GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF NORTH CAROLINA

2021 LEGISLATIVE SESSION, HOUSE FLOOR

VOTE ON SB 739 AND SB 740

NOVEMBER 4, 2021

Transcribed 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

1 (Transcription from audio recording 2 started at 6:53.) 3 SPEAKER MOORE: The bill will be 4 temporarily displaced. 5 Let's go to Senate Bill 739. The clerk 6 will read. 7 THE CLERK: Senators Hise, Daniel, and 8 Newton, Senate Bill 739, the bill will be entitled Senate Redistricting Plan 2021 SBK-7. 10 The General Assembly of North Carolina enacts. 11 SPEAKER MOORE: Gentleman from 12 Caldwell, Representative Hall, is recognized to 13 debate the bill. 14 REPRESENTATIVE HALL: Thank you, 15 Mr. Speaker. 16 Members, this is the State Senate 17 proposed map that was drawn in the State Senate 18 committee. I'll tell the members that the 19 Senate has passed our state House map this 20 morning and have not made any changes. And 21 historically, the bodies have not changed each 22 other's maps in terms of the State House and 23 State Senate, and so I would ask you to approve 24 this map. 25 I'll speak briefly to the merits of

this map. And I think one of the best pieces of
information about this map is that they were
able to really limit the split of municipalities
in this map to 10. That's 10 total municipality
splits out of 552 in North Carolina, or
1.8 percent of municipalities across the state.
Additionally, there were a couple of
Democratic amendments that were accepted into
the map. And so ultimately I would ask the

members to vote yes on the State Senate map.

SPEAKER MOORE: Further discussion, further debate. If not, the question before the House is the adoption -- or the passage, rather, of Senate Bill 739 on second reading. Those in favor will vote aye. Those opposed will vote no. The clerk will open the vote.

Representative Brody. Representative Saine.

Brody aye.

The clerk will lock the machine and record the vote.

64 having voted in the affirmative and 48 in the negative, Senate Bill 739 passed the second reading and will be read a third time.

THE CLERK: The General Assembly of

_

1 North Carolina enacts. 2 SPEAKER MOORE: The question before the 3 House is the passage of Senate Bill 739 on third reading. Those in favor will vote aye. 5 opposed will vote no. The clerk will open the 6 vote. 7 Representative Gill. The chair sees 8 Representative Baker. Representative Autry wish to vote. 10 Is Representative Gill on the floor? 11 There she is. Okay. 12 Saine. Saine ave. 13 The clerk will lock the machine and 14 record the vote. 15 65 having voted in the affirmative and 16 49 in the negative, Senate Bill 739 passes its 17 third reading and the bill was ordered enrolled. 18 Senate Bill 740, the clerk will read. 19 Sorry. Senate Bill 740 is back before 20 the body. 21 And actually, before the gentleman 22 debates, the chair would like to extend the 23 courtesy to the gallery on motion of the

courtesy to the gallery on motion of the
gentleman from Forsyth county, Representative
Zenger. The chair is happy to extend the

2.5

courtesies to the gallery to Cheryl Key, Allison Duncan, and their students who are here with us from the Redeemer School. Would y'all please stand so we can recognize you and welcome you. Thanks for being with us today.

Also on motion of Representative Meyer of Orange county, the chair is happy to extend the courtesy of the gallery to Mebane city council member Sean Ewing. Sean, would you please stand. Thanks for being with us here today, sir.

The gentleman from Caldwell,
Representative Hall, has the floor to debate the
bill.

REPRESENTATIVE HALL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Members, I've said this before in this process, and I'm going to say it again because I think it's important and it bears repeating, and that is that the 2021 redistricting process that has been undertaken by this body is a historic process. We have an unprecedented amount of transparency in this process with every single district that was drawn done so in full public view with live audio and live video in the

committee room.

2.5

We also made the unprecedented and historic decision to voluntarily not use election data in the drawing of these maps.

Maps have been being drawn by this state by this body for literally hundreds of years, and that has never happened voluntarily until now. When our committees adopted criteria to say we're not going to use election data, we're going to focus on traditional redistricting criteria. We're going to look at things like keeping counties whole, keeping municipalities whole, not splitting precincts or VTDs. And the result that you see of that is the maps that we've had before this body and the congressional map that you have before you now.

I will say that I have been disappointed about the lack of involvement of the Democrats in drawing congressional maps in our committee room. Senate Democrats submitted proposed congressional maps, they spent time in the committee room drawing, and as far as I know, none of our members, unfortunately, participated in that process, although I have learned that there's apparently an amendment

this morning that I just learned about, but I think that it's essentially an amendment that was drafted by Senate Democrats.

Members, after the map itself that's before you today, I'll mention that the House and Senate have filed the same map. I filed the same map that you see before you today in the Senate, but for procedural purposes, we're using the map that was passed over by the Senate.

The map before you, and the one that I filed, were both drafted in the Senate committee room, and I drew a separate map that was posted for the public to view before our public comment, but I ultimately decided that the map drawn in the Senate committee was a better map because, among other reasons, it splits fewer municipalities.

Also, we heard from public comment that it was important to keep the finger counties, as they're called, in the northeast together, so I advocated with the Senate chairs that change be made, and it was, and therefore I felt that the map drawn in the Senate committee was ultimately the best member-submitted map that I saw.

As I did with our State House map, I am

going to briefly go through the criteria the committee adopted and how it corresponds with the proposed map that's before you today.

The first thing we tried to do was keep counties whole. Within the map, where counties could be kept whole, they are. In total, there are only 11 counties split, and that's done for equalizing population across the map, which, of course, is tougher to do because for congress you have to have zero deviation. You don't have that plus or minus 5 percent that you do on the State House and State Senate maps.

One of our criteria was to not split VTDs. And again, this is important. It's important to understand context. In 2011, there were many, many VTD splits across the map. In this map, there are only 24 total VTD splits for a statewide for a congressional map, 24 VTD splits, that's it, across the entire map.

This map honors municipal boundaries.

Again, another very important note about this map is that there are only two total municipal splits in the entire congressional map. If you spent any time at all over in that committee room drafting, you know how hard that is to do.

There are only two municipalities split in the entire congressional map, and that's Charlotte and that's Greensboro. Charlotte has to be split, it's got too much population, so we already have to have one in the map no matter what we do. And there's only one more across the entire map, and that's Greensboro, and still yet over 90 percent of the city of Greensboro remains in one district. That is an incredible feat for a congressional map.

Of course, we -- every district in this map is contiguous. We looked at compactness.

And again, despite not having an algorithm to use or somebody else using an algorithm, the map contains compact districts. And of course, we did not consider racial data. And as I said earlier, for the first time in the history of this state, we did not use election data.

Members, the process that we've gone through has been a transparent one. Election data has not been used. Only tried traditional redistricting criteria has been used. And as I told you, the map before you only splits one more municipality that you absolutely have to anyway under this map. There are two total

1	municipality splits, very few VTD splits.
2	However you measure this thing under our
3	criteria, this is a great map that meets our
4	criteria that the committee adopted. I hope
5	you'll support this map.
6	SPEAKER MOORE: Representative Reives
7	is recognized to send forth amendment AST-73.
8	The clerk will read.
9	THE CLERK: Representative Reives moves
10	to amend the bill.
11	SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman from
12	Chatham, Representative Reives, is recognized to
13	debate the amendment.
14	REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: Thank you,
15	Mr. Speaker.
16	And again, I will have to repeat, I
17	don't think the lack of submissions on
18	Democrats' part would indicate a lack of desire
19	to be a part of the process. I would bet
20	there's some Democrats that would have loved to
21	have had more opportunity in the process, and I
22	don't think that that opportunity comes from
23	sitting and drawing maps that may not be
24	considered. That is my opinion.

With that being said, the amendment

that we are offering today was offered in the senate, so it has been in public view for a couple of weeks now. People have had a chance to look at it, they've had a chance to talk about it, to analyze it.

So because none of us are using partisan data or anything of that sort, we have to depend on what outside groups have looked at. One of those groups is the Princeton Gerrymandering Project. And the congressional map that we're being asked to vote on today rated an F with that particular process. Specifically, they cite that there's a 21.4 percent Republican partisan bias which measures how much Republicans would overperform on this map in a 50/50 race statewide. That clearly would indicate that there is a partisan bias to this congressional map.

The map -- the amendment that I'm presenting would get a fairness grade of A.

Benefits neither party; it is completely fair.

An analysis from the website

FiveThirtyEight indicates that the congressional

map that is being submitted by the senate

results in ten seats leaning wards Republican,

one very competitive seat, and three seats that lean towards Democrats. That generates an efficiency gap of 20.1 percent favoring Republicans which is the difference -- an efficiency gap is the difference between each party's wasted votes. 8 percent is considered a bad sign.

On the other hand, this amendment would result in six Republican-leaning seats, four Democratic-leaning seats, and four highly competitive seats, more reflecting of what North Carolina looks like today. And this map would only have a 5.8 percent efficiency gap.

So in the sense of what we're trying to do and what we're trying to present -- and I think you can feel good about voting for this amendment because this is a congressional map that came from the Senate, so it's not a situation where the House has been involved.

And I know that guys like to vote against the Senate, so this would be a great opportunity to show the Senate that they did the wrong thing here, and I would ask that you support the amendment.

SPEAKER MOORE: For what purpose does

1 the gentleman from Guilford, Representative 2 Quick, rise? 3 REPRESENTATIVE QUICK: To debate the 4 amendment. 5 SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman has the 6 floor. 7 REPRESENTATIVE QUICK: I stand in 8 support of the amendment. As a representative from Guilford county, I sat here and heard some 10 very curious congratulatory remarks about 11 keeping counties whole when the third largest 12 county in North Carolina was split into three 13 districts on the original bill. 14 Guilford county has enough citizens to 15 be two-thirds of a congressional district by 16 itself and deserves to have representation that 17 focuses on the issues of the third largest 18 county in this state. 19 This amendment would keep Guilford 20 county whole, and I ask you to support the 21 amendment on behalf of the citizens of the third 22 largest county in the state of North Carolina. 23 SPEAKER MOORE: For what purpose does 24 the gentleman from Caldwell, 2.5 Representative Hall, rise?

REPRESENTATIVE HALL: To debate the amendment.

SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman has the floor.

REPRESENTATIVE HALL: Members, as I previously said about the amendment, I didn't see it until just a few minutes ago when I came in and sat down, so, of course, I haven't had time to sit down and analyze the map, but in the limited time that I have had, I already notice, right off the bat, that this map would split the finger counties in the northeast that we heard so much about from public comment wanting to keep those together. It splits more municipalities. Again, the map that I have before you splits only two municipalities across the state. And this amendment would split more counties.

So again, in a very limited amount of time, we can clearly see that this map, the amendment, that is, does not comply as well with our criteria as our base map does, and I would ask you to vote down the amendment.

SPEAKER MOORE: Further discussion, further debate. If not, the question before the

1	House is the adoption of Amendment A1 sent
2	forward by Representative Reives. Those in
3	favor of the amendment will vote aye. Those
4	opposed will vote no. The clerk will open the
5	vote.
6	The clerk will lock the machine and
7	record the vote.
8	47 having voted in the affirmative and
9	67 in the negative, the amendment is not
10	adopted.
11	For what purpose does the lady from
12	Guilford, Representative Harrison, rise?
13	REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: To debate the
14	bill.
15	SPEAKER MOORE: The lady has the floor
16	to debate the bill.
17	REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: Thank you,
18	Mr. Speaker.
19	I don't want to repeat too much of what
20	I said on Tuesday about the public process, but
21	I know we keep bragging about the great public
22	process and transparency that went on with
23	redistricting, but I think the public did not
24	feel like it was a very friendly public process,
25	nor did they feel it was very accessible, nor

3

4

5

10

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

did they feel that it was very transparent.

strong -- first of all, we didn't have a public hearing in Guilford county, the third largest

county in the state. Those individuals felt

The public hearings, we heard some

strongly about how the Guilford county map

should look went to Forsyth and Alamance and

8 other places and online to make their comments

heard. And what we heard resoundingly was keep

Guilford county whole, keep the Piedmont Triad

whole. It's the Piedmont Triad. It's

High Point. It's Greensboro. It's

13 Winston-Salem.

I heard Senator Daniel say yesterday, when he was talking about the fifth district in Wake county, this is where the constituents there worship, play, commute and work together. Well, that's the same thing that you would say about the Piedmont Triad, that there's no real justification for splitting up that county.

It's crazy how one part of it runs from downtown Greensboro to the Tennessee border, picks up Virginia Fox's precinct Blowing Rock.

And I curiously notice the only thing that that district has in common is my great

grandfather Julian Price, the Jefferson Standard building, he hired the architect for that, that's in downtown Greensboro. The district runs by his house in Fisher Park and then it goes out to Price Park in Blowing Rock which used to be his land, but it's now part of the national park service, but there is very little in common about this proposed Congressional District 11.

And you have this other part that goes from eastern Greensboro, and some of the smaller municipalities in the county, down to Harnett and Lee, and then the other part goes down through Davie and Cabarrus, and there's just very little in common with these areas.

And I think -- I think this particular congressional grouping is the worst example of not keeping communities of interest together or keeping municipalities together.

And furthermore, it's worth noting, I know we had some dispute about the necessity of compliance with the Voting Rights Act and the ruling in Covington, but I think that the splitting up of the African American populations in Guilford county into three different

congressional districts is really problematical, and we were warned of that by the lawyers early on in August, at the very first public hearing, that we needed to take into account these populations when we were drawing these maps. We neither did a racial voting polarization study, nor did we draw these VRA districts first, and I think that's going to be a problem for us.

There's some statistics -- I can't verify that only -- that 90 percent of Greensboro feels whole. I don't feel like it feels very whole, but I will say the county doesn't feel very whole. We've got 60 percent of it in one district, 26 percent in another district, and then 14 percent in another district. And I think the cracking of the African American vote is a real problem.

I know that there are other urban counties that were split up and the same thing happened with African American population in those counties, and those were more necessary because of their populations, but we did not need to split up Guilford county.

So we heard very strong public commentary not to split it up before we drew the

maps and then after the maps were drawn, people came and told us to please keep the Piedmont

Triad whole and then we seemed to have ignored that public comment. I feel like this was very arbitrary about how the public comment was important in drawing some congressional districts but not in others, but, boy, they did not listen to the public comment when they were drawing the Guilford county districts.

I made the point which I thought was interesting when I was reviewing the comments that we had -- that had been made on the days that we heard about the congressional district hearing which I think was Monday, a week ago, which I think are very telling. And I will note that these were bipartisan comments. We heard from Republicans and Democrats. We heard from retirees. I remember there was a farmer in Alamance county who spoke, a retired sheriff.

These were some of the comments that they made about the congressional map:
Ludicrous, racially unfair, grossly partisan, disconnected, scary, undemocratic, dishonest, confusing. That is something that I am not proud of, and I can't believe any of us would be

proud of in voting for this map today.

This is a gross gerrymander. It appears to be a very gross partisan gerrymander. It looks like we have violated the Voting Rights Act in drawing these districts. This is wrong. We can do better. I urge you to vote no. Thank you.

SPEAKER MOORE: For what purpose does the gentleman from Guilford, Representative Quick, rise?

REPRESENTATIVE QUICK: To debate the bill.

SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman has the floor.

REPRESENTATIVE QUICK: Joining in with my colleague from Guilford county and agreeing with everything that she just said, I also would like to keep this body reminded of an earlier court's warning and chastising of us about targeting African Americans with surgical precision.

I think a reasonable argument can be made in Greensboro and Guilford county that the African American population there again feels targeted with surgical precision, and I would

1 ask that you vote no. 2 SPEAKER MOORE: For what purpose does 3 the gentleman from Durham, Representative 4 Hawkins, rise? 5 REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: To debate the 6 bill. 7 SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman has the 8 floor. 9 REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: I want to 10 thank all my colleagues for their remarks. And 11 I just want to add on three specifics pieces 12 specifically for the Watauga to Guilford county 13 congressional draw. 14 What is going to stick out to people 15 for this, and this is, again, reasons that I 16 join my colleagues in asking you to vote no and 17 reconsider, is that it seems deliberate that 18

those places were -- especially Greensboro was chose to be split and there was a deliberate choice on who to double-bunk.

And so if you look at the [unintelligible] from Caldwell and, you know, maneuvering into Watauga county to go get Appalachian State and Blowing Rock, that was a deliberate draw so that on the other side of it,

19

20

21

22

23

24

in Guilford county, that particular congressional member was double-bunked with someone else. And so those intentional decisions, those surgical precisions are going to stick out to voters. And again, I hope that we are not having to redraw multiple times this decade, but decisions like that are going to lead us down that path.

Secondly, the largest county in the state that borders Durham county, Wake county was split multiple times. Wake county, I think we all know, has the ability to hold at least one congressional district on its own and then the remainder of it can be placed alongside other counties that are less populated. In this, it seems like there was — the way that this was drawn allows for the illusion of the impact of that county and one would only have to draw the direct correlation that is done for partisan reasons. And again, just sharing reasons why we should vote no and reconsider because, again, we don't want to have do this multiple times.

And lastly, and this was in some of the questioning in committee with the senator that

was presenting, that with the use of criteria, it seemed that Wake was placed inconsistently, but sometimes it seemed like it was strategic depending on what district was -- district was being drawn.

And so as a legislator, I want to be able to walk my constituents through this map and tell them sort of how decisions were made, and when I can't have a consistent answer on how the criteria were weighed district by district or do we use the same sort of weight and system in ranking as we went across the state, if I can't have that conversation with them and you can't walk your constituent through that in how that criteria was used, then this map is not worth the paper it was printed on.

And so I want to make sure that, again, the goal is is that as a member of the redistricting committee, we want to do this once, and we will revisit it in 2030, but when those — the things that I've just outlined are just crystal clear to the majority of us, we need to make sure that we think about this, take our time, slow down, and make better maps.

And so I ask you to join with my

1 colleagues in voting no, but as always, to 2 chairmen, thank you for your hard work. 3 SPEAKER MOORE: For what purpose does 4 the gentleman from Chatham, Representative 5 Reives, rise? 6 REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: Thank you, 7 Mr. Speaker. To debate the bill. 8 SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman has the 9 floor. 10 REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: Thank you. 11 I think all of us agree on one thing, 12 that the most important result of this vote is 13 that folks have faith in this process, that voters walk out of here and feel like they were 15 represented, that they had their views heard, 16 had concerns made clear, and that they feel like 17 that they're in a situation where they have fair 18 maps. 19 I think that we can look at outside 20 groups that look to these maps and say that 21 there are probably going to be a lot of voters 22 who feel like that's not what happened. 23 I think to look at the congressional 24 map and see what results, according to experts

25

that have looked at this map, a map that gives

us ten Republican seats, three Democratic seats, one very competitive seat to me is fairly unbelievable if you say that that represents

North Carolina. A map that splits up Wake,

Meck, Guilford in the ways that it does I think, again, is fairly unbelievable that people are going to think that that's a fair map.

We had a group from Duke that looked at this map, and they ran tens of thousands of computer simulations. And according to their simulations, they found that this congressional map was a statistical anomaly. They made tens of thousands of maps just following our criteria, not using racial data, not using partisan data, and after running tens of thousands of simulations, all of those maps that they were running generally elected fewer Republicans than the version that's presented to us today.

That means something, and that should mean something beyond worrying about who gets what advantage or anything of that sort, but it should mean something in the sense of whatever process we had, whatever intent there was, that we shouldn't want a map that has those type of

problems and has that type of reflection.

The amendment I offered before actually split fewer voter districts. Instead of 24, it split 14; made the districts more compact, with Reock scores of 45 compared to 42; Polsby-Popper of 36 compared to 30; kept communities of interest together; created a Sandhills congressional district for those of us that are originally from down that way understand how important that is. Again, gave Guilford what it would feel would be true representation.

So ultimately what I would say is we've got an opportunity just to do things better.

House maps are done. Senate maps are done. The congressional map's a whole different ball game.

And I would say out of the three maps, what you have seen from outside analysis is the congressional map seems to be the worse at doing the things that people are concerned about. And that has nothing to do with process, that has nothing to do with intent. Ultimately, it's about final result. And because of that final result, this is something we need to go back and revisit.

All of us are tired of looking at maps.

All of us are tired of going through this. I understand that, but I think it would be good as one of the accomplishments that we have coming out of this biennium is to serve notice to the rest of the country that this can get done in the right way. We have led on other issues. This would be an outstanding issue for us to lead on, and I think we're missing that opportunity. And I don't know why we're missing that opportunity. I don't know why we're not taking it, but we're not, but I really, really, really personally, I know, would love to see us move in a different direction, change the way that we do things and try to be better.

Again, going back to the amendment that was offered, that amendment still allowed for a Republican advantage. You can still draw maps that have a Republican advantage without presenting this type of advantage which is going to make the most considerate of us raise an eyebrow in concern, so please consider voting no.

SPEAKER MOORE: For what purpose does the gentleman from Caldwell,
Representative Hall, rise?

REPRESENTATIVE HALL: Debate the bill a second time.

SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman has the floor.

REPRESENTATIVE HALL: Members, I'm a bit -- I'm taken aback when I hear folks say that the Democrats wish that they had more involvement in this process.

I've been here when the maps were drawn outside of this building and they were brought in and you were essentially shown what the map was going to look like and we just voted on it. And that's the way things were done for probably 150 years or so under mostly Democrats, but then, of course, Republicans for the first part -- or the last decade. You didn't have much input. You certainly didn't have the ability to sit down in public and draw maps with members of both parties.

That didn't happen this time around.

As we've said, and as everyone knows, we voluntarily chose to do it out in public and not use election data even though the law doesn't require us to do that. We chose to do that because that's the right thing to do. We did

that. This body did that. None of the -- none of the previous bodies in the last 150 or 200 years. This general assembly chose to do that.

And that committee room has been open since October 6th. I've been in there most of the time since October 6th, and so I know who was there, and I didn't see a whole lot of my friends on the Democratic side, and that's unfortunate because in 2019 I did. When we drew those maps in 2019, you saw a lot of computer terminals where Democrats and Republicans were sitting there together. In fact, I got to know some of you that I didn't know very well through that process. That was available to everybody this time around. And I don't know why some didn't -- some chose not to do that. I've got some suspicions, but again, I don't question people's intent.

We don't have a proposed alternative congressional map from House Democrats, and so ultimately it's a process argument that's being made. And we've heard a whole lot also about outcomes and these outside groups in the way that they rated these maps. I've intentionally

1	not looked at any of that stuff. I'm not
2	considering political data, electoral data in
3	the drafting of these maps, so I have no idea
4	what their outcome is going to be.
5	But ultimately, if you have a process
6	where you don't consider election data, a
7	process that's done out in the open, in video
8	with full audio for the world to see and you
9	only consider traditional criteria, like keeping
10	cities and counties whole, and if you still
11	don't like the outcome of what comes out of
12	that, perhaps the problem is not the process or
13	these maps. Perhaps the problem is your ideas.
14	SPEAKER MOORE: Further discussion,
15	further debate.
16	For what purpose does the lady from
17	Pitt, Representative Smith, rise?
18	REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: I would rise to
19	ask a question.
20	SPEAKER MOORE: Of
21	REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: Of the bill
22	sponsor.
23	SPEAKER MOORE: Representative Hall,
24	does the gentleman yield?
25	REPRESENTATIVE HALL: I yield.

SPEAKER MOORE: He yields.

2 PERRESENTATIVE SMITH: My

REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: My question is can you clarify that last statement because I'm confused now. The very last statement that you made about the ideas, so can you just clarify that for me.

REPRESENTATIVE HALL: I will do my best to clarify.

REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: I appreciate it.

REPRESENTATIVE HALL: And what I said was this is the most transparent process in the history of this state. We voluntarily did not use election data. I do not know the outcome of these maps, but if you don't like that outcome, again, perhaps the problem is not the process of this, perhaps it's not the maps themselves, but perhaps it's the ideas that you're putting forth to the public.

REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: Okay. Can I please debate the bill, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER MOORE: The lady is recognized to debate the bill.

REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: Okay. So I'm breathing because that's important. I just want to make sure that we're clear. There's been so

many options of things being put forth to this body throughout this entire session and they have been ignored, and so to hear someone get up and praise themselves for the work they've done independently versus working collectively is already a red flag.

It appears that there's an attack on the African American vote, but there's no concern for that. It's important to know that people are supposed to elect us and not the other way around, but we see where we're headed.

When I look at these congressional maps, when I look at the house maps, all of them -- all of them reek of just -- they stink because there's something wrong with them. I've been hearing so much about transparency. If we truly had transparency when we had those meetings ahead of time, with no maps that we wasted the people's time, we would have had those meetings after these maps, but we know what we would have heard. People don't want gerrymandering; that's what we have. People don't want us packing; that's what we're doing. People don't want to separate individuals of the same interest; that's what we're doing. But we

2.5

have so many individuals who feel like they're the only ones that's right.

So to go into a room and to draw a map that you're going to vote down and to stand on the floor and begin to say everything that I receive was at the last minute. Well, that's really what's happened this entire session. From the budget on down, everything was a last minute, and now we're going to say I am so disappointed in Democrats because of the lack of participation at the last minute. That's what we've been experiencing. That's unfortunate, and to go back and say we're working across aisles, that is untrue.

So if we're going to really listen to the people, we should be listening to the people. Transparency of having a camera in a room, that you're not doing the work in that room and you're doing that work in another room and then you come into this room and say, oh, here it is, that's not good.

So I urge everyone to please make sure that we vote these down, and then we need to make sure the people do what they need to do to vote on individuals who want to be a voice and

1 represent them and listen to them and make sure 2 that we're representing the people. It is not 3 about us. It's about the people. Thank you. 4 Please vote no. 5 SPEAKER MOORE: For what purpose does 6 the gentleman from Guilford, Representative 7 Quick, rise? 8 REPRESENTATIVE QUICK: To speak to the 9 bill a second time. 10 SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman has the 11 floor. 12 REPRESENTATIVE OUICK: With all due 13 respect to my friend, Mr. Chairman, in a state 14 with 36 percent of registered voters are 15 Democrats approximately, 33 percent of 16 registered voters are unaffiliated 17 approximately, and 30 percent are registered 18 Republican approximately, and yet a 19 congressional map has the probability of 20 electing ten Republicans and three Democrats, I 21 don't think it's an idea problem. I think it's 22 a map-drawing problem. And I wonder how many 23 Republicans -- you criticize Democrats for not

34

24

25

drawing maps. How many Republicans actually

drew maps? Please vote no for this map.

1	SPEAKER MOORE: Further discussion,
2	further debate. If not, the question before the
3	House is the passage of Senate Bill 740 on
4	second reading. Those in favor will vote aye.
5	Those opposed will vote no. The clerk will open
6	the vote.
7	The clerk will lock the machine and
8	record the vote.
9	65 having voted in the affirmative and
10	49 in the negative, Senate Bill 740 passes its
11	second reading and will be read a third time.
12	THE CLERK: General Assembly of
13	North Carolina enacts.
14	SPEAKER MOORE: Further discussion,
15	further debate. If not, the question before the
16	House is the passage of Senate Bill 740 on third
17	reading. Those in favor will vote aye. Those
18	opposed will vote no. The clerk will open the
19	vote.
20	The clerk will lock the machine and
21	record the vote.
22	65 having voted in the affirmative and
23	49 in the negative, Senate Bill 740 passes its

(Transcription from audio recording

third reading and the bill is ordered enrolled.

1	stopped at 44:51 and continued again at 46:37.)
2	SPEAKER MOORE: For what purpose does
3	the lady from Guilford, Representative Harrison,
4	rise?
5	REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: I would like
6	to be recorded as an aye on the Reives amendment
7	on Senate Bill 740, please.
8	SPEAKER MOORE: The lady will be
9	recorded as having voted aye on the Reives
10	amendment.
11	For what purpose does the gentleman
12	from Mecklenburg, Representative Autry, rise?
13	REPRESENTATIVE AUTRY: Thank you,
14	Mr. Speaker. I would like to be recorded as
15	voting aye on Amendment A1 for Senate Bill 740,
16	please.
17	SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman will also
18	be recorded as having voted aye on Amendment A1.
19	For what purpose does the lady from
20	Wake, Representative Dahle, rise?
21	REPRESENTATIVE DAHLE: I would like to
22	object to the last bill being added to the
23	calendar
24	(Transcription from audio recording
25	stopped at 47:14.)

1	STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA)
) CERTIFICATE
2	COUNTY OF WAKE)
3	
4	I, DENISE MYERS BYRD, Stenographic Court
5	Reporter, CSR 8340, do hereby certify that the
6	transcription of the audio recorded General Assembly
7	of North Carolina House Floor Vote on SB 739 and
8	SB 740, held on November 4, 2021, was taken down by
9	me stenographically to the best of my ability and
10	thereafter transcribed under my supervision; and that
11	the foregoing pages, inclusive, constitute a true and
12	accurate transcription of said recording.
13	Signed this the 19th day of December 2021.
14	
15	
16	
	Denise Myers Byrd
17	CSR 8240, RPR, CLR 102409-2
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

			 I	
A	12:8,17,24	4:12 15:3 35:4	briefly 2:25 8:1	24:16 31:25
A1 15:1 36:15	13:4,8,19,21	35:17 36:6,9	Brody 3:17,19	clearly 11:17
36:18	14:2,6,17,21	36:15,18	brought 28:10	14:20
aback 28:6	14:23 15:1,3,9		budget 33:8	clerk 2:5,7 3:16
ability 22:12	26:2 27:15,16	<u>B</u>	building 17:2	3:20,25 4:5,13
28:18 37:9	36:6,10,15,18	back 4:19 26:23	28:10	4:18 10:8,9
able 3:3 23:7	amendments 3:8	27:15 33:13	Byrd 1:18 37:4	15:4,6 35:5,7
absolutely 9:24	American 17:24	bad 12:7	37:16	35:12,18,20
accepted 3:8	18:17,20 20:24	Baker 4:8		CLR 37:17
accessible 15:25	32:8	ball 26:15		colleague 20:16
accomplishme	Americans	base 14:22	C 37:1,1	colleagues 21:10
27:3	20:20	bat 14:11	Cabarrus 17:14	21:16 24:1
account 18:4	amount 5:22	bears 5:19	Caldwell 2:12	collectively 32:5
accurate 37:12	14:19	behalf 13:21	5:12 13:24	come 33:20
Act 17:22 20:5	analysis 11:22	believe 19:25	21:22 27:24	comes 10:22
add 21:11	26:17	Benefits 11:21	calendar 36:23	30:11
added 36:22	analyze 11:5	best 3:1 7:24 31:7 37:9	called 7:20	coming 27:3
Additionally 3:7	14:9	bet 10:19	camera 33:17	comment 7:14
adopted 6:8 8:2	anomaly 25:12	better 7:15 20:6	Carolina 1:1,23	7:18 14:13
10:4 15:10	answer 23:9	23:24 26:13	2:10 3:5 4:1 12:12 13:12,22	19:4,5,8
adoption 3:13	anyway 9:25	27:14	25:4 35:13	commentary
15:1	Appalachian	beyond 25:21	37:1,7	18:25
advantage 25:22	21:24	bias 11:14,18	certainly 28:17	comments 16:8
27:17,18,19	apparently 6:25	biennium 27:4	certify 37:5	19:11,16,20
advocated 7:21	appears 20:3	bill 2:3,5,8,8,13	chair 4:7,22,25	committee 2:18
affirmative 3:22	32:7	3:14,23 4:3,16	5:7	6:1,20,22 7:11
4:15 15:8 35:9	appreciate 31:9 approve 2:23	4:17,18,19	Chairman 34:13	7:15,23 8:2,24 10:4 22:25
35:22	approve 2.23 approximately	5:14 10:10	chairmen 24:2	23:19 29:5
African 17:24	34:15,17,18	13:13 15:14,16	chairs 7:21	committees 6:8
18:17,20 20:20	arbitrary 19:5	20:12 21:6	chance 11:3,4	common 16:25
20:24 32:8	architect 17:2	24:7 28:1	change 7:21	17:8,15
ago 14:7 19:14	areas 17:15	30:21 31:20,22	27:13	communities
agree 24:11	argument 20:22	34:9 35:3,10	changed 2:21	17:18 26:6
agreeing 20:16	29:22	35:16,23,24	changes 2:20	commute 16:17
ahead 32:18	asked 11:11	36:7,15,22	Charlotte 9:2,3	compact 9:15
aisles 33:14	asking 21:16	bipartisan 19:16	chastising 20:19	26:4
Alamance 16:7 19:19	assembly 1:1	bit 28:6	Chatham 10:12	compactness
algorithm 9:13	2:10 3:25 29:3	Blowing 16:23	24:4	9:12
9:14	35:12 37:6	17:5 21:24	Cheryl 5:1	compared 26:5
Allison 5:1	AST-73 10:7	bodies 2:21 29:2	choice 21:20	26:6
allowed 27:16	attack 32:7	body 4:20 5:21	chose 21:19	competitive 12:1
allows 22:17	audio 2:1 5:25	6:6,15 20:18	28:22,24 29:3	12:11 25:2
alongside 22:14	30:8 35:25	29:1 32:2	29:17	completely
alternative	36:24 37:6	border 16:22	cite 11:13	11:21
29:20	August 18:3	borders 22:10	cities 30:10	compliance
amend 10:10	Autry 4:8 36:12	boundaries 8:20	citizens 13:14,21	17:22
amendment	36:13	boy 19:7	city 5:8 9:8	comply 14:21
6:25 7:2 10:7	available 29:15	bragging 15:21	clarify 31:3,5,8	computer 25:10
10:13,25 11:19	aye 3:15,19 4:4	breathing 31:24	clear 23:22	29:11
-,	1	1	1	1
				38

	l		 	
concern 27:21	county 4:24 5:7	30:15 31:20,22	dispute 17:21	efficiency 12:3,5
32:9	13:9,12,14,18	35:2,15	district 5:24 9:9	12:13
concerned 26:19	13:20,22 16:4	debates 4:22	9:11 13:15	elect 32:10
concerns 24:16	16:5,6,10,16	decade 22:7	16:15,25 17:3	elected 25:17
confused 31:4	16:20 17:12,25	28:16	17:9 18:14,15	electing 34:20
confusing 19:24	18:12,23 19:9	December 37:13	18:16 19:13	election 6:4,9
congratulatory	19:19 20:16,23	decided 7:14	22:13 23:4,4	9:18,20 28:23
13:10	21:12,23 22:1	decision 6:3	23:10,10 26:8	30:6 31:13
congress 8:9	22:9,10,10,11	decisions 22:4,7	districts 9:15	electoral 30:2
congressional	22:18 37:2	23:8	13:13 18:1,7	enacts 2:10 4:1
6:15,19,21	couple 3:7 11:3	deliberate 21:17	19:7,9 20:5	35:13
8:18,23 9:2,10	course 8:9 9:11	21:19,25	26:3,4	enrolled 4:17
11:10,18,23	9:15 14:8 28:15	Democratic 3:8 25:1 29:9	doing 26:18	35:24
12:17 13:15			32:23,25 33:18	entire 8:19,23
17:8,17 18:1 19:6,13,21	Court 1:19 37:4 court's 20:19	Democratic-le 12:10	33:19 double-bunk	9:2,7 32:2 33:7 entitled 2:9
21:13 22:2,13	court's 20:19 courtesies 5:1	Democrats 6:19	21:20	equalizing 8:8
24:23 25:11	courtesy 4:23	6:20 7:3 10:20	double-bunked	especially 21:18
26:8,15,18	5:8	12:2 19:17	22:2	especially 21.18 essentially 7:2
29:21 32:12	Covington 17:23	28:7,14 29:12	downtown 16:22	28:11
34:19	cracking 18:16	29:21 33:10	17:3	everybody 29:15
consider 9:16	crazy 16:21	34:15,20,23	drafted 7:3,11	Ewing 5:9
27:21 30:6,9	created 26:7	Democrats'	drafting 8:25	example 17:17
considerate	criteria 6:8,10	10:18	30:3	experiencing
27:20	8:1,13 9:22	Denise 1:18 37:4	draw 18:7 21:13	33:12
considered	10:3,4 14:22	37:16	21:25 22:19	experts 24:24
10:24 12:6	23:1,10,15	denise@disco	27:17 28:18	extend 4:22,25
considering 30:2	25:14 30:9	1:25	33:3	5:7
consistent 23:9	criticize 34:23	depend 11:8	drawing 6:4,19	eyebrow 27:21
constituent	crystal 23:22	depending 23:4	6:22 10:23	
23:14	CSR 1:18 37:5	deserves 13:16	18:5 19:6,9	F
constituents	37:17	desire 10:18	20:5 34:24	F 11:12 37:1
16:16 23:7	curious 13:10	despite 9:13	drawn 2:17 5:24	fact 29:13
constitute 37:11	curiously 16:24	deviation 8:10	6:5 7:15,23	fair 11:21 24:17
contains 9:15		difference 12:4	19:1 22:17	25:7
context 8:15	<u>D</u>	12:5	23:5 28:9	fairly 25:2,6
contiguous 9:12	Dahle 36:20,21	different 17:25	drew 7:12 18:25	fairness 11:20
continued 36:1	Daniel 2:7 16:14	26:15 27:13	29:10 34:25	faith 24:13
conversation	data 6:4,9 9:16	direct 22:19	due 34:12	far 6:22
23:13	9:18,21 11:7	direction 27:13	Duke 25:8	farmer 19:18
correlation	25:14,15 28:23	disappointed	Duncan 5:2	favor 3:15 4:4
22:19	30:2,2,6 31:13	6:18 33:10	Durham 21:3	15:3 35:4,17
corresponds 8:2	Davie 17:14	disconnected	22:10	favoring 12:3
council 5:9	day 37:13	19:23		feat 9:10
counties 6:11	days 19:12	Discovery 1:19		feel 12:16 15:24
7:19 8:5,5,7	debate 2:13 3:12	discussion 3:11	E 37:1,1	15:25 16:1
13:11 14:12,18	5:13 10:13	14:24 30:14	earlier 9:17 20:18	18:11,13 19:4
18:19,21 22:15	13:3 14:1,25 15:13,16 20:11	35:1,14		24:14,16,22 26:11 33:1
30:10	21:5 24:7 28:1	dishonest 19:23	early 18:2 eastern 17:11	feels 18:11,12
country 27:5	21.3 24.7 20.1	displaced 2:4	Castern 17.11	10.11,12
	1	1	1	39

20:24	game 26:15	Guilford 13:1,9	31:12	6:18 28:8
felt 7:22 16:5	game 20.13 gap 12:3,5,13	13:14,19 15:12	hold 22:12	issue 27:7
fewer 7:16 25:17	gap 12.5,5,15 general 1:1 2:10	16:4,6,10	honors 8:20	issues 13:17 27:6
26:3	3:25 29:3	17:25 18:23	hope 10:4 22:5	188UES 13.17 27.0
20.3 fifth 16:15	35:12 37:6	19:9 20:9,16	house 1:2 2:19	J
filed 7:6,6,11	generally 25:17	20:23 21:12	2:22 3:13 4:3	Jefferson 17:1
7 7	generates 12:2	20.23 21.12 22:1 25:5	7:5,25 8:12	join 21:16 23:25
final 26:22,22 finger 7:19	generates 12.2 gentleman 2:11	26:10 34:6	12:19 15:1	Joining 20:15
14:12	4:21,24 5:12	36:3	17:4 26:14	Julian 17:1
first 8:4 9:17	10:11 13:1,5		29:21 32:13	justification
	13:24 14:3	guys 12:20		16:20
16:3 18:3,7 28:15		H	35:3,16 37:7 hundreds 6:6	10.20
	20:9,13 21:3,7	Hall 2:12,14	nunareus 0.0	K
Fisher 17:4	24:4,8 27:24	5:13,15 13:25		keep 7:19 8:4
FiveThirtyEight	28:3 30:24	14:1,5 27:25	idea 30:3 34:21	13:19 14:14
11:23	34:6,10 36:11	28:1,5 30:23	ideas 30:13 31:5	15:21 16:9,10
flag 32:6	36:17	30:25 31:7,10	31:17	19:2 20:18
floor 1:2 4:10	gerrymander 20:2,3	hand 12:8	ignored 19:3	keeping 6:11,12
5:13 13:6 14:4 15:15 20:14	·	happen 28:20	32:3	13:11 17:18,19
21:8 24:9 28:4	gerrymanderi 11:10 32:22	happened 6:7	illusion 22:17	30:9
		18:20 24:22	impact 22:18	kept 8:6 26:6
33:5 34:11 37:7	Gill 4:7,10	33:7	important 5:19	Key 5:1
	gives 24:25	happy 4:25 5:7	7:19 8:14,15	know 6:23 8:25
focus 6:9	go 2:5 8:1 21:23	hard 8:25 24:2	8:21 19:6	12:20 15:21
focuses 13:17	26:23 33:3,13	Harnett 17:12	24:12 26:10	17:21 18:18
folks 24:13 28:6	goal 23:18	Harrison 15:12	31:24 32:9	21:22 22:12
following 25:13	goes 17:5,10,13	15:13,17 36:3	inclusive 37:11	27:9,10,12
foregoing 37:11	going 5:18 6:9,9	36:5	inconsistently	29:7,13,14,16
Forks 1:21	6:11 8:1 18:8	Hawkins 21:4,5	23:2	31:13 32:9,20
Forsyth 4:24 16:7	21:14 22:4,7 24:21 25:7	21:9	incredible 9:9	knows 28:21
		headed 32:11	independently	
forth 10:7 31:17	27:1,15,19	hear 28:6 32:3	32:5	L
32:1	28:12 30:4	heard 7:18 13:9	indicate 10:18	lack 6:18 10:17
forward 15:2 found 25:11	33:4,9,15	14:12 16:2,9,9	11:17	10:18 33:10
	good 12:16 27:2 33:21	16:14 18:24	indicates 11:23	lady 15:11,15
four 12:9,10 Fox's 16:23		19:13,16,17	individuals 16:5	30:16 31:21
friend 34:13	grade 11:20 grandfather	24:15 29:23	32:24 33:1,25	36:3,8,19
friendly 15:24	17:1	32:21	information 3:2	land 17:6
friends 29:9		hearing 16:4	input 28:17	largest 13:11,17
full 5:24 30:8	great 10:3 12:21 15:21 16:25	18:3 19:14	intent 25:24	13:22 16:4
	Greensboro 9:3	32:16	26:21 29:19	22:9
further 3:11,12 14:24,25 30:14		hearings 16:2	intentional 22:3	lastly 22:24
30:15 35:1,2	9:7,8 16:12,22 17:3,11 18:11	held 37:8	intentionally	law 28:23
35:14,15	20:23 21:18	High 16:12	29:25	lawyers 18:2
furthermore	gross 20:2,3	highly 12:10	interest 17:18	lead 22:8 27:8
17:20	grossly 19:22	hired 17:2	26:7 32:25	lean 12:2
1 / .40	group 25:8	Hise 2:7	interesting	leaning 11:25
G	group 23.8 grouping 17:17	historic 5:21 6:3	19:11	learned 6:25 7:1
gallery 4:23 5:1	grouping 17.17 groups 11:8,9	historically 2:21	involved 12:19	led 27:6
5:8	24:20 29:24	history 9:17	involvement	Lee 17:13
5.0	24.20 29.24	1115tor y 7.17	in voi veinent	
	I	I	<u> </u>	40

	l			
Legal 1:20	14:11,15,20,22	Monday 19:14	37:1,7	P
LEGISLATIVE	16:6 19:21	MOORE 2:3,11	northeast 7:20	packing 32:23
1:2	20:1 23:7,15	3:11 4:2 10:6	14:12	pages 37:11
legislator 23:6	24:24,25,25	10:11 12:25	note 8:21 19:15	paper 23:16
Let's 2:5	25:4,7,9,12,25	13:5,23 14:3	notice 14:10	park 17:4,5,7
limit 3:3	26:18 28:11	14:24 15:15	16:24 27:4	part 10:18,19
limited 14:10,19	29:21 33:3	20:8,13 21:2,7	noting 17:20	16:21 17:6,10
listen 19:8 33:15	34:19,25	24:3,8 27:23	November 1:4	17:13 28:16
34:1	map's 26:15	28:3 30:14,20	37:8	participated
listening 33:16	map-drawing	30:23 31:1,21	0	6:24
literally 6:6	34:22	34:5,10 35:1	object 36:22	participation
little 17:7,15	maps 2:22 6:4,5	35:14 36:2,8	October 29:6,7	33:11
live 5:25,25	6:14,19,21	36:17	offered 11:1	particular 11:12
LLC 1:20	8:12 10:23	morning 2:20	26:2 27:16	17:16 22:1
lock 3:20 4:13	18:5 19:1,1	7:1	offering 11:1	parties 28:19
15:6 35:7,20	23:24 24:18,20	motion 4:23 5:6	oh 33:20	partisan 11:7,14
look 6:11 11:4 16:7 21:21	25:13,16 26:14 26:14,16,25	move 27:13 moves 10:9	Okay 4:11 31:19	11:17 19:22
	, ,		31:23	20:3 22:20
24:19,20,23 28:12 32:12,13	27:17 28:9,18 29:11,25 30:3	multiple 22:6,11 22:23	once 23:20	25:15
looked 9:12 11:8	30:13 31:14,16	municipal 8:20	ones 33:2	party 11:21
24:25 25:8	32:13,13,18,20	8:22	online 16:8	party's 12:6
30:1	34:24,25	municipalities	open 3:16 4:5	passage 3:13 4:3
looking 26:25	matter 9:5	3:3,6 6:12 7:17	15:4 29:5 30:7	35:3,16
looks 12:12 20:4	mean 25:21,23	9:1 14:15,16	35:5,18	passed 2:19 3:23
lot 24:21 29:8,11	means 25:20	17:12,19	opinion 10:24	7:9
29:23	measure 10:2	municipality 3:4	opportunity	passes 4:16
love 27:12	measures 11:15	9:24 10:1	10:21,22 12:21	35:10,23
loved 10:20	Mebane 5:8	Myers 1:18 37:4	26:13 27:9,10	path 22:8
Ludicrous 19:22	Meck 25:5	37:16	opposed 3:15	people 11:3 19:1
	Mecklenburg		4:5 15:4 35:5	21:14 25:6
M	36:12	N	35:18	26:19 32:10,21
machine 3:20	meetings 32:18	national 17:7	options 32:1	32:22,24 33:16 33:17,24 34:2
4:13 15:6 35:7	32:20	necessary 18:21	Orange 5:7	34:3
35:20	meets 10:3	necessity 17:21	ordered 4:17	people's 29:19
majority 23:22	member 5:9	need 18:23	35:24	32:19
maneuvering	22:2 23:18	23:23 26:23	original 13:13	percent 3:6 8:11
21:23	member-subm	33:23,24	originally 26:9	9:8 11:14 12:3
map 2:17,19,24	7:24	needed 18:4	other's 2:22	12:6,13 18:10
3:1,2,4,9,10	members 2:16	negative 3:23	outcome 30:4,11	18:13,14,15
6:15 7:4,6,7,9	2:18 3:10 5:17	4:16 15:9	31:13,14	34:14,15,17
7:10,12,14,15	6:23 7:4 9:19	35:10,23	outcomes 29:24	personally 27:12
7:23,24,25 8:3	14:5 28:5,19	neither 11:21	outlined 23:21	picks 16:23
8:5,8,16,17,18	mention 7:5	18:6	outside 11:8	pieces 3:1 21:11
8:19,20,22,23	merits 2:25	never 6:7	24:19 26:17	Piedmont 16:10
9:2,5,7,10,12	Meyer 5:6	Newton 2:8	28:10 29:24	16:11,19 19:2
9:14,23,25	minus 8:11	North 1:1,23	outstanding	Pitt 30:17
10:3,5 11:11	minute 33:6,9,11	2:10 3:5 4:1	27:7	placed 22:14
11:16,18,19,24	minutes 14:7	12:12 13:12,22	overperform	23:2
12:12,17 14:9	missing 27:8,9	25:4 35:13	11:15	places 16:8
	1			*
				41

21:18	process 5:18,20	Raleigh 1:23	21:10	24:12 26:22,23
Plan 2:9	_	ran 25:9		
	5:22,23 6:24		remember 19:18	results 11:25
play 16:17	9:19 10:19,21	ranking 23:12	reminded 20:18	24:24
please 5:3,10	11:12 15:20,22	rated 11:12	Reock 26:5	retired 19:19
19:2 27:21	15:24 24:13	29:25	repeat 10:16	retirees 19:18
31:20 33:22	25:24 26:20	read 2:6 3:24	15:19	reviewing 19:11
34:4,25 36:7	28:8 29:15,22	4:18 10:8	repeating 5:19	revisit 23:20
36:16	30:5,7,12	35:11	Reporter 37:5	26:24
plus 8:11	31:11,15	reading 3:14,24	Reporters 1:19	right 14:11 27:6
point 16:12	Project 11:10	4:4,17 35:4,11	represent 34:1	28:25 33:2
19:10	proposed 2:17	35:17,24	representation	Rights 17:22
polarization	6:21 8:3 17:8	real 16:19 18:17	13:16 26:11	20:4
18:6	29:20	really 3:3 18:1	representative	rise 13:2,25
political 30:2	proud 19:25	27:11,11,12	2:12,14 3:17	15:12 20:10
Polsby-Popper	20:1	33:7,15	3:17 4:7,8,8,10	21:4 24:5
26:5	public 5:24 7:13	reasonable	4:24 5:6,13,15	27:25 30:17,18
populated 22:15	7:13,18 11:2	20:22	10:6,9,12,14	34:7 36:4,12
population 8:8	14:13 15:20,21	reasons 7:16	13:1,3,7,8,25	36:20
9:4 18:20	15:23,24 16:2	21:15 22:20,21	14:1,5 15:2,12	Road 1:21
20:24	16:3 18:3,24	receive 33:6	15:13,17 20:9	Rock 16:23 17:5
populations	19:4,5,8 28:18	recognize 5:4	20:11,15 21:3	21:24
17:24 18:5,22	28:22 31:18	recognized 2:12	21:5,9 24:4,6	room 6:1,20,22
posted 7:12	purpose 12:25	10:7,12 31:21	24:10 27:25	7:12 8:25 29:5
praise 32:4	13:23 15:11	reconsider 21:17	28:1,5 30:17	33:3,18,19,19
precinct 16:23	20:8 21:2 24:3	22:21	30:18,21,23,25	33:20
precincts 6:13	27:23 30:16	record 3:21 4:14	31:2,7,9,10,19	RPR 1:18 37:17
precision 20:21	34:5 36:2,11	15:7 35:8,21	31:23 34:6,8	ruling 17:23
20:25	36:19	recorded 36:6,9	34:12 36:3,5	running 25:15
precisions 22:4	purposes 7:8	36:14,18 37:6	36:12,13,20,21	25:17
present 12:15	put 32:1	recording 2:1	represented	runs 16:21 17:4
presented 25:18	putting 31:17	35:25 36:24	24:15	
presenting		37:12	representing	S
11:20 23:1	Q	red 32:6	34:2	Saine 3:18 4:12
27:19	question 3:12	Redeemer 5:3	represents 25:3	4:12
previous 29:2	4:2 14:25	redistricting 2:9	Republican	Sandhills 26:7
previously 14:6	29:18 30:19	5:20 6:10 9:22	11:14,25 25:1	sat 13:9 14:8
Price 17:1,5	31:2 35:2,15	15:23 23:19	27:17,18 34:18	saw 7:24 29:11
Princeton 11:9	questioning	redraw 22:6	Republican-le	SB 1:3,3 37:7,8
printed 23:16	22:25	reek 32:14	12:9	SBK-7 2:9
probability	Quick 13:2,3,7	reflecting 12:11	Republicans	scary 19:23
34:19	20:10,11,15	reflection 26:1	11:15 12:4	School 5:3
probably 24:21	34:7,8,12	registered 34:14	19:17 25:18	scores 26:5
28:13		34:16,17	28:15 29:12	Sean 5:9,9
problem 18:8,17	R	Reives 10:6,9,12	34:20,23,24	seat 12:1 25:2
30:12,13 31:15	R 37:1	10:14 15:2	require 28:24	seats 11:25 12:1
34:21,22	race 11:16	24:5,6,10 36:6	resoundingly	12:9,10,11
problematical	racial 9:16 18:6	36:9	16:9	25:1,1
18:1	25:14	remainder 22:14	respect 34:13	second 3:14,24
problems 26:1	racially 19:22	remains 9:9	rest 27:5	28:2 34:9 35:4
procedural 7:8	raise 27:20	remarks 13:10	result 6:13 12:9	35:11
•				
				42

	I	 	1]
Secondly 22:9	Smith 30:17,18	37:1	34:20	12:12 20:1
see 6:14 7:7 14:7	30:21 31:2,9	statement 31:3,4	Tennessee 16:22	25:19
14:20 24:24	31:19,23	statewide 8:18	tens 25:9,12,15	told 9:23 19:2
27:12 29:8	somebody 9:14	11:16	terminals 29:12	total 3:4 8:6,17
30:8 32:11	Sorry 4:19	statistical 25:12	terms 2:22	8:22 9:25
seen 26:17	sort 11:7 23:8,11	statistics 18:9	thank 2:14 5:15	tougher 8:9
sees 4:7	25:22	Stenographic	10:14 15:17	traditional 6:10
senate 2:5,8,9,16	speak 2:25 34:8	37:4	20:6 21:10	9:21 30:9
2:17,19,23	Speaker 2:3,11	stenographica	24:2,6,10 34:3	transcribed 1:16
3:10,14,23 4:3	2:15 3:11 4:2	37:9	36:13	37:10
4:16,18,19	5:16 10:6,11	stick 21:14 22:5	Thanks 5:5,10	transcription
6:20 7:3,6,8,9	10:15 12:25	stink 32:14	thing 8:4 10:2	2:1 35:25
7:11,15,21,23	13:5,23 14:3	stopped 36:1,25	12:22 16:18,24	36:24 37:6,12
8:12 11:2,24	14:24 15:15,18	strategic 23:3	18:19 24:11	transparency
12:18,21,22	20:8,13 21:2,7	strong 16:3	28:25	5:23 15:22
26:14 35:3,10	24:3,7,8 27:23	18:24	things 6:11	32:16,17 33:17
35:16,23 36:7	28:3 30:14,20	strongly 16:6	23:21 26:13,19	transparent
36:15	30:23 31:1,20	students 5:2	27:14 28:13	9:20 16:1
senator 16:14	31:21 34:5,10	study 18:6	32:1	31:11
22:25	35:1,14 36:2,8	stuff 30:1	think 3:1 5:19	Triad 16:10,11
Senators 2:7	36:14,17	submissions	7:2 10:17,22	16:19 19:3
send 10:7	specifically	10:17	12:16 15:23	tried 8:4 9:21
sense 12:14	11:13 21:12	submitted 6:20	17:16,16,23	true 26:11 37:11
25:23	specifics 21:11	11:24	18:8,16 19:14	truly 32:17
sent 15:1	spent 6:21 8:24	Suite 1:22	19:15 20:22	try 27:14
separate 7:12	split 3:3 8:7,13	supervision	22:11 23:23	trying 12:14,15
32:24	9:1,4 13:12	37:10	24:11,19,23	Tuesday 15:20
serve 27:4	14:11,17 18:19	support 10:5	25:5,7 27:2,8	two 8:22 9:1,25
service 17:7	18:23,25 21:19	12:23 13:8,20	34:21,21	14:16
session 1:2 32:2	22:11 26:3,4	supposed 32:10	third 3:24 4:3,17	two-thirds 13:15
33:7	splits 3:5 7:16	sure 23:17,23	13:11,17,21	type 25:25 26:1
sharing 22:20	8:16,17,19,23	31:25 33:22,24	16:4 35:11,16	27:19
sheriff 19:19	9:23 10:1,1	34:1	35:24	U
show 12:22	14:14,16 25:4	surgical 20:20	thought 19:10	
shown 28:11	splitting 6:13	20:25 22:4	thousands 25:9	ultimately 3:9
side 21:25 29:9	16:20 17:24	suspicions 29:18	25:13,16	7:14,23 26:12
sign 12:7	spoke 19:19	system 23:11	three 12:1 13:12	26:21 29:22
Signed 37:13	sponsor 30:22	T	17:25 21:11	30:5
simulations	stand 5:4,10	T 37:1,1	25:1 26:16	unaffiliated 34:16
25:10,11,16	13:7 33:4	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	34:20	unbelievable
single 5:23	Standard 17:1	take 18:4 23:23 taken 28:6 37:8	time 3:24 6:21	25:3,6
sir 5:11	started 2:2	taken 28:0 37:8 talk 11:4	8:24 9:17 14:9	undemocratic
sit 14:9 28:18	state 2:16,17,19		14:10,20 23:24	19:23
sitting 10:23	2:22,23 3:6,10	talking 16:15	28:2,20 29:7	understand 8:15
29:13	6:5 7:25 8:12	targeted 20:25 targeting 20:20	29:16 32:18,19	26:9 27:2
situation 12:19	8:12 9:18	tell 2:18 23:8	34:9 35:11	undertaken 5:21
24:17	13:18,22 14:17	telling 19:15	times 22:6,11,23	undertaken 5.21 unfair 19:22
six 1:21 12:9	16:5 21:24	teming 19.13	tired 26:25 27:1	unfortunate
slow 23:24	22:10 23:12	temporarny 2.4 ten 11:25 25:1	today 5:5,11 7:5	29:10 33:12
smaller 17:11	31:12 34:13	CH 11.43 43.1	7:7 8:3 11:1,11	29.10 33.12
	1	1	1	43

unfortunately	voting 12:16	welcome 5:4	2019 29:10,11	8240 37:17
6:23	17:22 18:6	went 15:22 16:7	2021 1:2,4 2:9	8340 1:18 37:5
unintelligible	20:1,4 24:1	23:12	5:20 37:8,13	
21:22	27:21 36:15	Winston-Salem	2030 23:20	9
unprecedented	VRA 18:7	16:13	21.4 11:14	90 9:8 18:10
5:22 6:2	VTD 8:16,17,18	wish 4:8 28:7	24 8:17,18 26:3	919 1:24
untrue 33:14	10:1	wonder 34:22	26 18:14	
urban 18:18	VTDs 6:13 8:14	work 16:17 24:2	27609 1:23	
urge 20:6 33:22		32:4 33:18,19		
use 6:3,9 9:14,18	W	working 32:5	3	
23:1,11 28:23	Wake 16:16	33:13	30 26:6 34:17	
31:13	22:10,11 23:2	world 30:8	33 34:15	
	25:4 36:20	worrying 25:21	36 26:6 34:14	
V	37:2	worse 26:18		
verify 18:10	walk 23:7,14	worship 16:17	4	
version 25:18	24:14	worst 17:17	4 1:4 37:8	
versus 32:5	want 15:19 21:9	worth 17:20	42 26:5	
video 5:25 30:7	21:11 22:22	23:16	4208 1:21	
Videographers	23:6,17,19	wrong 12:22	424-8242 1:24	
1:20	25:25 31:24	20:5 32:15	44:51 36:1	
view 5:25 7:13	32:21,23,24	20.3 32.13	45 26:5	
11:2	33:25	X	46:37 36:1	
views 24:15	wanting 14:13		47 15:8	
violated 20:4	wards 11:25	Y	47:14 36:25	
Virginia 16:23	warned 18:2	y'all 5:3	48 3:23	
voice 33:25	warning 20:19	years 6:6 28:14	49 4:16 35:10,23	
voluntarily 6:3,7	wasted 12:6	29:3		
28:22 31:12	32:19	yesterday 16:14	5	
vote 1:3 3:10,15	Watauga 21:12	yield 30:24,25	5 8:11	
3:15,16,21 4:4	21:23	yields 31:1	5.8 12:13	
4:5,6,9,14	way 22:16 26:9		50/50 11:16	
11:11 12:20	27:6,13 28:13	Z	552 3:5	
14:23 15:3,4,5	29:24 32:11	Zenger 4:25	6	
15:7 18:17	ways 25:5	zero 8:10		
20:6 21:1,16	we're 6:8,9,10	0	6:53 2:2	
22:21 24:12	7:8 11:11	— <u>U</u>	60 18:13	
32:8 33:4,23	12:14,15 27:8	1	64 3:22	
33:25 34:4,25	27:9,10,11	1.8 3:6	65 4:15 35:9,22	
35:4,5,6,8,17	31:25 32:11,23	10 3:4,4	67 15:9	
35:18,19,21	32:25 33:9,13	10 3.4,4 1000 1:22	6th 29:6,7	
37:7	33:15 34:2	1000 1.22 102409-2 37:17	7	
voted 3:22 4:15	we've 6:14 9:19	102409-2 37.17 11 8:7 17:9	739 1:3 2:5,8	
15:8 28:12	18:13 26:12	14 18:15 26:4	3:14,23 4:3,16	
35:9,22 36:9	28:21 29:23	150 28:14 29:2	37:7	
36:18	33:12	130 28.14 29.2 19th 37:13	740 1:3 4:18,19	
voter 26:3	website 11:22	17111 37.13	,	
voters 22:5	week 19:14	2	35:3,10,16,23	
24:14,21 34:14	weeks 11:3	20.1 12:3	36:7,15 37:8	
34:16	weighed 23:10	200 29:3	8	
votes 12:6	weight 23:11	2011 8:15	8 12:6	
, 5005 12.0	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	4011 0.13	0 14.0	1