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THE COURT: Okay. You're ready. We can resume. MR. SAVITZKY: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.
MR. SAVITZKY: And picking up just where we left off, we had just talked about the corridor management plan, I think we had just been -- Alpha's 54 had just been accepted into evidence.

THE COURT: Yes.
MR. SAVITZKY: And, Your Honor, I have handed defense counsel and distributed, and I'll hand up as well, what's been marked for identification as Alpha's 325 . Here's another copy as well.

This is a resolution by the State Transportation Board of Georgia from 2015 accepting that corridor management plan and officially designating the route between Albany running through Camilla, Pelham, Meigs, and to Thomasville, the Old Dixie Highway, alongside US 19, as an official scenic byway in Georgia. And we would ask the Court to take judicial notice of that fact at this time.

THE COURT: Any objection, Mr. Tyson?
MR. TYSON: Your Honor, yes. I'm just going to lodge a relevance objection here in terms of this document. It's not something that we had had on the exhibit list. And I haven't heard any testimony from Mr. Cooper that he relied on the State Transportation Board's actions in terms of the
drawing of his map. So I think there would be a relevance issue. And it seems it's a government document, so I don't think there's really a hearsay issue but would just impose a relevance objection here.

THE COURT: This is the first time you've seen this exhibit?

MR. TYSON: Yes, Your Honor.
MR. SAVITZKY: Your Honor, judicial notice -- we're not asking the document to be admitted into evidence. We're asking that judicial notice be taken that the corridor management plan that was submitted, the idea that Dixie Highway would be officially designated as a scenic byway, was officially approved of by the state a year after that corridor management plan was submitted.

And Mr. Cooper has testified to the relevance of this information. It just further establishes that the connections between these communities that Mr. Cooper testified to have been validated by the state DOT, state agency, recognizing those connections.

THE COURT: Well, as long as it's been validated by the State -- in other words, Dr. Cooper's (sic) testimony does make it relevant, but I'11 take it the way it is and I'll give it whatever weight it's due over objection.

THE WITNESS: Your Honor, that's Mister.
THE COURT: Mister?

THE WITNESS: Mister.
THE COURT: I gave you a promotion.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
THE COURT: Sorry about that, sir.
BY MR. SAVITZKY:
Q. All right. Mr. Cooper, let me grab my clicker here.

Let's move on to the last majority Black district that you've identified as being in your illustrative plan. This is illustrative House District 145, Metro Macon area. We're looking at Alpha's 1, page 678 on the right, that is the 2021 plan; and Alpha's 1, 680, the illustrative plan 145, on the left-hand side. And 145 is the orange district we see here.

Tell us about the area that we're looking at right now.
A. Well, this is the area that I had identified, which includes the Macon-Bibb MSA and the Warner Robins MSA, which is Houston and Peach County combined.

And it turns out that one can get a third House district built off of Bibb County with a small amount of people over in Monroe County. So House District 145 stays within the MSA, the Macon-Bibb MSA.

And then the other two, 142 and 143 , would change slightly. 142 would go down into the Warner Robins MSA, which is right next door. So while it's a split of an MSA, it's a neighboring MSA that's contiguous.
Q. And, Mr. Cooper, focusing here on your illustrative plan
in addition to those MSA boundaries you've been referring to, did the location of incumbents come into play as you were configuring an illustrative plan in this area?
A. My recollection is that did become something of an issue. Not just in Macon-Bibb, but even in Monroe. So that was an issue I recall looking at different variations to protect incumbents. In the end, I protected the incumbents, I believe.
Q. Is this district compact in your opinion?
A. I think so. It's almost a perfect square in Macon-Bibb.

I mean, not quite so much in Monroe, but it's still following a county line and taking in a couple of VTDs.
Q. I think that's it. I just have a couple other questions to sum it up.

Did you form an opinion on whether the Black population in Georgia is sufficiently numerous and compact to comprise a voting age majority in additional State Senate and State House districts?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. What is your opinion?
A. My opinion is there can be three additional Senate districts in Georgia. As I've drawn them, two would be in Metro Atlanta and one would be in the Eastern Black Belt and includes some of those counties that have majority Black populations or significant Black populations that have never
been part of any kind of district since the passage of the Voting Rights Act that would have allowed them to elect a candidate of choice.
Q. And with respect to the House plan, did you form an opinion on whether the Black population in Georgia is sufficiently numerous and compact to comprise a voting age majority in additional State House districts?
A. Yes. I believe that at least five House districts could be drawn that would be majority Black.
Q. And --
A. And that are new.
Q. And were you able to draw illustrative plans that reflect those districts you found could be created?
A. Yes, following traditional redistricting principles.
Q. Do considerations of race predominate over those other principles in drawing your illustrative plans?
A. No. I was aware of race, it was a factor, as it should be following traditional redistricting principles.
Q. Is it your opinion, do you feel that you balanced the traditional districting principles in drawing these illustrative districts that we've talked about today?
A. I think so.
Q. And if the Court ultimately found that there was vote dilution in these areas that we have focused on today, could your plans be implemented to address and ameliorate vote
dilution in those areas?
A. I believe so. I've drawn other plans in other cases. For example, in South Dakota the Court ordered a plan that I developed in 2008 -- I think the year was 2008, when the lawsuit was finally resolved. The State of South Dakota had refused to produce a remedial plan, so the Judge just ordered my plan into place which created a new House district and a new Senate district around the Pine Ridge Reservation in South Dakota where the Sioux Nation resides predominantly.
Q. And you think that if the Court were to find there was vote dilution here, the plans you've drawn could be ordered into place as a remedy for that vote dilution?
A. I believe so.

MR. SAVITZKY: I have no further questions for the witness at this time.

THE COURT: A11 right. You're representing Alpha. I don't think Pendergrass and Grant have any questions however at this point; is that correct?

MS. KHANNA: Yes, that's correct, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Then, Mr. Tyson, proceed with your cross.
MR. TYSON: We believe we've resolved our technical problems, Your Honor, so we'll see if this works better this time.

THE COURT: All right.
MR. TYSON: And, Your Honor, like Mr. Savitzky, I
also have some notebooks for everybody. So if I could have permission to distribute those.

THE COURT: Yes. Thank you.
Mr. Tyson, a lot of trees died for this book.
MR. TYSON: They have, unfortunately, Your Honor. And just for reference as well, a number of the things we'll be looking at in Mr. Cooper's cross are from Mr. Morgan's report. I know that's not admitted yet, we'11 get that admitted when he testifies. But I just wanted to make sure there was no issue from anybody with using those exhibits from Mr. Morgan's report.

CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. TYSON:
Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Cooper.
A. Good afternoon to you.
Q. So we've heard a lot about maps and map drawing. And I wanted to just get some basic information as we talk about how you go about the process of drawing redistricting maps.

And I put up on the screen a demonstrative of Maptitude for Redistricting. I'm not asking this to be admitted, but wanted to just give some reference for people.

Is this similar to how your Maptitude screen looks when you were drawing redistricting plans?
A. No.
Q. Can you tell me, do you have a visual representation of
the map that you're drawing in the window titled "GA House Demonstratives," something similar to that when you're drawing?
A. Something similar. The one difference is, is that I run reports off using Maptitude for Redistricting 2021 or '22, whatever it is. When I'm drawing plans, because I started drawing plans long ago using an older version of Maptitude that I find much easier to deal with, I see a completely different screen.

For example, I don't get Reock scores on screen automatically. Reock being the compactness scores. But it's the same software. And when I need to run off report, I just export it into a Block Equivalency File and bring it up to look at the reports. Not really so much the map.

THE COURT: Yeah, slow down a little bit.
THE WITNESS: I'm sorry.
(Discussion held off the record)
THE COURT: Let's take it from the top again.
THE WITNESS: It's a lot easier for me to deal with the older version of Maptitude because I've used it for many years. And I use Maptitude for Redistricting to run off the reports.

When I'm actually printing these maps out, I use plain old Maptitude 2022 version that won't let you do redistricting, but it's very easy for me to use that to run
off maps in batch sequences of, you know, all the majority Black districts or -- I just have various macros and computer codes to run them off automatically.

THE COURT: Mr. Cooper, you've got to slow down a little bit for the court reporter.

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. I don't know why I talk fast. I'm from the south.

BY MR. TYSON:
Q. So, Mr. Cooper, in -- when you're drawing a redistricting map you can display different layers on that map; right?
A. Yes.
Q. And those layers are almost like old-style overhead projectors, you can add different --
A. Right.
Q. -- layers on top and see all of them simultaneously?
A. Yes.
Q. And that can include things like county boundaries and highways?
A. Yes.
Q. And that can include precinct outlines; correct?
A. Yes. I have those on screen using the older version.
Q. And there's a box here titled "Data View to Pending Changes." Is there a pending changes box when you're drawing redistricting plans?
A. No. I never use it. Never use it. Never have used it
since I first got the software in 1999. It just sort of gets in the way.
Q. And you can change the labels for the different layers that you're looking at; correct?
A. Well, that's right. You can put precinct numbers on there, you, can put population totals, sure.
Q. And --
A. But it gets very cluttered when you're zoomed out, so I typically don't do that. I will label cities and towns and I keep the highway lines up, so...
Q. And do you sometimes use labels to display population and demographic information?
A. I often display total population.
Q. And can you also set a setting to display racial population of different parts of geography?
A. You could. I rarely ever do that.
Q. And when you're drawing maps, let me just talk through what kind of data you have and didn't have. You had, I believe you said, racial data; correct?
A. I have a PL 94-171 file.
Q. And that's the geographic information from the census; right?
A. Right. That is from the census. And I -- typically with the old version I just run off -- I've run off the whole country to use with the old version, and so for -- with the
old version, I'm using the raw PL 94-171 data that I imported into the Maptitude 2022, which is using the data as delivered by Caliper Corporation as part of the cost of having Maptitude for Redistricting 2021.
Q. And I believe you indicated a few minutes ago you have the ability to run reports on compactness and split geographies; right?
A. Yes. And I can do that in the old version, too, it's just that the new version, I believe, automatically puts in a couple of scores when you first open up the box. I could be wrong about that, but I don't monitor it continuously. I do -- I can run it on the old version, though.
Q. So if you want to know a compactness score, you have to export a plan and run a report?
A. No. With the old version of Maptitude I get Reock, Polsby-Popper and a couple of other compactness scores.

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. That's a tricky one.
Reock, R-E-O-C-K, in the USA.
COURT REPORTER: Will you please repeat your answer.
THE COURT: Repeat that.
THE WITNESS: R-E-O-C-K is how you spell it.
THE COURT: Repeat the answer.
THE WITNESS: Oh, I'm sorry.
MR. TYSON: Maybe I'11 just ask it again.
THE WITNESS: Yeah. Please ask it again.

BY MR. TYSON:
Q. So when you're drawing maps, you don't continuously see a compactness score. You have to run a report to review a compactness score; is that right?
A. If you're using the older version of Maptitude for Redistricting, that's true. Well, it's an instantaneous report, though. I mean, you could constantly be checking it. I just don't obsess over compactness scores to the extent that I need to see one every two minutes.
Q. And when you're drawing, you generally rely for compactness on how a district looks and then check the compactness score towards the end of the drawing process; right?
A. Well, sometimes during the drawing process. It just varies.
Q. In terms of other data you had, you also had incumbent addresses so you could display that information on the map; right?
A. Right. And I displayed that all the time. I knew -- I had big blue stars where all the incumbents lived, or at least where I believed they lived based on the dataset you gave me and a couple of modifications based on information I received from the attorneys for the plaintiffs in 2022, late 2022.
Q. And you had the boundaries of the prior and enacted plans; right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you had the General Assembly guidelines; correct?
A. Yes. Well, I didn't have them on screen. I mean, I'd read them.
Q. And you had a table with racial information about each county and population in each county; right?
A. I ran off tables of that type for the report, but I was not accessing that while I was drawing the plan. I just ran that off as supplemental demographic information for my report.
Q. And in terms of data you did not have, you did not have any political data; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And so you were not able to use any political performance or election data when you were drawing any of the illustrative plans?
A. No. I was testifying on Gingles 1 and that's independent of partisan.
Q. And you've referenced several times American Community Survey data socioeconomic information.
A. Right.
Q. That was not displayed in Maptitude while you were drawing; correct?
A. I occasionally accessed the charts I produced. I don't think I accessed bloc group-level data relating to the ACSs.

I was drawing a plan and that gets very complicated.
Q. So later in your report when you discuss labor force participation, bachelor's degrees, you didn't have that information displayed on the screen while you were drawing; right?
A. No. I was looking at the county totals, not components of counties.
Q. And in terms of other --
A. Or -- or -- when I say "components of counties," I did look at some municipalities along the way.
Q. But to be clear, the ACS data is only at the county and municipality level, not below those levels of geography; right?
A. Well, it's at the bloc group level. One can do it at the bloc group level. I did not display bloc group-level data as I was drawing the plan. Of course, when you're looking at citizenship, then you can use disaggregated bloc group level and actually arrive at a rough estimate of what the percentage of the citizen population would be in a given district. And I wasn't displaying the citizen voting age population either. Q. And so just so we're clear, although that's possible, you weren't displaying any ACS data on the map while you were drawing the illustrative plans; correct?
A. I don't think I was.
Q. And you never reviewed any public testimony from Georgia
voters when you were preparing your plan; right?
A. No, I did not.
Q. And you didn't keep notes during the map drawing process to explain the decisions you made; correct?
A. I did not do that. It would be a laborious task.
Q. So let's talk --
A. I do name -- I save some plans, so I do name some plans like this part of the state, that part of the state, but not extensive notes on why I was doing that particular draft.
Q. So in terms of a choice for a particular district, when we're talking about different factors that went into that decision, you're going off your memory on that, not on any notes or other documents related to that; correct?
A. As we sit here today?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes.
Q. So let's move to some term definitions. I know we talked a little bit about that, too. And I believe you testified that a majority Black district in your report is a district where the any part Black voting age population is over 50 percent; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And the term "majority-minority district" can include other racial minorities with Black voters; right?
A. Anyone who is not non-Hispanic white.
Q. And so all majority Black districts are majority-minority districts, but not all majority-minority districts are necessarily majority Black districts; right?
A. Correct.
Q. Another term you use in your report is the term "packed" --

MR. TYSON: And, actually, I apologize, Your Honor. Let me get a copy of these slides for everybody. BY MR. TYSON:
Q. Mr. Cooper, on page 31, note -- footnote 23 on the screen, you define packing as "election districts where a minority population is unnecessarily concentrated, resulting in an overall dilution of minority voting strength on the plan"; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you didn't pack any districts on your illustrative plans; correct?
A. I probably did, because I left districts intact in some places that were drawn by the State. I was not trying to unpack the whole state, I was asked to develop Gingles 1-compliant districts. So some districts might have remained well over what would be considered packing, but I did not pursue that because it would have meant many more changes to the existing plan.
Q. For any districts that you changed, if you modified a
district, did you pack any of the districts that you drew that were not existing districts from the prior plan?
A. I'm not sure what you mean by that. I didn't pack any of the -- any of the new majority Black districts.
Q. And my question was, you modified several districts around the new majority Black districts; is that correct? A. That's correct.
Q. Are any of the districts surrounding a new majority Black district packed districts if you drew the district?
A. I could not answer that, but that's a little bit different if a district is now packed, in the sense that it's got more Black people in it than it previously did. The upside is a new majority Black district has been created, so that's not necessarily problematic.
Q. So sitting here today, you can't say whether you packed any districts that you drew that were different than districts drawn in the enacted plan; is that right?
A. I'm not as obsessed with race as you are, so I cannot say that.
Q. Okay. So let's look at the population summary report.

This is Exhibit 01 to your plan. This is a chart you created for part of your report; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. In the column that says "Percent AP Black" here is the Black voting age population; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And the column over here that says "NHDOJ Black CVAP" refers to non-Hispanic individuals who were voting age and citizens; is that also correct?
A. Well, that is a somewhat expanded category that would include anyone who is single race non-Hispanic Black, or of two races, namely Black and white and non-Hispanic. That -that reference to DOJ Black is the definition that the Department of Justice uses in most voting rights cases when there are just two sets of groups at issue, the non-Hispanic whites and the minority population at issue.

If it's a broader category, then there would be -- you know, coalition districts or something like that, then you might have non-Hispanic DOJ Black, non-Hispanic DOJ Indian or indigenous, non-Hispanic DOJ Asian. So that way you can get a sum total.

So you really cannot derive a non-Hispanic any part Black number from the US Census Bureau at the district level.
Q. Thank you.

In looking at the --
A. But by the non-Hispanic Black CVAP at the district level.
Q. And looking at District 34 on your illustrative Senate plan, it has an AP Black percentage of 77.84 and an NHDOJ Black CVAP percentage of 82.68 ; is that right?
A. That would be true.
Q. And it's your testimony that District 34 on the illustrative plan is not packed, while District 34 on the enacted plan is packed; is that right?
A. Well, the point that $I$ would make is that if, in fact -and I don't know for a fact -- that District 34 in the enacted plan is something under 77 percent, the point is that I've created a new majority Black district that is adjacent to District 34 that is not present in the 2021 plan.

So I would argue that it would be better to have a lower percentage perhaps, but the fact that additional majority Black district is created would suggest to me that in this instance it's probably okay.
Q. And, Mr. Cooper, my question was specifically about District 34 on the illustrative plan is not packed and is packed on the enacted plan. And so is that your testimony, that that's correct?
A. I did not say that. I mean, packing is a general term. And I would have to look at the numbers but the -- it goes beyond numbers. So if you're District -- House District 34 -yours, the State's -- is 68 percent, well, maybe it is packed, maybe it isn't, but you didn't create the second district that I did in South Metro Atlanta --

THE COURT: Yeah, but you're not answering his question.

THE WITNESS: Oh.

THE COURT: You're really not answering the question. Repeat the question again, Mr. Tyson. MR. TYSON: Yeah.

BY MR. TYSON:
Q. My question is, it's your testimony that District 34 is not packed on the illustrative plan and is packed on the enacted plan?

MR. SAVITZKY: Your Honor, objection --
THE WITNESS: That's a very difficult question to answer --

THE COURT: Hold on. Hold on.
THE WITNESS: I don't think I can --
THE COURT: Hold on. We've got an objection.
MR. SAVITZKY: I think that mischaracterizes the testimony that Mr. Cooper --

THE COURT: It's just a question. Overruled.
Repeat it one more time.
BY MR. TYSON:
Q. It's your testimony that District 34 is not packed on the illustrative plan and is packed on the enacted plan; correct? A. Well, what is the percentage Black in the enacted plan? Q. Let me go take a look at that.

On the enacted plan, I've just changed to Exhibit M1 from your report, District 34 is 69.5 percent AP Black and is 74.46 on the NHDOJ Black number. Here's the two side by side.
A. Yeah. Okay. In this instance I will say that both are packed.
Q. You say they're both packed?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall giving a deposition on February 10th, 2023?
A. I do recall having a deposition down here; right.
Q. And you were under oath for that deposition; correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. I'm going to hand you two pages of that deposition. MR. TYSON: May I approach, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes.
BY MR. TYSON:
Q. Mr. Cooper, if you'11 look at page 122, line 21, you see the question says, "So it's your testimony that District 34 is not packed on the illustrative plan and is packed on the enacted plan?"

Did I read that question correctly?
A. Yes.
Q. Then the answer you gave was, "Yeah. You can't just look at percentages and jump to a conclusion one way or the other. It's clear that one can create a very reasonably shaped District 28 by including parts of old 34 or -- yeah, old 34 as you drew it and the State drew it and create a new majority Black district that would include Fayette, Spalding and part of Clayton. And just knowing the percentages doesn't mean
much because of the issue relating to one person one vote."
Did I read that correctly?
A. Yes.

Does that contradict anything I've said?
Q. I'11 take that back. Thank you.

And to be clear, Mr. Cooper, District 34 on the illustrative plan is 77.84 percent AP Black VAP; District 34 on the enacted plan is 69.54 percent AP Black VAP; correct?
A. Correct. Well, I think it's correct.
Q. Do you want to verify real quick on the --
A. Well, I'11 take your word for it.

THE COURT: It's right there in front of you.
THE WITNESS: Yeah.
Okay. Well, I see the -- I see the illustrative plan.

BY MR. TYSON:
Q. The illustrative plan is the first red --
A. Oh, I'm sorry. Okay. Yes. Okay.
Q. And looking again at your report at paragraphs 98 and 99, you say, the second sentence there, "Senate District 16 is nevertheless drawn with a BVAP of 23 percent by packing majority Black neighborhoods into Northeast Fayette and into Senate District 24."

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And in your report you said that the Senate District 34 on the enacted plan was packed; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And then in paragraph 101 you say that you unpacked 2021 plan District 34 by drawing an additional majority Black district; is that correct?
A. That is correct. Population was moved out of

District 34 . Arguably, it was not unpacked, I will agree with that. There could have been -- more changes could be made to the Senate plan as drawn by the State.
Q. And moving to paragraph 166 of your report, you reference 2021 House District 117 and say you unpacked the Black population in 2021 House District 116; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And that was in service of creating a new majority Black district, illustrative District 117; right?
A. Correct.
Q. And that district was 58.12 percent AP Black VAP on the 2021 enacted plan; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And then after you unpacked District 116, the new illustrative plan VAP is 54.34 percent; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. So it's your testimony that a drop of less than four points is unpacking a district?
A. You know, things can be taken out of context, but the reality is I created a new majority Black district that was adjacent to a district that had a relatively high Black population percentage.

So I'm using the term "unpack" perhaps too broadly, or maybe I should have used another term, but Black voters were moved and shifted out of 116 into a new majority Black district.
Q. And it's correct that it's your view that you can never determine whether a district is packed with Black voters without knowing the context of the districts around it; right? A. Well, without knowing lots of things, but, yes. I mean, it is conceivable that there are areas in Georgia where the population is so segregated due to socioeconomic factors that you're going to have House districts that are in the 70s and there's not much you can do about it without creating really odd-shaped districts.
Q. So then it's your testimony there's no percentage alone that will tell you if a district is packed or not; correct?
A. I think that's a safe statement, yes.
Q. So Mr. Savitzky asked you some questions about traditional districting principles that you followed. I wanted to work through some of those.

You referenced the traditional principle of population equality. And I believe I heard you say your methodology was
generally following the same deviations from the ideal district size as the General Assembly did overall; is that correct?
A. That's correct. The Senate has plus or minus 1 percent.

I think maybe the Senate might go slightly over that. And the House districts were plus or minus 1.5.
Q. And then you referenced communities of interest. And you referenced a number of different areas where you had run reports on split geography. Do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you consider any communities of interest that are not covered in reports you could generate from Maptitude?
A. Well, most of these areas that I took into consideration could be represented demographically -- I mean geographically by established boundaries, like the county commissions and the MSAs. I did not have access to a statewide map of neighborhoods, for example, that might have been useful. Q. And my question was a little bit different.

My question was, in your map drawing process did you consider any communities of interest that could not be represented on a report run by Maptitude?
A. Yes. I mean, I looked at socioeconomic data that was at the municipal level and at the county level. And I could not derive a subset of that data down to the district level necessarily.
Q. Beyond socioeconomic data, are there any other communities of interest that you considered that were not either socioeconomic data related or from a report you could run from Maptitude?
A. Well, I mean, I was aware to a certain extent of transportation corridors and where some colleges were, that sort of thing, so -- but I guess you could run a report off in Maptitude doing that as well. So I'm not sure if I understand your question. I did not do interviews of local citizens, put it that way.
Q. And so my question is, you didn't rely on knowledge that can't be displayed in Maptitude or on a spreadsheet for a socioeconomic report for a community of interest when you were drawing your plans; right?
A. I think in general most of the factors I considered could be displayed on a map. I did not, for example, reproduce the GBPI report that has a pretty good description of the contemporary Black Belt. And one could have done a map that would have replicated their work and overlaid that onto Maptitude.

I did look at the map, so I was looking on a paper version, and I could not produce that in Maptitude without additional work.
Q. You referenced splits of core-based statistical areas. Do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you know if the General Assembly relied on core-based statistical areas when drawing the 2021 enacted plans?
A. I do not know that.
Q. You mentioned regional commission splits in your report. Do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you know if the General Assembly relied on regional commission boundaries when it was creating the 2021 enacted plans?
A. I don't know that for a fact. I would be very surprised if they didn't, though, because there's a lot of connection between regional commissions and the state legislature.
Q. And you explained your understanding of the role of a regional commission. How did you gather that understanding? A. From some Internet searches. I mean, the regional commissions in Georgia are actually very similar to planning and development districts in states like Mississippi and Louisiana or plain old planning districts in Virginia. And they're just a grouping of counties that are in a particular part of the state that have common interests, or it is perceived they have common interests.

So there's nothing unusual about the fact that Georgia has 12 regional commissions, because most states do. And I think most states started doing it about 50 years ago to
coordinate transportation planning and economic development planning. So it's a great idea.

So that's why I paid attention to regional commission lines as much as I could, but you can't draw plans that neatly fit into regional commissions for various and sundry reasons, not the least of which is one person one vote.
Q. So when you say you considered regional commission boundaries, it's fair to say you were aware of them but didn't necessarily rely on them; right?
A. I relied on them, I just was unable to avoid splitting some regional commission boundaries, that's true. Partly because I tried to keep some of your -- some of the State's districts intact without changing them. I think I changed 31 Senate seats -- Senate districts and maybe about half of the House districts.

So a lot of what I might be able to do was really hampered by the fact that I wanted to keep some of the existing plan intact without making changes.
Q. You referenced a community of interest called historical connections. Do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. And what was your methodology for determining historical connections as a community of interest?
A. Well, I think we've discussed the historical and cultural connections with the Black Belt and the Black population in

Georgia. So that was certainly a consideration.
Q. Besides the Black Belt are there other historical connections you relied on in creating your plan?
A. Well, yeah, the enacted plan because it has districts that are already there that may in some spots reflect historical information.
Q. So besides the enacted plan, the Black Belt, what other historical connections did you rely on in drawing your plans?
A. What do you mean by "historical"? I mean, I'm familiar with the history of the US. I don't know what you're exactly questioning me about.
Q. Mr. Cooper, I'm referring to slide 34 from your direct testimony where listed as one of the communities of interest was historical connections. And I had a note that Mr. Savitzky had asked you about that, and you had said you relied on those in drawing the plans. And I'm trying to determine beyond the enacted plan and the Black Belt as a region that you've identified, what else? What other historical connections did you rely on?
A. Well, regional commissions are historical. They've been there for 50 years or more. Probably more. I think they were developed in the 1960s. So that's a historical aspect as well.
Q. You also referenced socioeconomic commonalities as a community of interest. Do you recall that testimony?
A. I do recall that; yes.
Q. And the CD with the report that you referenced, that has data available at the county level and the city level but not below those levels of geography; right?
A. Not true. It also has census-designated places.
Q. Okay.
A. Which can be -- I mean, there are a number of them in Georgia that -- I limited those reports to populations that are 2,500 or more. So a very small community or even a small town would not show up in the socioeconomic data.

Part of the reason there is because once you get to levels below about 2,500 people, the margin of error becomes so great that it doesn't really paint a good picture of necessarily what that particular tiny community may represent in terms of socioeconomic well-being.
Q. So if a district splits counties and contains no whole counties and splits cities and contains no whole cities --
A. I'm sorry, I didn't understand what you said.
Q. If a district has county splits, has no whole counties in it, and has no whole cities in it, you couldn't determine the socioeconomic characteristics of that district from the data you provided; correct?
A. You could certainly determine the socioeconomic characteristics of -- are you saying no whole counties and no whole cities? What about census-designated places?
Q. Let's say no whole census-designated places.
A. Because I did look at -- yeah. Not from the charts, no. Q. You also referenced a community of interest of shared interests. Do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. What methodology did you use to determine what areas of the state had shared interests?
A. I looked at -- at the regions as defined by the -- by the State, the regional commissions. I'm aware of different regions in Georgia. I understand that there's Appalachian Georgia, there's Middle Georgia and there's South Georgia. And there are rivers and other things that factor into how people perceive the part of the state they live in.

I'm not an expert on Georgia in that sense. I guess you'11 hear from other experts later in this lawsuit, but I never heard anybody complain about how I drew the new majority Black districts from our side. I guess we'll hear differences from your side.
Q. You also referenced a traditional redistricting principle of non-dilution of minority voting strength. Do you recall that?
A. Yes. I'm not a Gingles 2 or Gingles 3 expert, so $I$ do have to rely on some assessments from the other experts in this case.
Q. Well, that was going to be my question. What methodology
do you use to determine if you're following that traditional principle as you're drawing your redistricting plan?
A. Well, in general, I understand that we no longer live in the world of the 1980s. It's no longer necessary to have districts that are 65 percent Black in order to, in some fashion, meet a standard set by the DOJ back 40 years ago. You can now have districts that are much lower than that that are effective districts, allowing for voters in that area to elect a candidate of choice.

So I produce an illustrative plan and then it is reviewed by statistical experts and election data is reviewed. And then a determination would be made that that district is going to also pass Gingles 2 and Gingles 3 and it's locked in.
Q. The analysis of whether the map passes Gingles 2 and Gingles 3 comes after you've drawn the plan; correct?
A. Well, after I've drawn a plan. But if I hear from an expert through the attorneys that -- that a particular district cannot meet Gingles 2 and Gingles 3 requirements, then I would look elsewhere.
Q. Did you make any adjustments to your illustrative plans based on Gingles 2 and 3 analysis in this case?
A. Not in this map. I think in the original preliminary injunction I may have made a change or two in the Eastern Black Belt, because there was some concern that one of the districts I drew in a draft form -- maybe I'm not even
supposed to be talking about that, I'm not sure.
But the reality is that I did change one district because it didn't quite pass muster with the Gingles 2 and Gingles 3 expert.
Q. Earlier in some of your questions with Judge Jones you testified about how you know race didn't predominate in the drawing of your illustrative plans. Do you recall that interaction?
A. Yes.
Q. And one of the ways you know that, you said, is that your statistics are similar to the enacted plans; is that right? A. Right. In terms of county splits and VTD splits, for sure.
Q. And so if there were additional county splits or VTD splits, you wouldn't say that meant the race predominated, but you would have less of a case that race did not predominate. Would you agree with that?
A. Not necessarily.
Q. In fact, you don't believe there's any metric that would identify if race predominated in the creation of a districting plan; correct?
A. Sure, there is. I mean, if you draw a really -- if you draw -- I think in the '90s I remember hearing about complaints in Georgia about max Black plans. And some of them were truly crazy looking, of course. There was the famous

Congressional plan that went from Downtown Atlanta to Savannah, that sort of thing. Well, you can eyeball them and see there's a problem there.

I just don't think you can eyeball any of the new majority Black districts that I've drawn and say there's a problem. And you can't do it with county splits. You can't do it with municipal splits. You can't do it with compactness.

So I personally think that you and some others are living in sort of a demographic fantasy world that things have not changed since 1990, so if you do draw a new additional majority Black district, you are somehow or another obsessed with race, and that's just not the case. I'm reflecting reality. You're reflecting Georgia 40 years ago.
Q. Do you have a way that you would determine in your work if race predominated in a districting plan you were reviewing? A. No, it's my opinion. And the Judge can make other decisions and that is that.
Q. And so if the map drawer's goal was to maximize -- was to draw the maximum number of majority Black districts in a plan, in your view race would not necessarily predominate in the creation of that district plan; right?
A. Well, first of all, that was not my goal. My goal was not to draw the maximum number of majority Black districts, because I suspect that I could have drawn several more.
Q. And my question was more general, not about these illustrative plans.
A. I see.
Q. As a hypothetical matter, if the map drawer's goal is to draw the maximum number of majority Black districts in a plan, in your view race would not necessarily predominate in the creation of that district plan; correct?
A. No. If -- I mean, if that were the goal, the maximum number that could be drawn, then that would seem to imply that race did predominate. That's not what I did.
Q. Mr. Cooper, I know we talked once about your deposition. Do you recall the deposition on February 10th? A. Parts of it.
Q. I'm going to hand you a page, it's front and back here.

I'11 begin on line 19 of that page 41.
Question -- and my question was, "If the map drawer's goal is to draw the maximum number of majority Black districts, in your view would race predominate in the creation of that district plan?"

Did I read that question correctly?
A. Yes.
Q. And your answer was, "Well, not necessarily. I mean, that's sort of an open-ended question. I really can't say. Normally you would not go into a situation where you were drawing the maximum number of majority Black or majority

Latino districts. If you were to do that, you would likely run into conflict with some other of the traditional redistricting principles."

Did I read that correctly?
A. Isn't that what I sort of said previously?

THE COURT: No. Did he read that correctly?
THE WITNESS: Well, it was transcribed, so I don't --
THE COURT: No. Did he --
THE WITNESS: Yes. Yes.
THE COURT: That's the answer. Yes.
MR. TYSON: Okay. Thank you.
If I may approach, Your Honor, just to get that back.
THE COURT: Yes.
MR. SAVITZKY: Your Honor, I'd just like to object and seek to strike that last colloquy. It was improper impeachment. And, you know, that line of questioning was objected to in the deposition as well as calling for speculation from Mr. Cooper. So we'd ask that it be stricken.

THE COURT: I'm going to overrule your objection. BY MR. TYSON:
Q. So, Mr. Cooper, you talked earlier about data that was displayed. And you can't recall specifically if you used any features of Maptitude that displayed racial data about census blocks when you were dividing a precinct on the illustrative plans; is that right?
A. I don't specifically recall a situation like that. At the bloc level, did you say?
Q. When you were dividing a precinct --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- you don't recall if you ever turned on racial information in order to make the decisions about dividing that precinct; correct?
A. Right. I don't recall that, but it's conceivable that somewhere along the line I saw a -- a percentage of a bloc that was Black or not Black, I don't recall.
Q. And when you were drawing the illustrative plan, you would sometimes use information to tell you where more heavily Black precincts were located; correct?
A. Well, yes. I've acknowledged that I use a little dot for precincts that are 30 percent or greater Black.
Q. And that displays on the plans so you can immediately locate precincts that are 30 percent or greater Black?
A. Right. In other words, it's 70 percent white. Often I put them in a majority Black district.
Q. Mr. Cooper, one of the exhibits is a report called Plan Components with Population Detail. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And can you explain to the Court what a plan components report is?
A. It just -- it runs through all of the districts and shows
how a population was divided into districts in a particular -by county. And so you can see that District 1, which is up in the north end of the state, is divided into three counties.
Q. And this report also shows the racial makeup of the total population line of the AP Black percentage and then the second line of each county would refer to the voting age population; is that right?
A. Right. And they're not -- District 1 is only in Dade and Walker Counties, as drawn in the illustrative House. It's quite possibly the same districts that the states run.
Q. I'd like to look at one of your districts in particular. We'11 come back to this when we get to the specific districts in your report. But this is your House District 133, one of your new majority Black districts as you call it; correct? A. Correct.
Q. And looking at the planned components report for Baldwin County, the portion of Baldwin County that you included in District 133 is 51.46 percent AP Black VAP; correct? A. Correct.
Q. And on the other side you can see is District 144. The portion that you -- of Baldwin you did not include in District 133 and put in 144 is 22.32 percent Black; is that correct?
A. That's correct. I was not looking at this table as I was drawing the plan, but that's the end result. So I really had
no idea as I was drawing the plan as to the exact demographics of the split in Baldwin County.
Q. And the boundary in Baldwin County in District 133 splits the City of Milledgeville as we discussed earlier; right?
A. It does split Milledgeville, that's right.
Q. And it splits some precincts in Baldwin County as well, doesn't it?
A. It does.
Q. Looking at the other split county in District 133, the portion of Wilkes County that's located in District 133 is 47.03 percent AP Black VAP; correct?
A. Right. A minority of the voting age population.
Q. But the portion that is not included in District 133 and is in 123 is 26.43 percent Black; right?
A. Correct.
Q. And it's your testimony that in splitting these counties on those boundaries, you never turned on any racial information in Wilkes or Baldwin County?
A. No, that's not true. I told you that I know where -- I see the data showing that a precinct is 30 percent or more Black. That is what I see. But I see so many reports coming from experts these days that are directed at bloc level racial shading and VTD racial shading. And I don't do that, I'm sorry. I know you want me to say that, but I don't do it. Q. But you'd agree that in each split county in District 133
the portion of the county that is most heavily Black is included in District 133 and the remainder is excluded from District 133?
A. In that particular incident, yes, but I have to say, why does that matter? Don't some of the districts the State drew have the same kind of breakout where the Black population is -- of a particular county is higher in one split than it is in the other? So I don't -- I don't see any meaning to that. Q. And to clarify, you didn't have any political data and you're aware the State had political data; right?
A. I did not use political data, no.
Q. Are you aware the State had access to political data or do you know?
A. I do not know what the State -- I don't know who drew the plans for the State, and I don't know what data they were using at all, whether it was strictly political or if there were instances where they relied on race data as a proxy for political data.
Q. So we'll come back to this question later, but in creating your illustrative plans, you relied in part on the history of the experience of Black Americans and the commonality that goes with that as a basis for a community of interest; correct?
A. Absolutely. I think there's something special about the Black experience in America.
Q. Mr. Cooper, we looked earlier, you had a display in your report that discussed the number of majority Black districts on the 1990s era plans, the 2006 plan, 2014-2015 plans and the 2021 plans. Do you recall that?
A. From when?
Q. I'm referring to Figure 11 from your report --
A. Yes.
Q. -- that showed the number of majority Black districts over time?
A. Yes.
Q. The 2006 plan for Georgia House and Senate was a court-drawn plan, wasn't it?
A. Probably. I think it was -- or at least a follow-up to the Laris decision, or am I wrong about that? I didn't know it was court drawn.
Q. And you referenced eight additional State House districts that could be drawn based on population growth by Black individuals in Georgia over the last decade. Do you recall that?
A. Yes. Just as a hypothetical, describing the enormous population change that's occurred in Georgia over the past decade.
Q. And you're only offering five new majority Black districts in your report in this case; right?
A. Well, I'm not offering it, it's the plaintiffs. I drew a
plan that the plaintiffs approved.
Q. So to be clear, your plan only draws five additional
districts --
A. Right.
Q. -- not eight additional districts?
A. That's true.
Q. So, Mr. Cooper, you were retained, I believe you said, by the Alpha Phi Alpha plaintiffs before the special session in November of 2021; is that right?
A. Yes. Sometime in the -- I may have been retained earlier in 2021, very early, but I didn't do any plans until the late summer, early fall of -- it was probably in August of 2021.
Q. And you first started drawing the House and Senate maps before the special session from the legislature was complete; right?
A. I drew plans, again, using pre-census data, ACS data, in August of 2021. Honestly, I don't think I started drawing any more plans in 2021 until sometime in November because I was working on other cases, like Ohio, which was a nightmare. And I was also working on the Alabama case, and helping some localities develop redistricting plans. San Juan County, Utah, was alive during that time period.

So I was working on various plans. I don't think I started on Georgia for the preliminary injunction until sometime in the middle to late part of November.
Q. And I believe you referenced in your deposition as well that you had also been hired to draw some alternative plans after the 2011 redistricting cycle in Georgia, but no litigation was brought until later in that decade; right?
A. Could you repeat that?
Q. I believe you testified in your deposition that you were also hired to create alternative plans after the 20 -- or during the 2011 redistricting cycle, but that no litigation was brought until later in the decade; is that right?
A. Well, the first project did not involve the same set of attorneys or even the same issues, maybe, as the lawsuit filed in the latter part of the decade. So there's really no direct connection at all, other than that I, you know, had a database with the various plans that were developed, 2011 and 2015, already on the computer when I was hired to work on Dwight v. Kemp.
Q. And you never discussed the design of these plans with any of the plaintiffs in this case; right?
A. Of which -- of those previous decade --
Q. I'm sorry. Let me clarify.

Back to 2021 and your work in the Alpha Phi Alpha case, you did not discuss the design of the plans before you drew them with any of the plaintiffs in the case; right?
A. No, I haven't discussed anything with any of the plaintiffs at all. I mean, I'm working through the attorneys.
Q. Let's talk a little bit about your drawing process.

You discuss with Mr. Savitzky these regions that you set up across the state. Do you recall that testimony?
A. Yes.
Q. And you didn't have a methodology by which you selected particular counties in each of those regions, did you? A. Well, yes, I did. I mean, as I've indicated, I was familiar with South Metro Atlanta and the tremendous population growth that had occurred there, having worked on the lawsuit in Fayette County and also later in the decade on the Dwight v. Kemp case, which involved Henry County and Gwinnett County. And I -- so I had kind of been in the area and I knew that would be a place where most likely additional majority Black districts could be created because I had seen the data showing the tremendous Black population growth in those areas just between 1990 and 2010. And then I subsequently looked at 2010 to 2020 and saw that the growth was continuing a pace.

So that's the knowledge I had going into it, along with a general knowledge of the Georgia Black Belt because I had worked on a lot of cases in Georgia and drawn a lot of plans, a lot of it non-litigation related, in that same Black Belt region stretching from Augusta down to the southwest part of the state.
Q. You'd agree that Baldwin County was not included in any
of your regions where you analyzed population; right?
A. What do you mean, any of the regions where I analyzed population?
Q. In the regions in your report, if you could --
A. Oh, that's true. It was not one of the Regions A, B, C or D, it was not within those four regions. Were just kind of a general guide as to places where I might think could support an additional majority Black district. That was done -- I created those regions before I really had even done a full plan.
Q. And the districts that you drew didn't stay within those regions either; correct?
A. No. Nor did I ever think they would. I just sort of selected a grouping of counties at the outset that appeared to be likely to result in another majority Black district. Q. And you referenced metropolitan statistical areas as another basis for assembling your regions; is that right? A. Well, I just wanted to -- I mean, they were like county lines, they are there. And in the case of Macon-Bibb and Warner Robins, those are two MSAs that are right next to one another. So I did focus on MSA lines in that particular part of the state.
Q. But you'd agree that Houston County and Bibb County are in different MSAs; right?
A. Yes.
Q. So talking first about the State Senate plan, you changed 35 of the 56 districts from the enacted plan to add the three additional majority Black districts; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you'd agree that's more than half of all the State Senate districts in Georgia; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. So what I want to do is put Mr. Morgan's summary up here, just because this has all this information in one place about the Senate plan, and start at the bottom and work up.

So, first, I believe you testified earlier that the deviation range, so the population sizes of these various districts, is the same for the enacted plan and the illustrative plan; right?
A. Well, I mean, it's roughly the same. It's 2 percent on the Senate plan. Of course, this is the -- is this the December 5th plan, is that the illustrative plan on the table today, or is that the one at the preliminary injunction? Q. So this is from Mr. Morgan's report responding to your report, so it's the 12 -- he refers to the 1205 plan, it's the illustrative plan you submitted in your December 5th report.
A. Yeah. Right.

So the deviation is the same. I mean, it's all -there's a difference of one tenth of -- one tenth of a percentage point, or one-one hundredth, but basically it's

2 percent versus 2.01 percent.
Q. And you have listed that there are 18 majority Black districts on your plan as opposed to 14 on the enacted plan; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And plaintiffs are only saying -- or, actually, your report only posits three additional majority Black districts on the Senate; correct?
A. Correct. One of the districts that I created is not being challenged.
Q. So 14 plus 3, we get to 18 . How does that happen?
A. Well, that's -- there are 18 majority Black districts in the Senate plan, one of which just was sort of organically created as I was redrawing the enacted plan. But it's not being challenged in this case, as I understand it. But there are 18 majority Black districts in the illustrative Senate plan.
Q. And the additional district that's not majority Black on the enacted plan but is majority Black on the illustrative plan that you don't discuss in your report is District 33 in Cobb County; correct?
A. Perhaps. I think that may be right. It's in my report.
Q. And District 33 currently elects a Black Democratic member of the Senate despite not being a majority district; right?
A. I don't know that to be a fact, but I will take your word for it.
Q. And you're aware that District 17, District 23 and District 28 on the State Senate plan, the districts you discussed and have illustrative districts for, all currently elect white Republican members of the Senate; right?
A. I don't know that for a fact either. I do have information about where the incumbents live and assumed they were white, but I didn't know their party.
Q. At the preliminary injunction stage of this case you drew 19 majority Black State Senate districts, didn't you?
A. Yes. I made changes and there were still only three challenged districts in that preliminary injunction hearing as well. I think that there was an additional majority Black district that was organically created, perhaps in Gwinnett County or Rockdale, I don't remember, but it was not one that's challenged. And it disappeared organically as I was working on this plan.
Q. But just so we're clear, your report only proposes three additional majority Black districts, but you can draw as many as two more majority Black districts beyond those three; right?
A. I don't know that. I mean, I -- I mean, it is probable because I -- I created a different one in the -- well, in the -- in the preliminary injunction plan I -- there were
five. And I said "I created," I drew three that are challenged. And then through the ripple effect two more were created.
Q. But just so we're clear, you agree that you can draw more than three additional majority Black districts on the State Senate plan; correct?
A. You could, yes.
Q. On the compactness scores we have each of the mean compactness for the Reock score, it looks like one-one hundredth of a point better on the Cooper plan, and the mean compactness on the Polsby-Popper score, one hundredth of a point better on the enacted plan; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And because this is an average compactness score, it's including districts that were unchanged as well; right?
A. Correct.
Q. So it's correct to say the illustrative plan is slightly more compact on Reock and the enacted plan is slightly more compact on Polsby-Popper; right?
A. Yes, but very slightly. So as far as I'm concerned, they are equal. There's not enough to really matter.
Q. And we've discussed you splitting fewer counties and precincts on the illustrative plan than the enacted plan; right?
A. That's right. Census VTDs. So precinct lines have
changed since then, I'm sure.
Q. And in Mr. Morgan's report he breaks out the specific counties that you split and didn't split; correct?
A. That's my recollection.
Q. So in looking at that chart from Mr. Morgan's report, there are five counties listed there that were split in the enacted plan but which are whole in the illustrative plan. Do you see that?
A. Yes, I see that.
Q. And it's correct that none of the counties that were previously split in the enacted plan that you made whole are majority Black; correct?
A. That's true. Actually, Newton is real close, though, isn't it?
Q. Newton is at 47 percent on voting age population.
A. Right. And 49.7 percent on AP Black, so...
Q. In terms of looking at Clarke County, that's not near any of the new majority Black districts you've added; correct?
A. Well, there's a ripple effect, though. So sometimes counties can be unsplit as a ripple effect progresses and one person one vote comes into play, and so you can avoid splitting a county elsewhere.
Q. And Jackson County also is a heavily white county that's pretty distant from the changes you've made, isn't it?
A. Is what?
Q. Jackson County is distant from the changes you made? A. Well, it is. It is. But I don't -- I don't see the problem there. I didn't split those counties. The State did. I was not like purposefully splitting -- I don't know why the State has the splits. It's possible they are more historical in nature because incumbents were protected in those counties or something, but in the end I didn't have to split some of those counties.
Q. But just so we're clear, you have testified that the illustrative plan has fewer county splits than the enacted plan, but that fewer county splits include counties like Coffee County and Clarke County and Jackson County; correct? A. Correct. So what? Coffee County could very well have been impacted by changes I made in Southwest Georgia. The same goes for Clarke County and the Augusta region. I mean, there was a ripple effect. And there's no point in splitting a county if you don't have to. Not very many counties -citizens of counties like having their counties split. But if there are counties that want to be split in that list, no doubt it could be done with a modification to the illustrative plan.
Q. And, Mr. Cooper, on the Senate plan you didn't make any changes in Southwest Georgia related to State Senate districts, right, for additional majority Black districts?
A. I did not. So I retract what I just said. For whatever
reason Coffee County is whole in my plan and it's not whole in the State plan. If it is preferable to split the county, of course, it could be done.
Q. And you actually created a plan that added majority Black districts in Districts 17, 23 and 28, while changing fewer districts that you decided not to use because it had more county splits than the enacted plan; right?
A. I missed that question.
Q. You created a plan that added majority Black districts in Districts 17, 23 and 28, while changing fewer overall districts that you decided not to use in your report because it had more county splits than the enacted plan; right?
A. I created a plan like that? Perhaps -- are you referring to the preliminary injunction plan? I'm not sure what you're referencing there.
Q. So, Mr. Cooper, in your deposition do you recall being asked a question -- well, let me ask this, Mr. Cooper.

Is it correct that you've not created a plan that includes majority Black seats in Districts 17, 23 and 28 that modifies fewer than 35 districts?
A. Well, I've -- I'm completely lost here in the point you're trying to make and really unable to respond. I did do different drafts of plans, but I don't understand -- I don't really follow this line of questioning at all.

THE COURT: Well, you don't have to understand the
line of questioning, just answer the questions.
THE WITNESS: We11 --
MR. SAVITZKY: Your Honor, I would just object to the question as creating a double negative, confusing and perhaps assuming some facts that are not in evidence yet.

THE COURT: Do you want to respond, Mr. Tyson?
MR. TYSON: Your Honor, if I could be permitted to proceed, I'm going to hand Mr. Cooper the exact question he was asked in his deposition and go with his answer on that.

THE COURT: Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: That would be helpful to look at that and then I --

THE COURT: Yeah.
BY MR. TYSON:
Q. I'm going to hand you page 157 of your deposition in this case.

And you recall giving a deposition; right?
A. Yes.
Q. Beginning at line 12, question: "So it's correct that you have not created a plan that includes majority Blacks in Districts 17, 23 and 28 that modifies fewer districts than 35 ; right?"

THE COURT: Hold on. Hold on. Hold on.
MR. SAVITZKY: Your Honor, just objecting to having Mr. Cooper read from his deposition where there's no grounds
for impeachment and he hasn't made --
THE COURT: Well, he said he didn't understand the question, so he handed it to him so he could read it so he could understand it. I don't see the problem. He's reading the question he's asked him because he said he didn't understand the question.

MR. TYSON: And that was my intention, Your Honor, that Mr. Cooper didn't give an answer, so I was trying to... BY MR. TYSON:
Q. Mr. Cooper, did I read that question correctly?
A. You did.
Q. And your answer was, "At some point I did, but it also had more county splits. And so I made a decision to reduce the split -- county splits at the expense of maintaining what are often just ephemeral enacted planned districts that you guys changed even in mid-decade, like you did in 2015 and 2014, so they are very volatile in terms of their lines; whereas the county lines in Georgia, and even the regional commission lines, are unlikely to change."

Did I read that correctly?
A. Yes.

MR. TYSON: Your Honor, I'11 get that back.
THE COURT: Yes.
BY MR. TYSON:
Q. So, Mr. Cooper, it's correct that you designed a plan
that had fewer county splits, but you decided to split more counties and change more districts, is that right, because you wanted to reduce the number of county splits?
A. Well, see, that's -- didn't you say that I -- I don't -THE WITNESS: I'm still confused about his question, frankly.

I developed various drafts, and some of them may have had more county splits than the illustrative plan. And so I may have reduced a county split that was not within the areas that I focused on, which in turn led to the plan overall having the same or fewer county splits than the enacted plan. I will agree with that statement.

But I can't pinpoint exactly which counties that impacted within the illustrative plan as presented here. I suspect that the split in Clarke County, for example, may have just been a ripple effect. Newton was probably a ripple effect to keep it whole.

So, you know, that's all I can say. There are just an infinitesimal number of ways to draw voting plans. And you could probably create a plan that adds majority Black districts, three additional majority Black districts that split fewer counties, I'm pretty confident of that, if you spent some time. Or you could get a computer algorithm to do it and that would work as well. It might have other issues. But there are so many different ways to draw plans that you
can't really set a limit one way or the other ultimately. Q. Let's move to the State House, global statistics.

You agree that you changed 92 of the 180 districts on your illustrative plan to add five majority Black State House districts; right?
A. I did, although I'm fairly confident, again, that one could have reduced the number of changes and still created those districts.
Q. And you agree that's more than half of all the State House districts in Georgia; right?
A. Yes.
Q. Looking at Mr. Morgan's summary again here, you'd agree that you used a higher overall deviation range on the House illustrative plan than on the enacted plan; correct?
A. The difference is de minimis, and my assumption was that it was 1.5 minus -- plus or minus 1.5. I saw nothing to indicate that it would be something as odd as minus 1.4 but plus 1.34.

And the difference is de minimis. It really in no way suggests that your pl an is somehow superior because it happens to have a lower overall deviation of 2.74 percent versus 2.98 percent, because, generally speaking, the range that can be accepted in a state legislative plan or a local plan is plus or minus 5 percent that is used in many different states.

So from a one person one vote standpoint, there's no
problem with the plan I drew.
Q. And just so I'm understanding your answer, you agree that the legislature used a total deviation range of 2.74 , and when you created the illustrative plan, you used a total deviation range of 2.98; right?
A. I used a total deviation range of $1.5,1.5$, and made the assumption that the State had that range as well, but managed to get below it for whatever reason.
Q. And just so it's clear to the Court, minus 1.49 to plus 1.49 relates to the variation from the size of a district if all districts were equally sized; right?
A. Correct.
Q. On majority Black VAP districts you'd agree that 49 on the enacted plan, which is an increase from the prior plan; right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you have five additional districts on your House plan; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And those five additional districts on this illustrative plan are different than the five additional districts you offered in the preliminary injunction phase of this case; correct?
A. Yes. I think there are differences.
Q. And there's a new district in Macon that you were
offering as an additional majority Black district in this report that you did not offer in your report in the preliminary injunction phase; right?
A. Correct.
Q. But the overall increase in majority Black districts on both your preliminary injunction plan and your 1205 plan is the same; right?
A. Correct.
Q. And so you'd agree that you can draw additional majority Black districts in different places depending on how you configure the remaining districts; right?
A. Yes. There would be opportunities to draw additional majority Black districts elsewhere in the state.
Q. Looking at compactness, this refers to the -- the mean compactness is the average of all House districts; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And so on a plan that has 88 districts that are the same, are you surprised to see similar compactness scores or identical compactness scores?
A. Not really, because if 80 districts are the same, then the neighboring districts would also have some similarities, so -- both -- . 39 is fine for a mean average Reock score in a state legislative plan, I think, based on plans I've seen. Q. And, again, you referenced that you have fewer county
splits but more precinct splits in the enacted plan; is that right?
A. I would have to see the other -- yes. Yes, there are a few more precinct splits.
Q. And Mr. Morgan, again, broke out the specific counties that were split and unsplit in his report. Do you recall reviewing that?
A. Well, I broke that out, too.
Q. So looking at Mr. Morgan's report, you'd agree with me that Dawson, Gordon, Lumpkin, Oconee and White Counties all have 5 and a half percent or less Black voting age population; right?
A. Yes.
Q. And they're all in North Georgia?
A. Northeast Georgia. Not far from illustrative Senate District 23. That's where the ripple effect begins to come into play if you're trying to avoid county splits. In the end, it could mean that some of the counties that are further north could be made whole.
Q. So, Mr. Cooper, we're on the State House plan now, and so is it --
A. I'm sorry. We're looking at -- yeah, I'm looking at the wrong map. But there was an additional House district created in the eastern part of the Black Belt. So my comment still remains the same.
Q. Is it your testimony that the splits of, for example, Dawson and Gordon Counties was related to the creation of new majority Black districts?
A. I suspect that I saw Gordon County because it's split and there didn't seem to be an incumbent involved and eliminated that split there, maybe independent of a ripple effect. But I could not say the same for some of the other House districts in the more eastern part of Georgia.
Q. So looking at, again, a few maps from Mr. Morgan's report, this is Northeast Georgia; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And you can see the boundary line for this group of House districts that runs here into Cherokee County, over, and then the state line. Do you see that?
A. I do see that, yes.
Q. And on your map, I know it's a little hard to see, but there's a purple line that runs right here. And you would agree that follows the same boundary as the enacted plans for that region; is that correct?
A. It appears to be correct.
Q. And the difference in the plans in this area is Gordon County is split on the enacted plan but unsplit on the illustrative plan; right?
A. Yes.
Q. And I think you just said you'd agree this is an area
that's wholly contained within itself unrelated to any effort to add majority Black districts; right?
A. No. I said that there is a chance that that's the case.
Q. Okay.
A. I will not say the same about the others that are further east, so I will say that much. I have no reason to think that that would in any way violate traditional redistricting principles; right?

I mean, to keep a county whole when you can is a good move normally, but it is possible, it is possible that there are citizens and voters in Gordon County that like that split. And if that's the case, I'm sure there could be a way to return that split to Gordon County, even holding most of the illustrative plan constant.
Q. You're testifying here in this proceeding that your illustrative plan splits fewer counties than the enacted plan; right?
A. Well, it does.
Q. And that includes splits like this one of Gordon County that are unrelated to adding majority Black districts?
A. Well, we don't know that. We don't know that. I said I suspect that maybe for Gordon County, okay, we're now on par, 29, 29. So that's as far as I can go with it because I suspect that some of those other splits are ripple effect splits that I was able to remove because I changed the area
around Augusta and north all the way up to Wilkes County and all of those factors come into play. You have to balance things.

And there's a ripple effect. When you make a change in one area, it goes beyond that one area, when it comes to balancing out one person one vote, even if the counties are majority white.

But I cannot affirmatively say one way or the other exactly what the impact was there. Also, I was looking at incumbents.

THE COURT: I guess my question is -- excuse me, Mr. Tyson -- is that did you intentionally set it out that there would be more splits in the majority white counties by redoing the maps, or are you saying it's just a ripple effect?

THE WITNESS: Well, it is ripple effect, but it is possible that -- and I don't know when I did Gordon County, but Gordon County is a little further west, so it is possible that I made a decision to keep Gordon County whole. But that decision was not necessarily looking at the number of split counties and saying, oh, yes, I can make Gordon County whole and that will mean we'll have fewer county splits in the illustrative plan. I wasn't thinking in that fashion.

And overlaying all this is the incumbents. And I wanted to avoid pairing incumbents. And so it may have been necessary because of the other ripple effects in Northeast

Georgia to make Gordon County whole to avoid pairing a couple of incumbents in another county and still stay within plus or minus 1.5 percent. It's a balancing act. I did the best I could. I think I could probably have reduced the number of splits in the illustrative plan given time and given 100 percent accurate information about where the incumbents live.
Q. And, Mr. Cooper, just to close out this line, though, you agree with me that this map shows the outer boundary of these districts is the same on both plans, and you'd agree this is -- based on these statistics, these are mostly precincts that are between 0 and 20 percent Black; right?
A. Yes.
Q. And so are you testifying this unsplitting of Gordon County was related to the creation of the new majority Black --
A. If they are exactly the same and completely surrounded exactly the same, then I think it's safe to say that I just made a decision to keep Gordon County whole because it could be done without having any adverse impact on one person one vote.
Q. So when you say that your plan splits one fewer county than the enacted plan, it's including Gordon County as one of those counties that's one less split?
A. Yes. It's a true statement.

And if I did split Gordon -- if we unsplit Gordon County, then the illustrative plan is still on par with the enacted plan in terms of county splits. So no problem; right?

MR. TYSON: So, Your Honor, I'm about to switch over to go into some detailed districts, and then we're approaching our 3:00 timeline.

THE COURT: Let's take a break right here.
MR. TYSON: Thank you.
THE COURT: We'11 start back at 3:15.
(After a recess, the proceedings continued at 3:16 p.m. as follows:)

THE COURT: You may be seated.
Mr. Tyson, you may proceed.
MR. TYSON: Thank you, Your Honor.
BY MR. TYSON:
Q. Mr. Cooper, what I'd like to do next is walk through each of the districts that you created in your illustrative plan that you identify as new majority Black districts. And to look at that, I have some views from Mr. Morgan's report.

Are you familiar with the display and the coloring of the precincts on these particular maps?
A. No, I'm not. That's not the way I draw voting plans, so...

I looked at Mr. Morgan's report three or four months ago, but I don't draw plans like this.
Q. And just so we're all oriented here, if a precinct is colored yellow or red, it's going to be above 50 percent total Black population; whereas the green is 35 to 50 , and then the blue and -- or kind of light and dark blue is more heavily white population. Do you see that?
A. I do see that.
Q. And the purple line here is the outline for illustrative Senate District 17; is that correct?
A. Yes, I believe it is. I don't know for certain, but I'11 take your word for it.
Q. And you'd agree that the district, District 17, runs from heavily Black areas in South DeKalb and Rockdale Counties to more heavily white areas in Henry County; is that correct?
A. In what county?
Q. In Henry County.
A. Some of those areas would have, it would appear, in the range of 20 to 35 percent Black; right. The light blue.
Q. Areas that are not majority Black; right?
A. As of the 2020 census; right. Assuming the map is correct. And I did not verify it.
Q. Just for reference at the top here, you see the title from Mr. Morgan, APA Cooper Illustrative Senate 1205 SD 17.

Do you see that?
A. Yes. I'm going to assume with no problem the lines are showing for SD 17. I have not confirmed that these particular
percentages are accurate. They probably are, but I have not confirmed that.
Q. You'd agree that the Black population in Henry County that is contained in Senate District 17 has white population between it and the more heavily Black concentrations of DeKalb and Rockdale; correct?
A. Yes. There is a little distance between the two; right. This is not like the Texas case where there was 300 miles' difference that's often cited between one Latino community in South Texas and another in West Texas.
Q. So let's look at the planned components report for this district. And this indicates that the DeKalb County portion of District 17 is 94.9 percent Black; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And the Henry portion is not majority Black; correct?
A. Taken as a whole, it is not majority Black, but it is not far from it.
Q. And Henry County is the largest county in Senate District 17; correct?
A. Yes, there would be 84,580 people in Henry County who are in District 17.
Q. And if District 17 did not have the portions of DeKalb and Rockdale that you've included in it, it would not be a majority Black district; correct?
A. It also wouldn't be large enough to be a Senate district,
so I'm not sure what you're demonstrating there.
Q. And you believe there's a geographically compact minority community in the entirety of District 17 as you've drawn it; right?
A. I believe that Senate District 17 fully complies with traditional redistricting principles. I don't think there should be a problem that there may be some areas of Henry County that are in the range of 20 to 35 percent Black that would be between other areas in Rockdale and DeKalb that have heavier Black populations, you would see that all over the map, not just the illustrative plan but your own Senate plan. That sort of thing happens.
Q. My question was a little bit different.

You believe that there is a geographically compact minority community in the entirety of District 17 as it's drawn on the illustrative plan; right?
A. I do believe that, yeah. It's over 50 percent.
Q. And can you identify specifically where that geographically compact Black community is in District 17?
A. It's in DeKalb, Rockdale and the western portion of Henry County.
Q. It's correct, isn't it, that you're not aware of any community of interest between South DeKalb County and Henry County except that the geographic distance isn't that far; right?
A. No. Both areas are suburban in nature, and so there's that connection. And it's in Metro Atlanta. How different can the people in Henry County really be from people who live in the extreme southwest tip of DeKalb County? I don't think there's going to be a lot of difference. They play on different sports teams and that sort of thing, but overall both groups would consider themselves to be part of Greater Atlanta.
Q. So it's your belief that people in South DeKalb and people in South Henry County share a community of interest? A. To a certain extent, because they're part of Greater Atlanta. If you -- if they travel to, I don't know, Virginia, they would say they're from the Atlanta area.
Q. And so is there any other community of interest between South DeKalb County and South Henry County besides being part of Metro Atlanta?
A. Yes, there would be. Same sports leagues probably. It is literally probably a ten-minute drive from western Henry County into Rockdale County. I don't -- I mean, your question really is preposterous. They're neighbors.

THE COURT: Well, hold on, hold on, hold on. We want to keep this civilized. Okay?

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry.
THE COURT: Just answer the question. Leave the editorials to me.

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry.
THE COURT: Just stick to answering questions. Be civilized and respectful. You may not agree with the question, but the answer was not that's preposterous, I don't think. Okay?

THE WITNESS: All right.
THE COURT: All right?
BY MR. TYSON:
Q. Mr. Cooper, District 17, as you've configured it, contains no whole counties; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And are you aware whether this district places an incumbent -- a Republican incumbent in a majority Black district?
A. I don't recall. Is that a problem?
Q. You don't recall?
A. No, I don't.
Q. And this district doesn't maintain the core of existing Senate District 17; correct?
A. No, it would not, because it's a new majority Black illustrative district.
Q. And this may be an obvious question, but you connected the geography you connected in Senate District 17 to create an additional majority Black district in this area; right?
A. I'm sorry, I didn't understand that.
Q. You connected the geography that you connected in District 17 in order to create an additional majority Black district in this area; right?
A. It is an additional majority Black district. It's not cast in stone, though. There would be other ways to do it. Q. And my question was, specifically, you chose these geographies as part of the process of drawing this as an additional majority Black district; right?
A. Oh, yes. But I could have chosen some other configuration. It might look a lot like this, but it would be different.
Q. I want to look at a few districts around District 17. And I want to begin with District 16, one district to the west.

You'd agree that this district also begins in a more heavily Black area and runs down into a more heavily white area at the south end of Spalding County; right?
A. The very south end, yes.
Q. And you'd agree that District 16 connects more urban areas with more rural areas; right?
A. Probably more suburban with more rural maybe would be a better way to put it.
Q. And District 16 contains no whole counties; correct?
A. Well, it doesn't, but that would be true for almost every Senate district in Metro Atlanta; right?
Q. And District 16 does not maintain the core of existing District 16, does it?
A. I'd have to look at the core constituencies report. I think maybe some of the population which was in the enacted 2021 Senate District 16 may well still be in 2021 Senate District 16, but I don't have those numbers before me. But you can get that from the exhibits. There's a -- someone got a core constituents report that I've mentioned previously, so you can see exactly where the component population in illustrative Senate District 17 comes from, which enacted Senate district it would be drawn from.
Q. Is there a community of interest you can identify from North Clayton County that connects it to South Spalding County?
A. Well --

MR. SAVITZKY: Objection, Your Honor, just to the relevance of discussing in detail communities of interest in a district that's not one of the illustrative districts at issue in the case.

THE COURT: Mr. Tyson, why is that relevant?
MR. TYSON: Your Honor, it's relevant. Mr. Cooper has testified that districts around the districts he drew, he had to make changes to create the new districts. And as we talked about earlier, we believe it's part of the totality of the circumstances what steps were necessary to create the
additional majority Black districts. It may not be a Gingles 1 question, but it is a question related to what this Court must consider on the mapping front.

THE COURT: I'11 allow it. I'11 look at what effect these changes have to make overall. I'll allow it.

MR. TYSON: Thank you, Your Honor.
BY MR. TYSON:
Q. Mr. Cooper, can you identify any community of interest that connects North Clayton County with rural parts of South Spalding County?
A. Again, Metro Atlanta area, very close to one another. There would be commuting patterns from Spalding County into Downtown Atlanta. There are no doubt sports teams that compete against one another, so people drive back and forth on Friday nights to see the football games.

It's -- there are commonalities there because this is a distance that is not overwhelming. I mean, you can drive from down around the border of Spalding and Lamar up into Clayton County or deeper into Atlanta probably in under an hour most likely.

So I don't get the point you're making, but -- the district could have been drawn differently. Again, this is an illustrative plan. And I am not offering this, and I know the plaintiffs aren't offering this, as the remedial plan. There would be other ways to draw it with additional information.

And, again, always in the back of my mind was trying to avoid pairing incumbents. And I also had a very tight deviation range to deal with, plus or minus 1 percent. And I wanted to avoid splitting counties, and I wanted to avoid splitting towns. All of those factors entered in to the way I drew Senate District 17 and by extension into Senate District 16 since it's adjacent.
Q. Do you recall if there were any incumbency-specific issues with Senate District 17-- 16 as you've drawn it?
A. I do not recall.
Q. I noticed that you've gone around the City of Griffin in Spalding County with the boundaries of Senate District 16; is that right?
A. All of Griffin, I believe, is in another district.
Q. Can you recall, sitting here today, why you didn't include Griffin in Senate District 16?
A. Because I believe it is in Senate District 28 ; right?
Q. And Senate District 28 is one of the new majority Black districts you drew?
A. Yes.
Q. And so you chose to place the majority Black city of Griffin into the new majority Black district and not into District 16?
A. Yes. Doesn't that make sense?
Q. And you constructed District 16 this way as part of the
creation and configuration of geography to create District 17 and Districts 28 as new majority Black districts; right?
A. Yes. However, I have to stress again, that District 16 could have looked different, as could District 28 and District 17. This is merely an illustrative plan, not a remedial plan that's going to be enforced tomorrow obviously.

So there are other options out there and the State will likely get the opportunity to present those options, if we prevail.
Q. So let's move next to District 28. And I've kind of taken a little bit more zoomed-out view here so we can see this.

You'd agree that District 28, as you've configured it, connects more heavily Black population in South Clayton County with more heavily white population in rural parts of Fayette and Spalding Counties; right?
A. There are areas in District 28 in the extreme southwest corner that are predominantly white.
Q. And I believe you referenced earlier that you've removed heavily white areas around Peachtree City from this district; correct?

MR. SAVITZKY: Your Honor, objection. Just mischaracterizing testimony. I don't think Mr. Cooper testified that he removed those areas.

MR. TYSON: I'm happy to rephrase the question, Your

Honor.
THE COURT: Rephrase.
BY MR. TYSON:
Q. Mr. Cooper, I believe you testified earlier that Peachtree City is not included in District 28 as you've configured it; right?
A. Correct.
Q. And I believe you also stated that Peachtree City is a more heavily white area; is that right?
A. I think so, based on my travels in that part of the state. Limited travels, albeit, but I think it's safe to say that Peachtree City is predominantly white.
Q. And --
A. Also I think there's an incumbent that lives over there, I could be wrong about that, but it seems like that rings a bell that maybe there's an incumbent in or around Peachtree City.
Q. And you chose to include the City of Griffin in District 28; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And did you choose to exclude the white population from Peachtree City in the configuration of this district?
A. Not necessarily, but I ran up against one person one vote. I mean, once you pick up Griffin and some of the area between Spalding County and Fayetteville, there's a lot of
population as you approach Fayetteville. So from one person one vote standpoint you could not include Peachtree City in District 28. And, frankly, probably if you did, it would no longer be majority Black. But there may be ways to include part of it in Senate District 28 still.
Q. And you're aware generally of the Black and white populations in Fayette County because of work you've done in that county; correct?
A. Generally speaking, yes. Yes.
Q. And you would agree there is intervening white population between the Black population in Clayton and Fayette Counties and the population in Griffin in Spalding County; right?
A. In Senate District 28?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes, there is some white population.
Q. Would you agree that the Black population in Griffin in Spalding County is older and less urban than the Black population in Clayton County?
A. I think it is more likely that it is older, yes. But I could not tell you that for a fact.
Q. And your reason for believing there's a connection between the Black communities in Griffin in Spalding County and Black communities in Clayton County is that they're relatively geographically close; right?
A. They're geographically close, that's right. And they are
in the same -- yeah, they're just neighbors, you know. I mean, you have to include neighbors when you're drawing districts; right? You can't just isolate certain areas. You would never be able to draw a district that adhered to one person one vote requirements.
Q. And District 28 contains no whole counties; correct? A. It does not, as there are many districts in and around Metro Atlanta that don't include whole counties.
Q. Do you recall if existing District 28 contained whole counties?
A. I don't recall.
Q. And District 28, as you've configured, does not maintain the core of existing District 28 ; right?
A. Do you have -- I'd need to look at a map of existing District 28 to really make a statement. I can probably find one here but...
Q. I'11 pull up your report real quick.

I believe Exhibit L to your report is going to contain the 2021 Senate plan.
A. That sounds about right.
Q. It might be easier to locate in your other binder with all the tabs on it.
A. Oh, yes, I guess I'm using your binder, aren't I? That will expedite matters.
Q. I apologize. I probably should have that visible for

MR. SAVITZKY: And I'11 -- just to inject, if you're looking for side-by-side images of District 28 in both plans, that would be pages 290 and 292 of Alpha's 1, Mr. Cooper's report. Those have closer-up images.

MR. TYSON: Thank you.
THE COURT: Which book?
THE WITNESS: 290? Yes, I now have 290 and 291,
which is the illustrative Senate.
BY MR. TYSON:
Q. Mr. Cooper, do you have an exhibit number on your 290 and 291 that you're referring to?
A. I'm looking at P1 and P2.
Q. P1 and P2. Okay.
A. In the plaintiffs' exhibits.
Q. In looking at Exhibits P1 and P2 of your report, can you tell if District 28 contains whole counties on the enacted plan?
A. It does. It includes Lamar, Pike and Spalding as whole counties, and then splits Fayette, including some predominantly minority populations around Tyrone and -- just south of Fayetteville in District 16.
Q. And just to be clear, Senate District 16 on the enacted plan includes all of Spalding, Pike and Lamar Counties; is that right?
A. That's true. Pike and Lamar are predominantly white and are, I think, kind of at the outer ring of --
(Clarification by the court reporter)
THE WITNESS: That's true. They are further south in the outer rim of the Atlanta MSA. BY MR. TYSON:
Q. And Coweta County is whole in Senate District 28 on the enacted plan as well; right?
A. Correct. And I believe it's also whole in the illustrative plan.
Q. So in this part of Atlanta you agree that Spalding County was not split on the enacted plan and is split on the illustrative plan; right?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you identify any community of interest between Clayton County and Griffin aside from the geographic distance between the two?
A. Well, as I've suggested, the areas are generally suburban in nature. I think Griffin, maybe the city itself, has been there for a while, so it's not all suburban. And it's a majority Black town, so there is the connection, the cultural history that we've mentioned, that makes it acceptable, I think, to include certain communities in a majority Black district. And so that's what I did.

And it also eliminates a split to Senate District 28 of

Fayetteville and Fayette County that is caused by District 34 dipping into Fayette County and picking up predominantly Black population and then allowing for a much whiter Senate District 16.
Q. And you would agree that illustrative District 28 splits Fayette County like the enacted plan does on different boundaries but Fayette County is split in both plans; right? A. That's true. The illustrative Senate District 28 splits Fayette County between House District 39 and -- between Senate District 39 and Senate District 28 . And the enacted plan splits Fayette County between Senate District 34 and Senate District 16.
Q. And you constructed Senate District 28 to be a new majority Black district in this area; right?
A. One possible majority-minority -- majority Black district that is currently not in place.
Q. And you'd agree that both Senate District 28 and Senate District 16 on the illustrative plan connect more exurban population with more rural population; is that right?
A. I think it's really connecting some suburban population with exurban population. Although I do understand that Griffin is a town that's been there for some time, so it was there before the exurban explosion that we've seen in the past three decades.
Q. And we talked about Senate District 34 on the
illustrative plan previously, about whether that district was packed or not. Do you recall that testimony?
A. I do.
Q. And in reviewing that area on the plan, going back to your screen there, the boundaries of District 34, do you see those.
A. Yes.
Q. And you'd agree that that Black VAP is 77.8 percent; right?
A. I don't know. I'm not looking at the table --
Q. The plan components report is right here. Here is your total voting age population for the district.
A. Well, that's Mr. Morgan's total, but I don't think -- I don't question that. I think it's probably accurate. He uses Maptitude as well as I.
Q. And the Fulton portion of that district is 92.89 percent Black; right?
A. Apparently.
Q. And Clayton County is split three ways on the illustrative plan; is that right?
A. I'm not sure about that. I'd have to look at the split report.
Q. But just visually you can see there's a portion of Clayton County here, a portion of Clayton County in District 16 and a portion of Clayton County in 28; right?
A. Probably. It looks that way. You've overlaid the Senate District's lines onto the county lines, but I think that's probably right.
Q. In looking at the enacted plan in the same area, which is Exhibit 34, Mr. Morgan's report, you'd agree that Clayton County on the enacted plan is only divided into two districts; correct?
A. This is really hard to look at.
Q. So your border of Clayton County runs --
A. Yeah. I mean, I see the border. Well, I sort of see the border. But I think there are two districts there.
Q. And you'd agree that the enacted Senate plan does not connect portions of Clayton County with rural areas in Spalding County; right?
A. And it doesn't connect it with exurban areas in Spalding County.
Q. Would you agree the enacted Senate plan doesn't connect, at least on District 10 and District 44, any urban areas in South DeKalb with rural areas in Spalding County; right? A. Well, I still maintain that we're looking really at urban versus -- suburban versus exurban. The rural flavor of Spalding County, while still there in some areas, is seemingly disappearing due to population growth.
Q. Let's move to Senate District 23. I want to begin with the enacted plan districts. This is Exhibit 35 of

Mr. Morgan's report.
You'd agree that Senate District 22 on the enacted plan was wholly within Richmond County; right?
A. It was. It was.
Q. And you believe that Senate District 22 on the enacted plan is packed; correct?
A. I believe that Augusta-Richmond County, can be reconfigured in a manner that would allow for an additional majority Black Senate district in the Eastern Black Belt to be created.

You'11 recall that maybe in our last hearing you complained about McDuffie County, which is a majority Black -I think it's a majority Black, or very close to it, it's part of the Black Belt, not being included in any of my plans. So this particular plan accomplishes what you were complaining about.

I added part of Augusta County -- I'm sorry, part of Augusta and -- Richmond Augusta County, I guess, and it included McDuffie in the majority Black district of -- with Richmond and Augusta County.

THE COURT: What was wrong with the enacted plan regarding Richmond being just the one county for that Senate seat?

THE WITNESS: Well, if -- you do need to split the county in order to get the second majority Black district. I
think that's true probably. Although I haven't seen the other plaintiffs' plans in this lawsuit, so I may be wrong about that.

THE COURT: Now, Richmond County is predominantly Black?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
THE COURT: There's 191,000 people used to make up a State Senate seat?

THE WITNESS: We11, 91,000 makes up a House seat.
THE COURT: But a Senate seat?
THE WITNESS: Oh, it's 161,000.
THE COURT: Okay. So you're saying you had to split Richmond County in order to get the second Black Senate seat?

THE WITNESS: Probably so. You split Richmond and Augusta County between Senate Districts 22 and 23, and then add in to Senate District 22 McDuffie County and eliminate a part of the existing plan that actually goes -- picks up white population in Columbia County.

So Columbia County is made whole in this illustrative plan, whereas it's split in the State's 2021 plan.

THE COURT: But doesn't the split in Richmond County, didn't it make it hard for the Black African-Americans trying to win that Senate seat if you split it?

THE WITNESS: Well, the Black VAP in that Senate district would be lower. And the understanding I have is that
based on the Gingles 2 and Gingles 3 analysis that has been done, a Black candidate would be able to prevail in a district that is not as heavily Black as the existing Senate District 22, because otherwise that particular configuration would not have been produced by the plaintiffs' side --

THE COURT: You change an almost safe seat into a seat at some risk?

THE WITNESS: Perhaps. I mean, it's certainly -yeah, it's certainly a smaller Black VAP for Senate District 22 than it has under the enacted plan. I'm not looking at the percentage, but I do think it would cut it.

THE COURT: Mr. Tyson asked the question and I may have missed the answer. You may have answered and I missed it. He asked the question, was that seat -- did you consider that seat packed, that Senate seat packed under the enacted plan. You may have answered it, I may have just missed it.

THE WITNESS: I may not have answered it. And I have a real -- I use the term "packed" and "cracked" kind of in a very broad brush. I -- I have to look -- you know, you can't really just look at the percentages but --

THE COURT: What do you look --
THE WITNESS: I -- well, I was aware of the percentages. And I was also aware that if Richmond County was split and then included in a new Senate District 22 that would bring in the adjacent rural counties, that you would still
have a majority Black VAP district.
THE COURT: We11 --
THE WITNESS: So the question was whether it would be sufficient, in other words, well over 50 percent, to make it likely that Black candidates would normally be able to prevail in that district. And the understanding I have is, based on the Gingles 2 and Gingles 3 analysis, it would be a district where the Black population would run competitively in a Senate seat.

THE COURT: Do we have a percentages? Do you know what the percentage would be if you split it?

THE WITNESS: Well, I do have -- I mean, I have the percentages -- we have both. We have the -- let me get the table.

THE COURT: What percentage of it now as-is?
THE WITNESS: Yeah. Yes, your Honor. I'11 find that here. It may take me a moment.

THE COURT: Well, we can come back to that.
MR. TYSON: I actually have it on the screen, Your Honor. This is the percentage of voting age population on the existing District 22, 56.5 percent.

THE COURT: If you split it -- it's 56 now, so if you split it, would it be under 50 ?

THE WITNESS: It would be a little bit over -- it would be 50.1-- 50.2 percent -- I'm sorry, 22 would be 50.36
percent any part Black.
THE COURT: A reduction of about 6 percent?
THE WITNESS: Yes. The white population would be 40.63 percent. So there's a 10 percentage point advantage to the Black voting age population in Senate District 22, because Augusta-Richmond has other minorities, Latinos, that would also be in the mix. So there's a ten percentage point gap, so that's still -- it's not a 50/50 district, but it would be more competitive, obviously.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
Go ahead.
MR. TYSON: Thank you, Your Honor.
BY MR. TYSON:
Q. And, Mr. Cooper, again, not to belabor this point, but in terms of District 22 on the enacted plan being packed, you believe that District 22 is packed on the enacted plan?
A. I think I've tried to state -- and I probably haven't done a very good job of it -- that it's -- there is no magic number for packing.

What I tend to say about packing is that it -- there -- I would suggest that you could slightly reduce the Black VAP in District 22 and thereby create a Senate District 23 that is majority Black, a Senate District 23 that does include part of Augusta-Richmond County, and then extends following the Black Belt counties down towards Twiggs County and back up in a
northeasterly direction.
So it's a fairly large district, but it would be majority Black in an area that those populations now are in districts that are overwhelmingly white.

THE COURT: Well, 56 percent, you think that's a possibility of calling that packing?

THE WITNESS: Well, no, I'm not -- I shouldn't use the term. I should stop using it altogether.

THE COURT: Well, I have to use it. It's the only thing I've got.

THE WITNESS: Well, yeah. I mean, there is sufficient population in Richmond Augusta County to allow for minor reduction in that percentage and, therefore, create a new majority Black Senate District. I mean, you create -essentially you create two more racially diverse districts than just the one that you have in Senate District 22.

THE COURT: Maybe.
THE WITNESS: We11, I mean, I'm not -- I'm just saying the districts are racially diverse, but I'm not predicting a winner here at all. But I'm basing my assumption that District 23 as drawn would be a reasonable opportunity district for a Black candidate, but it's no guarantee.

THE COURT: What would be the percentage in District 23, Senate District 23, what would be the percentage of Black?

THE WITNESS: 50.2. So it's a -- and the white population percentage in that district would be 45 percent. So it would be somewhat more competitive but still an advantage to the Black voting population.

THE COURT: Go ahead.
MR. TYSON: And, Your Honor, my learned co-counsel has corrected me on the break that I was not being sufficiently precise with my impeachment. I don't want to belabor this point, but I have one more piece to bring out. BY MR. TYSON:
Q. Mr. Cooper, you recall giving a deposition on

February 10th; right?
A. I was there, yes, on February 10th.
Q. And you recall a court reporter was present and took down what you said?
A. Yes.
Q. And you were under oath; right?
A. Yes.

MR. TYSON: So, Your Honor, I'd like for permission to read the deposition at 140, 8 through 13.

THE COURT: Yes.
MR. TYSON: I can bring one up to the Court as well or read one, whatever you'd prefer.

THE COURT: You can read it.
BY MR. TYSON:
Q. So, Mr. Cooper, do you remember when I asked you, you believe that Senate District 22 is packed on the enacted plan, and your answer was, "Yes, I do"? Do you recall that testimony?
A. Well, yeah. I mean, I apologize for not being able to really express myself on this issue adequately, but the point is, is that you have a district that's 56 percent Black. And with a minor change, you know, three or four percentage points apparently, I was able to create a second majority Black district. So given that, I believe that the Black population is somewhat packed, but there's not a -- there's not a -- I mean, it just varies from place to place and situation to situation.

THE COURT: But it kind of looks like you're looking for Black voters. You take a Senate District 22, which is 56 percent, I've got to admit, I kind of find it hard to find that that's a packed district.

THE WITNESS: Well --
THE COURT: And if you take 6 percent out in order to create -- I understand to create the second district. Then your argument is rather than having one Black Senate district, you have two. But, you know, you're saying, well, it's not really packed, Judge, I don't want to use that word, but you can't create that second district unless you take those 6 percent Blacks out of that district to put in this other
district.
THE WITNESS: That would seem to be the case, but I have not seen the plan that's been developed by the other plaintiffs in this lawsuit which may well accomplish that, I don't know.

But in my case I made a decision to split Richmond and Augusta and, therefore, have population that would allow for a majority Black district extending towards Wilkes County.

THE COURT: You split it so you can get 6 percent Blacks out of this district to make a second district?

THE WITNESS: Well, that's essentially what happens; right.

THE COURT: Go ahead.
BY MR. TYSON:
Q. Mr. Cooper, following up on those questions, in looking at the configuration of District 22, it is underpopulated on this indication in your report by zero -- by minus .92 percent; right?
A. Right.
Q. And you've used a plus or minus 1 percent deviation for your State Senate plan; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. So that is a very underpopulated district when you're using a plus or minus 1 percent deviation?
A. It would be on the low end for sure, but as I understand
it, it's a constitutional district because it's obviously adhering to the requirements of the State Senate and well below plus or minus 5 percent.
Q. Are you aware that Senate District 22 is part of the Georgia v. Ashcroft litigation in the 2001 redistricting cycle?
A. I was not.
Q. So you're not aware of what the BVAP was in the 2001 decision in Georgia v. Ashcroft?
(Clarification by the court reporter).
BY MR. TYSON:
Q. So you're not aware of the Black voting age percentage in Senate District 22 in the 2001 Georgia v. Ashcroft case; right?
A. I am not. I mean, I guess there was a plan that the Court adopt -- I mean that the state legislature adopted sometime in 2001, and then there was a lawsuit, and then the Court ordered a new plan. I'm not sure -- you're not referencing the -- you're not referencing -- are you referencing the 2006 plan or another plan?
Q. I was referencing the 2001 plan that was objected to by the Department of Justice.
A. Yes. That was a long time ago, but I don't know what the percentage is.
Q. So, Mr. Cooper, looking a little more closely at

District 22 --
THE COURT: Mr. Tyson, can I interrupt for one second.

MR. TYSON: Certain1y.
THE COURT: I would remind you that the court reporter needs us all to do two things: Speak slower and 1 ouder.

MR. TYSON: I will endeavor to do my best on that.
THE WITNESS: I will try to do better as well.
THE COURT: I'm guilty of that as we11, so she'11 start off being mad at me first.

MR. TYSON: I received a pretrial admonishment, and I still am struggling. So I'11 keep working on it. BY MR. TYSON:
Q. Mr. Cooper, in looking at the boundaries of Senate District 22 as you've drawn it, it now begins in Richmond County, but as you indicated, includes McDuffie, Warren and G1ascock Counties in addition to the portion of Richmond County; is that right?
A. Right.
Q. And by extending District 22 out of Richmond County, that freed up population that you can use in Senate District 23; correct?
A. Correct. Again, I'm not -- I'm not looking at where the incumbents live, so that might have been a factor.
Q. But you'd agree that moving District 22 into those three adjoining counties allowed for Black population to be available to go into District 23; right?
A. Yes.
Q. So let's take a look at some of the pieces we have of Senate District 23.

So 23 begins in Richmond County; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Oh, I'm sorry, Mr. Cooper, I got ahead of myself here.

Both Senate District 22 and Senate District 23 are underpopulated districts on the illustrative plan; right? A. They are underpopulated but within the plus or minus 1 percent. I mean, that's acceptable, as far as I know. Q. And you can't identify any community of interest between Richmond County and McDuffie, Warren or Glascock Counties, can you?
A. I think you can. They're neighbors. Richmond County and Augusta now, that's a consolidated county. So all you have to do is step across the line and you're in McDuffie County. They were all part of the Central Savannah Regional Commission, so those counties would have reason to cooperate with one another either under your enacted Senate plan or under the illustrative plan. So I -- I think that it makes sense to include McDuffie with Richmond Augusta County.
Q. And Columbia County is part of that same regional
commission; right?
A. Correct.
Q. And you did not include Columbia County with District 22; correct?
A. That's true. I eliminated the split of Columbia County that you -- that is in the enacted plan, in the 2021 plan. Q. And this configuration of Senate District 22 was in service of the goal of making District 23 a majority Black district; right?
A. It worked out to be a way to draw a majority Black district that included some of the more rural counties in the Black Belt, true. I don't know if that's the only way to do it, though.
Q. In looking at Senate District 23, as you've configured it, it appears that the two split counties are Richmond and then Wilkes, which is slightly out of view on this one, but you can see on this display here. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And the portion of Wilkes County from the plan components report that is put into District 23 is 69.86 percent Black; is that correct?
A. I'm going to assume that is correct.
Q. And this portion -- this split of Wilkes County divides the City of Washington, Georgia; right?
A. It follows -- if I'm not mistaken, it follows county
commission boundaries that also split the Town of Washington -- or the City of Washington.
Q. And the portion of Wilkes County that is not included in Districts 23 is 25.39 percent Black; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. When you were drawing Senate District 23, were you aware of the racial impact of the split of Wilkes County?
A. I was aware that I could not include all of Wilkes County in a majority Black district. I was also aware that it -that Wilkes County goes almost all the way right up to the South Carolina line, so it basically has to be split regardless of the underlying racial demographic.
Q. You said that you couldn't include all of Wilkes County in a majority Black district. Is that because the number would drop below 50 percent on --
A. No. There are the two reasons that I just named. One is the obvious one, that it would throw the deviation off. And the other reason is that it's slanted up towards the South Carolina line, and so it would just kind of create this very narrow passageway for Lincoln to be connected with something. So it makes sense to split Wilkes County.
Q. And is it your testimony that you never looked at racial data when you were making the split of Wilkes County?
A. No. As I've said, I've looked at VTD-level racial data.
Q. So it just happened that almost 70 percent of the
population from Wilkes County that you included in District 23 is of Black voting age?
A. I had no idea that was the percentage. As I was drawing the plan I did use the existing county commission district lines. So I did -- I mean, there's -- I mean, those are lines that have been established by local people; right?

And where I didn't follow the county commission lines in the Senate plan, I followed the municipal lines of the City of Washington. So what did I do wrong?
Q. You also split precincts in Wilkes County when you were following those other boundaries; right?
A. I did for the House plan. I'm not sure about the Senate plan. Well, the municipal lines do split precincts. See, that's the trade-off. There's a trade-off between following VTD lines and following municipal lines, because oftentimes VTD lines extend beyond municipal lines. So I made a decision just to include the City of Washington in the majority Black district.
Q. And that resulted in the portion you included in District 23 being 69.9 percent Black; right?
A. Apparently so. I'm taking your figures on the assumption they're correct.
Q. In looking at the broader boundaries of Senate District 23, you'd agree that it begins on a South Carolina border here and runs all the way to Twiggs County just south
of Macon; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And you'd agree that illustrative District 23 as you've drawn it includes counties from different regions than the regions you analyze at the beginning of your report; right?
A. Well, I've looked at different regions, that's true. I've looked at the contemporary Black Belt. I've looked at regional commissions. And I've looked at MSA lines and micropolitan and statistical area lines and county lines. So I've looked at different regions, true.
Q. And you'd agree that illustrative District 23 crosses regional commission boundaries as you've configured it; right? A. It does.
Q. And is it correct that the only connection you can identify between Richmond County and Twiggs County is that they're both in the area of the Black Belt?
A. They're in the Black Belt. And there are transportation corridors between the two areas now. There's a Fall Line Freeway that would allow you to pretty much travel from Twiggs to Augusta County with any -- without any problem at all.

And as you're probably aware, there's now in the works an I-14 that would go from the Macon area to Augusta that would go through many of these counties. I don't think the map's been plotted out exactly where those interstate boundaries would go. I would say it's a new development as of a couple
of years ago. And it will take a while for that particular interstate to be constructed.

But during the process of that construction it would be a very good thing if Twiggs County is in the same Senate district as Augusta-Richmond area because those counties are going to need to work together as plans for I-14 roll out. Q. Did you rely on the proposed route of I-14 for your choices to configure illustrative District 23 this way?
A. I was aware of the existence of a potential I-14. I don't know if -- I don't even think that this project is at the stage yet where there's actually a proposed route that is definitive. But I think it will follow a lot of what is now called the Fall Line Freeway, Highway 540, which is already a four-lane road, with some minor exceptions, that goes from somewhere south of the Macon area, Jefferson -- the City of Jeffersonville, I think, in Wilkins County -- Wilkinson County up to Augusta.
Q. Did you rely on the route of the Fall Line Freeway for your choices to configure Senate District 23 this way?
A. Well, I didn't rely on the -- I mean, it was not a boundary because it kind of cuts through the middle of the contemporary Black Belt. I mean, it's there. It exists. It, I think, used to be parts of other highways, but now it's all subsumed under Highway 540, a state highway.

And ultimately, a lot of that, as I understand it, will
become part of I-14.
Q. And so the communities that you relied on that connect Richmond and Twiggs Counties are both being part of your definition of the Black Belt and having some transportation commonality or corridors between them; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. So let's talk a little bit about the Black Belt.

You'd agree there is no uniform definition of the Black Belt; right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you can't say for sure which counties are in or out of the Black Belt in Georgia; is that right?
A. Well, different analysts would perhaps examine data and come to different conclusions about which ones should or should not be in the Black Belt. I think that the GBPI had a pretty good methodology and most of the area between Twiggs and Augusta, those counties, would be in the contemporary Black Belt.
Q. So let's take a look at that GBPI report. I believe that was Alpha Plaintiff's Exhibit 53. It's also in tab 4 of the second binder I handed up to you there marked as Defendant's 22, but it's the same report.
A. Wait a minute. This is in your -- I've got it but --
Q. It's fine to refer to the plaintiff's version if you'd like to.
A. I think it's in Exhibit E, isn't it, or somewhere thereabouts, no? Ah, here it is. Yes. It's in Exhibit D. Q. And you relied on this paper by the Georgia Budget \& Policy Institute for what the contemporary Black Belt region is; right?
A. Yes, as a general guide. It's not cast in stone, but as a general guide, I did.
Q. What other sources did you rely on besides this report for your understanding of the Black Belt region in Georgia? A. Well, I also just looked at the demographics. And if you go back to, I guess, Figure -- is it Figure -- I'll get you the figure from my report here in a second -- Figure 4, you see that most of the counties, stretching from Twiggs County to Augusta-Richmond, are 40 percent or more Black. Wilkinson would be an exception, I guess, it's 35 percent Black.
Q. So part of your definition of the Black Belt includes counties that have at least 35 to 40 percent Black population? A. Not necess- -- I didn't develop a hard and fast rule on that, but that would be reasonable. A county that is in the range of 40 percent or more is probably going to be part of the historical Black Belt and especially a part of the contemporary Black Belt.
Q. And you didn't include any counties from Metro Atlanta as part of that -- as part of the Black Belt?
A. I did not because Atlanta is some distance away from the
midsection of the state. So I did not try to draw a district that stretched, say, from Henry County down to Twiggs County or something. I just stuck with the northeast-southwest approach.
Q. And so turning to page 7 of the Georgia Budget \& Policy Institute report, this is the map that you relied on in creating your report; is that correct?
A. I used it just as general background information. It didn't really control exactly how $I$ was drawing the lines.
Q. You'd agree that this map includes Savannah and St. Simons Island as part of the Black Belt; right?
A. I don't know about St. Simons Island. It's what -- well, it's including Chatham County is what it's including, I guess.
Q. And it's including Glynn County as well?
A. Well, let's look. Yes. The slave population in Glynn County was 73 percent in 1860, and they are now -- school enrollment in Glynn County is 35 percent Black and there's 36-- 38 percent Black poverty. So that was how the Georgia Budget \& Policy Institute established what parts of the state is within -- what parts are within the Black Belt.

And so they didn't just restrict it to a narrow band of counties necessarily between Augusta and Southwest Georgia. It would have included some other areas of the state. And so it's -- it was a guidepost, but it was not the overriding map that I used to develop the illustrative plan.
Q. And you'd agree that the report includes Clarke County and Athens as a Black Belt area, Newton County, Butts County and Spalding County in Metro Atlanta as Black Belt counties; right?
A. Yes. And if you look at Clarke County, you can see that almost half of the Black population that enroll in school is Black, 49 percent. And the percent of poverty is really quite high, 46 percent in Clarke County.
Q. And Clayton County is well over 35 percent Black, but it is not included as part of the Black Belt; right?
A. Yes, but there is a proviso there. For some reason the authors of this report decided not to include the core counties of Atlanta as part of their analysis. And I'm -they didn't really -- at least I didn't see where they elaborate on that as to why that decision was made because Clayton County would qualify based on percent Black enrolled, which is 70 percent, and percent Black and poverty, 42 percent.
Q. And this report helped form your opinions about where the Black Belt is located in Georgia, didn't it?
A. It did inform my opinion, yes, because it showed me that there are areas that go beyond just looking at simple county-level data that could be included in the Black Belt.
Q. And this is a map not of counties but of school --
A. School systems, that's right. There are -- the school
systems don't stand out so much in the Black Belt because both the school systems and the counties are kind of, you know, colored deep blue. Most -- you can see some of the school systems in North Georgia are shown on this map, but they would not be Black Belt counties. I mean, they show up as being maybe a thicker line or something, but you can see them.
Q. Did you have a particular method by which you excluded counties that the GBPI found were part of the Black Belt and that you did not find to be part of the Black Belt?
A. No. I was looking at this as just general background information. So take it for what you will.
Q. In getting back to Senate District 23, your understanding of the Black Belt is what formed at least one of the communities of interest you relied on for this configuration of the district; right?
A. I'm sorry, I missed part of that question.
Q. In going back to Senate District 23, your understanding of the Black Belt is what formed -- I'm sorry.

Your understanding of the Black Belt helped inform the decisions you made about the configuration of Senate District 23; right?
A. Yes.
Q. In looking at the counties in District 23, is there one geographically compact Black community in illustrative District 23?
A. That's an odd question. I have trouble answering it. But I would say that there is a community that extends from Augusta-Richmond, down through the Black community, down through the Black Belt and back up towards Twiggs County based on cultural and historical factors.
Q. In wrapping up with illustrative District 23 , it splits two counties; correct?
A. As does your -- the State's District 23, if I'm not mistaken.
Q. Oand illustrative District 23 has a different footprint, obviously, than existing District 23; right?
A. Yes.
Q. And aside from the Black Belt and the transportation corridor between Richmond and Twiggs, you can't identify any other communities of interest in the counties contained in this district; right?
A. Well, that would seem to me to be enough. I mean, it goes beyond just being Black or having a transportation corridor. If you look at the poverty rates -- go back and look at the county data, those charts, and take a look at the poverty rates in this area of the state. And I'm talking specifically about Black poverty. And you may come away with a different feeling about it all.

And I would also mention that some of those counties have just been in -- the voting population in those counties have
been in majority white districts, going all the way back to the passage of the Voting Rights Act. So this would be the first opportunity for some Black voters, some of whom are quite elderly, to have a shot at having a meaningful vote cast for state legislature.
Q. And this construction of Senate District 23 was designed to be an additional majority Black district in this area; right?
A. Absolutely.
Q. So let's move to the State House districts.

First of all, before I get to that, you'd agree that the 2021 enacted plan added two majority Black districts from the prior House plan; right?
A. Yes. There were 47 in the prior plan, now there are 49, so two were added.
Q. And you drew five additional majority Black districts beyond the enacted plans number; right?
A. Right.
Q. And one of those districts is in a different location in the state than the preliminary injunction plan you drew; right?
A. That's true.
Q. So let's work through these districts as well. We're going to start with South Metro.

And your House map, looking at it here, has the same
pattern of taking higher concentrations of Black voters in Clayton and Fulton Counties and then running them like a stripe down into more heavily white areas in Fayette County in 69 and 77; right?
A. The Black population in that area is concentrated more around Fayette County in the northern part and Clayton County, that's true.
Q. And District 69 and 77 are already majority Black districts on the existing plan. District 64 is what you're calling the new district; right?
A. Yes.
Q. So looking at these districts, starting with District 69, you'd agree that most of the population in District 69 is in Fayette County; is that correct?
A. Yes, but -- it's 39,000 in Fayette; right.
Q. And the portion of Fayette that's included is only 34.43 percent Black; correct?
A. That's --

MR. SAVITZKY: Your Honor, I just renew my objection at this time to questioning about the details of districts that are not put forward as the illustrative districts in Mr. Cooper's plan.

And I would add only that to the extent that Mr. Tyson's position that these are relevant to the totality of the circumstances, Mr. Cooper is here as an expert in

Gingles 1, not the totality of the circumstances.
THE COURT: Yeah, Mr. Tyson, I'm not quite following you on the relevancy of this line of questioning on these. The other ones I could see the effect, but this one, I don't quite see the relevance in here.

MR. TYSON: And so, Your Honor, what we'11 see is the addition of District 77 is key to creating District 74 as a new majority Black district. So both 69 and 77, as we'll work through these, will show are longer and thinner than the districts that were drawn by the legislature. And that is necessary to create -- free up the population, kind of like with Richmond County for District 74 in this location. So that's the reason for the questions in this space.

MR. SAVITZKY: Your Honor, it doesn't go to the compactness or configuration of District 74 itself, which is being put forward as the illustrative district that we're suggesting can be drawn. So I don't think it's relevant to the Gingles 1 question.

THE COURT: I sort of agree with him here, Mr. Tyson, with the objection here.

MR. TYSON: Thank you, Your Honor.
BY MR. TYSON:
Q. Mr. Cooper, in configuring District 74 did you have to reconfigure other districts nearby?
A. Yes, other districts were configured nearby.
Q. And looking at District 74 as you've drawn it, you'd agree that the only portion -- only county that's majority Black on voting age population is the Clayton County portion of District 74; correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And District 74, as it's configured, places the heavily white portion of Spalding County in with an almost 80 percent Black-backed portion of Clayton County; correct?
A. I don't know the exact percentages, but maybe it would be about 7,000 people from Spalding County, of which about 15 percent is Black.
Q. Can you identify the geographically compact Black community in District 74?
A. Well, I think the district itself is compact. And most of the Black population does come from Clayton County, but it is picking up Black population in Henry County. The part of Henry County that is included in that district is 47 percent Black voting age, 50 percent Black. And there is some population from Spalding County that is Black, 15 percent. And you create a majority Black district. And that is unquestionably compact. And end of story as far as I'm concerned.
Q. You'd agree --
A. Very, very -- I mean, the distances there to get from one part of the district to the other are, you know, what is it,
maybe a 20-minute drive at most, unless you're going during rush hour traffic or something, maybe it's more than that. Q. And you'd agree that you need the Black population in Clayton County to make District 74 a majority Black district; correct?
A. I think as it's configured here, yes. Is that a problem? No.
Q. Are you aware that the enacted plan maintained Clayton County's borders except for a small portion over in Henry?
A. I am aware that a small portion of Clayton County was split, yes.
Q. And can you identify a community of interest in illustrative District 74 between the portions of Clayton and Spalding Counties that are included, besides geographic distance?
A. Well, they are neighbors. I mean, we're not -- I'm not drawing a district here, House District 74, that is in any way extending across vast territory to create a majority Black district. It's a very compact area. There are most certainly linkages between North Spalding County and Henry County and Clayton, which is, in that part of the county, as I understand it, largely suburban.
Q. Mr. Cooper, would changes in Districts 77 and 69 be part of the ripple effect of drawing District 74 as you testified ear1ier?
A. Part of a ripple effect, perhaps.

And if you think 77 is too elongated now, there would likely be other ways to draw it.

MR. TYSON: And, Your Honor, with that I'm going to renew my questions on District 77 and 69, expecting I might get an objection, but I just wanted to alert you. We feel like that we've laid the foundation now for why those are relevant to the drawing of District 74.

THE COURT: I guess it goes back to my summary judgment order, where I found that it would not be relevant. That's, more than anything, the basis of sustaining the objection.

MR. TYSON: Certain1y, Your Honor. And we'11 respect that. Thank you.

BY MR. TYSON:
Q. Mr. Cooper, have you reviewed Chart 8 in Mr. Morgan's report about compactness scores for these four districts? A. Some time ago, yes.
Q. And you've testified several times that District 74 is very compact; right?
A. Yes, it has a .63 compactness score on Reock and .36 on Polsby-Popper. And it's just visually compact.

THE COURT: Mr. Tyson.
MR. TYSON: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: I hate to interrupt y'all, but there's a
matter that's come up in my chambers that I need to step off for about five minutes to take care of it. Let's just take a break right here.

It's my goal to finish this witness today.
(After a recess, the proceedings continued at 4:40 p.m. as follows:)

THE COURT: Y'all can be seated.
I apologize, Mr. Tyson, just something came up I had to handle.

MR. TYSON: Certainly understand, Your Honor.
And just for timing logistics, I mean, we obviously have three districts left to talk through on the House plan. You've seen about how long it's taking per district. I just want to make sure I'm being forthright with kind of what we're looking at. I think it probably is going to be at least a 5:30 finish for me, and we have redirect, I'm assuming, after that, so...

THE COURT: Let me put it this way. We're going to go to 5:30, may go to 6:00. Well, we'11 see how long the redirect goes and then recross. You may be able to get your cross in and go from there.

MR. TYSON: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.
And one other housekeeping piece, Your Honor. I talked with co-counsel at the break. Just we do -- I understand your Court's ruling on the other districts. We
believe the racial predominance piece is in Gingles 1, and that we have testimony from Mr. Cooper now about the effects that he had while he was drawing the plans. And the only questions we would have asked additionally for 69 and 77 were going to be about communities of interest from the north part of the district to the south part of the district. So I just wanted that to be reflective.

THE COURT: So noted for the record.
MR. TYSON: Thank you.
THE COURT: You still have an objection; correct?
MR. SAVITZKY: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: A11 right. So noted for the record.
MR. TYSON: Understood. Thank you, Your Honor.
BY MR. TYSON:
Q. Mr. Cooper, let's move to Henry County, District 117.

And this is an additional majority Black district in Metro Atlanta; correct?
A. It is.
Q. And it includes portions of Henry and portions of Spalding Counties; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And this district splits the City of Locust Grove; right?
A. It does split Locust Grove.
Q. And the city also splits the city of -- I mean, sorry.

This district also splits the City of Griffin; right?
A. The southwest corner.
Q. And you connected a portion of Locust Grove with a portion of the City of Griffin in District 117; right?
A. Yes.
Q. And the basis for connecting Locust Grove and Griffin was their geographic proximity and the opportunity to create a new majority Black district; right?
A. I think that's a safe statement, yes. They're very close to one another.
Q. And you referenced earlier various labor force participation rates and socioeconomic data. Since District 117 does not include whole municipalities or whole counties, you can't conduct a socioeconomic analysis for the voters in District 117; right?
A. Well, I think you could look at socioeconomic data for Griffin. Perhaps for Locust Grove.
Q. But those would be for the entire cities --
A. Right. That's true. That's true.
Q. And both of those cities are split; correct?
A. Right. But it gives you an indication of the underlying population.
Q. And beyond what we've talked about you can't identify any other community of interest that connects Locust Grove and Griffin; right?
A. They are in an exurban area of Metro Atlanta. Both
communities are majority Black. And they're very close to one another. So I can't imagine that there's not a community of interest.

Locust Grove is exurban and really didn't exist in large part until the 2000s. I think in the 1990s it had a population of about 300 people. So it is a newer place than Griffin.
Q. And the connection of Locust Grove and Griffin was made in service of the goal of making this a new majority Black district; right?
A. Well, I'm looking at areas that could be contained within a majority Black district somewhere in Metro Atlanta. I don't believe that I sacrificed any traditional redistricting principles at all. In fact, I'm 100 percent certain that I did not. But you can parse the data and try to claim otherwise, as you've done so far today.
Q. Let's move over to East Georgia. And I want to begin with the enacted plan in the East Georgia area.

Are you looking at the map with me there?
A. I'm now looking at -- I mean, the map you're showing, I have to stress, is not the sort of map that I would ever be looking at as I'm drawing a plan. That's a very important point to make.

You guys seem to be totally obsessed with race. And I'm trying to develop plans that adhere to traditional
redistricting principles while simultaneously being aware of race but not just completely obsessed with racial shading.
Q. And, Mr. Cooper, you've testified that you were able to reduce the overall county splits from the enacted plan on the illustrative plan; right?
A. Yes. For the House plan by one county; right.
Q. And so looking at this area on the enacted plan, I count six split counties, McDuffie, Columbia, Richmond, Putnam, Jones and Baldwin. Do you agree with that?
A. I haven't counted them up, but we'11 accept that for now. Q. And now looking at the illustrative plan in the same area, I count additional county splits in Oglethorpe, Wilkes, Jefferson, Burke, Johnson, Laurens and Screven Counties. Did I name those correctly?
A. Yes.
Q. And those are counties that are not split on the enacted plan but are split on the illustrative plan; correct?
A. Correct. I specifically recall modifying this plan to protect an incumbent in Screven County.
Q. So looking specifically at District 133 -- I know we talked about this briefly before, but just to get our bearings -- there's a county split in Wilkes County here in the north part of the district; right?
A. Yes.
Q. And a county split in Baldwin County in the almost south
part of the district; right?
A. Right.
Q. And that split of Baldwin County splits the City of Milledgeville?
A. Yes.
Q. And the Baldwin split takes in more heavily Black portions of Baldwin into District 133 and leaves the more heavily white portion out of District 133; right?
A. Probably. I don't have the numbers in front of me, but I suspect that's the case.
Q. Do you recall earlier when we looked at these splits at the beginning of your testimony?
A. I think we did at some point. I just don't have the percentages in my head.
Q. In looking around the borders of District 133, you'd agree that most of the precincts that touch the outside of District 133 are that blue or light blue color; is that right? A. That would appear to be the case. Again, this is not a map that I would be looking at as I'm drawing a plan. Q. And those colors would indicate more heavily white population on the border around District 133; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And can you identify any community of interest or connection between Wilkes County and Baldwin County?
A. Yes. It's part of the Black Belt.
Q. Any other connection besides being part of the Black Belt?
A. It's the same general part of the state. I mean, it -I don't know -- I do not know how you can make things any clearer other than to say that those are counties that are -by and large, Hancock, Warren, Telfair and Wilkes -- are rural in nature. And except for, of course, Glascock, those counties are significantly Black.
Q. And, Mr. Cooper, in creating District 133 you had to make changes to the enacted District 128; correct?
A. I'm not looking at the enacted 128. Let's see.
Q. There you go. The enacted 128 is back on your screen.
A. Yeah, well, I'll look at it just from my own declaration here. I find your map very confusing, as I said.

But, yes, 128 was changed.
Q. And District 128 was previously a majority Black
district; right?
A. Yes. And it still is.
Q. And so putting District 128 up side by side with the enacted plan, on the enacted plan, District 128 has a portion of McDuffie, a portion of Baldwin and then contains whole counties; correct?
A. Yes. Why did you split McDuffie?
Q. And then on the illustrative plan District 128 begins in Dublin and Laurens County, takes a portion of Laurens, a
portion of Johnson, all of Washington, a portion of Jefferson and a portion of Burke; correct?
A. I think so. There are more splits in this part of the map than most of the other illustrative plans I've drawn.
Q. And on the enacted plan District 155 includes two whole counties; right?
A. I'm sorry? What --
Q. District 155 includes all of Laurens and all of Johnson?
A. It does, yes.
Q. And it now has a county split on illustrative plan in Laurens; right?
A. Yes.
Q. And the four split counties in a single district, in District 128, is the most county splits in a single district on the illustrative plan; right?
A. I believe so. I believe so.
Q. And the changes in 128 were necessary to create District 133 as a majority Black district; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And can you identify any connection between the portion of Burke County on the eastern side of District 128 and the portion of Laurens County and Dublin on the other end, besides the fact that they both have Black population in them?
A. Well, most of 128 , as I've drawn it, is in the -- is in the Central Savannah River Regional Commission, but Laurens

County would not be.
Q. And Laurens County, looking at the racial split of Laurens, 128, the portion in 128 is 52.89 percent -- or 8 percent Black; correct?

I know that's very small type.
A. Oh, yes. I see it's 52.8; right.
Q. And the portion excluded from Laurens County is 23 percent Black; correct?
A. That appears to be correct.
Q. And you created District 5 this way as part of the goal of adding a majority Black District 133; right?
A. It does require changes to House District 128, existing House District 128. You're right.

THE COURT: Hold on. Repeat that answer, please.
THE WITNESS: Yeah. It does require changes to House District 128 to create House District 133. BY MS. LAKIN:
Q. And my question was about District 150 -- I'm sorry -128 and 155 are both in Laurens County; right?
A. Apparently I'm not looking at a map in my declaration that actually shows the entire area, but it does appear that 155 in the illustrative House plan is in Laurens County.
Q. Did you also have to make changes to District 126 to make 133 a majority Black district?
A. Don't know. Where is $126 ?$
Q. It's over -- starting in Richmond and Burke. There we go. That's --
A. Yeah. Yeah. I see it. Yes.

I think so; yes.
Q. And on the enacted plan, 126 included all of Burke, all of Jenkins and part of Richmond; right?
A. Yes.
Q. And on the illustrative plan, it includes all of Glascock, a piece of Jefferson, a piece of Burke, a piece of Richmond, and a piece of Screven; right?
A. Right. I think there would be alternative ways to draw this particular House District 126 in the illustrative plan if I did not attempt to protect an incumbent in Screven County. Q. So it's your testimony that all of the county splits in that district are related to incumbent protection?
A. That's a fact; right. Because that incumbent would have to be drawn into 126 to avoid pairing that incumbent with someone else. That's my recollection. I hope I'm correct on that. It's easy to forget these things.
Q. And you can't identify any community of interest between the portion of Screven in District 126 and Glascock and North Jefferson; right?
A. Well, they're extremely close to one another. I mean, it's eastern -- it's the eastern end of the Black Belt. And they're in the -- basically in the same regional commission
except a little tiny part of Screven. So I don't -- I just don't understand your emphasis on requiring that I explain a community of interest for counties that are so close to one another. They're right next door to one another. They might have regional concerns, like high school football, but basically it's the same people.
Q. And looking at the split of Screven County in

District 126, the portion of Screven included in District 126 is 53.9 percent Black and the portion outside of District 126 is 33.41 percent Black; right?
A. Yes. Is that a problem?
Q. And you created District 126 in this configuration as part of creating District 133 as a new majority Black district in the area; right?
A. I believe that was a factor, if memory serves.
Q. So after looking at these areas, Mr. Cooper, would you agree that in order to create House District 133 as a new majority Black district, the illustrative plan adds more county splits to this region of Georgia; right?
A. In its present format, perhaps it does. But there is a ripple effect coming out of other areas. So it -- it may create more splits, but those splits can be eliminated elsewhere in order to keep some of the Black communities in the Eastern Black Belt together.
Q. So if not for eliminating county splits in other parts of
the state, your plan would split more counties than the enacted plan; right?
A. As drawn perhaps, yes. But other possibilities are out there.
Q. And the illustrative plan split in this area splits counties in such a way that higher concentrations of Black voters are included in majority Black districts and lower concentrations of Black voters are not included in those districts; right?
A. To an extent, yes. I was not obsessed with race, though.

I was not looking at a shaded map that breaks out Black population in increments of 0 to 20,20 to 30 . I mean, it's just -- it's too extreme for me, frankly.
Q. Let's move to Macon for our last district here.

This is a new majority Black district you drew that was not presented as part of your preliminary injunction plan; right?
A. Correct.
Q. And to get our bearings, there are heavy concentrations of Black voters in Downtown Macon that are currently included in Districts 142 and 143; right?
A. Correct.
Q. And on the enacted plan 142 and 143 are wholly within Bibb County; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And are you aware the Democratic leader of the House represents District 143?
A. No.
Q. In looking to the illustrative plan, District 145 is the new majority Black district you say you've created; right?
A. It is the new -- it is the new illustrative Black district in the Macon-Bibb area, yes.
Q. Instead of the Black population in Bibb being divided into two districts, it's divided into three districts on the illustrative plan; correct?
A. Yes. Parts of Bibb are in three districts; right.
Q. And it was necessary to remove Black population from Districts 142 and 143 to free up that population to be placed in District 145; right?
A. Yes, to a certain extent. I -- I added population from the Warner Robins area into 142 and made changes in Macon-Bibb.
Q. And so on the illustrative plan there are no State House districts that are wholly contained in Bibb County; correct?
A. I don't think that's true. Isn't -- I think that -well, I take that back. No, there is no longer a whole district in Macon County. That's right.
Q. And to free up the Black population to move into District 145, you expanded District 142 down to Warner Robins and District 143 into Twiggs and Wilkinson Counties; right?
A. Right. They're neighbors. They're all part of the Greater Macon area, which includes the Warner Robins MSA and the Macon-Bibb MSA.
Q. And the new District 145 you've created is only two-tenths of a point over 50 percent; correct?
A. That's true.
Q. And that district runs from Downtown Macon out into Monroe County; right?
A. Correct.
Q. And you'd agree that Monroe County is more rural than Bibb County; correct?
A. At least in parts, for sure.
Q. And you can't identify any community of interest between Downtown Macon in Bibb County and the portion of Monroe you've included in District 145; correct?
A. No. It's a very small population. And I made that decision to make sure we had a district that was within plus or minus 1.5 percent, taking into account where incumbents live in Macon-Bibb.

I mean, the incumbents are always in the background, so, you know, that tended to rule how I drew a lot of these districts. And they could have been drawn differently with a different set of incumbents.
Q. And you didn't provide any maps that showed the locations of incumbents for when you were drawing your plans; right?
A. I had a map; right. I had incumbents overlaid onto the map.
Q. In your expert report you didn't include any maps that showed the location of incumbents; right?
A. I did not. Incumbents are constantly moving, I mean, are constantly changing, you just had primaries. So I really would need from you folks an update should this case go on so that I can proceed with other alternatives given the location of the new batch of incumbents.
Q. And can you identify anything about the configuration of 142, 143 or 145 that you know for certain was related to incumbents?
A. Yes. I mean, I know that there are three incumbents, I believe, in -- I think there are three in Bibb and --Macon-Bibb, although there may be one who lives just on the other side of the line in Monroe. That was an uncertainty I had. But I believe that one of the incumbents in that general area of House districts actually lives in Monroe County. That's my recollection thinking back, but I may have faulty memory.
Q. And you drew 145 to be an additional majority Black district in the Macon area; right?
A. Yes.
Q. And I believe you said this already, but you'd agree District 142 crosses out of the Macon MSA into the Warner

Robins MSA; right?
A. Yes. It's part of what would be a combined statistical area according to the Census Bureau. In other words, joining two contiguous MSAs into one. The same thing happens with the Atlanta MSA and the Athens MSA. They have a whole other level, combined Athens and Atlanta. "They" being the Census Bureau.
Q. And you configured District 142 the way you did in service of the goal of drawing District 145 as a new majority Black district; right?
A. No, not really in service. I don't like that term. I was drawing this plan in part to deal with some incumbent issues in terms of where folks lived, the incumbents. And also, of course, to meet one person one vote requirements.

This is a balancing act. You think everything is done based on race. I, on the other hand, tried to balance things. I keep repeating myself. I'm not trying to be difficult on this, but just over and over again you are claiming that every move I make is somehow or another based on race and that is just false, and I want to make that clear right now.
Q. So let's move to Southwest Georgia and wrap up our legislative districts.

Starting with the enacted plan for this region, you'd agree that Lee County was not split; correct?
A. I think I would agree, although let me look at the -- let
me look at that portion of my declaration. Like I say, I can't follow your maps very well.

In the 2021 plan Lee was in House District 152; right.
Q. And Lee County is split on the illustrative plan; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And so you've added at least one additional county split in Southwest Georgia in the process of drawing District 171 as a new majority Black district; correct?
A. I'm not sure. But by the same token, I eliminated a four-way split in Dougherty County, so that should be taken into account as well.
Q. And District 171 is the new majority Black district; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And it runs, I think we talked about, from Albany in Dougherty County, through white population in Mitchell and Thomas Counties before it gets to Black population in Thomasville; is that correct?
A. I don't think it is. I believe Mitchell is majority Black. I can look at the county data. I think that's the case. It may be right around 50 percent, hovering around 50 percent.

Let's look.
Mitchell County has a 2020 population of 21,755 . The
in-part Black population is 10,394 . And the non-Hispanic white population is 10,106 . So it's plurality Black.
Q. And Thomas County is split on District 171; correct?
A. It is split, yes.
Q. And reviewing the racial makeup of that split in Thomas County, looking at the plan components report, you would agree the portion of Thomas County you included in District 171 is 51.07 percent Black VAP, and the rest of the county that is not in District 171 is 25.58 percent BVAP; right?
A. Yeah. But one thing I also need to point out here is I'm not looking at VAP when I'm drawing these plans. And so by focusing on VAP, you're making it look like I just drew the most narrowest possible district that could be drawn, barely over 50 percent, just barely got there somehow or another.

And I'm looking, in fact, at total population, not VAP. And the VAP in that particular area was 53 percent.
Q. And you also split several precincts when you were drawing District 171; correct?
A. Not so sure about that. I think I may have split a precinct in Thomas County.
Q. And do you recall splitting one in Dougherty County as well?
A. Might have. Again, incumbents may have come into play there. And I eliminated a county split. So getting rid of a county split trumps adding a VTD split.
Q. And to be clear, when you say getting rid of a county split, you're referring to reducing splits of Dougherty County from four districts to three districts; right?
A. Right.
Q. When you were drawing District 171, did you review at all its impact on -- actually, strike that.

You mentioned and discussed earlier the corridor management plan for US Highway 19 as a connection between Thomasville and Albany; right?
A. Well, it is a connection. That's not the scenic byway, but it is a connection. The scenic byway sort of parallels it. I think it's Highway 3.
Q. And did you rely on that corridor management plan when you were drawing your plan, or did you find it after you drew?
A. I was aware of it as I was drawing that part of the state, I believe.
Q. When did you --
A. I did not have complete information about whether or not it was a final deal in terms of being approved by the legislature, but I knew that it had been in the works since sometime in the mid 2010s.
Q. Did you ever check to see if US Highway 19 crosses out of District 171 as you've drawn it?
A. Well, it does. Actually, it eventually kind of goes just east of Thomasville. And Highway 84 dips down into Downtown

Thomasville. So 19 enters Thomas (sic) -- might not enter Thomasville, but I think it picks up on the eastern end. And then Highway 84, and I think maybe it's Route 3, goes through the center of the city.
Q. And you mentioned socioeconomic data when drawing District 171. You could only get reliable information on that from Mitchell County since it's the only whole county; right?
A. I think you can get reliable information from these socioeconomic charts that give you a general idea about the nature of the district you're drawing.

So in these rural counties I feel pretty confident that what you see in the county-level chart or in the case of Thomas County, maybe just a Thomasville chart, you'd get a good picture of the socioeconomic well-being of the Black and the white population in those areas.
Q. And you've never reviewed whether District 171 followed the description of the route in the corridor management plan document; correct?
A. I did not go mile by mile. I mean, it clearly follows the route through -- I think through Mitchell County. At some point it may not once it gets to Thomasville, but it must be pretty close.
Q. And besides US Highway 19, the only thing connecting Black communities in Albany and Thomasville are that they're both in Southwest Georgia, they're both part of the Black Belt
as you interpret that, and they're both smaller towns; is that right?
A. That would be a primary point to make. They're also part of the Southwest Georgia Regional Commission, those counties.

And you complain about my joining Albany to Thomasville, but House District 171 under the 2021 plan extends from Mitche11 down to Decatur County and picks up part of Grady County, so there's a county split there.

And the transportation corridor there is not as well developed as Highway 19, so I think it's kind of a circuitous route. Just pointing that out. It's a majority white House District 171.
Q. And to create District 171 as a majority Black district, you connected the Black populations in Albany and Thomasville; right?
A. I did. To create majority Black districts you have to have districts that contain majority Black populations. That's why this is all just kind of a circular argument.
Q. And the configuration of this district was part of the goal of drawing a new majority Black district in this area of the state; right?
A. It shows that one can be drawn that complies with traditional redistricting principles.
Q. Let's talk briefly about the American Community Survey socioeconomic data in your report.
A. Sure.
Q. You report after each plan for House and Senate various information for the counties in each district, but you didn't make the same comparisons of ACS data for each district you analyzed; is that right?
A. I'm not sure what you mean.
Q. So for some districts you looked at labor force participation rates, others you looked at the rate of bachelor's degrees.
A. Oh, sure. Yeah. There -- I just selected a few snippets from the reports that you can get from the CD that have probably I think close to 60 pages of charts and data. And so I -- I did select a snippet from each one of those reports, but I could have used others.

I could have used the same one, poverty, for all of them. Even in Fayette County, if you look at the poverty rates of Blacks and whites in Fayette County, you're going to find that Blacks are going to be a little higher. It's much worse in the Eastern Black Belt in Southwest Georgia. But there are disparities even in Fayette County.
Q. But to be clear, you did not report poverty rates for all the counties where you drew districts; correct?
A. Oh, yes, I did. I just didn't write it up in this report because it would have been more than 800 pages. Each one of these county reports has like 30 charts on one page and then
data directly from the Census Bureau on 30 more pages. So each report is 60 pages.

I didn't -- I mean, there are 100 and -- I don't know how many counties in Georgia have more than 10 percent Black population, but it's probably over 100. So that would be, what, about a thousand pages just of data. I mean, you have it if you want to reference it.
Q. And to be clear, you conducted that -- putting together the documentation about socioeconomic information after you drew the illustrative plans; right?
A. No. To be clear, I developed those charts a year before I even started on this report. The preliminary injunction report, not this report. Those charts were run off in the summer -- I exaggerate a little bit. Those charts were run off in the summer of 2021, about the same time that I initially looked at Georgia as a potential project for state legislative redistricting.

And I don't just put Georgia up there, I've got every state in the country up there with a significant Black population, county or city. So it was not -- I was not just selecting Georgia to target to analyze.
Q. But you didn't utilize those charts in the process of drawing the illustrative plans; did you?
A. Well, no. I was just trying to get a general picture of how things are in selected counties; right.
Q. And it's fair to say that in assembling that data you were focusing on areas with at least some Black population; right?
A. Well, right. Here we go with the circular argument again. You know, if you're going to draw a majority Black district, you have to go to areas that have Black population; right?

And we know that those areas have increased in large part just over the past ten years. 500,000 more African-Americans in the state in 2020 than in 2010. I mean, that's a huge jump. Way beyond anything you might have seen, say, in Alabama or Louisiana.

Georgia and Metro Atlanta are a magnet for in migration from Mississippi, Louisiana, Tennessee. I mean, there's just -- it's there. And that's where a lot of Black folks are moving, young and old, but particularly young.

And as you know, the -- as I mentioned in my report, the Governor's Office of Policy and Population Projections, or something like that, it's in the footnote, has estimated that there will be another 92,000 people in those South Metro counties I've identified, and most of that population will be Black for the coming decade, to clarify.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Cooper.

MR. TYSON: If I could consult with my co-counsel just briefly, I think I'm finished, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.
MR. TYSON: Mr. Cooper, I know it's been a long afternoon. I appreciate your time. It's always good to see you.

THE WITNESS: Yes, it's always a pleasure.
MR. TYSON: Those are all the questions I have for now. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thanks, Mr. Tyson.
Will there be a redirect?
MR. SAVITZKY: Yes, Your Honor. And I'm sorry to tell you I think we'll probably go a little longer than half hour, maybe closer to 45 minutes.

THE COURT: Well, I'm not going to -- even if it's going to be ten minutes, because then we'11 have a recross, so...

We'll stop right here for today. We're going to start tomorrow morning at 9:30 rather than 9:00. There's a matter I have to take up in the morning that's going to take some time. So we'll start tomorrow at 9:30, but we will go to 5:30 tomorrow to make up for that half hour difference.

MR. SAVITZKY: And, Your Honor, one other thing, during Mr. Cooper's direct examination you had asked to run off the full exhibits --

THE COURT: It can wait until tomorrow. It can wait until tomorrow. Because $I$ know he's been here all afternoon.

So tomorrow's fine.
MR. SAVITZKY: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Anything else?
MR. TYSON: Your Honor, just logistically I believe we had some witnesses whose only availability was tomorrow. I guess we can chat about that, but I just think --

THE COURT: Who are they? We may have to call them first. Because I was going to ask you-all, is the Grant Pendergrass people going to call Mr. Cooper tomorrow?

MS. KHANNA: We've had -- I think the order of operations was supposed to be Alpha's expert, Mr. Cooper; Alpha's fact witnesses; Grant's expert, Dr. Esselstyn; Grant's fact witnesses; and then Pendergrass's expert, Mr. Cooper.

I don't know even if that were the order, if we could do that, especially with the added wrinkle that I mentioned this morning, Dr. Palmer, who's our Gingles 2, 3 expert has to go tomorrow.

THE COURT: Well, I already agreed we can call those people out of order.

So Mr. Cooper can come back later; right? Once he finishes tomorrow after Gingles 1 , he will not be called back tomorrow. He'll be called back later, either later this week or sometime next week. Okay.

So what we'11 do tomorrow, the witnesses that can only come -- we'11 finish Mr. Cooper tomorrow, hopefully by
lunch, hopefully earlier than that. Nothing personal.
And then we'11 take the witnesses out of order that can only testify tomorrow.

Let Mr. Tyson know who they are and how you're going to call them.

MS. KHANNA: Absolutely, Your Honor.
MR. SAVITZKY: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you, all. Have a good evening.
(The proceedings recessed at 5:27 p.m.)
Tunch, hopefuly earlier than that. Nothing personal.
the witnesses out order that
(T, proceedings recessed at $5: 27$ p.m.)
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| 204:16, 204:24, | DIVIDES $_{[1]}-258: 23$ | 198:5, 198:17, | 288:22, 292:13, | 218:17, 222:16, |
| 205:3, 205:5, | DIVIDING [3] - 199:24, | 206:2, 211:20, | 293:23, 295:22 | 223:6, 224:24, |
| 207:14, 208:11, |  | 212:4, 218:19, | DRAWS ${ }_{[1]}$ - 205:2 | 225:4, 225:14, |


| 225:15, 235:4, | 227:2, 234:4, | 162:5, 162:5, 162:6, | EXHIBIT [8]-180:21, | EXTENT [6] - 175:8, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 271:4, 273:24, | 234:10, 241:17, | 162:6, 162:7, 162:7, | 183:23, 240:18, | 189:5, 231:11, |
| EFFECTIVE [1] - | 242:12, 243:6, | 162:9, 162:10, | 263:20, 264:1, 264:2 | $287: 15$ |
| 195:8 | 243:10, 245:4, | 162:10, 162:11, | EXHIBIT [3]-164:23, | EXTREME [3]-231:4, |
| EFFECTS [2] - 225:25, | 245:6, 245:12, | 162:13, 162:14, | 165:6, 241:11 | 237:17, 286:13 |
| 276:2 | 245:17, 245:25, | 162:14, 162:15, | EXHIBITS [5] - 170:11, | EXTREMELY [1] - |
| EFFORT ${ }_{[1]}$ - 224:1 | 246:2, 246:5, | 162:15 | 200:20, 234:7, | 284:23 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { EIGHT }[2]-204: 16, \\ & 205: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 246:21, 248:10, } \\ & 248: 15,250: 15, \end{aligned}$ | ESSELSTYN ${ }_{[1]}$ - $300: 12$ | 241:15, 299:23 <br> EXHIBITS ${ }_{[1]-241}$ | EXURBAN ${ }_{[7]}$ - <br> 243:18, 243.21 |
| EITHER [6] - 177:20, | 250:16, 253:2, | ESSENTIALLY ${ }_{[2]}$ - | EXIST [1] - 278:4 | 243:23, 245:15, |
| 189:3, 208:12, | 257:22, 258:6, | 251:15, 254:11 | EXISTENCE [1] - | 245:21, 277:25, |
| 211:7, 257:22, | 269:12, 269:17, | ESTABLISHED [3] - | 262:9 | 278:4 |
| 300:22 | 273:8, 278:18, | 188:15, 260:6, | EXISTING [15] - | EYEBALL [2] - 197:2, |
| ELABORATE ${ }_{[1]}$ - | 279:4, 279:7, | 265:19 | 179:24, 180:2, | 197:4 |
| 266:15 | 279:16, 281:10, | ESTABLISHES ${ }_{[1]}$ | 91:18, 232:18, |  |
| ELDERLY ${ }_{[1]}$ - 269:4 | 281:11, 281:12, | 165:16 | 234:1, 240:9, | F |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { ELECT }_{[3]}-168: 2, \\ \text { 195:9, 211:6 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 281:20, 282:5, } \\ & \text { 284:5, 286:2, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ESTIMATE }_{[1]}- \\ & 177: 18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 240:13, 240:14, } \\ & \text { 247:17, 248:3, } \end{aligned}$ | $\text { FACT }_{[17]}-164: 19,$ |
| ELECTION [3] - | 286:23, 290:23 | ESTIMATED ${ }_{[1]}$ - | 249:21, 260:4, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 182:4, 182:5, } \\ & \text { 182:10, 190:11, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 176:15, 179:11, | END ${ }_{\text {[13] }}$ - 167:7, | 298:19 | 268:11, 270:9, | 190:23, 191:17, |
| 195:11 | 175:12, 201:3, | ET [5]-161:4, 161:9, | 283:12 | 196:19, 211:1, |
| ELECTS $_{[1]}-210: 23$ | 201:25, 214:7, | 161:12, 161:14, | EXISTS $_{[1]}-262: 22$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 196:19, 211:1, } \\ & \text { 211:7, 239:20, } \end{aligned}$ |
| ELIMINATE ${ }_{[1]}$ | 222:18, 233:17, | 161:17 | EXPANDED ${ }_{[2]}$ | 278:14, 282:23, |
| 247:16 | 233:18, 254:25, $272 \cdot 21,282.22$, | EVENING ${ }_{[1]}-301: 8$ | 181:5, 287:24 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 28:14, 282:23, } \\ & \text { 284:16, 292:15, } \end{aligned}$ |
| ELIMINATED ${ }_{[5]}$ - <br> $223 \cdot 5,258.5$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 272:21, 282:22, } \\ & \text { 284:24, 294:2 } \end{aligned}$ | EVENTUALLY ${ }_{\text {[1] }}$ | EXPECTING ${ }_{[1]}$ - | $300: 12,300: 13$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 223: 5,258: 5, \\ & 285: 22,291: 1 \end{aligned}$ | ENDEAVOR ${ }_{[1]}$ |  |  | FACTOR [4]-168:17, |
| 292:24 | 256:8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EVIDENCE [3]- 164:7, } \\ & \text { 165:9, 216:5 } \end{aligned}$ | $240: 24$ | 194:12, 256:25, |
| ELIMINATES ${ }_{[1]}$ - | ENDED ${ }_{[1]}$ - 198:23 | EXACT [3]-202:1, | EXPENSE ${ }_{[1]}-217: 14$ | FACTORS ${ }_{[6]}$ |
| 242:25 | ENFORCED ${ }_{[1]}-$ $237: 6$ | 216:8, 272:9 <br> EXACTLY ${ }_{[81}$ - | EXPERIENCE [2] - | 178:11, 187:14, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ELIMINATING }_{[1]}- \\ & 285: 25 \end{aligned}$ | 237:6 ENORMOUS $[1]$ | EXACTLY ${ }_{[8]}-$ 192:10, $218: 13$, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 203:21, 203:25 } \\ & \text { EXPERT }[10]-194: 14, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 189:15, 225:2, } \\ & 236: 5,268: 5 \end{aligned}$ |
| ELONGATED ${ }_{[1]}$ - | 204:20 | 225:9, 226:17, | 194:22, 195:17, | $\text { FACTS }_{[1]}-216: 5$ |
| 274:2 | ENROLL [1]-266:6 | 226:18, 234:9, | 196:4, 270:25, |  |
| ELSEWHERE ${ }_{[4]}$ | ENROLLED ${ }_{[1]}$ | 261:24, 265:9 | 289:3, 300:11, | $\text { FAIRLY }_{[2]}-219: 6,$ |
| 195:19, 213:22, | 266:16 ENROL MENT | EXAGGERATE ${ }_{[1]}$ | 300:12, 300:13, | $251: 2$ |
| 221:13, 285:23 | ENROLLMENT ${ }_{[1]}$ - | 297:14 | 300:16 | FALL [3]-261:18, |
| EMPHASIS ${ }_{[1]}-285: 2$ | 265:17 | EXAMINATION ${ }_{[1]}$ - | EXPERTS ${ }_{[4]}$ | 262:13, 262:18 |
| ENACTED [82] - | ENTER [1] - 294:1 | 170:12 | 194:15, 194:23, | FALL [1]-205:12 |
| 175:24, 180:17, | ENTERED ${ }_{[1]}$ - 236:5 | EXAMINATION ${ }_{[1]}$ | 195:11, 202:22 | FALSE [1] - 290:20 |
| 182:3, 182:5, | ENTERS ${ }_{[1]}-294: 1$ ENTIRE $[2]-277: 17$, | 299:22 | EXPLAIN [3] - 178:4, |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 182:15, 183:7, } \\ & \text { 183:20, 183:21, } \end{aligned}$ | ENTIRE [2] - 277:17, 283:21 | EXAMINATION.......... | $200: 23,285: 2$ <br> EXPLAINED ${ }^{111}$ | 207:8, 227:20 |
| 183:23, 184:16, | ENTIRETY [2] - 230:3, | 163 | EXPLAINED | FAMOUS [1] - 196:25 |
| 185:8, 186:2, | 230:15 | EXAMINE [1] - 263:13 | EXPLOSION ${ }_{[1]}$ - | FANTASY [1] - 197:10 |
| 186:19, 190:3, | EPHEMERAL [1] - | EXAMPLE [6] - 169:3, | 243:23 | FAR [8] - 212:20, |
| 190:9, 192:4, 192:7, | 217:15 | 171:10, 188:17, | EXPORT [2] - 171:13, | 222:15, 224:23, |
| 192:17, 196:11, | EQUAL [1] - 212:21 | 189:16, 218:15, | 174:14 | 229:17, 230:24, |
| 209:2, 209:13, | EQUALITY [1] - | 223:1 | EXPRESS ${ }_{[1]}$ - 253:6 | 257:13, 272:21, |
| 210:3, 210:14, | 187:25 | EXCEPT [4]-230:24, | EXTEND [1] - 260:16 | 278:16 |
| 210:19, 212:12, | EQUALLY $_{[1]}-220: 11$ | 273:9, 281:7, 285:1 | EXTENDING [3] - | FASHION ${ }^{2}$ ] - 195:6, |
| 212:18, 212:23, | EQUIVALENCY ${ }_{[1]}$ - | EXCEPTION ${ }_{[1]}$ - | 254:8, 256:21, | $\text { FAST }_{[2]}-172: 7,$ |
| 213:7, 213:11, | 171:13 | 264:15 | 273:18 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FAST [2] - 172:7, } \\ & 264: 18 \end{aligned}$ |
| 214:10, 215:7, | ERA [1] - 204:3 | EXCEPTIONS ${ }_{[1]}$ - | EXTENDS ${ }_{[3]}$ - | FAULTY $_{[1]}$ - 289:19 |
| 215:12, 217:15, | ERROR ${ }_{[1]}$ - 193:12 | 262:14 | 250:24, 268:2, 295:6 | FAYETTE [21] - |
| 218:11, 219:14, | ESPECIALLY [2] - | EXCLUDE ${ }_{[1]}-238: 21$ | EXTENSION ${ }_{[1]}$ - | FAYETTE [21] - |
| 220:14, 222:1, | 264:21, 300:15 | EXCLUDED [3] - | 236:6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 184:24, 185:22, } \\ & 207: 10 \quad 237: 15 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 223:18, 223:22, } \\ & \text { 224:16, 226:23, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ESQ [22] - 162:3, } \\ & 162: 3,162: 4,162: 4, \end{aligned}$ | 203:2, 267:7, 283:7 | EXTENSIVE ${ }_{[1]}$ - | 239:7, 239:11, |


|  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 243:2, 243:6, 243:7, | 98:2 | FREE [3]-271:11, | 167 | 225:18, 225:20, |
| 243:9, 243:11, | FOLKS [3] - 289:7, | 287:13, 287:23 | 168:5, 177:25, | 226:1, 226:14 |
| 270:3, 270:6, | 290:13, 298:15 | FREED ${ }_{[1]}$ - 256:22 | 187:13, 190:17, | 226:19, 226:23, |
| 270:14, 270:15, | FOLLOW [5] - 204:13, | FREEWAY ${ }_{[3]}$ - | 190:23, 192:1, | 227:1 |
| 270:16, 296:16, | 215:24, 260:7, | 261:19, 262:13, | 193:8, 194:10, | GOVERNMENT ${ }_{[1]}$ - |
| 296:17, 296:20 | 262:12, 291:2 | 262:18 | 194:11, 194:14, | 165:2 |
| FAYETTEVILLE [4] - | FOLLOW-UP [1] - | FRIDAY $_{[1]}-235: 15$ | 196:24, 197:14, | GOVERNOR'S ${ }_{[1]}$ - |
| 238:25, 239:1, | 204:13 | FRONT [4] - 185:12, | 204:11, 204:18, | 298:18 |
| 241:22, 243:1 | FOLLOWED [3] - | 198:14, 235:3, 280:9 | 204:21, 205:24, | GRAB [1] - 166:6 |
| FEATURES ${ }_{[1]}$ - | 187:22, 260:8, | FULL [2] - 208:9, | 206:3, 207:20, | GRADY [1] - 295:7 |
| 199:23 | 294:16 | 299:23 | 207:21, 209:6, | GRANT [2] - 169:17, |
| FEBRUARY ${ }_{\text {[4] }}$ - | FOLLOWING [11] - | FULLY [1] - 230:5 | 214:14, 214:23, | 300:8 |
| 184:5, 198:12, | 167:11, 168:14, | FULTON ${ }_{[2]}$ - 244:16, | 217:18, 219:10, | GRANT [1] - 161:14 |
| 252:12, 252:13 | 168:18, 188:1, | 270:2 | 222:14, 222:15, | GRANT'S [2] - 300:12 |
| FEW [5] - 174:5, | 195:1, 250:24, |  | 223:8, 223:10, | GREAT [2]-191:2, |
| 222:4, 223:9, | 254:15, 260:11, | G | 226:1, 255:5, 255:9, | 193:13 |
| 233:12, 296:10 | 260:14, 260:15, |  | 255:13, 258:24, | GREATER [3] - 231:7, |
| FEWER [14]-212:22, | 271:2 | $\mathrm{GA}_{[1]}-171: 1$ | 263:12, 264:3, | 231:11, 288:2 |
| 214:10, 214:11, | FOLLOWS [6] - | GAMES ${ }_{[1]}-235: 15$ | 264:9, 265:5, | GREATER [2] - |
| 215:5, 215:10, | 223:18, 227:11, | GAP ${ }_{[1]}-250: 7$ | 265:18, 265:22, | 200:15, 200:17 |
| 215:20, 216:21, | 258:25, 275:6, | GARABADU ${ }_{[1]}$ - | 266:20, 267:4, | GREEN [1] - 228:3 |
| 218:1, 218:11, | 294:19 | 162:4 | 278:17, 278:18, | GRIFFIN ${ }^{19]}$ - 236:11, |
| 218:22, 221:25, | FOOTBALL ${ }_{[2]}$ - | GATHER $_{[1]}$ - 190:15 | 285:19, 290:21, | 236:14, 236:16, |
| 224:16, 225:21, | 235:15, 285:5 | GBPI [4]-189:17, | 291:8, 294:25, | 236:22, 238:18, |
| 226:22 | FOOTNOTE [2] - | 263:15, 263:19, | 295:4, 296:19, | 238:24, 239:12, |
| FIGURE $_{[1]}-264: 12$ | 179:10, 298:19 | 267:8 | 297:4, 297:16, | 239:16, 239:22, |
| FIGURE [4] - 204:6, 264:11, 264:12 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FOOTPRINT }{ }_{[1]}- \\ & 268: 10 \end{aligned}$ | GENERAL $[4]-176: 2$, 188:2, 190:2, 190:8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 297:18, 297:21, } \\ & 298: 13 \end{aligned}$ | 242:16, 242:19, |
| FIGURES [1]-260:21 | FOR [1] - 161:1 | GENERAL [14] - | GEORGIA [3] - 161:1, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 243:22, 276:25, } \\ & \text { 277:3, 277:5, } \end{aligned}$ |
| FILE [1]-171:13 | FORCE [3] - 177:2, | 182:17, 189:15, | 161:25, 302:4 | 277:16, 277:24, |
| FILE [1] - 173:20 | 277:10, 296:7 | 195:3, 198:1, | GINGLES [23] - | 278:7, 278:8 |
| FILED ${ }_{[1]}$ - 206:11 | FOREGOING ${ }_{[1]}$ - | 207:20, 208:7, | 176:17, 179:20, | GROUNDS [1] - |
| FINAL [1] - 293:19 | 302:6 | 264:6, 264:7, 265:8, | 194:22, 195:13, | 216:25 |
| FINALLY ${ }_{[1]}$ - 169:5 | FORGET $_{[1]}$ - 284:19 | 267:10, 281:3, | 195:14, 195:15, | GROUP [6] - 176:25, |
| FINE [3] - 221:23, | FORM [4] - 167:15, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 289:17, 294:9, } \\ & \text { 297:24 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 195:18, 195:21, } \\ & \text { 196:3, 235:1, 248:1, } \end{aligned}$ | 177:14, 177:15, |
| 263:24, 300:1 | 168:4, 195:25, | 297:24 | 196:3, 235:1, 248:1, | 177:17, 223:12 |
| FINISH [3] - 275:4, | 266:19 | GENERALLY ${ }^{[6]}$ - 175:10, 188:1, | 249:7, 271:1, 271:18, 276:1, | GROUP-LEVEL [2] - |
| 275:16, 300:25 | FORMAT [1] - 285:20 | 175:10, 188:1, 219:22. 239:6. | $\begin{aligned} & 271: 18,276: 1, \\ & 300 \cdot 16 \text { zon.01 } \end{aligned}$ | 176:25, 177:15 |
| FINISHED ${ }_{[1]}$ - 298:25 | FORMED [2] - 267:13, | 219:22, 239:6, | 300:16, 300:21 | GROUPING ${ }_{[2]}$ - |
| FINISHES [1] - 300:21 | 267:18 | 239:9, 242:18 | GIST [1] - 162:10 | 190:20, 208:14 |
| FIRST [13]-165:5, | FORTH $_{[1]}-235: 14$ | GENERATE [1] - 188:12 | GIVEN [5] - 177:19, <br> 226.5, 253:10, 289.8 | GROUPS [2] - 181:10, |
| 173:1, 174:10, | FORTHRIGHT ${ }_{[1]}$ - | 188:12 | 226:5, 253:10, 289:8 | 231:7 |
| 185:17, 197:23, | 275:14 | GEOGRAPHIC [5] | GLASCOCK [5] - | GROVE [8]-276:22, |
| 205:13, 206:10, | FORWARD ${ }_{[2]}$ | 173:21, 230:24, 242:16, 273:14, | 256:18, 257:15, <br> $281 \cdot 7,284 \cdot 9,284 \cdot 21$ | 276:23, 277:2, |
| 209:1, 209:11, | 270:21, 271:16 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 242:16, 273:14, } \\ & 277: 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\text { GLOBAL }_{[1]}-219: 2$ | 277:5, 277:16, |
| 256:11, 269:3, | FOUNDATION ${ }_{[1]}$ | GEOGRAPHICALLY | $\text { GLYNN }_{[3]}-265: 14,$ | 277:23, 278:4, 278:8 |
| 269:11, 300:8 | 274:7 | [8] - 188:14, 230:2, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { GLYNN[3] - } 265: 14, \\ & 265: 15.265: 17 \end{aligned}$ | GROWTH [5] - 204:17, |
| FIT [1] - 191:5 | FOUR [9] - 186:24, | $230: 14,230: 19$ | GOAL [12]-197:19, | 207:9, 207:15, |
| FIVE [11]-168:8, | 208:6, 227:24, | 239:24, 239:25, | GOAL [12] - 197:19, 197:23, 198:4, | 207:17, 245:23 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 204:23, 205:2, } \\ & \text { 212:1, 213:6, 219:4, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 253:8, 262:14, } \\ & \text { 274:17, 282:13, } \end{aligned}$ | 267:24, 272:12 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 197:23, 198:4, } \\ & \text { 198:8, 198:17, } \end{aligned}$ | GUARANTEE ${ }_{[1]}$ - 251:22 |
| 220:17, 220:20, | 291:11, 293:3 | GEOGRAPHIES [2] - | 258:8, 275:4, 278:9, | GUESS ${ }_{[12]}$ - 189:7, |
| 220:21, 269:16, | FOUR-LANE ${ }_{[1]}$ - | 174:7, 233:7 | 283:10, 290:9, | 194:14, 194:17, |
| 275:2 | 262:14 | GEOGRAPHY ${ }_{[7]}$ | 295:20 | 225:11, 240:23, |
| FLAVOR $_{[1]}$ - 245:21 | FOUR-WAY ${ }_{[1]}$ | 173:15, 177:12, | GORDON ${ }^{[18]}$ - | 246:18, 255:15, |
| FOCUS ${ }_{[1]}$ - 208:21 | 291:11 | 188:9, 193:4, | 222:10, 223:2, | 264:11, 264:15, |
| FOCUSED [2] - | FRANKLY $_{[3]}$ - 218:6, | 232:23, 233:1, 237:1 | 223:4, 223:21, | $265: 13,274: 9,300: 6$ |
| 168:24, 218:10 | 239:3, 286:13 | GEORGE [1] - 162:7 | 224:11, 224:13, | GUIDE [3] - 208:7, |
| FOCUSING [3] - | FRATERNITY ${ }_{[1]}$ - | GEORGIA [60] - | 224:19, 224:22, | 264:6, 264:7 |


| GUIDELINES ${ }_{[1]}$ | 230:7, 230:20, | 238:1, 249:16, | I | 242:10, 242:13, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 176:2 | 230:23, 231:3, | 249:20, 250:12, |  | 243:5, 243:8, |
| GUIDEPOST ${ }_{[1]}$ | 231:10, 231:15, | 252:6, 252:19, | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathbf{I}-14[5]-261: 22, \\ & 262: 6,262: 7,262: 9, \end{aligned}$ | 243:18, 244:1, |
| 265:24 | 231:18, 265:2, | 270:19, 271:6, | 262:6, 262:7, 262:9, | 244:20, 247:19, |
| GUILTY $_{[1]}-256: 10$ | 272:16, 272:17, | 271:14, 271:21, | 263:1 | 257:11, 257:23, |
| GUYS [2]-217:16, | 273:9, 273:20, | 274:4, 274:13, | IDEA [5] - 165:11, | 261:3, 261:11, |
| 278:24 | 276:15, 276:19 | 275:10, 275:22, | 191:2, 202:1, 260:3, | 262:8, 265:25, |
| GWINNETT ${ }_{[2]}$ - | HEREBY ${ }_{[1]}$ - 302:6 | 275:23, 276:11, | 294:9 | 267:24, 268:6, |
| 207:12, 211:15 | HIGH [3]-187:3, | 276:13, 298:25, | IDEAL ${ }_{[1]}-188: 1$ | 268:10, 270:21, |
|  | 266:8, 285:5 | 299:10, 299:21, | IDENTICAL [1] - | 271:16, 273:13, |
| H | HIGHER [5] - 203:7, <br> 219:13, 270:1 | $\begin{aligned} & 300: 2,300: 4,301: 6 \\ & 301: 7 \end{aligned}$ | 221:20 <br> IDENTIFICATION ${ }^{11]}$ - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 279:5, 279:11, } \\ & \text { 279:17, 281:24, } \end{aligned}$ |
| HALF [7] - 191:14, | 219:13, 270:1, | HONORABLE ${ }_{[1]}$ | 164:11 | 282:4, 282:10, |
| 209:5, 219:9, | HIGHWAY [11] - | 161:20 | IDENTIFIED ${ }_{[4]}$ | 282:15, 283:22, |
| 222:11, 266:6, | 164:17, 165:12, | HOPE [1] - 284:18 | 166:8, 166:14, | 284:8, 284:12, |
| 299:11, 299:20 | 262:13, 262:24, | HOPEFULLY [2] - | 192:18, 298:21 | 285:18, 286:5, |
| HAMPERED ${ }_{[1]}$ - | 293:8, 293:12, | 300:25, 301:1 | IDENTIFY ${ }_{\text {[17] }}$ - | 287:4, 287:6, |
| 191:17 | 293:22, 293:25, | HOUR [4]-235:19, | 196:20, 227:18, | 287:10, 287:18, |
| HANCOCK ${ }_{[1]}$ - 281:6 | 294:3, 294:23, | 273:2, 299:12, | 230:18, 234:12, | 291:4, 297:10, |
| HAND ${ }_{[7]}$ - 164:10, | 295:10 | 299:20 | 235:8, 242:15, | 297:23 |
| 166:12, 184:9, | HIGHWAY [2] - | HOUSE [53] - 166:9, | 257:14, 261:15, | IMAGES [2] - 241:3, |
| 198:14, 216:8, | 173:10, 262:24 | 166:17, 166:19, | 268:14, 272:12, | 241:5 |
| 216:15, 290:16 | HIGHWAYS ${ }_{[2]}$ - | 167:17, 168:4, | 273:12, 277:22, | IMAGINE ${ }_{[1]}-278: 2$ |
| HANDED [3] - 164:9, | 172:18, 262:23 | 168:7, 168:8, 169:7, | 280:23, 282:20, | IMMEDIATELY ${ }_{[1]}$ |
| 217:3, 263:21 | HIRED [3]-206:2, | 171:1, 182:19, | 284:20, 288:13, | 200:16 |
| HANDLE [1] - 275:9 | 206:7, 206:15 | 186:12, 186:13, | 289:10 | IMPACT $_{[4]}$ - 225:9, |
| HAPPY [1]-237:25 | HISPANIC ${ }_{[11]}$ - | 187:15, 188:6, | ILLUSTRATIVE ${ }_{[1]}$ | 226:20, 259:7, 293:6 |
| HARD [5] - 223:16, | 178:25, 181:3, | 191:15, 201:9, | 228:22 | IMPACTED [2] - |
| 245:8, 247:22, | 181:6, 181:7, | 201:13, 204:11, | ILLUSTRATIVE ${ }_{[103]}$ - | 214:14, 218:14 |
| 253:16, 264:18 | 181:10, 181:14, | 204:16, 205:13, | 166:8, 166:9, | IMPEACHMENT $\left.{ }^{3}\right]$ - |
| HATE [1] - 274:25 | 181:15, 181:17, | 219:2, 219:4, | 166:11, 166:25, | 199:16, 217:1, 252:8 |
| HEAD [1]-280:14 | 181:21, 292:1 | 219:10, 219:13, | 167:3, 168:12, | IMPLEMENTED ${ }_{[1]}$ - |
| HEAR [3] - 194:15, | HISTORICAL [14] - | 220:17, 221:15, | 168:16, 168:21, | 168:25 |
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| 283:15 | RIDGE [1] - 169:8 | 223:13, 223:17, | SCREEN [11] - 170:19, | SEEK [1] - 199:15 |
| REQUIREMENTS ${ }_{[4]}$ | RIGHTS [1] - 181:9 | 228:11, 233:16, | 170:22, 171:9, | SEEM [5] - 198:9, |
| 195:18, 240:5, | RIGHTS [2] - 168:2, | 245:9, 260:25, | 171:10, 172:21, | 223:5, 254:2, |
| 255:2, 290:14 | 269:2 | 288:7, 291:16 | 176:3, 177:4, | 268:17, 278:24 |
| REQUIRING ${ }_{[1]}$ - | RIM ${ }_{[1]}$ - 242:5 | RURAL [13] - 233:20, | 179:11, 244:5, | SEEMINGLY ${ }_{[1]}$ |
| 285:2 | RING [1] - 242:2 | 233:21, 235:9, | 249:19, 281:12 | 245:22 |
| RESERVATION ${ }_{[1]}$ - | RINGS [1] - 238:15 | 237:15, 243:19, | SCREVEN [8] - | SEGREGATED ${ }_{[1]}$ - |
| 169:8 | RIPPLE [16] - 212:2, | 245:13, 245:19, | 279:13, 279:19, | 187:14 |
| RESIDES ${ }_{[1]}$ - $169: 9$ | 213:19, 213:20, | 245:21, 248:25, | 284:10, 284:13, | SELECT [1] - 296:13 |
| RESOLUTION ${ }_{[1]}$ - | 214:16, 218:16, | 258:11, 281:6, | 284:21, 285:1, | SELECTED ${ }_{\text {[4] }}$ - |
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| RETAINED [2] - 205:7, | ROLL [1] - 262:6 |  | 263:21, 264:12 | 229:25, 230:5, |
| 205:10 | ROSS ${ }_{[1]}$ - 162:14 | 169:14, 183:8, | SEE [60]-166:12, | 230:11, 232:19, |
| RETRACT $_{[1]}-214: 25$ | ROUGH [1] - 177:18 | 183:14, 199:14, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 169:22, 171:8, } \\ & \text { 172:15, 175:2, } \end{aligned}$ | $234: 5,234: 10$ |
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|  | ROUTE [7]-164:15, | 241:2, 270:19, | 197:3, 198:3, | 236:16, 236:17, |
| 177:25, 195:10, | 262:7, 262:11, | 271:14, 276:11, 299:10, 299.21 | 200:21, 201:2, | 236:18, 239:5, |
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| 197:25, 274:19, | 220:10 | 232:1, 232:25, | 201:12, 213:2, | 214:5, 214:10, |
| 292:17 | SIZED [1]-220:11 | 246:17, 249:25, | 222:5, 236:8 | 214:11, 215:7, |
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| 251:13, 254:7 | TOOK [2] - 188:13, | TROUBLE [1] - 268:1 | 225:12, 227:13, | [4]-254:16, 254:23, |
| THEY'VE [1] - 192:20 | 252:14 | TRUE [25] - 175:6, | 234:20, 248:12, | 257:11, 257:12 |
| THICKER ${ }_{[1]}$ - 267:6 | TOP [3] - 171:18, | 181:25, 191:11, | 256:2, 271:2, | UNDERSTOOD ${ }_{[1]}$ - |
| THINKING [2] - $225: 22,289: 19$ | 172:15, 228:21 | 193:5, 202:19, | 271:19, 274:23, | 276:13 |
| THINNER ${ }_{[1]}-271: 9$ | TORO [1] - 162:8 | 205:6, 208:5, |  | UNFORTUNATELY |
| THIRD [1] - 166:17 | 181:16, 201:4, | 213:13, 226:25, | 164:21, 165:7, | [1] - 170:5 |
| THOMAS [7] - 291:18, | $220: 3,220: 4,220: 6,$ | 242:4, 243:8, 247:1, | 169:21, 169:25, | UNIFORM ${ }_{[1]}-263: 8$ |
| 292:3, 292:5, 292:7, | 228:2, 244:12, | 258:5, 258:12, | 170:5, 170:13, | UNITED [4] - 161:1, |
| 292:20, 294:1, | 244:13, 292:15 | 1:6, 261:10, | 172:8, 174:24, | 161:20, 161:25, 302:3 |
| 294:13 | TOTALITY ${ }_{[3]}$ - | 269:22, 270:7, | 175:1, 179:7, 179:9, | UNLESS ${ }_{[2]}-253: 24$, |


|  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 273:1 | UTILIZE [1] - 297:22 | 226:21, 238:24, | 193:15, 294:14 | $280: 24,281: 6$ |
| 217:19 | V | 90:1 | WEST [2]-225:17, | WILKINSON [3] |
| UNNECESSARILY ${ }_{[1]}$ |  | VOTERS [13] - 178:1, | 233:14 <br> WESTERN [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 262:16, 264:14, } \\ & 287: 25 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | VALIDATED ${ }_{\text {[2] }}$ - | 178:24, 187:6, |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { UNPACK [2] - 179:20, } \\ & \text { 187:5 } \end{aligned}$ | $\text { VAP }_{[17]}-185: 7,$ | 187:10, 195:8, | 230:20, 231:18 | WILLIAM $_{[1]}$ - 163:3 WILLIAMS ${ }_{[1]}$ - 162:5 |
|  |  |  | WHEREAS [3] - |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { UNPACKED }_{[4]} \text { - } \\ & \text { 186:4, 186:8, } \\ & \text { 186:12, 186:21 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 185:8, 186:18, } \\ & \text { 186:22, 201:18, } \end{aligned}$ | 269:3, 270:1, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 217:18, 228:3, } \\ & 247: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\text { WIN }_{[1]}-247: 23$ |
|  | 202:11, 220:13, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 277:14, 286:7, } \\ & 286: 8,286: 20 \end{aligned}$ |  | WINNER ${ }_{[1]}$ - 251:20 |
|  |  |  | WHITE [35] - 178:25, |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { UNPACKING }[1] \text { - } \\ & \text { 186:25 } \\ & \text { UNQUESTIONABLY } \\ & {[1]-272: 21} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 244: 8,247: 24, \\ & 248: 9,249: 1, \\ & 250: 21,292: 8, \end{aligned}$ | VOTING [2]-168:2, 269:2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 181:7, 200:18, } \\ & \text { 211:6, 211:9, } \end{aligned}$ | WITNESS [49] - 165:24, 166:1, |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 250:21, 292:8, } \\ & \text { 292:11, 292:12, } \end{aligned}$ | VOTING [24] - 167:17, | $\begin{aligned} & 213: 23,225: 7, \\ & 225: 13,228: 5, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 166:3, 171:16, } \\ & \text { 171:19, 172:6, } \end{aligned}$ |
| UNRELATED ${ }_{\text {[2] }}$ - | VARGHESE ${ }_{[1]}$ -162:7 | 178:20, 179:13 | 228:13, 229:4, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 174:17, 174:21, } \\ & \text { 174:23, 174:25, } \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | 180:25, 181:3, | 233:16, 237:15, |  |
| UNSPLIT [4]-213:20, 222:6, 223:22, 227:1 | VARIATION ${ }_{[1]}$ -220:10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 181:9, 194:20, } \\ & \text { 201:6, 202:12, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 237:18, 237:20, } \\ & \text { 238:9, 238:12, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 174:23, 174:25, } \\ & \text { 182:25, 183:9, } \end{aligned}$ |
| UNSPLITTING ${ }_{[1]}$ - |  | 213:15, 218:19, | $\begin{aligned} & 238: 9,238: 12, \\ & 238: 21,239: 6, \end{aligned}$ | 199:7, 199:9, 216:2, |
|  | VARIATIONS ${ }_{[1]}$ 167:6 | 222:11, 227:22,244:12, 249:20, | 239:10, 239:15, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 216:11, 218:5, } \\ & \text { 225:15, 231:23, } \end{aligned}$ |
| UNUSUAL [1] - 190:23 |  |  | 242:1, 247:17, |  |
| UP [50] - 164:4, | 167:6 <br> VARIES [2] - 175:15, | 250:5, 252:4, | 250:3, 251:4, 252:1, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 232:1, 232:6, 241:8, } \\ & \text { 242:4, 246:24, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 170:19, 171:13, | VARIOUS ${ }_{[8]}$ - 172:2, 191:5, 205:23, | 255:12, 260:2, 268:25, 272:3, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 269:1, 270:3, 272:7, } \\ & \text { 280:8, 280:20, } \end{aligned}$ | 247:6, 247:9, |
| 173:10, 174:10, |  | 272:18 | 291:17, 292:2 | 247:11, 247:14 |
| 193:10, 201:2, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 206:14, 209:12, } \\ & \text { 218:7, 277:10, 296:2 } \end{aligned}$ | VS ${ }_{[3]}$-161:6, 161:11, | 294:15, 295:1 | 247:24, 248:8, |
| 204:13, 207:3, | 218:7, 277:10, 296:2 | VTD [7] - 196:12, | WHITER ${ }^{11]}$ - 243:3 | 249:3, 249:12 |
| 209:8, 209:10, | $\text { VERIFY }_{[2]}-185: 10$ |  |  |  |
| 225:1, 235:18, |  | 196:14, 202:23, | WHITER [1] - 243:3 <br> WHITES [2] - 181:11, | 249:16, 249:24, |
| 238:23, 238:24, | VERSION [14] - 171:7, | 259:24, 260:15, |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 250:3, 251:7, } \\ & \text { 251:11, 251:18, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 240:17, 241:5, |  | $260: 16,292: 25$ |  |  |
| 243:2, 247:7, 247:9, | 171:20, 171:24, | VTD-LEVEL ${ }_{[1]}$ | 179:20, 193:16, | 252:1, 253:18, |
| 247:17, 250:25, | 172:21, 173:24, 173:25, 174:1, |  |  | 254:2, 254:11, |
| 252:22, 254:15, | 173:25, 174:1, 174:8, 174:9, | $\text { VTDS }_{[2]}-167: 12,$ | 193:20, 193:24 | 256:9, 283:15, 299:5 |
| 256:22, 259:10, | 174:8, 174:9, 174:12, 174:15, | 212:25 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 193:25, 194:1, } \\ & 213: 7,213: 11, \end{aligned}$ | WITNESS ${ }_{[2]}-169: 15$,275:4 |
| 259:18, 262:17, | 174:12, 174:15, | W |  |  |
| 263:21, 267:5, | 3:24 |  | 215:1, 218:17, | WITNESSES [1] - 163:2 |
| 271:11, 272:16, | $\text { VERSUS }_{[4]}-210: 1,$ $219: 21,245: 21$ | WAIT [3]-263:23, | $225: 18,225: 20$ | WITNESSES ${ }_{\text {[5] }}$ |
| 275:1, 275:8 | $\text { VIEW }_{[1]}-172: 22$ | WALK [1] - 227:16 | 6:1, 226:19, | 300:5, 300:12 |
| 279:10, 281:19, |  |  | 233:23, 240:6, | $300: 13,300: 24,$ |
| 287:13, 287:23, | VIEW [6] - 187:9, | WALKER ${ }_{[1]}$ - 201:9 |  | 301:2 |
| 290:21, 294:2, | 197:21, 198:6, <br> 198:18, 237:11 | WARNER [7] - 166:15, 166:22, 208:20, | 240:8, 240:9, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WORD }_{[4]}-185: 11, \\ & 211: 1,228: 10, \\ & 253: 23 \end{aligned}$ |
| 295:7, 296:23, 297:18, 297:19, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 198:18, 237:11, } \\ & 258: 16 \end{aligned}$ | 287:16, 287:24, | 241:17, 241:19, |  |
| 297:18, 297:19, 299:18, 299:20 | VIEWS [1] - 227:19 | 288:2, 289:25 | 242:7, 242:9, |  |
|  | VIOLATE ${ }_{[1]}$ - 224:7 | WARREN [3] - 256 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 247:19, 277:12, } \\ & \text { 281:21, 282:5, } \end{aligned}$ | $200: 18,249: 4,290: 3$ |
| UPDATE [1] - 289:7 | VIRGINIA [2] - 190:19, | 257:15, 281:6 | 287:21, 290:5, 294:7 |  |
| URBAN [4]-233:19, | ${ }^{\text {231:12 }}$ VISIBLE ${ }_{[1]}-240: 25$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 258:24, 259:2, } \\ & \text { 260:9, 260:17, 282:1 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WHOLLY }[4]-224: 1, \\ & 246: 3,286: 23, \\ & 287: 19 \end{aligned}$ | WORKS [3] - 169:22, $261: 21,293: 20$ |
| 239:17, 245:18, |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WORLD }[2]-195: 4, \\ & \text { 197:10 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 245:21 | VISUAL [1] - 170:25 |  |  |  |
| US [6]-164:17, | VISUALLY ${ }^{[2]}$ - 244:23, 274:22 | WAYS [9] - 196:10, | WILKES [20] - 202:10, | WORSE [1] - 296:18 WRAP [1] - 290:21 |
| 181:18, 192:10, | VOLATILE ${ }_{[1]}$ | 233:5, 235:25, | 254:8, 258:16, <br> 258:19, 258:23, <br> 259:3, 259:7, 259:8, |  |
| 294:23 | 17:17 | 239:4, 244:19 |  | WRAPPING [1] - |
| USA [1] - 174:18 | VOTE [15] - 168:23,168:25, 169:11, | WEEK [2] - 300:22, |  | WRINKLE [1] - 300:15 |
| USEFUL ${ }_{[1]}$ - 188:17 |  |  | 259:10, 259:13, | WRITE ${ }_{[1]}$ - 296:23 |
| USES [2] - 181:9, | 169:12, 185:1, |  | 259:21, 259:23, |  |
| 244:14 | 191:6, 213:21, | WEIGHT ${ }_{[1]}$ - 165:23 WELL-BEING [2] - | 279:12, 279:22, |  |
| UTAH ${ }_{[1]}-205: 22$ | 219:25, 225:6, |  |  |  |


| Y |
| :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Y'ALL }_{[2]}-274: 25, \\ & 275: 7 \\ & \text { YEAR }_{[3]}-165: 13, \\ & \text { 169:4, 297:11, } \\ & \text { YEARS }_{[7]}-171: 21, \\ & \text { 190:25, 192:21, } \\ & \text { 195:6, 197:14, } \\ & \text { 262:1, 298:9 } \\ & \text { YELLOW [1] - 228:2 } \\ & \text { YOU-ALL }[1]-300: 8 \\ & \text { YOUNG }[2]-298: 16 \end{aligned}$ |
| Z |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ZABEL }_{[1]}-162: 9 \\ & \text { ZERO }_{[1]}-254: 17 \\ & \text { ZOOMED }_{[2]}-173: 8, \\ & \text { 237:11 } \\ & \text { ZOOMED-OUT } \\ & \text { [1] - } \\ & \text { 237:11 } \end{aligned}$ |

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA



## NOTICE OF FILING OF OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT

Notice is hereby given that an official transcript of a proceeding has been filed by the court reporter/transcriber in the above-captioned matter. Counsel/Parties have twenty-one (21) days from the date of delivery of the transcript to the Clerk to file with the Court a Request for Redaction of this transcript. If no Request for Redaction is filed, the transcript may be made remotely electronically available to the public without redaction after 90 calendar days.

Any counsel or party needing a copy of the transcript to review for redaction purposes may purchase a copy from the court reporter/transcriber or view the document at the Clerk's Office public terminal.
$\frac{10 / 30 / 2023}{\text { Date }} \quad \frac{\text { PENNY COUDRIET }}{\text { Court Reporter }}$

## VERIFICATION OF FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS

| Proceeding Type: | BENCH TRIAL |
| :--- | :--- |
| Proceeding Date: | $\underline{9 / 5 / 2023}$ |
| Volume Number: | $\underline{1}$ |
|  |  |

Notice is hereby given that financial arrangements for a copy of the transcript have been made with the following individual(s): YES/TAYLOR ENGLISH/ACLU. PENDERGRASS PLAINTIFFS HAVE NOT PAID.
as counsel/party in this case. He/She is to be provided with remote access to the transcript via CM/ECF and PACER.
$\frac{10 / 30 / 2023}{\text { Date }} \quad \frac{\text { PENNY PRITTY COUDRIET }}{\text { Court Reporter }}$

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA



## NOTICE OF FILING OF OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT

Notice is hereby given that an official transcript of a proceeding has been filed by the court reporter/transcriber in the above-captioned matter. Counsel/Parties have twenty-one (21) days from the date of delivery of the transcript to the Clerk to file with the Court a Request for Redaction of this transcript. If no Request for Redaction is filed, the transcript may be made remotely electronically available to the public without redaction after 90 calendar days.

Any counsel or party needing a copy of the transcript to review for redaction purposes may purchase a copy from the court reporter/transcriber or view the document at the Clerk's Office public terminal.
$\frac{10 / 30 / 2023}{\text { Date }} \quad \frac{\text { PENNY COUDRIET }}{\text { Court Reporter }}$

## VERIFICATION OF FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS

| Proceeding Type: | BENCH TRIAL |
| :--- | :--- |
| Proceeding Date: | $\underline{9 / 5 / 2023}$ |
| Volume Number: | $\underline{1}$ |
|  |  |

Notice is hereby given that financial arrangements for a copy of the transcript have been made with the following individual(s): YES/TAYLOR ENGLISH/ACLU. PENDERGRASS PLAINTIFFS HAVE NOT PAID.
as counsel/party in this case. He/She is to be provided with remote access to the transcript via CM/ECF and PACER.
$\frac{10 / 30 / 2023}{\text { Date }} \quad \frac{\text { PENNY PRITTY COUDRIET }}{\text { Court Reporter }}$

