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CHAIRMAN HALL: ... today and were being printed downstairs. And, of course, we need a copy for every member to be able to look at, and that takes time to print these color copies, so that's what we've been waiting on this evening.

Members, we'll go ahead and jump right into it. I am going to move that the PCS for HBK-12 be before the committee. And without objection, that PCS will be before the committee.

I do have a proposed amendment to that, but I am going to yield the chair to Chairman Saine for him to chair, and I'm going to present from the podium. Chairman Saine.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman. Thank you, members of the committee.

We're going to start with Amendment 2; is that correct? Okay.

And the gentleman is recognized.
CHAIRMAN HALL: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman.

Members, this is H -- it's entitled HBK Amendment Number 2. There's two pages to this amendment, and I'll briefly go through, sort of from west to east, the reasons behind the changes in this map.

Beginning with Cabarrus county, the chair was informed that Representative Pittman does not plan to run again, and so we didn't have the concern of not double-bunking.

Representative Pittman said -- so I went in and tried to make it a bit more compact, so that's the reason for that change.

Moving east into the Durham
and -- excuse me -- the Chatham-Randolph
grouping, I did -- we heard a lot of public comment about population deviations between Chatham and the Randolph district, and so I went in and tried to fix some of that, to make those districts a little bit more even in terms of population deviation.

Moving on to the east in the
Sampson-Bladen-Wayne-Duplin-Pender-Onslow groupings, we -- I felt that Bladen and Pender made more sense being together in terms of counties that have similar interest, and if we
draw it this way, we're able to draw more compact districts.

So, Mr. Chair, I would move that this amendment be adopted.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Any further
presentation and the motion -- any questions for the maker of the motion?

Representative Szoka.
REPRESENTATIVE SZOKA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Just for clarity sake, I believe you said Bladen and Pender would be together. Mr. Chairman, I think you meant to say Bladen and Sampson because that's what the map shows, just for clarity.

CHAIRMAN HALL: That's right,
Representative Szoka. You're correct. My apologies.

REPRESENTATIVE SZOKA: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN SAINE: Any other questions?
Representative Harrison.
REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Chair Hall, I'm just -- it's hard to read this on the fly, but I'm wondering, are you splitting precincts, VTDs in Durham? And if so,
why?
CHAIRMAN HALL: Representative
Harrison, VTDs have been split, and that's because the populations are so large in that part of the state that they need to be split.

REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: Can I have a follow-up.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: You're recognized for a follow-up.

REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: And again, apologies for last minute here.

So with the -- with the Wayne grouping, what VRA issues did you take into consideration?

CHAIRMAN SAINE: The gentleman's recognized.

CHAIRMAN HALL: As the lady knows, and I've said previously in this committee, courts have found that there is no legally significant racially polarized voting in North Carolina.

The committee decided not to use race as a factor in drawing these maps, and therefore the maps comply with the VRA.

REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: Follow-up, if I may.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: You're recognized for
follow-up.
REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: I appreciate that. We may have a difference of opinion about that, but I'll wait for that discussion.

Another thing -- and I apologize. Are you splitting any municipalities in this -- in the Wayne county proposal?

CHAIRMAN HALL: No.
REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: And if I may
have one more follow-up.
CHAIRMAN SAINE: Yeah, one more.
REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: Are you
splitting any VTDs in Wayne?
CHAIRMAN HALL: There is one VTD that's split in the district.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Seeing no other questions, you've heard the motion. All those in favor signify with saying aye.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.
CHAIRMAN SAINE: Those opposed, like sign.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: No.
CHAIRMAN SAINE: In the opinion of the chair, the ayes have it, the ayes do have it, and the amendment is adopted.

Recognize the gentleman from Caldwell county.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman.
And, Members, now that the PCS as amended is before the committee, I do want to make some brief opening remarks because I think that the process, as I've previously said chairing this committee and in presenting, this is a historic process in this body that has never happened in the history of this state and in the history of this General Assembly.

We've embarked on the most transparent redistricting process in North Carolina history, and there is simply no debate that can be had about that. Every part of this map-making process was done in public, and it was recorded, it was archived for anyone who would like to see it. Not only was it the most transparent process, but for the first time in

North Carolina history, the legislature adopted a process on our own, on our own volition, that did not include the use of political data.

Further, we received an immense amount of public input on the maps which has resulted
in a North Carolina House map that reflects weeks of public comment both in person and online. Additionally, this room has been open since October 6th, Monday through Friday, from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., wherein any member could come in and draw whatever maps that they saw fit. There was not a problem with resources in terms of the computer. I was in here quite a bit over the course of that roughly three and a half weeks, and I don't think at any point that I see all four stations being filled at one time, so every member had every opportunity to come in and draw whatever map that they saw fit. Members, as you all know, the rural areas in North Carolina have lost an immense amount of population in the past decade which has resulted in wholesale change of some districts and areas. A couple of examples of that is Representative Willingham's district, where he kept all of his current district in Edgecombe and Martin, but he had to add the entirety of Bertie to make the minimum population. Same goes for Representative Wray who had to add another whole county, Warren county, to his current district of Halifax and

Northampton.
In addition, many of the groupings did not change over the course of the decade, or they remained similar to the previous decade, and given that there was so much litigation over the course of the last decade with respect to maps, the chair took advantage of many court cases that had previously dictated to the General Assembly on how to draw -- how to draw legislative maps and congressional maps. This is not applicable in all cases, however, but where applicable, the chair made every effort to keep the current districts intact and will encourage negative votes on any amendment that does not attempt to achieve that same goal.

I want to begin the presentation of the chair's proposed map by going through the criteria that this committee adopted and how the proposed map coincides with that criteria.

First, we decided to keep counties whole. Within the map -- of course, we all know that's a constitutional revision to the Stephenson decision. And within this map, where counties could be kept whole, they are kept whole. We kept every county whole that we
could. For example, Chatham, Lee county, Polk county are some counties where we had choices to make about keeping counties whole, and we kept those counties whole.

We attempted not to split VTDs. In 2011, there were hundreds of hundreds of VTD splits in the 2011 maps that were drawn. In the chair's proposed map that's before you today, there are only six VTD splits across the entire state of North Carolina, only six in this entire map.

We honored municipal boundaries. The chair made every effort to keep municipalities whole throughout the draw. The report in front of you will say that there are 82 municipality splits across the state, but the bulk of the split municipalities that you see in the report either have no population or extraordinarily small populations in the parts that are split.

Contiguity. Every district in this map is contiguous.

Incumbency considerations. In this map, we chose the bare minimum of number of -- of number of members who are double-bunked.

We looked at compactness. Despite not being drawn by a computer algorithm, this map contains the compactness of the current map that had the advantage of being drawn with a computer algorithm.

We did not consider race. As chair, I did not look at racial data in drawing these maps.

We did not consider political data. I did not look at political data in drawing these maps.

Again, given that $I$ did not have a computer-based algorithm or consultant using an algorithm, the final product has resulted in an impressive map that splits very few precincts, keeps municipalities whole, and creates compact districts.

And with that, Mr. Chairman, I will yield back to you.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: The chair thanks the gentleman from Caldwell.

It's the chair's understanding that there are some amendments that will come before the committee today.

And is there a particular order,

Mr. Chairman.
CHAIRMAN HALL: Probably just the order that are numbered, whatever you have in front of you. There's no particular --

CHAIRMAN SAINE: So the chair will take up Amendment 1, looks like Mecklenburg county. Who will be presenting that?

Representative Reives.
I'm sorry.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:
[Unintelligible].
CHAIRMAN SAINE: Okay. So this
actually will be Amendment Number 2, but on your sheet it's labeled 1. So Amendment 2.

Representative Reives, you are recognized.

REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

And one thing I would ask -- I'd be asking for the ayes and nos on each of these, and so if we could see about doing that now, then --

CHAIRMAN SAINE: If the gentleman wants to have that, then the chair will gladly entertain that.

REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Sure. And you are recognized.

REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: Thank you.
And what I would say is this: that looking at the map that we already have that's been presented by Chairman Hall, you -- and I'm trying to read my own writing. There's a split --

CHAIRMAN HALL: It says that one looks good.

REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: That is what my note says. It's amazing. You already saw it.

It says that VTD Number 134 was split in District 89, and you also have a lack of compactness in districts across that county.

The amendment that I presented -excuse me -- would split Charlotte definitely, splits Huntersville, and splits Stallings which crosses county lines, but it does not split any of the VTDs. And the average Reock score across all 13 districts is 49, compared to 44 with the chairman's map, and also the Polsby-Popper difference is 45 to 33. And so I would say with
the compactness and with the fact it doesn't split VTDs that I feel like it complies with the committee's criteria more and therefore we would ask that you accept the amendment.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: I read the gentleman's proposal. Anyone wishing to comment?

Representative Carney.
REPRESENTATIVE CARNEY: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman, and thank you to Leader Reives for this amendment.

As he had pointed out, it doesn't split VTDs, but you did -- this amendment has no split VTDs, but the Hall map does have. It splits 134. And can you tell me why you had to split that VTD.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Representative Hall, you are recognized.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Representative Carney, I -- let me -- let me get a more precinct-level detailed map so $I$ can see exactly which one it is you're talking about.

REPRESENTATIVE CARNEY: Okay.
CHAIRMAN SAINE: And as they're looking
for that, the chair is just going to -- as you're going through your paperwork, the next
one that we'll take up after this one will be Amendment 3 as it's labeled.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Mr. Chair.
CHAIRMAN SAINE: HBVA Amend 3, if you
just want to get that in your queue.
REPRESENTATIVE CARNEY: That --
Mr. Chairman, that -- Chairman Hall, that precinct is in District 89, I think, if that helps.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Mr. Chairman.
CHAIRMAN SAINE: You are recognized, Representative Hall.

CHAIRMAN HALL: I don't have that particular VTD map in front of me, Representative Carney. The reason that that split was made was to try to keep the municipality whole in northern Mecklenburg. I believe that's Huntersville that we were trying to keep whole, and that's why that was split.

REPRESENTATIVE CARNEY: Okay. And in District 90, there was another split VTD, and that particular one has the worst compactness score in the state. And so why -- I'm just questioning why did you draw it that way compared with the more compact version that we
have shown with the amendment offered by Representative Reives?

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Mr. Chairman, if we could perhaps displace that amendment and move on so I can get a copy of the Mecklenburg map with those precincts that are on there, we'll come back to that.

REPRESENTATIVE CARNEY: Sure. I appreciate that.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Yeah, we can displace that. We'll hold on to that one.

We'll move to what the chair had described as HBVA -- or HBV Amend 3 which looks like you'll see Randolph, Moore, Richmond.

Representative Harrison.
REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: That's my amendment.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Okay. You're recognized.

REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

So I'm not sure exactly how this compares to the changes that were made in Chair Hall's amendment, but there are -- there's a population deviation problem with Chatham and
the adjacent districts.
We heard a lot of comments, the public comments written and those who were present, that talked about the addition of -- I think it was the Providence precincts, specifically adding it to the Chatham county, which is rapidly growing, whereas the adjacent county Randolph is not and it's actually underpopulated. So this amendment simply takes that Providence voter tabulation district and keeps it in with House District 60, which is Representative McNeill's district.

And I believe that -- I believe that's all I have to say about that. I think it -- I think it handles the population issues better because you have -- Chatham county right now is nearly at 5 points, and it's growing rapidly, whereas the others are 3 to 5 points under the recommended deviation as required by Stephenson. So I would recommend this amendment for your approval.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Thank you,
Representative Harrison.
Any questions for the maker of the amendment?

CHAIRMAN HALL: Mr. Chairman.
CHAIRMAN SAINE: Representative Hall, you're recognized.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Members of the committee, the chair -- well, I listened to the public comment as well, and we did hear a lot of public comment about the deviation changes between the Chatham and Randolph districts. And so I am going to support this amendment, and I ask that you vote in favor of the amendment.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Any others wish to speak on the amendment?

Seeing none, all those in favor of the amendment please signify with saying aye.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.
CHAIRMAN SAINE: Those opposed.
In the opinion of the chair, the ayes
have it. The ayes do have it.
Representative Reives, you are correct. You asked for a roll call vote. I will certainly honor that.

If the clerk will call the roll.
THE CLERK: Adams.
REPRESENTATIVE ADAMS: Aye.
THE CLERK: Brockman.

Carney.
REPRESENTATIVE CARNEY: Aye.
THE CLERK: Cooper-Suggs.
REPRESENTATIVE COOPER-SUGGS: Aye.
THE CLERK: Dixon.
REPRESENTATIVE DIXON: Aye.
THE CLERK: Hardister.
REPRESENTATIVE HARDISTER: Aye.
THE CLERK: Garrison.
REPRESENTATIVE GARRISON: Aye.
THE CLERK: Hastings.
Hawkins.
REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: Aye.
THE CLERK: Jones.
REPRESENTATIVE JONES: Aye.
THE CLERK: Mills.
REPRESENTATIVE MILLS: Aye.
THE CLERK: Reives.
REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: Aye.
THE CLERK: Rogers.
REPRESENTATIVE ROGERS: Aye.
THE CLERK: Szoka.
REPRESENTATIVE SZOKA: Aye.
THE CLERK: Warren.
REPRESENTATIVE WARREN: Aye.

THE CLERK: Zachary.
REPRESENTATIVE ZACHARY: Aye.
THE CLERK: Richardson.
[Unintelligible].
THE CLERK: Saine.
CHAIRMAN SAINE: Aye.
THE CLERK: Torbett.
REPRESENTATIVE TORBETT: Aye.
THE CLERK: Bell.
REPRESENTATIVE BELL: Aye.
THE CLERK: Stevens.
Chairman Hall.
CHAIRMAN HALL: Aye.
CHAIRMAN SAINE: Before the clerk
proceeds, Representative Richardson, I see you
on the -- on Webex, and I also see
Representative Hastings. We didn't get audio
from you. If you'd like to cast your vote,
Representative Richardson.
If you'll give me a thumbs up. It
looks like aye; is that correct?
Okay, we've got an aye for
Representative Richardson.
Representative Hastings.
REPRESENTATIVE HASTINGS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: And, Representative Brockman, did we miss -- he's out of the room.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Aye.
CHAIRMAN SAINE: Representative
Hastings. There you are. We don't have audio, but if you're an aye, please signify with a thumbs up. And we'll record that as aye.

And Brockman online is giving us a thumbs up. If the committee members will verify that. It sounds like everyone's in agreement.

And the amendment does pass unanimously.

Representative Hall, do you have the data that you needed and we can go back to that?

CHAIRMAN HALL: If you will continue on, Mr. Chairman, and I will let you know when I get that up here.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: We've got -- the chair's just randomly pulling from his stack, just like yours. The chair pulls HST Amend 1. It looks like Alamance county.

Representative Harrison, is that yours?
REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: If I'm not mistaken, it's Representative Reives.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Representative Reives,
you're recognized.
REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: Thank you.
And in both the chair's map and my amendment, we split the city of Burlington, but both do not split VTDs or double-bunk any incumbents. My amendment proposes a more compact drawing of the two districts in Alamance, and I would ask that the committee adopt this amendment because of that.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Okay. You've heard the presentation on the amendment.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Mr. Chairman.
CHAIRMAN SAINE: Anyone wishing to be recognized.

Representative Hall.
CHAIRMAN HALL: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman.
Members, Alamance county has been the subject of litigation in the past. And as I said earlier, we tried to take what we learned from those cases and apply them to these maps. And so in this map, I only made three total changes in terms of VTDs in the -- in the whole -- the whole map, in this grouping, and so because of that, I would ask you to oppose this
amendment.

> CHAIRMAN SAINE: Any others wishing to speak?

Representative Harrison.
REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chair Hall, just a couple of quick questions. Comparing Representative Reives' proposed map -- proposed changes to the -- your proposal, it just looks on the face of it that Representative Reives' amendment is more compact. And I think you said this, but the Polsby-Popper score is . 39 versus .31, and you can see that there's that little, odd precinct that pokes out into Representative Riddell's proposed district from Representative Hurtado's.
And it seems like -- it looks like you're putting North Thompson voting tabulation district into 54 and you moved the South Burlington voter tabulation district out of 54, where there were other VTDs such as Faucette, and the northern section of the county that had an identical population or close population to Northern Thompson. So do you mind saying why you chose the ones you did.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Representative Hall. CHAIRMAN HALL: Thank you, Representative Harrison, for the question.

As an aside, the chair will say that this committee room has been open for three and a half weeks. I was not given any of these amendments until last night. That -- I don't want to cast aspersions on anyone, but one can infer that that was by design.

And so again, what I will say about this map and the one that was drawn is that Alamance county has been litigated and the current district has been upheld in a court, and so when I went in to draw this, my goal was to make as few changes as possible and as few changes as reasonably required with population changes because, again, it's been litigated and in making as few changes as possible, we stick with something that's similar to the current district and makes it more likely that it will be upheld.

Again, I didn't -- I've got eight amendments I think that are being put forth tonight, didn't get them until last night. Some of the printouts don't even have precinct-level
numbers on them. No members approached me during the map-drawing process. I did speak with Representative Reives quite a bit, and he was always open with me and upfront, and I was the same with him, but it doesn't change the fact that the members of this committee have had three and a half weeks to put forth amendments. We didn't get them until last night.

And so I think that -- you know, because of that, it makes it difficult to sit down and talk about precinct-level data with the members asking questions on amendments that they sent last night. Please oppose the amendment.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Representative Harrison.

REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: Just a quick follow-up.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: You are recognized.
REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: These are not my amendments so I can't speak to the process, but I do know that the staff has been pretty backed up drafting because we're just seeing them for the first time too.

I just -- not a question, but just think there are ways to move precincts and equal
populations that would improve the map's compactness because the Polsby-Popper scores are clearly better in Reives' amendment, so I would urge you to support it. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Mr. Chairman.
CHAIRMAN SAINE: You're recognized, sir.

CHAIRMAN HALL: I would like to see if Representative Harrison would yield for a question.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Representative
Harrison, will you yield?
REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: Yes.
CHAIRMAN HALL: The lady said that
these are not your amendments. Can you tell the committee whose amendments these are.

REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: I believe
Representative Reives. It's
Representative Reives' amendment. I just offered the Chatham county one. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN SAINE: Thank you.
Any others wishing recognition.
Seeing not, we will go into a roll call
vote at the request of Representative Reives.

The clerk will call the roll.
THE CLERK: Adams.
REPRESENTATIVE ADAMS: No.
THE CLERK: Brockman.
Carney.
REPRESENTATIVE CARNEY: Aye.
THE CLERK: Cooper-Suggs.
REPRESENTATIVE COOPER-SUGGS: Aye.
THE CLERK: Dixon.
REPRESENTATIVE DIXON: No.
THE CLERK: Hardister.
REPRESENTATIVE HARDISTER: No.
THE CLERK: Harrison.
REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: No.
THE CLERK: Hastings.
REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: I'm sorry. I
meant to say aye. I apologize.
THE CLERK: Hastings.
CHAIRMAN SAINE: Representative
Hastings and Representative Brockman, the chair and the vice chair have noticed you signified with a thumbs up as aye. If the clerk will record that for Representative Brockman.

Representative Hastings, we have no audio on your -- on your feed. If you could
either signify by cutting your camera on and showing us or using the app there that can give the thumbs up. We'll come back to you before we finish.

Go ahead, clerk.
THE CLERK: Hawkins.
REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: Aye.
THE CLERK: Jones.

REPRESENTATIVE JONES: No.
THE CLERK: Mills.
REPRESENTATIVE MILLS: No.

THE CLERK: Reives.

REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: Aye.
THE CLERK: Rogers.
REPRESENTATIVE ROGERS:
[Unintelligible].
THE CLERK: Szoka.
REPRESENTATIVE SZOKA: No.
THE CLERK: Warren.

REPRESENTATIVE WARREN: No.

THE CLERK: Zachary.
REPRESENTATIVE ZACHARY: No.
THE CLERK: Richardson.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Richardson on visual
is signifying aye.

THE CLERK: Saine.
CHAIRMAN SAINE: No.
THE CLERK: Torbett.
REPRESENTATIVE TORBETT: No.
THE CLERK: Bell.

REPRESENTATIVE BELL: No.
THE CLERK: Stevens.
Hall.

CHAIRMAN HALL: No.
CHAIRMAN SAINE: We'll try one
time -- one more time with Representative Hastings.

Representative Hastings, if you can come to your video or signify with the app there, with the thumbs up or thumbs down, whichever you prefer.

REPRESENTATIVE HASTINGS: Can you hear ne now, Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN SAINE: The chair sees no response from Representative Hastings.

The clerk --
COMMITTEE MEMBERS: There he is.
CHAIRMAN SAINE: Representative
Hastings signifies no. Thank you, sir.
THE CLERK: 7 yes; 14 no.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: The amendment fails. Next in our stack of stuff, try for

HBA Amend 3 which looks like Cumberland county. Who's the maker of this amendment? Who wants to present?

Representative Reives, you're recognized.

REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: All right. And thank you for that, Mr. Chair.

And what I would note for the committee is this amendment does not split any VTDs, does not double-bunk any incumbents. We believe it better follows the committee's criteria in two ways. First, other than Fayetteville, there are no municipality splits. The chair's map splits the town of Hope Mills. Second, this amendment has a better average compactness score than the chair's map, and therefore we would ask that the committee adopt the amendment.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Okay. You've heard the presentation on the amendment. Any --

CHAIRMAN HALL: Mr. Chairman.
CHAIRMAN SAINE: Representative Hall and then Representative Cooper-Suggs.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Mr. Chairman, I'll
yield to Representative Cooper-Suggs.
CHAIRMAN SAINE: Representative
Cooper-Suggs, you're recognized.
REPRESENTATIVE COOPER-SUGGS: Thank
you, Mr. Chair, and thank you,
Representative Hall. I have a question that I'd like to ask.

The amendment, as Leader Reives says, does not split Hope Mills, but why does your map split the town?

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Representative Hall.
CHAIRMAN HALL: 95 percent of
Hope Mills is not split in the map. Well -- and I'd like to be recognized at the appropriate time to speak to the amendment.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: You're recognized.
CHAIRMAN HALL: And I use 95 percent as a rough figure. But as to this particular map, again, I'll note, I've seen this amendment last night. The map that $I$ put out was put out over a week ago now with precinct-level data. I wanted to give the public time to look at it and make whatever suggestions they wanted to make. I seen this one, again, last night.

Cumberland county's been subject to
intense litigation over the course of the last decade in state and federal courts, and as a result, the map that we currently have on our current districts has been upheld in court. And so again, going with the same theory as some of the previous groupings, my goal in this map was to make as few changes as reasonably necessary with population shifts to ensure that we continued to have a legal map, and that's what you have before you.

REPRESENTATIVE COOPER-SUGGS: I have another question.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Representative Cooper-Suggs.

REPRESENTATIVE COOPER-SUGGS: Yes, just to follow up.

Chairman Hall, for Districts 27 and 28, before we pass these maps, are you going to take any steps to ensure that African American voters are not packed, being packed into these maps?

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Representative Hall.
CHAIRMAN HALL: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman.
As previously said, this map has been upheld -- the current -- the current districts
we have has been upheld in court. This map makes the minimal changes to that map, and so I am confident that this will be upheld in court. CHAIRMAN SAINE: Any others wishing to speak on the amendment? Seeing none, we will move to a roll call vote.

The clerk will call the roll.
THE CLERK: Adams.
REPRESENTATIVE ADAMS: No.
THE CLERK: Brockman.
CHAIRMAN SAINE: And just for those on Webex know, they're working on the audio now.

Brockman signifies aye with a thumbs up.

THE CLERK: Carney.
REPRESENTATIVE CARNEY: Aye.
THE CLERK: Cooper-Suggs.
REPRESENTATIVE COOPER-SUGGS: Aye.
THE CLERK: Dixon.
REPRESENTATIVE DIXON: No.
THE CLERK: Hardister.
REPRESENTATIVE HARDISTER: No.
THE CLERK: Harrison.
REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: Aye.
THE CLERK: Hastings.

Hawkins.
REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: Aye.
THE CLERK: Jones.
REPRESENTATIVE JONES: No.
THE CLERK: Mills.
REPRESENTATIVE MILLS: No.
THE CLERK: Reives.
REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: Aye.
THE CLERK: Rogers.
REPRESENTATIVE ROGERS: No.
THE CLERK: Szoka.

REPRESENTATIVE SZOKA: No.
THE CLERK: Warren.
REPRESENTATIVE WARREN: No.
THE CLERK: Zachary.
REPRESENTATIVE ZACHARY: No.
THE CLERK: Richardson.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: He's a yes.
CHAIRMAN SAINE: Richardson has
signified yes, thumbs up.
THE CLERK: Saine.
CHAIRMAN SAINE: No.
THE CLERK: Torbett.
REPRESENTATIVE TORBETT: No.
THE CLERK: Bell.

REPRESENTATIVE BELL: No.
THE CLERK: Stevens.
Hall.
CHAIRMAN HALL: No.
CHAIRMAN SAINE: And the chair will also note that Representative Richardson is having fun with emojis, and Representative Hastings has signified no.

THE CLERK: 7 yes; 14 no.
CHAIRMAN SAINE: The amendment does fail.

The chair has been informed it is time for us to go to session. We're going to stand at ease as a committee and we will come back ten minutes immediately after session.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Mr. Chair, can we leave our stuff.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: You can leave your stuff in the room. It will be attended to while we're in session.
[At ease.]
(Transcription from YouTube ended at
10:07:09 and started again at 10:59:42.)
CHAIRMAN SAINE: ... in the room
anticipating that he may be presenting these.

Let's see if this is one of his amendments, but we'll give it a few minutes. If somebody would like to text him and tell him we're starting.

REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: And,
Mr. Chair, I don't mind trying to offer an amendment in his name if you want to get moving while we're waiting on him. It's up to the committee.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Yeah. The chair will give him a moment if anyone gets a response back. You got him on the phone.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What are we looking at?

CHAIRMAN SAINE: So you can go ahead and pull up HBV Amend 5. Stokes is at the top of that one.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Mr. Chairman.
CHAIRMAN SAINE: Representative Hall.
CHAIRMAN HALL: I've called
Representative Reives. He's on his way up right now, so if we can give him just a minute.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: We will certainly suspend until he arrives.

We're going to start with HBV Amend 5, and it's got Stokes in yellow at the top.

Representative Hall, do you know if we've got the audio fixed for the folks on Webex?

CHAIRMAN HALL: If we can just direct staff, make sure that the audio is working for the folks on Webex.

REPRESENTATIVE RICHARDSON: Can you hear me.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Representative Richardson, we can hear you, sir. Thank you for the mic check.

Representative Reives, we'll give you just a moment to get settled. We're looking at the HBV Amend 5 which has got Stokes county in yellow at the top.

REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: Thank you for that, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Yes, sir. When you get settled, just let me know.

REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: All right.
Okay, I'm ready to proceed. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN SAINE: Yes, sir. And is this your amendment?

REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: Yes, it is.
CHAIRMAN SAINE: Okay. You are
recognized, sir.
REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: All right.
Thank you.
I would ask the committee consider
supporting this amendment. This amendment does not double-bunk any incumbents; it does not splitting any VTDs. It does split Walkertown and Winston-Salem which is the same as the chair's map. And this amendment better complies with our criteria by not splitting Tobaccoville.

This amendment also has better average compactness scores across all five districts. I would ask the committee to consider adopting the amendment.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: You've heard the amendment. Are there any questions or commentary?

Representative Hall.
CHAIRMAN HALL: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman.
Members, I took the same approach with this one as I previously have stated in other parts of the map, and that is Forsyth has been heavily litigated over the course of the last decade, and so I started with the current set of
districts and tried to make changes based upon population. One of the changes that had to be made in this grouping is the change between Stokes and Yadkin counties. The prior grouping had Yadkin county. This grouping has Forsyth and Stokes county, and so I basically swapped Stokes and Yadkin and then tried to make minimal changes to the district, again, knowing that this has been heavily litigated and trying to stick with something similar to what was already there. So I would respectfully ask the committee to vote no on the amendment.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Thank you.
Representative Harrison.
REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Chair Hall. I just had a couple of questions.

In looking at the map -- so as Representative Reives said, the compactness scores are quite different in the amendment that is before you and the proposed PCS. So the -- specifically the Reock is .52, which is great, and Chair Hall's map is . 42, and then on the Polsby-Popper it's .46 to .33, which I would say is a fairly significant difference on the
compactness scores.
But if you'll look at on the
Stokes -- on proposed House District 69, you see that weird finger that goes down into -- into Forsyth county, into Winston-Salem and takes out 12 percent of Winston-Salem residences and puts them in with Stokes county, which I would say is probably not a good fit. It seems like it would make more sense to keep Winston-Salem a little bit more whole. So I am trying to figure out why you did it the way you did it, unless you've already answered that.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Representative Hall.
CHAIRMAN HALL: That change was made to keep Wake Forest whole.

REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: Follow-up.
CHAIRMAN SAINE: Representative
Harrison, you are recognized for a follow-up.
REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: And if I
could also ask why you split the town of
Tobaccoville. Or the amendment that
Representative Reives is offering does not split Tobaccoville.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Representative Hall.
CHAIRMAN HALL: Again, this is a map
that I received last night. My map has been out for nearly ten days now. Members have had a chance to look at it. Nobody came to me until last night to try to change this map.

I stuck with what the current map was and tried to make minimal changes to it. The result is a map that complies with our criteria and also complies with a similar map to what the courts have already upheld. I would ask you to vote no on the amendment.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Representative Harrison.

REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: And just one more follow-up.

And I appreciate that response, Chair Hall. I do want to just point out, sort of in general, you mentioned this a couple of times about making minimal changes, but we have other -- we have other proposed districts where we started from scratch, say Buncombe county, and we have nuisances data and new county groupings, so I think it is worth contemplating making more compact districts in different configuration, and I will just end there. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Thank you. Any others wishing recognition.

Seeing none -- Representative
Richardson on Webex.
REPRESENTATIVE RICHARDSON: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'll be very brief.

I would hope that rather than looking at when the amendment came in, and I know it's frustrating and it's hard to compile all this, that we look at the actual merits of this. And while I do think it's important that we keep Wake Forest together, but taking Tobaccoville out of it, it seems like to me we can do a little bit better, and I think this amendment does that, so I would encourage folks to vote for the amendment. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Thank you, Representative Richardson.

Any others wishing recognition?
Seeing none, as previously asked by
Representative Reives, we will move to a roll call vote, and the clerk will call the roll.

THE CLERK: Adams.
REPRESENTATIVE ADAMS: No.
THE CLERK: Brockman.

REPRESENTATIVE BROCKMAN: Yes.
THE CLERK: Carney.
REPRESENTATIVE CARNEY: Aye.
THE CLERK: Cooper-Suggs.
REPRESENTATIVE COOPER-SUGGS: Aye.
THE CLERK: Dixon.
REPRESENTATIVE DIXON: No.
THE CLERK: Hardister.
REPRESENTATIVE HARDISTER: No.
THE CLERK: Harrison.
REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: Aye.
THE CLERK: Hastings.
CHAIRMAN SAINE: Representative
Hastings -- and the clerk, did you record
Representative Brockman as a yes?
THE CLERK: Yes.
CHAIRMAN SAINE: Okay. Representative
Hastings signifies no.
THE CLERK: Hawkins.

REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: Aye.
THE CLERK: Jones.
REPRESENTATIVE JONES: No.
THE CLERK: Mills.
REPRESENTATIVE MILLS: No.
THE CLERK: Reives.

REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: Aye.
THE CLERK: Rogers.
REPRESENTATIVE ROGERS: No.
THE CLERK: Szoka.

REPRESENTATIVE SZOKA: No.
THE CLERK: Warren.
REPRESENTATIVE WARREN: No.
THE CLERK: Zachary.
REPRESENTATIVE ZACHARY: No.
THE CLERK: Richardson.
REPRESENTATIVE RICHARDSON: Aye.
THE CLERK: Saine.
CHAIRMAN SAINE: No.
THE CLERK: Torbett.
REPRESENTATIVE TORBETT: No.

THE CLERK: Bell.
REPRESENTATIVE BELL: No.
THE CLERK: Stevens.
Hall.

CHAIRMAN HALL: No.
THE CLERK: 7 yes; 14 no.
CHAIRMAN SAINE: The amendment does
fail.

Members, next, choosing from the stack
here, I've got HBV Amend 6. Looks like Guilford
county. I'll give you a moment to pull that up. And who's the sponsor of that amendment? All right. Representative Reives. REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

And like we've just seen with the prior amendment, the differences in compactness and natural-looking districts $I$ think are clear when comparing these to the map that we're presented with as the overall chair map. The average Reock score for these six districts in amendment is 52, compared to 40 for the main map; Polsby-Popper is 43 compared to 30 .

And I know that -- we've seen a lot of this, but I would make the same argument here that with the compactness and with the natural look, we'd ask that you support this amendment.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Thank you. Others wishing recognition.

Representative Hall.
CHAIRMAN HALL: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman.
Members, as previously stated and as the same for Guilford county. Guilford county was heavily litigated over the course of the
last decade, so the chair took measures to try to make minimal changes. My map moved only four total precincts from the 2020 map that was approved by the court, and the proposed amendment completely changes how Guilford county's drawn and the district that the members currently represent, so I would respectfully ask the committee members to vote no.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Any others wishing recognition.

Representative Harrison.
REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: Thank you,
Mr. Chair, and thank you, Chair Hall.
I wanted to reiterate, I think
Representative Reives commented about the compactness, and it's an important criteria in the criteria that we are operating under in drawing maps that shouldn't be understated. But I was wondering why you split the town of Summerfield into three districts.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Representative Hall.
CHAIRMAN HALL: Again, I received this amendment last night with no prior warning. No member came to me to talk about, for example, the question the lady just asked whatsoever.

Again, I made minimal changes. I moved only four precincts from the map in 2020 to deal with population shifts. This map comports with prior court rulings, and I ask you to vote no on the amendment.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Any others wishing recognition.

Representative Harrison.
REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: Just a quick follow-up.

I disagree -- I want to encourage members to support this amendment because I think the compactness, which is a criteria in drawing the maps, is much better than the current proposal, and also we have a municipality that is not going to be split in the amendment that is being offered, so I encourage you to support Representative Reives' amendment. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Any others on Webex or here in the room. Seeing none, the clerk will call the roll.

THE CLERK: Adams.
REPRESENTATIVE ADAMS: No.
THE CLERK: Brockman.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Representative
Brockman. Representative Brockman signifies aye.

THE CLERK: Carney.
REPRESENTATIVE CARNEY: Aye.
THE CLERK: Cooper-Suggs.
REPRESENTATIVE COOPER-SUGGS: Aye.
THE CLERK: Dixon.
REPRESENTATIVE DIXON: No.
THE CLERK: Hardister.
REPRESENTATIVE HARDISTER: No.
THE CLERK: Harrison.
REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: Aye.
THE CLERK: Hastings.
REPRESENTATIVE HASTINGS: No.
THE CLERK: Hawkins.
REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: Aye.
THE CLERK: Jones.
REPRESENTATIVE JONES: No.
THE CLERK: Mills.
REPRESENTATIVE MILLS: No.
THE CLERK: Reives.
REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: Aye.
THE CLERK: Rogers.
REPRESENTATIVE ROGERS: [Inaudible.]

THE CLERK: Szoka.
REPRESENTATIVE SZOKA: No.
THE CLERK: Warren.
REPRESENTATIVE WARREN: No.

THE CLERK: Zachary.
REPRESENTATIVE ZACHARY: No.
THE CLERK: Richardson.

REPRESENTATIVE RICHARDSON: Aye.
THE CLERK: Saine.
CHAIRMAN SAINE: No.
THE CLERK: Torbett.

REPRESENTATIVE TORBETT: No.

THE CLERK: Bell.
REPRESENTATIVE BELL: No.
THE CLERK: Stevens.

Hall.

CHAIRMAN HALL: No.
THE CLERK: 7 yes; 14 no.
CHAIRMAN SAINE: And the amendment
fails.

Next we will take up HCE Amend 1 which
is Pitt county. Who's the sponsor of this one?
Representative Reives, you're
recognized.
REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: Thank you,

Mr. Chair.
And I would ask that the committee support this particular amendment. In the chair's map in my opinion will not be as compact as this map, and I've tried to improve on the compactness here. When you look at all the scores that we normally look at, it scores better on both scores, and also this amendment does not split the town of Winterville while the chairman's map, so no split VTDs, no double-bunked incumbents. I ask for your support.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Thank you, sir.
Representative Hall.
CHAIRMAN HALL: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman.
Members, again, I ask you to vote no on the amendment. I believe that my map does a better job of keeping municipalities whole. Winterville in this map is mostly unsplit. Again, I'd ask for you to vote the amendment down.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Representative
Hawkins.
REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: Yes, sir.

Chairman Hall, I want to thank you for being willing to answer questions today. And, you know, having grown up in eastern

North Carolina, I'm still vaguely familiar with sort of the landscape, and so it really does beg the question about the town of Winterville. You know, the amendment that Representative Reives put forward does keep it intact.

And so I guess the question is is why didn't yours, and what was the decisionmaking that sort of went into your splitting of Winterville?

CHAIRMAN HALL: Thank you for the question.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Representative Hall, you are recognized.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Thank you, sir.
You know, again, I'll go back to this amendment was just given to me last night. And I always enjoy working with the gentleman on redistricting, and as I've said, you're very thoughtful on these issues, and I appreciate that.

The position that I'm put in tonight is I've been in this room for three weeks drawing
maps. You've been in here some, but, you know, this is another area of the map where in my opinion, had I heard from other -- from members of the minority party, you know, we may have been able to give some of that input, but again, this is sort of sprung on me in the sense that I do want to give Representative Reives credit for letting me know -- he and I discussed amendments today, but as you know, Representative Hawkins, this is complicated stuff. And the map that I've got in front of me, I can't tell what cities are where.

Again, $I$ know that the map that we currently have does a better job of keeping Winterville whole, and for those reasons I would ask members to vote no on the amendment.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Representative Hawkins.

REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: Follow-up --
CHAIRMAN SAINE: And, Representative Richardson, I've got you next.

REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: And thank you so much for that answer. And again, I look forward to, you know, many more times of working on these maps with you because it seems like
that's where we're headed for this decade.
But one of the things that I want to make sure of, of course, is, again, sort of being familiar with the landscape and even in Pitt county, we know that voters live on different sides of town. And so are you concerned about sort of packing and sort of the ways that one district seems pretty -potentially pretty heavy with African American voters? I know you did not take this into consideration due to our rules and what we voted on, but I do want to make sure that if we find out that this is the case, how do we approach that?

CHAIRMAN HALL: I have not looked at race at all, Representative Hawkins, and so I can't answer that question.

REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman. Follow-up.
CHAIRMAN SAINE: You are recognized for a follow-up.

REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: And I -- you
know, I understand that we -- as this process has gone on, things do get presented with not -- you know, without the opportunity to be
fully digestible even for a skillful lawyer like yourself, but one of the things that I -- you know, before I ask my next question I'll just say this as a statement.

We're only bound by the ways in which we do this and sort of our own timelines and our own criteria so, you know, if the chairman feels that, you know, we don't have enough time to digest some of this, I do kindly offer, Mr. Chairman, that we look at, you know, pushing back our primaries and giving ourselves more time so that we can do that because I do believe that the people of North Carolina would want us to get it right, and I think, as you have so clearly stated, we're only supposed to do this once a decade, and so I want to make sure that we get a chance to, but I'll ask my question now. That was just my statement, Mr. Chairman. So one of the things, too, is that, you know, the number of the ways in which you split these precincts is -- you know, didn't
necessarily seem like you had to. Was there any rhyme or reason for the split of VTDs?

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Representative Hall.
CHAIRMAN HALL: Again, Representative

Hawkins, the gentleman's asking me just a general question tonight and, you know, sort of being bombarded. And I don't mean that as a -REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: Oh, sure. CHAIRMAN HALL: -- as a criticism of the gentleman, but we have gone through the most -- the most transparent process in this state's history. I literally drew this in in this committee room. Anybody in the public can go back and watch this video.

I believe that this map complies better with our criteria than the amendment. I don't have a lot of information about the amendment other than a picture of it in front of me that doesn't -- doesn't contain any of the VTDs, and so therefore I would ask the folks -- the members to oppose the amendment.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Representative
Hawkins.
REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: Last question.
And, you know, specific to sort of your map, and not the one that was put forth to you tonight, because I do understand that being sort of tougher to digest, but for the one that you drew, that, you know, you did within the last
three weeks, it seems that the southern -- it's specifically those southern precincts that border Lenoir county that seem to be one of the ones that -- you know, some of the issue that I want to sort of take note to and just sort of get a little bit of a thought process behind, you know, why we decided to do those because, you know, the way the county is broken up, it just didn't seem like it had to be done that way. So this is just referring specifically to the map that you drew, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Representative Hall. CHAIRMAN HALL: Again, Representative Hawkins, the map complies with the criteria. It actually -- it looks -- in my opinion, it looks like a better district when you look at Pitt county compared to the amendment, basically splitting the county in half from -- a northern portion and a southern portion, and I would ask the committee members to oppose the amendment.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Representative
Richardson -- Representative Hawkins, did you exhaust your question?

Okay. Representative Richardson, you are recognized.

REPRESENTATIVE RICHARDSON: Yes. Just for a brief making a point.

I don't know much, but $I$ know this, that whenever you take a county as vital -- and I want to underscore vital -- to eastern North Carolina as this county is and you make it less competitive on both sides, it's not good.

You know, I know what the criteria are, but everybody in this room knows exactly what's going on here, and it needs to be -- this -- one of those districts needs to be a very competitive district. We get better people up here when we have competitive districts. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Thank you,
Representative Richardson.
Any others wishing recognition.
Representative Hall.
CHAIRMAN HALL: Mr. Chairman, I'll
yield to Representative Reives.
CHAIRMAN SAINE: I'm sorry.
Representative Reives.
REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: Thank you,
Mr. Chair, and thank you, Mr. Chair.
I had one question with Pitt. One of
the things that we've talked about -- first I'll make a statement just for clarification. And I appreciate the chair's comments earlier that, you know, this wasn't an intentional spring. You know, staffs had to do a yeoman's job trying to get all of this stuff together for all of us, and we started putting together amendments as soon as we could based on once we saw the map we'd be working from. We did think it would be unproductive that every time somebody came in here and did a map that we would then come right behind them and tell them, hey, you've got to fix this or do this, and I tried to be considerate of people's process.

But with that being said, my question is so far with the amendments we've had, one of the things that we've emphasized have been minimalist changes to the prior maps. My question is what is it that was different about this county that -- you know, because, clearly, I mean, when you look at the maps and you look at the former map, there haven't been minimalist changes here but there have actually been a lot of changes. What is it about this particular map that caused this to have so many more
changes?
CHAIRMAN SAINE: Representative Hall. CHAIRMAN HALL: One of the things was that previously Pitt county had roughly two and a half members and now, because of population changes, they just have two members. And so just because of that fact alone, it's going to have to change. And again, I want to -- I do want to correct a couple of things that were said.

This does not -- this grouping in this map for Pitt county does not split any precincts at all in the chair's map.

And the other point that I want to speak to is Representative Richardson's comments about outcomes. I have not looked at any political data in drawing these maps, and so I do not know what the partisan outcome may be.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Any others wishing recognition on the amendment. Seeing none, we'll move to a roll call vote. The clerk will call the roll.

THE CLERK: Adams.
REPRESENTATIVE ADAMS: No.
THE CLERK: Brockman.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Brockman signifies
aye.
THE CLERK: Carney. REPRESENTATIVE CARNEY: Aye.

THE CLERK: Cooper-Suggs.
REPRESENTATIVE COOPER-SUGGS: Aye.
THE CLERK: Dixon.
REPRESENTATIVE DIXON: No.
THE CLERK: Hardister.
REPRESENTATIVE HARDISTER: No.
THE CLERK: Harrison.
REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: Aye.
THE CLERK: Hastings.
REPRESENTATIVE HASTINGS: No.
THE CLERK: Hawkins.
REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: Aye.
THE CLERK: Jones.
REPRESENTATIVE JONES: No.
THE CLERK: Mills.
REPRESENTATIVE MILLS: No.
THE CLERK: Reives.
REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: Aye.
THE CLERK: Rogers.
REPRESENTATIVE ROGERS: No.
THE CLERK: Szoka.

REPRESENTATIVE SZOKA: No.
THE CLERK: Warren.
REPRESENTATIVE WARREN: No.
THE CLERK: Zachary.
REPRESENTATIVE ZACHARY: No.
THE CLERK: Richardson.
REPRESENTATIVE RICHARDSON: A big aye.
THE CLERK: Saine.
CHAIRMAN SAINE: No.
THE CLERK: Torbett.
REPRESENTATIVE TORBETT: No.

THE CLERK: Bell.

REPRESENTATIVE BELL: No.
THE CLERK: Stevens.
Hall.

CHAIRMAN HALL: No.

THE CLERK: 7 yes; 14 no.
CHAIRMAN SAINE: In the opinion of the chair, and according to the vote, the amendment fails.

REPRESENTATIVE RICHARDSON:

Mr. Chairman, a point of order.
CHAIRMAN SAINE: You're recognized for a point.

REPRESENTATIVE RICHARDSON: In the interest of time, I think the last five votes have been 7 to -- 14 to 7. Can we short circuit this and say does anybody want to change their vote from the last five votes on the next amendment, speeding it up.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Representative Richardson, while the chair certainly appreciates the notion behind the request, I'm going to honor Representative Reives' original request. And we only have two more to go so I think we can make it through, but I do appreciate it and thank the gentleman.

Next we will take up HBA Amend 2 which is Wake county. Who is the sponsor of this amendment?

Representative Reives, you are recognized.

REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: And thank you for honoring the ayes and nos request. I appreciate that.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Yes, sir.
REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: And as to this amendment, like in the chair's map, it doesn't split any VTDs, doesn't double-bunk anybody.

The maps also have the same Reock compactness averages, but this amendment has a much better Polsby-Popper average, and so we feel it complies better in our compactness criteria, and therefore, based on that and based on the fact that we do a better job of not splitting any municipalities, like Rolesville, Morrisville, Fuquay-Varina, we'd ask that you support this amendment.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Representative Hall. CHAIRMAN HALL: Thank you,

Mr. Chairman.
Members, the chair's map does a better job of keeping the smaller, more rural municipalities in Wake county intact instead of lumping them in with Raleigh. Examples are Fuquay-Varina, Apex, Wake Forest, Roseville, and Angier.

And so the other note that the chair would make, again, and I made this a few times, but I want to be clear. I had -- we had -there's a tab on our website for
member-submitted maps, and I submitted a map, and I asked others, and I've announced this on the floor several times, get us a map if you
want to put it out. So none of these amendments, none other than my map, were put out as member-submitted maps for members of the public to be able to take a look at.

So again, as was the case for the other amendments, I would ask you to oppose this amendment.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Thank you. Those wishing recognition.

Representative Hawkins.
REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: Thank you.
And, you know, I want to make sure that the chairman hears that, you know, the time and the talent that went into drawing these is something that I'm just enamored with and so that's why I have sort of the questions that I do about sort of how you originated with some of these maps and sort of how you -- because Wake county is -- you know, it's the most populous county in the state so it's not an easy draw, and that was probably 50 percent of your time here while you were drawing.

But one of the things that I wanted to ask so that we can -- you know, especially for those who are in the committee just for their
pleasure and for those who are potentially watching at home, one of the questions, you know, for me is, you know, where did you start? And as a potential starting point, you know, did you look at and start with District 35? And so District 35 is sort of -- according, I guess -you know, I make sure that I would start with Durham, but then, you know, I sort of center everything else around that, but District 35 is southwest Wake county. And so did you start there, you know, with District 35 in the north and then 39 and 40 in the south before filling in the rest of the map? So walk us through how you built your -- your Wake county structure. CHAIRMAN SAINE: Representative Hall. CHAIRMAN HALL: Thank you, Representative Hawkins.

I know the gentleman's question is in good faith, but from my perspective, I sat in this room for three weeks, I made probably thousands -- or directed thousands of clicks on this map, and so to expect me to remember literally which one of these districts I started on in this map $I$ don't believe is a fair question. And again, I'm not saying it's a
question that's in bad faith at all, but it is 8:30, I've been in here for three weeks, but I will try to answer the gentleman's question. When drawing a map like Wake county, it's typically easier to start somewhere on the outside than it is to sort of start in the beginning and going out. And the gentleman knows, you sat in here and drawn some of these maps as well. So if the gentleman goes back and looks at the instant replay of how I did it, he'll be able to see which one I started with. REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: Follow-up, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: You are recognized for
a follow-up, Representative Hawkins.
REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: I didn't
realize that was an option, but now I may take you up on that.

The follow-up question for me is, you know, the amendment that was given -- was put forth does split fewer municipalities than your map, Mr. Chairman, in all due respect. And so in particular, why is Morrisville split 50/50 between two districts? Is there -- and I know, again, in broad strokes, you may not
remember -- well, in broad strokes, you may remember, but detail you may not, but that's a pretty broad question about a major municipality and why it was split in half between two districts.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Representative Hall.
CHAIRMAN HALL: Well, in large part, it
is because of Adcock and Dahle's residences makes it very difficult to draw a map that doesn't do that.

REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Follow-up.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: You are recognized for a follow-up.

REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: And so one of the things -- and I do, I think -- not to -again, with all due respect, you know, the amendment has a better compactness score. And again, you put a lot of work into yours, and so one of the -- that was put forth, but one of the questions is is that if you look at, you know, the VTDs and if you're looking here, you look at what -- this looks like -- almost like a red finger. And so, you know, why did you include that red finger VTD in District 45 instead of in

District 35? And so if you're, again, looking at the map here, you're looking at District, sort of, 35 , which is southwest Wake county, sort of towards the bottom of Wake county, and if you're looking at the one that's sort of, you know, next to it, it sort of has a little bit of a red finger. And so I wanted to make sure that we sort of asked the question about sort of the red finger VTD that looks like that. And I'm just -- you know, that's something that we can all sort of look at and use as a common because the majority knows what a finger looks like, but thinking about sort of how you got to that process and why that was put there.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Representative Hall.
CHAIRMAN HALL: Representative Hawkins, that is the shape of the VTDs, and my map does not split any VTDs in Wake county.

REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Thank you,
Representative Hawkins.
Any others wishing recognition? Seeing none, the clerk will call the roll.

THE CLERK: Adams.

REPRESENTATIVE ADAMS: No.
THE CLERK: Brockman.
REPRESENTATIVE BROCKMAN: Aye.
THE CLERK: Carney.
REPRESENTATIVE CARNEY: Aye.
THE CLERK: Cooper-Suggs.
REPRESENTATIVE COOPER-SUGGS: Aye.
THE CLERK: Dixon.

REPRESENTATIVE DIXON: No.
THE CLERK: Hardister.
REPRESENTATIVE HARDISTER: No.

THE CLERK: Harrison.

REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: Aye.
THE CLERK: Hastings.
REPRESENTATIVE HASTINGS: No.

THE CLERK: Hawkins.

REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: Aye.
THE CLERK: Jones.
REPRESENTATIVE JONES: No.
THE CLERK: Mills.
REPRESENTATIVE MILLS: No.
THE CLERK: Reives.

REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: Aye.
THE CLERK: Rogers.
REPRESENTATIVE ROGERS: No.

THE CLERK: Szoka.

REPRESENTATIVE SZOKA: No.
THE CLERK: Warren.
REPRESENTATIVE WARREN: No.

THE CLERK: Zachary.
REPRESENTATIVE ZACHARY: No.
THE CLERK: Richardson.
REPRESENTATIVE RICHARDSON: Aye.
THE CLERK: Saine.
CHAIRMAN SAINE: No.
THE CLERK: Torbett.

REPRESENTATIVE TORBETT: No.

THE CLERK: Bell.
REPRESENTATIVE BELL: No.
THE CLERK: Stevens.

Hall.
CHAIRMAN HALL: No.
THE CLERK: 7 yes; 14 no.
CHAIRMAN SAINE: In the opinion of the chair and according to the vote, the amendment fails.

The chairman is in possession of one
last amendment which we attempted to take up earlier from Representative Reives. It's HBA Amend 1, and it's Mecklenburg county. We
were giving Chairman Hall a little bit of time to gather some information. We're back on that amendment.

Representative Hall, you're recognized. CHAIRMAN HALL: Thank you,

Mr. Chairman.
And I want to speak to Representative Carney's question. And one of the reasons I wanted to get a copy of the map because I -- and I may have misunderstood the lady, but I thought I heard the lady say that we had two split precincts, and my recollection, off the top of my head, was we only had one split precinct in Wake county, so I wanted to get a copy of my map, and I've gotten that. I'm sorry. Mecklenburg county. And I've gotten that now, and I've confirmed that only one precinct is split in Mecklenburg county.

The other thing that I will note on this map is what $I$ did here was essentially start with a version of the current map because the current version of Mecklenburg county, if folks will remember back in 2019, when we redrew these, was basically largely drawn by the Democratic members of the House in this
committee room. And, of course, you know, we were all in front of the computer, but at the time this was one that the Democrats really had a huge amount of input on. And so one thought in drawing it this way was, well, Democrats have had a bunch of input on that and nobody seemed interested in giving me any other input during this process, so $I$ took the prior input into consideration in drawing this map, but it only splits one precinct, and therefore I would ask you to vote no on the amendment.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Representative Hastings -- excuse me, Representative Hall.

Representative Hastings, your mic is on.

I apologize Representative Hall. Had you concluded your remarks?

CHAIRMAN HALL: I've concluded.
REPRESENTATIVE HASTINGS: I apologize.
CHAIRMAN SAINE: No problem,
Representative Hastings.
And the chair does apologize to the committee. We did find one more amendment, so we will have one more left in my stack of stuff, but those wishing recognition on the amendment.

Seeing none, we will move into a roll
call vote. The clerk will call the roll.
THE CLERK: Adams.
REPRESENTATIVE ADAMS: No.
THE CLERK: Brockman.
REPRESENTATIVE BROCKMAN: Aye.
THE CLERK: Carney.
REPRESENTATIVE CARNEY: Aye.
THE CLERK: Cooper-Suggs.
REPRESENTATIVE COOPER-SUGGS: Aye.
THE CLERK: Dixon.
REPRESENTATIVE DIXON: No.
THE CLERK: Hardister.
REPRESENTATIVE HARDISTER: No.
THE CLERK: Harrison.
REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: Aye.
THE CLERK: Hastings.
REPRESENTATIVE HASTINGS: No.
THE CLERK: Hawkins.
REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: Aye.
THE CLERK: Jones.
REPRESENTATIVE JONES: [Inaudible.]
THE CLERK: Mills.
REPRESENTATIVE MILLS: No.
THE CLERK: Reives.

REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: Aye.
THE CLERK: Rogers.
REPRESENTATIVE ROGERS: No.
THE CLERK: Szoka.

REPRESENTATIVE SZOKA: No.
THE CLERK: Warren.
REPRESENTATIVE WARREN: No.

THE CLERK: Zachary.
REPRESENTATIVE ZACHARY: No.
THE CLERK: Richardson.
REPRESENTATIVE RICHARDSON: Aye.
THE CLERK: Saine.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: No.
THE CLERK: Torbett.
REPRESENTATIVE TORBETT: No.

THE CLERK: Bell.
REPRESENTATIVE BELL: No.
THE CLERK: Stevens.
Hall.

CHAIRMAN HALL: No.
THE CLERK: 7 yes; 14 no.
CHAIRMAN SAINE: The amendment does
fail.

Last, unless someone produces something else, I believe we've got the last amendment.

It's HBV Amend 2, and it's Buncombe county. And who is the sponsor of that amendment?

Representative Reives, you're recognized.

REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

In this particular amendment, again, I understand there's been an attempt to stick to minimal changes, and I think on the chair's map on this particular district -- or set of districts, we do have a lot of changes. In both my map and the chair's map, we split Asheville and one smaller municipality in the county. Neither of us split any VTDs, nor double-bunk any incumbents.

I would ask that the committee support my amendment because this proposes a much more compact drawing of the three districts in Buncombe. Average Reock score of my amendments 49 compared to 42. Difference with the Polsby-Popper is even greater with a 32 compared to 23. And because of the huge difference in compactness, I would ask the committee to support this amendment.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Representative Hall.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Members, in this
particular map, Asheville -- we attempted to keep Asheville in as few districts as possible. The amendment essentially slices Asheville into -- as far as I can tell in just looking at this without any municipality overlay and, again, just seeing it last night, along with all the amendments before you and some other proposed amendments, it looks to me like what this does is equally splits Asheville. And I believe that it's better to try to keep Asheville in as few districts as possible, and so therefore I would ask you to oppose the amendment.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Anyone seeking recognition? Representative Carney.

REPRESENTATIVE CARNEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And again, I'm going to point out to
all the members in here and to the chair, I wish that the podium was back in the middle of the room because over here we have to turn to watch -- look at the people we're speaking to, so I apologize if my back or side is to you, Mr. Chairman.

So I just have a question about the -- obviously, when you look at the map, the chairman's map, Chairman Hall's map and then you look at the configuration of Representative Reives' map, there's a big, vast difference when you look at the compactness of it. I mean, it's blatant.

But I'm just curious that why -- well, the District 16 -- 116 and 117 are in very different shapes, and when you look at the map of Representative Reives, it's very -- it's a map that citizens can look at and it makes sense to them and it shows that it's compact, but we don't have that with the way you've drawn it.

Could you -- could you elaborate on why you chose 116 and 117 to draw them the way you did.

CHAIRMAN HALL: And I believe the numbers are different --

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Representative Hall, you are recognized.

CHAIRMAN HALL: The numbers are different in my map, but, you know, essentially, the amendment splits -- again, splits Asheville. It looks to be sort of an equal -- in equal
spaces. And so what $I$ tried to do is in this map try to put Asheville in two districts rather than trying to split it equally between the three districts to try to keep it as whole as we could, and that's the difference that you see. REPRESENTATIVE CARNEY: And a follow-up.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Representative Carney. REPRESENTATIVE CARNEY: Thank you, and thank you, Mr. Chairman.

In District 117, that district in the last court rulings in the last decade, it was ruled as unconstitutional. It looks very similar as far as partisan gerrymandering. If partisan gerrymandering was -- partisan, rather, data was not used, how did you arrive again to this shape of 117?

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Representative Hall. CHAIRMAN HALL: Again, I'm trying to put Asheville in as few districts as we could to try to keep Asheville as whole as we could.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Any others wishing recognition? Seeing none, we will move into a roll call vote. The clerk will call the roll. THE CLERK: Adams.

REPRESENTATIVE ADAMS: No.
THE CLERK: Brockman.
REPRESENTATIVE BROCKMAN: Aye.
THE CLERK: Carney.
REPRESENTATIVE CARNEY: Aye.
THE CLERK: Cooper-Suggs.
REPRESENTATIVE COOPER-SUGGS: Aye.
THE CLERK: Dixon.

REPRESENTATIVE DIXON: No.
THE CLERK: Hardister.
REPRESENTATIVE HARDISTER: No.

THE CLERK: Harrison.

REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: Aye.
THE CLERK: Hastings.
REPRESENTATIVE HASTINGS: No.

THE CLERK: Hawkins.

REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: Aye.
THE CLERK: Jones.
REPRESENTATIVE JONES: No.

THE CLERK: Mills.
REPRESENTATIVE MILLS: No.
THE CLERK: Reives.

REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: Aye.
THE CLERK: Rogers.
REPRESENTATIVE ROGERS: No.

THE CLERK: Szoka.
REPRESENTATIVE SZOKA: No.
THE CLERK: Warren.
REPRESENTATIVE WARREN: No.
THE CLERK: Zachary.
REPRESENTATIVE ZACHARY: No.
THE CLERK: Richardson.
REPRESENTATIVE RICHARDSON: Aye.
THE CLERK: Saine.
CHAIRMAN SAINE: No.
THE CLERK: Torbett.

REPRESENTATIVE TORBETT: No.
THE CLERK: Bell.
REPRESENTATIVE BELL: No.
THE CLERK: Stevens.

Hall.

CHAIRMAN HALL: No.
THE CLERK: 7 yes; 14 no.
CHAIRMAN SAINE: And the amendment does
fail.

Back on the original proposal. Anyone
seeking -- Representative Harrison and then
Representative Hawkins.
REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: Thank you,
Mr. Chair. I have a question for Chair Hall.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: You are recognized. REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: Thank you. I'm -- we heard -- we heard a lot of comments from the public about the maps. We -- I think there have been more than 4,000 submitted online. I haven't had a chance to go through all of them, but I'm wondering if you all had a way to -- I've been trying to get through them, but there are a lot.

How did -- did you all have a way to organize those comments and to consider them in terms of the map drawing?

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Representative Hall.
CHAIRMAN HALL: I don't know if I
really understand the question. We were in the same committee room together listening to what folks were saying. We all had an opportunity to listen to that. The chair has directed -- as the chair of this committee, I've directed staff to regularly send out the public comments to everybody on the committee so we've all had time to read those.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Representative
Harrison.
REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: Follow-up. I
think my question was just more specifically how were you taking into account public input when you were drawing the maps, but that -- that's good.

I also wondered how -- so if you had criteria that were in conflict -- we had the list of criteria that we had adopted back in August. Was there -- I know that, if I recall, you declined to create a hierarchy, but how did you prioritize when they were in conflict, such as compactness versus splitting voter tabulation districts or splitting municipalities or incumbent protection.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Representative Hall.
CHAIRMAN HALL: I looked at it
holistically and tried to comply with as much of the criteria as possible.

REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: I appreciate that. I -- there are -- we heard a lot of comments from the public about the Princeton Gerrymandering Project and how it gave the House map and the Senate map and the proposed Congressional maps grades of $F$, but I appreciate that.
I'm mindful of the fact that if I
recall from some previous research that we spent \$11 million in taxpayer money on the past decade of redistricting litigation, so this drawing maps that are not going to pass court muster is expensive to the taxpayer, and I want us to be mindful that there's a way to do it and a way to do it right, and we thought we had proposed some good amendments that would have fixed some problematic areas. I just will -- those will be it for now. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Thank you.
Representative Hawkins.
REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And hopefully I'm the last voice that you may hear. Hopefully it's one that's impactful and helps to inform decisions about how you want to improve these maps. I'm glad to be that person for you, glad to be that colleague for you.

But one of the things that I want to talk about is the PCS, and so that should be fresh in your mind because we just got that last night and it was, you know, sort of proposed today, so we should be able to sort of discuss
that with a clear mind and potentially some detail.

You know, one thing about Durham is that it has not sort of gone through -- I think what I've heard quite a bit is that, you know, some of these areas have gone through litigation. Durham sort of -- and now this new grouping of Durham and Person have not for whatever reason. I guess I'm glad for it.

But one of the things that I sort of, you know, wanted to sort of dig into the detail just a little bit on is the fact that if, you know, you're looking at sort of this breakdown of how the maps and the individual VTDs were broken down, one thing I guess for the -- sort of the pleasure of the group is could you walk through -- you know, sort of what does it mean when it says VTD and then has all these little numbers by it? Is that something that you can sort of explain? Because not only are we, you know, trying to make better maps, but we're also trying to inform the greater public about sort of how this is going because $I$ think that that's just worth, to me, a little bit of detail because then it sort of sets up another question
about some reasoning and how you wanted to construct VTDs in some of those areas.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Representative Hall.
CHAIRMAN HALL: VTD is a voter
tabulation district. And some of the numbers that you might see when you're looking at these maps are the census data for folks who live in that particular VTD.

REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: Yep. And so that -- follow-up, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: You're recognized. REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: And so, you know, one of the things that we see as you go through this -- thank you for that clarification for the public -- is that as you go through VTD and you're started to looking at VTD 32, VTD 37, VTD 44, VTD 45, you get to a place like VTD 30-2 which in this grouping and the way that it was drawn seems pretty intentional. And so, you know, I'm pretty familiar with this grouping, and so it does sort of beg the detail of the question about after that, you're right. So many different individual census blocks were chosen to sort of build out the rest of this grouping alongside the Person county.

And so again, we just got these, they were just PCS last night so they, you know, should be fresh detail because those decisions should have just been made. Is there a reason that we decided to go into that individual precinct and pick those individual, you know, census blocks in that VTD? Because, you know, again, that sets up my follow-up, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Representative Hall.
CHAIRMAN HALL: Thank you, and I'll try to answer the gentleman's question.

Because there was no amendment on this particular grouping, $I$ don't have a map -- a layered map that shows which VTDs the gentleman's talking about, but what $I$ can say is that the -- that part of Durham, as you get down into the bottom of District 51 on the chair's map, the precincts or the VTDs are very large in number, and when you get down there it becomes very difficult to try to keep your populations correct.

And so some of the comment that we heard through public comment was the changes in deviations or the discrepancies in deviations, and one of the things that I did today is I went
in and tried to equalize those deviations. And I can tell you, at least as to the change today, that was the purpose of doing that was to change those deviations.

REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: Follow-up,
Mr. Chairman.
CHAIRMAN SAINE: You are recognized for a follow-up, Representative Hawkins.

REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: And related to -- and I'm pretty sure we'll get into some of this tomorrow, too, but, you know, for that side of town, you know, that sort of VTD, we have 30-2 and then VTD 32. And so the detail that I'm following are -- you know, it's not necessarily overlaid in a map, but it is outlined in the PCS. And so not only does it do every VTD that's in a district that also gives all the census blocks that are associated, and so we don't necessarily need the overlay to answer these questions.

But, you know, can you also talk about sort of what you think -- and I know as we have gone through a lot of this, we have talked about communities of interest and we talk about sort of making sure that areas are compact and that,
of course, voters understand who their
representative is and people that have things in common. Can you talk about what you think those people in this side of Durham in VTD 32 have in common with the people in Person county in the remainder of the grouping.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Representative Hall. CHAIRMAN HALL: Part of the problem, Representative Hawkins, is, you know, the grouping of Person and Durham counties. The gentleman probably agrees that Person and Durham, they don't really have a whole lot in common, but unfortunately, or depending on how you look at it, the Supreme Court has said there's a way to do groupings. And I think everybody agrees this is the optimal county grouping for Durham county, Durham and Person. Obviously, you've got to include a good chunk of Durham to get enough population into Person. So what I tried to do is to create a district that, as best I could, was compact and complied with our criteria, and I think that's what we've done.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Thank you. Any others seeking recognition.

Representatives Harrison.
REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I just wanted to raise a couple questions about the Voting Rights Act. I reviewed Stephenson in advance of today. I'm going to review Gingles tonight again, but Stephenson, from my perspective, mandates that we would draw the Voting Rights Act districts prior to drawing the rest of the plan, so I'm trying to figure out how -- how did you ensure VRA compliance.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Representative Hall.
CHAIRMAN HALL: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman.
And the lady is correct as to what Stephenson says, but the rest of that story is there was a case called Covington versus North Carolina that was from 2016, and in that case the court found there was not sufficient evidence of legally significant racially polarized voting in North Carolina. And so since that time, we have operated under the draws that we've done under a race-blind approach. That has been successful in court,
and so we're going to continue with that. REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: Follow-up.

Sorry.

## CHAIRMAN SAINE: Representative

Harrison, you are recognized.
REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: Thank you.
And I remember Covington because I
believe my district was one of the 28 that were race -- considered racially gerrymandered that the legislature had to redraw, and they found them unconstitutional, the districts unconstitutional racial gerrymanders. I'm just reading some facts here, unconstitutional racial gerrymanders, those 28 districts, and they acknowledge that there were two reports before the legislature indicating that there was statistically significant racially polarized voting in the state.

So I will just like -- I disagree with
y'all's perspective on this. I think that this is a very big problem for us, and we're reminded of it through communications from the very first day of public comments that we heard back in August. So I just -- I think this is a big problem for us, and I just -- I think we need a
racially polarized voting analysis. I think that in order to comply with Stephenson and the federal Voting Rights Act, excuse me, we need to be mindful of this problem. And I'll stop there. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Any others seeking recognition.

Representative Richardson from Webex. Representative Richardson, we don't have your audio. If you'll unmute your mic.

REPRESENTATIVE RICHARDSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I'll be very brief.

I just want to raise two points. In listening to us tonight and in watching us tonight, somebody asked a very pointed question, all we pay attention to is what the public hearing citizens demanded of us and requested of us.

And the second observation has to do with this process is virtually impossible to do and to do fairly if you don't listen to what the people are telling us to do. And let's go back to that. We heard time and time and time again that we need to have an impartial committee. And I know it takes a constitutional amendment,
but that's real simple to overcome and that is you can add legislative approval to the recommendation, but we need to have an impartial committee that -- commission that does this and we vote on it and approve it.

But the bottom line is we're not going to be a good body, we're not going to do what we need to do unless we have very competitive districts to draw out the best in all of us, in the ones that are elected. It just is essential that we go back to as many competitive districts as we possibly can have and then we let the people draw these lines. We're just not going to get anywhere. This is -- this process is impossible. A good man like Representative Hall, it's just so hard to do. You just -- you know, and follow all these guidelines and these theorems and these theories and what -- you know, and these precincts.

Let's just draw competitive districts, let the people draw competitive districts and let's move on. That's what we should do. That's what they want us to do. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Thank you.
Representative Carney.

REPRESENTATIVE CARNEY: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman.
And to that point $I$ just wanted to share with the members that I looked up, and since 2003, when I came to this legislature, there have been 39 -- 39 independent redistricting commission bills filed. 39. I just wanted you to know that. And that's -- the public has been weighing in all the years I have been up here and we still haven't done it.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Representative
Hawkins.
REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: To speak to the bill.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: You are recognized.
REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: Thank you.
I just want to sort of talk about the fact that before we sort of go into votes on this fairly soon, the remainder of the body, you know, that democracy just depends on what we do. And so the people -- the ten and a half people that call the great state of North Carolina home sort of depend on the 120 of us, and those specifically on this committee, to make sure that we're making the best decisions possible so
that they can have faith in the systems that we put forth, in the elections process, democracy, and so the way that they will be governed are potentially for the next decade and sort of how they will have relationship with the people who represent them, right. And so many want to make sure that they have a pretty decent hand in that, and so one of the ways, of course, we can always do that is by having fair maps, making sure that something is pretty, you know, dear to me and I know dear to all of you who give of your time and your talent to come to Raleigh is that people have faith in -- faith in these processes, but most importantly that they know who their representatives are; that we keep communities of interest whole so that when voters are making decisions and having conversations that we're talking about some of the same things. And so if a city, municipality is split in half or if an area is sort of placed in -- you know, awkwardly in a district that it doesn't have anything in common with, that sort of hurts the way that people understand and are able to connect to the important work that we do.

And so that goes down to making sure that we lessen the amount of split VTDs, which I know has been a goal; that compactness is something that -- as we look back and make final decisions is something that's absolutely paramount because, again, you know, many of us get a chance to dig into the details, like the chairman and I have just here today, by looking at and actually understanding what a VTD is and what a census block is, but so many people don't. They look at the actual map and they do the eye test, right. They make sure that they understand that, well, it looks like I should be in this area and it looks like, you know, myself and my neighbors should be able to vote for this same person, and when they can't do that, it puts us all in jeopardy.

And again, I want to commend the 120 members who come up here every single day. Some people come here for three or four hours away, some people come from 30 minutes, some people come from ten, but you give up your life, your talent and being able to do something else because you believe -- you know, was it Esse Quam Videri, that we are -- you know, we
are to be rather than we are to seem, and so we want to make sure that we're doing all the things that put us in the best possible light of the people because, again, we don't spend time here until 8:00 or 9:00 just for our health. We do it because we love this state, and so we have to make sure that we are being rather than seeming. And so I just want to leave this committee with this tonight, and I hope that when we have this discussion tomorrow it will be fruitful. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: Any others seeking recognition. Seeing none, I believe Representative Torbett has a motion.

REPRESENTATIVE TORBETT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My motion is that the House Committee on Redistricting report favorably to House Bill 976 as amended wrote into a new PCS with H976-ABA-31 controlling for Chatham, Lee, Moore, Randolph, and Richmond counties and leave the committee for staff to alter the short title to reflect the new resulting map.

CHAIRMAN SAINE: You have heard the motion, and the clerk will call the roll.

THE CLERK: Adams.

REPRESENTATIVE ADAMS: Aye.
THE CLERK: Brockman.
REPRESENTATIVE BROCKMAN: No.
THE CLERK: Carney.
REPRESENTATIVE CARNEY: No.
THE CLERK: Cooper-Suggs.
REPRESENTATIVE COOPER-SUGGS: No.
THE CLERK: Dixon.
REPRESENTATIVE DIXON: Aye.
THE CLERK: Hardister.
REPRESENTATIVE HARDISTER: Aye.
THE CLERK: Harrison.
REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: No.
THE CLERK: Hastings.
REPRESENTATIVE HASTINGS: Aye.
THE CLERK: Hawkins.
REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: No.
THE CLERK: Jones.
REPRESENTATIVE JONES: Aye.
THE CLERK: Mills.
REPRESENTATIVE MILLS: Aye.
THE CLERK: Reives.
REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: No.
THE CLERK: Rogers.
REPRESENTATIVE ROGERS: Yes.

THE CLERK: Szoka.

REPRESENTATIVE SZOKA: Aye.
THE CLERK: Warren.
REPRESENTATIVE WARREN: Aye.
THE CLERK: Zachary.
REPRESENTATIVE ZACHARY: Yes.
THE CLERK: Richardson.
REPRESENTATIVE RICHARDSON: A regretful
no.
THE CLERK: Saine.
CHAIRMAN SAINE: Aye.
THE CLERK: Torbett.
REPRESENTATIVE TORBETT: Aye.
THE CLERK: Bell.
REPRESENTATIVE BELL: Aye.
THE CLERK: Stevens.
Hall.
CHAIRMAN HALL: Aye.
THE CLERK: 14 yes; 7 no.
CHAIRMAN SAINE: The ayes have it. The motion passes.

With no other business being before the committee, we stand adjourned.
(Transcription from YouTube ended at
11:57:36.)
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| weighing 93:9 | years 93:9 | 2011 10:6,7 | 69 40:3 |
| weird 40:4 | yellow 36:25 | 2016 89:19 | 6th 8:4 |
| went 3:10,17 | 37:15 | 2019 71:23 |  |
| 24:14 51:11 | yeoman's 58:5 | 2020 46:3 47:2 | 7 |
| 64:14 86:25 | Yep 85:9 | 2021 1:3 99:7,12 | $729: 25$ 35:9 |
| west 3:4 | yield 2:15 11:19 | 23 75:22 | 44:21 49:18 |
| whatsoever | 26:9,12 31:1 | $2732: 17$ | 61:17 62:3,3 |
| 46:25 | 57:20 | 27609 1:23 | 70:18 74:21 |
| whichever 29:16 <br> wholesale 8:17 <br> willing 51:2 | YouTube 2:1 | 28 32:17 90:8,14 | 80:18 98:19 |
|  | 35:22 98:24 | 3 | 8 |
|  |  | $\frac{3}{315 \cdot 2,416 \cdot 13}$ | 8 |
| Willingham's$8: 19$ | Z | 3 15:2,4 16:13 | 8:00 96:5 |
|  | Zachary 20:1,2 | 17:18 30:3 | 8:30 66:2 |
| Winston-Salem$38: 8 \text { 40:5,6,9 }$ | 28:21,22 34:15 | 30 45:13 95:21 | 82 10:15 |
|  | 34:16 44:8,9 | 30-2 85:17 87:13 | 8240 99:16 |
| Winterville 50:9 | 49:5,6 61:4,5 | 31 23:13 | 8340 1:18 99:5 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 50: 20 \text { 51:6,12 } \\ & 52: 15 \end{aligned}$ | 70:5,6 74:8,9 | 32 75:21 85:16 | 89 13:16 15:8 |
|  | 80:5,6 98:5,6 | $\begin{gathered} 87: 1388: 4 \\ 3313: 25 \quad 39: 24 \end{gathered}$ | 9 |
| 22:13 23:2 |  | 68:1,3 | 9:36:14 2:2 |
| 26:23 33:4 | 1 | 37 85:16 | 90 15:21 |
| 42:2,19 45:19 | 11:312:6,14 | 39 23:13 65:12 | 919 1:24 |
| 46:9 47:6 | 21:20 49:21 $70: 2599.7$ | 93:6,6,7 | 9531:12,17 |
| 57:17 59:19 | 10:07:09 35:23 | 4 | 976 96:18 |
| 64:9 68:23 | 10:59:42 35:23 | $4,00081: 5$ |  |
| 72:25 78:22 | 1000 1:22 | $40 \text { 45:12 65:12 }$ |  |
| wondered 82:5 | 102409-2 99:16 | $\begin{aligned} & 40 \text { 45:12 65:12 } \\ & 42 \text { 39:23 75:20 } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| wondering 4:24 | $1183: 2$ | $4208 \text { 1:21 }$ |  |
| work 67:19 | 11:57:36 98:25 | $\text { 424-8242 } 1: 24$ |  |
|  | 11677:9,16 | $43 \text { 45:13 }$ |  |
| 94:24 | $11777: 9,16$ | 44 13:23 85:17 |  |
| working 33:12 | 78:11,17 | $45 \text { 13:25 67:25 }$ |  |
| 37:5 51:20 | 12 40:6 | 85:17 |  |
| 52:24 58:9 | 120 93:23 95:18 | $46 \text { 39:24 }$ |  |
| worst 15:22 | 13 13:23 | 49 13:23 75:20 |  |
| worth 41:22 | 134 13:15 14:14 | 4 13.23 75.20 |  |
| 84:24 | 13th 99:12 | 5 |  |
| Wray 8:23 | $1429: 25$ 35:9 | 517:17,18 36:15 |  |
| writing 13:9 | 44:21 49:18 | 36:24 37:14 |  |
| written 17:3wrote 96:18 | 61:17 62:3 | 5:00 8:5 |  |
|  | 70:18 74:21 | 50 64:21 |  |
| X | 1677:9 | 50/50 66:23 |  |
|  |  | 51 86:17 |  |
| Y |  | 52 39:22 45:12 |  |
| y'all's 90:20 | 2 | 54 23:19,20 |  |
|  | 22:213:2 12:13 |  |  |

