08/22/2017 {rptS04|dc2017HS|re1.3.0}

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections. Votes that could not be associated with a specific precinct were excluded. Reported statewide totals may therefore be marginally lower than official contest results.

HST-1: President 2016, US Senate 2016, Governor 2016

	US President 2016: Trump-Clinton-Johnson								US Senate 2016: Burr-Ross-Haugh						Governor 2016: Cooper-McCrory-Cecil					
District	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Write-In**	**Write-In %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**	**Dem**	**Dem %**	**Rep**	**Rep %**	**Lib**	**Lib %**
106	7,622	22.42%	24,886	73.20%	952	2.80%	539	1.59%	8,421	25.05%	24,052	71.55%	1,145	3.41%	24,815	73.54%	8,084	23.96%	846	2.51%
107	7,868	21.04%	28,142	75.25%	886	2.37%	500	1.34%	8,416	22.77%	27,293	73.84%	1,251	3.38%	27,988	75.41%	8,221	22.15%	903	2.43%
108	21,977	61.91%	12,155	34.24%	963	2.71%	405	1.14%	21,400	61.05%	11,934	34.04%	1,722	4.91%	13,133	37.22%	21,326	60.44%	824	2.34%
109	21,849	58.81%	13,856	37.29%	1,026	2.76%	424	1.14%	21,752	59.21%	13,385	36.43%	1,600	4.36%	14,614	39.57%	21,473	58.14%	845	2.29%
110	23,363	67.95%	10,064	29.27%	685	1.99%	272	0.79%	22,465	66.14%	10,103	29.74%	1,399	4.12%	11,006	32.21%	22,520	65.90%	648	1.90%
111	23,088	67.78%	10,066	29.55%	621	1.82%	290	0.85%	22,172	65.93%	10,185	30.29%	1,272	3.78%	11,069	32.68%	22,235	65.64%	569	1.68%
112	25,060	72.71%	8,351	24.23%	717	2.08%	339	0.98%	23,380	69.04%	9,131	26.96%	1,353	4.00%	10,575	31.07%	22,633	66.49%	831	2.44%
113	27,846	61.60%	15,495	34.27%	1,152	2.55%	715	1.58%	27,107	60.73%	15,907	35.64%	1,619	3.63%	17,776	39.74%	25,806	57.69%	1,150	2.57%
114	10,675	21.88%	35,226	72.20%	1,424	2.92%	1,464	3.00%	10,943	22.71%	35,335	73.32%	1,918	3.98%	36,921	76.30%	9,880	20.42%	1,589	3.28%
115	22,578	48.02%	21,856	46.49%	1,453	3.09%	1,127	2.40%	22,563	48.39%	22,221	47.66%	1,839	3.94%	24,377	52.10%	21,034	44.95%	1,382	2.95%
116	22,462	52.07%	18,367	42.57%	1,409	3.27%	903	2.09%	22,583	52.90%	18,335	42.95%	1,776	4.16%	20,574	48.00%	20,962	48.91%	1,323	3.09%
117	25,251	60.45%	14,625	35.01%	1,235	2.96%	660	1.58%	24,962	60.51%	14,605	35.40%	1,688	4.09%	16,583	40.08%	23,567	56.96%	1,227	2.97%
118	25,826	63.62%	13,002	32.03%	1,152	2.84%	616	1.52%	24,143	60.30%	14,050	35.09%	1,845	4.61%	16,169	40.08%	22,971	56.94%	1,202	2.98%
119	19,623	54.48%	14,434	40.08%	1,323	3.67%	637	1.77%	18,853	53.03%	15,016	42.24%	1,683	4.73%	17,194	48.15%	17,362	48.62%	1,156	3.24%
120	30,691	72.91%	9,871	23.45%	1,030	2.45%	501	1.19%	28,591	69.53%	10,931	26.58%	1,600	3.89%	12,825	31.06%	27,221	65.92%	1,249	3.02%
Totals:	**2,359,749**	**49.90%**	**2,180,316**	**46.10%**	**129,929**	**2.75%**	**59,397**	**1.26%**	**2,392,439**	**51.13%**	**2,119,696**	**45.30%**	**167,190**	**3.57%**	**2,300,381**	**48.95%**	**2,296,039**	**48.86%**	**102,729**	**2.19%**

HST-1: Lieutenant Governor 2016, Attorney General 2016

	Lieutenant Governor 2016: Forest-Coleman-Cole						Attorney General 2016: Stein-Newton			
District	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %
1	19,197	54.65%	15,053	42.86%	875	2.49%	15,882	46.04%	18,616	53.96%
2	21,550	57.60%	15,020	40.15%	840	2.25%	17,015	46.07%	19,917	53.93%
3	19,362	58.56%	12,769	38.62%	932	2.82%	13,595	41.50%	19,163	58.50%
4	18,524	62.83%	10,278	34.86%	683	2.32%	11,259	38.68%	17,851	61.32%
5	12,179	38.67%	18,855	59.87%	461	1.46%	19,360	62.27%	11,728	37.73%
6	24,969	62.46%	13,748	34.39%	1,261	3.15%	14,523	36.89%	24,849	63.11%
7	17,898	45.87%	20,551	52.67%	567	1.45%	21,475	55.06%	17,527	44.94%
8	11,543	34.32%	21,250	63.17%	844	2.51%	22,114	66.21%	11,285	33.79%
9	20,567	55.82%	15,300	41.53%	978	2.65%	16,594	45.44%	19,925	54.56%
10	24,002	67.76%	10,809	30.52%	609	1.72%	12,118	34.50%	23,009	65.50%
11	14,610	35.67%	24,541	59.92%	1,805	4.41%	26,983	66.46%	13,616	33.54%
12	17,425	52.08%	15,430	46.12%	602	1.80%	16,317	49.26%	16,804	50.74%
13	28,811	68.95%	11,868	28.40%	1,107	2.65%	12,793	30.86%	28,667	69.14%
14	15,667	60.14%	9,239	35.46%	1,146	4.40%	10,094	39.18%	15,668	60.82%
15	13,102	66.99%	5,648	28.88%	809	4.14%	6,333	32.79%	12,978	67.21%
16	24,001	61.02%	14,369	36.53%	963	2.45%	16,456	42.25%	22,490	57.75%
17	33,147	65.60%	16,131	31.92%	1,254	2.48%	19,137	38.21%	30,944	61.79%
18	15,040	40.84%	20,340	55.23%	1,451	3.94%	22,453	61.46%	14,080	38.54%
19	24,414	57.61%	16,318	38.51%	1,644	3.88%	19,234	45.77%	22,791	54.23%
20	25,574	57.77%	17,001	38.41%	1,690	3.82%	19,782	45.08%	24,099	54.92%
21	13,077	41.70%	17,726	56.53%	555	1.77%	18,648	60.01%	12,425	39.99%
22	19,677	56.99%	14,268	41.32%	582	1.69%	15,457	45.16%	18,773	54.84%
23	13,735	38.22%	21,664	60.28%	537	1.49%	22,629	63.31%	13,112	36.69%
24	17,614	46.94%	19,307	51.45%	603	1.61%	20,220	53.88%	17,311	46.12%
25	21,930	57.78%	15,216	40.09%	806	2.12%	16,847	44.72%	20,823	55.28%
26	28,746	61.91%	16,368	35.25%	1,320	2.84%	18,588	40.38%	27,446	59.62%
27	12,111	35.73%	21,357	63.01%	427	1.26%	22,185	65.86%	11,500	34.14%
28	24,565	67.45%	11,008	30.23%	846	2.32%	12,925	35.85%	23,132	64.15%
29	6,887	14.85%	38,300	82.61%	1,175	2.53%	39,832	86.28%	6,334	13.72%
30	14,967	30.49%	32,969	67.17%	1,147	2.34%	34,972	71.69%	13,809	28.31%
31	8,325	18.63%	35,107	78.57%	1,251	2.80%	36,433	81.98%	8,009	18.02%
32	13,338	35.53%	23,613	62.89%	594	1.58%	24,809	66.54%	12,475	33.46%
33	10,371	26.19%	27,861	70.35%	1,374	3.47%	29,565	75.35%	9,670	24.65%
34	19,459	39.75%	27,910	57.01%	1,588	3.24%	31,124	64.08%	17,447	35.92%
35	27,844	54.51%	21,849	42.78%	1,385	2.71%	24,423	48.43%	26,006	51.57%
36	27,546	54.81%	21,270	42.32%	1,440	2.87%	23,809	47.79%	26,015	52.21%
37	28,328	54.54%	21,888	42.14%	1,726	3.32%	24,325	47.28%	27,127	52.72%
38	8,817	22.74%	28,787	74.25%	1,168	3.01%	30,185	78.67%	8,182	21.33%
39	12,285	28.91%	29,153	68.59%	1,063	2.50%	30,320	72.01%	11,788	27.99%
40	28,809	53.80%	23,287	43.49%	1,455	2.72%	26,404	49.83%	26,588	50.17%
41	19,854	41.44%	26,406	55.12%	1,645	3.43%	28,681	60.41%	18,799	39.59%
42	6,383	26.30%	16,996	70.03%	891	3.67%	17,644	73.09%	6,497	26.91%
43	8,192	27.18%	20,960	69.55%	985	3.27%	21,834	72.91%	8,112	27.09%
44	14,388	45.35%	16,265	51.27%	1,074	3.39%	17,572	55.64%	14,009	44.36%
45	21,770	57.53%	14,903	39.38%	1,170	3.09%	16,323	43.39%	21,299	56.61%
46	14,441	57.97%	9,982	40.07%	487	1.96%	11,292	45.85%	13,335	54.15%
47	9,967	41.61%	13,476	56.25%	513	2.14%	14,324	60.47%	9,364	39.53%
48	13,005	42.20%	16,855	54.69%	958	3.11%	17,475	57.21%	13,069	42.79%
49	19,852	38.75%	29,600	57.78%	1,780	3.47%	32,796	64.39%	18,138	35.61%
50	19,497	43.57%	24,182	54.04%	1,066	2.38%	26,089	58.72%	18,339	41.28%
51	18,400	55.76%	13,619	41.27%	982	2.98%	15,312	46.95%	17,303	53.05%
52	26,962	63.92%	14,147	33.54%	1,075	2.55%	15,745	37.70%	26,021	62.30%

HST-1: Lieutenant Governor 2016, Attorney General 2016

	Lieutenant Governor 2016: Forest-Coleman-Cole						Attorney General 2016: Stein-Newton			
District	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %
53	21,328	61.54%	12,493	36.05%	835	2.41%	13,900	40.45%	20,460	59.55%
54	21,038	40.77%	29,281	56.74%	1,285	2.49%	31,512	61.45%	19,770	38.55%
55	22,921	65.35%	11,444	32.63%	707	2.02%	13,375	38.47%	21,391	61.53%
56	8,019	17.31%	36,854	79.55%	1,455	3.14%	38,609	83.76%	7,487	16.24%
57	5,185	13.28%	32,626	83.59%	1,221	3.13%	33,561	86.54%	5,219	13.46%
58	9,287	25.04%	26,651	71.86%	1,150	3.10%	27,954	75.69%	8,977	24.31%
59	25,437	55.49%	19,257	42.01%	1,150	2.51%	21,109	46.33%	24,449	53.67%
60	10,658	31.74%	21,827	65.01%	1,092	3.25%	23,010	68.91%	10,383	31.09%
61	25,459	53.65%	20,630	43.47%	1,366	2.88%	22,996	48.67%	24,252	51.33%
62	25,436	53.83%	20,543	43.48%	1,270	2.69%	22,809	48.55%	24,175	51.45%
63	20,032	54.75%	15,433	42.18%	1,125	3.07%	17,264	47.50%	19,085	52.50%
64	19,368	58.48%	12,814	38.69%	936	2.83%	14,428	43.87%	18,457	56.13%
65	22,925	62.41%	12,935	35.21%	874	2.38%	14,435	39.54%	22,070	60.46%
66	19,049	56.66%	13,778	40.98%	794	2.36%	15,495	46.44%	17,870	53.56%
67	31,501	73.63%	10,168	23.77%	1,114	2.60%	12,822	30.24%	29,581	69.76%
68	27,015	64.52%	13,606	32.49%	1,252	2.99%	15,674	37.79%	25,803	62.21%
69	23,744	65.63%	11,331	31.32%	1,104	3.05%	13,327	37.18%	22,517	62.82%
70	24,712	74.71%	7,488	22.64%	879	2.66%	8,822	26.83%	24,059	73.17%
71	9,831	29.19%	22,738	67.51%	1,114	3.31%	24,171	72.07%	9,367	27.93%
72	7,738	23.10%	24,959	74.51%	800	2.39%	26,121	78.27%	7,254	21.73%
73	26,437	67.76%	11,626	29.80%	951	2.44%	13,736	35.45%	25,011	64.55%
74	23,675	57.44%	16,356	39.68%	1,189	2.88%	18,577	45.30%	22,428	54.70%
75	26,030	59.30%	16,599	37.82%	1,263	2.88%	19,028	43.58%	24,635	56.42%
76	22,655	62.28%	12,646	34.76%	1,076	2.96%	14,921	41.29%	21,213	58.71%
77	30,027	73.04%	9,965	24.24%	1,120	2.72%	12,267	30.01%	28,609	69.99%
78	27,573	77.81%	7,048	19.89%	814	2.30%	8,576	24.38%	26,597	75.62%
79	22,124	61.39%	13,157	36.51%	760	2.11%	14,148	39.62%	21,559	60.38%
80	27,461	74.39%	8,544	23.14%	912	2.47%	9,959	27.05%	26,856	72.95%
81	25,744	71.35%	9,365	25.95%	974	2.70%	11,232	31.27%	24,684	68.73%
82	26,046	58.83%	16,802	37.95%	1,428	3.23%	19,140	43.65%	24,713	56.35%
83	20,975	58.79%	13,482	37.79%	1,221	3.42%	15,585	44.02%	19,820	55.98%
84	25,615	68.55%	10,772	28.83%	981	2.63%	12,983	35.05%	24,055	64.95%
85	25,753	73.78%	8,159	23.37%	995	2.85%	9,757	28.36%	24,643	71.64%
86	22,615	66.72%	10,457	30.85%	824	2.43%	12,699	37.72%	20,964	62.28%
87	26,540	74.72%	8,133	22.90%	848	2.39%	11,035	31.39%	24,120	68.61%
88	12,587	35.41%	21,535	60.57%	1,429	4.02%	23,404	66.33%	11,881	33.67%
89	25,345	71.91%	8,879	25.19%	1,023	2.90%	11,207	31.97%	23,846	68.03%
90	25,549	73.16%	8,601	24.63%	773	2.21%	10,369	29.84%	24,378	70.16%
91	27,844	73.57%	8,993	23.76%	1,010	2.67%	10,866	28.83%	26,826	71.17%
92	10,717	29.69%	23,935	66.30%	1,447	4.01%	25,771	71.73%	10,156	28.27%
93	23,009	55.17%	16,926	40.58%	1,774	4.25%	19,469	47.25%	21,733	52.75%
94	28,405	74.69%	8,697	22.87%	929	2.44%	11,208	29.76%	26,454	70.24%
95	28,982	67.70%	12,360	28.87%	1,470	3.43%	14,947	35.22%	27,490	64.78%
96	23,121	65.77%	10,946	31.14%	1,089	3.10%	13,281	38.01%	21,662	61.99%
97	28,690	73.47%	9,283	23.77%	1,078	2.76%	11,903	30.76%	26,797	69.24%
98	26,644	58.05%	17,734	38.63%	1,524	3.32%	20,452	45.00%	24,992	55.00%
99	7,163	21.09%	25,734	75.76%	1,073	3.16%	26,872	79.60%	6,888	20.40%
100	10,063	33.08%	19,181	63.06%	1,172	3.85%	20,835	69.05%	9,337	30.95%
101	9,666	25.39%	27,134	71.26%	1,276	3.35%	28,611	75.49%	9,289	24.51%
102	6,255	19.64%	24,161	75.87%	1,429	4.49%	25,604	80.91%	6,042	19.09%
103	25,117	58.86%	16,313	38.23%	1,242	2.91%	18,820	44.51%	23,460	55.49%
104	25,845	55.28%	19,567	41.85%	1,340	2.87%	22,699	48.98%	23,646	51.02%

HST-1: Lieutenant Governor 2016, Attorney General 2016

	Lieutenant Governor 2016: Forest-Coleman-Cole						Attorney General 2016: Stein-Newton			
District	Rep	Rep %	Dem	Dem %	Lib	Lib %	Dem	Dem %	Rep	Rep %
105	22,913	55.44%	17,133	41.45%	1,287	3.11%	19,598	47.84%	21,369	52.16%
106	8,550	25.79%	23,420	70.66%	1,176	3.55%	24,690	75.03%	8,218	24.97%
107	8,546	23.39%	26,870	73.54%	1,124	3.08%	28,191	77.62%	8,126	22.38%
108	22,310	64.29%	11,377	32.79%	1,013	2.92%	13,450	39.21%	20,851	60.79%
109	22,545	62.11%	12,803	35.27%	950	2.62%	14,882	41.40%	21,065	58.60%
110	23,200	68.91%	9,752	28.97%	715	2.12%	11,596	34.80%	21,723	65.20%
111	22,768	68.36%	9,875	29.65%	661	1.98%	11,856	36.00%	21,073	64.00%
112	23,864	71.32%	8,660	25.88%	937	2.80%	9,906	29.88%	23,248	70.12%
113	27,273	61.90%	15,470	35.11%	1,314	2.98%	16,730	38.29%	26,962	61.71%
114	10,534	22.22%	34,662	73.10%	2,218	4.68%	36,615	77.84%	10,425	22.16%
115	22,047	48.06%	22,007	47.98%	1,816	3.96%	23,858	52.43%	21,647	47.57%
116	21,972	52.39%	18,326	43.70%	1,641	3.91%	19,951	47.93%	21,673	52.07%
117	25,457	62.47%	14,037	34.45%	1,255	3.08%	15,539	38.46%	24,861	61.54%
118	23,864	60.56%	14,093	35.76%	1,451	3.68%	15,949	40.83%	23,111	59.17%
119	18,801	53.70%	14,824	42.34%	1,385	3.96%	16,595	47.85%	18,084	52.15%
120	28,296	69.92%	10,903	26.94%	1,271	3.14%	11,790	29.51%	28,166	70.49%
Totals:	**2,390,619**	**51.88%**	**2,084,975**	**45.25%**	**132,360**	**2.87%**	**2,294,855**	**50.20%**	**2,276,276**	**49.80%**

Plan: HST-1
Plan Type:

Administrator
User:

Districts & Their Incumbents

Thursday, August 24, 2017 9:05 PM

District	Name	Party	Previous District
1	Steinburg	Republican	1
2	Yarborough	Republican	2
3	Speciale	Republican	3
4	Dixon	Republican	4
5	Hunter	Democratic	5
6	Boswell	Republican	6
7	Collins	Republican	25
8			
9	Murphy	Republican	9
10	J.Bell	Republican	10
11	Duane Hall	Democratic	11
12	G.Graham	Democratic	12
13	McElraft	Republican	13
14	Cleveland	Republican	14
15	Shepard	Republican	15
16	Millis	Republican	16
17	Iler	Republican	17
18	Butler	Democratic	18
19	Davis	Republican	19
20	Grange	Republican	20
21	L.Bell	Democratic	21
22	Brisson	Democratic	22
23	Willingham	Democratic	23
24	S.Martin	Republican	8
24	Farmer-Butterfield	Democratic	24
25	B.Richardson	Democratic	7

Plan:	HST-1	Administrator:	
Type:		User:	

District	Name	Party	Previous District
26	White	Republican	26
27	Wray	Democratic	27
28	Strickland	Republican	28
29	Black	Democratic	29
30	Morey	Democratic	30
31	Michaux	Democratic	31
32	Garrison	Democratic	32
33	Gill	Democratic	33
34	G.Martin	Democratic	34
35	Malone	Republican	35
36	Dollar	Republican	36
37	Williams	Republican	37
38	Holley	Democratic	38
39	Jackson	Democratic	39
40	John	Democratic	40
41	Adcock	Democratic	41
42	Lucas	Democratic	42
43	Floyd	Democratic	43
44	W.Richardson	Democratic	44
45	Szoka	Republican	45
46	Brenden Jones	Republican	46
47	C.Graham	Democratic	47
48	Pierce	Democratic	48
49	Ball	Democrat	49
50	Meyer	Democratic	50
51	Sauls	Republican	51
51	Reives	Democratic	54
52	Boles	Republican	52
53	Lewis	Republican	53
54			
55	Brody	Republican	55

Plan: HST-1 Administrator:
Type: User:

District	Name	Party	Previous District
56	Insko	Democratic	56
57	Harrison	Democratic	57
58	Quick	Democratic	58
59			
60	Brockman	Democratic	60
61	Faircloth	Republican	61
61	Hardister	Republican	59
62	Blust	Republican	62
63	Ross	Republican	63
64	Riddell	Republican	64
65	Bert Jones	Republican	65
66	Goodman	Democratic	66
67	Burr	Republican	67
68	Horn	Republican	68
69	Arp	Republican	69
70	Hurley	Republican	70
71	Terry	Democratic	71
72	Hanes	Democratic	72
73	Zachary	Republican	73
74	Lambeth	Republican	75
75	Conrad	Republican	74
76	Warren	Republican	77
77	Howard	Republican	79
78	McNiell	Republican	78
79			
80	Watford	Republican	80
81	Potts	Republican	81
82	Johnson	Republican	83
83	Pittman	Republican	82
83	Ford	Republican	76
84	R.Turner	Republican	84
85	Dobson	Republican	85

Plan:	HST-1	Administrator:	
Type:		User:	

District	Name	Party	Previous District
86	Blackwell	Republican	86
87	Destin Hall	Republican	87
88	Beasley	Democratic	92
89	Setzer	Republican	89
90	Stevens	Republican	90
91	K.Hall	Republican	91
92	Belk	Democratic	88
93	Jordan	Republican	93
94	Elmore	Republican	94
95	Fraley	Republican	95
96	Adams	Republican	96
97	Saine	Republican	97
98	Bradford	Republican	98
99	R.Moore	Democratic	99
100	Autry	Democratic	100
101	Earle	Democratic	101
102	Carney	Democratic	102
103	Brawley	Republican	103
104	Dulin	Republican	104
105	Stone	Republican	105
106	Cunningham	Democratic	106
107	Alexander	Democratic	107
108	Torbett	Republican	108
109	Bumgardner	Republican	109
110	Hastings	Republican	110
111	T.Moore	Republican	111
112	Rogers	Republican	112
113	Henson	Republican	113
114	Fisher	Democratic	114
115	Ager	Democratic	115
116	B.Turner	Democratic	116
117	McGrady	Republican	117

Plan:	HST-1	Administrator:	
Type:		User:	

District	Name	Party	Previous District
118	Presnell	Republican	118
119	Clampitt	Republican	119
120	Corbin	Republican	120

Number of Incumbents in District with more than one Incumbent:	8	
Number of Districts with No Incumbent:	4	
Number of Districts with Incumbents of more than one party:	2	
Number of Districts with Paired Democrats:	0	
Number of Districts with Paired Republicans:	2	

Plan Name: HST-1
Plan Type:
Date: 08/22/2017
Time: 08:17:38PM
Administrator:

Measures of Compactness

08/22/2017

Sum	N/A
Min	0.13
Max	0.71
Mean	0.32
Std. Dev.	0.11

DISTRICT	Polsby-Popper
1	0.54
2	0.49
3	0.33
4	0.37
5	0.21
6	0.24
7	0.35
8	0.39
9	0.27
10	0.23
11	0.30
12	0.34
13	0.22
14	0.28
15	0.37
16	0.22
17	0.30
18	0.33
19	0.28
20	0.20
21	0.14
22	0.23
23	0.24
24	0.71
25	0.32
26	0.31
27	0.40
28	0.24
29	0.34
30	0.39
31	0.37
32	0.51
33	0.31
34	0.33
35	0.31
36	0.21
37	0.38
38	0.25
39	0.26
40	0.35

Plan Name:	HST-1	Administrator:	
Plan Type:		User:	

DISTRICT	Polsby-Popper
41	0.25
42	0.40
43	0.31
44	0.24
45	0.22
46	0.16
47	0.42
48	0.45
49	0.35
50	0.34
51	0.40
52	0.25
53	0.47
54	0.43
55	0.29
56	0.34
57	0.28
58	0.18
59	0.25
60	0.21
61	0.22
62	0.50
63	0.30
64	0.28
65	0.47
66	0.36
67	0.30
68	0.28
69	0.20
70	0.54
71	0.19
72	0.26
73	0.47
74	0.16
75	0.23
76	0.46
77	0.35
78	0.28
79	0.30
80	0.22
81	0.22
82	0.43
83	0.25
84	0.45
85	0.23
86	0.27
87	0.57
88	0.25
89	0.26
90	0.17
91	0.36
92	0.33
93	0.42
94	0.23
95	0.37
96	0.21

Plan Name:	HST-1	Administrator:	
Plan Type:		User:	

DISTRICT	Polsby-Popper
97	0.52
98	0.64
99	0.42
100	0.35
101	0.34
102	0.43
103	0.32
104	0.35
105	0.37
106	0.44
107	0.20
108	0.32
109	0.47
110	0.26
111	0.28
112	0.30
113	0.21
114	0.13
115	0.19
116	0.23
117	0.28
118	0.15
119	0.20
120	0.37

Plan Name: HST-1
Plan Type:
Date: 08/22/2017
Time: 08:16:45PM
Administrator:

Measures of Compactness

08/22/2017

Sum	N/A
Min	0.20
Max	0.70
Mean	0.42
Std. Dev.	0.09

DISTRICT	Reock
1	0.59
2	0.43
3	0.37
4	0.44
5	0.41
6	0.33
7	0.50
8	0.51
9	0.40
10	0.36
11	0.36
12	0.36
13	0.24
14	0.39
15	0.55
16	0.31
17	0.48
18	0.51
19	0.20
20	0.36
21	0.32
22	0.49
23	0.35
24	0.53
25	0.52
26	0.39
27	0.52
28	0.38
29	0.39
30	0.40
31	0.50
32	0.53
33	0.42
34	0.44
35	0.37
36	0.31
37	0.40
38	0.31
39	0.33
40	0.52

Plan Name:	HST-1	Administrator:
Plan Type:		User:

DISTRICT	Reock
41	0.33
42	0.50
43	0.34
44	0.50
45	0.46
46	0.23
47	0.57
48	0.48
49	0.40
50	0.38
51	0.52
52	0.32
53	0.59
54	0.45
55	0.42
56	0.49
57	0.37
58	0.44
59	0.39
60	0.29
61	0.32
62	0.47
63	0.34
64	0.34
65	0.52
66	0.40
67	0.49
68	0.33
69	0.37
70	0.54
71	0.35
72	0.50
73	0.46
74	0.22
75	0.38
76	0.49
77	0.39
78	0.36
79	0.48
80	0.28
81	0.50
82	0.42
83	0.32
84	0.51
85	0.39
86	0.38
87	0.50
88	0.44
89	0.34
90	0.39
91	0.40
92	0.60
93	0.57
94	0.42
95	0.43
96	0.30

Plan Name:	HST-1	Administrator:	
Plan Type:		User:	

DISTRICT	Reock
97	0.33
98	0.70
99	0.43
100	0.43
101	0.51
102	0.64
103	0.27
104	0.49
105	0.49
106	0.43
107	0.38
108	0.44
109	0.46
110	0.36
111	0.40
112	0.39
113	0.24
114	0.39
115	0.38
116	0.35
117	0.40
118	0.36
119	0.36
120	0.40