

Exhibit 4

In The Matter Of:

Evan Milligan,et al v. John H.Merrill, et al.

Chris Pringle

December 17, 2021

US Legal

Evan Milligan, et al v. John H. Merrill, et al.

Chris Pringle
12/17/2021

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	1 A P P E A R A N C E S
2 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ALABAMA	2
3	3 FOR THE MILLIGAN PLAINTIFFS:
4	4 MICHAEL L. TURRILL
5	5 Attorney at Law
6 EVAN MILLIGAN, et al.,)	6 Hogan Lovells US LLP
7) CIVIL CASE NO.	7 1999 Avenue of the Stars, Ste. 1400
8 Plaintiffs,) 2:2021-CV-01530-AMM	8 Los Angeles, California 90067
9 VS.) VIDEO DEPOSITION OF:	9 michael.turrill@hoganlovells.com
10 JOHN MERRILL, et al.,) CHRIS PRINGLE	10
11)	11 KATHRYN SADASIVAN
12 Defendants.)	12 Attorney at Law
13	13 NAACP Legal Defense & Educational Fund
14	14 40 Rector Street, FL 5
15	15 New York, New York 10006
16 S T I P U L A T I O N S	16 ksadasivan@naacpldf.org
17 IT IS STIPULATED AND AGREED, by and between	17
18 the parties through their respective counsel, that	18 DEUEL ROSS (Via Zoom)
19 the deposition of:	19 Attorney at Law
20 CHRIS PRINGLE,	20 NAACP Legal Defense & Educational Fund
21 may be taken before LeAnn Maroney, Notary Public,	21 700 14th Street N.W., Ste. 600
22 State at Large, at the law offices of Balch &	22 Washington, DC 20005
23 Bingham, 105 Tallapoosa Street, Montgomery, Alabama,	23 dross@naacpldf.org
24 36104, on December 17, 2021, commencing at 9:14 a.m.	24
25	25
Page 1	Page 3
1 IT IS FURTHER STIPULATED AND AGREED that the	1 JULIE A. EBENSTEIN
2 signature to and reading of the deposition by the	2 DAVIN M. ROSBOROUGH
3 witness is waived, the deposition to have the same	3 Attorneys at Law
4 force and effect as if full compliance had been had	4 American Civil Liberties Union Foundation
5 with all laws and rules of Court relating to the	5 125 Broad Street
6 taking of depositions.	6 New York, New York 10004
7	7 drosborough@aclu.org
8 IT IS FURTHER STIPULATED AND AGREED that it	8
9 shall not be necessary for any objections to be made	9 KAITLIN WELBORN
10 by counsel to any questions, except as to form or	10 LATISHA GOTELL FAULKS
11 leading questions, and that counsel for the parties	11 Attorneys at Law
12 may make objections and assign grounds at the time	12 American Civil Liberties Union of Alabama
13 of the trial, or at the time said deposition is	13 P.O. Box 6179
14 offered in evidence, or prior thereto.	14 Montgomery, Alabama 36106
15	15 kwelborn@aclualabama.org
16	16
17 ***	17 FOR THE SINGLETON PLAINTIFFS: (Via Zoom)
18	18 JAMES URIAH BLACKSHER
19	19 Attorney at Law
20	20 825 Linwood Road
21	21 Birmingham, Alabama 35222
22	22 jublacksher@gmail.com
23	23
24	24
25	25
Page 2	Page 4

Evan Milligan, et al v. John H. Merrill, et al.

Chris Pringle
12/17/2021

1 FOR THE CASTER PLAINTIFFS: (Via Zoom)	1 I, LeAnn Maroney, a Court Reporter of
2 DAN OSHER	2 Birmingham, Alabama, and a Notary Public for the
3 Attorney at Law	3 State of Alabama at Large, acting as commissioner,
4 Elias Law Group	4 certify that on this date, pursuant to the Federal
5 10 G Street NE, Ste. 600	5 Rules of Civil Procedure and the foregoing
6 Washington, DC 20002	6 stipulation of counsel, there came before me on
7 dosher@elias.law	7 December 17, 2021, CHRIS PRINGLE, witness in the
8	8 above cause, for oral examination, whereupon the
9 FOR DEFENDANT JOHN H. MERRILL:	9 following proceedings were had:
10 JIM DAVIS	10 * * * * *
11 Assistant Attorney General	11 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This marks the
12 Office of the Attorney General	12 beginning of the deposition of Chris Pringle in the
13 501 Washington Avenue	13 matter of Evan Milligan, et al., versus John H.
14 Montgomery, Alabama 36130	14 Merrill, et al., Civil Case Number 2:21-CV-01530-AMM
15 jim.davis@alabamaag.gov	15 filed in the United States District Court for the
16	16 Northern District of Alabama. The date is December
17 FOR THE DEFENDANTS JIM McCLENDON & CHRIS PRINGLE:	17 17, 2021. The time is 9:14 a.m.
18 DORMAN WALKER	18 All attorneys present, will you please
19 Attorney at Law	19 state your names and whom you represent.
20 Balch & Bingham	20 MS. WELBORN: Kaitlin Welborn from the
21 105 Tallapoosa Street, Ste. 200	21 ACLU of Alabama representing the plaintiffs.
22 Montgomery, Alabama 36104	22 MS. FAULKS: LaTisha Gotell Faulks, ACLU
23 dwalker@balch.com	23 of Alabama, representing the plaintiffs.
24	24 MR. WALKER: Dorman Walker, Balch &
25	25 Bingham, representing the intervenor defendants,
Page 5	Page 7
1 ALSO PRESENT:	1 Senator Jim McClendon and Representative Chris
2 Paige Ali, Videographer	2 Pringle.
3 Elizabeth Baggett	3 MR. DAVIS: Jim Davis, Alabama Attorney
4	4 General's office, representing Secretary of State
5	5 John Merrill.
6 I N D E X	6 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: All attorneys on
7 MS. WELBORN: 9-120	7 Zoom.
8 MR. OSHER: 120-125	8 MS. SADASIVAN: This is Kathryn
9 MR. BLACKSHER: 125-140	9 Sadasivan from LDF for the Milligan plaintiffs.
10 MR. DAVIS: 140-141	10 MR. ROSS: Deuel Ross for the Milligan
11	11 plaintiffs.
12 E X H I B I T L I S T	12 MR. TURRILL: Michael Turrill for the
13	13 Milligan plaintiffs.
14 Plaintiff's Exhibit 1 - 12	14 MR. OSHER: Hi. This is Dan Osher from
15 (Depo notice)	15 Elias Law Group representing the Caster plaintiffs.
16 Plaintiff's Exhibit 2 - 52	16 Good to see you all.
17 (Reapportionment Guidelines)	17 MR. WALKER: Good to see you, Dan.
18 Plaintiff's Exhibit 3 - 55	18 MR. ROSBOROUGH: Good morning. I'm
19 (Proposed guidelines handout)	19 Davin Rosborough for the Milligan plaintiffs.
20 Plaintiff's Exhibit 4 - 104	20 MS. EBENSTEIN: Julie Ebenstein for the
21 (Transcript of 10-26-21)	21 Milligan plaintiffs.
22 Plaintiff's Exhibit 5 - 116	22 MR. BLACKSHER: Jim Blacksher for the
23 (Transcript of 11-1-21)	23 Singleton plaintiffs.
24 Plaintiff's Exhibit 6 - 119	24 MS. BAGGETT: Elizabeth Baggett. I'm a
25 (2021 Congressional map)	25 law clerk with the ACLU, not an attorney, for the
Page 6	Page 8

Evan Milligan, et al v. John H. Merrill, et al.

Chris Pringle
12/17/2021

<p>1 Milligan plaintiffs.</p> <p>2 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Court reporter, will</p> <p>3 you please swear in the witness.</p> <p>4 CHRIS PRINGLE,</p> <p>5 having been duly sworn, was examined and testified</p> <p>6 as follows:</p> <p>7 THE REPORTER: Usual stipulations?</p> <p>8 MS. WELBORN: Yes.</p> <p>9 MR. WALKER: Yeah. Kaitlin, that means</p> <p>10 -- okay.</p> <p>11 MS. WELBORN: Yes, I understand.</p> <p>12 EXAMINATION BY MS. WELBORN:</p> <p>13 Q. Representative Pringle, my name is</p> <p>14 Kaitlin Welborn from the ACLU of Alabama. I</p> <p>15 represent the Milligan plaintiffs.</p> <p>16 Could you please state your full name</p> <p>17 for the record?</p> <p>18 A. Christopher Paul Pringle.</p> <p>19 Q. And do you understand that you're</p> <p>20 testifying under oath right now?</p> <p>21 A. I do.</p> <p>22 Q. Is there anything that might prevent you</p> <p>23 from understanding my questions or answering</p> <p>24 truthfully today?</p> <p>25 A. No.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 9</p>	<p>1 A. 2003.</p> <p>2 Q. And what was the case?</p> <p>3 A. Mr. Blacksher, redistricting.</p> <p>4 Q. Okay. And what was it -- it was about</p> <p>5 redistricting. Do you know what the result of that</p> <p>6 case was?</p> <p>7 A. No.</p> <p>8 Q. So I'll just go over some key rules of</p> <p>9 the road as a refresher. I'll ask the questions.</p> <p>10 And if you don't understand a question, let me know,</p> <p>11 just like you did just now. And if you answer a</p> <p>12 question, I will assume that you understood that</p> <p>13 question. Is that fair?</p> <p>14 A. Yes.</p> <p>15 Q. The court reporter is here, and she's</p> <p>16 typing everything you and I say and everybody else</p> <p>17 says. And she'll type everything said by anyone in</p> <p>18 the room or on Zoom.</p> <p>19 It's really important that only one</p> <p>20 person speaks at a time. So if you could just allow</p> <p>21 me to finish my questions and sentences, and I'll do</p> <p>22 my best to allow you to finish your answers before</p> <p>23 jumping on to the next question. Okay?</p> <p>24 I'd like to introduce my first exhibit,</p> <p>25 which is the deposition notice.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 11</p>
<p>1 Q. Are you represented by a lawyer today?</p> <p>2 A. Yes.</p> <p>3 Q. And who is that lawyer?</p> <p>4 A. Dorman Walker.</p> <p>5 Q. And is he the same lawyer who represents</p> <p>6 plaintiffs -- or defendants in this lawsuit?</p> <p>7 A. Yes.</p> <p>8 Q. And --</p> <p>9 MR. WALKER: I'm not sure what the</p> <p>10 question is.</p> <p>11 A. The defendants are --</p> <p>12 MS. WELBORN: That's okay.</p> <p>13 Q. The intervenors. He represents the</p> <p>14 intervenors --</p> <p>15 A. Yes.</p> <p>16 Q. -- is that correct? Okay.</p> <p>17 And are you paying Mr. Walker to be your</p> <p>18 lawyer today?</p> <p>19 A. No.</p> <p>20 Q. And do you assume that the State of</p> <p>21 Alabama is paying Mr. Walker to be your lawyer?</p> <p>22 A. Yes.</p> <p>23 Q. Have you ever been deposed before?</p> <p>24 A. One time.</p> <p>25 Q. And when was that?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 10</p>	<p>1 MR. WALKER: Are you -- are you</p> <p>2 numbering these sequentially from the last --</p> <p>3 MS. WELBORN: We'll start over. So this</p> <p>4 will be Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 1.</p> <p>5</p> <p>6 (Plaintiff's Exhibit 1 was</p> <p>7 marked for identification.)</p> <p>8</p> <p>9 Q. So have you seen this document before?</p> <p>10 A. Yes, ma'am.</p> <p>11 Q. And without disclosing the content of</p> <p>12 any discussions with your attorney, what did you do</p> <p>13 to prepare for your deposition today?</p> <p>14 A. We met yesterday to discuss the</p> <p>15 deposition.</p> <p>16 Q. With Mr. Walker?</p> <p>17 A. Yes.</p> <p>18 Q. With anybody else?</p> <p>19 A. Mr. Davis and Senator McClendon.</p> <p>20 Q. Okay. And for how long did you meet?</p> <p>21 A. An hour an 45 minutes, two hours maybe.</p> <p>22 It wasn't long.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. And other than Senator McClendon,</p> <p>24 did you meet with anyone who's not an attorney?</p> <p>25 A. No.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 12</p>

Evan Milligan, et al v. John H. Merrill, et al.

Chris Pringle
12/17/2021

<p>1 MS. WELBORN: I'm sorry. I don't know</p> <p>2 if you're an attorney or not.</p> <p>3 MR. McCLENDON: No.</p> <p>4 MS. WELBORN: I'm from DC. I just</p> <p>5 assume everybody is an attorney.</p> <p>6 MR. WALKER: He's an eye doctor, if you</p> <p>7 have any issues there. But he's not an attorney.</p> <p>8 MS. WELBORN: Well, clearly, I do.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay. And did you review any documents</p> <p>10 for today?</p> <p>11 A. No.</p> <p>12 Q. Okay. You didn't review the complaint</p> <p>13 for this case?</p> <p>14 A. No.</p> <p>15 Q. And have you discussed this case with</p> <p>16 anyone other than your attorney, Mr. Davis, and</p> <p>17 Senator McClendon?</p> <p>18 A. No.</p> <p>19 Q. And have you discussed your deposition</p> <p>20 with anyone?</p> <p>21 A. I told people I was being deposed. But</p> <p>22 that was the extent of it.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. And who first told you that this</p> <p>24 lawsuit had been filed?</p> <p>25 A. Was this the one that was filed before</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 13</p>	<p>1 government, I couldn't even tell you.</p> <p>2 Q. And that's your legislative --</p> <p>3 A. Yes.</p> <p>4 Q. -- email address?</p> <p>5 Do you have any other email accounts?</p> <p>6 A. No.</p> <p>7 Q. Do you have an email account for any</p> <p>8 PAC, for example?</p> <p>9 A. No.</p> <p>10 Q. So everything goes to either your</p> <p>11 legislative account or your personal account?</p> <p>12 A. Yes.</p> <p>13 Q. Okay. Do you have any personal social</p> <p>14 media accounts?</p> <p>15 A. I have a Facebook page.</p> <p>16 Q. So Twitter, anything like that, for</p> <p>17 personal use?</p> <p>18 A. Not for me, no.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay.</p> <p>20 A. I mean, there -- there are Twitter</p> <p>21 accounts for me, but I didn't use them. I didn't --</p> <p>22 they had my name on them, but I never used them.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. And on your personal Facebook</p> <p>24 account, it's just your name on the account; is that</p> <p>25 correct?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 15</p>
<p>1 we even introduced a bill?</p> <p>2 Q. No.</p> <p>3 A. Okay. So I have no recollection.</p> <p>4 Q. And who first told you that your</p> <p>5 deposition had been requested?</p> <p>6 A. My attorney.</p> <p>7 Q. And when was that? Do you remember?</p> <p>8 A. Shortly after y'all noticed it.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay. Which was --</p> <p>10 A. Just a couple of days ago.</p> <p>11 Q. Just a few days ago.</p> <p>12 Are you being compensated by anyone to</p> <p>13 be here today?</p> <p>14 A. I'm getting my usual legislative per</p> <p>15 diem for travel, which all state employees are</p> <p>16 entitled to.</p> <p>17 Q. Right. And do you expect to be</p> <p>18 compensated in any way if you testify at trial?</p> <p>19 A. I will receive the same compensation for</p> <p>20 travel that all state employees are entitled to.</p> <p>21 Q. Okay. Do you have an email account?</p> <p>22 A. Yes.</p> <p>23 Q. And what is that email account?</p> <p>24 A. My private personal is</p> <p>25 chrispringle@southerntimberlands.com. My state</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 14</p>	<p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. And have you been involved in any</p> <p>3 lawsuits other than the redistricting one with</p> <p>4 Mr. Blacksher?</p> <p>5 A. No.</p> <p>6 Q. Okay. What's the highest level of</p> <p>7 education that you've completed?</p> <p>8 A. A graduate of the University of Alabama.</p> <p>9 Q. And when was that?</p> <p>10 A. August 11th 1984.</p> <p>11 Q. And what degree did you obtain?</p> <p>12 A. I got a degree in communications with a</p> <p>13 minor in political science.</p> <p>14 Q. Okay. Do you have any certificates or</p> <p>15 any specialties, any certifications in anything?</p> <p>16 A. I'm a licensed realtor. I'm a licensed</p> <p>17 homebuilder. I'm a licensed general contractor.</p> <p>18 And until I let it expire, I was a certified control</p> <p>19 burn specialist.</p> <p>20 THE REPORTER: Control what?</p> <p>21 A. Control burn. You know when you see the</p> <p>22 woods on fire? Guys like me are burning it on</p> <p>23 purpose.</p> <p>24 Q. Okay. Well, if I need to fix anything</p> <p>25 in my apartment, it sounds like you're the person to</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 16</p>

Evan Milligan, et al v. John H. Merrill, et al.

Chris Pringle
12/17/2021

<p>1 come to.</p> <p>2 A. I don't fight fires.</p> <p>3 Q. Well, no fires. I hope there's not a</p> <p>4 fire in my apartment.</p> <p>5 So what do you do for a living other</p> <p>6 than burn things?</p> <p>7 A. I actually quit doing that. I am a real</p> <p>8 estate agent with Southern Timberlands. We</p> <p>9 specialize in timberland sales and acquisitions.</p> <p>10 And I am a licensed homebuilder and a licensed</p> <p>11 general contractor. I build houses, hunting camps,</p> <p>12 and I do commercial remodeling work.</p> <p>13 Q. Who so is your employer? I'm sorry.</p> <p>14 A. Southern Timberlands.</p> <p>15 Q. Okay. And so all of those, the realtor</p> <p>16 and being a contractor, et cetera, that's all for</p> <p>17 that company, correct?</p> <p>18 A. No.</p> <p>19 Q. No?</p> <p>20 A. My real estate license is held at</p> <p>21 Southern Timberlands, a division of Cooper &</p> <p>22 Company, Incorporated.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay.</p> <p>24 A. My contracting license are held under</p> <p>25 Chris Pringle, Incorporated.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 17</p>	<p>1 So seven years now. I mean seven years my second</p> <p>2 term.</p> <p>3 Q. Okay.</p> <p>4 A. So about 15 years.</p> <p>5 Q. And currently are you on any committees?</p> <p>6 A. Yes.</p> <p>7 Q. Which ones?</p> <p>8 A. I chair the committee on state</p> <p>9 government. I am cochairman of the house --</p> <p>10 cochairman of the reapportionment committee. I</p> <p>11 serve on constitution, campaigns, and elections;</p> <p>12 internal affairs; the oversight committee of public</p> <p>13 examiners; contract review. I believe that's all.</p> <p>14 Q. Okay. And during your first stint in</p> <p>15 the legislature -- so that's your first two terms.</p> <p>16 I'll just refer to it as your first stint. Is that</p> <p>17 okay?</p> <p>18 A. That's fine.</p> <p>19 Q. Or is there a different term that you --</p> <p>20 A. That works.</p> <p>21 Q. -- prefer?</p> <p>22 Okay. And what district did you</p> <p>23 represent at that time?</p> <p>24 A. 101.</p> <p>25 Q. Okay. So the same district?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 19</p>
<p>1 Q. Okay. Any other employers?</p> <p>2 A. Alabama House of Representatives.</p> <p>3 Q. Right. And at Southern Timberlands,</p> <p>4 what's your title?</p> <p>5 A. Realtor, agent.</p> <p>6 Q. Right. Okay. And how long have you</p> <p>7 worked there?</p> <p>8 A. 27 plus years.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay. And how long have you been a</p> <p>10 contractor?</p> <p>11 A. Since about 2007.</p> <p>12 Q. And what's your current role in the</p> <p>13 legislature?</p> <p>14 A. I'm a state representative from House</p> <p>15 District 101 in Mobile.</p> <p>16 Q. I'm sorry. Could you repeat that?</p> <p>17 A. State representative from House District</p> <p>18 101.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. And what portion of the state is</p> <p>20 that?</p> <p>21 A. Mobile.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. And how long have you been in</p> <p>23 office?</p> <p>24 A. I was elected in 1994. I served two</p> <p>25 terms. I left in 2002. I was re-elected in '14.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 18</p>	<p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 Q. And were you on any committees then?</p> <p>3 A. Yes.</p> <p>4 Q. Do you remember which ones?</p> <p>5 A. I know I served on reapportionment. I</p> <p>6 served on boards and commissions, I served on</p> <p>7 health, I served on constitution, campaigns, and</p> <p>8 elections, I served on contract review. And that's</p> <p>9 all I can remember right now.</p> <p>10 Q. Okay. Did you chair any of those</p> <p>11 committees?</p> <p>12 A. No.</p> <p>13 Q. Okay. I'm sorry.</p> <p>14 A. We were in the superminority at that</p> <p>15 time.</p> <p>16 Q. Right. Well, were you the ranking</p> <p>17 member in any of the committees?</p> <p>18 A. No.</p> <p>19 Q. And why did you leave office?</p> <p>20 A. I decided not to run and sought higher</p> <p>21 office and was defeated.</p> <p>22 Q. And other than serving in the house of</p> <p>23 representatives, have you served in any other public</p> <p>24 office?</p> <p>25 A. No.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 20</p>

Evan Milligan, et al v. John H. Merrill, et al.

Chris Pringle
12/17/2021

<p>1 Q. Okay. And you mentioned that you were</p> <p>2 on the reapportionment committee during your</p> <p>3 first --</p> <p>4 A. Yes.</p> <p>5 Q. -- stint in the legislature. So you</p> <p>6 were involved in the redistricting process, correct?</p> <p>7 A. Yes.</p> <p>8 Q. And what role did you have in the</p> <p>9 redistricting process?</p> <p>10 A. I was the ranking minority party member</p> <p>11 in the house, not the senate.</p> <p>12 Q. Okay. For the republicans, the minority</p> <p>13 party, correct?</p> <p>14 A. Yes.</p> <p>15 Q. And why did you become involved in</p> <p>16 redistricting?</p> <p>17 A. Congressman Sonny Callahan, who I had</p> <p>18 previously worked for in Washington, wanted me to</p> <p>19 serve on the committee because they were trying to</p> <p>20 draw him out of his district. He believed they were</p> <p>21 trying to draw him out of his district. Let me --</p> <p>22 Q. I see. Any other reason?</p> <p>23 A. No, ma'am. I like serving.</p> <p>24 Q. And so that redistricting process ended</p> <p>25 in 2001; is that correct?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 21</p>	<p>1 A. No.</p> <p>2 Q. So the 2002 congressional map, can you</p> <p>3 be a little more specific about what your</p> <p>4 involvement was in helping to draw that map?</p> <p>5 A. Virtually none.</p> <p>6 Q. Okay.</p> <p>7 A. Those maps were drawn off -- what we</p> <p>8 call off campus. They were not drawn in the state</p> <p>9 house.</p> <p>10 Q. Can you explain more about what that</p> <p>11 means?</p> <p>12 A. They were drawn by somebody off -- they</p> <p>13 were not drawn in the reapportionment office in the</p> <p>14 state house.</p> <p>15 Q. Okay. So they were drawn by somebody</p> <p>16 other than someone in the legislature?</p> <p>17 A. Yes.</p> <p>18 Q. Do you know who that was?</p> <p>19 A. No.</p> <p>20 Q. Did you work with anyone to change the</p> <p>21 map at all?</p> <p>22 A. Yes.</p> <p>23 Q. Who was that?</p> <p>24 A. Randy Hinaman.</p> <p>25 Q. Okay. And what did you do with him?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 23</p>
<p>1 A. January of 2002.</p> <p>2 Q. Of 2002. Okay.</p> <p>3 A. In the special session.</p> <p>4 Q. Okay. So the special session was in</p> <p>5 January of 2002?</p> <p>6 A. Yes, ma'am.</p> <p>7 Q. Okay. And what was the result of that</p> <p>8 redistricting?</p> <p>9 A. The democratic leadership drew the plans</p> <p>10 and passed them.</p> <p>11 Q. And how did you become a cochair -- I'm</p> <p>12 sorry. What is your role in the 2021 redistricting</p> <p>13 process?</p> <p>14 A. I'm the house cochairman.</p> <p>15 Q. Okay. And is that a nonpartisan role?</p> <p>16 A. I was elected by the members of the --</p> <p>17 the house members of the committee.</p> <p>18 Q. Okay. And why did you decide to seek</p> <p>19 that role?</p> <p>20 A. The house member that chaired it prior</p> <p>21 to me was leaving, and we needed somebody with</p> <p>22 experience to step up and be the house chairman.</p> <p>23 Q. And other than currently and the 2002</p> <p>24 redistricting cycle, have you been involved in any</p> <p>25 other redistricting process?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 22</p>	<p>1 A. We were in contact with Congressman</p> <p>2 Callahan. And he was in contact with the other</p> <p>3 members of the congressional delegation who had</p> <p>4 actually -- this is my memory, now.</p> <p>5 Q. Sure.</p> <p>6 A. The members of congress hired</p> <p>7 Mr. Hinaman to represent them on drawing --</p> <p>8 redrawing the congressional maps in 2002.</p> <p>9 Q. And so ultimately do you know who drew</p> <p>10 the 2002 map?</p> <p>11 A. I do not know who the democrats</p> <p>12 retained, no, ma'am.</p> <p>13 Q. Okay. But it was the democratic party</p> <p>14 of Alabama?</p> <p>15 A. They had somebody, yes. I don't know</p> <p>16 who.</p> <p>17 Q. Do you know the general method that was</p> <p>18 used to draw the map?</p> <p>19 A. I would -- I'm assuming that the</p> <p>20 guidelines we adopted in 2002 were used by them to</p> <p>21 draw the 2002 plan.</p> <p>22 Q. Do you know the software that was used</p> <p>23 to draw the maps?</p> <p>24 A. No, ma'am.</p> <p>25 Q. Do you know the data that was used to</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 24</p>

Evan Milligan, et al v. John H. Merrill, et al.

Chris Pringle
12/17/2021

<p>1 draw the maps?</p> <p>2 A. No, ma'am.</p> <p>3 Q. So the 1992 congressional map created</p> <p>4 the first majority black congressional district in</p> <p>5 Alabama history. That's District 7. Do you know if</p> <p>6 that map served as the starting point for the 2002</p> <p>7 congressional map?</p> <p>8 A. You are -- that is the Reed Buskey plan,</p> <p>9 correct?</p> <p>10 Q. To be honest, I don't know. I don't</p> <p>11 know the answer to that question.</p> <p>12 A. I'm pretty sure that's what we refer to</p> <p>13 as the Reed Buskey plan.</p> <p>14 Q. Okay.</p> <p>15 A. That was -- that was the first time that</p> <p>16 a map was drawn where a majority minority</p> <p>17 congressional district was created.</p> <p>18 Q. And so --</p> <p>19 A. And I know that the guidelines in 2002</p> <p>20 said we shall use the core of existing districts and</p> <p>21 not -- use the core of existing districts.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. So is it fair to say that Reed --</p> <p>23 well, who drew the 1992 map? You don't know?</p> <p>24 A. I just know it's referred as the Reed</p> <p>25 Buskey plan because Representative Buskey and I</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 25</p>	<p>1 A. Now, we're talking just the</p> <p>2 congressional plan, correct?</p> <p>3 Q. Yes. That's right. And that's</p> <p>4 throughout this -- throughout the deposition we're</p> <p>5 referring to the congressional plans. If we refer</p> <p>6 to any other plans, I'll make sure to be more</p> <p>7 specific.</p> <p>8 MR. OSHER: I'm sorry to interrupt.</p> <p>9 Would it be possible to move the microphone a little</p> <p>10 closer to the witness?</p> <p>11 (Discussion held off the record.)</p> <p>12 Q. Okay. So for the 2001 congressional</p> <p>13 map, do you know the -- did you know the racial</p> <p>14 makeup of districts other than District 7?</p> <p>15 A. No.</p> <p>16 Q. Did you know the racial makeup of</p> <p>17 District 7?</p> <p>18 A. No. I mean, after the maps were passed,</p> <p>19 yes, we knew it.</p> <p>20 Q. Okay.</p> <p>21 A. But going into it --</p> <p>22 Q. Do you recall what they were?</p> <p>23 A. No.</p> <p>24 Q. And do you know if the legislature</p> <p>25 considered race in drawing any districts other than</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 27</p>
<p>1 served together, and he's a personal friend of mine.</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. So you said that it was in the</p> <p>3 legislative guidelines to maintain the cores of</p> <p>4 prior districts?</p> <p>5 A. If I remember the 2002 guidelines</p> <p>6 correctly, that's been a longstanding tradition of</p> <p>7 the Alabama legislature.</p> <p>8 Q. Okay. Do you know if it was -- and</p> <p>9 we're talking still about the 2002 redistricting</p> <p>10 process -- if it was a primary goal of the</p> <p>11 legislature to keep the racial demographics of each</p> <p>12 district the same?</p> <p>13 A. I couldn't answer that. I don't know.</p> <p>14 Q. Okay. So you wouldn't know if it was a</p> <p>15 primary goal to keep about a 60 percent black</p> <p>16 population in District 7?</p> <p>17 A. I don't remember. I have no -- no</p> <p>18 recollection of that.</p> <p>19 Q. Do you know if the legislature took into</p> <p>20 account any other characteristics other than keeping</p> <p>21 the core of each district the same?</p> <p>22 A. In 2002?</p> <p>23 Q. Yes.</p> <p>24 A. No, ma'am.</p> <p>25 Q. Okay.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 26</p>	<p>1 District 7?</p> <p>2 A. In 2001?</p> <p>3 Q. That's right.</p> <p>4 A. Those maps were drawn off campus.</p> <p>5 That's the reason that ten-day rule comes into --</p> <p>6 into play. If you draw a map outside of the</p> <p>7 legislature reapportionment office, you have to</p> <p>8 submit it ten days before it can be introduced into</p> <p>9 the legislature so it can be put into the computer</p> <p>10 and analyzed.</p> <p>11 And those maps were drawn exactly ten</p> <p>12 days out at the last minute before the special</p> <p>13 session in 2020 -- in 2002.</p> <p>14 Q. And when did that rule come into play?</p> <p>15 A. It was there in 2002. Now, when it came</p> <p>16 into the guidelines, I don't know.</p> <p>17 Q. Okay. Do you know if in -- during the</p> <p>18 2001-2002 process if any legislators advocated for</p> <p>19 two majority black districts?</p> <p>20 A. Not to my recollection.</p> <p>21 Q. And if the 2000 -- well, did you vote</p> <p>22 for the 2002 congressional map? Did you vote to</p> <p>23 approve it?</p> <p>24 A. Yes.</p> <p>25 Q. And if --</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 28</p>

Evan Milligan, et al v. John H. Merrill, et al.

Chris Pringle
12/17/2021

<p>1 A. To the best of my recollection, I did.</p> <p>2 It protected Congressman Sonny Callahan and his</p> <p>3 district, so I'm assuming I voted for it.</p> <p>4 Q. Okay. And all of this is to the best of</p> <p>5 your --</p> <p>6 A. Yes.</p> <p>7 Q. -- recollection.</p> <p>8 A. Yes.</p> <p>9 Q. If the 2002 map had contained two</p> <p>10 majority black districts, would you have voted for</p> <p>11 it?</p> <p>12 A. I can't answer that.</p> <p>13 Q. Why not?</p> <p>14 A. Because I didn't look at how they would</p> <p>15 have drawn it.</p> <p>16 Q. Okay.</p> <p>17 A. It was never presented to me. So I</p> <p>18 can't tell you how I would vote on something I've</p> <p>19 never seen.</p> <p>20 Q. Do you think that the legislature as a</p> <p>21 whole would have approved a congressional map like</p> <p>22 that?</p> <p>23 A. I'm not going to speak to that.</p> <p>24 Q. Did you play a role in the 2011</p> <p>25 congressional redistricting process?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 29</p>	<p>1 A. We adopted the guidelines. If you read</p> <p>2 the guidelines, they lay out what we expect the</p> <p>3 committee and the plans to look like, to respect</p> <p>4 communities of interest, not to pit incumbents</p> <p>5 against each other. There's a whole list of things</p> <p>6 that we put into the guidelines that we wanted to</p> <p>7 see in our plans.</p> <p>8 And Mr. Hinaman was given those</p> <p>9 guidelines and instructed to draw those plans in a</p> <p>10 race-neutral manner following the guidelines and</p> <p>11 work with members of congress in how they wanted</p> <p>12 their districts drawn.</p> <p>13 Q. And as a member of the reapportionment</p> <p>14 committee, do you have any input on how the</p> <p>15 congressional maps are drawn?</p> <p>16 A. We voted on the guidelines.</p> <p>17 Q. Okay. You voted on --</p> <p>18 A. We gave -- we gave Mr. Hinaman the</p> <p>19 guidelines and told him to follow those guidelines</p> <p>20 and to draw those -- those maps in a race-neutral</p> <p>21 manner.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. Any other way that the members of</p> <p>23 the reapportionment committee are involved in</p> <p>24 drawing the congressional map?</p> <p>25 A. Once they were finished, we looked at</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 31</p>
<p>1 A. No.</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. And do you happen to know, even</p> <p>3 though you weren't there, if the 2001 congressional</p> <p>4 map or 2002 congressional map was considered as the</p> <p>5 starting point for the 2011 congressional map?</p> <p>6 A. No.</p> <p>7 Q. So you are the cochair of the</p> <p>8 reapportionment committee for this year's</p> <p>9 congressional redistricting process. What does it</p> <p>10 mean to be the cochair of the reapportionment</p> <p>11 committee?</p> <p>12 A. I work with members of the Alabama house</p> <p>13 on drawing their districts, their legislative</p> <p>14 districts.</p> <p>15 Q. And for congress, as well?</p> <p>16 A. No.</p> <p>17 Q. So who works on the congressional map?</p> <p>18 A. Mr. Hinaman worked with members of</p> <p>19 congress to help -- for them to draw the maps.</p> <p>20 Q. Okay.</p> <p>21 A. To have input from the members of</p> <p>22 congress on their districts, what they wanted.</p> <p>23 Q. So what is the role of the</p> <p>24 reapportionment committee with respect to</p> <p>25 congressional maps or the congressional map?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 30</p>	<p>1 them in committee.</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. And anything else?</p> <p>3 A. Not that I can remember right now.</p> <p>4 Q. Okay. And what are your</p> <p>5 responsibilities as the cochair of the</p> <p>6 reapportionment committee?</p> <p>7 A. We -- we set -- we oversaw the public</p> <p>8 hearings, the 28 public hearings we had dealing with</p> <p>9 congressional, state board of education, state</p> <p>10 senate, and state house maps and districts.</p> <p>11 And I worked with members of the Alabama</p> <p>12 house to work on their districts and what they</p> <p>13 wanted and how we could address communities of</p> <p>14 interest.</p> <p>15 But on congressional, I allowed</p> <p>16 Mr. Hinaman to meet with members of congress and</p> <p>17 take the information we gathered in the public</p> <p>18 hearings that was available to him and the</p> <p>19 guidelines.</p> <p>20 Q. Any other responsibilities?</p> <p>21 A. Not that I can think of right now.</p> <p>22 Q. And so what was the starting point for</p> <p>23 drawing the 2021 congressional map?</p> <p>24 A. I would say the guidelines. And part of</p> <p>25 our guidelines are preserve the core of the existing</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 32</p>

Evan Milligan, et al v. John H. Merrill, et al.

Chris Pringle
12/17/2021

<p>1 districts and not pit incumbents against each other.</p> <p>2 Q. And so is it fair to say that the 2011</p> <p>3 congressional map served as the starting point for</p> <p>4 the 2021 congressional map?</p> <p>5 A. I would assume it would. But I wasn't</p> <p>6 there when Mr. Hinaman started drawing them.</p> <p>7 Q. Did you instruct him to use the 2011 map</p> <p>8 as a starting point?</p> <p>9 A. I mean, the guidelines say preserve the</p> <p>10 core of the existing districts. So I would assume</p> <p>11 that if the committee told him to start with the</p> <p>12 core of the existing districts, he would start with</p> <p>13 the core of the existing districts.</p> <p>14 Q. Which is the 2011 congressional map,</p> <p>15 correct?</p> <p>16 A. Yes, ma'am.</p> <p>17 Q. And just really quickly going back to</p> <p>18 the 2001, 2002 redistricting process. You mentioned</p> <p>19 that it was a priority to protect Senator Callahan's</p> <p>20 district, correct?</p> <p>21 A. For Sonny Callahan, yes, and me.</p> <p>22 Q. And for you?</p> <p>23 A. Yes.</p> <p>24 Q. Right. Did you have any other</p> <p>25 priorities for the 2002 congressional map?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 33</p>	<p>1 A. Probably 2019. You know, we were</p> <p>2 working on trying to come up with some type of</p> <p>3 schedule. But with the census being delayed and</p> <p>4 getting the numbers so late, we were working on a</p> <p>5 schedule of public hearings and working on the</p> <p>6 guidelines.</p> <p>7 Q. Do you remember when in 2019 you</p> <p>8 started?</p> <p>9 A. No, ma'am.</p> <p>10 Q. So what was your first step?</p> <p>11 A. We had a -- the first step was actually</p> <p>12 getting me reelected house chairman after the 2018</p> <p>13 election. Because I was -- I assumed -- I came on</p> <p>14 the committee in 2000 and, I want to tell you, 17</p> <p>15 when Mr. Davis stepped down. And then after the</p> <p>16 election, I had to be reelected by my colleagues to</p> <p>17 serve as the house -- the house cochairman.</p> <p>18 Then we began the process of updating</p> <p>19 the guidelines to conform with what we considered to</p> <p>20 be the law dealing with reapportionment and</p> <p>21 redistricting to make sure our guidelines complied</p> <p>22 with the law.</p> <p>23 Then we had extensive conversations,</p> <p>24 Mr. Davis and Mr. Dorman and Senator McClendon and</p> <p>25 I, in the reapportionment office about public</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 35</p>
<p>1 A. No. Just protect the congressman --</p> <p>2 Q. Okay.</p> <p>3 A. -- who I worked for at one time.</p> <p>4 Q. Right. So you were -- you worked for</p> <p>5 him before you were in the --</p> <p>6 A. Yes.</p> <p>7 Q. -- Alabama legislature. So when you</p> <p>8 were in the Alabama legislature, you wanted to</p> <p>9 protect his seat, correct?</p> <p>10 A. Yes.</p> <p>11 Q. Okay. So that was really your</p> <p>12 motivation?</p> <p>13 A. Yes.</p> <p>14 Q. Anything else?</p> <p>15 A. I was trying to see if we could draw</p> <p>16 legislative districts. But that's not the point</p> <p>17 today.</p> <p>18 Q. I'm sorry?</p> <p>19 A. State legislative districts, also.</p> <p>20 Q. Right.</p> <p>21 A. But that was a different story.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. Thank you.</p> <p>23 So now back to today's redistricting</p> <p>24 process. When did you first start planning for the</p> <p>25 2021 redistricting process?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 34</p>	<p>1 hearings and how we were going to address public</p> <p>2 hearings, which all changed because of COVID-19.</p> <p>3 We began the process of laying out</p> <p>4 those -- talking about those meetings and where we</p> <p>5 were going to have them and how we were going to</p> <p>6 publicize them and conduct them.</p> <p>7 Q. Okay. So do you recall when you first</p> <p>8 started thinking about updating the reapportionment</p> <p>9 guidelines?</p> <p>10 A. 2019, 2000. I can't remember the exact</p> <p>11 date. But that was one of the first things we</p> <p>12 addressed, making sure our guidelines were updated</p> <p>13 based on the current reapportionment law and court</p> <p>14 cases.</p> <p>15 Q. Is it required to update the guidelines</p> <p>16 every redistricting cycle?</p> <p>17 A. Well, the law changes. So yes, you have</p> <p>18 to update your guidelines. I mean, the courts are</p> <p>19 constantly telling us -- handing down their rulings.</p> <p>20 And we have to update based on those rulings.</p> <p>21 Q. But it's not required by Alabama law or</p> <p>22 by any legislative rule to update the guidelines</p> <p>23 every -- you know, every cycle?</p> <p>24 A. I can't imagine not updating the</p> <p>25 guidelines going into this process if you know the</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 36</p>

Evan Milligan, et al v. John H. Merrill, et al.

Chris Pringle
12/17/2021

<p>1 law has changed. You have to.</p> <p>2 Q. If you could just give a broad overview</p> <p>3 or a timeline of the 2021 redistricting process for</p> <p>4 me.</p> <p>5 A. We were supposed to receive our initial</p> <p>6 numbers at the end of January. Then they -- then we</p> <p>7 were going to get our finals in April.</p> <p>8 Q. I'm sorry?</p> <p>9 A. We were supposed to get our initial --</p> <p>10 if I remember this correctly, we were supposed to</p> <p>11 get our initial census numbers in, I think, January.</p> <p>12 Yeah, January. And then we would get our final</p> <p>13 numbers in April.</p> <p>14 That all got bumped to -- we didn't get</p> <p>15 any numbers until the middle of the August. And we</p> <p>16 were trying to work out a schedule of public</p> <p>17 hearings from the spring and the summer. But we</p> <p>18 couldn't -- we couldn't engage in those public</p> <p>19 hearings because we had no numbers.</p> <p>20 And when we finally got our numbers in</p> <p>21 the middle of August, we immediately -- we laid out</p> <p>22 a series of public hearings, sent a notice to all</p> <p>23 the members of the committee. I think it was 22</p> <p>24 public hearings we had -- we proposed.</p> <p>25 Representative Hall sent us a letter</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 37</p>	<p>1 Q. And then what happened after that point?</p> <p>2 A. We worked right up to the last possible</p> <p>3 minute drawing those -- meeting with members, trying</p> <p>4 to adjust the districts to make sure the members</p> <p>5 were happy with them.</p> <p>6 But I'm talking about the state</p> <p>7 legislature.</p> <p>8 Q. Right. Right.</p> <p>9 A. The congressional, Mr. Hinaman met with</p> <p>10 the members of congress, and he worked on that. He</p> <p>11 -- I didn't. I was busy working on the state house.</p> <p>12 Q. Okay. For the congressional districts,</p> <p>13 what happened for you in between the public hearings</p> <p>14 and the reapportionment committee meeting at the end</p> <p>15 of October?</p> <p>16 A. Mr. Hinaman met with the members of</p> <p>17 congress. I did not.</p> <p>18 Q. Did you do anything else during that</p> <p>19 time with respect to the congressional map?</p> <p>20 A. No, ma'am. The closest I came, I walked</p> <p>21 in the room and he was on a team call with a member</p> <p>22 of congress. I picked up my paper and walked out of</p> <p>23 the room. I wasn't there but just a minute.</p> <p>24 Q. Okay.</p> <p>25 A. I didn't participate in any of those</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 39</p>
<p>1 requesting six additional public hearings in various</p> <p>2 parts of the state. We accepted her request and</p> <p>3 added the six additional public hearings Ms. Hall</p> <p>4 asked for, then published a list to everybody in the</p> <p>5 media and advertised that those are the public</p> <p>6 hearings we would be holding all over the state. As</p> <p>7 soon as we could get it to, we got it to.</p> <p>8 And as soon as those meetings were over,</p> <p>9 we took that information and began drawing</p> <p>10 districts. Because the secretary of state had given</p> <p>11 us a deadline of the 1st of November to have our</p> <p>12 plans passed in order for all the work behind the</p> <p>13 scenes that has to be done to get ready for the next</p> <p>14 election to occur.</p> <p>15 Q. So you started drawing the maps after</p> <p>16 the public hearings; is that correct?</p> <p>17 A. Yes, ma'am.</p> <p>18 Q. Okay. And when you said "we," who do</p> <p>19 you mean?</p> <p>20 A. Well, Randy Hinaman. And we began</p> <p>21 meeting with the individual house members about</p> <p>22 their -- their individual districts.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. But for the congressional map,</p> <p>24 you mean primarily Mr. Hinaman?</p> <p>25 A. Yes.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 38</p>	<p>1 meetings.</p> <p>2 Q. And what happened -- I'm just trying to</p> <p>3 get like a timeline of events rather than the</p> <p>4 specifics.</p> <p>5 So after the reapportionment committee</p> <p>6 met on, I think, October 26th of 2020, what happened</p> <p>7 after that point?</p> <p>8 A. We adopted the plans. And we were in</p> <p>9 special session dealing with the prisons. So we</p> <p>10 went -- we went straight into special session</p> <p>11 dealing with the prison system.</p> <p>12 I was not there that week. I was only</p> <p>13 there one day. I had a prior contractual obligation</p> <p>14 to finish a construction project that I had to stay</p> <p>15 on. So I came one day that week, and that was it.</p> <p>16 Q. Okay. And regarding redistricting, what</p> <p>17 was the first thing that happened for redistricting</p> <p>18 after the reapportionment committee on October 26th?</p> <p>19 A. I don't understand the question.</p> <p>20 Q. Well, what happened next? How --</p> <p>21 eventually the maps were passed and signed by the</p> <p>22 governor, including the congressional map. So they</p> <p>23 made it out of the reapportionment committee. Then</p> <p>24 what happened?</p> <p>25 A. They made it out of the committee. They</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 40</p>

Evan Milligan, et al v. John H. Merrill, et al.

Chris Pringle
12/17/2021

<p>1 became public. And when we went into the special 2 session for redistricting, they were introduced in 3 bill form.</p> <p>4 Q. Okay. And can you explain in sort of a 5 Schoolhouse Rock way how that bill became a law?</p> <p>6 A. It was brought up -- it was introduced 7 into the house. It passed. It was assigned to the 8 state government committee where it passed. It was 9 given a second reading on the floor. It was put on 10 the calendar. It was brought up on the floor, and 11 it was passed by the members of the Alabama house of 12 representatives.</p> <p>13 Q. And then what happened?</p> <p>14 A. It was sent to the senate --</p> <p>15 Q. Okay.</p> <p>16 A. -- where it went to committee, went to 17 the floor, and passed, was signed by the governor.</p> <p>18 Q. So I just wanted to make sure that I had 19 the full -- the full process.</p> <p>20 A. All nine steps occurred.</p> <p>21 Q. Okay. Well, I'm glad that I paid 22 attention to Schoolhouse Rock, then.</p> <p>23 I'm sorry to keep jumping back and 24 forth, but I'm just going to go back to the 2001, 25 2002 process really quickly.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 41</p>	<p>1 A. I can't answer that. That's 2 speculation. I don't know.</p> <p>3 Q. Okay. When you said that you were 4 protecting Representative Callahan's seat, what does 5 that mean?</p> <p>6 A. There was a plan produced that used the 7 Mobile ship channel to come up. They turned and 8 used the Dog River channel. And they hit 9 Congressman Callahan's property line, and they came 10 down his property line to the road and went up the 11 road to the other side and back down his property 12 line and back out into the Dog River ship channel 13 and back out into the Mobile ship channel. They 14 carved just his house into the 1st congressional 15 district and sent it all the way to Dothan.</p> <p>16 Q. So what was your -- what was your 17 response to that?</p> <p>18 A. It's quicker to drive to Huntsville, 19 Alabama, from Mobile than it is to drive to Dothan. 20 Think about that. It's quicker for us to get in a 21 car and drive to Huntsville, Alabama, than it is to 22 drive to Dothan or Henry County. The congressman 23 was adamant that we would not do that to him.</p> <p>24 Q. So what was the ideal outcome of the -- 25 of that situation?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 43</p>
<p>1 Which district did Representative 2 Callahan represent?</p> <p>3 A. The 1st congressional district.</p> <p>4 Q. And what area of the state is that?</p> <p>5 A. At that time, it was Mobile, Washington, 6 Clarke, Monroe, Escambia, and Baldwin County.</p> <p>7 Q. Okay.</p> <p>8 A. I believe it lost Wilcox County in -- I 9 believe the Buskey Reed plan took Wilcox County out 10 of the 1st congressional district, I believe.</p> <p>11 Q. Okay. And do you remember the racial 12 makeup of Representative Callahan's district?</p> <p>13 A. No, ma'am.</p> <p>14 Q. Do you have any sense at all?</p> <p>15 A. No, ma'am.</p> <p>16 Q. 10 percent black, 90 percent black?</p> <p>17 A. No, ma'am.</p> <p>18 Q. None at all?</p> <p>19 A. No.</p> <p>20 Q. Let's say that Representative Callahan's 21 district had -- previously had 40 percent black 22 population. If, in the redistricting cycle, his 23 district had an increase of black voters in the 24 district to 50 percent, would that be something that 25 you would have supported?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 42</p>	<p>1 A. We kept the core of the existing 1st 2 Congressional District intact. We kept Washington, 3 Clarke, Mobile, Monroe, Escambia, and Baldwin 4 County.</p> <p>5 Q. Okay. And what about Representative 6 Callahan's house?</p> <p>7 A. All of Mobile County was in the 8 district.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay.</p> <p>10 A. All of Mobile, all of Baldwin, all of 11 Washington, all of Monroe, all of Escambia. And I 12 believe that was the first time Clarke County was 13 split to achieve zero deviation.</p> <p>14 Q. So your aim was -- is it fair to say 15 that your aim was to keep Senator Callahan's 16 residence within his district?</p> <p>17 A. Yes, ma'am.</p> <p>18 Q. Okay. Is that what you mean by 19 protecting his district?</p> <p>20 A. Well, I mean, to draw just the lot his 21 house is on out of the district using a ship channel 22 or a boat channel, we didn't consider that to be 23 reasonable.</p> <p>24 Q. So what would be reasonable?</p> <p>25 A. Well, I mean, they didn't have the</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 44</p>

Evan Milligan, et al v. John H. Merrill, et al.

Chris Pringle
12/17/2021

<p>1 Gingles test then. But we didn't consider that to</p> <p>2 be compact, concise, or a community of interest to</p> <p>3 send one lot in Mobile County and share it with</p> <p>4 Dothan in Houston and Henry County.</p> <p>5 Q. Do you mean -- were there any other ways</p> <p>6 that you wanted to protect Representative Callahan's</p> <p>7 seat?</p> <p>8 A. Well, of course. He was elected by the</p> <p>9 people in that district, and they -- he wanted to</p> <p>10 continue to represent those people. That's why he</p> <p>11 won reelection so overwhelmingly every time he ran.</p> <p>12 Q. Is it fair to say that you wanted to</p> <p>13 make sure that Representative Callahan remained in</p> <p>14 the 1st District so that he could win reelection?</p> <p>15 A. I wanted to make sure he continued to</p> <p>16 represent the people that had elected him, yes. And</p> <p>17 they continued to reelect him overwhelmingly for</p> <p>18 years.</p> <p>19 Q. So you mentioned that one of the first</p> <p>20 steps of the 2021 redistricting cycle were updating</p> <p>21 the reapportionment committee redistricting</p> <p>22 guidelines; is that correct?</p> <p>23 A. (Witness nods head).</p> <p>24 Q. When did that happen?</p> <p>25 A. I'm going to yield to the attorneys.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 45</p>	<p>1 meeting?</p> <p>2 A. No, ma'am.</p> <p>3 Q. And was anybody in -- was anybody else</p> <p>4 in attendance other than Mr. Walker, Mr. Davis, and</p> <p>5 Senator McClendon?</p> <p>6 A. Not to my recollection, no.</p> <p>7 MS. SADASIVAN: The audio has stopped</p> <p>8 again.</p> <p>9 MS. WELBORN: Can you hear me, Kathryn?</p> <p>10 MS. SADASIVAN: I can hear you now. But</p> <p>11 the audio keeps coming in and out.</p> <p>12 Q. Did you -- was that your only meeting to</p> <p>13 talk about revising the reapportionment committee</p> <p>14 redistricting guidelines?</p> <p>15 A. No.</p> <p>16 Q. How many other meetings did you have, if</p> <p>17 you recall?</p> <p>18 A. I don't recall.</p> <p>19 Q. Do you have a sense of how many meetings</p> <p>20 you had?</p> <p>21 A. I would hate to put a number on it. But</p> <p>22 it was several.</p> <p>23 Q. Five, let's say?</p> <p>24 A. It was several meetings.</p> <p>25 Q. Okay. But less than ten?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 47</p>
<p>1 But I remember sitting at a table with Mr. Davis,</p> <p>2 Representative McClendon, and Mr. Walker, and we</p> <p>3 began the process of working on those guidelines to</p> <p>4 update.</p> <p>5 MR. OSHER: We can't hear you.</p> <p>6 A. I remember sitting at a table in the</p> <p>7 reapportionment office with Mr. Davis, Senator</p> <p>8 McClendon, Mr. Walker, and myself, and we began</p> <p>9 reviewing the guidelines from the past</p> <p>10 redistricting. And the discussion to update them</p> <p>11 based on new -- the current law and court rulings.</p> <p>12 I think the Gingles test came into play</p> <p>13 first. Because I don't think Gingles was in effect</p> <p>14 in 2011. But I'm not an attorney.</p> <p>15 MR. WALKER: I'm going to instruct you,</p> <p>16 given that Mr. Davis and I were there, not to</p> <p>17 discuss what we discussed at that meeting because it</p> <p>18 was an attorney-client meeting.</p> <p>19 THE WITNESS: Okay.</p> <p>20 Q. When did that meeting occur?</p> <p>21 A. 2019 or '20.</p> <p>22 Q. Do you have any sense of what time of</p> <p>23 the year?</p> <p>24 A. No, ma'am, I don't remember.</p> <p>25 Q. And did you bring any materials to that</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 46</p>	<p>1 A. I would -- I would say that, yes.</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. And who was at those meetings?</p> <p>3 A. I remember Mr. Davis, Senator McClendon,</p> <p>4 Mr. Walker, and myself.</p> <p>5 Q. Anybody else?</p> <p>6 A. I'm going to say maybe a member of the</p> <p>7 reapportionment staff was there.</p> <p>8 Q. From the reapportionment office?</p> <p>9 A. Yes.</p> <p>10 Q. And do you know who that was?</p> <p>11 A. To err on the safe side, I would say</p> <p>12 Ms. Overton.</p> <p>13 Q. And what's her role?</p> <p>14 A. She is the director of the</p> <p>15 reapportionment staff.</p> <p>16 Q. And do you remember when that meeting</p> <p>17 occurred?</p> <p>18 A. No, ma'am.</p> <p>19 Q. And what was the goal of these meetings?</p> <p>20 A. To write committee guidelines that we</p> <p>21 thought would conform with the existing</p> <p>22 reapportionment law.</p> <p>23 Q. So on May 5th 2001 there was a meeting</p> <p>24 of the reapportionment committee; is that right?</p> <p>25 A. I believe you.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 48</p>

Evan Milligan, et al v. John H. Merrill, et al.

Chris Pringle
12/17/2021

<p>1 Q. Okay. Well, when were there meetings of</p> <p>2 the reapportionment committee since 2019?</p> <p>3 A. I -- I couldn't answer that. I just</p> <p>4 don't remember.</p> <p>5 Q. Do you remember any --</p> <p>6 MR. ROSBOROUGH: I'm sorry. Everyone's</p> <p>7 audio has completely dropped out again.</p> <p>8 MS. FAULKS: We should take a break.</p> <p>9 MS. SADASIVAN: I think we should break</p> <p>10 possibly to resolve the audio issues quickly because</p> <p>11 we keep going in and out.</p> <p>12 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are off the</p> <p>13 record. The time is 10:03 a.m.</p> <p>14 (Recess was taken.)</p> <p>15 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the</p> <p>16 record. The time is 10:22 a.m.</p> <p>17 THE WITNESS: Can they hear me now? Is</p> <p>18 this better?</p> <p>19 MS. SADASIVAN: Right. Thank you so</p> <p>20 much.</p> <p>21 Q. So before the break, we were talking</p> <p>22 about the reapportionment committee. How many times</p> <p>23 has the reapportionment committee met in 2021, if</p> <p>24 you can recall?</p> <p>25 A. I don't remember. 20 --</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 49</p>	<p>1 committee meetings in 2021 except for the May 5th</p> <p>2 and the October 26th meetings.</p> <p>3 MS. WELBORN: Okay. Thank you. I just</p> <p>4 wanted to double-check.</p> <p>5 Q. So for the May 5th meeting, do you --</p> <p>6 did you do anything to prepare for the meeting that</p> <p>7 you recall?</p> <p>8 A. Nothing out of the -- that's -- that's</p> <p>9 the day we voted on the guidelines.</p> <p>10 Q. That's correct.</p> <p>11 A. Yes. I mean, I read the proposed</p> <p>12 guidelines and went over them with the attorney.</p> <p>13 Q. Okay. Did you do anything else to</p> <p>14 prepare?</p> <p>15 A. No, ma'am.</p> <p>16 Q. And other than the meetings with the</p> <p>17 attorneys and Senator McClendon to talk about the</p> <p>18 revised guidelines, did you talk to anyone else</p> <p>19 about the May 5th meeting ahead of time?</p> <p>20 A. I may have talked to the committee</p> <p>21 members in the house, but I don't recall any</p> <p>22 specific conversations.</p> <p>23 Q. So at the May 5th meeting, what</p> <p>24 happened?</p> <p>25 A. The guidelines were sent to the members</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 51</p>
<p>1 Q. This year.</p> <p>2 A. I don't remember the exact number.</p> <p>3 Q. A handful?</p> <p>4 A. Yes.</p> <p>5 Q. Okay. Is there a regular schedule for</p> <p>6 the reapportionment committee to have meetings?</p> <p>7 A. No reapportionment committee I've ever</p> <p>8 served on had a regular schedule.</p> <p>9 Q. So how --</p> <p>10 A. I mean, like my state government</p> <p>11 committee meets every Wednesday at 3:00 o'clock.</p> <p>12 Q. Right.</p> <p>13 A. Reapportionment doesn't do that.</p> <p>14 Q. So how do you decide when you have to</p> <p>15 have a meeting?</p> <p>16 A. When we have something to discuss.</p> <p>17 Q. Okay.</p> <p>18 MS. WELBORN: So if there -- so we know</p> <p>19 that there was a reapportionment committee meeting</p> <p>20 on May 5th and one on October 26th. Mr. Walker, if</p> <p>21 there were any other committee meetings for the</p> <p>22 reapportionment committee, we would request any</p> <p>23 records or recordings of those.</p> <p>24 MR. WALKER: Let me represent to you</p> <p>25 that I'm not aware of any other reapportionment</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 50</p>	<p>1 prior to the meeting for their review and input.</p> <p>2 And at the meeting, we talked about the guidelines.</p> <p>3 And if I remember correctly, the attorney explained</p> <p>4 them to the members of the committee, and we passed</p> <p>5 them. We adopted them.</p> <p>6 Q. And do you remember when the proposed</p> <p>7 guidelines were sent to members of the committee?</p> <p>8 A. No, ma'am. I know it was prior to the</p> <p>9 meeting.</p> <p>10 Q. And did you take any notes at the</p> <p>11 meeting?</p> <p>12 A. No, ma'am.</p> <p>13</p> <p>14 (Plaintiff's Exhibit 2 was</p> <p>15 marked for identification.)</p> <p>16</p> <p>17 Q. So I would like to introduce as</p> <p>18 Plaintiff's Exhibit 2 the reapportionment committee</p> <p>19 redistricting guidelines from May 5th of 2021.</p> <p>20 There's a copy.</p> <p>21 And did you have any role in drafting</p> <p>22 this document?</p> <p>23 A. It was reviewed with me by Mr. Walker,</p> <p>24 and we discussed it.</p> <p>25 Q. Okay. Did you have any other role in</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 52</p>

Evan Milligan, et al v. John H. Merrill, et al.

Chris Pringle
12/17/2021

<p>1 drafting the document?</p> <p>2 A. No, ma'am.</p> <p>3 Q. Who drafted the document?</p> <p>4 A. I would say Mr. Walker. Now, who he was</p> <p>5 in conjunction with, I do not know.</p> <p>6 Q. And is that normal to have an attorney</p> <p>7 draft the guidelines, would you say?</p> <p>8 A. Attorneys draft about everything we do.</p> <p>9 I'm not an attorney. I make no bones about it.</p> <p>10 Q. So the members of the reapportionment</p> <p>11 committee did not draft this document; is that</p> <p>12 correct?</p> <p>13 A. They were -- they reviewed it and the</p> <p>14 attorneys explained it to them.</p> <p>15 Q. Okay. Did anyone on the reapportionment</p> <p>16 committee make any changes to the document at that</p> <p>17 -- at the May 5th meeting?</p> <p>18 A. Not that I remember.</p> <p>19 Q. Do you know if they made any changes</p> <p>20 after the meeting? I guess they couldn't have if</p> <p>21 you voted on them.</p> <p>22 A. Right.</p> <p>23 Q. Sorry. I answered my own question for</p> <p>24 you.</p> <p>25 So what are these guidelines?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 53</p>	<p>1 guidelines?</p> <p>2 A. I don't recall any specifics. But there</p> <p>3 were a -- there were a handful of changes to update.</p> <p>4 But I don't remember the exact specifics.</p> <p>5 Q. And who provided you with those</p> <p>6 specifics?</p> <p>7 A. Our attorney.</p> <p>8 Q. Mr. Walker?</p> <p>9 A. Yes.</p> <p>10 Q. And do you know -- do you know why those</p> <p>11 specifics were chosen?</p> <p>12 A. It was my understanding that the courts</p> <p>13 had handed down additional rulings since the last</p> <p>14 reapportionment guidelines were adopted. And we</p> <p>15 updated them to reflect those changes in the law.</p> <p>16 Q. And do you know how those specifics were</p> <p>17 chosen?</p> <p>18 A. Changes in the law in courtrooms.</p> <p>19</p> <p>20 (Plaintiff's Exhibit 3 was</p> <p>21 marked for identification.)</p> <p>22</p> <p>23 Q. Let me introduce Plaintiff's Exhibit 3.</p> <p>24 This is the proposed guidelines handout.</p> <p>25 Do you recognize this document?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 55</p>
<p>1 A. That's the parameters that we used in</p> <p>2 order to draw districts we thought complied with the</p> <p>3 Voting Rights Act and the 14th amendment to the</p> <p>4 Constitution and the court rulings that the courts</p> <p>5 had handed down in redistricting.</p> <p>6 Q. And so what is your understanding --</p> <p>7 when you say "comply" with the Voting Rights Act or</p> <p>8 the constitution and court rulings, what do you mean</p> <p>9 by that?</p> <p>10 A. I mean, it deals with drawing districts</p> <p>11 on a race neutral -- race neutral. We didn't look</p> <p>12 at race while we were drawing the districts. And it</p> <p>13 complies with not putting incumbents together and</p> <p>14 respecting single-member districts and eliminating</p> <p>15 contests between incumbents. Everything is spelled</p> <p>16 out here. That was just a few of the highlights.</p> <p>17 Q. And other than compliance with federal</p> <p>18 laws, are there any other reasons why you have the</p> <p>19 guidelines?</p> <p>20 A. Just a road map for everybody to follow</p> <p>21 when we're drawing lines. It's agreed to by the</p> <p>22 committee and the members of the committee and what</p> <p>23 we prioritize as what we need to do.</p> <p>24 Q. And do you recall what updates there</p> <p>25 were to the law that needed to be put into the</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 54</p>	<p>1 A. It looks like the one I saw earlier,</p> <p>2 yes, ma'am, back in May.</p> <p>3 Q. And when you say you saw it earlier,</p> <p>4 could you explain?</p> <p>5 A. Back during the discussion of the</p> <p>6 guidelines.</p> <p>7 Q. And who provided this document to you?</p> <p>8 A. Mr. Walker.</p> <p>9 Q. And do you know when he provided it to</p> <p>10 you?</p> <p>11 A. Prior to -- I believe every member of</p> <p>12 the committee saw these -- the existing, the</p> <p>13 proposed changes, and the enrolled changes prior to</p> <p>14 the meeting for their review.</p> <p>15 Q. And did you see it before -- as a</p> <p>16 cochair, did you see it before any of the other</p> <p>17 members of the reapportionment committee?</p> <p>18 A. Yes, ma'am.</p> <p>19 Q. Did you have any role in drafting this</p> <p>20 document?</p> <p>21 A. No, ma'am, other than it was reviewed</p> <p>22 with me prior to that.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. But you did discuss revisions to</p> <p>24 the guidelines prior to this document --</p> <p>25 A. Yes, ma'am.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 56</p>

Evan Milligan, et al v. John H. Merrill, et al.

Chris Pringle
12/17/2021

<p>1 Q. -- being drafted?</p> <p>2 A. Yes, ma'am.</p> <p>3 Q. Do you know if any of your discussions</p> <p>4 went into the creation of this document?</p> <p>5 A. I couldn't answer that question.</p> <p>6 Q. Okay. Do you know if any of the updates</p> <p>7 that you wanted to make to the guidelines made it</p> <p>8 into this document?</p> <p>9 A. I know I was in favor of the 5 percent</p> <p>10 deviation.</p> <p>11 Q. And that's for the state --</p> <p>12 A. Yes.</p> <p>13 Q. -- legislative maps, correct?</p> <p>14 Anything else?</p> <p>15 A. Not that I recall.</p> <p>16 Q. Okay. Do you know what the process was</p> <p>17 for drafting this document?</p> <p>18 A. Our attorney met with us and we went</p> <p>19 over the old guidelines, some proposed changes, and</p> <p>20 what we thought we needed to update to comply with</p> <p>21 the law.</p> <p>22 Q. And did you suggest any changes?</p> <p>23 A. The 5 percent.</p> <p>24 Q. Anything else?</p> <p>25 A. Not that I recall.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 57</p>	<p>1 Justice under Section 5.</p> <p>2 Q. Okay.</p> <p>3 A. And they were -- they were drawn fairly</p> <p>4 closely aligned with the committee guidelines at that</p> <p>5 time.</p> <p>6 Q. And so you believe that the 2010</p> <p>7 guidelines, then, were based on the 2002 guidelines</p> <p>8 for that reason?</p> <p>9 A. What I remember from 2002, when they</p> <p>10 brought the 2010, I saw similarities that I</p> <p>11 remembered from both of them to the -- to the 2020</p> <p>12 guidelines, yes.</p> <p>13 Q. Okay. So one of the reasons that the</p> <p>14 2021 guidelines are based on the 2010 guidelines is</p> <p>15 because you believe that they would be -- they would</p> <p>16 have complied with Section 5 of the Voting Rights</p> <p>17 Act had that -- if that were still in effect?</p> <p>18 A. They would comply with Section 1 of the</p> <p>19 Voting Rights Act. I mean Section 2. I'm sorry.</p> <p>20 Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act. But they were</p> <p>21 precleared under Section 5.</p> <p>22 Q. Right.</p> <p>23 A. And I also thought they would comply</p> <p>24 with the 14th Amendment, one man, one vote.</p> <p>25 Q. Okay. Is there any other reason why you</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 59</p>
<p>1 Q. And just to make sure, other than</p> <p>2 Mr. Walker, Mr. Davis, and Senator McClendon, and</p> <p>3 perhaps one member of the reapportionment committee,</p> <p>4 did you speak to anyone else about revising the</p> <p>5 guidelines prior to the May 5th meeting?</p> <p>6 A. I can't recall.</p> <p>7 Q. Were the -- so on this document there</p> <p>8 are the 2010 guidelines. Would you say that it's</p> <p>9 fair -- is it fair to say that those were the basis</p> <p>10 for the 2021 guidelines?</p> <p>11 A. I would say that, yes.</p> <p>12 Q. Why did you choose to rely on the 2010</p> <p>13 guidelines rather than starting from scratch?</p> <p>14 A. Because the 2010 were based off the 2002</p> <p>15 guidelines, I would assume. I wasn't there.</p> <p>16 Q. Right.</p> <p>17 A. But I would just assume that they used</p> <p>18 the 2002 as the basis for the 2010, and we used them</p> <p>19 for the 2020.</p> <p>20 Q. Is there a reason why you would want to</p> <p>21 rely on the past documents?</p> <p>22 A. Because we had passed plans that were</p> <p>23 approved by the justice department under Section 5.</p> <p>24 In 2002, remember our plan -- our congressional plan</p> <p>25 was precleared by the United States Department of</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 58</p>	<p>1 based the 2021 guidelines off of the 2010 guidelines</p> <p>2 other than that you think that it would -- that they</p> <p>3 would have complied with federal law?</p> <p>4 A. Well, when I read the 2010, they were</p> <p>5 very similar to what I remember the 2002 guidelines.</p> <p>6 I remember specifically the ten-day rule was there</p> <p>7 in 2002.</p> <p>8 Q. Is it a principle that the committee</p> <p>9 follows to generally use what has come before, use</p> <p>10 materials that have come before?</p> <p>11 A. Yes.</p> <p>12 Q. Out of ease of use or out of tradition</p> <p>13 or because the -- you know, because you believe that</p> <p>14 they comply with the law? What -- what is the</p> <p>15 reason for reusing?</p> <p>16 A. I would say all three of those.</p> <p>17 Q. Is anything more important, any of those</p> <p>18 more important than the other?</p> <p>19 A. Complying with the law.</p> <p>20 Q. That's pretty important, huh?</p> <p>21 A. Yeah.</p> <p>22 Q. I think we all can agree on that.</p> <p>23 And do you know how the 2010 guidelines</p> <p>24 were created --</p> <p>25 A. No.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 60</p>

Evan Milligan, et al v. John H. Merrill, et al.

Chris Pringle
12/17/2021

<p>1 Q. -- other than being based off of the</p> <p>2 2002?</p> <p>3 A. No, ma'am.</p> <p>4 Q. Who would know how the 2010 guidelines</p> <p>5 were created?</p> <p>6 A. I would say Mr. Walker.</p> <p>7 Q. Okay. Anybody else?</p> <p>8 A. I wasn't there.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay.</p> <p>10 A. I take that back. I said Senator</p> <p>11 McClendon was there in 2010. I wasn't.</p> <p>12 Q. Let's see. If you could flip to Pages 7</p> <p>13 and 8. Let's start with 7. And as you'll see, that</p> <p>14 third box is entirely striked out in the middle with</p> <p>15 the proposed changes.</p> <p>16 A. Uh-huh.</p> <p>17 Q. That's the section on communities of</p> <p>18 interest. If you'd like to read through those boxes</p> <p>19 on Pages 7 and 8, it might be helpful.</p> <p>20 A. Okay.</p> <p>21 Q. So it looks to me like this subsection</p> <p>22 was entirely rewritten. Do you know why?</p> <p>23 A. I can't answer with certainty. But I</p> <p>24 believe it goes back -- and I'm just supposing -- to</p> <p>25 the Gingles test.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 61</p>	<p>1 Q. Who would know why?</p> <p>2 A. I would suggest you talk to my attorney.</p> <p>3 Q. Okay.</p> <p>4 A. When you get into legal definitions --</p> <p>5 Q. I understand that lawyers are pretty</p> <p>6 fond of legal definitions.</p> <p>7 So in the May 5th meeting, you mentioned</p> <p>8 that Mr. Walker discussed these proposed changes.</p> <p>9 Do you know if there were any other changes made at</p> <p>10 that meeting other than the ones proposed by</p> <p>11 Mr. Walker?</p> <p>12 MR. WALKER: I think the way that</p> <p>13 question is asked, I need to assert the</p> <p>14 attorney-client privilege.</p> <p>15 Q. I guess what I'm saying is did any --</p> <p>16 are there any differences between these proposed</p> <p>17 changes that were presented in the meeting and the</p> <p>18 final version in Exhibit 2, the final guidelines?</p> <p>19 Did anybody suggest any other changes?</p> <p>20 A. Not that I recall.</p> <p>21 Q. So the version that is here of these</p> <p>22 proposed changes, they were accepted in whole and no</p> <p>23 other changes were made?</p> <p>24 A. No changes were made after the committee</p> <p>25 adopted them.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 63</p>
<p>1 Q. And what's your understanding of the</p> <p>2 Gingles test?</p> <p>3 A. Compactness, contiguity, and communities</p> <p>4 of interest, I would assume. I don't know.</p> <p>5 Q. Can you think of any other reason why</p> <p>6 the section on communities of interest would be</p> <p>7 entirely rewritten?</p> <p>8 A. Other than a court ruling that gave a</p> <p>9 better definition, I don't know.</p> <p>10 Q. Did you have any role in this particular</p> <p>11 change?</p> <p>12 A. No, ma'am.</p> <p>13 Q. Do you know who made this particular</p> <p>14 change on the document?</p> <p>15 A. You would have to talk to the attorney.</p> <p>16 Q. Talk to Mr. Walker?</p> <p>17 A. Mr. Walker.</p> <p>18 Q. In this section, if you compare the 2010</p> <p>19 guidelines to the enrolled guidelines, the 2021</p> <p>20 guidelines eliminate partisan interest from the</p> <p>21 definition of communities of interest.</p> <p>22 So in 2010, partisan interests were part</p> <p>23 of the definition of community of interest. But in</p> <p>24 2021, they're not. Do you know why that is?</p> <p>25 A. No, ma'am.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 62</p>	<p>1 Q. Well, I guess I'm talking about at the</p> <p>2 -- at the committee meeting.</p> <p>3 A. I don't -- I don't remember.</p> <p>4 Q. Okay. And did you talk to anyone about</p> <p>5 the May 5th meeting after it happened?</p> <p>6 A. I'm sure I did. But I don't recall.</p> <p>7 Q. Do you recall what you would have talked</p> <p>8 about?</p> <p>9 A. The general guidelines that we adopted,</p> <p>10 the guidelines that would control the committee's --</p> <p>11 the way we drew plans. But they were public record</p> <p>12 at that point.</p> <p>13 Q. So what happened next in the</p> <p>14 redistricting process?</p> <p>15 A. Then we began trying to work on public</p> <p>16 hearings and how we were going to handle public</p> <p>17 hearings with COVID-19.</p> <p>18 Q. Okay.</p> <p>19 A. So we had -- we had to come up with a</p> <p>20 way to handle the public hearings and where we were</p> <p>21 going to hold them and how we were going to hold</p> <p>22 them.</p> <p>23 Q. So why did you hold public meetings?</p> <p>24 A. It's part of the guidelines, and it's</p> <p>25 tradition. They've been held -- I've heard they did</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 64</p>

Evan Milligan, et al v. John H. Merrill, et al.

Chris Pringle
12/17/2021

<p>1 them in 2010. I know we did them in 2002.</p> <p>2 Q. And what's the purpose of the public</p> <p>3 meetings?</p> <p>4 A. To take input from the community at</p> <p>5 large, the people that live in the communities and</p> <p>6 what they like or dislike about the existing plan</p> <p>7 and what they would like to see changed.</p> <p>8 Q. Was there a draft -- when you say</p> <p>9 "existing plan," what do you -- what do you mean by</p> <p>10 that?</p> <p>11 A. The plan that we were currently</p> <p>12 operating under.</p> <p>13 Q. So you mean the 2011 map?</p> <p>14 A. Yes.</p> <p>15 Q. So the purpose of the public meetings is</p> <p>16 for people to express what they like or do not like</p> <p>17 about the current setup?</p> <p>18 A. Yes.</p> <p>19 Q. Is there any other reason why public</p> <p>20 meetings are held?</p> <p>21 A. Well, we go to the public and show them</p> <p>22 the existing plans and where the population has</p> <p>23 shifted and how they would like to see the lines</p> <p>24 drawn.</p> <p>25 Q. So you mentioned that there were public</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 65</p>	<p>1 there were people that liked their members of</p> <p>2 congress and wanted the maps to stay the way they</p> <p>3 were.</p> <p>4 Q. Was there a draft of the congressional</p> <p>5 map prepared before the public meetings occurred?</p> <p>6 A. No, ma'am.</p> <p>7 Q. And when did the public meetings occur?</p> <p>8 Not every single one, but in general.</p> <p>9 A. As soon as we had numbers from the</p> <p>10 census bureau and we could tell the people whether</p> <p>11 their congressional district was overpopulated or</p> <p>12 underpopulated and how many people they had to gain</p> <p>13 or lose based on the new -- we didn't know what the</p> <p>14 number was going to be to get to zero deviation on</p> <p>15 the congressional map until we had the census</p> <p>16 numbers.</p> <p>17 So we couldn't go out and talk to people</p> <p>18 about how they wanted to see their congressional</p> <p>19 district change in order to comply with one man, one</p> <p>20 vote.</p> <p>21 Q. Why is it -- why was it necessary to</p> <p>22 have the census numbers if you don't have a map yet?</p> <p>23 I guess I'm curious why the -- why the census</p> <p>24 numbers are necessary to hold the public hearings.</p> <p>25 A. We had a map.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 67</p>
<p>1 meetings that were also held in 2001 when you were</p> <p>2 part of that redistricting process. Do you think</p> <p>3 that people's -- do you recall if people's -- their</p> <p>4 concerns are different now than they were then?</p> <p>5 A. Explain what you mean by that question.</p> <p>6 Q. Well, I guess I'm not talking about the</p> <p>7 nitty-gritty little, you know, this block here, this</p> <p>8 block there, but general opinions about how maps</p> <p>9 should be drawn or what a community of interest is</p> <p>10 or anything like that.</p> <p>11 Do people -- do you think that people</p> <p>12 felt the same way at public meetings back in 2001 as</p> <p>13 they did in the meetings this year?</p> <p>14 A. I would say, generally speaking, they</p> <p>15 held the same views.</p> <p>16 Q. And what sorts of views are those?</p> <p>17 A. I mean, some communities wanted to --</p> <p>18 I'm having -- I would have to separate congressional</p> <p>19 from --</p> <p>20 Q. Right.</p> <p>21 A. -- legislative.</p> <p>22 Some people wanted to see maps drawn</p> <p>23 differently. There was numerous people there to</p> <p>24 present the map for the League of Women Voters and</p> <p>25 discuss it. They asked us to look at that map. And</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 66</p>	<p>1 Q. The 2010?</p> <p>2 A. The existing map.</p> <p>3 Q. Okay.</p> <p>4 A. And then after we got the numbers, we</p> <p>5 knew which congressional district was over and which</p> <p>6 congressional districts were underpopulated and the</p> <p>7 amount of people we needed in each congressional</p> <p>8 district in order to comply with one man, one vote.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay.</p> <p>10 A. The same thing we did in 2001. We</p> <p>11 presented the existing map to the people in all the</p> <p>12 public hearings. And after the public hearings,</p> <p>13 then and only then was a map produced. And we had a</p> <p>14 lot more time in '01.</p> <p>15 Q. Right.</p> <p>16 Did the public have access to the</p> <p>17 numbers of people that would need to move between</p> <p>18 districts, about the overpopulation and</p> <p>19 underpopulation numbers? Did they have access to</p> <p>20 that?</p> <p>21 A. That was gone over in every public</p> <p>22 hearing.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. Why was it necessary to have</p> <p>24 those numbers before holding the public hearings?</p> <p>25 A. So we could -- we knew how many people</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 68</p>

Evan Milligan, et al v. John H. Merrill, et al.

Chris Pringle
12/17/2021

<p>1 went into a district and how many people were in the 2 current district.</p> <p>3 Q. Well, I guess people have concerns about 4 -- well, did people have concerns about districts 5 other than, you know, the pure numbers? Did they 6 have opinions about how maps should be drawn period 7 regardless of the census numbers? Do you understand 8 what I'm saying?</p> <p>9 A. If you are referring to the League of 10 Women Voters who sent somebody to virtually every --</p> <p>11 Q. I'm talking in general.</p> <p>12 A. There were people there every -- every 13 meeting that had their talking points that basically 14 read them that all said the same thing. They wanted 15 to adopt another plan that created two majority 16 minority districts.</p> <p>17 Q. Well, I assume that there were people at 18 the meetings who didn't share that view.</p> <p>19 A. Yeah.</p> <p>20 Q. Do you think -- I guess wouldn't it be 21 possible to have that opinion before the census 22 numbers were even out?</p> <p>23 A. Well, they did have the opinion before 24 the numbers were out.</p> <p>25 Q. Okay. I guess I'm just not really</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 69</p>	<p>1 Q. Well, there are people -- so the map 2 changed between 2010 and today, right?</p> <p>3 A. Yes.</p> <p>4 Q. And there are members who have kept 5 their -- there are citizens who have kept their 6 representatives even though the lines of the 7 districts have changed, right?</p> <p>8 A. Correct.</p> <p>9 Q. So you could keep your representative 10 even though the line of the district changes, 11 correct?</p> <p>12 A. Correct.</p> <p>13 Q. So when people are saying "I'm happy 14 with my representative," are they just saying that 15 they don't want the district to change at all? Or 16 what -- what do you think that they're saying?</p> <p>17 A. I would hate to interpret what they 18 would mean by that. They said they were happy with 19 their representative.</p> <p>20 Q. Okay. And how many of the public 21 hearings did you participate in?</p> <p>22 A. All 28.</p> <p>23 Q. Did you go in person --</p> <p>24 A. Yes.</p> <p>25 Q. -- to all 28?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 71</p>
<p>1 understanding why the -- why you had to wait to hold 2 the public hearings until the census numbers were 3 out.</p> <p>4 A. Accuracy.</p> <p>5 Q. Okay. So you had mentioned that at the 6 public meetings, public hearings, some people liked 7 their members of congress and wanted to keep them. 8 What did you mean by that?</p> <p>9 A. They were happy with the representation 10 they were receiving from their elected 11 representatives.</p> <p>12 Q. So what does that mean for those 13 representatives' districts? Would they want to keep 14 them the same or --</p> <p>15 A. Our guidelines say we try to protect the 16 core of the existing districts, yes.</p> <p>17 Q. Well, I guess if you're happy with your 18 representative, that doesn't mean that -- you could 19 still live in the district and have the rest of the 20 district change and still keep your representative 21 if like, you know, they're on the margins. The rest 22 of the district could change. If you live in the 23 center of the district, you're still going to keep 24 your representative, right?</p> <p>25 A. I couldn't answer that question.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 70</p>	<p>1 A. Yes. I want to say I -- I don't 2 remember missing any of them, no.</p> <p>3 Q. Okay. And how were the public meetings 4 held?</p> <p>5 A. Virtually, just like this meeting. We 6 were -- we were in COVID and we had to get as many 7 locations as we could to get as much input as we 8 could in a very compressed time period. So we did 9 it remotely.</p> <p>10 Q. And in person?</p> <p>11 A. Yes. We had one in the state house.</p> <p>12 Q. But 27 out of 28 were only held 13 virtually; is that right?</p> <p>14 A. Just like this meeting, yes, ma'am.</p> <p>15 Q. Okay. And what was your role in the 16 public meetings?</p> <p>17 A. I was to go over the -- to listen to the 18 house, when they talked about the state house 19 districts. And I listened to all the house, 20 congressional, senate, state school board, yes.</p> <p>21 Q. And were you just there to listen? Or 22 did you do anything else?</p> <p>23 A. I listened.</p> <p>24 Q. And did you answer any questions from 25 the public?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 72</p>

Evan Milligan, et al v. John H. Merrill, et al.

Chris Pringle
12/17/2021

<p>1 A. I believe I answered one.</p> <p>2 Q. And what was that question?</p> <p>3 A. I don't remember.</p> <p>4 Q. Was it about the congressional map?</p> <p>5 A. I don't remember.</p> <p>6 Q. And was Mr. Walker present at these</p> <p>7 public meetings?</p> <p>8 A. He was our moderator. Yes, ma'am.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay. And what does that mean?</p> <p>10 A. He conducted the meeting.</p> <p>11 Q. Okay. And is it fair to say that</p> <p>12 Mr. Walker primarily addressed or answered audience</p> <p>13 questions during the hearings?</p> <p>14 A. There was a time when people could</p> <p>15 either ask a question or submit a question</p> <p>16 electronically.</p> <p>17 Q. Okay.</p> <p>18 A. And he would address those questions.</p> <p>19 Q. And he addressed most of -- I'm sorry.</p> <p>20 Of the questions that were answered, Mr. Walker was</p> <p>21 the one who answered most of them?</p> <p>22 A. Yes, ma'am.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. And did audience members ever</p> <p>24 direct questions to you specifically?</p> <p>25 A. I can't remember.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 73</p>	<p>1 in order to get to zero deviation.</p> <p>2 Q. And who created that document?</p> <p>3 A. I'm not sure.</p> <p>4 Q. Do you know -- sorry.</p> <p>5 Did you take any notes during any of the</p> <p>6 public meetings?</p> <p>7 A. Any notes I took, I turned over in my</p> <p>8 evidence. They were handwritten on those -- those</p> <p>9 documents.</p> <p>10 Q. But you did take some --</p> <p>11 A. Very few.</p> <p>12 Q. -- notes? Okay.</p> <p>13 Did you take any notes after any of the</p> <p>14 public meetings?</p> <p>15 A. No, ma'am.</p> <p>16 Q. And did you talk to anyone about the --</p> <p>17 what happened in the public hearings?</p> <p>18 A. I'm sure I did. But I don't recall</p> <p>19 specifics.</p> <p>20 Q. Did you talk to Mr. Hinaman about what</p> <p>21 happened in the public meetings?</p> <p>22 A. Yes, ma'am.</p> <p>23 Q. And what did you tell him?</p> <p>24 A. Most of the conversations at the public</p> <p>25 hearings were dealing with state legislative races,</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 75</p>
<p>1 Q. And do you know if they directed</p> <p>2 questions to Senator McClendon specifically?</p> <p>3 A. I don't remember.</p> <p>4 Q. Did you prepare for any of the public</p> <p>5 meetings?</p> <p>6 A. We had the maps in front of us and the</p> <p>7 demographic shifts in front of us. And we would --</p> <p>8 I would read those as we went through the meetings.</p> <p>9 Q. And by "the maps," you mean the 2011 --</p> <p>10 A. Yes.</p> <p>11 Q. -- maps? Because you didn't have draft</p> <p>12 maps of the 2021 --</p> <p>13 A. No.</p> <p>14 Q. -- at that time. Okay.</p> <p>15 And what demographic figures are you</p> <p>16 talking about?</p> <p>17 A. The over and underpopulations, whether</p> <p>18 they had too many or too few people in them to stay</p> <p>19 within -- of course, I'm kind of talking legislative</p> <p>20 here and not congressional. Because congressional,</p> <p>21 we went to zero deviation. But we looked at the</p> <p>22 congressional districts to see which ones were</p> <p>23 overpopulated and which ones were underpopulated.</p> <p>24 Q. Okay.</p> <p>25 A. And how many people would have to change</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 74</p>	<p>1 if I remember correctly.</p> <p>2 Q. But occasionally people talked about</p> <p>3 congress, right?</p> <p>4 A. Yes. But we had not seen -- I had not</p> <p>5 seen the numbers on any plans until after they were</p> <p>6 submitted to reapportionment.</p> <p>7 So until I saw the -- you know, that</p> <p>8 ten-day rule kicked in and these plans that had been</p> <p>9 drawn off campus were submitted to the</p> <p>10 reapportionment office. Then and only then could we</p> <p>11 look at the demographics, the population changes,</p> <p>12 and the deviations in those districts.</p> <p>13 Q. Well, you had the demographic shift</p> <p>14 numbers to get to zero deviation during the public</p> <p>15 meetings, right?</p> <p>16 A. I had the number that we needed to get</p> <p>17 to, correct.</p> <p>18 Q. So you did talk to Mr. Hinaman about</p> <p>19 what was brought up at the public hearings about</p> <p>20 congress, correct?</p> <p>21 A. We talked -- I would assume we discussed</p> <p>22 it, yes.</p> <p>23 Q. And do you recall any specifics of what</p> <p>24 you talked about?</p> <p>25 A. Just the difference -- we were trying to</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 76</p>

Evan Milligan, et al v. John H. Merrill, et al.

Chris Pringle
12/17/2021

<p>1 get to zero deviation.</p> <p>2 Q. Did you relay any specific concerns that</p> <p>3 someone had at a public meeting about the</p> <p>4 congressional map to Mr. Hinaman?</p> <p>5 A. I was concerned about the deviations in</p> <p>6 any other proposed plans.</p> <p>7 Q. Well, the public, though, I'm talking</p> <p>8 about, what they brought up at the public hearings.</p> <p>9 Did you relay any of those specifics to Mr. Hinaman?</p> <p>10 A. I don't remember.</p> <p>11 Q. Do you recall discussing any of those</p> <p>12 kinds of specifics that the public had about</p> <p>13 congress to anyone else?</p> <p>14 A. I'm sure we did. I mean, it was the</p> <p>15 same talking points at every public hearing on the</p> <p>16 congressional plan.</p> <p>17 Q. I mean, that suggests that there was</p> <p>18 really only one view about the congressional map</p> <p>19 coming up at the public hearings.</p> <p>20 A. Well, it was the plan produced by the</p> <p>21 League of Women Voters. Every -- if I remember</p> <p>22 correctly, almost every single public hearing we</p> <p>23 had, somebody stood up with their talking points and</p> <p>24 read them to us and entered them into the record.</p> <p>25 Q. But not everybody who attended the</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 77</p>	<p>1 doing other things that aren't work related during</p> <p>2 the work hours. Do you think that that would have</p> <p>3 had an impact at all on --</p> <p>4 A. Well, the schedule of the public</p> <p>5 hearings was public. It was released. The links</p> <p>6 were public. You might not have been able to make</p> <p>7 one specific meeting, but you could have logged into</p> <p>8 any of the other 28 at any given time on any given</p> <p>9 day that we held them and listened and interjected</p> <p>10 into the congressional plan.</p> <p>11 Q. Well --</p> <p>12 A. I mean, you had 28 opportunities to log</p> <p>13 on over a three-week period that you could have come</p> <p>14 in and watched. It's not like you had to drive to a</p> <p>15 location like in the old days when you had to drive</p> <p>16 somewhere during the daytime to come hear us. You</p> <p>17 were able to listen at any time.</p> <p>18 Q. But even so, if you work at McDonald's</p> <p>19 from 9:00 to 5:00 and you're at the cash register,</p> <p>20 how are you going to attend one of those meetings?</p> <p>21 A. There are 28 different meetings at all</p> <p>22 different times of the day.</p> <p>23 Q. Well, not -- they're all between 9:00</p> <p>24 and 5:00 except for one.</p> <p>25 A. Then you could have logged in that night</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 79</p>
<p>1 public hearings would have known about the League of</p> <p>2 Women Voters' map, right?</p> <p>3 A. Somebody was there at virtually every</p> <p>4 meeting that I remember to talk about it.</p> <p>5 Q. Did anyone discuss anything about the</p> <p>6 congressional map that wasn't related to the League</p> <p>7 of Women Voters' map that you recall?</p> <p>8 A. I don't recall.</p> <p>9 Q. Do you know how many of the 28 meetings</p> <p>10 were held on weekdays during working hours, 9:00 to</p> <p>11 5:00?</p> <p>12 A. Like this one here, all but one of them.</p> <p>13 Q. Okay. And most people are working on</p> <p>14 weekdays during working hours from 9:00 to 5:00,</p> <p>15 right?</p> <p>16 That's a yes?</p> <p>17 A. That's -- I know a lot of people that</p> <p>18 work different hours.</p> <p>19 Q. But most people work on weekdays from</p> <p>20 the hours of around 9:00 to 5:00, would you say?</p> <p>21 A. I would say it's very common, yes.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. Do you think that that had an</p> <p>23 impact on who could attend the public meetings?</p> <p>24 A. I don't know.</p> <p>25 Q. I mean, if I'm at work, I tend to not be</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 78</p>	<p>1 and watched.</p> <p>2 Q. For that one meeting?</p> <p>3 A. Exactly. And you could have spoken your</p> <p>4 mind or emailed in your questions or your concerns</p> <p>5 at that time.</p> <p>6 Q. Okay. But you and others from the</p> <p>7 reapportionment committee set the times of those</p> <p>8 meetings, correct?</p> <p>9 A. Yes, ma'am.</p> <p>10 Q. Primarily you and Senator McClendon; is</p> <p>11 that right?</p> <p>12 A. In conjunction with the other members.</p> <p>13 Like I said, we produced a list of 22. And Ms. Hall</p> <p>14 asked us to add six meetings in communities she</p> <p>15 thought did not have enough representation or enough</p> <p>16 opportunities. So we added those additional six</p> <p>17 meetings and included them in our press releases so</p> <p>18 anybody could log in.</p> <p>19 Q. Did you consider holding more meetings</p> <p>20 in the evening other than just the one?</p> <p>21 A. I couldn't answer that question.</p> <p>22 Q. Before the public hearings happened,</p> <p>23 Senator McClendon told the press that the new maps</p> <p>24 wouldn't cause, quote, any surprises for the</p> <p>25 candidates or for the voters. I'll just represent</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 80</p>

Evan Milligan, et al v. John H. Merrill, et al.

Chris Pringle
12/17/2021

<p>1 to you that that happened.</p> <p>2 Do you know what the basis was for that</p> <p>3 statement?</p> <p>4 A. You'll have to ask Senator McClendon.</p> <p>5 Q. Do you agree with that statement, that</p> <p>6 even before the public hearings would have happened,</p> <p>7 that there wouldn't be surprises for candidates or</p> <p>8 for the voters?</p> <p>9 A. I think every time you change the lines,</p> <p>10 you surprise people.</p> <p>11 Q. But on the whole, would you say that</p> <p>12 that statement was true?</p> <p>13 A. Well, when your guidelines are to keep</p> <p>14 the core of the existing districts intact as much as</p> <p>15 practicable, it shouldn't be too earth shattering,</p> <p>16 some of the changes around the edges.</p> <p>17 Q. And do you know if any work had been</p> <p>18 conducted on drafting the congressional map prior to</p> <p>19 the public hearings?</p> <p>20 A. No, ma'am.</p> <p>21 Q. Do you know if any decisions on the</p> <p>22 lines for the congressional maps had been made</p> <p>23 before holding the public hearings?</p> <p>24 A. No, ma'am.</p> <p>25 Q. Are you familiar with the black belt</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 81</p>	<p>1 Q. Would you agree that the black belt is a</p> <p>2 community of interest?</p> <p>3 A. It's a very broad area that stretches</p> <p>4 from one side of the state to the other. I believe</p> <p>5 it has some communities of interest in it, yes.</p> <p>6 Q. But as a whole, is the black belt a</p> <p>7 community of interest?</p> <p>8 A. I couldn't answer that.</p> <p>9 Q. Why not?</p> <p>10 A. Because while I work in Wilcox and</p> <p>11 Marengo and Perry, I don't go to Macon or the</p> <p>12 counties on the other side. So I don't really know</p> <p>13 much about them.</p> <p>14 Q. But that's true for other communities of</p> <p>15 interest in other parts of the state, right?</p> <p>16 A. Explain that one to me.</p> <p>17 Q. I guess if the legislature -- if the</p> <p>18 reapportionment committee is tasked with approving a</p> <p>19 congressional map that keeps, you know, communities</p> <p>20 of interest together, you don't personally know</p> <p>21 about every community of interest in the same way</p> <p>22 that you do know about those particular counties,</p> <p>23 right?</p> <p>24 A. I mean, you know, I'm from Mobile. And</p> <p>25 we run up and -- it's the river system. So many of</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 83</p>
<p>1 counties in Alabama, that term?</p> <p>2 A. I sell timberland. I work all through</p> <p>3 the black belt.</p> <p>4 Q. Okay.</p> <p>5 A. I've spent more time in the black belt</p> <p>6 than . . .</p> <p>7 Q. And what's your understanding of the</p> <p>8 black belt?</p> <p>9 A. It's a region in the middle of the state</p> <p>10 of Alabama that got its name because of the rich</p> <p>11 soils.</p> <p>12 Q. And what counties are in it?</p> <p>13 A. It's like 28 counties, I think,</p> <p>14 something like that. I spend most of my time in</p> <p>15 Wilcox, Marengo, Lowndes, Perry, Hale, those areas.</p> <p>16 Q. And if you could just describe what</p> <p>17 portion of the state are we talking about.</p> <p>18 A. Central Alabama.</p> <p>19 Q. Do you recall if anyone discussed the</p> <p>20 black belt at any of the public hearings?</p> <p>21 MR. WALKER: What was --</p> <p>22 MS. WELBORN: If anyone at the public</p> <p>23 meetings discussed the black belt.</p> <p>24 A. It's a term that's often used in</p> <p>25 Alabama. But I don't remember specifically.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 82</p>	<p>1 the families in Mobile come from northern counties</p> <p>2 because of the way the river system is. We have</p> <p>3 very little to nothing in common with the people in</p> <p>4 the Wiregrass. It's not -- it's almost a totally</p> <p>5 different state over there.</p> <p>6 So I don't know -- if you're asking me</p> <p>7 do the people in Wilcox County have something in</p> <p>8 common with the people in Macon County, I can't</p> <p>9 answer that. But I know the people in Wilcox</p> <p>10 County. We go up and down the rivers.</p> <p>11 Q. Right. I guess what I'm saying is you</p> <p>12 still approve a map even though you don't have</p> <p>13 personal experience with every single community of</p> <p>14 interest, right?</p> <p>15 A. The state legislature approved the map,</p> <p>16 yes, ma'am.</p> <p>17 Q. Well, you voted for it, right?</p> <p>18 A. Yes.</p> <p>19 Q. So just going back to the black belt.</p> <p>20 Even though you don't necessarily have personal</p> <p>21 experience with every single county, can you still</p> <p>22 form an opinion about in general whether that is a</p> <p>23 community of interest?</p> <p>24 A. I know it's a very rural part of the</p> <p>25 state of Alabama.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 84</p>

Evan Milligan, et al v. John H. Merrill, et al.

Chris Pringle
12/17/2021

<p>1 Q. Does that make it a community of 2 interest?</p> <p>3 A. I don't know what your definition of a 4 community of interest is.</p> <p>5 Q. Well, the reapportionment committee has 6 a definition of community of interest, right?</p> <p>7 A. Yes.</p> <p>8 Q. So looking at that definition, would you 9 consider the black belt to be a community of 10 interest?</p> <p>11 A. Our definition of community of interest 12 is in certain circumstances to include political 13 subdivisions such as counties, voting precincts, 14 municipalities, tribal lands, reservations, or 15 school districts. Those counties -- the counties 16 are a community of interest.</p> <p>17 Q. Well, it also includes ethnic, racial, 18 economic, tribal, social, geographic, and historical 19 identities.</p> <p>20 A. Yes.</p> <p>21 Q. Under any of those aspects, does the 22 black belt constitute a community of interest?</p> <p>23 A. I know it's -- it is predominantly 24 African American.</p> <p>25 Q. And the black belt is a historical term, Page 85</p>	<p>1 A. The general public -- I mean, every 2 committee meeting had somebody standing up and 3 reading the talking points on the League of Women 4 Voters' plan. So if you read the record, it's all 5 in there. They all talked about that specific plan 6 on their talking points.</p> <p>7 Q. But the --</p> <p>8 A. I don't remember the general public 9 being dissatisfied with the members of congress.</p> <p>10 Q. Meaning other people at the -- at the 11 public meetings --</p> <p>12 A. Yes.</p> <p>13 Q. -- were not --</p> <p>14 A. I don't remember them being 15 dissatisfied, no, ma'am.</p> <p>16 Q. Okay. So how -- but you still took away 17 the idea that the general public was happy with 18 their current representation?</p> <p>19 A. Yes, ma'am.</p> <p>20 Q. Okay. And what did you do with that 21 information?</p> <p>22 A. I mean, it's all part of the permanent 23 record. I remembered it because I listened to all 24 of it.</p> <p>25 Q. Right. Page 87</p>
<p>1 right?</p> <p>2 A. Based on the soil, yes, ma'am.</p> <p>3 Q. Okay. And that term goes back quite a 4 long time?</p> <p>5 A. It was developed because of the rich 6 soil in that area.</p> <p>7 Q. So yes or no, under these guidelines, 8 does the black belt constitute a community of 9 interest?</p> <p>10 A. I couldn't answer that question. I just 11 couldn't answer that.</p> <p>12 Q. I don't understand why not.</p> <p>13 A. Because I'm not sure they are 14 politically cohesive and compact and contiguous 15 enough to constitute one.</p> <p>16 Q. What, if anything, did you learn or take 17 away from the public hearings?</p> <p>18 A. What do you mean by that?</p> <p>19 Q. Well, did you learn anything from what 20 you heard at the public hearings?</p> <p>21 A. I walked away thinking most people in 22 the state of Alabama were happy with their 23 representation the way it was in congress.</p> <p>24 Q. And do you recall any specifics about -- 25 about that? Page 86</p>	<p>1 A. We put it in the record. It's all 2 there.</p> <p>3 Q. After -- after the meetings, what did 4 you do with that information?</p> <p>5 A. It was put into the official record of 6 the committee.</p> <p>7 Q. I guess I'm -- did any of what you 8 learned at the public hearings influence how the 9 congressional map was drawn?</p> <p>10 A. I can't answer that. I don't -- I 11 wasn't a member -- that map was drawn by Mr. Hinaman 12 and in conjunction with the members of congress.</p> <p>13 Q. But you did discuss what you learned 14 about the public meetings with Mr. Hinaman with 15 respect to the congressional meetings at some point?</p> <p>16 A. That somebody had come to every meeting 17 and read the League of Women Voters' talking points, 18 yes.</p> <p>19 Q. But did you express to Mr. Hinaman your 20 sentiment that the general public was happy with 21 their representation?</p> <p>22 A. I don't remember.</p> <p>23 Q. Do you remember telling him, about the 24 congressional map, anything other than about the -- 25 from the public hearings other than the League of Page 88</p>

Evan Milligan, et al v. John H. Merrill, et al.

Chris Pringle
12/17/2021

<p>1 Women Voters' talking points?</p> <p>2 A. Not that I can recall.</p> <p>3 Q. And how much weight did you give to</p> <p>4 those -- the sentiment that the general public was</p> <p>5 happy with their representation in terms of its</p> <p>6 importance in drawing the map?</p> <p>7 A. We listened to the people. I was</p> <p>8 anxious to see what the League of Women Voters' map</p> <p>9 turned out to be.</p> <p>10 Q. Did you -- did you consider it to be</p> <p>11 more important when the congressional map was being</p> <p>12 drawn that the general public was satisfied with</p> <p>13 their representation compared to what was said about</p> <p>14 the League of Women Voters' map?</p> <p>15 A. You know, when every meeting somebody</p> <p>16 stands up and reads the same talking points and you</p> <p>17 could tell they've been prompted just to go say that</p> <p>18 to get it into the record, I put more weight on the</p> <p>19 people who came out of a true sense of wanting to</p> <p>20 express their opinion, not the opinion that was</p> <p>21 written down on a piece of paper form them by an</p> <p>22 attorney. What I assume was an attorney. I'm</p> <p>23 sorry.</p> <p>24 Q. So you gave less weight to those League</p> <p>25 of Women Voter talking points than you did the</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 89</p>	<p>1 or twice?</p> <p>2 A. I don't remember the number of times.</p> <p>3 But it came up a few.</p> <p>4 Q. A few. But not at every meeting?</p> <p>5 A. I don't remember it coming up at every</p> <p>6 meeting, no.</p> <p>7 Q. What was your response to the suggestion</p> <p>8 that there should be two majority black</p> <p>9 congressional districts?</p> <p>10 A. If somebody could show me a plan that</p> <p>11 met the guidelines, I would be interested in looking</p> <p>12 at it.</p> <p>13 Q. And what do you mean by "interested in</p> <p>14 looking at it"?</p> <p>15 A. I mean I would give it due consideration</p> <p>16 if it met the guidelines.</p> <p>17 Q. If you have competing maps that all meet</p> <p>18 the guidelines, how do you choose one over the</p> <p>19 other?</p> <p>20 A. I would go with the one that's most in</p> <p>21 line with the guidelines.</p> <p>22 Q. How do you determine what is most in</p> <p>23 line with the guidelines?</p> <p>24 A. The number of county splits, the</p> <p>25 deviations.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 91</p>
<p>1 people who were discussing on their own that they</p> <p>2 were happy with their representation?</p> <p>3 A. Somebody that was put in the room to put</p> <p>4 statements into the record is not, in my opinion,</p> <p>5 the same as somebody who comes on their own free</p> <p>6 will and their own fruition to express their</p> <p>7 personal opinion about their representation.</p> <p>8 Q. So did you give any instructions to</p> <p>9 Mr. Hinaman to change anything about the</p> <p>10 congressional map because of the public hearings?</p> <p>11 A. Not that I recall.</p> <p>12 Q. Did you give instructions to anyone else</p> <p>13 about changing the map because of the public</p> <p>14 hearings?</p> <p>15 A. Not that I recall.</p> <p>16 Q. At the public hearings, do you recall</p> <p>17 anyone discussing the need to have two majority</p> <p>18 black districts for congress?</p> <p>19 A. Two majority black congressional</p> <p>20 districts, yes, ma'am.</p> <p>21 Q. Yes. Who mentioned that?</p> <p>22 A. I don't recall specifically.</p> <p>23 Q. Was it mentioned often, would you say?</p> <p>24 A. I don't remember.</p> <p>25 Q. Was it something that only came up once</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 90</p>	<p>1 Q. Okay. Is something -- is one of those</p> <p>2 factors more important than the other?</p> <p>3 A. Deviations.</p> <p>4 Q. That's the most important factor, in</p> <p>5 your opinion?</p> <p>6 A. Yes, ma'am.</p> <p>7 Q. And how important are the county splits?</p> <p>8 A. Well, we tried to split as the few</p> <p>9 counties as possible in order to achieve the zero</p> <p>10 deviation.</p> <p>11 Q. Just quickly going back to talking about</p> <p>12 this sentiment that people were happy with their</p> <p>13 representation. How did you know or how did you</p> <p>14 determine who was there with their talking points</p> <p>15 and who was there, you know, coming of their own</p> <p>16 volition?</p> <p>17 A. If they're reading a piece of paper and</p> <p>18 it's the same talking points you've heard, I would</p> <p>19 assume they were sent there to read it. If they're</p> <p>20 talking extemporaneously and they don't line up with</p> <p>21 the talking points you've heard before, I would</p> <p>22 assume they were talking of their own fruition.</p> <p>23 Q. Did you ask anyone at any of the public</p> <p>24 meetings if they were part of a particular group?</p> <p>25 A. They were instructed by Mr. Dorman to</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 92</p>

Evan Milligan, et al v. John H. Merrill, et al.

Chris Pringle
12/17/2021

<p>1 state their name and who they represented.</p> <p>2 Q. And did you ask any of them if they were</p> <p>3 sent there by somebody else?</p> <p>4 A. No. They -- when they were called to</p> <p>5 speak, they were to state their name and who they</p> <p>6 represented.</p> <p>7 Q. Okay. And did you -- did you consider</p> <p>8 -- if someone came there, you know, with a prepared</p> <p>9 set of talking points, did you consider their</p> <p>10 opinion to be less -- less important to drawing the</p> <p>11 map than someone who came there to speak</p> <p>12 extemporaneously, like you said?</p> <p>13 A. I believe I answered that question</p> <p>14 already, didn't I?</p> <p>15 Q. Do you know if a map with two majority</p> <p>16 minority districts was proposed at any point?</p> <p>17 A. During the legislative process when we</p> <p>18 were in session, yes, ma'am.</p> <p>19 Q. Do you know if any were proposed before</p> <p>20 the special session?</p> <p>21 A. We have a rule that any plan drawn off</p> <p>22 campus, outside the reapportionment office, has to</p> <p>23 be turned over ten days before it can be introduced</p> <p>24 as a bill.</p> <p>25 So after they were turned over, at</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 93</p>	<p>1 Q. What --</p> <p>2 A. Until it -- until it reaches that bill</p> <p>3 form and we can analyze it based on the population</p> <p>4 and the deviations, I don't consider it a plan.</p> <p>5 Q. Okay. What all information could you</p> <p>6 look at from any plan at that point?</p> <p>7 A. At that point?</p> <p>8 Q. Uh-huh.</p> <p>9 A. After it's introduced from the outside</p> <p>10 source?</p> <p>11 Q. Yes.</p> <p>12 A. Then we look at the population, we look</p> <p>13 at the deviations, we look at the county splits, and</p> <p>14 we look at the BVAP, we look at the racial makeup of</p> <p>15 the district.</p> <p>16 Q. And when you say "BVAP," just for the</p> <p>17 record, what do you mean?</p> <p>18 A. Black voting age population.</p> <p>19 Q. And is that all black or any part black?</p> <p>20 Do you know?</p> <p>21 A. No, I couldn't answer that. I've seen</p> <p>22 both columns, but I don't know.</p> <p>23 Q. So just to clarify, you did not see a</p> <p>24 map for two majority minority or majority black</p> <p>25 congressional districts prior to the ten-day mark?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 95</p>
<p>1 whatever point they were turned over and they were</p> <p>2 put through our computers and we could get the</p> <p>3 information on them, the deviations and the county</p> <p>4 splits, we looked at them then.</p> <p>5 Q. So if someone submitted an outside plan,</p> <p>6 let's say, 30 days before the special session, so</p> <p>7 more than ten days, when would you have had access</p> <p>8 to that plan?</p> <p>9 A. I don't remember seeing the demographics</p> <p>10 of any plan that was introduced earlier than that.</p> <p>11 Q. I'm sorry. Could you --</p> <p>12 A. I don't remember seeing a plan that was</p> <p>13 submitted before then.</p> <p>14 Q. Before the ten days?</p> <p>15 A. Ten days, yes, ma'am.</p> <p>16 Q. Okay. And once a plan is submitted by</p> <p>17 outside groups, what happens?</p> <p>18 A. It's put through the computer and turned</p> <p>19 into what we call bill form. And then you have to</p> <p>20 find a member of the legislature that's willing to</p> <p>21 introduce it.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. But you mentioned deviation and</p> <p>23 demographic data. Does the computer program also</p> <p>24 give you that information?</p> <p>25 A. Yes.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 94</p>	<p>1 A. I did not see a plan that had the</p> <p>2 deviations in the populations until then. There's a</p> <p>3 difference between just color coding a map and</p> <p>4 letting me see an actual plan.</p> <p>5 Q. Okay. What's the difference?</p> <p>6 A. Well, you can -- you can draw anything</p> <p>7 you want to on a map. But until you actually have</p> <p>8 the census numbers and the demographic numbers in</p> <p>9 it, I don't consider it a plan.</p> <p>10 Q. And why not?</p> <p>11 A. Because until I know the population in</p> <p>12 that district -- the whole basis of redistricting is</p> <p>13 the 14th Amendment to the Constitution, equal</p> <p>14 protection, that my vote for a member of congress</p> <p>15 counts the same as another person in the state of</p> <p>16 Alabama's vote. That's the reason why we go through</p> <p>17 this process. It's one man, one vote. And until I</p> <p>18 look at a plan and the numbers associated with that</p> <p>19 plan, I don't consider it a full plan.</p> <p>20 Q. So I just want to make sure that I'm</p> <p>21 getting this right. I'm not trying to ask you over</p> <p>22 and over and over again.</p> <p>23 Is it right that you did not look at</p> <p>24 what you considered to be a plan, so an analyzed,</p> <p>25 you know, map with all that demographic information</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 96</p>

Evan Milligan, et al v. John H. Merrill, et al.

Chris Pringle
12/17/2021

<p>1 and deviation information, until after that ten-day 2 mark?</p> <p>3 A. Until after it was analyzed and I could 4 get the numbers, yes.</p> <p>5 Q. Okay.</p> <p>6 A. Then we looked at it to see what the 7 deviation was, the overall deviation of the plan, 8 and how many splits there were in counties and what 9 counties were split.</p> <p>10 Q. Okay. And at that point, were there any 11 maps that were -- had two majority black districts?</p> <p>12 A. I don't remember seeing two majority 13 black districts. I remember seeing one -- two of 14 what they call opportunity districts, what they were 15 calling -- the districts were not 50 percent 16 minority.</p> <p>17 Q. Could you define your understanding of 18 an opportunity district?</p> <p>19 A. That's what they were calling them. 20 They called them opportunity districts, and they 21 were both under 50 percent minority.</p> <p>22 THE REPORTER: Under 50 percent what?</p> <p>23 A. Minority population.</p> <p>24 Q. And who is "they"?</p> <p>25 A. The people who introduced them, the</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 97</p>	<p>1 A. I'm afraid we would run afoul of Section 2 2 of the Voting Rights Act.</p> <p>3 Q. Okay.</p> <p>4 MR. DAVIS: Can I ask how we're doing on 5 time? This was -- I know we had a break, a long 6 break, for audio. This was a two-hour deposition 7 that was noticed. We've got three PI motions we 8 need to get back to work on. This seems to be 9 really dragging.</p> <p>10 MS. WELBORN: Well, I mean, we have up 11 to 7 hours under the Rules of Federal Procedure.</p> <p>12 MR. DAVIS: You're going to take 14?</p> <p>13 MS. WELBORN: I would hope -- I would 14 really like to not do that. But it certainly is our 15 right to do that. I can't really tell you at this 16 point exactly how much longer. But I'm happy to 17 take a break right now to help confer --</p> <p>18 MR. DAVIS: I'm hearing a lot of 19 repetition and a lot of arguing with the witness. 20 If you're going to do this discovery before the 21 preliminary injunction hearing, it needs to get 22 pretty focused and be a little sensitive and 23 courteous towards everything that we've got to do on 24 the defense side to get ready to respond to your 25 motions.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 99</p>
<p>1 League of Women Voters and -- I can't remember who 2 introduced the bill in the house.</p> <p>3 Q. Okay. And -- sorry. One second. 4 If a district has under a 50 percent 5 minority population, what is the importance of that 6 number, I guess? Why was that number important?</p> <p>7 A. Under Section 2 of the Voting Rights 8 Act, we can't do anything to diminish the ability or 9 protect a class of minority citizens from electing 10 or defeating a candidate of their choice.</p> <p>11 Q. So if a district has under 50 percent 12 voting age population -- sorry. Under 50 percent 13 minority population, does that automatically 14 diminish their ability to choose a candidate of 15 their choice under Section 2?</p> <p>16 A. You're asking an attorney question.</p> <p>17 Q. Well, I mean, ultimately it's your 18 responsibility to --</p> <p>19 A. It would -- it would -- I would give 20 great caution in order to draw a district that was 21 less than 50 percent, yes.</p> <p>22 Q. Under 50 percent minority population?</p> <p>23 A. Yes. I would be very cautious.</p> <p>24 Q. Okay. And by "very cautious," does that 25 mean you are -- what does that mean?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 98</p>	<p>1 MS. WELBORN: I understand what you're 2 saying.</p> <p>3 MR. ROSBOROUGH: Counsel, I thought we 4 were going to refrain from speaking objections.</p> <p>5 MR. DAVIS: What did he say?</p> <p>6 THE REPORTER: Refrain from speaking 7 objections.</p> <p>8 MS. WELBORN: Let's take a break. Let's 9 go off the record. And we'll come back and talk 10 after that.</p> <p>11 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are off the 12 record. The time is 11:26 a.m.</p> <p>13 (Recess was taken.)</p> <p>14 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the 15 record. The time is 12:06 p.m.</p> <p>16 Q. So I'd like to talk about the October 17 26th reapportionment committee meeting. Do you 18 remember if you did anything to prepare for that 19 meeting?</p> <p>20 A. Yes. We sent the proposed maps to all 21 the members for their review prior to the meeting.</p> <p>22 Q. And by "we," who do you mean?</p> <p>23 A. The staff at the reapportionment 24 committee.</p> <p>25 Q. Okay. And do you remember how far in</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 100</p>

Evan Milligan, et al v. John H. Merrill, et al.

Chris Pringle
12/17/2021

<p>1 advance you sent them out?</p> <p>2 A. As fast as we could. Remember this</p> <p>3 whole process was very condensed, very condensed.</p> <p>4 Q. I think it was the day before the</p> <p>5 meeting. Is that right?</p> <p>6 A. Yes, ma'am, which is standard operating</p> <p>7 procedure. We get bills usually about a day before.</p> <p>8 Q. Okay.</p> <p>9 A. Usually. Not all the time.</p> <p>10 Q. And did you talk to anyone about this</p> <p>11 meeting beforehand?</p> <p>12 A. I approached the members of my -- the</p> <p>13 house members of the committee to make sure they</p> <p>14 read their information and make sure they came to</p> <p>15 the meeting.</p> <p>16 Q. And other than the maps themselves, did</p> <p>17 you provide any materials to the members of the</p> <p>18 committee?</p> <p>19 A. Whatever the committee sent with the</p> <p>20 notice.</p> <p>21 Q. With the -- I'm sorry. What do you mean</p> <p>22 by the notes?</p> <p>23 A. They were sent an email notifying them</p> <p>24 of the meeting. Whatever was contained in that</p> <p>25 notification of the meeting.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 101</p>	<p>1 Q. Who decides whether a racial</p> <p>2 polarization analysis should be done for a</p> <p>3 particular district?</p> <p>4 A. Not me.</p> <p>5 Q. Do you know who does decide?</p> <p>6 A. I would -- I would assume it would be</p> <p>7 our attorney.</p> <p>8 Q. Why that assumption?</p> <p>9 A. Because he's an attorney and he</p> <p>10 understands Section 2.</p> <p>11 Q. But the actual analysis itself is math,</p> <p>12 right?</p> <p>13 A. I would assume. But I've never -- never</p> <p>14 done it.</p> <p>15 Q. Okay. Would anyone other than your</p> <p>16 attorneys make the decision to have a racial</p> <p>17 polarization analysis done for a particular</p> <p>18 district?</p> <p>19 A. Not that I'm aware of. I'm sure if I</p> <p>20 asked for one, I could get it.</p> <p>21 Q. Okay. Can anyone ask for it?</p> <p>22 A. I don't know the answer to that</p> <p>23 question.</p> <p>24 Q. Well, could a member of the</p> <p>25 reapportionment committee ask for it and have it be</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 103</p>
<p>1 Q. And do you know who sent that email?</p> <p>2 A. Somebody on the reapportionment staff.</p> <p>3 Q. Okay. So a considerable portion of that</p> <p>4 meeting was about racial polarization analysis,</p> <p>5 which I'll also refer to as RPV. Does that --</p> <p>6 A. RP what?</p> <p>7 Q. RPV. Have you heard that term before?</p> <p>8 A. I've heard of racial population</p> <p>9 analysis.</p> <p>10 Q. I'll try to refer to it as racial</p> <p>11 polarization analysis. But that's also a lot of</p> <p>12 words.</p> <p>13 A. You can use the acronym.</p> <p>14 Q. So what's your understanding of racial</p> <p>15 polarization analysis?</p> <p>16 A. My understanding is that is done</p> <p>17 particularly for the courts to determine whether we</p> <p>18 either on purpose -- intentionally or</p> <p>19 unintentionally violated Section 2 of the Voting</p> <p>20 Rights Act and denied a group of protected class of</p> <p>21 minority citizens from electing or defeating a</p> <p>22 candidate of their choice based on the analysis of</p> <p>23 the historical vote.</p> <p>24 Q. And do you know how it's done?</p> <p>25 A. No, ma'am.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 102</p>	<p>1 performed?</p> <p>2 A. I'm sure if a member of the</p> <p>3 reapportionment committee wanted one, they could</p> <p>4 approach the legal counsel of the committee and</p> <p>5 request one.</p> <p>6 Q. How do you decide which district a</p> <p>7 racial polarization analysis should be done for?</p> <p>8 A. I didn't make that decision.</p> <p>9 Q. So you don't play any role in deciding</p> <p>10 district X should have a racial polarization</p> <p>11 analysis done?</p> <p>12 A. I did not, no.</p> <p>13 Q. Okay. Do you know if there are any</p> <p>14 written guidelines for how someone should decide</p> <p>15 whether a racial polarization analysis should be</p> <p>16 done?</p> <p>17 A. I don't recall ever seeing any.</p> <p>18 Q. Do you know if there are any informal</p> <p>19 guidelines?</p> <p>20 A. I don't recall ever seeing any.</p> <p>21 Q. Or hearing of any?</p> <p>22 A. No.</p> <p>23</p> <p>24 (Plaintiff's Exhibit 4 was</p> <p>25 marked for identification.)</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 104</p>

Evan Milligan, et al v. John H. Merrill, et al.

Chris Pringle
12/17/2021

<p>1</p> <p>2 Q. I'd like to introduce Exhibit 4. This</p> <p>3 is a transcript of the reapportionment committee</p> <p>4 meeting from October 26th.</p> <p>5 MS. WELBORN: And we will provide</p> <p>6 electronic copies.</p> <p>7 MR. WALKER: I understand. My only</p> <p>8 caveat is while I don't have any reason to believe</p> <p>9 that these are inaccurate, we haven't had a chance</p> <p>10 to check it.</p> <p>11 MS. WELBORN: Of course.</p> <p>12 Q. I'll get to that in a second.</p> <p>13 But do you know when a racial</p> <p>14 polarization analysis is conducted? At what point</p> <p>15 in the process, I mean.</p> <p>16 A. I was under the assumption that after we</p> <p>17 passed the bills, that a racial polarization</p> <p>18 analysis would be done for the lawsuits.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. So after they are already</p> <p>20 enacted, right?</p> <p>21 A. Well, given the timeline.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay.</p> <p>23 A. We didn't have time to.</p> <p>24 Q. If you could turn to Page 20. I'm</p> <p>25 sorry. It's Page 18. And at the very bottom,</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 105</p>	<p>1 racial issue, do you have an understanding of what</p> <p>2 that means?</p> <p>3 A. You would have to ask Mr. -- Senator</p> <p>4 McClendon.</p> <p>5 Q. Okay. Did you encounter any possible</p> <p>6 racial -- racial issues over the course of the</p> <p>7 redistricting process?</p> <p>8 MR. WALKER: Objection to form. I'm</p> <p>9 just not sure what you mean.</p> <p>10 Q. When did you take race into account in</p> <p>11 the redistricting process?</p> <p>12 A. Mr. Hinaman was directed by the</p> <p>13 committee to follow the guidelines and to draw those</p> <p>14 plans race neutral, without looking at race until</p> <p>15 after he had developed a plan. That's my</p> <p>16 understanding. The plan was developed, and race was</p> <p>17 not looked at until after it was drawn.</p> <p>18 Q. And then how was -- it was looked at</p> <p>19 after the plan was drawn?</p> <p>20 A. After the plan was drawn, yes, ma'am, in</p> <p>21 conjunction with the members of congress.</p> <p>22 Q. And do you know how it was looked at?</p> <p>23 A. No. He met with members of congress to</p> <p>24 go over it.</p> <p>25 Q. And do you know what data was looked at?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 107</p>
<p>1 Senator McClendon says, "Can I ask something? The</p> <p>2 question you're asking, the answer is our attorney,</p> <p>3 mine and your attorney, set that data off for</p> <p>4 districts that it looked like there might possibly</p> <p>5 be a racial issue."</p> <p>6 And this is referring to a racial</p> <p>7 polarization analysis. That is, that racial</p> <p>8 polarization is done -- analysis is done for</p> <p>9 districts where it looked like there might possibly</p> <p>10 be a racial issue.</p> <p>11 Is that your understanding of when</p> <p>12 racial polarization -- that that is why a racial</p> <p>13 polarization analysis is done, is because there</p> <p>14 might possibly be a racial issue?</p> <p>15 A. I read that as our attorney was going to</p> <p>16 make that determination.</p> <p>17 Q. And is it your understanding that</p> <p>18 looking like there might possibly be a racial issue</p> <p>19 is the criteria for determining whether a racial</p> <p>20 polarization analysis should be conducted for a</p> <p>21 particular district?</p> <p>22 A. Again, I was leaving that to the</p> <p>23 attorney to determine, what we would have to prepare</p> <p>24 for court cases.</p> <p>25 Q. So talking about might possibly be a</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 106</p>	<p>1 A. No, ma'am.</p> <p>2 MR. WALKER: Did you say date?</p> <p>3 MS. WELBORN: Data.</p> <p>4 Q. And do you know anything that would have</p> <p>5 changed because race was taken into account in the</p> <p>6 congressional map?</p> <p>7 A. No, ma'am.</p> <p>8 Q. And when you said the committee gave</p> <p>9 instructions to Mr. Hinaman, who are you referring</p> <p>10 to specifically?</p> <p>11 A. I would say Chairman McClendon and I</p> <p>12 told Mr. Hinaman to follow the guidelines in drawing</p> <p>13 these maps.</p> <p>14 Q. And in doing so, that means taking a</p> <p>15 race-neutral approach to drawing the first map; is</p> <p>16 that right?</p> <p>17 A. Yes, ma'am. The congressional map, yes,</p> <p>18 ma'am.</p> <p>19 Q. Did you give any other instructions to</p> <p>20 Mr. Hinaman?</p> <p>21 A. Follow the guidelines.</p> <p>22 Q. But that's it?</p> <p>23 A. That's the reason why we adopted the</p> <p>24 guidelines.</p> <p>25 Q. And how did you communicate with</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 108</p>

Evan Milligan, et al v. John H. Merrill, et al.

Chris Pringle
12/17/2021

<p>1 Mr. Hinaman?</p> <p>2 A. I would see him in the reapportionment</p> <p>3 office, and on the telephone.</p> <p>4 Q. Okay. Did you ever email with him?</p> <p>5 A. No, ma'am. I'm not a big email person.</p> <p>6 Q. I suppose that means you didn't text him</p> <p>7 either.</p> <p>8 A. Nothing of substance.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay.</p> <p>10 A. And I'll be glad to show you the texts.</p> <p>11 Q. So are you aware of any racial</p> <p>12 polarization analysis that was done for any district</p> <p>13 in the 2001 -- or 2021 congressional map prior to</p> <p>14 this meeting on October 26th?</p> <p>15 A. No, ma'am.</p> <p>16 Q. So not for District 7?</p> <p>17 A. No, ma'am.</p> <p>18 Q. Had a racial polarization analysis been</p> <p>19 done for some state legislative districts?</p> <p>20 A. No, ma'am.</p> <p>21 Q. Was any racial polarization analysis</p> <p>22 conducted for any of the maps at any point before</p> <p>23 October 26th?</p> <p>24 A. No, ma'am.</p> <p>25 Q. So a racial polarization analysis</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 109</p>	<p>1 analysis was done because the maps had already</p> <p>2 passed, right?</p> <p>3 A. Yes.</p> <p>4 Q. Sorry. I'm not trying to trick you.</p> <p>5 A. No. I had to think about it. Yes,</p> <p>6 we -- we passed the maps.</p> <p>7 Q. Okay. Did you ever suggest having a</p> <p>8 racial polarization analysis done before the maps</p> <p>9 were passed?</p> <p>10 A. I didn't consider it an option. We were</p> <p>11 under such a tight timeline. We knew we would have</p> <p>12 to do it because of the lawsuit that had already</p> <p>13 been filed before we ever filed a bill, and we knew</p> <p>14 it would be done. We just didn't have time to . . .</p> <p>15 Q. To get it done?</p> <p>16 A. To get it done.</p> <p>17 Q. Do you know how long it takes to perform</p> <p>18 a racial polarization analysis?</p> <p>19 A. No, ma'am.</p> <p>20 Q. Do you know if anyone suggested doing a</p> <p>21 racial polarization analysis prior to the bill's</p> <p>22 passing?</p> <p>23 A. It came up in the committee meeting.</p> <p>24 And we assured them that we were going to perform</p> <p>25 them, the ones that our attorneys deemed necessary,</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 111</p>
<p>1 couldn't be taken into account for drawing the</p> <p>2 initial map?</p> <p>3 A. We drew them race blind.</p> <p>4 Q. Do you know when the first time a racial</p> <p>5 polarization analysis was conducted for any district</p> <p>6 for the congressional map?</p> <p>7 A. My understanding, they were sent off</p> <p>8 sometime after the bills at the end of the special</p> <p>9 session.</p> <p>10 Q. Do you know who requested that?</p> <p>11 A. I believe Mr. Walker.</p> <p>12 Q. And do you know why that request was</p> <p>13 made?</p> <p>14 A. Because we already had a lawsuit filed.</p> <p>15 We had a lawsuit filed against us before we ever</p> <p>16 filed a bill.</p> <p>17 Q. Who -- do you know who did the racial</p> <p>18 polarization analysis?</p> <p>19 A. No, ma'am.</p> <p>20 Q. Do you know if a consultant was hired to</p> <p>21 do it?</p> <p>22 A. There was somebody hired. I do not know</p> <p>23 who.</p> <p>24 Q. So just to be clear, nothing changed as</p> <p>25 a part of the maps after the racial polarization</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 110</p>	<p>1 and we would get that to them when we had the</p> <p>2 information.</p> <p>3 Q. Do you know if a racial polarization</p> <p>4 analysis had been done for congressional maps in</p> <p>5 previous redistricting cycles?</p> <p>6 A. I have no knowledge.</p> <p>7 Q. You don't remember from the 2001, 2002</p> <p>8 cycle if that happened?</p> <p>9 A. Remember we were under Section 5</p> <p>10 preclearance at the time. And once they called and</p> <p>11 said we had been precleared -- I had never heard the</p> <p>12 term before that.</p> <p>13 Q. Okay. So do you know when the racial</p> <p>14 polarization analysis for the congressional map was</p> <p>15 finished?</p> <p>16 A. I have not seen it.</p> <p>17 Q. You have not seen it?</p> <p>18 A. I have not seen it.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. Have you asked to look at it?</p> <p>20 A. No, ma'am.</p> <p>21 Q. Have you talked to anyone about it?</p> <p>22 A. You.</p> <p>23 Q. So why don't you do the racial</p> <p>24 polarization analysis for all districts just as a</p> <p>25 matter of course? And I'm not talking -- I</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 112</p>

Evan Milligan, et al v. John H. Merrill, et al.

Chris Pringle
12/17/2021

<p>1 understand there's a time crunch here. But in 2 general, why isn't it done for all of the districts 3 just because?</p> <p>4 A. I don't see a need for some of the 5 districts. They're not being challenged in court, 6 are they?</p> <p>7 Q. Well, Districts 1, 2, and 3 are also 8 being challenged.</p> <p>9 A. Okay.</p> <p>10 Q. And when you say you don't see a need, 11 why is that?</p> <p>12 A. If you're not challenging them in court, 13 I mean, I don't see the need to do an analysis on 14 them.</p> <p>15 Q. Okay. But four of seven districts are 16 being challenged in this lawsuit.</p> <p>17 A. Okay.</p> <p>18 Q. If you turn to Page 19, Senator 19 McClendon and Representative England have a 20 back-and-forth here about a number, 54 percent of 21 black voting age population for District 7. So 54 22 percent BVAP.</p> <p>23 And Representative England is asking 24 that a racial polarization analysis be done. And 25 Senator McClendon says that he was told by</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 113</p>	<p>1 A. No, ma'am, I have no opinion.</p> <p>2 Q. Do you know what the relationship is 3 between having a BVAP of 54 percent and the decision 4 to do a racial polarization analysis?</p> <p>5 A. No, ma'am.</p> <p>6 Q. Do you know at what percent of BVAP a 7 district would have that you would need to do a 8 racial polarization analysis?</p> <p>9 A. No, ma'am.</p> <p>10 Q. So would you agree with the statement 11 that if a black district has a BVAP of under 54 12 percent, that requires a racial polarization 13 analysis?</p> <p>14 A. I can't agree or disagree with that 15 statement. I think it depends on the district. But 16 I don't know.</p> <p>17 Q. What would -- what do you mean by 18 "depends on the district"?</p> <p>19 A. I've seen majority minority districts 20 elect nonminorities.</p> <p>21 Q. I would like to introduce another 22 exhibit. This is the transcript of the floor 23 debate, Plaintiff's Exhibit 5, on November 1st.</p> <p>24 A. All right.</p> <p>25</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 115</p>
<p>1 Mr. Walker that a racial polarization analysis for 2 District 7 is unnecessary because District 7 has a 3 BVAP of around 54 percent.</p> <p>4 Why would it be unnecessary to conduct a 5 racial polarization analysis if a district has a 6 BVAP of around 54 percent?</p> <p>7 A. I think you need to ask Senator 8 McClendon that. I didn't say that.</p> <p>9 Q. But do you have an opinion on that?</p> <p>10 A. No, ma'am.</p> <p>11 Q. Do you think that having a BVAP of 12 around 54 percent for a particular district is 13 important?</p> <p>14 A. I -- it's my understanding that's -- 15 that's the plan that Congresswoman Sewell agreed to.</p> <p>16 Q. And what do you mean by that?</p> <p>17 A. Mr. Hinaman worked with the members of 18 congress, and they signed off on the map that he had 19 drawn and said they agreed to it and would accept 20 it. I was not privy to that conversation, though. 21 That's secondhand. I was just told that.</p> <p>22 Q. Who told you that?</p> <p>23 A. I don't remember.</p> <p>24 Q. So do you have any opinion on whether 25 District 7 should have a BVAP of around 54 percent?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 114</p>	<p>1 (Plaintiff's Exhibit 5 was 2 marked for identification.)</p> <p>3</p> <p>4 Q. And if you'll flip to Page 20.</p> <p>5 MR. WALKER: And, Kaitlin, I'll just put 6 on the record that we also have not had a chance to 7 check this. I don't have any reason to believe it's 8 inaccurate. But I just note that for the record.</p> <p>9 MS. WELBORN: Yes. We will stipulate to 10 that for all of the transcripts.</p> <p>11 MR. WALKER: Okay.</p> <p>12 Q. So you're having a back-and-forth here 13 with Representative England who again is asking why 14 a racial polarization analysis was not done on 15 District 7.</p> <p>16 And at the very bottom of the page, you 17 said, "We thought it was necessary, but they cut it 18 off, I think, at 51 percent. Anything under 51 19 percent they did it on. Anyone over that, they 20 didn't do it."</p> <p>21 Do you know what you mean -- what you 22 meant by that statement?</p> <p>23 A. I don't remember. I really -- I think 24 that what I was talking about at that point was 25 trying to get something done rapidly, as fast as</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 116</p>

Evan Milligan, et al v. John H. Merrill, et al.

Chris Pringle
12/17/2021

<p>1 possible. And we didn't have time to do 140</p> <p>2 legislative districts, eight school board digits,</p> <p>3 and seven congressional districts given the time</p> <p>4 frame we had.</p> <p>5 Q. And the 51 percent is BVAP. I'll tell</p> <p>6 you that that.</p> <p>7 Okay. And when you said, "We thought it</p> <p>8 was necessary," do you know who you were referring</p> <p>9 to?</p> <p>10 A. I would assume it was Mr. Walker and</p> <p>11 Mr. Hinaman and myself.</p> <p>12 Q. Okay. And when you said they --</p> <p>13 A. Because on that floor -- at this time,</p> <p>14 I'm sure you have my talking points.</p> <p>15 Q. Yes.</p> <p>16 A. I was going -- I was using my talking</p> <p>17 points. And remember this was rapid fire, as fast</p> <p>18 as -- and I was -- this was late into the session.</p> <p>19 And Mr. England is a very skilled</p> <p>20 attorney and chairman of the democratic party. So</p> <p>21 he is quite, quite gifted in the way he can ask</p> <p>22 questions and get people that are not attorneys to</p> <p>23 answer them.</p> <p>24 Q. And so when you said that they cut it</p> <p>25 off at 51 percent, do you know who the "they" is?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 117</p>	<p>1 A. That's a question I really can't -- I</p> <p>2 don't think there's a magic number that exists to</p> <p>3 guarantee the election or defeat of a minority</p> <p>4 candidate.</p> <p>5 Q. Is there some range?</p> <p>6 A. Again, I was told that Congresswoman</p> <p>7 Sewell was comfortable with the plan that had been</p> <p>8 presented and was in support of that plan. And the</p> <p>9 other members of congress were in support of it.</p> <p>10 Q. I would like to introduce Plaintiff's</p> <p>11 Exhibit 6, which is the final 2021 map for congress.</p> <p>12</p> <p>13 (Plaintiff's Exhibit 6 was</p> <p>14 marked for identification.)</p> <p>15</p> <p>16 Q. And District 7 is the one in brown.</p> <p>17 Would you agree that District 7 appears to be</p> <p>18 racially jerrymandered?</p> <p>19 A. I think just District 7 is in large part</p> <p>20 the same district that was drawn under the Reed</p> <p>21 Buskey, just adjusted for population increases.</p> <p>22 Q. And how would you describe the shape of</p> <p>23 District 7?</p> <p>24 A. Again, we try and maintain the core of</p> <p>25 existing districts. And this district was created</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 119</p>
<p>1 A. I would assume I was referring to</p> <p>2 Mr. Walker and Mr. Hinaman.</p> <p>3 Q. And how was that 51 percent number</p> <p>4 chosen?</p> <p>5 A. I'm sure I was just reading the talking</p> <p>6 point.</p> <p>7 Q. And who prepared those talking points?</p> <p>8 A. Mr. Walker and, I believe, Mr. Hinaman.</p> <p>9 Q. And did you discuss those talking points</p> <p>10 with either Mr. Walker or Mr. Hinaman?</p> <p>11 A. They were getting them to me as fast as</p> <p>12 they could. This was rapid fire.</p> <p>13 Q. What is your understanding of how you</p> <p>14 can tell whether minorities can elect their</p> <p>15 candidate of choice?</p> <p>16 A. In the congressional maps?</p> <p>17 Q. Yes.</p> <p>18 A. I don't really understand that question.</p> <p>19 Would you repeat it, please?</p> <p>20 Q. How can you tell whether minorities can</p> <p>21 elect their candidate of choice in a particular</p> <p>22 district?</p> <p>23 A. In a particular congressional district?</p> <p>24 Q. Well, any district. But in this case,</p> <p>25 yes, we're talking about a congressional district.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 118</p>	<p>1 in 1992 by the Reed Buskey plan.</p> <p>2 MS. WELBORN: I would like to take just</p> <p>3 a short break. We might be finished. I just want</p> <p>4 to double-check.</p> <p>5 MR. WALKER: Would you like for us to</p> <p>6 leave the room?</p> <p>7 MS. WELBORN: Let's go off the record.</p> <p>8 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are off the</p> <p>9 record. The time is 12:33 p.m.</p> <p>10 (Recess was taken.)</p> <p>11 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the</p> <p>12 record. The time is 12:40 p.m.</p> <p>13 MS. WELBORN: The Milligan plaintiffs</p> <p>14 are finished asking questions. I'm not sure if the</p> <p>15 Singleton or Caster plaintiffs have any questions</p> <p>16 for you. But after that, we can break for lunch and</p> <p>17 you'll be done.</p> <p>18 MR. WALKER: Yay.</p> <p>19 MS. WELBORN: Yay.</p> <p>20 MS. FAULKS: Do the Caster plaintiffs</p> <p>21 have any questions?</p> <p>22 MR. OSHER: Can you hear me?</p> <p>23 (Discussion held off the record.)</p> <p>24 EXAMINATION BY MR. OSHER:</p> <p>25 Q. I only have a few questions. So this</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 120</p>

Evan Milligan, et al v. John H. Merrill, et al.

Chris Pringle
12/17/2021

<p>1 should be -- this should be very quick.</p> <p>2 Representative, thank you for your time. My name is</p> <p>3 Daniel Osher. I am an attorney for the plaintiffs</p> <p>4 in the Caster litigation.</p> <p>5 You might have said this before. And I</p> <p>6 apologize if you did, Representative. How long have</p> <p>7 you served in the Alabama legislature?</p> <p>8 A. I was first elected in 1994. I served</p> <p>9 two terms. I left in 2002. And I was reelected in</p> <p>10 2014 and '18.</p> <p>11 Q. Okay. So that's roughly how many years?</p> <p>12 A. 12. How many years total? I'll be 16</p> <p>13 years in the legislature with a 12-year gap.</p> <p>14 Q. Great. Thank you.</p> <p>15 And have you been a member of the</p> <p>16 republican party that whole time?</p> <p>17 A. I've been an elected republican</p> <p>18 official. But I've never been an official member of</p> <p>19 the Alabama Republican Party.</p> <p>20 Q. I understand. Have you always</p> <p>21 considered yourself a republican?</p> <p>22 A. Yes, sir.</p> <p>23 Q. Based on your 16 years serving in the</p> <p>24 legislature, in your view, do the views of members</p> <p>25 of the democratic party in Alabama differ from the</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 121</p>	<p>1 A. I'm assuming that I've had numerous</p> <p>2 conversations with both republicans and democrats,</p> <p>3 yes.</p> <p>4 Q. And do you have a general sense of how</p> <p>5 one party views a major issue in Alabama as opposed</p> <p>6 to another party?</p> <p>7 A. I'm sure we differ on specific issues,</p> <p>8 yes.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay. So based on your 16 years serving</p> <p>10 in the legislature, do the views of members of the</p> <p>11 democratic party in Alabama generally differ from</p> <p>12 the members of the republican party in Alabama</p> <p>13 generally when it comes to affirmative action?</p> <p>14 A. Again, your definition of affirmative</p> <p>15 action I don't know.</p> <p>16 Q. Policies implementing a preference for</p> <p>17 individuals while considering their race.</p> <p>18 A. I think given my history of being in the</p> <p>19 Alabama legislature when the democrats were in</p> <p>20 supermajority, it's a pretty wide spectrum across</p> <p>21 political lines.</p> <p>22 Q. So you're saying that the two major</p> <p>23 parties in Alabama do not have the -- have the same</p> <p>24 view when it comes to affirmative action?</p> <p>25 A. I couldn't answer that. I've run across</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 123</p>
<p>1 members of the republican party in Alabama when it</p> <p>2 comes to removing confederate monuments from public</p> <p>3 spaces?</p> <p>4 A. I mean, you're asking me to suppose what</p> <p>5 other people are thinking. But I would say yes.</p> <p>6 Q. And based -- based on your 16 years in</p> <p>7 the legislature, do the views of members of the</p> <p>8 democratic party in Alabama differ from the members</p> <p>9 of the republican party in Alabama when it comes to</p> <p>10 affirmative action?</p> <p>11 MR. WALKER: Objection to form. Dan,</p> <p>12 I'm not sure that we have a clear understanding of</p> <p>13 what affirmative action is these days.</p> <p>14 MR. OSHER: I didn't catch that, Dorman.</p> <p>15 Can you say that again?</p> <p>16 MR. WALKER: Yeah. I'm not sure that I</p> <p>17 would have a clear understanding of what affirmative</p> <p>18 action is these days.</p> <p>19 MR. OSHER: Sure.</p> <p>20 Q. Representative, in your 16 years of</p> <p>21 service in the legislature, have you had an</p> <p>22 opportunity to view what the general views of each</p> <p>23 of the major parties in the state are?</p> <p>24 A. On which issue?</p> <p>25 Q. On various issues.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 122</p>	<p>1 varying opinions in different members.</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. Based on your 16 years in the</p> <p>3 legislature, do the views of members of the</p> <p>4 democratic party in Alabama generally differ from</p> <p>5 members of the republican party in Alabama generally</p> <p>6 when it comes to criminal justice reform?</p> <p>7 A. I think -- I think there's a divide,</p> <p>8 yes. But I know some -- some conservatives that are</p> <p>9 in favor of criminal justice reform themselves.</p> <p>10 Q. And just to clarify, you're saying that</p> <p>11 there is a difference between the general views of</p> <p>12 the democratic party -- members of the democratic</p> <p>13 party and members of the republican party when it</p> <p>14 comes to criminal justice reform?</p> <p>15 A. There could be, yes.</p> <p>16 Q. Is it -- in your view, is there a divide</p> <p>17 between the members of the party or not?</p> <p>18 A. I think some members hold different</p> <p>19 opinions, yes.</p> <p>20 Q. And the same question. Based on your</p> <p>21 experience in serving in the legislature, do the</p> <p>22 views of the members of the democratic party</p> <p>23 generally in Alabama differ from the members of the</p> <p>24 republican party generally in Alabama when it comes</p> <p>25 to the view of whether there's a significant amount</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 124</p>

Evan Milligan, et al v. John H. Merrill, et al.

Chris Pringle
12/17/2021

<p>1 of discrimination against black individuals in the 2 state?</p> <p>3 A. Yes.</p> <p>4 MR. OSHER: Okay. That's all I have. 5 Thank you very much for your time, Representative.</p> <p>6 MR. WALKER: Thank you. Thank you, 7 Daniel.</p> <p>8 MS. FAULKS: Singleton plaintiffs, do 9 you have any questions?</p> <p>10 MR. BLACKSHER: Did I get called? 11 MR. WALKER: You did. You did, Jim. 12 MR. BLACKSHER: Well, thank you.</p> <p>13 EXAMINATION BY MR. BLACKSHER:</p> <p>14 Q. Representative Pringle, I hope you make 15 it back to Mobile before the night is over.</p> <p>16 A. Thank you. So do I.</p> <p>17 Q. I wouldn't want to stay in Montgomery 18 overnight if I could get back to Mobile on a Friday 19 night.</p> <p>20 A. See, we have a lot in common, 21 Mr. Blacksher.</p> <p>22 Q. Yeah.</p> <p>23 A. I'm not --</p> <p>24 Q. I just have a --</p> <p>25 MR. WALKER: Go ahead.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 125</p>	<p>1 A. You were asking for a plan that had all 2 whole counties that created two opportunity 3 districts.</p> <p>4 Q. Did he tell you that the lawsuit 5 contended that the plan that was enacted in 2011 was 6 racially jerrymandered?</p> <p>7 MR. WALKER: I'm going to -- I'm going 8 to assert privilege. You might be able to ask that 9 question a different way, Jim. But I think the way 10 you've asked it, it calls -- or could call for an 11 attorney-client communication.</p> <p>12 Q. Okay. I lost you. All I see is a 13 telephone screen now. Oh, there you are up in the 14 corner.</p> <p>15 Let me ask it this way, Representative 16 Pringle. Were you aware and are you aware now that 17 the Singleton complaint alleged, when it was filed 18 September 27th, that the plan enacted in 2011 was 19 unconstitutional because it was racially 20 jerrymandered?</p> <p>21 A. Not specifically.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. Were you aware that the state 23 attorney general's office had said in a lawsuit in 24 Birmingham in 2019 that the 2011 plan was racially 25 jerrymandered?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 127</p>
<p>1 Q. I just have -- I have very few 2 questions.</p> <p>3 Representative Pringle, you said that -- 4 and I haven't been in on your whole discussion. I 5 confess I had to jump off on some other calls while 6 it was all going on. So I apologize if I go over 7 something that you've already spoken about.</p> <p>8 But I did hear you say with a smile on 9 your face that there was a lawsuit filed even before 10 you passed a plan. And that would be referring to 11 the Singleton case, right?</p> <p>12 A. I refer to it as the League of Women 13 Voters. But yes, sir.</p> <p>14 Q. The League of Women Voters. It was the 15 lawsuit that was advocating the League of Women 16 Voters whole county plan?</p> <p>17 A. Yes, sir.</p> <p>18 Q. Okay. And who informed you that that 19 suit had been filed? It was Mr. Walker, wasn't it?</p> <p>20 A. Yes, sir.</p> <p>21 Q. And did you get a chance to read the 22 complaint?</p> <p>23 A. No, sir.</p> <p>24 Q. And did Mr. Walker tell you what the 25 lawsuit was about?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 126</p>	<p>1 MR. DAVIS: Object to the form.</p> <p>2 MR. WALKER: Jim, did you hear that 3 objection to form from Jim Davis?</p> <p>4 MR. BLACKSHER: Yes.</p> <p>5 MR. DAVIS: That's not what it said.</p> <p>6 Q. Are you aware that that is what the 7 complaint that Singleton filed alleged, that the 8 state attorney general had conceded in federal court 9 in 2019 that the 2011 plan was racially 10 jerrymandered? Were you aware of that?</p> <p>11 MR. DAVIS: Object to the form.</p> <p>12 MR. WALKER: Object to form.</p> <p>13 Q. You -- you can answer.</p> <p>14 MR. WALKER: I'm sorry. You can answer, 15 if you can.</p> <p>16 A. No.</p> <p>17 Q. You weren't aware of that.</p> <p>18 Were you aware -- did anyone tell you 19 that the lawsuit contended that when drawing a new 20 congressional plan with 2020 census data, that the 21 legislature had a constitutional obligation to 22 remedy a racial jerrymandering?</p> <p>23 A. No.</p> <p>24 Q. Okay. And as chair of the 25 reapportionment committee, you can testify that</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 128</p>

Evan Milligan, et al v. John H. Merrill, et al.

Chris Pringle
12/17/2021

<p>1 there was no effort made by the reapportionment 2 committee to remedy any racial jerryandering in the 3 2011 claim; isn't that correct?</p> <p>4 A. I testified that Mr. Hinaman was 5 directed to draw those seven congressional districts 6 based on the guidelines of the committee.</p> <p>7 Q. Yeah. And no one informed you, and you 8 -- excuse me.</p> <p>9 The committee never attempted to remedy 10 a racial jerryandering; is that correct?</p> <p>11 A. I did not know there was a --</p> <p>12 Q. Racial jerryandering?</p> <p>13 A. Yes.</p> <p>14 Q. Okay. Now, my understanding from your 15 testimony is that Mr. Walker advised you as chair of 16 the reapportionment committee that the congressional 17 redistricting plan had to have zero deviation; is 18 that correct?</p> <p>19 A. Yes.</p> <p>20 Q. So did anyone else give you that advice, 21 zero deviation?</p> <p>22 A. Mr. Hinaman.</p> <p>23 Q. So Mr. Hinaman advised you that the plan 24 had to be zero deviation?</p> <p>25 A. Well, Mr. Blacksher, was not the 2011 Page 129</p>	<p>1 Q. Are you aware of any -- anyone -- did 2 Mr. Walker, by the way, advise you that he had 3 consulted other lawyers to reach this opinion?</p> <p>4 MR. WALKER: Jim, I'm going to object on 5 the grounds of privilege to that. You can ask it 6 some other way.</p> <p>7 Q. I'm just trying to get everything you 8 knew or did not know about the requirement of zero 9 deviation.</p> <p>10 And what I've heard you say, 11 Representative Pringle, is that you were aware, 12 since you've been involved in one way or the other 13 with redistricting, that it had been going on for 14 several decades, right?</p> <p>15 A. Zero deviation in congressional races?</p> <p>16 Q. Yes.</p> <p>17 A. Yes.</p> <p>18 Q. Okay. And when it came to drawing the 19 2020 plan, you were advised that that needed to 20 continue, zero deviation needed to continue. And 21 that advice came from Mr. Walker and Mr. Hinaman; is 22 that correct?</p> <p>23 MR. WALKER: Objection to form to the 24 extent it calls for an attorney-client 25 communication.</p> Page 131
<p>1 and the 2002 plans all zero deviations, and the 1992 2 plan?</p> <p>3 Q. Well, what I asked -- the question was 4 did Mr. Hinaman advise you that it needed to be zero 5 deviation.</p> <p>6 A. Again, Mr. Hinaman has been part of this 7 for years. And I think every plan has been drawn to 8 zero deviation.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay. Does that mean that he did advise 10 you to keep it at zero deviation?</p> <p>11 A. Yes. Because all the other plans had 12 been drawn to zero deviation.</p> <p>13 Q. Okay. That's fine.</p> <p>14 And did anyone besides Mr. Walker and 15 Mr. Hinaman advise the committee that the plan had 16 to keep a zero deviation?</p> <p>17 A. Not to my knowledge.</p> <p>18 Q. Did the -- did you as chair or did 19 anyone on the committee seek the advice of the 20 Alabama attorney general's office on whether it 21 needed to have zero deviation?</p> <p>22 A. I did not.</p> <p>23 Q. Are you aware of anyone on the 24 committee who did?</p> <p>25 A. No, sir. Page 130</p>	<p>1 Q. But you can answer, I think.</p> <p>2 MR. BLACKSHER: Counsel, can he answer?</p> <p>3 Q. Okay. Let me ask another question.</p> <p>4 Did Mr. Walker also advise you that in 5 order to comply with the Voting Rights Act, the 6 congressional redistricting plan had to have a 7 majority black district? Is that correct?</p> <p>8 MR. WALKER: Objection, attorney-client 9 privilege.</p> <p>10 Q. Well, that's in the talking points, 11 isn't it? Isn't that -- isn't the requirement of a 12 majority black district one of the things that's in 13 the talking points that you've exchanged with us 14 that you -- that you read from on the floor of the 15 legislature?</p> <p>16 A. I don't have any direct recollection of 17 that at this time.</p> <p>18 Q. So did anyone advise you, as chair of 19 the reapportionment committee, that in order to 20 comply with the Voting Rights Act, the plan had to 21 have one majority black district, at least one 22 majority black district?</p> <p>23 MR. WALKER: Object to the question to 24 the extent it calls for an attorney-client 25 communication. Otherwise, you can answer.</p> Page 132

Evan Milligan, et al v. John H. Merrill, et al.

Chris Pringle
12/17/2021

<p>1 A. We instructed Mr. Hinaman, quoting the</p> <p>2 guidelines, to protect the core of the existing</p> <p>3 districts to the extent possible and to draw it to</p> <p>4 zero deviation.</p> <p>5 Q. Okay. Representative Pringle, there's</p> <p>6 absolutely no mention of majority black in the</p> <p>7 guidelines.</p> <p>8 So the question is: In complying -- the</p> <p>9 guidelines say that you had to comply with the</p> <p>10 Voting Rights Act, right?</p> <p>11 A. Yes, sir.</p> <p>12 Q. Okay. But it doesn't say majority</p> <p>13 black, right?</p> <p>14 A. The guidelines, I don't recall them</p> <p>15 saying that.</p> <p>16 Q. Right. So the question is: Were you</p> <p>17 advised that to comply with the Voting Rights Act,</p> <p>18 there had to be a majority black district?</p> <p>19 MR. WALKER: Objection that I've made</p> <p>20 before to the extent it calls for attorney-client</p> <p>21 communication. Otherwise, he can answer.</p> <p>22 A. Again, those plans are drawn in a</p> <p>23 race-neutral manner based on the guidelines to</p> <p>24 preserve the core of the existing congressional</p> <p>25 districts.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 133</p>	<p>1 understand that you needed to have a majority black</p> <p>2 district.</p> <p>3 A. I understood that we needed to draw</p> <p>4 districts to help protect the incumbent, yes.</p> <p>5 Q. And to you, that meant a majority black</p> <p>6 district, protecting the incumbent. Is that your</p> <p>7 answer?</p> <p>8 A. Well, I acquiesced to Mr. Hinaman who</p> <p>9 met with the members of the congress and talked to</p> <p>10 them about their districts and what they wanted and</p> <p>11 how they wanted them drawn. And he presented a plan</p> <p>12 to me that he said the members of congress agreed to</p> <p>13 that were seeking reelection, that they had agreed</p> <p>14 to.</p> <p>15 Q. Okay. Let's talk for just a second</p> <p>16 about the League of Women Voters' whole county plan.</p> <p>17 According to the talking points, you</p> <p>18 were advised that that plan would be</p> <p>19 unconstitutional because its deviation was too</p> <p>20 large; isn't that correct?</p> <p>21 A. That was in my -- the analysis I</p> <p>22 received, yes.</p> <p>23 Q. And that information came from whoever</p> <p>24 wrote the talking points?</p> <p>25 A. Yes. That would be Mr. Hinaman and</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 135</p>
<p>1 Q. Yes, sir. I've heard that testimony.</p> <p>2 My question, though, is were you advised</p> <p>3 that the Voting Rights Act required there to be a</p> <p>4 majority black district?</p> <p>5 MR. WALKER: Same objection.</p> <p>6 A. The Voting Rights Act requires that we</p> <p>7 in no way intentionally nor unintentionally diminish</p> <p>8 the ability of a protected class of minority</p> <p>9 citizens from electing or defeating a candidate of</p> <p>10 their choosing.</p> <p>11 Q. And did that mean a majority black</p> <p>12 district?</p> <p>13 A. It means we had -- we drew a district</p> <p>14 that would allow -- that maintained the core of an</p> <p>15 existing minority district. But we did it in a</p> <p>16 race-neutral way.</p> <p>17 Q. Your understanding of the requirement of</p> <p>18 maintaining the cores and drawing a race-neutral</p> <p>19 plan meant that you needed to end up with a majority</p> <p>20 black district. Am I hearing you correctly?</p> <p>21 A. We -- we made every opportunity to</p> <p>22 protect the incumbents who were seeking reelection.</p> <p>23 Q. That's not the question I asked you</p> <p>24 about the incumbent.</p> <p>25 I asked if you were advised and did you</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 134</p>	<p>1 Mr. Walker.</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. And the talking points also</p> <p>3 advised, didn't they, that the League of Women</p> <p>4 Voters' plan would violate the Voting Rights Act</p> <p>5 because it did not have a majority black district;</p> <p>6 isn't that correct?</p> <p>7 A. It could potentially violate Section 2</p> <p>8 by diminishing the ability of a protected class of</p> <p>9 citizens from electing or defeating a candidate of</p> <p>10 their choosing, yes.</p> <p>11 Q. I'm just asking if the talking points</p> <p>12 said -- you know, I don't have them in front of me.</p> <p>13 You've probably been looking at them all morning.</p> <p>14 A. Actually, I haven't.</p> <p>15 Q. The talking points actually said, didn't</p> <p>16 it -- the talking points actually said that the</p> <p>17 League of Women Voters' whole county plan would</p> <p>18 violate the Voting Rights Act because it did not</p> <p>19 have a majority black district.</p> <p>20 Now, did you -- did anyone else give you</p> <p>21 that advice other than what was in the talking</p> <p>22 points?</p> <p>23 MR. DAVIS: Object to the form.</p> <p>24 MR. WALKER: Object to the form.</p> <p>25 THE WITNESS: Can I answer?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 136</p>

Evan Milligan, et al v. John H. Merrill, et al.

Chris Pringle
12/17/2021

<p>1 MR. WALKER: You can answer to the</p> <p>2 extent that you do not discuss any communication you</p> <p>3 may have received from an attorney, in particular</p> <p>4 one from the AG's office.</p> <p>5 A. I was reading the talking points that</p> <p>6 you have before you.</p> <p>7 Q. Actually, I don't have them before me.</p> <p>8 I'm sorry.</p> <p>9 But in any event, let me -- let me wrap</p> <p>10 this up this way. Was the -- was the committee ever</p> <p>11 presented in writing a statement that the League of</p> <p>12 Women Voters' whole county plan violated the Voting</p> <p>13 Rights Act?</p> <p>14 A. If my memory serves me correctly, we did</p> <p>15 not yet have the official League of Women Voters'</p> <p>16 plan in the computer at the time of the committee</p> <p>17 meeting. I think it was introduced later.</p> <p>18 Q. Okay. You're going to have to listen to</p> <p>19 the question again.</p> <p>20 MR. BLACKSHER: Could I ask the court</p> <p>21 reporter to read the question back, please?</p> <p>22 (Record read.)</p> <p>23 A. Was the committee ever presented --</p> <p>24 MR. WALKER: Was the committee ever</p> <p>25 presented in writing.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 137</p>	<p>1 "minimal deviation," you interpreted that on your</p> <p>2 own as meaning zero deviation; is that correct?</p> <p>3 A. Based on my knowledge and history of</p> <p>4 reapportionment, congressional reapportionment, and</p> <p>5 the fact that we have drawn zero deviation</p> <p>6 districts, yes, sir.</p> <p>7 Q. Okay. So that would -- and you reached</p> <p>8 that conclusion independently of anybody's advice,</p> <p>9 right?</p> <p>10 A. Well, Mr. Walker and Mr. Hinaman and I</p> <p>11 all concurred that minimum deviation means zero.</p> <p>12 And based on my readings, I would concur with that,</p> <p>13 what I read.</p> <p>14 Q. Thank you, Representative Pringle.</p> <p>15 Those are the only questions that I have.</p> <p>16 A. Mr. Blacksher, it's always a pleasure.</p> <p>17 Q. I hope to see you again soon.</p> <p>18 A. I'm sure you will.</p> <p>19 MR. WALKER: I think that can be</p> <p>20 arranged.</p> <p>21 MS. FAULKS: Dorman, with that, I think</p> <p>22 that we are done. For lunch, how long do we want to</p> <p>23 break?</p> <p>24 MR. WALKER: Wait. Can we have 30</p> <p>25 seconds to confer?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 139</p>
<p>1 A. I have no recollection of that.</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. Thank you.</p> <p>3 And was the committee ever presented in</p> <p>4 writing a statement that the League of Women Voters</p> <p>5 -- I'm sorry. Let me strike that. Let me start</p> <p>6 over.</p> <p>7 Was the committee ever presented in</p> <p>8 writing a statement that the congressional plan had</p> <p>9 to have zero deviation?</p> <p>10 A. I don't understand the question.</p> <p>11 Q. Did the committee have in writing a</p> <p>12 statement that the congressional plan had to have</p> <p>13 zero deviation?</p> <p>14 A. The guidelines called for it, which has</p> <p>15 been done for -- as you know, for years and years.</p> <p>16 For decades, we've always drawn down to zero</p> <p>17 deviation in congressional.</p> <p>18 Q. Okay. So the guidelines say that the</p> <p>19 congressional plan must have minimal deviation.</p> <p>20 A. Which we interpret to be -- which we</p> <p>21 interpret to be zero deviation just like it was, you</p> <p>22 know, in 2011, 2002, 1992.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. That's good.</p> <p>24 So in other words, when you saw, as</p> <p>25 chair of the committee, that the guidelines said</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 138</p>	<p>1 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We're off the record.</p> <p>2 The time is 1:05 p.m.</p> <p>3 (Recess was taken.)</p> <p>4 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We're back on the</p> <p>5 record. The time is 1:08 p.m.</p> <p>6 EXAMINATION BY MR. DAVIS:</p> <p>7 Q. Representative Pringle, this is Jim</p> <p>8 Davis. I represent Secretary Merrill in this</p> <p>9 lawsuit. I have just a couple of follow-up</p> <p>10 questions.</p> <p>11 Did you instruct Mr. Hinaman to -- when</p> <p>12 he drew a congressional plan, that it had to include</p> <p>13 a majority black district?</p> <p>14 A. No.</p> <p>15 Q. Did you instruct him to include</p> <p>16 districts with any particular demographics?</p> <p>17 A. No.</p> <p>18 Q. Are you aware of any member on the</p> <p>19 reapportionment committee who gave him such</p> <p>20 instructions?</p> <p>21 A. No.</p> <p>22 Q. Did you decide in advance that there had</p> <p>23 to be a majority black district in Alabama's</p> <p>24 congressional plan?</p> <p>25 A. No.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 140</p>

Evan Milligan, et al v. John H. Merrill, et al.

Chris Pringle
12/17/2021

<p>1 MR. DAVIS: Thank you. No other</p> <p>2 questions.</p> <p>3 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This ends the</p> <p>4 deposition of Chris Pringle. The time is now</p> <p>5 1:09 p.m.</p> <p>6</p> <p>7 (DEPOSITION ENDED AT 1:09 P.M.)</p> <p>8</p> <p>9</p> <p>10</p> <p>11</p> <p>12</p> <p>13</p> <p>14</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 141</p>	
<p>1 STATE OF ALABAMA)</p> <p>2 JEFFERSON COUNTY)</p> <p>3</p> <p>4 I hereby certify that the above</p> <p>5 proceedings were taken down by me and transcribed by</p> <p>6 me using computer-aided transcription and that the</p> <p>7 above is a true and correct transcript of said</p> <p>8 proceedings taken down by me and transcribed by me.</p> <p>9 I further certify that I am neither of</p> <p>10 kin nor of counsel to any of the parties nor in</p> <p>11 anywise financially interested in the result of this</p> <p>12 case.</p> <p>13 I further certify that I am duly</p> <p>14 licensed by the Alabama Board of Court Reporting as</p> <p>15 a Certified Court Reporter as evidenced by the ACCR</p> <p>16 number following my name found below.</p> <p>17 So certified on December 17, 2021.</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23 <u>LeAnn Maroney, Commissioner</u></p> <p>24 ACCR# 134, Expires 9/30/25</p> <p>25 505 North 20th Street, Suite 1250</p> <p>Birmingham, AL 35203</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 142</p>	

Evan Milligan, et al v. John H. Merrill, et al.

Chris Pringle
12/17/2021

<u>WORD INDEX</u>			
< 0 >	121:10	121:9 130:1	3 6:18 55:20,
01 68:14	19 113:18	138:22	23 113:7
< 1 >	1984 16:10	2003 11:1	3:00 50:11
1 6:14 12:4,	1992 25:3, 23	2007 18:11	30 94:6 139:24
6 59:18 113:7	120:1 130:1	2010 58:8, 12,	35203 142:24
1:05 140:2	138:22	14, 18 59:6, 10,	35222 4:21
1:08 140:5	1994 18:24	14 60:1, 4, 23	36104 1:24
1:09 141:5, 7	121:8	61:4, 11 62:18,	5:22
10 5:5 42:16	1999 3:7	22 65:1 68:1	36106 4:14
10:03 49:13	1st 38:11	71:2	36130 5:14
10:22 49:16	42:3, 10 43:14	2011 29:24	< 4 >
10004 4:6	44:1 45:14	30:5 33:2, 7,	4 6:20 104:24
10006 3:15	115:23	14 46:14	105:2
101 18:15, 18	< 2 >	65:13 74:9	40 3:14 42:21
19:24	2 6:16 52:14,	127:5, 18, 24	45 12:21
10-26-21 6:21	18 59:19, 20	128:9 129:3,	< 5 >
104 6:20	63:18 98:7, 15	25 138:22	5 3:14 6:22
105 1:23 5:21	99:2 102:19	2014 121:10	57:9, 23 58:23
11:26 100:12	103:10 113:7	2018 35:12	59:1, 16, 21
11-1-21 6:23	136:7	2019 35:1, 7	112:9 115:23
116 6:22	2:2021-CV-01530-	36:10 46:21	116:1
119 6:24	AMM 1:8	49:2 127:24	5:00 78:11, 14,
11th 16:10	2:21-CV-01530-AMM	128:9	20 79:19, 24
12 6:14 121:12	7:14	2020 28:13	50 42:24
12:06 100:15	20 46:21	40:6 58:19	97:15, 21, 22
12:33 120:9	49:25 105:24	59:11 128:20	98:4, 11, 12, 21,
12:40 120:12	116:4	131:19	22
120-125 6:8	200 5:21	2021 1:24	501 5:13
125 4:5	2000 28:21	6:25 7:7, 17	505 142:23
1250 142:23	35:14 36:10	22:12 32:23	51 116:18
125-140 6:9	20002 5:6	33:4 34:25	117:5, 25 118:3
12-year 121:13	20005 3:22	37:3 45:20	52 6:16
134 142:23	2001 21:25	49:23 51:1	54 113:20, 21
14 18:25 99:12	27:12 28:2	52:19 58:10	114:3, 6, 12, 25
140 117:1	30:3 33:18	59:14 60:1	115:3, 11
1400 3:7	41:24 48:23	62:19, 24	55 6:18
140-141 6:10	66:1, 12 68:10	74:12 109:13	5th 48:23
14th 3:21	109:13 112:7	119:11 142:17	50:20 51:1, 5,
54:3 59:24	2001-2002 28:18	20th 142:23	19, 23 52:19
96:13	2002 18:25	22 37:23 80:13	53:17 58:5
15 19:4	22:1, 2, 5, 23	26th 40:6, 18	63:7 64:5
16 121:12, 23	23:2 24:8, 10,	50:20 51:2	< 6 >
122:6, 20	20, 21 25:6, 19	100:17 105:4	6 6:24 119:11,
123:9 124:2	26:5, 9, 22	109:14, 23	13
17 1:24 7:7,	28:13, 15, 22	27 18:8 72:12	60 26:15
17 35:14	29:9 30:4	27th 127:18	600 3:21 5:5
142:17	33:18, 25	28 32:8 71:22,	6179 4:13
18 105:25	41:25 58:14,	25 72:12 78:9	< 7 >
	18, 24 59:7, 9	79:8, 12, 21	
	60:5, 7 61:2	82:13	
	65:1 112:7	< 3 >	

Evan Milligan, et al v. John H. Merrill, et al.

Chris Pringle
12/17/2021

7 25:5 26:16 27:14, 17 28:1 61:12, 13, 19 99:11 109:16 113:21 114:2, 25 116:15 119:16, 17, 19, 23 700 3:21	acquisitions 17:9 acronym 102:13 Act 54:3, 7 59:17, 19, 20 98:8 99:2 102:20 132:5, 20 133:10, 17 134:3, 6 136:4, 18 137:13 acting 7:3 action 122:10, 13, 18 123:13, 15, 24 actual 96:4 103:11 adamant 43:23 add 80:14 added 38:3 80:16 additional 38:1, 3 55:13 80:16 address 15:4 32:13 36:1 73:18 addressed 36:12 73:12, 19 adjust 39:4 adjusted 119:21 adopt 69:15 adopted 24:20 31:1 40:8 52:5 55:14 63:25 64:9 108:23 advance 101:1 140:22 advertised 38:5 advice 129:20 130:19 131:21 136:21 139:8 advise 130:4, 9, 15 131:2 132:4, 18 advised 129:15, 23 131:19 133:17 134:2, 25 135:18 136:3 advocated 28:18 advocating	126:15 affairs 19:12 affirmative 122:10, 13, 17 123:13, 14, 24 afoul 99:1 afraid 99:1 African 85:24 age 95:18 98:12 113:21 agent 17:8 18:5 ago 14:10, 11 agree 60:22 81:5 83:1 115:10, 14 119:17 AGREED 1:17 2:1, 8 54:21 114:15, 19 135:12, 13 AG's 137:4 ahead 51:19 125:25 aim 44:14, 15 al 1:6, 10 7:13, 14 142:24 ALABAMA 1:2, 23 4:12, 14, 21 5:14, 22 7:2, 3, 16, 21, 23 8:3 9:14 10:21 16:8 18:2 24:14 25:5 26:7 30:12 32:11 34:7, 8 36:21 41:11 43:19, 21 82:1, 10, 18, 25 84:25 86:22 121:7, 19, 25 122:1, 8, 9 123:5, 11, 12, 19, 23 124:4, 5, 23, 24 130:20 142:1, 14 Alabama's 96:16 140:23 Ali 6:2 alined 59:4 alleged 127:17 128:7	allow 11:20, 22 134:14 allowed 32:15 amendment 54:3 59:24 96:13 American 4:4, 12 85:24 amount 68:7 124:25 analysis 102:4, 9, 11, 15, 22 103:2, 11, 17 104:7, 11, 15 105:14, 18 106:7, 8, 13, 20 109:12, 18, 21, 25 110:5, 18 111:1, 8, 18, 21 112:4, 14, 24 113:13, 24 114:1, 5 115:4, 8, 13 116:14 135:21 analyze 95:3 analyzed 28:10 96:24 97:3 Angeles 3:8 answer 11:11 25:11 26:13 29:12 43:1 49:3 57:5 61:23 70:25 72:24 80:21 83:8 84:9 86:10, 11 88:10 95:21 103:22 106:2 117:23 123:25 128:13, 14 132:1, 2, 25 133:21 135:7 136:25 137:1 answered 53:23 73:1, 12, 20, 21 93:13 answering 9:23 answers 11:22 anxious 89:8 anybody 12:18 47:3 48:5 61:7 63:19
--	--	---	--

Evan Milligan, et al v. John H. Merrill, et al.

Chris Pringle
12/17/2021

80:18	assumption	131:1, 11	23 83:1, 6
anybody's 139:8	103:8 105:16	140:18	84:19 85:9, 22,
anywise 142:11	assured 111:24		25 86:8
apartment 16:25	attempted 129:9	< B >	best 11:22
17:4	attend 78:23	back 33:17	29:1, 4
apologize 121:6	79:20	34:23 41:23,	better 49:18
126:6	attendance 47:4	24 43:11, 12,	62:9
appears 119:17	attended 77:25	13 49:15 56:2,	big 109:5
approach 104:4	attention 41:22	5 61:10, 24	bill 14:1
108:15	Attorney 3:5,	66:12 84:19	41:3, 5 93:24
approached	12, 19 4:19	86:3 92:11	94:19 95:2
101:12	5:3, 11, 12, 19	99:8 100:9, 14	98:2 110:16
approve 28:23	8:3, 25 12:12,	120:11 125:15,	111:13
84:12	24 13:2, 5, 7,	18 137:21	bills 101:7
approved 29:21	16 14:6 46:14	140:4	105:17 110:8
58:23 84:15	51:12 52:3	back-and-forth	bill's 111:21
approving 83:18	53:6, 9 55:7	113:20 116:12	Bingham 1:23
April 37:7, 13	57:18 62:15	Baggett 6:3	5:20 7:25
area 42:4	63:2 89:22	8:24	Birmingham 4:21
83:3 86:6	98:16 103:7, 9	Balch 1:22	7:2 127:24
areas 82:15	106:2, 3, 15, 23	5:20 7:24	142:24
arguing 99:19	117:20 121:3	Baldwin 42:6	black 25:4
arranged 139:20	127:23 128:8	44:3, 10	26:15 28:19
asked 38:4	130:20 137:3	based 36:13, 20	29:10 42:16,
63:13 66:25	attorney-client	46:11 58:14	21, 23 81:25
80:14 103:20	46:18 63:14	59:7, 14 60:1	82:3, 5, 8, 20,
112:19 127:10	127:11 131:24	61:1 67:13	23 83:1, 6
130:3 134:23,	132:8, 24	86:2 95:3	84:19 85:9, 22,
25	133:20	102:22 121:23	25 86:8 90:18,
asking 84:6	Attorneys 4:3,	122:6 123:9	19 91:8 95:18,
98:16 106:2	11 7:18 8:6	124:2, 20	19, 24 97:11,
113:23 116:13	45:25 51:17	129:6 133:23	13 113:21
120:14 122:4	53:8, 14	139:3, 12	115:11 125:1
127:1 136:11	103:16 111:25	basically 69:13	132:7, 12, 21,
aspects 85:21	117:22	basis 58:9, 18	22 133:6, 13,
assert 63:13	audience 73:12,	81:2 96:12	18 134:4, 11,
127:8	23	began 35:18	20 135:1, 5
assign 2:12	audio 47:7, 11	36:3 38:9, 20	136:5, 19
assigned 41:7	49:7, 10 99:6	46:3, 8 64:15	140:13, 23
Assistant 5:11	August 16:10	beginning 7:12	BLACKSHER 4:18
associated 96:18	37:15, 21	believe 19:13	6:9 8:22
assume 10:20	automatically	42:8, 9, 10	11:3 16:4
11:12 13:5	98:13	44:12 48:25	125:10, 12, 13,
33:5, 10 58:15,	available 32:18	56:11 59:6, 15	21 128:4
17 62:4 69:17	Avenue 3:7	60:13 61:24	129:25 132:2
76:21 89:22	5:13	73:1 83:4	137:20 139:16
92:19, 22	aware 50:25	93:13 105:8	blind 110:3
103:6, 13	103:19 109:11	110:11 116:7	block 66:7, 8
117:10 118:1	127:16, 22	118:8	board 32:9
assumed 35:13	128:6, 10, 17,	believed 21:20	72:20 117:2
assuming 24:19	18 130:23	belt 81:25	142:14
29:3 123:1		82:3, 5, 8, 20,	

Evan Milligan, et al v. John H. Merrill, et al.

Chris Pringle
12/17/2021

boards 20:6	calls 126:5	certify 7:4	CHRIS 1:10, 20
boat 44:22	127:10 131:24	142:4, 9, 13	5:17 7:7, 12
bones 53:9	132:24 133:20	cetera 17:16	8:1 9:4
bottom 105:25	campaigns 19:11	chair 19:8	17:25 141:4
116:16	20:7	20:10 128:24	chrispringle@south
Box 4:13 61:14	camp 17:11	129:15 130:18	erntimberlands.com
boxes 61:18	campus 23:8	132:18 138:25	14:25
break 49:8, 9,	28:4 76:9	chaired 22:20	Christopher 9:18
21 99:5, 6, 17	93:22	chairman 22:22	circumstances
100:8 120:3,	candidate 98:10,	35:12 108:11	85:12
16 139:23	14 102:22	117:20	citizens 71:5
bring 46:25	118:15, 21	challenged	98:9 102:21
Broad 4:5	119:4 134:9	113:5, 8, 16	134:9 136:9
37:2 83:3	136:9	challenging	CIVIL 1:7 4:4,
brought 41:6,	candidates	113:12	12 7:5, 14
10 59:10	80:25 81:7	chance 105:9	claim 129:3
76:19 77:8	car 43:21	116:6 126:21	clarify 95:23
brown 119:16	carved 43:14	change 23:20	124:10
build 17:11	CASE 1:7 7:14	62:11, 14	Clarke 42:6
bumped 37:14	11:2, 6 13:13,	67:19 70:20,	44:3, 12
bureau 67:10	15 118:24	22 71:15	class 98:9
burn 16:19, 21	126:11 142:12	74:25 81:9	102:20 134:8
17:6	cases 36:14	90:9	136:8
burning 16:22	106:24	changed 36:2	clear 110:24
Buskey 25:8, 13,	cash 79:19	37:1 65:7	122:12, 17
25 42:9	CASTER 5:1	71:2, 7 108:5	clearly 13:8
119:21 120:1	8:15 120:15,	110:24	clerk 8:25
busy 39:11	20 121:4	changes 36:17	closely 59:4
BVAP 95:14, 16	catch 122:14	53:16, 19 55:3,	closer 27:10
113:22 114:3,	cause 7:8	15, 18 56:13	closest 39:20
6, 11, 25 115:3,	80:24	57:19, 22	cochair 22:11
6, 11 117:5	caution 98:20	61:15 63:8, 9,	30:7, 10 32:5
< C >	cautious 98:23,	17, 19, 22, 23,	56:16
calendar 41:10	24	24 71:10	cochairman 19:9,
California 3:8	caveat 105:8	76:11 81:16	10 22:14 35:17
call 23:8	census 35:3	changing 90:13	coding 96:3
39:21 94:19	37:11 67:10,	channel 43:7, 8,	cohesive 86:14
97:14 127:10	15, 22, 23 69:7,	12, 13 44:21, 22	colleagues 35:16
Callahan 21:17	21 70:2 96:8	characteristics	color 96:3
24:2 29:2	128:20	26:20	columns 95:22
33:21 42:2	center 70:23	check 105:10	come 17:1
45:13	Central 82:18	116:7	28:14 35:2
Callahan's	certain 85:12	choice 98:10,	43:7 60:9, 10
33:19 42:12,	certainly 99:14	15 102:22	64:19 79:13,
20 43:4, 9	certainty 61:23	118:15, 21	16 84:1 88:16
44:6, 15 45:6	certificates	choose 58:12	100:9
called 93:4	16:14	91:18 98:14	comes 28:5
97:20 112:10	certifications	choosing 134:10	90:5 122:2, 9
125:10 138:14	16:15	136:10	123:13, 24
calling 97:15,	certified 16:18	chosen 55:11,	124:6, 14, 24
19	142:15, 17	17 118:4	

Evan Milligan, et al v. John H. Merrill, et al.

Chris Pringle
12/17/2021

comfortable	132:25 133:21	computer-aided	67:4, 11, 15, 18
119:7	137:2	142:6	68:5, 6, 7
coming 47:11	communications	computers 94:2	72:20 73:4
77:19 91:5	16:12	conceded 128:8	74:20, 22 77:4,
92:15	communities	concerned 77:5	16, 18 78:6
commencing 1:24	31:4 32:13	concerns 66:4	79:10 81:18,
commercial 17:12	61:17 62:3, 6,	69:3, 4 77:2	22 83:19 88:9,
commissioner	21 65:5 66:17	80:4	15, 24 89:11
7:3 142:22	80:14 83:5, 14,	concise 45:2	90:10, 19 91:9
commissions 20:6	19	conclusion 139:8	95:25 108:6,
committee 19:8,	community 45:2	concur 139:12	17 109:13
10, 12 21:2, 19	62:23 65:4	concurred 139:11	110:6 112:4,
22:17 30:8, 11,	66:9 83:2, 7,	condensed 101:3	14 117:3
24 31:3, 14, 23	21 84:13, 23	conduct 36:6	118:16, 23, 25
32:1, 6 33:11	85:1, 4, 6, 9,	114:4	128:20 129:5,
35:14 37:23	11, 16, 22 86:8	conducted 73:10	16 131:15
39:14 40:5, 18,	compact 45:2	81:18 105:14	132:6 133:24
23, 25 41:8, 16	86:14	106:20 109:22	138:8, 12, 17,
45:21 47:13	Compactness 62:3	110:5	19 139:4
48:20, 24 49:2,	company 17:17,	confederate	140:12, 24
22, 23 50:6, 7,	22	122:2	Congressman
11, 19, 21, 22	compare 62:18	confer 99:17	21:17 24:1
51:1, 20 52:4,	compared 89:13	139:25	29:2 34:1
7, 18 53:11, 16	compensated	confess 126:5	43:9, 22
54:22 56:12,	14:12, 18	conform 35:19	Congresswoman
17 58:3 59:4	compensation	48:21	114:15 119:6
60:8 63:24	14:19	congress 24:6	conjunction
64:2 80:7	competing 91:17	30:15, 19, 22	53:5 80:12
83:18 85:5	complaint 13:12	31:11 32:16	88:12 107:21
87:2 88:6	126:22 127:17	39:10, 17, 22	conservatives
100:17, 24	128:7	67:2 70:7	124:8
101:13, 18, 19	completed 16:7	76:3, 20 77:13	consider 44:22
103:25 104:3,	completely 49:7	86:23 87:9	45:1 80:19
4 105:3	compliance 2:4	88:12 90:18	85:9 89:10
107:13 108:8	54:17	96:14 107:21,	93:7, 9 95:4
111:23 128:25	complied 35:21	23 114:18	96:9, 19 111:10
129:2, 6, 9, 16	54:2 59:16	119:9, 11	considerable
130:15, 19, 24	60:3	135:9, 12	102:3
132:19 137:10,	complies 54:13	Congressional	consideration
16, 23, 24	comply 54:7	6:25 23:2	91:15
138:3, 7, 11, 25	57:20 59:18,	24:3, 8 25:3,	considered
140:19	23 60:14	4, 7, 17 27:2,	27:25 30:4
committees 19:5	67:19 68:8	5, 12 28:22	35:19 96:24
20:2, 11, 17	132:5, 20	29:21, 25 30:3,	121:21
committee's	133:9, 17	4, 5, 9, 17, 25	considering
64:10	Complying 60:19	31:15, 24 32:9,	123:17
common 78:21	133:8	15, 23 33:3, 4,	constantly 36:19
84:3, 8 125:20	compressed 72:8	14, 25 38:23	constitute
communicate	computer 28:9	39:9, 12, 19	85:22 86:8, 15
108:25	94:18, 23	40:22 42:3, 10	constitution
communication	137:16	43:14 44:2	19:11 20:7
127:11 131:25		58:24 66:18	54:4, 8 96:13

Evan Milligan, et al v. John H. Merrill, et al.

Chris Pringle
12/17/2021

constitutional	25:9 27:2	102:17	day 40:13, 15
128:21	33:15, 20 34:9	COVID 72:6	51:9 79:9, 22
construction	38:16 45:22	COVID-19 36:2	101:4, 7
40:14	51:10 53:12	64:17	days 14:10, 11
consultant	57:13 71:8, 11,	created 25:3,	28:8, 12 79:15
110:20	12 76:17, 20	17 60:24 61:5	93:23 94:6, 7,
consulted 131:3	80:8 129:3, 10,	69:15 75:2	14, 15 122:13,
contact 24:1, 2	18 131:22	119:25 127:2	18
contained 29:9	132:7 135:20	creation 57:4	daytime 79:16
101:24	136:6 139:2	criminal 124:6,	DC 3:22 5:6
contended 127:5	142:7	9, 14	13:4
128:19	correctly 26:6	criteria 106:19	deadline 38:11
content 12:11	37:10 52:3	crunch 113:1	dealing 32:8
contests 54:15	76:1 77:22	curious 67:23	35:20 40:9, 11
contiguity 62:3	134:20 137:14	current 18:12	75:25
contiguous 86:14	counsel 1:18	36:13 46:11	deals 54:10
continue 45:10	2:10, 11 7:6	65:17 69:2	debate 115:23
131:20	100:3 104:4	87:18	decades 131:14
continued 45:15,	132:2 142:10	currently 19:5	138:16
17	counties 82:1,	22:23 65:11	December 1:24
contract 19:13	12, 13 83:12,	cut 116:17	7:7, 16 142:17
20:8	22 84:1 85:13,	117:24	decide 22:18
contracting	15 92:9 97:8,	cycle 22:24	50:14 103:5
17:24	9 127:2	36:16, 23	104:6, 14
contractor	counts 96:15	42:22 45:20	140:22
16:17 17:11,	County 42:6, 8,	112:8	decided 20:20
16 18:10	9 43:22 44:4,	cycles 112:5	decides 103:1
contractual	7, 12 45:3, 4	< D >	deciding 104:9
40:13	84:7, 8, 10, 21	DAN 5:2 8:14,	decision 103:16
control 16:18,	91:24 92:7	17 122:11	104:8 115:3
20, 21 64:10	94:3 95:13	Daniel 121:3	decisions 81:21
conversation	126:16 135:16	125:7	deemed 111:25
114:20	136:17 137:12	data 24:25	defeat 119:3
conversations	142:2	94:23 106:3	defeated 20:21
35:23 51:22	couple 14:10	107:25 108:3	defeating 98:10
75:24 123:2	140:9	128:20	102:21 134:9
Cooper 17:21	course 45:8	date 7:4, 16	136:9
copies 105:6	74:19 105:11	36:11 108:2	DEFENDANT 5:9
copy 52:20	107:6 112:25	DAVIN 4:2 8:19	Defendants 1:12
core 25:20, 21	COURT 1:1 2:5	DAVIS 5:10	5:17 7:25
26:21 32:25	7:1, 15 9:2	6:10 8:3	10:6, 11
33:10, 12, 13	11:15 36:13	12:19 13:16	Defense 3:13,
44:1 70:16	46:11 54:4, 8	35:15, 24 46:1,	20 99:24
81:14 119:24	62:8 106:24	7, 16 47:4	define 97:17
133:2, 24	113:5, 12	48:3 58:2	definition 62:9,
134:14	128:8 137:20	99:4, 12, 18	21, 23 85:3, 6,
cores 26:3	142:14, 15	100:5 128:1, 3,	8, 11 123:14
134:18	courteous 99:23	5, 11 136:23	definitions
corner 127:14	courtrooms 55:18	140:6, 8 141:1	63:4, 6
correct 10:16	courts 36:18		degree 16:11, 12
15:25 17:17	54:4 55:12		delayed 35:3
21:6, 13, 25			delegation 24:3

Evan Milligan, et al v. John H. Merrill, et al.

Chris Pringle
12/17/2021

democratic 22:9	138:9, 13, 17,	56:5 120:23	14 68:6, 18
24:13 117:20	19, 21 139:1, 2,	126:4	69:4, 16 70:13,
121:25 122:8	5, 11	discussions	16 71:7 72:19
123:11 124:4,	deviations	12:12 57:3	74:22 76:12
12, 22	76:12 77:5	dislike 65:6	81:14 85:15
democrats 24:11	91:25 92:3	dissatisfied	90:18, 20 91:9
123:2, 19	94:3 95:4, 13	87:9, 15	93:16 95:25
demographic	96:2 130:1	DISTRICT 1:1, 2	97:11, 13, 14,
74:7, 15 76:13	diem 14:15	7:15, 16 18:15,	15, 20 106:4, 9
94:23 96:8, 25	differ 121:25	17 19:22, 25	109:19 112:24
demographics	122:8 123:7,	21:20, 21 25:4,	113:2, 5, 7, 15
26:11 76:11	11 124:4, 23	5, 17 26:12, 16,	115:19 117:2,
94:9 140:16	difference	21 27:14, 17	3 119:25
denied 102:20	76:25 96:3, 5	28:1 29:3	127:3 129:5
department	124:11	33:20 42:1, 3,	133:3, 25
58:23, 25	differences	10, 12, 21, 23,	135:4, 10
depends 115:15,	63:16	24 43:15 44:2,	139:6 140:16
18	different 19:19	8, 16, 19, 21	divide 124:7, 16
Depo 6:15	34:21 66:4	45:9, 14 67:11,	division 17:21
deposed 10:23	78:18 79:21,	19 68:5, 8	doctor 13:6
13:21	22 84:5 124:1,	69:1, 2 70:19,	document 12:9
DEPOSITION 1:9,	18 127:9	20, 22, 23	52:22 53:1, 3,
19 2:2, 3, 13	differently	71:10, 15	11, 16 55:25
7:12 11:25	66:23	95:15 96:12	56:7, 20, 24
12:13, 15	digits 117:2	97:18 98:4, 11,	57:4, 8, 17
13:19 14:5	diminish 98:8,	20 103:3, 18	58:7 62:14
27:4 99:6	14 134:7	104:6, 10	75:2
141:4, 7	diminishing	106:21 109:12,	documents 13:9
depositions 2:6	136:8	16 110:5	58:21 75:9
describe 82:16	direct 73:24	113:21 114:2,	Dog 43:8, 12
119:22	132:16	5, 12, 25 115:7,	doing 17:7
determination	directed 74:1	11, 15, 18	79:1 99:4
106:16	107:12 129:5	116:15 118:22,	108:14 111:20
determine 91:22	director 48:14	23, 24, 25	DORMAN 5:18
92:14 102:17	disagree 115:14	119:16, 17, 19,	7:24 10:4
106:23	disclosing 12:11	20, 23, 25	35:24 92:25
determining	discovery 99:20	132:7, 12, 21,	122:14 139:21
106:19	discrimination	22 133:18	doshier@elias.law
DEUEL 3:18	125:1	134:4, 12, 13,	5:7
8:10	discuss 12:14	15, 20 135:2, 6	Dothan 43:15,
developed 86:5	46:17 50:16	136:5, 19	19, 22 45:4
107:15, 16	56:23 66:25	140:13, 23	double-check
deviation 44:13	78:5 88:13	districts 25:20,	51:4 120:4
57:10 67:14	118:9 137:2	21 26:4 27:14,	draft 53:7, 8,
74:21 75:1	discussed 13:15,	25 28:19	11 65:8 67:4
76:14 77:1	19 46:17	29:10 30:13,	74:11
92:10 94:22	52:24 63:8	14, 22 31:12	drafted 53:3
97:1, 7 129:17,	76:21 82:19, 23	32:10, 12 33:1,	57:1
21, 24 130:5, 8,	discussing	10, 12, 13	drafting 52:21
10, 12, 16, 21	77:11 90:1, 17	34:16, 19	53:1 56:19
131:9, 15, 20	Discussion	38:10, 22 39:4,	57:17 81:18
133:4 135:19	27:11 46:10	12 54:2, 10, 12,	dragging 99:9

Evan Milligan, et al v. John H. Merrill, et al.

Chris Pringle
12/17/2021

draw 21:20, 21 23:4 24:18, 21, 23 25:1 28:6 30:19 31:9, 20 34:15 44:20 54:2 96:6 98:20 107:13 129:5 133:3 135:3	94:10 earth 81:15 ease 60:12 EBENSTEIN 4:1 8:20 economic 85:18 edges 81:16 education 16:7 32:9 Educational 3:13, 20 effect 2:4 46:13 59:17 effort 129:1 eight 117:2 either 15:10 73:15 102:18 109:7 118:10 elect 115:20 118:14, 21 elected 18:24 22:16 45:8, 16 70:10 121:8, 17 electing 98:9 102:21 134:9 136:9 election 35:13, 16 38:14 119:3 elections 19:11 20:8 electronic 105:6 electronically 73:16 Elias 5:4 8:15 eliminate 62:20 eliminating 54:14 Elizabeth 6:3 8:24 email 14:21, 23 15:4, 5, 7 101:23 102:1 109:4, 5 emailed 80:4 employees 14:15, 20 employer 17:13 employers 18:1 enacted 105:20 127:5, 18 encounter 107:5	ended 21:24 141:7 ends 141:3 engage 37:18 England 113:19, 23 116:13 117:19 enrolled 56:13 62:19 entered 77:24 entirely 61:14, 22 entirety 62:7 entitled 14:16, 20 equal 96:13 err 48:11 Escambia 42:6 44:3, 11 estate 17:8, 20 et 1:6, 10 7:13, 14 17:16 ethnic 85:17 EVAN 1:6 7:13 evening 80:20 event 137:9 events 40:3 eventually 40:21 everybody 11:16 13:5 38:4 54:20 77:25 Everyone's 49:6 evidence 2:14 75:8 evidenced 142:15 exact 36:10 50:2 55:4 exactly 28:11 80:3 99:16 examination 7:8 9:12 120:24 125:13 140:6 examined 9:5 examiners 19:13 example 15:8 exchanged 132:13 excuse 129:8 Exhibit 6:14, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24 11:24 12:4, 6 52:14, 18 55:20, 23	63:18 104:24 105:2 115:22, 23 116:1 119:11, 13 existing 25:20, 21 32:25 33:10, 12, 13 44:1 48:21 56:12 65:6, 9, 22 68:2, 11 70:16 81:14 119:25 133:2, 24 134:15 exists 119:2 expect 14:17 31:2 experience 22:22 84:13, 21 124:21 expire 16:18 Expires 142:23 explain 23:10 41:4 56:4 66:5 83:16 explained 52:3 53:14 express 65:16 88:19 89:20 90:6 extemporaneously 92:20 93:12 extensive 35:23 extent 13:22 131:24 132:24 133:3, 20 137:2 eye 13:6 < F > face 126:9 Facebook 15:15, 23 fact 139:5 factor 92:4 factors 92:2 fair 11:13 25:22 33:2 44:14 45:12 58:9 73:11 fairly 59:3 familiar 81:25 families 84:1 far 100:25
--	--	---	--

Evan Milligan, et al v. John H. Merrill, et al.

Chris Pringle
12/17/2021

fast 101:2 116:25 117:17 118:11 FAULK 4:10 7:22 49:8 120:20 125:8 139:21 favor 57:9 124:9 Federal 7:4 54:17 60:3 99:11 128:8 felt 66:12 fight 17:2 figures 74:15 filed 7:15 13:24, 25 110:14, 15, 16 111:13 126:9, 19 127:17 128:7 final 37:12 63:18 119:11 finally 37:20 finals 37:7 financially 142:11 find 94:20 fine 19:18 130:13 finish 11:21, 22 40:14 finished 31:25 112:15 120:3, 14 fire 16:22 17:4 117:17 118:12 fires 17:2, 3 first 11:24 13:23 14:4 19:14, 15, 16 21:3 25:4, 15 34:24 35:10, 11 36:7, 11 40:17 44:12 45:19 46:13 108:15 110:4 121:8 Five 47:23 fix 16:24 FL 3:14	flip 61:12 116:4 floor 41:9, 10, 17 115:22 117:13 132:14 focused 99:22 follow 31:19 54:20 107:13 108:12, 21 following 7:9 31:10 142:16 follows 9:6 60:9 follow-up 140:9 fond 63:6 force 2:4 foregoing 7:5 form 2:10 41:3 84:22 89:21 94:19 95:3 107:8 122:11 128:1, 3, 11, 12 131:23 136:23, 24 forth 41:24 found 142:16 Foundation 4:4 four 113:15 frame 117:4 free 90:5 Friday 125:18 friend 26:1 front 74:6, 7 136:12 fruition 90:6 92:22 full 2:4 9:16 41:19 96:19 Fund 3:13, 20 FURTHER 2:1, 8 142:9, 13 < G > gain 67:12 gap 121:13 gathered 32:17 General 5:11, 12 16:17 17:11 24:17 64:9 66:8 67:8 69:11	84:22 87:1, 8, 17 88:20 89:4, 12 113:2 122:22 123:4 124:11 128:8 generally 60:9 66:14 123:11, 13 124:4, 5, 23, 24 General's 8:4 127:23 130:20 geographic 85:18 getting 14:14 35:4, 12 96:21 118:11 gifted 117:21 Gingles 45:1 46:12, 13 61:25 62:2 give 37:2 89:3 90:8, 12 91:15 94:24 98:19 108:19 129:20 136:20 given 31:8 38:10 41:9 46:16 79:8 105:21 117:3 123:18 glad 41:21 109:10 go 11:8 41:24 65:21 67:17 71:23 72:17 83:11 84:10 89:17 91:20 96:16 100:9 107:24 120:7 125:25 126:6 goal 26:10, 15 48:19 goes 15:10 61:24 86:3 going 27:21 29:23 33:17 36:1, 5, 25 37:7 41:24 45:25 46:15 48:6 49:11 64:16, 21 67:14 70:23 79:20 84:19	92:11 99:12, 20 100:4 106:15 111:24 117:16 126:6 127:7 131:4, 13 137:18 Good 8:16, 17, 18 138:23 GOTELL 4:10 7:22 government 15:1 19:9 41:8 50:10 governor 40:22 41:17 graduate 16:8 great 98:20 121:14 grounds 2:12 131:5 Group 5:4 8:15 92:24 102:20 groups 94:17 guarantee 119:3 guess 53:20 63:15 64:1 66:6 67:23 69:3, 20, 25 70:17 83:17 84:11 88:7 98:6 Guidelines 6:17, 19 24:20 25:19 26:3, 5 28:16 31:1, 2, 6, 9, 10, 16, 19 32:19, 24, 25 33:9 35:6, 19, 21 36:9, 12, 15, 18, 22, 25 45:22 46:3, 9 47:14 48:20 51:9, 12, 18, 25 52:2, 7, 19 53:7, 25 54:19 55:1, 14, 24 56:6, 24 57:7, 19 58:5, 8, 10, 13, 15 59:4, 7, 12, 14 60:1, 5, 23 61:4 62:19,
---	--	---	---

Evan Milligan, et al v. John H. Merrill, et al.

Chris Pringle
12/17/2021

20 63:18 64:9, 10, 24 70:15 81:13 86:7 91:11, 16, 18, 21, 23 104:14, 19 107:13 108:12, 21, 24 129:6 133:2, 7, 9, 14, 23 138:14, 18, 25 Guys 16:22 < H > Hale 82:15 Hall 37:25 38:3 80:13 handed 54:5 55:13 handful 50:3 55:3 handing 36:19 handle 64:16, 20 handout 6:19 55:24 handwritten 75:8 happen 30:2 45:24 happened 39:1, 13 40:2, 6, 17, 20, 24 41:13 51:24 64:5, 13 75:17, 21 80:22 81:1, 6 112:8 happens 94:17 happy 39:5 70:9, 17 71:13, 18 86:22 87:17 88:20 89:5 90:2 92:12 99:16 hate 47:21 71:17 head 45:23 health 20:7 hear 46:5 47:9, 10 49:17 79:16 120:22 126:8 128:2 heard 64:25 86:20 92:18, 21 102:7, 8	112:11 131:10 134:1 hearing 68:22 77:15, 22 99:18, 21 104:21 134:20 hearings 32:8, 18 35:5 36:1, 2 37:17, 19, 22, 24 38:1, 3, 6, 16 39:13 64:16, 17, 20 67:24 68:12, 24 70:2, 6 71:21 73:13 75:17, 25 76:19 77:8, 19 78:1 79:5 80:22 81:6, 19, 23 82:20 86:17, 20 88:8, 25 90:10, 14, 16 held 17:20, 24 27:11 64:25 65:20 66:1, 15 72:4, 12 78:10 79:9 120:23 help 30:19 99:17 135:4 helpful 61:19 helping 23:4 Henry 43:22 45:4 Hi 8:14 higher 20:20 highest 16:6 highlights 54:16 Hinaman 23:24 24:7 30:18 31:8, 18 32:16 33:6 38:20, 24 39:9, 16 75:20 76:18 77:4, 9 88:11, 14, 19 90:9 107:12 108:9, 12, 20 109:1 114:17 117:11 118:2, 8, 10 129:4, 22, 23 130:4, 6, 15 131:21 133:1	135:8, 25 139:10 140:11 hired 24:6 110:20, 22 historical 85:18, 25 102:23 history 25:5 123:18 139:3 hit 43:8 Hogan 3:6 hold 64:21, 23 67:24 70:1 124:18 holding 38:6 68:24 80:19 81:23 homebuilder 16:17 17:10 honest 25:10 hope 17:3 99:13 125:14 139:17 hour 12:21 hours 12:21 78:10, 14, 18, 20 79:2 99:11 House 18:2, 14, 17 19:9 20:22 21:11 22:14, 17, 20, 22 23:9, 14 30:12 32:10, 12 35:12, 17 38:21 39:11 41:7, 11 43:14 44:6, 21 51:21 72:11, 18, 19 98:2 101:13 houses 17:11 Houston 45:4 huh 60:20 hunting 17:11 Huntsville 43:18, 21 < I > idea 87:17 ideal 43:24 identification 12:7 52:15	55:21 104:25 116:2 119:14 identities 85:19 imagine 36:24 immediately 37:21 impact 78:23 79:3 implementing 123:16 importance 89:6 98:5 important 11:19 60:17, 18, 20 89:11 92:2, 4, 7 93:10 98:6 114:13 inaccurate 105:9 116:8 include 85:12 140:12, 15 included 80:17 includes 85:17 including 40:22 Incorporated 17:22, 25 increase 42:23 increases 119:21 incumbent 134:24 135:4, 6 incumbents 31:4 33:1 54:13, 15 134:22 independently 139:8 individual 38:21, 22 individuals 123:17 125:1 influence 88:8 informal 104:18 information 32:17 38:9 87:21 88:4 94:3, 24 95:5 96:25 97:1 101:14 112:2 135:23 informed 126:18 129:7 initial 37:5, 9,
---	--	--	---

Evan Milligan, et al v. John H. Merrill, et al.

Chris Pringle
12/17/2021

11 110:2	31:23 131:12	81:13 130:10,	17, 20, 22
injunction 99:21	involvement 23:4	16	111:17, 20
input 30:21	issue 106:5, 10,	keeping 26:20	112:3, 13
31:14 52:1	14, 18 107:1	keeps 47:11	115:2, 6, 16
65:4 72:7	122:24 123:5	83:19	116:21 117:8,
instruct 33:7	issues 13:7	kept 44:1, 2	25 123:15
46:15 140:11,	49:10 107:6	71:4, 5	124:8 129:11
15	122:25 123:7	key 11:8	131:8 136:12
instructed 31:9	its 82:10	kicked 76:8	138:15, 22
92:25 133:1	89:5 135:19	kin 142:10	knowledge 112:6
instructions		kind 74:19	130:17 139:3
90:8, 12 108:9,	< J >	kinds 77:12	known 78:1
19 140:20	JAMES 4:18	knew 27:19	ksadasivan@naacpld
intact 44:2	January 22:1, 5	68:5, 25	f.org 3:16
81:14	37:6, 11, 12	111:11, 13	kwelborn@aclualaba
intentionally	JEFFERSON 142:2	131:8	ma.org 4:15
102:18 134:7	jerrymandered	know 11:5, 10	
interest 31:4	119:18 127:6,	13:1 16:21	< L >
32:14 45:2	20, 25 128:10	20:5 23:18	laid 37:21
61:18 62:4, 6,	jerrymandering	24:9, 11, 15, 17,	lands 85:14
20, 21, 23 66:9	128:22 129:2,	22, 25 25:5, 10,	Large 1:22
83:2, 5, 7, 15,	10, 12	11, 19, 23, 24	7:3 65:5
20, 21 84:14,	JIM 5:10, 17	26:8, 13, 14, 19	119:19 135:20
23 85:2, 4, 6,	8:1, 3, 22	27:13, 16, 24	late 35:4
10, 11, 16, 22	125:11 127:9	28:16, 17 30:2	117:18
86:9	128:2, 3 131:4	35:1 36:23, 25	LaTISHA 4:10
interested	140:7	43:2 48:10	7:22
91:11, 13	jim.davis@alabamaa	50:18 52:8	law 1:22 3:5,
142:11	g.gov 5:15	53:5, 19 55:10,	12, 19 4:3, 11,
interests 62:22	JOHN 1:10 5:9	16 56:9 57:3,	19 5:3, 4, 19
interjected 79:9	7:13 8:5	6, 9, 16 60:13,	8:15, 25 35:20,
internal 19:12	jublacksher@gmail.	23 61:4, 22	22 36:13, 17,
interpret 71:17	com 4:22	62:4, 9, 13, 24	21 37:1 41:5
138:20, 21	JULIE 4:1 8:20	63:1, 9 65:1	46:11 48:22
interpreted	jump 126:5	66:7 67:13	54:25 55:15,
139:1	jumping 11:23	69:5 70:21	18 57:21 60:3,
interrupt 27:8	41:23	74:1 75:4	14, 19
intervenor 7:25	justice 58:23	76:7 78:9, 17,	laws 2:5 54:18
intervenor	59:1 124:6, 9,	24 81:2, 17, 21	lawsuit 10:6
sors	14	83:12, 19, 20,	13:24 110:14,
10:13, 14		22, 24 84:6, 9,	15 111:12
introduce 11:24	< K >	24 85:3, 23	113:16 126:9,
52:17 55:23	KAITLIN 4:9	89:15 92:13,	15, 25 127:4,
94:21 105:2	7:20 9:9, 14	15 93:8, 15, 19	23 128:19
115:21 119:10	116:5	95:20, 22	140:9
introduced 14:1	KATHRYN 3:11	96:11, 25 99:5	lawsuits 16:3
28:8 41:2, 6	8:8 47:9	102:1, 24	105:18
93:23 94:10	keep 26:11, 15	103:5, 22	lawyer 10:1, 3,
95:9 97:25	41:23 44:15	104:13, 18	5, 18, 21
98:2 137:17	49:11 70:7, 13,	105:13 107:22,	lawyers 63:5
involved 16:2	20, 23 71:9	25 108:4	131:3
21:6, 15 22:24		110:4, 10, 12,	

Evan Milligan, et al v. John H. Merrill, et al.

Chris Pringle
12/17/2021

lay 31:2	Liberties 4:4,	looked 31:25	112:20 114:10
laying 36:3	12	74:21 94:4	115:1, 5, 9
LDF 8:9	license 17:20,	97:6 106:4, 9	Macon 83:11
leadership 22:9	24	107:17, 18, 22,	84:8
leading 2:11	licensed 16:16,	25	magic 119:2
League 66:24	17 17:10	looking 85:8	maintain 26:3
69:9 77:21	142:14	91:11, 14	119:24
78:1, 6 87:3	liked 67:1	106:18 107:14	maintained
88:17, 25 89:8,	70:6	136:13	134:14
14, 24 98:1	line 43:9, 10,	looks 56:1	maintaining
126:12, 14, 15	12 71:10	61:21	134:18
135:16 136:3,	91:21, 23 92:20	Los 3:8	major 122:23
17 137:11, 15	lines 54:21	lose 67:13	123:5, 22
138:4	65:23 71:6	lost 42:8	majority 25:4,
LeAnn 1:21	81:9, 22 123:21	127:12	16 28:19
7:1 142:22	links 79:5	lot 44:20	29:10 69:15
learn 86:16, 19	Linwood 4:20	45:3 68:14	90:17, 19 91:8
learned 88:8, 13	list 31:5	78:17 99:18,	93:15 95:24
leave 20:19	38:4 80:13	19 102:11	97:11, 12
120:6	listen 72:17,	125:20	115:19 132:7,
leaving 22:21	21 79:17	Lovells 3:6	12, 21, 22
106:22	137:18	Lowndes 82:15	133:6, 12, 18
left 18:25	listened 72:19,	lunch 120:16	134:4, 11, 19
121:9	23 79:9 87:23	139:22	135:1, 5 136:5,
Legal 3:13, 20	89:7	< M >	19 140:13, 23
63:4, 6 104:4	litigation 121:4	ma'am 12:10	makeup 27:14,
legislative	little 23:3	21:23 22:6	16 42:12 95:14
14:14 15:2, 11	27:9 66:7	24:12, 24 25:2	making 36:12
26:3 30:13	84:3 99:22	26:24 33:16	man 59:24
34:16, 19	live 65:5	35:9 38:17	67:19 68:8
36:22 57:13	70:19, 22	39:20 42:13,	96:17
66:21 74:19	living 17:5	15, 17 44:17	manner 31:10,
75:25 93:17	LLP 3:6	46:24 47:2	21 133:23
109:19 117:2	location 79:15	48:18 51:15	map 6:25 23:2,
legislators	locations 72:7	52:8, 12 53:2	4, 21 24:10, 18
28:18	log 79:12	56:2, 18, 21, 25	25:3, 6, 7, 16,
legislature	80:18	57:2 61:3	23 27:13 28:6,
18:13 19:15	logged 79:7, 25	62:12, 25 67:6	22 29:9, 21
21:5 23:16	long 12:20, 22	72:14 73:8, 22	30:4, 5, 17, 25
26:7, 11, 19	18:6, 9, 22	75:15, 22 80:9	31:24 32:23
27:24 28:7, 9	86:4 99:5	81:20, 24	33:3, 4, 7, 14,
29:20 34:7, 8	111:17 121:6	84:16 86:2	25 38:23
39:7 83:17	139:22	87:15, 19	39:19 40:22
84:15 94:20	longer 99:16	90:20 92:6	54:20 65:13
121:7, 13, 24	longstanding	93:18 94:15	66:24, 25 67:5,
122:7, 21	26:6	101:6 102:25	15, 22, 25 68:2,
123:10, 19	look 29:14	107:20 108:1,	11, 13 71:1
124:3, 21	31:3 54:11	7, 17, 18 109:5,	73:4 77:4, 18
128:21 132:15	66:25 76:11	15, 17, 20, 24	78:2, 6, 7
letter 37:25	95:6, 12, 13, 14	110:19 111:19	81:18 83:19
letting 96:4	96:18, 23		84:12, 15 88:9,
level 16:6	112:19		11, 24 89:6, 8,

Evan Milligan, et al v. John H. Merrill, et al.

Chris Pringle
12/17/2021

11, 14 90:10,	114:8	100:17, 19, 21	123:10, 12
13 93:11, 15	McDonald's 79:18	101:5, 11, 15,	124:1, 3, 5, 12,
95:24 96:3, 7,	mean 15:20	24, 25 102:4	13, 17, 18, 22,
25 108:6, 15,	19:1 27:18	105:4 109:14	23 135:9, 12
17 109:13	30:10 33:9	111:23 137:17	memory 24:4
110:2, 6	36:18 38:19,	meetings 36:4	137:14
112:14 114:18	24 43:5 44:18,	38:8 40:1	mention 133:6
119:11	20, 25 45:5	47:16, 19, 24	mentioned 21:1
maps 23:7	50:10 51:11	48:2, 19 49:1	33:18 45:19
24:8, 23 25:1	54:8, 10 59:19	50:6, 21 51:1,	63:7 65:25
27:18 28:4, 11	65:9, 13 66:5,	2, 16 64:23	70:5 90:21, 23
30:19, 25	17 70:8, 12, 18	65:3, 15, 20	94:22
31:15, 20	71:18 73:9	66:1, 12, 13	MERRILL 1:10
32:10 38:15	74:9 77:14, 17	67:5, 7 69:18	5:9 7:14 8:5
40:21 57:13	78:25 79:12	70:6 72:3, 16	140:8
66:8, 22 67:2	83:24 86:18	73:7 74:5, 8	met 12:14
69:6 74:6, 9,	87:1, 22 91:13,	75:6, 14, 21	39:9, 16 40:6
11, 12 80:23	15 95:17	76:15 78:9, 23	49:23 57:18
81:22 91:17	98:17, 25	79:20, 21 80:8,	91:11, 16
97:11 100:20	99:10 100:22	14, 17, 19	107:23 135:9
101:16 108:13	101:21 105:15	82:23 87:11	method 24:17
109:22 110:25	107:9 113:13	88:3, 14, 15	MICHAEL 3:4
111:1, 6, 8	114:16 115:17	92:24	8:12
112:4 118:16	116:21 122:4	meets 50:11	michael.turrill@ho
Marengo 82:15	130:9 134:11	member 20:17	ganlovells.com
83:11	Meaning 87:10	21:10 22:20	3:9
margins 70:21	139:2	31:13 39:21	microphone 27:9
mark 95:25	means 9:9	48:6 56:11	middle 37:15,
97:2	23:11 107:2	58:3 88:11	21 61:14 82:9
marked 12:7	108:14 109:6	94:20 96:14	MILLIGAN 1:6
52:15 55:21	134:13 139:11	103:24 104:2	3:3 7:13 8:9,
104:25 116:2	meant 116:22	121:15, 18	10, 13, 19, 21
119:14	134:19 135:5	140:18	9:1, 15 120:13
marks 7:11	media 15:14	members 22:16,	mind 80:4
Maroney 1:21	38:5	17 24:3, 6	mine 26:1
7:1 142:22	meet 12:20, 24	30:12, 18, 21	106:3
materials 46:25	32:16 91:17	31:11, 22	minimal 138:19
60:10 101:17	meeting 38:21	32:11, 16	139:1
math 103:11	39:3, 14 46:17,	37:23 38:21	minimum 139:11
matter 7:13	18, 20 47:1, 12	39:3, 4, 10, 16	minor 16:13
112:25	48:16, 23	41:11 51:21,	minorities
McCLENDON 5:17	50:15, 19 51:5,	25 52:4, 7	118:14, 20
8:1 12:19, 23	6, 19, 23 52:1,	53:10 54:22	minority 21:10,
13:3, 17 35:24	2, 9, 11 53:17,	56:17 67:1	12 25:16
46:2, 8 47:5	20 56:14 58:5	70:7 71:4	69:16 93:16
48:3 51:17	63:7, 10, 17	73:23 80:12	95:24 97:16,
58:2 61:11	64:2, 5 69:13	87:9 88:12	21, 23 98:5, 9,
74:2 80:10, 23	72:5, 14 73:10	100:21 101:12,	13, 22 102:21
81:4 106:1	77:3 78:4	13, 17 107:21,	115:19 119:3
107:4 108:11	79:7 80:2	23 114:17	134:8, 15
113:19, 25	87:2 88:16	119:9 121:24	minute 28:12
	89:15 91:4, 6	122:1, 7, 8	

Evan Milligan,et al v. John H.Merrill, et al.

Chris Pringle
12/17/2021

39:3, 23	neutral 54:11	22, 24 70:2	15:13, 19, 23
minutes 12:21	107:14	76:5, 14 96:8,	16:2, 6, 14, 24
missing 72:2	never 15:22	18 97:4	17:15, 23 18:1,
Mobile 18:15,	29:17, 19	numerous 66:23	6, 9, 19, 22
21 42:5 43:7,	103:13 112:11	123:1	19:3, 14, 17, 22,
13, 19 44:3, 7,	121:18 129:9	< O >	25 20:10, 13
10 45:3 83:24	New 3:15 4:6	oath 9:20	21:1, 12 22:2,
84:1 125:15, 18	46:11 67:13	Object 128:1,	4, 7, 15, 18
moderator 73:8	80:23 128:19	11, 12 131:4	23:6, 15, 25
Monroe 42:6	night 79:25	132:23 136:23,	24:13 25:14,
44:3, 11	125:15, 19	24	22 26:2, 8, 14,
Montgomery 1:23	nine 41:20	Objection 107:8	25 27:12, 20
4:14 5:14, 22	nitty-gritty	122:11 128:3	28:17 29:4, 16
125:17	66:7	131:23 132:8	30:2, 20 31:17,
monuments 122:2	nods 45:23	133:19 134:5	22 32:2, 4
morning 8:18	nonminorities	objections 2:9,	34:2, 11, 22
136:13	115:20	12 100:4, 7	36:7 38:18, 23
motions 99:7, 25	nonpartisan	obligation	39:12, 24
motivation 34:12	22:15	40:13 128:21	40:16 41:4, 15,
move 27:9	normal 53:6	obtain 16:11	21 42:7, 11
68:17	North 142:23	occasionally	43:3 44:5, 9,
municipalities	NORTHERN 1:2	76:2	18 46:19
85:14	7:16 84:1	occur 38:14	47:25 48:2
< N >	Notary 1:21	46:20 67:7	49:1 50:5, 17
N.W 3:21	7:2	occurred 41:20	51:3, 13 52:25
NAACP 3:13, 20	note 116:8	48:17 67:5	53:15 56:23
name 9:13, 16	notes 52:10	o'clock 50:11	57:6, 16 59:2,
15:22, 24	75:5, 7, 12, 13	October 39:15	13, 25 61:7, 9,
82:10 93:1, 5	101:22	40:6, 18 50:20	20 63:3 64:4,
121:2 142:16	notice 6:15	51:2 100:16	18 68:3, 9, 23
names 7:19	11:25 37:22	105:4 109:14,	69:25 70:5
NE 5:5	101:20	23	71:20 72:3, 15
necessarily	noticed 14:8	offered 2:14	73:9, 11, 17, 23
84:20	99:7	Office 5:12	74:14, 24
necessary 2:9	notification	8:4 18:23	75:12 78:13,
67:21, 24	101:25	20:19, 21, 24	22 80:6 82:4
68:23 111:25	notifying 101:23	23:13 28:7	86:3 87:16, 20
116:17 117:8	November 38:11	35:25 46:7	92:1 93:7
need 16:24	115:23	48:8 76:10	94:16, 22 95:5
54:23 63:13	Number 7:14	93:22 109:3	96:5 97:5, 10
68:17 90:17	12:4 47:21	127:23 130:20	98:3, 24 99:3
99:8 113:4, 10,	50:2 67:14	137:4	100:25 101:8
13 114:7 115:7	76:16 91:2, 24	offices 1:22	102:3 103:15,
needed 22:21	98:6 113:20	official 88:5	21 104:13
54:25 57:20	118:3 119:2	121:18 137:15	105:19, 22
68:7 76:16	142:16	Oh 127:13	107:5 109:4, 9
130:4, 21	numbering 12:2	okay 9:10	111:7 112:13,
131:19, 20	numbers 35:4	10:12, 16 11:4,	19 113:9, 15,
134:19 135:1, 3	37:6, 11, 13, 15,	23 12:20, 23	17 116:11
needs 99:21	19, 20 67:9, 16,	13:9, 12, 23	117:7, 12
neither 142:9	22, 24 68:4, 17,	14:3, 9, 21	121:11 123:9
	19, 24 69:5, 7,		124:2 125:4

Evan Milligan, et al v. John H. Merrill, et al.

Chris Pringle
12/17/2021

126:18 127:12, 22 128:24 129:14 130:9, 13 131:18 132:3 133:5, 12 135:15 136:2 137:18 138:2, 18, 23 139:7 old 57:19 79:15 Once 31:25 90:25 94:16 112:10 ones 19:7 20:4 63:10 74:22, 23 111:25 operating 65:12 101:6 opinion 69:21, 23 84:22 89:20 90:4, 7 92:5 93:10 114:9, 24 115:1 131:3 opinions 66:8 69:6 124:1, 19 opportunities 79:12 80:16 opportunity 97:14, 18, 20 122:22 127:2 134:21 opposed 123:5 option 111:10 oral 7:8 order 38:12 54:2 67:19 68:8 75:1 92:9 98:20 132:5, 19 OSHER 5:2 6:8 8:14 27:8 46:5 120:22, 24 121:3 122:14, 19 125:4 outcome 43:24 outside 28:6 93:22 94:5, 17	95:9 overall 97:7 overnight 125:18 overpopulated 67:11 74:23 overpopulation 68:18 oversaw 32:7 oversight 19:12 Overton 48:12 overview 37:2 overwhelmingly 45:11, 17 < P > p.m 100:15 120:9, 12 140:2, 5 141:5, 7 P.O 4:13 PAC 15:8 PAGE 6:13 15:15 105:24, 25 113:18 116:4, 16 Pages 61:12, 19 paid 41:21 Paige 6:2 paper 39:22 89:21 92:17 parameters 54:1 part 32:24 62:22 64:24 66:2 84:24 87:22 92:24 95:19 110:25 119:19 130:6 participate 39:25 71:21 particular 62:10, 13 83:22 92:24 103:3, 17 106:21 114:12 118:21, 23 137:3 140:16 particularly 102:17 parties 1:18 2:11 122:23 123:23 142:10	partisan 62:20, 22 parts 38:2 83:15 party 21:10, 13 24:13 117:20 121:16, 19, 25 122:1, 8, 9 123:5, 6, 11, 12 124:4, 5, 12, 13, 17, 22, 24 passed 22:10 27:18 38:12 40:21 41:7, 8, 11, 17 52:4 58:22 105:17 111:2, 6, 9 126:10 passing 111:22 Paul 9:18 paying 10:17, 21 people 13:21 45:9, 10, 16 65:5, 16 66:11, 22, 23 67:1, 10, 12, 17 68:7, 11, 17, 25 69:1, 3, 4, 12, 17 70:6 71:1, 13 73:14 74:18, 25 76:2 78:13, 17, 19 81:10 84:3, 7, 8, 9 86:21 87:10 89:7, 19 90:1 92:12 97:25 117:22 122:5 people's 66:3 percent 26:15 42:16, 21, 24 57:9, 23 97:15, 21, 22 98:4, 11, 12, 21, 22 113:20, 22 114:3, 6, 12, 25 115:3, 6, 12 116:18, 19 117:5, 25 118:3 perform 111:17, 24 performed 104:1	period 69:6 72:8 79:13 permanent 87:22 Perry 82:15 83:11 person 11:20 16:25 71:23 72:10 96:15 109:5 personal 14:24 15:11, 13, 17, 23 26:1 84:13, 20 90:7 personally 83:20 PI 99:7 picked 39:22 piece 89:21 92:17 pit 31:4 33:1 Plaintiffs 1:8 3:3 4:17 5:1 7:21, 23 8:9, 11, 13, 15, 19, 21, 23 9:1, 15 10:6 120:13, 15, 20 121:3 125:8 Plaintiff's 6:14, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24 12:4, 6 52:14, 18 55:20, 23 104:24 115:23 116:1 119:10, 13 plan 24:21 25:8, 13, 25 27:2 42:9 43:6 58:24 65:6, 9, 11 69:15 77:16, 20 79:10 87:4, 5 91:10 93:21 94:5, 8, 10, 12, 16 95:4, 6 96:1, 4, 9, 18, 19, 24 97:7 107:15, 16, 19, 20 114:15 119:7, 8 120:1 126:10, 16 127:1, 5, 18, 24
--	--	--	--

Evan Milligan, et al v. John H. Merrill, et al.

Chris Pringle
12/17/2021

128:9, 20	105:14, 17	prepared 67:5	Procedure 7:5
129:17, 23	106:7, 8, 12, 13,	93:8 118:7	99:11 101:7
130:2, 7, 15	20 109:12, 18,	PRESENT 6:1	proceedings 7:9
131:19 132:6,	21, 25 110:5,	7:18 66:24	142:5, 8
20 134:19	18, 25 111:8,	73:6	process 21:6, 9,
135:11, 16, 18	18, 21 112:3,	presented 29:17	24 22:13, 25
136:4, 17	14, 24 113:24	63:17 68:11	26:10 28:18
137:12, 16	114:1, 5 115:4,	119:8 135:11	29:25 30:9
138:8, 12, 19	8, 12 116:14	137:11, 23, 25	33:18 34:24,
140:12, 24	Policies 123:16	138:3, 7	25 35:18 36:3,
planning 34:24	political 16:13	preserve 32:25	25 37:3 41:19,
plans 22:9	85:12 123:21	33:9 133:24	25 46:3 57:16
27:5, 6 31:3,	politically	press 80:17, 23	64:14 66:2
7, 9 38:12	86:14	pretty 25:12	93:17 96:17
40:8 58:22	population	60:20 63:5	101:3 105:15
64:11 65:22	26:16 42:22	99:22 123:20	107:7, 11
76:5, 8 77:6	65:22 76:11	prevent 9:22	produced 43:6
107:14 130:1,	95:3, 12, 18	previous 112:5	68:13 77:20
11 133:22	96:11 97:23	previously	80:13
play 28:6, 14	98:5, 12, 13, 22	21:18 42:21	program 94:23
29:24 46:12	102:8 113:21	primarily 38:24	project 40:14
104:9	119:21	73:12 80:10	prompted 89:17
please 7:18	populations 96:2	primary 26:10,	property 43:9,
9:3, 16 118:19	portion 18:19	15	10, 11
137:21	82:17 102:3	principle 60:8	Proposed 6:19
pleasure 139:16	possible 27:9	PRINGLE 1:10,	37:24 51:11
plus 18:8	39:2 69:21	20 5:17 7:7,	52:6 55:24
point 25:6	92:9 107:5	12 8:2 9:4,	56:13 57:19
30:5 32:22	117:1 133:3	13, 18 17:25	61:15 63:8, 10,
33:3, 8 34:16	possibly 49:10	125:14 126:3	16, 22 77:6
39:1 40:7	106:4, 9, 14, 18,	127:16 131:11	93:16, 19
64:12 88:15	25	133:5 139:14	100:20
93:16 94:1	potentially	140:7 141:4	protect 33:19
95:6, 7 97:10	136:7	prior 2:14	34:1, 9 45:6
99:16 105:14	practicable	22:20 26:4	70:15 98:9
109:22 116:24	81:15	40:13 52:1, 8	133:2 134:22
118:6	precincts 85:13	56:11, 13, 22,	135:4
points 69:13	preclearance	24 58:5 81:18	protected 29:2
77:15, 23 87:3,	112:10	95:25 100:21	102:20 134:8
6 88:17 89:1,	precleared	109:13 111:21	136:8
16, 25 92:14,	58:25 59:21	priorities 33:25	protecting 43:4
18, 21 93:9	112:11	prioritize 54:23	44:19 135:6
117:14, 17	predominantly	priority 33:19	protection 96:14
118:7, 9	85:23	prison 40:11	provide 101:17
132:10, 13	prefer 19:21	prisons 40:9	105:5
135:17, 24	preference	private 14:24	provided 55:5
136:2, 11, 15,	123:16	privilege 63:14	56:7, 9
16, 22 137:5	preliminary	127:8 131:5	Public 1:21
polarization	99:21	132:9	7:2 19:12
102:4, 11, 15	prepare 12:13	privy 114:20	20:23 32:7, 8,
103:2, 17	51:6, 14 74:4	Probably 35:1	17 35:5, 25
104:7, 10, 15	100:18 106:23	136:13	36:1 37:16, 18,

Evan Milligan, et al v. John H. Merrill, et al.

Chris Pringle
12/17/2021

22, 24 38:1, 3, 5, 16 39:13 41:1 64:11, 15, 16, 20, 23 65:2, 15, 19, 21, 25 66:12 67:5, 7, 24 68:12, 16, 21, 24 70:2, 6 71:20 72:3, 16, 25 73:7 74:4 75:6, 14, 17, 21, 24 76:14, 19 77:3, 7, 8, 12, 15, 19, 22 78:1, 23 79:4, 5, 6 80:22 81:6, 19, 23 82:20, 22 86:17, 20 87:1, 8, 11, 17 88:8, 14, 20, 25 89:4, 12 90:10, 13, 16 92:23 122:2 publicize 36:6 published 38:4 pure 69:5 purpose 16:23 65:2, 15 102:18 pursuant 7:4 put 28:9 31:6 41:9 47:21 54:25 88:1, 5 89:18 90:3 94:2, 18 116:5 putting 54:13 < Q > question 10:10 11:10, 12, 13, 23 25:11 40:19 53:23 57:5 63:13 66:5 70:25 73:2, 15 80:21 86:10 93:13 98:16 103:23 106:2 118:18 119:1 124:20 127:9 130:3 132:3, 23 133:8, 16 134:2, 23	137:19, 21 138:10 questions 2:10, 11 9:23 11:9, 21 72:24 73:13, 18, 20, 24 74:2 80:4 117:22 120:14, 15, 21, 25 125:9 126:2 139:15 140:10 141:2 quick 121:1 quicker 43:18, 20 quickly 33:17 41:25 49:10 92:11 quit 17:7 quite 86:3 117:21 quote 80:24 quoting 133:1 < R > race 27:25 54:11, 12 107:10, 14, 16 108:5 110:3 123:17 race-neutral 31:10, 20 108:15 133:23 134:16, 18 races 75:25 131:15 racial 26:11 27:13, 16 42:11 85:17 95:14 102:4, 8, 10, 14 103:1, 16 104:7, 10, 15 105:13, 17 106:5, 6, 7, 10, 12, 14, 18, 19 107:1, 6 109:11, 18, 21, 25 110:4, 17, 25 111:8, 18, 21 112:3, 13, 23 113:24 114:1, 5 115:4,	8, 12 116:14 128:22 129:2, 10, 12 racially 119:18 127:6, 19, 24 128:9 ran 45:11 Randy 23:24 38:20 range 119:5 ranking 20:16 21:10 rapid 117:17 118:12 rapidly 116:25 reach 131:3 reached 139:7 reaches 95:2 read 31:1 51:11 60:4 61:18 69:14 74:8 77:24 87:4 88:17 92:19 101:14 106:15 126:21 132:14 137:21, 22 139:13 reading 2:2 41:9 87:3 92:17 118:5 137:5 readings 139:12 reads 89:16 ready 38:13 99:24 real 17:7, 20 really 11:19 33:17 34:11 41:25 69:25 77:18 83:12 99:9, 14, 15 116:23 118:18 119:1 realtor 16:16 17:15 18:5 Reapportionment 6:17 19:10 20:5 21:2 23:13 28:7 30:8, 10, 24 31:13, 23 32:6 35:20, 25 36:8,	13 39:14 40:5, 18, 23 45:21 46:7 47:13 48:7, 8, 15, 22, 24 49:2, 22, 23 50:6, 7, 13, 19, 22, 25 52:18 53:10, 15 55:14 56:17 58:3 76:6, 10 80:7 83:18 85:5 93:22 100:17, 23 102:2 103:25 104:3 105:3 109:2 128:25 129:1, 16 132:19 139:4 140:19 reason 21:22 28:5 58:20 59:8, 25 60:15 62:5 65:19 96:16 105:8 108:23 116:7 reasonable 44:23, 24 reasons 54:18 59:13 recall 27:22 36:7 47:17, 18 49:24 51:7, 21 54:24 55:2 57:15, 25 58:6 63:20 64:6, 7 66:3 75:18 76:23 77:11 78:7, 8 82:19 86:24 89:2 90:11, 15, 16, 22 104:17, 20 133:14 receive 14:19 37:5 received 135:22 137:3 receiving 70:10 Recess 49:14 100:13 120:10 140:3 recognize 55:25
---	--	---	--

Evan Milligan, et al v. John H. Merrill, et al.

Chris Pringle
12/17/2021

recollection	referring 27:5	remodeling 17:12	21 122:1, 9
14:3 26:18	69:9 106:6	remotely 72:9	123:12 124:5,
28:20 29:1, 7	108:9 117:8	removing 122:2	13, 24
47:6 132:16	118:1 126:10	repeat 18:16	republicans
138:1	reflect 55:15	118:19	21:12 123:2
record 9:17	reform 124:6, 9,	repetition 99:19	request 38:2
27:11 49:13,	14	Reporter 7:1	50:22 104:5
16 64:11	refrain 100:4, 6	9:2, 7 11:15	110:12
77:24 87:4, 23	refresher 11:9	16:20 97:22	requested 14:5
88:1, 5 89:18	regarding 40:16	100:6 137:21	110:10
90:4 95:17	regardless 69:7	142:15	requesting 38:1
100:9, 12, 15	region 82:9	Reporting 142:14	required 36:15,
116:6, 8 120:7,	register 79:19	represent 7:19	21 134:3
9, 12, 23	regular 50:5, 8	9:15 19:23	requirement
137:22 140:1, 5	related 78:6	24:7 42:2	131:8 132:11
recordings 50:23	79:1	45:10, 16	134:17
records 50:23	relating 2:5	50:24 80:25	requires 115:12
Rector 3:14	relationship	140:8	134:6
redistricting	115:2	representation	reservations
11:3, 5 16:3	relay 77:2, 9	70:9 80:15	85:14
21:6, 9, 16, 24	released 79:5	86:23 87:18	residence 44:16
22:8, 12, 24, 25	releases 80:17	88:21 89:5, 13	resolve 49:10
26:9 29:25	rely 58:12, 21	90:2, 7 92:13	respect 30:24
30:9 33:18	remained 45:13	Representative	31:3 39:19
34:23, 25	remedy 128:22	8:1 9:13	88:15
35:21 36:16	129:2, 9	18:14, 17	respecting 54:14
37:3 40:16, 17	remember 14:7	25:25 37:25	respective 1:18
41:2 42:22	20:4, 9 26:5,	42:1, 12, 20	respond 99:24
45:20, 21	17 32:3 35:7	43:4 44:5	response 43:17
46:10 47:14	36:10 37:10	45:6, 13 46:2	91:7
52:19 54:5	42:11 46:1, 6,	70:18, 20, 24	responsibilities
64:14 66:2	24 48:3, 16	71:9, 14, 19	32:5, 20
96:12 107:7,	49:4, 5, 25	113:19, 23	responsibility
11 112:5	50:2 52:3, 6	116:13 121:2,	98:18
129:17 131:13	53:18 55:4	6 122:20	rest 70:19, 21
132:6	58:24 59:9	125:5, 14	result 11:5
redrawing 24:8	60:5, 6 64:3	126:3 127:15	22:7 142:11
Reed 25:8, 13,	72:2 73:3, 5,	131:11 133:5	retained 24:12
22, 24 42:9	25 74:3 76:1	139:14 140:7	reusing 60:15
119:20 120:1	77:10, 21 78:4	Representatives	review 13:9, 12
reelect 45:17	82:25 87:8, 14	18:2 20:23	19:13 20:8
reelected 35:12,	88:22, 23	41:12 70:11,	52:1 56:14
16 121:9	90:24 91:2, 5	13 71:6	100:21
re-elected 18:25	94:9, 12 97:12,	represented	reviewed 52:23
reelection	13 98:1	10:1 93:1, 6	53:13 56:21
45:11, 14	100:18, 25	representing	reviewing 46:9
134:22 135:13	101:2 112:7, 9	7:21, 23, 25	revised 51:18
refer 19:16	114:23 116:23	8:4, 15	revising 47:13
25:12 27:5	117:17	represents 10:5,	58:4
102:5, 10	remembered	13	revisions 56:23
126:12	59:11 87:23	republican	rewritten 61:22
referred 25:24		121:16, 17, 19,	62:7

Evan Milligan, et al v. John H. Merrill, et al.

Chris Pringle
12/17/2021

rich 82:10	ROSBOROUGH 4:2	second 19:1	107:3 113:18,
86:5	8:18, 19 49:6	41:9 98:3	25 114:7
right 9:20	100:3	105:12 135:15	send 45:3
14:17 18:3, 6	ROSS 3:18 8:10	secondhand	sense 42:14
20:9, 16 27:3	roughly 121:11	114:21	46:22 47:19
28:3 32:3, 21	RP 102:6	seconds 139:25	89:19 123:4
33:24 34:4, 20	RPV 102:5, 7	Secretary 8:4	sensitive 99:22
39:2, 8 48:24	rule 28:5, 14	38:10 140:8	sent 37:22, 25
49:19 50:12	36:22 60:6	Section 58:23	41:14 43:15
53:22 58:16	76:8 93:21	59:1, 16, 18, 19,	51:25 52:7
59:22 66:20	rules 2:5 7:5	20, 21 61:17	69:10 92:19
68:15 70:24	11:8 99:11	62:6, 18 98:7,	93:3 100:20
71:2, 7 72:13	ruling 62:8	15 99:1	101:1, 19, 23
76:3, 15 78:2,	rulings 36:19,	102:19 103:10	102:1 110:7
15 80:11	20 46:11 54:4,	112:9 136:7	sentences 11:21
83:15, 23	8 55:13	see 8:16, 17	sentiment 88:20
84:11, 14, 17	run 20:20	16:21 21:22	89:4 92:12
85:6 86:1	83:25 99:1	31:7 34:15	separate 66:18
87:25 96:21,	123:25	56:15, 16	September 127:18
23 99:15, 17	rural 84:24	61:12, 13 65:7,	sequentially
101:5 103:12		23 66:22	12:2
105:20 108:16	< S >	67:18 74:22	series 37:22
111:2 115:24	SADASIVAN 3:11	89:8 95:23	serve 19:11
126:11 131:14	8:8, 9 47:7,	96:1, 4 97:6	21:19 35:17
133:10, 13, 16	10 49:9, 19	109:2 113:4,	served 18:24
139:9	safe 48:11	10, 13 125:20	20:5, 6, 7, 8,
Rights 54:3, 7	sales 17:9	127:12 139:17	23 25:6 26:1
59:16, 19, 20	satisfied 89:12	seeing 94:9, 12	33:3 50:8
98:7 99:2	saw 56:1, 3, 12	97:12, 13	121:7, 8
102:20 132:5,	59:10 76:7	104:17, 20	serves 137:14
20 133:10, 17	138:24	seek 22:18	service 122:21
134:3, 6 136:4,	saying 63:15	130:19	serving 20:22
18 137:13	69:8 71:13, 14,	seeking 134:22	21:23 121:23
River 43:8, 12	16 84:11	135:13	123:9 124:21
83:25 84:2	100:2 123:22	seen 12:9	session 22:3, 4
rivers 84:10	124:10 133:15	29:19 76:4, 5	28:13 40:9, 10
Road 4:20	says 11:17	95:21 112:16,	41:2 93:18, 20
11:9 43:10, 11	106:1 113:25	17, 18 115:19	94:6 110:9
54:20	scenes 38:13	sell 82:2	117:18
Rock 41:5, 22	schedule 35:3,	senate 21:11	set 32:7 80:7
role 18:12	5 37:16 50:5,	32:10 41:14	93:9 106:3
21:8 22:12, 15,	8 79:4	72:20	setup 65:17
19 29:24	school 72:20	Senator 8:1	seven 19:1
30:23 48:13	85:15 117:2	12:19, 23	113:15 117:3
52:21, 25	Schoolhouse	13:17 33:19	129:5
56:19 62:10	41:5, 22	35:24 44:15	Sewell 114:15
72:15 104:9	science 16:13	46:7 47:5	119:7
room 11:18	scratch 58:13	48:3 51:17	shape 119:22
39:21, 23 90:3	screen 127:13	58:2 61:10	share 45:3
120:6	seat 34:9	74:2 80:10, 23	69:18
	43:4 45:7	81:4 106:1	shattering 81:15

Evan Milligan, et al v. John H. Merrill, et al.

Chris Pringle
12/17/2021

she'll 11:17	91:10 93:3	76:23 77:9, 12	15 116:22
shift 76:13	102:2 110:22	86:24	137:11 138:4,
shifted 65:23	Sonny 21:17	spectrum 123:20	8, 12
shifts 74:7	29:2 33:21	speculation 43:2	statements 90:4
ship 43:7, 12,	soon 38:7, 8	spelled 54:15	STATES 1:1
13 44:21	67:9 139:17	spend 82:14	7:15 58:25
short 120:3	sorry 13:1	spent 82:5	stay 40:14
Shortly 14:8	17:13 18:16	split 44:13	67:2 74:18
show 65:21	20:13 22:12	92:8 97:9	125:17
91:10 109:10	27:8 34:18	splits 91:24	Ste 3:7, 21
side 43:11	37:8 41:23	92:7 94:4	5:5, 21
48:11 83:4, 12	49:6 53:23	95:13 97:8	step 22:22
99:24	59:19 73:19	spoken 80:3	35:10, 11
signature 2:2	75:4 89:23	126:7	stepped 35:15
signed 40:21	94:11 98:3, 12	spring 37:17	steps 41:20
41:17 114:18	101:21 105:25	staff 48:7, 15	45:20
significant	111:4 128:14	100:23 102:2	stint 19:14, 16
124:25	137:8 138:5	standard 101:6	21:5
similar 60:5	sort 41:4	standing 87:2	stipulate 116:9
similarities	sorts 66:16	stands 89:16	STIPULATED 1:17
59:10	sought 20:20	Stars 3:7	2:1, 8
single 67:8	sounds 16:25	start 12:3	stipulation 7:6
77:22 84:13, 21	source 95:10	33:11, 12	stipulations 9:7
single-member	Southern 17:8,	34:24 61:13	stood 77:23
54:14	14, 21 18:3	138:5	stopped 47:7
SINGLETON 4:17	spaces 122:3	started 33:6	story 34:21
8:23 120:15	speak 29:23	35:8 36:8	straight 40:10
125:8 126:11	58:4 93:5, 11	38:15	Street 1:23
127:17 128:7	speaking 66:14	starting 25:6	3:14, 21 4:5
sir 121:22	100:4, 6	30:5 32:22	5:5, 21 142:23
126:13, 17, 20,	speaks 11:20	33:3, 8 58:13	stretches 83:3
23 130:25	special 22:3, 4	State 1:22	strike 138:5
133:11 134:1	28:12 40:9, 10	7:3, 19 8:4	strided 61:14
139:6	41:1 93:20	9:16 10:20	subdivisions
sitting 46:1, 6	94:6 110:8	14:15, 20, 25	85:13
situation 43:25	specialist 16:19	18:14, 17, 19	submit 28:8
six 38:1, 3	specialize 17:9	19:8 23:8, 14	73:15
80:14, 16	specialties	32:9, 10 34:19	submitted 76:6,
skilled 117:19	16:15	38:2, 6, 10	9 94:5, 13, 16
smile 126:8	specific 23:3	39:6, 11 41:8	subsection 61:21
social 15:13	27:7 51:22	42:4 50:10	substance 109:8
85:18	77:2 79:7	57:11 72:11,	suggest 57:22
software 24:22	87:5 123:7	18, 20 75:25	63:2, 19 111:7
soil 86:2, 6	specifically	82:9, 17 83:4,	suggested 111:20
soils 82:11	60:6 73:24	15 84:5, 15, 25	suggestion 91:7
somebody 22:21	74:2 82:25	86:22 93:1, 5	suggests 77:17
23:12, 15	90:22 108:10	96:15 109:19	suit 126:19
24:15 69:10	127:21	122:23 125:2	Suite 142:23
77:23 78:3	specifics 40:4	127:22 128:8	summer 37:17
87:2 88:16	55:2, 4, 6, 11,	142:1	supermajority
89:15 90:3, 5	16 75:19	statement 81:3,	123:20
		5, 12 115:10,	

Evan Milligan, et al v. John H. Merrill, et al.

Chris Pringle
12/17/2021

superminority	100:9, 16	terms	18:25	100:3 116:17
20:14	101:10 135:15	19:15 89:5	121:9	117:7
support 119:8, 9	talked 51:20	test 45:1	three 60:16	99:7
supported 42:25	52:2 64:7	46:12 61:25	three-week 79:13	tight 111:11
suppose 109:6	72:18 76:2, 21, 24 87:5	62:2	timberland 17:9	82:2
supposed 37:5, 9, 10	112:21 135:9	testified 9:5	Timberlands	17:8, 14, 21
supposing 61:24	talking 26:9	129:4	18:3	time 2:12, 13
sure 10:9	27:1 36:4	testify 14:18	7:17 10:24	11:20 19:23
24:5 25:12	39:6 49:21	128:25	20:15 25:15	34:3 39:19
27:6 35:21	64:1 66:6	testifying 9:20	42:5 44:12	45:11 46:22
36:12 39:4	69:11, 13	testimony	49:13, 16	51:19 59:5
41:18 45:13,	74:16, 19 77:7, 15, 23 82:17	129:15 134:1	68:14 72:8	73:14 74:14
15 58:1 64:6	87:3, 6 88:17	text 109:6	79:8, 17 80:5	81:9 82:5, 14
75:3, 18 77:14	89:1, 16, 25	texts 109:10	86:4 99:5	100:12, 15
86:13 96:20	92:11, 14, 18,	Thank 34:22	101:9 105:23	110:4 111:14
101:13, 14	20, 21, 22 93:9	49:19 51:3	112:10 113:1	117:1, 3, 13
103:19 104:2	106:25 112:25	121:2, 14	120:9, 12	121:2, 16
107:9 117:14	116:24 117:14,	125:5, 6, 12, 16	125:5 132:17	137:16 140:2,
118:5 120:14	16 118:5, 7, 9,	138:2 139:14	5 141:4	timeline 37:3
122:12, 16, 19	25 132:10, 13	141:1	times 49:22	79:22 80:7
123:7 139:18	135:17, 24	thereto 2:14	91:2	title 18:4
surprise 81:10	136:2, 11, 15,	thing 40:17	today 9:24	10:1, 18 12:13
surprises 80:24	16, 21 137:5	68:10 69:14	13:10 14:13	34:17 71:2
81:7	Tallapoosa 1:23	things 17:6	today's 34:23	told 13:21, 23
swear 9:3	5:21	31:5 36:11	14:4 31:19	33:11 80:23
sworn 9:5	tasked 83:18	79:1 132:12	108:12 113:25	
system 40:11	team 39:21	think 29:20		
83:25 84:2	telephone 109:3	32:21 37:11,		
	127:13	23 40:6 43:20		
< T >	tell 15:1	46:12, 13 49:9		
table 46:1, 6	29:18 35:14	60:2, 22 62:5		
take 32:17	67:10 75:23	63:12 66:2, 11		
49:8 52:10	89:17 99:15	69:20 71:16		
61:10 65:4	117:5 118:14,	78:22 79:2		
75:5, 10, 13	20 126:24	81:9 82:13		
86:16 99:12,	127:4 128:18	101:4 111:5		
17 100:8	telling 36:19	114:7, 11		
107:10 120:2	88:23	115:15 116:18,		
taken 1:21	ten 28:8, 11	23 119:2, 19		
49:14 100:13	47:25 93:23	123:18 124:7,		
108:5 110:1	94:7, 14, 15	18 127:9		
120:10 140:3	tend 78:25	130:7 132:1		
142:5, 8	ten-day 28:5	137:17 139:19,		
takes 111:17	60:6 76:8	21		
talk 47:13	95:25 97:1	thinking 36:8		
51:17, 18	term 19:2, 19	86:21 122:5		
62:15, 16 63:2	82:1, 24 85:25	third 61:14		
64:4 67:17	86:3 102:7	thought 48:21		
75:16, 20	112:12	54:2 57:20		
76:18 78:4		59:23 80:15		

Evan Milligan, et al v. John H. Merrill, et al.

Chris Pringle
12/17/2021

114:21, 22	12, 13 121:9	update 36:15,	voted 29:3, 10
119:6	123:22 127:2	18, 20, 22 46:4,	31:16, 17 51:9
total 121:12	two-hour 99:6	10 55:3 57:20	53:21 84:17
totally 84:4	type 11:17	updated 36:12	Voter 89:25
tradition 26:6	35:2	55:15	voters 42:23
60:12 64:25	typing 11:16	updates 54:24	66:24 69:10
transcribed		57:6	77:21 78:2, 7
142:5, 8	< U >	updating 35:18	80:25 81:8
Transcript 6:21,	Uh-huh 61:16	36:8, 24 45:20	87:4 88:17
23 105:3	95:8	URIAH 4:18	89:1, 8, 14
115:22 142:7	ultimately 24:9	use 15:17, 21	98:1 126:13,
transcription	98:17	25:20, 21 33:7	14, 16 135:16
142:6	unconstitutional	60:9, 12 102:13	136:4, 17
transcripts	127:19 135:19	Usual 9:7	137:12, 15
116:10	underpopulated	14:14	138:4
travel 14:15, 20	67:12 68:6	usually 101:7, 9	Voting 54:3, 7
trial 2:13	74:23		59:16, 19, 20
14:18	underpopulation	< V >	85:13 95:18
tribal 85:14, 18	68:19	various 38:1	98:7, 12 99:2
trick 111:4	underpopulations	122:25	102:19 113:21
tried 92:8	74:17	varying 124:1	132:5, 20
true 81:12	understand 9:11,	version 63:18,	133:10, 17
83:14 89:19	19 11:10	21	134:3, 6 136:4,
142:7	40:19 63:5	versus 7:13	18 137:12
truthfully 9:24	69:7 86:12	VIDEO 1:9	VS 1:9
try 70:15	100:1 105:7	Videographer	
102:10 119:24	113:1 118:18	6:2 7:11 8:6	< W >
trying 21:19,	121:20 135:1	9:2 49:12, 15	wait 70:1
21 34:15 35:2	138:10	100:11, 14	139:24
37:16 39:3	understanding	120:8, 11	waived 2:3
40:2 64:15	9:23 54:6	140:1, 4 141:3	walked 39:20,
76:25 96:21	55:12 62:1	view 69:18	22 86:21
111:4 116:25	70:1 82:7	77:18 121:24	WALKER 5:18
131:7	97:17 102:14,	122:22 123:24	7:24 8:17
turn 105:24	16 106:11, 17	124:16, 25	9:9 10:4, 9,
113:18	107:1, 16	views 66:15, 16	17, 21 12:1, 16
turned 43:7	110:7 114:14	121:24 122:7,	13:6 46:2, 8,
75:7 89:9	118:13 122:12,	22 123:5, 10	15 47:4 48:4
93:23, 25 94:1,	17 129:14	124:3, 11, 22	50:20, 24
18	134:17	violate 136:4,	52:23 53:4
TURRILL 3:4	understands	7, 18	55:8 56:8
8:12	103:10	violated 102:19	58:2 61:6
twice 91:1	understood	137:12	62:16, 17 63:8,
Twitter 15:16,	11:12 135:3	Virtually 23:5	11, 12 73:6, 12,
20	unintentionally	69:10 72:5, 13	20 82:21
two 12:21	102:19 134:7	78:3	105:7 107:8
18:24 19:15	Union 4:4, 12	volition 92:16	108:2 110:11
28:19 29:9	UNITED 1:1	vote 28:21, 22	114:1 116:5,
69:15 90:17,	7:15 58:25	29:18 59:24	11 117:10
19 91:8 93:15	University 16:8	67:20 68:8	118:2, 8, 10
95:24 97:11,	unnecessary	96:14, 16, 17	120:5, 18
	114:2, 4	102:23	122:11, 16

Evan Milligan, et al v. John H. Merrill, et al.

Chris Pringle
12/17/2021

125:6, 11, 25	13:1, 4, 8	46:19 49:17	23 122:6, 20
126:19, 24	47:9 50:18	99:19 136:25	123:9 124:2
127:7 128:2,	51:3 82:22	Women 66:24	130:7 138:15
12, 14 129:15	99:10, 13	69:10 77:21	year's 30:8
130:14 131:2,	100:1, 8 105:5,	78:2, 7 87:3	yesterday 12:14
4, 21, 23 132:4,	11 108:3	88:17 89:1, 8,	yield 45:25
8, 23 133:19	116:9 120:2, 7,	14, 25 98:1	York 3:15 4:6
134:5 136:1,	13, 19	126:12, 14, 15	
24 137:1, 24	Well 13:8	135:16 136:3,	< Z >
139:10, 19, 24	16:24 17:3	17 137:12, 15	zero 44:13
want 35:14	20:16 25:23	138:4	67:14 74:21
58:20 70:13	28:21 30:15	won 45:11	75:1 76:14
71:15 72:1	36:17 38:20	woods 16:22	77:1 92:9
96:7, 20 120:3	40:20 41:21	words 102:12	129:17, 21, 24
125:17 139:22	44:20, 25 45:8	138:24	130:1, 4, 8, 10,
wanted 21:18	49:1 60:4	work 17:12	12, 16, 21
30:22 31:6, 11	64:1 65:21	23:20 30:12	131:8, 15, 20
32:13 34:8	66:6 69:3, 4,	31:11 32:12	133:4 138:9,
41:18 45:6, 9,	17, 23 70:17	37:16 38:12	13, 16, 21
12, 15 51:4	71:1 76:13	64:15 78:18,	139:2, 5, 11
57:7 66:17, 22	77:7, 20 79:4,	19, 25 79:1, 2,	Zoom 3:18
67:2, 18 69:14	11, 23 81:13	18 81:17 82:2	4:17 5:1 8:7
70:7 104:3	84:17 85:5, 17	83:10 99:8	11:18
135:10, 11	86:19 92:8	worked 18:7	
wanting 89:19	96:6 98:17	21:18 30:18	
Washington 3:22	99:10 103:24	32:11 34:3, 4	
5:6, 13 21:18	105:21 113:7	39:2, 10 114:17	
42:5 44:2, 11	118:24 125:12	working 35:2, 4,	
watched 79:14	129:25 130:3	5 39:11 46:3	
80:1	132:10 135:8	78:10, 13, 14	
way 14:18	139:10	works 19:20	
31:22 41:5	went 40:10	30:17	
43:15 63:12	41:1, 16 43:10	wrap 137:9	
64:11, 20	51:12 57:4, 18	write 48:20	
66:12 67:2	69:1 74:8, 21	writing 137:11,	
83:21 84:2	we're 26:9	25 138:4, 8, 11	
86:23 117:21	27:1, 4 54:21	written 89:21	
127:9, 15	99:4 118:25	104:14	
131:2, 6, 12	140:1, 4	wrote 135:24	
134:7, 16	We've 99:7, 23		
137:10	138:16	< Y >	
ways 45:5	wide 123:20	y'all 14:8	
Wednesday 50:11	Wilcox 42:8, 9	Yay 120:18, 19	
week 40:12, 15	82:15 83:10	Yeah 9:9	
weekdays 78:10,	84:7, 9	37:12 60:21	
14, 19	willing 94:20	69:19 122:16	
weight 89:3, 18,	win 45:14	125:22 129:7	
24	Wiregrass 84:4	year 46:23	
WELBORN 4:9	witness 2:3	50:1 66:13	
6:7 7:20 9:8,	7:7 9:3	years 18:8	
11, 12, 14	27:10 45:23	19:1, 4 45:18	
10:12 12:3		121:11, 12, 13,	