(Transcriptionist's note: the following transcript is of proceedings held at the satellite hearing site following disconnection of the communications feed from the central Raleigh site.)

REP. SZOKA: Ladies and gentlemen,
because some of the other sites are having
difficulty with their audio and their video, a
decision has been made to disconnect all the remote sites. And we're going to continue this public hearing here today just within the site where we are right now.

So we have been recording everything that we've been doing so far. Everything that has been said here and everything that will be said here will become a part of the permanent record, will be transcribed by a court reporter when the tape of this, which -- as I said, it's been recorded from the beginning until now and will be through the end, is sent out to Raleigh. So any questions about that? Yes. Yes, ma'am?

FEMALE SPEAKER: So is this over with now?

SEN. JACKSON: No, ma'am

REP. SZOKA: Well, it's not over right now. No, ma'am. We're going to continue this --
we had a committee that was distributed over the state. Now we're -- we're going to continue with myself and Senator Jackson as the chair here to run the committee for the public hearing right here, right now. And if you were signed up on the list by 6:30, you'll still have your opportunity to be heard. All of your comments will be transcribed by the court reporter and will be entered into the permanent record. So --

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: John, if everyone's still here, we have 15 speakers.

REP. SZOKA: Okay. So let me go through the list here to make sure that you're here. And if you are here, would you just raise your hand? If somebody isn't here -- is out in the parking lot on a smoke break and comes back in -- when they're called, the rules say that they'll be allowed to speak after everybody else is here.

So the next two minutes or so, we'll get Mr. Buxton up, then Linda Devore, Hiram Reynolds, Ray Hudson, James Baker, Harold Mendelson, I'm sorry if I butcher your name, Amariche Hawkins, Lelia Harrington, Maude Gibbs, Susan Mills, Michael Mills, Al McSurely, O'Linda Watkins, Dennis Biddle and Mitch Colvin.
So you'll still have three minutes to speak, and when you come up to the microphone, please identify yourself. And if you choose to say what group you're representing if you're representing something, however you choose to do it, say that for the record. And the Sergeant-at-Arms here will keep time as he's been doing. He flashes up the one-minute warning. When he puts up to stop, that means stop.

So any -- any questions on that? It's really the same thing we're doing -- we've just been doing here. So -- you're ready now?

MR. BUXTON: Yes, sir.

REP. SZOKA: Please identify yourself for the record, and you have three minutes.

MALE SPEAKER: If you feel comfortable about picking that thing up out of the microphone stand, go ahead and talk into it that way. Either way.

MR. BUXTON: I'm Jimmy Buxton, President of the Fayetteville branch of the NAACP, here in Fayetteville, North Carolina. I'm really disappointed to stand here as I did back in 2011 in Raleigh in the same manner that this is the comments about redistricting and actually having
people to tell the representatives at that time that they were drawing racial gerrymandering districts.

I'm also disappointed that when I went to my state representative, who I thought maybe could give me some information on the maps that were drawn this past Friday and Sunday night, they were put out at that time, that he could give me some information on it. At that time, he told me he didn't have any information, mainly because he was not called to sit in on this redistricting, which means that's a sham. If he sits on this redistricting committee and was not allowed to have input for this map drawing, it's a sham.

The three-judge panel has already deemed that these maps that were drawn before 2011 were unconstitutional. After reviewing the redrawn maps, I feel that they are unconstitutional. These maps were drawn to benefit those who are set in their mind to not give Medicaid to thousands of people, to cut education, to take away the power of the duly elected governor.

Gerrymandering is a way of forcing the outcome of the elections in their favor. I hope and I pray that this three-judge panel will hold
every legislator that is responsible for this in contempt and have these maps redrawn again and that can be fair to elect people that -- and will elect -- to elect and to reject those people that are duly running for the election. Thank you.

REP. SZOKA: Thank you, sir. Next is Ms. Linda Devore. Please approach the mic, identify yourself and you'll have three minutes when you start talking. Thank you.

MS. DEVORE: My name is Linda Devore. I'm not here to represent any organization. These are my own remarks. I've lived in Fayetteville for 37 years. And my ideas and my thoughts on not only the 2011 districts, the 2001 districts, the 1991 districts, the 1981 districts and the districts we're looking at today may not reflect any particular group's perspective other than my own.

First of all, I want to thank our members in the legislature for the good work they've done. Because as I look at the new districts, the ones that are proposed here tonight, I realize that for a very long time, we've been -- this -- that these districts go a long ways towards correcting a wrong that's existed in our state for a very long time. You don't have to look back very far. Just go back
to the 2001 districts if you want to.

You know, in -- in the 1970s, the Supreme Court of the United States made what I consider to be a very unfortunate decision. They decided that -- that in spite of -- of the bad rap that gerrymandering deserved and had gotten over the years, that political gerrymandering would be allowed in this country. So as a result of that, in the 1980s, the 1990s, the early 2000s and after the Census of 2010, states across the country, whether they be Republican or Democratic legislatures, have increasingly engaged in gerrymandering for political whim because the Supreme Court said that that was constitutional in this country.

There is a case before the Supreme Court which will be heard this fall, which comes out of Wisconsin. The case is Gill versus Whitford, which may reverse that. And that will be for the benefit of all of us. But what I want to tell you is that the maps we're looking at tonight are by far, on their face, the least gerrymandered districts we've had in the State of North Carolina in the 37 years that I have lived here.

I was one of the first to speak out in
early 2012 and 2013 about the designer districts that were created in 2011. You know, it wasn't just here in North Carolina. Software got to the point by 2011 that either party could design districts to benefit their partisan interests. There were irregular boundaries in our districts, there were land bridges joining largely contiguous areas, split precincts, split communities. And if you look at the line, the line in our county between the Senate 19 and 21 District, the boundary was an embarrassment to fairness. I don't see how anybody could see a different way, no matter which side of the aisle you're on.

We need a reset. And here's the thing; these nine districts that we're looking at tonight, they are a reset. We are looking at compact districts, regular boundaries. They bring together communities of common interest. There are nine municipalities in Cumberland County. Eight of them are -- eight of them are unsplit. The ninth -- the ninth municipality, which is Fayetteville, is too large to be within one district.

Y'all, we're looking at the best job I've seen in Cumberland in the state of North Carolina in the 37 years I've been here. Thank you.
REP. SZOKA: Please finish up. Thank you. All right. Hold your applause, please.

Hiram Reynolds. Hiram Reynolds. Hiram Reynolds. All right. We'll go on. If Mr. Reynolds shows up, he'll be able to finish speaking then. Ray Hudson.

Sir, please identify yourself for the record, and then you have three minutes.

MR. HUDSON: Certainly. Yes, I have -- if you're the gentleman I want to speak to, do you mind if I turn this mic around?


MR. HUDSON: My name is Ray Hudson. I'm from Montgomery County, a rural county. Somebody said you live in the sticks --

REP. SZOKA: Would you -- excuse me, would you get closer to the mic, so that you it gets picked up.

MR. HUDSON: Certainly. My name is Ray Hudson. I live in Montgomery County, it's a rural county, close from-- is this good? Well, someone said, do you live in the sticks? I have to drive five miles to get to the sticks to buy gas. That's how far out I live. And something I was told in that community is you don't use harsh words,
particularly in mixed groups like this when we just
don't know anybody. But to be perfectly blunt, my
parents told me that, my teachers. But frankly,
they never encountered the legislature we've got
now. And I'm going to have to use some blunt
words.

North Carolina used to be known for
intelligent, progressive leadership. We have a
little bounce in our step. We saw somebody from
South Carolina be blunt, we go hmm. Well, folks,
we can't do that anymore. North Carolina is not
that intelligent, progressive leadership anymore.
We're about bathrooms, gerrymandered districts and
voter suppression. And I'm ashamed of it. There's
no excuse for it.

Now, this -- I used to teach. I've done
a number of things and I told those children, you
be proud you're American. And I still tell people
that. That the political system works, it's fair,
you have to keep fighting. That's a lie now. It's
a flat out lie. You have disenfranchised people.

You got a man -- and I'm going to use --
I'm going to say a -- well, scoundrel crook,
whatever to draw those first districts. And then,
lord, you give them the job a second time. That's
like the crook got repelled the first time, so we're going to let him have another crack at breaking into the house. Don't tell me that's fair. It's simply not. And here's what's so bad about that.

You probably figured out I am a staunch Democrat, and I am, and a proud one. But I want two strong, competitive parties that we can respect. Going to be blunt with you. Conservative -- heard that first word when what it meant was, we didn't want the blacks in the schools. It was a code word for a bigot. If I'm insulting somebody, I'm sorry. But y'all can fix that. You can have Eisenhower-type conservatives where we can respect you and disagree with you. You start by coming up with a fair commission to put together the districts. And I thank you for your time and have a good day.

REP. SZOKA: Thank you for your comments, sir. Next up is Mr. James Baker.

MR. BAKER: My name is James Baker from Cumberland County. First of all, thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed redistricting for the North Carolina Senate and House. I have two points I'd like to make.
First, from what I've seen in the preliminary maps, both those presented here today and those presented in other settings and from what I've read about the redistricting plans in various media outlets, the new districts apparently respect the principle of contiguity; all the parts of each district seem to be connected. Along with this, the new districts seem a good bit more compact than some of the ones we presently have.

As a former elections worker myself, I'm encouraged when we don't have a lot of voting precincts that are split by district lines. I'm also encouraged that the new district boundaries, for the most part, don't seem to violate municipal boundaries very often. For the most part, district lines should hopefully allow citizens to vote with the same neighbors they work and shop and play and worship and go to school with. Wherever possible, district lines should respect communities and neighborhoods. And as far as I can tell, most of these do. That's my first point.

My second is this. Elected legislature -- elected legislators have a constitutional role in drawing district lines. We do not have a parliamentary system Statewide
election results have never been expected to
determine the precise percentage of legislative
seats won or lost. To the best of my knowledge, it
has never been constitutionally required of the
executive branch or the judicial branch, or for
that matter the legislative majority that they
should compensate for weak performance at the
ballot box on the part of the current legislative
minority. Now, policy differences exist, but
that’s not the same thing as legality. It’s easy
to call something unethical or immoral or unfair,
but that’s not the same thing as legality, either.

And finally, it’s easy to charge that
something is illegal; but just saying it’s that way
doesn’t make it so. As long as the proposed
districts comply with the one man, one vote
requirement; as long as they contain approximately
equal populations under the 2010 Census; as long as
they comply with the Voting Rights Act; as long as
they follow the law as it’s currently understood;
specifically, yes, to include court precedents and
rulings now in effect; then these maps are legal,
and they deserve our support. Thank you.

REP. SZOKA: Thank you, sir. Next
speaker is Mr. Harold Mendelson. Sir, please
identify yourself for the record, and you have three minutes.

MR. MENDELSON: My name is Harold Mendelson. I am from Moore County, and I appreciate the opportunity to speak tonight. I would like to say that the purpose of the redistricting is based on the ruling of the Fourth District Court of Appeals which stated that they felt the existing maps were racially biased. The redistricting as shown in the new maps did not use race as a determining factor in forming the new districts. It is in compliance with the court's mandate.

Other comments would have the redistricting ignore party affiliation. While this could be a better than -- better than the current methods, it is not the purpose of the redistricting. And this issue has no bearing on requirements of the federal court's requirements at this time.

In 1965, the Voting Rights Act established the rules to determine the -- the rules of establishing voting districts. Up until 2010, the Democrats determined the districts and used party affiliation and population in determining the
districts. When the Republicans came to power in 2008 in spite of the Democrat gerrymandering and maintaining control in 2010, this was the first time that the Republicans had an opportunity to create these maps.

In 2011, the Department of Justice approved these voting maps. And then in 2016, there were number of lawsuits that were instigated against the maps being racially biased. And eventually the -- the Department of Justice joined in on these suits. This brings to light that the real reason behind the lawsuits -- and the reason was to -- and that reason was to reduce the power of Republicans. When the Democrats were in power, why didn't they remove political affiliation from the districts?

The comments here was that an outside company created maps. That's not correct. The outside company supplied the software, and the legislators supplied the limitations or -- or the actual specific areas for that -- redrawing the maps.

All right. Now, these new districts comply with the federal courts; at least, apparently so. It would obviously be up to them to
make the final determination. If the public wants to remove party affiliation from determining districts, then they should ask their representatives to create bills that will do so. If the representatives don’t respond to the voters, then they have absolutely -- that can be resolved in the elections.

REP. SZOKA: Sir, if you could finish up?

MR. MENDELSON: I’m done.

REP. SZOKA: Thank you very much. Our next speaker -- and again, I apologize if I butcher your name -- is Amariche Hawkins. Is -- is there anybody with the last name of Hawkins here? Hawkins, one more time? All right. We’ll hold that to the end as well. Next speaker would be Lelia Harrington or Harrington.

MS. HARRINGTON: Harrington.

REP. SZOKA: Sorry. Again, I apologize.

MS. HARRINGTON: It’s okay. You said Lelia.

REP. SZOKA: Lelia, okay. I was never a good speller. So --

MS. HARRINGTON: Hi --

REP. SZOKA: If you’d approach the mic, identify yourself for the record, please. And you
have three minutes. Thank you.

MS. HARRINGTON: Hi. Hi. My name is Lelia Harrington. I'm a retired veteran. And I'm speaking here on behalf of myself and on the veterans. Now, I had a look at that map. You have 76 districts for the Republicans on that map and 52 for the Democrats. And I'm not even familiar with this map because I haven't had a chance to really study it. I just briefed over it.

Now, my vote should count. Now, you all can get up here and you can -- like the young -- like the man before me and you can talk about oh, this map is great. But you don't know this map is great. This map is crap. I fought 21 years. I served 21 years in the American Armed Forces. Army. For the First Amendment. The Second Amendment. Every damn amendment on the Constitution. How many of you all have served? And here I stand. Every day I have to fight for my rights as a woman that served and you all have not. I have to fight for my right for me to vote.

My son was kicked off voter registration -- who served in the Armed Forces. Why is that? And you going to tell me this is fair? No, it's not fair. It's a piece of crap. I
counted, and I don't even know that much about this map yet. Okay. You are going to win. You fear my vote. But instead of you reaching across the aisle getting to know me, you would rather suppress my voice. You can reach across the aisle and get to know me. Hi, my name is Lelia Harrington. This is who I am. Oh, you don't want to shake my hand? Okay. I -- this is what I'm talking about. This man don't want to shake the hand of a black woman who served in the Armed Forces, but he wants to tell you he's fair. What, is my hand too dark for you? Am I too dark for you? See, you fear my vote because you don't like me. But my vote is going to count. This is crap, and it will be turned down. And this time the courts will do it. Said all I had to say.

REP. SZOKA: Thank you for your comments. And just for the record, three of the four legislators up here are veterans. Next is Maude Gibbs.

MS. HARRINGTON: You served 21 years? I don't think so. And if you couldn't shake my hand you shouldn't be called --

REP. SZOKA: Ma'am your time is up, please. Is Maude Gibbs here?
MS. GIBBS: Yes, I'm here.

REP. SZOKA: Yes, ma'am. Please approach the mic. Identify yourself for the record, and you have three minutes. Thank you.

MS. GIBBS: Yes, sir. Thank you. My name is Maude Gibbs. A lot of the stuff I've seen here today is ridiculous. The disrespect I've seen to one of our legislators. Whether you like him or not, I know he served this country. I know this for a fact. My family -- I have a third of my family are veterans. My ex-husband's a veteran. And let me tell you one thing. Half my family are officers. Army, Air Force and Navy, all three branches. I have several first cousins who are [inaudible].

This is craziness, is what's going on in this country right now. This gerrymandering been going on forever; definitely in the Democrat party. Let's keep it real, missy. So when -- when Republican got a chance to do it, now you want to cry it's not fair. It was fair all the other time. Might as well continue being fair now. Sitting in these churches, telling lies. Knowing you're lying, not telling the truth. You know what's in your heart.
Everybody gets an opportunity to get the upper hand, you going to take advantage of the upper hand. They got the upper hand now, and the only reason they got the upper hand is because the people voted for them. If the citizens walking around didn't want them, they wouldn't be up there. That's just setting; one, two, three. Whether you're black or white, it doesn't matter -- an eye for God. Let's keep it real. Let's call it like it is. What's goose -- what's good for the goose is good -- is good for the gander, my grandmother always used to say. That's what I got to say.

Anybody don't like it -- don't care if you're black or white. I don't look at color. I look at -- I vote according to what you -- what you stand for. What you believe in your hearts. And for HB2, let me tell you one thing. I supported the ex-governor on HB2 because I'm going to stand on my true Christian values. I'm not selling out for 30 pieces of -- of gold -- of silver. Thank you.

REP. SZOKA: Thank you for your comments, ma'am. Next speaker is Susan Mills. Please approach the mic, identify yourself for the record, and you'll have three minutes. Thank you.
MS. MILLS: Thank you. My name is Susan Mills. I am from Cumberland County, and I am a schoolteacher. And I want to thank you all for the pay raise that we got. We really do appreciate it, and it's something that we hadn't seen under the Democrats. So thank you very much.

I'm very pleased the General Assembly has drawn the maps in a color-blind way with no use of racial data. These maps are fair and they're legal. Excuse me, we've all given everybody else courtesy, so if we could please do that, too. These maps are fair and legal. They follow the letter of the law as understood today. The districts are fair and compact. They split fewer precincts. City and town boundaries are respected where possible.

And I would like to say it's great to be able now that I'm going to be able to look out my window and see that my neighbors have the same sign that I have in my yard because across the street, we didn't have that. So now with the districts being redrawn we're going have that. So the towns and cities are all going be more compact and much more in common than other places.

Let's face it: there's no way to please
everybody. However, I really do believe that these
districts are fair to all and comply with the one
man, one vote law. I thank you all for your time.
Thank you for all that you do. And hopefully we'll
keep these districts. Thank you.

REP. SZOKA: Thank you for your comments.
The next speaker is Michael Mills. Sir, please
approach the mic, identify yourself for the record,
and you'll have three minutes to speak.

MR. MILLS: Michael Mills, Cumberland
County. I want to thank you guys for this
opportunity to come and speak. I actually support
the new districts. I also recognize that when the
Democrats were in control, they did the same thing.
So, you know, we -- we can't now all of a sudden
choose sides and direction.

These new districts will not solve the
Democrats' problems. They need a new -- they need
to change their policies. For example, Democrats
lost nine out of the ten presidential elections.
They've lost three straight US Senate elections and
14 out of the last 18 partisan statewide elections.
So clearly, the Republicans have gained
approximately 125,000 state -- elector -- citizens
and the Democrats have lost about that same amount.
So you guys are still running for election the next
go-round, the Democrats need to get candidates and
run against you guys. Thank you.

REP. SZOKA: Thank you for your comments, sir. Next speaker is Al McSurely. Sir, please
approach the microphone, identify yourself for the
record, and you'll have three minutes.

MR. MCSURELY: My name is Al McSurely, 81
years old. Been a lawyer for 29 years. Worked
with the NAACP for every part of my life -- for 60
years, fighting against racism I just want to try
to clarify a few very bad mistakes that some of the
speakers have been made.

There's [inaudible] suits; I think the
two people -- two people that mentioned. One
they're talking about, of course, the voter
suppression suit, that was Fourth Circuit. And
Supreme Court upheld that for just the Fourth
Circuit. That has nothing to do with this hearing
today. The hearing today is about a three-judge
federal court that ruled that these -- the same
maps that are hanging up there are
unconstitutional -- they didn't change them at all.
And this -- this case has been decided nine to
nothing by Neil Gorsuch, by Clarence Thomas and
all -- all nine of the Supreme Court. So there's no appeal to this. People are kind of upset, there's going to be some kind of appeals on this. This case is not appealable. This case has been decided by nine Supreme Court judges.

The three judges that heard it -- and those of you who are here that were up in Greensboro, went up there and saw the three judges. Margaret Eagles, Jim Wynn and Schroeder -- I mean Schroeder who heard the first part of the -- of the big case. And they ruled three to nothing, a narrow three to nothing ruling stood up in the Supreme Court. That was what was adopted. So there's no more appeals. This is it.

So when the all-white Republican caucus that will be in Raleigh gets that case -- last August, the -- 12 months ago and had it for 12 months and decided not to do -- to sit on their hands for 12 months, and now are waiting until last night to tell us how they designed these new maps, they presented what lawyers call a bad faith and what the Old Testament calls unclean hands. So they've come to the court with unclean hands of sitting on something for 12 months, being in contempt both of the federal court here and of the
Supreme Court now by not recognizing any of the law that they have to go by.

So what is obviously going to happen and I -- I hope the reason I get up to talk is that the three-judge court -- this will go back to them next week in September. And they will look at it to see whether these maps meet what the Supreme Court said is the law of the case. There is no other law. And they -- and they will argue that this -- this all-white supermajority caucus that has been running our state for the last six and a half years --

REP. SZOKA: Sir, would you finish up, please?

MR. MCSURELY: -- come to court with unclean hands. And I'm hoping that the judges get a sense of how these bogus hearings were put together. Not talking about how you run this, but I'm just talking about -- general.

REP. SZOKA: Thank you, sir.

MR. MCSURELY: Gentleman, I thank you for your courtesy. Thank you.

REP. SZOKA: Thank you, sir, for your comments. Is O'Linda Watkins here? Yes, ma'am Please identify yourself for the official record,
and you'll have three minutes. Thank you.

MS. WATKINS: Thank you. My name is O'Linda Watkins. I'm President of Moore County NAACP. Our preliminary analysis shows House District 21 continues as it did in the illegal 2011 plans to sprawl into Sampson and Wayne Counties to maximize the black voter population in the district and limit the power of those black voters whose votes would have greater impact in fairly-drawn districts.

The same is true in Senate District 19, which is nearly entirely located in Hoke County itself except for a protrusion that is in the illegal 2011 plans. The biggest addition to the border are reaching into Cumberland County to grab black voters who would otherwise be casting their ballots in Senate District 20. Likewise, Senate District 28 in Guilford County retains -- retains the same irregular shape it did in the illegal 2011 plans and similar packing black voters into it's odd [inaudible] shape.

These maps also grandfather in race discrimination by protecting incumbents who were elected in under the 2011 racially-gerrymandered maps. Instead of protecting those incumbents who
were elected under unconstitutional maps, the proper comparison would be to the -- to the last constitutional maps for General Assembly seeks prior -- and to the 2011 were drawn.

The GOP caucus admits that they considered one, past election outcomes and two, the ability of the Republican Party to win these districts, and that they have drawn these maps for partisan advantages. House District 10 and 36 and Senate District 41, for example, combines different communities and fractured communities of interest and appear to serve only the purpose of creating a Republican advantage in those districts.

We do not trust these maps, which were drawn by the same odd helper who drew the 2011 racially-gerrymandered maps and which were commissioned by an illegal legislature that has failed at every turn to act with integrity. Instead, an independent special master could be tasked with drawing new maps to ensure that it is the law that is followed and not the directions of an illegal legislature that the federal courts have already found guilty and intentionally -- of intentionally acting to suppress the votes of African-Americans, and that numerous federal and
state courts have found guilty of passing legislators that ignores the federal and the state constitution and the will of the people. The -- these games must stop. Thank you.

REP. SZOKA: Thank you for your comments, ma'am. The next speaker is Dennis Biddle or Bidell. Yes, sir. Please approach the microphone, identify yourself for the record, and you'll have three minutes to speak.

MR. BIDDLE: Good evening. My name is Dennis Biddle. I'm a Cumberland County resident. After carefully listening to all these different comments and statements over the last two hours regarding the reconstruction or realignment of the matter at hand -- the reconstruction, realigning of mapping to me personally is nothing more than an underlying attempt to camouflage its efforts to continue the economic control for the few.

It reminds me of the 1835 treaty in which the Supreme Court found it that it was legal to remove a nation of people to a -- a prison in Oklahoma, to take through political process -- and states -- Arkansas, Louisiana, Texas -- from a people. From my ancestors, that -- I'm a -- a -- think it's like a one percent blood of -- my
great-great grandmother was Caddo Indian from Arkansas. And they had to move. But the only expense is to a prison. And other folk came in. It -- this ploy is nothing more than another repeated attempt to control the distribution of the wealth generated by middle America.

I must move personally towards the recommendation that was made by the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King. He spoke about the disproportion of the land and -- and the disproportion of loans given to only certain people in this country to allow them to economically grow financially. He recommended that if those that stand behind these -- these ruthless and deplorable decisions to control and manipulate wealth, that we move to our other agenda. And that other agenda is nothing more than we will mobilize and we will control the support that we make in this American economy. And for those that -- those companies that represent these officials in these offices, they will feel the economic pinch in reference to their behaviors. Thank you.

REP. SZOKA: The last speaker we have is Mitch Colvin. Is he still here? Again, is Mitch Colvin here? According with the rules that were
established, I'll go back and repeat the names of the folks who didn't respond the first time, because we are at the end. Hiram Reynolds? Amariche Hawkins? Or Mitch Colvin? Seeing no one respond, we have gone through the list of everyone who signed up here at Fayetteville for this public hearing.

Before we adjourn the public hearing, I would just like to thank the -- Senator Brent Jackson and my fellow House members, Representative Floyd and Representative Lucas, for being here, as well as all the members who signed up to give -- or all the members of the public, that is, who signed up to give testimony today. We appreciate your comments, whether you submitted them today verbally or in writing. I'd also like to thank our staff, the Sergeant-at-Arms and the local law enforcement folks who supplemented our Sergeant-at-Arms. There being no further testimony, this public hearing in Fayetteville is adjourned.

(End of proceedings.)
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