EXHIBIT E

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

GEORGIA STATE CONFERENCE)
OF THE NAACP, et al.,)
Plaintiffs,)
)Case No:
vs.)
)1:21-CV-5338-ELB-SCJ-SDG
)
STATE OF GEORGIA, et al.,)
Defendants.)
_____
COMMON CAUSE, et al.,)
Plaintiffs,)
)Case No:
vs.)
)1:22-CV-00090-ELB-SCJ-SDG
BRAD RAFFENSPERGER)
Defendant.)
_____

DEPOSITION OF
JOSEPH BAGLEY, PH.D.

February 28, 2023
10:04 a.m.

Taylor English Duma, LLP
1600 Parkwood Circle, SE
Suite 200
Atlanta, Georgia

Reported by: Marsi Koehl, CCR-B-2424

the second, third, fourth and fifth Arlington Heights factors; right?

A. Yes.

Q. And you're also opining about Senate Factor 6; correct?

A. Yes.

Q. And you're not offering opinions on any other Arlington Heights factors except for the second, third, fourth and fifth ones; right?

A. That's correct. Insofar as to me the way that I read Arlington Heights, the first factor asks whether it is just plainly obvious that there is discriminatory intent. And if that is not the case, the Court sort of directs you to the remaining factors. And so for me, you don't see in modern times an inquiry on Factor 1.

Q. And so did you conduct an analysis of Factor 1 before moving to the other Arlington Heights factors you analyzed?

A. I would say to me looking at the evidence, it required an inquiry into the other factors.

Q. So in your view, the first Arlington Heights factor of obvious discriminatory intent wasn't present and that's what led you to look at the other factors?

A. In plain obvious terms, that is correct.
Q. And so aside, I guess, from that limitation on the first factor, the only factors from Arlington Heights you're offering any opinions about in this report are the second, third, fourth and fifth factors; right?
A. Correct.
Q. And you're not offering an opinion on any other Senate factor other than Senate Factor 6; correct?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. So let's look at the top of page 6 of what the plaintiff asked you to do here. And you were asked to examine the drafting, passage and enactment of the Georgia General Assembly's new congressional State House and State Senate redistricting plans.
That was kind of piece number one; right?
A. Yes.
Q. And that analysis and evaluation didn't look at boundaries, political impact or racial make-up after those plans; right?
A. Not in the way that a political scientist would.
Q. Was there any way that you looked at boundaries, political impact, racial make-up of the

1 districts themselves as part of your analysis?
2 A. Not in terms of a numbers-crunching
3 analysis, if that's what you mean.
4 Q. And you primarily reviewed the process by
5 which those maps became law. Is that fair to say?
6 A. Yes, sir.
7 Q. So I'm looking at paragraph four in this
8 section. You say: Insofar, as the Supreme Court
9 directed trial courts to use this framework --
10 referring to Arlington Heights framework -- in making
11 determinations on discriminatory intent, experts in
12 my understanding should also follow this guidance in
13 assisting courts to do the same.
14 Where did you gain the understanding that
15 you're referencing in that paragraph?
16 A. From Arlington Heights itself and from -- in
17 previous work on Arlington Heights framework reports.
18 Q. In your previous work on Arlington Heights
19 framework reports, have you reached a conclusion
20 about the intent of the legislature you were
21 analyzing or did you reach an opinion similar to that
22 here that just evidence would support an intent
23 finding?
24 A. Similar to this here.
25 Q. In the next paragraph, you talk about you're

consider"?

A. I mean that this is among the things that people at the time would have raised a red flag about, that it is potentially packing those districts.

Q. And so it's your belief that raising districts above 50 percent, black voter registration, is packing or can be?

A. It depends --

MR. DAVIS: Objection to the extent that calls for a legal conclusion, but you may answer.

THE WITNESS: It depends. I don't myself perform racially polarized voting analyses. But if one were to do that, you would then determine what would be a viable number for minority candidates to elect a candidate of their choice.

BY MR. TYSON:

Q. Now, you'd agree that in the 2011 cycle, the House, Senate and congressional plans were precleared by the Department of Justice on the first attempt; right?

A. They were.

Q. And that was the first time since the Voting

Rights Act was passed in 1965 that all three of Georgia's redistricting plans were approved on the first attempt; right?

A. Yes.

Q. And 2011 was also the first time Republicans drew the House, Senate and congressional plans for Georgia; right?

A. Indeed.

Q. Moving over to page 39, you say: In 2015, after Shelby County versus Holder ended the preclearance requirement and the General Assembly passed a redistricting plan -- and this was a mid-decade redistricting involving the change in a few districts; correct?

A. Correct.

Q. And you're not saying Shelby County was decided in 2015. You're saying the lawsuit was filed in 2015?

A. That's correct.

Q. And you'd agree that the 2015 litigation you reference here never resulted in a court order finding that those changes in the 2015 map to be illegal; right?

A. Right. I believe that was voluntarily dismissed.

Q. And it was voluntarily dismissed after Democrats won both of the challenged seats?
A. Correct.
Q. And are you aware that -- or are you aware if there was ever any court order finding any of the plans drawn by Republicans statewide in the 2011 cycle to be unlawful or unconstitutional?
A. No.
Q. So you're not aware or were there no such orders?
A. There were no such orders that I'm aware of.
Q. Down on the bottom of page 40 you reference a program for then Secretary of State Brian Kemp removing voters from the voter registration rolls; right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you're aware that that system was upheld in the Fair Fight Action litigation against both constitutional and other legal challenges; right?
A. Yes.
Q. You also reference Senate Bill 202.
Are you saying that Senate Bill 202 is intentionally racially discriminatory?
MR. DAVIS: Objection to the extent it calls for a legal conclusion, but you may

A. Yes, including Chairwoman Rich.
(Reporter asks for clarification.)
BY MR. TYSON:
Q. And you're aware the speaker pro tem of the Georgia House is a Republican woman?
A. Yes. Jones.
Q. And you're aware that the chair of the Public Service Commission is a statewide elected Republican woman?
A. Right.
Q. You then reference Republicans in the General Assembly routinely invoked the Democrats' abuse of power in the 2001 redistricting cycle as an excuse for their own potential abuse of power in the current cycle.
Are you opining that the 2021 maps were an abuse of power?
A. What I mean there is that when they are confronted by members of the public at the town halls at the public hearings, these people are expressing their opinion that these same sort of things are occurring. And the response from leadership very often to those comments was, well, the Democrats did it in 2001.
Q. And so is it your opinion that the 2021

redistricting maps in Georgia were an abuse of power by Republican legislatures?

A. I couldn't say that outright. No.

Q. And you'd agree that in Georgia, race and politics tends to be coextensive; right?

MR. DAVIS: Objection. You may answer.

THE WITNESS: I'm not sure I would say "coextensive." Obviously, as a historian, I appreciate that they are deeply intertwined historically. So, yeah, I...

BY MR. TYSON:

Q. Do you believe it's possible to separate racial goals from political goals by elected officials in Georgia?

A. Could you restate?

Q. Yeah. Do you believe that it's possible to determine if a legislator is motivated by partisanship or by racial goals?

A. It's difficult to get into the heart or the mind of anyone, particularly a specific legislator. And, again, as a historian, you appreciate that, historically speaking, race and politics in a state like Georgia have a very long history.

In an inquiry like this, however, you consider political motivations. You consider

Q. And when you say the degree of racial polarization has changed, you'd agree that racial polarization has increased since the '90s in Georgia; right?

A. That's probably fair to say.

Q. You'd agree that partisan polarization has also increased in Georgia since the 1990s?

A. Right.

Q. So let's move next to the sequence of events for the 2021 redistricting cycle.

And in the first bullet there, you say that: The public was critical -- widely critical, I'm sorry, of holding the meetings before the release of the census data and the publication of the maps.

Do you know if any town hall meetings in Georgia were held in the 2001 or 2011 redistricting cycles after maps were published?

A. I don't believe so.

Q. And so it wasn't unusual for Georgia to hold town hall meetings prior to the publication of maps based on prior redistricting cycles; right?

A. Based on prior redistricting cycles, yeah, that's the way it was done before.

Q. And you reference calls for a more transparent process.

What do you take a more transparent process to mean from those public comments?

A. That was the number one concern. That was voiced by people over and over at the town halls and at the, you know, publicly opened committee hearings.

And from what I understand people's concerns to be was that not only is the process of actual map drawing occurring behind the scenes, as it were, but that in their view, rushing through the process once the actual maps in terms of the versions that were actually enacted were put forward was a deliberate attempt to truncate feedback on those.

And so those were among the things that they would be concerned about when they are saying that we want a more transparent process.

Q. And the word "truncate" would, to me, necessarily imply a shorter timeline?

A. Right.

Q. You next -- the next bullet at the top of 42, you reference that the Republican members of the committee wanted more of a dialogue than a one-way street of taking community comments at hearings; right?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you know if the hearings that were held

in 2001 and 2011 were also a one-way street of taking community comment without dialogue?

A. They were.

Q. So the 2021 cycle utilized the same process for the town halls themselves, in terms of taking testimony, as was used in 2001 and 2011; right?

A. Right. And so people continued to express their frustration with that as before, yeah.

Q. The next bullet references that the members of the public asking for hearings to be held in the most populous areas of the state where they should have been. Do you see that?

A. I do.

Q. And why should they have been held in the most populous areas of the state?

A. According to people who raised those concerns, if you were really committed to, as I believe the committee set forth in their press releases and guidelines, hearing from as many people as possible, then it would stand to reason that you would want to hold those hearings where they were the most accessible to the most amount of people.

Q. Did you review where prior redistricting cycle public hearings were held across the state?

A. Yes. Although, I couldn't recount to you

to say you're reporting what people asked for instead of offering your own opinions about the process?

A. I am reporting what people have said in large part in this portion. Although, it's part of performing my own opinion in the broader report.

And so when I see a chorus of views or a view to me that continues throughout this process even after maps are published and that dovetails with the other pieces of the report, then that rises to me to a level of significance.

Q. So would it be fair to say that Section 5 of your report, you're not offering opinions, but you're explaining the parts of the process that helped form your opinions in the case?

A. That's fair.

Q. Next paragraph on 42, you reference the public's concerns regarding the nature of the town hall hearings. And then as a hyphen, they're being held before data and maps were published and the input only format constitute procedural departures from, if not past practice, then certainly from the mass of the public -- what the mass of the public viewed as best practices and good governance; right?

A. Yes.

Q. And we discussed, since the town hall format

1 was identical to the 2001 and 2011 hearings and the
2 timing before maps were introduced was the same as
3 the 2001 and 2011 hearings, you'd agree that the 2021
4 hearings were consistent with past practice in
5 Georgia; right?
6 A. Yes. And that wasn't necessarily the public
7 coming forth and saying, Why are you doing it
8 differently? It's saying, We still don't understand
9 why it's being done this way.
10 Q. You also say that the committee ignored the
11 vast majority of the input at that end of that
12 section; is that right?
13 A. Yes.
14 Q. And so what methodology did you use to
15 determine that the committee ignored the vast
16 majority of the input from the public?
17 A. None of that in terms of what we see moving
18 forward in this process -- well, it does not appear
19 that their commentary was taken to heart in terms of
20 any actual changes to the process.
21 For example, multiple people said, This
22 turnaround after the maps have been published is far,
23 far too short. Give us two weeks. Give us a week.
24 Give us whatever amount of time to analyze these
25 plans, to offer feedback on the plans themselves, on

my review of the process, seems to not act upon the major issues that were conveyed by way of that input.

Q. The next sentence says using the 2001 process as an excuse for elements of the current process is both a procedural and substantive departure.

Did I read that right?

A. Yes.

Q. So what do you mean by using the 2001 process as an excuse?

A. There were times where -- well, there were many, many times people repeatedly saying, Why can't with we have more time, particularly post-publication of maps to analyze these plans, review these plans, provide feedback on these plans.

And Chairman Kennedy, in particular, but others would say, Well, this is analogous to the way the Democrats did it in 2001, or at one point says, Well, I look back and wouldn't you know it, there was a vote held within three days, or whatever it may have been.

And yet it -- there seems to be nothing that would commit the committee to, you know, fashion its process in that way based upon that.

Q. And so when you say in this sentence that

using the 2001 process is both a procedural and substantive departure, what do you mean by a procedural and substantive departure?

A. So, substantively, there's, again, nothing in the guidelines that would con- -- again, constrain the committee or the assembly to strictly fashion its behavior based upon previous cycles, which is a procedural issue, as well, of course.

Q. But you'd agree that the 2001, 2011 and 2021 processes were all procedurally similar; right?

A. In major elements of the process, yes.

Q. And were they substantively similar across those three cycles, as well?

A. Yes. So when I say substantively and procedurally, it's not necessarily in comparison to previous cycles.

Q. So a departure isn't a departure from previous cycles; right?

A. Not necessarily, right.

Q. What is it a departure from?

A. It's a departure from what the committee itself purports to be holding itself to, which is to receive and act upon public input and not necessarily to be bound by the strictures of previous cycles.

Q. So let's work through process here.

(Defendant's Exhibit 5 was marked for identification.)

BY MR. TYSON:

Q. This is the call for the 2011 special session.

Did you review the call for the 2011 special session in analyzing or preparing your report at all?

A. Not this specific proclamation, no.

Q. You're aware that the committees both held committee education days on August the 30th prior to the special session; right?

A. Yes.

Q. And have you watched that video?

A. Yes. I did.

Q. And you're aware that a variety of different groups spoke to the committee and presented their view of redistricting?

A. That's right.

Q. Are you aware that the House committee adopted its redistricting guidelines following that August 30th meeting?

A. I believe that's correct. It would be in the report somewhere.

Q. And the Senate committee had a meeting on August 30th about the guidelines, but are you aware

Q. So in Section C you, cover the November 4th, 2021 hearing. And like the other sections we've talked about, you're not offering opinions in this report -- this section. You're summarizing the meeting, but it hasn't had some bearing on your ultimate opinion; right?

A. That's correct.

Q. And you'd agree that the Senate committee took public comment at this meeting on November 4th; right?

A. They did.

Q. And that was after districts were released; right?

A. Let me see.

Yeah. This is immediately thereafter.

Q. And at the end of this meeting, page 62, Democratic Leader Butler asked the chairman to postpone a meeting for tomorrow before the presentation of her map; right?

A. Yes.

Q. And the chair advised her that the map was going to -- the meeting was going to go forward tomorrow and she could present her map at that point; right?

A. Right.

BY MR. TYSON:

Q. So in this November 5th Senate committee meeting, Leader Butler answered questions about her proposal like Senator Kennedy had the opportunity to answer questions about his proposal for district maps; right?

A. Yes.

Q. And you'd agree that the committee, again, took public comments at this meeting; right?

A. They did.

Q. And at the end, there was no motion about the democratic Senate map; correct?

A. That is correct. At that time, yes.

Q. And then Senator Kennedy's bill was passed out of committee by a nine-four vote?

A. Right.

Q. And when you say, All black members voted against the bill, that's the same as saying all Democrats in the committee voted against it; right?

A. Yes. In this particular committee, yes.

Q. So in Section E, you then have a November 5th meeting of the House committee where Chairman Rich presented the majority State House plan and Democratic Leader Beverly presented the democratic caucus' plan; right?

A. Right.
Q. And so you'd agree the democratic leader was able to present its plan and answer questions about it from the committee; right?
A. Yes. He at that time, yes.
Q. And moving to Section F, November 8 meeting, that was three days later; right?
A. Yes.
Q. And at this meeting, a Republican representative opposed the Republican plan but didn't have his request for changes agreed to by the committee; right?
A. Representative Singleton is to whom you refer?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes.
Q. And so the committee declined to accept Representative Singleton's proposed changes to the map?
A. Correct.
Q. And then public comments was taken at this committee meeting as well; right?
A. There was some. Yes.
Q. And no vote was taken at the conclusion of this meeting?

A. I believe that's correct. Yes.
Q. And you reference the removal of a Ms. Jones from the meeting.
What relevance is that to the redistricting plans and the process that happened here?
A. This woman was extremely upset and had to be removed from the meeting. It just shows you, I guess, the fervor that some people have in their disagreement with the process.
Q. You're not saying Ms. Jones' removal was motivated by racist actions by Chairman Rich --
A. No.
Q. -- are you?
Moving to Section G, this is another meeting of the House committee on November 9th; right?
A. Yes.
Q. And more public commentary was allowed at this meeting as well?
A. Yes.
Q. And -- so you'd agree that in both the House and the Senate committees there were opportunities for public input after draft plans were released; right?
A. Yes. But I think if you listen to what people are saying that a lot of times during this

November 11th Senate committee meeting.

A. Okay.

Q. And you didn't cover that meeting in any more detail than that sentence; right?

A. That certainly would have been something that I reviewed. But, yes, I don't see a specific section on that.

Q. And are you aware that the Senate committee allowed public comment on the House plan before voting on the map on November 11th in that meeting?

A. Yes.

Q. You can set those to the side and move to floor debate.

Section I of your report begins with debate on the floor of the State Senate; right?

A. Yes.

Q. And in terms of the presentation, you didn't summarize Senator Kennedy's presentation of the bill. You only summarized the interactions he had with other senators asking questions. Is that fair to say?

A. That's fair to say. Of course, I remember his going through the plan as with Chairman Rich on the House side. They established, you know, how many county splits are there, increasing the splits and

say this plan complies with the Voting Rights Act and sort of check off all those boxes.

Q. Did Senator Kennedy include discussions of various communities of interest as part of his presentation?

A. I believe so. There are a few.

Q. Are you opining that a floor vote on a Senate plan on November 9th, 2021, was a rushed or truncated process compared to prior redistricting special sessions?

A. Not necessarily compared to prior sessions or cycles.

Q. So what I wanted to do is just walk through some of those prior sessions.

So you're aware that when the General Assembly -- when you pull a bill on the General Assembly's website, it includes a list of events that happened around the passage of that bill; right?

A. Sure.

(Defendant's Exhibit 8 was marked for identification.)

BY MR. TYSON:

Q. I'm going to hand you what I've marked as Defendant's Exhibit 8. And I'll represent to you this is a collection of the bills for the final maps

A. Right.
Q. So did you review any of that information about the timeline of past redistricting special sessions when you were preparing your report?
A. I'm generally aware of it and it's something I considered. What I will tell you is that I don't, again, think that when people are voicing a lot of these concerns, it's necessarily that they're saying it's a deviation from past practice. I think they would also disagree with that past practice as well.
Q. But you're not opining that the redistricting session in 2021 -- or the process was rushed compared to the prior two redistricting cycles in Georgia; right?
A. Not compared to those two.
Q. At the end of Section -- this is section on page 71, you say: The bill passed 34/21 with no black members voting in favor.
And that was because it was a party line vote; right?
A. There are no current -- well, there were no black members at the time in the other party. Correct.
Q. So all the Republicans voted yes and all the Democrats voted no on the Senate plan?

A. Yes.
Q. Going to subsection J and the floor debate for the House plan, similarly to the Senate plan, you didn't present Representative Rich's presentation of the plan; correct?
A. Right. It's the same sort of rundown as with Senator Kennedy.
Q. At the end after Leader Beverly's speech on page 73, you report that Chairman Rich said that some democratic members had met with her but, apparently, others had been advised not to do so.
Do you know if Democrats were advised not to meet with Senator Rich?
A. I believe some were advised in that way. Yes.
Q. Is that relevant to your assessment of the process if Democratic members refuse to meet with the chair of the committee?
A. It's relevant. Yes.
Q. And does it change any of your conclusions about the process if democratic members refuse to participate in the process?
A. No. In fact, given the sort of totality of these circumstances here, it would indicate to me that, perhaps, they saw it as futile; perhaps, they

didn't feel like it necessarily would be in their interest at that time for whatever reason.

Q. Do you know if either the House or Senate plan included changes requested by democratic members in the final map after the draft was release?

A. In terms of drawing lines, I know there were at least some.

Q. So when democratic members made suggestions, at least in some cases, the Republican majority took those suggestions; right?

A. In some cases, yes.

Q. And there were times when the Republican majority refused Republican requests for changes like Representative Singleton; right?

A. In that one instance. Although, I think in his case, he had run afoul of the late speaker.

Q. Then you say the plan voted on the House floor by a vote of 99 to 79 with no black members voting yes.

You'd agree that no Democrats voted in favor of the plan; right?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And most of the Republicans voted for the plan; right?

A. Correct.

now, tell you exactly what was different. But I can tell you that people who spoke at the meeting were under the impression significant differences.

Q. And in Section I, you discuss the House committee meeting to consider the Congressional plan; right?

A. Yes.

Q. And in both this discussion of the November 17th Senate meeting and November 17th House meeting, again, you're recounting what happened there, which informed your opinions but are not offering any opinions; right?

A. This is the basis. This is part of the basis for my overall opinions. Yes.

Q. And in this House meeting on November 17th, the democratic caucus was able to present a congressional redistricting plan through Democratic Leader Beverly; right?

A. Which meeting? I'm sorry, which subsection?

Q. I'm on page 75, subsection I, November 17th House --

A. Oh, yes.

Q. And so Leader Beverly was able to present the democratic proposed congressional plan at that meeting?

A. Right.

Q. And you reference Chairman Rich replying: There's not a magic formula or standard or equation where we find that there are areas where we can draw the voting rights districts and we do that.

Did I quote that correctly?

A. You did.

Q. And you mentioned, I think, earlier in your report comments made about the Voting Rights Act. Is.

This a comment about the Voting Rights Act that is part of your analysis of the redistricting process in Georgia?

MR. DAVIS: Objection to form. You may answer.

THE WITNESS: This comment is significant to me insofar as it -- if racially polarized analysis is done, then there actually is a formula or a standard that would be followed and -- but Representative Rich and Senator Kennedy said repeatedly had conducted such an analysis, but I don't think ever shared the specific results of that and certainly not in the case of individual districts.

BY MR. TYSON:
Q. And so your view of Representative Rich's comment here is that it was not accurate?
MR. DAVIS: Objection to the extent it calls for a legal conclusion, but you may answer.
THE WITNESS: No. I just think in terms of this whole mosaic, I think it's indicative of the kinds of comments you would get from leadership about the Voting Rights Act that are sort of vague and potentially misleading.
BY MR. TYSON:
Q. You're not saying --
A. I'm not saying that Representative Rich doesn't understand the Voting Rights Act.
Q. You're not saying her comment was inaccurate -- let me put it this way -- let me ask this: Why specifically did you include this comment on page 75 of your report?
A. It's just part of the back and forth that, again, I think is indicative of the kinds of exchanges that you see between leadership and others.
Q. Going over to Section J, November 18th, 2021 House committee.

A. Yes.
Q. Again, this was a meeting that allowed public comment on the map; right?
A. Yes. And I can't remember -- this is within a day or two of a plan being published, but yes.
Q. In a second paragraph, you reference a residence of the area of Cobb County named Leroy Hutchins. Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. Are you aware that Mr. Hutchins is an elected Democrat in Cobb County, Georgia?
A. I was not aware of that, but I would say that's not uncommon for those people to come forward in these meetings.
Q. And there was no vote held on the November 18th House committee meeting; correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Subsection K, we move to another Senate committee meeting. And you'd agree at this meeting Senator Butler was allowed to present the democratic proposed congressional plan; right?
A. He did.
Q. And I think we've already discussed this. But this is the point where Senator Butler refused to share information from the Legislative Black Caucus'

tour of the state about redistricting; right?
A. I believe it came up. And I don't know that at that time he refused. I think it was noted that that information had not been shared up to that point.
Q. And do you agree the committee took public comment again on the map?
A. Yes. This is the same day as the previous -- or, yes, the same day as the House committee meeting we were just talking about.
Q. And the first individual you reference in the middle of page 77 for public comment is a man named David Garcia?
A. Yes. I see it.
Q. And are you aware that Mr. Garcia works for one of the organizations that's suing the State about its redistricting maps?
A. I am.
Q. And there was ultimately a vote on Leader Butler's plan in the committee meeting; right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And you say the vote was along racial lines, but that's the same thing as saying in this committee, it was along party lines; right?
A. In this -- yes. In this committee, that's

1 correct.
2 Q. And then the map Senator Kennedy proposed
3 also passed along party lines; right?
4 A. Correct.
5 Q. Subsection K, we move to the floor debate on
6 the congressional plan in the Senate. And,
7 similarly, here you don't present Senator Kennedy's
8 presentation of the plan. You begin with Senator
9 Parent's criticisms of the plan; right?
10 A. Right. This -- those presentations are kind
11 of pro forma, checking off certain boxes. So it was
12 easier just to summarize that and move forward.
13 Q. And in looking through this section, the
14 only comment I saw in favor of the plan was the next
15 to the last paragraph where Senator Kennedy responded
16 about the issue.
17 Did you quote anybody else who spoke in
18 support of the plan?
19 A. I can tell you I didn't deliberately leave
20 out anyone who spoke in favor of the plan. I can
21 tell you on balance at these floor debates committee
22 meetings and hearings, the vast majority of comments
23 were in opposition.
24 Q. And then the vote took place. And you'd
25 agree even though it says, No black members voting

aye, that this was a party line vote in favor of the plan; right?

A. It was.

Q. And next we move to a November 20th committee meeting that was held via Zoom; right?

A. Right.

Q. And this was both held on a Saturday and allowed public comment; is that right?

A. Yes. Although, I think a lot of these -- the people that spoke would have characterized it as sort of an 11th-hour meeting, but yes.

Q. And at the end of this meeting when the bill passed through the committee with a favorable vote and no black member voted aye, that's the same as saying it passed on a party line vote for this committee; right?

A. That's correct.

Q. Then Section M, we have the floor debate on the congressional plan.

Do you know if the reapportionment office was close to Leader Beverly in terms of redrawing redistricting maps?

A. I believe they actually went with their map to Ms. Wright in terms of some technical adjustments and that sort of thing at some point.

Q. So the reapportionment office was able to work with Leader Beverly to facility the introduction of his plans?

A. That's a fair characterization in terms of some technical stuff after their plan was created that just sort of brought that in line and helped him in that regard technically.

Q. Do you know if Ms. Wright had worked with Leader Beverly or his staff at all on any other plans apart from the technical review?

A. I'm not sure of the exact details of that interaction.

Q. Going to the middle of page 83, you move to Chairman Rich closing the debate beginning with her concerns about CD6, saying that although it only needed to add 657 people -- and I'm going to summarize, the other districts around it --

A. Yes.

Q. -- needed to be changed; right?

A. Yes.

Q. And have you reviewed the democratic congressional plan?

A. In general, yes.

Q. Are you aware that it significantly redrew District 6, as well?

A. Yes.
Q. And then, ultimately, the vote on page 84 was a party line vote as well; right?
A. That's right.
Q. So it looks to me this is the end of the section on the Arlington Heights analysis because we're moving into Senate Factor 6 on the next page; is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. So what opinions are you offering about Arlington Heights in light of what we've discussed in these prior pages in Sections, I guess, 3 through 6?
A. So that constitutes a review of the process under Arlington Heights. And as I point out in the beginning of that section, it shows to me significant departures in terms of having this flurry of input before and after the maps are published that does not seem to have that addressed.
And so if the committee says they are very concerned with taking in public input -- which they did take in public input at numerous times -- then you would tend to see then, them acting upon that. And to me, you really don't see that with the process.
Q. So are you opining that the specific

conclusion where it's only those individuals who are expressing these concerns, if that makes sense.

BY MR. TYSON:

Q. Would it be relevant whether the individuals expressing concerns were engaged in other litigation against the State but not the redistricting litigation?

A. I suppose, although I would imagine it would be litigation like that against SB 202.

Q. Are you opining that any of the contemporary statements made by legislatures evidenced racial intent during the 2021 process?

MR. DAVIS: Objection to the extent it calls for any kind of legal conclusion, but you may answer.

THE WITNESS: I believe the only thing I discuss in here that -- in that regard -- and let me actually back up and say we're long since passed the day and age in which anyone would plainly say with any sort of racial intent.

But there are occasionally items that are perhaps telling, again, within the context of this entire report. And so when

you have a leader of a committee suggest that, perhaps, the application of the Voting Rights Act is unfair, that to me raises a flag.

BY MR. TYSON:

Q. So is that the only comment that you identify that raises a flag of contemporary statements made by legislatures?

A. That's the one that I found most significant.

Q. And that's the comment on page 75 by Chairman Rich?

A. Correct.

Q. Are you offering the opinion that this specific sequence of events leading up to the adoption of the 2021 redistricting plans was racially discriminatory?

MR. DAVIS: Objection to the extent it calls for a legal conclusion, but you may answer.

THE WITNESS: It's my opinion that the sequence of events along with the history of discrimination that I discuss in the report and as part of this report as a whole would tend to lend credence to a finding of

1 discriminatory intent in the process.
2 BY MR. TYSON:
3 Q. So it's your opinion that someone could find
4 that there was discriminatory intent in the process,
5 but you're not saying there was discriminatory intent
6 in the process; right?
7 A. I'm not drawing the legal conclusion which
8 is left for the Court to do.
9 Q. So just so we're completely clear on this,
10 you are not offering the opinion that there was
11 discriminatory intent in the process. You're
12 offering the opinion that evidence would support a
13 finding of discriminatory intent?
14 A. Correct.
15 Q. So aside from the conclusion of your report
16 at the very end, have we -- is it correct that the
17 pages from page 8 where you begin historical
18 background section through page 84 is the entirety of
19 your opinions about the Arlington Heights factors in
20 your report?
21 A. Yes.
22 Q. And barring new facts -- I want to set aside
23 additional facts. But if there are no other new
24 facts that arise, you are not planning to offer any
25 further expert opinions about the Arlington Heights

1 motivated by discriminatory intent when it passed the
2 bills in question.
3 So you don't view that as your job to offer
4 an opinion on the General Assembly's motivation;
5 right?
6 A. It's not my job to reach the final legal
7 conclusion, I don't think.
8 Q. And your determination is that there's
9 enough evidence for the Court to determine the lines
10 were drawn to deny voters their equitable right to
11 participate in the political process. But you are
12 not saying the lines were drawn to deny voters of
13 color their equitable right to participate in the
14 political process; right?
15 A. I would say that I am -- it is my opinion
16 that the evidence is there for the Court to find
17 that -- to make that final determination.
18 Q. But to be clear, you are not making that
19 final determination?
20 A. Correct.
21 Q. You also reference the nature of the report
22 is to present a mosaic of a continuum. I know we
23 talked a little bit about mosaic and continuums
24 earlier, but can you walk me through what you mean by
25 that phrase in the conclusion?

1 legislative process?
2 A. Yes. Failing to account for public comment
3 after the maps are published, refusal to allow access
4 to the map drawing process and rushing the process in
5 general and so on.
6 Q. So when you say failing to make time for
7 public comments after maps were published at the last
8 minute, you'd agree there was -- there were multiple
9 committee meetings that allowed comments after the
10 maps were published; right?
11 A. There were, but I would say those were in a
12 very, very tight window of time where in some cases
13 maps are published the day of and commentary is taken
14 the day of, possibly the day after. So what people
15 were asking for is a much larger window of time to be
16 able to really systematically analyze those maps and
17 provide substantive feedback.
18 Q. And you reference rushing the process. But
19 you'd agree that the process was not rushed when
20 compared to the 2001 and 2011 redistricting cycles;
21 right?
22 A. Yes. But that would indicate to me it was
23 also rushed in those cycles, as well, insofar voters
24 want more time with the publication of maps.
25 Q. You say failing to account for minority

BY MR. TYSON:

Q. And so you call these items in this list departures in the legislative process. But the departure was only from what you read in the public comment the public was asking for; is that right?

A. And then in terms of what the committee itself purported to value.

Q. When you say what the committee itself purported to value, are you relying on the guidelines that were adopted by House and Senate committees?

A. And comments made by leadership throughout the process, yes.

Q. But you'd agree that there were not procedural and substantive departures in the legislative process when the comparison point is the 2001 and 2011 redistricting cycles?

A. They are generally analogous in that regard.

MR. TYSON: Those are all the questions I have for you.

THE WITNESS: All right.

MR. TYSON: Alex may have some more, but I'm finished for today. Thank you.

THE WITNESS: Thanks, Mr. Tyson.

MR. DAVIS: I have a few questions.

(Discussion ensued off the record.)

BY THE GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF GEORGIA

A PROCLAMATION

CONVENING THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF GEORGIA IN SPECIAL SESSION

WHEREAS: Article V, Section II, Paragraph VII of the Constitution of the State of Georgia grants to the Governor the power to convene a special session of the General Assembly, stating and thereby limiting its purposes; and

WHEREAS: The Regular Session of the 2011 General Assembly adjourned sine die on April 14, 2011; and

WHEREAS: The Governor has determined that certain purposes warrant the convocation of a special session; and

THEREFORE: By virtue of the power and authority conferred upon me by the Constitution of Georgia, I, Nathan Deal, Governor of the State of Georgia, do hereby convene the General Assembly of this State in Special Session at ten o'clock (10:00) a.m. on Monday, August 15, 2011, for the purposes and only those purposes specified as follows:

1. For enacting, revising, repealing or amending general law for :
   (a) The division of the State into appropriate districts from which members of the Georgia State Senate shall be elected,
   (b) The division of the State into appropriate districts from which members of the Georgia State House of Representatives shall be elected,
   (c) The division of the State into appropriate districts from which members of the House of Representatives to the United States Congress shall be elected; and

2. To ratify the Executive Order dated June 23, 2011, and numbered 06.23.11.03 in the official records of the Office of the Governor until the General Assembly acts upon this Order; and

3. For amending the Official Code of Georgia Annotated Section 48-8-244(a), relating to the special district transportation sales and use tax; and

4. For enacting, revising, repealing or amending local laws which the General Assembly deems necessary to avoid unreasonable hardship or to avoid undue impairment of public functions if consideration and enactment thereof are postponed.

Given under my hand and the Great Seal of the State of Georgia, at the City of Atlanta, on this 10TH day of August 2011.

Nathan Deal
GOVERNOR

ATTEST

CHIEF OF STAFF

DEFENDANT'S EXHIBIT 5

Session: 2001 2nd Special Session

You are viewing a page from the 2001 2nd Special Session. ***This is not the current session.***

SB 1EX2

Congressional Election Districts; reapportion; campaign posters on public roads, change a cross-reference

Current Version | Past Versions

Sponsors

No.	Name	District
1.	Golden, Tim	8th

Committees

House Committee:
Legislative & Congressional Reapportionment
Senate Committee:
Reapportionment

First Reader Summary

A BILL to be entitled an Act to amend Title 21 of the Official Code of Georgia Annotated, relating to elections, so as to define certain terms; to provide for the composition of the congressional districts of Georgia; to provide for the election of members of Congress; to provide when the members of Congress shall take office; to provide for the continuation of present congressional districts until a certain time; to redesignate certain provisions designating congressional districts; to amend Code Section 32-6-51 of the Official Code of Georgia Annotated, relating to certain unlawful or unauthorized structures, so as to change a cross-reference; to provide for other matters relative to the foregoing; to provide an effective date; to repeal conflicting laws; and for other purposes.

Status History

Date	Status
10/01/2001	Effective Date
10/01/2001	Act 2EX11
10/01/2001	Senate Date Signed by Governor
10/01/2001	Senate Sent to Governor
09/28/2001	Senate Conference Committee Report Adopted
09/28/2001	House Conference Committee Report Adopted
09/11/2001	House Conference Committee Appointed 169th, 159th, 136th
09/11/2001	Senate Conference Committee Appointed 8th, 10th, 26th
09/11/2001	House Insisted
09/11/2001	Senate Disagreed House Amend or Sub
09/11/2001	House Immediately Transmitted to Senate
09/11/2001	House Passed/Adopted By Substitute
09/11/2001	House Third Readers
09/10/2001	House Committee Favorably Reported By Substitute
09/10/2001	House Second Readers

DEFENDANT'S EXHIBIT 8

Date	Status
09/07/2001	House First Readers
09/07/2001	Senate Passed/Adopted By Substitute
09/07/2001	Senate Third Read
09/06/2001	Senate Committee Favorably Reported By Substitute
08/30/2001	Senate Recommitted
08/30/2001	Senate Third Read
08/29/2001	Senate Read Second Time
08/28/2001	Senate Committee Favorably Reported By Substitute
08/22/2001	Senate Read and Referred
08/22/2001	Senate Hopper

Footnotes

8/20/01 Senator of 22nd replaced by Senator of 10th on SB 1EX2 Conference Committee; 8/28/01 Favorably reported by substitute; 9/21/01 Motion to dissolve Conference Committee lost.

Votes

Date	Vote No.	Yea	Nay	NV	Exc
		No Votes available.			

Helpful Links

Georgia.gov

Governor's Office

Secretary of State

Georgia Department of Motor Vehicles

Georgia Department of Driver Services

Georgia Department of Revenue

Georgia Department of Labor

Legislative Resources

House of Representatives

Senate

Open RFP's

Senate Staffing

Intern Program

COPYRIGHT © 2023 THE GEORGIA GENERAL ASSEMBLY

You are viewing a page from the 2001 2nd Special Session. ***This is not the current session.***

HB 14EX2

House districts; reapportion

Current Version | Past Versions

Sponsors

No.	Name	District
1.	Smith, Tommy	169th
2.	Connell, Jack	115th
3.	Walker, Larry	141st
4.	Skipper, Jimmy	137th
5.	Smyre, Calvin	136th
6.	Murphy, Thomas	18th

Committees

House Committee:
Legislative & Congressional Reapportionment
Senate Committee:
Reapportionment

First Reader Summary

A BILL to amend Chapter 2 of Title 28 of the Official Code of Georgia Annotated, relating to apportionment of the House of Representatives and Senate and qualifications of members, so as to provide for the composition and number of state representative districts; and for other purposes.

Status History

Date	Status
10/01/2001	Effective Date
10/01/2001	Act 2EX23
10/01/2001	House Date Signed by Governor
09/26/2001	House Sent to Governor
09/06/2001	Senate Notice to Reconsider
09/06/2001	Senate Passed/Adopted
09/06/2001	Senate Third Read
09/05/2001	Senate Read Second Time
09/04/2001	Senate Committee Favorably Reported
08/29/2001	Senate Read and Referred
08/29/2001	House Passed/Adopted
08/29/2001	House Third Readers
08/28/2001	House Committee Favorably Reported

Date	Status
08/28/2001	House 2nd Read Engrossed Failed
08/28/2001	House Second Readers
08/27/2001	House Notice of Motion to Engross
08/27/2001	House First Readers
08/26/2001	House Hopper

Footnotes

9/7/01 Motion to reconsider lost in Senate.

Votes

Date	Vote No.	Yea	Nay	NV	Exc

No Votes available.

Helpful Links

Georgia.gov

Governor's Office

Secretary of State

Georgia Department of Motor Vehicles

Georgia Department of Driver Services

Georgia Department of Revenue

Georgia Department of Labor

Legislative Resources

House of Representatives

Senate

Open RFP's

Senate Staffing

Intern Program

COPYRIGHT © 2023 THE GEORGIA GENERAL ASSEMBLY

You are viewing a page from the 2001 1st Special Session. ***This is not the current session.***

SB 1EX1

Senatorial Districts; reapportion election districts; change composition to take office in 2003

Current Version | Past Versions

Sponsors

No.	Name	District
1.	Golden, Tim	8th
2.	Starr, Terrell	44th
3.	Walker, Charles	22nd

Committees

House Committee:
Legislative & Congressional Reapportionment
Senate Committee:
Reapportionment

First Reader Summary

A BILL to be entitled an Act to amend Chapter 2 of Title 28 of the Official Code of Georgia Annotated, relating to apportionment of the House of Representatives and Senate and qualifications of members, so as to provide for the composition and number of state senatorial districts; to provide for the number of Senators; to provide for certain qualifications; to provide for the election of Senators; to provide when the Senators elected shall take office; to provide for the continuation of present senatorial districts until a certain time; to provide for other matters relative to the foregoing; to provide an effective date; to repeal conflicting laws; and for other purposes.

Status History

Date	Status
08/24/2001	Effective Date
08/24/2001	Act 1EX6
08/24/2001	Senate Date Signed by Governor
08/17/2001	Senate Sent to Governor
08/17/2001	House Passed/Adopted
08/17/2001	House Third Readers
08/16/2001	House Committee Favorably Reported
08/14/2001	House Second Readers
08/13/2001	House First Readers
08/10/2001	Senate Passed/Adopted By Substitute
08/10/2001	Senate Third Read
08/09/2001	Senate Committee Favorably Reported By Substitute
08/08/2001	Senate Recommitted

Date	Status
08/08/2001	Senate Third Read
08/07/2001	Senate Read Second Time
08/06/2001	Senate Committee Favorably Reported By Substitute
08/01/2001	Senate Read and Referred
08/01/2001	Senate Hopper

Footnotes

8/6/01 Favorably reported by substitute

Votes

Date	Vote No.	Yea	Nay	NV	Exc

No Votes available.

Helpful Links

Georgia.gov

Governor's Office

Secretary of State

Georgia Department of Motor Vehicles

Georgia Department of Driver Services

Georgia Department of Revenue

Georgia Department of Labor

Legislative Resources

House of Representatives

Senate

Open RFP's

Senate Staffing

Intern Program

COPYRIGHT © 2023 THE GEORGIA GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Session: 2011 Special Session

You are viewing a page from the 2011 Special Session. ***This is not the current session.***

HB 20EX

Georgia Congressional Reapportionment Act of 2011; enact

Current Version | Past Versions

Sponsors

No.	Name	District
1.	Lane, Roger	167th

Sponsored In Senate By:
Seabaugh, Mitch

Committees

House Committee:
Legislative & Congressional Reapportionment
Senate Committee:
Reapportionment and Redistricting

First Reader Summary

A BILL to be entitled an Act to provide for the composition and number of congressional districts; to provide for a short title; to amend Title 21 of the Official Code of Georgia Annotated, relating to elections, so as to provide for election of members of Congress; to provide when such members shall take office; to provide for definitions and inclusions; to provide for continuation of present congressional districts until a certain time; to correct a certain reference; to provide for other matters relative to the foregoing; to provide an effective date; to repeal conflicting laws; and for other purposes.

Status History

Date	Status
09/06/2011	Effective Date
09/06/2011	Act 3EX
09/06/2011	House Date Signed by Governor
09/01/2011	House Sent to Governor
08/31/2011	Senate Passed/Adopted
08/31/2011	Senate Third Read
08/30/2011	Senate Read Second Time
08/30/2011	Senate Committee Favorably Reported
08/25/2011	Senate Read and Referred
08/25/2011	House Immediately Transmitted to Senate
08/25/2011	House Passed/Adopted By Substitute
08/25/2011	House Third Readers
08/24/2011	House Committee Favorably Reported By Substitute
08/23/2011	House Second Readers
08/22/2011	House First Readers

DEFENDANT'S EXHIBIT 9

Date	Status
08/19/2011	House Hopper

Footnotes

8/25/2011 Structured Rule; 8/25/2011 Immediately transmitted to Senate

Votes

Date	Vote No.	Yea	Nay	NV	Exc
08/25/2011	House Vote #409	110	60	4	6
08/31/2011	Senate Vote #22	34	21	0	1

Helpful Links

Georgia.gov

Governor's Office

Secretary of State

Georgia Department of Motor Vehicles

Georgia Department of Driver Services

Georgia Department of Revenue

Georgia Department of Labor

Legislative Resources

House of Representatives

Senate

Open RFP's

Senate Staffing

Intern Program

COPYRIGHT © 2023 THE GEORGIA GENERAL ASSEMBLY

You are viewing a page from the 2011 Special Session. ***This is not the current session.***

SB 1EX

Georgia Senate Reapportionment Act of 2011; provide for composition and number of State Senatorial districts

Current Version | Past Versions

Sponsors

No.	Name	District
1.	Seabaugh, Mitch	28th
2.	Cowsert, Bill	46th
3.	Bethel, Charlie	54th
4.	Williams, Tommie	19th
5.	Rogers, Chip	21st

Sponsored In House By:
Lane, Roger

Committees

House Committee:
Legislative & Congressional Reapportionment
Senate Committee:
Reapportionment and Redistricting

First Reader Summary

A BILL to be entitled an Act to provide for the composition and number of state senatorial districts; to provide for a short title; to amend Chapter 2 of Title 28 of the Official Code of Georgia Annotated, relating to apportionment of the House of Representatives and Senate and qualifications of members, so as to provide for the number and election of Senators; to provide for qualifications; to provide when the Senators elected shall take office; to provide for the continuation of present senatorial districts until a certain time; to provide that the provisions of this Act shall supersede and replace an interim apportionment plan; to provide for other matters relative to the foregoing; to provide an effective date; to repeal conflicting laws; and for other purposes.

Status History

Date	Status
08/24/2011	Effective Date
08/24/2011	Act 2EX
08/24/2011	Senate Date Signed by Governor
08/23/2011	Senate Sent to Governor
08/23/2011	House Immediately Transmitted to Senate
08/23/2011	House Passed/Adopted
08/23/2011	House Third Readers
08/22/2011	House Committee Favorably Reported
08/22/2011	House Second Readers

Date	Status
08/18/2011	House First Readers
08/18/2011	Senate Transmitted House
08/18/2011	Senate Passed/Adopted By Substitute
08/18/2011	Senate Third Read
08/17/2011	Senate Read Second Time
08/17/2011	Senate Committee Favorably Reported By Substitute
08/15/2011	Senate Read and Referred
08/09/2011	Senate Hopper

Footnotes

8/23/2011 Structured Rule; 8/23/2011 Immediately transmitted to Senate and Governor

Votes

Date	Vote No.	Yea	Nay	NV	Exc
08/18/2011	Senate Vote #4	35	18	1	2
08/23/2011	House Vote #403	104	56	6	14

Helpful Links

Georgia.gov

Governor's Office

Secretary of State

Georgia Department of Motor Vehicles

Georgia Department of Driver Services

Georgia Department of Revenue

Georgia Department of Labor

Legislative Resources

House of Representatives

Senate

Open RFP's

Senate Staffing

Intern Program

COPYRIGHT © 2023 THE GEORGIA GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Session: 2011 Special Session

You are viewing a page from the 2011 Special Session. ***This is not the current session.***

HB 1EX

Georgia House of Representatives Reapportionment Act of 2011; enact

Current Version | Past Versions

Sponsors

No.	Name	District
1.	Lane, Roger	167th

Sponsored In Senate By:
Seabaugh, Mitch

Committees

House Committee:
Legislative & Congressional Reapportionment
Senate Committee:
Reapportionment and Redistricting

First Reader Summary

A BILL to be entitled an Act to provide for the composition and number of state house districts; to provide for a short title; to amend Chapter 2 of Title 28 of the Official Code of Georgia Annotated, relating to apportionment of the House of Representatives and Senate and qualifications of members, so as to provide for the number and election of Representatives; to provide for certain qualifications; to provide when the Representatives elected shall take office; to provide for the continuation of the present representative districts until a certain time; to provide that the provisions of this Act shall supersede and replace an interim apportionment plan and certain changes thereto; to provide for other matters relative to the foregoing; to provide an effective date; to repeal conflicting laws; and for other purposes.

Status History

Date	Status
08/24/2011	Effective Date
08/24/2011	Act 1EX
08/24/2011	House Date Signed by Governor
08/23/2011	House Sent to Governor
08/23/2011	Senate Transmitted House
08/23/2011	Senate Passed/Adopted
08/23/2011	Senate Third Read
08/22/2011	Senate Read Second Time
08/22/2011	Senate Committee Favorably Reported
08/18/2011	Senate Read and Referred
08/18/2011	House Immediately Transmitted to Senate
08/18/2011	House Passed/Adopted By Substitute
08/18/2011	House Third Readers

Date	Status
08/16/2011	House Committee Favorably Reported By Substitute
08/16/2011	House Second Readers
08/15/2011	House First Readers
08/15/2011	House Hopper

Footnotes

8/18/2011 Passed House by Rules Committee Substitute; 8/18/2011 Structured Rule; 8/18/2011 Immediately transmitted to Senate; 8/23/2011 Immediately transmitted to House and Governor

Votes

Date	Vote No.	Yea	Nay	NV	Exc
08/18/2011	House Vote #399	108	64	4	4
08/23/2011	Senate Vote #7	36	16	0	4

Helpful Links

Georgia.gov

Governor's Office

Secretary of State

Georgia Department of Motor Vehicles

Georgia Department of Driver Services

Georgia Department of Revenue

Georgia Department of Labor

Legislative Resources

House of Representatives

Senate

Open RFP's

Senate Staffing

Intern Program

COPYRIGHT © 2023 THE GEORGIA GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Session: 2021 Special Session

You are viewing a page from the 2021 Special Session. ***This is not the current session.***

SB 2EX

"Georgia Congressional Redistricting Act"; enact

Current Version | Past Versions

Sponsors

No.	Name	District
1.	Kennedy, John	18th
2.	Cowsert, Bill	46th
3.	Dugan, Mike	30th
4.	Gooch, Steve	51st
5.	Burke, Dean	11th
6.	Walker, III, Larry	20th
7.	Miller, Butch	49th

Committees

House Committee:
Legislative & Congressional Reapportionment
Senate Committee:
Reapportionment and Redistricting

First Reader Summary

A BILL to be entitled an Act to provide for the composition and number of congressional districts; to provide for a short title; to provide when such representatives shall take office; to provide for continuation of present congressional districts until a certain time; to provide for related matters; to provide an effective date; to repeal a specific Act; to repeal conflicting laws; and for other purposes.

Status History

Date	Status
12/30/2021	Effective Date
12/30/2021	Act 8EX
12/30/2021	Senate Date Signed by Governor
11/30/2021	Senate Sent to Governor
11/22/2021	House Passed/Adopted
11/22/2021	House Third Readers
11/20/2021	House Committee Favorably Reported
11/20/2021	House Second Readers
11/19/2021	House First Readers
11/19/2021	Senate Passed/Adopted By Substitute
11/19/2021	Senate Third Read

DEFENDANT'S EXHIBIT 10

Date	Status
11/18/2021	Senate Read Second Time
11/18/2021	Senate Committee Favorably Reported By Substitute
11/03/2021	Senate Read and Referred
11/02/2021	Senate Hopper

Footnotes

11/18/2021 Notice of intent to file Minority Report; 11/19/2021 Minority Report Filed; 11/22/2021 Structured Rule

Votes

Date	Vote No.	Yea	Nay	NV	Exc
11/19/2021	Senate Vote #23	32	21	0	3
11/22/2021	House Vote #22	96	68	4	12

Helpful Links

Georgia.gov

Governor's Office

Secretary of State

Georgia Department of Motor Vehicles

Georgia Department of Driver Services

Georgia Department of Revenue

Georgia Department of Labor

Legislative Resources

House of Representatives

Senate

Open RFP's

Senate Staffing

Intern Program

COPYRIGHT © 2023 THE GEORGIA GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Session: 2021 Special Session

You are viewing a page from the 2021 Special Session. ***This is not the current session.***

SB 1EX

"Georgia Senate Redistricting Act of 2021"; enact

Current Version | Past Versions

Sponsors

No.	Name	District
1.	Kennedy, John	18th
2.	Cowsert, Bill	46th
3.	Dugan, Mike	30th
4.	Gooch, Steve	51st
5.	Burke, Dean	11th
6.	Walker, III, Larry	20th
7.	Miller, Butch	49th

Committees

House Committee:
Legislative & Congressional Reapportionment
Senate Committee:
Reapportionment and Redistricting

First Reader Summary

A BILL to be entitled an Act to provide for the composition and number of state senatorial districts; to provide for a short title; to provide when members of the Senate elected shall take office; to provide for the continuation of present senatorial districts until a certain time; to provide that the provisions of this Act shall supersede and replace a districting plan and certain changes thereto; to provide for related matters; to provide an effective date; to repeal specific Acts; to repeal conflicting laws; and for other purposes.

Status History

Date	Status
12/30/2021	Effective Date
12/30/2021	Act 7EX
12/30/2021	Senate Date Signed by Governor
11/30/2021	Senate Sent to Governor
11/15/2021	House Passed/Adopted
11/15/2021	House Third Readers
11/12/2021	House Committee Favorably Reported
11/12/2021	House Second Readers
11/10/2021	House First Readers
11/09/2021	Senate Passed/Adopted By Substitute

Date	Status
11/09/2021	Senate Third Read
11/08/2021	Senate Read Second Time
11/08/2021	Senate Committee Favorably Reported By Substitute
11/03/2021	Senate Read and Referred
11/02/2021	Senate Hopper

Footnotes

11/08/21 Notice of Intent to file Minority Report; 11/09/2021 Minority Report Filed; 11/15/2021 Structured Rule

Votes

Date	Vote No.	Yea	Nay	NV	Exc
11/09/2021	Senate Vote #6	21	33	1	1
11/09/2021	Senate Vote #7	34	21	0	1
11/15/2021	House Vote #12	96	70	1	13

Helpful Links

Georgia.gov

Governor's Office

Secretary of State

Georgia Department of Motor Vehicles

Georgia Department of Driver Services

Georgia Department of Revenue

Georgia Department of Labor

Legislative Resources

House of Representatives

Senate

Open RFP's

Senate Staffing

Intern Program

COPYRIGHT © 2023 THE GEORGIA GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Session: 2021 Special Session

You are viewing a page from the 2021 Special Session. ***This is not the current session.***

HB 1EX

Georgia House of Representatives Redistricting Act of 2021; enact

Current Version | Past Versions

Sponsors

No.	Name	District
1.	Rich, Bonnie	97th

Sponsored In Senate By:
Kennedy, John

Committees

House Committee:
Legislative & Congressional Reapportionment
Senate Committee:
Reapportionment and Redistricting

First Reader Summary

A BILL to be entitled an Act to provide for the composition and number of state house districts; to provide for a short title; to provide when members of the House of Representatives elected shall take office; to provide for the continuation of the present representative districts until a certain time; to provide that the provisions of this Act shall supersede and replace a districting plan and certain changes thereto; to provide for related matters; to provide an effective date; to repeal specific Acts; to repeal conflicting laws; and for other purposes.

Status History

Date	Status
12/30/2021	Effective Date
12/30/2021	Act 6EX
12/30/2021	House Date Signed by Governor
11/29/2021	House Sent to Governor
11/12/2021	Senate Passed/Adopted
11/12/2021	Senate Third Read
11/11/2021	Senate Read Second Time
11/11/2021	Senate Committee Favorably Reported
11/10/2021	Senate Read and Referred
11/10/2021	House Immediately Transmitted to Senate
11/10/2021	House Passed/Adopted By Substitute
11/10/2021	House Third Readers
11/09/2021	House Committee Favorably Reported By Substitute
11/04/2021	House Second Readers
11/03/2021	House First Readers

Date	Status
11/03/2021	House Hopper

Footnotes

11/10/2021 Structured Rule; 11/10/2021 Immediately transmitted to Senate

Votes

Date	Vote No.	Yea	Nay	NV	Exc
11/10/2021	House Vote #8	99	79	1	1
11/12/2021	Senate Vote #13	32	21	0	3

Helpful Links

Georgia.gov

Governor's Office

Secretary of State

Georgia Department of Motor Vehicles

Georgia Department of Driver Services

Georgia Department of Revenue

Georgia Department of Labor

Legislative Resources

House of Representatives

Senate

Open RFP's

Senate Staffing

Intern Program

COPYRIGHT © 2023 THE GEORGIA GENERAL ASSEMBLY