IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
ATLANTA DIVISION

COAKLEY PENDERGRASS; TRIANA ARNOLD JAMES; ELLIOTT HENNINGTON; ROBERT RICHARDS; JENS RUECKERT; and OJUAN GLAZE,

Plaintiffs,

v.

BRAD RAFFENSPERGER, in his official capacity as the Georgia Secretary of State; WILLIAM S. DUFFEY, JR., in his official capacity as chair of the State Election Board; MATTHEW MASHBURN, in his official capacity as a member of the State Election Board; SARA TINDALL GHAZAL, in her official capacity as a member of the State Election Board; EDWARD LINDSEY, in his official capacity as a member of the State Election Board; and JANICE W. JOHNSTON, in her official capacity as a member of the State Election Board,

Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION FILE
NO. 1:21-CV-05339-SCJ

REPLY IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Defendants offer no meaningful evidence to rebut Plaintiffs' Section 2 claim. Instead, they try to move the goalposts, inventing novel legal requirements and arguing that Plaintiffs failed to meet them. Sometimes, Defendants do not hide their revisionism, admitting that courts have "disagreed" with their racially polarized voting standard. ECF No. 187 ("Defs.' Opp'n") at 18 n.5. Other times, their temerity is concealed—albeit barely. For example, they fault Dr. Loren Collingwood for "not offer[ing] an opinion that racism . . . has caused lower turnout for Black voters," *id.* at 28, even though the U.S. Supreme Court recognized in *Thornburg v. Gingles* that Congress "*repudiated*" the Section 2 intent test in part because "it involve[d] charges of racism on the part of individual officials or entire communities," 478 U.S. 30, 44 (1986) (emphasis added) (quoting S. Rep. No. 97-417, pt. 1, at 36 (1982)). Defendants cannot defeat summary judgment by inventing new law; that this is their best defense speaks volumes. Because there is no genuine dispute of fact as to the elements of Plaintiffs' claim, summary judgment in their favor is warranted.

ARGUMENT

I. Plaintiffs have standing to bring their claim.

Standing in a Section 2 vote-dilution case requires that "each voter resides in a district where their vote has been cracked or packed." *Harding v. County of Dallas*,

948 F.3d 302, 307 (5th Cir. 2020); *see also, e.g.*, *Robinson v. Ardoin*, 605 F. Supp. 3d 759, 817–18 (M.D. La.) ("[T]he relevant standing inquiry is . . . whether Plaintiffs have made supported allegations that they reside in a reasonably compact area that could support additional majority-minority districts.'" (cleaned up)), *cert. granted*, 142 S. Ct. 2892 (2022).

Here, Plaintiffs are registered voters who reside in the western Atlanta metropolitan area—the compact area where Plaintiffs have demonstrated the possibility of an additional majority-Black congressional district—either in districts where their votes have been cracked (Congressional Districts 3, 11, and 14) or packed (Congressional District 13). *See* Exs. 28–33.[1] They therefore have standing.

Notably, Plaintiffs *did* provide the Court with the "evidence supporting the residence of particular plaintiffs" needed to establish standing, Defs.' Opp'n 11–12, in the form of declarations filed with their preliminary injunction motion, which Plaintiffs now resubmit, *see* Exs. 28–33. Moreover, Defendants asked Plaintiffs in their depositions to confirm their pertinent details in the amended complaint, their addresses, or both, providing further record evidence of standing. *See* Exs. 34–39.

[1] Exhibits 1 through 27 are attached to the declaration of Jonathan P. Hawley in support of Plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment. *See* ECF No. 174. Exhibits 28 through 42 are attached to the second declaration of Jonathan P. Hawley in support of Plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment, filed concurrently with this reply.

At any rate, that Plaintiffs have satisfied the applicable residence requirement is not disputed as a factual matter; Defendants included this information in their own statement of undisputed material facts. *See* ECF No. 176 ¶¶ 12, 17, 24, 28, 30.[2]

II. There is no genuine dispute that Plaintiffs satisfied the first *Gingles* precondition.

The illustrative congressional plan drawn by William Cooper satisfies the first *Gingles* precondition because it demonstrates that the Black population in the western Atlanta metropolitan area is "sufficiently large and geographically compact to constitute a majority in a single-member district." 478 U.S. at 50.

Mr. Cooper demonstrated that "minorities make up more than 50 percent of the voting-age population in the relevant geographic area," *Bartlett v. Strickland*, 556 U.S. 1, 18 (2009) (plurality opinion). His illustrative Congressional District 6 has a Black voting-age population of 51.87%, ECF No. 173-2 ("Pls.' SUMF") ¶ 36; Ex. 1 ("Cooper Report") fig. 11, which neither Defendants nor their expert disputes, *see* ECF No. 188 ("Defs.' SUMF Resp.") ¶ 31; Ex. 8 at 65:10–66:13.

Compactness, in turn, requires that the illustrative district satisfy "traditional districting principles such as maintaining communities of interest and traditional

[2] Defendants erroneously stated that Plaintiff Ojuan Glaze lives in Marietta when he in fact testified that he currently resides in Douglasville. *See* ECF No. 189-1 ¶ 33.

boundaries." *LULAC v. Perry*, 548 U.S. 399, 433 (2006) (plurality opinion) (quoting *Abrams v. Johnson*, 521 U.S. 74, 92 (1997)). Illustrative Congressional District 6 not only complies with the same redistricting principles that the Georgia General Assembly adopted to inform its own redistricting efforts, but also outperforms the enacted map on several criteria. *See* ECF No. 173-1 ("Pls.' Mot.") at 9–11. Defendants dismiss as unhelpful "[t]he various scores and calculations about the illustrative plan trumpeted by Plaintiffs," Defs.' Opp'n 13, but they do not dispute them, nor do they dispute that courts routinely look to these metrics as part of the compactness inquiry, *see* ECF No. 97 ("PI Order") at 54–55.

Defendants' critiques of districts *other* than illustrative Congressional District 6, by contrast, *are* unhelpful to the Court. *See* Defs.' Opp'n 14. The Section 2 compactness inquiry implicates the "compactness of the minority population" whose voting strength is improperly diluted, *LULAC*, 548 U.S. at 433, meaning there is neither a requirement nor a reason for Plaintiffs to demonstrate the shared interests of communities outside of the geographic area where they have alleged vote dilution, *see* ECF No. 189 ("Pls.' Opp'n") at 12–14. No amount of handwaving can change this Court's (and the Eleventh Circuit's) conclusion that the "compactness requirement under *Gingles* requires a showing that it is 'possible to design *an electoral district[]* consistent with traditional redistricting principles,'" PI Order 70

(alteration in original) (emphasis added) (quoting *Davis v. Chiles*, 139 F.3d 1414, 1425 (11th Cir. 1998)), which is exactly what Plaintiffs have done here.

With respect to illustrative Congressional District 6, rather than *rebut* Plaintiffs' evidence, Defendants simply ignore it. For example, they claim that Mr. Cooper "could not explain . . . why he looked at Atlanta instead of east Georgia" as the location for the additional majority-Black district. Defs.' Opp'n 13. To the contrary, in the portion of his deposition right *after* the excerpt Defendants cite for this contention, Mr. Cooper explained that he focused on Atlanta because of changes in the population of the Atlanta metropolitan area as revealed by the 2020 census, which makes sense given the *Gingles* numerosity requirement. *See* Ex. 40 ("Cooper Dep.") at 43:4–13; *see also* Cooper Report ¶ 35.[3]

More significantly, Defendants suggest that Plaintiffs did not "demonstrate connections between the disparate geographic communities they unite that go beyond race." Defs.' Opp'n 13–14. But Mr. Cooper's report explained that his illustrative Congressional District 6 unites "nonracial communities of interest," *LULAC*, 548 U.S. at 433—namely, Atlanta-area voters in Cobb, Douglas, Fulton,

[3] Defendants themselves acknowledge Mr. Cooper's explanation in their statement of additional material facts. *See* ECF No. 187-1 ¶ 4 ("Mr. Cooper could not explain why he chose a different approach here *apart from population-growth numbers and a different Census*." (emphasis added) (citing Cooper Dep. 43:4–13)).

and Fayette counties, all of which are core metro counties under the Atlanta Regional Commission, *see* Pls.' Mot. 11–13; Pls.' SUMF ¶¶ 61, 63–64; Cooper Report ¶¶ 60, 65, 68, Exs. G & H-1; PI Order 79–85.

Defendants contest the undeniably suburban/exurban character of illustrative Congressional District 6 *only* by suggesting that "this fact is refuted by Mr. Cooper's testimony that the western part of Douglas County, which he included in Illustrative District 6, is rural." Defs.' SUMF Resp. ¶¶ 63–64. Defendants misconstrue Mr. Cooper's testimony. In the cited excerpt from his deposition transcript, he explained that "illustrative District 6 is largely suburban/exurban Atlanta. So it's part of the Atlanta core counties, the 11 core counties, which are also part of the Atlanta MSA. So there are economic and transportation commonalities there, lots of small cities." Cooper Dep. 54:6–20. Although he noted that "[i]t can get *sort of* rural once you get out into western Douglas County," *id.* (emphasis added), Mr. Cooper did *not* characterize this part of a single county as outside the core Atlanta area or otherwise insufficiently linked to illustrative Congressional District 6. Nor did Mr. Morgan. In short, there is no genuine dispute that Plaintiffs' illustrative district unites

Georgians—within Douglas County and the other core counties of the Atlanta metropolitan area—who share common interests.[4]

Defendants' reliance on *LULAC* demonstrates the shortcomings of their position. They cite that case to suggest that Mr. Cooper's process was "not allow[ed]" because he purportedly "just drew a district and concluded there was geographic compactness as a result." Defs.' Opp'n 14. This is yet another mischaracterization of Mr. Cooper's testimony, as he explained in detail his methodology for drawing his illustrative plan and the considerations that informed that process, demographic and otherwise. *See* Cooper Report ¶¶ 38–72. In any event, the *LULAC* plurality prescribed no mandatory procedure for drawing illustrative plans. Instead, it explained that "district[s] that combine[] two farflung segments of a racial group with disparate interests" cannot satisfy the first *Gingles* precondition, *LULAC*, 548 U.S. at 433—and illustrative Congressional District 6 *does not do this*.

Even a visual examination of the district confirms that Defendants' protestations are misguided. *See, e.g.*, *Robinson v. Ardoin*, 37 F.4th 208, 223 (5th

[4] Indeed, by Defendants' logic, Mr. Cooper should have divided Douglas County to segment off its "rural" areas—splitting not only a political subdivision, but a de facto community of interest as well. *See, e.g.*, *Caster v. Merrill*, No. 2:21-cv-1536-AMM, 2022 WL 264819, at *19 (N.D. Ala. Jan. 24, 2022) (recognizing that "political subdivisions such as counties" can constitute communities of interest (cleaned up)), *cert. granted sub nom. Merrill v. Milligan*, 142 S. Ct. 879 (2022).

Cir. 2022) (per curiam) (employing "visual inspection" of illustrative district to determine geographic compactness). The *LULAC* plurality objected to a "district that combined two groups of Latinos, hundreds of miles apart, that represent different communities of interest." 548 U.S. at 441. By striking contrast, Plaintiffs' illustrative Congressional District 6 is contained entirely in the geographically compact western Atlanta metropolitan area—and, as Mr. Cooper testified, unites the *demographically* compact suburban and exurban Georgians who live there:



Cooper Report Ex. H-2.

Having failed to meaningfully dispute the compactness of Plaintiffs' illustrative district, Defendants cast about for additional points of argument, none

availing. They fault illustrative Congressional District 6 for including majority-white areas of three counties, *see* Defs.' Opp'n 14–15, but *Bartlett*'s 50% rule applies district-wide, and there is no authority requiring any sort of numeric threshold for sub-district components. They suggest that Plaintiffs' ability-to-elect analysis is somehow irrelevant, *see id.* at 15; *see also* Pls.' Mot. 13, but "the first *Gingles* prong is 'needed to establish that the minority has the potential to elect a representative of its own choice in some single-member district,'" *Wright v. Sumter Cnty. Bd. of Elections & Registration*, 979 F.3d 1282, 1303 (11th Cir. 2020) (quoting *Growe v. Emison*, 507 U.S. 25, 40 (1993)), making this *undisputed* fact material to Plaintiffs' satisfaction of the elements of a Section 2 claim. Finally, Defendants offer yet another refrain of their racial-predominance argument, *see* Defs.' Opp'n 15, but for the reasons already discussed in Plaintiffs' opposition to Defendants' summary judgment motion, this argument is premised on misreadings of caselaw and the record, *see* Pls.' Opp'n 5–11.

III. There is no genuine dispute that Plaintiffs proved the existence of legally significant racially polarized voting.

As discussed at length in Plaintiffs' opposition to Defendants' summary judgment motion, *see* Pls.' Opp'n 14–32, Defendants advance a standard for racially polarized voting that is wholly divorced from both this circuit's caselaw and the evidence in the record.

A. Plaintiffs have proved the existence of racially polarized voting, and Defendants have failed to rebut this showing.

As the Eleventh Circuit has explained, satisfaction of the second and third *Gingles* preconditions creates an inference of racial bias, since "[t]he surest indication of race-conscious politics is a pattern of racially polarized voting." *United States v. Marengo Cnty. Comm'n*, 731 F.2d 1546, 1567 (11th Cir. 1984); *see also, e.g.*, *Nipper v. Smith*, 39 F.3d 1494, 1525–26 (11th Cir. 1994) (en banc) (opinion of Tjoflat, C.J.). Here, there is no dispute that, in the area where Plaintiffs have proposed a new majority-Black congressional district, Black voters overwhelmingly support their candidates of choice and white voters consistently and cohesively vote in opposition to Black-preferred candidates. *See* Pls.' Mot. 16–19; Pls.' Opp'n 16–17. Plaintiffs' evidence has firmly established that voting is polarized along racial lines, thus creating an "inference that racial bias is at work." *Nipper*, 39 F.3d at 1525.

After a Section 2 plaintiff has established minority cohesion and bloc voting, "[t]he weight that should be placed on the extent of such polarization—and any link to partisanship—must necessarily be part of the totality-of-the-circumstances analysis under the second Senate Factor." PI Order 174–75. But there is no inferential assumption of partisan effect, nor any requirement that Plaintiffs affirmatively disclaim the effects of non-racial factors as part of the threshold *Gingles* preconditions. Instead, *Defendants* may disprove *racial* motivation among

the electorate to rebut the presumption created by Plaintiffs' showing—but they have failed to do so here, as Plaintiffs explained in their opposition to Defendants' summary judgment motion. *See* Pls.' Opp'n 18–22.

Defendants blithely (and incorrectly) accuse Plaintiffs of "oversimplify[ing]" the racial-polarization inquiry. Defs.' Opp'n 16. But there is no actual dispute that Plaintiffs have proved a prima facie case of legally significant racially polarized voting, and Defendants have not adduced countervailing evidence to rebut this showing. Summary judgment in Plaintiffs' favor is therefore warranted.

B. Defendants' approach to racially polarized voting is out of step with *Gingles*, circuit precedent, and Section 2.

Defendants' response to Plaintiffs' unrebutted evidence of racially polarized voting is once again to invent new requirements that, they claim, Plaintiffs must satisfy to prevail on summary judgment. Their arguments are not only unsupported by binding caselaw, but also out of step with the principles animating Section 2.

First, Defendants rely on *Marengo County* for the proposition that "the focus of the Eleventh Circuit with respect to racially polarized voting fell on the *candidates* and not the *electorate* itself," Defs.' Opp'n 17–19, but that opinion did not endorse Defendants' position that racial polarization among the electorate is insufficient to satisfy Section 2, "tacitly" or otherwise. Notably, *Marengo County* preceded the *Gingles* majority's adoption of a definition of racially polarized voting consistent

with Plaintiffs' position. *See infra* at 14. Setting that aside, the *Marengo County* court referenced "the consistent lack of success of qualified black candidates" as merely *one* way to establish polarization under the totality of circumstances, *distinct* from proving polarization "through direct statistical analysis of the vote returns," as Plaintiffs have done here. 731 F.2d at 1567 n.34 (quoting *Nevett v. Sides*, 571 F.2d 209, 223 n.18 (5th Cir. 1978)). Moreover, the court "completely agree[d]" that "the race of the candidates" might not be dispositive or even relevant in a given case; it concluded only that, "at least as of 1978" in Marengo County, Alabama, the race of candidates was significant as a factual matter. *Id.* at 1567. That candidate race is less significant in contemporary Georgia does not mean that race no longer drives the electorate's polarization; instead, as Dr. Orville Vernon Burton has demonstrated, *see infra* at 15–16, race remains "the main issue in [Georgia] politics," *Marengo County*, 731 F.2d at 1567.[5]

[5] Indeed, a closer read of *Marengo County*, *Nipper*, and other cases from decades past demonstrates that focusing on the race of candidates had less to do with safeguarding the ability of Black candidates to win elections and more to do with the apparent unhelpfulness of white-on-white elections where "the candidate of choice of black voters was also the preferred candidate of the white voters." 39 F.3d at 1539–41 ("[W]hite-on-white elections in which a small majority (or a plurality) of black voters prefer the winning candidate seem comparatively less important."). *Nipper* acknowledged that "electoral races involving only white candidates where the record indicates that one of the candidates was strongly preferred by black voters"—in other words, where, as demonstrated here, "black voters were energized

Defendants further concede that "courts in this judicial circuit, including this Court in prior rulings, have disagreed with [their] interpretation of racial polarization." Defs.' Opp'n 18 n.5. This is an understatement, to say the least; courts have regularly held that the *Gingles* preconditions provide the quantitative basis to assess "whether voting is racially polarized and, if so, whether the white majority is usually able to defeat the minority bloc's candidates." *Brooks v. Miller*, 158 F.3d 1230, 1240 (11th Cir. 1998); *see also, e.g.*, *Uno v. City of Holyoke*, 72 F.3d 973, 983 (1st Cir. 1995) ("The resultant inference is not immutable, but it is strong; it will endure *unless and until* the defendant adduces credible evidence tending to prove that detected voting patterns can most logically be explained by factors unconnected to the intersection of race with the electoral system."). This standard makes sense: Because Section 2 is ultimately concerned, as *Marengo County* itself recognized, with whether "a particular election method can deny *minority voters* equal opportunity to participate meaningfully in elections," 731 F.2d at 1566–67 (emphasis added) (quoting S. Rep. No. 97-417, pt. 1, at 33), the focus of this inquiry properly belongs on whether Plaintiffs and other Black voters in the western Atlanta

---

to support a particular white candidate"—*would* be legally significant. *Id.* at 1540; *see also Lewis v. Alamance County*, 99 F.3d 600, 605–06 (4th Cir. 1996).

metropolitan area are foreclosed from electing their preferred candidates due to white bloc voting.

Second, Defendants' approach to racially polarized voting is inconsistent with *Gingles*. Although Defendants claim that the *Gingles* majority did not endorse a standard for racially polarized voting that focuses on the race of the electorate, this is simply incorrect: The majority expressly "adopt[ed a] definition of 'racial bloc' or 'racially polarized' voting" that was premised on "correlation," concluding that "'racial polarization' exists where there is a consistent relationship *between the race of the voter and the way in which the voter votes*." 478 U.S. at 53 n.21 (emphasis added) (cleaned up). Although Justice White's concurrence disagreed with the *Gingles* plurality's position that the race of a candidate is *never* relevant to the racially polarized voting analysis, he did not suggest that it is *always* relevant. To the contrary, he acknowledged that, "on the facts of [that] case"—where, as here, "the degree of racial bloc voting was so marked as to be substantively significant, in the sense that the results of the individual election would have been different depending upon whether it had been held among only the white voters or only the black voters," *id.* at 54 (cleaned up)—"there [wa]s *no need* to draw the voter/candidate distinction," *id.* at 83 (White, J., concurring) (emphasis added); *see also* Pls.' Opp'n 29–30.

Third, given that Plaintiffs need not prove the *causes* of racially polarized voting in the first instance—and, indeed, need not prove it here *at all* given Defendants' failure to rebut the "inference that racial bias is at work" established by the second and third *Gingles* preconditions, *Nipper*, 39 F.3d at 1525—Defendants' objections to Dr. Palmer's analysis are irrelevant. They are also misguided. Defendants fault Dr. Palmer for excluding primaries from his analysis, relying on Dr. Alford to suggest that analysis of primaries would have yielded probative evidence of causation. *See* Defs.' Opp'n 22. But Dr. Alford admitted that ecological inference analysis "is never going to answer a causation question," Ex. 41 at 82:17–84:14—whether the analysis focuses on primary or general elections.

Finally, Defendants suggest that "the Court here has no evidence before it that" voting is polarized on account of race. Defs.' Opp'n 23. Proving the causes of polarization is not Plaintiffs' burden in this case. But even if it were, Plaintiffs *did* submit such evidence: the report of Dr. Burton, who explored the relationship between race and partisanship in Georgia politics. As explained in Plaintiffs' opposition to Defendants' summary judgment motion, *see* Pls.' Opp'n 22–27, Dr. Burton demonstrated that partisanship in the South has been and continues to be driven by race, and that "race and partisanship [are] so deeply intertwined[] that statisticians refer to it as multicollinearity, meaning one cannot, as a scientific

matter, separate partisanship from race in Georgia elections," Pls.' SUMF ¶ 149; Ex. 4 ("Burton Report") at 61; *see also* Pls.' SUMF ¶¶ 137–53; *Rose v. Raffensperger*, No. 1:20-cv-02921-SDG, 2022 WL 3135915, at *13 (N.D. Ga. Aug. 5, 2022), *appeal docketed*, No. 22-12593 (11th Cir. Aug. 8, 2022).

In short, Plaintiffs have not only proved the existence of legally sufficient racially polarized voting through their *undisputed* satisfaction of the second and third *Gingles* preconditions, they have further demonstrated that race drives this polarization—and Defendants adduced *no* evidence to the contrary.[6]

IV. Defendants misconstrue the totality-of-circumstances inquiry.

In response to Plaintiffs' (also unrebutted) evidence relating to the totality of circumstances, *see* Pls.' Mot. 19–40; Pls.' SUMF ¶¶ 86–217, Defendants primarily employ their familiar tactic of imposing novel standards and requirements.

History of discrimination. That Georgia pursued discriminatory, state-sponsored policies aimed at disenfranchising Black voters throughout the 19th and 20th centuries cannot be disputed; this Court has taken judicial notice of the fact that, "prior to the 1990s, Georgia had a long sad history of racist policies in a number

[6] Defendants also raise a constitutional argument regarding Plaintiffs' interpretation of racially polarized voting, *see* Defs.' Opp'n 24, but Plaintiffs addressed and refuted this contention in their opposition to Defendants' summary judgment motion, *see* Pls.' Opp'n 28–32.

of areas including voting." *Fair Fight Action, Inc. v. Raffensperger*, 593 F. Supp. 3d 1320, 1342 (N.D. Ga. 2021). As the Court has further noted,

> whether some of the history Dr. Burton discussed is decades or centuries old does not diminish the importance of those events and trends under this Senate Factor, which specifically requires the Court to consider the *history* of official discrimination in Georgia. And it is not a novel concept that a history of discrimination can have present-day ramifications.

PI Order 208 (citing *Marengo Cnty. Comm'n*, 731 F.2d at 1567). Rather than contest this history, Defendants fault Plaintiffs for not "connect[ing] the challenged 2021 congressional plan to" it. Defs.' Opp'n 25. But there is no requirement under Section 2 that the challenged election practice be directly "connect[ed]" (whatever that might mean) to a history of discrimination that has the effect of "impair[ing] the present-day ability of minorities to participate on an equal footing in the political process." *Marengo Cnty. Comm'n*, 731 F.2d at 1567; *see also infra* at 23.

Defendants' other arguments are no more persuasive. They accuse Plaintiffs of "gloss[ing] over" the U.S. Department of Justice's preclearance of Georgia's 2011 congressional plan, Defs.' Opp'n 25, but do not explain how this single act nullifies the other acts of state-sponsored discrimination identified by Plaintiffs, *see Robinson*, 605 F. Supp. 3d at 847 ("[T]o the extent these facts are offered as mitigation of the repugnant history of discrimination . . . , they fall completely

flat.").[7] Defendants brush aside post-*Shelby County* polling-place closures (including those that occurred in the Atlanta suburbs) on the ground that they are "not the responsibility of state officials," Defs.' Opp'n 26, which is both irrelevant—this factor considers "official discrimination *in* the state" and is not limited only to discrimination *by* the State, *Gingles*, 478 U.S. at 36 (emphasis added) (quoting S. Rep. No. 97-417, pt. 1, at 28)—and ignores Dr. Burton's testimony that these closures were tacitly encouraged by former Secretary of State Brian Kemp, *see* Burton Report 49–50. Lastly, that "partisan motivations may be at issue here versus racial ones," Defs.' Opp'n 26, is essentially a distinction without a difference given the inextricability of race and partisanship in Georgia, *see supra* at 15–16. The discrimination reported by Dr. Burton indisputably "touche[s] the right of" Black Georgians "to register, to vote, or otherwise to participate in the democratic process," regardless of the motivation behind it. *Gingles*, 478 U.S. at 36–37 (quoting S. Rep. No. 97-417, pt. 1, at 28).

Racially polarized voting. Plaintiffs need not prove that race causes polarization in Georgia's electorate—but did nevertheless. *See supra* at 15–16.

[7] Nor, for that matter, would the Department of Justice's previous determination under a different legal framework—Section 5's retrogression standard—insulate the enacted congressional plan from scrutiny under Section 2's vote-dilution standard. *See, e.g.*, *Georgia v. Ashcroft*, 539 U.S. 461, 478 (2003).

Past voting practices. That Georgia's majority-vote requirement led in recent years to the success of two Black-preferred candidates does not undo this practice's general discriminatory effect; "[o]n balance, the features of the electoral system operate to submerge minority interests." *Marengo Cnty. Comm'n*, 731 F.2d at 1570.

Past discrimination affecting ability to participate. Puzzlingly, Defendants fault Plaintiffs for relying on census data to demonstrate that Black Georgians suffer from socioeconomic disparities, Defs.' Opp'n 27, but this is precisely how the fifth Senate Factor is generally established, *see, e.g.*, *Rose*, 2022 WL 3135915, at *17; *Caster v. Merrill*, No. 2:21-cv-1536-AMM, 2022 WL 264819, at *73 (N.D. Ala. Jan. 24, 2022), *cert. granted sub nom. Merrill v. Milligan*, 142 S. Ct. 879 (2022). Defendants flag that "socioeconomic disparities affect political participation, regardless of the race of the voters involved," Defs.' Opp'n 27, but Dr. Collingwood demonstrated—and Defendants do not dispute—that these disparities are more pronounced for Black Georgians, *cf. Teague v. Attala County*, 92 F.3d 283, 294–95 (5th Cir. 1996) ("The fact that blacks *and* whites . . . are going to the polls in decreasing proportions does not explain why blacks *alone* are essentially shut out of the political processes[.]"). And there certainly is no requirement that Plaintiffs prove that "racism . . . has caused lower turnout for Black voters," nor that they connect the challenged congressional plan to depressed Black voter participation.

Defs.' Opp'n 28. Plaintiffs have undisputedly demonstrated (1) "*disproportionate* educational, employment, income level, and living conditions arising from past discrimination" and (2) that "the level of black participation is depressed," and thus they "need not prove any further causal nexus between their disparate socio-economic status and the depressed level of political participation." *Wright*, 979 F.3d at 1294 (emphasis added) (quoting *Marengo Cnty. Comm'n*, 731 F.2d at 1568–69).[8]

Racial appeals. Defendants suggest that Plaintiffs' "failure to offer such appeals in *congressional* races means they cannot carry their burden on this factor," Defs.' Opp'n 29 (emphasis added), but *Gingles* did not impose such a qualification on this factor, *see* 478 U.S. at 37, and the authority Defendants cite for this proposition stated only that "the type of campaign to which [the appeals] relate is *relevant* to the weight this evidence carries," *Rose*, 2022 WL 3135915, at *17 (emphasis added) (considering "political campaign advertisements in Georgia generally"). Nor does it matter that some candidates lost after making racial appeals;

[8] Defendants also elliptically refer to "several incorrect statements by Dr. Collingwood," Defs.' Opp'n 27, but the only apparent inaccuracy they identify is his conclusion that "Black children [are] more than three times as likely [] to live below the poverty line," Ex. 5 at 4, on the trivial ground that "[t]he figures included in Table 1 on page 5 of Dr. Collingwood's Report from the 2015-2019 ACS for children below the poverty line are 31.3% for Black children and 11.5% for white children, which is less than a three-fold difference," Defs.' SUMF Resp. ¶ 165.

as this Court has noted, "[e]ven if the Court were to weigh the evidence, this factor does not require that racially polarized statements be made by successful candidates. The factor simply asks whether campaigns include racial appeals." *Fair Fight Action*, 593 F. Supp. 3d at 1343–44.

Defendants otherwise misconstrue (but, tellingly, never dispute) Plaintiffs' evidence. Plaintiffs do not contend that "efforts to prevent voter fraud" are necessarily "proof of racism." Defs.' Opp'n 29. Instead, Plaintiffs have demonstrated through Dr. Burton's report that *false* allegations of voter fraud in the wake of the 2020 election carried undeniable racial undertones and reflected historic efforts to curtail Black suffrage in Georgia. *See* Pls.' Mot. 35; Pls.' SUMF ¶¶ 196–99; Burton Report 70–74. Nor do Plaintiffs rely on impermissible hearsay in support of this factor. As an expert, Dr. Burton may rely on otherwise-inadmissible evidence where, as here, such practices are accepted in his field. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 703; *City of South Miami v. DeSantis*, No. 19-cv-22927-BLOOM/Louis, 2020 WL 7074644, at *15 (S.D. Fla. Dec. 3, 2020) ("[T]he newspaper articles and studies at issue are the types of sources generally relied upon by historians, statisticians, political scientists, and social scientists[.]"). And the additional newspaper articles cited by Plaintiffs, *see* Exs. 14–25, are offered not for the truth of the matters asserted—which is to say, whether racial appeals were actually made—but rather for the non-

hearsay purpose of demonstrating that racial appeals remain a fixture of Georgia's political environment as a consequence of frequent media coverage, *see, e.g.*, *Cochran v. City of Atlanta*, 289 F. Supp. 3d 1276, 1290 n.8 (N.D. Ga. 2017).

Rate of election of Black candidates. Defendants cannot and do not dispute Plaintiffs' evidence on the seventh Senate Factor. Defs.' Opp'n 29–30. Instead, they vaguely point to the elections of "judicial candidates and Black members of statewide courts," *id.*, but provide no evidence for the Court to evaluate. At any rate, "some success at the polls does not . . . disprove the existence of vote dilution." *Sanchez v. Colorado*, 97 F.3d 1303, 1324 (10th Cir. 1996).

Justification is tenuous. Defendants trumpet "partisanship" as the motivation and justification for the enacted congressional map, Defs.' Opp'n 30–31, but they cite no authority to suggest that the pursuit of political gain somehow excuses the State of Georgia from doing what "the Voting Rights Act requires," PI Order 219.

Proportionality. As Plaintiffs explained in their opposition to Defendants' summary judgment motion, Defendants employ the wrong metrics to assess proportionality. *See* Pls.' Opp'n 32–35. Properly considered, proportionality does not weigh against Plaintiffs' claim—and certainly does not foreclose it.

* * *

Defendants repeatedly fault Plaintiffs for not demonstrating direct connections between the Senate Factors and the challenged vote dilution. This overarching criticism fundamentally misunderstands the role of the totality-of-circumstances analysis. The Senate Factors are "circumstantial evidence [that] support an inference of vote dilution under section 2" because they "were designed as objective indicia that ordinarily would show whether the voting community as a whole is driven by racial bias as well as whether the contested electoral scheme allows that bias to dilute the minority group's voting strength." *Nipper*, 39 F.3d at 1534. The explicit "connections" that Defendants demand are not required; these factors, taken together, create an *inference* of unlawful dilution—especially since Defendants have produced no evidence whatsoever to contest Plaintiffs' proof.

V. Summary judgment in Plaintiffs' favor is appropriate.

Throughout their opposition, Defendants emphasize that "it is unusual to find summary judgment awarded to the plaintiffs in a vote dilution case." *Ga. State Conf. of NAACP v. Fayette Cnty. Bd. of Comm'rs*, 775 F.3d 1336, 1345 (11th Cir. 2015). But they overlook that this case *is* unusual: Rather than dispute the material facts, Defendants instead try to change the law.

Fayette County does not otherwise foreclose summary judgment for Plaintiffs. The record here contains none of the factual disputes that precluded entry of

summary judgment for the plaintiffs in that case. *See id.* at 1346 ("[T]he district court did not plainly state that no genuine issues of material fact were present."). Moreover, that court was forced to weigh in on disputes between the parties' experts and make credibility determinations. *See id.* at 1347–48 (to enter summary judgment in plaintiffs' favor, "the [district] court clearly rejected the deposition testimony of the [defendant's] expert and accepted the deposition testimony of the [plaintiffs'] expert"). Here, by contrast, there is no dispute of material fact among the experts. Mr. Morgan does not dispute that minority voters are sufficiently numerous and geographically compact to constitute a majority in illustrative Congressional District 6. *See supra* at 3–9; Pls.' Mot. 13–16. Dr. Alford conceded in his deposition that the relevance of his analysis hinges not on the *fact* of racial polarization, which is not in dispute, *see* Ex. 7 at 3, but on a threshold *legal* question, *see* Ex. 9 at 114:13–21; *see also* Pls.' Mot. 25–28; Pls.' Opp'n 19–22. And neither expert meaningfully disputes that the totality of circumstances permits the inference that "the contested electoral scheme allows [racial] bias to dilute the minority group's voting strength." *Nipper*, 39 F.3d at 1534. Plaintiffs are thus entitled to summary judgment.

There is no rule against summary judgment for plaintiffs in Section 2 vote-dilution cases, and courts have granted it both in full, *see Montes v. City of Yakima*, 40 F. Supp. 3d 1377, 1414 (E.D. Wash. 2014), and in part, *see, e.g.*, *Rose v.*

Raffensperger, 584 F. Supp. 3d 1278, 1295 (N.D. Ga. 2022) (granting summary judgment for plaintiffs as to *Gingles* preconditions), *appeal docketed*, No. 22-12593 (11th Cir. Aug. 8, 2022); *United States v. Charleston County*, 318 F. Supp. 2d 302, 328 (D.S.C. 2002) (same); *Harper v. City of Chicago Heights*, 824 F. Supp. 786, 792–93 (N.D. Ill. 1993) (same); *Pope v. County of Albany*, No. 1:11-cv-0736 (LEK/CFH), 2014 WL 316703, at *15 (N.D.N.Y. Jan. 28, 2014) (granting summary judgment for plaintiffs as to first *Gingles* precondition). Here, as in those cases, there is no genuine dispute that Plaintiffs satisfied their evidentiary burden—especially as to the *Gingles* preconditions, which are readily amenable to summary disposition both generally and in this case. Should the Court wish to proceed to trial in whole or in part for further factual consideration, then Plaintiffs will reproduce their evidence in that forum. But this outcome should not be required here simply because summary judgment in Section 2 cases is rare.

CONCLUSION

Defendants want to change the rules because they don't like the score. While Plaintiffs have satisfied their evidentiary burden as to the *Gingles* preconditions and Senate Factors, Defendants have adduced no compelling evidence to the contrary. For this reason and those in their summary judgment briefing, Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court enter summary judgment in their favor.

Dated: May 3, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

By: **Adam M. Sparks**
Joyce Gist Lewis
Georgia Bar No. 296261
Adam M. Sparks
Georgia Bar No. 341578
KREVOLIN & HORST, LLC
One Atlantic Center
1201 West Peachtree Street, NW,
Suite 3250
Atlanta, Georgia 30309
Telephone: (404) 888-9700
Facsimile: (404) 888-9577
Email: JLewis@khlawfirm.com
Email: Sparks@khlawfirm.com

Abha Khanna*
Jonathan P. Hawley*
Makeba A.K. Rutahindurwa*
ELIAS LAW GROUP LLP
1700 Seventh Avenue,
Suite 2100
Seattle, Washington 98101
Phone: (206) 656-0177
Facsimile: (206) 656-0180
Email: AKhanna@elias.law
Email: JHawley@elias.law
Email: MRutahindurwa@elias.law

Michael B. Jones
Georgia Bar No. 721264
ELIAS LAW GROUP LLP
250 Massachusetts Avenue NW,
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20001
Phone: (202) 968-4490
Facsimile: (202) 968-4498
Email: MJones@elias.law

Counsel for Plaintiffs

*Admitted *pro hac vice*

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

I hereby certify that the foregoing Reply in Support of Motion for Summary Judgment has been prepared in accordance with the font type and margin requirements of LR 5.1, NDGa, using font type of Times New Roman and a point size of 14.

Dated: May 3, 2023

Adam M. Sparks
Counsel for Plaintiffs

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
ATLANTA DIVISION

COAKLEY PENDERGRASS; TRIANA ARNOLD JAMES; ELLIOTT HENNINGTON; ROBERT RICHARDS; JENS RUECKERT; and OJUAN GLAZE,

Plaintiffs,

v.

BRAD RAFFENSPERGER, in his official capacity as the Georgia Secretary of State; WILLIAM S. DUFFEY, JR., in his official capacity as chair of the State Election Board; MATTHEW MASHBURN, in his official capacity as a member of the State Election Board; SARA TINDALL GHAZAL, in her official capacity as a member of the State Election Board; EDWARD LINDSEY, in his official capacity as a member of the State Election Board; and JANICE W. JOHNSTON, in her official capacity as a member of the State Election Board,

Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION FILE
NO. 1:21-CV-05339-SCJ

PLAINTIFFS' RESPONSE TO DEFENDANTS' STATEMENT OF ADDITIONAL MATERIAL FACTS

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56 and LR 56.1(B)(3), NDGa, Plaintiffs COAKLEY PENDERGRASS, TRIANA ARNOLD JAMES, ELLIOTT HENNINGTON, ROBERT RICHARDS, JENS RUECKERT, and OJUAN GLAZE respond to Defendants' statement of additional material facts. *See* ECF No. 187-1.

1. Five of Georgia's fourteen members of Congress are Black individuals. Deposition of William Cooper [Doc. 167] ("Cooper Dep.") 19:19-21.

Plaintiffs' Response: The Court can properly consider Defendants' submitted fact for purposes of Plaintiffs' summary judgment motion.

2. Plaintiffs' expert set out to draw an additional majority-Black district beyond those drawn by the state plan. Cooper Dep. 14:15-15:2.

Plaintiffs' Response: Objection. Defendants' evidence does not support the fact. The cited excerpt from Mr. Cooper's deposition transcript demonstrates only his acknowledgment that he "did not attempt to draw two additional majority black districts." When asked in his deposition whether "it would be fair to say your goal was to add a majority black congressional district above the number drawn by the General Assembly," Mr. Cooper responded, "*No, that was not my goal*. My goal was

to determine whether it was *possible* while, at the same time, to include traditional redistricting principles." Ex. 40 ("Cooper Dep.") at 14:3–11 (emphases added).*

3. Mr. Cooper set out to draw a new majority-Black district in this case in Atlanta despite opining in a 2018 case that a new majority-Black congressional district should have been drawn in east Georgia, combining Macon, Augusta, and Savannah in the same district. Cooper Dep. 41:22-42:23.

Plaintiffs' Response: Objection. Defendants' evidence does not support the fact. The cited excerpt from Mr. Cooper's deposition transcript does not support the assertion that he "set out to draw a new majority-Black district in this case." Instead, when asked in his deposition whether "it would be fair to say your goal was to add a majority black congressional district above the number drawn by the General Assembly," Mr. Cooper responded, "*No, that was not my goal*. My goal was to determine whether it was *possible* while, at the same time, to include traditional redistricting principles." Cooper Dep. 14:3–11 (emphases added). This statement is otherwise neither material nor relevant to any issue before the Court.

* Exhibits 1 through 27 are attached to the declaration of Jonathan P. Hawley in support of Plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment. *See* ECF No. 174. Exhibits 28 through 42 are attached to the second declaration of Jonathan P. Hawley in support of Plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment, filed concurrently with Plaintiffs' reply.

4. Mr. Cooper could not explain why he chose a different approach here apart from population-growth numbers and a different Census. Cooper Dep. 43:4-13.

Plaintiffs' Response: Objection. This statement is neither material nor relevant to any issue before the Court.

5. Map-drawers distinguish "majority-minority" from "majority- Black." Majority-minority districts have a majority of non-white and Latino voters, while majority-Black districts are districts where Black voters as a single racial category constitute a majority of a district. Cooper Dep. 16:14-20.

Plaintiffs' Response: Objection. Defendants' evidence does not support the fact. The cited excerpt of Mr. Cooper's deposition transcript demonstrates that he defined a "majority black district" as "a district that is over 50 percent majority *any part* black." (emphasis added).

6. In illustrative District 6, Mr. Cooper united a Black community in Fulton County with non-majority-Black portions of surrounding counties to create a new majority-Black district. Cooper Dep. 77:12-17.

Plaintiffs' Response: Objection. Defendants' evidence does not support the fact. The cited excerpt from Mr. Cooper's deposition testimony demonstrates only that the portion of Fulton County included in illustrative Congressional District 6 is

majority-Black, while the portions of the other counties included in the district have Black voting-age populations below 50%. The excerpt does not otherwise describe Mr. Cooper's map-drawing process or how he "create[d] a new majority-Black district."

7. The only portion of a county in illustrative District 6 that is majority-Black is Fulton County. Cooper Dep. 77:12-17.

Plaintiffs' Response: Objection. Defendants' evidence does not support the fact. The cited excerpt from Mr. Cooper's deposition testimony demonstrates only that the portion of Fulton County included in illustrative Congressional District 6 is majority-Black, while the portions of the other counties included in the district have Black voting-age populations below 50%. It does not necessarily follow that *any* sub-county portion included in illustrative Congressional District 6 has a Black voting-age population below 50%.

8. Without the portion of Fulton County that Mr. Cooper moved out of District 13 into illustrative District 6, the remaining components of the district would not allow it to be majority-Black. Cooper Dep. 78:6-11.

Plaintiffs' Response: Objection. Defendants' evidence does not support the fact. The cited excerpt from Mr. Cooper's deposition testimony demonstrates only that illustrative Congressional District 6 "*as drawn*" would not be majority-Black

without the portion of Fulton County included in the district, not that this would be true of *any* version of illustrative Congressional District 6.

9. Mr. Cooper connected urban areas in North Fulton with rural areas in Bartow County. Cooper Dep. 59:6-60:1.

Plaintiffs' Response: The Court can properly consider Defendants' submitted fact for purposes of Plaintiffs' summary judgment motion.

10. Mr. Cooper connected Cobb County with rural parts of Georgia all the way to Columbus, Georgia, in District 3. Cooper Dep. 63:15-24, 64:17-65:4; Cooper Report, Ex. I-2.

Plaintiffs' Response: The Court can properly consider Defendants' submitted fact for purposes of Plaintiffs' summary judgment motion.

11. The only connection Mr. Cooper could identify to this similar configuration of enacted District 14 was that Heard and Troup counties were closer to Atlanta. Cooper Dep. 65:20-66:2.

Plaintiffs' Response: Objection. Defendants' evidence does not support the fact. The cited excerpt from Mr. Cooper's deposition transcript demonstrates only that, in illustrative Congressional District 3, Heard and Troup counties share a community of interest with portions of west Cobb and Paulding counties. Mr.

Cooper did not state that this was the "only" common connection that he could identify.

12. Mr. Cooper agreed that his illustrative District 13 connected urban (and heavily Black) parts of Clayton County with rural areas out to Jasper County. Cooper Dep. 73:13-17.

Plaintiffs' Response: Objection. Defendants' evidence does not support the fact. The cited excerpt from Mr. Cooper's deposition transcript demonstrates only his agreement that "District 13 as drawn connects urban areas in Clayton County with rural areas in Fayette, Spalding, Butts, and Jasper Counties." It does not otherwise address the demographic makeup of these areas.

13. When asked why he connected majority-Black Hancock County (from the Black Belt, according to his testimony in other cases) to the North Carolina border, Mr. Cooper could only point to population equality. Cooper Dep. 68:6-69:2, 70:16-22; 86:5-8; Cooper Report, Ex. I-2.

Plaintiffs' Response: Objection. Defendants' evidence does not support the fact. In his deposition, Mr. Cooper referenced, in addition to population equality, socioeconomic similarities and the desire to avoid county splits as reasons for the configuration of illustrative Congressional District 10. *See* Cooper Dep. 70:23–71:20.

14. Mr. Cooper could not explain why he included Athens/Clarke County in the same district as Hancock County and Rabun County. Cooper Dep. 71:21-72:11.

Plaintiffs' Response: Objection. Defendants' evidence does not support the fact. The cited excerpt from Mr. Cooper's deposition transcript demonstrates only that illustrative Congressional District 10 includes socioeconomically diverse communities. Mr. Cooper did not state that he "could not explain why he included Athens/Clarke County in the same district as Hancock County and Rabun County."

15. In drawing the illustrative plan, Mr. Cooper did not alter several districts that currently elect Black Democratic members of congress. Cooper Dep. 36:5-14.

Plaintiffs' Response: The Court can properly consider Defendants' submitted fact for purposes of Plaintiffs' summary judgment motion.

16. Plaintiffs' sole statistical expert, Dr. Palmer, declined to examine primary contests in his report. Deposition of Maxwell Palmer [Doc. 168] ("Palmer Dep.") 59:23-60:1.

Plaintiffs' Response: The Court can properly consider Defendants' submitted fact for purposes of Plaintiffs' summary judgment motion.

17. Without those primary contests which would remove partisanship from the calculation, Dr. Palmer found highly polarized general- election contests. Palmer Dep. 59:23-60:1.

Plaintiffs' Response: Objection. Defendants' evidence does not support the fact. The cited excerpt from Dr. Palmer's deposition transcript demonstrates only that he did not examine primary data in his analysis. Dr. Palmer did not otherwise suggest that analysis of "primary contests [] would remove partisanship from the calculation."

18. Dr. Palmer only examined general election contests in the focus areas within the timeframes considered by his report. Palmer Dep. 59:23- 60:1.

Plaintiffs' Response: The Court can properly consider Defendants' submitted fact for purposes of Plaintiffs' summary judgment motion.

19. Dr. Alford opined that "one of the ways that you can recognize the limited nature of the general election fact pattern from what we care about in this case is to look at some elections where that party signal is not going to be such a strong driver. . ." Deposition of John Alford [Doc. 158] ("Alford Dep.") 156:1-5.

Plaintiffs' Response: The Court can properly consider Defendants' submitted fact for purposes of Plaintiffs' summary judgment motion.

20. In Dr. Alford's view, the way to do that is by "looking at primaries." Alford Dep. 156:6.

Plaintiffs' Response: Objection. Defendants' evidence does not support the fact. The cited excerpt from Dr. Alford's deposition transcript demonstrates only his acknowledgement that Dr. Handley looked at primaries.

21. Mr. Cooper could not explain many features of his plan, including why he looked at Atlanta instead of east Georgia, as he did in 2018, to draw a new majority-Black congressional district. Cooper Dep. 42:10-23.

Plaintiffs' Response: Objection. Defendants' evidence does not support the fact. In his deposition testimony, Mr. Cooper explained that he focused on the Atlanta metropolitan area because of changes in the population as revealed by the 2020 census. *See* Cooper Dep. 43:4–13. Mr. Cooper did not otherwise state that he "could not explain many features of his plan," and the cited excerpt from his deposition transcript does not support this assertion.

22. In 2018, Mr. Cooper analyzed a 71-county area in east Georgia for the creation of a new majority-Black congressional district. Cooper Dep. 41:25-43:3.

Plaintiffs' Response: Objection. This statement is neither material nor relevant to any issue before the Court.

23. In 2018, Mr. Cooper drew an additional majority-Black congressional district in east Georgia by joining Black communities in Macon, Augusta, and Savannah. Cooper Dep. 42:19-23.

Plaintiffs' Response: Objection. This statement is neither material nor relevant to any issue before the Court.

24. Mr. Cooper did not consider any other area of the state to draw an additional majority-Black congressional district besides metro Atlanta in this case. Cooper Dep. 43:4-13.

Plaintiffs' Response: The Court can properly consider Defendants' submitted fact for purposes of Plaintiffs' summary judgment motion.

25. Mr. Cooper's illustrative plan connects the same types of communities he criticized the enacted plan for connecting, placing parts of Cobb County with rural parts of west Georgia stretching all the way down to Columbus. Cooper Dep. 63:15-24, 64:17-65:4, 73:13-17.

Plaintiffs' Response: Objection. Defendants' evidence does not support the fact. The cited excerpts from Mr. Cooper's deposition transcript do not support this statement. Moreover, Mr. Cooper testified that the enacted plan includes southern Cobb County in Congressional District 14, thereby placing that portion of the county in a district that includes the suburbs of Chattanooga and Appalachian north Georgia.

Mr. Cooper observed greater differences between these communities than between Cobb County and Columbus. *See* Cooper Dep. at 63:25–64:16.

26. Mr. Cooper could not explain his own approach to map-drawing beyond drawing a majority-Black district with a focus on population in other districts. Cooper Dep. 68:6-69:2, 70:16-22; 86:5-8.

Plaintiffs' Response: Objection. Defendants' evidence does not support the fact. The cited excerpts from Mr. Cooper's deposition transcript demonstrate only that (1) the one-person, one-vote requirement motivated the configuration of illustrative Congressional District 10, *see* Cooper Dep. 68:6–69:2; (2) illustrative Congressional District 10 includes two counties that are "different" and might not share common interests, *see id.* at 70:16–22; (3) illustrative Congressional District 13 includes urban areas in Clayton County and rural areas in Fayette, Spalding, Butts, and Jasper counties, *see id.* at 73:13–17; and (4) illustrative Congressional District 10 includes Appalachian north Georgia and parts of the Black Belt in eastern Georgia, *see id.* at 86:5–8. In none of these excerpts did Mr. Cooper state he could not explain his map-drawing approach.

27. The prior congressional district 6 was electing a Black candidate to Congress with a 14.6% Black VAP. Cooper Dep. 45:19-22.

Plaintiffs' Response: The Court can properly consider Defendants' submitted fact for purposes of Plaintiffs' summary judgment motion.

28. The 2021 enacted plan lowered the Black VAP percentage in District 6 by almost five points to 9.9%. Cooper Dep. 45:23-46:1.

Plaintiffs' Response: The Court can properly consider Defendants' submitted fact for purposes of Plaintiffs' summary judgment motion.

29. The 2021 enacted plan Black VAP population for congressional district 4 is 54.52%. Cooper Report, Ex. K-1.

Plaintiffs' Response: The Court can properly consider Defendants' submitted fact for purposes of Plaintiffs' summary judgment motion.

30. On the illustrative plan, District 13 is below 50% Black on the DOJ Black number. Cooper Dep. 57:21-25.

Plaintiffs' Response: The Court can properly consider Defendants' submitted fact for purposes of Plaintiffs' summary judgment motion.

31. The illustrative plan lowers the Black population in district 14 by nine points compared to the enacted plan. Cooper Dep. 58:1-8.

Plaintiffs' Response: The Court can properly consider Defendants' submitted fact for purposes of Plaintiffs' summary judgment motion.

32. Mr. Cooper could not identify a process to determine the geographic compactness of the Black community in Atlanta—he just drew a district and concluded there was geographic compactness as a result. Cooper Dep. 22:13-23:17.

Plaintiffs' Response: Objection. Defendants' evidence does not support the fact. The cited excerpt from Mr. Cooper's deposition testimony demonstrates that he relied on the Maptitude for Redistricting software, census data, and prior knowledge and experience with Georgia to ascertain that it was possible to draw an additional majority-Black district in the Atlanta metropolitan area.

33. Mr. Cooper added an additional split of Cobb County in the illustrative plan over the plan he presented at the preliminary injunction hearing. Cooper Dep. 51:3-6.

Plaintiffs' Response: The Court can properly consider Defendants' submitted fact for purposes of Plaintiffs' summary judgment motion.

34. The only portion of District 6 as drawn by Mr. Cooper that is majority-Black is one county out of four. Cooper Dep. 77:12-17; 78:6-11.

Plaintiffs' Response: The Court can properly consider Defendants' submitted fact for purposes of Plaintiffs' summary judgment motion.

35. The portion of Fulton County that is in illustrative district 6 is 88.29% Black VAP. Cooper Dep. 77:12-17.

Plaintiffs' Response: The Court can properly consider Defendants' submitted fact for purposes of Plaintiffs' summary judgment motion.

36. The portion of Cobb County that is in illustrative district 6 is 37.4% Black VAP. Cooper Dep. 76:22-25.

Plaintiffs' Response: The Court can properly consider Defendants' submitted fact for purposes of Plaintiffs' summary judgment motion.

37. The portion of Douglas County that is in illustrative district 6 is below 50% Black VAP. Cooper Dep. 77:2-5.

Plaintiffs' Response: The Court can properly consider Defendants' submitted fact for purposes of Plaintiffs' summary judgment motion.

38. The portion of Fayette County that is in illustrative district 6 is 21.73% Black VAP. Cooper Dep. 77:6-11.

Plaintiffs' Response: The Court can properly consider Defendants' submitted fact for purposes of Plaintiffs' summary judgment motion.

39. Without the portion of Fulton County Mr. Cooper included, illustrative District 6 would not be a majority-Black district. Cooper Dep. 78:6-11.

Plaintiffs' Response: Objection. Defendants' evidence does not support the fact. The cited excerpt from Mr. Cooper's deposition testimony demonstrates only that illustrative Congressional District 6 "*as drawn*" would not be majority-Black without the portion of Fulton County included in the district, not that this would be true of *any* version of illustrative Congressional District 6.

40. The lack of data related to primary elections (which take party out of the equation) leaves no way to determine the meaning of polarization. Alford Dep. 29:12-14.

Plaintiffs' Response: Objection. Defendants' evidence does not support the fact. Dr. Alford (and Dr. Palmer) testified that it is not possible to determine causation—which is to say, the reasons voters cast ballots for particular candidates—using the data and methodology employed by Dr. Palmer. *See* Ex. 41 at 82:17–84:14, 90:4–91:9; Ex. 42 at 88:11–17. Dr. Alford further testified that the meaning of

polarization is fundamentally a legal rather than a factual question. *See* Ex. 9 at 114:13–21.

41. Dr. Alford opined that "one of the ways that you can recognize the limited nature of the general election fact pattern from what we care about in this case is to look at some elections where that party signal is not going to be such a strong driver. . ." Alford Dep. 156:1-5.

Plaintiffs' Response: The Court can properly consider Defendants' submitted fact for purposes of Plaintiffs' summary judgment motion.

42. In Dr. Alford's view, the way to do that is by "looking at primaries." Alford Dep. at 156:6.

Plaintiffs' Response: Objection. Defendants' evidence does not support the fact. The cited excerpt from Dr. Alford's deposition transcript demonstrates only his acknowledgement that Dr. Handley looked at primaries.

43. Dr. Alford conducted an analysis of the statewide primary election for United States Senate, in which Herschel Walker prevailed. Alford Dep. at 157:5-7.

Plaintiffs' Response: Objection. Defendants' evidence does not support the fact. The cited excerpt from Dr. Alford's deposition transcript demonstrates only a factual description about Mr. Walker's performance in the primary election, not acknowledgement that he conducted any sort of additional analysis.

44. Dr. Alford noted that "the evidence here suggests that white voters in the Republican primary did support Black candidates." Alford Dep. at 157:5-7.

Plaintiffs' Response: The Court can properly consider Defendants' submitted fact for purposes of Plaintiffs' summary judgment motion.

45. Plaintiffs do not discuss the 2011 congressional plan, which was precleared by the U.S. Department of Justice under Section 5 of the VRA on the first attempt. Deposition of Orville Burton [Doc. 185] ("Burton Dep.") 63:18-25.

Plaintiffs' Response: Objection. This statement is neither material nor relevant to any issue before the Court.

46. The challenge to House Districts 105 and 111 in 2015 was dismissed after Democrats won those seats. Burton Dep. 73:19-24.

Plaintiffs' Response: Objection. This statement is neither material nor relevant to any issue before the Court.

47. The 2015 Georgia House redistricting plan was never found to be illegal by any court. Burton Dep. 73:25-74:2.

Plaintiffs' Response: Objection. This statement is neither material nor relevant to any issue before the Court.

48. The Any-Part Black VAP for Georgia as a whole is 31.73%. Cooper Report, ¶ 18.

Plaintiffs' Response: The Court can properly consider Defendants' submitted fact for purposes of Plaintiffs' summary judgment motion.

49. Dr. Loren Collingwood was not asked by Plaintiffs to look at the role of partisanship in the voting patterns of Black and White voters in Georgia. Deposition of Loren Collingwood [Doc. 186] ("Collingwood Dep.") 32:15-18.

Plaintiffs' Response: Objection. This statement is neither material nor relevant to any issue before the Court.

50. Socioeconomic disparities affect political participation, regardless of the race of the voters involved. Collingwood Dep. 58:24-59:7.

Plaintiffs' Response: The Court can properly consider Defendants' submitted fact for purposes of Plaintiffs' summary judgment motion.

51. Voter motivation can affect voter turnout for different groups of voters. Collingwood Dep. 64:1-14.

Plaintiffs' Response: The Court can properly consider Defendants' submitted fact for purposes of Plaintiffs' summary judgment motion.

52. Dr. Collingwood admitted that the narrowest gap in voter turnout between Black and White Georgia voters from 2010-22 was in 2012, the year that President Obama ran for re-election, and that it was a "pretty plausible hypothesis" that Black Georgia voters were turning out in greater numbers in 2012 than in 2010 to vote for Mr. Obama. Collingwood Dep. 64:1-25.

Plaintiffs' Response: The Court can properly consider Defendants' submitted fact for purposes of Plaintiffs' summary judgment motion.

53. Dr. Collingwood also testified that motivation may have increased Black voter turnout in 2018, when Stacy Abrams, who is African- American, ran as the Democratic nominee for Governor, and the gap in voter turnout between Black and White Georgia voters narrowed from 11.6% in 2016 to 8.3% in 2018. Collingwood Dep. 71:16-72:17; Report of Loren Collingwood [Doc. 174-6] ("Collingwood Report") at 8, 12.

Plaintiffs' Response: The Court can properly consider Defendants' submitted fact for purposes of Plaintiffs' summary judgment motion.

54. Dr. Collingwood opined that for Black voters, voter turnout goes down as the percentage of Black voters without a high-school education goes up, but he does not know whether the same is true for White voters with and without a high-school education. Collingwood Dep. 84:3-8.

Plaintiffs' Response: The Court can properly consider Defendants' submitted fact for purposes of Plaintiffs' summary judgment motion.

55. Dr. Collingwood did not and would not offer an opinion that racism, rather than other factors, has caused lower turnout for Black voters compared to White voters in Georgia. Collingwood Dep. 86:22-87:13.

Plaintiffs' Response: Objection. This statement is neither material nor relevant to any issue before the Court. Moreover, Defendants' evidence does not support the fact. The cited excerpt from Dr. Collingwood's deposition transcript demonstrates only that, when asked whether racism in Georgia causes lower levels of voting participation by Black voters comparted to white voters, he stated, "I don't have a specific measure of racism that's associated with voter turnout here. A social scientist would likely look at all of this and potentially say the reasons we're seeing this is because of that. But those variables don't measure that specifically."

56. Dr. Collingwood did not have an opinion on whether the 2021 Georgia redistricting (or prior redistricting since 2010) may have caused the lower levels of Black voting participation compared to White voting participation that he found in Georgia. Collingwood Dep. 87:21-88:1.

Plaintiffs' Response: Objection. This statement is neither material nor relevant to any issue before the Court. Moreover, Defendants' evidence does not support the fact. The cited excerpt from Dr. Collingwood's deposition transcript demonstrates only that he did not look at prior redistricting as part of his analysis in this case.

57. Dr. Collingwood testified that the data taken from the 2020 Cooperative Election Study ("CES") in Table 10 of his Report, "Did a candidate or political campaign organization contact you during the 2020 election?", are "statistically indistinguishable" for Black voters and White voters. Collingwood Dep. 92:1-4; Collingwood Report at 37.

Plaintiffs' Response: The Court can properly consider Defendants' submitted fact for purposes of Plaintiffs' summary judgment motion.

58. Dr. Collingwood testified that the data taken from the 2020 CES in Table 11 of his Report, "Have you ever run for elective office at any level of government (local, state or federal)?", are "statistically indistinguishable" for Black voters and White voters. Collingwood Dep. 92:5-6; Collingwood Report at 38.

Plaintiffs' Response: The Court can properly consider Defendants' submitted fact for purposes of Plaintiffs' summary judgment motion.

59. Congressman Jody Hice lost the 2022 primary election. Burton Dep. 127:14-18.

Plaintiffs' Response: The Court can properly consider Defendants' submitted fact for purposes of Plaintiffs' summary judgment motion.

60. Senator Butch Miller lost the 2022 primary election. Burton Dep. 127:19-23.

Plaintiffs' Response: The Court can properly consider Defendants' submitted fact for purposes of Plaintiffs' summary judgment motion.

61. Mr. Cooper is unable to determine how much of the change in Black voters residing in majority-Black districts on the illustrative plan was due to the reconfiguration of District 6. Cooper Dep. 90:13-92:4.

Plaintiffs' Response: Objection. Defendants' evidence does not support the fact. The cited excerpt from Mr. Cooper's deposition transcripts demonstrates only

his testimony that he did not conduct such an analysis, not that he is "unable" to do so.

Dated: May 3, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

By: **Adam M. Sparks**
Joyce Gist Lewis
Georgia Bar No. 296261
Adam M. Sparks
Georgia Bar No. 341578
KREVOLIN & HORST, LLC
One Atlantic Center
1201 West Peachtree Street, NW,
Suite 3250
Atlanta, Georgia 30309
Telephone: (404) 888-9700
Facsimile: (404) 888-9577
Email: JLewis@khlawfirm.com
Email: Sparks@khlawfirm.com

Abha Khanna*
Jonathan P. Hawley*
Makeba A.K. Rutahindurwa*
ELIAS LAW GROUP LLP
1700 Seventh Avenue,
Suite 2100
Seattle, Washington 98101
Phone: (206) 656-0177
Facsimile: (206) 656-0180
Email: AKhanna@elias.law
Email: JHawley@elias.law
Email: MRutahindurwa@elias.law

Michael B. Jones
Georgia Bar No. 721264
ELIAS LAW GROUP LLP
250 Massachusetts Avenue NW,
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20001
Phone: (202) 968-4490
Facsimile: (202) 968-4498
Email: MJones@elias.law

Counsel for Plaintiffs

*Admitted *pro hac vice*

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

I hereby certify that the foregoing **Plaintiffs' Response to Defendants' Statement of Additional Material Facts** has been prepared in accordance with the font type and margin requirements of LR 5.1, NDGa, using font type of Times New Roman and a point size of 14.

Dated: May 3, 2023

Adam M. Sparks

Counsel for Plaintiffs