

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA **FILED** IN THE GENERAL COURT OF JUSTICE  
COUNTY OF WAKE SUPERIOR COURT DIVISION

COMMON CAUSE; *et al.*

2019 JUL -8 P 3:22

*Plaintiffs,*

WAKE CO., C.S.C.

v.

BY           *SD*          

DAVID R. LEWIS, *et al.*

*Defendants.*

Case No. 18 CVS 014001

**NOTICE OF FILING OF OBJECTIONS TO PLAINTIFFS' EXHIBITS**

Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Intervenors hereby jointly give notice that attached hereto as Exhibit 1 are Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Intervenors' Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List.

This the 8th day of July, 2019.

Respectfully submitted,

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

By: 

Phillip J. Strach (N.C. Bar # 29456)  
Thomas A. Farr (N.C. Bar # 10871)  
Michael D. McKnight (N.C. Bar # 36932)  
4208 Six Forks Road, Suite 1100  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27609  
phil.strach@ogletreedeakins.com  
michael.mcknight@ogletreedeakins.com  
Telephone: (919) 787-9700  
Facsimile: (919) 783-9412

**SHANAHAN LAW GROUP. PLLC**

By: 

John E. Branch III, NCSB # 32598  
Nathaniel J. Pencook, NCSB # 52339  
Andrew D. Brown, NCSB # 45898  
128 E. Hargett Street, Suite 300  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27601  
Telephone: (919) 856-9494  
Facsimile: (919) 856-9499  
[jbranch@shanahanlawgroup.com](mailto:jbranch@shanahanlawgroup.com)  
[npencook@shanahanlawgroup.com](mailto:npencook@shanahanlawgroup.com)  
[abrown@shanahanlawgroup.com](mailto:abrown@shanahanlawgroup.com)  
*Attorney for Defendant-Intervenor*

**BAKER & HOSTETLER, LLP**

E. Mark Braden\* (DC Bar No. 419915)  
Richard B. Raile\* (Va. Bar No. 84340)  
Trevor M. Stanley\* (Va. Bar No. 77351)  
1050 Connecticut Ave Suite 1100  
Washington, DC, 20036  
rraile@bakerlaw.com  
mbraden@bakerlaw.com  
tstanley@bakerlaw.com  
Telephone: (202) 861-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 861-1783

*Counsel for Legislative Defendants*

*\*Admitted Pro hac vice*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This is to certify that the undersigned has this day served the foregoing in the above titled action upon all other parties to this cause by:

- Hand delivering a copy hereof to each said party or to the attorney thereof;
- Transmitting a copy hereof to each said party via facsimile transmittal;
- By email transmittal;
- Depositing a copy here of, first class postage pre-paid in the United States mail, properly addressed to:

Edwin M. Speas, Jr.  
Caroline P. Mackie  
P.O. Box 1801  
Raleigh, NC 27602-1801  
(919) 783-6400  
[espeas@poynerspruill.com](mailto:espeas@poynerspruill.com)

*Counsel for Common Cause, the North Carolina Democratic Party, and the Individual Plaintiffs*

John E. Branch, III  
Nate Pencook  
128 E. Hargett St, Suite 300  
Raleigh, NC 27601  
(919)856-9494  
[jbranch@shanahanlawgroup.com](mailto:jbranch@shanahanlawgroup.com)  
*Counsel for the Intervenor-Defendants*

R. Stanton Jones  
David P. Gersch  
Elisabeth S. Theodore  
Daniel F. Jacobson  
601 Massachusetts Ave. NW  
Washington, DC 20001-3761  
(202) 942-5000  
[Stanton.jones@arnoldporter.com](mailto:Stanton.jones@arnoldporter.com)

Marc E. Elias  
Aria C. Branch  
700 13<sup>th</sup> Street NW  
Washington, DC 20005-3960  
(202) 654-6200  
[melias@perkinscoie.com](mailto:melias@perkinscoie.com)

Abha Khanna  
1201 Third Avenue  
Suite 4900  
Seattle, WA 98101-3099  
(206) 359-8000

*Counsel for Common Cause and the Individual Plaintiffs*

This the 8th day of July, 2019.

By:



John E. Branch III, N.C. Bar #32598

# **Exhibit 1**

**Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Interveners' Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List**  
**Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,**

<b>Exhibit #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Bates Number (if applicable)</b>	<b>Objection</b>
1	Expert Report of Jowei Chen, Ph.D.		Relevance; Hearsay
2	Jowei Chen, Ph.D. - Curriculum Vitae		Relevance; Hearsay
3	County Groupings Used for the 2017 House Plan and All Computer-Simulated House Plans [Chen Report Table 1]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)
4	County Groupings Used for the 2017 Senate Plan and All Computer-Simulated Senate Plans [Chen Report Table 2]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)
5	The Calculation of District-Level Partisanship Using the 2010-2016 Statewide Election Composite [Chen Report Table 3]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)
6	Calculating the Partisanship of Districts Originally Drawn in 2011, Using the 2004-2010 Statewide Election Composite [Chen Report Table 4]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)
7	Summary of the Enacted 2017 House Plan and House Simulation Sets 1 and 2 [Chen Report Table 5]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)
8	Example of a Computer-Simulated House Map from House Simulation Set 1 (Following Only Non-Partisan Redistricting Criteria) [Chen Report Figure 1]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)
9	House Simulation Set 1 (Following Only Non-Partisan Redistricting Criteria): Democratic-Favoring Districts in 2017 House Plan Versus 1,000 Simulated Plans (Measured Using 2010-2016 Election Composite) [Chen Report Figure 2]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)
10	Number of Democratic Districts Under Alternative Uniform Swings in House Simulation Set 1 Plans [Chen Report Figure U1]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)
11	Number of Democratic House Districts Measured Using the 2010-2016 Election Composite with a +4.5% Uniform Swing, Corresponding to a 52.42% Statewide Democratic Vote Share (House Simulation Set 1) [Chen Report Figure U2]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)
12	Number of Democratic House Districts Measured Using the 2010-2016 Election Composite with a +5% Uniform Swing, Corresponding to a 52.92% Statewide Democratic Vote Share (House Simulation Set 1) [Chen Report Figure U3]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)

**Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Intervenor's Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List**  
**Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,**

<b>Exhibit #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Bates Number (if applicable)</b>	<b>Objection</b>
13	House Simulation Set 1 (Following Only Non-Partisan Redistricting Criteria): Comparison of 2017 House Plan to 1,000 Simulated Plans on Compactness and Mean-Median Difference [Chen Report Figure 3]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
14	House Simulation Set 1 (Following Only Non-Partisan Redistricting Criteria): Comparison of 2017 House Plan Versus 1,000 Simulated Plans on Compactness [Chen Report Figure 4]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
15	House Simulation Set 1 (Following Only Non-Partisan Redistricting Criteria): Split Municipalities in 2017 House Plan Versus 1,000 Simulated Plans [Chen Report Figure 5]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
16	House Simulation Set 1 (Following Only Non-Partisan Redistricting Criteria): Split VTDs in 2017 House Plan Versus 1,000 Simulated Plans [Chen Report Figure 6]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
17	Example of a Computer-Simulated House Map from House Simulation Set 2 (Following Only Non-Partisan Redistricting Criteria and Avoiding Incumbent Pairings) [Chen Report Figure 7]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
18	House Simulation Set 2 (Following Non-Partisan Redistricting Criteria and Avoiding Incumbent Pairings): Democratic-Favoring Districts in 2017 House Plan Versus 1,000 Simulated Plans (Measured Using 2010-2016 Election Composite) [Chen Report Figure 8]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
19	House Simulation Set 2 (Following Non-Partisan Redistricting Criteria and Avoiding Incumbent Pairings): Comparison of 2017 House Plan to 1,000 Simulated Plans on Compactness and Mean-Media Difference [Chen Report Figure 9]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
20	House Simulation Set 2 (Following Non-Partisan Redistricting Criteria and Avoiding Incumbent Pairings): Comparison of 2017 House Plan to 1,000 Simulated Plans on Compactness [Chen Report Figure 10]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
21	House Simulation Set 2 (Following Non-Partisan Redistricting Criteria and Avoiding Incumbent Pairings): Split Municipalities in 2017 House Plan Versus 1,000 Simulated Plans [Chen Report Figure 11]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
22	House Simulation Set 2 (Following Non-Partisan Redistricting Criteria and Avoiding Incumbent Pairings): Split VTDs in 2017 House Plan Versus 1,000 Simulated Plans [Chen Report Figure 12]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)

**Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Interveners' Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List**  
**Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,**

<b>Exhibit #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Bates Number (if applicable)</b>	<b>Objection</b>
23	Number of Democratic Districts Under Alternative Uniform Swings in House Simulation Set 2 Plans [Chen Report Figure U4]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
24	Number of Democratic House Districts Measured Using the 2010-2016 Election Composite with 5% Uniform Swing, Corresponding to a 52.92% Statewide Democratic Vote Share [Chen Report Figure U5]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
25	Number of Democratic House Districts Measured Using the 2010-2016 Election Composite [Chen Report Figure U6]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
26	Summary of the Enacted 2017 Senate Plan and Senate Simulation Sets 1 and 2 [Chen Report Table 6]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
27	Example of a Computer-Simulated Senate Map From Senate Simulation Set 1 (Following Only Non-Partisan Redistricting Criteria) [Chen Report Figure 13]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
28	Senate Simulation Set 1 (Following Only Non-Partisan Redistricting Criteria): Democratic-Favoring Districts in 2017 Senate Plan Versus 1,000 Simulated Plans (Measured Using 2010-2016 Election Composite) [Chen Report Figure 14]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
29	Number of Democratic Districts Under Alternative Uniform Swings in Senate Simulation Set 1 Plans [Chen Report Figure U7]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
30	Number of Democratic Senate Districts Measured Using the 2010-2016 Election Composite With a +4% Uniform Swing, Corresponding to a 51.92% Statewide Democratic Vote Share (Senate Simulation Set 1) [Chen Report Figure U8]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
31	Number of Democratic Senate Districts Measured Using the 2010-2016 Election Composite With a +4.5% Uniform Swing, Corresponding to a 52.42% Statewide Democratic Vote Share (Senate Simulation Set 1) [Chen Report Figure U9]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
32	Senate Simulation Set 1 (Following Only Non-Partisan Redistricting Criteria): Comparison of 2017 Senate Plan to 1,000 Simulated Plans on Compactness and Mean-Median Difference [Chen Report Figure 15]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
33	Senate Simulation Set 1 (Following Only Non-Partisan Redistricting Criteria): Comparison of 2017 Senate Plan Versus 1,000 Simulated Plans on Compactness [Chen Report Figure 16]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)

**Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Interveners' Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List**  
**Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,**

Exhibit #	Description	Bates Number (if applicable)	Objection
34	Senate Simulation Set 1 (Following Only Non-Partisan Redistricting Criteria): Split Municipalities in 2017 Senate Plan Versus 1,000 Simulated Plans [Chen Report Figure 17]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)
35	Senate Simulation Set 1 (Following Only Non-Partisan Redistricting Criteria): Split VTDs in 2017 Senate Plan Versus 1,000 Simulated Plans [Chen Report Figure 18]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)
36	Example of a Computer-Simulated Senate Map From Senate Simulation Set 2 (Following Non-Partisan Redistricting Criteria and Protecting Incumbents) [Chen Report Figure 19]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)
37	Senate Simulation Set 2 (Following Non-Partisan Redistricting Criteria and Protecting Incumbents): Democratic-Favoring Districts in Enacted Senate Plan Versus 1,000 Simulated Plans (Measured Using 2010-2016 Election Composite) [Chen Report Figure 20]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)
38	Senate Simulation Set 2 (Following Non-Partisan Redistricting Criteria and Protecting Incumbents): Comparison of 2017 Senate Plan Versus 1,000 Simulated Plans on Compactness and Median Difference [Chen Report Figure 21]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)
39	Senate Simulation Set 2 (Following Non-Partisan Redistricting Criteria and Protecting Incumbents): Comparison of Enacted Plan Versus 1,000 Simulated Plans on Compactness [Chen Report Figure 22]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)
40	Senate Simulation Set 2 (Following Non-Partisan Redistricting Criteria and Protecting Incumbents): Split Municipalities in Enacted Plan Versus 1,000 Simulated Plans [Chen Report Figure 23]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)
41	Senate Simulation Set 2 (Following Non-Partisan Redistricting Criteria and Protecting Incumbents): Split VTDs in Enacted Plan Versus 1,000 Simulated Plans [Chen Report Figure 24]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)
42	Number of Democratic Districts Under Alternative Uniform Swings in Senate Simulation Set 2 Plans [Chen Report Figure U10]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)
43	Number of Democratic Senate Districts Measured Using the 2010-2016 Election Composite With a +4% Uniform Swing, Corresponding to a 51.92% Statewide Democratic Vote Share (Senate Simulation Set 2) [Chen Report Figure U11]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)



**Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Intervenor's Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List**  
**Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,**

<b>Exhibit #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Bates Number (if applicable)</b>	<b>Objection</b>
44	Number of Democratic Senate Districts Measured Using the 2010-2016 Election Composite With a +4.5% Uniform Swing, Corresponding to a 52.42% Statewide Democratic Vote Share (Senate Simulation Set 2) [Chen Report Figure U12]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
45	House Simulation Set 1: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Guilford County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 25]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
46	House Simulation Set 1: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Cabarrus-Davie-Montgomery-Richmond-Rowan-Stanly County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 26]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
47	House Simulation Set 1: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Columbus-Pender-Robeson County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 27]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
48	House Simulation Set 1: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Cumberland County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 28]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
49	House Simulation Set 1: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Forsyth-Yadkin County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 29]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
50	House Simulation Set 1: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Franklin-Nash County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 30]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
51	House Simulation Set 1: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Granville-Person-Vance-Warren County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 31]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
52	House Simulation Set 1: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Lenoir-Pitt County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 32]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
53	House Simulation Set 1: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Mecklenburg County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 33]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
54	House Simulation Set 1: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Wake County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 34]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)

**Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Interveners' Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List**  
**Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,**

<b>Exhibit #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Bates Number (if applicable)</b>	<b>Objection</b>
55	House Simulation Set 1: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Alamance County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 35]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
56	House Simulation Set 1: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Anson-Union County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 36]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
57	House Simulation Set 1: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Brunswick-New Hanover County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 37]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
58	House Simulation Set 1: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Buncombe County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 38]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
59	House Simulation Set 1: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Cleveland-Gaston County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 39]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
60	House Simulation Set 1: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Duplin-Onslow County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 40]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
61	House Simulation Set 2: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Guilford County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 41]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
62	House Simulation Set 2: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Wake County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 42]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
63	House Simulation Set 2: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Mecklenburg County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 43]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
64	House Simulation Set 2: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Lenoir-Pitt County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 44]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
65	House Simulation Set 2: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Granville-Person-Vance-Warren County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 45]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)

**Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Interveners' Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List**  
**Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,**

<b>Exhibit #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Bates Number (if applicable)</b>	<b>Objection</b>
66	House Simulation Set 2: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Franklin-Nash County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 46]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)
67	House Simulation Set 2: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Forsyth-Yadkin County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 47]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)
68	House Simulation Set 2: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Cumberland County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 48]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)
69	House Simulation Set 2: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Columbus-Pender-Robson County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 49]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)
70	House Simulation Set 2: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Cabarrus-Davis-Montgomery-Richmond-Rowan-Stanly County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 50]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)
71	House Simulation Set 2: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Duplin-Onslow County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 51]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)
72	House Simulation Set 2: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Cleveland-Gaston County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 52]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)
73	House Simulation Set 2: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Buncombe County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 53]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)
74	House Simulation Set 2: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Brunswick-New Hanover County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 54]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)
75	House Simulation Set 2: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Anson-Union County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 55]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)

**Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Interveners' Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List**  
**Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,**

<b>Exhibit #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Bates Number (if applicable)</b>	<b>Objection</b>
76	House Simulation Set 2: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Alamance County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 56]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
77	Number of House Districts With At Least HD-66's Republican Vote Share 54.44% in the Cabarrus-Davie-Montgomery-Richmond-Rowan-Stanly County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 57]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
78	Number of House Districts With At Least HD-83's Republican Vote Share 59.31% in the Cabarrus-Davie-Montgomery-Richmond-Rowan-Stanly County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 58]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
79	Number of House Districts With At Least HD-46's Republican Vote Share 55.56% in the Columbus-Pender-Robeson County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 59]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
80	Number of House Districts With At Least HD-45's Republican Vote Share 58.08% in the Cumberland County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 60]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
81	Number of House Districts With At Least HD-75's Republican Vote Share of 58.74% in the Forsyth-Yadkin County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 61]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
82	Number of House Districts With At Least HD-7's Republican Vote Share of 56.75% in the Franklin-Nash County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 62]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
83	Number of House Districts With At Least HD-2's Republican Vote Share of 56.12% in the Granville-Person-Vance-Warren County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 63]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
84	Number of House Districts With At Least HD-59's Republican Vote Share of 59.59% in the Guilford County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 64]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
85	Number of House Districts With At Least HD-12's Republican Vote Share of 51.73% in the Lenoir-Pitt County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 65]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
86	Number of House Districts With At Least HD-104's Republican Vote Share of 57.75% in the Mecklenburg County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 66]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
87	Number of House Districts With At Least HD-40's Republican Vote Share of 54.54% in the Wake County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 67]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)

**Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Intervenor's Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List**

**Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,**

<b>Exhibit #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Bates Number (if applicable)</b>	<b>Objection</b>
88	Number of House Districts With At Least HD-63's Republican Vote Share of 51.48% in the Alamance County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 68]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
89	Number of House Districts With At Least HD-55's Republican Vote Share of 55.02% in the Anson-Union County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 69]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
90	Number of House Districts With At Least HD-19's Republican Vote Share of 56.26% in the Brunswick-New Hanover County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 70]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
91	Number of House Districts With At Least HD-116's Republican Vote Share of 53.52% in the Buncombe County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 71]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
92	Number of House Districts With At Least HD-111's Republican Vote Share of 55.44% in the Cleveland-Gaston County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 72]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
93	Number of House Districts With At Least HD-4's Republican Vote Share of 50.09% in the Duplin-Onslow County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 73]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
94	Senate Simulation Set 1: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Alamance-Guilford-Randolph County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 74]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
95	Senate Simulation Set 1: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Davie-Forsyth County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 75]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
96	Senate Simulation Set 1: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Duplin-Harnett-Johnston-Lee-Nash-Sampson County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 76]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
97	Senate Simulation Set 1: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Franklin-Wake County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 77]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
98	Senate Simulation Set 1: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Mecklenburg County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 78]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)

**Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Intervenor's Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List**  
**Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,**

Exhibit #	Description	Bates Number (if applicable)	Objection
99	Senate Simulation Set 1: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Buncombe-Henderson-Transylvania County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 79]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)
100	Senate Simulation Set 1: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Bladen-Brunswick-New Hanover-Pender County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 80]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)
101	Senate Simulation Set 2: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Alamance-Guilford-Randolph County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 81]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)
102	Senate Simulation Set 2: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Davie-Forsyth County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 82]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)
103	Senate Simulation Set 2: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Duplin-Harnett-Johnston-Lee-Nash-Sampson County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 83]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)
104	Senate Simulation Set 2: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Franklin-Wake County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 84]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)
105	Senate Simulation Set 2: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Mecklenburg County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 85]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)
106	Senate Simulation Set 2: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Buncombe-Henderson-Transylvania County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 86]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)
107	Senate Simulation Set 2: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Bladen-Brunswick-New Hanover-Pender County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 87]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)
108	Number of Senate Districts With At Least SD-27's Republican Vote Share of 55.38% in the Alamance-Guilford-Randolph County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 88]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)

**Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Interveners' Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List**  
**Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,**

<b>Exhibit #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Bates Number (if applicable)</b>	<b>Objection</b>
109	Number of Senate Districts With At Least SD-31's Republican Vote Share of 65.41% in the Davie-Forsyth County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 89]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)
110	Number of Senate Districts With At Least SD-11's Republican Vote Share of 57.3% in the Duplin-Harnett-Johnston-Lee-Nash-Sampson County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 90]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)
111	Number of Senate Districts With At Least SD-17's Republican Vote Share of 55.55% in the Franklin-Wake County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 91]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)
112	Number of Senate Districts With At Least SD-41's Republican Vote Share of 52.43% in the Mecklenburg County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 92]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)
113	Number of Senate Districts With At Least SD-8's Republican Vote Share of 50.11% in the Bladen-Brunswick-New Hanover-Pender County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 93]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)
114	Number of Senate Districts With At Least SD-48's Republican Vote Share of 57.21% in the Buncombe-Henderson-Transylvania County Grouping [Chen Report Figure 94]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)
115	Plaintiffs: House Simulation Set 1 [Chen Report Figure 95]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)
116	Plaintiffs: House Simulation Set 2 [Chen Report Figure 96]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)
117	Plaintiffs: Senate Simulation Set 1 [Chen Report Figure 97]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)
118	Plaintiffs: Senate Simulation Set 2 [Chen Report Figure 98]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)
119	Appendix A: House Simulation Set 1 (Following Only Non-Partisan Redistricting Criteria); Democratic-Favoring Districts in 2017 House Plan Versus 1,000 Simulated Plans (Measured Using 2016 Attorney General Election) [Chen Report Figure A1]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)

**Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Intervenor's Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List**  
**Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,**

<b>Exhibit #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Bates Number (if applicable)</b>	<b>Objection</b>
120	Appendix A: House Simulation Set 2 (Following Non-Partisan Redistricting Criteria and Avoiding Incumbent Pairings): Democratic-Favoring Districts in 2017 House Plan Versus 1,000 Simulated Plans (Measured Using 2016 Attorney General Election) [Chen Report Figure A2]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)
121	Appendix A: Senate Simulation Set 1 (Following Only Non-Partisan Redistricting Criteria): Democratic-Favoring Districts in 2017 Senate Plan Versus 1,000 Simulated Plans (Measured Using 2016 Attorney General Election) [Chen Report Figure A3]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)
122	Appendix A: Senate Simulation Set 2 (Following Non-Partisan Redistricting Criteria and Avoiding Incumbent Pairings): Democratic-Favoring Districts in 2017 Senate Plan Versus 1,000 Simulated Plans (Measured Using 2016 Attorney General Election) [Chen Report Figure A4]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)
123	[CORRECTED] Response Report of Jowei Chen, Ph.D.		Relevance; Lack of Foundation; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
124	Mecklenburg County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 1]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
125	Alexander-Alleghany-Rockingham-Stokes-Surry-Wilkes County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 2]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
126	Bladen-Greene-Harnett-Johnston-Lee-Sampson-Wayne County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 3]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
127	Caswell-Orange County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 4]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
128	Chatham-Durham County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 5]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)



**Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Intervenor's Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List**  
**Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,**

<b>Exhibit #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Bates Number (if applicable)</b>	<b>Objection</b>
129	Columbia-Pender-Robeson County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 6]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
130	Duplin-Onslow County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 7]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
131	Forsyth-Yadkin County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 8]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
132	Granville-Person-Vance-Warren County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 9]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
133	Lenoir-Pitt County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 10]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
134	Beaufort-Craven County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 11]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
135	Cabarrus-Davis-Montgomery-Richmond-Rowan-Stanly County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 12]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
136	Cumberland County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 13]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
137	Franklin-Nash County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 14]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
138	Guilford County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 15]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)

**Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Interveners' Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List**  
**Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,**

<b>Exhibit #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Bates Number (if applicable)</b>	<b>Objection</b>
139	Wake County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 16]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
140	Alamance-Guilford-Randolph County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 17]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
141	Alleghany-Ashe-Caswell-Rockingham-Stokes-Surry-Watauga- Wilkes County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 18]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
142	Cumberland-Hoke County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 19]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
143	Davie-Forsyth County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 20]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
144	Duplin-Harnett-Johnston-Lee-Nash-Sampson County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 21]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
145	Durham- Granville-Person County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 22]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
146	Franklin-Wake County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 23]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
147	Mecklenburg County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 24]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
148	Screenshot of Dataview Window For Dr. Hofeller's "NC House J- 25003.bak.zip" [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 25]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)

**Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Intervenor's Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List**  
**Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,**

<b>Exhibit #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Bates Number (if applicable)</b>	<b>Objection</b>
149	Screenshot of Dataview Window For Dr. Hofeller's "NC House J-25003.bak.zip" Draft Plan [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 26]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
150	Screenshot of "Formula" Window and District Labels for Dr. Hofeller's "NC House J-25003.bak.zip" Draft Plan (August 14, 2017) [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 27]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
151	Screenshot of District Labels Reporting Racial Characteristics of Dr. Hofeller's "NC House J-25003.bak.zip" Draft Plan (August 14, 2017) [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 28]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
152	Screenshot of Dataview Window for Dr. Hofeller's "NC Senate J-23005.bak.zip" Draft Plan (August 13, 2017) [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 29]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
153	Dr. Hofeller's "FORMULA FOR POLITICAL ANALYSIS OF LEGISLATIVE DISTRICTS.doc" [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 30]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
154	Screenshot of Dr. Hofeller's Draft Plan File: "NC House Plan June 7.xls" [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 31]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
155	Dr. Hofeller's Draft Plan File: "House Minimum-Partisan-Members D.xlsx" (December 6, 2016) [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 32]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
156	Dr. Hofeller's Draft Plan File: "House Minimum-Partisan-Members D.xlsx" (December 3, 2016) [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 33]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
157	Dr. Hofeller's Draft Plan File: "House Minimum-Partisan-Members D.xlsx" (June 12, 2017) [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 36]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
158	Dr. Hofeller's Draft Plan File: "NC Senate Minimum Partisan J-2" (June 13, 2017) [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 39]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)

**Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Interveners' Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List**  
**Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,**

<b>Exhibit #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Bates Number (if applicable)</b>	<b>Objection</b>
159	Dr. Hofeller's Draft Plan File: "House Minimum-Partisan-Members J-2.xlsx" (June 14, 2017) [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 40]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
160	Dr. Hofeller's Draft Plan File: "House Minimum-Partisan-Members J-2.xlsx" (June 14, 2017) [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 41]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
161	Dr. Hofeller's Draft Plan File: "NC Senate Minimum-Partisan J-2.xlsx" (June 13, 2017) [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 42]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
162	Dr. Hofeller's Draft Plan File: "Senate Minimum-Partisan-Members.xlsx" (November 26, 2016) [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 43]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
163	Dr. Hofeller's Draft Plan File: "Senate Minimum-Partisan-Members J-2.xlsx" (July 13, 2017) [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 44]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
164	Dr. Hofeller's Draft Plan File: "PPI Indicator Votes for New 2017 Legislative Districts.xlsx" (June 24, 2017) [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 45]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
165	Dr. Hofeller's Draft Plan File: "House Minimum Renumbered.xls" (December 3, 2016) [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 45b]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
166	Dr. Hofeller's Draft Plan File: "Johnston Senate Switch.xlsx" (December 11, 2016) [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 46]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
167	Dr. Hofeller's Draft Plan File: "NC Senate CCNC Sample Plan - June 2017.xlsx" (July 8, 2017) [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 47]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
168	Screenshot (Upper Half) of Dr. Hofeller's Draft Plan File: " NC Senate CCNC PPI" (July 8, 2017) [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 48a]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)

**Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Interveners' Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List**  
**Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,**

<b>Exhibit #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Bates Number (if applicable)</b>	<b>Objection</b>
169	Screenshot (Lower Half) of Dr. Hofeller's Draft Plan File: " NC Senate CCNC PPI" (July 8, 2017) [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 48b] Dr. Hofeller's Draft Plan File: "NC House CCNC Sample Plan - June 2017.xlsx" (July 5, 2017) [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 49]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
170	African-American Population of 2017 House Plan Districts [Chen Rebuttal Report Table 3]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)
171	African-American Population of 2017 Senate Plan Districts [Chen Rebuttal Report Table 4]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)
172	House Computer-Simulated Districts Achieving Dr. Lewis' Estimated Black CVAP Thresholds [Chen Rebuttal Report Table 5]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)
173	House Simulation Set 1: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Columbus-Pender- Robeson County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 101]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)
174	House Simulation Set 1: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Columbus-Pender- Robeson County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 102]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)
175	House Simulation Set 1: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Cumberland County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 103]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)
176	House Simulation Set 1: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Cumberland County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 104]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)
177	House Simulation Set 1: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Forsyth-Yadkin County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 105]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)
178	House Simulation Set 1: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Forsyth-Yadkin County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 106]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit; Defendants might withdraw these objections)

**Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Intervenor's Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List**  
**Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,**

<b>Exhibit #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Bates Number (if applicable)</b>	<b>Objection</b>
180	House Simulation Set 1: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Forsyth-Yadkin County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 107]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
181	House Simulation Set 1: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Franklin-Nash County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 108]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
182	House Simulation Set 1: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Franklin-Nash County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 109]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
183	House Simulation Set 1: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Granville-Person-Vance-Warren County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 110]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
184	House Simulation Set 1: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Granville-Person-Vance-Warren County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 111]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
185	House Simulation Set 1: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Guilford County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 112]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
186	House Simulation Set 1: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Guilford County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 113]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
187	House Simulation Set 1: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Guilford County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 114]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
188	House Simulation Set 1: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Guilford County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 115]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
189	House Simulation Set 1: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Guilford County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 116]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
190	House Simulation Set 1: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Guilford County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 117]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
191	House Simulation Set 1: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Guilford County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 118]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)

**Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Intervenor's Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List**

Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,

Exhibit #	Description	Bates Number (if applicable)	Objection
192	House Simulation Set 1: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Lenoir-Pitt County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 119]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
193	House Simulation Set 1: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Lenoir-Pitt County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 120]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
194	House Simulation Set 2: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Columbus-Pender-Robeson County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 123]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
195	House Simulation Set 2: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Columbus-Pender-Robeson County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 124]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
196	House Simulation Set 2: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Cumberland County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 125]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
197	House Simulation Set 2: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Cumberland County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 126]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
198	House Simulation Set 2: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Cumberland County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 127]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
199	House Simulation Set 2: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Forsyth-Yadkin County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 128]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
200	House Simulation Set 2: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Forsyth-Yadkin County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 129]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
201	House Simulation Set 2: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Franklin-Nash County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 130]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)

**Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Interveners' Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List**  
**Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,**

<b>Exhibit #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Bates Number (if applicable)</b>	<b>Objection</b>
202	House Simulation Set 2: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Franklin-Nash County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 131]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
203	House Simulation Set 2: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Granville-Person-Vance-Warren County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 132]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
204	House Simulation Set 2: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Granville-Person-Vance-Warren County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 133]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
205	House Simulation Set 2: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Guilford County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 134]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
206	House Simulation Set 2: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Guilford County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 135]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
207	House Simulation Set 2: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Guilford County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 136]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
208	House Simulation Set 2: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Guilford County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 137]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
209	House Simulation Set 2: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Guilford County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 138]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
210	House Simulation Set 2: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Guilford County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 139]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
211	House Simulation Set 2: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Guilford County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 140]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
212	House Simulation Set 2: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Lenoir-Pitt County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 141]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
213	House Simulation Set 2: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Lenoir-Pitt County Grouping [[Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 142]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)



**Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Interveners' Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List**  
**Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,**

<b>Exhibit #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Bates Number (if applicable)</b>	<b>Objection</b>
214	House Simulation Set 1: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Alamance-Guilford-Randolph County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 145]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
215	House Simulation Set 1: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Alamance-Guilford-Randolph County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 146]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
216	House Simulation Set 2: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Alamance-Guilford-Randolph County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 147]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
217	House Simulation Set 2: Democratic Vote Share of the Enacted and Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Alamance-Guilford-Randolph County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 148]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
218	Senate Computer-Simulated Districts Achieving Dr. Lewis' Estimated Black CVAP Thresholds [Chen Rebuttal Report Table 6]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
219	Comparison of 2017 House Plan and House Simulation Set 1 and Set 2 On Number of Districts with Dr. Lewis' Black CVAP thresholds in Individual Counties [Chen Rebuttal Report Table 7]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
220	Comparison of 2017 Senate Plan and Senate Simulation Set 1 and Set 2 On Number of Districts with Dr. Lewis' Black CVAP thresholds in Individual Counties [Chen Rebuttal Report Table 8]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
221	10,000 Computer-Simulated House Plans for the Franklin-Nash County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 149]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
222	The Computer-Simulated House Plan for the Franklin-Nash County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 150]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
223	Senate District Boundaries for the Davie-Forsyth County Grouping With the Highest Possible Black Voting Age Population [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 151]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
224	House Simulation Set 1: Black CVAP of the Enacted Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Alamance County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 152]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
225	House Simulation Set 1: Black CVAP of the Enacted Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Anson-Union County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 153]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)

**Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Interveners' Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List**  
**Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,**

<b>Exhibit #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Bates Number (if applicable)</b>	<b>Objection</b>
226	House Simulation Set 1: Black CVAP of the Enacted Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Cleveland-Gaston County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 154]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
227	House Simulation Set 1: Black CVAP of the Enacted Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Columbus-Pender-Robeson County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 155]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
228	House Simulation Set 1: Black CVAP of the Enacted Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Duplin-Onslow County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 156]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
229	House Simulation Set 2: Black CVAP of the Enacted Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Alamance County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 157]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
230	House Simulation Set 2: Black CVAP of the Enacted Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Anson-Union County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 158]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
231	House Simulation Set 2: Black CVAP of the Enacted Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Cleveland-Gaston County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 159]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
232	House Simulation Set 2: Black CVAP of the Enacted Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Columbus-Pender-Robeson County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 160]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
233	House Simulation Set 2: Black CVAP of the Enacted Computer-Simulated Districts Within the Duplin-Onslow County Grouping [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 161]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
234	Actual Distribution of Democratic-Favoring Districts Across 1,000 Simulated Plans in House Simulation Set 1 vs. Binomial Distribution Created by Dr. Thornton [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 50]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
235	Actual Distribution of Democratic-Favoring Districts Across 1,000 Simulated Plans in House Simulation Set 2 vs. Binomial Distribution Created by Dr. Thornton [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 51]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
236	Actual Distribution of Democratic-Favoring Districts Across 1,000 Simulated Plans in Senate Simulation Set 1 vs. Binomial Distribution Created by Dr. Thornton [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 52]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
237	Actual Distribution of Democratic-Favoring Districts Across 1,000 Simulated Plans in Senate Simulation Set 2 vs. Binomial Distribution Created by Dr. Thornton [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 53]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)

**Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Intervenor's Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List**

**Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,**

<b>Exhibit #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Bates Number (if applicable)</b>	<b>Objection</b>
238	Plaintiffs: House Simulation Set 1 [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 54]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
239	Plaintiffs: House Simulation Set 2 [Chen Rebuttal Report Figure 55]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
240	Dr. Hofeller's Draft Plan File: "NC House Plan June7.xls"		Authenticity; Relevance; Lack of Foundation; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.); Exhibit insufficiently identified
241	Dr. Hofeller's Draft Plan File: "House Minimum-Partisan-Members D.xlsx" (December 6, 2016)		Authenticity; Relevance; Lack of Foundation; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.); Exhibit insufficiently identified
242	Dr. Hofeller's Draft Plan File: "House Minimum-Partisan-Members.xlsx" (December 3, 2016)		Authenticity; Relevance; Lack of Foundation; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.); Exhibit insufficiently identified
243	Dr. Hofeller's Draft Plan File: "House Minimum-Partisan-Members D.xlsx" (June 12, 2017)		Authenticity; Relevance; Lack of Foundation; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.); Exhibit insufficiently identified
244	Dr. Hofeller's Draft Plan File: "NC Senate Minimum Partisan J-2" (June 13, 2017)		Authenticity; Relevance; Lack of Foundation; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.); Exhibit insufficiently identified
245	Dr. Hofeller's Draft Plan File: "House Minimum-Partisan-Members J-2.xlsx" (June 14, 2017)		Authenticity; Relevance; Lack of Foundation; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.); Exhibit insufficiently identified
246	Dr. Hofeller's Draft Plan File: "House Minimum-Partisan-Members J-2.xlsx" (June 14, 2017)		Authenticity; Relevance; Lack of Foundation; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.); Exhibit insufficiently identified
247	Dr. Hofeller's Draft Plan File: "NC Senate Minimum-Partisan J-2.xlsx" (June 13, 2017)		Authenticity; Relevance; Lack of Foundation; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.); Exhibit insufficiently identified
248	Dr. Hofeller's Draft Plan File: "Senate Minimum-Partisan-Members.xlsx" (November 26, 2016)		Authenticity; Relevance; Lack of Foundation; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.); Exhibit insufficiently identified

**Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Intervenor's Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List**

Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,

<b>Exhibit #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Bates Number (if applicable)</b>	<b>Objection</b>
249	Dr. Hofeller's Draft Plan File: "Senate Minimum-Partisan-Member J-2.xlsx" (June 13, 2017)		Authenticity; Relevance; Lack of Foundation; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.); Exhibit insufficiently identified
250	Dr. Hofeller's Draft Plan File: "House Minimum Renumbered.xls" (December 3, 2016)		Authenticity; Relevance; Lack of Foundation; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.); Exhibit insufficiently identified
251	Dr. Hofeller's Draft Plan File: "NC Senate CCNC Sample Plan - June 2017.xlsx" (July 8, 2017)		Authenticity; Relevance; Lack of Foundation; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.); Exhibit insufficiently identified
252	Dr. Hofeller's Draft Plan File: "NC House CCNC Sample Plan - June 2017.xlsx" (July 5, 2017)		Authenticity; Relevance; Lack of Foundation; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.); Exhibit insufficiently identified
253	Expert Report of Christopher Cooper		Relevance; Hearsay
254	Christopher Cooper- Curriculum Vitae		Relevance; Hearsay
255	NC Rank in Presidential Vote Share Among 50 States [Cooper Report Figure 1]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
256	NC Council of State Electoral Results 2004-2016 [Cooper Report Figure 2]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
257	Percent of Republican Two-Party Vote Share in NCGA Elections 2012-2018 [Cooper Report Figure 3]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
258	2016 Citizen Political Ideology by State [Cooper Report Figure 4]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
259	Percentage of Seats Held by Democrats in the NCGA 2001-2018 [Cooper Report Figure 5]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
260	Average Member Ideology in the NCGA 2000-2016 [Cooper Report Figure 6]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
261	2016 State Legislative Ideology by State [Cooper Report Figure 7]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
262	NC State Senate Election Margins 2018 [Cooper Report Figure 8]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)

**Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Interveners' Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List**

Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,

<b>Exhibit #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Bates Number (if applicable)</b>	<b>Objection</b>
263	NC State House Election Margins 2018 [Cooper Report Figure 9]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
264	Percent of Democratic Votes and Seats in the NC General Assembly 2012-2018 [Cooper Report Table 1]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
265	Distribution of Senate CPI Scores [Cooper Report Figure 10]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
266	Distribution of House CPI Scores [Cooper Report Figure 11]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
267	NCFEF Senate Ratings [Cooper Report Figure 12]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
268	NCFEF House Ratings [Cooper Report Figure 13]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
269	NC Senate Distribution of Civitas Action Scores 2018 [Cooper Report Figure 14]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
270	NC House Distribution of Civitas Action Scores 2018 [Cooper Report Figure 15]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
271	Legend for Area Maps [Cooper Report Map 1]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
272	Senate Districts 8 and 9 [Cooper Report Map 2]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
273	Wilmington Notch [Cooper Report Map 3]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
274	Senate Districts 10, 11 and 12 [Cooper Report Map 4]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
275	Senate District 11 Country Clubs [Cooper Report Map 5]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
276	Senate Districts 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18 [Cooper Report Map 6]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)

**Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Interveners' Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List**

Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,

<b>Exhibit #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Bates Number (if applicable)</b>	<b>Objection</b>
277	Municipalities in Senate Districts 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18 [Cooper Report Map 7]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
278	Portions of Raleigh City Limits in Senate Districts 14, 15, 16, 17 and 18 [Cooper Report Map 8]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
279	Lynn Road Traversal in Senate Districts 14, 15, 16, and 18 [Cooper Report Map 9]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
280	Country Clubs in Senate Districts 14, 15, 16, and 18 [Cooper Report Map 10]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
281	Senate Districts 24, 26, 27, and 28 [Cooper Report Map 11]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
282	Senate Districts 31 and 32 [Cooper Report Map 12]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
283	Portions of Winston-Salem City Limits in Senate Districts 31 and 32 [Cooper Report Map 13]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
284	Peace Haven Road Traversal in Senate Districts 31 and 32 [Cooper Report Map 14]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
285	Senate Districts 37, 38, 39, 40, and 41 [Cooper Report Map 15]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
286	Portions of Charlotte City Limits in Senate Districts 37, 38, 39, 40, and 41 [Cooper Report Map 16]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
287	Arrowood Quarry and Senate Districts 37 and 41 [Cooper Report Map 17]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
288	Senate Districts 48 and 49 [Cooper Report Map 18]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
289	House Districts 2 and 32 [Cooper Report Map 19]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
290	Municipalities in House Districts 2 and 32 [Cooper Report Map 20]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)

**Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Interveners' Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List**

Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,

Exhibit #	Description	Bates Number (if applicable)	Objection
291	House Districts 4, 14, and 15 [Cooper Report Map 21]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
292	Municipalities in House Districts 4, 14, and 15 [Cooper Report Map 22]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
293	House Districts 7 and 25 [Cooper Report Map 23]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
294	House Districts 8, 9, and 12 [Cooper Report Map 24]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
295	Municipalities in House Districts 8, 9, and 12 [Cooper Report Map 25]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
296	ECU Bisection in House Districts 8 and 9 [Cooper Report Map 26]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
297	House Districts 11, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, and 49 [Cooper Report Map 27]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
298	Municipalities in House Districts 11, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, and 49 [Cooper Report Map 28]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
299	House Districts Representing Raleigh and Percentage of District Area in City Limits [Cooper Report Map 29]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
300	NCSU Campus Divisions in House Districts 11, 33, 34, and 49 [Cooper Report Map 30]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
301	House Districts 16, 46, and 47 [Cooper Report Map 31]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
302	House Districts 17, 18, 19, and 20 [Cooper Report Map 32]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
303	Portions of Wilmington City Limits in House Districts 18, 19, and 20 [Cooper Report Map 33]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
304	UNC Wilmington Divisions in House Districts 18, 19, and 20 [Cooper Report Map 34]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)

**Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Intervenor's Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List**

Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,

Exhibit #	Description	Bates Number (if applicable)	Objection
305	House Districts 42, 43, 44, and 45 [Cooper Report Map 35]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
306	Municipalities in House Districts 42, 43, 44, and 45 [Cooper Report Map 36]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
307	House Districts 55, 68, and 69 [Cooper Report Map 37]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
308	Municipalities in House Districts 55, 68, and 69 [Cooper Report Map 38]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
309	US Hwy 74 Traversal in House Districts 55, 68, and 69 [Cooper Report Map 39]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
310	House Districts 58, 59, and 60 [Cooper Report Map 40]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
311	House Districts 63 and 64 [Cooper Report Map 41]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
312	Municipalities in House Districts 63 and 64 [Cooper Report Map 42]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
313	US Hwy 70 Traversal in House Districts 63 and 64 [Cooper Report Map 43]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
314	House Districts 66, 67, 76, 77, 82, and 83 [Cooper Report Map 44]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
315	Municipalities in House Districts 66, 67, 76, 77, 82, and 83 [Cooper Report Map 45]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
316	House Districts 71, 72, 73, 74, and 75 [Cooper Report Map 46]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
317	Municipalities in House Districts 71, 72, 73, 74, and 75 [Cooper Report Map 47]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
318	Portions of Winston-Salem City Limits in House Districts 71, 72, 73, 74, and 75 [Cooper Report Map 48]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)



**Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Intervenor's Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List**  
**Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,**

<b>Exhibit #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Bates Number (if applicable)</b>	<b>Objection</b>
319	House Districts 88, 92, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, and 107 [Cooper Report Map 49]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
320	Portions of Charlotte City Limits in House Districts 88, 92, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, and 107 [Cooper Report Map 50]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
321	Precincts in House Districts 88, 92, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, and 107 [Cooper Report Map 51]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
322	Civitas and NCFEF Ratings for House Districts 88, 92, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106 and 107 [Cooper Report Table 2]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
323	House Districts 108, 109, 110, and 111 [Cooper Report Map 52]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
324	Gastonia Division in House Districts 108, 109, and 110 [Cooper Report Map 53]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
325	Municipalities in House Districts 108, 109, 110, and 111 [Cooper Report Map 54]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
326	House Districts 114, 115, and 116 [Cooper Report Map 55]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
327	Municipalities in House Districts 114, 115, and 116 [Cooper Report Map 56]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
328	Warren Wilson College Bisection in House Districts 114 and 115 [Cooper Report Map 57]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
329	Expert Response Report of Christopher Cooper		Relevance; Lack of Foundation; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
330	Partisan Formula Field for 2017 NC Senate Redistricting from Dr. Hofeller's Hard Drive [Cooper Rebuttal Report Figure 1]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)

**Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Intervenor's Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List**  
**Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,**

<b>Exhibit #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Bates Number (if applicable)</b>	<b>Objection</b>
331	Example of NC Senate Partisan Targeting from Dr. Hofeller's Hard Drive [Cooper Rebuttal Report Figure 2]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
332	Partisan Targeting in Senate Districts 10, 11, and 12 [Cooper Rebuttal Report Figure 3]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
333	Partisan Targeting in Senate Districts 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18 [Cooper Rebuttal Report Figure 4]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
334	Partisan Targeting in Senate Districts 24, 26, 27, and 28 [Cooper Rebuttal Report Figure 5]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
335	Partisan Targeting in Senate Districts 31 and 32 [Cooper Rebuttal Report Figure 6]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
336	Partisan Targeting in Senate Districts 37, 38, 39, 40, and 41 [Cooper Rebuttal Report Figure 7]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
337	Partisan Formula Field for 2017 House Redistricting from Dr. Hofeller's Hard Drive [Cooper Rebuttal Report Figure 8]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
338	Partisan Targeting in House Districts 2 and 32 [Cooper Rebuttal Report Figure 9]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
339	Partisan Targeting in House Districts 4, 14, and 15 [Cooper Rebuttal Report Figure 10]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
340	Partisan Targeting in House Districts 8, 9, and 12 [Cooper Rebuttal Report Figure 11]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)

**Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Intervenor's Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List**  
**Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,**

<b>Exhibit #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Bates Number (if applicable)</b>	<b>Objection</b>
341	Partisan Targeting in House Districts 11, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, and 49 [Cooper Rebuttal Report Figure 12]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
342	Partisan Targeting in House Districts 16, 46, and 47 [Cooper Rebuttal Report Figure 13]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
343	Partisan Targeting in House Districts 42, 43, 44, and 45 [Cooper Rebuttal Report Figure 14]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
344	Partisan Targeting in House Districts 58, 59, and 60 [Cooper Rebuttal Report Figure 15]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
345	Partisan Targeting in House Districts 71, 72, 73, 74, and 75 [Cooper Rebuttal Report Figure 16]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
346	Partisan Targeting in House Districts 88, 92, 98, 99, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, and 107 [Cooper Rebuttal Report Figure 17]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
347	Partisan Formula Field for 2011 NC Senate Redistricting from Dr. Hofeller's Hard Drive [Cooper Rebuttal Report Figure 18]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
348	Partisan Targeting in Senate Districts 8 and 9 [Cooper Rebuttal Report Figure 19]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
349	Partisan Targeting in Senate Districts 48 and 49 [Cooper Rebuttal Report Figure 20]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
350	Partisan Formula Field for July 2011 House Redistricting [Cooper Rebuttal Report Figure 21]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)

**Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Intervenor's Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List**  
**Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,**

<b>Exhibit #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Bates Number (if applicable)</b>	<b>Objection</b>
351	Partisan Targeting in House Districts 17, 18, 19, and 20 [Cooper Rebuttal Report Figure 23]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
352	Partisan Formula Field for the June 2011 House Maps [Cooper Rebuttal Report Figure 24]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
353	Partisan Targeting in House Districts 55, 68, and 69 [Cooper Rebuttal Report Figure 25]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
354	Partisan Targeting in House Districts 63 and 64 [Cooper Rebuttal Report Figure 26]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
355	Partisan Targeting in House Districts 108, 109, 110 and 111 [Cooper Rebuttal Report Figure 27]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
356	Partisan Targeting in House Districts 114, 115, and 116 [Cooper Rebuttal Report Figure 28]		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
357	Applying Lewis' Three Assumptions to the 2018 NC Senate Elections [Cooper Rebuttal Report Table 1]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
358	Applying Lewis' Three Assumptions to the 2018 NC House Elections [Cooper Rebuttal Report Table 2]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
359	Expert Report of Jonathan Mattingly		Relevance; Hearsay
360	Jonathan Mattingly- Curriculum Vitae		Relevance; Hearsay
361	Chance that a certain number of Democrats are elected to the North Carolina Senate using the partisan vote counts from the 2008 Lieutenant Governor. [Mattingly Report Figure 1]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
362	Range of Democratic seats won in the ensemble of plans [Mattingly Report Figure 2]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
363	Median number of elected Democrats over the plans in the Senate ensemble for each considered election. [Mattingly Report Figure 3]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)

**Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Interveners' Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List**

Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,

<b>Exhibit #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Bates Number (if applicable)</b>	<b>Objection</b>
364	Range of the 15th least Democratic district to the 35th least democratic district. [Mattingly Report Figure 4]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
365	Range of possible Democratic seats won in the ensemble to plans. [Mattingly Report Figure 5]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
366	Median number of elected Democrats over the plans in the House ensemble for each considered election. [Mattingly Report Figure 6]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
367	Typical range of the 40th least Democratic district to the 80th least democratic district [Mattingly Report Figure 7]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
368	Collection of histograms in the Senate and House [Mattingly Report Figure 8]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
369	Enacted districting plan, colored by county, municipalities and averaged Democratic vote fractions: Mecklenburg Cluster ( Senate) [Mattingly Report Figure 9]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
370	Districts in each plan of the ensemble ordered from least to most Democratic for a given election [Mecklenburg Cluster- Senate] [Mattingly Report Figure 10]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
371	Enacted districting plan, colored by county, municipalities and averaged Democratic vote fractions: Wake-Franklin Cluster ( Senate) [Mattingly Report Figure 11]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
372	Districts in each plan of the ensemble ordered from least to most Democratic for a given election [Wake/Franklin Cluster- Senate] [Mattingly Report Figure 12]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
373	Enacted districting plan, colored by county, municipalities and averaged Democratic vote fractions: Davie-Forsyth Cluster ( Senate) [Mattingly Report Figure 13]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
374	Districts in each plan of the ensemble ordered from least to most Democratic for a given election [Davie-Forsyth Cluster -Senate] [Mattingly Report Figure 14]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
375	Enacted districting plan, colored by county, municipalities and averaged Democratic vote fractions: Bladen-Brunswick-Pender- New Hanover Cluster ( Senate) [Mattingly Report Figure 15]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
376	Districts in each plan of the ensemble ordered from least to most Democratic for a given election [Bladen-Brunswick-Pender- New Hanover Cluster- Senate] [Mattingly Report Figure 16]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)

**Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Intervenor's Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List**  
**Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,**

<b>Exhibit #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Bates Number (if applicable)</b>	<b>Objection</b>
377	Enacted districting plan, colored by county, municipalities and averaged Democratic vote fractions: Buncombe-Transylvania-Henderson Cluster (Senate) [Mattingly Report Figure 17]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
378	Districts in each plan of the ensemble ordered from least to most Democratic for a given election [Buncombe-Transylvania-Henderson Cluster- Senate] [Mattingly Report Figure 18]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
379	Enacted districting plan, colored by county, municipalities and averaged Democratic vote fractions: Guilford-Alamance-Randolph Cluster (Senate) [Mattingly Report Figure 19]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
380	Districts in each plan of the ensemble ordered from least to most Democratic for a given election [Guilford-Alamance-Randolph Cluster-Senate] [Mattingly Report Figure 20]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
381	Enacted districting plan, colored by county, municipalities and averaged Democratic vote fractions: Lee-Sampson-Harnett-Duplin-Johnston-Nash Cluster (Senate) [Mattingly Report Figure 21]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
382	Districts in each plan of the ensemble ordered from least to most Democratic for a given election [Lee-Sampson-Harnett-Duplin-Johnston-Nash Senate] [Mattingly Report Figure 22]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
383	Enacted districting plan, colored by county, municipalities and averaged Democratic vote fractions: Alamance Cluster (House) [Mattingly Report Figure 23]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
384	Districts in each plan of the ensemble ordered from least to most Democratic for a given election [Alamance Cluster- House] [Mattingly Report Figure 24]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
385	Enacted districting plan, colored by county, municipalities and averaged Democratic vote fractions: Buncombe Cluster (House) [Mattingly Report Figure 25]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
386	Districts in each plan of the ensemble ordered from least to most Democratic for a given election [Buncombe Cluster- House] [Mattingly Report Figure 26]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)

**Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Interveners' Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List**

Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,

Exhibit #	Description	Bates Number (if applicable)	Objection
387	Enacted districting plan, colored by county, municipalities and averaged Democratic vote fractions: Columbia-Pender-Robeson Cluster (House) [Mattingly Report Figure 27]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
388	Districts in each plan of the ensemble ordered from least to most Democratic for a given election [Columbus-Pender-Robeson Cluster - House] [Mattingly Report Figure 28]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
389	Enacted districting plan, colored by county, municipalities and averaged Democratic vote fractions: Cumberland Cluster (House) [Mattingly Report Figure 29]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
390	Districts in each plan of the ensemble ordered from least to most Democratic for a given election [Cumberland Cluster - House] [Mattingly Report Figure 30]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
391	Enacted districting plan, colored by county, municipalities and averaged Democratic vote fractions: Davie-Montgomery-Richmond-Cabarrus-Rowan-Stanly Cluster (House) [Mattingly Report Figure 31]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
392	Districts in each plan of the ensemble ordered from least to most Democratic for a given election [Davie-Montgomery-Richmond-Cabarrus-Rowan-Stanly Cluster - House] [Mattingly Report Figure 32]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
393	Enacted districting plan, colored by county, municipalities and averaged Democratic vote fractions: Duplin-Onslow Cluster (House) [Mattingly Report Figure 33]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
394	Districts in each plan of the ensemble ordered from least to most Democratic for a given election [Duplin-Onslow Cluster - House] [Mattingly Report Figure 34]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
395	Enacted districting plan, colored by county, municipalities and averaged Democratic vote fractions: Gaston-Cleveland Cluster (House) [Mattingly Report Figure 35]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
396	Districts in each plan of the ensemble ordered from least to most Democratic for a given election [Gaston-Cleveland Cluster - House] [Mattingly Report Figure 36]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
397	Enacted districting plan, colored by county, municipalities and averaged Democratic vote fractions: Guilford Cluster (House) [Mattingly Report Figure 37]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
398	Districts in each plan of the ensemble ordered from least to most Democratic for a given election [Guilford Cluster - House] [Mattingly Report Figure 38]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)

**Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Intervenor's Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List**

Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,

<b>Exhibit #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Bates Number (if applicable)</b>	<b>Objection</b>
399	Enacted districting plan, colored by county, municipalities and averaged Democratic vote fractions: Mecklenburg Cluster (House) [Mattingly Report Figure 39]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
400	Districts in each plan of the ensemble ordered from least to most Democratic for a given election [Guilford Cluster - House] [Mattingly Report Figure 40]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
401	Enacted districting plan, colored by county, municipalities and averaged Democratic vote fractions: Nash-Franklin Cluster (House) [Mattingly Report Figure 41]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
402	Districts in each plan of the ensemble ordered from least to most Democratic for a given election [Nash-Franklin Cluster- House] [Mattingly Report Figure 42]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
403	Enacted districting plan, colored by county, municipalities and averaged Democratic vote fractions: New Haven-Brunswick Cluster (House) [Mattingly Report Figure 43]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
404	Districts in each plan of the ensemble ordered from least to most Democratic for a given election [New Haven-Brunswick Cluster - House] [Mattingly Report Figure 44]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
405	Enacted districting plan, colored by county, municipalities and averaged Democratic vote fractions: Person-Vance-Granville- Warren Cluster (House) [Mattingly Report Figure 45]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
406	Districts in each plan of the ensemble ordered from least to most Democratic for a given election [Person-Vance-Granville-Warren Cluster - House] [Mattingly Report Figure 46]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
407	Enacted districting plan, colored by county, municipalities and averaged Democratic vote fractions: Pitt-Lenoir Cluster (House) [Mattingly Report Figure 47]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
408	Districts in each plan of the ensemble ordered from least to most Democratic for a given election [Pitt-Lenoir Cluster - House] [Mattingly Report Figure 48]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
409	Enacted districting plan, colored by county, municipalities and averaged Democratic vote fractions: Union-Anson Cluster (House) [Mattingly Report Figure 49]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
410	Districts in each plan of the ensemble ordered from least to most Democratic for a given election [Union-Anson Cluster - House] [Mattingly Report Figure 50]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)



**Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Interveners' Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List**  
**Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,**

<b>Exhibit #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Bates Number (if applicable)</b>	<b>Objection</b>
411	Enacted districting plan, colored by county, municipalities and averaged Democratic vote fractions: Wake Cluster (House) [Mattingly Report Figure 51]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
412	Districts in each plan of the ensemble ordered from least to most Democratic for a given election [Wake Cluster - House] [Mattingly Report Figure 52]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
413	Enacted districting plan, colored by county, municipalities and averaged Democratic vote fractions: Yadkin-Forsyth Cluster (House) [Mattingly Report Figure 53]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
414	Districts in each plan of the ensemble ordered from least to most Democratic for a given election [Yadkin-Forsyth Cluster - House] [Mattingly Report Figure 54]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
415	Range of expected partisan results in the enacted plan and the ensemble for the North Carolina Senate [Mattingly Report Table 1]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
416	Range of expected partisan results in the enacted plan and the ensemble for the North Carolina House [Mattingly Report Table 2]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
417	Percent chance of electing a given number of Democrats for a given election in the North Carolina Senate. [Mattingly Report Table 3]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
418	Percent chance of electing a given number of Democrats for a given election in the North Carolina House. [Mattingly Report Table 4]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
419	List of municipalities in a given plan [Mattingly Report Table 5]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
420	Sampling parameters for the Senate clusters [Mattingly Report Table 6]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
421	Sampling parameters for the House clusters [Mattingly Report Table 7]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
422	The districts in each plan of the ensemble ordered from least to most compact - [Mecklenburg Cluster (Senate)] [Mattingly Report Figure 55]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
423	Comparison of municipal divisions of the enacted plan with the ensemble [Mecklenburg Cluster (Senate)] [Mattingly Report Figure 56]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)

**Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Interveners' Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List**  
**Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,**

<b>Exhibit #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Bates Number (if applicable)</b>	<b>Objection</b>
424	The districts in each plan of the ensemble ordered from least to most compact [Wake-Franklin Cluster (Senate)] [Mattingly Report Figure 57]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
425	Comparison of municipal divisions of the enacted plan with the ensemble [Wake-Franklin Cluster (Senate)] [Mattingly Report Figure 58]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
426	The districts in each plan of the ensemble ordered from least to most compact [Davie-Forsyth Cluster (Senate)] [Mattingly Report Figure 59]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
427	Comparison of municipal divisions of the enacted plan with the ensemble [Davie-Forsyth Cluster (Senate)] [Mattingly Report Figure 60]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
428	The districts in each plan of the ensemble ordered from least to most compact [Bladen-Brunswick-Pender-New Hanover Cluster (Senate)] [Mattingly Report Figure 61]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
429	Comparison of municipal divisions of the enacted plan with the ensemble [Bladen-Brunswick-Pender-New Hanover Cluster (Senate)] [Mattingly Report Figure 62]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
430	The districts in each plan of the ensemble ordered from least to most compact [Buncombe-Transylvania-Henderson Cluster (Senate)] [Mattingly Report Figure 63]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
431	Comparison of municipal divisions of the enacted plan with the ensemble [Buncombe-Transylvania-Henderson Cluster (Senate)] [Mattingly Report Figure 64]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
432	The districts in each plan of the ensemble ordered from least to most compact [Guilford-Alamance-Randolph Cluster (Senate)] [Mattingly Report Figure 65]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
433	Comparison of municipal divisions of the enacted plan with the ensemble [Guilford-Alamance-Randolph Cluster (Senate)] [Mattingly Report Figure 66]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)

**Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Intervenor's Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List**

Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,

Exhibit #	Description	Bates Number (if applicable)	Objection
434	The districts in each plan of the ensemble ordered from least to most compact [Lee-Sampson-Harnett-Duplin-Johnston-Nash Cluster (Senate)] [Mattingly Report Figure 67]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
435	Comparison of municipal divisions of the enacted plan with the ensemble [Lee-Sampson-Harnett-Duplin-Johnston-Nash Cluster (Senate)] [Mattingly Report Figure 68]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
436	The districts in each plan of the ensemble ordered from least to most compact [Alamance Cluster (House)] [Mattingly Report Figure 69]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
437	Comparison of municipal divisions of the enacted plan with the ensemble [Alamance Cluster House]] [Mattingly Report Figure 70]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
438	The districts in each plan of the ensemble ordered from least to most compact [Buncombe Cluster (House)] [Mattingly Report Figure 71]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
439	Comparison of municipal divisions of the enacted plan with the ensemble [Buncombe Cluster House]] [Mattingly Report Figure 72]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
440	The districts in each plan of the ensemble ordered from least to most compact [Columbus-Pender-Robeson Cluster (House)] [Mattingly Report Figure 73]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
441	Comparison of municipal divisions of the enacted plan with the ensemble [Columbus-Pender-Robeson Cluster House]] [Mattingly Report Figure 74]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
442	The districts in each plan of the ensemble ordered from least to most compact [Cumberland Cluster (House)] [Mattingly Report Figure 75]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
443	Comparison of municipal divisions of the enacted plan with the ensemble [Cumberland Cluster House]] [Mattingly Report Figure 76]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)

**Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Intervenor's Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List**  
**Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,**

<b>Exhibit #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Bates Number (if applicable)</b>	<b>Objection</b>
444	The districts in each plan of the ensemble ordered from least to most compact [Davie-Montgomery-Richmond-Cabarrus-Rowan-Stanly Cluster (House)] [Mattingly Report Figure 77]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
445	Comparison of municipal divisions of the enacted plan with the ensemble [Davie-Montgomery-Richmond-Cabarrus-Rowan-Stanly Cluster (House)] [Mattingly Report Figure 78]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
446	The districts in each plan of the ensemble ordered from least to most compact [Duplin-Onslow Cluster (House)] [Mattingly Report Figure 79]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
447	Comparison of municipal divisions of the enacted plan with the ensemble [Duplin-Onslow Cluster House] [Mattingly Report Figure 80]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
448	The districts in each plan of the ensemble ordered from least to most compact [Gastow-Cleveland Cluster (House)] [Mattingly Report Figure 81]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
449	Comparison of municipal divisions of the enacted plan with the ensemble [Gastow-Cleveland Cluster House] [Mattingly Report Figure 82]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
450	The districts in each plan of the ensemble ordered from least to most compact [Guilford Cluster (House)] [Mattingly Report Figure 83]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
451	Comparison of municipal divisions of the enacted plan with the ensemble [Guilford Cluster House] [Mattingly Report Figure 84]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
452	The districts in each plan of the ensemble ordered from least to most compact [Mecklenburg Cluster (House)] [Mattingly Report Figure 85]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
453	Comparison of municipal divisions of the enacted plan with the ensemble [Mecklenburg Cluster House] [Mattingly Report Figure 86]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)

**Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Interveners' Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List**

**Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,**

<b>Exhibit #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Bates Number (if applicable)</b>	<b>Objection</b>
454	The districts in each plan of the ensemble ordered from least to most compact [Nash-Franklin Cluster (House)] [Mattingly Report Figure 87] Comparison of municipal divisions of the enacted plan with the ensemble [Nash-Franklin Cluster House] [Mattingly Report Figure 88]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
455	The districts in each plan of the ensemble ordered from least to most compact [New Hanover-Brunswick Cluster (House)] [Mattingly Report Figure 89]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
456	Comparison of municipal divisions of the enacted plan with the ensemble [New Hanover-Brunswick Cluster House] [Mattingly Report Figure 90]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
457	The districts in each plan of the ensemble ordered from least to most compact [Person-Vance-Granville-Warren Cluster (House)] [Mattingly Report Figure 91]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
458	Comparison of municipal divisions of the enacted plan with the ensemble [[Person-Vance-Granville-Warren Cluster House]] [Mattingly Report Figure 92]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
459	The districts in each plan of the ensemble ordered from least to most compact [Pitt-Lenoir Cluster (House)] [Mattingly Report Figure 93]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
460	Comparison of municipal divisions of the enacted plan with the ensemble [[Pitt-Lenoir Cluster House]] [Mattingly Report Figure 94]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
461	The districts in each plan of the ensemble ordered from least to most compact [Union-Anson Cluster (House)] [Mattingly Report Figure 95]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
462	Comparison of municipal divisions of the enacted plan with the ensemble [[Union-Anson Cluster House]] [Mattingly Report Figure 96]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
463			

**Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Intervenor's Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List**  
**Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,**

<b>Exhibit #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Bates Number (if applicable)</b>	<b>Objection</b>
464	The districts in each plan of the ensemble ordered from least to most compact [Wake Cluster (House)] [Mattingly Report Figure 97]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
465	Comparison of municipal divisions of the enacted plan with the ensemble [(Wake Cluster House)] [Mattingly Report Figure 98]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
466	The districts in each plan of the ensemble ordered from least to most compact [Yadkin-Forsyth (House)] [Mattingly Report Figure 99]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
467	Comparison of municipal divisions of the enacted plan with the ensemble [(Yadkin-Forsyth Cluster House)] [Mattingly Report Figure 100]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
468	Ranked vote marginals in Mecklenburg and Wake [Mattingly Report Figure 101]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
469	Parameters used when resampling senate clusters [Mattingly Report Table 8]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
470	Difference in the marginal distributions when considering incumbency [Mattingly Report Figure 102]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
471	Number of elections in which the enacted plan is a 1% outlier and a 0.1% outlier favoring either the Republican or the Democrats. [Mattingly Report Table 9]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
472	Difference in the marginal distributions when considering incumbency [Mattingly Report Figure 103]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
473	Difference in the marginal distributions when considering incumbency [Mattingly Report Figure 104]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
474	Ranked marginal distributions of each district in the ensemble from the most to least Republican district [Mattingly Report Figure 105]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
475	Convergence Statistics for cluster-level ensemble of maps for N.C. Senate [Mattingly Report Table 10]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
476	Convergence Statistics for cluster-level ensemble of maps for N.C. House [Mattingly Report Table 11]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)

**Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Intervenor's Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List**  
**Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,**

<b>Exhibit #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Bates Number (if applicable)</b>	<b>Objection</b>
477	Convergence Statistics for cluster-level ensemble of maps that preserve incumbents [Mattingly Report Table 12]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
478	The total number of maps in the ensemble for the North Carolina Senate, along with the total number of unique maps [Mattingly Report Table 13]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
479	The total number of maps in the ensemble for the North Carolina House, along with the total number of unique maps [Mattingly Report Table 14]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
480	Number of samples gathered for the few additional ensembles gathered in order to test for the effects on the ensemble when preserving incumbency [Mattingly Report Table 15]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
481	Number of sub-samples in the North Carolina Senate. [Mattingly Report Table 16]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
482	Number of sub-samples in the North Carolina House. [Mattingly Report Table 17]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
483	Mattingly Report Appendix G - Ranked Marginal Distributions (House)		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
484	Mattingly Report Appendix G - Ranked Marginal Distributions (Senate)		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
485	Mattingly Report - Zoomed-in Ranked Marginal Distributions (House)		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
486	Mattingly Report - Zoomed-in Ranked Marginal Distributions (Senate)		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
487	Rebuttal Report of Jonathan Mattingly		Relevance; Hearsay
488	(Mattingly Rebuttal Report Figure 1)		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
489	Statewide distribution of elected Democrats over the 5 different initial conditions for the 2012 and 2016 Presidential vote counts for the North Carolina House and Senate [Mattingly Rebuttal Report Figure 2]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
490	[Mattingly Rebuttal Report Figure 3]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)

**Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Intervenor's Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List**  
**Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,**

<b>Exhibit #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Bates Number (if applicable)</b>	<b>Objection</b>
491	Number of elections under the enacted plan is as or more extreme than a given percent of the ensemble of plans, favoring either the Republicans or Democrats. [Mattingly Rebuttal Report Table 1]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
492	[Mattingly Rebuttal Report Figure 4]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
493	[Mattingly Rebuttal Report Figure 5]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
494	[Mattingly Rebuttal Report Table 2]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
495	[Mattingly Rebuttal Report Figure 6]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
496	[Mattingly Rebuttal Report Table 3]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
497	[Mattingly Rebuttal Report Table 4]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
498	[Mattingly Rebuttal Report Table 5]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
499	[Mattingly Rebuttal Report Figure 7]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
500	[Mattingly Rebuttal Report Figure 8]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
501	[Mattingly Rebuttal Report Table 6]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
502	[Mattingly Rebuttal Report Table 7]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
503	[Mattingly Rebuttal Report Table 8]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)



**Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Interveners' Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List**  
**Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,**

<b>Exhibit #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Bates Number (if applicable)</b>	<b>Objection</b>
504	[Mattingly Rebuttal Report Table 9]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
505	[Mattingly Rebuttal Report Figure 9]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
506	[Mattingly Rebuttal Report Figure 10]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
507	[Mattingly Rebuttal Report Table 10]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
508	Expert Report of Wesley Pegden		Relevance; Hearsay
509	Wesley Pegden, Ph.D.- Curriculum Vitae (Exhibit A to Pegden Report)		Relevance; Hearsay
510	Article - Chikina, Maria et al. "Assessing significance in a Markov chain without mixing" (Exhibit B to Pegden Report)		Relevance; Hearsay
511	Chikina, Maria et al., "Practical Tests for Significance in Markov Chains" (Exhibit C to Pegden Report)		Relevance; Hearsay
512	Random changes to a map (VTD) [Pegden Report Map 1]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
513	Random changes to a map (geounit) [Pegden Report Map 2]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
514	Comparison map examples (House) [Pegden Report Map 3]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
515	Whole state with 2016 voting data (House) [Pegden Report Table 1]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
516	Districts redrawn in 2017, with 2016 voting data (House) [Pegden Report Table 2]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
517	Unchanged 2011 districts with 2008 voting data (House) [Pegden Report Table 3]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
518	Comparison map examples (Senate) [Pegden Report Map 4]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)

**Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Interveners' Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List**

Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,

<b>Exhibit #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Bates Number (if applicable)</b>	<b>Objection</b>
519	Whole state with 2016 voting data (Senate) [Pegden Report Table 4]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
520	Districts redrawn in 2017, with 2016 voting data (Senate) [Pegden Report Table 5]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
521	Unchanged 2011 districts with 2008 voting data (Senate) [Pegden Report Table 6]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
522	Alamance County ( House) [Pegden Report Figure 1]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
523	Anson/Union Custer (House) [Pegden Report Figure 2]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
524	Brunswick/New Hanover Cluster (House) [Pegden Report Figure 3]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
525	Buncombe County ( House) [Pegden Report Figure 4]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
526	Pender/Columbus/Robeson Cluster (House) [Pegden Report Figure 5]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
527	Guilford Cluster (House) [Pegden Report Figure 6]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
528	Duplin/Onslow Cluster (House) [Pegden Report Figure 7]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
529	Cumberland County (House) [Pegden Report Figure 8]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
530	Forsyth/Yadkin Cluster (House) [Pegden Report Figure 9]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
531	Mecklenburg (House) [Pegden Report Figure 10]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
532	Lenoir/Pitt (House) [Pegden Report Figure 11]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)

**Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Intervenor's Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List**  
**Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,**

<b>Exhibit #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Bates Number (if applicable)</b>	<b>Objection</b>
533	Wake (House) [Pegden Report Figure 12]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
534	Gaston/Cleveland Cluster (House) [Pegden Report Figure 13]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
535	Richmond/Montgomery/Stanly-Cabarrus-Rowan/ Davie Cluster (House) [Pegden Report Figure 14]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
536	Person/Granville/Vance/Warren Cluster (House) [Pegden Report Figure 15]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
537	Franklin/Nash Cluster (House) [Pegden Report Figure 16]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
538	Davie/Forsyth (Senate) [Pegden Report Figure 17]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
539	Franklin/Wake (Senate) [Pegden Report Figure 18]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
540	Mecklenburg (Senate) [Pegden Report Figure 19]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
541	Transylvania-Henderson-Buncombe (Senate) [Pegden Report Figure 20]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
542	Lee/Sampson/Harnett/Duplin/Johnston/Nash (Senate) [Pegden Report Figure 21]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
543	Randolph/Guilford/Alamance (Senate) [Pegden Report Figure 22]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
544	Bladen/Pender/Brunswick/New Hanover (Senate) [Pegden Report Figure 23]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
545	Robustness to the choice of compactness metric Results for House [Pegden Report Table 7]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
546	Robustness to the choice of compactness metric Example maps for perimeter constraint (House) [Pegden Report Map 5]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)

**Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Intervenor's Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List**

Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,

<b>Exhibit #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Bates Number (if applicable)</b>	<b>Objection</b>
547	Robustness to the choice of compactness metric Results for Senate [Pegden Report Table 8]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
548	Robustness to the choice of compactness metric Example maps for perimeter constraint (Senate) [Pegden Report Map 6]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
549	Robustness to election / partisan metric Results for House [Pegden Report Table 9]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
550	Robustness to election / partisan metric Results for Senate [Pegden Report Table 10]		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
551	Rebuttal Report of Wesley Pegden		Relevance; Hearsay; Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Subject of Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
552	Pegden Rebuttal Report Figure 1.1		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
553	Pegden Rebuttal Report Figure 1.2		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
554	Pegden Rebuttal Report Figure 1.3		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
555	Pegden Rebuttal Report Figure 1.4		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
556	Pegden Rebuttal Report Figure 1.5		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
557	Pegden Rebuttal Report Figure 1.6		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
558	Pegden Rebuttal Report Figure 1.7		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections)
559	Rebuttal Report of Lisa Handley		Relevance; Hearsay
560	Lisa Handley- Curriculum Vitae		Relevance; Hearsay
561	Elections with African American Candidates that Dr. Lewis Used or Chose Not to Use in His Analysis [Handley Rebuttal Report Table 1]		None

**Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Intervenor's Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List**  
**Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,**

Exhibit #	Description	Bates Number (if applicable)	Objection
562	NC House J-25 -Plan properties screenshot		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.); Misleading and Prejudicial (screenshot is not a screenshot of Dr. Hofeller's computer, but of a third party's)
563	NC House Master July 18 1200 -Plan properties screenshot		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.); Misleading and Prejudicial (screenshot is not a screenshot of Dr. Hofeller's computer, but of a third party's)
564	NC House w New Raleigh - June 28 ~ Plan properties screenshot		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.); Misleading and Prejudicial (screenshot is not a screenshot of Dr. Hofeller's computer, but of a third party's)
565	NC Senate J-24 - Plan properties screenshot		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.); Misleading and Prejudicial (screenshot is not a screenshot of Dr. Hofeller's computer, but of a third party's)
566	NC Senate Master July 11 0115 Plan properties screenshot		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.); Misleading and Prejudicial (screenshot is not a screenshot of Dr. Hofeller's computer, but of a third party's)
567	Plan properties screenshot from NC House A-1 from 20170811		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.); Misleading and Prejudicial (screenshot is not a screenshot of Dr. Hofeller's computer, but of a third party's)
568	Plan properties screenshot from NC House J-3 from 20170814		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.); Misleading and Prejudicial (screenshot is not a screenshot of Dr. Hofeller's computer, but of a third party's)

**Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Intervenor's Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List**  
**Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,**

<b>Exhibit #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Bates Number (if applicable)</b>	<b>Objection</b>
569	Plan properties screenshot from NC House J-25 from 20170628		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.); Misleading and Prejudicial (screenshot is not a screenshot of Dr. Hofeller's computer, but of a third party's)
570	Plan properties screenshot from NC House J-25 from 20170814		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.); Misleading and Prejudicial (screenshot is not a screenshot of Dr. Hofeller's computer, but of a third party's)
571	Plan properties screenshot from NC Senate J-23 from 20170813		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.); Misleading and Prejudicial (screenshot is not a screenshot of Dr. Hofeller's computer, but of a third party's)
572	Plan properties screenshot from NC Senate J-24 from 20170624		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.); Misleading and Prejudicial (screenshot is not a screenshot of Dr. Hofeller's computer, but of a third party's)
573	Plan properties screenshot from NC Senate J-24 from 20170712		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.); Misleading and Prejudicial (screenshot is not a screenshot of Dr. Hofeller's computer, but of a third party's)
574	Dickson, et al v. Rucho - Defendants - Appellees' Brief		Relevance; Hearsay; Rule of Completeness
575	Dickson, et al v. Rucho - Defendants - Appellees' Brief on Remand		Relevance; Hearsay; Rule of Completeness
576	Fain, Travis. "Did House leader see new district 'long time before we did'?" WRAL.com, September 27, 2017.		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay
577	Blake Esselstyn- Curriculum Vitae		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay; Document Untimely Disclosed
578	Jon Matthews- Curriculum Vitae		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay; Document Untimely Disclosed
579	Legislative Defendants' & State of North Carolina Responses to Plaintiffs' First Set of Interrogatories, dated January 4, 2019		Relevance; Rule of Completeness
580	State Defendants' Responses to Plaintiffs' First Set of Interrogatories, dated January 7, 2019		Relevance; Rule of Completeness

**Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Intervenor's Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List**

Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,

<b>Exhibit #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Bates Number (if applicable)</b>	<b>Objection</b>
581	Legislative Defendants' Objections and Responses to Plaintiffs' Second Set of Interrogatories, dated February 15, 2019		Relevance; Rule of Completeness
582	Legislative Defendants' Objections and Responses to Plaintiffs' Third Set of Interrogatories, dated February 15, 2019		Relevance; Rule of Completeness
583	Defendant-Intervenor's Responses to Plaintiffs' First Set of Interrogatories and Request for Production of Documents to Individual Defendant-intervenors, dated April 3, 2019		Relevance; Rule of Completeness
584	Legislative Defendants' Second Supplemental Objections and Responses to Plaintiffs' First Set of Interrogatories, dated April 3, 2019		Relevance; Rule of Completeness
585	Defendant-Intervenor's Responses to Plaintiffs' Second Set of Interrogatories and Request for Production of Documents to Individual Defendant-Intervenors, dated April 11, 2019		Relevance; Rule of Completeness
586	Legislative Defendants' Supplemental Objections and Responses to Plaintiffs' Fourth Set of Interrogatories and Requests for Production, dated, April 30, 2019		Relevance; Rule of Completeness
587	Legislative Defendants' Objections and Responses to Plaintiffs' First Request for admission, dated February 15, 2019		Relevance; Rule of Completeness
588	2017 House and Senate Plans Criteria	LDNC001883	None
589	Map of 2017 House Redistricting Plan		None
590	August 28, 2017 House Floor Session		None
591	Stat Pack for 2017 House Plan		None
592	Additional Statistics on 2017 House Redistricting Plans		None
593	August 28, 2017 Senate Floor Session		None
594	Map of 2017 Senate Redistricting Plan		None
595	August 29 2017 Senate Redistricting Committee Meeting		None
596	August 29 2017 House Select Committee on Redistricting		None
597	Stat Pack for 2017 Senate Redistricting Plan		None
598	August 30 2017 Senate Floor Session		None
599	Additional Statistics on 2017 Senate Redistricting Plans		None
600	August 30 2017 House Floor Session		None
601	July 26 2017 Joint Redistricting Committee Meeting		None
602	August 4 2017 Joint Redistricting Committee Meeting		None
603	August 10 2017 Joint Redistricting Committee Meeting		None
604	August 25 2017 Senate Floor Session		None
605	August 25 2017 House Select Committee on Redistricting Meeting		None
606	August 24 2017 Senate Redistricting Committee Meeting		None
607	Raleigh Public Hearing Transcript		None
608	Beaufort Public Hearing Transcript		None
609	Charlotte Public Hearing Transcript		None
610	Fayetteville Public Hearing Transcript		None
611	Hudson Public Hearing Transcript		None

**Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Interveners' Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List**  
**Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,**

<b>Exhibit #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Bates Number (if applicable)</b>	<b>Objection</b>
612	Jamestown Public Hearing Transcript		None
613	Weldon Public Hearing Transcript		None
614	Rep Pittman Amendment		None
615	Rep Jackson Amendment - Redistricting Committee		None
616	Rep Lewis Amendment		None
617	Rep Speciale Amendment		None
618	Sen Blue Amendment - Redistricting Committee		None
619	Sen Blue Amendment - Senate Floor		None
620	Sen Blue Amendment - Senate Floor Failed		None
621	Sen Robinson Amendment - Withdrawn		None
622	Sen Jeff Jackson Amendment		None
623	Sen Robinson Amendment - Failed		None
624	Sen Clark Amendment - Senate Floor		None
625	Sen Clark Amendment - Redistricting Committee		None
626	Rep Hunter Amendment		None
627	House Bill 927 - Public Law		None
628	Senate Bill 691 - Public Law		None
629	Legislative Defendants Filing in Covington Attaching Legislative Record		None
630	Public Policy Polling-2018		Authenticity; Improper Expert and/or Lay Opinion; Relevance; Hearsay
631	Senate Bill 285		Relevance; Hearsay
632	House Bill 824		Relevance; Hearsay
633	Senate Bill 25		Relevance; Hearsay
634	House Bill 252		Relevance; Hearsay
635	H927 Bill History		None
636	House vote (third reading) for House plan		None
637	House vote (third reading) for Senate plan		None
638	s691 Bill History		None
639	Senate vote (third reading) for House plan		None
640	Senate vote (third reading) for Senate plan		None
641	Contract dated June 27, 2017	LDNC001879-	Relevance
642	Invoice dated September 1, 2017	LDNC001880	Relevance; Hearsay
643	Email from D. Lewis dated August 11, 2017	LDNC001881	Relevance; Hearsay
644	Common Cause Summary Stats	LDNC001882	Authenticity; relevance; hearsay
645	2018 Campaign Finance Breakdown	CC-00001	Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay
		NCDP 0039343	Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay
646	State Senate District Snapshots		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay; Lack of Foundation as to DPI Statistics
647	State House District Snapshots		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay; Lack of Foundation as to DPI Statistics
648	Letter to NC DOJ, dated May 3, 2019		None



**Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Intervenor's Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List**  
**Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,**

<b>Exhibit #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Bates Number (if applicable)</b>	<b>Objection</b>
649	T. Hofeller Media Received from Arnold & Porter Kaye Scholer LLP		None
650	Letter to Setec Investigations dated May 3, 2019		None
651	T. Hofeller Media Received from Arnold & Porter Kaye Scholer LLP		None
652	Letter to Virtacore Systems, dated May 3, 2019		None
653	T. Hofeller Media Received from Arnold & Porter Kaye Scholer LLP		None
654	Declaration of Staci Goede on Behalf of the Republican State Leadership ...		Authenticity; Relevance; Lack of Foundation; Hearsay
655	Declaration of Staci Goede on Behalf of the State Government Leadership ...		Authenticity; Relevance; Lack of Foundation; Hearsay
656	Republican State Leadership Overview	RSLC00001019-21	Authenticity; Relevance; Lack of Foundation; Hearsay
657	Redistricting 2010, Preparing for Success, RSLC June 7, 2009 PowerPoint slides		Authenticity; Relevance; Lack of Foundation; Hearsay
658	RSLC Announces Redistricting Majority Project (REDMAP) - Press release		Authenticity; Relevance; Lack of Foundation; Hearsay
659	Redistricting Majority Project PowerPoint slides		Authenticity; Relevance; Lack of Foundation; Hearsay
660	REDMAP Political Report July 2010		Authenticity; Relevance; Lack of Foundation; Hearsay
661	REDMAP Political Report July 2010		Authenticity; Relevance; Lack of Foundation; Hearsay
662	E-mail to Tom Hofeller from Lindsay Fisher 05-23-08 Dear Legislative Leaders letter		Authenticity; Relevance; Lack of Foundation; Hearsay
663	Dear Legislative Leaders letter from Chris Jankowski		Authenticity; Relevance; Lack of Foundation; Hearsay
664	Final REDMAP Report		Authenticity; Relevance; Lack of Foundation; Hearsay
665	REDMAP 2012 Summary Report		Authenticity; Relevance; Lack of Foundation; Hearsay
666	REDMAP Political Report Final Report		Authenticity; Relevance; Lack of Foundation; Hearsay
667	2012 RSLC Year in Review		Authenticity; Relevance; Lack of Foundation; Hearsay
668	2012 Cycle Redistricting Budget		Authenticity; Relevance; Lack of Foundation; Hearsay
669	2030 - What I've Learned about Redistricting The Hard Way! January 24, 2011 PowerPoint slides		Authenticity; Relevance; Lack of Foundation; Hearsay
670	E-mail re TBH Travel to Raleigh May 21, 2012		Relevance; Hearsay
671	2011 Geographic Strategies invoices to Ogletree Deakins		Relevance; Hearsay

**Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Interveners' Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List**  
**Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,**

<b>Exhibit #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Bates Number (if applicable)</b>	<b>Objection</b>
672	E-mail to Matt Walter from Chris Jankowski 2012-02-24 re Req for Payment and inv for Geographic Strategies		Authenticity; Relevance; Lack of Foundation; Hearsay
673	Letter from Robin Hayes, RSLC		Authenticity; Relevance; Lack of Foundation; Hearsay
674	Printout of Facebook Post, dated April 16, 2019 [Exhibit 2 to R. Reid Deposition]		Hearsay; Relevance; Content subject to pending motion in limine
675	Printout of Facebook Post, dated April 10, 2019 [Exhibit 3 to R. Reid Deposition]		Hearsay; Relevance; Content subject to pending motion in limine
676	Subpoena - Stephanie Hofeller [Exhibit 1 to S. Hofeller Deposition]		None
677	Photographs of T. Hofeller Media Received from Arnold & Porter Kay Scholer LLP [Exhibit 2 to S. Hofeller Deposition]		None
678	Aaron Matthew Wolff Affidavit		None
679	Alyce Machak Affidavit		None
680	Amy Oseroff Affidavit		None
681	Ann McCracken Affidavit		None
682	Carlton Campbell Affidavit		None
683	David Dwight Brown Affidavit		None
684	Deborah Anderson Smith Affidavit		None
685	Derrick Miller Affidavit		Hearsay; Relevance
686	Donald Rumph Affidavit		None
687	Dwight Jordan Affidavit		None
688	Electa Person Affidavit		None
689	George David Gauck Affidavit		None
690	Howard Du Bose Affidavit		None
691	James Nesbit Affidavit		None
692	Joseph Thomas Gates Affidavit		None
693	John Balla Affidavit		None
694	John Mark Turner Affidavit		None
695	Joshua Brown Affidavit		Hearsay; Relevance
696	Julie Frey Affidavit		None
697	Karen Sue Holbrook Affidavit		None
698	Kathleen Barnes Affidavit		None
699	Kristin Parker Affidavit		None
700	Leon Schaller Affidavit		Hearsay; Relevance
701	Lesley Wischmann Affidavit		None
702	Mark Peters Affidavit		None
703	Nancy Bradley Affidavit		None
704	Nicole Quick Affidavit		Hearsay; Relevance

Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Intervenors' Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List  
Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,

Exhibit #	Description	Bates Number (if applicable)	Objection
705	Pamela Morton Affidavit		None
706	Paula Chapman Affidavit		None
707	Rebecca Harper Affidavit		None
708	Rebecca Johnson Affidavit		Hearsay; Relevance
709	Rosalyn Sloan Affidavit		None
710	Stephen Douglas McGrigor Affidavit		None
711	Tom Dunn Affidavit		None
712	Vinod Thomas Affidavit		None
713	Virginia Brien Affidavit		None
714	William Service		None
715	Jowei Chen Trial Subpoena		None
716	Christopher Cooper Trial Subpoena		None
717	Lisa Handley Trial Subpoena		None
718	Jonathan Mattingly Trial Subpoena		None
719	Wesley Pegden Trial Subpoena		None
720	NC General Assembly - 2011 Redistricting Database - Field Layout		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay; Document Untimely Disclosed
721	Analysis of selected Democratic primary election contests and areas [Lewis Table 2]		Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay
722	Analysis of selected general election contests and areas [Lewis Table 3]		Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay
723	Analysis of a hypothetical 2016 general election contest in various areas [Lewis Table 4]		Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay
724	C:\Seagate Dashboard 2.0\TOSHIBA-PC\toshiba\Backup\7bc3748- d314-4cc2-a86b- ea77894bb5b2\20170705_130329_toshibalnc2731\CIMPRwork\NC Plans\NC Senate J-24 Backups\NC Senate J-24003 bak.zip		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
725	C:\Seagate Dashboard 2.0\TOSHIBA-PC\toshiba\Backup\7bc3748- d314-4cc2-a86b- ea77894bb5b2\20170807_211230_toshibalnc3011\CIMPRwork\NC Plans\NC House J-25 Backups\NC House J-25003 bak.zip		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)

**Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Intervenor's Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List**  
**Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,**

<b>Exhibit #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Bates Number (if applicable)</b>	<b>Objection</b>
726	C:\Seagate Dashboard 2.0\TOSHIBA-PC\toshiba\Backup\7bc3748-d314-4cc2-a86b- ea77894bb5b2\20150328_151333_toshiba\C\MPRwork\NCPlans\NC Senate Master July 11 0115 Backups\NC Senate Master July 11 0115001.bak.zip		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
727	C:\Seagate Dashboard 2.0\TOSHIBA-PC\toshiba\Backup\7bc3748- d314-4cc2-a86b- ea77894bb5b2\20150328_151333_toshiba\C\MPRwork\NCPlans\NC House Master July 18 1200 Backups\NC House Master July 18 1200001.bak.zip		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
728	C:\Seagate Dashboard 2.0\TOSHIBA-PC\toshiba\Backup\7bc3748- d314-4cc2-a86b- ea77894bb5b2\20150328_151333_toshiba\C\MPRwork\NCPlans\NC House w New Raleigh - June 28 Backups\NC House w New Raleigh - June 28005.bak.zip		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
729	C:\Seagate Dashboard 2.0\TOSHIBA-PC\toshiba\Backup\7bc3748- d314-4cc2-a86b- ea77894bb5b2\20170628_120524_toshiba\nc2724\C\MPRwork\NC Plans\NC House J-25 Backups\NC House J-25003.bak.zip		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
730	C:\Seagate Dashboard 2.0\TOSHIBA-PC\toshiba\Backup\7bc3748- d314-4cc2-a86b- ea77894bb5b2\20170624_093938_toshiba\nc2590\C\MPRwork\NC Plans\NC Senate J-24 Backups\NC Senate J-24001.bak.zip		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
731	C:\Seagate Dashboard 2.0\TOSHIBA-PC\toshiba\Backup\7bc3748- d314-4cc2-a86b- ea77894bb5b2\20170814_071931_toshiba\nc3051\C\MPRwork\NC Plans\NC House J-25 Backups\NC House J-25003.bak.zip		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
732	C:\Seagate Dashboard 2.0\TOSHIBA-PC\toshiba\Backup\7bc3748- d314-4cc2-a86b- ea77894bb5b2\20170813_172720_toshiba\nc3047\C\MPRwork\NC Plans\NC Senate J-23 Backups\NC Senate J-23005.bak.zip		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)

**Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Intervenor's Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List**

Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,

Exhibit #	Description	Bates Number (if applicable)	Objection
733	C:\Seagate Dashboard 2.0\TOSHIBA-PC\toshiba\Backup\7bc3748-d314-4cc2-a86b- ea77894bb5b2\20170811_083948_toshiba\nc3039\nc\IMPRwork\nc Plans\nc House A-1 Backups\nc House A-1001.bak.zip		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
734	C:\Seagate Dashboard 2.0\TOSHIBA-PC\toshiba\Backup\7bc3748-d314-4cc2-a86b- ea77894bb5b2\20170814_203114_toshiba\nc3065\nc\IMPRwork\nc Plans\nc House J-3 Backups\nc House J-3003.bak.zip		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
735	C:\Seagate Dashboard 2.0\TOSHIBA-PC\toshiba\Backup\7bc3748-d314-4cc2-a86b- ea77894bb5b2\20170624_093938_toshiba\nc2590\nc\IMPRwork\nc Plans\nc Senate J-24 Backups\nc Senate J-24001.bak.zip		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
736	C:\Seagate Dashboard 2.0\TOSHIBA-PC\toshiba\Backup\7bc3748-d314-4cc2-a86b- ea77894bb5b2\20170712_151351_toshiba\nc2792\nc\IMPRwork\nc Plans\nc Senate J-24 Backups\nc Senate J-24005.bak.zip		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.)
737	C:\Seagate Dashboard 2.0\TOSHIBA-PC\toshiba\Backup\7bc3748-d314-4cc2-a86b- ea77894bb5b2\20161025_151544_toshiba\nc1350\nc\Users\toshiba\Documents\Tom\2017 Redistricting\FORMULA FOR POLITICAL ANALYSIS OF LEGISLATIVE DISTRICTS.docx		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.); Document Insufficiently Identified
738	C:\Seagate Dashboard 2.0\TOSHIBA-PC\toshiba\Backup\7bc3748-d314-4cc2-a86b- ea77894bb5b2\20170607_152743_toshiba\nc2347\nc\Users\toshiba\Documents\Tom\nc 2017 Redistricting\nc House Plan June 7.xls		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.); Document Insufficiently Identified
739	C:\Seagate Dashboard 2.0\TOSHIBA-PC\toshiba\Backup\7bc3748-d314-4cc2-a86b- ea77894bb5b2\20161201_112948_toshiba\nc1350\nc\Users\toshiba\Documents\Tom\2017 Redistricting\House Minimum-Partisan- Members D.xlsx		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.); Document Insufficiently Identified

**Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Intervenor's Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List**  
**Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,**

<b>Exhibit #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Bates Number (if applicable)</b>	<b>Objection</b>
740	C:\Seagate Dashboard 2.0\TOSHIBA-PC\toshibalBackup\7bc3748-d314-4cc2-a86b- ea77894bb5b2\20161201_112948_toshibalnc1350\C\Users\toshibal Documents\Tom\2017 Redistricting\House Minimum-Partisan- Members.xlsx		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.); Document Insufficiently Identified
741	C:\Seagate Dashboard 2.0\TOSHIBA-PC\toshibalBackup\7bc3748- d314-4cc2-a86b- ea77894bb5b2\20170612_230105_toshibalnc2436\C\Users\toshibal Documents\Tom\2017 Redistricting\House Minimum-Partisan- Members D.xlsx		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.); Document Insufficiently Identified
742	C:\Seagate Dashboard 2.0\TOSHIBA-PC\toshibalBackup\7bc3748- d314-4cc2-a86b- ea77894bb5b2\20170613_171944_toshibalnc2453\C\Users\toshibal Documents\Tom\2017 Redistricting\NC Senate Minimum- Partisan J-2.xlsx		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.); Document Insufficiently Identified
743	C:\Seagate Dashboard 2.0\TOSHIBA-PC\toshibalBackup\7bc3748- d314-4cc2-a86b- ea77894bb5b2\20170615_103911_toshibalnc2461\C\Users\toshibal Documents\Tom\2017 Redistricting\House Minimum-Partisan- Members J-2.xlsx		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.); Document Insufficiently Identified
744	C:\Seagate Dashboard 2.0\TOSHIBA-PC\toshibalBackup\7bc3748- d314-4cc2-a86b- ea77894bb5b2\20170618_062153_toshibalnc2502\C\Users\toshibal Documents\Tom\2017 Redistricting\House Minimum-Partisan- Members J-2.xlsx		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.); Document Insufficiently Identified
745	C:\Seagate Dashboard 2.0\TOSHIBA-PC\toshibalBackup\7bc3748- d314-4cc2-a86b- ea77894bb5b2\20170613_104847_toshibalnc2443\C\Users\toshibal Documents\Tom\2017 Redistricting\Senate Minimum-Partisan- Members J-2.xlsx		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.); Document Insufficiently Identified
746	C:\Seagate Dashboard 2.0\TOSHIBA-PC\toshibalBackup\7bc3748- d314-4cc2-a86b- ea77894bb5b2\20170613_103309_toshibalnc2442\C\Users\toshibal Documents\Tom\2017 Redistricting\Senate Minimum-Partisan- Members.xlsx		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.); Document Insufficiently Identified

**Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Intervenor's Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List**

Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,

Exhibit #	Description	Bates Number (if applicable)	Objection
747	C:\Seagate Dashboard 2.0\TOSHIBA-PC\toshiba\Backup\7bc3748-d314-4cc2-a86b- ea77894bb5b2\20170615_103911_toshiba\Inc2461\C\Users\toshiba\Documents\Tom\NC 2017 Redistricting\Senate Minimum-Partisan-Members J-2.xlsx		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.); Document Insufficiently Identified
748	C:\Seagate Dashboard 2.0\TOSHIBA-PC\toshiba\Backup\7bc3748-d314-4cc2-a86b- ea77894bb5b2\20170624_121146_toshiba\Inc2595\C\Users\toshiba\Documents\Tom\NC 2017 Redistricting\PP\Indicator Votes for New 2017 Legislative Districts.xlsx		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.); Document Insufficiently Identified
749	C:\Seagate Dashboard 2.0\TOSHIBA-PC\toshiba\Backup\7bc3748-d314-4cc2-a86b- ea77894bb5b2\20161201_112948_toshiba\Inc1350\C\Users\toshiba\Documents\Tom\2017 Redistricting\House Minimum Renumbered.xls		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.); Document Insufficiently Identified
750	C:\Seagate Dashboard 2.0\TOSHIBA-PC\toshiba\Backup\7bc3748-d314-4cc2-a86b- ea77894bb5b2\20170531_084929_toshiba\Inc2210\C\Users\toshiba\Documents\Tom\NC 2017 Redistricting\House Minimum-Partisan-Members D.xlsx		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.); Document Insufficiently Identified
751	C:\Seagate Dashboard 2.0\TOSHIBA-PC\toshiba\Backup\7bc3748-d314-4cc2-a86b- ea77894bb5b2\20170608_095810_toshiba\Inc2357\C\Users\toshiba\Documents\Tom\NC 2017 Redistricting\House Minimum-Partisan-Members D.xlsx		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.); Document Insufficiently Identified
752	C:\Seagate Dashboard 2.0\TOSHIBA-PC\toshiba\Backup\7bc3748-d314-4cc2-a86b- ea77894bb5b2\20170612_230105_toshiba\Inc2436\C\Users\toshiba\Documents\Tom\NC 2017 Redistricting\House Minimum-Partisan-Members.xlsx		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.); Document Insufficiently Identified
753	C:\Seagate Dashboard 2.0\TOSHIBA-PC\toshiba\Backup\7bc3748-d314-4cc2-a86b- ea77894bb5b2\20161201_112948_toshiba\Inc1350\C\Users\toshiba\Documents\Tom\2017 Redistricting\Johnston Senate Switch.xlsx		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.); Document Insufficiently Identified

**Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Intervenor's Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List**  
**Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,**

<b>Exhibit #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Bates Number (if applicable)</b>	<b>Objection</b>
754	C:\Seagate Dashboard 2.0\TOSHIBA-PC\toshiba\Backup\7bc3748-d314-4cc2-a86b- ea77894bb5b2\20170708_130532_toshiba\nc2751\C:\Users\toshiba\Documents\Tom\nc 2017 Redistricting\nc Senate CCNC Sample Plan - June 2017.xls		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.); Document Insufficiently Identified
755	C:\Seagate Dashboard 2.0\TOSHIBA-PC\toshiba\Backup\7bc3748-d314-4cc2-a86b- ea77894bb5b2\20170708_200016_toshiba\nc2756\C:\Users\toshiba\Documents\Tom\nc 2017 Redistricting\nc Senate CCNC PPI.xlsx		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.); Document Insufficiently Identified
756	C:\Seagate Dashboard 2.0\TOSHIBA-PC\toshiba\Backup\7bc3748-d314-4cc2-a86b- ea77894bb5b2\20170705_130329_toshiba\nc2731\C:\Users\toshiba\Documents\Tom\nc 2017 Redistricting\nc House CCNC Sample Plan - June 2017.xls		Authenticity; Lack of Foundation; Relevance; Hearsay; Content Subject To Pending Motion in Limine (re: improperly obtained Hofeller files, et al.); Document Insufficiently Identified
757	Email from Woodrow to Myers, dated June 29, 2017	LDNC 014005	Relevance; Hearsay
758	Email from Inman to Boughton, dated August 22, 2019	LDNC 014109	Relevance; Hearsay
759	Email from Hofeller to Long, dated February 10, 2011 (produced in Dickson)	PS_00010258	Relevance; Attorney-client Privilege
760	Email from Farr to Hofeller, dated March 10, 2011 (produced in Dickson)	PS_00010278	Relevance; Attorney-client Privilege
761	Email from Hofeller to Rucho & Farr, dated May 27, 2011 (produced in Dickson)	PS_00010318	Relevance; Attorney-client Privilege
762	Email from Farr to Hofeller, dated May 27, 2011 (produced in Dickson)	PS_00010320	Relevance; Attorney-client Privilege
763	Email from Raupe to Hofeller, dated June 13, 2011 (produced in Dickson)	PS_00010322	Relevance; Attorney-client Privilege
764	2011 House Partisan Scoring Spreadsheet (produced in Dickson)	PS_00010323	Relevance; Attorney-client Privilege
765	Email from Kay to Farr, dated June 30, 2011 (produced in Dickson)	PS_00010434	Relevance; Attorney-client Privilege
766	Email from Woodcox to Farr, dated June 30, 2011 (produced in Dickson)	PS_00010435	Relevance; Attorney-client Privilege
767	Email from Woodcox to Blaine, DATED June 30, 2011 (produced in Dickson)	PS_00010436	Relevance; Attorney-client Privilege
768	Remaining Redistricting Preparation Tasks , dated February 2, 2011 (produced in Dickson)	PS_00010833	Relevance; Attorney-client Privilege
769	2011 Redistricting Database Construction Status and Recommendations , January 14, 2011 (produced in Dickson)	PS_00010956	Relevance; Attorney-client Privilege



**Legislative Defendants and Defendant-Intervenor's Objections to Plaintiffs' Exhibit List**  
**Common Cause, et al. v. David Lewis, et al.,**

<b>Exhibit #</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Bates Number (if applicable)</b>	<b>Objection</b>
770	Declaration of Jon G. Matthews		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay; Lack of Foundation; Document Untimely Disclosed; Improper and Undisclosed Expert Testimony
771	Files Reviewed and Relied Upon by the Plaintiffs' Experts		Relevance; Hearsay; Document Untimely Disclosed
772	Mattingly Swing Animations		Authenticity; Relevance; Hearsay (upon testimony by expert as to exhibit, Defendants might withdraw these objections); Document Untimely Disclosed