

NORTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY
SENATE REDISTRICTING COMMITTEE

FEBRUARY 16, 2022

Transcribed by:

Denise Myers Byrd, CSR 8340, RPR
Discovery Court Reporters and
Legal Videographers, LLC
4208 Six Forks Road
Suite 1000
Raleigh, North Carolina 27609
(919) 424-8242
denise@discoverydepo.com

1 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: ... Michael Carvanus,
2 Jake Dorn, Rod Fuller, Dwight Green, Dean
3 Gustafson, Mike Harris, Sherry Hedrick, and
4 Linda Matthews, so it looks like they've all
5 ganged up on us today.

6 So today the calendar has two bills on
7 it. We're just going to hear Senate Bill 744
8 today. We are continuing to review
9 Senate Bill 745, based on the Court's guidance,
10 and trying to make sure that that score is as
11 good as possible. We intended to proceed with
12 that map today, but after scoring the map on the
13 metrics required by the Supreme Court, the
14 mean-median and efficiency gap analysis, we
15 determined we could attempt to draw a map that
16 would better meet the Court's test, so that map
17 will be presented at the meeting tomorrow
18 morning at 9:00 that was already scheduled and
19 already noticed. So just one bill today.

20 By way of introduction, on
21 February 4th, the majority of the Supreme Court
22 of North Carolina found unconstitutional the
23 congressional and legislative maps enacted by
24 the General Assembly and enjoined their use for
25 the upcoming 2022 elections. The Supreme Court

1 ordered the General Assembly to submit to the
2 three-judge trial court a proposed remedial plan
3 that complies with all provisions of the
4 North Carolina Constitution. So we're here
5 today to follow that order and believe that the
6 proposed maps we will present do in fact comply
7 with the constitution as the Supreme Court's
8 majority interpreted in the February 14th Harper
9 v Hall opinion.

10 So let's talk about the process. As
11 you all know, the Supreme Court's remedial order
12 gave the General Assembly two weeks, until this
13 Friday, to submit to the trial court proposed
14 remedial plans. Senate Republican and
15 Democratic leadership made a commitment to each
16 other to try to work together to find common
17 ground. Leadership met several times and
18 exchanged good faith proposals. Ultimately, no
19 agreement could be reached.

20 SENATOR DAVIS: Yes, we'd like to raise
21 an inquiry of the chair.

22 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: State your inquiry.

23 SENATOR DAVIS: I just want to make
24 sure, for clarity purposes, understanding the
25 process. You said there was a current map, and

1 I'm assuming that's the map that's now gone out
2 and that's been shared, that that's going to be
3 revised and -- for the purpose of the -- looking
4 at the scoring and getting those scores better.

5 Is that correct?

6 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: The congressional map
7 will change, yes.

8 SENATOR DAVIS: The congressional map.
9 Okay.

10 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: And we anticipate it
11 will be released sometime later this evening.

12 SENATOR DAVIS: Okay. So that will be
13 released later this evening.

14 Mr. Chair, when do you anticipate,
15 then, that coming before the committee and
16 moving through the committee?

17 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: So it will be before
18 the committee tomorrow morning at 9:00 a.m. At
19 the same time, we will consider the House
20 legislative map, assuming that they have, you
21 know, sent it to us by that time.

22 SENATOR DAVIS: Okay. Thanks,
23 Mr. Chair.

24 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: We would like to
25 thank Senator Blue for his willingness to work

1 with us. Regardless, I am confident in the maps
2 we will propose today -- or the map we will
3 propose today and tomorrow morning.

4 We've used this two-week period to draw
5 maps that we believe are constitutionally
6 compliant. Namely, what we submit today and
7 tomorrow are plans that honor neutral
8 redistricting criteria, plans that respect the
9 will of the people, plans that meet the
10 political science standards the Supreme Court
11 used to measure voting power, and plans that
12 ensure that the right of all voters in
13 North Carolina to vote on equal terms is
14 respected.

15 One other item we present -- before we
16 present the proposed remedial plans for the
17 senate map, the chairs would like to address an
18 issue raised in the Supreme Court concerning
19 what is called a racially polarized voting
20 study.

21 The Supreme Court's majority found that
22 the Stephenson decision requires the General
23 Assembly to conduct such a study. If you'll
24 look in your materials, you should have some
25 information regarding that on your desk. As a

1 result, the trial court ordered the General
2 Assembly as part of what we file on Friday to
3 provide the initial assessment of whether a
4 racially polarized voting analysis requires the
5 drawing of a VRA district. We will comply in
6 good faith with that order but wanted to take
7 time now briefly to describe why we believe, as
8 we did with the enacted plans, that a
9 majority -- that majority-minority districts are
10 completely unnecessary in North Carolina for
11 African American voters to have an equal
12 opportunity to elect the candidates of their
13 choice.

14 Recall that the General Assembly cannot
15 draw districts using race under the Voting
16 Rights Act unless we satisfy the three Gingles
17 preconditions, which are, one, a reasonably
18 compact majority-minority voting age population
19 district; two, a politically cohesive minority
20 community; and three, white bloc voting usually
21 defeating that community's candidate of choice.

22 To draw VRA districts, according to
23 Covington and other recent US Supreme Court
24 cases, the General Assembly needs a strong basis
25 in evidence for each of those three factors.

1 There is no evidence available to demonstrate
2 the presence of these conditions. Let's start
3 with what we knew before the enacted plans were
4 passed in the fall.

5 First, we learned through redistricting
6 litigation from the last decade that there was
7 not enough evidence to support a finding that
8 the Gingles threshold conditions were met in
9 North Carolina. Second, in our most recent
10 redistricting efforts, overseen and approved by
11 the courts, not only did the Common Cause v
12 Lewis court approve our decision to draw race
13 blind, the court conducted its own racial
14 analysis finding none of the Gingles factors
15 were met. Thus the Common Cause court found as
16 recently as January 2020 that no Section 2
17 districts are required in North Carolina.
18 Indeed, African American candidates were elected
19 in numbers that equal or exceed the percentage
20 of black voting age population in 2018 and 2020
21 under maps that did not use race to draw
22 districts.

23 We also proved as much in January's
24 trial over the enacted plans. There were two
25 expert witnesses, one from the plaintiffs and

1 one of our own, who confirmed that no VRA
2 districts were required.

3 First, plaintiffs' expert Dr. Moon
4 Duchin produced the polarization analysis to
5 determine what would constitute an effective
6 district for black voters. She did not,
7 however, conduct a Gingles analysis. In fact,
8 at trial, Dr. Duchin admitted that she was not
9 offering an opinion in this case that black
10 voters require -- and this is a quote from
11 Dr. Duchin, she was not, quote, offering an
12 opinion in this case that black voters require a
13 district anywhere in the state of North Carolina
14 with at least 50 percent black voting age
15 population, unquote.

16 Instead, the test she adopted by its
17 plain terms demonstrates that a district with
18 50 percent BVAP is not required to be an
19 effective black district. In fact, she
20 testified that, quote, effective black districts
21 could have a black voting age population as low
22 as 25 percent.

23 The legislative defendants did such a
24 polarization report. Dr. Jeffrey Lewis, who
25 offered the report in front of you and that we

1 are submitting to the record, confirms the
2 absence of legally significant racially
3 polarized voting in North Carolina.

4 Dr. Lewis studied the polarization
5 rates for hundreds of elections, including
6 primary elections and general elections. Those
7 can be found in the tables in the report for the
8 years 2014, 2016, 2018, and 2020.

9 What his report does is use those prior
10 elections to assess the voting strength of black
11 voters in the 2020 plans and enacted legislative
12 and congressional plans. He concluded using
13 Dr. Duchin's definition of an effective black
14 district which, remember, was less than
15 50 percent BVAP, that there were at least three
16 effective black congressional districts in the
17 2021 enacted plan, at least 12 effective black
18 Senate districts in the 2021 enacted plan, and
19 at least 31 effective black districts in the
20 2021 House enacted plan.

21 Considering all of this, the
22 three-judge panel found as a matter of fact a
23 finding that was not disturbed but adopted in
24 full by the Supreme Court that, quote, in no
25 district enacted or in 2020 does it appear that

1 a majority of BVAP is needed for that district
2 to regularly generate majority support for
3 minority preferred candidates in the
4 reconstituted elections, unquote.

5 In plain terms, majority-minority
6 districts are not required to elect candidates
7 of minority voters' choice.

8 The evidence before the General
9 Assembly when it enacted the 2021 plans and the
10 evidence available today to the General
11 Assembly, including the reports by Dr. Duchin
12 and Dr. Lewis, clearly demonstrate that nowhere
13 in the state is there evidence of legally
14 significant racially polarized voting.

15 Under the circumstances of this case,
16 the General Assembly cannot now draw districts
17 to achieve a racial target because it would, as
18 we noted months ago, subject the state to
19 liability under the Equal Protection Clause of
20 the 14th Amendment of the US Constitution.

21 Next, we will also discuss briefly how
22 we approach drawing proposed remedial maps.
23 First, a brief point to make sure we are on the
24 same page. I will refer to the enacted map and
25 the proposed remedial map. The former is what

1 we passed in November of 2021 that is currently
2 enjoined by the Supreme Court. The latter is
3 what you have before you today.

4 In drawing these proposed remedial
5 plans, pending court approval, we followed the
6 Supreme Court order closely and carefully,
7 prioritizing the map as a whole as directed.

8 The opinion stated, quote, in a
9 statewide election, ascertaining the will of the
10 people is straightforward, but in legislative
11 elections, voters have -- only have equal
12 representational influence if results fairly
13 reflect the will of the people not only district
14 by district but in aggregate and on equal terms.

15 Again, quoting from the opinion, quote,
16 the partisan gerrymandering violation is based
17 on the redistricting plan as a whole, not a
18 finding with regard to any individual district.
19 Certainly, it is possible, as the plaintiffs in
20 the trial court demonstrated, to identify which
21 individual districts in the state legislative
22 maps ignore traditional redistricting principles
23 to achieve a partisan outcome that otherwise
24 would not occur. It is possible to identify the
25 most gerrymandered individual districts, but

1 here the violation is statewide because of the
2 evidence that on the whole the districts have
3 been drawn such that voters supporting one
4 political party have their votes systematically
5 devalued by having less opportunity to elect
6 representatives to seats compared to an equal
7 number of voters in the favored party, end of
8 quote.

9 As I just quoted from the opinion, the
10 Supreme Court found the map as a whole to be
11 unconstitutional. Certainly, we can and did
12 identify districts that could be considered for
13 changes in this proposed remedial plan. And
14 Senator Newton will go through all of those
15 changes to the Senate proposal in a moment, but
16 I want to underscore the point -- this point:
17 To comply, we were instructed to consider the
18 map as a whole. So how do we do that? How do
19 we evaluate the map as a whole?

20 The court order addresses this, and I
21 am going to read the relevant section from the
22 order, and I'm quoting here. Please stay awake.

23 Quote -- quoting the Court:

24 As the trial court's finding of fact
25 indicate, there are multiple reliable ways of

1 demonstrating the existence of an
2 unconstitutional partisan gerrymander. In
3 particular, mean-median difference analysis,
4 efficiency gap analysis, close votes, close seat
5 analysis, and partisan symmetry analysis may be
6 useful in assessing whether the mapmaker adhered
7 to traditional neutral districting criteria and
8 whether a meaningful partisan skew necessarily
9 results from North Carolina's unique political
10 geography.

11 If some combination of these metrics
12 demonstrates there is a significant likelihood
13 that the districting plan will give the voters
14 of all political parties substantially equal
15 opportunity to translate votes into seats across
16 the plan, then the plan is presumptively
17 constitutional.

18 To be sure, the evidence in this case
19 and in prior partisan gerrymandering cases
20 provides ample guidance as to the possible
21 bright line standards that can be used to
22 distinguish presumptively constitutional
23 redistricting plans from partisan gerrymanders,
24 end of quote.

25 The analysis the Court lists are

1 mean-median difference analysis, efficiency gap
2 analysis, close votes analysis, close seats
3 analysis, and partisan symmetry. Out of these
4 analyses, mean-median and efficiency gap
5 analysis are the broadly used and replicable
6 political science techniques that produce a
7 quantifiable metric to analyze.

8 So let me stop to define these terms.

9 Mean-median difference is a simple
10 measure of asymmetry that attempts to measure
11 partisan skew. A large difference between a
12 party's median district and its average
13 statewide vote share can suggest partisan skew.

14 Efficiency gap looks at the number of
15 wasted votes across districts. The efficiency
16 gap is calculated by taking one party's total
17 wasted votes in an election, subtracting the
18 other party's total wasted votes, and dividing
19 this by the total number of votes cast. A large
20 difference between the party's wasted votes is
21 said to indicate one party is treated more
22 favorably than the other by the redistricting
23 map.

24 I'm going to again quote the court
25 order where mean-median and efficiency gap

1 analysis were explained.

2 Quote: Based on Dr. Magleby's
3 testimony, any mean-median difference that is
4 not zero could be treated as presumptively
5 unconstitutional. However, using the actual
6 mean-median difference measure from 1972 through
7 2016, the average mean-median difference in
8 North Carolina's congressional redistricting
9 plans was 1 percent. That measure instead could
10 be a threshold standard such that any plan with
11 a mean-median difference of 1 percent or less,
12 when analyzed using representative sample of
13 past elections, is presumptively constitutional,
14 end of quote.

15 To underscore the point of this section
16 of the order, the Court proposes a standard for
17 the mean-median analysis of 1 percent or less
18 when analyzing a proposed map. And again, this
19 is to analyze the map as a whole, not any
20 particular county grouping or district. The
21 proposed standard is a mean-median score of
22 1 percent or less, and if the map meets this
23 standard it is presumptively constitutional.

24 Now I will read the relevant section in
25 the court order on the efficiency gap analysis.

1 Quote: With regard to the efficiency
2 gap measure, courts have found that an
3 efficiency gap above 7 percent in any
4 districting plan's first election year will
5 continue to favor that party for the life of the
6 plan. It is entirely workable to consider the
7 7 percent efficiency gap threshold as a
8 presumption of constitutionality such that,
9 absent other evidence, any plan falling within
10 the limit is presumptively constitutional. The
11 efficiency gap, like other measures of partisan
12 symmetry, is not premised on a strict
13 proportional representation but rather on the
14 notion that the magnitude of the winner's bonus
15 should be approximately the same for both
16 parties, end of quote.

17 To summarize, the proposed standard
18 using the efficiency gap, the court says that a
19 score of 7 percent or below -- again, this is
20 for the entire map and not for a county grouping
21 or district -- is presumptively constitutional.

22 So at this time, I would like to
23 recognize Senator Newton for explanation of
24 Senate Bill 744. And I believe Senator Ford has
25 a motion.

1 SENATOR FORD: Send forward an
2 amendment.

3 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: All right. The
4 committee members have a copy of the amendment
5 to Senate Bill 744.

6 Senator Newton, you are recognized to
7 explain the amendment.

8 SENATOR NEWTON: Thank you,
9 Mr. Chairman.

10 Members, with these mean-median and
11 efficiency gap standards in mind, I'll now step
12 through the proposed remedial Senate plan as a
13 whole, highlighting how the map scores in these
14 metrics and how it compares to the enacted
15 Senate map. And again, when I'm talking about
16 the enacted Senate map, that's the November 2021
17 map as opposed to the remedial map which is what
18 we're considering today.

19 So first, on the mean-median test, the
20 proposed remedial Senate map scores
21 approximately negative .65 in the mean-median
22 and efficiency gap --

23 SENATOR CLARK: Mr. Chair.

24 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Senator Clark.

25 SENATOR CLARK: When is it an

1 appropriate time for questions?

2 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Can we let Senator
3 Newton get through his presentation and then
4 wait until then.

5 SENATOR NEWTON: So just so you're
6 aware, the mean-median and efficiency gap tests,
7 when you have a negative number, it indicates a
8 Republican advantage. A positive number
9 indicates a Democratic advantage. So this is a
10 negative .65, so it indicates a slight
11 Republican advantage.

12 But I just want to repeat that the
13 proposed -- that the mean -- that according to
14 the Court, the mean-median score for the
15 proposed remedial Senate map is presumptively
16 constitutional and the remedial map -- because
17 the remedial map scores better than plus or
18 minus 1 percent. So the remedial map is well
19 within the Court's proposed standard for
20 presumptive constitutionality of plus or minus
21 1 percent.

22 For the efficiency gap, the Court's
23 proposed standard is plus or minus 7 percent.
24 The proposed remedial Senate map scores
25 approximately negative 3.97 percent. That's

1 3.97 percent, again, well within the Court's
2 proposed standard for presumptive
3 constitutionality of plus or minus 7 percent.

4 Before I go into the specific changes
5 on a county-by-county and district-by-district
6 basis, I want to underscore how seriously and
7 meticulously we followed this proposed standard
8 in the Supreme Court's order. We made
9 significant changes to some districts, we made
10 tweaks in other districts, and we did everything
11 we could, in the short time we had, to produce a
12 proposed remedial map that meets these political
13 science standards for measuring the partisan
14 fairness of the statewide map.

15 Here are a few other metrics
16 demonstrating how the overall map has changed,
17 proving that it's a, quote, unquote, fair map,
18 using the definitions and metrics of the Supreme
19 Court order.

20 The proposed remedial Senate map
21 includes ten districts that were within -- that
22 were within 10 points in the 2020 presidential
23 race. That is ten competitive districts. In
24 fact, eight of those districts are in a tighter
25 range of 47 to 53 percent for the Republican

1 vote share in the 2020 presidential race. Four
2 districts are 49/49 or 50/48 in favor of one
3 side or the other.

4 In the enacted Senate map from 2020,
5 President Trump won 30 of the districts. In the
6 proposed remedial Senate map, Trump won 28
7 districts, but only 26 with over 50 percent.

8 In the enacted Senate map from 2020,
9 Governor Cooper won 23 of the districts. In the
10 proposed remedial Senate map, Cooper won 25
11 districts.

12 In 2020, the closest statewide race was
13 for attorney general. Josh Stein won
14 50.1 percent to 49.9 percent, a difference of
15 13,622 votes out of over 5.4 million votes. In
16 the proposed remedial Senate map, Stein wins 23
17 of the 50 seats. However, Stein was within 636
18 votes in two Senate districts of winning 25 of
19 the 50 seats. So let me say that again. In the
20 closest race in 2020, essentially a 50/50 race
21 statewide, the Democrat candidate was just 67
22 votes away in Senate District 21 and 569 votes
23 away in Senate District 24 from capturing
24 exactly 25 seats, or 50 percent of the seats.
25 That, we believe, is a fair map, folks.

1 We used 12 statewide races in our
2 composite metric for the mean-median and
3 efficiency gap analyses. These are the same 12
4 races used by the plaintiffs' expert,
5 Dr. Mattingly, in analyzing our enacted map. So
6 we used the plaintiffs' expert's 12 races.

7 Those races are president, US Senate,
8 governor, lieutenant governor, attorney general,
9 auditor, commissioner of ag, labor, secretary of
10 state, and treasurer from 2020, and president
11 and lieutenant governor from 2016. I just want
12 to note again, these are the races that
13 Dr. Mattingly chose. I don't believe the
14 analysis would change if you were to look at
15 additional races from 2020 or 2016, but you're
16 certainly welcome, of course, to do that.

17 But of these 12 races, the statewide
18 winner in that contest also won a majority of
19 the Senate districts in 10 of the 12 races. One
20 race resulted in a 25/25 tie. The only
21 exception to this was the 2020 AG race where
22 Josh Stein won statewide by only 13,000 votes or
23 .2 percent. In that case, Stein would have won
24 23 of the 50 Senate seats. However, a mere 636
25 votes across two additional Senate districts

1 would have resulted in a 25/25 tie, reflecting
2 result of a very close statewide race.

3 In the enacted Senate map, we worked
4 hard to keep municipalities whole. You remember
5 that, we tried to keep municipalities whole,
6 worked hard to do that. In that map, we split
7 19 precincts to keep as many municipalities
8 whole as possible. However, the plaintiffs'
9 expert, Dr. Mattingly, testified that in his
10 opinion, municipalities were only kept whole in
11 the Senate map to gain partisan advantage.
12 Therefore, in this proposed remedial map, we
13 prioritized compliance with the Court's order,
14 meaning mean-median and efficiency gap
15 standards, keeping precincts whole,
16 competitiveness and compactness over
17 municipalities being kept whole.

18 In the proposed remedial map, we
19 reduced split VTDs statewide from 19 to three.
20 All three of these split VTDs occur in Wake
21 county, and the reason for this is the
22 population deviation in the Wake-Granville
23 county grouping is so close to the lower limit
24 that there's little flexibility in drawing the
25 six districts here within the plus or minus

1 5 percent deviation.

2 We attempted to split as few VTDS as
3 possible while complying with the court order,
4 and we were able to reduce the split VTDS from
5 ten in wake county in the enacted map to only
6 three in the proposed remedial map. Ten in wake
7 county in the enacted map, three statewide in
8 the remedial map. Significant improvement in
9 split VTDS.

10 The Court also -- the court order
11 stated that we could consider where incumbent
12 senators live in the drawing of the remedial
13 map. We did that, and no senators are
14 double-bunked with other members other than
15 those who are paired together due to the
16 Stephenson county groupings. With Senator Clark
17 running for congress, there are no Democratic
18 members double-bunked with other incumbents.
19 Again, zero Democrats are double-bunked in this
20 map.

21 Now, I'll go through the changes on the
22 proposed remedial map as compared to the enacted
23 map.

24 As I just mentioned, that we've removed
25 as many split VTDS as possible across the state.

1 The counties where we removed split VTDs are
2 Buncombe, Cabarrus, Caldwell, Guilford,
3 Randolph, and Sampson. When we removed these
4 split VTDs, it caused Senate District 35 to
5 become overpopulated. We moved a VTD in Union
6 county and some VTDs in Randolph county to make
7 Senate Districts 35, 29, and 25 balance within
8 the plus or minus 5 percent deviation.

9 In the Cumberland-Moore county
10 grouping, we altered Senate District 19 and
11 Senate District 21 to make Senate District 21
12 extremely competitive. In the composite score
13 developed by Dr. Mattingly to evaluate the
14 districts, the composite Republican average for
15 Senate District 21 is 50.17 percent.

16 President Trump received 49.94 percent
17 to President Biden's 48.35 percent. This
18 hypercompetitive district was drawn to comply
19 with the court's order which results in more
20 competitive districts and partisan fairness
21 statewide.

22 In the Guilford-Rockingham county
23 grouping, we drew Senate District 28 to match
24 the court-ordered configuration for the 2018 and
25 2020 elections. The proposed remedial draw for

1 Senate District 28 exactly replicates -- exactly
2 replicates the court-ordered draw which was
3 completed by the special master at that time
4 Nathan Persily. Likewise, the border between
5 Senate District 26 and Senate District 27 in
6 southern Guilford county follows the Persily
7 draw exactly.

8 We attempted to maximize compactness in
9 these districts while considering member
10 residences in Guilford county. Senator Berger
11 lives in Senate District 26, Senator Garrett
12 lives in Senate District 27, and Senator
13 Robinson lives in Senate District 28.

14 In the Forsyth-Stokes county grouping,
15 we drew Senate District 31 and Senate
16 District 32 to respect member residences.
17 Senator Krawiec lives in Senate District 31.
18 Senator Lowe lives in Senate District 32.

19 In the enacted Senate plan, we
20 attempted to keep as much of Winston-Salem whole
21 as possible while not splitting any other
22 municipality in Forsyth county. In the proposed
23 remedial map, we attempted to draw two very
24 compact districts and meet the Court's statewide
25 guidance for partisan fairness.

1 There is an alternative configuration
2 for Forsyth county that pairs it with Yadkin
3 instead of Stokes. We evaluated that
4 configuration; however, the resulting districts
5 in this configuration, Senate District 31, 32,
6 and 36, in Alexander, Wilkes, Surry, and Stokes
7 counties, would have been less compact. This
8 configuration also made it much harder to
9 respect incumbent residences and keep those
10 members, Senators Lowe and Krawiec, in different
11 districts.

12 I want to note that while Stokes and
13 Yadkin county are each very Republican-leaning
14 counties, Yadkin county is slightly more
15 Republican. In 2020, President Trump received
16 78 percent of the vote in Stokes county. In
17 Yadkin county, he received 80 percent of the
18 vote. We decided to leave Stokes, the slightly
19 less Republican county, paired with Forsyth,
20 draw two more compact districts, and comply with
21 the court's order for partisan fairness in the
22 statewide plan.

23 We also concluded that Buncombe county
24 paired better with McDowell and Burke to create
25 the most logical and compact districts in that

1 county grouping and in the Henderson-Polk-
2 Rutherford and Cleveland-Gaston-Lincoln county
3 groupings. If we had switched these county
4 groupings, the resulting districts would have
5 been significantly less compact.

6 In Buncombe county, we altered
7 Senate District 46 and Senate District 49,
8 making each district more compact than in the
9 enacted map. We also removed split VTDS which
10 were drawn in the enacted map to keep
11 municipalities whole.

12 In the Iredell-Mecklenburg county
13 grouping, we drew six districts respecting
14 incumbent residences. Senators Sawyer, Marcus,
15 Waddell, Mohammed, and Salvador each have
16 districts. There's an open seat in southern
17 Mecklenburg county where Senator Jeff Jackson
18 lives but is not running. In the enacted Senate
19 map, this southern Mecklenburg district was
20 quasi-competitive in the enacted map but leaning
21 Democrat. In the proposed remedial map, this
22 district had a Republican composite percentage
23 of 45.5 percent, and Trump only received
24 41.6 percent of the vote in 2020. Therefore,
25 this district is no longer competitive in all

1 likelihood. Again, this district and others in
2 this county grouping were drawn to meet the
3 Court's statewide standard for partisan
4 fairness.

5 In the northeast, we flipped the
6 configuration of those counties so that
7 Senate District 1 includes Carteret, Pamlico,
8 Hyde, Dare, Washington, Chowan, Perquimans, and
9 Pasquotank. We renumbered the other district
10 which is now Senate District 3. It now includes
11 Warren, Halifax, Northampton, Martin, Bertie,
12 Hertford, Gates, Camden, Currituck, and Tyrrell.

13 What was Senate District 3 in the
14 enacted map is now Senate District 2 in the
15 proposed remedial map. The new Senate
16 District 3 in the proposed remedial map is
17 competitive with a composite Republican average
18 of 47 percent. These districts were drawn to
19 meet the Court's standard for statewide partisan
20 fairness.

21 In New Hanover county, we changed some
22 of the precincts that were in Senate District 8.
23 In the enacted map, we chose precincts to
24 balance population between Districts 7 and 8
25 while keeping all municipalities whole. In the

1 proposed remedial map, we prioritize compactness
2 in meeting the Court's proposed standards for
3 statewide partisan fairness. Senate District 7
4 is now configured to be a very close -- very
5 close to a 50/50 district, with Biden narrowly
6 carrying the district in 2020: 49.2 percent to
7 49 percent.

8 The districts are more compact in this
9 draw than they were in the enacted map, and
10 Senate District 7 is more competitive. This
11 configuration of Senate District 7 was a
12 component of the statewide plan that meets the
13 Court's proposed standards for partisan fairness
14 and competitiveness.

15 Finally -- finally -- in wake county,
16 as mentioned previously, we removed as many
17 split VTDS as possible which were in -- which
18 were -- which were in the enacted map to keep
19 municipalities whole. The proposed remedial
20 draw in wake county has three split VTDS, down
21 from ten, and these split only to balance
22 population and to keep the districts within the
23 5 percent deviation. All incumbents in the
24 county, Senators Blue, Batch, Chaudhuri,
25 Crawford, and Nickel, have their own districts.

1 We attempted to maximize compactness in these
2 districts and comply with the state's order on
3 statewide partisan fairness.

4 Senate District 17 is more
5 Democrat-leaning than in the enacted map.
6 President Biden carried the district 51.5 to
7 46.4. What is now Senate District 18, which
8 includes Granville county and northern wake
9 county, is also more Democratic-leaning compared
10 to what was Senate District 13 in the enacted
11 Senate map. Senate District 18 was carried by
12 Biden 50.9 to 47.3.

13 Again, these districts were drawn to
14 meet the Court's proposed metrics for
15 mean-median and efficiency gap tests of
16 statewide partisan fairness and political
17 responsiveness.

18 Mr. Chair, this concludes my summary of
19 the proposed remedial Senate map, and I'm happy
20 to take any questions.

21 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Thank you, Senator
22 Newton. I think Senator Clark had a question.

23 SENATOR CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

24 Mr. Chair, a lot of comments have been
25 made referencing Dr. Mattingly's use of 12

1 elections in his analysis. Did he, by chance,
2 compute efficiency gap and mean-median scores
3 with those -- that data? Dr. Mattingly.

4 SENATOR NEWTON: I do not know the
5 answer to that.

6 SENATOR CLARK: Well, he did not.

7 Are you aware that he personally is
8 somewhat disdainful of the use of individual
9 measures, such as mean-median and efficiency
10 gap, for the determination whether or not a plan
11 is fair or not?

12 SENATOR NEWTON: I do not.

13 SENATOR CLARK: Well, he does. Read
14 some of his writings and view some of his
15 lectures, you'll find that out.

16 Also, I'd like to draw your attention
17 again to, let's see, paragraph 167 of the
18 opinion by the Court. You read that to us
19 previously, but you sort of read very quickly
20 over the part that said such that absence of
21 other evidence -- in other words, if there's
22 other evidence to the contrary that a plan is
23 constitutional -- then we cannot presumptively
24 assume it's constitutional.

25 Have you actually, maybe, performed

1 some of the tests performed by Dr. Mattingly to
2 determine whether or not there was evidence to
3 the contrary with regard to the plans that you
4 presented to us today?

5 SENATOR NEWTON: I don't necessarily
6 agree with your characterization of what the
7 order says. It does not explicitly say what you
8 just described.

9 We have met the constitutional
10 presumption under two of the measures, and they
11 were examples of many measures, specific
12 examples that are easy -- easily replicable by
13 anyone so that they understand what we're saying
14 is in fact true that these are constitutionally
15 presumptive -- presumptively constitutional. We
16 believe that they are, even though, yes, there
17 are other -- you know, you may propose to the
18 Court anything you want, I suppose.

19 SENATOR CLARK: Well, I don't want to
20 propose anything I want to propose.

21 But it states explicitly here with
22 regard to the efficiency gap, it applies in the
23 absence of evidence to the contrary, and
24 Dr. Mattingly, in his presentations, presented a
25 lot of evidence to the contrary. So I was

1 wondering whether or not you ran any form of
2 ensemble analysis to determine whether or not
3 there possibly was evidence to the contrary and
4 therefore the efficiency gap measures really
5 were not presumptively constitutional.

6 SENATOR NEWTON: We ran the ensemble
7 for those two measures that was most favorable
8 to the plaintiffs, frankly, which is your own
9 expert's 12 races, so we think we have more than
10 met the majority's desire to see metrics that
11 are presumptively constitutional.

12 SENATOR CLARK: Mr. Chair.

13 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Follow-up.

14 SENATOR CLARK: Using 12 elections to
15 determine what the average -- or the mean
16 efficiency gap score is or mean-median score is
17 does not constitute ensemble analysis.

18 SENATOR NEWTON: Senator Clark, you and
19 I are just going to have to agree to disagree on
20 this, and we'll let the lawyers fight it out in
21 their briefings before the courts.

22 SENATOR CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

23 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Senator Blue.

24 SENATOR BLUE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

25 And just a couple questions. I want to

1 understand that Senator Newton, you understand
2 that the evidence in the trial was still the
3 evidence before the trial court now. The
4 evidence found at the trial court level and as
5 affirmed in the North Carolina Supreme Court is
6 the evidence that the trial court will use to
7 determine whether or not the gerrymanders that
8 they identified have been repaired.

9 SENATOR NEWTON: Senator Blue, I
10 suspect they'll also consider the reports of
11 counsel, including other third parties that
12 aren't even explaining the work that they're
13 doing. So I don't think they're limited. It
14 certainly -- it's up to them.

15 SENATOR BLUE: I understand that. Let
16 me ask you another question, then, if you will,
17 Mr. Chairman.

18 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Follow-up,
19 Senator Blue. You are recognized for a series
20 of questions.

21 SENATOR BLUE: Were you aware that in
22 finding that there were gerrymanders in Wake
23 county, and this was specific findings, I think,
24 and the Court findings page 82 through 86, I got
25 it in the Supreme Court opinion as well, but

1 they found that part of what created the
2 gerrymanders in wake county was -- and I'll
3 paraphrase it, but I think closely to quoting
4 it, that the map that you -- the 19 -- the 2021
5 map had packed leaning VTDs, voting tabulation
6 districts, into Districts 14, 15, 16, and 18 in
7 order to make Districts 13 and 17 as competitive
8 as possible for Republicans, and it put
9 Raleigh's few Republican-leaning VTDs in
10 District 13.

11 I know that there were some changes in
12 the numbers of the district, but what has your
13 proposed map done, a redraw of the map done, to
14 address those specific other factors in
15 determining that there's not a political
16 gerrymander still in wake county?

17 SENATOR NEWTON: As I described
18 earlier, Senator Blue, what we have done we
19 believe meets the Court's test, including in
20 wake county.

21 SENATOR BLUE: Follow-up, Mr. Chairman.

22 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: You're recognized for
23 a series of questions, Senator Blue.

24 SENATOR BLUE: Thank you, sir.

25 But my specific question, have you gone

1 into Districts 14, 15, 16, and 18 to see whether
2 you reduced the Democratic average in those four
3 districts, all in Wake County, with the average
4 in the other two districts to determine whether
5 this observation, this specific finding affirmed
6 by the Supreme Court and made by the trial
7 court, that the gerrymander consisted of the
8 illegal packing of Democratic voters in those
9 four districts? Have you measured how you
10 addressed that specific finding?

11 SENATOR NEWTON: It's been measured in
12 our overall approach satisfying the Court's
13 order.

14 SENATOR BLUE: But not specific the.

15 SENATOR NEWTON: I can't -- I can't go
16 to that level of detail with you, but it is what
17 it is, and we'll be happy to -- you know, you'll
18 obviously get a chance to look at exactly what
19 we did in that area.

20 SENATOR BLUE: Following up. I know
21 you indicated there was a slight difference,
22 maybe half a percent or something, in both of
23 those districts in the Democratic performance.

24 And are you aware that in the evidence
25 in the trial court, those four districts in Wake

1 county that I identified all are over 60 plus
2 percent Democratic performing, some of them
3 70 percent, as opposed to the 50 percent of the
4 two -- you consider them competitive districts
5 in wake county? Are you aware of that?

6 SENATOR NEWTON: I'm not going to
7 debate you on that, Senator Blue.

8 SENATOR BLUE: No. No. I just asked
9 are you aware of it.

10 SENATOR NEWTON: I am not aware of
11 that.

12 SENATOR BLUE: Okay. Another question.
13 You indicated that you did in Guilford
14 county what the Persily special master report
15 did in Guilford county in 2019. You replicated
16 exactly what he did; is that right?

17 SENATOR NEWTON: Yes, we replicated
18 those two Persily maps.

19 SENATOR BLUE: Are you aware that
20 Persily's maps were aimed at fixing a racial
21 gerrymander and did not relate at all to a
22 political gerrymander in Guilford county?

23 SENATOR NEWTON: Well, Senator Blue, I
24 can tell you that with those draws, we satisfied
25 the Court's requirements.

1 SENATOR BLUE: If I could just then
2 follow-up.

3 And the Court, regarding Guilford
4 county, found specifically that Mattingly's
5 expert report in fact found that there could be
6 three Democratic districts drawn in Guilford
7 county.

8 SENATOR NEWTON: I have no reason to
9 doubt that.

10 SENATOR BLUE: Do you realize that
11 Mattingly's report found that -- in fact, I
12 think he said that three districts pack
13 exceptional number of Democrats in District 28
14 and exceptionally few in District 26, and that
15 if in fact you unpacked 28 and whatever the
16 other number in Guilford county is, the other
17 Democratic district, you would have all
18 districts with greater than 54 percent
19 Democratic performance?

20 SENATOR NEWTON: Senator Blue, I just
21 recommend that you submit that to your counsel
22 and have them brief that up and propose that
23 it's of significance.

24 We believe we've met the standard the
25 Court set out on our statewide analytics around

1 this map.

2 SENATOR BLUE: Okay. And just for the
3 record, I'm not a party. I don't have counsel
4 in this matter. Okay.

5 SENATOR NEWTON: Fair enough. Thank
6 you, Senator Blue.

7 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Senator Blue, can you
8 hit your microphone.

9 SENATOR BLUE: I'm neither a party nor
10 a witness in the proceedings, so I don't have
11 counsel.

12 But you also indicated that in the
13 simulated plans, out of the billions or millions
14 that somebody made, maybe not him, across
15 elections that less than one-tenth of 1 percent
16 of the plans had more packed Democrats into
17 these two districts than the adopted plan.

18 SENATOR NEWTON: If that's what he
19 said, that's what he said.

20 SENATOR BLUE: Okay. And I'm about
21 done.

22 You indicate that you changed precincts
23 in New Hanover county.

24 SENATOR NEWTON: That's correct.

25 SENATOR BLUE: And you changed

1 precincts in that district because you had
2 sacrificed -- you wanted to sacrifice municipal
3 completeness for compactness; is that correct?
4 You were willing to cut the city limits in order
5 to get a more compact map.

6 SENATOR NEWTON: The Court -- the
7 majority of the Court signaled to us that
8 keeping municipalities whole was not as
9 important to it as it seemed to be to us in the
10 enacted map. Therefore, we changed New Hanover
11 county to improve its scores under the Supreme
12 Court majority's test for what would be
13 sufficient and constitutional. So we believe
14 we've met that test better, even assuming we did
15 before in New Hanover. The whole state scores
16 better when we -- when we made this move in
17 New Hanover.

18 SENATOR BLUE: And just to follow up,
19 because as you were talking about him I was
20 thinking of comparables.

21 In Buncombe county, you chose to keep a
22 municipality whole even though you could have
23 gotten a more compact had you not kept the
24 municipality whole; is that right?

25 SENATOR NEWTON: I don't know the

1 answer to that.

2 SENATOR BLUE: So that I can get my
3 numbers right on the test that you use -- and
4 I'm not going back to being a mathematician, but
5 as I understand it, you said that the -- in the
6 mean-median in the 2021 map, looking at the
7 districts as they existed, was 1 percent -- what
8 was .65 percent, I think you said; is that
9 right?

10 SENATOR NEWTON: No. The mean-median
11 test is on this map, the proposed remedial map.

12 SENATOR BLUE: So you didn't go back
13 and see what the mean-medians were in the --

14 SENATOR NEWTON: In the enacted map?

15 SENATOR BLUE: -- 2021 map? Yes.

16 SENATOR NEWTON: Not to my knowledge.

17 SENATOR BLUE: And you didn't do the
18 efficiency gap on the 2021 map?

19 SENATOR NEWTON: Well, no. I take that
20 back. We did. And these are improvements over
21 the enacted map.

22 SENATOR BLUE: Well, that's what I
23 thought you said.

24 Well, what were these two measurements
25 in the 2021 map?

1 SENATOR NEWTON: I don't have that in
2 front of me.

3 SENATOR BLUE: And you say in the
4 proposal that's before us, the efficiency
5 gap --

6 SENATOR NEWTON: We can get you that.

7 SENATOR BLUE: -- is minus 3.97, I
8 believe you said.

9 SENATOR NEWTON: That's correct, 3.97.

10 SENATOR BLUE: And something .65.

11 SENATOR NEWTON: .65. Negative .65 and
12 negative 3.97. And I'll be happy to provide you
13 with any data we have on the enacted map.

14 SENATOR BLUE: Other than in
15 New Hanover county, did you take a district and
16 increase the Republican score, that is, a
17 performance of Republican candidates, throughout
18 this map anywhere? And I'll say so -- that I'm
19 not trying to trick you or anything. I'll
20 represent to you that you just indicated that
21 you moved precincts in New Hanover county and
22 the movement of those precincts made that
23 district a more Republican district. And I'm
24 asking you is there anywhere else in the map
25 that you moved precincts that did that.

1 SENATOR NEWTON: Senate District 7,
2 which is the New Hanover county district, is now
3 very, very close to a 50/50 district.

4 SENATOR BLUE: My question to you is
5 what was it before?

6 SENATOR NEWTON: I do not have the
7 answer to that.

8 SENATOR BLUE: So you don't dispute
9 that it was a more Democratic district before
10 you added those additional four precincts to it
11 in the proposal?

12 SENATOR NEWTON: I do not, but I will
13 say that we scored it as it was -- in the
14 enacted form and it scored worse under the
15 majority's opinion and guidance to us than after
16 this change. So this improved the scoring both
17 as to compactness and meeting the Court's
18 proposed standards for statewide partisan
19 fairness.

20 SENATOR BLUE: Last question,
21 Mr. Chairman.

22 And you read the opinion, I take it,
23 and you've had advice about what it means. Is
24 it -- as you state what this new map does, is it
25 your opinion that it didn't matter to the

1 Supreme Court in their ruling and based on the
2 opinion and order that there was a map -- to use
3 their exact language, I think, basically made
4 the chances equal for parties that got a similar
5 number of the votes to do what the other party
6 did as far as seats that came out of the General
7 Assembly through that particular election?

8 SENATOR NEWTON: Senator Blue, I will
9 not speak for the Supreme Court. I don't know
10 what they're thinking.

11 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Senator Perry.

12 SENATOR PERRY: Thank you,
13 Mr. Chairman, but I've been worn out by the
14 court proceedings in here today. I'll pass.
15 Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Senator Clark.

17 SENATOR CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
18 I have a comment and a few questions, if you
19 don't mind.

20 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: You're recognized for
21 a few questions.

22 SENATOR CLARK: Thank you.

23 Mr. Chair, you all have made mention
24 about Dr. Duchin. In January 2018, she wrote an
25 article "Gerrymandering Metrics: How to

1 measure? what's the baseline?"

2 In this particular article regarding
3 the use of the efficiency gap as a single
4 judicially manageable indicator of partisan
5 gerrymandering, she stated that the problem is
6 that gerrymandering is a fundamentally
7 multidimensional problem, so it is manifestly
8 impossible to convert that into a single number
9 without a loss of information that is bound to
10 produce many false positives or false negatives
11 for gerrymandering.

12 Then later in an article, May of
13 2017 -- maybe not later, but in another article
14 in 2017 -- regarding the efficiency gap, she
15 wrote: In its simplest form, we can see that
16 the efficiency gap has numerous potentially
17 undesirable properties. One, it penalizes
18 proportionality; two, is volatile in competitive
19 races; three, it fetishizes three-to-one
20 landslide districts; four, it breaks down in
21 edge cases; and five, it's nongranular.

22 Did you all evaluate your use of the
23 efficiency gap to determine whether or not any
24 of these problems existed in your analysis?

25 SENATOR NEWTON: Mr. Chair.

1 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Senator Newton.

2 SENATOR NEWTON: All I can say to that,
3 Senator Clark, is apparently the Supreme Court
4 majority disagreed with the plaintiffs' witness
5 on those points because they were very specific
6 about the metrics to be used under those two
7 tests. And we did not rely on a single test.
8 We have two tests in addition to all the
9 anecdotal evidence that I went through earlier
10 here today.

11 SENATOR CLARK: Mr. Chair.

12 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: You are recognized
13 for a series of questions.

14 SENATOR CLARK: Oh, thank you,
15 Mr. Chair.

16 And you also indicated that you used 12
17 elections for your -- for calculating the
18 average efficiency gap, I believe, and you
19 thought that was a representative sample
20 sufficient?

21 SENATOR NEWTON: We thought it was more
22 than appropriate to use the plaintiffs' expert's
23 own 12 races that he represented to the Court
24 were representative and appropriate to use. So
25 instead of having that fight and taking that

1 fight on, we used his 12 races, and we do think
2 that's appropriate.

3 SENATOR CLARK: Did Dr. Mattingly say
4 that the use of only 12 elections were
5 sufficient for calculating mean-median scores
6 and efficiency gap scores for making a
7 determination as to whether or not a map was
8 constitutionally compliant? He didn't use those
9 tests for that purpose.

10 SENATOR NEWTON: Chair Clark, we do not
11 consult with Dr. Mattingly.

12 SENATOR CLARK: Well, you've indicated
13 you've consulted his work quite extensively
14 since we've been here.

15 No further questions, Mr. Chair.

16 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Any other comments or
17 questions?

18 Senator Marcus.

19 SENATOR MARCUS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
20 I have a series of questions about the process,
21 if I could.

22 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: You are recognized
23 for a series of questions.

24 SENATOR MARCUS: Thank you very much.

25 I'm curious, and I know I've heard from

1 many voters in my district and across the state
2 who are curious about the process for how we
3 came up with this map, a lot of frustration that
4 we saw it so late, that this is the first
5 hearing and the first day that the public's been
6 able to see it. It's also the first day I got
7 to see it.

8 So some of my initial questions I'm
9 hoping you can answer are when was -- when was
10 this map completed? In other words, when was
11 the last time this map that we're seeing today
12 was changed by you or whoever drew this map?

13 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Senator Newton.

14 SENATOR NEWTON: Yesterday. I'm
15 not -- I don't recall specifically,
16 Senator Marcus, but although it was subject to
17 change literally before, you know, we came in
18 this room. We were scoring it to make sure it
19 satisfied the Court's criteria, and until we had
20 that score we could not release a map. And as
21 you know, we were dealing with an
22 extraordinarily compressed timeframe and did the
23 very best we could in the time we had.

24 So it was -- you know, the earliest we
25 could release the map was, like, midmorning

1 today. we did not finish it until the night
2 before, late the night before.

3 SENATOR MARCUS: Okay. what I hear you
4 saying, it was not edited at all after -- after
5 yesterday at some point, and the delay in us not
6 seeing it until today was due to your internal
7 analysis of it and deciding whether to make any
8 additional changes. Is that what you said?

9 SENATOR NEWTON: We released it as soon
10 as we were -- we were confident it was going to
11 be the right map, and we actually -- so that
12 was, what, midmorning this morning that it
13 scored well. And we were -- you know, we want
14 to make sure it scores well. So if we -- we
15 didn't want to release something and pull it
16 back unless we had to. You know, we're doing
17 the very best we can in the time we've got. So
18 we released it as soon as it was ready to go.
19 How's that.

20 SENATOR MARCUS: Okay. I'm also
21 curious about who drew the map, what legislators
22 were involved, what staff was involved,
23 consultants, et cetera.

24 SENATOR NEWTON: well, Senator Daniel
25 and I and to a lesser extent -- as you know,

1 Senator Hise is not here today, he hasn't been
2 here the last few days. Working with typical
3 staff like we normally would with a bill. Of
4 course, we do have outside counsel, but
5 primarily with our staffers.

6 SENATOR MARCUS: Were any professional
7 mapmakers involved in drawing this map?

8 SENATOR NEWTON: Not to my knowledge.

9 SENATOR MARCUS: Okay. Thank you.

10 SENATOR CLARK: Mr. Chair.

11 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Senator Clark.

12 SENATOR CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

13 Senator Newton, could you explain to me
14 the process that you all went through in your
15 attempts to achieve the desired scores.

16 SENATOR NEWTON: We started with the
17 enacted map and tried to improve the scoring of
18 the enacted map and satisfy all the requirements
19 of the Court that we've already described in
20 detail. They were multifaceted. So when we got
21 to an acceptable score, we thought we had a map
22 that passed muster and was in fact competitive
23 as required by the majority opinion and no need
24 to go any further.

25 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Senator Blue.

1 SENATOR BLUE: Just a quick follow-up
2 again because I'm somewhat confused.

3 If in fact the Court adopted all of the
4 facts found by the trial court, that is, the
5 Supreme Court, and the trial court is bound by
6 their findings from however long ago they made
7 their findings, how are you going to fix the
8 gerrymander without addressing what they found
9 to be the specific gerrymanders?

10 And I understand that you don't measure
11 whether a map is gerrymandered by specific
12 districts, but I'm just trying to figure out how
13 you fix it without addressing the gerrymanders
14 that they have found are political gerrymanders
15 because they're still political gerrymanders
16 when you've changed them -- changed the map if
17 you haven't addressed why they became political
18 gerrymanders.

19 Can you answer that for me because
20 that's what's got me confused regardless of the
21 wording in the opinion or the test that they
22 say -- and by the way, they said those four
23 tests are among many other possible tests that
24 you can use to determine whether a gerrymander
25 is present.

1 SENATOR NEWTON: I think that's a
2 question that is going to be asked of the Court.
3 We've done the best we can. We have what we
4 believe is a constitutionally compliant map.
5 And as you said, it's not a district -- you
6 know, a single district doesn't kick out a map,
7 and I don't believe the district you're
8 discussing is going to in any way invalidate a
9 constitutionally acceptable map statewide. And,
10 you know, that district presents unique
11 challenges with respect to population. So we're
12 going to let the lawyers brief it out and let
13 the Court consider it, and if you're right,
14 you're right; if you're wrong, you're wrong.

15 SENATOR BLUE: Last question, again,
16 Mr. Chairman.

17 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Follow-up.

18 SENATOR BLUE: And with regard to the
19 New Hanover district which wasn't in question,
20 if the intentional creation of these other
21 districts knowing what the partisan performance
22 was, although -- I mean, that's what the
23 testimony was about, that's why the expert said
24 you had to know what the partisan performance
25 was, you couldn't have drawn them because the

1 chances were .08 out of a trillion that you
2 could have drawn that combination without
3 knowing what the partisan performance was.

4 And if that was the basis for finding
5 these other eight gerrymanders in the Senate
6 map, what gives you assurance that they won't
7 find that this specific decision to change
8 New Hanover is not an additional specific
9 partisan gerrymander?

10 SENATOR NEWTON: Because it made the
11 scoring they gave us to work with, thin though
12 it was in terms of concreteness, we -- that
13 change scored better than the alternative, and
14 so we are -- it better satisfies the order of
15 the Court as it's written and the metrics they
16 provided, few that they were, than the
17 alternative. And if they -- that doesn't
18 satisfy them, maybe they'll -- you know, they'll
19 have to make that decision.

20 But we have a constitutionally
21 acceptable map, a fair map, a competitive map,
22 and we're satisfied that it's going to pass
23 muster. But if you're right, may perhaps it
24 won't.

25 SENATOR BLUE: Okay.

1 SENATOR NEWTON: But we'll see.

2 SENATOR CLARK: Mr. Chair.

3 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Senator Clark.

4 SENATOR CLARK: You know, I'm not an
5 attorney, and I think I understood what
6 Senator Blue said, but I'm not sure. So if you
7 don't mind, I have to ask this one more time.

8 The courts identified very specific
9 problems with this plan, and they said it was
10 unconstitutional, but it sounds like I'm hearing
11 that you're saying, well, we fixed it without
12 addressing any of the problems identified based
13 solely on gaming a couple of scores, a
14 mean-median and efficiency gap scores, to say
15 that you have solved the problem. Something
16 sounds not quite right about that.

17 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: I'll take that as a
18 statement. I don't think that's a question that
19 Senator Newton needs to respond to.

20 Any other comments or questions from
21 the committee?

22 Seeing none, we have a motion by
23 Senator Ford before the committee to amend
24 Senate Bill 744.

25 All in favor of the motion, please

1 indicate by saying aye.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.

3 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: All opposed no.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBERS: No.

5 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: The ayes have it.

6 The bill as amended is back before the

7 committee.

8 Is there any further discussion?

9 Seeing none, I see a motion from
10 Senator Perry to give the bill as amended a
11 favorable report.

12 Anything else I needed to add?

13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:

14 [Unintelligible].

15 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: Rolled into a new PCS
16 and unfavorable to the original bill.

17 All in favor of that, please indicate
18 by saying aye.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.

20 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: All opposed no.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBERS: No.

22 CHAIRMAN DANIEL: The ayes have it.

23 The bill passes.

24 Thank you for your work, Committee.

25 (End of recording.)

C E R T I F I C A T E

Signed this the 18th day of February 2022.

Denise Myers Byrd
CSR 8240, RPR, CLR 102409-2

NORTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY
SENATE REDISTRICTING COMMITTEE

FEBRUARY 17, 2022

Transcribed by:

Denise Myers Byrd, CSR 8340, RPR
Discovery Court Reporters and
Legal Videographers, LLC
4208 Six Forks Road
Suite 1000
Raleigh, North Carolina 27609
(919) 424-8242
denise@discoverydepo.com

1 CHAIRMAN NEWTON: Committee members,
2 good morning to you. We're going to go ahead
3 and get started.

4 Hello, Senator Lowe. So good to see
5 you.

6 SENATOR LOWE: I was trying to see if I
7 needed [unintelligible].

8 CHAIRMAN NEWTON: Well, the House maps
9 are getting passed out to you now.

10 Let me go ahead and acknowledge our
11 sergeant-at-arms here today. And I'll give you
12 a little context for what's going on this
13 morning, and we'll take it from there.

14 But Terry Barnhardt is the first on the
15 list. Terry, good morning, and thank you for
16 being here. Robert Cordell. Robert. Robert.
17 John Enloe. Rod Fuller is here. And Matthew
18 Lee. Linda Matthews. And finally, Hal Roach.
19 Hal, always good to see you. And thank you all
20 for being here, our sergeant-at-arms.

21 So here's what this morning's going to
22 look like, folks. We are going to start with
23 the House maps. We're going to let
24 Chairman Hall present and be done with the
25 Senate side on his maps. We are then going to

1 most likely -- well, we're then going to stand
2 at ease, and the reason we got to do that is
3 last night -- as we promised you, we were going
4 to have to rework to make the Senate -- I'm
5 sorry -- the congressional maps score better.
6 It didn't score as well as we hoped it would, so
7 we reworked those. We've got those -- we got
8 those processing last night, and about 2:00 a.m.
9 it became evident that there was an IT error, a
10 processing error in those maps. It only
11 affected about I think it was 26 people. Erika
12 can explain in detail if you want her to, but
13 they're fixing that now. So they're rerunning
14 it, they're getting those few VTDS put where
15 they belong, and then we will have the
16 congressional map for you to look at. And, you
17 know, we're all pressed for time. You know,
18 we'll give you as much time as we reasonably can
19 before Senator Daniel presents that map to you.

20 But, Senator Clark, you have a
21 question.

22 SENATOR CLARK: Mr. Chair, I have a map
23 that would score very well.

24 CHAIRMAN NEWTON: I bet you do. I bet
25 you do.

1 All right. So with that, unless
2 there's any other order of business, I am going
3 to turn to Chairman Hall and ask him to present
4 the House map. You should all have a copy of
5 that before you.

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: At the
7 appropriate time I will have a series of
8 questions for Senator Clark on his map. I just
9 wanted to get that on the record.

10 CHAIRMAN NEWTON: Hopefully it will
11 include a motion for a favorable.

12 Senator Hall -- I mean Chairman Hall,
13 it's all yours.

14 CHAIRMAN HALL: Thank you,
15 Mr. Chairman.

16 Members, I'll be pretty brief. We had
17 a 115 to 5 vote on this map last night, so
18 obviously a large bipartisan vote. There were
19 six Democratic amendments that were adopted. I
20 think that probably speaks for itself, so I
21 would ask you to support the bill.

22 CHAIRMAN NEWTON: Any questions for
23 Chairman Hall? Comments?

24 Senator Perry moves for a favorable.
25 All those in favor say aye.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.

2 CHAIRMAN NEWTON: Those opposed, no.

3 Ayes have it.

4 Thank you, Chairman Hall.

5 CHAIRMAN HALL: Thank you,

6 Mr. Chairman.

7 CHAIRMAN NEWTON: All right. With
8 that, committee, unless there are other comments
9 from the chairs, from Chairman Daniel, we are
10 going to stand at ease until central staff can
11 complete the computational work on the
12 congressional map. We'll get that to you as
13 soon as we possibly can, give you a little bit
14 of time with it anyway. But, of course, Senator
15 Daniel will walk you through that map and
16 explain what that map contains.

17 All right. Thanks. With that, we will
18 stand at ease.

19 (At ease.)

20 CHAIRMAN NEWTON: The staff thinks that
21 by 9:45 we'll probably have hard copies of the
22 maps available. The CSV files will be available
23 before that, sometime shortly before that.
24 They're going to post those immediately upon
25 receipt. So you've got a little bit of time to

1 mill around, but they'll all be here. So come
2 on back here if you leave the room and we'll
3 have those to you as quickly as possible.

4 (At ease.)

5 CHAIRMAN NEWTON: We're going to go
6 ahead and get started based on the electronic
7 versions of the congressional maps before you.
8 The hard copies will be coming here shortly.

9 Senator Daniel has a motion to amend.

10 SENATOR DANIEL: Yeah. I move to amend
11 Senate Bill I think it's 745, Mr. Chair.

12 CHAIRMAN NEWTON: It's Senate Bill 745.
13 All those in favor say aye.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.

15 CHAIRMAN NEWTON: Those opposed.

16 All right. Senator Daniel will explain
17 the motion.

18 SENATOR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

19 So the map before you, which you can
20 access electronically, was drawn to comply with
21 the Supreme Court's order. It contains what we
22 believe will be four of the most highly
23 competitive congressional districts in the
24 country.

25 According to the redistricting expert

1 Dave Wasserman, there have been only 19
2 congressional districts in the country drawn
3 during this year's ongoing redistricting process
4 with an election result in the Biden-Trump 2020
5 race with a difference of less than 5 percent.

6 This map will make home to
7 North Carolina four additional highly
8 competitive congressional districts. We believe
9 that the map is constitutional. We believe that
10 it is fair to all candidates, voters, political
11 parties in the state. Also, it follows the
12 Court's order, and it will reflect the will of
13 the people if adopted by the Court.

14 The map scores well within the ranges
15 for measuring mean-median and efficiency gap
16 announced by the Court in its opinion. The
17 Court set a baseline of plus or minus 1 percent
18 for the mean-median score. This map scores at
19 minus 0.61 percent. The Court set a baseline of
20 plus or minus 7 percent for the efficiency gap
21 score. This map scores at minus 5.3 percent.

22 So I'll go through the districts one by
23 one with a brief description.

24 District 1 remains a district that is
25 rooted in mostly rural counties in northeastern

1 North Carolina. We have consistently been told
2 during this process that it is important to keep
3 counties -- the counties forming the belt along
4 the northern border of the state together. This
5 district does that.

6 District 2 is contained wholly within
7 wake county. Adhering to our original criteria,
8 wake county is split only once in this map. It
9 has one incumbent in it, and she has announced
10 her intention to seek reelection.

11 District 3 is a district taking in much
12 of eastern North Carolina, including the
13 majority of the state's coastline and counties
14 with close proximity to the coast. The district
15 contains one incumbent.

16 District 4 contains all of Caswell,
17 Durham, Orange, and Person counties, and most of
18 Alamance county and Granville county. This
19 configuration forms a highly compact district in
20 the northern central counties in the state.

21 District 5 is based in the northwestern
22 corner of North Carolina and is made up of six
23 whole counties. Those counties are Allegheny,
24 Ashe, Forsyth, Stokes, Surry, Watauga, and
25 Wilkes. Most of Rockingham county and a portion

1 of Yadkin make up the rest of the district.
2 There is only one incumbent in the district.

3 District 6 contains all of Chatham,
4 Harnett, Lee, and Randolph counties. It also
5 contains most of Guilford and parts of Alamance
6 and Rockingham. The district contains one
7 incumbent and will be one of the most
8 politically competitive congressional districts
9 in the country.

10 District 7 is based in southeastern
11 North Carolina, and it takes in the rural
12 counties south of Harnett and joins them to the
13 remaining coastal counties. It contains all of
14 Bladen, Brunswick, Cumberland, New Hanover
15 counties and a portion of Columbus. This
16 district contains one incumbent member of
17 congress. It, too, will be one of the most
18 politically competitive congressional districts
19 in the country.

20 District 8 is a district taking in
21 mostly counties and cities located between the
22 Triad and Charlotte. It contains all of
23 Cabarrus and portions of Davidson, Rowan, and
24 Guilford. The district is home currently to one
25 incumbent.

1 District 9 contains nine whole
2 counties. Those are Anson, Hoke, Montgomery,
3 Moore, Richmond, Robeson, Scotland, Stanly, and
4 Union. It also contains portions of Columbus
5 and Davidson. There are no incumbents in this
6 district.

7 District 10 is a western North Carolina
8 based district stretching from Forsyth county
9 west into the mountains. It keeps eight
10 counties whole. Alexander, Avery, Burke,
11 Caldwell, Catawba, Davie, Iredell, and Lincoln.
12 It also contains part of McDowell, Rowan, and
13 Yadkin. There is one incumbent in the district.

14 District 11 is a western North Carolina
15 mountain based district. It contains the whole
16 of the 14 westernmost North Carolina counties.
17 It also contains parts of McDowell and
18 Rutherford counties. There is one incumbent
19 currently living in the district.

20 District 12 is a district containing
21 the northeastern section of Mecklenburg county,
22 including the majority of Charlotte. The areas
23 in and around Charlotte are too large to be
24 wholly contained in one congressional district.
25 Mecklenburg county is split only one way in this

1 map. There is currently one incumbent living in
2 District 12.

3 District 13 is the new open seat
4 created as a result of the North Carolina
5 receiving an additional seat in congress after
6 the 2020 census. It contains all of Duplin,
7 Johnson, Sampson counties and parts of Wake and
8 Wayne. This will again be one of the most
9 highly competitive congressional districts in
10 the country.

11 District 14 is a seat taking in the
12 remaining portions of Mecklenburg and stretching
13 west across the southern boundary of the state
14 into Rutherford county taking in all of
15 Cleveland and Gaston. It is a compact district
16 with only one incumbent.

17 District 14 will likely be among the
18 most politically competitive congressional
19 districts found anywhere in the United States.

20 So we believe that this map is highly
21 competitive, that it follows the Court's order,
22 and that it will represent the will of the
23 people adopted by the Court in the course of the
24 ongoing litigation. So I would ask for your
25 support of the amendment and for the bill.

1 CHAIRMAN NEWTON: Thank you, Senator
2 Daniel.

3 Members, you're welcome to ask
4 questions or make comments.

5 Senator Lowe.

6 SENATOR LOWE: I'm looking at the fifth
7 district which encompasses -- which is part
8 of -- where you have all of Forsyth. Forsyth,
9 as I've stated earlier, has far more in common
10 with Guilford, there's no question about that.
11 When I see Forsyth and we go way over to Watauga
12 and Ashe and Allegheny and Wilkes, we have far
13 more in common with Guilford. Explain that.

14 CHAIRMAN NEWTON: Is that --

15 SENATOR LOWE: That's a question. It
16 may be rhetorical, but it's a question.

17 CHAIRMAN NEWTON: Senator Daniel.

18 SENATOR DANIEL: Thank you, Senator
19 Lowe, for the question. I think the answer is
20 that when -- I believe that was in the previous
21 version of the map that was released earlier
22 this week. When we did the scoring based on the
23 metrics that the Court had given us, the map did
24 not score appropriately within that range, and
25 so we went back to work to make a map that did

1 score well within the range, and that is this
2 map.

3 I think there's some great people in
4 Forsyth and some great people in the mountains,
5 and I hope you'll get to like those folks and
6 become friends.

7 SENATOR LOWE: I don't dislike them. I
8 just don't think we have much in common.

9 CHAIRMAN NEWTON: All right. Thank
10 you.

11 SENATOR DANIEL: We're all humans so we
12 have a lot in common.

13 CHAIRMAN NEWTON: Thank you, Senator
14 Daniel.

15 Any other questions or comments?

16 Senator Blue.

17 SENATOR BLUE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

18 I heard Senator Daniel lay out that the
19 districts were competitive. Tell me what the
20 political measurements on all of these districts
21 were.

22 SENATOR DANIEL: Can staff --

23 CHAIRMAN NEWTON: Staff, do you have
24 the political measurements?

25 ERIKA CHURCHILL: Mr. Chair, the stat

1 pack is posted to the website, or are you asking
2 for something slightly different than that the
3 standard stat pack?

4 CHAIRMAN NEWTON: Senator Blue.

5 SENATOR DANIEL: We don't have paper
6 copies, it's just electronic right now.

7 CHAIRMAN NEWTON: We do have the paper
8 copies.

9 SENATOR BLUE: All I need, just read it
10 to me.

11 ERIKA CHURCHILL: So the paper copies
12 are coming. Is there a particular something
13 that you're interested in?

14 SENATOR BLUE: Yes. I'm just trying to
15 see what the political layout of it is. Senator
16 Daniel said he had all of these competitive
17 districts, but I want to see how they match up,
18 and eventually I want to see how they fit on
19 charts and stuff, histograms and what have you
20 to show what's really happening here.

21 CHAIRMAN NEWTON: So we'll ask staff to
22 work on that. If you have another question or
23 others have questions, give them a minute to
24 collect their thoughts on that.

25 SENATOR DANIEL: Erika, are you just

1 going to review some of those statistics?

2 ERIKA CHURCHILL: We'll work through
3 that and [unintelligible].

4 SENATOR CLARK: Question, Mr. Chair.

5 CHAIRMAN NEWTON: I think she's ready
6 to roll, Senator Clark.

7 SENATOR DANIEL: Senator Blue, would it
8 be okay if Erika goes through the composite --

9 SENATOR BLUE: Sure.

10 SENATOR DANIEL: -- 12 race statistics
11 for the 14 districts.

12 SENATOR BLUE: Yes, that's fine.

13 ERIKA CHURCHILL: Senator Blue, I think
14 we have it up on the screen. It may not be the
15 most readable in the room, but I'm going to go
16 through each district individually.

17 SENATOR BLUE: Okay. Fine.

18 ERIKA CHURCHILL: So District 1, the
19 composite score with the 12 election contests
20 from 2016 to 2020, for percent Democrat is 53.94
21 and for Republican is 45.26.

22 For District 2, percent Democrat is
23 63.3; for Senate Republican is 35.39.

24 For District 3, the Democrat percentage
25 is 38.42; Republican, 60.39.

1 For District 4, the percent Democrat is
2 66.17; for Senate Republican is 32.78.

3 For District 5, the percent Democrat is
4 43.52; for Senate Republican is 55.3.

5 For District 6, percent Democrat is
6 49.55; Republican, 49.37 percent.

7 For District 7, 49.71 percent for
8 Democrat; 49.03 percent Republican.

9 For District 8, 41.33 percent for
10 Democrat; 57.5 for Republican.

11 District 9 percent Democrat is
12 38.11 percent; percent Republican is 60.87.

13 For District 10, percent Democrat is
14 28.92; Republican, 69.96.

15 For District 11, percent Democrat is
16 42 -- 44.12; for Senate Republican, 54.62.

17 For District 12, percent Democrat is
18 66.1; percent Republican is 32.61.

19 For District 13, percent Democrat is
20 47.8; Republican, 51.03.

21 District 14 percent Democrat is 47.96;
22 Republican 50.87.

23 And the 12 election contests are the
24 2016 US president, 2016 lieutenant governor,
25 2020 president, 2020 US senate, 2020 governor,

1 2020 lieutenant governor, 2020 attorney general,
2 2020 auditor, 2020 commissioner of labor, 2020
3 commissioner of agriculture, 2020 secretary of
4 state, and 2020 treasurer.

5 CHAIRMAN NEWTON: Thank you,
6 Ms. Churchill.

7 Senator Blue.

8 SENATOR BLUE: Yeah, and I was counting
9 as we went along. So as I counted up, about
10 eight districts that are over 50 percent
11 Republican, and is it three districts over
12 50 percent Democrat, and the rest of them 49 one
13 way or the other.

14 CHAIRMAN NEWTON: Is that a question
15 for --

16 SENATOR BLUE: Yes. I was trying to
17 write it down as Erika was talking. I think I
18 counted it right.

19 ERIKA CHURCHILL: Yes, sir,
20 Senator Blue, in my count as well with the
21 percent Democrat above 50.0 percent is
22 three -- is three, and for the Republican is
23 eight. However, one of those is at 50 percent.

24 SENATOR BLUE: Okay. So to be
25 technically accurate, there are eight Republican

1 districts 50 percent plus and three
2 Democratic -- three districts 50 percent plus
3 Democrat.

4 ERIKA CHURCHILL: Yes, sir.

5 CHAIRMAN NEWTON: Senator Daniel.

6 Well, I'm not -- I think that's a
7 question for Senator Daniel.

8 SENATOR BLUE: Yeah. No. No. I'm
9 just wanting to make sure my counting is right.
10 I'm not trying to put her on the spot. Just
11 wanted to be accurate. I hear the grunts and
12 groans, but I can describe something pretty
13 accurately. That's my job.

14 SENATOR DANIEL: So if you go back to
15 the previous map that was released a couple days
16 ago, I guess the pundits would say it was a
17 7-5-2 map. This one would be a 6-4-4 map.

18 SENATOR BLUE: Question of Senator
19 Daniel.

20 CHAIRMAN NEWTON: Yes, Senator Blue.

21 SENATOR BLUE: What is it that makes
22 it's a 6-4-2 map?

23 SENATOR DANIEL: 6-4-4.

24 SENATOR BLUE: 6-4-4.

25 SENATOR DANIEL: It essentially has

1 four of the most competitive districts which are
2 I think 6, 7, 13, and 14, then has six likely
3 Republican districts and four likely Democrat
4 districts.

5 SENATOR BLUE: Okay.

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Mr. Chair.

7 CHAIRMAN NEWTON: Hold on one second.

8 Mr. Daniel, Warren Daniel -- Senator
9 Daniel, anything you wanted to clarify there
10 or --

11 SENATOR DANIEL: Senator Blue, if you
12 look at the chart, the four -- there are four
13 districts with greater than 50 percent Democrat
14 performance. That would be District 1,
15 District 2, District 4, and District 12.

16 CHAIRMAN NEWTON: All right. Thank
17 you, Senator Daniel.

18 Who had a question? Senator Clark.

19 SENATOR CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

20 According to our criteria, I assume
21 we're still using it, we should only split the
22 minimum number of VTDS in order to achieve
23 population balance. This one splits 15 as
24 opposed to the 13 required. Why did we do that?

25 CHAIRMAN NEWTON: Senator Daniel.

1 SENATOR DANIEL: So all the changes
2 that were made were made to achieve compliance
3 with the Court's objective criteria, with the
4 mean-median and efficiency gap, and so that's
5 why that was done.

6 SENATOR CLARK: Mr. Chair, you are
7 aware that we can do those things with 13 VTD
8 splits, are you not?

9 CHAIRMAN NEWTON: Is this a follow-up,
10 or is that just a comment?

11 SENATOR CLARK: That's a question to
12 you, asking you since you are aware we can
13 achieve the Court's requirements with the 13 VTD
14 splits.

15 CHAIRMAN NEWTON: Okay. That sounds
16 like a comment and your opinion on that, and I
17 appreciate that.

18 SENATOR CLARK: Well, there's an
19 opinion that's been filed. Feel free to check
20 it out.

21 CHAIRMAN NEWTON: Very good. Thank
22 you, Senator Clark.

23 Any other questions or comments for
24 Senator Daniel?

25 SENATOR CLARK: Mr. Chair.

1 CHAIRMAN NEWTON: Yes.

2 SENATOR CLARK: Was it also necessary
3 to split 14 counties as opposed to 13 in order
4 to achieve objectives of the Court?

5 CHAIRMAN NEWTON: Senator Daniel.

6 SENATOR DANIEL: Well, we could go back
7 to the enacted map which was 11, but this
8 one does -- there's 14 districts, 14 splits,
9 so...

10 SENATOR PERRY: Mr. Chairman.

11 SENATOR CLARK: Comment, Mr. Chairman.
12 The enacted map had too many county
13 splits. It may not have split more counties,
14 but it had too many county splits.

15 CHAIRMAN NEWTON: Senator Perry.

16 SENATOR PERRY: Thank you,
17 Mr. Chairman. I think this question is for
18 Senator Daniel, if that is all right.

19 To my knowledge, this is the only map
20 that we have for consideration, it's the only
21 thing before us today. Is that accurate?

22 CHAIRMAN NEWTON: That is accurate.

23 SENATOR PERRY: So I don't know how we
24 can speak to hypotheticals about anything other
25 than what's contained in this map, and I would

1 think that would be what is germane to this
2 committee if we're going to have a committee
3 discussion about the maps and this committee
4 room not be treated like a cross-examination or
5 a courtroom. If we're going to have committee
6 discussion, I think it's suggested that we have
7 to discuss what's before the committee for it to
8 be germane. I'd like for us to be able to get
9 through this today in a reasonable amount of
10 time while answering reasonable questions, but I
11 don't know that having a lot of conversations
12 about what is not in here or not done is going
13 to be helpful. I don't know where that ends and
14 how long we would be here.

15 CHAIRMAN NEWTON: Thank you, Senator
16 Perry. I think --

17 SENATOR BLUE: Mr. Chairman.

18 CHAIRMAN NEWTON: Senator Blue, yes,
19 sir.

20 SENATOR BLUE: Just to comment because
21 I think that Senator Perry's cynicism and
22 comments deserve response.

23 We got this map -- what time is it now?
24 We got this map 30 minutes ago, and we get to
25 comment that this is the only thing before us.

1 That is genuine, unadulterated
2 misrepresentation. Nobody has had a chance to
3 prepare amendments to it, look at any
4 alternative maps, and that's the way this
5 process works.

6 So I don't want anybody to get the
7 impression that somewhere or other all of us are
8 sitting up twiddling our thumbs rather than
9 coming with alternatives to look at. He's
10 absolutely right. Committees look at what's
11 before them, what maps are. We're not going to
12 take a break to look and put other things before
13 you now, but it's not fair to somewhere cast
14 aspersions on those who might have different
15 ideas because those ideas are not in front of us
16 now.

17 CHAIRMAN NEWTON: Thank you,
18 Senator Blue. You're both right, and we're not
19 going to cast aspersions.

20 And with that, do I see a motion to
21 adopt the amendment?

22 SENATOR PERRY: So moved.

23 CHAIRMAN NEWTON: So moved. Senator
24 Perry.

25 All those in favor say aye.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN NEWTON: Those opposed.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: No.

CHAIRMAN NEWTON: The ayes have it.

So I would also, then, like to see if
there's a motion to -- unfavorable as to the
original bill, favorable as to the amendment,
rolled into a new PCS. Senator Perry so moves.

All those in favor say aye.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN NEWTON: Those opposed.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: No.

CHAIRMAN NEWTON: The ayes have it.

Thank you, and we stand adjourned.

(End of recording.)

1 STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA)
2 COUNTY OF WAKE) C E R T I F I C A T E

3
4 I, DENISE MYERS BYRD, Stenographic
5 Court Reporter, CSR 8340, do hereby certify that
6 the transcription of the recorded Senate
7 Redistricting Committee held on February 17,
8 2022, was taken down by me stenographically to
9 the best of my ability and thereafter
10 transcribed under my supervision; and that the
11 foregoing pages, inclusive, constitute a true
12 and accurate transcription of said
13 recording.

14 Signed this the 18th day of February
15 2022.

16
17
18 Denise Myers Byrd
19 Denise Myers Byrd
20 CSR 8240, RPR, CLR 102409-2
21
22
23
24
25

NORTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE REDISTRICTING COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 16, 2022

Transcribed by:
Taura J. Vulcano, RPR
Discovery Court Reporters and
Legal Videographers, LLC
4208 Six Forks Road
Suite 1000
Raleigh, North Carolina 27609
(919) 424-8242

(Transcription from recorded video file.)

CHAIRMAN HALL: -- Sergeant at Arms for the great work that they do. The Chair apologizes for the delay. We had some printing issues, and I think that we now have everything that's to be passed out to the committee. The remaining document is being passed out to all committee members right now. You should have a copy of both the congressional and state house map and also a document that's being passed out to you right now which is an expert report in the pending litigation.

Members, I remind you -- we didn't do this the last time when we were in this committee, but I'll ask members to state your name before you speak each time. Because while we don't have a court reporter in here right now, when they go back and try to transcribe this, it's sometimes difficult for them to know who's speaking. So when you're recognized to speak, just say, I'm representative so and so. You don't have to say where you're from. You don't have to do all that. Just say I'm representative so-and-so, so they can identify you before you're speaking.

1 Members on the agenda, as you saw on
2 the congressional map is for discussion only
3 today. I will tell the members at this point
4 because we were so delayed in getting the other
5 documents out here -- and I know it's lunch --
6 the Chair does not anticipate having any
7 discussion on that congressional map during this
8 committee meeting. But watch your inbox. We
9 may have a meeting this evening after session,
10 and we will have some committee meeting at some
11 point tomorrow. But again, we're not going to
12 bring up that congressional map in today's
13 committee. We're only going to do the state
14 house map.

15 So, Members, with that, I will turn the
16 gavel over to Chairman Saine, and I will ask
17 Chairman Saine to recognize me to debate the
18 bill.

19 CHAIRMAN SAINE: Chairman Hall, you're
20 recognized.

21 CHAIRMAN HALL: Thank you,
22 Mr. Chairman.

23 Members, I'll try to be brief in my
24 opening so I can answer your questions and
25 hopefully not keep you in here too long today.

1 Members, as you know, the Supreme Court
2 held that our maps must, quote, give the voters
3 of all political parties substantially equal
4 opportunity to translate votes into seats across
5 the plan, and that's exactly what the map before
6 you today does. I will tell you that I have,
7 along with the speaker, we've worked with
8 Representative Reives where we could. We've met
9 quite a bit with Representative Reives to try to
10 come to some compromise. And I can tell you
11 that in a number of areas within the map, we've
12 incorporated ideas from Representative Reives
13 and from the Democrats. And I'll also tell you
14 that those discussions are ongoing today, and
15 this map could perhaps change before we even get
16 into session this afternoon.

17 So back to the map. So how do we --
18 how do we go about complying with the court's
19 order with the map that you see before you?
20 well, we used the election data from 12
21 statewide races from 2016 and 2020 that were
22 utilized by the plaintiffs' expert,
23 Dr. Mattingly of Duke University.

24 And so what are the numbers on this
25 map? Under the map that you've got before you

1 today, Governor Cooper would have won 63 House
2 districts in 2020. So Governor Cooper would
3 have won a majority of the House districts in
4 the map before you in 2020. While former
5 President Trump under this dataset would have
6 won 62 House districts. Compare that to the
7 enacted map where Governor Cooper would have won
8 58 House districts and former President Trump
9 would have won 70 House districts.

10 The Supreme Court told us that there
11 are multiple reliable ways of demonstrating the
12 existence of an unconstitutional partisan
13 gerrymander. That's their quote. Their quote
14 also said, in particular, mean-median difference
15 analysis and efficiency gap analysis were two
16 important measurements. The map before you
17 today meets both of the measurements that the
18 Supreme Court gave us on those two analyses.
19 Specifically, this map scores within under a one
20 point mean-median difference analysis and under
21 a two point efficiency gap analysis.

22 The Court told us a mean-median
23 difference of one percent or less is
24 presumptively constitutional. This map meets
25 that. The Court also told us that an efficiency

1 gap analysis under 7 percent is presumptively
2 constitutional. And, again, this map easily
3 meets that threshold. Furthermore, the Court
4 told us that we needed to quote -- they -- the
5 Court said, quote, the map exhibited a selective
6 failure to preserve municipalities in the House
7 map based solely on considerations of partisan
8 advantage. The enacted map split 81
9 municipalities and this map contains only 49
10 splits in municipalities involving population.
11 The map also prioritizes keeping districts
12 compact. Specifically, we improve compactness
13 of the map overall compared to the enacted map
14 using both Reock and Polsby-Popper analysis,
15 which this committee is very familiar with.

16 Members, as you also know, the
17 Stephenson case requires, to the extent there is
18 legally significant racially polarized voting,
19 the drawing of majority-minority districts as
20 the first step in the process. However, the
21 analysis performed by Dr. Jeffrey Lewis of UCLA
22 determined that majority-minority districts are
23 not required.

24 And, Members, as a reminder, the
25 Supreme Court adopted the trial court's findings

1 of fact that, quote, In no district enacted or
2 in 2020 does it appear that a majority of BVAP
3 is needed for the district to regularly generate
4 majority support for minority-preferred
5 candidates in reconstituted elections.

6 And, Members, now I'll briefly go
7 through some of the groupings in the map that
8 are -- that are and have been the most heavily
9 debated in this Committee on the House floor and
10 the most heavily litigated. We'll begin with
11 Buncombe.

12 In Buncombe, the map before you today,
13 it changes from a one Republican and two
14 Democrat map to three Democratic districts that
15 split no municipalities except for Asheville,
16 which as you all know by now must be split
17 because of that city's sprawling geography
18 throughout Buncombe County. In Pitt County,
19 we've drawn two Democratic districts, which is a
20 change from the previous 1-1 Democrat-Republic
21 split in the enacted map.

22 We kept Winterville whole, where the
23 enacted map did not. And I know there was some
24 dispute about ECU being kept whole or not that
25 Representative Hawkins and I had talked some

1 about. And whatever the last map did, this one
2 does not split ECU. In Guilford County, all six
3 districts in this map were won by President
4 Biden, every single one of them were won by
5 President Biden. The map keeps Summerfield
6 whole, where the enacted plan did not. In
7 Cumberland, we've drawn compact maps that keep
8 Hope Mills whole. Where the enacted plan had
9 split Hope Mills, this map has three solid
10 Democratic districts and one competitive
11 district.

12 In Mecklenburg County, President Biden
13 and Governor Cooper won all 13 districts under
14 this map. The map before you is a compact plan.
15 This splits no municipalities other than
16 Charlotte and Huntersville, which must be split
17 in this -- in the map.

18 In New Hanover, we drew an additional
19 competitive district based in Wilmington. In
20 Cabarrus we drew an additional competitive
21 district, again won by Governor Cooper. In
22 Robeson County, we drew one district much more
23 competitive than the enacted plan. And in Wake
24 County, especially in Wake County, we borrowed
25 from a lot of the ideas from drafts provided to

1 us by the minority leader in our negotiations.
2 We kept Mooresville whole. We unsplit
3 Rolseville. Governor Cooper again won all 13
4 districts in Wake County under this map.

5 Members, in closing, using the data
6 that analyzed by the plaintiffs' own expert,
7 Dr. Mattingly of Duke, we've drawn a map under
8 which Governor Cooper would have won 63 House
9 districts in 2020. If that metric does not
10 comply with the Court's order, I'm not sure that
11 I know what does. Members, I also note that you
12 have the -- as to the racially polarized voting
13 study, you have the plaintiffs' expert report
14 that is before you that was passed out.

15 And, Mr. Chairman, I'm glad to stand
16 for any questions.

17 CHAIRMAN SAINÉ: Gentleman yields.

18 Representative Harrison. And remember
19 to state your name for the record.

20 REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON:

21 Representative Pricey Harrison, Guilford County.
22 Thank you, Mr. Chair and thank you, Chair Hall.

23 I -- just to start with, I appreciate
24 your succinct analysis of what the Court
25 ordered, but I wondered if we could get a little

1 bit more thorough on highlights from our staff
2 about the Court's ruling. would that be
3 possible if we have some time?

4 CHAIRMAN SAINÉ: That --

5 REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: I haven't --
6 I haven't had a chance to read the 200-page
7 opinion yet. And I know the order was easy to
8 digest, but there might be more to it.

9 CHAIRMAN SAINÉ: Representative
10 Harrison, hearing from staff back here, I'm not
11 sure that anyone is prepared for that
12 presentation at the moment, that they also would
13 like to be accurate when they present it, and
14 they're not ready for your question. So I don't
15 know how we resolve that here in the Committee
16 right now.

17 REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: I appreciate
18 that. Follow up.

19 I appreciate that. I think it's
20 probably important to understand what the Court
21 was ordering in the context of looking at that
22 whether we are complying with the order. And I
23 guess specifically the point that -- and I know
24 everybody is working very hard and I appreciate
25 the back-and-forth between the majority party

1 and the minority party. But we just received
2 these maps, these draft maps, a couple hours
3 before the Committee meeting. And I don't think
4 that any of us, at least on our side of the
5 aisle, have had a chance to actually digest
6 them.

7 I've just reviewed the Court order
8 before the Committee meeting started, and I --
9 so I've been trying to understand about what it
10 means. You have said that this meets the -- the
11 Court says this meets the constitutionality that
12 a mean-median difference of under one point and
13 efficiency gap analysis. I understand there
14 were others that were offered, close votes,
15 close seats analysis, partisan symmetry
16 analysis. I guess -- I guess the Court was
17 saying we could choose whichever ones of
18 these -- these measuring tools. Is that -- is
19 that my -- is that correct?

20 CHAIRMAN HALL: I think that's a good
21 question that I wish the Supreme Court would
22 have more readily answered. But what I can tell
23 you, Representative Harrison, is that my reading
24 of it is the Court really focused on the
25 mean-median difference and the efficiency gap

1 analysis. They gave us some bright line rules
2 or at least something approaching bright line
3 rules on those two metrics. And as I said
4 earlier, we've met both of those, those -- those
5 metrics.

6 REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: I appreciate
7 that. Follow up?

8 CHAIRMAN SAINÉ: You're recognized for
9 follow-up.

10 REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: Thank you.
11 I -- and I appreciate that. I sure wish we had
12 a chance to spend a little bit more time and to
13 spend a little bit more time understanding the
14 impact as far as the Supreme Court's order goes.
15 But specifically with regard -- because this has
16 just come up from my constituents back home
17 about Guilford County.

18 It seems like the Mattingly analysis
19 shows that this is -- that the gerrymander is
20 extreme. And the Court found the Republican
21 gerrymander to be extreme in Guilford County.
22 And that -- I understand they're still using
23 non-compact districts to give Republicans a
24 chance of winning two seats. I know you say
25 that Biden won all six. But also it shows --

1 the Mattingly analysis shows five seats should
2 be solidly Democratic and one seat should be
3 highly competitive. I'm just wondering because
4 it seems like you sometimes follow the analysis
5 and sometimes not or -- Mattingly analysis.

6 CHAIRMAN HALL: Yeah. So I
7 respectfully disagree with the lady's analysis
8 of what we've done.

9 I think that what the Court told us
10 is -- is essentially we needed to look at these
11 metrics across the entire map. Guilford County
12 has districts that were all won by President
13 Biden and Governor Cooper.

14 You know, again -- and then let me
15 strike that. I know they were all won by
16 President Biden. I don't have in my notes what
17 the Cooper scores were. But, again, every one
18 of these districts were won by -- by President
19 Biden. So I don't -- I can't -- I don't know
20 that you can fairly say there are any
21 quote-unquote Republican districts in this
22 Guilford County map.

23 REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: I appreciate
24 that. One more follow-up.

25 CHAIRMAN SAINÉ: You're recognized for

1 follow-up.

2 REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: Thank you.

3 And I guess there are similar concerns
4 about the Forsyth County draw in the Mattingly
5 analysis shows that it would reliably elect a
6 Republican in an analysis analyzing statewide
7 results in a district that should vary between
8 close and strongly favoring a Democrat. So
9 we're probably going to respectfully agree to
10 disagree on that as well.

11 But I did want to raise that since they
12 are both close to home. And I'll just hold off.
13 I may have more questions. Thank you. And I
14 appreciate your work on this, Representative
15 Hall.

16 CHAIRMAN HALL: Thank you,
17 Representative Harrison. And for the court
18 reporter later on, that was myself,
19 Representative Destin Hall, and Representative
20 Pricey Harrison on that exchange. And I didn't
21 follow my own directions, so I apologize for
22 that.

23 CHAIRMAN SAINE: Thank you,
24 Mr. Chairman.

25 Questions for Representative --

1 Representative Hawkins, you're recognized.

2 Please state your name.

3 REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: Glad to
4 reintroduce myself. That's for you,
5 Representative Saine. I'm pretty sure you got
6 that reference.

7 CHAIRMAN SAINÉ: Thank you, sir.

8 REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: Representative
9 Zack Hawkins, Durham County. And here we are,
10 again, talking about maps that have gone through
11 litigation and hopefully will not have to be
12 done multiple times in a decade. So that's why,
13 you know, my questions -- that's sort of where
14 my questions will lead us to, hopefully.

15 So the first question that I have is
16 you, in your opening statement, Mr. Chairman,
17 you said where we could work with Representative
18 Reives. Could you elaborate on sort of that?
19 Give me a little more explanation to where that
20 went, like where we could. Like what -- what
21 was the tipping point for you in not being able
22 to work with such a fine gentleman such as
23 Representative Reives?

24 CHAIRMAN SAINÉ: Representative Hall,
25 you're recognized.

1 CHAIRMAN HALL: Representative Destin
2 Hall. You know, certainly I always enjoy
3 working with Representative Reives and you as
4 well, Representative Hawkins. You know, what we
5 did, we looked at what the Court said and they
6 told us statewide here are the metrics that you
7 have to meet. And so we felt like we drew a map
8 that met those metrics. And we didn't feel like
9 the Court told us we needed to go extreme one
10 way or the other within those body of metrics.
11 And so in my opinion, we are in a safe harbor
12 within those metrics of constitutionality,
13 considering, of course, all of the other factors
14 that we have to consider like compactness, for
15 example.

16 REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: Follow-up?

17 CHAIRMAN SAINÉ: You're recognized for
18 follow-up.

19 REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: Representative
20 Zack Hawkins. And one of the things that you --
21 that we -- you also mentioned was the fact that
22 Governor Cooper and President Trump I think
23 split 63/62 based on your analysis. Do you --
24 those are pretty high watermarks, because people
25 pay attention to the top of the ticket. I think

1 we all understand electoral politics and voter
2 sort of reaction and response to those offices.

3 what about the remainder of our
4 statewide candidates? Do we know how they
5 performed? I think that's also equally
6 important and probably pretty -- probably more
7 accurate for voter -- you know, voter
8 appetite/voter activity.

9 CHAIRMAN HALL: We do have that and
10 I --

11 CHAIRMAN SAINES: Chairman Hall, you're
12 recognized.

13 CHAIRMAN HALL: Thank you,
14 Mr. Chairman. Again, Representative Destin
15 Hall.

16 We have that. I don't know that it's
17 been passed out. I don't have the packet that
18 was passed out to Committee members, but we took
19 the ensemble of different elections. There were
20 12 statewide races that were considered and we
21 do have that. That was loaded into the computer
22 terminals. Of course, the Democrats had -- had
23 one, we have one. All that was loaded in there.
24 So, yes, we do have it. We can certainly get it
25 to you.

1 CHAIRMAN SAINÉ: Representative
2 Hawkins.

3 REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: Follow up.

4 CHAIRMAN SAINÉ: I'm sorry,
5 Representative Szoka.

6 REPRESENTATIVE SZOKA: (Unintelligible)
7 it's the packet that you passed out.

8 CHAIRMAN SAINÉ: Representative John
9 Szoka saying that it is in the packet.
10 Representative Hawkins, you're recognized.

11 REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: Yeah. And
12 so -- and so I guess one of the things with the
13 packets being multiple here, we took a little
14 time to sort of, you know, scan through these,
15 but -- and I'll come back to that question. But
16 I think that's relevant to, you know, our
17 discussion, right, related to how they decided
18 to lean. And I'm pretty sure that none of them
19 sort of met the mark of Cooper and -- and maybe,
20 you know -- maybe just looking at a few of them
21 could be more helpful in guiding our discussion.
22 So I'll go on and I'll come back to that and
23 I'll take Representative Szoka's suggestion of
24 looking at that in a -- in the sort of pile of
25 packets that we did get.

1 Follow up, Mr. --

2 CHAIRMAN SAINÉ: Representative Zack
3 Hawkins recognized for follow-up.

4 REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: Representative
5 Zack Hawkins. So one of the things that in
6 Cabarrus, I want to ask about what the breakdown
7 of Cabarrus and New Hanover competitiveness
8 looks like.

9 CHAIRMAN SAINÉ: Representative Hall.

10 CHAIRMAN HALL: Representative Destin
11 Hall. So in terms of competitiveness, here
12 where we're at -- and I'm looking at the map I
13 have of just Cabarrus County. I know that this
14 goes into other groupings. It looks like the
15 composite for all of those races in District 82,
16 which is the competitive district, was 52.08
17 percent Republican and 46.62 Democratic.

18 REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: Okay. And
19 let me follow up.

20 CHAIRMAN SAINÉ: Representative Zack
21 Hawkins.

22 REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: Does your sort
23 of meaning of competitive change from district
24 to district or is that -- does that remain
25 consistent across what we determine as

1 competitive districts?

2 CHAIRMAN SAINÉ: Representative Hall.

3 REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: What's the
4 sort of range in the median of what the spread
5 is across, a quote-unquote, competitive
6 district?

7 CHAIRMAN SAINÉ: I apologize,
8 Representative Hawkins.

9 Representative Hall.

10 CHAIRMAN HALL: Representative Destin
11 Hall. I think it's in the eye of the beholder
12 of what a competitive district is, but it's more
13 so than that. It depends on a given election.
14 Certainly, you know, 52 percent, 46 percent
15 composite is a -- is a district that either side
16 could win in any given year. And in a good
17 Democrat year, they could win; in a good
18 Republican year, they would probably win.

19 CHAIRMAN SAINÉ: Representative
20 Hawkins, recognized for follow-up.

21 REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: Representative
22 Zack Hawkins, Durham County. So one of the
23 districts, of course, that I think my colleague
24 Representative Harrison may have alluded to it,
25 but it's looking at sort of the analysis,

1 especially, you know, racially polarized
2 analysis of wayne County specifically. And so
3 in your mind, in this particular district, do
4 you think that there is equal opportunity for an
5 African American for -- well, specifically for
6 black voters to elect someone of their choice in
7 that district? Sort of the composite of that
8 district in a partisanship -- partisanship or
9 in -- from a racial perspective, do you think it
10 at least meets the criteria to even be eligible
11 for black voters to have the choice of their
12 candidate?

13 CHAIRMAN SAINÉ: Representative Destin
14 Hall recognized.

15 CHAIRMAN HALL: Thank you,
16 Mr. Chairman.

17 Representative Hawkins, as I said
18 earlier, my reading of the plaintiffs' expert is
19 that there are no VRA districts in
20 North Carolina because there is no legally
21 significant racially polarized voting. So I
22 think in that particular district we can't draw
23 a district to meet those requirements that you
24 may be talking about unless we first have the
25 evidence of racially polarized voting. It would

1 not be permissible for us to do that. And so I
2 do think that this district is legal and would
3 meet any legal standard.

4 REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: Okay. Next
5 question was --

6 CHAIRMAN SAINÉ: Representative
7 Hawkins, you're recognized for follow-up.

8 REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: Yep, thank
9 you.

10 CHAIRMAN SAINÉ: This is follow-up.

11 REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: Representative
12 Zack Hawkins, Durham County. Thank you for the
13 follow-up. And then last and then I'll yield to
14 other colleagues who may have questions around
15 the competitiveness in Cumberland County, what
16 the breakdown of that competitive district is in
17 Cumberland County.

18 CHAIRMAN SAINÉ: Representative Hall.

19 CHAIRMAN HALL: Representative Destin
20 Hall. So, again, that is three Democratic
21 districts. And one district is essentially a
22 toss-up. The composite -- and again, I think
23 all this is in that packet, but we can certainly
24 get it for members if it's not. So the one
25 toss-up district is a 50.06 Republican; 48.81

1 Democrat composite.

2 REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: And then last
3 question.

4 CHAIRMAN SAINÉ: Representative
5 Hawkins, you're recognized.

6 REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: Representative
7 Zack Hawkins, Durham County. And, you know, and
8 so as we are looking through Durham County
9 specifically -- I'm familiar with that area --
10 could you walk us through how the -- you or
11 whomever assisted in drawing that area sort of
12 decided on -- on the district outline.

13 CHAIRMAN SAINÉ: Representative Hall.

14 CHAIRMAN HALL: Representative Destin
15 Hall. Representative Hawkins, I'll tell, you
16 know, under the time crunch we had this time, I
17 had representative Sainé, Representative
18 Stevens, and other members come in and help me.
19 And I don't believe that I was the person who
20 actually drew that. But I can tell you
21 generally, you know, in looking at those
22 standards that the Court gave us, we knew that
23 this had to be a Democratic district at the end
24 of the day. And so we drew it a clear
25 Democratic district. And I can say in your

1 district you're probably going to do really well
2 this election.

3 CHAIRMAN SAINÉ: Representative
4 Hawkins.

5 REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: I will likely
6 do well in any district. But I think the
7 follow-up for me is one of the things that's
8 pretty important, and I think we argued this.
9 It was argued through the trial, but then also
10 argued in -- you know, when we were doing the
11 redistricting, is that communities of interest
12 are very, very important for all areas.

13 And so even though in a partisanship
14 perspective, I think this district is -- right,
15 it will lean a certain way from, you know,
16 Democrat. But I think making sure that people
17 have the opportunity to -- again, you know,
18 someone like Representative Sainé, of course,
19 they know who to go to for all the things that
20 are happening in their community, right?

21 And so I think just as we're thinking
22 through this. And of course, there are other
23 examples. Again, I'm going to yield for other
24 colleagues, but that is just an example and one
25 that you don't have control from a partisan

1 perspective where the issues of community
2 interest are not held intact.

3 So with that I'll pass along to someone
4 else. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

5 CHAIRMAN SAINÉ: Thank you,
6 Representative Hawkins.

7 Other members of the Committee seeking
8 recognition now. Representative Harrison.
9 Representative Cooper next.

10 REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: Thank you.
11 Pricey Harrison again.

12 And I wanted to follow up on a line of
13 questioning that Representative Hawkins raised,
14 because I'm reviewing while we're talking. So
15 we all received this letter from the Souther
16 Coalition of Social Justice. It was dated
17 February 15, 2022, yesterday.

18 And I haven't had a chance to give it
19 the debrief that I need to give it, but I was
20 comparing it to the requirement in the Supreme
21 Court order that's on page 8 about the
22 General Assembly must first assess whether using
23 current election and population data racially
24 polarized voting is legally sufficient in any
25 area of the state, such as Section 2 of the

1 Voting Rights Act requires the drawing of a
2 district to avoid diluting and -- the voting
3 right -- the voting strength of African American
4 voters.

5 And I -- it sounds like from SCSJ
6 letter that they indicate that this -- that
7 House District 10 satisfies Gingles criteria.
8 The report that you-all distributed is the
9 report that's dated December 28th during the
10 court -- the trial court proceeding. And I
11 guess I'm kind of confused if we are actually
12 complying with the Supreme Court order in that
13 regard since it looks like the SCSJ analysis
14 indicates that we do meet -- that the district
15 does satisfy the Gingles criteria and that a
16 racially polarized voting analysis should have
17 been done. And I guess I'm confused about how
18 that plays out.

19 CHAIRMAN SAINÉ: Representative Hall.

20 CHAIRMAN HALL: Representative Destin
21 Hall. To answer the first question, the
22 analysis is -- we've used the plaintiffs'
23 analysis in the case to show that there is no
24 legally significant racially polarized voting
25 that would require a VRA district.

1 But I would say as to the SCSJ -- I
2 think I've got that acronym right -- the SCSJ
3 letter that the Lady references, I have not had
4 time to study their submission in detail.
5 Obviously, others who are involved -- the
6 lawyers involved in the case have had some time
7 to do that. And I'll tell you, my reading of
8 it, my understanding -- again, not haven't -- I
9 candidly have not read the letter that you
10 reference, but I know the gist of it.

11 We do know that the majority-minority
12 districts they proposed in that letter, they're
13 not based upon compact minority population.
14 They closely resemble those 2011 racially
15 gerrymandered districts that were declared
16 illegal by the federal courts. So that's the
17 first problem.

18 The other one is the -- is that in
19 that -- in that letter, SCSJ, it's my
20 understanding that they used gerrymandered
21 majority-minority districts to attempt to
22 justify using race to draw what are called
23 crossover districts and which is prohibited by
24 the Bartlett SCOTUS, Supreme Court United
25 States, decision.

1 CHAIRMAN SAINÉ: Representative
2 Harrison, you're recognized for follow-up.

3 REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: Follow-up.
4 Pricey Harrison still.

5 So I mean, I guess the map -- the
6 letter that they've sent us includes a map of a
7 district that they felt complied with the
8 Supreme Court --

9 CHAIRMAN SAINÉ: Representative
10 Harrison, excuse me one second.

11 Representative Hawkins, your microphone
12 is still on. Thank you very much, sir.

13 I apologize, Representative Harrison.

14 REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: Oh, sure. So
15 it seems like the letter that they -- that they
16 distributed to us contains the proposed district
17 that seems to comply with the Supreme Court
18 order and meets the Gingles criteria and
19 satisfies that. I guess we're just going to
20 agree to disagree that there's no racially
21 polarized voting. All right. Thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN SAINÉ: Thank you.

23 Representative Cooper-Suggs.

24 REPRESENTATIVE COOPER-SUGGS: Linda
25 Cooper-Suggs, Wilson County. I just want to

1 follow up in regard to the racially polarized
2 discussion that we're having. And we know that
3 in the beginning we had asked for a racial
4 polarized analysis. So I just want to make sure
5 that I'm hearing you say that based on the
6 Court's ruling, because the Court just told
7 us -- instructed us to do this, did we do that?
8 Has that been done? And if so, where is it? Or
9 did you use some other resource? Is that what
10 I'm hearing?

11 CHAIRMAN SAINÉ: Representative Hall.

12 CHAIRMAN HALL: Yeah, Representative
13 Destin Hall. The report that you have in front
14 of you, that is the study that was completed.
15 Again, we're using the plaintiffs' expert in
16 that case, and we feel like that is really the
17 best evidence that we can possibly use.

18 Again, the plaintiffs are the folks who
19 are suing us and saying that our maps are
20 unconstitutional for a number of reasons. We're
21 using that expert report in terms of racially
22 polarized voting study because that really takes
23 away an argument that we have somehow made a
24 study that's more favorable to us than -- than
25 the facts would allow.

1 CHAIRMAN SAINÉ: Before I recognize you
2 for a follow-up, Representative Brockman, I see
3 you on the WebEx and we'll come to you next.

4 Representative Cooper-Suggs, you're
5 recognized for a follow-up.

6 REPRESENTATIVE COOPER-SUGGS: Linda
7 Cooper-Suggs. I guess my follow-up is in
8 regards to when the Court mandated, when they
9 sent their ruling and telling us to do this, to
10 do the racial polarized analysis, but yet still
11 we use the research from another person, from
12 the plaintiffs, then have we really complied
13 with what the Courts have asked us to do from a
14 legislative standpoint?

15 CHAIRMAN SAINÉ: Representative Hall.

16 REPRESENTATIVE COOPER-SUGGS: Thank
17 you.

18 CHAIRMAN HALL: Representative Destin
19 Hall. The short answer is yes. I believe, you
20 know, we've taken, again, the plaintiffs' own
21 report on this issue, and that's what we're
22 using to make our decision about drawing maps.

23 My understanding is, is that the
24 lawyers will also be submitting some other study
25 to the Court later on. But what -- we are using

1 the plaintiffs' expert to make the decision
2 about not drawing VRA districts.

3 CHAIRMAN SAINÉ: Thank you very much.

4 Representative Cecil Brockman on WebEx,
5 you're recognized.

6 REPRESENTATIVE BROCKMAN:

7 Representative Cecil Brockman. Thank you,
8 Mr. Chair.

9 I just want to take you back to
10 Guilford County. I see what -- Guilford County,
11 you have Jamestown, the town of Jamestown broken
12 up into two districts. As the current
13 representative of Jamestown, all of Jamestown
14 right now, can you talk to me a little bit about
15 how that decision was made and if you think it's
16 possible to keep Jamestown whole, as a community
17 of interest.

18 CHAIRMAN SAINÉ: Representative Hall,
19 you're recognized.

20 CHAIRMAN HALL: Representative Destin
21 Hall. Give me one minute. Let me pull my
22 Forsyth map.

23 MR. BROCKMAN: It's Guilford County.

24 CHAIRMAN SAINÉ: Thank you,
25 Representative Brockman.

1 The gentleman mentioned Forsyth. I
2 think it's on the same page as Guilford, so...
3 I'm not sure what you can see on webEx, but he's
4 looking for that right now.

5 CHAIRMAN HALL: Yeah, Representative
6 Destin Hall. Again, I don't have the packet in
7 front of me, but my understanding is the part of
8 Jamestown that's split has no population in it.

9 CHAIRMAN SAINE: Representative
10 Brockman, were you able to hear that answer?

11 REPRESENTATIVE BROCKMAN: I did. Thank
12 you.

13 CHAIRMAN SAINE: Thank you, sir.

14 Other members of the Committee wishing
15 recognition.

16 Representative Hawkins, was that a --
17 and then Representative Harrison.

18 REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: Representative
19 Zack Hawkins, Durham County. So I want to go
20 back to the -- I got a chance to research just a
21 little bit with sort of who was able to win
22 statewide with the congressional districts. And
23 so would you -- can we talk about that at this
24 time, Mr. Chairman?

25 CHAIRMAN SAINE: Representative Hall.

1 REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: I believe --
2 so I don't know if you got a chance to look at
3 it. So we -- if you're looking at -- I think,
4 believe, it's 47, 47 Democratic seats for Yvonne
5 Holley, who was a candidate for Lieutenant
6 Governor, and 55 for Jessica Holmes, who ran for
7 Secretary of Labor. And so I -- you know, so
8 given sort of those -- and I just want to make
9 sure I'm -- anyone can help me verify these
10 numbers, because I just sort of glanced because
11 I wanted to get back to this discussion as soon
12 as we could.

13 With that portion of it, are we
14 still -- are we still confident that we've not
15 only sort of done what the Courts have asked us
16 to do but also are drawing maps in good faith
17 and from a racial perspective and from a
18 partisan perspective, given the numbers that
19 Yvonne Holley won 47 compared to, you know, Roy
20 Cooper for all intents and purposes, who has
21 been on the ballot since the year 2000. And so
22 I don't know if he is an accurate description
23 nor a presidential candidate that had over a
24 hundred million dollars spent.

25 Does that make sense? So I think more

1 accurate is to look at the 47 and the 55 versus
2 those high watermarks that you gave. And so I
3 want to make sure that given that data -- and
4 we're, you know, sort of out in the open about
5 that now -- if we really think that we're moving
6 in the right direction.

7 CHAIRMAN SAINÉ: Representative Destin
8 Hall.

9 CHAIRMAN HALL: Thank you,
10 Mr. Chairman.

11 Representative Destin Hall, and I
12 appreciate the gentleman's question. And the
13 answer is, yes, I do think we're complying with
14 the Court's order because they gave us the
15 metrics, and we're using those metrics. You
16 know, efficiency gap sort of is what it is,
17 whether, you know, you look at those particular
18 races or not.

19 And mean-median, again, another study
20 that I -- again, Mr. Chair, may want to -- if
21 staff may want to be recognized to describe that
22 if they possibly can. But I think that those
23 two -- those two measurements, as outlined by
24 the Supreme Court, solve that issue and we are
25 within the safe harbor that they gave in the

1 case.

2 CHAIRMAN SAINÉ: Thank you,
3 Representative Hall.

4 Any member of staff like to attempt to
5 answer that question.

6 CHAIRMAN HALL: And, Mr. Chairman,
7 while we wait, I think if staff just could
8 confirm that with mean-median, that it's not
9 really a factor in terms of those individual
10 races that are across. I think it's a statewide
11 average in terms of total votes, I think. So it
12 doesn't really look at race by race each
13 campaign, the way we're talking about right now.

14 But we're all learning this at the same
15 time, Representative Hawkins. So --

16 MS. CHURCHILL: Mr. Chair, I'm going to
17 try that one.

18 CHAIRMAN SAINÉ: Okay.

19 MS. CHURCHILL: This is Erika
20 Churchill. And so with the Maptitude reports
21 for mean-median, they can be run race by race;
22 however, we at central staff have not run those
23 on any of the plans before the committee today.

24 REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: Follow-up,
25 Mr. Chairman?

1 CHAIRMAN SAINÉ: Representative
2 Hawkins, you're recognized for follow-up.

3 REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: Thank you for
4 that clarification. And I would say that it
5 will be important to me, as a member of the
6 committee and someone who, of course, has
7 invested, just like all of us, the time and the
8 will to get these maps right for the people of
9 North Carolina, because just because the data
10 isn't available doesn't mean someone doesn't
11 know that data and is able to use that data.

12 Because it's easy to throw out that 63,
13 you know, votes were won by Cooper. Again, he's
14 been on the ballot since the year 2000. The
15 voters of North Carolina know that particular
16 person, regardless of is it's a partisanship.
17 So I think -- just because we know that that
18 number is the case, were we working from that
19 number or were we knowing -- do we know that,
20 again, these other candidates didn't do as well,
21 and what we're using, sort of Trump and Cooper
22 as exemplars, right, knowing that that's not
23 sort of the real level of voter activity, nor is
24 it really sort of based on, you know, the true
25 election status, right, or what we potentially

1 could look forward to in '22 and '24.

2 So anyway, I just want to make sure
3 that I ask that particular question that, are we
4 working off of the fact that we knew that Cooper
5 win -- won 63, or are you working off other data
6 just like I gave you, knowing that, again, you
7 know, those two races are exemplars and not the
8 norm.

9 CHAIRMAN SAINÉ: Representative Hall.

10 CHAIRMAN HALL: Representative Destin
11 Hall. And I think I understand the gentleman's
12 question, you know, and my answer to it is, you
13 know, we -- obviously both sides in this thing
14 have experts who will look at and calculate that
15 kind of measurement that the Supreme Court has
16 given us. And our maps have been sent to an
17 expert to tell us whether we meet mean-median,
18 whether we meet efficiency gap. And I'm told
19 that we do meet both of those thresholds.

20 My understanding of both of those is it
21 would not be affected by the analysis that the
22 gentleman is putting forth. And I understand
23 that, you know, while Roy Cooper may have done
24 very well, another Democratic candidate down the
25 ballot maybe did not do so well. But, you know,

1 I think that's why that efficiency gap,
2 mean-median sort of accounts for those
3 discrepancies in the data as you run down the
4 list.

5 But the other thing that I'll say is
6 that I think this has been the crux of a lot of
7 partisan gerrymandering cases across the
8 country, as I understand it, is the argument
9 that, well, you know, people vote for one party
10 for president and they just go down the ballot
11 these days. That's been, you know, one of
12 the -- one of the main contentions is that you
13 can predict all these races because whoever you
14 vote for for president, you're going to vote for
15 that same party for down ballot races.

16 Now, whether we agree or disagree with
17 that analysis, that's been largely the argument,
18 is that that's why, you know, Courts say they
19 have to get involved because we can predict, you
20 know, so well what's going to happen in the
21 future. I happen to disagree with that because
22 I know, you know, back in the last -- or the
23 decade of the 2010 election, Democrats had drawn
24 that map and Republicans won on it. And so we
25 know that over time elections change. So that's

1 a long way of saying I think the mean-median and
2 efficiency gap do deal with what you're talking
3 about.

4 CHAIRMAN SAINÉ: Representative
5 Hawkins, you're recognized for a follow-up.

6 REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: Last
7 follow-up. And it's just worth noting that in
8 order for Republicans to win on maps in 2010,
9 they had to be fair maps. So I'll just -- I'll
10 leave that last little piece for you there.

11 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

12 CHAIRMAN SAINÉ: Representative
13 Harrison, I had you next.

14 REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: Thank you,
15 Chair Saine and Chair Hall. I apologize.
16 Pricey Harrison still from Guilford County.

17 I apologize for the barrage of
18 questions today. I know y'all have worked
19 really hard, and the Court has given us a very
20 truncated schedule, so there hasn't been a lot
21 of time.

22 But I will just repeat that I think
23 that it's really important before we vote on
24 these maps that we all have sufficient time to
25 analyze, because I'm still trying to understand

1 the import of these maps that we got this
2 morning.

3 And I have heard some concerns about
4 some of these drawings, if I could ask you
5 specifically about them. One is House District
6 83. It seems that -- I'll try to pull up my
7 questions. It seems like the Kannapolis --
8 Kannapolis is split more than in the previous
9 map.

10 CHAIRMAN SAINÉ: Representative Hall,
11 you're recognized.

12 CHAIRMAN HALL: Representative Destin
13 Hall here. I don't have in front of me, you
14 know, what's more or less. I can just go -- I
15 can go off what the Supreme Court told us, and
16 that is try to make this map better, look at
17 these factors. I can tell you the map as a
18 whole is more compact than the enacted map.

19 REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: I appreciate
20 that, and I don't want to --

21 CHAIRMAN SAINÉ: Representative
22 Harrison, you're recognized.

23 REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: Thank you,
24 Chair Saine.

25 I don't want to belabor the point, and

1 we've got session in an hour. As I said, I hope
2 we have some more time to look at this map
3 before we vote it. It seems like the
4 Onslow-Pender County grouping -- and this was a
5 concern with the first set of maps -- still
6 splits the most Democratic precincts with higher
7 black populations in Jacksonville in the eastern
8 part of the city. That was in -- I believe that
9 was also in the previous map.

10 And it looks like in District 53,
11 Harnett-Johnston county line seems to be shaped
12 kind of oddly and changed quite a bit from the
13 previous version. Do you have any recollection
14 of what happened there?

15 CHAIRMAN HALL: Yeah, again, just an
16 effort to make the more -- the map more compact.

17 CHAIRMAN SAINES: And that was
18 Representative Hall, for the record.

19 Representative Harrison --

20 REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: I think --

21 CHAIRMAN SAINES: -- you're recognized
22 for follow-up.

23 REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: I do think
24 this is the last follow-up. Pricey Harrison.

25 So I appreciate these improvements to

1 the previously enacted map that was found to be
2 an extreme partisan gerrymander. I think
3 there's still a better way to do this. I think
4 that the House District 10, I think that it's
5 clear based on the information that the SCSJ
6 lawyer sent us that we need to draw a district
7 that has enough Black voting age population to
8 allow equal opportunity to avoid vote dilution.

9 And I guess I should just make one
10 other point because you have mentioned several
11 times the plaintiffs' own experts, and I assume
12 you're talking about the Mattingly report. And
13 just so folks know, we do not have that in front
14 of us. We do have the Lewis report, but we do
15 not have the Mattingly report.

16 CHAIRMAN HALL: Mr. Chairman, if I may
17 too --

18 CHAIRMAN SAINES: Representative Hall,
19 you're recognized.

20 CHAIRMAN HALL: I want to clarify one
21 thing I said. What we passed out, what we're
22 looking at is the Dr. Lewis report, which is not
23 the plaintiffs' expert, and I apologize for my
24 misstatement earlier.

25 And I will say because the last time we

1 were in here and we were getting amendments, you
2 know, sort of at the end, and I, you know, said
3 that was sort of frustrating, and I am
4 frustrated with this process this time around
5 that we have so little time, and I wish we had
6 more time for everyone to look at these maps.
7 And if you'll remember, we did try to delay the
8 primary further knowing it looked like we were
9 going to have to redraw with the hope of -- and
10 nobody wanted to delay the primary. But, I
11 mean, it was one of those things that if we
12 needed to have more time to redraw, we were
13 going to have to delay the primary.

14 And we all know, you know, what a long
15 process this is in this committee. And you
16 think, well, you know, if you've got two weeks,
17 you ought to do it. As the lady knows, two
18 weeks in -- on the redistricting committee is
19 really, is really no time. And so we're having
20 to sort of throw things together as best we can.
21 But with that said, I can tell you, we have
22 spent a ton of time drawing this map, to try to
23 meet the Court's requirement. We met with
24 Leader Reives quite a bit, the Speaker and
25 myself, and tried to do what we could in the

1 Court's truncated timeline with, you know,
2 really an unprecedented decision in
3 North Carolina, and trying to really understand
4 what the metrics mean that they're trying to
5 give us.

6 And so I will say I wish we had more
7 time to look at it. But as the lady knows,
8 we've got to submit these maps before Friday and
9 try to do all we can to meet that deadline. So
10 I appreciate the lady's patience.

11 CHAIRMAN SAINÉ: Any other members
12 wishing recognition?

13 The chair sees none and none on WebEx.
14 Representative Hawkins.

15 REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: Representative
16 Zack Hawkins, Durham County. I did want to
17 follow up with the staff request that I made
18 earlier about when I potentially could receive
19 that information. Is it possible to do that
20 before session, because I'm assuming we're
21 supposed to still go in at 2:00 p.m.

22 CHAIRMAN SAINÉ: And Mr. Chairman.

23 CHAIRMAN HALL: Representative Destin
24 Hall. I will make sure that you get that
25 information before we go into session. My guess

1 is we're probably going to be delayed a little
2 bit on the session. We don't want to -- I don't
3 know that the staff has time to get this bill
4 out of here and get to session by 2:00.

5 The other thing I'll say is keep in
6 mind that we did a composite number of all of
7 those elections. So numbers I was reading you
8 earlier, those were composites of those 12
9 elections. So they sort of take -- took into
10 account both, you know, Roy Cooper's election
11 and, you know, somebody way down the ballot --
12 or not -- I shouldn't say way down. In another
13 race who may have been Democrat who didn't do as
14 well, those were composite scores. So it tries
15 to deal with that data that may not always line
16 up between members of the same party.

17 So, I mean, we'll make sure that you
18 get that. And I'll work with staff and work
19 with you to make sure I understand exactly what
20 you want. We'll get it.

21 REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: Yeah. I'd
22 like to follow up.

23 CHAIRMAN SAINÉ: Represent Hawkins for
24 follow-up.

25 REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: And the sort

1 of the trend that I'm looking at just in sort
2 of, you know, pulling together the back of the
3 napkin is that especially for statewide minority
4 candidates of color that ran, they did not do
5 well in the outlying map, and so they're
6 underperforming. Whereas, again, you took the
7 composite that looks like 63, but when you
8 disaggregate that, it -- you know, potentially
9 -- and, again, we'll find out when she sends the
10 data -- that statewide candidates of color did
11 not do well in these individual maps. And so,
12 again, I'd love to talk to you about it further,
13 but I wanted to make sure we had all that data.
14 Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN SAINÉ: Any other members of
16 the committee seeking recognition? The Chair
17 sees none. I'm sorry, Representative Stevens.

18 REPRESENTATIVE STEVENS: For a motion.

19 CHAIRMAN SAINÉ: You're recognized for
20 a motion.

21 REPRESENTATIVE STEVENS: Move for
22 favorable report to House Bill 77, and back to
23 the floor.

24 CHAIRMAN SAINÉ: Okay. You heard
25 the motion. All those in favor will signify

1 by saying aye.

2 COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.

3 CHAIRMAN SAINÉ: Those opposed.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBERS: No.

5 REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: Can I have
6 division?

7 CHAIRMAN SAINÉ: Division has been
8 called.

9 CHAIRMAN HALL: Mr. Chairman, if you
10 will do a roll call vote with the clerk.

11 CHAIRMAN SAINÉ: The Chair will honor
12 that, and the clerk will call the roll.

13 THE CLERK: Representative Adams?

14 REPRESENTATIVE ADAMS: Aye.

15 THE CLERK: Representative Adams, Aye.
16 Representative Brockman?

17 REPRESENTATIVE BROCKMAN: No.

18 THE CLERK: Representative Brockman,
19 no.

20 Representative Carney?

21 REPRESENTATIVE CARNEY: No.

22 THE CLERK: Representative Carney, no.
23 Representative Cooper-Suggs?

24 REPRESENTATIVE COOPER-SUGGS: No.

25 THE CLERK: Representative

1 Cooper-Suggs, no.

2 Representative Dixon?

3 REPRESENTATIVE DIXON: Yes.

4 THE CLERK: Representative Dixon, yes.

5 Representative Hardister?

6 REPRESENTATIVE HARDISTER: Aye.

7 THE CLERK: Representative Hardister,

8 aye.

9 Representative Harrison?

10 REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: No.

11 THE CLERK: Representative Harrison,

12 no.

13 Representative Hawkins?

14 REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: No.

15 THE CLERK: Representative Hawkins, no.

16 Representative Brenden Jones?

17 REPRESENTATIVE JONES: Aye.

18 THE CLERK: Representative Brenden

19 Jones, aye.

20 Representative Mills?

21 REPRESENTATIVE MILLS: Aye.

22 THE CLERK: Representative Mills, aye.

23 Representative Reives?

24 REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: No.

25 THE CLERK: Representative Reives, no.

1 Representative Rogers?

2 CHAIRMAN SAINÉ: Representative Rogers
3 is on WebEx and -- Representative Rogers.

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Mr. Chair, he
5 did a thumbs up.

6 CHAIRMAN SAINÉ: Representative Rogers,
7 the Chair did not see that. If you intend to
8 vote in favor, you can use a thumbs up/thumbs
9 down and the Chair can reasonably discern what
10 you mean. Or you can turn on your microphone.

11 I see a thumbs up. Other members of
12 the Committee can verify that as well as an aye.

13 THE CLERK: Representative Rogers, aye.
14 Representative Szoka?

15 REPRESENTATIVE SZOKA: Aye.

16 THE CLERK: Representative Szoka, aye.
17 Representative Warren?

18 REPRESENTATIVE WARREN: Aye.

19 THE CLERK: Representative Warren, aye.
20 Representative Zachary?

21 CHAIRMAN SAINÉ: The Chair does not see
22 Representative Zachary in the room.

23 THE CLERK: Okay. Representative
24 Stevens?

25 REPRESENTATIVE STEVENS: Aye.

1 THE CLERK: Representative Stevens,
2 aye.

3 Representative Bell?
4 Representative Richardson?

5 REPRESENTATIVE RICHARDSON: No.

6 THE CLERK: Representative Richardson,
7 no.

8 Representative Saine?

9 CHAIRMAN SAINE: Aye.

10 THE CLERK: Representative Saine, aye.
11 Representative Torbett?

12 REPRESENTATIVE TORBETT: Aye.

13 THE CLERK: Representative Torbett,
14 aye.

15 Representative Destin Hall?

16 CHAIRMAN HALL: Aye.

17 THE CLERK: Representative Destin Hall,
18 aye.

19 CHAIRMAN SAINE: The clerk is
20 tabulating the vote, and we'll give you that
21 count shortly.

22 By a vote of 12 to 7, the motion does
23 pass. And we stand adjourned. Thank you.

24 (House Redistricting Committee was
25 adjourned.)

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

COUNTY OF BURKE

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, TAURA J. VULCANO, RPR, do hereby
certify that the transcription of the recorded
House Redistricting Committee, held on February
16, 2022, was taken down by me stenographically
to the best of my ability and thereafter
transcribed under my supervision; and that the
foregoing pages, inclusive, constitute a true
and accurate transcription of said recording.

Signed this the 18th day of February
2022.



TAURA J. VULCANO, RPR

NORTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE REDISTRICTING COMMITTEE

FEBRUARY 17, 2022

Transcribed by:

Denise Myers Byrd, CSR 8340, RPR
Discovery Court Reporters and
Legal Videographers, LLC
4208 Six Forks Road
Suite 1000
Raleigh, North Carolina 27609
(919) 424-8242
denise@discoverydepo.com

1 CHAIRMAN HALL: ... state Senate map
2 and the congressional map before the committee
3 today. The chair is going to begin with the
4 state Senate map, and the chair will give the
5 Senate chair or chairs a minute to get up there
6 and get ready.

7 We'll start with the state Senate map.
8 And the chair will remind members or tell
9 members, if you were not there this morning, the
10 chair presented the state House map in the
11 Senate Redistricting Committee and there was
12 essentially no debate, and so we -- they did
13 defer to the map that we passed out, and so the
14 chair would obviously recognize any member who
15 wants to speak or ask questions, but ask members
16 to remember that the Senate deferred to us
17 today.

18 Senator Newton, the gentleman is
19 recognized.

20 SENATOR NEWTON: Thank you,
21 Mr. Chairman.

22 Thank you, Members, thank you for
23 having us here. I just wanted to say with
24 regard to the Senate map, we worked very hard to
25 ensure that our map complied with the majority

1 opinion in the Supreme Court. We believe we
2 have done that, and I just ask you to support
3 this so we can go on and take this to the next
4 step. Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN HALL: Is there any discussion
6 or debate?

7 Representative Hawkins.

8 REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: Zack Hawkins,
9 Durham county.

10 I just have a few questions. And
11 again, thank you for your work and for the
12 opportunity to ask you questions.

13 First question is how many of the
14 districts have a composite score of 50 percent
15 or more -- or higher in the districts that
16 you've outlined?

17 SENATOR NEWTON: I'm not sure,
18 Representative. I don't have that data in front
19 of me.

20 REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: Maybe we can
21 defer --

22 CHAIRMAN HALL: Representative Hawkins,
23 the chair is going to recognize staff. I think
24 they've got that question.

25 And, Representative Hawkins, remember

1 to put -- to state his name before he spoke.
2 And so the chair will remind folks to continue
3 to follow that example and state your name
4 before you speak.

5 Staff, you're recognized.

6 ERIKA CHURCHILL: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
7 This is Erika Churchill from legislative
8 analysis. And, Representative Hawkins, looking
9 at the election contest report, the 2016, 2020
10 composite, which is contained in the stat pack
11 at your desk. For the -- I believe this is the
12 congressional plan.

13 District 1 is at 53.94 percent
14 Democrat. District 2 is at 63.30 percent
15 Democrat. District 4 is at 66.17 percent
16 Democrat. And District 12 is at 66.10 percent
17 Democrat.

18 SENATOR NEWTON: Excuse me, Mr. Chair.

19 CHAIRMAN HALL: Senator Newton, the
20 gentleman is recognized.

21 SENATOR NEWTON: I apologize for
22 interrupting Ms. Churchill there, but those are
23 the congressional numbers.

24 ERIKA CHURCHILL: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
25 I just realized that.

1 CHAIRMAN HALL: ... recognized to speak
2 to the Senate map.

3 ERIKA CHURCHILL: I apologize for that.

4 Now, on Senate Bill 744, the Senate
5 map, District 3 percent Democrat is 52.21.
6 District 5 percent Democrat is 56.66.
7 District 11 percent Democrat is 50.57.
8 District 13 percent Democrat is 62.09.
9 District 14 percent Democrat is 70.51.
10 District 15 percent Democrat is 65.86.
11 District 16 percent Democrat is 63.76.
12 District 18 percent Democrat is 50.12.
13 District 19 is 54.86 percent Democrat.
14 District 20 is 70.73 percent Democrat.
15 District 22 is 77.76 percent Democrat.
16 District 23 is 64.54 percent Democrat.
17 District 27 is 56.25 percent Democrat.
18 District 28 is 74.2 percent Democrat.
19 District 32 is 58.76 percent Democrat.
20 District 38 is 78.55 percent Democrat.
21 District 39 is 63.08 percent Democrat.
22 District 40 is 69.19 percent Democrat.
23 District 41 is 66.33 percent Democrat.
24 District 42 is 53.28 percent Democrat, for a
25 total of 20 of 50 districts above 50 percent

1 Democrat.

2 CHAIRMAN HALL: Representative Hawkins.

3 REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: Thank you,
4 Mr. Chairman. And so I really appreciate you
5 for doing that, staff.

6 And so -- and so that's 20, since you
7 answered my question.

8 And the question for the chairman is do
9 we believe that there are any competitive seats?
10 Because I think if we're talking partisan terms,
11 I believe that's what -- I don't know that I
12 follow your math over there, but our math is
13 better in the House, I guess. But the super
14 minority, the supermajority balance, how does
15 that work with this map?

16 SENATOR NEWTON: Thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN HALL: The gentleman is
18 recognized.

19 SENATOR NEWTON: Representative
20 Hawkins, our math is that there are 27 of the 50
21 seats that lean Republican. You asked if there
22 were any competitive seats, and, yes, there are.
23 The map is very competitive.

24 And from the enacted map to our now
25 remedial map, changes that we have made in the

1 districts that were contested in the court case,
2 Senator Daniel's seat is 2.4 points now more
3 Democratic. The Krawiec seat is 6.6 points now
4 more Democratic. Berger's seat, Phil Berger's
5 5.1 points more Democratic. Jeff Jackson's seat
6 3.6 points more Democratic. Batch seat
7 .8 points more Democratic. And the Crawford
8 seat, 2.3 points more Democratic.

9 So we've made a number of changes to
10 ensure competitiveness across the state. In
11 fact, we believe that if either party runs good
12 candidates and good campaigns and touches the
13 issues that people care about, either party
14 could have a majority at the end of the next
15 election.

16 REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: Follow-up.

17 CHAIRMAN HALL: Representative Hawkins.

18 REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: Thank you. I
19 appreciate that. Thank you, sir.

20 CHAIRMAN HALL: Further discussion or
21 debate on the bill?

22 Representative Stevens.

23 REPRESENTATIVE STEVENS: I'm just
24 moving for a favorable report.

25 CHAIRMAN HALL: Members, you've heard

1 the motion from Representative Stevens. All
2 those in favor will signify by saying aye, all
3 those -- did someone call a division? I thought
4 so. All right.

5 We'll call the roll, Madam Clerk.

6 THE CLERK: Representative Adams.

7 REPRESENTATIVE ADAMS: Aye.

8 THE CLERK: Representative Adams, aye.
9 Brockman.

10 REPRESENTATIVE BROCKMAN: No.

11 THE CLERK: Representative Brockman.

12 REPRESENTATIVE BROCKMAN: No.

13 THE CLERK: Representative Brockman,
14 no.

15 Representative Carney.

16 REPRESENTATIVE CARNEY: No.

17 THE CLERK: Carney, no.
18 Cooper-Suggs.

19 REPRESENTATIVE COOPER-SUGGS: No.

20 THE CLERK: Cooper-Suggs, no.
21 Dixon.

22 REPRESENTATIVE DIXON: Yes.

23 THE CLERK: Dixon, yes.
24 Hardister.

25 REPRESENTATIVE HARDISTER: Aye.

1 THE CLERK: Hardister, aye.
2 Harrison.

3 REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: No.

4 THE CLERK: Harrison, no.
5 Hawkins.

6 REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: No.

7 THE CLERK: Hawkins, no.
8 Hastings.

9 REPRESENTATIVE HASTINGS: Aye.

10 THE CLERK: Hastings, aye.
11 Brenden Jones.

12 REPRESENTATIVE JONES: Aye.

13 THE CLERK: Brenden Jones, aye.
14 Mills.

15 REPRESENTATIVE MILLS: Aye.

16 THE CLERK: Mills, aye.
17 Reives.

18 REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: No.

19 THE CLERK: Reives, no.
20 Rogers.

21 REPRESENTATIVE ROGERS: Yes.

22 THE CLERK: Rogers, aye.
23 Szoka.

24 REPRESENTATIVE SZOKA: Aye.

25 THE CLERK: Szoka, aye.

1 Warren.

2 REPRESENTATIVE WARREN: Aye.

3 THE CLERK: Warren, aye.

4 Zachary.

5 Bell.

6 REPRESENTATIVE BELL: Aye.

7 THE CLERK: Bell, aye.

8 Stevens.

9 REPRESENTATIVE STEVENS: Aye.

10 THE CLERK: Stevens, aye.

11 Richardson.

12 It shows he's online.

13 CHAIRMAN HALL: Representative
14 Richardson, can the gentleman hear us?

15 REPRESENTATIVE RICHARDSON: Yeah. Let
16 me get back with you. I was distracted for a
17 second. Can you call on me later.

18 CHAIRMAN HALL: Yeah, we can call on
19 you at the end as to whether you want to vote
20 yes or no.

21 Madam Clerk, continue on.

22 THE CLERK: Representative Saine.

23 REPRESENTATIVE SAINE: Aye.

24 THE CLERK: Saine, aye.

25 Torbett.

1 REPRESENTATIVE TORBETT: Aye.

2 THE CLERK: Torbett, aye.

3 Representative Richardson.

4 CHAIRMAN HALL: Representative
5 Richardson, this is the state Senate map that's
6 being presented. Does the gentleman wish to be
7 recorded as voting on it?

8 REPRESENTATIVE RICHARDSON: What did my
9 Democratic colleagues do?

10 CHAIRMAN HALL: They all -- I think
11 they voted against it. We haven't counted it up
12 yet.

13 REPRESENTATIVE RICHARDSON: Vote no.

14 THE CLERK: Representative Richardson,
15 no.

16 REPRESENTATIVE RICHARDSON: Thanks for
17 your indulgence.

18 CHAIRMAN HALL: Yes, sir.

19 13 voting yes and 7 voting no, the bill
20 passes and receives a favorable report.

21 Members, we will now move into the
22 congressional map.

23 SENATOR NEWTON: Thank you,
24 Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Members.

25 CHAIRMAN HALL: And Senator Daniel is

1 recognized to present S745, Second Edition.

2 SENATOR DANIEL: Thank you, Mr. Chair
3 and Members of the Committee.

4 You have the congressional map before
5 you with the stat pack. I guess I'd start by --
6 maybe start with the fact that all of us earlier
7 in the week knew that -- well, let me first say,
8 while the Senate took the lead on this map, we
9 did work in conjunction with Chairman Hall and
10 Speaker Moore and his staff and other members
11 throughout this process.

12 And so as you know, earlier in the
13 week, we released a map that we thought was
14 going to be the map that was going to be before
15 us today, but we're all aware that the Supreme
16 Court had given us two metrics by which we need
17 to grade maps, that being the mean-median that
18 needs to be plus or minus 1 percent, and then
19 the efficiency gap analysis which needs to be
20 less than 7 percent.

21 We -- when we drew the original map
22 that was released earlier this week, we thought
23 that it was going to meet both metrics, but in
24 fact it only met the mean-median and was outside
25 of the boundary that the Supreme Court had given

1 us for the efficiency gap. So we went back to
2 the drawing board and realized that the only way
3 to achieve compliance with the efficiency gap
4 was to create more -- additional competitive
5 districts.

6 So the first map we considered to be a
7 7-5-2 map, and the map that you see before you
8 is -- has four competitive districts rather than
9 the two from the other map. Those I guess
10 being -- the four competitive districts now
11 being 13, 14 and I believe 6 and 7.

12 This map scores a minus .61 on the
13 mean-median score and also a minus 5.3 on the
14 efficiency gap score, so it is compliant with
15 the Supreme Court's stated objective guidelines.

16 And be glad to answer any questions
17 about it. You know, obviously a picture is
18 worth a thousand words. You can see what's in
19 front of you, be glad to try to answer any
20 questions.

21 CHAIRMAN HALL: Is there --
22 Representative Harrison.

23 REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: Thank you,
24 Mr. Chair.

25 And thank you, Chair Daniel. I tried

1 to listen in on the Senate committee so that I'd
2 have some context of what we're looking at. I
3 have a couple questions, but I would appreciate
4 if Ms. Churchill could continue with her -- the
5 percentage, the performance that you were going
6 through.

7 SENATOR DANIEL: I believe those are
8 all in your stat pack.

9 REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: Oh, they are.

10 SENATOR DANIEL: And there's a variety
11 of different races that were analyzed, including
12 the composite and then some individual races.
13 They should be in the stat pack. Is that
14 correct?

15 CHAIRMAN HALL: The chair is going to
16 look through it, but the chair believes the
17 gentleman is correct that all these numbers are
18 in the stat pack.

19 So, Representative Harrison, are you
20 okay with looking at that stat pack?

21 REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: Yes, sir.
22 I'm sorry. It's Pricey Harrison, Guilford
23 county.

24 So I had several questions. And I read
25 the order, tried to read most of the opinion.

1 The previous congressional maps were struck down
2 based on the violation of our constitution, free
3 election, free speech, equal protection, freedom
4 of assembly. And I looked at this map compared
5 to the map that was struck down, and while I
6 appreciate the fact that Guilford county is no
7 longer split into three congressional districts,
8 it's now split into two and have been associated
9 with other counties that are not like minded.

10 We had a lot of public
11 commentary -- while we didn't have a hearing in
12 Guilford county per se, we had a hearing in
13 Forsyth and Alamance -- I mean -- yeah,
14 Alamance. And so folks -- and I attended both
15 of those, and folks were very strong-willed
16 about the need to keep the Triad together, the
17 fact that there's a lot of similarity. And I'm
18 just trying to figure out how you arrived at
19 this map that has Guilford drawn all the way
20 down into Harnett and the other half of Guilford
21 drawn down into Cabarrus and that with what
22 seems to make a more sense to have it with
23 Forsyth.

24 CHAIRMAN HALL: The gentleman is
25 recognized.

1 SENATOR DANIEL: So, Representative
2 Harrison, I think maybe the simple but not
3 satisfying answer to that is that if you looked
4 at the previous edition of the map that we
5 released earlier this week had the -- those two
6 counties together, as you mentioned the Triad
7 district, and it just didn't score appropriately
8 with the Supreme Court metrics.

9 So between, you know, our members who
10 were drawing and the House leadership who were
11 drawing, we went back to the drawing board and
12 created additional competitive districts so that
13 this map has four competitive districts rather
14 than the two in the previous map which then
15 brought it into compliance.

16 CHAIRMAN HALL: The lady is recognized.

17 REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: I appreciate
18 that. And I appreciate that you've used these
19 two metrics. And I am still learning this stuff
20 so a lot of it is over my head, but I do know
21 the Supreme Court gave other metrics to use, and
22 I'm not sure why you all settled on the
23 efficiency gap and the mean-median only. It
24 seemed like there were several -- several
25 opportunities -- I don't know if you want to

1 respond to that, more of a comment than a
2 question.

3 I guess my other question is the
4 concerns have been expressed -- you know, we all
5 haven't had a lot of time to look at this, but I
6 appreciate the fact that we in the House have
7 had a lot more time than the folks in the
8 Senate. It seems that -- so I will just state
9 for the record that I think there's a real
10 problem splitting the three major cities in the
11 Triad into three different congressional
12 districts which are all included with counties
13 that aren't at all similarly -- similarly
14 aligned.

15 There also seems to -- like why is the
16 Sandhills split up? I guess you're going to
17 give me the same answer. I don't want to be a
18 pain. It seems like the Sandhills is split up
19 and Cumberland is in a different district than
20 the rest of the Sandhills, and now you've got
21 Fort Bragg split.

22 CHAIRMAN HALL: The gentleman is
23 recognized.

24 SENATOR DANIEL: I think that's the
25 same answer. You know, we needed to create

1 additional competitive districts, and, you know,
2 this was really the only practical area of the
3 state that that was -- that was sort of feasible
4 based on where -- you know, the different
5 parties are situated in their residency.

6 CHAIRMAN HALL: Representative
7 Harrison.

8 REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: Follow-up. I
9 won't make these questions any more because
10 you're going to give me the same answer. I
11 don't want to waste everybody's time. There are
12 concerns about the fast-growing suburbs of
13 Raleigh and southern Wake county, Apex,
14 Holly Springs, Fuquay-Varina, and Garner are
15 all -- are put in a district that stretches all
16 the way down to Duplin, with very different
17 interests there. I heard concerns expressed
18 about the fact that the city of Cary is now
19 split.

20 And Charlotte is split in half, half of
21 it in its own district and then another half put
22 into a district that includes Gaston and
23 Cleveland and parts of Rutherford. The city of
24 Greenville is split in half, and Goldsboro is
25 split.

1 And I guess I do have a question. The
2 municipality splits in this map compared to the
3 enacted map.

4 CHAIRMAN HALL: The gentleman is
5 recognized.

6 SENATOR DANIEL: I would refer that to
7 staff, if we could, Mr. Chair.

8 CHAIRMAN HALL: Staff is recognized to
9 answer the question.

10 ERIKA CHURCHILL: Mr. Chair, we'll have
11 to pull out the stat pack from the enacted plan
12 to get this number, but if -- again, in the stat
13 pack, there is a municipality-by-district
14 report. It reports that there are a total of
15 553 municipalities, and the number of splits
16 within the plan that is before you is 45. Of
17 those, only 33 involve population.

18 CHAIRMAN HALL: Representative
19 Harrison.

20 REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: I appreciate
21 that. I don't -- I don't really want to waste
22 the committee's time on this, but I think it's
23 really important to point out that -- now from
24 my sort of limited perspective here, this map
25 doesn't seem to be an improvement on the map

1 that got struck down by the court for violating
2 our constitution. Folks in Guilford are pretty
3 upset about how they are split into these
4 different congressional districts that make no
5 sense and very different from the current
6 congressional district we have. And I'm not
7 talking about the enacted map but the map
8 that -- the district that Representative Manning
9 represents right now. I think there's probably
10 a better way to do this. That's all I want to
11 say. And I thank you for your indulgence,
12 Chair Hall and Chair Daniel. Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN HALL: Representative
14 Brockman.

15 REPRESENTATIVE BROCKMAN: Thank you,
16 Mr. Chair. I just want to really just second
17 Representative Harrison's frustration as a
18 member of the [unintelligible] about how
19 frustrated we are to be separated the way we
20 are.

21 And I guess I do have a question. I'm
22 not going to belabor the point because I think
23 Representative Harrison did a great job of
24 articulating what the frustrations are, but my
25 question would be are you telling us that this

1 is the only way that you are going to be able to
2 draw these maps? This is the only option that
3 is available is to split us up the way we are
4 being split up?

5 CHAIRMAN HALL: The gentleman is
6 recognized.

7 SENATOR DANIEL: I'm trying to see
8 where Representative Brockman is.

9 CHAIRMAN HALL: He's on the computer.

10 SENATOR DANIEL: Oh, okay.

11 CHAIRMAN HALL: He's in the middle.

12 SENATOR DANIEL: I guess not to be
13 cute, in a congressional map, you know, there's
14 an infinitesimal amount of ways you can draw a
15 map. In two weeks -- you know, we thought we
16 had the solution until yesterday afternoon, had
17 to go back to the drawing board and sort of
18 rapidly drew this map, so it is a compliant map.

19 I would go back to Representative
20 Harrison's question a minute ago because I know
21 staff answered the question that 33
22 municipalities were split didn't include
23 population, but only 14 of those involve -- only
24 14 of those were not because of county line
25 splits, you know, were not municipalities that

1 split -- that straddled a county line.

2 CHAIRMAN HALL: Further discussion or
3 debate?

4 Representative Szoka.

5 REPRESENTATIVE SZOKA: Thank you,
6 Mr. Chair.

7 When I look at this map what it drives
8 me to believe is that the Supreme Court has made
9 some erroneous decisions in their decision to
10 make redistricting slavishly obey numbers. And
11 I will use the Fort Bragg area as an example.

12 Fort Bragg is the largest military
13 installation in the United States, largest
14 military installation in the world, one of the
15 main economic drivers for Cumberland, Harnett,
16 Moore, Lee, and Hoke counties. It actually is
17 in more than Cumberland county. And because of
18 going to these numbers that we've been mandated
19 to go by, now we have a district which for my
20 county makes little sense.

21 I understand that when we initially did
22 redistricting that we did consider communities
23 of interest which now I'm hearing some of my
24 Democratic colleagues talk about communities of
25 interest, yet we've been forced down a road to

1 obey statistics, which statistics, as good as
2 they may or may not be, are not human beings,
3 and human beings do not follow statistics.

4 I am disappointed in this draw of the
5 map even though it does appear to meet the
6 Supreme Court's guidelines, but it just points
7 out to me that statistics is not the answer to
8 redistricting.

9 CHAIRMAN HALL: Further discussion or
10 debate on the bill?

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman.

12 CHAIRMAN HALL: The gentleman is
13 recognized.

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.
15 Clarity, please. I'm looking at a map that has
16 Guilford broken into two congressional
17 districts. I think I heard Representative
18 Harrison say three, and just making sure that
19 the maps I have are the same maps --

20 CHAIRMAN HALL: The chair assumes the
21 lady was talking about the enacted map and not
22 this particular one; is that right? And she's
23 signalling that's correct.

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Copy that.
25 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

1 CHAIRMAN HALL: Further discussion or
2 debate on the bill?

3 If not, Representative Torbett moves
4 for a favorable report of the bill. All those
5 in favor will say aye, all those opposed will
6 say no. The clerk will call the roll.

7 THE CLERK: Adams.

8 REPRESENTATIVE ADAMS: Aye.

9 THE CLERK: Adams, aye.

10 Brockman.

11 REPRESENTATIVE BROCKMAN: No.

12 THE CLERK: Brockman, no.

13 Carney.

14 REPRESENTATIVE CARNEY: No.

15 THE CLERK: Carney, no.

16 Cooper-Suggs.

17 REPRESENTATIVE COOPER-SUGGS: No.

18 THE CLERK: Cooper-Suggs, no.

19 Dixon.

20 REPRESENTATIVE DIXON: Yes.

21 THE CLERK: Dixon, yes.

22 Hardister.

23 REPRESENTATIVE HARDISTER: Aye.

24 THE CLERK: Hardister, aye.

25 Harrison.

1 REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: No.

2 THE CLERK: Harrison, no.

3 Hawkins.

4 REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: No.

5 THE CLERK: Hawkins, no.

6 Hastings.

7 REPRESENTATIVE HASTINGS: Aye.

8 THE CLERK: Hastings, aye.

9 Brenden Jones.

10 REPRESENTATIVE JONES: Aye.

11 THE CLERK: Brenden Jones, aye.

12 Mills.

13 REPRESENTATIVE MILLS: Aye.

14 THE CLERK: Mills, aye.

15 Reives.

16 REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: No.

17 THE CLERK: Reives, no.

18 Rogers.

19 REPRESENTATIVE ROGERS: Yes.

20 THE CLERK: Rogers, yes.

21 Szoka.

22 REPRESENTATIVE SZOKA: No.

23 THE CLERK: Szoka, no.

24 Warren.

25 REPRESENTATIVE WARREN: Aye.

1 THE CLERK: Warren, aye.

2 Zachary.

3 Bell.

4 REPRESENTATIVE BELL: No. Aye. Excuse
5 me.

6 THE CLERK: Bell, aye.

7 Stevens.

8 REPRESENTATIVE STEVENS: Aye.

9 THE CLERK: Stevens, aye.
10 Richardson.

11 REPRESENTATIVE RICHARDSON: No.

12 THE CLERK: Richardson, no.
13 Saine.

14 REPRESENTATIVE SAINE: Aye.

15 THE CLERK: Saine, aye.
16 Torbett.

17 REPRESENTATIVE TORBETT: Aye.

18 THE CLERK: Torbett, aye.

19 CHAIRMAN HALL: Members, 12 having
20 voted in the affirmative and 8 in the negative,
21 the bill receives a favorable report.

22 Members, the chair anticipates us
23 beginning session, really, as soon as we can get
24 these bills back over to the House chamber. So
25 if you will go back over to the House chamber

1 and just be lingering around. Again, it takes
2 some time for central staff to get these bills
3 over there and get them ready to go, but as soon
4 as we can get them on the floor to be heard,
5 we'll do our best to do that.

6 So with there being no further business
7 before this committee, it is now adjourned.

8 (End of recording.)
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA)
COUNTY OF WAKE) C E R T I F I C A T E

I, DENISE MYERS BYRD, Stenographic Court Reporter, CSR 8340, do hereby certify that the transcription of the recorded House Redistricting Committee held on February 17, 2022, was taken down by me stenographically to the best of my ability and thereafter transcribed under my supervision; and that the foregoing pages, inclusive, constitute a true and accurate transcription of said recording.

Signed this the 18th day of February 2022.

Denise Myers Byrd
Denise Myers Byrd
CSR 8240, RPR, CLR 102409-2

GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF NORTH CAROLINA
2022 LEGISLATIVE SESSION, HOUSE FLOOR
VOTE ON HOUSE BILL 980
FEBRUARY 16, 2022

Transcribed by:
Taura J. Vulcano, RPR
Discovery Court Reporters and
Legal Videographers, LLC
4208 Six Forks Road
Suite 1000
Raleigh, North Carolina 27609
(919) 424-8242

1 (Transcribed from recorded audio file.)

2 SPEAKER MOORE: The House will come to
3 order. Members will take their seats. Visitors
4 will retire from the chamber, and the Sergeant
5 of Arm will close the doors. Members and guests
6 are asked to silence all electronic devices.

7 This morning's prayer will be offered
8 by Representative White. We'd ask everyone to
9 stand for the prayer and remain standing for the
10 pledge of allegiance. Representative White.

11 REPRESENTATIVE WHITE: Father, in the
12 midst of these troubled times, we pray for
13 comfort and especially for our fellow House
14 members who have lost fellow -- family members
15 just recently. We pray for -- For mercy when we
16 falter from your guidance and direction. We
17 pray as Hubakkuk did that that petulance will
18 lead our land. Your light will shine on our
19 path and you will be greater us than we -- than
20 he who is in the world. In Jesus' name I pray.
21 Amen.

22 (Pledge of Allegiance.)

23 SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman from
24 Duplin, Representative Dixon, is recognized for
25 a motion.

1 REPRESENTATIVE DIXON: Mr. Speaker, the
2 journal for February the 15th has been examined
3 and found to be correct. I move that it be
4 approved as written.

5 SPEAKER MOORE: Representative Dixon
6 moves the journal for February 15th be approved
7 as written. Those in favor will say aye. Those
8 opposed, no. The ayes have it, and the journal
9 is approved as written.

10 Members, the plan for today, of course,
11 is to take up as many of the redistricting maps
12 as we can. We -- we will certainly be dealing
13 with the House map, and if we can vote on the
14 Senate and the Congressional plans we will.
15 That just depends upon the schedule. Those
16 could role into the tomorrow. The -- I believe
17 the committee meeting notice has gone out for
18 11:00 a.m. That is -- that Chair understands
19 that that is still on, and depending upon how
20 long that process takes will determine when we
21 come back for session today. My thought is
22 2:00 p.m. I've consulted with all the folks
23 involved with the process, and that seems to be
24 a consensus time, but I will go ahead and warn
25 members there is a chance that it could be later

1 than that, just the way these things go.

2 So but 2:00 p.m. is going to be the
3 time that we come back today to hopefully take
4 up business on the -- on the redistricting
5 matter. And there maybe one other matter that
6 goes through as well that will be noticed later
7 on today. So that is -- that is the plan as per
8 the announcement made earlier this week and last
9 week.

10 The Chair does anticipate votes --
11 there will be votes today. There will be votes
12 tomorrow. There very likely will be votes on
13 Friday. So that is -- that is the order of
14 business for today.

15 Any notices or announcements? All
16 right. Seeing none, the Chair is going to
17 declare the House stands in recess till
18 2:00 p.m., subject to the standard stipulations
19 in Rule 15.1. So as the modifications to
20 calendar, so ordered.

21 - - - o00o - - -

22 SPEAKER MOORE: Representative
23 Destin Hall is recognized to send forth the
24 redistricting committee report. House Bill 980,
25 Realign North Carolina House Districts 2022,

1 favorable Committee substitute on unfavorable
2 original bill. The original bill will be placed
3 on the unfavorable calendar, whereas, the
4 committee substitute for House Bill 980 will be
5 placed on today's calendar.

6 (Recess until 2:10 p.m.)

7 CHAIRMAN MOORE: I bet the teachers
8 wish you guys had something like that, right?
9 The House will come to order.

10 Members, we've -- the plan today is
11 that the House is going to -- is about to go
12 into recess until 4:00. The reason for that is
13 the redistricting committee has met, has gone
14 through the maps, and central staff has informed
15 my office that they need a couple hours to go
16 through and to do the final proofreading and
17 make sure everything is correct before it comes
18 to the floor.

19 And that's, as you might imagine, with
20 doing a reapportionment of 120 districts
21 around -- of the State House, that's not a --
22 not a small task. So I've advised central staff
23 and the majority leader and the minority leader
24 that we are about to go into recess until 4:00.

25 But before we do that, I did want to

1 recognize a few special guests that we have with
2 us. And we have a school group with us today.
3 You might have heard them shriek a second ago
4 when I hit the gag- -- the gavel here. But we
5 have a group of students who are here as guests
6 of Representative Sasser from Stanly County.
7 And these are students that attend Locust
8 Elementary School. Would y'all stand so that we
9 can welcome you with us. Over here.

10 On behalf of my colleagues and I, we're
11 glad you're here with us today. What you're --
12 what you're watching right now, this is the
13 House floor. There are 120 members. Your
14 representative is Representative Sasser. I saw
15 him right over here, standing -- he just waved
16 to you in the red tie. But there's 120 members
17 of the House from all corners of the state, from
18 the mountains to the sea.

19 And we are -- we're here today. We're
20 going to be taking up something called
21 redistricting, which is where we look at the
22 districts for where each member is from in the
23 state. So there's 120 of those to represent
24 everybody in this -- in this state. So that's
25 what we're doing. It's a big job. It's been

1 taking several weeks. And you guys, I think,
2 have to leave soon so you won't get to see much.
3 But when we start, you'll see all these chairs
4 will be full and members will be here, and we'll
5 probably be here for several hours today. But
6 we're glad to have you guys with us today, and
7 we hope you have a great visit to our state
8 capitol.

9 We also have on motion of
10 Representative Winslow of Franklin County some
11 special guests. We have Glenn and Melissa
12 Cogliati, who are the owners of the Hudson Manor
13 Estate in Louisburg. Would y'all please stand,
14 so we can welcome you as well. Right up here in
15 the back. Thank you all for being with us
16 today.

17 So at this point, what it appears we
18 are going to do for members to plan is that we
19 will come back at 4:00 today. We will take up
20 the House redistricting plan. And depending on
21 how that goes, we may also take a dinner break
22 between the second and third reading or if the
23 second reading turns into something quite
24 lengthy, we may do it during that. But we --
25 that will be our business to dispose of this

1 evening.

2 It is the intention of the chair that
3 we will take up tomorrow the Senate Districts
4 and the Congressional Districts. Those bills
5 are going to be sourced from the Senate and will
6 be coming from the Senate to us, and those will
7 be the matters that we -- we take up from the
8 Senate side. And, of course, the House Bill --
9 the House Districts will be sent to the Senate,
10 and they would take those up tomorrow. We do
11 have the -- the maps are not due back to the
12 Court until Friday, so we have an extra day
13 built in, in case we need it.

14 But just -- just want to remind members
15 and any members of the public listening just
16 that this is a lengthy process that is the
17 result of many, many, many hours of work by a
18 lot of folks, and it is a -- it just takes a lot
19 of time for our central staff to get all of this
20 together. So I would ask for your patience and
21 your indulgence as we -- as we do that.

22 So with that, that's all the business
23 the Chair is aware of. Notices and
24 announcements. For what purpose does the
25 gentleman from Burke, Representative Blackwell,

1 rise?

2 REPRESENTATIVE BLACKWELL: An
3 announcement, Mr. Speaker.

4 CHAIRMAN MOORE: The Gentleman has the
5 floor.

6 REPRESENTATIVE BLACKWELL: You may have
7 gotten it already, but the House Education
8 Policy Committee will meet in the morning at
9 9:00. That's not our usual time, but we'll meet
10 in morning at 9:00 in 643. I believe we'll have
11 just one bill.

12 CHAIRMAN MOORE: For what purpose does
13 the gentleman from Wayne, Representative Bell,
14 rise?

15 REPRESENTATIVE BELL: For an
16 announcement.

17 CHAIRMAN MOORE: The gentleman has the
18 floor.

19 REPRESENTATIVE BELL: Thank you,
20 Speaker. Republicans we will not caucus during
21 the recess. If anything happens in between the
22 recess that we need to make you aware of, we'll
23 send that by e-mail or text. Thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN MOORE: For what purpose does
25 the gentleman from Iredell, Representative

1 McNeely, rise?

2 REPRESENTATIVE MCNEELY: Point of
3 personal privilege, Mr. Speaker.

4 CHAIRMAN MOORE: Gentleman has the
5 floor.

6 REPRESENTATIVE MCNEELY: Thank you. I
7 just want you to keep my family, especially my
8 wife, in your prayers. My father-in-law passed
9 away about 1:30 last night -- or this morning
10 and so -- he's been in hospice. This is
11 something that's not a shock, but yet still not
12 quite ready. And so please just keep us in your
13 prayers. He was a good man. I know where he's
14 at. I'm not worried about him.

15 CHAIRMAN MOORE: Yes, sir.

16 For what purpose does the gentleman
17 from Gaston, Representative Loftis, rise?

18 REPRESENTATIVE LOFTIS: For a point of
19 personal privilege, Mr. Speaker.

20 CHAIRMAN MOORE: Gentleman has the
21 floor.

22 REPRESENTATIVE LOFTIS: Thank you,
23 Mr. Speaker.

24 I want to recognize Harold Varner III
25 from Gaston County, who still owes his dad, and

1 who recently won the Dubai Golf Tournament with
2 a prize money of \$990,000. Great young man from
3 Gastonia, who takes care of his mom and dad. So
4 just wanted to make sure we recognize him for
5 doing good work for Gaston County.

6 CHAIRMAN MOORE: I'll tell you, he
7 represented the State of North Carolina very
8 well in that and very proud of him. So thank
9 you for reminding us of that.

10 For what purpose does the gentleman
11 from Catawba, Representative Adams, rise?

12 REPRESENTATIVE ADAMS: Point of
13 personal privilege.

14 CHAIRMAN MOORE: Gentleman has the
15 floor.

16 REPRESENTATIVE ADAMS: A week from
17 today is my son's 26th birthday, and I just want
18 to wish him that today because he just finished
19 his college training in the United States Air
20 Force, and he's going to be going to Washington
21 State for training, physical training, and he'll
22 be out of touch with any communications. He
23 says he's going to learn how to be a POW. But I
24 wanted to wish him a happy birthday because next
25 week, I won't be able to. Thank you.

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm sure he's
2 sitting at home watching this, waiting for you
3 to do that, right?

4 CHAIRMAN MOORE: I certainly wish him a
5 happy birthday.

6 Anything further notices or
7 announcements?

8 Seeing none, the Chair is going to
9 declare that the House stand in recess subject
10 to the standard stipulations under Rule 15.1
11 until 4:00 p.m. this afternoon.

12 (Recess taken.)

13 SPEAKER MOORE: The House will come to
14 order. Members, the Chair to have your
15 attention, please. The Republican members,
16 you're being called to an immediate caucus in
17 Room 1228. The House is going to stand at ease
18 until four -- would you like to announce --
19 Representative Bell is recognized for an
20 announcement.

21 REPRESENTATIVE BELL: What time? Right
22 now?

23 SPEAKER MOORE: Right now.

24 REPRESENTATIVE BELL: Thank you,
25 Mr. Speaker. Republicans, we will caucus in

1 1228 at 4:10, so caucus at 4:10.

2 SPEAKER MOORE: For those that are
3 wondering, it's 4:11, so you're already late.
4 Your watch is fast.

5 Chair -- yes, we do have time travel at
6 the legislature.

7 So here's what we're going to do,
8 Members. Here's what we're going to do. The
9 Republican members should to ahead and proceed
10 to caucus. We will -- we'll stand at ease and
11 hopefully we'll be able to get -- come back
12 relatively soon.

13 The Chair is aware there still may
14 still be some draft that may take us a little
15 bit to get -- to get movement, but we'll report
16 back shortly.

17 SPEAKER MOORE: The House will come
18 back to order. Members are asked to take their
19 seats.

20 Members, we are honored to have a
21 number of guests with us in our first slot. I
22 believe most of our Democrat members are still
23 in caucus right now, and so that's why there's a
24 few empty chairs, but some discussions going on
25 about some minor legislation the body is

1 considering today.

2 But we're very honored to have with
3 us -- and I'm going to introduce each one of
4 them -- a number of our community college
5 presidents from around the state. And these are
6 men and women who are a key part in educating so
7 many citizens of this state and also a key part
8 in economic development and worker training.
9 And what so I -- and so what I -- and the Chair
10 has also extended them the courtesies of the
11 floor. So we're glad to have you. So when I
12 introduce you, I'll call by name and county.
13 Stand up. And at the end, we'll give an
14 applause for everybody altogether.

15 First off from my home county,
16 Cleveland County, we have Jason Hurst, who is
17 here with us this evening. We have Jay
18 Carraway, James Sprunt Community College.
19 John -- John Ena- -- Enamait -- somebody's
20 handwriting is not great here -- I apologize if
21 I'm mispronouncing it -- from Stanly Community
22 College. Jack Bagwell from Albemarle Community
23 College. Murray Williams from Roanoke-Chowan
24 Community College.

25 Representative Stevens, it's Chowan not

1 Choan (phonetic).

2 Lew Hunnicutt from Nash Community
3 College. Audrey Yager from North Carolina
4 State, which I don't think is a community
5 college, but you're along for the ride this
6 evening. J.B. Buxton from Durham Technical
7 Community College. Chris English from
8 Southeastern Community College. Brian Merritt
9 from the McDowell Technical Community College.
10 And then Gene Smith from Brunswick Community
11 college.

12 Did I forget anybody? If I forgot you,
13 stand up and say your name, introduce yourself.

14 MS. WHITE: Shelley White, Haywood
15 Community College.

16 SPEAKER MOORE: Yes, ma'am.

17 MS. PFEIFFER: Patty Pfeiffer, Wayne
18 Community College.

19 MR. HUNT: Rusty Hunt, Lenoir Community
20 College.

21 MS. ANNUNZIATA: Margaret Annunziata,
22 Isothermal Community College.

23 MR. WELCH: Joel Welch, Western
24 Piedmont Community College.

25 CHAIRMAN MOORE: Did we get everybody

1 there? A little unconventional, but it will all
2 go. I just so -- just so you'll know, that's
3 the list I read, and it -- and it was a
4 challenge. I'm just going to say, whoever wrote
5 this list, I'm glad they're not drawing our
6 maps, all right?

7 Welcome to the House of
8 Representatives.

9 And I see Kevin Corbin on the end who
10 is trying to be a student in community college
11 still, so...

12 Members, let me give you -- let me give
13 you an update of where we are. There will be a
14 formal release, an announcement, coming out in
15 just a bit, so I won't say anything more on
16 that. But I will tell you that it is the
17 intention of the Chair -- or excuse me, an
18 understanding of the Chair that there will be --
19 there are some amendments being prepared that
20 will be agreed to, and that it's going to take
21 staff until about 6:30 to have those amendments
22 ready. So what the Chair is going to do at this
23 point -- we're about ready to go into a recess
24 for a dinner break. And then that way that will
25 give time for the amendments to be prepared,

1 folks to review those, and then come back at
2 7:30.

3 And based upon the trajectory that I
4 understand we are right now, it is the chair's
5 hope and belief that this evening session could
6 be a relatively short session to dispose of
7 those amendments and then ultimately a map this
8 evening. So that's where we are, but I don't
9 want to announce anything prematurely because --
10 well, just because we don't do that.

11 For what purpose gentleman from
12 Cabarrus, Representative Pittman, rise?

13 REPRESENTATIVE PITTMAN: On a personal
14 privilege.

15 CHAIRMAN MOORE: Gentleman has the
16 floor.

17 REPRESENTATIVE PITTMAN: You know, time
18 goes by fast. And he was -- just the little
19 things seem like two weeks ago, but today my son
20 Sam will turn 38. And I love you guys, but I
21 wish I was with him, you know. But Samuel is a
22 very fine son and a husband and just a great
23 father and a great soldier. And we're so proud
24 of him I can't stand it, but happy birthday to
25 my son Samuel.

1 CHAIRMAN MOORE: Certainly wish him a
2 happy birthday, Representative Pittman.

3 To give you an idea of tomorrow's
4 schedule, I know we're going to come back at
5 7:30, but -- and I would ask as many members to
6 be present as can this evening as well as
7 tomorrow. It does appear that tomorrow's
8 schedule will proceed as follows: That we
9 will -- that the Senate intends to vote out a
10 Senate map and a Congressional map tomorrow.
11 They are not going to be voting anything, as I
12 understand, on the floor today. They are doing
13 the Committee work in the morning. They are
14 still working and they will be voting on maps
15 sometime.

16 And it does appear so that for us to
17 take action tomorrow, it's looking like in the
18 afternoon. But those maps will need to come
19 here. We'll need to go through the House
20 Redistricting Committee. Once that happens,
21 those will get recorded to the House Floor for
22 us to take up. So it does appear based upon
23 that schedule, that more than likely tomorrow's
24 session would be an afternoon session.

25 We'll do a morning session that will be

1 an admin session, but right now the chair is
2 looking at a 2:00 p.m. session tomorrow.
3 Hopefully that will hold and we won't have to
4 push that back, but that's what it looks like.

5 Again, we'll be back this evening and I
6 can give you more details. But just while
7 you're planning out things, be thinking along
8 those lines. And again when we come back at
9 7:30 this evening, it's the Chair's hope that
10 we'll be able to reso -- excuse me, resolve
11 everything in an expeditious manner this
12 evening.

13 For what purpose does the gentleman
14 from Duplin, Representative Dixon, rise?

15 REPRESENTATIVE DIXON: On a privilege.

16 CHAIRMAN MOORE: Gentleman has the
17 floor.

18 REPRESENTATIVE DIXON: Thank you,
19 Mr. Speaker, colleagues and our guests. I'd
20 just like to recognize the fact that Duplin
21 County is the home of Mr. Dallas Herring, who is
22 considered one of the founding fathers of the
23 community college system. And Mr. Herring once
24 said, referring to the community colleges,
25 "These doors, these sacred doors, must never be

1 closed." And I'd like to express what I think
2 is the opinion of all of us in the General
3 Assembly, that we support that and we hope and
4 pray to continue to be able to do the right
5 thing as far as our community colleges is
6 considered, so that you can do for our citizens
7 what they need done.

8 CHAIRMAN MOORE: Any further notices or
9 announcements at this time?

10 Seeing none, the Chair is going to
11 declare that the House stands in recess subject
12 to the standard stipulations until 7:30 p.m.
13 this evening.

14 (Recess taken.)

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Colleagues,
16 colleagues, if I could have your attention for
17 just a minute. Speaker would like to announce
18 that we are not going to reconvene until 7:55 in
19 order to give folks time to get back from their
20 dinner break and for everybody to be present.
21 Thank you.

22 (Recess.)

23 - - - o00o - - -

24 SPEAKER MOORE: Members, our first
25 business is the seating of a new member.

1 Representative Rudow's appointment proclamation
2 was officially read on February 3rd, and he
3 subscribed to the oath of office on
4 February 1st. He will occupy seat 67. The
5 Senate will be notified of the seating by
6 special message.

7 The following members are appointed to
8 an escort committee. Representative John Bell,
9 chair, and Representative Robert Reives. Those
10 named members may now repair to the end of the
11 chamber to escort Representative Rudow to his
12 seat.

13 Representative Rudow, welcome again.
14 We had the -- you and I had the pleasure to meet
15 a couple times, and you've been here for some of
16 the skeleton votes. Obviously, this is a little
17 different than the other times you've been here.
18 But glad to have you here and want to officially
19 welcome you once again and serve the State, of
20 course, represent the good folks of Buncombe
21 County. Representative Rudow is appointed to
22 the following standing committee assignments.
23 The clerk will read.

24 THE CLERK: Speaker Moore appoints
25 Representative Rudow to the following House

1 Standing Committees: Alcoholic Beverage
2 Control, appropriations, appropriations
3 education, local government land use, planning
4 and development.

5 SPEAKER MOORE: The Senate will be
6 notified of the seating as well as the committee
7 assignments.

8 Petitions, memorials, or papers
9 addressed to the House the clerk will read.

10 THE CLERK: February 16, 2022. Dear
11 Mr. Speaker, please accept my resignation from
12 the North Carolina House of Representatives for
13 the 56th House District for Orange County,
14 effective March 31, 2022. It has been a great
15 honor to have served the people of Orange County
16 for these 25-plus years. I'm grateful for the
17 opportunity to have made a positive difference
18 for people with mental health illness,
19 developmental disabilities, addiction disease,
20 as well as to have helped initiate and improve
21 our Early Childhood Education Program. It was
22 also gratifying to have influenced improvements
23 in our laws on the environment and election law.

24 I have many happy memories of members
25 of the North Carolina House that I've met and

1 served with over the years, many of whom are
2 lifelong friends. I grew to have a respect and
3 gratitude for the General Assembly staff and the
4 superb assistance I could count on.

5 I will be forever grateful to my
6 constituents that helped me to serve Orange
7 County in the North Carolina House. I feel
8 blessed to have had the opportunity to help make
9 the state government a positive factor in the
10 lives of people of this great state.

11 Sincerely, Representative Verla Insko.

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Noted.

13 SPEAKER MOORE: House Bill 980. The
14 clerk will read.

15 THE CLERK: Representatives Destin
16 Hall, Stevens, Saine, House Bill 980, A Bill to
17 Be Entitled an Act to Realign North Carolina
18 House of Representatives Districts Pursuant To
19 Order of the North Carolina Supreme Court in
20 Harper versus Hall. The General Assembly of
21 North Carolina enacts.

22 SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman from
23 Caldwell, Representative Hall, is recognized to
24 debate the bill.

25 REPRESENTATIVE HALL: Thank you,

1 Mr. Speaker. Members, the Supreme Court held
2 that our districting map must, quote, give the
3 voters of all political parties substantial
4 equal opportunity to translate votes into seats
5 across the plan. Though we disagree with the
6 Court's opinion, this map is exactly -- this map
7 complies with the Court's criteria.

8 I will say that we're pleased to have
9 worked with Leader Reives over the course of the
10 last several days in good faith negotiations,
11 and we came from probably being very far apart
12 on maps to ultimately reaching a deal. And the
13 result of that is the map that hopefully this
14 body is going to approve tonight. So with that,
15 I would ask for your support.

16 SPEAKER MOORE: Representative Reives
17 is recognized to send forward Amendment ATU-48
18 [v.1].

19 Clerk will read.

20 THE CLERK: Representative Reives moves
21 to amend the bill.

22 SPEAKER MOORE: Chairman from Chatham
23 is recognized to debate the amendment.

24 REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: Thank you,
25 Mr. Speaker.

1 And ladies and gentlemen, this and the
2 next couple of amendments that I'll be running
3 are amendments that were talked about with
4 leadership. We've come to an agreement on, both
5 sides support, and so we'd ask for your green
6 vote.

7 SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman from
8 Caldwell, Representative Hall, is recognized to
9 debate the amendment.

10 CHAIRMAN HALL: I'll add and per our
11 agreement with the minority leader, please
12 support the amendment.

13 SPEAKER MOORE: Further discussion?
14 Further debate?

15 If not, the question before the House
16 is the adoption of Amendment A.1 set forward by
17 Representative Reives. Those in favor will vote
18 aye; those opposed will vote no. The clerk will
19 open the vote.

20 The Chair is going to hold the vote
21 open. We may have some members who have
22 requested proxy votes, but our present -- so
23 we'll make it -- at the end, the Chair is going
24 to hold it open for members to come in. I
25 believe there's some members here off the floor.

1 They're coming in to vote too.

2 Representative Hall, would you like to
3 vote?

4 Members, we're just working on the
5 proxy votes, those who are going to proxy vote
6 versus coming in person.

7 The Chair apologizes for the length of
8 this first vote. We just need to determine the
9 proxy -- members that are voting by proxy.

10 The Chair will reflect that as of this
11 vote, 103 members have voted in person on the
12 floor at this point as well, but we'll be taking
13 the proxy votes as well.

14 The gentleman from Wayne, House
15 Majority Leader Representative Bell, is
16 recognized to announce the proxy votes for the
17 Republican members.

18 REPRESENTATIVE BELL: Thank you,
19 Mr. Speaker.

20 The following members have officially
21 designated me to announce the vote on their
22 behalf:

23 Representative Jake Johnson, aye.

24 Representative Lambeth, aye.

25 Representative McNeeley, aye.

1 Representative Rogers, aye.

2 Representative Shepard, aye.

3 Representative Zachary, aye.

4 Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

5 SPEAKER MOORE: Chairman from Chatham,
6 Representative Reives, the House minority leader
7 is recognized to announce the proxy votes of the
8 Democratic members.

9 MR. REIVES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

10 The following members have authorized
11 me to enter votes on their behalf:

12 Representative Ager, aye.

13 Representative Alexander, aye.

14 Representative Brockman, aye.

15 Representative Hunter, aye.

16 Representative Insko, aye.

17 Representative Lucas, aye.

18 Representative Martin, aye.

19 Representative Terry, aye.

20 Representative Turner, aye.

21 SPEAKER MOORE: The clerk will lock the
22 machine and record the vote.

23 118 having voted in the affirmative and
24 none in the negative. The amendment is adopted.

25 Representative Reives is recognized to

1 send forth Amendment ABW-30. Clerk will read.

2 THE CLERK: Representative Reives moves
3 to amend the bill.

4 SPEAKER MOORE: Gentleman is recognized
5 to make the amendment.

6 REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: Thank you,
7 Mr. Speaker. And we ask again for your green
8 vote.

9 SPEAKER MOORE: Gentleman from
10 Caldwell, Representative Hall, is recognized to
11 debate the amendment.

12 CHAIRMAN HALL: Please support the
13 amendment.

14 SPEAKER MOORE: Further discussion,
15 further debate?

16 If not, the question for the House is
17 the adoption of Amendment ABW-30, which is
18 Amendment A2 sent forth by Representative
19 Reives. Those in favor will vote aye; those
20 opposed will vote no. The clerk will open the
21 vote.

22 SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman from
23 Wayne, Representative Bell, House Majority
24 Leader, is recognized to announce the proxy
25 votes for the Republican members.

1 REPRESENTATIVE BELL: Thank you,
2 Mr. Speaker.

3 The following members have officially
4 designated me to announce a vote on their
5 behalf:

6 Representative Jake Johnson, aye.

7 Representative Lambeth, aye.

8 Representative McNeeley, aye.

9 Representative Rogers, aye.

10 Representative Shepard, aye.

11 Thank you.

12 SPEAKER MOORE: And how about
13 Representative Zachary, did you -- does the
14 gentleman wish to vote for him?

15 REPRESENTATIVE BELL: I'm sorry, I
16 forgot. I apologize.

17 Representative Zachary, aye.

18 SPEAKER MOORE: Gentleman from Chatham,
19 Representative Reives, the House Minority
20 Leader, is recognized to announce the proxy
21 votes of the Democrat members.

22 REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: Thank you,
23 Mr. Speaker.

24 The following representatives
25 authorized me to enter votes on their behalf:

1 Representative Ager, aye.

2 Representative Alexander, aye.

3 Representative Brockman, aye.

4 Representative Hunter, aye.

5 Representative Insko, aye.

6 Representative Lucas, aye.

7 Representative Martin, aye.

8 Representative Terry, aye.

9 Representative Turner, aye.

10 SPEAKER MOORE: Representative Carney
11 wish to vote? Representative Baker wish to
12 vote?

13 The clerk will lock the machine and
14 record the vote. 117 have voted in the
15 affirmative; one in the negative. The amendment
16 is adopted.

17 Representative Carney, does the lady
18 intend to vote? Would the lady let me record as
19 having voted aye on the amendment?

20 REPRESENTATIVE CARNEY: Yes,
21 Mr. Speaker.

22 SPEAKER MOORE: So the clerk recorded
23 as having voted aye.

24 Representative Reives is recognized to
25 send forth Amendment ABA-53. The clerk will

1 read.

2 THE CLERK: Representative Reives moves
3 to amend the bill.

4 SPEAKER MOORE: Gentleman is recognized
5 to make the amendment.

6 REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: Thank you,
7 Mr. Speaker. And we would ask again for a big
8 green vote.

9 SPEAKER MOORE: Gentleman from
10 Caldwell, Representative Hall, recognized to
11 debate the amendment.

12 REPRESENTATIVE BELL: Members, please
13 support the amendment.

14 SPEAKER MOORE: Further discussion and
15 further debate? If not, the question for the
16 House is the adoption of Amendment A3. Those in
17 favor will vote aye; those opposed will vote no.
18 The clerk will open the vote.

19 The gentleman from Wayne,
20 Representative Bell, the House Majority Leader,
21 is recognized to announce the proxy votes of the
22 Republican members.

23 REPRESENTATIVE BELL: Thank you,
24 Mr. Speaker.

25 The following members have officially

1 designated me to announce a vote on their
2 behalf:

3 Representative Johnson, aye.

4 Representative Lambeth, aye.

5 Representative McNeeley, aye.

6 Representative Rogers, aye.

7 Representative Shepard, aye.

8 Representative Zachary, aye.

9 Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

10 SPEAKER MOORE: Gentleman from Chatham,
11 Representative Reives, is -- the House Minority
12 Leader is recognized to announce the proxy votes
13 of the Democratic members.

14 REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: Thank you,
15 Mr. Speaker. The following members have
16 authorized me to enter votes on their behalf:

17 Representative Ager, aye.

18 Representative Alexander, aye.

19 Representative Brockman, aye.

20 Representative Hunter, aye.

21 Representative Insko, aye.

22 Representative Lucas, aye.

23 Representative Martin, aye.

24 Representative Terry, aye.

25 Representative Turner, aye.

1 SPEAKER MOORE: Representative Autry,
2 gentleman like to vote on the amendment?

3 The clerk will lock the machine and
4 record the vote.

5 118 having voted in the affirmative and
6 none in the negative, the amendment is adopted.

7 Representative Reives is recognized to
8 send forth Amendment ABA-52.

9 The clerk will read.

10 THE CLERK: Representative Reives moves
11 to amend the bill.

12 SPEAKER MOORE: Gentleman from Chatham
13 is recognized to debate the amendment.

14 REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: Thank you,
15 Mr. Speaker. And we just ask for one more green
16 vote.

17 SPEAKER MOORE: Gentleman from
18 Caldwell, Representative Hall, is recognized to
19 debate the amendment.

20 CHAIRMAN HALL: I'm going to ask for a
21 few more green votes, but please vote yes on
22 this amendment.

23 SPEAKER MOORE: Please score the
24 amendment. Further discussion, further debate?

25 Now the question for the House is the

1 adaption of Amendment A4 sent forward by
2 Representative Reives. Those in favor will vote
3 aye; those opposed will vote no.

4 The clerk will open the vote.

5 SPEAKER MOORE: Gentleman from Wayne,
6 Representative Bell, House Majority Leader,
7 recognized to announce the proxy votes of the
8 Republican members.

9 REPRESENTATIVE BELL: Thank you,
10 Mr. Speaker.

11 The following members have officially
12 designated me to announce a vote on their
13 behalf:

14 Representative Johnson, aye.

15 Representative Lambeth, aye.

16 Representative McNeeley, aye.

17 Representative Rogers, aye.

18 Representative Shepard, aye.

19 Representative Zachary, aye.

20 Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

21 SPEAKER MOORE: Gentleman from Chatham,
22 Representative Reives, the House Minority
23 Leader, is recognized to announce the proxy
24 votes of the Democratic members.

25 REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: Thank you,

1 Mr. Speaker.

2 The following members have authorized
3 me to enter votes on their behalf:

4 Representative Ager, aye.

5 Representative Alexander, aye.

6 Representative Brockman, aye.

7 Representative Hunter, aye.

8 Representative Insko, aye.

9 Representative Lucas, aye.

10 Representative Martin, aye.

11 Representative Terry, aye.

12 Representative Turner, aye.

13 SPEAKER MOORE: The clerk will lock the
14 machine and record the vote.

15 119 having voted in the affirmative and
16 none in the negative, the amendment is adopted.

17 Representative Meyer is recognized to
18 send forth the Amendment ABW-31.

19 The clerk will read.

20 THE CLERK: Representative Meyer moves
21 to amend the bill.

22 REPRESENTATIVE MEYER: Thank you,
23 Mr. Speaker.

24 Ladies and gentlemen --

25 SPEAKER MOORE: Gentleman will be

1 recognized to debate the amendment.

2 REPRESENTATIVE MEYER: In the current
3 map there is a precinct flip between House
4 District 50 and House District 56. This would
5 return them to our existing House districts so
6 that the voters are in the same district they've
7 been in. It also makes sure that the Town of
8 Carrboro remains whole rather than being split.
9 Neither Representative Insko nor I are running
10 for either of these districts, but we think our
11 voters would appreciate going back to the
12 existing maps. Thank you.

13 SPEAKER MOORE: Representative Hall is
14 recognized to debate the amendment.

15 CHAIRMAN HALL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

16 Members, this particular amendment was
17 not part of the big compromise bill, but I spoke
18 to Representative Meyer, and he's explained his
19 reasoning. And so I'm going to ask you to
20 support the amendment and vote yes.

21 SPEAKER MOORE: Further discussion,
22 further debate? If not, the question before the
23 House is the adoption of Amendment A5. Those in
24 favor -- excuse me. Those in favor will vote
25 aye; those opposed will vote no. The clerk will

1 open the vote.

2 The gentleman from Wayne,
3 Representative Bell, is recognized to announce
4 the proxy votes of the Republican members.

5 REPRESENTATIVE BELL: Thank you,
6 Mr. Speaker.

7 The following members have officially
8 designated me to announce a vote on their
9 behalf:

10 Representative Johnson, aye.

11 Representative Lambeth, aye.

12 Representative McNeeley, aye.

13 Representative Rogers, aye.

14 Representative Shepard, aye.

15 Representative Zachary, aye.

16 Thank you, sir.

17 SPEAKER MOORE: Representative
18 Blackwell wish to vote?

19 Gentleman from Chatham, Representative
20 Reives, the House Minority Leader, is recognized
21 to announce the proxy votes of the Democratic
22 members.

23 REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: Thank you,
24 Mr. Speaker.

25 The following members have authorized

1 me to enter votes on their behalf:

2 Representative Ager, aye.

3 Representative Alexander, aye.

4 Representative Brockman, aye.

5 Representative Hunter, aye.

6 Representative Insko, aye.

7 Representative Lucas, aye.

8 Representative Martin, aye.

9 Representative Terry, aye.

10 Representative Turner, aye.

11 SPEAKER MOORE: The clerk will lock the
12 machine and record the vote.

13 118 having voted in the affirmative and
14 one in the negative, the amendment is adopted.

15 Representative Hawkins is recognized to
16 send forth Amendment AVA-54. The clerk will
17 read.

18 THE CLERK: Representative Hawkins
19 moves to amend the bill.

20 SPEAKER MOORE: Gentleman from Durham
21 is recognized to debate the amendment.

22 REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: Thank you,
23 Mr. Speaker. I wanted to thank everybody for
24 all their hard work on this incredible bill and
25 all the conversations. And so I move to amend

1 this bill to slightly change the -- sort of the
2 size of town to specifically sort of match the
3 way that communities of interest are set up in
4 Durham County as well as sort of the natural
5 movement in educational institutions that people
6 are used to being able to attend and the kids
7 attend, of course. And then also have the
8 ability to talk to their representative about
9 that.

10 So it also does not split any VTDs, has
11 incredible score, and most importantly so it
12 keeps common interests and accommodates the
13 growth of Durham County into the future. So I
14 ask for your green vote. Thank you.

15 SPEAKER MOORE: Gentleman from
16 Caldwell, Representative Hall, is recognized to
17 debate the amendment.

18 CHAIRMAN HALL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
19 Again, members, this was not an
20 amendment that was part of our -- our bigger
21 deal, but I've looked at the amendment and heard
22 from Representative Hawkins and his explanation.
23 And I'll ask you to support the amendment.

24 SPEAKER MOORE: Further discussion?
25 Further debate? If not, the question before the

1 House is the adoption of Amendment A6 sent
2 forward by Representative Hawkins. Those in
3 favor will vote aye; those opposed will vote no.
4 The clerk will open the vote.

5 The gentleman from Wayne,
6 Representative Bell, the House Majority Leader,
7 is recognized to announce the proxy votes of the
8 Republican members.

9 REPRESENTATIVE BELL: Thank you,
10 Mr. Speaker.

11 The following members have officially
12 designated me to announce a vote on their
13 behalf:

14 Representative Johnson, aye.

15 Representative Lambeth, aye.

16 Representative McNeeley, aye.

17 Represent Rogers, aye.

18 Representative Shepard, aye.

19 Representative Zachary, aye.

20 Thank you, sir.

21 SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman from
22 Chatham, Representative Reives, the House
23 Minority Leader, is recognized to announce the
24 proxy votes of the Democratic members.

25 REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: Thank you,

1 Mr. Speaker.

2 The following members have authorized
3 me to enter votes on their behalf:

4 Representative Ager, aye.

5 Representative Alexander, aye.

6 Representative Brockman, aye.

7 Representative Hunter, aye.

8 Representative Insko, aye.

9 Representative Lucas, aye.

10 Representative Martin, aye.

11 Representative Terry, aye.

12 Representative Turner, aye.

13 SPEAKER MOORE: The clerk will lock the
14 machine and record the vote.

15 116 having voted in the affirmative and
16 3 in the negative. The amendment is adopted.

17 Stand at ease just a moment.

18 - - - oOOo - - -

19 SPEAKER MOORE: Members, I just advise
20 the body, we're trying to resolve a few
21 administrative matters for tomorrow. We -- and
22 I'm aware there is still one amendment, and then
23 the second and third reading on the bill. But
24 just to give the members some clarity, we're
25 looking at other bills that we may be able to

1 dispose of tomorrow that have been requested by
2 another member but under the adjournment
3 resolution that we're under right now, those
4 that would be eligible. So that's what part of
5 the determination is.

6 - - - o00o - - -

7 SPEAKER MOORE: The House will come
8 back to order. Chair appreciates the members'
9 indulgence. We were trying to work a few things
10 up before folks started headed for -- heading
11 for the door when we finished that final vote.
12 There will be one additional bill added to this
13 evening's calendar that will not be
14 controversial.

15 Representative Harrison is now
16 recognized to send forward Amendment ABW-29.

17 The clerk will read.

18 THE CLERK: Representative Harrison
19 moves to amend a bill.

20 SPEAKER MOORE: Lady from Guilford,
21 Representative Harrison, recognized to debate
22 the amendment.

23 REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: Thank you,
24 Mr. Speaker.

25 Ladies and gentlemen of the House, I --

1 this amendment amends the Wayne County cluster
2 to address a potential voting rights issue that
3 has been raised in at least three different
4 letters from the Southern Coalition for Social
5 Justice both on the enacted maps and more
6 recently to our Committee yesterday.

7 And for those of who you are not
8 familiar with the Supreme Court opinion, page
9 8 -- the order, sorry, not the opinion. The
10 General Assembly must first assess whether using
11 current election and population data racially
12 polarized voting is legally sufficient in any
13 area of the state, such that the Section 2 of
14 the Voting Rights Act requires a drawing of a
15 district to avoid diluting the voting rights of
16 African American voters.

17 It's our feeling and the Southern
18 Coalition for Social Justice, as I said,
19 continues to raise this issue that we face a
20 voting rights issue in this particular cluster.
21 And we think it meets and they have pointed out
22 that it meets the Gingles criteria. And I
23 remember Chairman Lewis talking about Gingles.
24 I had no idea what he was talking about, and I
25 finally looked it up.

1 And it's a Supreme Court case based on
2 a North Carolina situation. It sets forth three
3 criteria you must meet in order to -- in order
4 to satisfy a voting rights claim. And first
5 criteria is that population could be majority --
6 minority-majority enough that black voting
7 population in this area satis- -- sorry, got
8 that one wrong.

9 That there's enough in this area that
10 prevents voter dilution, racially polarized
11 voting on this enacted map. I would go --
12 basically what you have to have is a cohesive of
13 African America voters that will elect their
14 candidates of their choice. The second criteria
15 is black voters vote cohesively. The third is
16 that white voters will overcome the candidate of
17 the black voters' choice.

18 So the three criteria have been met,
19 and they -- and they set it out in their letter
20 that they sent the members of the Committee
21 yesterday, as I said. And so it's their opinion
22 that based on the facts of this case, remedial
23 districts should be developed to achieve the
24 black voting age population required to ensure
25 that black voters have an equal opportunity to

1 elect representatives of their choice within
2 their particular area.

3 And what we're trying to do in this
4 amendment is to avoid more costly litigation.
5 We know how much we've spent on redistricting
6 over the past ten years, and it's over
7 \$11 million now of taxpayer money enacting
8 unconstitutional maps. And we have an issue
9 here that we could address by changing this
10 particular cluster to have a district that's
11 going to elect a candidate who is the choice of
12 the black voting age population in that
13 district.

14 So I can go into more detail about why
15 this is important, but I don't want to waste
16 anybody's time, but I think this is a really
17 critical issue that we should get out in front
18 of before we get sued. Thank you. I urge your
19 support. Thank you.

20 SPEAKER MOORE: For what purpose does
21 the gentleman from Caldwell, Representative
22 Hall, rise?

23 CHAIRMAN HALL: To debate the
24 amendment.

25 SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman has the

1 floor.

2 CHAIRMAN HALL: Members, again, this is
3 another one of those amendments that was not
4 part of the deal between the two parties. And
5 I -- I believe that the adoption of this
6 amendment would actually make our entire map
7 illegal. So I'm going to respectfully ask
8 members to oppose this amendment and vote
9 against it.

10 In our lawsuit, the Legislature
11 submitted to the trial Court the racially
12 polarized voting analysis performed by
13 Dr. Jeffrey Lewis of UCLA. Dr. Lewis' analysis
14 expanded on that of the plaintiffs' own expert,
15 Dr. Moon Duchin. The analysis determined that
16 majority-minority districts are not required to
17 elect candidates of minority voters' choice.

18 In finding -- in fact, in finding of
19 fact number 595, the trial Court found that,
20 quote, in no district enacted or in 2020 does it
21 appear the majority of BVAP is needed for that
22 district to regularly generate majority support,
23 minority preferred candidates, and to
24 reconstitute elections, end quote.

25 This finding of fact was subsequently

1 adopted by our State Supreme Court and,
2 therefore, no VRA districts are required to be
3 drawn in North Carolina. And I would ask you to
4 oppose this amendment.

5 SPEAKER MOORE: Further discussion or
6 further debate? If not, the question before the
7 House is the adoption of Amendment A7, sent
8 forward by Representative Harrison. Those in
9 favor of the amendment will vote aye; those
10 opposed will vote no. The clerk will open the
11 vote.

12 The gentleman from Wayne,
13 Representative Bell, the House Majority Leader,
14 is recognized to announce the proxy votes of the
15 Republican members.

16 REPRESENTATIVE BELL: Thank you,
17 Mr. Speaker.

18 The following members have officially
19 designated me to announce a vote on their
20 behalf:

21 Representative Johnson, no.

22 Representative Lambeth, no.

23 Representative McNeeley, no.

24 Representative Rogers, no.

25 Representative Shepard, no.

1 Representative Zachary, no.

2 Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

3 SPEAKER MOORE: Gentleman from Chatham,
4 Representative Reives, is recognized to announce
5 the proxy votes of the Democratic members.

6 REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: Thank you,
7 Mr. Speaker.

8 The following members have authorized
9 me to enter votes on their behalf:

10 Representative Ager, aye.

11 Representative Alexander, aye.

12 Representative Brockman, aye,.

13 Representative Hunter, aye.

14 Representative Insko, aye.

15 Representative Lucas, aye.

16 Representative Martin, aye.

17 Representative Terry, aye.

18 Representative Turner, aye.

19 SPEAKER MOORE: The clerk will lock the
20 machine and record the vote.

21 50 having voted in the affirmative and
22 70 in the negative, the amendment is not
23 adopted.

24 Members, that has resolved the
25 amendments to the bill. Further discussion?

1 Further debate on the bill?

2 For what purpose does the lady from
3 Guilford, Representative Harrison, rise?

4 REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: To debate the
5 bill.

6 SPEAKER MOORE: Lady has the floor.

7 REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: Thank you,
8 Mr. Speaker.

9 Ladies and gentlemen of the House, I
10 wish that I was standing up here and telling you
11 how much I love the maps, especially if you
12 passed that last amendment. But I do want to,
13 first off, thank all the folks who were involved
14 in this, because I know it was a very truncated
15 schedule. And central staff, speaker staff, our
16 staff, the legislators who are involved in this,
17 I know they put in a lot of hours and I really
18 appreciate that.

19 And I just -- I don't mean any
20 disrespect by criticizing both the process and
21 the maps. On the process, we just saw these
22 maps for the very first time with the electronic
23 data a couple hours before our committee
24 meeting, and folks had not really had a chance
25 to process the information and to understand the

1 outcome. And certainly we're hearing from the
2 public with their concerns about what might be
3 in the map that they couldn't understand because
4 they had just gotten the -- the process.

5 I had asked the -- I just got the maps.
6 I asked if we could have an explanation of the
7 Supreme Court order and the Supreme Court
8 opinion so that we would understand whether we
9 were actually complying with what the Court
10 ordered, and we did not get that. So I'm not
11 even sure that this map actually does comply
12 with the Supreme Court order. And maybe it
13 does, but we weren't briefed on that. The
14 Supreme Court order -- opinion just came out on
15 Monday.

16 I think there is a better way to do
17 this. We all know that a better way to do this
18 would be to have an independent process where
19 we're not drawing our own maps to shave our own
20 districts. And I realize that's not is what's
21 before us, but I know that that's what the
22 public wants, and I hope eventually we're going
23 to get there before we have the next redraw.

24 I -- there were some specific problems
25 in the -- in the proposed maps that I brought up

1 in Committee, and I'm sorry to repeat for those
2 of you who are on the Committee, but they seem
3 to be some problems with the gerrymandering in
4 the Forsyth and Guilford County districts,
5 proposed districts. In fact, the Guilford
6 County map is more extreme than all of the
7 80,000 simulations in the Mattingly report that
8 the Supreme Court relied on in issuing its
9 opinion.

10 And, similarly, there are other
11 problems in other districts, if you want to go
12 into it in detail. But I think if we had -- the
13 Voting Rights Act is a real problem that needs
14 to be addressed and we're going face a lawsuit
15 and more taxpayer dollars defending this matter
16 that I think is indefensible on that particular
17 point.

18 I do want to reiterate my appreciation
19 to all of you who worked so hard. And -- and I
20 really appreciate the fact that the majority and
21 the minority parties come together in large part
22 to agree to a map that most people can live
23 with. I just can't and I apologize, but I will
24 be voting no. Thank you.

25 SPEAKER MOORE: Gentleman from

1 Caldwell, Representative Hall, is recognized to
2 debate the bill.

3 REPRESENTATIVE HALL: Thank you,
4 Mr. Speaker. And, Members, I just want to
5 address a couple of things respectfully that I
6 heard from Representative Harrison, who I've
7 always enjoyed working with on redistricting and
8 I know her comments and criticisms are always
9 sincere. But I'll address a couple of those by
10 saying, you know, part of the problem we have in
11 this case is we're under such a time crunch.
12 You know, we essentially had two weeks to come
13 in and redraw all three maps: Congressional,
14 State House, and State Senate. That takes a
15 long time.

16 If you're on the redistricting
17 committee and spent much time around it, you
18 know what a task that is and how -- how short of
19 a time span two weeks is to go in and redraw
20 these maps. And that's why this body attempted
21 to further delay the primary. Again, we didn't
22 want to have to delay the primary, but we knew
23 what a challenge and what a monumental task it
24 was going to be to get these maps -- these maps
25 done in two weeks' time.

1 Not only have we got them done, but
2 we're about to get them done, I think, with
3 bipartisan support, and that's because the
4 speaker, myself, and Leader Reives got together,
5 and we talked when we first got the Court's
6 order and we continued to talk, to hammer out a
7 compromise that, frankly, both sides are not
8 completely happy with, but that's what a
9 compromise is. And so I hope you'll join me
10 tonight in recognizing the work of the
11 Democratic leader and the speaker and others in
12 each chamber and vote in a bipartisan manner for
13 these maps.

14 SPEAKER MOORE: Gentleman from Chatham,
15 Representative Reives, recognized to debate the
16 bill.

17 REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: Thank you,
18 Mr. Speaker. And I would echo what the Rules
19 Chair has said. What I appreciated was that we
20 did talk. And I think that when we talk and we
21 listen to each other, that we're able to come up
22 with something. I would say for purposes of
23 House Republican leadership to the rest of the
24 caucus, I will re-emphasize nobody came out of
25 this happy. Nobody came out of this dancing for

1 joy and figuring, "We won, we won."

2 what we were happy about is that we
3 came to an agreement that both of us could live
4 with, and that's the important thing and that's
5 what we should do up here. And I appreciate the
6 fact that we stayed on this, we talked, talked,
7 talked. I think the speaker staff have gotten
8 so used to seeing me I was afraid they were
9 going to put a seat out for me and just put my
10 name on it. But that's what we're supposed to
11 be doing. And that's what I appreciate, and I
12 appreciate your support of this bill.

13 Again, we're not asking for a green
14 vote because we think that you're jumping for
15 joy, but because this is what was asked of us.
16 We did it. The things that we'd love to see
17 differently -- I've said for eight years I'd
18 love to see an independent commission. That's
19 not what we were tasked to do. I've said it for
20 eight years, lots of things I'd like to see done
21 differently in the process. That's not what we
22 were tasked to do.

23 I do feel that Representative
24 Harrison's amendment is one of those situations
25 that we do have to address under our state

1 constitution; but, again, that's a sincere
2 disagreement on the law in this situation and
3 what was expected. And I'll take those
4 disagreements all day. That did not become a
5 partisan disagreement. That was not a yelling
6 and screaming match. That was a sincere
7 discussion between two sets of leaders about
8 what we felt the Court required at the end of
9 this. And we just ask that you support this
10 bill.

11 SPEAKER MOORE: Further discussion?
12 Further debate? If not, the question for the
13 House is the passage of House Bill 980 on the
14 second reading. Those in favor will vote aye;
15 those opposed will vote no. The clerk will open
16 the vote.

17 Representative Bell, the House Majority
18 Leader, is recognized to announce the proxy
19 votes of the Republican members.

20 REPRESENTATIVE BELL: Thank you,
21 Mr. Speaker.

22 The following members have officially
23 designated me to announce a vote on their
24 behalf:

25 Representative Johnson, aye.

1 Representative Lambeth, aye.

2 Representative McNeeley, aye.

3 Representative Rogers, aye,.

4 Representative Shepard, aye.

5 Representative Zachary, aye.

6 Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

7 SPEAKER MOORE: Gentleman from Chatham,
8 Representative Reives, the House Minority
9 Leader, is recognized to announce the proxy
10 votes of the Democratic members.

11 REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: Thank you,
12 Mr. Speaker.

13 The following members have authorized
14 me to enter votes on their behalf:

15 Representative Ager, aye.

16 Representative Alexander, aye.

17 Representative Brockman, aye.

18 Representative Hunter, no.

19 Representative Insko, aye.

20 Representative Lucas, aye.

21 Representative Martin, aye.

22 Representative Terry, aye.

23 Representative Turner, Aye.

24 SPEAKER MOORE: The clerk will lock the
25 machine and record the vote.

1 115 having voted in the affirmative and
2 5 in the negative. House Bill 980 passed a
3 second reading and will be read a third time.

4 THE CLERK: General Assembly of North
5 Carolina Enacts.

6 SPEAKER MOORE: Further discussion?
7 Further debate? If not, the question for the
8 House is the passage of House Bill 980 on third
9 reading.

10 All those in favor will say aye.

11 QUORUM: Aye.

12 SPEAKER MOORE: Those opposed, no.

13 QUORUM: No.

14 SPEAKER MOORE: In the opinion of the
15 Chair, the ayes have it. They ayes do have it.
16 House Bill 980 having passed its third reading
17 is ordered engrossed and sent to the Senate
18 by -- by special messenger.

19 Members, there's a bill being added to
20 this evening's calendar. By way of explanation,
21 before the clerk reads the title, let me explain
22 this to you.

23 The bill is Senate Bill 128, the title
24 on the original bill is an Act to Allow Up to
25 Two Members of the Board of Trustees of

1 Isothermal Community College to be Members of
2 the Board of the County Commissioners and To
3 Require Trustees to Maintain Their County of
4 Residence.

5 The bill has become a different bill
6 called An Act Removing the Cap On Satellite
7 Annexations for the Town of Goldston.

8 So some procedural information on it
9 before it's added to this evening's calendar.
10 This is a bill that back in November 29th we --
11 we added to the calendar. And so what we did
12 was we took the amendment, which changed the
13 title. It was a material amendment and, as a
14 result, it was not able to have the second or
15 third reading. It only had its first reading at
16 that time.

17 So the Chair would ask without
18 objection that the bill be added to this
19 evening's calendar.

20 Hearing none, it's so ordered.

21 Senate Bill 128, having been added to
22 the calendar, the Chair calls Senate Bill 128
23 for a second -- for a second reading. Clerk
24 will read.

25 THE CLERK: Senator Hise, Senate Bill

1 128, a Bill to be Entitled An Act to Allow Up to
2 Two Members of the Board of Trustees of
3 Isothermal Community College to be Members of
4 the Board of Commissioners and to Require
5 Trustees to Maintain Their County of Residence.
6 General Assembly of North Carolina Enacts.

7 SPEAKER MOORE: Gentleman from Chatham,
8 Representative Reives, is recognized to debate
9 the bill.

10 REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: Thank you,
11 Mr. Speaker.

12 And we're just asking for another green
13 vote on this one. We did vote on this back in
14 November. This is -- this will allow for a
15 project that we've got coming to the small town
16 of Goldston. We've got about 200 people, and
17 we've got a chance to get us about 40 or 50
18 jobs. And so we appreciate your support before.
19 Just ask for your support again. We voted this
20 one out last time with only one no vote. Thank
21 you.

22 SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman from
23 Wayne, Representative Bell, is recognized to
24 debate the bill.

25 REPRESENTATIVE BELL: Thank you,

1 Mr. Speaker.

2 Members, this is a non-controversial
3 bill and I ask for your support. Thank you.

4 SPEAKER MOORE: Further discussion?
5 Further debate? My question for the House is to
6 pass Senate Bill 128 on second reading. Those
7 in favor will vote aye; those opposed will vote
8 no. The clerk will open the vote.

9 Gentleman from Wayne, Representative
10 Bell, House Majority Leader, is recognized to
11 announce the proxy votes of the Republican
12 members.

13 REPRESENTATIVE BELL: Thank you,
14 Mr. Speaker.

15 The following members have officially
16 designated me to announce a vote on their
17 behalf:

18 Representative Johnson, aye.

19 Representative Lambeth, aye.

20 Representative McNeeley, aye.

21 Rogers -- Representative Rogers, aye.

22 Representative Shepard, aye.

23 Representative Zachary, aye.

24 Thank you, sir.

25 SPEAKER MOORE: Gentleman from Chatham,

1 Representative Reives, the House Minority
2 Leader, is recognized to announce the proxy
3 votes of the Democratic members.

4 REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: Thank you,
5 Mr. Speaker.

6 The following members have authorized
7 me to enter votes on their behalf:

8 Representative Ager, aye.

9 Representative Alexander, aye.

10 Representative Brockman, aye.

11 Representative Hunter, aye.

12 Representative Insko, aye.

13 Representative Lucas, aye.

14 Representative Martin, aye.

15 Representative Terry, aye.

16 Representative Turner, aye.

17 SPEAKER MOORE: The clerk will lock the
18 machine and record the vote.

19 118 having voted in the affirmative,
20 one in the negative. Senate Bill 128 passes its
21 second reading, remains on the calendar.

22 Members, for your planning purposes
23 tomorrow, we -- I've conferred with the Senate,
24 and it's my understanding that we should receive
25 their -- their bills, the Congressional map and

1 the State Senate map tomorrow. And it appears
2 that we will -- we're going to have our admin
3 session at 10:30 tomorrow morning. We're going
4 to do the -- it looks like the votes are going
5 to be around 2 o'clock tomorrow afternoon. I
6 would anticipate a redistricting committee vote
7 possibly around 1 o'clock. I believe that's
8 what Chairman Hall is going probably tentatively
9 announce is a 1 o'clock Committee meeting.

10 Again, bear in mind, we may need to be
11 flexible with what's set -- with what's
12 involved. I'll properly thank central staff
13 tomorrow for their work. But just for those of
14 you who have been involved in this, you know
15 this is a lengthy process. The -- you know, the
16 media will show the map, and people will talk
17 about the map. But there's a really thick bill
18 that accompanies all that and actually has to
19 get down into the VTDS of the precincts. And
20 then when you're having to divide for
21 Congressional maps, you get into the census
22 blocks.

23 So there's a lot of detail. And so
24 when, you know, one move of a cursor here or
25 there can result in multiple changes of pages to

1 a document, and so the central staff really has
2 to work very diligently to make sure that that
3 is done correctly, that there's no errors. And
4 it's very tedious and time-consuming work
5 because it has to be checked, rechecked and then
6 checked again to make sure it's accurate.

7 So that's why it takes so long to do --
8 when we do amendments and when things are done.
9 So I know that members get anxious and want to
10 -- want to kind of get on with business, but
11 it's just part of the process to make sure it's
12 right.

13 Representative Carney talked about when
14 she worked back in the proofreading, they had
15 typewriters. Can you imagine that right now
16 with all this, right, and trying to do all this.
17 So it's a long, lengthy process. So again I'll
18 properly thank staff tomorrow, but just bear in
19 mind that could cause us to run a little bit,
20 you know, behind tomorrow and that's basically
21 what we're dealing with.

22 The Chair does intend that we'll be
23 taking up a couple of other bills tomorrow as
24 well as the redistricting bill and we'll -- if
25 we can get those noticed tonight, we will. But

1 we may not be able to notice them till -- for
2 tomorrow. So we'll let folks know what those
3 are.

4 And there's a couple of agency bills,
5 and there's a bill having to do with the masks
6 in schools. That's going to be one that we're
7 going to deal with tomorrow. And that will be
8 in the form of a conference report. So I think
9 that one's been broadcast, but I wanted to go
10 ahead and make -- let folks be on notice that
11 that's another bill that we're going to be
12 dealing with.

13 In that vein, too, the Chair is
14 relieving the conferees that were appointed to
15 Senate Bill 173 previously and the -- the bill
16 is the Free to Smiles Act, conferees are
17 dismissed. And the Chair appoints the following
18 conferees: Speaker as Chair, members Willis,
19 Torbett and Baker and Willingham as a conferee.
20 The Senate will be so notified.

21 So tomorrow's plan is that we would
22 come in admin session at 10:30. Committee, if
23 everything stays on track, 1 o'clock. And then
24 we're looking at a 2 o'clock session tomorrow to
25 take up the -- take up the bills. The Chair has

1 been informed by talking to the minority leader,
2 I think, there's not going to be any intent, at
3 least at this point, running amendments. So
4 that will -- that will allow that process to
5 hopefully go through streamline. If something
6 changes, we'll know on that.

7 So with that, any notices or
8 announcements?

9 For what purposes does the gentleman
10 from Caldwell, Representative Hall, arise?

11 CHAIRMAN HALL: For announcement.

12 SPEAKER MOORE: Gentleman has the floor
13 House.

14 CHAIRMAN HALL: Members, I anticipate
15 likely having House redistricting at some point
16 at 1:00 p.m. or later tomorrow. A lot of that
17 depends on what the Senate does. They don't
18 appear to have their things together like we do
19 over here. So just watch your inbox. But if
20 all else -- if it all works out well, we'll do
21 1:00.

22 SPEAKER MOORE: That was Representative
23 Baker of Cabarrus.

24 For what purpose does the gentleman
25 from Burke, Representative Blackwell, rise?

1 REPRESENTATIVE BLACKWELL:

2 Announcement.

3 SPEAKER MOORE: Gentleman has the
4 floor.

5 REPRESENTATIVE BLACKWELL: With
6 reference to the K-12 Education Committee, there
7 have been several corrected notices that have
8 gone out. I just want to confirm our new
9 meeting time tomorrow is at 11:00 a.m. in the
10 usual room, 643, and we have one item to
11 discuss.

12 SPEAKER MOORE: For what purpose does
13 the lady from Mecklenburg, Representative
14 Carney, rise?

15 REPRESENTATIVE CARNEY: Inquiry of the
16 Chair.

17 SPEAKER MOORE: Lady is recognized.

18 REPRESENTATIVE CARNEY: Just to
19 clarify, if we're in a hotel tomorrow, we do --
20 we do not have to stay over Thursday night?

21 SPEAKER MOORE: It does not appear at
22 this moment. But if the wheels come off the
23 wagon, who knows. I would pack -- I would pack
24 my stuff. If you're in a hotel, I would pack
25 when I leave in the morning if I were you.

1 REPRESENTATIVE CARNEY: Got it. I'll
2 send the bill to you if I don't.

3 SPEAKER MOORE: That will be fine.
4 That will be fine. You're welcome to send the
5 bill. Can't say what will happen then, but send
6 it out. I'll -- I'll pass it on to
7 Representative Reives and get him to pay.

8 For what purpose does the gentleman
9 from Guilford, Representative Hardister, rise?

10 REPRESENTATIVE HARDISTER: For a
11 personal privilege.

12 SPEAKER MOORE: Gentleman has the
13 floor.

14 REPRESENTATIVE HARDISTER: Thank you,
15 Mr. Speaker. Member I know -- Members, I know
16 we've done a lot of important work here today,
17 but there's something else very important that
18 happened today. It is Representative John
19 Faircloth's birthday, and I'm sure there is
20 nothing else he'd rather do than be with us here
21 tonight to celebrate. So I hope you'll join me
22 in wishing Representative Faircloth a happy
23 birthday.

24 SPEAKER MOORE: For what purpose does
25 the lady from Forsyth, Representative Baker,

1 rise?

2 REPRESENTATIVE BAKER: Thank you,
3 Mr. Speaker, for a point of personal privilege.

4 SPEAKER MOORE: The lady has the floor.

5 REPRESENTATIVE BAKER: I just wanted to
6 say thank you to everyone who called and sent
7 e-mails and prayed for us during the weaver
8 fire. As you all know that me and my families
9 were evacuated because we were in the evacuation
10 zone. And so we get pretty heated in here, but
11 I think whenever we go through something, it is
12 always reassuring when your colleagues reach out
13 to you to let you know that they're concerned
14 about your well-being and that -- and the
15 well-being of your family. And additionally for
16 the calls and concerns about my mother, who is
17 still hospitalized at this point. So I do
18 appreciate those prayers as well. So I thank
19 you all for that.

20 And that is all I have, Mr. Speaker.

21 SPEAKER MOORE: Yes, ma'am, thank you.

22 Any further notices or announcements?

23 Seeing none, the gentleman from Caldwell,
24 Representative Hall, is recognized for a motion.

25 REPRESENTATIVE HALL: Mr. Speaker, I

1 move the House be now adjourned to reconvene
2 Thursday, February 17th, at 10:30 a.m., subject
3 to the standard stipulations set forth in
4 Rule 15.1.

5 SPEAKER MOORE: Representative Hall
6 moved, seconded by Representative Bell, that the
7 House is now adjourned to reconvene Thursday,
8 February 17th at 10:30 a.m., subject to the
9 standard stipulations set forth in Rule 15.1.
10 Those in favor will say aye; those opposed, no.

11 The ayes have it. The House stands
12 adjourned.

13 (The General Assembly 2022 House Floor
14 Legislative Session was adjourned.)
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

2 COUNTY OF BURKE

3
4 C E R T I F I C A T E

5
6 I, TAURA J. VULCANO, RPR, do hereby
7 certify that the transcription of the recorded
8 General Assembly of North Carolina 2022
9 Legislative Session, House Floor, Vote on House
10 Bill 980, held on February 16, 2022, was taken
11 down by me stenographically to the best of my
12 ability and thereafter transcribed under my
13 supervision; and that the foregoing pages,
14 inclusive, constitute a true and accurate
15 transcription of said recording.

16
17 Signed this the 18th day of February
18 2022.

19
20
21
22 
23 TAURA J. VULCANO, RPR
24
25

GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF NORTH CAROLINA
2022 LEGISLATIVE SESSION, HOUSE FLOOR
VOTE ON SB 744 and SB 745
FEBRUARY 17, 2022

Transcribed by:
Taura J. Vulcano, RPR
Discovery Court Reporters and
Legal Videographers, LLC
4208 Six Forks Road
Suite 1000
Raleigh, North Carolina 27609
(919) 424-8242

1 (Transcribed from recorded audio file.)

2 SPEAKER MOORE: The House will come
3 back to order.

4 Members, we have a procedural matter
5 that we need to deal with, and the Chair is
6 going to ask -- well, first off, Senate
7 Bill 347, this was that Captive Insurance Bill
8 that we -- that we passed where we had the
9 Jeopardy moment with the questions. It's been
10 brought to the Chair's attention that there
11 actually are some technical adjustments that are
12 going to have to be made to that bill, so the
13 chair is going to order that the bill be
14 recalled from enrolling. The Chair is also
15 going to strike the enrollment order. And then
16 this is where I'll need unanimous consent -- or
17 I'll need to suspend to do a reconsideration.

18 The Chair is going to ask, without
19 objection, that the body -- actually, we bring
20 the bill back before us. So the Chair is
21 calling the bill back before us. That's Senate
22 Bill 347. And this is on the third reading.
23 The Chair is going to ask, without objection,
24 that the House reconsider the third reading by
25 which Senate Bill 347 was passed.

1 Is there any objection?

2 Hearing none, the Chair declares that
3 the House has reconsidered the third reading of
4 Senate Bill 347, so the bill would be before the
5 body for third reading. The Chair is going to
6 refer the bill to the Committee on Rules,
7 Calendar, and Operations of the House.

8 Representative Hall is recognized to
9 send forth the committee report.

10 The clerk will read.

11 THE CLERK: Representative Hall,
12 Redistricting Committee Report, Senate Bill 744,
13 Realign NC State Districts 2022, SCH22-4
14 Favorable.

15 SPEAKER MOORE: Senate Bill 744 is
16 added to this evening's calendar.

17 THE CLERK: Senate Bill 745, Realign
18 Congressional Districts 2022, CST22-3 Favorable.

19 SPEAKER MOORE: Senate Bill 745 is
20 added to this evening's calendar. Senate Bill
21 744. The clerk will read.

22 THE CLERK: Senators Hise, Newton and
23 Daniel. Senate Bill 744, A Bill to be Entitled
24 an Act to realign the North Carolina Senate
25 District Pursuant to the Order of the

1 North Carolina Supreme Court, Harper vs. Hall.

2 The General Assembly of North Carolina
3 Enacts.

4 SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman from
5 Caldwell, Representative Hall, is recognized to
6 debate the bill.

7 REPRESENTATIVE HALL: Members, this is
8 the State Senate's proposed map. I did not draw
9 this map, and so I'm not sure how great I will
10 be at answering specific questions about it.
11 But I will say that the information I've been
12 given is the mean-median is within the Supreme
13 Court's prescribed frame and so is the
14 efficiency gap. And so I would ask you to
15 approve the bill.

16 Further discussion? Further debate?
17 If not, the question before the House is the
18 passage of Senate Bill 744 on its second
19 reading. Those in favor will vote aye; those
20 opposed will vote no.

21 The clerk will open the vote.

22 The gentleman from Wayne,
23 Representative Bell, the House Majority Leader,
24 is recognized to announce the proxy votes of the
25 Republican members.

1 REPRESENTATIVE BELL: Thank you,
2 Mr. Speaker.

3 The following members have officially
4 designated me to announce a vote on their
5 behalf:

6 Representative Clampitt, aye.

7 Representative McNeeley, aye.

8 Representative Moss, aye.

9 Representative Riddell, aye.

10 Representative Yarborough, no.

11 SPEAKER MOORE: Is Representative Davis
12 off the floor? Okay. Representative Kyle Hall,
13 you're still --

14 The gentleman from Chatham,
15 Representative Reives, the House Minority
16 Leader, is recognized to announce the proxy
17 votes of the Democratic members.

18 REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: Thank you,
19 Mr. Speaker.

20 And the following members have
21 authorized me to enter votes on their behalf:

22 Representative Aycock, no.

23 Representative Ager, no.

24 Representative Alexander, no.

25 Representative Brockman, no.

1 Representative Everett, no.

2 Representative Hunter, no.

3 Representative Insko, no.

4 Representative Lucas, no.

5 Representative Martin, no.

6 Representative Richardson, no.

7 Representative Terry, no.

8 Representative Turner, no.

9 SPEAKER MOORE: Members, the Chair had
10 saw Representative Kyle Hall, so I'd like to
11 give just a minute, since we're being flexible
12 under the COVID rules, for folks to come. So
13 let me -- we're going hang tight. We'll give
14 him an opportunity to record on the vote.

15 And also, Representative Quick. Is
16 Representative Quick off the floor,
17 Representative Reives? I noticed Representative
18 Quick has not voted. If you want to see if he's
19 going to vote or not.

20 REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: I'm going to
21 see if I can find him because he was just
22 outside.

23 SPEAKER MOORE: Yeah. We'll hold it
24 open here for a second. I see Representative
25 Hall now. Good for you to show up.

1 (Pause.)

2 SPEAKER MOORE: I'm holding it open for
3 you, Representative Quick. Go ahead. I'm not
4 sure where you and Representative Hall were, but
5 I'm glad you came in.

6 The clerk will lock the machine and
7 record the vote.

8 67 having voted in the affirmative, 52
9 in negative, Senate Bill 744 passes its second
10 reading. It will be read a third time.

11 THE CLERK: The General Assembly of
12 North Carolina Enacts.

13 SPEAKER MOORE: Question before the
14 House is the passage of Senate Bill 744 in its
15 third reading. Those in favor will say aye.

16 COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.

17 Those opposed no.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBERS: No.

19 SPEAKER MOORE: The ayes appear to have
20 it. The ayes do have it. Senate Bill 744
21 having passed its third reading is ordered
22 enrolled.

23 Senate Bill 745, the clerk will read.

24 THE CLERK: Senators Hise, Newton and
25 Daniel. Senate Bill 745, a Bill to Be Entitled

1 an Act to Realign the North Carolina
2 Congressional District Pursuant to the Order of
3 the North Carolina Supreme Court in Harper vs.
4 Hall.

5 The General Assembly of North Carolina
6 Enacts.

7 SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman from
8 Caldwell, Representative Hall, is recognized to
9 debate the bill.

10 REPRESENTATIVE HALL: Thank you,
11 Mr. Speaker.

12 Members, the map before you was drawn
13 to comply with the Supreme Court's order, and I
14 believe it does comply with the Supreme Court's
15 order. It contains what we believe will be four
16 of the most highly competitive congressional
17 districts in the country. According to a
18 redistricting expert named Dave Wasserman, there
19 have been only 19 congressional districts in the
20 country drawn during this year's ongoing
21 redistricting cycle with an election result in
22 the Biden-Trump 2020 race with a difference of
23 only 5 percent. So only 19.

24 The map that you have before you today
25 will make North Carolina home to four additional

1 highly competitive congressional districts. The
2 map scores well within the ranges for measuring
3 mean-median and efficiency gap as announced by
4 the Supreme Court in their opinion. No county
5 in this map is split more than one time, and the
6 map has 21 municipality splits that are not just
7 a town that crosses county lines. So true
8 municipality splits, there were only 21 across
9 this entire congressional map.

10 Members, I ask for your support.

11 SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman from
12 Durham, Representative Hawkins, is recognized to
13 send forth an amendment.

14 The clerk will read.

15 THE CLERK: Representative Hawkins
16 moves to amend a bill.

17 SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman from
18 Durham is recognized to debate the amendment.

19 REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: Thank you,
20 Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for that
21 explanation.

22 I'd like to put forth an amendment to
23 change these maps to make them what we -- as we
24 see more fair because we believe that North
25 Carolinians deserve free and fair elections.

1 we've talked about that a lot. And, you know,
2 what we saw and the North Carolina Supreme Court
3 found is that the maps don't meet their
4 standards truly.

5 And so we believe that in -- starting
6 in the fall we were given an opportunity to
7 right the wrongs of previously maps, but even in
8 the ones that were reenacted that were just
9 enacted by the Senate and committee and voted on
10 in the Senate, they did not meet what we believe
11 is a good, fair opportunity for North
12 Carolinians.

13 And so this amendment is one that we've
14 consistently talked about since the fall, and so
15 that shows our consistent approach and
16 commitment to bipartisan fairness, but
17 unfortunately, the map we are going to vote on,
18 of course, falls completely short on a
19 required -- what the Court requires. And most
20 importantly, it falls short of what
21 North Carolinians deserve.

22 I'm offering an amendment that would
23 address these concerns and provide voters an
24 opportunity to vote for candidates and
25 elections, again, that are free and fair.

1 This amendment, as analyzed by the
2 Princeton Gerrymandering Project, it received a
3 fairness grade of A. You just don't get much
4 better than that. The Gerrymandering Project
5 analysis found that this amended map will give a
6 partisan advantage of zero percent neither -- of
7 neither Democrats or Republicans would benefit
8 from the map that I'm proposing.

9 The efficiency gaps, as you well may
10 know, they measure how many wasted votes a
11 district could produce, a measure of how stacked
12 the deck for one party over the other a map is.
13 An efficiency gap of more than 8 is considered a
14 red flag. For this map that we're putting
15 forward, it would have an efficiency gap of 5.8
16 that still favors Republicans but falls well
17 within the reasonable parameters. And so we
18 believe that this is a 6-5 with a -- with 3
19 competitive seats.

20 And so one thing that's also good about
21 this amendment is that we that were supposed to
22 split voting districts only when necessary. My
23 amended map would only split voter districts 14
24 times.

25 We were also supposed to make an effort

1 to draw compact districts guided by the Reock
2 and Polsby-Popper scores. My amended map will
3 score a .45 on the Reock metric. My amended map
4 will score .36 on the Polsby-Popper.

5 These indicate a more compact map,
6 which would be our goal, which should be
7 everyone's goal in this Assembly. We also
8 wanted to have a map that preserves communities
9 of interest. Those who are on the committee and
10 probably those across this body know that that's
11 something I'm personally passionate about, which
12 this would do.

13 As Representative Szoka talked about in
14 committee, he pointed out in committee that we
15 have to have these communities of interest
16 together, such as Hoke and Cumberland. It goes
17 past the stats, as he said, and talks about the
18 people. Those people in those communities
19 understand and commute and work in those areas,
20 and they belong together, which this map
21 accomplishes.

22 This map would ensure that the Triad,
23 one of the major areas that has brought in, I
24 believe, 15,000 jobs recently in this hub for
25 activity, that it would stay together. Again,

1 people work, live and play across those areas,
2 and this map would keep them together. And it
3 would also create a Sand- -- a true Sandhills
4 district. Again, that is pretty consistent with
5 what people across the state want.

6 And so lastly, the upside, of course,
7 of this map is that we have a chance to get this
8 right so that we don't have to litigate
9 throughout the decade. One thing that I know
10 for sure with everyone in this body, especially
11 those who have been around for a while, we want
12 to do this once and for the decade. And so I
13 hope that we can all stand on that premise of
14 moving forward in that direction. We do not
15 need to go through another round of costly
16 litigation. Because if this amendment is moved
17 forward, it will settle it and allow us to have,
18 again, the maps that we want and the ones that
19 people expect of a body such as the
20 North Carolina General Assembly.

21 And then lastly, of course, this will
22 remedy the issue of partisan gerrymandering in
23 our congressional map. And, of course, I vote
24 you -- I ask you to vote yes. And so I hope
25 that my explanation of this amendment is clear,

1 and I hope that you will vote yes because we
2 all, at least in this body in the North Carolina
3 House, know how to work together to solve big
4 things just as we did with our own maps
5 yesterday.

6 Thank you.

7 SPEAKER MOORE: And if -- I would ask,
8 Members, this is on the amendment at this point.
9 If members have their lights on to debate the
10 overall bill, if you'll turn those off, and then
11 we will come back to you on the -- on the
12 overall bill.

13 The gentleman from Caldwell,
14 Representative Hall, is recognized to debate the
15 amendment.

16 REPRESENTATIVE HALL: Thank you,
17 Mr. Speaker.

18 Members, I'm going to ask you to oppose
19 the amendment. The amendment would result in
20 five more municipality splits across the map.

21 Additionally, the map that I put before
22 you today, it has more competitive districts
23 than the amendment would, so overall, it's a
24 more competitive map, and I believe it better
25 complies with the Court's order. And therefore

1 I would respectfully ask you to vote no on the
2 amendment.

3 SPEAKER MOORE: Further discussion,
4 further debate on the amendment.

5 If not, the question before the House
6 is the adoption of Amendment A-1 sent forward by
7 Representative Hawkins. Those in favor will
8 vote aye; those opposed will vote no.

9 The clerk will open the vote.

10 The gentleman from Wayne, Majority
11 Leader Representative Bell, is recognized to
12 announce the proxy votes of the Republican
13 members.

14 REPRESENTATIVE BELL: Thank you,
15 Mr. Speaker.

16 The following members have officially
17 designated me to announce a vote on their
18 behalf:

19 Representative Clampitt, no.

20 Representative McNeeley, no.

21 Representative Moss, no.

22 Representative Riddell, no.

23 Representative Yarborough, no.

24 Thank you, sir.

25 SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman from

1 Chatham, the House Minority Leader,
2 Representative Reives is recognized to announce
3 the proxy votes of the Democratic members.

4 REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: Thank you,
5 Mr. Speaker.

6 The following members have authorized
7 me to enter votes on their behalf:

8 Representative Aycock, yes.

9 Representative Ager, aye.

10 Representative Alexander, aye.

11 Representative Brockman, aye.

12 Representative Everett, aye.

13 Representative Hunter, aye.

14 Representative Insko, aye.

15 Representative Lucas, aye

16 Representative Martin, aye.

17 Representative Richardson, aye.

18 Representative Terry, aye.

19 Representative Turner, aye.

20 SPEAKER MOORE: The clerk will lock the
21 machine and record the vote.

22 51 having voted in the affirmative and
23 68 in the negative, the amendment is not
24 adopted.

25 We're now back on debate or discussion

1 on the bill. The lady from Guilford,
2 Representative Harrison, is recognized to debate
3 the bill.

4 REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: Thank you,
5 Mr. Speaker.

6 Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I --
7 boy, I am -- I'm really not sure how this map is
8 going to pass constitutional muster.

9 And I will address first the Guilford
10 County situation that Representative --
11 Representative Hawkins alluded to.

12 So I appreciate the fact -- and I
13 mentioned this in the committee -- that Guilford
14 is no longer split into three different
15 congressional districts but only two. But these
16 are very problematic splits because it splits
17 Greensboro and Guilford County into two
18 districts that are not at all aligned.

19 One, the western part of the county
20 goes down to Harnett. The eastern part of the
21 county is going down to Cabarrus, running
22 through Davidson and Rowan.

23 It's -- we didn't have a -- we did not
24 have a hearing, a public hearing in Guilford,
25 which I think was a major oversight back in the

1 November draw. We were the biggest city that
2 did not -- Guilford County is the biggest county
3 that didn't have one. But what we heard in the
4 committee meetings or the hearings that were
5 held in Forsyth and in Alamance and then after
6 the map was drawn about how important it was
7 that the Triad stay together. There's so many
8 common interests amongst the two counties of
9 Forsyth and Guilford.

10 This map splits the three major
11 municipalities in that two-county cluster and
12 puts them in three congressional districts. So
13 Winston-Salem and Forsyth are now heading out
14 to -- all the way to Ashe and Watauga,
15 Greensboro is up in Rockingham down to Harnett,
16 and High Point is running down to Cabarrus.

17 This seems unacceptable to me, and I
18 noticed a number of major municipal splits. And
19 maybe there are fewer municipal splits, but they
20 sure are splitting major municipalities in the
21 state.

22 There's also -- the other major splits
23 are the -- sorry, I'm going to need my glasses.
24 My eyes are getting old. Excuse me.

25 So you've got the -- you've got the

1 fast-growing suburbs of Raleigh in southern Wake
2 County. These are Apex, Holly Springs,
3 Fuquay-Varina, and puts them in a district that
4 stretches from Duplin County, extremely rural
5 area, with very different interests. The city
6 of Cary is split. You've got Charlotte split in
7 half, half of it staying -- wholly contained
8 within Mecklenburg, but the other half in a
9 district that stretches into Rutherford County
10 where there are very different interests. The
11 city of Greenville is split in half; Goldsboro
12 is split in half.

13 The Sandhills is problematic.
14 Representative Szoka mentioned this in
15 committee. You've got Fort Bragg in two
16 different congressional districts. You've got
17 the Sandhill district split in two different
18 congressional districts.

19 So I raised this issue in committee,
20 and the response I got was, well, this meets the
21 efficiency gap analysis and mean-median
22 analysis, which are the two metrics of the
23 multiple metrics that were offered by the
24 Supreme Court to use in analyzing the
25 competitiveness of districts.

1 So I took advantage of the recess to
2 get a crash course in metric analysis, and what
3 I found out is that it's -- you can get very
4 different results depending on what you use as
5 the data.

6 And so I guess I have a question for
7 the bill sponsor -- actually, he's managing the
8 bill. He's not the bill sponsor, but maybe he
9 can answer it, if he would yield for a question,
10 please.

11 SPEAKER MOORE: Representative Hall,
12 does the gentleman yield a question?

13 REPRESENTATIVE HALL: I yield.

14 SPEAKER MOORE: He yields.

15 REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: Thank you.
16 And I hope I'm asking this right because I'm
17 still sort of new to understanding the issue.

18 But as I understand it, when you're
19 using these analyses, that it depends on what
20 data you're using. And I'm just wondering what
21 data were you using when you're running these
22 analyses?

23 REPRESENTATIVE HALL: So the data that
24 we were using in running the analysis was an
25 ensemble of 12 elections that was -- that were

1 used by one of the plaintiff's own experts in
2 the lawsuit, and that's one of the reasons we
3 chose to use that because, again, it was the
4 elections that the plaintiff's own expert
5 decided to use.

6 REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: Follow-up?

7 REPRESENTATIVE HALL: I yield.

8 SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman yields
9 for follow-up question?

10 He yields.

11 REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: So you used
12 those 12 races in all of your analyses, those 12
13 races? You didn't just use like one race in one
14 of the -- you used all 12 races in all of the
15 analyses?

16 REPRESENTATIVE HALL: Representative
17 Harrison, that's my understanding of how the
18 various metrics were calculated, yes.

19 REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: If I can have
20 a follow-up and hopefully --

21 SPEAKER MOORE: Gentleman yield?

22 REPRESENTATIVE HALL: I yield.

23 REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: And so was it
24 the same D-R split that the General Assembly was
25 using or --

1 REPRESENTATIVE HALL: Again, that is my
2 understanding, yes.

3 REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: Is there any
4 way we can see this analysis?

5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm sorry. I
6 apologize. I was talking --

7 REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: I'm sorry. I
8 just --

9 SPEAKER MOORE: He'll keep yielding.
10 Go head. Just keep asking him questions.
11 That's fine. He'll tell me when he doesn't want
12 to yield anymore.

13 REPRESENTATIVE HALL: I yield.

14 SPEAKER MOORE: Keep going. That's
15 fine.

16 REPRESENTATIVE HALL: So,
17 Representative Harrison, I'm told it's in the
18 stat pack that was handed out in committee, and
19 it should be on your dashboard now.

20 REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: I appreciate
21 that. Thank you.

22 If I could continue the debate.

23 SPEAKER MOORE: The lady has the floor.

24 REPRESENTATIVE HARRISON: Thank you.
25 And I'm close to being finished.

1 So while I appreciate that this was
2 represented as a potential 6-4-4 map, there are
3 some that say that it's really a 10-4 map in a
4 good GOP year. There -- it looks like more on
5 -- from my perspective, it's more like an 8-3-2
6 map even in a good year for Democrats.

7 I will say that David Wasserman -- I
8 appreciate Chair Hall mentioning him earlier in
9 his debate -- that he tweeted that it's still --
10 this map is still quite a gerrymander. In
11 twenty- -- using the 2020 statistics, it would
12 be a 9-5 map but likely 10-4 in 2022. 10-4.
13 That's the same map that got -- the 10-4 split
14 was a map that got struck down as a partisan
15 gerrymander. He calls this map an extreme
16 partisan gerrymander.

17 I don't know how this passes Court
18 muster. I encourage you to vote no.

19 Thank you.

20 SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman from
21 Cumberland, Representative Zsoka,
22 is recognized to debate the bill.

23 REPRESENTATIVE ZSOKA: Thank you,
24 Mr. Speaker.

25 I'm going to repeat some of what I said

1 in committee for those of you who didn't have
2 the opportunity to hear me.

3 First of all, this map meets the
4 requirements of the Court. Based on that, I
5 should vote for it. What I feel has happened,
6 though, is that the Court -- the judicial system
7 has become enamored of statics. We're not
8 statics. I don't say welcome Mr. One, Two,
9 Three, Four, Five, Six. I call you by your
10 name; likewise, you call me John.

11 We're trying to -- I feel like we've
12 gone down in -- Alice in Wonderland, down the
13 rabbit hole, and we're in this land where things
14 appear to be one thing and they end up being
15 something else.

16 I actually have a master's degree in
17 applied statistics, so I do know what I'm
18 talking about when it comes to statistics.

19 Many of the complaints I've heard about
20 this and the other maps have been about
21 communities of interest. My biggest problem
22 with this map is a community of interest in my
23 community, Fort Bragg. The largest military
24 installation in the world, over 53,000
25 active-duty service members serving at

1 Fort Bragg each and every day. And you add
2 around 60,000 retirees around that, with their
3 spouses and dependants and everybody else, that
4 is a very large community of interest.

5 The counties, including Cumberland,
6 around us have wanted for years to not be
7 represented by more than one US congressman.
8 We've had up to three congressmen in the past,
9 and they've all done a great job: Richard
10 Hudson; Price, he did a good job. But the fact
11 of the matter is that when you have a community
12 of interest of hundreds of thousands of people
13 centered around a military base, which is the
14 main economic driver for that region of the
15 state, there's a military term for it, it's
16 called "unity of command," one person in charge.

17 We haven't had that unity of effort,
18 that unity of command in the United States
19 Congress. That's what I want. That's what the
20 people in my county want. That's what people in
21 my district want. Yet, in this map we don't see
22 that.

23 We have a map that's compliant with
24 what the Court wants, which is this fasciation
25 with statistics; yet, the people in my community

1 aren't getting what they want because the Court
2 in their big -- and I'm not an attorney, but in
3 their big decision said, well, you have to do
4 all these Polsby-Popper, you have to do this,
5 you have to do that, you have to do the other
6 thing. And somehow this fascination with
7 numbers translates to fairness. I don't believe
8 that for an instant.

9 I think it's a great case of showing
10 judicial overreach and trying to take the
11 humanness out of what we do. Look, I don't
12 agree with everybody in here. I frequently
13 disagree with people on this side of the aisle.
14 I frequently disagree with people on that side
15 of the aisle, because we're human beings; we're
16 not numbers.

17 I'm not going to vote for this map, but
18 it's not because it doesn't meet the Court's
19 criteria, because it does. I spent over 20
20 years in the Army wearing the -- serving my
21 country. I came up here to serve my
22 constituents. I came up here to serve
23 Fort Bragg and those active-duty soldiers who
24 they live in Cumberland county and surrounding
25 counties, but most of them vote other places for

1 a variety of reasons.

2 But I feel in my heart of hearts, I'm
3 up here to represent them, to do the best that I
4 can for the Fort Bragg Community, the greater
5 Fort Bragg community, as well as all the
6 civilians, including myself now a civilian, who
7 live in Cumberland County.

8 My biggest gripe isn't the fact that
9 the map meets the statistics. My biggest gripe
10 is that we've been forced into a map which just
11 doesn't relate to reality. It doesn't relate to
12 my reality where I live, where the people I
13 represent live. We're forced to this, and it's
14 completely compliant.

15 So you should vote for this map. I
16 just can't. Thank you.

17 SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman from
18 Robeson, Representative Graham, is recognized to
19 debate the bill.

20 REPRESENTATIVE GRAHAM: Thank you,
21 Mr. Speaker.

22 Members, I'll be brief. I just want to
23 convey some of the same sentiments that's been
24 heard today. But I think my constituents down
25 in the Sandhills would be very disappointed if I

1 didn't stand here and advocate for Sandhills to
2 have representation that looks like the
3 Sandhills.

4 You know, for too long the counties
5 down in Sandhills -- and if you want to look at
6 your map, you can figure that out -- which is a
7 diverse part of our state: white, black,
8 American Indian, Hispanic, just a great cultural
9 base down in that area. But you know what, for
10 years the Sandhills have been sliced, diced,
11 packed to where we don't even understand, you
12 know, who are we, what are we now in terms of
13 the political arena.

14 But I can tell you this, folks down in
15 Sandhills, they have good common sense. I'm not
16 going to talk to you about statistics. I'm
17 going to talk to you about the will of our
18 people, not just my culture. I'm talking about
19 the people in those rural communities want
20 someone who can understood their need,
21 understand their desires, understand their
22 economy, understand their culture, and that's
23 all they're asking for.

24 And here again, we have an opportunity
25 to do something good for the Sandhills of this

1 state. You know, we're talking about farmers.
2 we're talking about business owners who want a
3 representative who can relate to their needs,
4 and this does not do that. Now, this is common
5 sense.

6 You know, Sandhills has been split
7 towards Charlotte. What does the Sandhills have
8 in common with Charlotte? No disrespect for the
9 folks in Charlotte. But now we're looking at
10 Sandhills being split again, going up to
11 Davidson County and Union County. I have no
12 problems with those counties. Davidson is a
13 beautiful county. Union county is a thriving
14 county, and folks who represent that county do a
15 good job representing them on this floor. But
16 the Sandhills are the Sandhills: farming
17 communities, rural communities, hardworking
18 people who want representation.

19 You know, I had an understanding last
20 evening that we were trying to move in that
21 direction and giving the Sandhills
22 respectability in terms of a region of our
23 state, and then we come back here today, and I
24 just heard that, you know, we potentially could
25 look at 10-4 congressional makeup.

1 Ladies and gentlemen, North Carolina is
2 not a 10-4 state. We are a purple state. Last
3 night it was 7-5-2. Now it's 10-4. I don't
4 know where we're getting that math from, but
5 it's not fair to the Sandhills.

6 You know, folks don't worry about this
7 constitutional stuff that we're talking about up
8 here. They worry about those core values,
9 family issues. Forget the constitution when it
10 comes to the farmer out there working on the
11 farm or the person working in that factory
12 trying to make ends meet. They want someone
13 that they can trust and someone that can
14 represent them in a meaningful way.

15 We have hardly -- and we've just talked
16 about this -- no communities of interests,
17 neighborhoods of interest or counties of
18 interest. It's clustered together. So, you
19 know, over the years -- and this is my second
20 time going through redistricting. We've seen
21 what we've gone through in the past ten years:
22 court battle, court battle, disagreements over
23 the years. We know what unites us. Our
24 cultures unite us. Our interests unite us. And
25 what we have before us today is very

1 disrespectful to the Sandhills portion of our
2 state. It's like you're irrelevant. You don't
3 matter. We'd rather have you cracked and packed
4 and sent in different directions. So I'm not
5 going to support this.

6 One of the reasons -- another thing
7 that is very important to me is my culture and
8 having someone that's going to fight in
9 Washington for Lumbee recognition. For
10 125 years we've been fighting and getting lip
11 service, and I think it's time for that to end.

12 Ladies and gentlemen, you know, the
13 Sandhills has voted historically for Republicans
14 and Democrats. I'm standing here as a Democrat
15 in my district, Robeson County. Donald Trump
16 won my district. I won my district. And some
17 of your other representatives here, some of you
18 -- some of your constituents voted for Obama,
19 but then they turned around and voted for you.

20 I'll call out my good friend here,
21 Representative Pierce, over in Scotland County.
22 Folks in Scotland County and Hoke County voted
23 for him but voted for Senator Tillis. So, you
24 know, our folks know and understand how to cast
25 a vote, and I think it's unfair that we would

1 stand here today breaking up our communities of
2 interest. And that's -- that's not -- that's
3 not good for our state; it's not good for our
4 communities.

5 And I would say to you, let's go back
6 to -- let's go back to the drawing table. Let's
7 do this over. We should do that. We should do
8 that because rural communities understand rural
9 communities. People understand each other. And
10 I would ask you, let's not support this. It's
11 not fair. It does the Sandhills communities an
12 injustice, and I think we deserve better than
13 that. And I think the will of the people needs
14 to be heard today, and this is not the will of
15 the people.

16 Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

17 SPEAKER MOORE: Further discussion?
18 Further debate?

19 If not, the question before the House
20 is the passage of Senate Bill 745 on its second
21 reading. Those in favor will vote aye; those
22 opposed will vote no.

23 The clerk will open the vote.

24 The gentleman from Wayne,
25 Representative Bell, the House Majority Leader,

1 is recognized to announce the proxy votes of the
2 Republican members.

3 REPRESENTATIVE BELL: Thank you,
4 Mr. Speaker.

5 The following members have officially
6 designated me to announce a vote on their
7 behalf:

8 Representative Clampitt, aye.

9 Representative McNeeley, aye.

10 Representative Moss, aye.

11 Representative Riddell, aye.

12 Representative Yarborough, aye.

13 Thank you, sir.

14 SPEAKER MOORE: The gentleman from
15 Chatham, Representative Reives, the House
16 Minority Leader, is recognized to announce the
17 proxy votes of the Democratic members.

18 REPRESENTATIVE REIVES: Thank you,
19 Mr. Speaker.

20 The following members have allowed me
21 to enter votes on their behalf:

22 Representative Aycock, no.

23 Representative Ager, no.

24 Representative Alexander, no.

25 Representative Brockman, no.

1 Representative Everett, no.

2 Representative Hunter, no.

3 Representative Insko, no.

4 Representative Lucas, no.

5 Representative Martin, no.

6 Representative Richardson, no.

7 Representative Terry, no.

8 Representative Turner, no.

9 REPRESENTATIVE HALL: The clerk will
10 lock the machine and record the vote.

11 66 having voted in the affirmative and
12 53 in the negative, Senate Bill 745 passed its
13 second reading and will be read a third time.

14 THE CLERK: The General Assembly of
15 North Carolina Enacts.

16 SPEAKER MOORE: The question before the
17 House is the passage of Senate Bill 745 on its
18 third reading. Those in favor will say, aye.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.

20 SPEAKER MOORE: Those opposed, no.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBERS: No.

22 SPEAKER MOORE: The ayes appear to have
23 it. The ayes do it. Senate Bill 745, having
24 passed its third reading, is ordered enrolled.

25 Stand at ease momentarily.

1 (Recess.)

2 SPEAKER MOORE: I want to take a
3 moment -- the staff's not here, but if the body
4 would give me a few moments. I think it's
5 appropriate to recognize and -- well, I see
6 Erika back -- I see a couple back in the back.
7 I just want to tell you the hours and hours of
8 work that our central staff, the clerk's office,
9 of course, the sergeant-at-arms, but our central
10 staff have been putting in working through this
11 process, both in the first round and then this
12 latest round, under a very tight deadline that
13 we were given to work through that, to really
14 undertake, to have a process that went before
15 us.

16 And I would submit that whether you
17 voted for the maps or not or liked them, you got
18 to respect the hardworking staff that we have
19 who put the hours in to do this. I would ask my
20 colleagues to join me in showing our
21 appreciation to our staff for their hard work.

22 (Applause.)

23 SPEAKER MOORE: So we have -- we have
24 concluded our business at this time. It is --
25 and so now in terms of the process, these maps

1 will be submitted to the Court tomorrow, well in
2 time for the deadline that was put in place.

3 And the Chair is informed by all of the -- by
4 staff and by the individuals that all the maps
5 have scored and met the criteria that the Court
6 laid out, so those will all be put in. So we'll
7 be awaiting any response there.

8 But we will remain in session, but
9 with -- I don't know of anything that would be
10 calendared for next week. We'll go back to the
11 same process where if something -- if it does
12 appear that this General Assembly needs to take
13 up any action that we give sufficient notice for
14 everyone. But, frankly, I don't see anything
15 happening next week. But I just -- we're in
16 sort of some new territory here, folks, so we'll
17 just have to see what happens, but that's the --
18 that's the plan. So there's no more business to
19 do this evening or this week, but we will -- and
20 we'll see where we are next week.

21 But I do want to thank -- I do want to
22 thank every member of this House. I know that
23 this process has been -- the hours have been
24 long here, the process is tough. It can be very
25 tedious. And, inherently, these can be

1 difficult subjects to discuss. And I certainly
2 want to thank members on both sides of the aisle
3 for the candor and the ability to disagree
4 without being disagreeable when that was but to
5 work together, and I'm extremely proud of the
6 way the State House maps passed on a strong
7 bipartisan basis yesterday, but just very proud
8 of all the members of this House and this
9 General Assembly. And I just want each one --
10 each and every one of you to know I appreciate
11 what you do in your service to the State of
12 North Carolina.

13 So with that we'll go to notices and
14 announcements. If the body would please come to
15 order, we have some notices and announcements.

16 (Notices and announcements not
17 transcribed by reporter.)

1 STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

2 COUNTY OF BURKE

3
4 C E R T I F I C A T E

5
6 I, TAURA J. VULCANO, RPR, do hereby
7 certify that the transcription of the recorded
8 General Assembly of North Carolina 2022
9 Legislative Session, House Floor vote on SB 744
10 and SB 745, held on February 17, 2022, was taken
11 down by me stenographically to the best of my
12 ability and thereafter transcribed under my
13 supervision; and that the foregoing pages,
14 inclusive, constitute a true and accurate
15 transcription of said recording.

16
17 Signed this the 19th day of February
18 2022.

19
20
21
22 
23 TAURA J. VULCANO, RPR
24
25

GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF NORTH CAROLINA
2022 LEGISLATIVE SESSION, SENATE FLOOR
VOTE ON SB 744, SB 745 AND HB 980
FEBRUARY 17, 2022

Transcribed by:

Denise Myers Byrd, CSR 8340, RPR
Discovery Court Reporters and
Legal Videographers, LLC
4208 Six Forks Road
Suite 1000
Raleigh, North Carolina 27609
(919) 424-8242
denise@discoverydepo.com

1 THE PRESIDENT: The Senate will come to
2 order. Sergeant-at-arms will close the doors.
3 Members will go to their seats. Members and
4 guests of the gallery will please silence all
5 electronic devices.

6 Leading the Senate in prayer, Senator
7 Paul Lowe, Forsyth county. All members and
8 guests in the gallery will please stand.

9 SENATOR LOWE: Let us pray. Thou who
10 art eternal, we thank you for this day, and we
11 thank you for all of our lives. We ask that you
12 would continue to help us as we do the work of
13 the Old North State. We ask that you would
14 encourage our hearts and our minds to do those
15 things that you have called us to do. These
16 things we pray in the Son in the Name of He that
17 orders our steps and meets us with mercy in the
18 Name of Jesus the Christ. Thank you, and all of
19 the people said.

20 THE PRESIDENT: Senator Berger is
21 recognized for a motion.

22 SENATOR BERGER: Thank you,
23 Mr. President.

24 The journal for February 16, 2022, has
25 been examined and has found to be correct. I

1 move that we dispense with the reading of the
2 journal and that it stand approved as written.

3 THE PRESIDENT: Without objection, the
4 journal for February 16, 2022, stands approved
5 as written.

6 Leaves of absences are requested and
7 without objection are granted for Senators Hise,
8 Robinson, and Batch.

9 And we are on to our calendar.

10 First on our -- Senator Rabon, for what
11 purpose do you rise?

12 SENATOR RABON: A series of motions,
13 please, Mr. President.

14 THE PRESIDENT: You have the floor for
15 your motions.

16 SENATOR RABON: Thank you,
17 Mr. President.

18 I move that all bills voted out of the
19 Senate today be sent to the House by special
20 message. Senate Bill 745, Realign Congressional
21 Districts 2022-CT -- CST 22-3 and
22 House Bill 980, Realign NC House Districts 22/8
23 TU 22-4 were heard in committee today and
24 reported favorably. Move that those bills be
25 added to today's floor calendar for

1 consideration, please.

2 THE PRESIDENT: Without objection, so
3 ordered.

4 SENATOR RABON: The conference report
5 for Senate Bill 173, Free Smiles Act, has been
6 handed in to the principal clerk, move that the
7 bill be added to today's calendar for
8 consideration.

9 THE PRESIDENT: Without objection, so
10 ordered.

11 SENATOR RABON: Thank you,
12 Mr. President.

13 Senator Harrington was not present for
14 the floor session January 19, 2022. I move that
15 Senator Harrington receive an excused absence
16 for that day.

17 THE PRESIDENT: Likewise, without
18 objection, that is so ordered.

19 We are on to our calendar.

20 There are a number of amendments need
21 to be added to the dashboard, so we will stand
22 at ease while that's taking place, just stand at
23 ease.

24 (At ease.)

25 THE PRESIDENT: The Senate is back in

1 order. Members will return to their seats.
2 Silence all electronic devices.

3 Before we go on to our calendar, I have
4 one courtesy of the gallery upon the motion of
5 Senator Ted Alexander of Cleveland, Lincoln, and
6 Gaston counties. Courtesies are extended to
7 Debbie and Mike Gates with Compassion to Act
8 which is a nonprofit organization that combats
9 human trafficking, something that is desperately
10 needed in our time, sadly. So thank you very
11 much for being here.

12 We are on to our calendar. First up on
13 our calendar, we have public bill, second
14 reading, Senate Bill 744. The clerk will read.

15 THE CLERK: Senate Bill 744, Realign NC
16 Senate District 2022/SCH 22-4.

17 THE PRESIDENT: Senator Newton is
18 recognized to explain the bill.

19 SENATOR NEWTON: Thank you,
20 Mr. President.

21 Members, the proposed remedial Senate
22 plan was explained in detail yesterday in
23 committee, so I will not repeat the depth of
24 that discussion unless you have a question, and
25 I'm happy to do so, but back in November 2021,

1 we drew and passed what we thought was a
2 constitutional map. The majority of the
3 North Carolina Supreme Court has told us
4 otherwise and provided at least some guidance on
5 what presumptively constitutional -- a
6 presumptively constitutional map should be.

7 Specifically, the majority told us that
8 we should apply the mean-median and efficiency
9 gap tests against our remedial draw on a
10 statewide basis, and that if we pass those
11 tests, scoring sufficiently well, our remedial
12 map would be presumptively constitutional.
13 Although other possible tests were identified by
14 the Court, these two tests are particularly
15 appropriate because the formulas are not
16 proprietary or unique to a single expert witness
17 but are replicable. Democrats, plaintiffs, and
18 plaintiffs' counsel can run the remedial map
19 through these analyses and will get the exact
20 same results.

21 Now, you and I may have other preferred
22 methods, but in drawing maps -- in drawing maps
23 that pass both the mean-median and efficiency
24 gap test, we've done exactly what the majority
25 of the North Carolina Supreme Court told us to

1 do. This remedial map scored a negative
2 0.65 percent on the mean-median test and
3 therefore scores better than the required plus
4 or minus 1 percent.

5 This remedial map scored a negative
6 3.97 percent on the efficiency gap measure,
7 scoring better than the required plus or minus
8 7 percent. Nonpartisan central staff ran the
9 analysis, and their results were statistically
10 identical, with efficiency gap found to be
11 negative 3.98 percent which is statistically a
12 statistical insignificant difference. Thus the
13 remedial map is presumptively constitutional.

14 And you know, I think it's important to
15 know that early in the process, middle of last
16 week, the Senate GOP offered the Senate
17 Democrats to come join the Senate redistricting
18 chairs to draft the new map on a pod-by-pod
19 basis, and the Senate Democrats never took us up
20 on that offer. That's not to say that they
21 haven't acted in good faith with us; they have
22 acted in good faith. Both Republicans and
23 Democrats I believe did the very best they could
24 in the time that this Court gave us, but I just
25 want the record to reflect that we did offer to

1 sit down pod by pod, district by district, with
2 the Democrats and that was -- was not -- was not
3 accepted, that offer was not accepted.

4 One housekeeping matter that I would
5 like to clarify is that yesterday, in committee,
6 I was asked about whether we scored and perhaps
7 started our draw with the enacted map. The
8 enacted map was November 2021.

9 I want to be precise on that point. We
10 started with the enacted map. In terms of the
11 remedial map, we started with the enacted map,
12 but because it was already declared
13 unconstitutional, there was no need to score it.
14 We did not begin scoring until we had made
15 significant changes across the map resulting in
16 a presumptively constitutional map that we have
17 before us today.

18 In response to Senator Blue's questions
19 in committee, we ran the data on the enacted
20 map, and it performed very poorly. No surprise.
21 The efficiency gap was negative 8.1 percent, and
22 a negative number means it skews Republican.
23 That's outside the bounds of the 7 percent
24 prescribed by the Supreme Court majority.

25 The mean-median was negative

1 3.79 percent, outside the bounds of the plus or
2 minus 1 percent.

3 This new remedial map improves on both
4 those measures and falls within the range
5 prescribed by the Court.

6 Also, I want to clarify a point that
7 Senator Blue raised in committee yesterday. His
8 point seemed to be that in his view we had not
9 addressed the allegedly gerrymandered districts
10 challenged by the plaintiffs.

11 I want to say unequivocally that that
12 is not the case. We did address every single
13 district cited in the trial court's opinion.
14 Many of these districts were changed
15 substantially, some were changed slightly, but
16 all were changed. And every single district
17 that was changed was moved in the Democrats
18 favor. Let me repeat that point: Every single
19 district cited in the trial court's opinion was
20 changed and every single change favored
21 Democrats. Some competitive districts became
22 safe for Democrats. Some competitive seats
23 remained competitive but more -- but more in the
24 Democrats favor. Some safe Republican seats
25 became less safe. Some became competitive or

1 even leaning.

2 Changes to the proposed remedial plan
3 sorted out like this. The Daniel's seat in the
4 remedial plan, 2.4 points more Democratic. The
5 Krawiec seat, 6.6 points more Democratic. The
6 Berger seat, 5.1 points more Democratic. The
7 Jeff Jackson seat, 3.6 points more Democratic.
8 The Batch seat .8 points more Democratic. The
9 Crawford seat, 2.3 points more Democratic. The
10 Lee seat became 1.2 points more Republican.
11 That was not one of the disputed districts, but
12 it is slightly more Republican after the redraw,
13 and I wanted to point that out. And I'll
14 explain a little more here about that.

15 So Senator Blue and our colleagues on
16 the other side of the aisle clearly do not like
17 all of our changes and would prefer even more
18 seats to be moved into their column or changed
19 in a different way, perhaps, but it is not the
20 case that we didn't address all of the
21 challenged districts in the trial court's
22 opinion. The Democrats have seemed to simply
23 disagree with our reading of the Supreme Court's
24 ruling that the map as a whole was
25 unconstitutional, not a specific district.

1 Let me quote the Supreme Court's
2 opinion again for the record.

3 Quote: The partisan gerrymandering
4 violation is based on the redistricting plan as
5 a whole, not a finding with regard to any
6 individual district. Certainly, it is possible,
7 as the plaintiffs and the trial court
8 demonstrated, to identify which individual
9 districts in the state legislative maps ignore
10 traditional redistricting principles to achieve
11 a partisan outcome that otherwise would not
12 occur. It is possible to identify the most
13 gerrymandered individual districts, but here the
14 violation is statewide because of the evidence
15 that on the whole the districts have been drawn
16 such that voters supporting one political party
17 have their votes systematically devalued by
18 having less opportunity to elect representatives
19 to seats compared with an equal number of voters
20 of the favored party -- in the favored party.

21 I also want to address a point
22 Senator Blue made yesterday about
23 Senate District 7 -- I alluded to it earlier --
24 in New Hanover county.

25 It is true that the plaintiffs did not

1 challenge this district and the trial court did
2 not weigh in on the merits of the draw here in
3 the enacted map. In creating this new remedial
4 district, in the process of refining it and
5 getting it scored in compliance with the court
6 ruling, we swapped out three precincts that were
7 in District 8 in New Hanover county for four
8 different ones. The net effect of this change
9 was to make the district approximately
10 1.2 points more Republican, closer to a 50/50
11 competitive district. Biden still won the
12 proposed Senate District 7 49.2 percent to
13 49 percent.

14 And as I stated yesterday in committee,
15 we changed this district, as well as a few
16 others elsewhere in the map, to produce an
17 overall product, a statewide map that scored
18 well on the mean-median and efficiency gap tests
19 as directed by the majority on the
20 North Carolina Supreme Court.

21 Senate District 7 could have been drawn
22 to be slightly more Republican, but we crafted
23 it to be a 50/50 competitive district, and this
24 configuration scored exceptionally well in the
25 context of the statewide plan that treats

1 Republicans and Democrats fairly.

2 Members, this map -- this remedial map
3 allows both parties, Democrats and Republicans,
4 an opportunity to compete for the majority.
5 That's what the Court said it wanted, that's
6 what the people asked for, and that's what we
7 have delivered. With good candidates and good
8 messages, either party can win the majority
9 under this remedial map.

10 And with that, Members, I do ask for
11 your support. Thank you.

12 THE PRESIDENT: Senator Chaudhuri, for
13 what purpose do you rise?

14 SENATOR CHAUDHURI: To speak on the
15 bill.

16 THE PRESIDENT: You have the floor.

17 SENATOR CHAUDHURI: Thank you,
18 Mr. President.

19 Mr. President, we believe that the
20 state Senate maps drawn by the governing
21 majority fails to meet the state's highest court
22 opinion and order, and we believe that the
23 governing majority failed to do so because the
24 process to draw such maps were never bipartisan
25 and collaborative, that such maps reflect the

1 governing majority's belief that its legislative
2 powers rise above our constitution and that the
3 remedial maps before us still remain
4 gerrymandered.

5 First, let me start with the
6 map-drawing process itself. Certainly, Senate
7 Democrats on our side remained hopeful that we
8 could craft a bipartisan set of maps. As
9 Senator Blue said in a joint release statement
10 with Senator Berger last week, it was his desire
11 that both sides would work together in hopes of
12 reaching a negotiated end product. However,
13 unlike our House colleagues, where a true
14 collaborative process took place, we were not
15 able to do so. And unfortunately, our hope
16 became hopeless because we continued to observe
17 major problems with the Senate maps that don't
18 comport with the finding of facts from the
19 bipartisan three-judge panel. Let me cite just
20 one example.

21 In the Harper opinion, the three-judge
22 panel makes clear, this governing majority's
23 decision to group Buncombe county with Burke and
24 McDowell counties to the east allowed more
25 Republicans to, quote, neutralize the Democratic

1 stronghold in and around Asheville.

2 The trial court also cites Dr. Duchin's
3 study, an expert in the case, who observed that
4 this Buncombe-Burke-McDowell cluster never
5 elected a Democrat in any of the 52 elections in
6 his study. And I should point out that in the
7 Court opinion that word never was italicized and
8 bolded. Not surprisingly, the trial court said
9 that this county cluster was the result of
10 intentional pro Republican partisan
11 redistricting, a phrase that is found 59 times
12 in the trial court's opinion.

13 The trial court also suggests that the
14 Buncombe county-Henderson county cluster seems
15 to be a better alternative. It states that
16 Henderson county has become a bedroom community
17 of Asheville, and the trial court said that the
18 alternative cluster would result in neutralizing
19 Democrats in Asheville to a lesser extent.

20 In the maps before us, the governing
21 majority refused to adopt the alternative
22 Buncombe-Henderson cluster.

23 Second, the governing majority has
24 publicly stated that our highest court has
25 become a policymaking body where it advances its

1 political ideals, something that should be left
2 to the legislature, yet it is important to make
3 two comments.

4 First, even though our country's
5 highest court refused to reject partisan
6 gerrymandering, Chief Justice John Roberts did
7 state that, quote, provision in state statutes
8 and state constitutions can provide standards
9 and guidance for state courts to apply.

10 And second, our state's highest court
11 did not engage in policymaking. Instead it
12 carried out its most important duty: protecting
13 the constitutional right of our people from
14 legislative overreach.

15 If we combine the governing majority's
16 approach with the three-judge panel's findings,
17 we would essentially live in a state where it's
18 legally valid to gerrymander 16 state Senate
19 districts; in other words, one out of three
20 state Senate districts would be legally
21 gerrymandered. We would live in a state where
22 partisan gerrymander trumps our citizen's state
23 constitutional rights.

24 And finally, as I've mentioned before,
25 we believe that these maps remain gerrymandered.

1 These state Senate maps are designed to lock in
2 Republicans as the governing majority for the
3 remainder of the decade that does not ultimately
4 reflect the will of the people.

5 The governing majority did not use the
6 ensembles of thousands of maps. As
7 Senator Clark inquired during yesterday's
8 committee meetings, they did not use the close
9 vote, close seat analysis as a part of its
10 analysis either. And in the end we still see
11 evidence of gerrymandering.

12 In one instance, contrary to what
13 Senator Newton has pointed out, we might argue
14 we've seen the governing majority carry out
15 almost the same gerrymander from almost three
16 years ago that a three-judge panel said was
17 gerrymandering. In 2019, in the Common Cause v
18 Lewis case, the panel pointed out that the
19 General Assembly cracked Democratic voters in
20 the two voting districts that's been called the
21 wilmington notch. The Common Cause Court
22 pointed out that an expert's analysis, quote,
23 demonstrates that the moving of Democratic
24 voters in the wilmington notch into
25 Senate District 8 made Senate District 9 as

1 favorable for Republicans as possible. And now
2 in 2022 the General Assembly has drawn yet
3 another Senate district in which the Wilmington
4 voting district's moved into the Senate
5 District 7 from Senate District 8, a concern
6 raised by Senator Blue in yesterday's committee
7 hearings. Three years later we see the return
8 of the Wilmington notch, and that appears to be
9 partisan gerrymandering.

10 We recognize and acknowledge that the
11 governing majority has put its best efforts, but
12 best efforts don't necessarily address the trial
13 court's findings of facts and our state's
14 highest court's opinion.

15 We are drawing maps for this year's
16 coming election day and for future election days
17 to come. The voters that go cast their ballots
18 do so because they want to feel like their votes
19 are meaningful. Unfortunately, the maps before
20 us still diminishes the will of our people.

21 And, Mr. President, if the opportunity
22 presents itself, I would also like to offer a
23 few amendments.

24 THE PRESIDENT: Are you sending forward
25 an amendment now?

1 SENATOR CHAUDHURI: Yes, Mr. President.

2 THE PRESIDENT: Send forward your
3 amendment.

4 SENATOR CHAUDHURI: Okay. So I want to
5 make sure that this is coordinated with the
6 amendments that we have on the dashboard,
7 Mr. President. I believe the first amendment
8 that I would like to offer is ABA 59 which is an
9 amendment that deals the New Hanover county
10 cluster.

11 THE PRESIDENT: Amendment Number 1 to
12 Senate Bill 744, the clerk will read.

13 THE CLERK: Senator Chaudhuri moves to
14 amend the bill.

15 THE PRESIDENT: You have the floor.
16 Explain your amendment.

17 SENATOR CHAUDHURI: Thank you,
18 Mr. President.

19 Mr. President, this amendment addresses
20 an issue that I just discussed, and that is the
21 fact that the governing majority had created
22 partisan gerrymandering that was similar to what
23 the Common Cause trial court pointed out in
24 which they had cracked Democratic voters in two
25 Democratic districts that's been called the

1 wilmington notch.

2 The amendment that you see before you
3 now creates a more compact Senate district where
4 the Reock and Polsby-Popper scores are higher.
5 It also does away with the partisan
6 gerrymandering identified from the Common Cause
7 trial court. I encourage my colleagues to
8 support this amendment.

9 THE PRESIDENT: Senator Daniel, for
10 what purpose do you rise?

11 SENATOR DANIEL: Mr. President, to
12 Amendment 1 do lie upon the table.

13 SENATOR NEWTON: Second.

14 THE PRESIDENT: Senator Daniel has
15 offered a motion to table Amendment Number 1 to
16 Senate Bill 744 that was seconded by Senator
17 Newton.

18 This is a non-debatable motion and will
19 go straight to a vote. The question before the
20 body is the motion to table Amendment Number 1,
21 the Senate Bill 744. All in favor will vote
22 aye, all opposed will vote no. Five seconds
23 will be allowed for voting. The clerk will
24 record the vote.

25 27 having voted in the affirmative, 20

1 in the negative, Amendment Number 1 to
2 Senate Bill 744 will lie upon the table, and we
3 are back to the bill.

4 Is there further discussion or debate
5 on Senate Bill 744?

6 SENATOR CHAUDHURI: Yes, Mr. President.
7 I would like offer a second amendment.

8 THE PRESIDENT: Send forward your
9 amendment.

10 SENATOR CHAUDHURI: I believe this
11 amendment number is ATU 49.

12 THE PRESIDENT: Amendment Number 2 to
13 Senate Bill 744, the clerk will read.

14 THE CLERK: Senator Chaudhuri moves to
15 amend the bill.

16 THE PRESIDENT: You have the floor,
17 sir.

18 SENATOR CHAUDHURI: Okay. Thank you,
19 Mr. President.

20 Given the Senate's decision to vote
21 down my first amendment, I now offer an
22 amendment to do away with the wilmington notch
23 entirely. I view this amendment as
24 slightly -- certainly the worst of the two
25 amendments that were offered for this cluster.

1 However, this amendment does restore
2 Senate District 7 and 8 back to the originally
3 enacted set of maps proposed or passed by this
4 body. I would encourage you to support it.

5 THE PRESIDENT: Senator Daniel, for
6 what purpose do you rise?

7 SENATOR DANIEL: Mr. President, I move
8 that Amendment 2 do lie upon the table.

9 SENATOR NEWTON: Second.

10 THE PRESIDENT: Senator Daniel moves
11 Amendment Number 2 to Senate Bill 744 do lie
12 upon the table. That was seconded by Senator
13 Newton.

14 This is a non-debatable motion and
15 we'll go straight to a vote. The question
16 before the body is the motion to table Amendment
17 Number 2 to Senate Bill 744. All in favor will
18 vote aye, all opposed will vote no. Five
19 seconds will be allowed for voting, and the
20 clerk will record the vote.

21 27 having voted in the affirmative, 20
22 in the negative, Amendment Number 2 to
23 Senate Bill 744 will lie upon the table, and we
24 are once again back to the bill.

25 Is there further discussion or debate?

1 SENATOR CHAUDHURI: Mr. President, I
2 would like to offer my final amendment.

3 THE PRESIDENT: Senator Chaudhuri, send
4 forward your amendment. Excuse me.

5 SENATOR CHAUDHURI: Thank you,
6 Mr. President.

7 I believe the amendment for this title
8 is ABW 32.

9 THE PRESIDENT: Amendment Number 3 to
10 Senate Bill 744, the clerk will read.

11 THE CLERK: Senator Chaudhuri moves to
12 amend the bill.

13 THE PRESIDENT: You have the floor.

14 SENATOR CHAUDHURI: This is -- this is
15 the Granville-Wake amendment, correct? Is that
16 what's appearing on the dashboard? Okay. Thank
17 you. Given that I'm 0 for 2 on amendments
18 today.

19 As I've mentioned, many of the clusters
20 remain partisan gerrymandered. Specifically
21 with regard to this amendment, it's important to
22 point out that the trial court's findings of
23 facts clearly lays out where partisan
24 gerrymandering takes place. The trial court
25 stated that the simulations of Dr. Mattingly and

1 Pegden confirm that Dr. Cooper's analysis, who
2 was another expert, had independently
3 established that the Wake-Granville groups is an
4 intentional pro Republican partisan
5 redistricting.

6 Furthermore, the trial court found that
7 the Democrats were cracked out of the two most
8 Republican Senate districts, including
9 Senate District 13 that's before us and packed
10 them into the most Democratic Districts 14, 15,
11 16, and 18. And not surprisingly, Dr. Pegden,
12 an expert in the case, found that the
13 Granville-Wake Senate county is more favorable
14 to Republicans than 99.99 percent of the maps
15 that his algorithm encountered.

16 And, Mr. President, I offer this
17 amendment as an alternative.

18 THE PRESIDENT: Senator Daniel, for
19 what purpose do you rise?

20 SENATOR DANIEL: Mr. President, I move
21 that Amendment 3 do lie upon the table.

22 SENATOR NEWTON: Second.

23 THE PRESIDENT: Senator Daniel moves
24 that Amendment Number 3 to Senate Bill 744 do
25 lie upon the table, seconded by Senator Newton.

1 This is a non-debatable motion and will
2 go straight to a vote. The question before the
3 body is the motion to table Amendment Number 3
4 to Senate Bill 744. All in favor will vote aye,
5 all opposed will vote no. Five seconds will be
6 allowed for voting, and the clerk will record
7 the vote.

8 27 having voted in the affirmative, 20
9 in the negative, Amendment Number 3 to
10 Senate Bill 744 will lie upon the table, and we
11 are once again back to the bill.

12 Is there further discussion or debate?

13 Senator Marcus, for what purpose do you
14 rise?

15 SENATOR MARCUS: To bring forward an
16 amendment.

17 THE PRESIDENT: Send forward your
18 amendment.

19 SENATOR MARCUS: I believe it's on the
20 dashboard, and I hope I have the letters right.
21 It should be ATU 50 dealing with the
22 Cumberland-Moore county clusters.

23 THE PRESIDENT: Amendment Number 4 to
24 Senate Bill 744, the clerk will read.

25 THE CLERK: Senator Marcus moves to

1 amend the bill.

2 THE PRESIDENT: You have the floor.

3 SENATOR MARCUS: Thank you,
4 Mr. President.

5 Keeping with the theme here of
6 attempting to improve this map to comply better
7 with the court order and to better reflect the
8 will of North Carolina voters, I'd like to draw
9 your attention to the Cumberland-Moore county
10 cluster dealing with Senate District 19 and 21.

11 The trial court found here, and the
12 Supreme Court affirmed, that this cluster in the
13 enacted map packs more Democrats in and around
14 Fayetteville and into Senate District 19,
15 leaving Senate District 21 decidedly more
16 Republican than it should be. And the map also
17 separates Fayetteville State University from its
18 namesake city.

19 So our amendment that I'm offering to
20 you today is the fair way to remedy the partisan
21 gerrymander that was identified by the Court by
22 putting Fayetteville State back with
23 Fayetteville, where it belongs, respecting other
24 communities of interest and making both
25 districts more competitive.

1 This amendment would make the map more
2 fair, more competitive and compliant with the
3 court order, and I ask for your support.

4 THE PRESIDENT: Senator Daniel, for
5 what purpose do you rise?

6 SENATOR DANIEL: Mr. President, I move
7 that Amendment Four do lie upon the table.

8 SENATOR NEWTON: Second.

9 THE PRESIDENT: Senator Daniel moves
10 that Amendment Number 4 to Senate Bill 744 do
11 lie upon the table, seconded by Senator Newton.

12 This is a non-debatable motion, and
13 we'll go straight to a vote. The question
14 before the body is the motion to table Amendment
15 Number 4 to Senate Bill 744. All in favor will
16 vote aye, opposed will vote no. Five seconds
17 will be allowed for voting, and the clerk will
18 record the vote.

19 Senator Britt is no. Or Senator Britt
20 is aye. Excuse me. Sorry. I don't want to do
21 that. Senator Britt is aye. I got bad eyes.

22 Senator Corbett. Senator Corbett is
23 aye.

24 27 having voted in the affirmative, 20
25 in the negative, Amendment Number 4 to

1 Senate Bill 744 will lie upon the table, and
2 we're once again back to the bill.

3 Is there further discussion or debate?

4 Senator Garrett, for what purpose do
5 you rise?

6 SENATOR GARRETT: To send forward an
7 amendment.

8 THE PRESIDENT: Send forward your
9 amendment.

10 SENATOR GARRETT: And it is
11 S744-ABW-35.

12 THE PRESIDENT: Amendment Number 5 to
13 Senate Bill 744. The clerk will read.

14 SENATOR CLARK: Senator Garrett moves
15 to amend the bill.

16 THE PRESIDENT: You have the floor.

17 SENATOR GARRETT: Thank you,
18 Mr. President.

19 The aim of the amendment before you is
20 fairly straightforward. The revision to the
21 Guilford county -- Guilford-Rockingham county
22 grouping creates three commonsense compact
23 districts which abide by the requirements set
24 forth by the Court. The map before you contains
25 no split VTDS, minimal splitting of

1 municipalities, and preserves historic
2 communities of interest. The first of these is
3 District 28 which would span the southern third
4 of Guilford county, including all of High Point,
5 Jamestown, Pleasant Garden and parts of
6 Greensboro. No incumbent senator resides in
7 this proposed district.

8 Second is District 27 which would cover
9 the northwest quadrant of Guilford county,
10 including Summerfield, Oakridge, Stokes, Dale,
11 and most of west Greensboro. Both I and Senator
12 Robinson reside in this proposed district.

13 Third, District 26 which would cover
14 all of Rockingham county and adjacent northeast
15 Guilford county and east Greensboro, virtually
16 following Church Street, a major road in
17 Guilford county, as a dividing line between
18 Districts 27 and 26. Senator Berger would
19 reside in this district.

20 I offer this to the proposed 2022
21 Senate map not because I believe it would
22 benefit me but because I believe it is the most
23 reasonable court-ordered compliant map that I
24 have seen for this county grouping to date. If
25 adopted, I know would break many of yours hearts

1 because it would mean the end of my Senate
2 career as I would never run against my seat mate
3 Senator Robinson. If we are truly here to do
4 the work in the interest of the people we
5 represent, rather than our own political
6 careers, this is the way it must go sometimes.

7 Frankly, I see none of this sentiment
8 in the 2022 remedial map before us today which
9 was conjured in secret, using the same old bag
10 of tricks last fall, and this amendment will
11 right the wrong in my home county grouping, and
12 I urge your support.

13 THE PRESIDENT: Senator Daniel, for
14 what purpose do you rise?

15 SENATOR DANIEL: Mr. President, I move
16 that Amendment 5 do lie on the table.

17 SENATOR NEWTON: Second.

18 THE PRESIDENT: Senator Daniel moves
19 that Amendment Number 5 to Senate Bill 744 do
20 lie upon the table, seconded by Senator Newton.

21 This is a non-debatable motion, and
22 we'll go straight to a vote. The question
23 before the body is the motion to table Amendment
24 Number 5 to Senate Bill 744. All in favor will
25 vote aye, all opposed will vote no. Five

1 seconds will be allowed for voting, and the
2 clerk will record the vote.

3 28 having voted in the affirmative --
4 Senator Woodard, for what purpose do
5 you rise?

6 SENATOR WOODWARD: Mr. President, I'm
7 sorry. I want to change my vote from an aye to
8 no.

9 THE PRESIDENT: Senator Woodard changes
10 to no. I wondered about that.

11 So we have 27 having voted in the
12 affirmative, 20 in the negative. Amendment
13 Number 5 to Senate Bill 744 will lie upon the
14 table, and we are once again back to the bill.

15 Further discussion or debate?

16 Senator Garrett, for what purpose do
17 you rise?

18 SENATOR GARRETT: To send forward a
19 second amendment, Mr. President.

20 THE PRESIDENT: Send forward your
21 amendment.

22 SENATOR GARRETT: It's S744-ABA-55.

23 THE PRESIDENT: Amendment Number 6 to
24 Senate Bill 744, the clerk will read.

25 THE CLERK: Senator Garrett moves to

1 amend the bill.

2 THE PRESIDENT: You have the floor,
3 sir.

4 SENATOR GARRETT: This second amendment
5 does a lot of what my first amendment does.
6 However, I know you all tabled it because you
7 don't want to see me go home, so I'm providing a
8 different version that doesn't double-bunk
9 incumbents.

10 It creates three districts:
11 District 26, which would be all of Rockingham
12 county and most of eastern and southeastern
13 Guilford county; District 27, which would be
14 High Point, Jamestown, and unincorporated
15 Guilford county on the west; and a northern
16 Greensboro and northwest district which would be
17 Number 28. Again, I believe this rights some of
18 the wrongs done to my home county grouping, and
19 I would respectfully urge your support. Thank
20 you.

21 THE PRESIDENT: Senator Daniel, for
22 what purpose do you rise?

23 SENATOR DANIEL: Mr. President, I move
24 that Amendment 6 do lie upon the table.

25 SENATOR NEWTON: Second.

1 THE PRESIDENT: Senator Daniel moves
2 that Amendment Number 6 to Senate Bill 744 do
3 lie upon the table, seconded by Senator Newton.

4 This is a non-debatable motion and will
5 go straight to a vote. The question before the
6 body is the motion to table Amendment Number 6
7 to Senate Bill 744. All in favor will vote aye,
8 all opposed will vote no. Five seconds will be
9 allowed for voting, and the clerk will record
10 the vote.

11 27 having voted in the affirmative, 20
12 in the negative, Amendment Number 6 to
13 Senate Bill 744 will lie upon the table, and we
14 are once again back to the bill.

15 Further discussion or debate?

16 Senator Blue, for what purpose do you
17 rise, sir?

18 SENATOR BLUE: To send forward an
19 amendment.

20 THE PRESIDENT: Send forward your
21 amendment.

22 SENATOR BLUE: Several amendments. But
23 the first one, Mr. President, is ATU 51.

24 THE PRESIDENT: Senator Blue, they
25 don't have that amendment.

1 SENATOR BLUE: It disappeared in the
2 ether, then. Let me ask staff because that's
3 the number I see on it. It involves the
4 Forsyth, Yadkin, Stokes, Wilkes, Alexander
5 split.

6 Mr. President, I'm informed by staff
7 that that one has not been sent forth, but they
8 will send it forward.

9 And while that is happening, then I
10 would ask for recognition to send forth
11 Amendment Number ABW 33.

12 THE PRESIDENT: Amendment Number 7 to
13 Senate Bill 744, the clerk will read.

14 THE CLERK: Senator Blue moves to amend
15 the bill.

16 THE PRESIDENT: You have the floor,
17 sir.

18 SENATOR BLUE: Thank you very much,
19 Mr. President.

20 Let me first begin by saying that
21 Senator Berger and I have talked and we issued a
22 joint statement that we plan to and hope to work
23 together to redraw these districts. And we had
24 several conversations, I thought very cordial,
25 and we laid out where we thought we would go.

1 On Friday -- I think it was Friday,
2 Thursday or Friday, after we had discussions, I
3 assembled some of my members to look at various
4 maps and to read the order as best we could at
5 the time trying to figure out where we ought to
6 go with these maps.

7 As you recall, the Court last week
8 issued an order, I think four or five pages or
9 20 pages or something, but didn't have an
10 opinion expressing some of the reasoning for the
11 order. And so by the end of the week, some folk
12 were still doing their day jobs, we had examined
13 most of the clusters that the Court had
14 questioned -- first the trial court in its
15 200-and-some-page order, I believe, it was a
16 very long order, and we read through all of
17 those, many of what you've heard about here on
18 the floor.

19 But in the Senate map, in the Senate
20 plan that the Court struck down, the trial court
21 found gerrymanders in and the Supreme Court
22 struck down, there was seven clusters and eight
23 districts. And the Court made specific findings
24 about each of those districts and the clusters,
25 and it found that because of decisions that were

1 made in putting together certain clusters that
2 the legislature had gerrymandered those
3 districts, and it made suggestions as to why
4 they found that these districts had been
5 gerrymandered. Seven clusters, eight districts.

6 We weren't changing any of the clusters
7 that Stephenson spat through the computer last
8 year, and what we found in each of those was a
9 roadmap for fixing them, at least a way to start
10 to fix them. And so Senator Berger and I had
11 talked about the obvious changes that clearly
12 you would have to make.

13 The cluster up in the northeastern part
14 of North Carolina, the Court said that that
15 cluster was purposefully chosen and was made a
16 partisan gerrymander. So the map that's before
17 you, that district was flipped. Senator Berger
18 agreed to flip that district without any further
19 discussion because the Court said that was a
20 gerrymander. I think it was District 1 or 2.

21 Also said that -- Senator Chaudhuri
22 pointed out what the findings were in Wake
23 county. This is a county that has six districts
24 now that it's paired with -- now that it's
25 paired with Granville county, and it said that

1 the district that was before the Court which
2 does not vary a whole lot with respect to the
3 wake county cluster than the district before you
4 now. It said that that district had basically
5 packed all the Democrats in the four districts
6 in the core of the city and in the core of the
7 county. My district, Senator Chaudhuri's
8 district, and the other two districts here in
9 wake county.

10 And it said that in the northern part
11 of wake county they had chosen selectively
12 Republican districts to pair with Granville
13 county in order to get a district that was most
14 Republican. And the most Republican that you
15 could draw that district and had any criteria
16 was roughly a 50, 51 -- 50 percent Republican
17 district, 50, 51 percent.

18 And in the bottom of the county,
19 represented by Senator Batch, it said that all
20 of the Republicans in the southern part of wake
21 county had been grouped together, and again the
22 districts bleached of Democrats and they were
23 pumped into the districts above them, making
24 these four Democratic districts, for the most
25 part, 60 plus, 70 percent, and some of them even

1 greater than that, performance Democratic
2 districts.

3 Now, they did all of the scientific
4 stuff, all of the technical discussion about how
5 you got there with histograms and all of those
6 other things that these expert witnesses, these
7 mathematicians used to show that they were
8 gerrymanders. And the percentage in those two
9 Republican districts in the map before you now
10 is pretty much the same as they were in the
11 districts that the Courts struck down.

12 So we said, okay, we'll change those
13 districts subject to certain rules. And so as
14 we moved along -- these are my conversations,
15 very open conversations -- we then looked at the
16 other districts. And the amendment that I'm
17 sending forth addresses one of them, and I'll
18 send another one that addresses the second one,
19 which led to the breakdown of any further
20 discussions about the districts.

21 Now, let me say this much: Senator
22 Newton said that every district was changed in
23 favor of Democrats. You studied the Wake county
24 districts. I don't need to tell you how to
25 interpret what the Court said, but you studied

1 the districts, and if they changed in
2 composition by a point, a half a point, I don't
3 think it answers the Court's inquiry.

4 Now, in the language that was released
5 just this Monday, Monday evening, in the Court's
6 opinion, Monday after 5:00, it talks about all
7 of these and the reasons that they found these
8 districts, again, to be gerrymanders. They
9 adopted every single finding, every single
10 finding of the trial court.

11 Now, you know, we like to talk about
12 how the courts are partisan and this and that
13 and the other, but those of us who earn and have
14 earned a living working in the courts really do
15 believe that there is some justice that runs
16 through them or we wouldn't be involved in them
17 all the time.

18 And this three-judge panel that this
19 case is going back to has already found these
20 districts to be gerrymanders. Now, the Supreme
21 Court might have some language in the opinion,
22 and there's a lot of other language in that
23 opinion, and I'll hit on that when I finish
24 these amendments, that you can harp on, one
25 sentence, one paragraph in a 200-some-page;

1 opinion, and they harp on that as the only thing
2 that you got to look at to determine whether or
3 not you still have gerrymanders in these maps.

4 And where we disagree, I think, and
5 where any further discussion broke down is that
6 the Court said in the district that I just
7 introduced an amendment for, the Forsyth -- here
8 it's the Forsyth-Yadkin district, the Court said
9 that in that pairing, you had two choices. And
10 you might remember we talked about the two
11 choices in these districts when we passed the
12 maps back in October. There were two choices in
13 four places in the state. Two choices in the
14 east, where you could change the first district
15 and I think the second district, and if you took
16 one of them, you would remove seven or eight
17 historically eastern majority black districts
18 and separate them and put some in one and some
19 in the other.

20 Well, the Court said that was a knowing
21 partisan gerrymander by the Republicans by not
22 choosing the first cluster which would have kept
23 those counties together. That was a partisan
24 gerrymander. And that's the one that I talked
25 about Senator Berger and I in our initial

1 discussions realized could be fixed by simply
2 flipping, but that's the same case in this
3 cluster as well.

4 It doesn't make it a Democratic
5 district if you flip the cluster. What the
6 Court said is that you have done a gerrymander
7 in two ways in the district that exist out
8 there. The first way that you've done a
9 gerrymander is that you chose the cluster that
10 enables you to gerrymander even further because
11 you chose Forsyth to be paired with Stokes
12 county, and you had a choice. You could have
13 paired Forsyth with Yadkin and maybe another
14 county out there, but I think it was just Yadkin
15 county. And if you had made that choice you
16 would have had a better chance to draw fair
17 districts. Didn't have to change the partisan
18 makeup of them. You could still have a
19 Democratic and Republican district, but you
20 would at least create a chance in that district
21 for a Democrat to win if in fact you had
22 Democratic majorities.

23 And that was the whole question behind
24 this case, that if Democrats get a majority of
25 the vote, then it's right to think that

1 somewhere or other you could district so that
2 they could get a majority of the districts. Not
3 a proportionality, but just sort of commonsense.
4 If you can get a majority of the votes, there
5 ought to be some circumstances in which you can
6 get a majority of the seats in this chamber, and
7 that's what's behind this whole lawsuit.

8 So you gerrymandered by not choosing
9 the right pair of counties. And secondly, even
10 after you chose the wrong pair of counties to
11 make this district, you gerrymandered further by
12 the way that you drew the lines within the
13 district you chose. Not my language, but that's
14 the intent of the language coming from the
15 three-judge panel and that was adopted and
16 embraced 100 percent by the Supreme Court in its
17 opinion and in its order. And it said
18 specifically, we adopt each and every finding of
19 the trial court.

20 Now, this is unusual in many ways in
21 that this case is going back to the very same
22 court, the same court that already said that
23 these gerrymanders exist and this is how they
24 exist. And we're not addressing how they say
25 those gerrymanders exist.

1 So the facts are still there. You can
2 read a quote out of the opinion, but the facts
3 are still in the three-judge panel, and the
4 Supreme Court knows what those facts were. And
5 unlike most of the stuff we do here, we already
6 know that it's going to be reviewed by next
7 Wednesday and they're going to see how we
8 reacted to what they found.

9 Now, so what this amendment would do,
10 Mr. President, is it would create the cluster.
11 And we had talked about creating it so that you
12 could preserve incumbency, if that was one of
13 the desires that we had. We didn't have to draw
14 a district -- a Republican district that was
15 50 percent Democratic, although you could. You
16 could draw two Democratic districts in the
17 cluster. We didn't propose that you draw them,
18 two Democratic districts, but at least draw
19 districts so that if in fact there was a
20 majority of votes by Democrats, this district
21 could perform accordingly and maybe be a
22 Democratic district.

23 And so that's what this does in the
24 version that is before you. It does not make
25 the second district a Democratic district. It

1 has a Democratic district and a Republican
2 district, and we think it meets the goals and
3 the instructions of the Court. And I would move
4 the adoption of the amendment, Mr. President.

5 THE PRESIDENT: Senator Daniel, for
6 what purpose do you rise?

7 SENATOR DANIEL: Mr. President, I do
8 move that Amendment 7 do lie upon the table.

9 SENATOR NEWTON: Second.

10 THE PRESIDENT: Senator Daniel moves
11 that Amendment Number 7 to Senate Bill 744 do
12 lie upon the table, seconded by Senator Newton.

13 This is a non-debatable motion, and
14 we'll go straight for a vote. The question
15 before the body is the motion to table Amendment
16 Number 7 to Senate Bill 744. All in favor will
17 vote aye, all opposed will vote no. Five
18 seconds will be allowed for voting, and the
19 clerk will record the vote.

20 Senator Perry -- Senator Perry is aye.
21 Senator Chaudhuri is no.

22 27 having voted in the affirmative, 20
23 in the negative, Amendment Number 7 to
24 Senate Bill 744 will lie upon the table, and
25 we're once again back to the bill.

1 THE PRESIDENT: Senator Blue, for what
2 purpose do you rise?

3 SENATOR BLUE: Send forth with another
4 amendment. I think you have it up there now.
5 Let's see. It's -- is that ATU 51.

6 THE PRESIDENT: I have it. Give me one
7 second, please. Amendment Number 8 to
8 Senate Bill 744. The clerk will read.

9 THE CLERK: Senator Blue moves to amend
10 the bill.

11 THE PRESIDENT: You have the floor
12 again, sir.

13 SENATOR BLUE: Thank you very much,
14 Mr. President.

15 And to my colleagues, I say to you the
16 comments about Stokes and the other districts I
17 can incorporate in this one, and I will just
18 simply read what the Court found the gerrymander
19 was and let you draw your own conclusions, but
20 we initiated a conversation about this district
21 and said that the Court found in the Buncombe
22 district, and these are their findings.

23 The Republican map plays around with
24 the district lines but largely remains a
25 partisan gerrymander, that is, in the

1 McDowell-Buncombe cluster, and that's Buncombe,
2 McDowell, and Burke counties, I believe. And it
3 said that you play around with the lines.
4 Instead of pairing Buncombe with Henderson
5 county, Republicans move blue Buncombe in with
6 Burke and McDowell to the east, clearly diluting
7 the voting power in the Asheville area. Those
8 are more heavily Republican counties than
9 Henderson county next door. The Republican map
10 does not fix the gerrymander which the Court
11 found based on the choice of county groupings.

12 And so I say to you that further, this
13 grouping resulted in neutralizing the Democratic
14 stronghold in and around Asheville to a greater
15 extent than the alternate grouping would have
16 done. And within the grouping you enact the
17 enacted plan maximizes Republican advantage by
18 drawing lopsidedly Democratic districts while
19 the rest is heavily reliably Republican.

20 District 46, a reliably Republican
21 district, never elects a Democrat in any of the
22 42 elections in Dr. Duchin's study.

23 Now, you need to understand that there
24 were millions, and I think even billions, of
25 maps drawn by these mathematicians to determine

1 whether or not a gerrymander existed. That was
2 the evidence before the Court. That's what they
3 used to determine that there was a gerrymander.
4 And they were saying that the reason for that
5 gerrymander wasn't that you didn't make a second
6 district majority Democrat but that you didn't
7 look at the grouping. You had a choice there to
8 choose a grouping that would have given you a
9 chance to draw districts that more accurately
10 reflected what the vote was and would give
11 Democrats an opportunity to be elected in that
12 district if in fact Democrats got a majority of
13 the votes. That's what they said.

14 And what this map does, it fixes that
15 far from a Democratic district in that cluster
16 that it fixes it with. It would simply leave a
17 Democratic district and a Republican district,
18 but the Republican district, nor the Democratic
19 district would be as lopsided as they are now.
20 Still over time they would probably perform
21 pretty much the same way, but they at least make
22 the opportunity to have a Democrat win the
23 district, in certain settings get a majority,
24 just like Republicans have the opportunity to
25 get a majority in several settings. That's all

1 it does. It tells you what fairness is all
2 about and what our perception about it is.

3 And so, Mr. President, I move the
4 adoption of that amendment.

5 THE PRESIDENT: Senator Daniel, for
6 what purpose do you rise?

7 SENATOR DANIEL: Mr. President, I move
8 that Amendment 8 do lie upon the table.

9 SENATOR NEWTON: Second.

10 THE PRESIDENT: Senator Daniels moves
11 that Amendment Number 8 to Senate Bill 744 do
12 lie upon the table, seconded by Senator Newton.
13 This is a non-debatable motion, and will go
14 straight to a vote. The question before the
15 body is the motion to table Amendment Number 8
16 to Senate Bill 744. All in favor will vote aye,
17 all opposed will vote no. Five seconds will be
18 allowed for voting. The clerk will record the
19 vote.

20 Senator Lowe is no.

21 27 having voted in the affirmative, 20
22 in the negative, Amendment Number 8 to
23 Senate Bill 744 will lie upon the table, and
24 we're once again back to the bill.

25 SENATOR BLUE: Mr. President.

1 THE PRESIDENT: Senator -- I'm sorry.
2 Senator Blue, for what purpose do you
3 rise?

4 SENATOR BLUE: Send forth an amendment.

5 THE PRESIDENT: Okay. Send forward
6 your amendment.

7 SENATOR BLUE: The amendment is ABA 57.
8 I don't know whether that means American Bar
9 Association. Maybe that's reminding me that
10 there's some law involved here. ABA 57.

11 THE PRESIDENT: Amendment Number 9 to
12 Senate Bill 744. The clerk will read.

13 THE CLERK: Senator Blue moves to amend
14 the bill.

15 THE PRESIDENT: You have the floor,
16 sir.

17 SENATOR BLUE: Thank you very much,
18 Mr. President.

19 And this wraps up the amendments that
20 we were talking about. This just puts them all
21 in a state map for the most part. There may be
22 some small variations in it, but this -- this
23 sets forth what we thought the initial approach
24 to solving these gerrymanders were. And this is
25 information that we exchanged as to what we

1 thought should be a starting point for
2 discussions on how we fix these gerrymanders.
3 And this is what as a result of it basically
4 indicated that it was a no starter because
5 certain changes weren't going to be made. Even
6 those that were set forth specifically in the
7 three-judge panel's opinion and findings and in
8 the Supreme Court order and now in its opinion.

9 So I won't be redundant, but I'll
10 simply say that it contains amendments to the
11 seven clusters that we talked about. I don't
12 think it -- it changed the New Hanover county
13 clusters because we didn't know that they were
14 going to be in play. And so when we drew these,
15 I think on Friday or Saturday, quite frankly,
16 when we drew these, we didn't know that
17 New Hanover, so it's not in that. And I just
18 wanted you to see what we had proposed were the
19 beginning points of what productive talks could
20 produce in these maps.

21 So you'll see, I think in the
22 deliberations that we see in this bill, that
23 there were some changes, as I said, in
24 District 1, or in the northeast cluster. There
25 were some changes in the Cumberland county

1 cluster. There were some changes -- the changes
2 you already heard about in the Wake County
3 cluster, but not material changes. Well, they
4 were material. They flipped Sarah Crawford into
5 the district up in Granville County. But other
6 than that there weren't any significant changes
7 in it with respect to percentages in either the
8 Democratic districts or the two districts that
9 are probably Republican districts.

10 It -- I think it did some minor
11 modifications in the Guilford district, but not
12 those along the line of what the three-judge
13 panel pointed out. And I will say to you that
14 the changes in the Guilford district were
15 changes made by a special master in the
16 litigation several years ago when Guilford was
17 coupled with Randolph and Alamance counties.
18 And so the special master configured the
19 district that Senator Robinson represents a
20 certain way so that he could address the issues
21 in that case. Nothing to do with this case,
22 nothing to do with partisan gerrymander the way
23 this one exists.

24 But I think that that's the fix in the
25 Guilford district in that map. And I point out

1 to you that in this map, I misspoke when I said
2 it incorporates the changes. This district did
3 not break down Guilford county the way the
4 amendment -- the first amendment that was
5 offered because this did not make the portion of
6 Guilford county that Senator Berger
7 represents -- I don't think it did, it wasn't
8 intended to -- a majority Democratic district as
9 the first map that was introduced regarding
10 Guilford county, just showing you what is
11 possible and what the Court could look at as it
12 considers how to draw these maps.

13 And it made, again, I say -- I proposed
14 changes in the cluster in Forsyth county and the
15 cluster in Buncombe county, but again were
16 offered for discussions on how we could satisfy
17 fixing this gerrymander. That's what it does,
18 and I move adoption of it.

19 THE PRESIDENT: Senator Daniel, for
20 what purpose do you rise?

21 SENATOR DANIEL: Mr. President, I move
22 that Amendment 9 do lie upon the table.

23 SENATOR NEWTON: Second.

24 THE PRESIDENT: Senator Daniel moves
25 that Amendment 9 to Senate Bill 744 do lie upon

1 the table. This is a non-debatable motion, and
2 we'll go straight to a vote. The question
3 before the body -- I gotcha this time. Yes, I'm
4 sorry.

5 Before we move forward with that vote,
6 a leave of absence is requested and without
7 objection is granted for Senator Perry.

8 This is a non-debatable motion, and
9 we'll go straight to a vote. The question
10 before the body is the motion to table Amendment
11 Number 9 to Senate Bill 744. All in favor will
12 vote aye, all opposed will vote no. Five
13 seconds will be allowed for voting, and the
14 clerk will record the vote.

15 Senator Britt is aye. Senator Blue is
16 no.

17 26 having voted in the affirmative, 20
18 in the negative, Amendment Number 9 to Senate
19 Bill 744 will lie upon the table, and we're once
20 again back to the bill.

21 SENATOR BLUE: Mr. President.

22 THE PRESIDENT: Yes, Senator Blue. For
23 what purpose do you rise?

24 SENATOR BLUE: Debate the bill.

25 THE PRESIDENT: Excuse me. I'm sorry.

1 SENATOR BLUE: Debate the bill.

2 THE PRESIDENT: You have the floor.

3 SENATOR BLUE: Thank you.

4 And ladies and gentlemen, I know you're
5 glad I'm getting toward the end of this, and I
6 am. I'd like to say that some of the best
7 reading that you can do, not so much because of
8 this case but because of the way it discloses
9 North Carolina's rich history, is reading the
10 opinion in this case, the majority opinion
11 because it sets forth what liberty and
12 independence and fairness means under our state
13 constitution, but more importantly how we came
14 to the point of believing that these things were
15 important in setting forth the rights of the
16 people in this state.

17 It talks about the Declaration of
18 Rights, pointed out that our Declaration of
19 Rights predated the Bill of Rights, just like
20 our Declaration of Independence predated the
21 declaration in Philadelphia, but it goes through
22 the rich history of how we have these things as
23 North Carolinians.

24 We didn't put them there, but those who
25 were wise enough and came before us as they

1 contemplated a state government in the age
2 of -- in the 1700s reflecting on the glorious
3 revolution in England where people's rights
4 became important and where government couldn't
5 trod over the people and how they set forth all
6 of these protections against government and
7 against tyranny. Because they knew if you
8 didn't separate and provide for certain powers,
9 the nature of human beings is and has been since
10 we started keeping a recorded history of
11 ourselves is to seize power and seize power and
12 seize power. It's the whole reason that our
13 federal government is set up the way it is, our
14 state government, separation of powers so the
15 chambers can -- or departments, judicial
16 departments, executive departments and
17 legislative departments can check each other.

18 And with most of the power being vested
19 in -- all of the power of the people being
20 vested in the legislative branch of government
21 they were wise enough to set up a court to say,
22 no, we got to go back to this thing that pulled
23 us together in the first place, a constitution,
24 in this case a Declaration of Rights because
25 that's what they so richly cite from. And we

1 can pull the people that we represent back to
2 these basic core principles that underlie our
3 Declaration of Rights. We can even pull the
4 legislature back. They can't just go
5 willy-nilly and do what they want to, especially
6 when it comes to our fundamental liberties and
7 our fundamental rights, our civil rights.

8 And they found in this opinion that
9 these four rights were fundamental in our
10 Declaration of Rights. The Bill of Rights was
11 modeled somewhat on North Carolina's Declaration
12 of Rights. The Bill of Rights to the
13 constitution that North Carolina wouldn't sign
14 until they were put into the United States
15 Constitution because we put such faith and
16 confidence in this Declaration of Rights.

17 So regardless of how you vote or think
18 about what we're doing now, go back to that and
19 it will show you the reason that we're here
20 today. Because I believe that everybody on this
21 floor believes that history is important,
22 believes that democracy is important, and
23 believes that these fundamental documents define
24 who we are are things that we have to be
25 protective of, and that's what the Supreme Court

1 is saying in its opinion before you get to the
2 technical mumble jumble and stuff like that on
3 it, the stuff that lawyers like to read.

4 Now, I want to say that -- and I've
5 already outlined why I thought we sort of bogged
6 down and weren't able to go further because we
7 said that we would negotiate. There's no
8 absolutes when you enter into a negotiation
9 unless you're just crazy. I mean, you're not
10 going to get anything resolved if you don't
11 move, and you got to leave room to do that. And
12 in this case the mediator, if you will, or the
13 group that will determine whether you've moved
14 enough or whether we were too stubborn will
15 initially be the three-judge panel and I'm
16 pretty sure at the end the North Carolina
17 Supreme Court as they recommit themselves,
18 restate the rights under the Declaration of
19 Rights.

20 Now, this case was not brought -- and
21 as I pointed out, I'm not a litigant to it. I
22 don't represent anybody in it. I don't have a
23 lawyer in it or anything else, just is my
24 opinion. This case was brought and the Supreme
25 Court considered it as a way to ensure that an

1 identified party who receives a certain vote
2 should be able to get the same benefits over
3 time as another party who is organized and has
4 the same kind of numbers of votes. That's what
5 they were trying to fix in doing this case. I
6 don't believe that they did all of this to boil
7 it down to a formula that you look at whether or
8 not one test out of multiple tests say that you
9 haven't done a gerrymander.

10 Now, the Court said that there are
11 multiple ways you can do it. They happened to
12 choose the four tests that they listed in the
13 opinion because they had four experts who used
14 different tests to determine whether or not a
15 gerrymander existed, but if you are telling me
16 that commonsense tells you that you can take a
17 map where they found all of these gerrymanders,
18 take that map, create another gerrymander in
19 New Hanover county -- because it's clear why you
20 did it: to increase the Republican percentage in
21 that district in New Hanover county -- that you
22 can fix another gerrymander without directly
23 addressing the gerrymanders that they said you
24 had in the map and then come out with a formula
25 and say, well, it tests this on this test and so

1 there's no gerrymander there any more. That's
2 the sole reason that I mention that this same
3 court who is going to look at this case starting
4 Friday, I guess, is a court that decided that
5 the gerrymanders existed in all of these places.

6 Now, the Supreme Court did say you
7 don't have to look at specific districts to tell
8 it, but the districts tell you whether one is
9 there, and this Court opinion tells you that you
10 got to make a serious effort to fix it. It
11 doesn't say create more Democratic districts.
12 It talks a lot about districts in the middle so
13 that they can move certain ways depending on
14 what the vote looks like. And so we have
15 different ways of analyzing that.

16 In the material that's before you, they
17 chose 15 elections, I believe, in 2016 and 2020
18 to say how these districts possibly would
19 operate, but in 2022, the science and the math
20 and the computer capability is such that, again,
21 they can look at a trillion districts, using a
22 quantum computer, and say how these districts
23 still lie outside the norm and how they're still
24 partisan gerrymanders. And I'm hoping, you
25 know, as I see this, it's not déjà vu all over

1 again. Because I was here, and I think a couple
2 of other people on the floor, Senator Berger was
3 here, as we went through this process beginning
4 in 2011.

5 I'm still reminded that the system
6 belongs to the people. That's why I say it's
7 exciting to read what the Court gave as its
8 historical reason for doing what it did. And I
9 believe that the Court is going to decide that
10 you can arrange and rearrange the chairs on the
11 Titanic so many times before you go down with
12 the ship. That's one of the reasons that they
13 showed little patience for letting this thing
14 linger on and on through an entire decade.
15 Because it took us eight years of a decade to
16 fix the gerrymanders, one kind or another, first
17 racial, then partisan gerrymanders, in the
18 districts from 2011, and the Court has said that
19 these are going to be fixed before we have the
20 first elections on them.

21 So as I look at it, we keep pushing
22 ourselves to a mandatory reform of the way this
23 process is done. People are not going to keep
24 tolerating it because that's whose rights we're
25 trampling on.

1 And so as I think about 2019, following
2 that redistricting session, I issued a joint
3 statement with Senator Berger praising the
4 process as probably the most collaborative and
5 transparent in our state's history, and I still
6 stand by those comments, but if you want to test
7 how collaborative this process was, it was
8 collaborative in the beginning, but you have
9 just seen all of the amendments and all of the
10 discussions that we were trying to promote on
11 this map. And what did you do with every single
12 one of them? Think about that. What did you do
13 with every single discussion that are in that
14 big map that I introduced? You discarded them
15 like none of them had any relevance or any
16 importance. A broke clock is right twice a day.
17 So there had to be some value in it if we
18 engaged all of the minority membership in the
19 Senate in the discussions in trying to draw this
20 map.

21 Now, let me tell you one other thing
22 that you think about. We represent, as we are
23 right now, 44 percent of this legislature. You
24 tell me, where do we have 44 percent of the
25 influence on legislation? Just go back to the

1 budget and various other things.

2 And so what this does, if you really
3 looked at the performance that they've used in
4 these tests, you know, what would make sense at
5 the end of the day if you really worked hard and
6 you had great candidates and you had maps that
7 were fair, you get 52, 53 percent of the
8 electorate, of the vote which they cited the
9 governor I think in some of these or they cited
10 some of the people in the 15 examples. How
11 many -- how many of the seats would he have won?
12 Not 52 percent of them. Not half of them. How
13 many would the attorney general have won? He
14 won statewide. I think they said 22, 23 seats,
15 and two of them would have been real close.
16 That's why the Supreme Court has said that it's
17 gerrymandered in a partisan fashion, and you
18 don't give people the rights as guaranteed by
19 the Declaration of Rights.

20 I was optimistic after 2019. I was
21 optimistic in other efforts that we've made to
22 get things done collaboratively in this chamber.
23 We did some things collaboratively in the last
24 session, but we just can't seem to get our hands
25 on it in redistricting any more, even if the

1 Supreme Court is telling us that we ought to and
2 that we need to.

3 And, you know, I don't know, maybe it's
4 that we really do believe that the courts -- we
5 can get along without them, that they're
6 irritants, that they're in the way, that we
7 better know what the constitution provides and
8 how it ought to be interpreted than the court
9 itself. Because I think that what we are doing
10 in passing this map today is sticking our finger
11 up toward the courts, snubbing our nose at them,
12 that we're going to play a game on you, and you
13 put this language in there and we're going to
14 say that this is the language that determines
15 everything that you're going about doing.

16 And at the end of the day, if you look
17 at the projections in this map, if you change
18 wilmington, you change the projected Democratic
19 senators in that map so that you create a
20 supermajority and an environment where almost
21 50 percent of the vote in the last election, if
22 you look at the different candidates, went to
23 Democrats and almost 50 percent went to
24 Republicans, and you reduce the Democratic
25 participation in this chamber below 40 percent

1 by the way that you've drawn these districts.
2 Do your own analysis. You don't have to take my
3 word for it. But I think by the end of next
4 week we'll have somewhere -- some idea where
5 it's going.

6 Now, lastly, people want to believe in
7 their elected officials. They want to believe
8 in us. They certainly want to believe in their
9 courts. And it's our advantage that people
10 believe in their courts. There's got to be
11 somewhere where they know that they're going to
12 get a fair deal, that it's not a deal based on
13 partisanship, it's not a deal based on favorites
14 and stuff, but it's a place where that lady of
15 justice, holding the balances and with a
16 blindfold over her eyes is going to be fair to
17 everybody, and that's what the Court was trying
18 to obtain in its opinion on these districts.

19 I think that a lot of folk, some in
20 here have been stoking fears about election
21 fraud and all of those things so we break their
22 reliance on the courts, we break their beliefs
23 in what we do and how we do it because we
24 convince them that our elections somewhere or
25 other resulted because of fraud. And that's

1 what you're doing when you pass maps that tells
2 them that they have a fair shot to get something
3 done and they can see the results and see that
4 they can't get something done.

5 If we want to protect the integrity of
6 our elections, as all of my colleagues up front
7 would say that you do, then we need to bring
8 integrity back to this redistricting process.

9 The House has shown us this time how to
10 do it. We showed them the last time. And I
11 don't think it was beyond this Senate to do the
12 same thing in time.

13 I close with a very instructive quote
14 from the opinion, very instructive. It's at
15 paragraph 223 of the opinion.

16 It is the sincere hope of this Court
17 that these new maps -- talking about the maps
18 they were hoping we would draw -- ensure that
19 the channelling of political power from the
20 people to their representatives in government
21 through elections, the central democratic
22 process envisioned by our constitutional system,
23 is done on equal terms so that ours is a
24 government of right that originates from the
25 people and speaks with their voices.

1 The amendments that we offered would
2 have taken us along that path. The path that we
3 have chosen, I'm afraid, takes us in the
4 opposite direction.

5 THE PRESIDENT: Before we go any
6 further, a leave of absence is requested and
7 without objection is granted for Senator
8 Crawford.

9 Is there any further discussion or
10 debate on Senate Bill 744?

11 Hearing none, the question before the
12 Senate is the passage of Senate Bill 744 on
13 second reading. All in favor will vote aye, all
14 opposed will vote no. Five seconds will be
15 allowed for voting, and the clerk will record
16 the vote.

17 26 having voted in the affirmative, 19
18 in the negative, Senate Bill 744 passes its
19 second reading and without objection will be
20 read a third time.

21 THE CLERK: The General Assembly of
22 North Carolina enacts.

23 THE PRESIDENT: Is there further
24 discussion or debate?

25 Hearing none, all in favor of the

1 passage of Senate Bill 744 on its third reading
2 will vote aye, all opposed will vote no. Five
3 seconds will be allowed for voting, and the
4 clerk will record the vote.

5 26 having voted in the affirmative, 19
6 in the negative, Senate Bill 744 passes its
7 third reading and will be sent to the House by
8 special message.

9 SENATOR RABON: Mr. President.

10 THE PRESIDENT: Senator Rabon, for what
11 purpose do you rise?

12 SENATOR RABON: A motion, please, sir.

13 THE PRESIDENT: You have the floor for
14 your motion.

15 SENATOR RABON: Thank you, sir.

16 Mr. President, I move that Senate Bill
17 173, Free the Smiles, be moved to the top of
18 today's calendar.

19 THE PRESIDENT: Without objection, so
20 ordered. So that would be next on our calendar,
21 Senate Bill 173.

22 (SB 173 was not transcribed by the
23 court reporter.)

24 THE PRESIDENT: Next on the calendar,
25 we have Senate Bill 745. The clerk will read.

1 THE CLERK: Senate Bill 745, Realign
2 Congressional Districts 2022/CST 22-3.

3 THE PRESIDENT: Senator Daniel has the
4 floor to explain the bill.

5 SENATOR DANIEL: Thank you,
6 Mr. President.

7 Members, the map before you was drawn
8 to comply with the Supreme Court's order. It
9 contains what we believe will be four of the
10 most highly competitive congressional districts
11 in the country.

12 According to redistricting expert Dave
13 Wasserman, there have been only 19 congressional
14 districts in the country drawn during this
15 year's ongoing redistricting process with an
16 election result in the Biden-Trump race with a
17 less than 5 percent margin of victory.

18 This map will make North Carolina home
19 to four additional highly competitive
20 congressional districts. We believe the map is
21 constitutional. We believe it is fair to all
22 candidates, voters, and political parties in our
23 state. It follows the Court's order, and it
24 will reflect the will of the people.

25 The map scores well within the ranges

1 for measuring mean-median and efficiency gap
2 announced by the Court in its opinion. The
3 Court set a baseline of plus or minus 1 percent
4 for the mean-median score. This map scores
5 minus 0.61 percent. The Court set a baseline of
6 plus or minus 7 percent for the efficiency gap
7 score. This map scores minus 5.3 percent.

8 I'll briefly go through a description
9 of the 14 districts.

10 District 1 remains a district that is
11 rooted in mostly rural counties in northeastern
12 North Carolina. We have consistently been told
13 during the process that it is important to keep
14 the counties forming the belt along the northern
15 border of the state together. This district
16 does that.

17 District 2 is contained wholly within
18 wake county, adhering to our original criteria.
19 wake county is split only once in this map. It
20 has one incumbent in it, and she has announced
21 her intention to seek reelection this year.

22 District 3 is a district taking in much
23 of eastern North Carolina, including the
24 majority of the state's coastline and counties
25 with close proximity to the coast. The district

1 contains one incumbent.

2 District 4 contains all of Caswell,
3 Durham, Orange, and Person counties, and most of
4 Alamance and Granville counties. This
5 configuration forms a highly compact district in
6 northern central counties in the state.

7 District 5 is based in the northwestern
8 corner of North Carolina and is made up of six
9 whole counties. Those are Allegheny, Ashe,
10 Forsyth, Stokes, Surry, Watauga, and Wilkes.
11 Most of Rockingham county and a portion of
12 Yadkin make up the rest of the district.
13 There's only one incumbent in the district.

14 District 6 contains all of Chatham,
15 Harnett, Lee, Randolph counties and also
16 contains most of Guilford and parts of Alamance
17 and Rockingham. This district contains one
18 incumbent, and will be one of the most
19 politically competitive congressional districts
20 in the country.

21 District 7 is a district based in
22 southeastern North Carolina that takes in the
23 rural counties south of Harnett county and joins
24 them to the remaining coastal counties. It
25 contains all of Bladen, Brunswick, Cumberland,

1 and New Hanover counties, and a portion of
2 Columbus county. This district contains one
3 incumbent member of congress. It, too, will be
4 one of the most politically competitive
5 congressional districts in the country.

6 District 8 is a district taking in
7 mostly counties and cities located between the
8 Triad and Charlotte. It contains all of
9 Cabarrus county and portions of Davidson, Rowan,
10 and Guilford counties, and this district is home
11 to one incumbent.

12 District 9 contains nine whole
13 counties. Those are Anson, Hoke, Montgomery,
14 Moore, Richmond, Robeson, Scotland, Stanly, and
15 Union. It also contains portions of Columbus
16 and Davidson counties. There is not an
17 incumbent in this district.

18 District 10 is a western North Carolina
19 based district stretching from Forsyth west into
20 the mountains. It keeps eight counties whole.
21 Those are Alexander, Avery, Burke, Caldwell,
22 Catawba, Davie, Iredell, and Lincoln. It also
23 contains parts of McDowell, Rowan, and Yadkin
24 counties. There is one incumbent in the
25 district.

1 District 11 is a western North Carolina
2 mountain based district. It contains the whole
3 of the 14 westernmost counties in
4 North Carolina. It also contains parts of
5 McDowell and Rutherford. There is one incumbent
6 currently residing in the district.

7 District 12 is a district containing
8 the northeastern sections of Mecklenburg county,
9 including the majority of Charlotte. The areas
10 in and around Charlotte are too large to be
11 wholly contained in one congressional district.
12 Mecklenburg county is split only once in this
13 map, and there is currently one incumbent living
14 in District 12.

15 District 13 is the new open seat
16 created as a result of North Carolina receiving
17 an additional congressional seat after the 2020
18 census. It contains all of Duplin, Johnston,
19 and Sampson counties and parts of Wake and Wayne
20 counties. This will again be one of the most
21 highly competitive congressional districts in
22 the country.

23 And District 14 is a seat taking in the
24 remainder of Mecklenburg county and stretching
25 west across the southern boundary of the state

1 into Rutherford county, taking in all of
2 Cleveland and Gaston counties. It's a very
3 compact district with only one incumbent.
4 District 14 will likewise be among the most
5 politically competitive congressional districts
6 anywhere in the United States.

7 We believe that this map is highly
8 politically competitive, that it follows the
9 Court's order, and that it will represent the
10 will of the people if adopted by the Court in
11 the course of the ongoing litigation. I would
12 ask for your support for this bill. Thank you.

13 THE PRESIDENT: Senator Clark, for what
14 purpose do you rise, sir?

15 SENATOR CLARK: To send forth an
16 amendment.

17 THE PRESIDENT: Send forward your
18 amendment.

19 Amendment Number 1 to Senate Bill 745.
20 The clerk will read.

21 THE CLERK: Senator Clark moves to
22 amend the bill.

23 THE PRESIDENT: You have the floor to
24 explain your amendment, sir.

25 SENATOR CLARK: Thank you,

1 Mr. President.

2 Senators, the bill that is presented
3 before us for consideration still has problems.
4 There was an attempt made to remedy some of the
5 metrics, more specifically the mean-median and
6 efficiency gap. However, there were more
7 problems with the original map than those.

8 First of all, the Court did chide this
9 body for not complying with its own standards.
10 One of those happened to be in the area of split
11 VTDs. In this particular map here that we're
12 being asked to support, 15 VTDs have been split.
13 Now, the minimum necessary in order to comply
14 with our own requirements of a minimum split of
15 VTDs is 13. So one might ask, well, why are we
16 splitting 15? Because essentially what we have
17 is essentially a gateway to a gerrymander.

18 In the amendment I have before you, and
19 hopefully you've seen the map on the screen,
20 there are only 13 VTDs split, the minimum
21 required in accordance with our own standard to
22 split no VTDs for a reason other than population
23 equality. Likewise, if we look at the map here,
24 we see that we violated our own standard against
25 splitting counties.

1 Now, in the previous map, the one that
2 was enacted, we split 10 counties a total of 14
3 times because we trisected three of those. In
4 this amendment before you, only 13 counties are
5 split for a total of 13 times. So then again
6 you may ask, well, why is this map that we're
7 being asked to support, why does it split
8 counties 14 times? Because, again, that's a
9 gateway to a gerrymander. We don't need to do
10 that.

11 Now, we've talked about the metrics.
12 We've talked about the mean-median, the
13 efficiency gap. And like the proposed map that
14 has been submitted for our consideration, the
15 amendment scores exceptionally well on those
16 also and meets the standard that they claim the
17 Court is requiring in terms of their values, but
18 I caution you, because we're computing that
19 mean-median and the efficiency gap based upon a
20 single index comprised of about I think it's 12
21 elections which is significantly inefficient.
22 You're never going to rely on a value computed
23 based upon an index consisting of 12 elections.

24 And they indicate, yes, correctly so,
25 that Dr. Mattingly used those elections as well.

1 He did but not as a composite index used within
2 an efficiency gap or a mean-median measure to
3 determine whether or not our maps were
4 constitutional -- actually, whether or not they
5 were free of extreme gerrymandering, and neither
6 should we.

7 And although they did not specifically
8 cite a measure called declination, I ran that
9 value as well, or I should say the staff did,
10 and the map that I'm asking you to support has
11 an exceptional declination score.

12 Let's see. Okay. They talked about
13 performance. During the committee meeting it
14 was stated that the map we're being asked to
15 vote on was highly competitive and that
16 essentially it would elect six Republicans, four
17 Democrats and have four competitive seats.

18 Well, the amendment that I have before
19 you would elect six Republicans and, depending
20 on what your measure of competitiveness is, six
21 Democrats and have two highly competitive seats,
22 or five Democrats and have three competitive
23 seats, again, depending on what your definition
24 of competitiveness is.

25 But all that being said, you know,

1 sometimes you get a feel that you want to use
2 the numbers to try to generate some kind of
3 result for a partisan advantage and ultimately
4 end up with a map that is not a map that the
5 state of North Carolina deserves.

6 I remember when I first talked to
7 Senator Blue about getting in this business. I
8 made it clear that I would never put my
9 signature to a map that I believe to be a
10 partisan gerrymander in favor of anybody, not
11 the Democrats, not the Republicans, and this
12 amendment that is -- that I'm asking you to
13 support does neither of that. And if you look
14 at that map -- I'm not going to provide an
15 explanation of the different districts because,
16 when you look at it, I think it's probably quite
17 clear to you what it is.

18 You know, we have major geocultural
19 regions in this state that we all understand.
20 we all recognize -- we know where the Triad is,
21 we know the Triangle, the Sandhills, at least
22 the folks in the Sandhills know, and we know the
23 northeast. We know the -- we know those things,
24 and when you look at that map that I'm asking
25 you to support in place of the one we're asking

1 to vote on, it is clear what is going on. No
2 one has to tell you. So I won't waste your time
3 telling you.

4 But those who served in the military at
5 some time or another, we understand this concept
6 of pursuing the commander's intent. When the
7 commander gives us an order, it could be a
8 five-page order, six-page, 10, 20, whatever, the
9 Court has given us an order. Now, when you're
10 in the military, you don't go nitpicking that
11 order to try to find some sort of loophole to do
12 what you want to do. You read it in its
13 entirety, you understand the intent of that
14 order, and you make sure you achieve that
15 intent.

16 Now, the intent of that order that the
17 Court provided to us was to provide the state of
18 North Carolina with fair maps. Nothing less,
19 nothing more. This amendment that I'm asking
20 you to support does just that: It provides the
21 state of North Carolina with fair maps.

22 THE PRESIDENT: Senator Daniel, for
23 what purpose do you rise?

24 SENATOR DANIEL: Mr. President, I move
25 that Amendment 1 do lie upon the table.

1 SENATOR NEWTON: Second.

2 THE PRESIDENT: Senator Daniel moves
3 that Amendment Number 1 to Senate Bill 745 do
4 lie upon the table. It was seconded by Senator
5 Newton.

6 This is a non-debatable motion and will
7 go straight to a vote. The question before the
8 body is the motion to table Amendment Number 1
9 to Senate Bill 745. All in favor will vote aye,
10 all opposed will vote no. Five seconds will be
11 allowed for voting, and the clerk will record
12 the vote.

13 Senator Ballard is aye.

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Aye.

15 THE PRESIDENT: Senator Britt is aye.

16 27 --

17 SENATOR CHAUDHURI: Mr. President.

18 THE PRESIDENT: Senator Chaudhuri, yes,
19 for what purpose do you rise?

20 SENATOR CHAUDHURI: Change my vote from
21 aye to no.

22 THE PRESIDENT: I'm sorry. That would
23 make the count 26 having voted in the
24 affirmative, 19 in the negative. Amendment
25 Number 1 to Senate Bill 745 will lie on the

1 table, and we are back to the bill.

2 Any further discussion or debate? No,
3 no further -- okay, that's great. I'm sorry,
4 guys, I lost my place here. Excuse me. Here we
5 go.

6 Hearing none, the question before the
7 body -- the question before the Senate is the
8 passage of Senate Bill 745 on second reading.
9 All in favor will vote aye, all opposed will
10 vote no. Five seconds will be allowed for
11 voting. The clerk will record the vote.

12 Senator Britt is aye. I'm sorry.
13 Senator Chaudhuri. Senator Chaudhuri is no.

14 26 having voted in the affirmative, 19
15 in the negative, Senate Bill 745 passes its
16 second reading and without objection will be
17 read a third time.

18 THE CLERK: The General Assembly of
19 North Carolina enacts.

20 THE PRESIDENT: Is there further
21 discussion or debate?

22 Hearing none, all in favor of the
23 passage of Senate Bill 745 on its third reading
24 will vote aye, all opposed will vote no. Five
25 seconds will be allowed for voting, and the

1 clerk will record the vote.

2 Senator Sawyer -- Senator Britt is aye.
3 Leave of absence is requested and granted for
4 Senator Sawyer.

5 25 having voted in the affirmative, 19
6 in the negative, Senate Bill 745 passes its
7 third reading and will be sent to the House by
8 special message.

9 Senator Rabon, for what purpose do you
10 rise?

11 SENATOR RABON: To send -- bring forth
12 the committee report, please.

13 THE PRESIDENT: The clerk wants to know
14 if we can pause that for just a second.

15 Message from the House, the clerk will
16 read.

17 THE CLERK: Mr. President, it's ordered
18 that a message be sent to the Senate informing
19 that honorable body that conferees for
20 House Bill 797, Senate Committee Substitute,
21 Third Edition, a bill to be entitled An Act
22 Authorizing a Board of County Commissioners to
23 Delegate to a Hearing Officer the Determination
24 of whether a Taxpayer has Overpaid the Excise
25 Tax on Conveyances have been Dismissed and New

1 Conferees have been Appointed. Speaker Moore
2 has appointed Representative Kidwell chair.
3 Respectfully, James White, Principal Clerk.

4 (HB 797 was not transcribed by the
5 court reporter.)

6 THE PRESIDENT: Next on our calendar,
7 we have House Bill 980. The clerk will read.

8 THE CLERK: House Bill 980, Realign NC
9 House Districts 2022/HTU 22-4.

10 THE PRESIDENT: Senator Newton is
11 recognized to explain the bill.

12 SENATOR NEWTON: Thank you,
13 Mr. President.

14 Members, this is the House
15 redistricting map. The map passed 115 to 5 in
16 the House last night. On the floor, six
17 Democrat amendments were accepted including four
18 from the minority leader.

19 The Supreme Court in its opinion stated
20 a map has to -- that has under 1 percent
21 mean-median difference is presumptively
22 constitutional. This House plan has a
23 mean-median difference of .71 percent, so it's
24 presumptively constitutional. The Supreme Court
25 in its opinion stated that a map under 7 percent

1 efficiency gap is presumptively constitutional.
2 This House map is .84 percent efficiency gap.
3 Governor Cooper would have won well over 60
4 seats on this map.

5 This House map has 30 fewer splits of
6 municipalities involving population than the
7 enacted maps, and the House plan improves
8 considerably on the compactness compared to the
9 enacted map. This map improves on the Reock/
10 Polsby-Popper metrics compared to the enacted
11 map.

12 I commend the bill to you and ask for
13 your support on behalf of the House. Thank you.

14 THE PRESIDENT: Is there further
15 discussion or debate?

16 Hearing none, the question before the
17 senate is the passage of House Bill 980 on its
18 second reading. All in favor will vote aye, all
19 opposed will vote no. Five seconds will be
20 allowed for voting. The clerk will record the
21 vote.

22 Senator Craven is aye. Senator Clark
23 is aye. Senator Blue is aye. Senator Britt is
24 aye. I think we have it.

25 41 having voted in the affirmative, 3

1 in the negative, House Bill 980 passes its
2 second reading and without objection will be
3 read a third time.

4 THE CLERK: The General Assembly of
5 North Carolina enacts.

6 THE PRESIDENT: Is there further
7 discussion or debate on House Bill 980?

8 Hearing none, all in favor of the
9 passage of House Bill 980 on its third reading
10 will vote aye, all opposed will vote no. Five
11 seconds will be allowed for voting, and the
12 clerk will record the vote.

13 Senator Britt -- Senator Davis, Senator
14 Chaudhuri are aye. Senator Britt is aye.
15 Senator Foushee is aye. Senator Fitch is aye.
16 Senator Woodard is aye. Senator Mohammad is no.
17 Senator Craven -- Senator Craven is aye.

18 41 having voted in the affirmative, 3
19 in the negative, House Bill 980 passes its third
20 reading and will be sent -- will be enrolled and
21 I guess sent to the governor. No, it will just
22 be enrolled. Yes, just enrolled, not sent to
23 the governor.

24 That concludes our calendar.
25

1 STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA)
2 COUNTY OF WAKE) C E R T I F I C A T E

3
4 I, DENISE MYERS BYRD, Stenographic
5 Court Reporter, CSR 8340, do hereby certify that
6 the transcription of the recorded senate session
7 held on February 17, 2022, was taken down by me
8 stenographically to the best of my ability and
9 thereafter transcribed under my supervision; and
10 that the foregoing pages, inclusive, constitute
11 a true and accurate transcription of said
12 recording.

13 Signed this the 18th day of February
14 2022.

15
16
17 Denise Myers Byrd
18 Denise Myers Byrd
19 CSR 8240, RPR, CLR 102409-2
20
21
22
23
24
25

List of Hearing Video and Audio Links

The Audio Files for the following sessions may be found at <https://ncleg.gov/Documents/503#Audio>

- February 16, 2022 House Redistricting Committee
- February 16, 2022 House Session
- February 16, 2022 Senate Redistricting Committee
- February 17, 2022 House Redistricting Committee
- February 17, 2022 Senate Redistricting Committee
- February 17, 2022 House Session
- February 17, 2022 Senate Session

The Video Files¹ for the following sessions may be found at <https://ncleg.gov/Documents/503#Video>

- February 16, 2022 House Redistricting Committee
- February 16, 2022 House Session
- February 16, 2022 Senate Redistricting Committee
- February 17, 2022 House Redistricting Committee
- February 17, 2022 Senate Redistricting Committee
- February 17, 2022 House Session


¹ The Senate does not video record its sessions. Therefore, there is only an audio recording.

Legislative Defendants' Submission of 2022 Remedial Maps County Grouping
Overlay*†




* Corresponding csv files and shapefiles are submitted to the Court in native file via flash drive.



† Maptitude or an equivalent program is required to open these files.

Duke_House 03



Legend

-  District
-  Fixed District
-  County



Population Deviation Report**District Plan: Duke_House 03**

District	Seats	Ideal Pop	Actual Pop	Deviation	Deviation %
AA	1	86,995	83,282	-3,713	-4.27%
A	1	86,995	1,115,482	1,028,487	1182.24%
BB	1	86,995	84,745	-2,250	-2.59%
B	1	86,995	1,129,410	1,042,415	1198.25%
CC	1	86,995	90,212	3,217	3.70%
C	1	86,995	623,272	536,277	616.45%
DD	1	86,995	84,735	-2,260	-2.60%
D	1	86,995	541,299	454,304	522.22%
E	1	86,995	427,110	340,115	390.96%
EE	1	86,995	87,570	575	0.66%
FF	1	86,995	88,255	1,260	1.45%
F	1	86,995	426,414	339,419	390.16%
G	1	86,995	452,605	365,610	420.27%
GG	1	86,995	84,907	-2,088	-2.40%
H	1	86,995	362,395	275,400	316.57%
HH	1	86,995	173,772	86,777	99.75%
II	1	86,995	172,203	85,208	97.95%
I	1	86,995	334,728	247,733	284.77%
J	1	86,995	349,567	262,572	301.82%
JJ	1	86,995	88,642	1,647	1.89%
K	1	86,995	347,303	260,308	299.22%
KK	1	86,995	166,048	79,053	90.87%
LL	1	86,995	264,779	177,784	204.36%
L	1	86,995	363,930	276,935	318.33%
M	1	86,995	260,322	173,327	199.24%
MM	1	86,995	167,493	80,498	92.53%
NN	1	86,995	82,953	-4,042	-4.65%
N	1	86,995	269,452	182,457	209.73%
O	1	86,995	167,153	80,158	92.14%
P	1	86,995	173,754	86,759	99.73%
Q	1	86,995	168,406	81,411	93.58%
R	1	86,995	168,930	81,935	94.18%
S	1	86,995	172,143	85,148	97.88%
T	1	86,995	170,243	83,248	95.69%
U	1	86,995	171,415	84,420	97.04%
V	1	86,995	171,432	84,437	97.06%
W	1	86,995	91,096	4,101	4.71%
X	1	86,995	88,865	1,870	2.15%
Y	1	86,995	86,810	-185	-0.21%
Z	1	86,995	86,256	-739	-0.85%
Totals:	40		10,439,388		

Deviation range: -4.65% to 1198.25%

2020 Election Contest Report - US President-15025-

NC General Assembly

District Plan: Duke_House 03

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib	Grn	% Grn	Cnst	% Cnst	W-I	% W-I
A	179,215	31.60%	378,057	66.66%	5,426	0.96%	1,610	0.28%	937	0.17%	1,935	0.34%
AA	30,814	62.02%	18,044	36.32%	437	0.88%	126	0.25%	140	0.28%	122	0.25%
BB	22,745	53.22%	19,633	45.94%	186	0.44%	42	0.10%	90	0.21%	42	0.10%
B	226,197	35.79%	393,336	62.24%	7,514	1.19%	1,612	0.26%	981	0.16%	2,287	0.36%
CC	27,153	55.49%	20,815	42.53%	509	1.04%	171	0.35%	148	0.30%	141	0.29%
C	218,089	65.11%	112,340	33.54%	2,582	0.77%	660	0.20%	629	0.19%	639	0.19%
D	107,295	37.69%	173,087	60.81%	2,232	0.78%	704	0.25%	579	0.20%	746	0.26%
DD	17,514	39.82%	26,098	59.34%	154	0.35%	69	0.16%	106	0.24%	39	0.09%
E	105,198	46.33%	118,317	52.11%	1,965	0.87%	529	0.23%	422	0.19%	625	0.28%
EE	31,019	69.43%	13,118	29.36%	270	0.60%	83	0.19%	117	0.26%	69	0.15%
F	143,144	62.21%	84,080	36.54%	1,726	0.75%	398	0.17%	346	0.15%	401	0.17%
FF	33,869	72.35%	12,456	26.61%	303	0.65%	45	0.10%	83	0.18%	56	0.12%
GG	35,662	73.07%	12,414	25.44%	336	0.69%	99	0.20%	168	0.34%	124	0.25%
G	146,696	62.17%	85,748	36.34%	2,017	0.85%	488	0.21%	418	0.18%	610	0.26%
H	119,104	53.69%	99,329	44.78%	2,162	0.97%	481	0.22%	281	0.13%	470	0.21%
HH	67,473	76.65%	19,619	22.29%	552	0.63%	97	0.11%	147	0.17%	139	0.16%
II	62,539	64.48%	33,014	34.04%	820	0.85%	201	0.21%	195	0.20%	226	0.23%
I	60,032	40.78%	84,469	57.38%	1,645	1.12%	423	0.29%	299	0.20%	337	0.23%
JJ	27,078	59.16%	18,286	39.95%	211	0.46%	41	0.09%	92	0.20%	63	0.14%
J	103,530	61.03%	63,350	37.34%	1,872	1.10%	340	0.20%	230	0.14%	328	0.19%
K	123,598	66.50%	59,577	32.05%	1,559	0.84%	372	0.20%	357	0.19%	410	0.22%
KK	44,423	56.88%	32,882	42.10%	462	0.59%	125	0.16%	118	0.15%	93	0.12%
LL	68,034	63.93%	35,989	33.82%	1,835	1.72%	199	0.19%	169	0.16%	201	0.19%
L	45,596	22.63%	152,829	75.85%	1,646	0.82%	561	0.28%	299	0.15%	565	0.28%
MM	61,416	61.35%	37,382	37.34%	746	0.75%	151	0.15%	251	0.25%	169	0.17%
M	85,704	60.24%	54,514	38.32%	1,177	0.83%	252	0.18%	246	0.17%	369	0.26%
N	62,412	38.61%	96,510	59.70%	1,460	0.90%	542	0.34%	329	0.20%	415	0.26%
NN	20,932	49.27%	21,024	49.49%	306	0.72%	69	0.16%	65	0.15%	84	0.20%
O	44,636	60.59%	28,466	38.64%	249	0.34%	96	0.13%	137	0.19%	91	0.12%
P	45,408	48.80%	46,701	50.19%	532	0.57%	131	0.14%	136	0.15%	137	0.15%
Q	61,060	63.72%	33,241	34.69%	999	1.04%	156	0.16%	188	0.20%	174	0.18%
R	64,628	73.00%	22,627	25.56%	703	0.79%	187	0.21%	243	0.27%	140	0.16%
S	45,939	51.04%	42,871	47.63%	671	0.75%	154	0.17%	202	0.22%	171	0.19%
T	38,743	44.53%	46,881	53.89%	788	0.91%	209	0.24%	169	0.19%	207	0.24%
U	46,056	53.49%	38,825	45.09%	686	0.80%	223	0.26%	170	0.20%	150	0.17%
V	27,265	28.07%	68,452	70.48%	717	0.74%	236	0.24%	159	0.16%	287	0.30%
W	31,301	65.47%	15,992	33.45%	312	0.65%	75	0.16%	55	0.12%	74	0.15%
X	19,515	40.88%	27,868	58.38%	184	0.39%	61	0.13%	70	0.15%	39	0.08%
Y	36,341	72.33%	13,274	26.42%	373	0.74%	87	0.17%	84	0.17%	83	0.17%
Z	16,926	46.47%	18,990	52.14%	316	0.87%	81	0.22%	53	0.15%	56	0.15%
Total:	2,754,299	49.91%	2,680,505	48.57%	48,640	0.88%	12,186	0.22%	9,908	0.18%	13,314	0.24%

Candidates: Trump (Rep), Biden (Dem), Jorgensen (Lib), Hawkins (Grn), Blankenship (Cst)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Duke_House 03.csv', modified 2/18/2022 10:53 AM

[EL20-PRS-20G] - Generated 2/18/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - US Senate -15026-

NC General Assembly

District Plan: Duke_House 03

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib	Cnst	% Cnst
A	186,685	33.17%	350,823	62.34%	19,764	3.51%	5,524	0.98%
AA	28,901	58.63%	18,157	36.83%	1,444	2.93%	791	1.60%
BB	21,536	50.86%	19,285	45.55%	962	2.27%	557	1.32%
B	232,388	37.05%	367,754	58.63%	22,230	3.54%	4,925	0.79%
CC	25,818	53.30%	20,259	41.82%	1,638	3.38%	728	1.50%
C	208,283	62.82%	109,568	33.05%	9,055	2.73%	4,660	1.41%
D	104,907	37.16%	165,884	58.76%	8,590	3.04%	2,940	1.04%
DD	16,389	37.49%	26,051	59.60%	812	1.86%	459	1.05%
E	101,820	45.25%	112,911	50.17%	7,345	3.26%	2,960	1.32%
EE	28,934	65.39%	13,180	29.79%	1,309	2.96%	822	1.86%
F	136,501	59.88%	81,718	35.85%	6,573	2.88%	3,150	1.38%
FF	31,632	68.33%	12,445	26.88%	1,285	2.78%	930	2.01%
GG	33,709	69.91%	12,581	26.09%	1,162	2.41%	766	1.59%
G	139,891	59.82%	82,151	35.13%	7,850	3.36%	3,970	1.70%
H	114,316	52.12%	93,775	42.75%	8,394	3.83%	2,854	1.30%
HH	62,394	71.60%	20,828	23.90%	2,399	2.75%	1,516	1.74%
II	58,877	61.39%	32,376	33.76%	3,087	3.22%	1,567	1.63%
I	57,121	39.19%	81,014	55.59%	5,379	3.69%	2,232	1.53%
JJ	25,476	56.27%	18,119	40.02%	1,034	2.28%	642	1.42%
J	98,143	58.39%	61,294	36.46%	6,081	3.62%	2,578	1.53%
K	118,323	64.19%	56,776	30.80%	6,037	3.28%	3,183	1.73%
KK	42,054	54.46%	32,130	41.61%	1,893	2.45%	1,144	1.48%
LL	63,528	60.52%	34,630	32.99%	4,901	4.67%	1,916	1.83%
L	46,300	23.14%	146,602	73.26%	5,631	2.81%	1,589	0.79%
MM	58,926	59.59%	35,978	36.38%	2,710	2.74%	1,273	1.29%
M	84,626	60.02%	50,895	36.10%	3,969	2.81%	1,511	1.07%
N	60,688	37.90%	92,723	57.91%	5,054	3.16%	1,663	1.04%
NN	20,178	48.30%	20,128	48.18%	1,007	2.41%	462	1.11%
O	40,772	56.56%	28,761	39.90%	1,471	2.04%	1,082	1.50%
P	43,361	46.96%	45,934	49.74%	2,002	2.17%	1,042	1.13%
Q	58,034	61.23%	32,270	34.04%	3,084	3.25%	1,399	1.48%
R	60,659	68.78%	23,684	26.85%	2,496	2.83%	1,356	1.54%
S	43,216	48.37%	42,292	47.34%	2,608	2.92%	1,225	1.37%
T	37,709	43.68%	45,269	52.43%	2,496	2.89%	863	1.00%
U	44,246	51.73%	38,043	44.48%	2,302	2.69%	935	1.09%
V	27,505	28.49%	66,154	68.53%	2,239	2.32%	641	0.66%
W	28,971	61.23%	16,189	34.22%	1,473	3.11%	680	1.44%
X	18,175	38.39%	27,687	58.48%	919	1.94%	562	1.19%
Y	34,673	69.64%	12,871	25.85%	1,482	2.98%	763	1.53%
Z	15,704	43.80%	18,321	51.10%	1,231	3.43%	599	1.67%
Total:	2,661,369	48.67%	2,567,510	46.95%	171,398	3.13%	68,459	1.25%

Candidates: Tillis (Rep), Cunningham (Dem), Bray (Lib), Hayes (Cst)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Duke_House 03.csv', modified 2/18/2022 10:53 AM

[EL20-SEN-20G] - Generated 2/18/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Governor15027-

NC General Assembly

District Plan: Duke_House 03

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep	Lib	% Lib	Cnst	% Cnst
A	382,680	67.78%	171,116	30.31%	8,146	1.44%	2,613	0.46%
AA	20,269	40.91%	28,538	57.59%	528	1.07%	216	0.44%
BB	20,533	48.14%	21,713	50.91%	255	0.60%	152	0.36%
B	410,386	65.16%	209,183	33.22%	7,928	1.26%	2,269	0.36%
CC	22,675	46.52%	25,166	51.63%	657	1.35%	241	0.49%
C	122,578	36.75%	206,501	61.90%	3,168	0.95%	1,342	0.40%
D	180,159	63.72%	97,971	34.65%	3,305	1.17%	1,305	0.46%
DD	27,191	61.93%	16,317	37.16%	240	0.55%	158	0.36%
E	125,228	55.40%	97,316	43.05%	2,545	1.13%	973	0.43%
EE	15,028	33.74%	28,898	64.88%	364	0.82%	253	0.57%
F	93,174	40.66%	133,104	58.09%	1,996	0.87%	869	0.38%
FF	14,482	31.03%	31,644	67.81%	360	0.77%	178	0.38%
GG	13,696	28.19%	34,169	70.32%	476	0.98%	252	0.52%
G	92,816	39.53%	138,373	58.93%	2,593	1.10%	1,030	0.44%
H	106,248	48.10%	110,941	50.23%	2,695	1.22%	992	0.45%
HH	24,373	27.75%	62,546	71.21%	643	0.73%	270	0.31%
II	36,460	37.74%	58,721	60.78%	1,023	1.06%	405	0.42%
I	88,278	60.24%	55,197	37.67%	2,168	1.48%	895	0.61%
JJ	19,668	43.14%	25,492	55.91%	279	0.61%	152	0.33%
J	69,152	40.88%	97,359	57.56%	1,908	1.13%	737	0.44%
K	64,642	34.88%	117,764	63.55%	2,055	1.11%	850	0.46%
KK	34,649	44.53%	42,277	54.34%	566	0.73%	316	0.41%
LL	38,252	36.26%	64,692	61.31%	1,852	1.76%	712	0.67%
L	156,096	77.63%	42,238	21.00%	2,094	1.04%	661	0.33%
MM	39,498	39.66%	58,763	59.00%	890	0.89%	451	0.45%
M	57,422	40.52%	82,282	58.06%	1,447	1.02%	575	0.41%
N	99,396	61.92%	58,151	36.22%	2,272	1.42%	713	0.44%
NN	21,550	51.04%	20,093	47.59%	395	0.94%	187	0.44%
O	32,589	44.73%	39,599	54.35%	419	0.58%	252	0.35%
P	49,706	53.49%	42,367	45.59%	568	0.61%	281	0.30%
Q	35,729	37.44%	58,303	61.09%	972	1.02%	433	0.45%
R	26,586	30.06%	60,748	68.69%	797	0.90%	301	0.34%
S	46,338	51.54%	42,420	47.19%	796	0.89%	345	0.38%
T	48,602	55.99%	36,982	42.60%	895	1.03%	328	0.38%
U	41,979	48.84%	42,921	49.93%	756	0.88%	299	0.35%
V	70,327	72.59%	25,444	26.26%	855	0.88%	253	0.26%
W	18,197	38.19%	28,891	60.63%	415	0.87%	149	0.31%
X	29,071	61.00%	18,255	38.30%	201	0.42%	132	0.28%
Y	14,730	29.39%	34,711	69.25%	449	0.90%	237	0.47%
Z	20,268	56.02%	15,296	42.28%	437	1.21%	179	0.49%
Total:	2,830,701	51.50%	2,582,462	46.98%	60,408	1.10%	22,956	0.42%

Candidates: Cooper (Dem), Forest (Rep), DiFiore (Lib), Pisano (Cst)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Duke_House 03.csv', modified 2/18/2022 10:53 AM

[EL20-GOV-20G] - Generated 2/18/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Lieutenant Governor

NC General Assembly

District Plan: Duke_House 03

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
A	192,531	34.56%	364,529	65.44%
AA	30,851	63.04%	18,084	36.96%
BB	22,795	54.11%	19,333	45.89%
B	240,123	38.69%	380,586	61.31%
CC	27,651	57.52%	20,418	42.48%
C	217,653	66.36%	110,333	33.64%
D	111,354	39.75%	168,770	60.25%
DD	17,331	39.86%	26,148	60.14%
E	108,187	48.57%	114,544	51.43%
EE	30,728	69.97%	13,191	30.03%
F	143,272	63.52%	82,267	36.48%
FF	33,459	73.10%	12,312	26.90%
GG	35,489	74.16%	12,367	25.84%
G	148,090	63.83%	83,925	36.17%
H	120,325	55.66%	95,860	44.34%
HH	66,752	77.13%	19,796	22.87%
II	62,289	65.76%	32,431	34.24%
I	60,299	41.65%	84,485	58.35%
JJ	26,810	59.65%	18,137	40.35%
J	103,666	62.34%	62,615	37.66%
K	124,252	68.03%	58,402	31.97%
KK	44,302	57.71%	32,462	42.29%
LL	67,850	65.69%	35,431	34.31%
L	48,549	24.47%	149,872	75.53%
MM	61,498	62.83%	36,383	37.17%
M	86,681	62.41%	52,210	37.59%
N	63,843	40.30%	94,567	59.70%
NN	20,907	50.26%	20,690	49.74%
O	42,196	59.23%	29,048	40.77%
P	45,658	49.61%	46,382	50.39%
Q	61,351	65.51%	32,295	34.49%
R	65,177	74.18%	22,685	25.82%
S	45,887	51.72%	42,831	48.28%
T	39,959	46.62%	45,754	53.38%
U	46,891	54.96%	38,421	45.04%
V	28,847	30.18%	66,722	69.82%
W	31,170	66.26%	15,871	33.74%
X	19,406	41.22%	27,668	58.78%
Y	36,359	73.84%	12,883	26.16%
Z	16,538	46.51%	19,018	53.49%
Total:	2,796,976	51.64%	2,619,726	48.36%

Candidates: Robinson (Rep), Holley (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Duke_House 03.csv', modified 2/18/2022 10:53 AM

[EL20-LG-20G] - Generated 2/18/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Attorney General

NC General Assembly

District Plan: Duke_House 03

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
A	369,162	66.36%	187,106	33.64%
AA	19,157	39.23%	29,674	60.77%
BB	20,228	48.20%	21,742	51.80%
B	391,610	63.13%	228,681	36.87%
CC	21,335	44.52%	26,589	55.48%
C	116,035	35.35%	212,244	64.65%
D	172,997	61.94%	106,315	38.06%
DD	26,887	62.09%	16,416	37.91%
E	116,375	52.11%	106,954	47.89%
EE	14,313	32.58%	29,620	67.42%
F	86,800	38.59%	138,115	61.41%
FF	13,617	29.89%	31,936	70.11%
GG	12,995	27.24%	34,703	72.76%
G	88,977	38.43%	142,564	61.57%
H	99,900	46.28%	115,975	53.72%
HH	22,074	25.56%	64,282	74.44%
II	34,689	36.68%	59,879	63.32%
I	86,301	59.74%	58,157	40.26%
JJ	19,037	42.60%	25,647	57.40%
J	66,136	39.96%	99,379	60.04%
K	61,846	33.92%	120,466	66.08%
KK	33,750	44.13%	42,723	55.87%
LL	36,681	35.54%	66,521	64.46%
L	151,914	76.70%	46,161	23.30%
MM	37,693	38.67%	59,792	61.33%
M	54,506	39.21%	84,519	60.79%
N	96,435	61.04%	61,562	38.96%
NN	20,957	50.77%	20,319	49.23%
O	30,682	43.35%	40,093	56.65%
P	48,965	53.29%	42,916	46.71%
Q	33,708	36.16%	59,523	63.84%
R	24,530	27.95%	63,243	72.05%
S	45,111	50.90%	43,523	49.10%
T	47,475	55.56%	37,973	44.44%
U	40,125	47.21%	44,859	52.79%
V	68,397	71.59%	27,149	28.41%
W	16,993	36.19%	29,959	63.81%
X	28,819	61.43%	18,094	38.57%
Y	14,212	28.95%	34,874	71.05%
Z	19,351	54.66%	16,050	45.34%
Total:	2,710,775	50.13%	2,696,297	49.87%

Candidates: Stein (Dem), O'Neill (Rep)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Duke_House 03.csv', modified 2/18/2022 10:53 AM

[EL20-AG-20G] - Generated 2/18/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Auditor -15030-

District Plan: Duke_House 03

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
A	367,233	66.66%	183,637	33.34%
AA	19,183	39.57%	29,292	60.43%
BB	21,088	50.44%	20,721	49.56%
B	394,225	64.24%	219,428	35.76%
CC	21,452	45.16%	26,054	54.84%
C	114,710	35.36%	209,663	64.64%
D	173,315	62.68%	103,185	37.32%
DD	27,455	63.37%	15,871	36.63%
E	118,262	53.62%	102,294	46.38%
EE	14,098	32.33%	29,506	67.67%
F	87,546	39.26%	135,426	60.74%
FF	13,384	29.49%	32,001	70.51%
GG	13,223	27.91%	34,149	72.09%
G	88,191	38.43%	141,302	61.57%
H	98,560	46.38%	113,966	53.62%
HH	21,899	25.62%	63,580	74.38%
II	34,119	36.51%	59,337	63.49%
I	86,092	59.99%	57,415	40.01%
JJ	19,354	43.39%	25,249	56.61%
J	68,363	41.48%	96,445	58.52%
K	61,519	33.96%	119,639	66.04%
KK	34,523	45.39%	41,541	54.61%
LL	37,409	36.69%	64,557	63.31%
L	152,339	77.43%	44,412	22.57%
MM	39,322	40.59%	57,545	59.41%
M	53,633	39.02%	83,813	60.98%
N	96,094	61.34%	60,573	38.66%
NN	21,582	52.37%	19,632	47.63%
O	31,459	44.65%	39,002	55.35%
P	52,922	57.85%	38,567	42.15%
Q	36,003	38.88%	56,602	61.12%
R	24,881	28.50%	62,428	71.50%
S	45,966	52.18%	42,131	47.82%
T	49,599	58.24%	35,571	41.76%
U	39,796	47.19%	44,534	52.81%
V	67,937	71.75%	26,753	28.25%
W	16,900	36.32%	29,631	63.68%
X	29,950	64.00%	16,849	36.00%
Y	13,988	28.70%	34,749	71.30%
Z	19,799	56.18%	15,444	43.82%
Total:	2,727,373	50.89%	2,632,494	49.11%

Candidates: Wood (Dem), Street (Rep)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Duke_House 03.csv', modified 2/18/2022 10:53 AM

[EL20-AUD-20G] - Generated 2/18/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Commissioner of Agriculture

NC General Assembly

District Plan: Duke_House 03

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
A	197,287	35.75%	354,563	64.25%
AA	31,917	65.36%	16,915	34.64%
BB	23,094	54.99%	18,905	45.01%
B	272,537	44.21%	343,947	55.79%
CC	27,955	58.56%	19,779	41.44%
C	219,703	67.28%	106,828	32.72%
D	120,807	43.35%	157,891	56.65%
DD	17,911	41.26%	25,494	58.74%
E	112,924	51.01%	108,442	48.99%
EE	30,950	70.83%	12,744	29.17%
F	148,632	66.22%	75,829	33.78%
FF	34,043	74.51%	11,647	25.49%
GG	35,232	74.22%	12,236	25.78%
G	151,189	65.66%	79,081	34.34%
H	121,043	56.79%	92,086	43.21%
HH	67,901	78.82%	18,248	21.18%
II	63,518	67.59%	30,454	32.41%
I	61,726	42.86%	82,308	57.14%
JJ	27,427	61.22%	17,377	38.78%
J	108,956	65.59%	57,158	34.41%
K	125,439	69.06%	56,198	30.94%
KK	45,448	59.42%	31,038	40.58%
LL	67,408	66.02%	34,688	33.98%
L	54,517	27.70%	142,278	72.30%
MM	61,893	63.78%	35,145	36.22%
M	86,929	63.16%	50,712	36.84%
N	65,779	41.81%	91,565	58.19%
NN	21,057	51.02%	20,215	48.98%
O	41,881	59.33%	28,705	40.67%
P	47,557	51.75%	44,334	48.25%
Q	62,211	66.80%	30,915	33.20%
R	67,045	76.45%	20,654	23.55%
S	48,466	54.83%	39,924	45.17%
T	40,774	47.96%	44,244	52.04%
U	49,210	57.93%	35,743	42.07%
V	32,080	33.82%	62,774	66.18%
W	32,616	69.49%	14,323	30.51%
X	19,929	42.44%	27,025	57.56%
Y	36,248	74.16%	12,633	25.84%
Z	16,761	47.54%	18,498	52.46%
Total:	2,898,000	53.85%	2,483,543	46.15%

Candidates: Troxler (Rep), Wadsworth (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Duke_House 03.csv', modified 2/18/2022 10:53 AM

[EL20-COA-20G] - Generated 2/18/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Commissioner of Labor

NC General Assembly

District Plan: Duke_House 03

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
A	188,036	34.15%	362,616	65.85%
AA	29,870	61.68%	18,554	38.32%
BB	21,914	52.31%	19,981	47.69%
B	234,071	38.30%	377,061	61.70%
CC	26,681	56.14%	20,844	43.86%
C	214,402	65.84%	111,238	34.16%
D	107,459	38.88%	168,947	61.12%
DD	16,884	39.00%	26,411	61.00%
E	105,331	47.83%	114,895	52.17%
EE	30,191	69.09%	13,504	30.91%
F	139,722	62.72%	83,043	37.28%
FF	32,803	72.24%	12,606	27.76%
GG	34,534	72.95%	12,808	27.05%
G	144,756	63.14%	84,504	36.86%
H	116,216	54.55%	96,822	45.45%
HH	65,110	76.05%	20,508	23.95%
II	60,904	65.07%	32,698	34.93%
I	58,659	40.76%	85,259	59.24%
JJ	26,008	58.29%	18,610	41.71%
J	101,237	61.44%	63,549	38.56%
K	122,063	67.37%	59,128	32.63%
KK	43,125	56.60%	33,068	43.40%
LL	64,829	63.72%	36,907	36.28%
L	46,991	23.90%	149,588	76.10%
MM	59,260	61.25%	37,484	38.75%
M	85,089	61.92%	52,319	38.08%
N	62,090	39.65%	94,512	60.35%
NN	20,059	48.75%	21,087	51.25%
O	39,839	56.55%	30,610	43.45%
P	44,670	48.84%	46,801	51.16%
Q	59,232	64.01%	33,309	35.99%
R	64,116	73.44%	23,191	26.56%
S	44,621	50.69%	43,405	49.31%
T	38,089	44.79%	46,949	55.21%
U	45,699	54.12%	38,738	45.88%
V	28,127	29.72%	66,528	70.28%
W	30,328	65.17%	16,206	34.83%
X	18,672	39.84%	28,196	60.16%
Y	35,586	73.04%	13,133	26.96%
Z	15,833	44.90%	19,428	55.10%
Total:	2,723,106	50.82%	2,635,045	49.18%

Candidates: Dobson (Rep), Holmes (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Duke_House 03.csv', modified 2/18/2022 10:53 AM

[EL20-COL-20G] - Generated 2/18/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Secretary of State

NC General Assembly

District Plan: Duke_House 03

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
A	370,864	67.03%	182,444	32.97%
AA	19,607	40.36%	28,977	59.64%
BB	21,082	50.27%	20,859	49.73%
B	395,550	64.20%	220,608	35.80%
CC	21,805	45.67%	25,935	54.33%
C	117,349	36.01%	208,535	63.99%
D	174,719	62.96%	102,771	37.04%
DD	27,367	63.02%	16,059	36.98%
E	119,175	53.94%	101,757	46.06%
EE	14,649	33.49%	29,090	66.51%
F	88,982	39.75%	134,890	60.25%
FF	13,906	30.59%	31,546	69.41%
GG	13,491	28.39%	34,035	71.61%
G	89,521	38.89%	140,669	61.11%
H	100,581	46.93%	113,718	53.07%
HH	22,652	26.39%	63,196	73.61%
II	35,148	37.43%	58,757	62.57%
I	87,599	60.73%	56,656	39.27%
JJ	20,046	44.77%	24,733	55.23%
J	70,380	42.55%	95,042	57.45%
K	62,335	34.34%	119,192	65.66%
KK	35,143	46.02%	41,222	53.98%
LL	37,794	36.91%	64,598	63.09%
L	152,939	77.52%	44,355	22.48%
MM	39,419	40.57%	57,736	59.43%
M	54,419	39.33%	83,939	60.67%
N	96,560	61.48%	60,496	38.52%
NN	21,675	52.47%	19,631	47.53%
O	32,510	46.04%	38,102	53.96%
P	49,971	54.46%	41,789	45.54%
Q	35,102	37.84%	57,661	62.16%
R	25,052	28.62%	62,468	71.38%
S	46,519	52.62%	41,894	47.38%
T	48,646	57.11%	36,538	42.89%
U	40,740	48.08%	44,000	51.92%
V	68,360	71.91%	26,704	28.09%
W	17,342	37.14%	29,355	62.86%
X	29,408	62.65%	17,532	37.35%
Y	14,388	29.45%	34,460	70.55%
Z	19,968	56.51%	15,366	43.49%
Total:	2,752,763	51.17%	2,627,315	48.83%

Candidates: Marshall (Dem), Sykes (Rep)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Duke_House 03.csv', modified 2/18/2022 10:53 AM

[EL20-SOS-20G] - Generated 2/18/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Treasurer15034-

NC General Assembly

District Plan: Duke_House 03

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
A	206,451	37.58%	342,958	62.42%
AA	30,445	63.07%	17,828	36.93%
BB	22,520	53.96%	19,211	46.04%
B	250,985	41.00%	361,158	59.00%
CC	27,499	57.99%	19,918	42.01%
C	215,456	66.54%	108,339	33.46%
D	111,196	40.21%	165,361	59.79%
DD	17,456	40.48%	25,668	59.52%
E	110,272	49.94%	110,547	50.06%
EE	30,299	69.77%	13,127	30.23%
F	141,151	63.52%	81,080	36.48%
FF	32,736	72.48%	12,427	27.52%
GG	34,641	73.39%	12,563	26.61%
G	147,309	64.44%	81,295	35.56%
H	119,952	56.70%	91,597	43.30%
HH	64,682	75.68%	20,789	24.32%
II	61,688	66.24%	31,442	33.76%
I	62,163	43.40%	81,071	56.60%
JJ	26,117	58.88%	18,241	41.12%
J	102,665	62.69%	61,102	37.31%
K	124,159	68.79%	56,322	31.21%
KK	43,834	57.91%	31,863	42.09%
LL	66,422	65.43%	35,100	34.57%
L	51,890	26.49%	144,016	73.51%
MM	60,599	62.88%	35,775	37.12%
M	86,745	63.33%	50,236	36.67%
N	65,424	41.95%	90,544	58.05%
NN	20,833	50.85%	20,136	49.15%
O	40,509	57.85%	29,521	42.15%
P	45,925	50.40%	45,196	49.60%
Q	59,956	65.14%	32,086	34.86%
R	63,459	72.62%	23,928	27.38%
S	46,067	52.50%	41,688	47.50%
T	39,571	46.74%	45,092	53.26%
U	46,162	54.66%	38,286	45.34%
V	29,995	31.77%	64,422	68.23%
W	30,302	65.18%	16,191	34.82%
X	19,309	41.40%	27,336	58.60%
Y	35,799	73.96%	12,602	26.04%
Z	16,560	47.21%	18,519	52.79%
Total:	2,809,203	52.57%	2,534,581	47.43%

Candidates: Folwell (Rep), Chatterji (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Duke_House 03.csv', modified 2/18/2022 10:53 AM

[EL20-TRS-20G] - Generated 2/18/2022

2016 Election Contest Report - US President-15035-

District Plan: Duke_House 03

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib	W-I	% W-I
A	153,915	33.13%	288,101	62.01%	15,372	3.31%	7,246	1.56%
AA	25,726	61.23%	14,406	34.29%	1,241	2.95%	644	1.53%
BB	20,836	52.78%	17,864	45.26%	543	1.38%	231	0.59%
B	196,078	37.16%	302,733	57.38%	19,460	3.69%	9,346	1.77%
CC	23,870	56.13%	16,402	38.57%	1,462	3.44%	793	1.86%
C	188,241	65.66%	88,357	30.82%	6,777	2.36%	3,302	1.15%
D	97,816	38.12%	148,758	57.97%	6,731	2.62%	3,327	1.30%
DD	15,717	35.38%	27,991	63.01%	520	1.17%	192	0.43%
E	93,123	46.35%	99,122	49.34%	5,945	2.96%	2,705	1.35%
EE	26,224	67.41%	11,248	28.91%	988	2.54%	443	1.14%
F	121,125	61.32%	69,557	35.21%	4,905	2.48%	1,945	0.98%
FF	29,091	70.18%	11,244	27.12%	867	2.09%	252	0.61%
GG	30,694	72.91%	9,872	23.45%	1,030	2.45%	501	1.19%
G	126,098	64.00%	63,343	32.15%	5,332	2.71%	2,244	1.14%
H	98,046	54.41%	74,235	41.19%	5,666	3.14%	2,265	1.26%
HH	61,183	74.98%	17,871	21.90%	1,817	2.23%	731	0.90%
II	53,530	62.96%	27,368	32.19%	2,645	3.11%	1,485	1.75%
I	51,264	40.21%	71,604	56.16%	3,373	2.65%	1,263	0.99%
JJ	23,395	55.93%	17,602	42.08%	605	1.45%	227	0.54%
J	81,985	62.12%	45,104	34.18%	3,599	2.73%	1,290	0.98%
K	103,178	66.55%	45,967	29.65%	4,159	2.68%	1,733	1.12%
KK	39,760	55.57%	30,054	42.00%	1,223	1.71%	512	0.72%
LL	54,764	64.41%	26,867	31.60%	2,609	3.07%	781	0.92%
L	39,454	22.54%	128,483	73.40%	4,406	2.52%	2,708	1.55%
MM	52,308	60.11%	31,788	36.53%	2,161	2.48%	768	0.88%
M	71,180	61.25%	40,191	34.58%	3,456	2.97%	1,390	1.20%
N	55,718	40.10%	75,447	54.30%	4,287	3.09%	3,495	2.52%
NN	17,620	46.59%	19,115	50.54%	826	2.18%	258	0.68%
O	34,918	54.34%	27,882	43.39%	1,101	1.71%	361	0.56%
P	40,853	47.61%	42,898	50.00%	1,417	1.65%	635	0.74%
Q	54,285	64.05%	27,565	32.52%	2,118	2.50%	789	0.93%
R	54,301	72.55%	18,114	24.20%	1,859	2.48%	571	0.76%
S	37,291	47.99%	38,012	48.92%	1,667	2.15%	728	0.94%
T	35,647	44.35%	41,728	51.91%	2,160	2.69%	850	1.06%
U	38,804	54.54%	29,829	41.93%	1,795	2.52%	714	1.00%
V	24,581	26.32%	64,710	69.28%	2,618	2.80%	1,494	1.60%
W	26,834	63.46%	14,231	33.65%	871	2.06%	349	0.83%
X	17,584	38.18%	27,744	60.23%	517	1.12%	215	0.47%
Y	28,706	71.96%	9,865	24.73%	970	2.43%	348	0.87%
Z	14,006	43.57%	17,044	53.02%	831	2.59%	266	0.83%
Total:	2,359,749	49.90%	2,180,316	46.10%	129,929	2.75%	59,397	1.26%

Candidates: Trump (Rep), Clinton (Dem), Johnson (Lib)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Duke_House 03.csv', modified 2/18/2022 10:53 AM

[EL20-PRS-16G] - Generated 2/18/2022

2016 Election Contest Report - NC Lieutenant Governor

NC General Assembly

District Plan: Duke_House 03

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib
A	174,106	38.49%	262,735	58.08%	15,520	3.43%
AA	24,010	58.91%	15,207	37.31%	1,540	3.78%
BB	20,258	52.55%	17,663	45.82%	629	1.63%
B	217,772	42.14%	282,548	54.68%	16,429	3.18%
CC	22,955	55.48%	16,811	40.63%	1,611	3.89%
C	185,812	66.51%	86,156	30.84%	7,418	2.66%
D	101,459	40.55%	141,524	56.56%	7,249	2.90%
DD	15,277	35.05%	27,754	63.67%	560	1.28%
E	96,433	49.18%	94,068	47.97%	5,584	2.85%
EE	25,656	67.66%	11,334	29.89%	930	2.45%
F	120,189	62.35%	67,798	35.17%	4,786	2.48%
FF	28,404	70.19%	11,091	27.41%	971	2.40%
GG	28,299	69.92%	10,904	26.94%	1,271	3.14%
G	126,196	65.65%	60,335	31.39%	5,680	2.96%
H	98,176	56.42%	69,791	40.11%	6,039	3.47%
HH	59,033	74.50%	18,379	23.19%	1,829	2.31%
II	53,118	64.48%	26,508	32.18%	2,752	3.34%
I	50,732	40.92%	69,123	55.76%	4,120	3.32%
JJ	22,328	55.10%	17,532	43.27%	661	1.63%
J	82,243	63.49%	43,880	33.88%	3,411	2.63%
K	103,180	68.45%	42,987	28.52%	4,564	3.03%
KK	39,286	56.44%	29,031	41.71%	1,289	1.85%
LL	52,804	64.48%	26,053	31.82%	3,030	3.70%
L	44,174	25.76%	123,006	71.73%	4,304	2.51%
MM	50,289	59.65%	31,857	37.79%	2,160	2.56%
M	73,654	65.13%	36,372	32.16%	3,062	2.71%
N	54,556	40.34%	74,993	55.46%	5,676	4.20%
NN	16,951	46.24%	18,868	51.47%	839	2.29%
O	31,034	50.72%	28,935	47.29%	1,215	1.99%
P	41,038	48.51%	42,270	49.96%	1,294	1.53%
Q	53,274	64.50%	27,101	32.81%	2,219	2.69%
R	53,189	72.87%	17,914	24.54%	1,886	2.58%
S	37,175	48.79%	37,404	49.09%	1,617	2.12%
T	36,380	46.47%	39,926	50.99%	1,989	2.54%
U	39,392	56.52%	28,245	40.52%	2,061	2.96%
V	27,510	30.21%	61,031	67.02%	2,521	2.77%
W	25,691	62.43%	14,470	35.16%	992	2.41%
X	16,999	37.88%	27,264	60.75%	617	1.37%
Y	28,590	73.46%	9,253	23.77%	1,077	2.77%
Z	12,997	42.19%	16,854	54.70%	958	3.11%
Total:	2,390,619	51.88%	2,084,975	45.25%	132,360	2.87%

Candidates: Forest (Rep), Coleman (Dem), Cole (Lib)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Duke_House 03.csv', modified 2/18/2022 10:53 AM

[EL20-LG-16G] - Generated 2/18/2022

Election Contest Report - 2016/2020 Composite

NC General Assembly

District Plan: Duke_House 03

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
A	349,527	64.72%	183,544	33.98%
AA	17,951	37.68%	29,085	61.05%
BB	19,567	47.03%	21,728	52.23%
B	366,741	60.75%	229,004	37.94%
CC	20,209	43.00%	26,111	55.56%
C	108,653	33.88%	208,715	65.08%
D	165,951	60.32%	106,045	38.54%
DD	26,710	61.29%	16,595	38.08%
E	112,657	51.50%	103,467	47.30%
EE	13,295	30.90%	29,260	68.01%
F	81,823	37.13%	136,273	61.84%
FF	12,635	28.07%	31,930	70.94%
GG	12,429	26.60%	33,776	72.29%
G	81,657	36.22%	141,094	62.59%
H	93,232	44.52%	113,482	54.19%
HH	20,586	24.09%	64,011	74.92%
II	32,226	34.71%	59,430	64.00%
I	82,300	58.12%	57,452	40.57%
JJ	18,501	41.75%	25,480	57.50%
J	61,007	38.03%	97,554	60.81%
K	57,142	32.16%	118,438	66.66%
KK	32,549	43.00%	42,500	56.15%
LL	34,650	34.65%	63,834	63.83%
L	145,830	75.14%	46,220	23.81%
MM	36,477	38.08%	58,335	60.90%
M	50,619	37.49%	82,930	61.43%
N	91,612	59.21%	60,941	39.39%
NN	20,586	50.44%	19,851	48.64%
O	29,931	42.85%	39,382	56.38%
P	46,840	51.55%	43,342	47.70%
Q	32,444	35.29%	58,458	63.58%
R	22,821	26.70%	61,788	72.28%
S	42,697	49.21%	43,219	49.81%
T	45,847	54.20%	37,828	44.72%
U	37,398	45.26%	44,398	53.73%
V	66,318	69.82%	27,663	29.12%
W	16,075	34.86%	29,587	64.16%
X	28,170	60.16%	18,360	39.21%
Y	12,819	26.95%	34,258	72.01%
Z	18,838	54.01%	15,623	44.79%
Total:	2,567,320	48.54%	2,660,991	50.31%

Values represent average vote count from 12 contests: 2016 President and Lieutenant Governor; 2020 President, US Senate, Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Attorney General, Auditor, Commissioner of Agriculture, Commissioner of Labor, Secretary of State, and Treasurer.

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' files, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Duke_House 03.csv', modified 2/18/2022 10:53 AM

[EL20-CMP-1620G] - Generated 2/18/2022

County - District Report**District Plan: Duke_House 03**

County	District	Total County Population	Total District Population	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Alamance	U	171,415	171,415	171,415	100.00 %	100.00 %
Alexander	HH	36,444	173,772	36,444	100.00 %	20.97 %
Alleghany	II	10,888	172,203	10,888	100.00 %	6.32 %
Anson	M	22,055	260,322	22,055	100.00 %	8.47 %
Ashe	II	26,577	172,203	26,577	100.00 %	15.43 %
Avery	C	17,806	623,272	17,806	100.00 %	2.86 %
Beaufort	MM	44,652	167,493	44,652	100.00 %	26.66 %
Bertie	X	17,934	88,865	17,934	100.00 %	20.18 %
Bladen	JJ	29,606	88,642	29,606	100.00 %	33.40 %
Brunswick	H	136,693	362,395	136,693	100.00 %	37.72 %
Buncombe	N	269,452	269,452	269,452	100.00 %	100.00 %
Burke	EE	87,570	87,570	87,570	100.00 %	100.00 %
Cabarrus	G	225,804	452,605	225,804	100.00 %	49.89 %
Caldwell	II	80,652	172,203	80,652	100.00 %	46.84 %
Camden	NN	10,355	82,953	10,355	100.00 %	12.48 %
Carteret	Q	67,686	168,406	67,686	100.00 %	40.19 %
Caswell	V	22,736	171,432	22,736	100.00 %	13.26 %
Catawba	K	160,610	347,303	160,610	100.00 %	46.24 %
Chatham	F	76,285	426,414	76,285	100.00 %	17.89 %
Cherokee	GG	28,774	84,907	28,774	100.00 %	33.89 %
Chowan	MM	13,708	167,493	13,708	100.00 %	8.18 %
Clay	GG	11,089	84,907	11,089	100.00 %	13.06 %
Cleveland	C	99,519	623,272	99,519	100.00 %	15.97 %
Columbus	O	50,623	167,153	50,623	100.00 %	30.29 %
Craven	Q	100,720	168,406	100,720	100.00 %	59.81 %
Cumberland	I	334,728	334,728	334,728	100.00 %	100.00 %
Currituck	MM	28,100	167,493	28,100	100.00 %	16.78 %
Dare	MM	36,915	167,493	36,915	100.00 %	22.04 %
Davidson	R	168,930	168,930	168,930	100.00 %	100.00 %
Davie	G	42,712	452,605	42,712	100.00 %	9.44 %
Duplin	KK	48,715	166,048	48,715	100.00 %	29.34 %
Durham	L	324,833	363,930	324,833	100.00 %	89.26 %
Edgecombe	X	48,900	88,865	48,900	100.00 %	55.03 %
Forsyth	E	382,590	427,110	382,590	100.00 %	89.58 %
Franklin	S	68,573	172,143	68,573	100.00 %	39.83 %
Gaston	C	227,943	623,272	227,943	100.00 %	36.57 %
Gates	NN	10,478	82,953	10,478	100.00 %	12.63 %
Graham	GG	8,030	84,907	8,030	100.00 %	9.46 %
Granville	S	60,992	172,143	60,992	100.00 %	35.43 %
Greene	BB	20,451	84,745	20,451	100.00 %	24.13 %
Guilford	D	541,299	541,299	541,299	100.00 %	100.00 %
Halifax	DD	48,622	84,735	48,622	100.00 %	57.38 %

District plan definition file: 'Duke_House 03.csv', modified 2/18/2022 10:53 AM

Data Source: 2020 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File - North Carolina

[G20-CntyDist] - Generated 2/18/2022

County - District Report**District Plan: Duke_House 03**

County	District	Total County Population	Total District Population	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Harnett	J	133,568	349,567	133,568	100.00 %	38.21 %
Haywood	AA	62,089	83,282	62,089	100.00 %	74.55 %
Henderson	C	116,281	623,272	116,281	100.00 %	18.66 %
Hertford	NN	21,552	82,953	21,552	100.00 %	25.98 %
Hoke	Z	52,082	86,256	52,082	100.00 %	60.38 %
Hyde	MM	4,589	167,493	4,589	100.00 %	2.74 %
Iredell	K	186,693	347,303	186,693	100.00 %	53.76 %
Jackson	CC	43,109	90,212	43,109	100.00 %	47.79 %
Johnston	J	215,999	349,567	215,999	100.00 %	61.79 %
Jones	BB	9,172	84,745	9,172	100.00 %	10.82 %
Lee	F	63,285	426,414	63,285	100.00 %	14.84 %
Lenoir	BB	55,122	84,745	55,122	100.00 %	65.04 %
Lincoln	Y	86,810	86,810	86,810	100.00 %	100.00 %
Macon	GG	37,014	84,907	37,014	100.00 %	43.59 %
Madison	AA	21,193	83,282	21,193	100.00 %	25.45 %
Martin	X	22,031	88,865	22,031	100.00 %	24.79 %
McDowell	C	44,578	623,272	44,578	100.00 %	7.15 %
Mecklenburg	A	1,115,482	1,115,482	1,115,482	100.00 %	100.00 %
Mitchell	C	14,903	623,272	14,903	100.00 %	2.39 %
Montgomery	FF	25,751	88,255	25,751	100.00 %	29.18 %
Moore	F	99,727	426,414	99,727	100.00 %	23.39 %
Nash	P	94,970	173,754	94,970	100.00 %	54.66 %
New Hanover	H	225,702	362,395	225,702	100.00 %	62.28 %
Northampton	DD	17,471	84,735	17,471	100.00 %	20.62 %
Onslow	LL	204,576	264,779	204,576	100.00 %	77.26 %
Orange	V	148,696	171,432	148,696	100.00 %	86.74 %
Pamlico	MM	12,276	167,493	12,276	100.00 %	7.33 %
Pasquotank	NN	40,568	82,953	40,568	100.00 %	48.90 %
Pender	LL	60,203	264,779	60,203	100.00 %	22.74 %
Perquimans	MM	13,005	167,493	13,005	100.00 %	7.76 %
Person	L	39,097	363,930	39,097	100.00 %	10.74 %
Pitt	T	170,243	170,243	170,243	100.00 %	100.00 %
Polk	C	19,328	623,272	19,328	100.00 %	3.10 %
Randolph	F	144,171	426,414	144,171	100.00 %	33.81 %
Richmond	F	42,946	426,414	42,946	100.00 %	10.07 %
Robeson	O	116,530	167,153	116,530	100.00 %	69.71 %
Rockingham	W	91,096	91,096	91,096	100.00 %	100.00 %
Rowan	G	146,875	452,605	146,875	100.00 %	32.45 %
Rutherford	C	64,444	623,272	64,444	100.00 %	10.34 %
Sampson	JJ	59,036	88,642	59,036	100.00 %	66.60 %
Scotland	Z	34,174	86,256	34,174	100.00 %	39.62 %
Stanly	FF	62,504	88,255	62,504	100.00 %	70.82 %

District plan definition file: 'Duke_House 03.csv', modified 2/18/2022 10:53 AM

Data Source: 2020 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File - North Carolina

[G20-CntyDist] - Generated 2/18/2022

County - District Report

District Plan: Duke_House 03

County	District	Total County Population	Total District Population	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Stokes	E	44,520	427,110	44,520	100.00 %	10.42 %
Surry	HH	71,359	173,772	71,359	100.00 %	41.06 %
Swain	CC	14,117	90,212	14,117	100.00 %	15.65 %
Transylvania	CC	32,986	90,212	32,986	100.00 %	36.56 %
Tyrrell	MM	3,245	167,493	3,245	100.00 %	1.94 %
Union	M	238,267	260,322	238,267	100.00 %	91.53 %
Vance	S	42,578	172,143	42,578	100.00 %	24.73 %
Wake	B	1,129,410	1,129,410	1,129,410	100.00 %	100.00 %
Warren	DD	18,642	84,735	18,642	100.00 %	22.00 %
Washington	MM	11,003	167,493	11,003	100.00 %	6.57 %
Watauga	II	54,086	172,203	54,086	100.00 %	31.41 %
Wayne	KK	117,333	166,048	117,333	100.00 %	70.66 %
Wilkes	HH	65,969	173,772	65,969	100.00 %	37.96 %
Wilson	P	78,784	173,754	78,784	100.00 %	45.34 %
Yadkin	G	37,214	452,605	37,214	100.00 %	8.22 %
Yancey	C	18,470	623,272	18,470	100.00 %	2.96 %
Assigned Geography Total:				10,439,388		

Report display: all assigned counties

Total Counties Statewide: 100

Fully Assigned Counties: 100

Partially Assigned Counties: 0

Fully Unassigned Counties: 0

Total Districts Assigned: 40

Split Counties: 0

District - County Report

District Plan: Duke_House 03

District	County	Total District Population	Total County Population	District Pop in County	Percent of District Pop in County	Percent of County Pop in District
AA	Haywood	83,282	62,089	62,089	74.55 %	100.00 %
	Madison	83,282	21,193	21,193	25.45 %	100.00 %
A	Mecklenburg	1,115,482	1,115,482	1,115,482	100.00 %	100.00 %
BB	Greene	84,745	20,451	20,451	24.13 %	100.00 %
	Jones	84,745	9,172	9,172	10.82 %	100.00 %
	Lenoir	84,745	55,122	55,122	65.04 %	100.00 %
B	Wake	1,129,410	1,129,410	1,129,410	100.00 %	100.00 %
C	Avery	623,272	17,806	17,806	2.86 %	100.00 %
	Cleveland	623,272	99,519	99,519	15.97 %	100.00 %
	Gaston	623,272	227,943	227,943	36.57 %	100.00 %
	Henderson	623,272	116,281	116,281	18.66 %	100.00 %
CC	Jackson	90,212	43,109	43,109	47.79 %	100.00 %
C	McDowell	623,272	44,578	44,578	7.15 %	100.00 %
	Mitchell	623,272	14,903	14,903	2.39 %	100.00 %
	Polk	623,272	19,328	19,328	3.10 %	100.00 %
	Rutherford	623,272	64,444	64,444	10.34 %	100.00 %
CC	Swain	90,212	14,117	14,117	15.65 %	100.00 %
	Transylvania	90,212	32,986	32,986	36.56 %	100.00 %
C	Yancey	623,272	18,470	18,470	2.96 %	100.00 %
D	Guilford	541,299	541,299	541,299	100.00 %	100.00 %
DD	Halifax	84,735	48,622	48,622	57.38 %	100.00 %
	Northampton	84,735	17,471	17,471	20.62 %	100.00 %
	Warren	84,735	18,642	18,642	22.00 %	100.00 %
EE	Burke	87,570	87,570	87,570	100.00 %	100.00 %
E	Forsyth	427,110	382,590	382,590	89.58 %	100.00 %
	Stokes	427,110	44,520	44,520	10.42 %	100.00 %
F	Chatham	426,414	76,285	76,285	17.89 %	100.00 %
	Lee	426,414	63,285	63,285	14.84 %	100.00 %
FF	Montgomery	88,255	25,751	25,751	29.18 %	100.00 %
F	Moore	426,414	99,727	99,727	23.39 %	100.00 %
	Randolph	426,414	144,171	144,171	33.81 %	100.00 %
	Richmond	426,414	42,946	42,946	10.07 %	100.00 %
FF	Stanly	88,255	62,504	62,504	70.82 %	100.00 %
G	Cabarrus	452,605	225,804	225,804	49.89 %	100.00 %
GG	Cherokee	84,907	28,774	28,774	33.89 %	100.00 %
	Clay	84,907	11,089	11,089	13.06 %	100.00 %
G	Davie	452,605	42,712	42,712	9.44 %	100.00 %
GG	Graham	84,907	8,030	8,030	9.46 %	100.00 %
	Macon	84,907	37,014	37,014	43.59 %	100.00 %
G	Rowan	452,605	146,875	146,875	32.45 %	100.00 %
	Yadkin	452,605	37,214	37,214	8.22 %	100.00 %

District - County Report

District Plan: Duke_House 03

District	County	Total District Population	Total County Population	District Pop in County	Percent of District Pop in County	Percent of County Pop in District
HH	Alexander	173,772	36,444	36,444	20.97 %	100.00 %
H	Brunswick	362,395	136,693	136,693	37.72 %	100.00 %
	New Hanover	362,395	225,702	225,702	62.28 %	100.00 %
HH	Surry	173,772	71,359	71,359	41.06 %	100.00 %
	Wilkes	173,772	65,969	65,969	37.96 %	100.00 %
II	Alleghany	172,203	10,888	10,888	6.32 %	100.00 %
	Ashe	172,203	26,577	26,577	15.43 %	100.00 %
	Caldwell	172,203	80,652	80,652	46.84 %	100.00 %
I	Cumberland	334,728	334,728	334,728	100.00 %	100.00 %
II	Watauga	172,203	54,086	54,086	31.41 %	100.00 %
JJ	Bladen	88,642	29,606	29,606	33.40 %	100.00 %
J	Harnett	349,567	133,568	133,568	38.21 %	100.00 %
	Johnston	349,567	215,999	215,999	61.79 %	100.00 %
JJ	Sampson	88,642	59,036	59,036	66.60 %	100.00 %
K	Catawba	347,303	160,610	160,610	46.24 %	100.00 %
KK	Duplin	166,048	48,715	48,715	29.34 %	100.00 %
K	Iredell	347,303	186,693	186,693	53.76 %	100.00 %
KK	Wayne	166,048	117,333	117,333	70.66 %	100.00 %
L	Durham	363,930	324,833	324,833	89.26 %	100.00 %
LL	Onslow	264,779	204,576	204,576	77.26 %	100.00 %
	Pender	264,779	60,203	60,203	22.74 %	100.00 %
L	Person	363,930	39,097	39,097	10.74 %	100.00 %
M	Anson	260,322	22,055	22,055	8.47 %	100.00 %
MM	Beaufort	167,493	44,652	44,652	26.66 %	100.00 %
	Chowan	167,493	13,708	13,708	8.18 %	100.00 %
	Currituck	167,493	28,100	28,100	16.78 %	100.00 %
	Dare	167,493	36,915	36,915	22.04 %	100.00 %
	Hyde	167,493	4,589	4,589	2.74 %	100.00 %
	Pamlico	167,493	12,276	12,276	7.33 %	100.00 %
	Perquimans	167,493	13,005	13,005	7.76 %	100.00 %
	Tyrrell	167,493	3,245	3,245	1.94 %	100.00 %
M	Union	260,322	238,267	238,267	91.53 %	100.00 %
MM	Washington	167,493	11,003	11,003	6.57 %	100.00 %
N	Buncombe	269,452	269,452	269,452	100.00 %	100.00 %
NN	Camden	82,953	10,355	10,355	12.48 %	100.00 %
	Gates	82,953	10,478	10,478	12.63 %	100.00 %
	Hertford	82,953	21,552	21,552	25.98 %	100.00 %
	Pasquotank	82,953	40,568	40,568	48.90 %	100.00 %
O	Columbus	167,153	50,623	50,623	30.29 %	100.00 %
	Robeson	167,153	116,530	116,530	69.71 %	100.00 %
P	Nash	173,754	94,970	94,970	54.66 %	100.00 %
	Wilson	173,754	78,784	78,784	45.34 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'Duke_House 03.csv', modified 2/18/2022 10:53 AM

Data Source: 2020 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File - North Carolina

[G20-DistCnty] - Generated 2/18/2022

District - County Report

District Plan: Duke_House 03

District	County	Total District Population	Total County Population	District Pop in County	Percent of District Pop in County	Percent of County Pop in District
Q	Carteret	168,406	67,686	67,686	40.19 %	100.00 %
	Craven	168,406	100,720	100,720	59.81 %	100.00 %
R	Davidson	168,930	168,930	168,930	100.00 %	100.00 %
S	Franklin	172,143	68,573	68,573	39.83 %	100.00 %
	Granville	172,143	60,992	60,992	35.43 %	100.00 %
	Vance	172,143	42,578	42,578	24.73 %	100.00 %
T	Pitt	170,243	170,243	170,243	100.00 %	100.00 %
U	Alamance	171,415	171,415	171,415	100.00 %	100.00 %
V	Caswell	171,432	22,736	22,736	13.26 %	100.00 %
	Orange	171,432	148,696	148,696	86.74 %	100.00 %
W	Rockingham	91,096	91,096	91,096	100.00 %	100.00 %
X	Bertie	88,865	17,934	17,934	20.18 %	100.00 %
	Edgecombe	88,865	48,900	48,900	55.03 %	100.00 %
	Martin	88,865	22,031	22,031	24.79 %	100.00 %
Y	Lincoln	86,810	86,810	86,810	100.00 %	100.00 %
Z	Hoke	86,256	52,082	52,082	60.38 %	100.00 %
	Scotland	86,256	34,174	34,174	39.62 %	100.00 %
Total:				10,439,388		

Total Districts Assigned: 40

Total Counties Statewide: 100

Fully Assigned Counties: 100

Partially Assigned Counties: 0

Fully Unassigned Counties: 0

Split Counties: 0

Municipality - District Report**District Plan: Duke_House 03**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Aberdeen	F	8,516	426,414	8,516	100.00 %	2.00 %
Ahoskie	NN	4,891	82,953	4,891	100.00 %	5.90 %
Alamance	U	988	171,415	988	100.00 %	0.58 %
Albemarle	FF	16,432	88,255	16,432	100.00 %	18.62 %
Alliance	MM	733	167,493	733	100.00 %	0.44 %
Andrews	GG	1,667	84,907	1,667	100.00 %	1.96 %
Angier	B	5,265	1,129,410	556	10.56 %	0.05 %
	J	5,265	349,567	4,709	89.44 %	1.35 %
Ansonville	M	440	260,322	440	100.00 %	0.17 %
Apex	B	58,780	1,129,410	58,780	100.00 %	5.20 %
Arapahoe	MM	416	167,493	416	100.00 %	0.25 %
Archdale	D	11,907	541,299	380	3.19 %	0.07 %
	F	11,907	426,414	11,527	96.81 %	2.70 %
Archer Lodge	J	4,797	349,567	4,797	100.00 %	1.37 %
Asheboro	F	27,156	426,414	27,156	100.00 %	6.37 %
Asheville	N	94,589	269,452	94,589	100.00 %	35.10 %
Askewville	X	184	88,865	184	100.00 %	0.21 %
Atkinson	LL	296	264,779	296	100.00 %	0.11 %
Atlantic Beach	Q	1,364	168,406	1,364	100.00 %	0.81 %
Aulander	X	763	88,865	763	100.00 %	0.86 %
Aurora	MM	455	167,493	455	100.00 %	0.27 %
Autryville	JJ	167	88,642	167	100.00 %	0.19 %
Ayden	T	4,977	170,243	4,977	100.00 %	2.92 %
Badin	FF	2,024	88,255	2,024	100.00 %	2.29 %
Bailey	P	568	173,754	568	100.00 %	0.33 %
Bakersville	C	450	623,272	450	100.00 %	0.07 %
Bald Head Island	H	268	362,395	268	100.00 %	0.07 %
Banner Elk	C	1,049	623,272	1,049	100.00 %	0.17 %
Bath	MM	245	167,493	245	100.00 %	0.15 %
Bayboro	MM	1,161	167,493	1,161	100.00 %	0.69 %
Bear Grass	X	89	88,865	89	100.00 %	0.10 %
Beaufort	Q	4,464	168,406	4,464	100.00 %	2.65 %
Beech Mountain	C	675	623,272	62	9.19 %	0.01 %
	II	675	172,203	613	90.81 %	0.36 %
Belhaven	MM	1,410	167,493	1,410	100.00 %	0.84 %
Belmont	C	15,010	623,272	15,010	100.00 %	2.41 %
Belville	H	2,406	362,395	2,406	100.00 %	0.66 %
Belwood	C	857	623,272	857	100.00 %	0.14 %
Benson	J	3,967	349,567	3,967	100.00 %	1.13 %
Bermuda Run	G	3,120	452,605	3,120	100.00 %	0.69 %
Bessemer City	C	5,428	623,272	5,428	100.00 %	0.87 %
Bethania	E	344	427,110	344	100.00 %	0.08 %

District plan definition file: 'Duke_House 03.csv', modified 2/18/2022 10:53 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/18/2022

Municipality - District Report**District Plan: Duke_House 03**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Bethel	T	1,373	170,243	1,373	100.00 %	0.81 %
Beulaville	KK	1,116	166,048	1,116	100.00 %	0.67 %
Biltmore Forest	N	1,409	269,452	1,409	100.00 %	0.52 %
Biscoe	FF	1,848	88,255	1,848	100.00 %	2.09 %
Black Creek	P	692	173,754	692	100.00 %	0.40 %
Black Mountain	N	8,426	269,452	8,426	100.00 %	3.13 %
Bladenboro	JJ	1,648	88,642	1,648	100.00 %	1.86 %
Blowing Rock	II	1,376	172,203	1,376	100.00 %	0.80 %
Boardman	O	166	167,153	166	100.00 %	0.10 %
Bogue	Q	695	168,406	695	100.00 %	0.41 %
Boiling Spring Lakes	H	5,943	362,395	5,943	100.00 %	1.64 %
Boiling Springs	C	4,615	623,272	4,615	100.00 %	0.74 %
Bolivia	H	149	362,395	149	100.00 %	0.04 %
Bolton	O	519	167,153	519	100.00 %	0.31 %
Boone	II	19,092	172,203	19,092	100.00 %	11.09 %
Boonville	G	1,185	452,605	1,185	100.00 %	0.26 %
Bostic	C	355	623,272	355	100.00 %	0.06 %
Brevard	CC	7,744	90,212	7,744	100.00 %	8.58 %
Bridgeton	Q	349	168,406	349	100.00 %	0.21 %
Broadway	F	1,267	426,414	1,267	100.00 %	0.30 %
	J	1,267	349,567	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Brookford	K	442	347,303	442	100.00 %	0.13 %
Brunswick	O	973	167,153	973	100.00 %	0.58 %
Bryson City	CC	1,558	90,212	1,558	100.00 %	1.73 %
Bunn	S	327	172,143	327	100.00 %	0.19 %
Burgaw	LL	3,088	264,779	3,088	100.00 %	1.17 %
Burlington	D	57,303	541,299	1,822	3.18 %	0.34 %
	U	57,303	171,415	55,481	96.82 %	32.37 %
Burnsville	C	1,614	623,272	1,614	100.00 %	0.26 %
Butner	S	8,397	172,143	8,397	100.00 %	4.88 %
Cajah's Mountain	II	2,722	172,203	2,722	100.00 %	1.58 %
Calabash	H	2,011	362,395	2,011	100.00 %	0.55 %
Calypso	KK	327	166,048	327	100.00 %	0.20 %
Cameron	F	244	426,414	244	100.00 %	0.06 %
Candor	F	813	426,414	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	FF	813	88,255	813	100.00 %	0.92 %
Canton	AA	4,422	83,282	4,422	100.00 %	5.31 %
Cape Carteret	Q	2,224	168,406	2,224	100.00 %	1.32 %
Carolina Beach	H	6,564	362,395	6,564	100.00 %	1.81 %
Carolina Shores	H	4,588	362,395	4,588	100.00 %	1.27 %
Carrboro	V	21,295	171,432	21,295	100.00 %	12.42 %
Carthage	F	2,775	426,414	2,775	100.00 %	0.65 %

District plan definition file: 'Duke_House 03.csv', modified 2/18/2022 10:53 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/18/2022

Page 2 of 15

Municipality - District Report**District Plan: Duke_House 03**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Cary	B	174,721	1,129,410	171,012	97.88 %	15.14 %
	F	174,721	426,414	3,709	2.12 %	0.87 %
Casar	C	305	623,272	305	100.00 %	0.05 %
Castalia	P	264	173,754	264	100.00 %	0.15 %
Caswell Beach	H	395	362,395	395	100.00 %	0.11 %
Catawba	K	702	347,303	702	100.00 %	0.20 %
Cedar Point	Q	1,764	168,406	1,764	100.00 %	1.05 %
Cedar Rock	II	301	172,203	301	100.00 %	0.17 %
Cerro Gordo	O	131	167,153	131	100.00 %	0.08 %
Chadbourn	O	1,574	167,153	1,574	100.00 %	0.94 %
Chapel Hill	L	61,960	363,930	2,906	4.69 %	0.80 %
	V	61,960	171,432	59,054	95.31 %	34.45 %
Charlotte	A	874,579	1,115,482	874,579	100.00 %	78.40 %
Cherryville	C	6,078	623,272	6,078	100.00 %	0.98 %
Chimney Rock Village	C	140	623,272	140	100.00 %	0.02 %
China Grove	G	4,434	452,605	4,434	100.00 %	0.98 %
Chocowinity	MM	722	167,493	722	100.00 %	0.43 %
Claremont	K	1,692	347,303	1,692	100.00 %	0.49 %
Clarkton	JJ	614	88,642	614	100.00 %	0.69 %
Clayton	B	26,307	1,129,410	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	J	26,307	349,567	26,307	100.00 %	7.53 %
Clemmons	E	21,163	427,110	21,163	100.00 %	4.95 %
Cleveland	G	846	452,605	846	100.00 %	0.19 %
Clinton	JJ	8,383	88,642	8,383	100.00 %	9.46 %
Clyde	AA	1,368	83,282	1,368	100.00 %	1.64 %
Coats	J	2,155	349,567	2,155	100.00 %	0.62 %
Cofield	NN	267	82,953	267	100.00 %	0.32 %
Colerain	X	217	88,865	217	100.00 %	0.24 %
Columbia	MM	610	167,493	610	100.00 %	0.36 %
Columbus	C	1,060	623,272	1,060	100.00 %	0.17 %
Como	NN	67	82,953	67	100.00 %	0.08 %
Concord	G	105,240	452,605	105,240	100.00 %	23.25 %
Conetoe	X	198	88,865	198	100.00 %	0.22 %
Connelly Springs	EE	1,529	87,570	1,529	100.00 %	1.75 %
Conover	K	8,421	347,303	8,421	100.00 %	2.42 %
Conway	DD	752	84,735	752	100.00 %	0.89 %
Cooleemee	G	940	452,605	940	100.00 %	0.21 %
Cornelius	A	31,412	1,115,482	31,412	100.00 %	2.82 %
Cove City	Q	378	168,406	378	100.00 %	0.22 %
Cramerton	C	5,296	623,272	5,296	100.00 %	0.85 %
Creedmoor	S	4,866	172,143	4,866	100.00 %	2.83 %
Creswell	MM	207	167,493	207	100.00 %	0.12 %

District plan definition file: 'Duke_House 03.csv', modified 2/18/2022 10:53 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/18/2022

Page 3 of 15

Municipality - District Report**District Plan: Duke_House 03**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Crossnore	C	143	623,272	143	100.00 %	0.02 %
Dallas	C	5,927	623,272	5,927	100.00 %	0.95 %
Danbury	E	189	427,110	189	100.00 %	0.04 %
Davidson	A	15,106	1,115,482	14,728	97.50 %	1.32 %
	K	15,106	347,303	378	2.50 %	0.11 %
Dellview	C	6	623,272	6	100.00 %	0.00 %
Denton	R	1,494	168,930	1,494	100.00 %	0.88 %
Dillsboro	CC	213	90,212	213	100.00 %	0.24 %
Dobbins Heights	F	687	426,414	687	100.00 %	0.16 %
Dobson	HH	1,462	173,772	1,462	100.00 %	0.84 %
Dortches	P	1,082	173,754	1,082	100.00 %	0.62 %
Dover	Q	349	168,406	349	100.00 %	0.21 %
Drexel	EE	1,760	87,570	1,760	100.00 %	2.01 %
Dublin	JJ	267	88,642	267	100.00 %	0.30 %
Duck	MM	742	167,493	742	100.00 %	0.44 %
Dunn	J	8,446	349,567	8,446	100.00 %	2.42 %
Durham	B	283,506	1,129,410	269	0.09 %	0.02 %
	L	283,506	363,930	283,093	99.85 %	77.79 %
	V	283,506	171,432	144	0.05 %	0.08 %
Earl	C	198	623,272	198	100.00 %	0.03 %
East Arcadia	JJ	418	88,642	418	100.00 %	0.47 %
East Bend	G	634	452,605	634	100.00 %	0.14 %
East Laurinburg	Z	234	86,256	234	100.00 %	0.27 %
Eastover	I	3,656	334,728	3,656	100.00 %	1.09 %
East Spencer	G	1,567	452,605	1,567	100.00 %	0.35 %
Eden	W	15,421	91,096	15,421	100.00 %	16.93 %
Edenton	MM	4,460	167,493	4,460	100.00 %	2.66 %
Elizabeth City	NN	18,631	82,953	18,631	100.00 %	22.46 %
Elizabethtown	JJ	3,296	88,642	3,296	100.00 %	3.72 %
Elkin	HH	4,122	173,772	4,122	100.00 %	2.37 %
Elk Park	C	542	623,272	542	100.00 %	0.09 %
Ellenboro	C	723	623,272	723	100.00 %	0.12 %
Ellerbe	F	864	426,414	864	100.00 %	0.20 %
Elm City	P	1,218	173,754	1,218	100.00 %	0.70 %
Elon	U	11,336	171,415	11,336	100.00 %	6.61 %
Emerald Isle	Q	3,847	168,406	3,847	100.00 %	2.28 %
Enfield	DD	1,865	84,735	1,865	100.00 %	2.20 %
Erwin	J	4,542	349,567	4,542	100.00 %	1.30 %
Eureka	KK	214	166,048	214	100.00 %	0.13 %
Everetts	X	150	88,865	150	100.00 %	0.17 %
Fair Bluff	O	709	167,153	709	100.00 %	0.42 %
Fairmont	O	2,191	167,153	2,191	100.00 %	1.31 %

District plan definition file: 'Duke_House 03.csv', modified 2/18/2022 10:53 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/18/2022

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: Duke_House 03

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Fairview	M	3,456	260,322	3,456	100.00 %	1.33 %
Faison	JJ	784	88,642	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	KK	784	166,048	784	100.00 %	0.47 %
Faith	G	819	452,605	819	100.00 %	0.18 %
Falcon	I	324	334,728	324	100.00 %	0.10 %
	JJ	324	88,642	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Falkland	T	47	170,243	47	100.00 %	0.03 %
Fallston	C	627	623,272	627	100.00 %	0.10 %
Farmville	T	4,461	170,243	4,461	100.00 %	2.62 %
Fayetteville	I	208,501	334,728	208,501	100.00 %	62.29 %
Flat Rock	C	3,486	623,272	3,486	100.00 %	0.56 %
Fletcher	C	7,987	623,272	7,987	100.00 %	1.28 %
Fontana Dam	GG	13	84,907	13	100.00 %	0.02 %
Forest City	C	7,377	623,272	7,377	100.00 %	1.18 %
Forest Hills	CC	303	90,212	303	100.00 %	0.34 %
Fountain	T	385	170,243	385	100.00 %	0.23 %
Four Oaks	J	2,158	349,567	2,158	100.00 %	0.62 %
Foxfire	F	1,288	426,414	1,288	100.00 %	0.30 %
Franklin	GG	4,175	84,907	4,175	100.00 %	4.92 %
Franklinton	S	2,456	172,143	2,456	100.00 %	1.43 %
Franklinville	F	1,197	426,414	1,197	100.00 %	0.28 %
Fremont	KK	1,196	166,048	1,196	100.00 %	0.72 %
Fuquay-Varina	B	34,152	1,129,410	34,152	100.00 %	3.02 %
	J	34,152	349,567	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Gamewell	II	3,702	172,203	3,702	100.00 %	2.15 %
Garland	JJ	595	88,642	595	100.00 %	0.67 %
Garner	B	31,159	1,129,410	31,159	100.00 %	2.76 %
Garysburg	DD	904	84,735	904	100.00 %	1.07 %
Gaston	DD	1,008	84,735	1,008	100.00 %	1.19 %
Gastonia	C	80,411	623,272	80,411	100.00 %	12.90 %
Gatesville	NN	267	82,953	267	100.00 %	0.32 %
Gibson	Z	449	86,256	449	100.00 %	0.52 %
Gibsonville	D	8,920	541,299	4,642	52.04 %	0.86 %
	U	8,920	171,415	4,278	47.96 %	2.50 %
Glen Alpine	EE	1,529	87,570	1,529	100.00 %	1.75 %
Godwin	I	128	334,728	128	100.00 %	0.04 %
Goldsboro	KK	33,657	166,048	33,657	100.00 %	20.27 %
Goldston	F	234	426,414	234	100.00 %	0.05 %
Graham	U	17,157	171,415	17,157	100.00 %	10.01 %
Grandfather Village	C	95	623,272	95	100.00 %	0.02 %
Granite Falls	II	4,965	172,203	4,965	100.00 %	2.88 %
Granite Quarry	G	2,984	452,605	2,984	100.00 %	0.66 %

District plan definition file: 'Duke_House 03.csv', modified 2/18/2022 10:53 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/18/2022

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: Duke_House 03

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Grantsboro	MM	692	167,493	692	100.00 %	0.41 %
Greenevers	KK	567	166,048	567	100.00 %	0.34 %
Green Level	U	3,152	171,415	3,152	100.00 %	1.84 %
Greensboro	D	299,035	541,299	299,035	100.00 %	55.24 %
Greenville	T	87,521	170,243	87,521	100.00 %	51.41 %
Grifton	BB	2,448	84,745	147	6.00 %	0.17 %
	T	2,448	170,243	2,301	94.00 %	1.35 %
Grimesland	T	386	170,243	386	100.00 %	0.23 %
Grover	C	802	623,272	802	100.00 %	0.13 %
Halifax	DD	170	84,735	170	100.00 %	0.20 %
Hamilton	X	306	88,865	306	100.00 %	0.34 %
Hamlet	F	6,025	426,414	6,025	100.00 %	1.41 %
Harmony	K	543	347,303	543	100.00 %	0.16 %
Harrells	JJ	160	88,642	160	100.00 %	0.18 %
	KK	160	166,048	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Harrellsville	NN	85	82,953	85	100.00 %	0.10 %
Harrisburg	G	18,967	452,605	18,967	100.00 %	4.19 %
Hassell	X	49	88,865	49	100.00 %	0.06 %
Havelock	Q	16,621	168,406	16,621	100.00 %	9.87 %
Haw River	U	2,252	171,415	2,252	100.00 %	1.31 %
Hayesville	GG	461	84,907	461	100.00 %	0.54 %
Hemby Bridge	M	1,614	260,322	1,614	100.00 %	0.62 %
Henderson	S	15,060	172,143	15,060	100.00 %	8.75 %
Hendersonville	C	15,137	623,272	15,137	100.00 %	2.43 %
Hertford	MM	1,934	167,493	1,934	100.00 %	1.15 %
Hickory	EE	43,490	87,570	79	0.18 %	0.09 %
	II	43,490	172,203	32	0.07 %	0.02 %
	K	43,490	347,303	43,379	99.74 %	12.49 %
Highlands	CC	1,072	90,212	12	1.12 %	0.01 %
	GG	1,072	84,907	1,060	98.88 %	1.25 %
High Point	D	114,059	541,299	107,321	94.09 %	19.83 %
	E	114,059	427,110	84	0.07 %	0.02 %
	F	114,059	426,414	8	0.01 %	0.00 %
	R	114,059	168,930	6,646	5.83 %	3.93 %
High Shoals	C	595	623,272	595	100.00 %	0.10 %
Hildebran	EE	1,679	87,570	1,679	100.00 %	1.92 %
Hillsborough	V	9,660	171,432	9,660	100.00 %	5.63 %
Hobgood	DD	268	84,735	268	100.00 %	0.32 %
Hoffman	F	418	426,414	418	100.00 %	0.10 %
Holden Beach	H	921	362,395	921	100.00 %	0.25 %
Holly Ridge	LL	4,171	264,779	4,171	100.00 %	1.58 %
Holly Springs	B	41,239	1,129,410	41,239	100.00 %	3.65 %

District plan definition file: 'Duke_House 03.csv', modified 2/18/2022 10:53 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/18/2022

Page 6 of 15

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: Duke_House 03

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Hookerton	BB	413	84,745	413	100.00 %	0.49 %
Hope Mills	I	17,808	334,728	17,808	100.00 %	5.32 %
Hot Springs	AA	520	83,282	520	100.00 %	0.62 %
Hudson	II	3,780	172,203	3,780	100.00 %	2.20 %
Huntersville	A	61,376	1,115,482	61,376	100.00 %	5.50 %
Indian Beach	Q	223	168,406	223	100.00 %	0.13 %
Indian Trail	M	39,997	260,322	39,997	100.00 %	15.36 %
Jackson	DD	430	84,735	430	100.00 %	0.51 %
Jacksonville	LL	72,723	264,779	72,723	100.00 %	27.47 %
Jamestown	D	3,668	541,299	3,668	100.00 %	0.68 %
Jamesville	X	424	88,865	424	100.00 %	0.48 %
Jefferson	II	1,622	172,203	1,622	100.00 %	0.94 %
Jonesville	G	2,308	452,605	2,308	100.00 %	0.51 %
Kannapolis	G	53,114	452,605	53,114	100.00 %	11.74 %
Kelford	X	203	88,865	203	100.00 %	0.23 %
Kenansville	KK	770	166,048	770	100.00 %	0.46 %
Kenly	J	1,491	349,567	1,293	86.72 %	0.37 %
	P	1,491	173,754	198	13.28 %	0.11 %
Kernersville	D	26,449	541,299	502	1.90 %	0.09 %
	E	26,449	427,110	25,947	98.10 %	6.08 %
Kill Devil Hills	MM	7,656	167,493	7,656	100.00 %	4.57 %
King	E	7,197	427,110	7,197	100.00 %	1.69 %
Kings Mountain	C	11,142	623,272	11,142	100.00 %	1.79 %
Kingstown	C	656	623,272	656	100.00 %	0.11 %
Kinston	BB	19,900	84,745	19,900	100.00 %	23.48 %
Kittrell	S	132	172,143	132	100.00 %	0.08 %
Kitty Hawk	MM	3,689	167,493	3,689	100.00 %	2.20 %
Knightdale	B	19,435	1,129,410	19,435	100.00 %	1.72 %
Kure Beach	H	2,191	362,395	2,191	100.00 %	0.60 %
La Grange	BB	2,595	84,745	2,595	100.00 %	3.06 %
Lake Lure	C	1,365	623,272	1,365	100.00 %	0.22 %
Lake Park	M	3,269	260,322	3,269	100.00 %	1.26 %
Lake Santeetlah	GG	38	84,907	38	100.00 %	0.04 %
Lake Waccamaw	O	1,296	167,153	1,296	100.00 %	0.78 %
Landis	G	3,690	452,605	3,690	100.00 %	0.82 %
Lansing	II	126	172,203	126	100.00 %	0.07 %
Lasker	DD	64	84,735	64	100.00 %	0.08 %
Lattimore	C	406	623,272	406	100.00 %	0.07 %
Laurel Park	C	2,250	623,272	2,250	100.00 %	0.36 %
Laurinburg	Z	14,978	86,256	14,978	100.00 %	17.36 %
Lawndale	C	570	623,272	570	100.00 %	0.09 %
Leggett	X	37	88,865	37	100.00 %	0.04 %

District plan definition file: 'Duke_House 03.csv', modified 2/18/2022 10:53 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/18/2022

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: Duke_House 03

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Leland	H	22,908	362,395	22,908	100.00 %	6.32 %
Lenoir	II	18,352	172,203	18,352	100.00 %	10.66 %
Lewiston Woodville	X	426	88,865	426	100.00 %	0.48 %
Lewisville	E	13,381	427,110	13,381	100.00 %	3.13 %
Lexington	R	19,632	168,930	19,632	100.00 %	11.62 %
Liberty	F	2,655	426,414	2,655	100.00 %	0.62 %
Lilesville	M	395	260,322	395	100.00 %	0.15 %
Lillington	J	4,735	349,567	4,735	100.00 %	1.35 %
Lincolnton	Y	11,091	86,810	11,091	100.00 %	12.78 %
Linden	I	136	334,728	136	100.00 %	0.04 %
Littleton	DD	559	84,735	559	100.00 %	0.66 %
Locust	FF	4,537	88,255	3,996	88.08 %	4.53 %
	G	4,537	452,605	541	11.92 %	0.12 %
Long View	EE	5,088	87,570	735	14.45 %	0.84 %
	K	5,088	347,303	4,353	85.55 %	1.25 %
Louisburg	S	3,064	172,143	3,064	100.00 %	1.78 %
Love Valley	K	154	347,303	154	100.00 %	0.04 %
Lowell	C	3,654	623,272	3,654	100.00 %	0.59 %
Lucama	P	1,036	173,754	1,036	100.00 %	0.60 %
Lumber Bridge	O	82	167,153	82	100.00 %	0.05 %
Lumberton	O	19,025	167,153	19,025	100.00 %	11.38 %
McAdenville	C	890	623,272	890	100.00 %	0.14 %
Macclesfield	X	413	88,865	413	100.00 %	0.46 %
McDonald	O	94	167,153	94	100.00 %	0.06 %
McFarlan	M	94	260,322	94	100.00 %	0.04 %
Macon	DD	110	84,735	110	100.00 %	0.13 %
Madison	W	2,129	91,096	2,129	100.00 %	2.34 %
Maggie Valley	AA	1,687	83,282	1,687	100.00 %	2.03 %
Magnolia	KK	831	166,048	831	100.00 %	0.50 %
Maiden	K	3,736	347,303	3,736	100.00 %	1.08 %
	Y	3,736	86,810	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Manteo	MM	1,600	167,493	1,600	100.00 %	0.96 %
Marietta	O	111	167,153	111	100.00 %	0.07 %
Marion	C	7,717	623,272	7,717	100.00 %	1.24 %
Marshall	AA	777	83,282	777	100.00 %	0.93 %
Mars Hill	AA	2,007	83,282	2,007	100.00 %	2.41 %
Marshville	M	2,522	260,322	2,522	100.00 %	0.97 %
Marvin	M	6,358	260,322	6,358	100.00 %	2.44 %
Matthews	A	29,435	1,115,482	29,435	100.00 %	2.64 %
Maxton	O	2,110	167,153	1,902	90.14 %	1.14 %
	Z	2,110	86,256	208	9.86 %	0.24 %
Mayodan	W	2,418	91,096	2,418	100.00 %	2.65 %

District plan definition file: 'Duke_House 03.csv', modified 2/18/2022 10:53 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/18/2022

Page 8 of 15

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: Duke_House 03

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Maysville	BB	818	84,745	818	100.00 %	0.97 %
Mebane	U	17,797	171,415	14,626	82.18 %	8.53 %
	V	17,797	171,432	3,171	17.82 %	1.85 %
Mesic	MM	144	167,493	144	100.00 %	0.09 %
Micro	J	458	349,567	458	100.00 %	0.13 %
Middleburg	S	101	172,143	101	100.00 %	0.06 %
Middlesex	P	912	173,754	912	100.00 %	0.52 %
Midland	A	4,684	1,115,482	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	G	4,684	452,605	4,684	100.00 %	1.03 %
Midway	R	4,742	168,930	4,742	100.00 %	2.81 %
Mills River	C	7,078	623,272	7,078	100.00 %	1.14 %
Milton	V	155	171,432	155	100.00 %	0.09 %
Mineral Springs	M	3,159	260,322	3,159	100.00 %	1.21 %
Minnesott Beach	MM	530	167,493	530	100.00 %	0.32 %
Mint Hill	A	26,450	1,115,482	26,444	99.98 %	2.37 %
	M	26,450	260,322	6	0.02 %	0.00 %
Misenheimer	FF	650	88,255	650	100.00 %	0.74 %
Mocksville	G	5,900	452,605	5,900	100.00 %	1.30 %
Momeyer	P	277	173,754	277	100.00 %	0.16 %
Monroe	M	34,562	260,322	34,562	100.00 %	13.28 %
Montreat	N	901	269,452	901	100.00 %	0.33 %
Mooresboro	C	293	623,272	293	100.00 %	0.05 %
Mooresville	K	50,193	347,303	50,193	100.00 %	14.45 %
Morehead City	Q	9,556	168,406	9,556	100.00 %	5.67 %
Morganton	EE	17,474	87,570	17,474	100.00 %	19.95 %
Morrisville	B	29,630	1,129,410	29,423	99.30 %	2.61 %
	L	29,630	363,930	207	0.70 %	0.06 %
Morven	M	329	260,322	329	100.00 %	0.13 %
Mount Airy	HH	10,676	173,772	10,676	100.00 %	6.14 %
Mount Gilead	FF	1,171	88,255	1,171	100.00 %	1.33 %
Mount Holly	C	17,703	623,272	17,703	100.00 %	2.84 %
Mount Olive	KK	4,198	166,048	4,198	100.00 %	2.53 %
Mount Pleasant	G	1,671	452,605	1,671	100.00 %	0.37 %
Murfreesboro	NN	2,619	82,953	2,619	100.00 %	3.16 %
Murphy	GG	1,608	84,907	1,608	100.00 %	1.89 %
Nags Head	MM	3,168	167,493	3,168	100.00 %	1.89 %
Nashville	P	5,632	173,754	5,632	100.00 %	3.24 %
Navassa	H	1,367	362,395	1,367	100.00 %	0.38 %
New Bern	Q	31,291	168,406	31,291	100.00 %	18.58 %
Newland	C	715	623,272	715	100.00 %	0.11 %
New London	FF	607	88,255	607	100.00 %	0.69 %
Newport	Q	4,364	168,406	4,364	100.00 %	2.59 %

District plan definition file: 'Duke_House 03.csv', modified 2/18/2022 10:53 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/18/2022

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: Duke_House 03

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Newton	K	13,148	347,303	13,148	100.00 %	3.79 %
Newton Grove	JJ	585	88,642	585	100.00 %	0.66 %
Norlina	DD	920	84,735	920	100.00 %	1.09 %
Norman	F	100	426,414	100	100.00 %	0.02 %
North Topsail Beach	LL	1,005	264,779	1,005	100.00 %	0.38 %
Northwest	H	703	362,395	703	100.00 %	0.19 %
North Wilkesboro	HH	4,382	173,772	4,382	100.00 %	2.52 %
Norwood	FF	2,367	88,255	2,367	100.00 %	2.68 %
Oakboro	FF	2,128	88,255	2,128	100.00 %	2.41 %
Oak City	X	266	88,865	266	100.00 %	0.30 %
Oak Island	H	8,396	362,395	8,396	100.00 %	2.32 %
Oak Ridge	D	7,474	541,299	7,474	100.00 %	1.38 %
Ocean Isle Beach	H	867	362,395	867	100.00 %	0.24 %
Old Fort	C	811	623,272	811	100.00 %	0.13 %
Oriental	MM	880	167,493	880	100.00 %	0.53 %
Orrum	O	59	167,153	59	100.00 %	0.04 %
Ossipee	U	536	171,415	536	100.00 %	0.31 %
Oxford	S	8,628	172,143	8,628	100.00 %	5.01 %
Pantego	MM	164	167,493	164	100.00 %	0.10 %
Parkton	O	504	167,153	504	100.00 %	0.30 %
Parmele	X	243	88,865	243	100.00 %	0.27 %
Patterson Springs	C	571	623,272	571	100.00 %	0.09 %
Peachland	M	390	260,322	390	100.00 %	0.15 %
Peletier	Q	769	168,406	769	100.00 %	0.46 %
Pembroke	O	2,823	167,153	2,823	100.00 %	1.69 %
Pikeville	KK	712	166,048	712	100.00 %	0.43 %
Pilot Mountain	HH	1,440	173,772	1,440	100.00 %	0.83 %
Pinebluff	F	1,473	426,414	1,473	100.00 %	0.35 %
Pinehurst	F	17,581	426,414	17,581	100.00 %	4.12 %
Pine Knoll Shores	Q	1,388	168,406	1,388	100.00 %	0.82 %
Pine Level	J	2,046	349,567	2,046	100.00 %	0.59 %
Pinetops	X	1,200	88,865	1,200	100.00 %	1.35 %
Pineville	A	10,602	1,115,482	10,602	100.00 %	0.95 %
Pink Hill	BB	451	84,745	451	100.00 %	0.53 %
Pittsboro	F	4,537	426,414	4,537	100.00 %	1.06 %
Pleasant Garden	D	5,000	541,299	5,000	100.00 %	0.92 %
Plymouth	MM	3,320	167,493	3,320	100.00 %	1.98 %
Polkton	M	2,250	260,322	2,250	100.00 %	0.86 %
Polkville	C	516	623,272	516	100.00 %	0.08 %
Pollocksville	BB	268	84,745	268	100.00 %	0.32 %
Powellsville	X	189	88,865	189	100.00 %	0.21 %
Princeton	J	1,315	349,567	1,315	100.00 %	0.38 %

District plan definition file: 'Duke_House 03.csv', modified 2/18/2022 10:53 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/18/2022

Page 10 of 15

Municipality - District Report**District Plan: Duke_House 03**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Princeville	X	1,254	88,865	1,254	100.00 %	1.41 %
Proctorville	O	121	167,153	121	100.00 %	0.07 %
Raeford	Z	4,559	86,256	4,559	100.00 %	5.29 %
Raleigh	B	467,665	1,129,410	466,106	99.67 %	41.27 %
	L	467,665	363,930	1,559	0.33 %	0.43 %
Ramseur	F	1,774	426,414	1,774	100.00 %	0.42 %
Randleman	F	4,595	426,414	4,595	100.00 %	1.08 %
Ranlo	C	4,511	623,272	4,511	100.00 %	0.72 %
Raynham	O	60	167,153	60	100.00 %	0.04 %
Red Cross	FF	762	88,255	762	100.00 %	0.86 %
Red Oak	P	3,342	173,754	3,342	100.00 %	1.92 %
Red Springs	O	3,087	167,153	3,087	100.00 %	1.85 %
	Z	3,087	86,256	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Reidsville	W	14,583	91,096	14,583	100.00 %	16.01 %
Rennert	O	275	167,153	275	100.00 %	0.16 %
Rhodhiss	EE	997	87,570	639	64.09 %	0.73 %
	II	997	172,203	358	35.91 %	0.21 %
Richfield	FF	582	88,255	582	100.00 %	0.66 %
Richlands	LL	2,287	264,779	2,287	100.00 %	0.86 %
Rich Square	DD	894	84,735	894	100.00 %	1.06 %
River Bend	Q	2,902	168,406	2,902	100.00 %	1.72 %
Roanoke Rapids	DD	15,229	84,735	15,229	100.00 %	17.97 %
Robbins	F	1,168	426,414	1,168	100.00 %	0.27 %
Robbinsville	GG	597	84,907	597	100.00 %	0.70 %
Robersonville	X	1,269	88,865	1,269	100.00 %	1.43 %
Rockingham	F	9,243	426,414	9,243	100.00 %	2.17 %
Rockwell	G	2,302	452,605	2,302	100.00 %	0.51 %
Rocky Mount	P	54,341	173,754	38,927	71.63 %	22.40 %
	X	54,341	88,865	15,414	28.37 %	17.35 %
Rolesville	B	9,475	1,129,410	9,475	100.00 %	0.84 %
Ronda	HH	438	173,772	438	100.00 %	0.25 %
Roper	MM	485	167,493	485	100.00 %	0.29 %
Roseboro	JJ	1,163	88,642	1,163	100.00 %	1.31 %
Rose Hill	KK	1,371	166,048	1,371	100.00 %	0.83 %
Rosman	CC	701	90,212	701	100.00 %	0.78 %
Rowland	O	885	167,153	885	100.00 %	0.53 %
Roxboro	L	8,134	363,930	8,134	100.00 %	2.24 %
Roxobel	X	187	88,865	187	100.00 %	0.21 %
Rural Hall	E	3,351	427,110	3,351	100.00 %	0.78 %
Ruth	C	347	623,272	347	100.00 %	0.06 %
Rutherford College	EE	1,226	87,570	1,226	100.00 %	1.40 %
	II	1,226	172,203	0	0.00 %	0.00 %

District plan definition file: 'Duke_House 03.csv', modified 2/18/2022 10:53 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/18/2022

Page 11 of 15

Municipality - District Report**District Plan: Duke_House 03**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Rutherfordton	C	3,640	623,272	3,640	100.00 %	0.58 %
St. Helena	LL	417	264,779	417	100.00 %	0.16 %
St. James	H	6,529	362,395	6,529	100.00 %	1.80 %
St. Pauls	O	2,045	167,153	2,045	100.00 %	1.22 %
Salemburg	JJ	457	88,642	457	100.00 %	0.52 %
Salisbury	G	35,540	452,605	35,540	100.00 %	7.85 %
Saluda	C	631	623,272	631	100.00 %	0.10 %
Sandy Creek	H	248	362,395	248	100.00 %	0.07 %
Sandyfield	O	430	167,153	430	100.00 %	0.26 %
Sanford	F	30,261	426,414	30,261	100.00 %	7.10 %
Saratoga	P	353	173,754	353	100.00 %	0.20 %
Sawmills	II	5,020	172,203	5,020	100.00 %	2.92 %
Scotland Neck	DD	1,640	84,735	1,640	100.00 %	1.94 %
Seaboard	DD	542	84,735	542	100.00 %	0.64 %
Seagrove	F	235	426,414	235	100.00 %	0.06 %
Sedalia	D	676	541,299	676	100.00 %	0.12 %
Selma	J	6,317	349,567	6,317	100.00 %	1.81 %
Seven Devils	C	313	623,272	38	12.14 %	0.01 %
	II	313	172,203	275	87.86 %	0.16 %
Seven Springs	KK	55	166,048	55	100.00 %	0.03 %
Severn	DD	191	84,735	191	100.00 %	0.23 %
Shallotte	H	4,185	362,395	4,185	100.00 %	1.15 %
Sharpsburg	P	1,697	173,754	1,482	87.33 %	0.85 %
	X	1,697	88,865	215	12.67 %	0.24 %
Shelby	C	21,918	623,272	21,918	100.00 %	3.52 %
Siler City	F	7,702	426,414	7,702	100.00 %	1.81 %
Simpson	T	390	170,243	390	100.00 %	0.23 %
Sims	P	275	173,754	275	100.00 %	0.16 %
Smithfield	J	11,292	349,567	11,292	100.00 %	3.23 %
Snow Hill	BB	1,481	84,745	1,481	100.00 %	1.75 %
Southern Pines	F	15,545	426,414	15,545	100.00 %	3.65 %
Southern Shores	MM	3,090	167,493	3,090	100.00 %	1.84 %
Southport	H	3,971	362,395	3,971	100.00 %	1.10 %
Sparta	II	1,834	172,203	1,834	100.00 %	1.07 %
Speed	X	63	88,865	63	100.00 %	0.07 %
Spencer	G	3,308	452,605	3,308	100.00 %	0.73 %
Spencer Mountain	C	0	623,272	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Spindale	C	4,225	623,272	4,225	100.00 %	0.68 %
Spring Hope	P	1,309	173,754	1,309	100.00 %	0.75 %
Spring Lake	I	11,660	334,728	11,660	100.00 %	3.48 %
Spruce Pine	C	2,194	623,272	2,194	100.00 %	0.35 %
Staley	F	397	426,414	397	100.00 %	0.09 %

District plan definition file: 'Duke_House 03.csv', modified 2/18/2022 10:53 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/18/2022

Municipality - District Report**District Plan: Duke_House 03**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Stallings	A	16,112	1,115,482	384	2.38 %	0.03 %
	M	16,112	260,322	15,728	97.62 %	6.04 %
Stanfield	FF	1,585	88,255	1,585	100.00 %	1.80 %
Stanley	C	3,963	623,272	3,963	100.00 %	0.64 %
Stantonsburg	P	762	173,754	762	100.00 %	0.44 %
Star	FF	806	88,255	806	100.00 %	0.91 %
Statesville	K	28,419	347,303	28,419	100.00 %	8.18 %
Stedman	I	1,277	334,728	1,277	100.00 %	0.38 %
Stem	S	960	172,143	960	100.00 %	0.56 %
Stokesdale	D	5,924	541,299	5,924	100.00 %	1.09 %
Stoneville	W	1,308	91,096	1,308	100.00 %	1.44 %
Stonewall	MM	214	167,493	214	100.00 %	0.13 %
Stovall	S	324	172,143	324	100.00 %	0.19 %
Sugar Mountain	C	371	623,272	371	100.00 %	0.06 %
Summerfield	D	10,951	541,299	10,951	100.00 %	2.02 %
Sunset Beach	H	4,175	362,395	4,175	100.00 %	1.15 %
Surf City	LL	3,867	264,779	3,867	100.00 %	1.46 %
Swansboro	LL	3,744	264,779	3,744	100.00 %	1.41 %
Sweepsonville	U	2,445	171,415	2,445	100.00 %	1.43 %
Sylva	CC	2,578	90,212	2,578	100.00 %	2.86 %
Tabor City	O	3,781	167,153	3,781	100.00 %	2.26 %
Tarboro	X	10,721	88,865	10,721	100.00 %	12.06 %
Tar Heel	JJ	90	88,642	90	100.00 %	0.10 %
Taylorsville	HH	2,320	173,772	2,320	100.00 %	1.34 %
Taylortown	F	634	426,414	634	100.00 %	0.15 %
Teachey	KK	448	166,048	448	100.00 %	0.27 %
Thomasville	F	27,183	426,414	521	1.92 %	0.12 %
	R	27,183	168,930	26,662	98.08 %	15.78 %
Tobaccoville	E	2,578	427,110	2,578	100.00 %	0.60 %
Topsail Beach	LL	461	264,779	461	100.00 %	0.17 %
Trenton	BB	238	84,745	238	100.00 %	0.28 %
Trent Woods	Q	4,074	168,406	4,074	100.00 %	2.42 %
Trinity	F	7,006	426,414	7,006	100.00 %	1.64 %
Troutman	K	3,698	347,303	3,698	100.00 %	1.06 %
Troy	FF	2,850	88,255	2,850	100.00 %	3.23 %
Tryon	C	1,562	623,272	1,562	100.00 %	0.25 %
Turkey	JJ	213	88,642	213	100.00 %	0.24 %
Unionville	M	6,643	260,322	6,643	100.00 %	2.55 %
Valdese	EE	4,689	87,570	4,689	100.00 %	5.35 %
Vanceboro	Q	869	168,406	869	100.00 %	0.52 %
Vandemere	MM	246	167,493	246	100.00 %	0.15 %
Varnamtown	H	525	362,395	525	100.00 %	0.14 %

District plan definition file: 'Duke_House 03.csv', modified 2/18/2022 10:53 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/18/2022

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: Duke_House 03

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Vass	F	952	426,414	952	100.00 %	0.22 %
Waco	C	310	623,272	310	100.00 %	0.05 %
Wade	I	638	334,728	638	100.00 %	0.19 %
Wadesboro	M	5,008	260,322	5,008	100.00 %	1.92 %
Wagram	Z	615	86,256	615	100.00 %	0.71 %
Wake Forest	B	47,601	1,129,410	46,097	96.84 %	4.08 %
	S	47,601	172,143	1,504	3.16 %	0.87 %
Walkertown	E	5,692	427,110	5,692	100.00 %	1.33 %
Wallace	KK	3,413	166,048	3,413	100.00 %	2.06 %
	LL	3,413	264,779	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Wallburg	R	3,051	168,930	3,051	100.00 %	1.81 %
Walnut Cove	E	1,586	427,110	1,586	100.00 %	0.37 %
Walnut Creek	KK	1,084	166,048	1,084	100.00 %	0.65 %
Walstonburg	BB	193	84,745	193	100.00 %	0.23 %
Warrenton	DD	851	84,735	851	100.00 %	1.00 %
Warsaw	KK	2,733	166,048	2,733	100.00 %	1.65 %
Washington	MM	9,875	167,493	9,875	100.00 %	5.90 %
Washington Park	MM	392	167,493	392	100.00 %	0.23 %
Watha	LL	181	264,779	181	100.00 %	0.07 %
Waxhaw	M	20,534	260,322	20,534	100.00 %	7.89 %
Waynesville	AA	10,140	83,282	10,140	100.00 %	12.18 %
Weaverville	N	4,567	269,452	4,567	100.00 %	1.69 %
Webster	CC	372	90,212	372	100.00 %	0.41 %
Weddington	A	13,181	1,115,482	5	0.04 %	0.00 %
	M	13,181	260,322	13,176	99.96 %	5.06 %
Weldon	DD	1,444	84,735	1,444	100.00 %	1.70 %
Wendell	B	9,793	1,129,410	9,793	100.00 %	0.87 %
Wentworth	W	2,662	91,096	2,662	100.00 %	2.92 %
Wesley Chapel	M	8,681	260,322	8,681	100.00 %	3.33 %
West Jefferson	II	1,279	172,203	1,279	100.00 %	0.74 %
Whispering Pines	F	4,987	426,414	4,987	100.00 %	1.17 %
Whitakers	P	627	173,754	337	53.75 %	0.19 %
	X	627	88,865	290	46.25 %	0.33 %
White Lake	JJ	843	88,642	843	100.00 %	0.95 %
Whiteville	O	4,766	167,153	4,766	100.00 %	2.85 %
Whitsett	D	584	541,299	584	100.00 %	0.11 %
Wilkesboro	HH	3,687	173,772	3,687	100.00 %	2.12 %
Williamston	X	5,248	88,865	5,248	100.00 %	5.91 %
Wilmington	H	115,451	362,395	115,451	100.00 %	31.86 %
Wilson	P	47,851	173,754	47,851	100.00 %	27.54 %
Wilson's Mills	J	2,534	349,567	2,534	100.00 %	0.72 %
Windsor	X	3,582	88,865	3,582	100.00 %	4.03 %

District plan definition file: 'Duke_House 03.csv', modified 2/18/2022 10:53 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/18/2022

Municipality - District Report**District Plan: Duke_House 03**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Winfall	MM	555	167,493	555	100.00 %	0.33 %
Wingate	M	4,055	260,322	4,055	100.00 %	1.56 %
Winston-Salem	E	249,545	427,110	249,545	100.00 %	58.43 %
Winterville	T	10,462	170,243	10,462	100.00 %	6.15 %
Winton	NN	629	82,953	629	100.00 %	0.76 %
Woodfin	N	7,936	269,452	7,936	100.00 %	2.95 %
Woodland	DD	557	84,735	557	100.00 %	0.66 %
Wrightsville Beach	H	2,473	362,395	2,473	100.00 %	0.68 %
Yadkinville	G	2,995	452,605	2,995	100.00 %	0.66 %
Yanceyville	V	1,937	171,432	1,937	100.00 %	1.13 %
Youngsville	S	2,016	172,143	2,016	100.00 %	1.17 %
Zebulon	B	6,903	1,129,410	6,903	100.00 %	0.61 %
	J	6,903	349,567	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Assigned Geography Total:				6,017,605		

Report display: all municipalities

Total Municipalities Statewide: 553

Fully Assigned Municipalities: 553

Partially Assigned Municipalities: 0

Fully Unassigned Municipalities: 0

Total Districts Assigned: 40

Split Municipalities: 44

Splits Involving Population: 31

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: Duke_House 03

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Aberdeen	F	8,516	426,414	8,516	100.00 %	2.00 %
Ahoskie	NN	4,891	82,953	4,891	100.00 %	5.90 %
Alamance	U	988	171,415	988	100.00 %	0.58 %
Albemarle	FF	16,432	88,255	16,432	100.00 %	18.62 %
Alliance	MM	733	167,493	733	100.00 %	0.44 %
Andrews	GG	1,667	84,907	1,667	100.00 %	1.96 %
Angier (Harnett)	J	4,709	349,567	4,709	100.00 %	1.35 %
Angier (Wake)	B	556	1,129,410	556	100.00 %	0.05 %
Ansonville	M	440	260,322	440	100.00 %	0.17 %
Apex	B	58,780	1,129,410	58,780	100.00 %	5.20 %
Arapahoe	MM	416	167,493	416	100.00 %	0.25 %
Archdale (Guilford)	D	380	541,299	380	100.00 %	0.07 %
Archdale (Randolph)	F	11,527	426,414	11,527	100.00 %	2.70 %
Archer Lodge	J	4,797	349,567	4,797	100.00 %	1.37 %
Asheboro	F	27,156	426,414	27,156	100.00 %	6.37 %
Asheville	N	94,589	269,452	94,589	100.00 %	35.10 %
Askewville	X	184	88,865	184	100.00 %	0.21 %
Atkinson	LL	296	264,779	296	100.00 %	0.11 %
Atlantic Beach	Q	1,364	168,406	1,364	100.00 %	0.81 %
Aulander	X	763	88,865	763	100.00 %	0.86 %
Aurora	MM	455	167,493	455	100.00 %	0.27 %
Autryville	JJ	167	88,642	167	100.00 %	0.19 %
Ayden	T	4,977	170,243	4,977	100.00 %	2.92 %
Badin	FF	2,024	88,255	2,024	100.00 %	2.29 %
Bailey	P	568	173,754	568	100.00 %	0.33 %
Bakersville	C	450	623,272	450	100.00 %	0.07 %
Bald Head Island	H	268	362,395	268	100.00 %	0.07 %
Banner Elk	C	1,049	623,272	1,049	100.00 %	0.17 %
Bath	MM	245	167,493	245	100.00 %	0.15 %
Bayboro	MM	1,161	167,493	1,161	100.00 %	0.69 %
Bear Grass	X	89	88,865	89	100.00 %	0.10 %
Beaufort	Q	4,464	168,406	4,464	100.00 %	2.65 %
Beech Mountain (Avery)	C	62	623,272	62	100.00 %	0.01 %
Beech Mountain (Watauga)	II	613	172,203	613	100.00 %	0.36 %
Belhaven	MM	1,410	167,493	1,410	100.00 %	0.84 %
Belmont	C	15,010	623,272	15,010	100.00 %	2.41 %
Belville	H	2,406	362,395	2,406	100.00 %	0.66 %
Belwood	C	857	623,272	857	100.00 %	0.14 %
Benson (Harnett)	J	0	349,567	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Benson (Johnston)	J	3,967	349,567	3,967	100.00 %	1.13 %
Bermuda Run	G	3,120	452,605	3,120	100.00 %	0.69 %

District plan definition file: 'Duke_House 03.csv', modified 2/18/2022 10:53 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/18/2022

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: Duke_House 03

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Bessemer City	C	5,428	623,272	5,428	100.00 %	0.87 %
Bethania	E	344	427,110	344	100.00 %	0.08 %
Bethel	T	1,373	170,243	1,373	100.00 %	0.81 %
Beulaville	KK	1,116	166,048	1,116	100.00 %	0.67 %
Biltmore Forest	N	1,409	269,452	1,409	100.00 %	0.52 %
Biscoe	FF	1,848	88,255	1,848	100.00 %	2.09 %
Black Creek	P	692	173,754	692	100.00 %	0.40 %
Black Mountain	N	8,426	269,452	8,426	100.00 %	3.13 %
Bladenboro	JJ	1,648	88,642	1,648	100.00 %	1.86 %
Blowing Rock (Caldwell)	II	91	172,203	91	100.00 %	0.05 %
Blowing Rock (Watauga)	II	1,285	172,203	1,285	100.00 %	0.75 %
Boardman	O	166	167,153	166	100.00 %	0.10 %
Bogue	Q	695	168,406	695	100.00 %	0.41 %
Boiling Spring Lakes	H	5,943	362,395	5,943	100.00 %	1.64 %
Boiling Springs	C	4,615	623,272	4,615	100.00 %	0.74 %
Bolivia	H	149	362,395	149	100.00 %	0.04 %
Bolton	O	519	167,153	519	100.00 %	0.31 %
Boone	II	19,092	172,203	19,092	100.00 %	11.09 %
Boonville	G	1,185	452,605	1,185	100.00 %	0.26 %
Bostic	C	355	623,272	355	100.00 %	0.06 %
Brevard	CC	7,744	90,212	7,744	100.00 %	8.58 %
Bridgeton	Q	349	168,406	349	100.00 %	0.21 %
Broadway (Harnett)	J	0	349,567	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Broadway (Lee)	F	1,267	426,414	1,267	100.00 %	0.30 %
Brookford	K	442	347,303	442	100.00 %	0.13 %
Brunswick	O	973	167,153	973	100.00 %	0.58 %
Bryson City	CC	1,558	90,212	1,558	100.00 %	1.73 %
Bunn	S	327	172,143	327	100.00 %	0.19 %
Burgaw	LL	3,088	264,779	3,088	100.00 %	1.17 %
Burlington (Alamance)	U	55,481	171,415	55,481	100.00 %	32.37 %
Burlington (Guilford)	D	1,822	541,299	1,822	100.00 %	0.34 %
Burnsville	C	1,614	623,272	1,614	100.00 %	0.26 %
Butner	S	8,397	172,143	8,397	100.00 %	4.88 %
Cajah's Mountain	II	2,722	172,203	2,722	100.00 %	1.58 %
Calabash	H	2,011	362,395	2,011	100.00 %	0.55 %
Calypso	KK	327	166,048	327	100.00 %	0.20 %
Cameron	F	244	426,414	244	100.00 %	0.06 %
Candor (Montgomery)	FF	813	88,255	813	100.00 %	0.92 %
Candor (Moore)	F	0	426,414	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Canton	AA	4,422	83,282	4,422	100.00 %	5.31 %
Cape Carteret	Q	2,224	168,406	2,224	100.00 %	1.32 %

District plan definition file: 'Duke_House 03.csv', modified 2/18/2022 10:53 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/18/2022

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: Duke_House 03

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Carolina Beach	H	6,564	362,395	6,564	100.00 %	1.81 %
Carolina Shores	H	4,588	362,395	4,588	100.00 %	1.27 %
Carrboro	V	21,295	171,432	21,295	100.00 %	12.42 %
Carthage	F	2,775	426,414	2,775	100.00 %	0.65 %
Cary (Chatham)	F	3,709	426,414	3,709	100.00 %	0.87 %
Cary (Wake)	B	171,012	1,129,410	171,012	100.00 %	15.14 %
Casar	C	305	623,272	305	100.00 %	0.05 %
Castalia	P	264	173,754	264	100.00 %	0.15 %
Caswell Beach	H	395	362,395	395	100.00 %	0.11 %
Catawba	K	702	347,303	702	100.00 %	0.20 %
Cedar Point	Q	1,764	168,406	1,764	100.00 %	1.05 %
Cedar Rock	II	301	172,203	301	100.00 %	0.17 %
Cerro Gordo	O	131	167,153	131	100.00 %	0.08 %
Chadbourn	O	1,574	167,153	1,574	100.00 %	0.94 %
Chapel Hill (Durham)	L	2,906	363,930	2,906	100.00 %	0.80 %
Chapel Hill (Orange)	V	59,054	171,432	59,054	100.00 %	34.45 %
Charlotte	A	874,579	1,115,482	874,579	100.00 %	78.40 %
Cherryville	C	6,078	623,272	6,078	100.00 %	0.98 %
Chimney Rock Village	C	140	623,272	140	100.00 %	0.02 %
China Grove	G	4,434	452,605	4,434	100.00 %	0.98 %
Chocowinity	MM	722	167,493	722	100.00 %	0.43 %
Claremont	K	1,692	347,303	1,692	100.00 %	0.49 %
Clarkton	JJ	614	88,642	614	100.00 %	0.69 %
Clayton (Johnston)	J	26,307	349,567	26,307	100.00 %	7.53 %
Clayton (Wake)	B	0	1,129,410	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Clemmons	E	21,163	427,110	21,163	100.00 %	4.95 %
Cleveland	G	846	452,605	846	100.00 %	0.19 %
Clinton	JJ	8,383	88,642	8,383	100.00 %	9.46 %
Clyde	AA	1,368	83,282	1,368	100.00 %	1.64 %
Coats	J	2,155	349,567	2,155	100.00 %	0.62 %
Cofield	NN	267	82,953	267	100.00 %	0.32 %
Colerain	X	217	88,865	217	100.00 %	0.24 %
Columbia	MM	610	167,493	610	100.00 %	0.36 %
Columbus	C	1,060	623,272	1,060	100.00 %	0.17 %
Como	NN	67	82,953	67	100.00 %	0.08 %
Concord	G	105,240	452,605	105,240	100.00 %	23.25 %
Conetoe	X	198	88,865	198	100.00 %	0.22 %
Connelly Springs	EE	1,529	87,570	1,529	100.00 %	1.75 %
Conover	K	8,421	347,303	8,421	100.00 %	2.42 %
Conway	DD	752	84,735	752	100.00 %	0.89 %
Cooleemee	G	940	452,605	940	100.00 %	0.21 %

District plan definition file: 'Duke_House 03.csv', modified 2/18/2022 10:53 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/18/2022

Municipality by County - District Report**District Plan: Duke_House 03**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Cornelius	A	31,412	1,115,482	31,412	100.00 %	2.82 %
Cove City	Q	378	168,406	378	100.00 %	0.22 %
Cramerton	C	5,296	623,272	5,296	100.00 %	0.85 %
Creedmoor	S	4,866	172,143	4,866	100.00 %	2.83 %
Creswell	MM	207	167,493	207	100.00 %	0.12 %
Crossnore	C	143	623,272	143	100.00 %	0.02 %
Dallas	C	5,927	623,272	5,927	100.00 %	0.95 %
Danbury	E	189	427,110	189	100.00 %	0.04 %
Davidson (Iredell)	K	378	347,303	378	100.00 %	0.11 %
Davidson (Mecklenburg)	A	14,728	1,115,482	14,728	100.00 %	1.32 %
Dellview	C	6	623,272	6	100.00 %	0.00 %
Denton	R	1,494	168,930	1,494	100.00 %	0.88 %
Dillsboro	CC	213	90,212	213	100.00 %	0.24 %
Dobbins Heights	F	687	426,414	687	100.00 %	0.16 %
Dobson	HH	1,462	173,772	1,462	100.00 %	0.84 %
Dortches	P	1,082	173,754	1,082	100.00 %	0.62 %
Dover	Q	349	168,406	349	100.00 %	0.21 %
Drexel	EE	1,760	87,570	1,760	100.00 %	2.01 %
Dublin	JJ	267	88,642	267	100.00 %	0.30 %
Duck	MM	742	167,493	742	100.00 %	0.44 %
Dunn	J	8,446	349,567	8,446	100.00 %	2.42 %
Durham (Durham)	L	283,093	363,930	283,093	100.00 %	77.79 %
Durham (Orange)	V	144	171,432	144	100.00 %	0.08 %
Durham (Wake)	B	269	1,129,410	269	100.00 %	0.02 %
Earl	C	198	623,272	198	100.00 %	0.03 %
East Arcadia	JJ	418	88,642	418	100.00 %	0.47 %
East Bend	G	634	452,605	634	100.00 %	0.14 %
East Laurinburg	Z	234	86,256	234	100.00 %	0.27 %
East Spencer	G	1,567	452,605	1,567	100.00 %	0.35 %
Eastover	I	3,656	334,728	3,656	100.00 %	1.09 %
Eden	W	15,421	91,096	15,421	100.00 %	16.93 %
Edenton	MM	4,460	167,493	4,460	100.00 %	2.66 %
Elizabeth City (Camden)	NN	38	82,953	38	100.00 %	0.05 %
Elizabeth City (Pasquotank)	NN	18,593	82,953	18,593	100.00 %	22.41 %
Elizabethtown	JJ	3,296	88,642	3,296	100.00 %	3.72 %
Elk Park	C	542	623,272	542	100.00 %	0.09 %
Elkin (Surry)	HH	4,049	173,772	4,049	100.00 %	2.33 %
Elkin (Wilkes)	HH	73	173,772	73	100.00 %	0.04 %
Ellenboro	C	723	623,272	723	100.00 %	0.12 %
Ellerbe	F	864	426,414	864	100.00 %	0.20 %
Elm City (Nash)	P	0	173,754	0	0.00 %	0.00 %

District plan definition file: 'Duke_House 03.csv', modified 2/18/2022 10:53 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/18/2022

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: Duke_House 03

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Elm City (Wilson)	P	1,218	173,754	1,218	100.00 %	0.70 %
Elon	U	11,336	171,415	11,336	100.00 %	6.61 %
Emerald Isle	Q	3,847	168,406	3,847	100.00 %	2.28 %
Enfield	DD	1,865	84,735	1,865	100.00 %	2.20 %
Erwin	J	4,542	349,567	4,542	100.00 %	1.30 %
Eureka	KK	214	166,048	214	100.00 %	0.13 %
Everetts	X	150	88,865	150	100.00 %	0.17 %
Fair Bluff	O	709	167,153	709	100.00 %	0.42 %
Fairmont	O	2,191	167,153	2,191	100.00 %	1.31 %
Fairview	M	3,456	260,322	3,456	100.00 %	1.33 %
Faison (Duplin)	KK	784	166,048	784	100.00 %	0.47 %
Faison (Sampson)	JJ	0	88,642	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Faith	G	819	452,605	819	100.00 %	0.18 %
Falcon (Cumberland)	I	324	334,728	324	100.00 %	0.10 %
Falcon (Sampson)	JJ	0	88,642	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Falkland	T	47	170,243	47	100.00 %	0.03 %
Fallston	C	627	623,272	627	100.00 %	0.10 %
Farmville	T	4,461	170,243	4,461	100.00 %	2.62 %
Fayetteville	I	208,501	334,728	208,501	100.00 %	62.29 %
Flat Rock	C	3,486	623,272	3,486	100.00 %	0.56 %
Fletcher	C	7,987	623,272	7,987	100.00 %	1.28 %
Fontana Dam	GG	13	84,907	13	100.00 %	0.02 %
Forest City	C	7,377	623,272	7,377	100.00 %	1.18 %
Forest Hills	CC	303	90,212	303	100.00 %	0.34 %
Fountain	T	385	170,243	385	100.00 %	0.23 %
Four Oaks	J	2,158	349,567	2,158	100.00 %	0.62 %
Foxfire	F	1,288	426,414	1,288	100.00 %	0.30 %
Franklin	GG	4,175	84,907	4,175	100.00 %	4.92 %
Franklinton	S	2,456	172,143	2,456	100.00 %	1.43 %
Franklinville	F	1,197	426,414	1,197	100.00 %	0.28 %
Fremont	KK	1,196	166,048	1,196	100.00 %	0.72 %
Fuquay-Varina (Harnett)	J	0	349,567	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Fuquay-Varina (Wake)	B	34,152	1,129,410	34,152	100.00 %	3.02 %
Gamewell	II	3,702	172,203	3,702	100.00 %	2.15 %
Garland	JJ	595	88,642	595	100.00 %	0.67 %
Garner	B	31,159	1,129,410	31,159	100.00 %	2.76 %
Garysburg	DD	904	84,735	904	100.00 %	1.07 %
Gaston	DD	1,008	84,735	1,008	100.00 %	1.19 %
Gastonia	C	80,411	623,272	80,411	100.00 %	12.90 %
Gatesville	NN	267	82,953	267	100.00 %	0.32 %
Gibson	Z	449	86,256	449	100.00 %	0.52 %

District plan definition file: 'Duke_House 03.csv', modified 2/18/2022 10:53 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/18/2022

Municipality by County - District Report**District Plan: Duke_House 03**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Gibsonville (Alamance)	U	4,278	171,415	4,278	100.00 %	2.50 %
Gibsonville (Guilford)	D	4,642	541,299	4,642	100.00 %	0.86 %
Glen Alpine	EE	1,529	87,570	1,529	100.00 %	1.75 %
Godwin	I	128	334,728	128	100.00 %	0.04 %
Goldsboro	KK	33,657	166,048	33,657	100.00 %	20.27 %
Goldston	F	234	426,414	234	100.00 %	0.05 %
Graham	U	17,157	171,415	17,157	100.00 %	10.01 %
Grandfather Village	C	95	623,272	95	100.00 %	0.02 %
Granite Falls	II	4,965	172,203	4,965	100.00 %	2.88 %
Granite Quarry	G	2,984	452,605	2,984	100.00 %	0.66 %
Grantsboro	MM	692	167,493	692	100.00 %	0.41 %
Green Level	U	3,152	171,415	3,152	100.00 %	1.84 %
Greenevers	KK	567	166,048	567	100.00 %	0.34 %
Greensboro	D	299,035	541,299	299,035	100.00 %	55.24 %
Greenville	T	87,521	170,243	87,521	100.00 %	51.41 %
Grifton (Lenoir)	BB	147	84,745	147	100.00 %	0.17 %
Grifton (Pitt)	T	2,301	170,243	2,301	100.00 %	1.35 %
Grimesland	T	386	170,243	386	100.00 %	0.23 %
Grover	C	802	623,272	802	100.00 %	0.13 %
Halifax	DD	170	84,735	170	100.00 %	0.20 %
Hamilton	X	306	88,865	306	100.00 %	0.34 %
Hamlet	F	6,025	426,414	6,025	100.00 %	1.41 %
Harmony	K	543	347,303	543	100.00 %	0.16 %
Harrells (Duplin)	KK	0	166,048	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Harrells (Sampson)	JJ	160	88,642	160	100.00 %	0.18 %
Harrellsville	NN	85	82,953	85	100.00 %	0.10 %
Harrisburg	G	18,967	452,605	18,967	100.00 %	4.19 %
Hassell	X	49	88,865	49	100.00 %	0.06 %
Havelock	Q	16,621	168,406	16,621	100.00 %	9.87 %
Haw River	U	2,252	171,415	2,252	100.00 %	1.31 %
Hayesville	GG	461	84,907	461	100.00 %	0.54 %
Hemby Bridge	M	1,614	260,322	1,614	100.00 %	0.62 %
Henderson	S	15,060	172,143	15,060	100.00 %	8.75 %
Hendersonville	C	15,137	623,272	15,137	100.00 %	2.43 %
Hertford	MM	1,934	167,493	1,934	100.00 %	1.15 %
Hickory (Burke)	EE	79	87,570	79	100.00 %	0.09 %
Hickory (Caldwell)	II	32	172,203	32	100.00 %	0.02 %
Hickory (Catawba)	K	43,379	347,303	43,379	100.00 %	12.49 %
High Point (Davidson)	R	6,646	168,930	6,646	100.00 %	3.93 %
High Point (Forsyth)	E	84	427,110	84	100.00 %	0.02 %
High Point (Guilford)	D	107,321	541,299	107,321	100.00 %	19.83 %

District plan definition file: 'Duke_House 03.csv', modified 2/18/2022 10:53 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/18/2022

Municipality by County - District Report**District Plan: Duke_House 03**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
High Point (Randolph)	F	8	426,414	8	100.00 %	0.00 %
High Shoals	C	595	623,272	595	100.00 %	0.10 %
Highlands (Jackson)	CC	12	90,212	12	100.00 %	0.01 %
Highlands (Macon)	GG	1,060	84,907	1,060	100.00 %	1.25 %
Hildebran	EE	1,679	87,570	1,679	100.00 %	1.92 %
Hillsborough	V	9,660	171,432	9,660	100.00 %	5.63 %
Hobgood	DD	268	84,735	268	100.00 %	0.32 %
Hoffman	F	418	426,414	418	100.00 %	0.10 %
Holden Beach	H	921	362,395	921	100.00 %	0.25 %
Holly Ridge	LL	4,171	264,779	4,171	100.00 %	1.58 %
Holly Springs	B	41,239	1,129,410	41,239	100.00 %	3.65 %
Hookerton	BB	413	84,745	413	100.00 %	0.49 %
Hope Mills	I	17,808	334,728	17,808	100.00 %	5.32 %
Hot Springs	AA	520	83,282	520	100.00 %	0.62 %
Hudson	II	3,780	172,203	3,780	100.00 %	2.20 %
Huntersville	A	61,376	1,115,482	61,376	100.00 %	5.50 %
Indian Beach	Q	223	168,406	223	100.00 %	0.13 %
Indian Trail	M	39,997	260,322	39,997	100.00 %	15.36 %
Jackson	DD	430	84,735	430	100.00 %	0.51 %
Jacksonville	LL	72,723	264,779	72,723	100.00 %	27.47 %
Jamestown	D	3,668	541,299	3,668	100.00 %	0.68 %
Jamesville	X	424	88,865	424	100.00 %	0.48 %
Jefferson	II	1,622	172,203	1,622	100.00 %	0.94 %
Jonesville	G	2,308	452,605	2,308	100.00 %	0.51 %
Kannapolis (Cabarrus)	G	42,846	452,605	42,846	100.00 %	9.47 %
Kannapolis (Rowan)	G	10,268	452,605	10,268	100.00 %	2.27 %
Kelford	X	203	88,865	203	100.00 %	0.23 %
Kenansville	KK	770	166,048	770	100.00 %	0.46 %
Kenly (Johnston)	J	1,293	349,567	1,293	100.00 %	0.37 %
Kenly (Wilson)	P	198	173,754	198	100.00 %	0.11 %
Kernersville (Forsyth)	E	25,947	427,110	25,947	100.00 %	6.08 %
Kernersville (Guilford)	D	502	541,299	502	100.00 %	0.09 %
Kill Devil Hills	MM	7,656	167,493	7,656	100.00 %	4.57 %
King (Forsyth)	E	591	427,110	591	100.00 %	0.14 %
King (Stokes)	E	6,606	427,110	6,606	100.00 %	1.55 %
Kings Mountain (Cleveland)	C	10,032	623,272	10,032	100.00 %	1.61 %
Kings Mountain (Gaston)	C	1,110	623,272	1,110	100.00 %	0.18 %
Kingstown	C	656	623,272	656	100.00 %	0.11 %
Kinston	BB	19,900	84,745	19,900	100.00 %	23.48 %
Kittrell	S	132	172,143	132	100.00 %	0.08 %
Kitty Hawk	MM	3,689	167,493	3,689	100.00 %	2.20 %

District plan definition file: 'Duke_House 03.csv', modified 2/18/2022 10:53 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/18/2022

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: Duke_House 03

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Knightdale	B	19,435	1,129,410	19,435	100.00 %	1.72 %
Kure Beach	H	2,191	362,395	2,191	100.00 %	0.60 %
La Grange	BB	2,595	84,745	2,595	100.00 %	3.06 %
Lake Lure	C	1,365	623,272	1,365	100.00 %	0.22 %
Lake Park	M	3,269	260,322	3,269	100.00 %	1.26 %
Lake Santeetlah	GG	38	84,907	38	100.00 %	0.04 %
Lake Waccamaw	O	1,296	167,153	1,296	100.00 %	0.78 %
Landis	G	3,690	452,605	3,690	100.00 %	0.82 %
Lansing	II	126	172,203	126	100.00 %	0.07 %
Lasker	DD	64	84,735	64	100.00 %	0.08 %
Lattimore	C	406	623,272	406	100.00 %	0.07 %
Laurel Park	C	2,250	623,272	2,250	100.00 %	0.36 %
Laurinburg	Z	14,978	86,256	14,978	100.00 %	17.36 %
Lawndale	C	570	623,272	570	100.00 %	0.09 %
Leggett	X	37	88,865	37	100.00 %	0.04 %
Leland	H	22,908	362,395	22,908	100.00 %	6.32 %
Lenoir	II	18,352	172,203	18,352	100.00 %	10.66 %
Lewiston Woodville	X	426	88,865	426	100.00 %	0.48 %
Lewisville	E	13,381	427,110	13,381	100.00 %	3.13 %
Lexington	R	19,632	168,930	19,632	100.00 %	11.62 %
Liberty	F	2,655	426,414	2,655	100.00 %	0.62 %
Lilesville	M	395	260,322	395	100.00 %	0.15 %
Lillington	J	4,735	349,567	4,735	100.00 %	1.35 %
Lincolnton	Y	11,091	86,810	11,091	100.00 %	12.78 %
Linden	I	136	334,728	136	100.00 %	0.04 %
Littleton	DD	559	84,735	559	100.00 %	0.66 %
Locust (Cabarrus)	G	541	452,605	541	100.00 %	0.12 %
Locust (Stanly)	FF	3,996	88,255	3,996	100.00 %	4.53 %
Long View (Burke)	EE	735	87,570	735	100.00 %	0.84 %
Long View (Catawba)	K	4,353	347,303	4,353	100.00 %	1.25 %
Louisburg	S	3,064	172,143	3,064	100.00 %	1.78 %
Love Valley	K	154	347,303	154	100.00 %	0.04 %
Lowell	C	3,654	623,272	3,654	100.00 %	0.59 %
Lucama	P	1,036	173,754	1,036	100.00 %	0.60 %
Lumber Bridge	O	82	167,153	82	100.00 %	0.05 %
Lumberton	O	19,025	167,153	19,025	100.00 %	11.38 %
Macclesfield	X	413	88,865	413	100.00 %	0.46 %
Macon	DD	110	84,735	110	100.00 %	0.13 %
Madison	W	2,129	91,096	2,129	100.00 %	2.34 %
Maggie Valley	AA	1,687	83,282	1,687	100.00 %	2.03 %
Magnolia	KK	831	166,048	831	100.00 %	0.50 %

District plan definition file: 'Duke_House 03.csv', modified 2/18/2022 10:53 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/18/2022

Municipality by County - District Report**District Plan: Duke_House 03**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Maiden (Catawba)	K	3,736	347,303	3,736	100.00 %	1.08 %
Maiden (Lincoln)	Y	0	86,810	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Manteo	MM	1,600	167,493	1,600	100.00 %	0.96 %
Marietta	O	111	167,153	111	100.00 %	0.07 %
Marion	C	7,717	623,272	7,717	100.00 %	1.24 %
Mars Hill	AA	2,007	83,282	2,007	100.00 %	2.41 %
Marshall	AA	777	83,282	777	100.00 %	0.93 %
Marshville	M	2,522	260,322	2,522	100.00 %	0.97 %
Marvin	M	6,358	260,322	6,358	100.00 %	2.44 %
Matthews	A	29,435	1,115,482	29,435	100.00 %	2.64 %
Maxton (Robeson)	O	1,902	167,153	1,902	100.00 %	1.14 %
Maxton (Scotland)	Z	208	86,256	208	100.00 %	0.24 %
Mayodan	W	2,418	91,096	2,418	100.00 %	2.65 %
Maysville	BB	818	84,745	818	100.00 %	0.97 %
McAdenville	C	890	623,272	890	100.00 %	0.14 %
McDonald	O	94	167,153	94	100.00 %	0.06 %
McFarlan	M	94	260,322	94	100.00 %	0.04 %
Mebane (Alamance)	U	14,626	171,415	14,626	100.00 %	8.53 %
Mebane (Orange)	V	3,171	171,432	3,171	100.00 %	1.85 %
Mesic	MM	144	167,493	144	100.00 %	0.09 %
Micro	J	458	349,567	458	100.00 %	0.13 %
Middleburg	S	101	172,143	101	100.00 %	0.06 %
Middlesex	P	912	173,754	912	100.00 %	0.52 %
Midland (Cabarrus)	G	4,684	452,605	4,684	100.00 %	1.03 %
Midland (Mecklenburg)	A	0	1,115,482	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Midway	R	4,742	168,930	4,742	100.00 %	2.81 %
Mills River	C	7,078	623,272	7,078	100.00 %	1.14 %
Milton	V	155	171,432	155	100.00 %	0.09 %
Mineral Springs	M	3,159	260,322	3,159	100.00 %	1.21 %
Minnesott Beach	MM	530	167,493	530	100.00 %	0.32 %
Mint Hill (Mecklenburg)	A	26,444	1,115,482	26,444	100.00 %	2.37 %
Mint Hill (Union)	M	6	260,322	6	100.00 %	0.00 %
Misenheimer	FF	650	88,255	650	100.00 %	0.74 %
Mocksville	G	5,900	452,605	5,900	100.00 %	1.30 %
Momeyer	P	277	173,754	277	100.00 %	0.16 %
Monroe	M	34,562	260,322	34,562	100.00 %	13.28 %
Montreat	N	901	269,452	901	100.00 %	0.33 %
Mooresboro	C	293	623,272	293	100.00 %	0.05 %
Mooresville	K	50,193	347,303	50,193	100.00 %	14.45 %
Morehead City	Q	9,556	168,406	9,556	100.00 %	5.67 %
Morganton	EE	17,474	87,570	17,474	100.00 %	19.95 %

District plan definition file: 'Duke_House 03.csv', modified 2/18/2022 10:53 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/18/2022

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: Duke_House 03

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Morrisville (Durham)	L	207	363,930	207	100.00 %	0.06 %
Morrisville (Wake)	B	29,423	1,129,410	29,423	100.00 %	2.61 %
Morven	M	329	260,322	329	100.00 %	0.13 %
Mount Airy	HH	10,676	173,772	10,676	100.00 %	6.14 %
Mount Gilead	FF	1,171	88,255	1,171	100.00 %	1.33 %
Mount Holly	C	17,703	623,272	17,703	100.00 %	2.84 %
Mount Olive (Duplin)	KK	5	166,048	5	100.00 %	0.00 %
Mount Olive (Wayne)	KK	4,193	166,048	4,193	100.00 %	2.53 %
Mount Pleasant	G	1,671	452,605	1,671	100.00 %	0.37 %
Murfreesboro	NN	2,619	82,953	2,619	100.00 %	3.16 %
Murphy	GG	1,608	84,907	1,608	100.00 %	1.89 %
Nags Head	MM	3,168	167,493	3,168	100.00 %	1.89 %
Nashville	P	5,632	173,754	5,632	100.00 %	3.24 %
Navassa	H	1,367	362,395	1,367	100.00 %	0.38 %
New Bern	Q	31,291	168,406	31,291	100.00 %	18.58 %
New London	FF	607	88,255	607	100.00 %	0.69 %
Newland	C	715	623,272	715	100.00 %	0.11 %
Newport	Q	4,364	168,406	4,364	100.00 %	2.59 %
Newton	K	13,148	347,303	13,148	100.00 %	3.79 %
Newton Grove	JJ	585	88,642	585	100.00 %	0.66 %
Norlina	DD	920	84,735	920	100.00 %	1.09 %
Norman	F	100	426,414	100	100.00 %	0.02 %
North Topsail Beach	LL	1,005	264,779	1,005	100.00 %	0.38 %
North Wilkesboro	HH	4,382	173,772	4,382	100.00 %	2.52 %
Northwest	H	703	362,395	703	100.00 %	0.19 %
Norwood	FF	2,367	88,255	2,367	100.00 %	2.68 %
Oak City	X	266	88,865	266	100.00 %	0.30 %
Oak Island	H	8,396	362,395	8,396	100.00 %	2.32 %
Oak Ridge	D	7,474	541,299	7,474	100.00 %	1.38 %
Oakboro	FF	2,128	88,255	2,128	100.00 %	2.41 %
Ocean Isle Beach	H	867	362,395	867	100.00 %	0.24 %
Old Fort	C	811	623,272	811	100.00 %	0.13 %
Oriental	MM	880	167,493	880	100.00 %	0.53 %
Orrum	O	59	167,153	59	100.00 %	0.04 %
Ossipee	U	536	171,415	536	100.00 %	0.31 %
Oxford	S	8,628	172,143	8,628	100.00 %	5.01 %
Pantego	MM	164	167,493	164	100.00 %	0.10 %
Parkton	O	504	167,153	504	100.00 %	0.30 %
Parmele	X	243	88,865	243	100.00 %	0.27 %
Patterson Springs	C	571	623,272	571	100.00 %	0.09 %
Peachland	M	390	260,322	390	100.00 %	0.15 %

District plan definition file: 'Duke_House 03.csv', modified 2/18/2022 10:53 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/18/2022

Municipality by County - District Report**District Plan: Duke_House 03**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Peletier	Q	769	168,406	769	100.00 %	0.46 %
Pembroke	O	2,823	167,153	2,823	100.00 %	1.69 %
Pikeville	KK	712	166,048	712	100.00 %	0.43 %
Pilot Mountain	HH	1,440	173,772	1,440	100.00 %	0.83 %
Pine Knoll Shores	Q	1,388	168,406	1,388	100.00 %	0.82 %
Pine Level	J	2,046	349,567	2,046	100.00 %	0.59 %
Pinebluff	F	1,473	426,414	1,473	100.00 %	0.35 %
Pinehurst	F	17,581	426,414	17,581	100.00 %	4.12 %
Pinetops	X	1,200	88,865	1,200	100.00 %	1.35 %
Pineville	A	10,602	1,115,482	10,602	100.00 %	0.95 %
Pink Hill	BB	451	84,745	451	100.00 %	0.53 %
Pittsboro	F	4,537	426,414	4,537	100.00 %	1.06 %
Pleasant Garden	D	5,000	541,299	5,000	100.00 %	0.92 %
Plymouth	MM	3,320	167,493	3,320	100.00 %	1.98 %
Polkton	M	2,250	260,322	2,250	100.00 %	0.86 %
Polkville	C	516	623,272	516	100.00 %	0.08 %
Pollocksville	BB	268	84,745	268	100.00 %	0.32 %
Powellsville	X	189	88,865	189	100.00 %	0.21 %
Princeton	J	1,315	349,567	1,315	100.00 %	0.38 %
Princeville	X	1,254	88,865	1,254	100.00 %	1.41 %
Proctorville	O	121	167,153	121	100.00 %	0.07 %
Raeford	Z	4,559	86,256	4,559	100.00 %	5.29 %
Raleigh (Durham)	L	1,559	363,930	1,559	100.00 %	0.43 %
Raleigh (Wake)	B	466,106	1,129,410	466,106	100.00 %	41.27 %
Ramseur	F	1,774	426,414	1,774	100.00 %	0.42 %
Randleman	F	4,595	426,414	4,595	100.00 %	1.08 %
Ranlo	C	4,511	623,272	4,511	100.00 %	0.72 %
Raynham	O	60	167,153	60	100.00 %	0.04 %
Red Cross	FF	762	88,255	762	100.00 %	0.86 %
Red Oak	P	3,342	173,754	3,342	100.00 %	1.92 %
Red Springs (Hoke)	Z	0	86,256	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Red Springs (Robeson)	O	3,087	167,153	3,087	100.00 %	1.85 %
Reidsville	W	14,583	91,096	14,583	100.00 %	16.01 %
Rennert	O	275	167,153	275	100.00 %	0.16 %
Rhodhiss (Burke)	EE	639	87,570	639	100.00 %	0.73 %
Rhodhiss (Caldwell)	II	358	172,203	358	100.00 %	0.21 %
Rich Square	DD	894	84,735	894	100.00 %	1.06 %
Richfield	FF	582	88,255	582	100.00 %	0.66 %
Richlands	LL	2,287	264,779	2,287	100.00 %	0.86 %
River Bend	Q	2,902	168,406	2,902	100.00 %	1.72 %
Roanoke Rapids	DD	15,229	84,735	15,229	100.00 %	17.97 %

District plan definition file: 'Duke_House 03.csv', modified 2/18/2022 10:53 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/18/2022

Municipality by County - District Report**District Plan: Duke_House 03**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Robbins	F	1,168	426,414	1,168	100.00 %	0.27 %
Robbinsville	GG	597	84,907	597	100.00 %	0.70 %
Robersonville	X	1,269	88,865	1,269	100.00 %	1.43 %
Rockingham	F	9,243	426,414	9,243	100.00 %	2.17 %
Rockwell	G	2,302	452,605	2,302	100.00 %	0.51 %
Rocky Mount (Edgecombe)	X	15,414	88,865	15,414	100.00 %	17.35 %
Rocky Mount (Nash)	P	38,927	173,754	38,927	100.00 %	22.40 %
Rolesville	B	9,475	1,129,410	9,475	100.00 %	0.84 %
Ronda	HH	438	173,772	438	100.00 %	0.25 %
Roper	MM	485	167,493	485	100.00 %	0.29 %
Rose Hill	KK	1,371	166,048	1,371	100.00 %	0.83 %
Roseboro	JJ	1,163	88,642	1,163	100.00 %	1.31 %
Rosman	CC	701	90,212	701	100.00 %	0.78 %
Rowland	O	885	167,153	885	100.00 %	0.53 %
Roxboro	L	8,134	363,930	8,134	100.00 %	2.24 %
Roxobel	X	187	88,865	187	100.00 %	0.21 %
Rural Hall	E	3,351	427,110	3,351	100.00 %	0.78 %
Ruth	C	347	623,272	347	100.00 %	0.06 %
Rutherford College (Burke)	EE	1,226	87,570	1,226	100.00 %	1.40 %
Rutherford College (Caldwell)	II	0	172,203	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Rutherfordton	C	3,640	623,272	3,640	100.00 %	0.58 %
Salemburg	JJ	457	88,642	457	100.00 %	0.52 %
Salisbury	G	35,540	452,605	35,540	100.00 %	7.85 %
Saluda (Henderson)	C	11	623,272	11	100.00 %	0.00 %
Saluda (Polk)	C	620	623,272	620	100.00 %	0.10 %
Sandy Creek	H	248	362,395	248	100.00 %	0.07 %
Sandyfield	O	430	167,153	430	100.00 %	0.26 %
Sanford	F	30,261	426,414	30,261	100.00 %	7.10 %
Saratoga	P	353	173,754	353	100.00 %	0.20 %
Sawmills	II	5,020	172,203	5,020	100.00 %	2.92 %
Scotland Neck	DD	1,640	84,735	1,640	100.00 %	1.94 %
Seaboard	DD	542	84,735	542	100.00 %	0.64 %
Seagrove	F	235	426,414	235	100.00 %	0.06 %
Sedalia	D	676	541,299	676	100.00 %	0.12 %
Selma	J	6,317	349,567	6,317	100.00 %	1.81 %
Seven Devils (Avery)	C	38	623,272	38	100.00 %	0.01 %
Seven Devils (Watauga)	II	275	172,203	275	100.00 %	0.16 %
Seven Springs	KK	55	166,048	55	100.00 %	0.03 %
Severn	DD	191	84,735	191	100.00 %	0.23 %
Shallotte	H	4,185	362,395	4,185	100.00 %	1.15 %
Sharpsburg (Edgecombe)	X	215	88,865	215	100.00 %	0.24 %

District plan definition file: 'Duke_House 03.csv', modified 2/18/2022 10:53 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/18/2022

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: Duke_House 03

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Sharpsburg (Nash)	P	1,061	173,754	1,061	100.00 %	0.61 %
Sharpsburg (Wilson)	P	421	173,754	421	100.00 %	0.24 %
Shelby	C	21,918	623,272	21,918	100.00 %	3.52 %
Siler City	F	7,702	426,414	7,702	100.00 %	1.81 %
Simpson	T	390	170,243	390	100.00 %	0.23 %
Sims	P	275	173,754	275	100.00 %	0.16 %
Smithfield	J	11,292	349,567	11,292	100.00 %	3.23 %
Snow Hill	BB	1,481	84,745	1,481	100.00 %	1.75 %
Southern Pines	F	15,545	426,414	15,545	100.00 %	3.65 %
Southern Shores	MM	3,090	167,493	3,090	100.00 %	1.84 %
Southport	H	3,971	362,395	3,971	100.00 %	1.10 %
Sparta	II	1,834	172,203	1,834	100.00 %	1.07 %
Speed	X	63	88,865	63	100.00 %	0.07 %
Spencer	G	3,308	452,605	3,308	100.00 %	0.73 %
Spencer Mountain	C	0	623,272	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Spindale	C	4,225	623,272	4,225	100.00 %	0.68 %
Spring Hope	P	1,309	173,754	1,309	100.00 %	0.75 %
Spring Lake	I	11,660	334,728	11,660	100.00 %	3.48 %
Spruce Pine	C	2,194	623,272	2,194	100.00 %	0.35 %
St. Helena	LL	417	264,779	417	100.00 %	0.16 %
St. James	H	6,529	362,395	6,529	100.00 %	1.80 %
St. Pauls	O	2,045	167,153	2,045	100.00 %	1.22 %
Staley	F	397	426,414	397	100.00 %	0.09 %
Stallings (Mecklenburg)	A	384	1,115,482	384	100.00 %	0.03 %
Stallings (Union)	M	15,728	260,322	15,728	100.00 %	6.04 %
Stanfield	FF	1,585	88,255	1,585	100.00 %	1.80 %
Stanley	C	3,963	623,272	3,963	100.00 %	0.64 %
Stantonsburg	P	762	173,754	762	100.00 %	0.44 %
Star	FF	806	88,255	806	100.00 %	0.91 %
Statesville	K	28,419	347,303	28,419	100.00 %	8.18 %
Stedman	I	1,277	334,728	1,277	100.00 %	0.38 %
Stem	S	960	172,143	960	100.00 %	0.56 %
Stokesdale	D	5,924	541,299	5,924	100.00 %	1.09 %
Stoneville	W	1,308	91,096	1,308	100.00 %	1.44 %
Stonewall	MM	214	167,493	214	100.00 %	0.13 %
Stovall	S	324	172,143	324	100.00 %	0.19 %
Sugar Mountain	C	371	623,272	371	100.00 %	0.06 %
Summerfield	D	10,951	541,299	10,951	100.00 %	2.02 %
Sunset Beach	H	4,175	362,395	4,175	100.00 %	1.15 %
Surf City (Onslow)	LL	334	264,779	334	100.00 %	0.13 %
Surf City (Pender)	LL	3,533	264,779	3,533	100.00 %	1.33 %

District plan definition file: 'Duke_House 03.csv', modified 2/18/2022 10:53 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/18/2022

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: Duke_House 03

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Swansboro	LL	3,744	264,779	3,744	100.00 %	1.41 %
Sweptsonville	U	2,445	171,415	2,445	100.00 %	1.43 %
Sylva	CC	2,578	90,212	2,578	100.00 %	2.86 %
Tabor City	O	3,781	167,153	3,781	100.00 %	2.26 %
Tar Heel	JJ	90	88,642	90	100.00 %	0.10 %
Tarboro	X	10,721	88,865	10,721	100.00 %	12.06 %
Taylorsville	HH	2,320	173,772	2,320	100.00 %	1.34 %
Taylortown	F	634	426,414	634	100.00 %	0.15 %
Teachey	KK	448	166,048	448	100.00 %	0.27 %
Thomasville (Davidson)	R	26,662	168,930	26,662	100.00 %	15.78 %
Thomasville (Randolph)	F	521	426,414	521	100.00 %	0.12 %
Tobaccoville (Forsyth)	E	2,578	427,110	2,578	100.00 %	0.60 %
Tobaccoville (Stokes)	E	0	427,110	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Topsail Beach	LL	461	264,779	461	100.00 %	0.17 %
Trent Woods	Q	4,074	168,406	4,074	100.00 %	2.42 %
Trenton	BB	238	84,745	238	100.00 %	0.28 %
Trinity	F	7,006	426,414	7,006	100.00 %	1.64 %
Troutman	K	3,698	347,303	3,698	100.00 %	1.06 %
Troy	FF	2,850	88,255	2,850	100.00 %	3.23 %
Tryon	C	1,562	623,272	1,562	100.00 %	0.25 %
Turkey	JJ	213	88,642	213	100.00 %	0.24 %
Unionville	M	6,643	260,322	6,643	100.00 %	2.55 %
Valdese	EE	4,689	87,570	4,689	100.00 %	5.35 %
Vanceboro	Q	869	168,406	869	100.00 %	0.52 %
Vandemere	MM	246	167,493	246	100.00 %	0.15 %
Varnamtown	H	525	362,395	525	100.00 %	0.14 %
Vass	F	952	426,414	952	100.00 %	0.22 %
Waco	C	310	623,272	310	100.00 %	0.05 %
Wade	I	638	334,728	638	100.00 %	0.19 %
Wadesboro	M	5,008	260,322	5,008	100.00 %	1.92 %
Wagram	Z	615	86,256	615	100.00 %	0.71 %
Wake Forest (Franklin)	S	1,504	172,143	1,504	100.00 %	0.87 %
Wake Forest (Wake)	B	46,097	1,129,410	46,097	100.00 %	4.08 %
Walkertown	E	5,692	427,110	5,692	100.00 %	1.33 %
Wallace (Duplin)	KK	3,413	166,048	3,413	100.00 %	2.06 %
Wallace (Pender)	LL	0	264,779	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Wallburg	R	3,051	168,930	3,051	100.00 %	1.81 %
Walnut Cove	E	1,586	427,110	1,586	100.00 %	0.37 %
Walnut Creek	KK	1,084	166,048	1,084	100.00 %	0.65 %
Walstonburg	BB	193	84,745	193	100.00 %	0.23 %
Warrenton	DD	851	84,735	851	100.00 %	1.00 %

District plan definition file: 'Duke_House 03.csv', modified 2/18/2022 10:53 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/18/2022

Municipality by County - District Report**District Plan: Duke_House 03**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Warsaw	KK	2,733	166,048	2,733	100.00 %	1.65 %
Washington	MM	9,875	167,493	9,875	100.00 %	5.90 %
Washington Park	MM	392	167,493	392	100.00 %	0.23 %
Watha	LL	181	264,779	181	100.00 %	0.07 %
Waxhaw	M	20,534	260,322	20,534	100.00 %	7.89 %
Waynesville	AA	10,140	83,282	10,140	100.00 %	12.18 %
Weaverville	N	4,567	269,452	4,567	100.00 %	1.69 %
Webster	CC	372	90,212	372	100.00 %	0.41 %
Weddington (Mecklenburg)	A	5	1,115,482	5	100.00 %	0.00 %
Weddington (Union)	M	13,176	260,322	13,176	100.00 %	5.06 %
Weldon	DD	1,444	84,735	1,444	100.00 %	1.70 %
Wendell	B	9,793	1,129,410	9,793	100.00 %	0.87 %
Wentworth	W	2,662	91,096	2,662	100.00 %	2.92 %
Wesley Chapel	M	8,681	260,322	8,681	100.00 %	3.33 %
West Jefferson	II	1,279	172,203	1,279	100.00 %	0.74 %
Whispering Pines	F	4,987	426,414	4,987	100.00 %	1.17 %
Whitakers (Edgecombe)	X	290	88,865	290	100.00 %	0.33 %
Whitakers (Nash)	P	337	173,754	337	100.00 %	0.19 %
White Lake	JJ	843	88,642	843	100.00 %	0.95 %
Whiteville	O	4,766	167,153	4,766	100.00 %	2.85 %
Whitsett	D	584	541,299	584	100.00 %	0.11 %
Wilkesboro	HH	3,687	173,772	3,687	100.00 %	2.12 %
Williamston	X	5,248	88,865	5,248	100.00 %	5.91 %
Wilmington	H	115,451	362,395	115,451	100.00 %	31.86 %
Wilson	P	47,851	173,754	47,851	100.00 %	27.54 %
Wilson's Mills	J	2,534	349,567	2,534	100.00 %	0.72 %
Windsor	X	3,582	88,865	3,582	100.00 %	4.03 %
Winfall	MM	555	167,493	555	100.00 %	0.33 %
Wingate	M	4,055	260,322	4,055	100.00 %	1.56 %
Winston-Salem	E	249,545	427,110	249,545	100.00 %	58.43 %
Winterville	T	10,462	170,243	10,462	100.00 %	6.15 %
Winton	NN	629	82,953	629	100.00 %	0.76 %
Woodfin	N	7,936	269,452	7,936	100.00 %	2.95 %
Woodland	DD	557	84,735	557	100.00 %	0.66 %
Wrightsville Beach	H	2,473	362,395	2,473	100.00 %	0.68 %
Yadkinville	G	2,995	452,605	2,995	100.00 %	0.66 %
Yanceyville	V	1,937	171,432	1,937	100.00 %	1.13 %
Youngsville	S	2,016	172,143	2,016	100.00 %	1.17 %
Zebulon (Johnston)	J	0	349,567	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Zebulon (Wake)	B	6,903	1,129,410	6,903	100.00 %	0.61 %

District plan definition file: 'Duke_House 03.csv', modified 2/18/2022 10:53 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/18/2022

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: Duke_House 03

Assigned Geography Total: 6,017,605

Report display: all municipalities

Total Municipalities (by County) Statewide: 614

Fully Assigned Municipalities: 614

Partially Assigned Municipalities: 0

Fully Unassigned Municipalities: 0

Total Districts Assigned: 40

Split Municipalities: 0

Splits Involving Population: 0

District - Municipality by County Report**District Plan: Duke_House 03**

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
AA	Canton	83,282	4,422	4,422	5.31 %	100.00 %
A	Charlotte	1,115,482	874,579	874,579	78.40 %	100.00 %
AA	Clyde	83,282	1,368	1,368	1.64 %	100.00 %
A	Cornelius	1,115,482	31,412	31,412	2.82 %	100.00 %
	Davidson (Mecklenburg)	1,115,482	14,728	14,728	1.32 %	100.00 %
AA	Hot Springs	83,282	520	520	0.62 %	100.00 %
A	Huntersville	1,115,482	61,376	61,376	5.50 %	100.00 %
AA	Maggie Valley	83,282	1,687	1,687	2.03 %	100.00 %
	Mars Hill	83,282	2,007	2,007	2.41 %	100.00 %
	Marshall	83,282	777	777	0.93 %	100.00 %
A	Matthews	1,115,482	29,435	29,435	2.64 %	100.00 %
	Midland (Mecklenburg)	1,115,482	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Mint Hill (Mecklenburg)	1,115,482	26,444	26,444	2.37 %	100.00 %
	Pineville	1,115,482	10,602	10,602	0.95 %	100.00 %
	Stallings (Mecklenburg)	1,115,482	384	384	0.03 %	100.00 %
AA	Waynesville	83,282	10,140	10,140	12.18 %	100.00 %
A	Weddington (Mecklenburg)	1,115,482	5	5	0.00 %	100.00 %
B	Angier (Wake)	1,129,410	556	556	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Apex	1,129,410	58,780	58,780	5.20 %	100.00 %
	Cary (Wake)	1,129,410	171,012	171,012	15.14 %	100.00 %
	Clayton (Wake)	1,129,410	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Durham (Wake)	1,129,410	269	269	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Fuquay-Varina (Wake)	1,129,410	34,152	34,152	3.02 %	100.00 %
	Garner	1,129,410	31,159	31,159	2.76 %	100.00 %
BB	Grifton (Lenoir)	84,745	147	147	0.17 %	100.00 %
B	Holly Springs	1,129,410	41,239	41,239	3.65 %	100.00 %
BB	Hookerton	84,745	413	413	0.49 %	100.00 %
	Kinston	84,745	19,900	19,900	23.48 %	100.00 %
B	Knightdale	1,129,410	19,435	19,435	1.72 %	100.00 %
BB	La Grange	84,745	2,595	2,595	3.06 %	100.00 %
	Maysville	84,745	818	818	0.97 %	100.00 %
B	Morrisville (Wake)	1,129,410	29,423	29,423	2.61 %	100.00 %
BB	Pink Hill	84,745	451	451	0.53 %	100.00 %
	Pollocksville	84,745	268	268	0.32 %	100.00 %
B	Raleigh (Wake)	1,129,410	466,106	466,106	41.27 %	100.00 %
	Rolesville	1,129,410	9,475	9,475	0.84 %	100.00 %
BB	Snow Hill	84,745	1,481	1,481	1.75 %	100.00 %
	Trenton	84,745	238	238	0.28 %	100.00 %
B	Wake Forest (Wake)	1,129,410	46,097	46,097	4.08 %	100.00 %
BB	Walstonburg	84,745	193	193	0.23 %	100.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report**District Plan: Duke_House 03**

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
B	Wendell	1,129,410	9,793	9,793	0.87 %	100.00 %
	Zebulon (Wake)	1,129,410	6,903	6,903	0.61 %	100.00 %
C	Bakersville	623,272	450	450	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Banner Elk	623,272	1,049	1,049	0.17 %	100.00 %
	Beech Mountain (Avery)	623,272	62	62	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Belmont	623,272	15,010	15,010	2.41 %	100.00 %
	Belwood	623,272	857	857	0.14 %	100.00 %
	Bessemer City	623,272	5,428	5,428	0.87 %	100.00 %
	Boiling Springs	623,272	4,615	4,615	0.74 %	100.00 %
	Bostic	623,272	355	355	0.06 %	100.00 %
CC	Brevard	90,212	7,744	7,744	8.58 %	100.00 %
	Bryson City	90,212	1,558	1,558	1.73 %	100.00 %
C	Burnsville	623,272	1,614	1,614	0.26 %	100.00 %
	Casar	623,272	305	305	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Cherryville	623,272	6,078	6,078	0.98 %	100.00 %
	Chimney Rock Village	623,272	140	140	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Columbus	623,272	1,060	1,060	0.17 %	100.00 %
	Cramerton	623,272	5,296	5,296	0.85 %	100.00 %
	Crossnore	623,272	143	143	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Dallas	623,272	5,927	5,927	0.95 %	100.00 %
	Dellview	623,272	6	6	0.00 %	100.00 %
CC	Dillsboro	90,212	213	213	0.24 %	100.00 %
C	Earl	623,272	198	198	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Elk Park	623,272	542	542	0.09 %	100.00 %
	Ellenboro	623,272	723	723	0.12 %	100.00 %
	Fallston	623,272	627	627	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Flat Rock	623,272	3,486	3,486	0.56 %	100.00 %
	Fletcher	623,272	7,987	7,987	1.28 %	100.00 %
	Forest City	623,272	7,377	7,377	1.18 %	100.00 %
CC	Forest Hills	90,212	303	303	0.34 %	100.00 %
C	Gastonia	623,272	80,411	80,411	12.90 %	100.00 %
	Grandfather Village	623,272	95	95	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Grover	623,272	802	802	0.13 %	100.00 %
	Hendersonville	623,272	15,137	15,137	2.43 %	100.00 %
	High Shoals	623,272	595	595	0.10 %	100.00 %
CC	Highlands (Jackson)	90,212	12	12	0.01 %	100.00 %
C	Kings Mountain (Cleveland)	623,272	10,032	10,032	1.61 %	100.00 %
	Kings Mountain (Gaston)	623,272	1,110	1,110	0.18 %	100.00 %
	Kingstown	623,272	656	656	0.11 %	100.00 %
	Lake Lure	623,272	1,365	1,365	0.22 %	100.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report**District Plan: Duke_House 03**

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
C	Lattimore	623,272	406	406	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Laurel Park	623,272	2,250	2,250	0.36 %	100.00 %
	Lawndale	623,272	570	570	0.09 %	100.00 %
	Lowell	623,272	3,654	3,654	0.59 %	100.00 %
	Marion	623,272	7,717	7,717	1.24 %	100.00 %
	McAdenville	623,272	890	890	0.14 %	100.00 %
	Mills River	623,272	7,078	7,078	1.14 %	100.00 %
	Mooresboro	623,272	293	293	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Mount Holly	623,272	17,703	17,703	2.84 %	100.00 %
	Newland	623,272	715	715	0.11 %	100.00 %
	Old Fort	623,272	811	811	0.13 %	100.00 %
	Patterson Springs	623,272	571	571	0.09 %	100.00 %
	Polkville	623,272	516	516	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Ranlo	623,272	4,511	4,511	0.72 %	100.00 %
CC	Rosman	90,212	701	701	0.78 %	100.00 %
C	Ruth	623,272	347	347	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Rutherfordton	623,272	3,640	3,640	0.58 %	100.00 %
	Saluda (Henderson)	623,272	11	11	0.00 %	100.00 %
	Saluda (Polk)	623,272	620	620	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Seven Devils (Avery)	623,272	38	38	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Shelby	623,272	21,918	21,918	3.52 %	100.00 %
	Spencer Mountain	623,272	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Spindale	623,272	4,225	4,225	0.68 %	100.00 %
	Spruce Pine	623,272	2,194	2,194	0.35 %	100.00 %
	Stanley	623,272	3,963	3,963	0.64 %	100.00 %
	Sugar Mountain	623,272	371	371	0.06 %	100.00 %
CC	Sylva	90,212	2,578	2,578	2.86 %	100.00 %
C	Tryon	623,272	1,562	1,562	0.25 %	100.00 %
	Waco	623,272	310	310	0.05 %	100.00 %
CC	Webster	90,212	372	372	0.41 %	100.00 %
D	Archdale (Guilford)	541,299	380	380	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Burlington (Guilford)	541,299	1,822	1,822	0.34 %	100.00 %
DD	Conway	84,735	752	752	0.89 %	100.00 %
	Enfield	84,735	1,865	1,865	2.20 %	100.00 %
	Garysburg	84,735	904	904	1.07 %	100.00 %
	Gaston	84,735	1,008	1,008	1.19 %	100.00 %
D	Gibsonville (Guilford)	541,299	4,642	4,642	0.86 %	100.00 %
	Greensboro	541,299	299,035	299,035	55.24 %	100.00 %
DD	Halifax	84,735	170	170	0.20 %	100.00 %
D	High Point (Guilford)	541,299	107,321	107,321	19.83 %	100.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: Duke_House 03

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
DD	Hobgood	84,735	268	268	0.32 %	100.00 %
	Jackson	84,735	430	430	0.51 %	100.00 %
D	Jamestown	541,299	3,668	3,668	0.68 %	100.00 %
	Kernersville (Guilford)	541,299	502	502	0.09 %	100.00 %
DD	Lasker	84,735	64	64	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Littleton	84,735	559	559	0.66 %	100.00 %
	Macon	84,735	110	110	0.13 %	100.00 %
	Norlina	84,735	920	920	1.09 %	100.00 %
D	Oak Ridge	541,299	7,474	7,474	1.38 %	100.00 %
	Pleasant Garden	541,299	5,000	5,000	0.92 %	100.00 %
DD	Rich Square	84,735	894	894	1.06 %	100.00 %
	Roanoke Rapids	84,735	15,229	15,229	17.97 %	100.00 %
	Scotland Neck	84,735	1,640	1,640	1.94 %	100.00 %
	Seaboard	84,735	542	542	0.64 %	100.00 %
D	Sedalia	541,299	676	676	0.12 %	100.00 %
DD	Severn	84,735	191	191	0.23 %	100.00 %
D	Stokesdale	541,299	5,924	5,924	1.09 %	100.00 %
	Summerfield	541,299	10,951	10,951	2.02 %	100.00 %
DD	Warrenton	84,735	851	851	1.00 %	100.00 %
	Weldon	84,735	1,444	1,444	1.70 %	100.00 %
D	Whitsett	541,299	584	584	0.11 %	100.00 %
DD	Woodland	84,735	557	557	0.66 %	100.00 %
E	Bethania	427,110	344	344	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Clemmons	427,110	21,163	21,163	4.95 %	100.00 %
EE	Connelly Springs	87,570	1,529	1,529	1.75 %	100.00 %
E	Danbury	427,110	189	189	0.04 %	100.00 %
EE	Drexel	87,570	1,760	1,760	2.01 %	100.00 %
	Glen Alpine	87,570	1,529	1,529	1.75 %	100.00 %
	Hickory (Burke)	87,570	79	79	0.09 %	100.00 %
E	High Point (Forsyth)	427,110	84	84	0.02 %	100.00 %
EE	Hildebran	87,570	1,679	1,679	1.92 %	100.00 %
E	Kernersville (Forsyth)	427,110	25,947	25,947	6.08 %	100.00 %
	King (Forsyth)	427,110	591	591	0.14 %	100.00 %
	King (Stokes)	427,110	6,606	6,606	1.55 %	100.00 %
	Lewisville	427,110	13,381	13,381	3.13 %	100.00 %
EE	Long View (Burke)	87,570	735	735	0.84 %	100.00 %
	Morganton	87,570	17,474	17,474	19.95 %	100.00 %
	Rhodhiss (Burke)	87,570	639	639	0.73 %	100.00 %
E	Rural Hall	427,110	3,351	3,351	0.78 %	100.00 %
EE	Rutherford College (Burke)	87,570	1,226	1,226	1.40 %	100.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report**District Plan: Duke_House 03**

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
E	Tobaccoville (Forsyth)	427,110	2,578	2,578	0.60 %	100.00 %
	Tobaccoville (Stokes)	427,110	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
EE	Valdese	87,570	4,689	4,689	5.35 %	100.00 %
E	Walkertown	427,110	5,692	5,692	1.33 %	100.00 %
	Walnut Cove	427,110	1,586	1,586	0.37 %	100.00 %
	Winston-Salem	427,110	249,545	249,545	58.43 %	100.00 %
F	Aberdeen	426,414	8,516	8,516	2.00 %	100.00 %
FF	Albemarle	88,255	16,432	16,432	18.62 %	100.00 %
F	Archdale (Randolph)	426,414	11,527	11,527	2.70 %	100.00 %
	Asheboro	426,414	27,156	27,156	6.37 %	100.00 %
FF	Badin	88,255	2,024	2,024	2.29 %	100.00 %
	Biscoe	88,255	1,848	1,848	2.09 %	100.00 %
F	Broadway (Lee)	426,414	1,267	1,267	0.30 %	100.00 %
	Cameron	426,414	244	244	0.06 %	100.00 %
FF	Candor (Montgomery)	88,255	813	813	0.92 %	100.00 %
F	Candor (Moore)	426,414	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Carthage	426,414	2,775	2,775	0.65 %	100.00 %
	Cary (Chatham)	426,414	3,709	3,709	0.87 %	100.00 %
	Dobbins Heights	426,414	687	687	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Ellerbe	426,414	864	864	0.20 %	100.00 %
	Foxfire	426,414	1,288	1,288	0.30 %	100.00 %
	Franklinville	426,414	1,197	1,197	0.28 %	100.00 %
	Goldston	426,414	234	234	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Hamlet	426,414	6,025	6,025	1.41 %	100.00 %
	High Point (Randolph)	426,414	8	8	0.00 %	100.00 %
	Hoffman	426,414	418	418	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Liberty	426,414	2,655	2,655	0.62 %	100.00 %
FF	Locust (Stanly)	88,255	3,996	3,996	4.53 %	100.00 %
	Misenheimer	88,255	650	650	0.74 %	100.00 %
	Mount Gilead	88,255	1,171	1,171	1.33 %	100.00 %
	New London	88,255	607	607	0.69 %	100.00 %
F	Norman	426,414	100	100	0.02 %	100.00 %
FF	Norwood	88,255	2,367	2,367	2.68 %	100.00 %
	Oakboro	88,255	2,128	2,128	2.41 %	100.00 %
F	Pinebluff	426,414	1,473	1,473	0.35 %	100.00 %
	Pinehurst	426,414	17,581	17,581	4.12 %	100.00 %
	Pittsboro	426,414	4,537	4,537	1.06 %	100.00 %
	Ramseur	426,414	1,774	1,774	0.42 %	100.00 %
	Randleman	426,414	4,595	4,595	1.08 %	100.00 %
FF	Red Cross	88,255	762	762	0.86 %	100.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report**District Plan: Duke_House 03**

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
FF	Richfield	88,255	582	582	0.66 %	100.00 %
F	Robbins	426,414	1,168	1,168	0.27 %	100.00 %
	Rockingham	426,414	9,243	9,243	2.17 %	100.00 %
	Sanford	426,414	30,261	30,261	7.10 %	100.00 %
	Seagrove	426,414	235	235	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Siler City	426,414	7,702	7,702	1.81 %	100.00 %
	Southern Pines	426,414	15,545	15,545	3.65 %	100.00 %
	Staley	426,414	397	397	0.09 %	100.00 %
	Stanfield	88,255	1,585	1,585	1.80 %	100.00 %
FF	Star	88,255	806	806	0.91 %	100.00 %
F	Taylortown	426,414	634	634	0.15 %	100.00 %
	Thomasville (Randolph)	426,414	521	521	0.12 %	100.00 %
	Trinity	426,414	7,006	7,006	1.64 %	100.00 %
FF	Troy	88,255	2,850	2,850	3.23 %	100.00 %
F	Vass	426,414	952	952	0.22 %	100.00 %
	Whispering Pines	426,414	4,987	4,987	1.17 %	100.00 %
GG	Andrews	84,907	1,667	1,667	1.96 %	100.00 %
G	Bermuda Run	452,605	3,120	3,120	0.69 %	100.00 %
	Boonville	452,605	1,185	1,185	0.26 %	100.00 %
	China Grove	452,605	4,434	4,434	0.98 %	100.00 %
	Cleveland	452,605	846	846	0.19 %	100.00 %
	Concord	452,605	105,240	105,240	23.25 %	100.00 %
	Cooleemee	452,605	940	940	0.21 %	100.00 %
	East Bend	452,605	634	634	0.14 %	100.00 %
	East Spencer	452,605	1,567	1,567	0.35 %	100.00 %
	Faith	452,605	819	819	0.18 %	100.00 %
GG	Fontana Dam	84,907	13	13	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Franklin	84,907	4,175	4,175	4.92 %	100.00 %
G	Granite Quarry	452,605	2,984	2,984	0.66 %	100.00 %
	Harrisburg	452,605	18,967	18,967	4.19 %	100.00 %
GG	Hayesville	84,907	461	461	0.54 %	100.00 %
	Highlands (Macon)	84,907	1,060	1,060	1.25 %	100.00 %
G	Jonesville	452,605	2,308	2,308	0.51 %	100.00 %
	Kannapolis (Cabarrus)	452,605	42,846	42,846	9.47 %	100.00 %
	Kannapolis (Rowan)	452,605	10,268	10,268	2.27 %	100.00 %
GG	Lake Santeetlah	84,907	38	38	0.04 %	100.00 %
G	Landis	452,605	3,690	3,690	0.82 %	100.00 %
	Locust (Cabarrus)	452,605	541	541	0.12 %	100.00 %
	Midland (Cabarrus)	452,605	4,684	4,684	1.03 %	100.00 %
	Mocksville	452,605	5,900	5,900	1.30 %	100.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: Duke_House 03

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
G	Mount Pleasant	452,605	1,671	1,671	0.37 %	100.00 %
GG	Murphy	84,907	1,608	1,608	1.89 %	100.00 %
	Robbinsville	84,907	597	597	0.70 %	100.00 %
G	Rockwell	452,605	2,302	2,302	0.51 %	100.00 %
	Salisbury	452,605	35,540	35,540	7.85 %	100.00 %
	Spencer	452,605	3,308	3,308	0.73 %	100.00 %
	Yadkinville	452,605	2,995	2,995	0.66 %	100.00 %
H	Bald Head Island	362,395	268	268	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Belville	362,395	2,406	2,406	0.66 %	100.00 %
	Boiling Spring Lakes	362,395	5,943	5,943	1.64 %	100.00 %
	Bolivia	362,395	149	149	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Calabash	362,395	2,011	2,011	0.55 %	100.00 %
	Carolina Beach	362,395	6,564	6,564	1.81 %	100.00 %
	Carolina Shores	362,395	4,588	4,588	1.27 %	100.00 %
	Caswell Beach	362,395	395	395	0.11 %	100.00 %
HH	Dobson	173,772	1,462	1,462	0.84 %	100.00 %
	Elkin (Surry)	173,772	4,049	4,049	2.33 %	100.00 %
	Elkin (Wilkes)	173,772	73	73	0.04 %	100.00 %
H	Holden Beach	362,395	921	921	0.25 %	100.00 %
	Kure Beach	362,395	2,191	2,191	0.60 %	100.00 %
	Leland	362,395	22,908	22,908	6.32 %	100.00 %
HH	Mount Airy	173,772	10,676	10,676	6.14 %	100.00 %
H	Navassa	362,395	1,367	1,367	0.38 %	100.00 %
HH	North Wilkesboro	173,772	4,382	4,382	2.52 %	100.00 %
H	Northwest	362,395	703	703	0.19 %	100.00 %
	Oak Island	362,395	8,396	8,396	2.32 %	100.00 %
	Ocean Isle Beach	362,395	867	867	0.24 %	100.00 %
HH	Pilot Mountain	173,772	1,440	1,440	0.83 %	100.00 %
	Ronda	173,772	438	438	0.25 %	100.00 %
H	Sandy Creek	362,395	248	248	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Shallotte	362,395	4,185	4,185	1.15 %	100.00 %
	Southport	362,395	3,971	3,971	1.10 %	100.00 %
	St. James	362,395	6,529	6,529	1.80 %	100.00 %
	Sunset Beach	362,395	4,175	4,175	1.15 %	100.00 %
HH	Taylorsville	173,772	2,320	2,320	1.34 %	100.00 %
H	Varnamtown	362,395	525	525	0.14 %	100.00 %
HH	Wilkesboro	173,772	3,687	3,687	2.12 %	100.00 %
H	Wilmington	362,395	115,451	115,451	31.86 %	100.00 %
	Wrightsville Beach	362,395	2,473	2,473	0.68 %	100.00 %
II	Beech Mountain (Watauga)	172,203	613	613	0.36 %	100.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: Duke_House 03

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
II	Blowing Rock (Caldwell)	172,203	91	91	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Blowing Rock (Watauga)	172,203	1,285	1,285	0.75 %	100.00 %
	Boone	172,203	19,092	19,092	11.09 %	100.00 %
	Cajah's Mountain	172,203	2,722	2,722	1.58 %	100.00 %
	Cedar Rock	172,203	301	301	0.17 %	100.00 %
I	Eastover	334,728	3,656	3,656	1.09 %	100.00 %
	Falcon (Cumberland)	334,728	324	324	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Fayetteville	334,728	208,501	208,501	62.29 %	100.00 %
II	Gamewell	172,203	3,702	3,702	2.15 %	100.00 %
I	Godwin	334,728	128	128	0.04 %	100.00 %
II	Granite Falls	172,203	4,965	4,965	2.88 %	100.00 %
	Hickory (Caldwell)	172,203	32	32	0.02 %	100.00 %
I	Hope Mills	334,728	17,808	17,808	5.32 %	100.00 %
II	Hudson	172,203	3,780	3,780	2.20 %	100.00 %
	Jefferson	172,203	1,622	1,622	0.94 %	100.00 %
	Lansing	172,203	126	126	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Lenoir	172,203	18,352	18,352	10.66 %	100.00 %
I	Linden	334,728	136	136	0.04 %	100.00 %
II	Rhodhiss (Caldwell)	172,203	358	358	0.21 %	100.00 %
	Rutherford College (Caldwell)	172,203	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Sawmills	172,203	5,020	5,020	2.92 %	100.00 %
	Seven Devils (Watauga)	172,203	275	275	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Sparta	172,203	1,834	1,834	1.07 %	100.00 %
I	Spring Lake	334,728	11,660	11,660	3.48 %	100.00 %
	Stedman	334,728	1,277	1,277	0.38 %	100.00 %
	Wade	334,728	638	638	0.19 %	100.00 %
II	West Jefferson	172,203	1,279	1,279	0.74 %	100.00 %
J	Angier (Harnett)	349,567	4,709	4,709	1.35 %	100.00 %
	Archer Lodge	349,567	4,797	4,797	1.37 %	100.00 %
JJ	Autryville	88,642	167	167	0.19 %	100.00 %
J	Benson (Harnett)	349,567	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Benson (Johnston)	349,567	3,967	3,967	1.13 %	100.00 %
JJ	Bladenboro	88,642	1,648	1,648	1.86 %	100.00 %
J	Broadway (Harnett)	349,567	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
JJ	Clarkton	88,642	614	614	0.69 %	100.00 %
J	Clayton (Johnston)	349,567	26,307	26,307	7.53 %	100.00 %
JJ	Clinton	88,642	8,383	8,383	9.46 %	100.00 %
J	Coats	349,567	2,155	2,155	0.62 %	100.00 %
JJ	Dublin	88,642	267	267	0.30 %	100.00 %
J	Dunn	349,567	8,446	8,446	2.42 %	100.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: Duke_House 03

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
JJ	East Arcadia	88,642	418	418	0.47 %	100.00 %
	Elizabethtown	88,642	3,296	3,296	3.72 %	100.00 %
J	Erwin	349,567	4,542	4,542	1.30 %	100.00 %
JJ	Faison (Sampson)	88,642	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Falcon (Sampson)	88,642	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
J	Four Oaks	349,567	2,158	2,158	0.62 %	100.00 %
	Fuquay-Varina (Harnett)	349,567	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
JJ	Garland	88,642	595	595	0.67 %	100.00 %
	Harrells (Sampson)	88,642	160	160	0.18 %	100.00 %
J	Kenly (Johnston)	349,567	1,293	1,293	0.37 %	100.00 %
	Lillington	349,567	4,735	4,735	1.35 %	100.00 %
	Micro	349,567	458	458	0.13 %	100.00 %
JJ	Newton Grove	88,642	585	585	0.66 %	100.00 %
J	Pine Level	349,567	2,046	2,046	0.59 %	100.00 %
	Princeton	349,567	1,315	1,315	0.38 %	100.00 %
JJ	Roseboro	88,642	1,163	1,163	1.31 %	100.00 %
	Salemburg	88,642	457	457	0.52 %	100.00 %
J	Selma	349,567	6,317	6,317	1.81 %	100.00 %
	Smithfield	349,567	11,292	11,292	3.23 %	100.00 %
JJ	Tar Heel	88,642	90	90	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Turkey	88,642	213	213	0.24 %	100.00 %
	White Lake	88,642	843	843	0.95 %	100.00 %
J	Wilson's Mills	349,567	2,534	2,534	0.72 %	100.00 %
	Zebulon (Johnston)	349,567	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
KK	Beulaville	166,048	1,116	1,116	0.67 %	100.00 %
K	Brookford	347,303	442	442	0.13 %	100.00 %
KK	Calypso	166,048	327	327	0.20 %	100.00 %
K	Catawba	347,303	702	702	0.20 %	100.00 %
	Claremont	347,303	1,692	1,692	0.49 %	100.00 %
	Conover	347,303	8,421	8,421	2.42 %	100.00 %
	Davidson (Iredell)	347,303	378	378	0.11 %	100.00 %
KK	Eureka	166,048	214	214	0.13 %	100.00 %
	Faison (Duplin)	166,048	784	784	0.47 %	100.00 %
	Fremont	166,048	1,196	1,196	0.72 %	100.00 %
	Goldsboro	166,048	33,657	33,657	20.27 %	100.00 %
	Greenevers	166,048	567	567	0.34 %	100.00 %
K	Harmony	347,303	543	543	0.16 %	100.00 %
KK	Harrells (Duplin)	166,048	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
K	Hickory (Catawba)	347,303	43,379	43,379	12.49 %	100.00 %
KK	Kenansville	166,048	770	770	0.46 %	100.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: Duke_House 03

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
K	Long View (Catawba)	347,303	4,353	4,353	1.25 %	100.00 %
	Love Valley	347,303	154	154	0.04 %	100.00 %
KK	Magnolia	166,048	831	831	0.50 %	100.00 %
K	Maiden (Catawba)	347,303	3,736	3,736	1.08 %	100.00 %
	Mooresville	347,303	50,193	50,193	14.45 %	100.00 %
KK	Mount Olive (Duplin)	166,048	5	5	0.00 %	100.00 %
	Mount Olive (Wayne)	166,048	4,193	4,193	2.53 %	100.00 %
K	Newton	347,303	13,148	13,148	3.79 %	100.00 %
KK	Pikeville	166,048	712	712	0.43 %	100.00 %
	Rose Hill	166,048	1,371	1,371	0.83 %	100.00 %
	Seven Springs	166,048	55	55	0.03 %	100.00 %
K	Statesville	347,303	28,419	28,419	8.18 %	100.00 %
KK	Teachey	166,048	448	448	0.27 %	100.00 %
K	Troutman	347,303	3,698	3,698	1.06 %	100.00 %
KK	Wallace (Duplin)	166,048	3,413	3,413	2.06 %	100.00 %
	Walnut Creek	166,048	1,084	1,084	0.65 %	100.00 %
	Warsaw	166,048	2,733	2,733	1.65 %	100.00 %
LL	Atkinson	264,779	296	296	0.11 %	100.00 %
	Burgaw	264,779	3,088	3,088	1.17 %	100.00 %
L	Chapel Hill (Durham)	363,930	2,906	2,906	0.80 %	100.00 %
	Durham (Durham)	363,930	283,093	283,093	77.79 %	100.00 %
LL	Holly Ridge	264,779	4,171	4,171	1.58 %	100.00 %
	Jacksonville	264,779	72,723	72,723	27.47 %	100.00 %
L	Morrisville (Durham)	363,930	207	207	0.06 %	100.00 %
LL	North Topsail Beach	264,779	1,005	1,005	0.38 %	100.00 %
L	Raleigh (Durham)	363,930	1,559	1,559	0.43 %	100.00 %
LL	Richlands	264,779	2,287	2,287	0.86 %	100.00 %
L	Roxboro	363,930	8,134	8,134	2.24 %	100.00 %
LL	St. Helena	264,779	417	417	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Surf City (Onslow)	264,779	334	334	0.13 %	100.00 %
	Surf City (Pender)	264,779	3,533	3,533	1.33 %	100.00 %
	Swansboro	264,779	3,744	3,744	1.41 %	100.00 %
	Topsail Beach	264,779	461	461	0.17 %	100.00 %
	Wallace (Pender)	264,779	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Watha	264,779	181	181	0.07 %	100.00 %
MM	Alliance	167,493	733	733	0.44 %	100.00 %
M	Ansonville	260,322	440	440	0.17 %	100.00 %
MM	Arapahoe	167,493	416	416	0.25 %	100.00 %
	Aurora	167,493	455	455	0.27 %	100.00 %
	Bath	167,493	245	245	0.15 %	100.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: Duke_House 03

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
MM	Bayboro	167,493	1,161	1,161	0.69 %	100.00 %
	Belhaven	167,493	1,410	1,410	0.84 %	100.00 %
	Chocowinity	167,493	722	722	0.43 %	100.00 %
	Columbia	167,493	610	610	0.36 %	100.00 %
	Creswell	167,493	207	207	0.12 %	100.00 %
	Duck	167,493	742	742	0.44 %	100.00 %
	Edenton	167,493	4,460	4,460	2.66 %	100.00 %
M	Fairview	260,322	3,456	3,456	1.33 %	100.00 %
MM	Grantsboro	167,493	692	692	0.41 %	100.00 %
M	Hemby Bridge	260,322	1,614	1,614	0.62 %	100.00 %
MM	Hertford	167,493	1,934	1,934	1.15 %	100.00 %
M	Indian Trail	260,322	39,997	39,997	15.36 %	100.00 %
MM	Kill Devil Hills	167,493	7,656	7,656	4.57 %	100.00 %
	Kitty Hawk	167,493	3,689	3,689	2.20 %	100.00 %
M	Lake Park	260,322	3,269	3,269	1.26 %	100.00 %
	Lilesville	260,322	395	395	0.15 %	100.00 %
MM	Manteo	167,493	1,600	1,600	0.96 %	100.00 %
M	Marshville	260,322	2,522	2,522	0.97 %	100.00 %
	Marvin	260,322	6,358	6,358	2.44 %	100.00 %
	McFarlan	260,322	94	94	0.04 %	100.00 %
MM	Mesic	167,493	144	144	0.09 %	100.00 %
M	Mineral Springs	260,322	3,159	3,159	1.21 %	100.00 %
MM	Minnesott Beach	167,493	530	530	0.32 %	100.00 %
M	Mint Hill (Union)	260,322	6	6	0.00 %	100.00 %
	Monroe	260,322	34,562	34,562	13.28 %	100.00 %
	Morven	260,322	329	329	0.13 %	100.00 %
MM	Nags Head	167,493	3,168	3,168	1.89 %	100.00 %
	Oriental	167,493	880	880	0.53 %	100.00 %
	Pantego	167,493	164	164	0.10 %	100.00 %
M	Peachland	260,322	390	390	0.15 %	100.00 %
MM	Plymouth	167,493	3,320	3,320	1.98 %	100.00 %
M	Polkton	260,322	2,250	2,250	0.86 %	100.00 %
MM	Roper	167,493	485	485	0.29 %	100.00 %
	Southern Shores	167,493	3,090	3,090	1.84 %	100.00 %
M	Stallings (Union)	260,322	15,728	15,728	6.04 %	100.00 %
MM	Stonewall	167,493	214	214	0.13 %	100.00 %
M	Unionville	260,322	6,643	6,643	2.55 %	100.00 %
MM	Vandemere	167,493	246	246	0.15 %	100.00 %
M	Wadesboro	260,322	5,008	5,008	1.92 %	100.00 %
MM	Washington	167,493	9,875	9,875	5.90 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'Duke_House 03.csv', modified 2/18/2022 10:53 AM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 2/18/2022

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 11 of 16

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: Duke_House 03

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
MM	Washington Park	167,493	392	392	0.23 %	100.00 %
M	Waxhaw	260,322	20,534	20,534	7.89 %	100.00 %
	Weddington (Union)	260,322	13,176	13,176	5.06 %	100.00 %
	Wesley Chapel	260,322	8,681	8,681	3.33 %	100.00 %
MM	Winfall	167,493	555	555	0.33 %	100.00 %
M	Wingate	260,322	4,055	4,055	1.56 %	100.00 %
NN	Ahoskie	82,953	4,891	4,891	5.90 %	100.00 %
N	Asheville	269,452	94,589	94,589	35.10 %	100.00 %
	Biltmore Forest	269,452	1,409	1,409	0.52 %	100.00 %
	Black Mountain	269,452	8,426	8,426	3.13 %	100.00 %
NN	Cofield	82,953	267	267	0.32 %	100.00 %
	Como	82,953	67	67	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Elizabeth City (Camden)	82,953	38	38	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Elizabeth City (Pasquotank)	82,953	18,593	18,593	22.41 %	100.00 %
	Gatesville	82,953	267	267	0.32 %	100.00 %
	Harrellsville	82,953	85	85	0.10 %	100.00 %
N	Montreat	269,452	901	901	0.33 %	100.00 %
NN	Murfreesboro	82,953	2,619	2,619	3.16 %	100.00 %
N	Weaverville	269,452	4,567	4,567	1.69 %	100.00 %
NN	Winton	82,953	629	629	0.76 %	100.00 %
N	Woodfin	269,452	7,936	7,936	2.95 %	100.00 %
O	Boardman	167,153	166	166	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Bolton	167,153	519	519	0.31 %	100.00 %
	Brunswick	167,153	973	973	0.58 %	100.00 %
	Cerro Gordo	167,153	131	131	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Chadbourn	167,153	1,574	1,574	0.94 %	100.00 %
	Fair Bluff	167,153	709	709	0.42 %	100.00 %
	Fairmont	167,153	2,191	2,191	1.31 %	100.00 %
	Lake Waccamaw	167,153	1,296	1,296	0.78 %	100.00 %
	Lumber Bridge	167,153	82	82	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Lumberton	167,153	19,025	19,025	11.38 %	100.00 %
	Marietta	167,153	111	111	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Maxton (Robeson)	167,153	1,902	1,902	1.14 %	100.00 %
	McDonald	167,153	94	94	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Orrum	167,153	59	59	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Parkton	167,153	504	504	0.30 %	100.00 %
	Pembroke	167,153	2,823	2,823	1.69 %	100.00 %
	Proctorville	167,153	121	121	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Raynham	167,153	60	60	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Red Springs (Robeson)	167,153	3,087	3,087	1.85 %	100.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: Duke_House 03

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
O	Rennert	167,153	275	275	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Rowland	167,153	885	885	0.53 %	100.00 %
	Sandyfield	167,153	430	430	0.26 %	100.00 %
	St. Pauls	167,153	2,045	2,045	1.22 %	100.00 %
	Tabor City	167,153	3,781	3,781	2.26 %	100.00 %
	Whiteville	167,153	4,766	4,766	2.85 %	100.00 %
P	Bailey	173,754	568	568	0.33 %	100.00 %
	Black Creek	173,754	692	692	0.40 %	100.00 %
	Castalia	173,754	264	264	0.15 %	100.00 %
	Dortches	173,754	1,082	1,082	0.62 %	100.00 %
	Elm City (Nash)	173,754	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Elm City (Wilson)	173,754	1,218	1,218	0.70 %	100.00 %
	Kenly (Wilson)	173,754	198	198	0.11 %	100.00 %
	Lucama	173,754	1,036	1,036	0.60 %	100.00 %
	Middlesex	173,754	912	912	0.52 %	100.00 %
	Momeyer	173,754	277	277	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Nashville	173,754	5,632	5,632	3.24 %	100.00 %
	Red Oak	173,754	3,342	3,342	1.92 %	100.00 %
	Rocky Mount (Nash)	173,754	38,927	38,927	22.40 %	100.00 %
	Saratoga	173,754	353	353	0.20 %	100.00 %
	Sharpsburg (Nash)	173,754	1,061	1,061	0.61 %	100.00 %
	Sharpsburg (Wilson)	173,754	421	421	0.24 %	100.00 %
	Sims	173,754	275	275	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Spring Hope	173,754	1,309	1,309	0.75 %	100.00 %
	Stantonsburg	173,754	762	762	0.44 %	100.00 %
	Whitakers (Nash)	173,754	337	337	0.19 %	100.00 %
	Wilson	173,754	47,851	47,851	27.54 %	100.00 %
Q	Atlantic Beach	168,406	1,364	1,364	0.81 %	100.00 %
	Beaufort	168,406	4,464	4,464	2.65 %	100.00 %
	Bogue	168,406	695	695	0.41 %	100.00 %
	Bridgeton	168,406	349	349	0.21 %	100.00 %
	Cape Carteret	168,406	2,224	2,224	1.32 %	100.00 %
	Cedar Point	168,406	1,764	1,764	1.05 %	100.00 %
	Cove City	168,406	378	378	0.22 %	100.00 %
	Dover	168,406	349	349	0.21 %	100.00 %
	Emerald Isle	168,406	3,847	3,847	2.28 %	100.00 %
	Havelock	168,406	16,621	16,621	9.87 %	100.00 %
	Indian Beach	168,406	223	223	0.13 %	100.00 %
	Morehead City	168,406	9,556	9,556	5.67 %	100.00 %
	New Bern	168,406	31,291	31,291	18.58 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'Duke_House 03.csv', modified 2/18/2022 10:53 AM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 2/18/2022

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 13 of 16

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report**District Plan: Duke_House 03**

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
Q	Newport	168,406	4,364	4,364	2.59 %	100.00 %
	Peletier	168,406	769	769	0.46 %	100.00 %
	Pine Knoll Shores	168,406	1,388	1,388	0.82 %	100.00 %
	River Bend	168,406	2,902	2,902	1.72 %	100.00 %
	Trent Woods	168,406	4,074	4,074	2.42 %	100.00 %
	Vanceboro	168,406	869	869	0.52 %	100.00 %
R	Denton	168,930	1,494	1,494	0.88 %	100.00 %
	High Point (Davidson)	168,930	6,646	6,646	3.93 %	100.00 %
	Lexington	168,930	19,632	19,632	11.62 %	100.00 %
	Midway	168,930	4,742	4,742	2.81 %	100.00 %
	Thomasville (Davidson)	168,930	26,662	26,662	15.78 %	100.00 %
	Wallburg	168,930	3,051	3,051	1.81 %	100.00 %
S	Bunn	172,143	327	327	0.19 %	100.00 %
	Butner	172,143	8,397	8,397	4.88 %	100.00 %
	Creedmoor	172,143	4,866	4,866	2.83 %	100.00 %
	Franklinton	172,143	2,456	2,456	1.43 %	100.00 %
	Henderson	172,143	15,060	15,060	8.75 %	100.00 %
	Kittrell	172,143	132	132	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Louisburg	172,143	3,064	3,064	1.78 %	100.00 %
	Middleburg	172,143	101	101	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Oxford	172,143	8,628	8,628	5.01 %	100.00 %
	Stem	172,143	960	960	0.56 %	100.00 %
	Stovall	172,143	324	324	0.19 %	100.00 %
	Wake Forest (Franklin)	172,143	1,504	1,504	0.87 %	100.00 %
	Youngsville	172,143	2,016	2,016	1.17 %	100.00 %
T	Ayden	170,243	4,977	4,977	2.92 %	100.00 %
	Bethel	170,243	1,373	1,373	0.81 %	100.00 %
	Falkland	170,243	47	47	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Farmville	170,243	4,461	4,461	2.62 %	100.00 %
	Fountain	170,243	385	385	0.23 %	100.00 %
	Greenville	170,243	87,521	87,521	51.41 %	100.00 %
	Grifton (Pitt)	170,243	2,301	2,301	1.35 %	100.00 %
	Grimesland	170,243	386	386	0.23 %	100.00 %
	Simpson	170,243	390	390	0.23 %	100.00 %
	Winterville	170,243	10,462	10,462	6.15 %	100.00 %
U	Alamance	171,415	988	988	0.58 %	100.00 %
	Burlington (Alamance)	171,415	55,481	55,481	32.37 %	100.00 %
	Elon	171,415	11,336	11,336	6.61 %	100.00 %
	Gibsonville (Alamance)	171,415	4,278	4,278	2.50 %	100.00 %
	Graham	171,415	17,157	17,157	10.01 %	100.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: Duke_House 03

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
U	Green Level	171,415	3,152	3,152	1.84 %	100.00 %
	Haw River	171,415	2,252	2,252	1.31 %	100.00 %
	Mebane (Alamance)	171,415	14,626	14,626	8.53 %	100.00 %
	Ossipee	171,415	536	536	0.31 %	100.00 %
	Swepsonville	171,415	2,445	2,445	1.43 %	100.00 %
V	Carrboro	171,432	21,295	21,295	12.42 %	100.00 %
	Chapel Hill (Orange)	171,432	59,054	59,054	34.45 %	100.00 %
	Durham (Orange)	171,432	144	144	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Hillsborough	171,432	9,660	9,660	5.63 %	100.00 %
	Mebane (Orange)	171,432	3,171	3,171	1.85 %	100.00 %
	Milton	171,432	155	155	0.09 %	100.00 %
	Yanceyville	171,432	1,937	1,937	1.13 %	100.00 %
W	Eden	91,096	15,421	15,421	16.93 %	100.00 %
	Madison	91,096	2,129	2,129	2.34 %	100.00 %
	Mayodan	91,096	2,418	2,418	2.65 %	100.00 %
	Reidsville	91,096	14,583	14,583	16.01 %	100.00 %
	Stoneville	91,096	1,308	1,308	1.44 %	100.00 %
	Wentworth	91,096	2,662	2,662	2.92 %	100.00 %
X	Askewville	88,865	184	184	0.21 %	100.00 %
	Aulander	88,865	763	763	0.86 %	100.00 %
	Bear Grass	88,865	89	89	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Colerain	88,865	217	217	0.24 %	100.00 %
	Conetoe	88,865	198	198	0.22 %	100.00 %
	Everetts	88,865	150	150	0.17 %	100.00 %
	Hamilton	88,865	306	306	0.34 %	100.00 %
	Hassell	88,865	49	49	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Jamesville	88,865	424	424	0.48 %	100.00 %
	Kelford	88,865	203	203	0.23 %	100.00 %
	Leggett	88,865	37	37	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Lewiston Woodville	88,865	426	426	0.48 %	100.00 %
	Macclesfield	88,865	413	413	0.46 %	100.00 %
	Oak City	88,865	266	266	0.30 %	100.00 %
	Parmelee	88,865	243	243	0.27 %	100.00 %
	Pinetops	88,865	1,200	1,200	1.35 %	100.00 %
	Powellsville	88,865	189	189	0.21 %	100.00 %
	Princeville	88,865	1,254	1,254	1.41 %	100.00 %
	Robersonville	88,865	1,269	1,269	1.43 %	100.00 %
	Rocky Mount (Edgecombe)	88,865	15,414	15,414	17.35 %	100.00 %
	Roxobel	88,865	187	187	0.21 %	100.00 %
	Sharpsburg (Edgecombe)	88,865	215	215	0.24 %	100.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: Duke_House 03

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
X	Speed	88,865	63	63	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Tarboro	88,865	10,721	10,721	12.06 %	100.00 %
	Whitakers (Edgecombe)	88,865	290	290	0.33 %	100.00 %
	Williamston	88,865	5,248	5,248	5.91 %	100.00 %
	Windsor	88,865	3,582	3,582	4.03 %	100.00 %
Y	Lincolnton	86,810	11,091	11,091	12.78 %	100.00 %
	Maiden (Lincoln)	86,810	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Z	East Laurinburg	86,256	234	234	0.27 %	100.00 %
	Gibson	86,256	449	449	0.52 %	100.00 %
	Laurinburg	86,256	14,978	14,978	17.36 %	100.00 %
	Maxton (Scotland)	86,256	208	208	0.24 %	100.00 %
	Raeford	86,256	4,559	4,559	5.29 %	100.00 %
	Red Springs (Hoke)	86,256	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Wagram	86,256	615	615	0.71 %	100.00 %
Total:				6,017,605		

Total Districts Assigned: 40

Total Municipalities (by County) Statewide: 614

Fully Assigned Municipalities: 614

Partially Assigned Municipalities: 0

Fully Unassigned Municipalities: 0

Split Municipalities: 0

Splits Involving Population: 0

Whole-Split VTD Counts by District Report**District Plan: Duke_House 03**

District	County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
AA	Haywood	29	0
	Madison	12	0
A	Mecklenburg	195	0
BB	Greene	10	0
	Jones	7	0
	Lenoir	22	0
B	Wake	204	0
C	Avery	19	0
	Cleveland	21	0
	Gaston	46	0
	Henderson	34	0
CC	Jackson	13	0
C	McDowell	17	0
	Mitchell	9	0
	Polk	7	0
	Rutherford	17	0
CC	Swain	5	0
	Transylvania	15	0
C	Yancey	11	0
D	Guilford	165	0
DD	Halifax	23	0
	Northampton	13	0
	Warren	14	0
EE	Burke	33	0
E	Forsyth	101	0
	Stokes	18	0
F	Chatham	18	0
	Lee	10	0
FF	Montgomery	14	0
F	Moore	26	0
	Randolph	22	0
	Richmond	16	0
FF	Stanly	22	0
G	Cabarrus	40	0
GG	Cherokee	16	0
	Clay	9	0
G	Davie	14	0
GG	Graham	4	0
	Macon	15	0
G	Rowan	41	0
	Yadkin	12	0

Whole-Split VTD Counts by District Report**District Plan: Duke_House 03**

District	County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
HH	Alexander	10	0
H	Brunswick	25	0
	New Hanover	43	0
HH	Surry	24	0
	Wilkes	27	0
II	Alleghany	4	0
	Ashe	17	0
	Caldwell	20	0
I	Cumberland	76	0
II	Watauga	20	0
JJ	Bladen	17	0
J	Harnett	13	0
	Johnston	36	0
JJ	Sampson	23	0
K	Catawba	40	0
KK	Duplin	19	0
K	Iredell	29	0
KK	Wayne	28	0
L	Durham	57	0
LL	Onslow	24	0
	Pender	20	0
L	Person	11	0
M	Anson	9	0
MM	Beaufort	21	0
	Chowan	6	0
	Currituck	11	0
	Dare	16	0
	Hyde	7	0
	Pamlico	10	0
	Perquimans	7	0
	Tyrrell	6	0
M	Union	52	0
MM	Washington	6	0
N	Buncombe	79	0
NN	Camden	3	0
	Gates	6	0
	Hertford	13	0
	Pasquotank	9	0
O	Columbus	26	0
	Robeson	39	0
P	Nash	24	0
	Wilson	24	0

Whole-Split VTD Counts by District Report**District Plan: Duke_House 03**

District	County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
Q	Carteret	28	0
	Craven	21	0
R	Davidson	43	0
S	Franklin	18	0
	Granville	15	0
	Vance	12	0
T	Pitt	40	0
U	Alamance	37	0
V	Caswell	9	0
	Orange	41	0
W	Rockingham	15	0
X	Bertie	12	0
	Edgecombe	21	0
	Martin	13	0
Y	Lincoln	23	0
Z	Hoke	15	0
	Scotland	7	0
Total:		2,666	

Total Districts Assigned: 40

Total VTDs Statewide: 2666

Fully Assigned VTDs: 2666

Partially Assigned VTDs: 0

Fully Unassigned VTDs: 0

Split VTDs: 0

Splits Involving Population: 0

Whole-Split VTD Counts by County Report**District Plan: Duke_House 03**

County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
Alamance	37	0
Alexander	10	0
Alleghany	4	0
Anson	9	0
Ashe	17	0
Avery	19	0
Beaufort	21	0
Bertie	12	0
Bladen	17	0
Brunswick	25	0
Buncombe	79	0
Burke	33	0
Cabarrus	40	0
Caldwell	20	0
Camden	3	0
Carteret	28	0
Caswell	9	0
Catawba	40	0
Chatham	18	0
Cherokee	16	0
Chowan	6	0
Clay	9	0
Cleveland	21	0
Columbus	26	0
Craven	21	0
Cumberland	76	0
Currituck	11	0
Dare	16	0
Davidson	43	0
Davie	14	0
Duplin	19	0
Durham	57	0
Edgecombe	21	0
Forsyth	101	0
Franklin	18	0
Gaston	46	0
Gates	6	0
Graham	4	0
Granville	15	0
Greene	10	0
Guilford	165	0
Halifax	23	0
Harnett	13	0

District plan definition file: 'Duke_House 03.csv', modified 2/18/2022 10:53 AM

Based on TIGER 2020 VTDs

[G20-VTD-SbC] - Generated 2/18/2022

Whole-Split VTD Counts by County Report**District Plan: Duke_House 03**

County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
Haywood	29	0
Henderson	34	0
Hertford	13	0
Hoke	15	0
Hyde	7	0
Iredell	29	0
Jackson	13	0
Johnston	36	0
Jones	7	0
Lee	10	0
Lenoir	22	0
Lincoln	23	0
Macon	15	0
Madison	12	0
Martin	13	0
McDowell	17	0
Mecklenburg	195	0
Mitchell	9	0
Montgomery	14	0
Moore	26	0
Nash	24	0
New Hanover	43	0
Northampton	13	0
Onslow	24	0
Orange	41	0
Pamlico	10	0
Pasquotank	9	0
Pender	20	0
Perquimans	7	0
Person	11	0
Pitt	40	0
Polk	7	0
Randolph	22	0
Richmond	16	0
Robeson	39	0
Rockingham	15	0
Rowan	41	0
Rutherford	17	0
Sampson	23	0
Scotland	7	0
Stanly	22	0
Stokes	18	0
Surry	24	0

District plan definition file: 'Duke_House 03.csv', modified 2/18/2022 10:53 AM

Based on TIGER 2020 VTDs

[G20-VTD-SbC] - Generated 2/18/2022

Whole-Split VTD Counts by County Report**District Plan: Duke_House 03**

County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
Swain	5	0
Transylvania	15	0
Tyrrell	6	0
Union	52	0
Vance	12	0
Wake	204	0
Warren	14	0
Washington	6	0
Watauga	20	0
Wayne	28	0
Wilkes	27	0
Wilson	24	0
Yadkin	12	0
Yancey	11	0
Totals:	2,666	0

Total VTDs Statewide: 2666

Fully Assigned VTDs: 2666

Partially Assigned VTDs: 0

Fully Unassigned VTDs: 0

Total Districts Assigned: 40

Split VTDs: 0

Splits Involving Population: 0

Split VTD Detail Report

District Plan: Duke_House 03

County	VTD	District	Total VTD Population	VTD Pop in District	Percent of VTD Pop in District
Assigned Geography Total:					

Total VTDs Statewide: 2666

Fully Assigned VTDs: 2666

Partially Assigned VTDs: 0

Fully Unassigned VTDs: 0

Total Districts Assigned: 40

Split VTDs: 0

Splits Involving Population: 0

Incumbent-District Report**District Plan: Duke_House 03****Residence Set: NC House - 2/10/2022**

Last Name	First Name	Party	Current District	District in this Plan
Adams	James	Republican	96	K
Adcock	Gale	Democratic	41	B
Ager	John	Democratic	115	N
Alexander	Kelly	Democratic	107	A
Alston	Vernetta	Democratic	29	L
Arp	Larry	Republican	69	M
Autry	Johnnie	Democratic	100	A
Baker	Amber	Democratic	72	E
Baker	Kristin	Republican	82	G
Ball	Cynthia	Democratic	49	B
Belk	Mary	Democratic	88	A
Bell	John	Republican	10	KK
Blackwell	Hugh	Republican	86	EE
Boles	James	Republican	52	F
Bradford	John	Republican	98	A
Brisson	William	Republican	22	JJ
Brockman	Cecil	Democratic	60	D
Brody	Mark	Republican	55	M
Brown	Terry	Democratic	92	A
Butler	Deborah	Democratic	18	H
Carney	Becky	Democratic	102	A
Clampitt	James	Republican	119	CC
Clemmons	Ashton	Democratic	57	D
Cleveland	George	Republican	14	LL
Cooper-Suggs	Linda	Democratic	24	P
Cunningham	Carla	Democratic	106	A
Dahle	Allison	Democratic	11	B
Davis	Robert	Republican	20	H
Dixon	James	Republican	4	KK
Elmore	Jeffrey	Republican	94	HH
Everitt	Terence	Democratic	35	B
Faircloth	Joseph	Republican	62	D
Farkas	Brian	Democratic	9	T
Gailliard	James	Democratic	25	P
Garrison	Terry	Democratic	32	S
Gill	Rosa	Democratic	33	B
Gillespie	Karl	Republican	120	GG
Goodwin	Edward	Republican	1	MM
Graham	Charles	Democratic	47	O
Greene	Edwin	Republican	85	C
Hall	Destin	Republican	87	II
Hall	Kyle	Republican	91	E

District plan definition file: 'Duke_House 03.csv', modified 2/18/2022 10:53 AM

Row shading indicates that the district in this plan is shared by more than one incumbent.

[G20-IncDist] - Generated 2/18/2022

Incumbent-District Report**District Plan: Duke_House 03****Residence Set: NC House - 2/10/2022**

Last Name	First Name	Party	Current District	District in this Plan
Hanig	Robert	Republican	6	MM
Hardister	Jonathan	Republican	59	D
Harris	Wesley	Democratic	105	A
Harrison	Mary	Democratic	61	D
Hastings	Kelly	Republican	110	C
Hawkins	Zack	Democratic	31	L
Howard	Julia	Republican	77	G
Humphrey	Thomas	Republican	12	BB
Hunt	Rachel	Democratic	103	A
Hunter	Howard	Democratic	5	NN
Hurley	Patricia	Republican	70	F
Hurtado	Ricardo	Democratic	63	U
Iler	Francis	Republican	17	H
Insko	Verla	Democratic	56	V
John	Joseph	Democratic	40	B
Johnson	Jake	Republican	113	C
Jones	Abraham	Democratic	38	B
Jones	Brenden	Republican	46	O
Kidwell	Keith	Republican	79	MM
Lambeth	Donny	Republican	75	E
Loftis	Donnie	Republican	109	C
Lofton	Brandon	Democratic	104	A
Logan	Carolyn	Democratic	101	A
Lucas	Marvin	Democratic	42	I
Majeed	Nasif	Democratic	99	A
Martin	David	Democratic	34	B
McElraft	Patricia	Republican	13	Q
McNeely	Jeffrey	Republican	84	K
McNeill	Allen	Republican	78	F
Meyer	Graig	Democratic	50	V
Miller	Charles	Republican	19	H
Mills	Paul	Republican	95	K
Moffitt	Timothy	Republican	117	C
Moore	Timothy	Republican	111	C
Morey	Marcia	Democratic	30	L
Moss	Ben	Republican	66	F
Paré	Erin	Republican	37	B
Penny	Howard	Republican	53	J
Pickett	Phillip	Republican	93	II
Pierce	Garland	Democratic	48	Z
Pittman	Larry	Republican	83	G
Pless	Steven	Republican	118	AA

District plan definition file: 'Duke_House 03.csv', modified 2/18/2022 10:53 AM

Row shading indicates that the district in this plan is shared by more than one incumbent.

[G20-IncDist] - Generated 2/18/2022

Incumbent-District Report**District Plan: Duke_House 03****Residence Set: NC House - 2/10/2022**

Last Name	First Name	Party	Current District	District in this Plan
Potts	Larry	Republican	81	R
Pyrtle	Armor	Republican	65	W
Quick	Amos	Democratic	58	D
Reives	Robert	Democratic	54	F
Richardson	William	Democratic	44	I
Riddell	Dennis	Republican	64	U
Roberson	James	Democratic	39	B
Rogers	David	Republican	112	C
Rudow	Caleb	Democratic	114	N
Saine	Jason	Republican	97	Y
Sasser	Clayton	Republican	67	FF
Sauls	John	Republican	51	F
Setzer	Mitchell	Republican	89	K
Shepard	Phillip	Republican	15	LL
Smith	Carson	Republican	16	LL
Smith	Kandie	Democratic	8	T
Smith	Raymond	Democratic	21	KK
Stevens	Sarah	Republican	90	HH
Strickland	Larry	Republican	28	J
Szoka	John	Republican	45	I
Terry	Evelyn	Democratic	71	E
Torbett	John	Republican	108	C
Turner	Brian	Democratic	116	N
Tyson	John	Republican	3	Q
von Haefen	Julie	Democratic	36	B
Warren	Harry	Republican	76	G
Watford	Samuel	Republican	80	R
Wheatley	Diane	Republican	43	I
White	Donna	Republican	26	J
Willingham	Shelly	Democratic	23	X
Willis	David	Republican	68	M
Winslow	Matthew	Republican	7	S
Wray	Michael	Democratic	27	DD
Yarborough	Lawrence	Republican	2	L
Zachary	Walter	Republican	73	G
Zenger	Jeffrey	Republican	74	E

District-Incumbent Report**District Plan: Duke_House 03****Residence Set: NC House - 2/10/2022**

District in this Plan	Last Name	First Name	Party	Current District
A	Alexander	Kelly	Democratic	107
	Autry	Johnnie	Democratic	100
	Belk	Mary	Democratic	88
	Bradford	John	Republican	98
	Brown	Terry	Democratic	92
	Carney	Becky	Democratic	102
	Cunningham	Carla	Democratic	106
	Harris	Wesley	Democratic	105
	Hunt	Rachel	Democratic	103
	Lofton	Brandon	Democratic	104
	Logan	Carolyn	Democratic	101
	Majeed	Nasif	Democratic	99
AA	Pless	Steven	Republican	118
B	Adcock	Gale	Democratic	41
	Ball	Cynthia	Democratic	49
	Dahle	Allison	Democratic	11
	Everitt	Terence	Democratic	35
	Gill	Rosa	Democratic	33
BB	Humphrey	Thomas	Republican	12
B	John	Joseph	Democratic	40
	Jones	Abraham	Democratic	38
	Martin	David	Democratic	34
	Paré	Erin	Republican	37
	Roberson	James	Democratic	39
	von Haefen	Julie	Democratic	36
CC	Clampitt	James	Republican	119
C	Greene	Edwin	Republican	85
	Hastings	Kelly	Republican	110
	Johnson	Jake	Republican	113
	Loftis	Donnie	Republican	109
	Moffitt	Timothy	Republican	117
	Moore	Timothy	Republican	111
	Rogers	David	Republican	112
	Torbett	John	Republican	108
D	Brockman	Cecil	Democratic	60
	Clemmons	Ashton	Democratic	57
	Faircloth	Joseph	Republican	62
	Hardister	Jonathan	Republican	59
	Harrison	Mary	Democratic	61
	Quick	Amos	Democratic	58
DD	Wray	Michael	Democratic	27

District-Incumbent Report**District Plan: Duke_House 03****Residence Set: NC House - 2/10/2022**

District in this Plan	Last Name	First Name	Party	Current District
E	Baker	Amber	Democratic	72
EE	Blackwell	Hugh	Republican	86
E	Hall	Kyle	Republican	91
	Lambeth	Donny	Republican	75
	Terry	Evelyn	Democratic	71
	Zenger	Jeffrey	Republican	74
F	Boles	James	Republican	52
	Hurley	Patricia	Republican	70
	McNeill	Allen	Republican	78
	Moss	Ben	Republican	66
	Reives	Robert	Democratic	54
FF	Sasser	Clayton	Republican	67
F	Sauls	John	Republican	51
G	Baker	Kristin	Republican	82
GG	Gillespie	Karl	Republican	120
G	Howard	Julia	Republican	77
	Pittman	Larry	Republican	83
	Warren	Harry	Republican	76
	Zachary	Walter	Republican	73
H	Butler	Deborah	Democratic	18
	Davis	Robert	Republican	20
HH	Elmore	Jeffrey	Republican	94
H	Iler	Francis	Republican	17
	Miller	Charles	Republican	19
HH	Stevens	Sarah	Republican	90
II	Hall	Destin	Republican	87
I	Lucas	Marvin	Democratic	42
II	Pickett	Phillip	Republican	93
I	Richardson	William	Democratic	44
	Szoka	John	Republican	45
	Wheatley	Diane	Republican	43
JJ	Brisson	William	Republican	22
J	Penny	Howard	Republican	53
	Strickland	Larry	Republican	28
	White	Donna	Republican	26
K	Adams	James	Republican	96
KK	Bell	John	Republican	10
	Dixon	James	Republican	4
K	McNeely	Jeffrey	Republican	84
	Mills	Paul	Republican	95
	Setzer	Mitchell	Republican	89
KK	Smith	Raymond	Democratic	21

District-Incumbent Report**District Plan: Duke_House 03****Residence Set: NC House - 2/10/2022**

District in this Plan	Last Name	First Name	Party	Current District
L	Alston	Vernetta	Democratic	29
LL	Cleveland	George	Republican	14
L	Hawkins	Zack	Democratic	31
	Morey	Marcia	Democratic	30
LL	Shepard	Phillip	Republican	15
	Smith	Carson	Republican	16
L	Yarborough	Lawrence	Republican	2
M	Arp	Larry	Republican	69
	Brody	Mark	Republican	55
MM	Goodwin	Edward	Republican	1
	Hanig	Robert	Republican	6
	Kidwell	Keith	Republican	79
M	Willis	David	Republican	68
N	Ager	John	Democratic	115
NN	Hunter	Howard	Democratic	5
N	Rudow	Caleb	Democratic	114
	Turner	Brian	Democratic	116
O	Graham	Charles	Democratic	47
	Jones	Brenden	Republican	46
P	Cooper-Suggs	Linda	Democratic	24
	Gailliard	James	Democratic	25
Q	McElraft	Patricia	Republican	13
	Tyson	John	Republican	3
R	Potts	Larry	Republican	81
	Watford	Samuel	Republican	80
S	Garrison	Terry	Democratic	32
	Winslow	Matthew	Republican	7
T	Farkas	Brian	Democratic	9
	Smith	Kandie	Democratic	8
U	Hurtado	Ricardo	Democratic	63
	Riddell	Dennis	Republican	64
V	Insko	Verla	Democratic	56
	Meyer	Graig	Democratic	50
W	Pyrtle	Armor	Republican	65
X	Willingham	Shelly	Democratic	23
Y	Saine	Jason	Republican	97
Z	Pierce	Garland	Democratic	48

User:

Plan Name: **Duke_House 03**

Plan Type: **House**

Measures of Compactness Report

Friday, February 18, 2022

10:43 AM

	Reock	Polsby-Popper
Sum	N/A	N/A
Min	0.28	0.20
Max	0.67	0.77
Mean	0.45	0.42
Std. Dev.	0.09	0.13

District	Reock	Polsby-Popper
A	0.54	0.48
AA	0.41	0.25
B	0.55	0.61
BB	0.31	0.29
C	0.37	0.20
CC	0.28	0.22
D	0.61	0.77
DD	0.44	0.35
E	0.56	0.62
EE	0.49	0.44
F	0.42	0.30

Measures of Compactness Report

Duke_House 03

	Reock	Polsby-Popper
Sum	N/A	N/A
Min	0.28	0.20
Max	0.67	0.77
Mean	0.45	0.42
Std. Dev.	0.09	0.13

District	Reock	Polsby-Popper
FF	0.45	0.49
G	0.32	0.31
GG	0.40	0.37
H	0.49	0.41
HH	0.38	0.32
I	0.50	0.45
II	0.42	0.26
J	0.38	0.45
JJ	0.53	0.36
K	0.39	0.46
KK	0.42	0.47
L	0.36	0.42
LL	0.49	0.37
M	0.47	0.53

Measures of Compactness Report

Duke_House 03

	Reock	Polsby-Popper
Sum	N/A	N/A
Min	0.28	0.20
Max	0.67	0.77
Mean	0.45	0.42
Std. Dev.	0.09	0.13

District	Reock	Polsby-Popper
MM	0.54	0.32
N	0.49	0.37
NN	0.28	0.30
O	0.41	0.32
P	0.58	0.50
Q	0.38	0.27
R	0.51	0.48
S	0.49	0.52
T	0.67	0.41
U	0.53	0.67
V	0.36	0.43
W	0.60	0.76
X	0.46	0.36
Y	0.32	0.51

Measures of Compactness Report

Duke_House 03

	Reock	Polsby-Popper
Sum	N/A	N/A
Min	0.28	0.20
Max	0.67	0.77
Mean	0.45	0.42
Std. Dev.	0.09	0.13
District	Reock	Polsby-Popper
Z	0.48	0.44

Measures of Compactness Report

Measures of Compactness Summary

Reock	The measure is always between 0 and 1, with 1 being the most compact.
Polsby-Popper	The measure is always between 0 and 1, with 1 being the most compact.

GEOID20	District	Body	PartyID	First	Middle	Last	Street	City	ZIP	County	Party
370850709031021	1	S	R	Bob		Steinburg	103 South Granville Street	Edenton	27932	Chowan	Republican
370510007022012	2	S	R	Norman	Wesley	Sanderson	269 Bennett Rd. #4	Arapahoe	28510	Pamlico	Republican
371139704001000	3	S	D	Ernestine		Bazemore	1040 NC Highway 305	Aulander	27805	Bertie	Democrat
371559610002042	4	S	D	Milton	Frederick "Toby"	Fitch	516 Lodge Street S	Wilson	27893	Wilson	Democrat
371219504001006	5	S	D	Donald	Gene	Davis	2760 W. Arlington Blvd. #308	Greenville	27834	Pitt	Democrat
371330014001007	6	S	R	Michael	A.	Lazzara	105 Dover Lane	Jacksonville	28540	Onslow	Republican
370899315002012	7	S	R	Jim		Perry	3504 Lakeview Trail	Kinston	28504	Lenoir	Republican
370010214002012	8	S	R	William	Peter	Rabon	521 Cherrytree Rd	Winnabow	28479	Brunswick	Republican
371350109022018	9	S	R	Michael	Vincent	Lee	801 Meherrin Ln	Wilmington	28403	New Hanover	Republican
371070110012009	10	S	R	Brent		Jackson	2924 Ernest Williams Road	Autryville	28318	Sampson	Republican
370630004012019	11	S	R	Lisa	Stone	Barnes	302 Bend of the River Road	Spring Hope	27882	Nash	Republican
370670031031012	12	S	R	James	Andrew	Burgin	6099 NC 55 W	Angier	27501	Harnett	Republican
370159602002050	13	S	R	Danny	Earl	Britt	1101 North Walnut Street	Lumberton	28358	Robeson	Republican
370459510003052	14	S	D	Daniel	T.	Blue	4917 Long Point Court	Raleigh	27604	Wake	Democrat
370190206023073	15	S	D	Jay	J.	Chaudhuri	820 Graham Street	Raleigh	27605	Wake	Democrat
370810157075013	16	S	D	George	Wilmarth	Nickel	2632 Louis Stephens Dr	Cary	27519	Wake	Democrat
371830532031059	17	S	D	Sydney		Batch	128 Ironcreek Place	Apex	27539	Wake	Democrat
370939701083008	18	S	D	Sarah		Crawford	3407 Piping Plover Drive	Raleigh	27616	Wake	Democrat
370419301012044	19	S	D	Kirk	Joseph	deViere	1110 Offshore Drive	Fayetteville	28305	Cumberland	Democrat
371830536041000	20	S	D	Natalie		Murdock	800 Finsbury St,	Durham	27703	Durham	Democrat
370350105012040	21	S	D	Robert	B.	Clark	603 East Lake Ridge Road	Raeford	28376	Hoke	Democrat
371830541212020	22	S	D	Mike		Woodard	2009 Woodrow Street	Durham	27705	Durham	Democrat
370710333131013	23	S	D	Valerie	P.	Foushee	145 Rubrum Drive	Hillsborough	27278	Orange	Democrat
371639703023010	24	S	R	Amy	Scott	Galey	233 Dr Floyd Scott Lane	Burlington	27217	Alamance	Republican
370810160091011	25	S	R	Thomas	Moses	McInnis	800 Haywood Parker Road	Ellerbe	28338	Richmond	Republican
370970614022016	26	S	R	David	W.	Craven	809 Cliff Road	Asheboro	27203	Randolph	Republican
371470006051014	27	S	D	Michael	Kennedy	Garrett	3208 Wingrave Ter	Greensboro	27410	Guilford	Democrat
370630020372034	28	S	D	Gladys	A.	Robinson	3 Jacobs Way	Greensboro	27455	Guilford	Democrat
371190059232000	29	S	R	Steven	Henry	Jarvis	470 Old NC Hwy 75	Lexington	27292	Davidson	Republican
371190064041039	30	S	R	Philip	Edward	Berger	311 Pinewood Place	Eden	27288	Rockingham	Republican
371190055202000	31	S	R	Joyce	R.	Krawiec	7030 Interlaken Drive	Kernersville	27284	Forsyth	Republican
371510302013020	32	S	D	Paul	Arthur	Lowe	3641 Shaw Rd	Winston-Salem	27105	Forsyth	Democrat
371379502043020	33	S	R	Carl	Lindsey	Ford	320 Ketchie Estate Road	China Grove	28023	Rowan	Republican
371830541181000	34	S	R	Vickie		Sawyer	337 Whippoorwill Road	Mooresville	28117	Iredell	Republican
371590517005033	35	S	R	Matthew	Todd	Johnson	3118 E. Lawyers Rd	Monroe	28110	Union	Republican
371570403003002	36	S	R	Paul	Robert	Newton	3500 Little Buffalo Creek Road	Mount Pleasant	28124	Cabarrus	Republican
371950002001042	37	S	D	Jeffrey	Neale	Jackson	3300 Maryhurst Lane	Charlotte	28226	Mecklenburg	Democrat
370670016012004	38	S	D	Mujtaba	Aziz	Mohammed	1426 Bershire Lane	Charlotte	28262	Mecklenburg	Democrat
371830512001004	39	S	D	DeAndrea		Salvador	6130 Berewick Commons Parkway	Charlotte	28278	Mecklenburg	Democrat
370210011002007	40	S	D	Joyce	Davis	Waddell	1928 Bonnie Lane	Charlotte	28213	Mecklenburg	Democrat
371290119041016	41	S	D	Natasha	R.	Marcus	806 Ashby Drive	Davidson	28036	Mecklenburg	Democrat
371270113001020	42	S	R	Dean		Proctor	125 6th Street N.W.	Hickory	28601	Catawba	Republican
371790201003028	43	S	R	Kathryn		Harrington	3324 Lincoln Lane	Gastonia	28056	Gaston	Republican
371190030181004	44	S	R	W. Ted		Alexander	409 Beaumonde Avenue	Shelby	28150	Cleveland	Republican
371190056232004	45	S	R	Deanna		Ballard	132-1 Whitney Lane	Blowing Rock	28605	Watauga	Republican
370250417022015	46	S	R	Warren	Todd	Daniel	1248 Bethel Rd.	Morganton	28655	Burke	Republican

371899208001001	47	S	R	Ralph	E.	Hise	70 Rhododendron Avenue	Spruce Pine	28777	Mitchell	Republican
371539702003049	48	S	R	Charles	Marion	Edwards	127 Berry Creek Drive	Flat Rock	28731	Henderson	Republican
370570619022027	49	S	D	Julie		Mayfield	109 Estes Court	Asheville	28806	Buncombe	Democrat
370230208021020	50	S	R	Harold	Kevin	Corbin	25 Corbin Hills Dr	Franklin	28734	Macon	Republican
370419302022011	1	H	R	Edward	Charles	Goodwin	1015 Macedonia Rd	Edenton	27932	Chowan	Republican
371459202003017	2	H	R	Lawrence	Emile	Yarborough	87 Duck Pointe Dr	Roxboro	27574	Person	Republican
370499610041004	3	H	R	John	Steven	Tyson	200 Bridge Pointe Dr	New Bern	28562	Craven	Republican
370610902021035	4	H	R	James	W.	Dixon	427 West Trade Rd.	Mount Olive	28365	Duplin	Republican
370919502022026	5	H	D	Howard	Jacque	Hunter	950 US Hwy 13 S	Ahoskie	27910	Hertford	Democratic
370531104031003	6	H	R	Robert	Otho	Hanig	102 Orchard Ln	Powells Point	27966	Currituck	Republican
370690605022029	7	H	R	Matthew	Dale	Winslow	518 Moores Pond Rd	Youngsville	27596	Franklin	Republican
371470008003044	8	H	D	Kandie	Diane	Smith	2201 French Ct	Greenville	27834	Pitt	Democratic
371470005033002	9	H	D	Brian	Austin	Farkas	1670 Wimbledon Dr, Apt 201	Greenville	27858	Pitt	Democratic
371910011041009	10	H	R	John	Richard	Bell	501 Holland Hill Dr	Goldsboro	27530	Wayne	Republican
371830524072005	11	H	D	Allison	Anne	Dahle	4200 Pepperton Dr	Raleigh	27606	Wake	Democratic
371070106001007	12	H	R	Thomas	Christopher	Humphrey	1308 Par Dr	Kinston	28504	Lenoir	Republican
370319709042043	13	H	R	Patricia	E.	McElraft	10108 Coast Guard Rd	Emerald Isle	28594	Carteret	Republican
371330021001018	14	H	R	George	Grant	Cleveland	224 Campbell Place	Jacksonville	28546	Onslow	Republican
371330003063006	15	H	R	Phillip	R.	Shepard	111 Vernon Shepard Ln	Jacksonville	28540	Onslow	Republican
371419202031030	16	H	R	Carson	Henry	Smith	47 Hidden Bluff Trl	Hampstead	28443	Pender	Republican
370190205043001	17	H	R	Francis	Robertson	Iler	330 S Middleton Dr NW # 1104	Calabash	28467	Brunswick	Republican
371290112002010	18	H	D	Deborah	Armfield	Butler	401 South 4th St.	Wilmington	28401	New Hanover	Democratic
370190203053019	19	H	R	Charles	William	Miller	3103 Spring Oak Lane	Southport	28461	Brunswick	Republican
371290120041007	20	H	R	Robert	Theodore	Davis	7111 East Creeks Edge Dr.	Wilmington	28409	New Hanover	Republican
371910015002018	21	H	D	Raymond	Edward	Smith	403 Hamilton Dr	Goldsboro	27530	Wayne	Democratic
370179503012019	22	H	R	William	Dale	Brisson	780 NC 410 Hwy	Bladenboro	28320	Bladen	Republican
370650202003012	23	H	D	Shelly		Willingham	916 Hill St	Rocky Mount	27801	Edgecombe	Democratic
371950004021006	24	H	D	Linda	Darnell	Cooper-Suggs	2417 Saint John Dr SW	Wilson	27893	Wilson	Democratic
371270103021011	25	H	D	James	David	Gailliard	9121 West Mount Dr	Rocky Mount	27803	Nash	Democratic
371010410042001	26	H	R	Donna	McDowell	White	1330 W Main St	Clayton	27520	Johnston	Republican
371319204013024	27	H	D	Michael	H.	Wray	220 Davie St	Gaston	27832	Northampton	Democratic
371010404001026	28	H	R	Larry	Craig	Strickland	201 Kingston St	Pine Level	27568	Johnston	Republican
370630020081006	29	H	D	Vernetta	R.	Alston	3433 Dover Rd	Durham	27707	Durham	Democratic
370630020302004	30	H	D	Marcia	Helen	Morey	2 Middlesborough Ct.	Durham	27705	Durham	Democratic
370630018082012	31	H	D	Zack	Anthony-Forde	Hawkins	130 Elmsford St	Durham	27703	Durham	Democratic
371819607005001	32	H	D	Terry	Edward	Garrison	222 Peachtree St	Henderson	27536	Vance	Democratic
371830521021000	33	H	D	Rosa	Underwood	Gill	2408 Foxtrot Rd	Raleigh	27610	Wake	Democratic
371830517002009	34	H	D	David	Grier	Martin	2203 Byrd St	Raleigh	27608	Wake	Democratic
371830542191013	35	H	D	Terence	Jason	Everitt	1305 Heritage Heights Ln	Wake Forest	27587	Wake	Democratic
371830534191028	36	H	D	Julie	Marie	von Haefen	1002 South Wellonsburg Place	Apex	27502	Wake	Democratic
371830532021007	37	H	R	Erin	Pauling	Par Tr	5300 Lake Edge Dr	Holly Springs	27540	Wake	Republican
371830527062010	38	H	D	Abraham	Penn	Jones	2000 Brentmoor Dr, Apt 209	Raleigh	27604	Wake	Democratic
371830541153025	39	H	D	James	Aubrey	Roberson	1201 Matthews Glenn Dr	Knightdale	27545	Wake	Democratic
371830537202006	40	H	D	Joseph	Robert	John	11800 Black Horse Run	Raleigh	27613	Wake	Democratic
371830534251003	41	H	D	Gale	Brown	Adcock	300 Legault Dr	Cary	27513	Wake	Democratic
370510036023017	42	H	D	Marvin	W.	Lucas	3318 Hedgemoor Cir	Spring Lake	28390	Cumberland	Democratic
370510037004028	43	H	R	Diane	D.	Wheatley	9774 Ramsey St	Linden	28356	Cumberland	Republican

370510007011015	44	H	D	William	O.	Richardson	3694 Glenbarry Pl	Fayetteville	28314	Cumberland	Democratic
370510032073008	45	H	R	John	David	Szoka	6922 Surrey Rd	Fayetteville	28306	Cumberland	Republican
370479312011039	46	H	R	Brenden	H.	Jones	607 Hickman Rd.	Tabor City	28463	Columbus	Republican
371559613013030	47	H	D	Charles	Vinson	Graham	479 Bee Gee Rd	Lumberton	28358	Robeson	Democratic
371650106012015	48	H	D	Garland	E.	Pierce	21981 Buie St	Wagram	28396	Scotland	Democratic
371830516005002	49	H	D	Cynthia	J.	Ball	1428 Canterbury Rd	Raleigh	27608	Wake	Democratic
371350112043007	50	H	D	Graig	Roy	Meyer	2109 Mt Sinai Rd	Chapel Hill	27514	Orange	Democratic
371050306011029	51	H	R	John	Irwin	Sauls	2609 Wellington Dr	Sanford	27330	Lee	Republican
371259505063003	52	H	R	James	Larry	Boles	15 Harmon Dr	Whispering Pines	28327	Moore	Republican
370850704012002	53	H	R	Howard	Lassiter	Penny	1500 Old Stage Rd N	Coats	27521	Harnett	Republican
370370206004054	54	H	D	Robert	Tyrone	Reives	98 Roberts Chapel Rd	Goldston	27252	Chatham	Democratic
371790209024009	55	H	R	Mark	Allen	Brody	5315 S Rocky River Rd	Monroe	28112	Union	Republican
371350114001004	56	H	D	Verla	Clemens	Insko	610 Surry Rd	Chapel Hill	27514	Orange	Democratic
370810125033023	57	H	D	Ashton	Wheeler	Clemmons	1607 Beechtree Rd	Greensboro	27408	Guilford	Democratic
370810167013007	58	H	D	Amos	Lewis	Quick	529 Foxridge Rd	Greensboro	27406	Guilford	Democratic
370810153012013	59	H	R	Jonathan	Yates	Hardister	924 Golf House Rd West	Whitsett	27377	Guilford	Republican
370810145031019	60	H	D	Cecil	Antonio	Brockman	1166 Roberts Ln	High Point	27260	Guilford	Democratic
370810105002015	61	H	D	Mary	Price Taylor	Harrison	204 Ridgeway Dr	Greensboro	27403	Guilford	Democratic
370810162031018	62	H	R	Joseph	Aubrey	Faircloth	4456 Orchard Knob Ln	High Point	27265	Guilford	Republican
370010212052006	63	H	D	Ricardo	Alcides	Hurtado	411 E Webb St	Mebane	27302	Alamance	Democratic
370010218021029	64	H	R	Dennis	Patrick	Riddell	6343 Beale Rd	Snow Camp	27349	Alamance	Republican
371570406022007	65	H	R	Armor	Reece	Pyrtle	130 Tamerlane Ct	Stoneville	27048	Rockingham	Republican
371539708001007	66	H	R	Ben	Thomas	Moss	316 Old Cheraw Hwy	Rockingham	28379	Richmond	Republican
371679307003011	67	H	R	Clayton	Wayne	Sasser	29013 Jordan Pond Dr	Albemarle	28001	Stanly	Republican
371790210072014	68	H	R	David	Allen	Willis	1004 Shinnecock Ln	Marvin	28173	Union	Republican
371790202061010	69	H	R	Larry	Dean	Arp	523 Baucom Deese Rd	Monroe	28110	Union	Republican
371510302012001	70	H	R	Patricia	B.	Hurley	141 Ridgecrest Rd	Asheboro	27203	Randolph	Republican
370670033092007	71	H	D	Evelyn	Abrams	Terry	1224 Reynolds Forest Dr	Winston-Salem	27107	Forsyth	Democratic
370670003021019	72	H	D	Amber	Maria	Baker	452 W 25th St	Winston-Salem	27105	Forsyth	Democratic
371970505032002	73	H	R	Walter	Lee	Zachary	721 West Main St.	Yadkinville	27055	Yadkin	Republican
370670040091020	74	H	R	Jeffrey	Alan	Zenger	7830 Grapevine Rd	Lewisville	27023	Forsyth	Republican
370670036002002	75	H	R	Donny	Carr	Lambeth	4627 S Main St	Winston-Salem	27127	Forsyth	Republican
371590505003029	76	H	R	Harry	Joseph	Warren	213 S Merritt Ave	Salisbury	28144	Rowan	Republican
370590806001010	77	H	R	Julia	Craven	Howard	203 Magnolia Ave.	Mocksville	27028	Davie	Republican
371510306003034	78	H	R	Allen	Ray	McNeill	4172 NC Hwy 49 S	Asheboro	27205	Randolph	Republican
370139310012011	79	H	R	Keith	Douglas	Kidwell	53 Elks Rd	Chocowinity	27817	Beaufort	Republican
370570619031004	80	H	R	Samuel	Lee	Watford	4111 Denton Rd	Thomasville	27360	Davidson	Republican
370570617012003	81	H	R	Larry	Wayne	Potts	373 Waitman Rd	Lexington	27295	Davidson	Republican
370250425012006	82	H	R	Kristin	Dutrow	Baker	3607 Curtland Place NW	Concord	28027	Cabarrus	Republican
370250420002006	83	H	R	Larry	Graham	Pittman	250 Roberta Rd SW	Concord	28027	Cabarrus	Republican
370970611012006	84	H	R	Jeffrey	Carrol	McNeely	191 New Sterling Rd	Stony Point	28678	Iredell	Republican
371119706003019	85	H	R	Edwin	Dudley	Greene	87 Nix Creek Church Rd	Marion	28752	McDowell	Republican
370230209023035	86	H	R	Hugh	Allen	Blackwell	321 Mountain View Ave SE	Valdese	28690	Burke	Republican
370270305001036	87	H	R	Destin	Chase	Hall	1254 Camelot Ct. NE	Lenoir	28645	Caldwell	Republican
371190035001009	88	H	D	Mary	Gardner	Belk	1630 Dilworth Rd E	Charlotte	28203	Mecklenburg	Democratic
370350114023006	89	H	R	Mitchell	Smith	Setzer	1013 Murrays Mill Rd	Catawba	28609	Catawba	Republican
371719303011018	90	H	R	Sarah	Suzanne	Stevens	2161 Margaret Dr	Mt. Airy	27030	Surry	Republican

371690705051016	91	H	R	Kyle	Ethan	Hall	633 W Dalton Rd	King	27021	Stokes	Republican
371190059081026	92	H	D	Terry	Martin	Brown	10627 Honeyfur Ct	Charlotte	28327	Mecklenburg	Democratic
371899208001082	93	H	R	Phillip	Ray	Pickett	336 Sourwood Ln	Blowing Rock	28605	Watauga	Republican
371939606003023	94	H	R	Jeffrey	Carter	Elmore	509 F St	North Wilkesboro	28659	Wilkes	Republican
370970614063000	95	H	R	Paul	Grey	Mills	156 Brick Kiln Way	Mooreville	28117	Iredell	Republican
370350105012052	96	H	R	James	Cecil	Adams	322 3rd Ave NE	Hickory	28601	Catawba	Republican
371090710014007	97	H	R	Jason	Ray	Saine	1954 Hidden Valley Ave	Lincolnton	28092	Lincoln	Republican
371190062202000	98	H	R	John	Ray	Bradford	18632 Nantz Rd	Cornelius	28031	Mecklenburg	Republican
371190015091009	99	H	D	Nasif	Rashad	Majeed	5401 Rupert Ln	Charlotte	28215	Mecklenburg	Democratic
371190019181002	100	H	D	Johnnie	Newton	Autry	4728 Amity Pl	Charlotte	28212	Mecklenburg	Democratic
371190060121017	101	H	D	Carolyn	Green	Logan	7216 Tall Tree Ln	Charlotte	28214	Mecklenburg	Democratic
371190027012001	102	H	D	Becky		Carney	325 Queens Rd. - Unit 18	Charlotte	28204	Mecklenburg	Democratic
371190058152001	103	H	D	Rachel	Henderson	Hunt	3310 Windbluff Dr	Charlotte	28277	Mecklenburg	Democratic
371190029083004	104	H	D	Brandon	Marcus	Lofton	921 Dacavin Dr	Charlotte	28226	Mecklenburg	Democratic
371190058392005	105	H	D	Wesley	Ryan	Harris	3570 Toringdon Way	Charlotte	28277	Mecklenburg	Democratic
371190055364002	106	H	D	Carla	D.	Cunningham	1400 Sansberry Rd	Charlotte	28262	Mecklenburg	Democratic
371190046001012	107	H	D	Kelly	Miller	Alexander	2128 Senior Dr.	Charlotte	28216	Mecklenburg	Democratic
370710302081008	108	H	R	John	A.	Torbett	210 Blueridge Dr	Stanley	28164	Gaston	Republican
370710333131015	109	H	R	Dana	Byron	Bumgardner	3517 Lincoln Ln	Gastonia	28056	Gaston	Republican
370710306021017	110	H	R	Kelly	Eugene	Hastings	1650 Shelby Hwy	Cherryville	28021	Gaston	Republican
370459504002015	111	H	R	Timothy	Keith	Moore	408 West Mountain St.	Kings Mountain	28086	Cleveland	Republican
371619604002010	112	H	R	David	William	Rogers	910 Union Rd	Rutherfordton	28139	Rutherford	Republican
371499203011016	113	H	R	Jake	Hunter	Johnson	46 Lynnbrook Way	Columbus	28722	Polk	Republican
370210011002016	114	H	D	Susan	C.	Fisher	7 Maple Ridge Ln	Asheville	28806	Buncombe	Democratic
370210032043001	115	H	D	John	Curtis	Ager	15 Clarke Ln	Fairview	28730	Buncombe	Democratic
370210021011048	116	H	D	Brian	Mills	Turner	10 Cedarcliff Rd	Asheville	28803	Buncombe	Democratic
370899301001021	117	H	R	Timothy	Douglas	Moffitt	5016 Bearwallow Mountain Rd	Hendersonville	28792	Henderson	Republican
370879213021004	118	H	R	Steven	Mark	Pless	79 Osborne Ridge Rd	Canton	28716	Haywood	Republican
371739602002009	119	H	R	James	Michael	Clampitt	1154 Toot Hollow Rd	Bryson City	28713	Swain	Republican
371139704001000	120	H	R	Karl	Ellis	Gillespie	552 Corbin Rd	Franklin	28734	Macon	Republican
371950005022008	1	C	D	GK	Kenneth	Butterfield	3501 South Meade Pl NW	Wilson	27896	Wilson	Democratic
371899209003017	5	C	R	Virginia	Ann	Foxx	616 Rime Frost	Banner Elk	28604	Watauga	Republican
371470005011008	3	C	R	Greg	Francis	Murphy	502 Queen Annes Rd	Greenville	27858	Pitt	Republican
371290117031007	7	C	R	David	Cheston	Rouzer	604 Bedminister Ln	Wilmington	28405	New Hanover	Republican
370810125052004	6	C	D	Kathy	Ellen	Manning	302 Kemp Rd W	Greensboro	27410	Guilford	Democratic
371830510002007	2	C	D	Deborah		Ross	425 S Boylan Ave	Raleigh	27603	Wake	Democratic
370250426011004	8	C	R	Richard	Lane	Hudson	1526 Chadmore Ln NW	Concord	28027	Cabarrus	Republican
371190025001000	12	C	D	Alma	Shealey	Adams	730 Hawthorne Ln #411	Charlotte	28204	Mecklenburg	Democratic
370590802001002	13	C	R	Ted	Paul	Budd	321 Maplewood Ln	Advance	27006	Davie	Republican
371350119022006	4	C	D	David	Eugene	Price	2200 N Lakeshore Dr	Chapel Hill	27514	Orange	Democratic
371090712022005	10	C	R	Patrick	Timothy	McHenry	7918 Norman Ct	Denver	28037	Lincoln	Republican
371190029052002	9	C	R	James	Daniel	Bishop	2216 Whilden Ct	Charlotte	28211	Mecklenburg	Republican
370899308001016	11	C	R	David	Madison	Cawthorn	657 N Rugby Rd	Hendersonville	28791	Henderson	Republican

Population Deviation Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173**

District	Seats	Ideal Pop	Actual Pop	Deviation	Deviation %
1	1	208,788	199,623	-9,165	-4.39%
2	1	208,788	198,557	-10,231	-4.90%
3	1	208,788	200,494	-8,294	-3.97%
4	1	208,788	216,568	7,780	3.73%
5	1	208,788	219,143	10,355	4.96%
6	1	208,788	204,576	-4,212	-2.02%
7	1	208,788	212,582	3,794	1.82%
8	1	208,788	200,436	-8,352	-4.00%
9	1	208,788	204,809	-3,979	-1.91%
10	1	208,788	215,999	7,211	3.45%
11	1	208,788	206,121	-2,667	-1.28%
12	1	208,788	198,776	-10,012	-4.80%
13	1	208,788	198,354	-10,434	-5.00%
14	1	208,788	198,506	-10,282	-4.92%
15	1	208,788	198,385	-10,403	-4.98%
16	1	208,788	198,412	-10,376	-4.97%
17	1	208,788	198,391	-10,397	-4.98%
18	1	208,788	198,354	-10,434	-5.00%
19	1	208,788	216,471	7,683	3.68%
20	1	208,788	199,272	-9,516	-4.56%
21	1	208,788	217,984	9,196	4.40%
22	1	208,788	201,846	-6,942	-3.32%
23	1	208,788	210,529	1,741	0.83%
24	1	208,788	202,786	-6,002	-2.87%
25	1	208,788	216,895	8,107	3.88%
26	1	208,788	201,897	-6,891	-3.30%
27	1	208,788	217,296	8,508	4.07%
28	1	208,788	213,202	4,414	2.11%
29	1	208,788	216,220	7,432	3.56%
30	1	208,788	211,642	2,854	1.37%
31	1	208,788	212,299	3,511	1.68%
32	1	208,788	214,811	6,023	2.88%
33	1	208,788	209,379	591	0.28%
34	1	208,788	218,896	10,108	4.84%
35	1	208,788	218,398	9,610	4.60%
36	1	208,788	210,986	2,198	1.05%
37	1	208,788	212,852	4,064	1.95%
38	1	208,788	218,466	9,678	4.64%
39	1	208,788	219,067	10,279	4.92%
40	1	208,788	218,411	9,623	4.61%
41	1	208,788	216,686	7,898	3.78%
42	1	208,788	216,693	7,905	3.79%
43	1	208,788	211,229	2,441	1.17%

Population Deviation Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

District	Seats	Ideal Pop	Actual Pop	Deviation	Deviation %
44	1	208,788	203,043	-5,745	-2.75%
45	1	208,788	209,349	561	0.27%
46	1	208,788	200,575	-8,213	-3.93%
47	1	208,788	219,135	10,347	4.96%
48	1	208,788	200,053	-8,735	-4.18%
49	1	208,788	201,025	-7,763	-3.72%
50	1	208,788	213,909	5,121	2.45%
Totals:	50		10,439,388		

Deviation range: -5.00% to 4.96%

2020 Election Contest Report - US President-15115-

NC General Assembly

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib	Grn	% Grn	Cnst	% Cnst	W-I	% W-I
1	60,216	53.77%	50,297	44.92%	848	0.76%	190	0.17%	227	0.20%	200	0.18%
2	63,545	56.11%	48,448	42.78%	681	0.60%	161	0.14%	263	0.23%	145	0.13%
3	62,059	57.54%	44,386	41.15%	889	0.82%	151	0.14%	204	0.19%	164	0.15%
4	55,164	52.50%	48,801	46.44%	649	0.62%	156	0.15%	175	0.17%	139	0.13%
5	47,950	42.63%	62,968	55.98%	885	0.79%	242	0.22%	214	0.19%	232	0.21%
6	46,078	63.79%	24,266	33.59%	1,506	2.08%	136	0.19%	103	0.14%	149	0.21%
7	59,510	47.85%	62,629	50.36%	1,413	1.14%	343	0.28%	177	0.14%	290	0.23%
8	76,424	61.66%	46,146	37.23%	837	0.68%	161	0.13%	172	0.14%	204	0.16%
9	65,150	60.92%	40,676	38.03%	651	0.61%	138	0.13%	194	0.18%	136	0.13%
10	68,353	61.38%	41,257	37.05%	1,164	1.05%	215	0.19%	150	0.13%	218	0.20%
11	55,119	49.80%	54,257	49.02%	714	0.65%	174	0.16%	225	0.20%	194	0.18%
12	52,525	59.42%	34,432	38.95%	950	1.07%	194	0.22%	135	0.15%	163	0.18%
13	57,872	49.67%	56,588	48.57%	1,244	1.07%	206	0.18%	205	0.18%	402	0.35%
14	26,271	26.16%	72,429	72.13%	973	0.97%	276	0.27%	165	0.16%	303	0.30%
15	30,729	28.07%	76,423	69.81%	1,430	1.31%	356	0.33%	146	0.13%	396	0.36%
16	35,764	33.49%	69,075	64.68%	1,190	1.11%	252	0.24%	140	0.13%	367	0.34%
17	55,135	47.12%	59,382	50.75%	1,626	1.39%	259	0.22%	192	0.16%	423	0.36%
18	37,073	32.72%	74,000	65.30%	1,295	1.14%	318	0.28%	183	0.16%	452	0.40%
19	32,713	33.39%	63,402	64.71%	1,097	1.12%	313	0.32%	221	0.23%	232	0.24%
20	32,054	26.81%	85,671	71.64%	1,001	0.84%	315	0.26%	191	0.16%	346	0.29%
21	64,085	59.57%	41,846	38.90%	1,068	0.99%	195	0.18%	160	0.15%	226	0.21%
22	21,544	19.83%	85,480	78.69%	867	0.80%	294	0.27%	143	0.13%	306	0.28%
23	40,449	33.99%	76,917	64.63%	861	0.72%	278	0.23%	203	0.17%	310	0.26%
24	44,732	53.50%	38,010	45.46%	477	0.57%	154	0.18%	122	0.15%	123	0.15%
25	65,055	59.06%	43,596	39.58%	841	0.76%	262	0.24%	206	0.19%	183	0.17%
26	71,402	61.96%	42,317	36.72%	893	0.77%	201	0.17%	192	0.17%	225	0.20%
27	43,720	37.69%	70,407	60.69%	998	0.86%	304	0.26%	238	0.21%	338	0.29%
28	23,474	23.19%	76,355	75.44%	653	0.65%	274	0.27%	204	0.20%	257	0.25%
29	73,120	67.64%	33,827	31.29%	677	0.63%	165	0.15%	175	0.16%	138	0.13%
30	82,856	72.77%	29,340	25.77%	916	0.80%	240	0.21%	297	0.26%	212	0.19%
31	75,550	61.10%	46,306	37.45%	1,084	0.88%	217	0.18%	205	0.17%	295	0.24%
32	29,648	28.67%	72,011	69.64%	881	0.85%	312	0.30%	217	0.21%	330	0.32%
33	74,755	69.60%	31,243	29.09%	802	0.75%	186	0.17%	201	0.19%	214	0.20%
34	60,467	53.33%	51,113	45.08%	1,071	0.94%	248	0.22%	160	0.14%	332	0.29%
35	73,490	60.76%	45,659	37.75%	1,053	0.87%	224	0.19%	195	0.16%	332	0.27%
36	83,406	77.25%	23,382	21.66%	683	0.63%	125	0.12%	204	0.19%	174	0.16%
37	75,103	62.80%	42,755	35.75%	1,043	0.87%	198	0.17%	202	0.17%	294	0.25%
38	36,152	32.21%	74,228	66.13%	1,054	0.94%	315	0.28%	138	0.12%	359	0.32%
39	26,459	26.20%	72,732	72.02%	1,001	0.99%	358	0.35%	167	0.17%	276	0.27%
40	15,910	16.48%	79,067	81.88%	748	0.77%	325	0.34%	197	0.20%	320	0.33%
41	57,866	45.40%	67,430	52.90%	1,245	0.98%	288	0.23%	203	0.16%	440	0.35%
42	34,735	30.82%	75,733	67.19%	1,242	1.10%	304	0.27%	212	0.19%	484	0.43%
43	66,190	61.87%	39,352	36.78%	859	0.80%	216	0.20%	156	0.15%	218	0.20%
44	76,982	69.92%	31,836	28.91%	753	0.68%	177	0.16%	193	0.18%	165	0.15%
45	77,467	70.50%	30,925	28.14%	827	0.75%	217	0.20%	230	0.21%	221	0.20%
46	69,635	63.82%	37,927	34.76%	806	0.74%	257	0.24%	261	0.24%	219	0.20%
47	80,078	63.12%	44,847	35.35%	1,059	0.83%	301	0.24%	290	0.23%	293	0.23%
48	72,600	63.03%	40,848	35.47%	974	0.85%	258	0.22%	246	0.21%	249	0.22%

Candidates: Trump (Rep), Biden (Dem), Jorgensen (Lib), Hawkins (Grn), Blankenship (Cst)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-173.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:21 PM

[EL20-PRS-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - US President-15116-

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib	Grn	% Grn	Cnst	% Cnst	W-I	% W-I
49	40,679	33.82%	77,533	64.47%	1,108	0.92%	413	0.34%	230	0.19%	303	0.25%
50	76,986	63.62%	41,950	34.67%	1,053	0.87%	324	0.27%	379	0.31%	323	0.27%
Total:	2,754,299	49.91%	2,680,505	48.57%	48,640	0.88%	12,186	0.22%	9,908	0.18%	13,314	0.24%

2020 Election Contest Report - US Senate -15117-

NC General Assembly

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib	Cnst	% Cnst
1	58,150	52.68%	48,207	43.67%	2,845	2.58%	1,180	1.07%
2	59,982	53.46%	48,073	42.85%	2,704	2.41%	1,437	1.28%
3	58,888	55.16%	43,190	40.45%	3,069	2.87%	1,614	1.51%
4	52,407	50.34%	47,837	45.95%	2,493	2.39%	1,366	1.31%
5	46,289	41.45%	61,228	54.83%	3,001	2.69%	1,153	1.03%
6	42,868	60.21%	23,345	32.79%	3,627	5.09%	1,363	1.91%
7	57,855	47.06%	58,359	47.47%	5,178	4.21%	1,545	1.26%
8	72,022	58.78%	45,037	36.75%	3,732	3.05%	1,743	1.42%
9	61,214	57.93%	39,929	37.78%	2,936	2.78%	1,599	1.51%
10	64,822	58.82%	39,771	36.09%	3,953	3.59%	1,667	1.51%
11	52,249	47.55%	53,394	48.59%	2,818	2.56%	1,417	1.29%
12	49,589	56.55%	33,576	38.29%	3,135	3.57%	1,393	1.59%
13	57,537	49.72%	53,468	46.21%	3,630	3.14%	1,081	0.93%
14	25,587	25.66%	69,513	69.72%	3,597	3.61%	1,006	1.01%
15	33,282	30.62%	71,034	65.35%	3,752	3.45%	629	0.58%
16	37,625	35.51%	64,088	60.48%	3,530	3.33%	717	0.68%
17	55,820	48.05%	54,763	47.14%	4,566	3.93%	1,012	0.87%
18	38,223	34.00%	69,265	61.61%	4,062	3.61%	878	0.78%
19	31,128	32.10%	60,735	62.63%	3,657	3.77%	1,459	1.50%
20	32,872	27.64%	81,908	68.86%	3,259	2.74%	908	0.76%
21	61,678	57.86%	39,923	37.45%	3,482	3.27%	1,521	1.43%
22	22,275	20.64%	81,923	75.89%	2,943	2.73%	803	0.74%
23	39,697	33.61%	74,635	63.18%	2,839	2.40%	956	0.81%
24	40,915	50.01%	37,461	45.79%	2,186	2.67%	1,247	1.52%
25	61,948	56.68%	43,021	39.36%	2,995	2.74%	1,331	1.22%
26	68,016	59.50%	41,400	36.22%	3,457	3.02%	1,432	1.25%
27	42,930	37.34%	67,265	58.50%	3,617	3.15%	1,172	1.02%
28	22,932	22.85%	73,408	73.16%	2,989	2.98%	1,016	1.01%
29	68,684	64.25%	33,632	31.46%	2,861	2.68%	1,731	1.62%
30	78,074	68.87%	30,260	26.69%	3,277	2.89%	1,758	1.55%
31	72,156	58.81%	44,827	36.54%	3,994	3.26%	1,712	1.40%
32	29,664	28.98%	68,084	66.52%	3,351	3.27%	1,248	1.22%
33	70,337	66.13%	30,688	28.85%	3,215	3.02%	2,128	2.00%
34	58,598	52.18%	47,886	42.64%	4,150	3.70%	1,669	1.49%
35	72,972	60.87%	42,189	35.19%	3,514	2.93%	1,204	1.00%
36	77,193	72.20%	24,874	23.26%	2,952	2.76%	1,897	1.77%
37	72,990	61.61%	39,793	33.59%	3,900	3.29%	1,789	1.51%
38	36,559	32.83%	69,681	62.58%	4,011	3.60%	1,092	0.98%
39	26,356	26.31%	68,683	68.57%	3,886	3.88%	1,243	1.24%
40	15,759	16.44%	75,208	78.47%	3,618	3.78%	1,256	1.31%
41	60,732	48.04%	60,877	48.15%	3,879	3.07%	939	0.74%
42	38,608	34.49%	68,484	61.18%	3,957	3.53%	897	0.80%
43	63,023	59.57%	37,960	35.88%	3,323	3.14%	1,490	1.41%
44	73,070	67.03%	31,285	28.70%	2,942	2.70%	1,710	1.57%
45	73,518	67.41%	30,205	27.70%	3,351	3.07%	1,984	1.82%
46	65,726	60.86%	37,449	34.67%	3,164	2.93%	1,663	1.54%
47	75,532	60.17%	44,365	35.34%	3,733	2.97%	1,906	1.52%
48	70,334	61.59%	39,377	34.48%	3,030	2.65%	1,458	1.28%

Candidates: Tillis (Rep), Cunningham (Dem), Bray (Lib), Hayes (Cst)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-173.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:21 PM

[EL20-SEN-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - US Senate -15118-

NC General Assembly

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib	Cnst	% Cnst
49	39,790	33.40%	74,404	62.45%	3,764	3.16%	1,180	0.99%
50	72,894	60.86%	41,543	34.69%	3,474	2.90%	1,860	1.55%
Total:	2,661,369	48.67%	2,567,510	46.95%	171,398	3.13%	68,459	1.25%

Candidates: Tillis (Rep), Cunningham (Dem), Bray (Lib), Hayes (Cst)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-173.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:21 PM

[EL20-SEN-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Governor

NC General Assembly

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep	Lib	% Lib	Cnst	% Cnst
1	52,138	46.85%	57,552	51.71%	1,098	0.99%	502	0.45%
2	51,386	45.50%	60,369	53.45%	756	0.67%	425	0.38%
3	46,935	43.65%	59,230	55.09%	912	0.85%	444	0.41%
4	51,594	49.23%	52,039	49.66%	753	0.72%	412	0.39%
5	65,390	58.24%	45,468	40.50%	1,003	0.89%	417	0.37%
6	25,653	35.89%	43,838	61.33%	1,454	2.03%	536	0.75%
7	65,803	53.14%	55,773	45.04%	1,720	1.39%	537	0.43%
8	50,753	41.16%	70,879	57.48%	1,114	0.90%	563	0.46%
9	43,442	40.78%	61,836	58.05%	823	0.77%	415	0.39%
10	45,165	40.66%	64,310	57.90%	1,137	1.02%	462	0.42%
11	58,279	52.72%	51,070	46.20%	821	0.74%	376	0.34%
12	37,728	42.85%	48,846	55.48%	1,064	1.21%	404	0.46%
13	60,326	51.91%	54,316	46.74%	1,166	1.00%	399	0.34%
14	74,605	74.52%	23,855	23.83%	1,223	1.22%	430	0.43%
15	78,414	71.89%	28,798	26.40%	1,517	1.39%	346	0.32%
16	72,493	68.14%	32,244	30.31%	1,291	1.21%	356	0.33%
17	63,307	54.26%	51,400	44.06%	1,538	1.32%	425	0.36%
18	76,992	68.21%	33,982	30.11%	1,474	1.31%	429	0.38%
19	65,793	67.45%	29,593	30.34%	1,519	1.56%	632	0.65%
20	87,896	73.56%	30,057	25.15%	1,156	0.97%	379	0.32%
21	45,458	42.43%	59,918	55.92%	1,258	1.17%	507	0.47%
22	87,027	80.31%	19,822	18.29%	1,160	1.07%	350	0.32%
23	79,628	67.09%	37,740	31.80%	997	0.84%	326	0.27%
24	42,549	51.40%	39,184	47.34%	717	0.87%	323	0.39%
25	47,850	43.56%	60,685	55.25%	922	0.84%	385	0.35%
26	46,916	40.88%	66,359	57.82%	1,064	0.93%	420	0.37%
27	73,548	63.86%	39,630	34.41%	1,419	1.23%	575	0.50%
28	77,892	77.53%	20,873	20.78%	1,237	1.23%	459	0.46%
29	38,260	35.55%	68,060	63.24%	875	0.81%	433	0.40%
30	34,490	30.33%	77,852	68.46%	997	0.88%	381	0.34%
31	51,318	41.62%	70,269	56.98%	1,237	1.00%	488	0.40%
32	73,910	71.93%	27,047	26.32%	1,308	1.27%	485	0.47%
33	34,886	32.58%	70,698	66.02%	1,014	0.95%	484	0.45%
34	53,525	47.57%	57,042	50.70%	1,454	1.29%	497	0.44%
35	48,047	39.89%	70,638	58.65%	1,270	1.05%	488	0.41%
36	29,151	27.05%	77,455	71.88%	802	0.74%	344	0.32%
37	45,329	38.05%	71,916	60.37%	1,384	1.16%	496	0.42%
38	75,400	67.51%	34,198	30.62%	1,619	1.45%	472	0.42%
39	73,717	73.38%	24,566	24.45%	1,642	1.63%	537	0.53%
40	79,624	82.78%	14,372	14.94%	1,619	1.68%	569	0.59%
41	69,053	54.40%	55,917	44.05%	1,459	1.15%	499	0.39%
42	75,932	67.68%	34,109	30.40%	1,650	1.47%	495	0.44%
43	42,129	39.57%	62,717	58.91%	1,147	1.08%	472	0.44%
44	35,224	32.10%	73,183	66.69%	914	0.83%	422	0.38%
45	34,495	31.47%	73,555	67.11%	1,062	0.97%	495	0.45%
46	41,901	38.59%	65,067	59.92%	1,090	1.00%	524	0.48%
47	49,418	39.08%	75,173	59.44%	1,321	1.04%	552	0.44%
48	44,461	38.74%	68,727	59.88%	1,121	0.98%	460	0.40%

Candidates: Cooper (Dem), Forest (Rep), DiFiore (Lib), Pisano (Cst)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-173.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:21 PM

[EL20-GOV-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Governor

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep	Lib	% Lib	Cnst	% Cnst
49	79,374	66.47%	37,743	31.61%	1,749	1.46%	544	0.46%
50	46,097	38.24%	72,492	60.14%	1,361	1.13%	585	0.49%
Total:	2,830,701	51.50%	2,582,462	46.98%	60,408	1.10%	22,956	0.42%

Candidates: Cooper (Dem), Forest (Rep), DiFiore (Lib), Pisano (Cst)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-173.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:21 PM

[EL20-GOV-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Lieutenant Governor

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
1	60,074	54.91%	49,323	45.09%
2	63,416	57.02%	47,801	42.98%
3	62,486	59.03%	43,363	40.97%
4	55,143	53.23%	48,451	46.77%
5	49,133	44.28%	61,826	55.72%
6	45,953	65.77%	23,914	34.23%
7	61,048	50.34%	60,226	49.66%
8	75,761	62.68%	45,117	37.32%
9	64,752	61.76%	40,097	38.24%
10	68,446	62.83%	40,493	37.17%
11	55,294	50.58%	54,018	49.42%
12	52,426	60.34%	34,457	39.66%
13	59,762	52.11%	54,913	47.89%
14	26,945	27.18%	72,207	72.82%
15	33,942	31.62%	73,397	68.38%
16	38,438	36.74%	66,191	63.26%
17	58,102	50.61%	56,707	49.39%
18	39,555	35.55%	71,697	64.45%
19	32,967	34.21%	63,397	65.79%
20	34,226	29.06%	83,537	70.94%
21	64,259	61.05%	40,993	38.95%
22	23,129	21.59%	84,003	78.41%
23	41,856	35.82%	75,005	64.18%
24	42,250	52.27%	38,583	47.73%
25	65,793	60.37%	43,190	39.63%
26	72,302	63.74%	41,132	36.26%
27	45,656	40.07%	68,281	59.93%
28	24,566	24.62%	75,228	75.38%
29	72,533	68.34%	33,602	31.66%
30	83,771	74.17%	29,179	25.83%
31	76,709	63.10%	44,862	36.90%
32	31,478	31.12%	69,682	68.88%
33	74,354	70.54%	31,049	29.46%
34	61,595	55.38%	49,632	44.62%
35	74,563	63.21%	43,398	36.79%
36	82,647	77.81%	23,570	22.19%
37	75,952	64.98%	40,937	35.02%
38	37,919	34.40%	72,324	65.60%
39	27,418	27.59%	71,957	72.41%
40	16,607	17.43%	78,661	82.57%
41	62,382	49.91%	62,616	50.09%
42	39,447	35.73%	70,941	64.27%
43	65,627	63.07%	38,425	36.93%
44	76,301	70.80%	31,462	29.20%
45	77,766	71.68%	30,724	28.32%
46	69,503	64.90%	37,594	35.10%
47	79,795	64.32%	44,266	35.68%
48	73,633	64.87%	39,872	35.13%

Candidates: Robinson (Rep), Holley (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-173.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:21 PM

[EL20-LG-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Lieutenant Governor

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
49	41,890	35.55%	75,951	64.45%
50	77,406	65.11%	41,475	34.89%
Total:	2,796,976	51.64%	2,619,726	48.36%

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Attorney General

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
1	50,084	46.07%	58,620	53.93%
2	50,010	45.06%	60,967	54.94%
3	45,171	42.91%	60,091	57.09%
4	50,591	48.93%	52,798	51.07%
5	64,215	58.04%	46,431	41.96%
6	24,606	35.19%	45,316	64.81%
7	62,789	51.85%	58,301	48.15%
8	47,248	39.18%	73,352	60.82%
9	42,021	40.32%	62,197	59.68%
10	42,994	39.68%	65,352	60.32%
11	57,087	52.28%	52,103	47.72%
12	36,267	41.88%	50,331	58.12%
13	57,199	49.95%	57,317	50.05%
14	73,402	74.17%	25,565	25.83%
15	75,561	70.32%	31,899	29.68%
16	68,022	65.01%	36,604	34.99%
17	58,928	51.41%	55,700	48.59%
18	73,810	66.37%	37,401	33.63%
19	64,354	66.96%	31,750	33.04%
20	84,916	72.15%	32,775	27.85%
21	42,751	40.67%	62,360	59.33%
22	84,902	79.32%	22,135	20.68%
23	77,323	66.30%	39,308	33.70%
24	39,896	49.65%	40,465	50.35%
25	45,396	41.82%	63,153	58.18%
26	43,579	38.54%	69,484	61.46%
27	70,200	61.73%	43,512	38.27%
28	76,211	76.60%	23,278	23.40%
29	36,037	34.09%	69,664	65.91%
30	31,535	27.95%	81,292	72.05%
31	46,564	38.27%	75,122	61.73%
32	69,811	68.68%	31,832	31.32%
33	33,768	32.10%	71,415	67.90%
34	51,846	46.73%	59,106	53.27%
35	45,174	38.25%	72,922	61.75%
36	26,328	24.84%	79,662	75.16%
37	42,696	36.61%	73,919	63.39%
38	73,039	66.35%	37,036	33.65%
39	72,217	72.85%	26,914	27.15%
40	78,917	82.95%	16,219	17.05%
41	64,550	51.71%	60,276	48.29%
42	72,199	65.46%	38,094	34.54%
43	40,682	38.80%	64,176	61.20%
44	33,971	31.60%	73,537	68.40%
45	33,419	30.83%	74,993	69.17%
46	39,743	37.17%	67,167	62.83%
47	46,915	37.90%	76,874	62.10%
48	41,066	36.27%	72,158	63.73%

Candidates: Stein (Dem), O'Neill (Rep)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-173.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:21 PM

[EL20-AG-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Attorney General

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
49	77,325	65.75%	40,281	34.25%
50	43,440	36.65%	75,073	63.35%
Total:	2,710,775	50.13%	2,696,297	49.87%

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Auditor -15125-

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
1	51,610	47.68%	56,631	52.32%
2	51,827	46.98%	58,494	53.02%
3	47,728	45.49%	57,201	54.51%
4	51,902	50.48%	50,924	49.52%
5	67,091	60.83%	43,207	39.17%
6	25,254	36.65%	43,653	63.35%
7	61,906	51.91%	57,360	48.09%
8	46,782	39.33%	72,160	60.67%
9	42,853	41.27%	60,994	58.73%
10	44,616	41.36%	63,253	58.64%
11	61,037	56.19%	47,583	43.81%
12	37,135	43.08%	49,057	56.92%
13	58,329	51.40%	55,159	48.60%
14	73,631	74.90%	24,671	25.10%
15	75,401	71.09%	30,660	28.91%
16	68,412	66.20%	34,933	33.80%
17	59,827	52.78%	53,518	47.22%
18	74,266	67.48%	35,793	32.52%
19	64,268	67.26%	31,281	32.74%
20	85,205	72.99%	31,526	27.01%
21	42,916	41.23%	61,174	58.77%
22	85,056	79.97%	21,307	20.03%
23	77,104	66.69%	38,505	33.31%
24	41,130	51.40%	38,892	48.60%
25	45,001	41.78%	62,706	58.22%
26	43,657	39.04%	68,159	60.96%
27	70,468	62.66%	42,001	37.34%
28	76,090	77.06%	22,656	22.94%
29	35,925	34.19%	69,158	65.81%
30	32,017	28.55%	80,121	71.45%
31	47,300	39.34%	72,924	60.66%
32	70,962	70.73%	29,370	29.27%
33	33,060	31.63%	71,460	68.37%
34	51,381	46.79%	58,429	53.21%
35	44,427	38.10%	72,193	61.90%
36	26,180	24.94%	78,782	75.06%
37	42,829	37.02%	72,857	62.98%
38	72,729	66.72%	36,273	33.28%
39	71,899	73.01%	26,586	26.99%
40	78,531	82.95%	16,138	17.05%
41	64,128	52.02%	59,147	47.98%
42	71,747	65.89%	37,144	34.11%
43	39,743	38.59%	63,256	61.41%
44	33,487	31.36%	73,286	68.64%
45	32,645	30.30%	75,099	69.70%
46	39,499	37.26%	66,510	62.74%
47	46,485	38.07%	75,635	61.93%
48	41,036	36.54%	71,271	63.46%

Candidates: Wood (Dem), Street (Rep)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-173.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:21 PM

[EL20-AUD-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Auditor -15126-

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
49	76,997	66.02%	39,637	33.98%
50	43,864	37.29%	73,760	62.71%
Total:	2,727,373	50.89%	2,632,494	49.11%

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Commissioner of Agriculture

NC General Assembly

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
1	60,258	55.56%	48,195	44.44%
2	64,948	58.56%	45,955	41.44%
3	63,179	60.03%	42,075	39.97%
4	57,059	55.25%	46,216	44.75%
5	50,236	45.60%	59,934	54.40%
6	45,521	65.96%	23,497	34.04%
7	61,506	51.34%	58,287	48.66%
8	75,978	63.77%	43,173	36.23%
9	65,484	62.82%	38,759	37.18%
10	72,402	66.48%	36,498	33.52%
11	58,055	53.22%	51,021	46.78%
12	54,780	63.21%	31,890	36.79%
13	64,572	56.65%	49,404	43.35%
14	31,093	31.52%	67,557	68.48%
15	41,298	38.74%	65,303	61.26%
16	43,316	41.75%	60,446	58.25%
17	63,412	55.65%	50,527	44.35%
18	46,380	41.95%	64,185	58.05%
19	33,811	35.29%	62,010	64.71%
20	38,187	32.67%	78,702	67.33%
21	66,255	63.29%	38,428	36.71%
22	26,352	24.81%	79,870	75.19%
23	45,658	39.33%	70,441	60.67%
24	42,201	52.73%	37,829	47.27%
25	68,503	63.11%	40,034	36.89%
26	76,396	67.52%	36,746	32.48%
27	49,293	43.55%	63,892	56.45%
28	27,734	27.93%	71,576	72.07%
29	73,596	69.65%	32,071	30.35%
30	86,203	76.51%	26,462	23.49%
31	79,328	65.64%	41,531	34.36%
32	33,596	33.43%	66,911	66.57%
33	75,914	72.39%	28,952	27.61%
34	62,559	56.80%	47,571	43.20%
35	74,718	63.97%	42,086	36.03%
36	84,191	79.59%	21,594	20.41%
37	76,561	66.02%	39,412	33.98%
38	38,290	35.06%	70,922	64.94%
39	27,742	28.13%	70,874	71.87%
40	17,138	18.08%	77,677	81.92%
41	63,670	51.59%	59,756	48.41%
42	41,568	38.06%	67,638	61.94%
43	65,781	63.32%	38,108	36.68%
44	76,738	71.55%	30,514	28.45%
45	78,540	72.72%	29,457	27.28%
46	70,363	66.07%	36,138	33.93%
47	81,562	66.20%	41,647	33.80%
48	74,705	66.29%	37,996	33.71%

Candidates: Troxler (Rep), Wadsworth (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-173.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:21 PM

[EL20-COA-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Commissioner of Agriculture

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
49	43,276	36.97%	73,769	63.03%
50	78,094	66.12%	40,007	33.88%
Total:	2,898,000	53.85%	2,483,543	46.15%

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Commissioner of Labor

NC General Assembly

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
1	57,946	53.61%	50,132	46.39%
2	61,297	55.60%	48,958	44.40%
3	60,100	57.24%	44,895	42.76%
4	53,828	52.32%	49,063	47.68%
5	46,960	42.62%	63,226	57.38%
6	43,833	63.78%	24,888	36.22%
7	58,670	49.07%	60,898	50.93%
8	73,306	61.54%	45,813	38.46%
9	62,402	60.06%	41,502	39.94%
10	66,758	61.91%	41,065	38.09%
11	53,888	49.65%	54,651	50.35%
12	51,173	59.44%	34,919	40.56%
13	58,522	51.72%	54,619	48.28%
14	26,048	26.57%	71,996	73.43%
15	33,359	31.58%	72,268	68.42%
16	37,135	36.10%	65,723	63.90%
17	56,514	50.06%	56,373	49.94%
18	38,729	35.37%	70,773	64.63%
19	31,942	33.34%	63,877	66.66%
20	33,409	28.61%	83,376	71.39%
21	62,966	60.46%	41,184	39.54%
22	22,579	21.25%	83,673	78.75%
23	40,514	35.06%	75,043	64.94%
24	39,912	49.85%	40,149	50.15%
25	64,122	59.48%	43,690	40.52%
26	70,201	62.76%	41,654	37.24%
27	44,059	39.22%	68,273	60.78%
28	23,527	23.82%	75,226	76.18%
29	70,559	67.16%	34,502	32.84%
30	82,384	73.45%	29,775	26.55%
31	74,824	62.28%	45,309	37.72%
32	30,507	30.48%	69,586	69.52%
33	73,101	69.93%	31,435	30.07%
34	59,802	54.60%	49,723	45.40%
35	73,180	62.80%	43,352	37.20%
36	80,693	76.77%	24,421	23.23%
37	74,392	64.34%	41,235	35.66%
38	36,764	33.72%	72,258	66.28%
39	26,746	27.14%	71,797	72.86%
40	16,158	17.06%	78,565	82.94%
41	60,929	49.51%	62,129	50.49%
42	38,864	35.72%	69,938	64.28%
43	64,346	62.19%	39,125	37.81%
44	74,893	70.10%	31,944	29.90%
45	76,545	70.99%	31,278	29.01%
46	68,632	64.56%	37,680	35.44%
47	78,030	63.61%	44,640	36.39%
48	72,307	64.35%	40,050	35.65%

Candidates: Dobson (Rep), Holmes (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-173.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:21 PM

[EL20-COL-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Commissioner of Labor

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
49	40,688	34.90%	75,886	65.10%
50	75,063	63.84%	42,510	36.16%
Total:	2,723,106	50.82%	2,635,045	49.18%

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Secretary of State

NC General Assembly

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
1	51,876	47.81%	56,625	52.19%
2	51,732	46.77%	58,883	53.23%
3	46,973	44.66%	58,205	55.34%
4	52,300	50.68%	50,895	49.32%
5	65,540	59.36%	44,864	40.64%
6	25,482	36.81%	43,743	63.19%
7	63,282	52.64%	56,924	47.36%
8	47,788	39.87%	72,077	60.13%
9	43,792	42.01%	60,439	57.99%
10	45,383	41.92%	62,870	58.08%
11	58,442	53.64%	50,507	46.36%
12	38,950	45.00%	47,605	55.00%
13	58,445	51.27%	55,539	48.73%
14	74,111	75.17%	24,483	24.83%
15	76,019	71.34%	30,536	28.66%
16	68,440	65.95%	35,333	34.05%
17	59,679	52.48%	54,028	47.52%
18	74,636	67.49%	35,957	32.51%
19	65,333	68.02%	30,718	31.98%
20	85,479	72.96%	31,684	27.04%
21	43,490	41.56%	61,150	58.44%
22	85,286	80.00%	21,322	20.00%
23	77,682	66.92%	38,398	33.08%
24	41,989	52.37%	38,185	47.63%
25	46,078	42.60%	62,099	57.40%
26	44,428	39.56%	67,871	60.44%
27	70,894	62.82%	41,965	37.18%
28	76,739	77.49%	22,290	22.51%
29	36,794	34.92%	68,580	65.08%
30	32,269	28.70%	80,156	71.30%
31	47,907	39.74%	72,659	60.26%
32	71,268	71.01%	29,098	28.99%
33	34,006	32.45%	70,783	67.55%
34	51,879	47.11%	58,248	52.89%
35	45,109	38.41%	72,344	61.59%
36	27,067	25.68%	78,331	74.32%
37	43,211	37.27%	72,728	62.73%
38	73,372	67.03%	36,084	32.97%
39	72,670	73.52%	26,173	26.48%
40	79,218	83.45%	15,715	16.55%
41	64,717	52.26%	59,113	47.74%
42	72,568	66.23%	37,007	33.77%
43	40,649	39.25%	62,907	60.75%
44	34,446	32.17%	72,624	67.83%
45	33,442	30.95%	74,607	69.05%
46	40,318	37.92%	66,011	62.08%
47	47,761	38.86%	75,136	61.14%
48	41,817	37.11%	70,859	62.89%

Candidates: Marshall (Dem), Sykes (Rep)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-173.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:21 PM

[EL20-SOS-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Secretary of State

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
49	77,337	66.15%	39,568	33.85%
50	44,670	37.84%	73,389	62.16%
Total:	2,752,763	51.17%	2,627,315	48.83%

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Treasurer15133-

NC General Assembly

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
1	59,619	55.45%	47,894	44.55%
2	62,277	56.68%	47,607	43.32%
3	61,487	58.85%	42,989	41.15%
4	55,092	53.82%	47,266	46.18%
5	48,908	44.57%	60,833	55.43%
6	44,940	65.52%	23,646	34.48%
7	61,429	51.73%	57,309	48.27%
8	74,392	62.85%	43,971	37.15%
9	63,226	61.16%	40,149	38.84%
10	67,530	63.08%	39,529	36.92%
11	55,430	51.24%	52,750	48.76%
12	52,283	60.96%	33,487	39.04%
13	60,894	53.82%	52,241	46.18%
14	29,019	29.59%	69,043	70.41%
15	36,680	34.65%	69,191	65.35%
16	39,869	38.68%	63,205	61.32%
17	59,328	52.49%	53,708	47.51%
18	41,964	38.22%	67,818	61.78%
19	34,743	36.44%	60,602	63.56%
20	36,128	31.05%	80,220	68.95%
21	64,253	61.93%	39,493	38.07%
22	25,287	23.87%	80,656	76.13%
23	42,493	36.90%	72,649	63.10%
24	41,200	51.79%	38,357	48.21%
25	64,314	59.64%	43,515	40.36%
26	70,091	62.67%	41,759	37.33%
27	45,746	40.67%	66,732	59.33%
28	25,661	25.99%	73,061	74.01%
29	70,732	67.44%	34,146	32.56%
30	81,672	72.76%	30,582	27.24%
31	76,182	63.22%	44,330	36.78%
32	34,090	33.99%	66,217	66.01%
33	73,290	70.52%	30,635	29.48%
34	62,234	56.96%	47,030	43.04%
35	74,664	64.26%	41,535	35.74%
36	80,195	76.39%	24,783	23.61%
37	75,942	66.01%	39,100	33.99%
38	40,216	37.00%	68,486	63.00%
39	30,054	30.58%	68,224	69.42%
40	19,556	20.71%	74,852	79.29%
41	64,635	52.61%	58,219	47.39%
42	42,957	39.52%	65,740	60.48%
43	65,330	63.43%	37,664	36.57%
44	75,256	70.83%	30,993	29.17%
45	77,644	72.20%	29,897	27.80%
46	68,585	64.99%	36,939	35.01%
47	78,464	64.41%	43,353	35.59%
48	73,431	65.56%	38,569	34.44%

Candidates: Folwell (Rep), Chatterji (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-173.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:21 PM

[EL20-TRS-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Treasurer15134-

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
49	43,503	37.46%	72,619	62.54%
50	76,288	65.05%	40,988	34.95%
Total:	2,809,203	52.57%	2,534,581	47.43%

2016 Election Contest Report - US President-15135-

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib	W-I	% W-I
1	50,284	51.61%	44,066	45.23%	2,329	2.39%	757	0.78%
2	56,694	53.08%	47,518	44.49%	1,893	1.77%	713	0.67%
3	55,760	57.38%	38,588	39.71%	2,035	2.09%	798	0.82%
4	49,451	51.02%	45,041	46.47%	1,715	1.77%	721	0.74%
5	43,907	41.71%	57,952	55.05%	2,444	2.32%	967	0.92%
6	37,124	64.98%	17,512	30.65%	1,926	3.37%	573	1.00%
7	52,202	49.28%	48,418	45.71%	3,740	3.53%	1,562	1.47%
8	60,114	61.33%	34,881	35.59%	2,232	2.28%	794	0.81%
9	55,498	58.55%	37,146	39.19%	1,589	1.68%	561	0.59%
10	54,369	63.29%	28,362	33.02%	2,347	2.73%	828	0.96%
11	47,013	47.97%	48,332	49.32%	1,821	1.86%	832	0.85%
12	42,059	58.36%	27,370	37.98%	1,954	2.71%	688	0.95%
13	47,918	50.43%	42,548	44.78%	2,980	3.14%	1,575	1.66%
14	21,569	25.53%	59,610	70.57%	2,220	2.63%	1,074	1.27%
15	29,368	30.00%	62,520	63.86%	4,091	4.18%	1,930	1.97%
16	31,599	36.17%	50,681	58.02%	3,485	3.99%	1,587	1.82%
17	45,244	49.95%	40,008	44.17%	3,741	4.13%	1,583	1.75%
18	33,978	34.10%	60,280	60.49%	3,539	3.55%	1,854	1.86%
19	28,622	33.00%	55,004	63.41%	2,267	2.61%	853	0.98%
20	26,135	26.02%	69,875	69.56%	2,861	2.85%	1,588	1.58%
21	53,131	59.40%	32,928	36.81%	2,461	2.75%	928	1.04%
22	19,236	20.29%	71,836	75.76%	2,256	2.38%	1,491	1.57%
23	35,766	31.65%	72,543	64.19%	3,037	2.69%	1,672	1.48%
24	34,654	47.68%	35,862	49.34%	1,626	2.24%	536	0.74%
25	55,154	59.78%	34,020	36.88%	2,222	2.41%	861	0.93%
26	61,878	62.93%	33,030	33.59%	2,427	2.47%	994	1.01%
27	41,327	39.66%	58,352	56.00%	3,067	2.94%	1,447	1.39%
28	21,445	22.25%	71,607	74.28%	2,108	2.19%	1,235	1.28%
29	63,219	65.18%	31,041	32.00%	1,960	2.02%	771	0.79%
30	69,900	72.36%	23,384	24.21%	2,490	2.58%	824	0.85%
31	65,937	62.11%	35,756	33.68%	3,188	3.00%	1,273	1.20%
32	27,186	28.70%	63,366	66.88%	2,757	2.91%	1,432	1.51%
33	64,798	68.70%	26,507	28.10%	2,182	2.31%	837	0.89%
34	51,557	57.10%	34,874	38.62%	2,717	3.01%	1,145	1.27%
35	60,788	62.99%	31,434	32.57%	3,076	3.19%	1,206	1.25%
36	75,063	75.65%	21,031	21.20%	2,215	2.23%	917	0.92%
37	61,576	63.85%	31,068	32.21%	2,695	2.79%	1,101	1.14%
38	32,200	35.23%	54,778	59.94%	3,007	3.29%	1,405	1.54%
39	20,342	25.92%	54,950	70.02%	2,252	2.87%	928	1.18%
40	12,626	15.86%	64,081	80.50%	1,889	2.37%	1,009	1.27%
41	52,099	48.83%	48,861	45.79%	3,831	3.59%	1,909	1.79%
42	29,829	31.53%	59,096	62.47%	3,883	4.10%	1,788	1.89%
43	56,223	63.00%	29,764	33.35%	2,310	2.59%	951	1.07%
44	62,761	68.41%	26,244	28.60%	1,955	2.13%	788	0.86%
45	65,746	69.31%	25,511	26.89%	2,509	2.65%	1,092	1.15%
46	59,890	63.42%	30,544	32.35%	2,481	2.63%	1,515	1.60%
47	69,078	62.02%	37,052	33.26%	3,347	3.00%	1,908	1.71%
48	64,429	64.83%	31,065	31.26%	2,521	2.54%	1,372	1.38%

Candidates: Trump (Rep), Clinton (Dem), Johnson (Lib)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-173.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:21 PM

[EL20-PRS-16G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2016 Election Contest Report - US President-15136-

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib	W-I	% W-I
49	36,622	35.45%	60,820	58.88%	3,190	3.09%	2,667	2.58%
50	66,381	63.71%	33,199	31.86%	3,061	2.94%	1,557	1.49%
Total:	2,359,749	49.90%	2,180,316	46.10%	129,929	2.75%	59,397	1.26%

Candidates: Trump (Rep), Clinton (Dem), Johnson (Lib)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-173.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:21 PM

[EL20-PRS-16G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2016 Election Contest Report - NC Lieutenant Governor

NC General Assembly

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib
1	48,044	50.98%	43,892	46.58%	2,302	2.44%
2	55,153	52.88%	47,116	45.17%	2,036	1.95%
3	54,637	57.67%	37,978	40.09%	2,127	2.25%
4	49,273	51.96%	43,917	46.32%	1,632	1.72%
5	44,485	43.33%	55,835	54.38%	2,354	2.29%
6	35,421	64.57%	17,156	31.27%	2,282	4.16%
7	52,833	51.79%	45,113	44.22%	4,073	3.99%
8	58,590	61.82%	33,841	35.71%	2,345	2.47%
9	53,716	58.47%	36,312	39.52%	1,845	2.01%
10	54,745	65.02%	27,276	32.40%	2,173	2.58%
11	46,973	48.72%	47,777	49.56%	1,661	1.72%
12	41,806	59.11%	27,030	38.22%	1,884	2.66%
13	51,312	54.96%	39,693	42.51%	2,358	2.53%
14	22,761	27.35%	58,238	69.99%	2,214	2.66%
15	34,432	36.03%	57,459	60.13%	3,662	3.83%
16	35,816	42.12%	46,272	54.42%	2,937	3.45%
17	48,553	54.84%	37,126	41.93%	2,863	3.23%
18	38,522	39.34%	56,349	57.55%	3,042	3.11%
19	28,681	33.98%	52,949	62.74%	2,765	3.28%
20	29,323	29.69%	66,897	67.73%	2,554	2.59%
21	52,882	60.66%	31,729	36.40%	2,565	2.94%
22	21,890	23.55%	68,759	73.97%	2,304	2.48%
23	38,463	34.96%	68,666	62.41%	2,887	2.62%
24	30,784	44.48%	36,626	52.92%	1,794	2.59%
25	55,365	61.29%	32,397	35.87%	2,564	2.84%
26	61,346	63.90%	32,235	33.58%	2,426	2.53%
27	43,222	42.63%	54,989	54.23%	3,184	3.14%
28	22,582	24.03%	68,770	73.17%	2,631	2.80%
29	61,321	65.04%	30,789	32.66%	2,171	2.30%
30	68,723	72.97%	22,967	24.39%	2,484	2.64%
31	66,722	64.26%	34,189	32.93%	2,913	2.81%
32	29,711	32.20%	59,879	64.90%	2,671	2.90%
33	63,711	69.23%	25,792	28.03%	2,524	2.74%
34	52,602	59.74%	32,589	37.01%	2,858	3.25%
35	63,174	67.31%	27,962	29.79%	2,719	2.90%
36	72,763	75.42%	21,523	22.31%	2,197	2.28%
37	62,291	66.51%	28,538	30.47%	2,831	3.02%
38	34,999	39.34%	50,882	57.19%	3,083	3.47%
39	22,098	29.02%	51,297	67.37%	2,744	3.60%
40	13,911	17.91%	61,169	78.77%	2,571	3.31%
41	59,039	56.68%	41,912	40.24%	3,207	3.08%
42	36,368	39.54%	52,068	56.61%	3,535	3.84%
43	57,050	65.39%	27,862	31.93%	2,336	2.68%
44	62,365	69.57%	25,200	28.11%	2,080	2.32%
45	65,833	71.19%	24,021	25.97%	2,627	2.84%
46	57,785	62.91%	31,129	33.89%	2,940	3.20%
47	66,647	61.95%	37,197	34.57%	3,741	3.48%
48	63,344	65.45%	30,624	31.64%	2,814	2.91%

Candidates: Forest (Rep), Coleman (Dem), Cole (Lib)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-173.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:21 PM

[EL20-LG-16G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2016 Election Contest Report - NC Lieutenant Governor

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib
49	36,011	35.83%	60,183	59.88%	4,307	4.29%
50	62,541	61.99%	34,806	34.50%	3,543	3.51%
Total:	2,390,619	51.88%	2,084,975	45.25%	132,360	2.87%

Candidates: Forest (Rep), Coleman (Dem), Cole (Lib)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-173.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:21 PM

[EL20-LG-16G] - Generated 2/17/2022

Election Contest Report - 2016/2020 Composite

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
1	48,976	45.76%	57,002	53.26%
2	48,869	44.30%	60,502	54.85%
3	43,689	41.94%	59,444	57.07%
4	48,582	47.50%	52,839	51.67%
5	62,170	56.66%	46,487	42.36%
6	23,268	34.42%	43,191	63.89%
7	58,752	49.68%	57,784	48.87%
8	44,213	37.91%	71,255	61.10%
9	40,557	39.42%	61,409	59.69%
10	39,367	37.49%	64,434	61.37%
11	54,254	50.57%	52,107	48.57%
12	33,937	40.25%	49,373	58.56%
13	53,148	47.82%	56,727	51.04%
14	69,695	72.24%	25,656	26.59%
15	71,083	67.37%	32,915	31.19%
16	63,587	62.67%	36,556	36.03%
17	54,195	49.07%	54,730	49.55%
18	69,506	63.71%	38,130	34.95%
19	61,810	65.37%	31,496	33.31%
20	81,140	70.73%	32,365	28.21%
21	40,095	39.13%	61,176	59.70%
22	81,539	77.76%	22,240	21.21%
23	74,803	64.54%	39,904	34.43%
24	39,037	49.25%	39,448	49.77%
25	42,316	40.00%	62,408	58.99%
26	40,738	36.86%	68,625	62.10%
27	66,942	59.83%	43,588	38.96%
28	74,347	75.21%	23,418	23.69%
29	34,219	32.80%	69,102	66.24%
30	29,355	26.70%	79,417	72.24%
31	44,183	37.20%	73,199	61.63%
32	68,474	68.48%	30,269	30.27%
33	31,002	29.99%	71,218	68.90%
34	47,421	44.20%	58,520	54.54%
35	41,698	36.49%	71,304	62.40%
36	24,492	23.39%	79,198	75.62%
37	39,742	35.09%	72,186	63.74%
38	69,008	64.63%	36,391	34.08%
39	68,418	71.55%	25,955	27.14%
40	75,464	81.60%	15,842	17.13%
41	60,354	49.68%	59,650	49.10%
42	68,507	63.76%	37,394	34.81%
43	37,622	36.96%	63,052	61.94%
44	31,384	29.90%	72,583	69.14%
45	30,502	28.78%	74,276	70.07%
46	37,238	35.56%	66,240	63.25%
47	43,996	36.20%	76,000	62.53%
48	38,898	35.12%	70,650	63.79%

Values represent average vote count from 12 contests: 2016 President and Lieutenant Governor; 2020 President, US Senate, Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Attorney General, Auditor, Commissioner of Agriculture, Commissioner of Labor, Secretary of State, and Treasurer.

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' files, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-173.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:21 PM

[EL20-CMP-1620G] - Generated 2/17/2022

Election Contest Report - 2016/2020 Composite

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
49	73,517	63.87%	39,974	34.73%
50	41,212	35.52%	73,364	63.23%
Total:	2,567,321	48.54%	2,660,993	50.31%

Values represent average vote count from 12 contests: 2016 President and Lieutenant Governor; 2020 President, US Senate, Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Attorney General, Auditor, Commissioner of Agriculture, Commissioner of Labor, Secretary of State, and Treasurer.

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' files, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-173.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:21 PM

[EL20-CMP-1620G] - Generated 2/17/2022

County - District Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

County	District	Total County Population	Total District Population	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Alamance	25	171,415	216,895	171,415	100.00 %	79.03 %
Alexander	36	36,444	210,986	36,444	100.00 %	17.27 %
Alleghany	47	10,888	219,135	10,888	100.00 %	4.97 %
Anson	29	22,055	216,220	22,055	100.00 %	10.20 %
Ashe	47	26,577	219,135	26,577	100.00 %	12.13 %
Avery	47	17,806	219,135	17,806	100.00 %	8.13 %
Beaufort	3	44,652	200,494	44,652	100.00 %	22.27 %
Bertie	1	17,934	199,623	17,934	100.00 %	8.98 %
Bladen	9	29,606	204,809	29,606	100.00 %	14.46 %
Brunswick	8	136,693	200,436	136,693	100.00 %	68.20 %
Buncombe	46	269,452	200,575	68,427	25.39 %	34.12 %
	49	269,452	201,025	201,025	74.61 %	100.00 %
Burke	46	87,570	200,575	87,570	100.00 %	43.66 %
Cabarrus	34	225,804	218,896	218,896	96.94 %	100.00 %
	35	225,804	218,398	6,908	3.06 %	3.16 %
Caldwell	45	80,652	209,349	48,739	60.43 %	23.28 %
	47	80,652	219,135	31,913	39.57 %	14.56 %
Camden	1	10,355	199,623	10,355	100.00 %	5.19 %
Carteret	2	67,686	198,557	67,686	100.00 %	34.09 %
Caswell	23	22,736	210,529	22,736	100.00 %	10.80 %
Catawba	45	160,610	209,349	160,610	100.00 %	76.72 %
Chatham	20	76,285	199,272	76,285	100.00 %	38.28 %
Cherokee	50	28,774	213,909	28,774	100.00 %	13.45 %
Chowan	2	13,708	198,557	13,708	100.00 %	6.90 %
Clay	50	11,089	213,909	11,089	100.00 %	5.18 %
Cleveland	44	99,519	203,043	99,519	100.00 %	49.01 %
Columbus	8	50,623	200,436	50,623	100.00 %	25.26 %
Craven	3	100,720	200,494	100,720	100.00 %	50.24 %
Cumberland	19	334,728	216,471	216,471	64.67 %	100.00 %
	21	334,728	217,984	118,257	35.33 %	54.25 %
Currituck	1	28,100	199,623	28,100	100.00 %	14.08 %
Dare	1	36,915	199,623	36,915	100.00 %	18.49 %
Davidson	30	168,930	211,642	168,930	100.00 %	79.82 %
Davie	30	42,712	211,642	42,712	100.00 %	20.18 %
Duplin	9	48,715	204,809	48,715	100.00 %	23.79 %
Durham	20	324,833	199,272	122,987	37.86 %	61.72 %
	22	324,833	201,846	201,846	62.14 %	100.00 %
Edgecombe	5	48,900	219,143	48,900	100.00 %	22.31 %
Forsyth	31	382,590	212,299	167,779	43.85 %	79.03 %
	32	382,590	214,811	214,811	56.15 %	100.00 %
Franklin	11	68,573	206,121	68,573	100.00 %	33.27 %

County - District Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

County	District	Total County Population	Total District Population	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Gaston	43	227,943	211,229	211,229	92.67 %	100.00 %
	44	227,943	203,043	16,714	7.33 %	8.23 %
Gates	1	10,478	199,623	10,478	100.00 %	5.25 %
Graham	50	8,030	213,909	8,030	100.00 %	3.75 %
Granville	13	60,992	198,354	60,992	100.00 %	30.75 %
Greene	4	20,451	216,568	20,451	100.00 %	9.44 %
Guilford	26	541,299	201,897	110,801	20.47 %	54.88 %
	27	541,299	217,296	217,296	40.14 %	100.00 %
	28	541,299	213,202	213,202	39.39 %	100.00 %
Halifax	2	48,622	198,557	48,622	100.00 %	24.49 %
Harnett	12	133,568	198,776	133,568	100.00 %	67.20 %
Haywood	47	62,089	219,135	23,299	37.53 %	10.63 %
	50	62,089	213,909	38,790	62.47 %	18.13 %
Henderson	48	116,281	200,053	116,281	100.00 %	58.13 %
Hertford	1	21,552	199,623	21,552	100.00 %	10.80 %
Hoke	24	52,082	202,786	52,082	100.00 %	25.68 %
Hyde	2	4,589	198,557	4,589	100.00 %	2.31 %
Iredell	37	186,693	212,852	186,693	100.00 %	87.71 %
Jackson	50	43,109	213,909	43,109	100.00 %	20.15 %
Johnston	10	215,999	215,999	215,999	100.00 %	100.00 %
Jones	9	9,172	204,809	9,172	100.00 %	4.48 %
Lee	12	63,285	198,776	63,285	100.00 %	31.84 %
Lenoir	3	55,122	200,494	55,122	100.00 %	27.49 %
Lincoln	44	86,810	203,043	86,810	100.00 %	42.75 %
Macon	50	37,014	213,909	37,014	100.00 %	17.30 %
Madison	47	21,193	219,135	21,193	100.00 %	9.67 %
Martin	2	22,031	198,557	22,031	100.00 %	11.10 %
McDowell	46	44,578	200,575	44,578	100.00 %	22.23 %
Mecklenburg	37	1,115,482	212,852	26,159	2.35 %	12.29 %
	38	1,115,482	218,466	218,466	19.58 %	100.00 %
	39	1,115,482	219,067	219,067	19.64 %	100.00 %
	40	1,115,482	218,411	218,411	19.58 %	100.00 %
	41	1,115,482	216,686	216,686	19.43 %	100.00 %
	42	1,115,482	216,693	216,693	19.43 %	100.00 %
Mitchell	47	14,903	219,135	14,903	100.00 %	6.80 %
Montgomery	29	25,751	216,220	25,751	100.00 %	11.91 %
Moore	21	99,727	217,984	99,727	100.00 %	45.75 %
Nash	11	94,970	206,121	94,970	100.00 %	46.07 %
New Hanover	7	225,702	212,582	212,582	94.19 %	100.00 %
	8	225,702	200,436	13,120	5.81 %	6.55 %
Northampton	1	17,471	199,623	17,471	100.00 %	8.75 %
Onslow	6	204,576	204,576	204,576	100.00 %	100.00 %

County - District Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

County	District	Total County Population	Total District Population	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Orange	23	148,696	210,529	148,696	100.00 %	70.63 %
Pamlico	2	12,276	198,557	12,276	100.00 %	6.18 %
Pasquotank	1	40,568	199,623	40,568	100.00 %	20.32 %
Pender	9	60,203	204,809	60,203	100.00 %	29.39 %
Perquimans	1	13,005	199,623	13,005	100.00 %	6.51 %
Person	23	39,097	210,529	39,097	100.00 %	18.57 %
Pitt	5	170,243	219,143	170,243	100.00 %	77.69 %
Polk	48	19,328	200,053	19,328	100.00 %	9.66 %
Randolph	25	144,171	216,895	45,480	31.55 %	20.97 %
	29	144,171	216,220	98,691	68.45 %	45.64 %
Richmond	29	42,946	216,220	42,946	100.00 %	19.86 %
Robeson	24	116,530	202,786	116,530	100.00 %	57.46 %
Rockingham	26	91,096	201,897	91,096	100.00 %	45.12 %
Rowan	33	146,875	209,379	146,875	100.00 %	70.15 %
Rutherford	48	64,444	200,053	64,444	100.00 %	32.21 %
Sampson	9	59,036	204,809	57,113	96.74 %	27.89 %
	12	59,036	198,776	1,923	3.26 %	0.97 %
Scotland	24	34,174	202,786	34,174	100.00 %	16.85 %
Stanly	33	62,504	209,379	62,504	100.00 %	29.85 %
Stokes	31	44,520	212,299	44,520	100.00 %	20.97 %
Surry	36	71,359	210,986	71,359	100.00 %	33.82 %
Swain	50	14,117	213,909	14,117	100.00 %	6.60 %
Transylvania	50	32,986	213,909	32,986	100.00 %	15.42 %
Tyrrell	1	3,245	199,623	3,245	100.00 %	1.63 %
Union	29	238,267	216,220	26,777	11.24 %	12.38 %
	35	238,267	218,398	211,490	88.76 %	96.84 %
Vance	11	42,578	206,121	42,578	100.00 %	20.66 %
Wake	13	1,129,410	198,354	137,362	12.16 %	69.25 %
	14	1,129,410	198,506	198,506	17.58 %	100.00 %
	15	1,129,410	198,385	198,385	17.57 %	100.00 %
	16	1,129,410	198,412	198,412	17.57 %	100.00 %
	17	1,129,410	198,391	198,391	17.57 %	100.00 %
	18	1,129,410	198,354	198,354	17.56 %	100.00 %
Warren	2	18,642	198,557	18,642	100.00 %	9.39 %
Washington	2	11,003	198,557	11,003	100.00 %	5.54 %
Watauga	47	54,086	219,135	54,086	100.00 %	24.68 %
Wayne	4	117,333	216,568	117,333	100.00 %	54.18 %
Wilkes	36	65,969	210,986	65,969	100.00 %	31.27 %
Wilson	4	78,784	216,568	78,784	100.00 %	36.38 %
Yadkin	36	37,214	210,986	37,214	100.00 %	17.64 %
Yancey	47	18,470	219,135	18,470	100.00 %	8.43 %
Assigned Geography Total:				10,439,388		

County - District Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

Report display: all assigned counties

Total Counties Statewide: 100

Fully Assigned Counties: 100

Partially Assigned Counties: 0

Fully Unassigned Counties: 0

Total Districts Assigned: 50

Split Counties: 15

District - County Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173**

District	County	Total District Population	Total County Population	District Pop in County	Percent of District Pop in County	Percent of County Pop in District
1	Bertie	199,623	17,934	17,934	8.98 %	100.00 %
	Camden	199,623	10,355	10,355	5.19 %	100.00 %
	Currituck	199,623	28,100	28,100	14.08 %	100.00 %
	Dare	199,623	36,915	36,915	18.49 %	100.00 %
	Gates	199,623	10,478	10,478	5.25 %	100.00 %
	Hertford	199,623	21,552	21,552	10.80 %	100.00 %
	Northampton	199,623	17,471	17,471	8.75 %	100.00 %
	Pasquotank	199,623	40,568	40,568	20.32 %	100.00 %
	Perquimans	199,623	13,005	13,005	6.51 %	100.00 %
	Tyrrell	199,623	3,245	3,245	1.63 %	100.00 %
2	Carteret	198,557	67,686	67,686	34.09 %	100.00 %
	Chowan	198,557	13,708	13,708	6.90 %	100.00 %
	Halifax	198,557	48,622	48,622	24.49 %	100.00 %
	Hyde	198,557	4,589	4,589	2.31 %	100.00 %
	Martin	198,557	22,031	22,031	11.10 %	100.00 %
	Pamlico	198,557	12,276	12,276	6.18 %	100.00 %
	Warren	198,557	18,642	18,642	9.39 %	100.00 %
	Washington	198,557	11,003	11,003	5.54 %	100.00 %
3	Beaufort	200,494	44,652	44,652	22.27 %	100.00 %
	Craven	200,494	100,720	100,720	50.24 %	100.00 %
	Lenoir	200,494	55,122	55,122	27.49 %	100.00 %
4	Greene	216,568	20,451	20,451	9.44 %	100.00 %
	Wayne	216,568	117,333	117,333	54.18 %	100.00 %
	Wilson	216,568	78,784	78,784	36.38 %	100.00 %
5	Edgecombe	219,143	48,900	48,900	22.31 %	100.00 %
	Pitt	219,143	170,243	170,243	77.69 %	100.00 %
6	Onslow	204,576	204,576	204,576	100.00 %	100.00 %
7	New Hanover	212,582	225,702	212,582	100.00 %	94.19 %
8	Brunswick	200,436	136,693	136,693	68.20 %	100.00 %
	Columbus	200,436	50,623	50,623	25.26 %	100.00 %
	New Hanover	200,436	225,702	13,120	6.55 %	5.81 %
9	Bladen	204,809	29,606	29,606	14.46 %	100.00 %
	Duplin	204,809	48,715	48,715	23.79 %	100.00 %
	Jones	204,809	9,172	9,172	4.48 %	100.00 %
	Pender	204,809	60,203	60,203	29.39 %	100.00 %
	Sampson	204,809	59,036	57,113	27.89 %	96.74 %
10	Johnston	215,999	215,999	215,999	100.00 %	100.00 %
11	Franklin	206,121	68,573	68,573	33.27 %	100.00 %
	Nash	206,121	94,970	94,970	46.07 %	100.00 %
	Vance	206,121	42,578	42,578	20.66 %	100.00 %

District - County Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173**

District	County	Total District Population	Total County Population	District Pop in County	Percent of District Pop in County	Percent of County Pop in District
12	Harnett	198,776	133,568	133,568	67.20 %	100.00 %
	Lee	198,776	63,285	63,285	31.84 %	100.00 %
	Sampson	198,776	59,036	1,923	0.97 %	3.26 %
13	Granville	198,354	60,992	60,992	30.75 %	100.00 %
	Wake	198,354	1,129,410	137,362	69.25 %	12.16 %
14	Wake	198,506	1,129,410	198,506	100.00 %	17.58 %
15	Wake	198,385	1,129,410	198,385	100.00 %	17.57 %
16	Wake	198,412	1,129,410	198,412	100.00 %	17.57 %
17	Wake	198,391	1,129,410	198,391	100.00 %	17.57 %
18	Wake	198,354	1,129,410	198,354	100.00 %	17.56 %
19	Cumberland	216,471	334,728	216,471	100.00 %	64.67 %
20	Chatham	199,272	76,285	76,285	38.28 %	100.00 %
	Durham	199,272	324,833	122,987	61.72 %	37.86 %
21	Cumberland	217,984	334,728	118,257	54.25 %	35.33 %
	Moore	217,984	99,727	99,727	45.75 %	100.00 %
22	Durham	201,846	324,833	201,846	100.00 %	62.14 %
23	Caswell	210,529	22,736	22,736	10.80 %	100.00 %
	Orange	210,529	148,696	148,696	70.63 %	100.00 %
	Person	210,529	39,097	39,097	18.57 %	100.00 %
24	Hoke	202,786	52,082	52,082	25.68 %	100.00 %
	Robeson	202,786	116,530	116,530	57.46 %	100.00 %
	Scotland	202,786	34,174	34,174	16.85 %	100.00 %
25	Alamance	216,895	171,415	171,415	79.03 %	100.00 %
	Randolph	216,895	144,171	45,480	20.97 %	31.55 %
26	Guilford	201,897	541,299	110,801	54.88 %	20.47 %
	Rockingham	201,897	91,096	91,096	45.12 %	100.00 %
27	Guilford	217,296	541,299	217,296	100.00 %	40.14 %
28	Guilford	213,202	541,299	213,202	100.00 %	39.39 %
29	Anson	216,220	22,055	22,055	10.20 %	100.00 %
	Montgomery	216,220	25,751	25,751	11.91 %	100.00 %
	Randolph	216,220	144,171	98,691	45.64 %	68.45 %
	Richmond	216,220	42,946	42,946	19.86 %	100.00 %
	Union	216,220	238,267	26,777	12.38 %	11.24 %
30	Davidson	211,642	168,930	168,930	79.82 %	100.00 %
	Davie	211,642	42,712	42,712	20.18 %	100.00 %
31	Forsyth	212,299	382,590	167,779	79.03 %	43.85 %
	Stokes	212,299	44,520	44,520	20.97 %	100.00 %
32	Forsyth	214,811	382,590	214,811	100.00 %	56.15 %
33	Rowan	209,379	146,875	146,875	70.15 %	100.00 %
	Stanly	209,379	62,504	62,504	29.85 %	100.00 %
34	Cabarrus	218,896	225,804	218,896	100.00 %	96.94 %

District - County Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

District	County	Total District Population	Total County Population	District Pop in County	Percent of District Pop in County	Percent of County Pop in District
35	Cabarrus	218,398	225,804	6,908	3.16 %	3.06 %
	Union	218,398	238,267	211,490	96.84 %	88.76 %
36	Alexander	210,986	36,444	36,444	17.27 %	100.00 %
	Surry	210,986	71,359	71,359	33.82 %	100.00 %
	Wilkes	210,986	65,969	65,969	31.27 %	100.00 %
	Yadkin	210,986	37,214	37,214	17.64 %	100.00 %
37	Iredell	212,852	186,693	186,693	87.71 %	100.00 %
	Mecklenburg	212,852	1,115,482	26,159	12.29 %	2.35 %
38	Mecklenburg	218,466	1,115,482	218,466	100.00 %	19.58 %
39	Mecklenburg	219,067	1,115,482	219,067	100.00 %	19.64 %
40	Mecklenburg	218,411	1,115,482	218,411	100.00 %	19.58 %
41	Mecklenburg	216,686	1,115,482	216,686	100.00 %	19.43 %
42	Mecklenburg	216,693	1,115,482	216,693	100.00 %	19.43 %
43	Gaston	211,229	227,943	211,229	100.00 %	92.67 %
44	Cleveland	203,043	99,519	99,519	49.01 %	100.00 %
	Gaston	203,043	227,943	16,714	8.23 %	7.33 %
	Lincoln	203,043	86,810	86,810	42.75 %	100.00 %
45	Caldwell	209,349	80,652	48,739	23.28 %	60.43 %
	Catawba	209,349	160,610	160,610	76.72 %	100.00 %
46	Buncombe	200,575	269,452	68,427	34.12 %	25.39 %
	Burke	200,575	87,570	87,570	43.66 %	100.00 %
	McDowell	200,575	44,578	44,578	22.23 %	100.00 %
47	Alleghany	219,135	10,888	10,888	4.97 %	100.00 %
	Ashe	219,135	26,577	26,577	12.13 %	100.00 %
	Avery	219,135	17,806	17,806	8.13 %	100.00 %
	Caldwell	219,135	80,652	31,913	14.56 %	39.57 %
	Haywood	219,135	62,089	23,299	10.63 %	37.53 %
	Madison	219,135	21,193	21,193	9.67 %	100.00 %
	Mitchell	219,135	14,903	14,903	6.80 %	100.00 %
	Watauga	219,135	54,086	54,086	24.68 %	100.00 %
	Yancey	219,135	18,470	18,470	8.43 %	100.00 %
48	Henderson	200,053	116,281	116,281	58.13 %	100.00 %
	Polk	200,053	19,328	19,328	9.66 %	100.00 %
	Rutherford	200,053	64,444	64,444	32.21 %	100.00 %
49	Buncombe	201,025	269,452	201,025	100.00 %	74.61 %

District - County Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

District	County	Total District Population	Total County Population	District Pop in County	Percent of District Pop in County	Percent of County Pop in District
50	Cherokee	213,909	28,774	28,774	13.45 %	100.00 %
	Clay	213,909	11,089	11,089	5.18 %	100.00 %
	Graham	213,909	8,030	8,030	3.75 %	100.00 %
	Haywood	213,909	62,089	38,790	18.13 %	62.47 %
	Jackson	213,909	43,109	43,109	20.15 %	100.00 %
	Macon	213,909	37,014	37,014	17.30 %	100.00 %
	Swain	213,909	14,117	14,117	6.60 %	100.00 %
	Transylvania	213,909	32,986	32,986	15.42 %	100.00 %
Total:				10,439,388		

Total Districts Assigned: 50

Total Counties Statewide: 100

Fully Assigned Counties: 100

Partially Assigned Counties: 0

Fully Unassigned Counties: 0

Split Counties: 15

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Aberdeen	21	8,516	217,984	8,516	100.00 %	3.91 %
Ahoskie	1	4,891	199,623	4,891	100.00 %	2.45 %
Alamance	25	988	216,895	988	100.00 %	0.46 %
Albemarle	33	16,432	209,379	16,432	100.00 %	7.85 %
Alliance	2	733	198,557	733	100.00 %	0.37 %
Andrews	50	1,667	213,909	1,667	100.00 %	0.78 %
Angier	12	5,265	198,776	4,709	89.44 %	2.37 %
	17	5,265	198,391	556	10.56 %	0.28 %
Ansonville	29	440	216,220	440	100.00 %	0.20 %
Apex	16	58,780	198,412	26,547	45.16 %	13.38 %
	17	58,780	198,391	32,233	54.84 %	16.25 %
Arapahoe	2	416	198,557	416	100.00 %	0.21 %
Archdale	27	11,907	217,296	380	3.19 %	0.17 %
	29	11,907	216,220	11,527	96.81 %	5.33 %
Archer Lodge	10	4,797	215,999	4,797	100.00 %	2.22 %
Asheboro	25	27,156	216,895	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	29	27,156	216,220	27,156	100.00 %	12.56 %
Asheville	46	94,589	200,575	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	49	94,589	201,025	94,589	100.00 %	47.05 %
Askewville	1	184	199,623	184	100.00 %	0.09 %
Atkinson	9	296	204,809	296	100.00 %	0.14 %
Atlantic Beach	2	1,364	198,557	1,364	100.00 %	0.69 %
Aulander	1	763	199,623	763	100.00 %	0.38 %
Aurora	3	455	200,494	455	100.00 %	0.23 %
Autryville	9	167	204,809	167	100.00 %	0.08 %
Ayden	5	4,977	219,143	4,977	100.00 %	2.27 %
Badin	33	2,024	209,379	2,024	100.00 %	0.97 %
Bailey	11	568	206,121	568	100.00 %	0.28 %
Bakersville	47	450	219,135	450	100.00 %	0.21 %
Bald Head Island	8	268	200,436	268	100.00 %	0.13 %
Banner Elk	47	1,049	219,135	1,049	100.00 %	0.48 %
Bath	3	245	200,494	245	100.00 %	0.12 %
Bayboro	2	1,161	198,557	1,161	100.00 %	0.58 %
Bear Grass	2	89	198,557	89	100.00 %	0.04 %
Beaufort	2	4,464	198,557	4,464	100.00 %	2.25 %
Beech Mountain	47	675	219,135	675	100.00 %	0.31 %
Belhaven	3	1,410	200,494	1,410	100.00 %	0.70 %
Belmont	43	15,010	211,229	15,010	100.00 %	7.11 %
Belville	8	2,406	200,436	2,406	100.00 %	1.20 %
Belwood	44	857	203,043	857	100.00 %	0.42 %
Benson	10	3,967	215,999	3,967	100.00 %	1.84 %
	12	3,967	198,776	0	0.00 %	0.00 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-173.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:21 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Bermuda Run	30	3,120	211,642	3,120	100.00 %	1.47 %
Bessemer City	43	5,428	211,229	5,428	100.00 %	2.57 %
	44	5,428	203,043	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Bethania	31	344	212,299	344	100.00 %	0.16 %
Bethel	5	1,373	219,143	1,373	100.00 %	0.63 %
Beulaville	9	1,116	204,809	1,116	100.00 %	0.54 %
Biltmore Forest	49	1,409	201,025	1,409	100.00 %	0.70 %
Biscoe	29	1,848	216,220	1,848	100.00 %	0.85 %
Black Creek	4	692	216,568	692	100.00 %	0.32 %
Black Mountain	46	8,426	200,575	8,426	100.00 %	4.20 %
Bladenboro	9	1,648	204,809	1,648	100.00 %	0.80 %
Blowing Rock	47	1,376	219,135	1,376	100.00 %	0.63 %
Boardman	8	166	200,436	166	100.00 %	0.08 %
Bogue	2	695	198,557	695	100.00 %	0.35 %
Boiling Spring Lakes	8	5,943	200,436	5,943	100.00 %	2.97 %
Boiling Springs	44	4,615	203,043	4,615	100.00 %	2.27 %
Bolivia	8	149	200,436	149	100.00 %	0.07 %
Bolton	8	519	200,436	519	100.00 %	0.26 %
Boone	47	19,092	219,135	19,092	100.00 %	8.71 %
Boonville	36	1,185	210,986	1,185	100.00 %	0.56 %
Bostic	48	355	200,053	355	100.00 %	0.18 %
Brevard	50	7,744	213,909	7,744	100.00 %	3.62 %
Bridgeton	3	349	200,494	349	100.00 %	0.17 %
Broadway	12	1,267	198,776	1,267	100.00 %	0.64 %
Brookford	45	442	209,349	442	100.00 %	0.21 %
Brunswick	8	973	200,436	973	100.00 %	0.49 %
Bryson City	50	1,558	213,909	1,558	100.00 %	0.73 %
Bunn	11	327	206,121	327	100.00 %	0.16 %
Burgaw	9	3,088	204,809	3,088	100.00 %	1.51 %
Burlington	25	57,303	216,895	55,481	96.82 %	25.58 %
	26	57,303	201,897	1,822	3.18 %	0.90 %
Burnsville	47	1,614	219,135	1,614	100.00 %	0.74 %
Butner	13	8,397	198,354	8,397	100.00 %	4.23 %
Cajah's Mountain	45	2,722	209,349	2,722	100.00 %	1.30 %
	47	2,722	219,135	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Calabash	8	2,011	200,436	2,011	100.00 %	1.00 %
Calypso	9	327	204,809	327	100.00 %	0.16 %
Cameron	21	244	217,984	244	100.00 %	0.11 %
Candor	21	813	217,984	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	29	813	216,220	813	100.00 %	0.38 %
Canton	47	4,422	219,135	4,422	100.00 %	2.02 %
Cape Carteret	2	2,224	198,557	2,224	100.00 %	1.12 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-173.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:21 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Carolina Beach	7	6,564	212,582	6,564	100.00 %	3.09 %
Carolina Shores	8	4,588	200,436	4,588	100.00 %	2.29 %
Carrboro	23	21,295	210,529	21,295	100.00 %	10.11 %
Carthage	21	2,775	217,984	2,775	100.00 %	1.27 %
Cary	15	174,721	198,385	23,315	13.34 %	11.75 %
	16	174,721	198,412	136,584	78.17 %	68.84 %
	17	174,721	198,391	11,113	6.36 %	5.60 %
	20	174,721	199,272	3,709	2.12 %	1.86 %
Casar	44	305	203,043	305	100.00 %	0.15 %
Castalia	11	264	206,121	264	100.00 %	0.13 %
Caswell Beach	8	395	200,436	395	100.00 %	0.20 %
Catawba	45	702	209,349	702	100.00 %	0.34 %
Cedar Point	2	1,764	198,557	1,764	100.00 %	0.89 %
Cedar Rock	45	301	209,349	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	47	301	219,135	301	100.00 %	0.14 %
Cerro Gordo	8	131	200,436	131	100.00 %	0.07 %
Chadbourn	8	1,574	200,436	1,574	100.00 %	0.79 %
Chapel Hill	20	61,960	199,272	2,906	4.69 %	1.46 %
	23	61,960	210,529	59,054	95.31 %	28.05 %
Charlotte	38	874,579	218,466	118,479	13.55 %	54.23 %
	39	874,579	219,067	176,791	20.21 %	80.70 %
	40	874,579	218,411	209,480	23.95 %	95.91 %
	41	874,579	216,686	153,144	17.51 %	70.68 %
	42	874,579	216,693	216,685	24.78 %	100.00 %
Cherryville	44	6,078	203,043	6,078	100.00 %	2.99 %
Chimney Rock Village	48	140	200,053	140	100.00 %	0.07 %
China Grove	33	4,434	209,379	4,434	100.00 %	2.12 %
Chocowinity	3	722	200,494	722	100.00 %	0.36 %
Claremont	45	1,692	209,349	1,692	100.00 %	0.81 %
Clarkton	9	614	204,809	614	100.00 %	0.30 %
Clayton	10	26,307	215,999	26,307	100.00 %	12.18 %
	14	26,307	198,506	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Clemmons	31	21,163	212,299	21,163	100.00 %	9.97 %
Cleveland	33	846	209,379	846	100.00 %	0.40 %
Clinton	9	8,383	204,809	8,383	100.00 %	4.09 %
Clyde	47	1,368	219,135	1,368	100.00 %	0.62 %
Coats	12	2,155	198,776	2,155	100.00 %	1.08 %
Cofield	1	267	199,623	267	100.00 %	0.13 %
Colerain	1	217	199,623	217	100.00 %	0.11 %
Columbia	1	610	199,623	610	100.00 %	0.31 %
Columbus	48	1,060	200,053	1,060	100.00 %	0.53 %
Como	1	67	199,623	67	100.00 %	0.03 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-173.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:21 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Concord	34	105,240	218,896	105,240	100.00 %	48.08 %
Conetoe	5	198	219,143	198	100.00 %	0.09 %
Connelly Springs	46	1,529	200,575	1,529	100.00 %	0.76 %
Conover	45	8,421	209,349	8,421	100.00 %	4.02 %
Conway	1	752	199,623	752	100.00 %	0.38 %
Cooleemee	30	940	211,642	940	100.00 %	0.44 %
Cornelius	37	31,412	212,852	10,223	32.54 %	4.80 %
	38	31,412	218,466	21,189	67.46 %	9.70 %
Cove City	3	378	200,494	378	100.00 %	0.19 %
Cramerton	43	5,296	211,229	5,296	100.00 %	2.51 %
Creedmoor	13	4,866	198,354	4,866	100.00 %	2.45 %
Creswell	2	207	198,557	207	100.00 %	0.10 %
Crossnore	47	143	219,135	143	100.00 %	0.07 %
Dallas	43	5,927	211,229	5,927	100.00 %	2.81 %
Danbury	31	189	212,299	189	100.00 %	0.09 %
Davidson	37	15,106	212,852	15,106	100.00 %	7.10 %
Dellview	44	6	203,043	6	100.00 %	0.00 %
Denton	30	1,494	211,642	1,494	100.00 %	0.71 %
Dillsboro	50	213	213,909	213	100.00 %	0.10 %
Dobbins Heights	29	687	216,220	687	100.00 %	0.32 %
Dobson	36	1,462	210,986	1,462	100.00 %	0.69 %
Dortches	11	1,082	206,121	1,082	100.00 %	0.52 %
Dover	3	349	200,494	349	100.00 %	0.17 %
Drexel	46	1,760	200,575	1,760	100.00 %	0.88 %
Dublin	9	267	204,809	267	100.00 %	0.13 %
Duck	1	742	199,623	742	100.00 %	0.37 %
Dunn	12	8,446	198,776	8,446	100.00 %	4.25 %
Durham	15	283,506	198,385	269	0.09 %	0.14 %
	16	283,506	198,412	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	20	283,506	199,272	115,188	40.63 %	57.80 %
	22	283,506	201,846	167,905	59.22 %	83.18 %
	23	283,506	210,529	144	0.05 %	0.07 %
Earl	44	198	203,043	198	100.00 %	0.10 %
East Arcadia	9	418	204,809	418	100.00 %	0.20 %
East Bend	36	634	210,986	634	100.00 %	0.30 %
East Laurinburg	24	234	202,786	234	100.00 %	0.12 %
Eastover	21	3,656	217,984	3,656	100.00 %	1.68 %
East Spencer	33	1,567	209,379	1,567	100.00 %	0.75 %
Eden	26	15,421	201,897	15,421	100.00 %	7.64 %
Edenton	2	4,460	198,557	4,460	100.00 %	2.25 %
Elizabeth City	1	18,631	199,623	18,631	100.00 %	9.33 %
Elizabethtown	9	3,296	204,809	3,296	100.00 %	1.61 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-173.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:21 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Elkin	36	4,122	210,986	4,122	100.00 %	1.95 %
Elk Park	47	542	219,135	542	100.00 %	0.25 %
Ellenboro	48	723	200,053	723	100.00 %	0.36 %
Ellerbe	29	864	216,220	864	100.00 %	0.40 %
Elm City	4	1,218	216,568	1,218	100.00 %	0.56 %
	11	1,218	206,121	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Elon	25	11,336	216,895	11,336	100.00 %	5.23 %
Emerald Isle	2	3,847	198,557	3,847	100.00 %	1.94 %
Enfield	2	1,865	198,557	1,865	100.00 %	0.94 %
Erwin	12	4,542	198,776	4,542	100.00 %	2.28 %
Eureka	4	214	216,568	214	100.00 %	0.10 %
Everetts	2	150	198,557	150	100.00 %	0.08 %
Fair Bluff	8	709	200,436	709	100.00 %	0.35 %
Fairmont	24	2,191	202,786	2,191	100.00 %	1.08 %
Fairview	35	3,456	218,398	3,456	100.00 %	1.58 %
Faison	9	784	204,809	784	100.00 %	0.38 %
Faith	33	819	209,379	819	100.00 %	0.39 %
Falcon	9	324	204,809	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	21	324	217,984	324	100.00 %	0.15 %
Falkland	5	47	219,143	47	100.00 %	0.02 %
Fallston	44	627	203,043	627	100.00 %	0.31 %
Farmville	5	4,461	219,143	4,461	100.00 %	2.04 %
Fayetteville	19	208,501	216,471	183,928	88.21 %	84.97 %
	21	208,501	217,984	24,573	11.79 %	11.27 %
Flat Rock	48	3,486	200,053	3,486	100.00 %	1.74 %
Fletcher	48	7,987	200,053	7,987	100.00 %	3.99 %
Fontana Dam	50	13	213,909	13	100.00 %	0.01 %
Forest City	48	7,377	200,053	7,377	100.00 %	3.69 %
Forest Hills	50	303	213,909	303	100.00 %	0.14 %
Fountain	5	385	219,143	385	100.00 %	0.18 %
Four Oaks	10	2,158	215,999	2,158	100.00 %	1.00 %
Foxfire	21	1,288	217,984	1,288	100.00 %	0.59 %
Franklin	50	4,175	213,909	4,175	100.00 %	1.95 %
Franklinton	11	2,456	206,121	2,456	100.00 %	1.19 %
Franklinville	25	1,197	216,895	1,197	100.00 %	0.55 %
Fremont	4	1,196	216,568	1,196	100.00 %	0.55 %
Fuquay-Varina	12	34,152	198,776	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	17	34,152	198,391	34,152	100.00 %	17.21 %
Gamewell	45	3,702	209,349	3,702	100.00 %	1.77 %
	47	3,702	219,135	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Garland	9	595	204,809	595	100.00 %	0.29 %

Municipality - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Garner	14	31,159	198,506	31,159	100.00 %	15.70 %
	17	31,159	198,391	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Garysburg	1	904	199,623	904	100.00 %	0.45 %
Gaston	1	1,008	199,623	1,008	100.00 %	0.50 %
Gastonia	43	80,411	211,229	80,411	100.00 %	38.07 %
	44	80,411	203,043	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Gatesville	1	267	199,623	267	100.00 %	0.13 %
Gibson	24	449	202,786	449	100.00 %	0.22 %
Gibsonville	25	8,920	216,895	4,278	47.96 %	1.97 %
	26	8,920	201,897	4,642	52.04 %	2.30 %
Glen Alpine	46	1,529	200,575	1,529	100.00 %	0.76 %
Godwin	21	128	217,984	128	100.00 %	0.06 %
Goldsboro	4	33,657	216,568	33,657	100.00 %	15.54 %
Goldston	20	234	199,272	234	100.00 %	0.12 %
Graham	25	17,157	216,895	17,157	100.00 %	7.91 %
Grandfather Village	47	95	219,135	95	100.00 %	0.04 %
Granite Falls	45	4,965	209,349	4,965	100.00 %	2.37 %
Granite Quarry	33	2,984	209,379	2,984	100.00 %	1.43 %
Grantsboro	2	692	198,557	692	100.00 %	0.35 %
Greenevers	9	567	204,809	567	100.00 %	0.28 %
Green Level	25	3,152	216,895	3,152	100.00 %	1.45 %
Greensboro	26	299,035	201,897	12,873	4.30 %	6.38 %
	27	299,035	217,296	92,205	30.83 %	42.43 %
	28	299,035	213,202	193,957	64.86 %	90.97 %
Greenville	5	87,521	219,143	87,521	100.00 %	39.94 %
Grifton	3	2,448	200,494	147	6.00 %	0.07 %
	5	2,448	219,143	2,301	94.00 %	1.05 %
Grimesland	5	386	219,143	386	100.00 %	0.18 %
Grover	44	802	203,043	802	100.00 %	0.39 %
Halifax	2	170	198,557	170	100.00 %	0.09 %
Hamilton	2	306	198,557	306	100.00 %	0.15 %
Hamlet	29	6,025	216,220	6,025	100.00 %	2.79 %
Harmony	37	543	212,852	543	100.00 %	0.26 %
Harrells	9	160	204,809	160	100.00 %	0.08 %
Harrellsville	1	85	199,623	85	100.00 %	0.04 %
Harrisburg	34	18,967	218,896	18,967	100.00 %	8.66 %
Hassell	2	49	198,557	49	100.00 %	0.02 %
Havelock	3	16,621	200,494	16,621	100.00 %	8.29 %
Haw River	25	2,252	216,895	2,252	100.00 %	1.04 %
Hayesville	50	461	213,909	461	100.00 %	0.22 %
Hemby Bridge	35	1,614	218,398	1,614	100.00 %	0.74 %
Henderson	11	15,060	206,121	15,060	100.00 %	7.31 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-173.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:21 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Hendersonville	48	15,137	200,053	15,137	100.00 %	7.57 %
Hertford	1	1,934	199,623	1,934	100.00 %	0.97 %
Hickory	45	43,490	209,349	43,411	99.82 %	20.74 %
	46	43,490	200,575	79	0.18 %	0.04 %
Highlands	50	1,072	213,909	1,072	100.00 %	0.50 %
High Point	27	114,059	217,296	107,321	94.09 %	49.39 %
	29	114,059	216,220	8	0.01 %	0.00 %
	30	114,059	211,642	6,646	5.83 %	3.14 %
	31	114,059	212,299	84	0.07 %	0.04 %
High Shoals	43	595	211,229	595	100.00 %	0.28 %
	44	595	203,043	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Hildebran	46	1,679	200,575	1,679	100.00 %	0.84 %
Hillsborough	23	9,660	210,529	9,660	100.00 %	4.59 %
Hobgood	2	268	198,557	268	100.00 %	0.13 %
Hoffman	29	418	216,220	418	100.00 %	0.19 %
Holden Beach	8	921	200,436	921	100.00 %	0.46 %
Holly Ridge	6	4,171	204,576	4,171	100.00 %	2.04 %
Holly Springs	17	41,239	198,391	41,239	100.00 %	20.79 %
Hookerton	4	413	216,568	413	100.00 %	0.19 %
Hope Mills	19	17,808	216,471	2,593	14.56 %	1.20 %
	21	17,808	217,984	15,215	85.44 %	6.98 %
Hot Springs	47	520	219,135	520	100.00 %	0.24 %
Hudson	45	3,780	209,349	3,780	100.00 %	1.81 %
	47	3,780	219,135	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Huntersville	38	61,376	218,466	61,376	100.00 %	28.09 %
Indian Beach	2	223	198,557	223	100.00 %	0.11 %
Indian Trail	35	39,997	218,398	39,997	100.00 %	18.31 %
Jackson	1	430	199,623	430	100.00 %	0.22 %
Jacksonville	6	72,723	204,576	72,723	100.00 %	35.55 %
Jamestown	27	3,668	217,296	3,668	100.00 %	1.69 %
Jamesville	2	424	198,557	424	100.00 %	0.21 %
Jefferson	47	1,622	219,135	1,622	100.00 %	0.74 %
Jonesville	36	2,308	210,986	2,308	100.00 %	1.09 %
Kannapolis	33	53,114	209,379	10,268	19.33 %	4.90 %
	34	53,114	218,896	42,846	80.67 %	19.57 %
Kelford	1	203	199,623	203	100.00 %	0.10 %
Kenansville	9	770	204,809	770	100.00 %	0.38 %
Kenly	4	1,491	216,568	198	13.28 %	0.09 %
	10	1,491	215,999	1,293	86.72 %	0.60 %
Kernersville	26	26,449	201,897	502	1.90 %	0.25 %
	31	26,449	212,299	25,947	98.10 %	12.22 %
Kill Devil Hills	1	7,656	199,623	7,656	100.00 %	3.84 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-173.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:21 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
King	31	7,197	212,299	7,197	100.00 %	3.39 %
Kings Mountain	43	11,142	211,229	1,110	9.96 %	0.53 %
	44	11,142	203,043	10,032	90.04 %	4.94 %
Kingstown	44	656	203,043	656	100.00 %	0.32 %
Kinston	3	19,900	200,494	19,900	100.00 %	9.93 %
Kittrell	11	132	206,121	132	100.00 %	0.06 %
Kitty Hawk	1	3,689	199,623	3,689	100.00 %	1.85 %
Knightdale	13	19,435	198,354	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	14	19,435	198,506	19,435	100.00 %	9.79 %
Kure Beach	7	2,191	212,582	2,191	100.00 %	1.03 %
La Grange	3	2,595	200,494	2,595	100.00 %	1.29 %
Lake Lure	48	1,365	200,053	1,365	100.00 %	0.68 %
Lake Park	35	3,269	218,398	3,269	100.00 %	1.50 %
Lake Santeetlah	50	38	213,909	38	100.00 %	0.02 %
Lake Waccamaw	8	1,296	200,436	1,296	100.00 %	0.65 %
Landis	33	3,690	209,379	3,690	100.00 %	1.76 %
Lansing	47	126	219,135	126	100.00 %	0.06 %
Lasker	1	64	199,623	64	100.00 %	0.03 %
Lattimore	44	406	203,043	406	100.00 %	0.20 %
Laurel Park	48	2,250	200,053	2,250	100.00 %	1.12 %
Laurinburg	24	14,978	202,786	14,978	100.00 %	7.39 %
Lawndale	44	570	203,043	570	100.00 %	0.28 %
Leggett	5	37	219,143	37	100.00 %	0.02 %
Leland	8	22,908	200,436	22,908	100.00 %	11.43 %
Lenoir	45	18,352	209,349	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	47	18,352	219,135	18,352	100.00 %	8.37 %
Lewiston Woodville	1	426	199,623	426	100.00 %	0.21 %
Lewisville	31	13,381	212,299	13,381	100.00 %	6.30 %
Lexington	30	19,632	211,642	19,632	100.00 %	9.28 %
Liberty	25	2,655	216,895	2,655	100.00 %	1.22 %
Lilesville	29	395	216,220	395	100.00 %	0.18 %
Lillington	12	4,735	198,776	4,735	100.00 %	2.38 %
Lincolnton	44	11,091	203,043	11,091	100.00 %	5.46 %
Linden	21	136	217,984	136	100.00 %	0.06 %
Littleton	2	559	198,557	559	100.00 %	0.28 %
Locust	33	4,537	209,379	3,996	88.08 %	1.91 %
	34	4,537	218,896	423	9.32 %	0.19 %
	35	4,537	218,398	118	2.60 %	0.05 %
Long View	45	5,088	209,349	4,353	85.55 %	2.08 %
	46	5,088	200,575	735	14.45 %	0.37 %
Louisburg	11	3,064	206,121	3,064	100.00 %	1.49 %
Love Valley	37	154	212,852	154	100.00 %	0.07 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-173.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:21 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Lowell	43	3,654	211,229	3,654	100.00 %	1.73 %
Lucama	4	1,036	216,568	1,036	100.00 %	0.48 %
Lumber Bridge	24	82	202,786	82	100.00 %	0.04 %
Lumberton	24	19,025	202,786	19,025	100.00 %	9.38 %
McAdenville	43	890	211,229	890	100.00 %	0.42 %
Macclesfield	5	413	219,143	413	100.00 %	0.19 %
McDonald	24	94	202,786	94	100.00 %	0.05 %
McFarlan	29	94	216,220	94	100.00 %	0.04 %
Macon	2	110	198,557	110	100.00 %	0.06 %
Madison	26	2,129	201,897	2,129	100.00 %	1.05 %
Maggie Valley	50	1,687	213,909	1,687	100.00 %	0.79 %
Magnolia	9	831	204,809	831	100.00 %	0.41 %
Maiden	44	3,736	203,043	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	45	3,736	209,349	3,736	100.00 %	1.78 %
Manteo	1	1,600	199,623	1,600	100.00 %	0.80 %
Marietta	24	111	202,786	111	100.00 %	0.05 %
Marion	46	7,717	200,575	7,717	100.00 %	3.85 %
Marshall	47	777	219,135	777	100.00 %	0.35 %
Mars Hill	47	2,007	219,135	2,007	100.00 %	0.92 %
Marshville	29	2,522	216,220	2,522	100.00 %	1.17 %
Marvin	35	6,358	218,398	6,358	100.00 %	2.91 %
Matthews	41	29,435	216,686	29,435	100.00 %	13.58 %
Maxton	24	2,110	202,786	2,110	100.00 %	1.04 %
Mayodan	26	2,418	201,897	2,418	100.00 %	1.20 %
Maysville	9	818	204,809	818	100.00 %	0.40 %
Mebane	23	17,797	210,529	3,171	17.82 %	1.51 %
	25	17,797	216,895	14,626	82.18 %	6.74 %
Mesic	2	144	198,557	144	100.00 %	0.07 %
Micro	10	458	215,999	458	100.00 %	0.21 %
Middleburg	11	101	206,121	101	100.00 %	0.05 %
Middlesex	11	912	206,121	912	100.00 %	0.44 %
Midland	34	4,684	218,896	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	35	4,684	218,398	4,684	100.00 %	2.14 %
	41	4,684	216,686	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Midway	30	4,742	211,642	4,742	100.00 %	2.24 %
Mills River	48	7,078	200,053	7,078	100.00 %	3.54 %
Milton	23	155	210,529	155	100.00 %	0.07 %
Mineral Springs	35	3,159	218,398	3,159	100.00 %	1.45 %
Minnesott Beach	2	530	198,557	530	100.00 %	0.27 %
Mint Hill	35	26,450	218,398	6	0.02 %	0.00 %
	40	26,450	218,411	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	41	26,450	216,686	26,444	99.98 %	12.20 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-173.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:21 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Misenheimer	33	650	209,379	650	100.00 %	0.31 %
Mocksville	30	5,900	211,642	5,900	100.00 %	2.79 %
Momeyer	11	277	206,121	277	100.00 %	0.13 %
Monroe	35	34,562	218,398	34,562	100.00 %	15.83 %
Montreat	46	901	200,575	901	100.00 %	0.45 %
Mooreboro	44	293	203,043	293	100.00 %	0.14 %
Mooreville	37	50,193	212,852	50,193	100.00 %	23.58 %
Morehead City	2	9,556	198,557	9,556	100.00 %	4.81 %
Morganton	46	17,474	200,575	17,474	100.00 %	8.71 %
Morrisville	16	29,630	198,412	29,423	99.30 %	14.83 %
	20	29,630	199,272	207	0.70 %	0.10 %
Morven	29	329	216,220	329	100.00 %	0.15 %
Mount Airy	36	10,676	210,986	10,676	100.00 %	5.06 %
Mount Gilead	29	1,171	216,220	1,171	100.00 %	0.54 %
Mount Holly	43	17,703	211,229	17,703	100.00 %	8.38 %
Mount Olive	4	4,198	216,568	4,193	99.88 %	1.94 %
	9	4,198	204,809	5	0.12 %	0.00 %
Mount Pleasant	34	1,671	218,896	1,671	100.00 %	0.76 %
Murfreesboro	1	2,619	199,623	2,619	100.00 %	1.31 %
Murphy	50	1,608	213,909	1,608	100.00 %	0.75 %
Nags Head	1	3,168	199,623	3,168	100.00 %	1.59 %
Nashville	11	5,632	206,121	5,632	100.00 %	2.73 %
Navassa	8	1,367	200,436	1,367	100.00 %	0.68 %
New Bern	3	31,291	200,494	31,291	100.00 %	15.61 %
Newland	47	715	219,135	715	100.00 %	0.33 %
New London	33	607	209,379	607	100.00 %	0.29 %
Newport	2	4,364	198,557	4,364	100.00 %	2.20 %
Newton	45	13,148	209,349	13,148	100.00 %	6.28 %
Newton Grove	9	585	204,809	585	100.00 %	0.29 %
Norlina	2	920	198,557	920	100.00 %	0.46 %
Norman	29	100	216,220	100	100.00 %	0.05 %
North Topsail Beach	6	1,005	204,576	1,005	100.00 %	0.49 %
Northwest	8	703	200,436	703	100.00 %	0.35 %
North Wilkesboro	36	4,382	210,986	4,382	100.00 %	2.08 %
Norwood	33	2,367	209,379	2,367	100.00 %	1.13 %
Oakboro	33	2,128	209,379	2,128	100.00 %	1.02 %
Oak City	2	266	198,557	266	100.00 %	0.13 %
Oak Island	8	8,396	200,436	8,396	100.00 %	4.19 %
Oak Ridge	26	7,474	201,897	7,474	100.00 %	3.70 %
Ocean Isle Beach	8	867	200,436	867	100.00 %	0.43 %
Old Fort	46	811	200,575	811	100.00 %	0.40 %
Oriental	2	880	198,557	880	100.00 %	0.44 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-173.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:21 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Orrum	24	59	202,786	59	100.00 %	0.03 %
Ossipee	25	536	216,895	536	100.00 %	0.25 %
Oxford	13	8,628	198,354	8,628	100.00 %	4.35 %
Pantego	3	164	200,494	164	100.00 %	0.08 %
Parkton	24	504	202,786	504	100.00 %	0.25 %
Parmele	2	243	198,557	243	100.00 %	0.12 %
Patterson Springs	44	571	203,043	571	100.00 %	0.28 %
Peachland	29	390	216,220	390	100.00 %	0.18 %
Peletier	2	769	198,557	769	100.00 %	0.39 %
Pembroke	24	2,823	202,786	2,823	100.00 %	1.39 %
Pikeville	4	712	216,568	712	100.00 %	0.33 %
Pilot Mountain	36	1,440	210,986	1,440	100.00 %	0.68 %
Pinebluff	21	1,473	217,984	1,473	100.00 %	0.68 %
Pinehurst	21	17,581	217,984	17,581	100.00 %	8.07 %
Pine Knoll Shores	2	1,388	198,557	1,388	100.00 %	0.70 %
Pine Level	10	2,046	215,999	2,046	100.00 %	0.95 %
Pinetops	5	1,200	219,143	1,200	100.00 %	0.55 %
Pineville	39	10,602	219,067	10,602	100.00 %	4.84 %
	41	10,602	216,686	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Pink Hill	3	451	200,494	451	100.00 %	0.22 %
Pittsboro	20	4,537	199,272	4,537	100.00 %	2.28 %
Pleasant Garden	26	5,000	201,897	5,000	100.00 %	2.48 %
Plymouth	2	3,320	198,557	3,320	100.00 %	1.67 %
Polkton	29	2,250	216,220	2,250	100.00 %	1.04 %
Polkville	44	516	203,043	516	100.00 %	0.25 %
Pollocksville	9	268	204,809	268	100.00 %	0.13 %
Powellsville	1	189	199,623	189	100.00 %	0.09 %
Princeton	10	1,315	215,999	1,315	100.00 %	0.61 %
Princeville	5	1,254	219,143	1,254	100.00 %	0.57 %
Proctorville	24	121	202,786	121	100.00 %	0.06 %
Raeford	24	4,559	202,786	4,559	100.00 %	2.25 %
Raleigh	13	467,665	198,354	8,083	1.73 %	4.08 %
	14	467,665	198,506	98,578	21.08 %	49.66 %
	15	467,665	198,385	167,598	35.84 %	84.48 %
	16	467,665	198,412	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	17	467,665	198,391	1	0.00 %	0.00 %
	18	467,665	198,354	191,846	41.02 %	96.72 %
	20	467,665	199,272	233	0.05 %	0.12 %
	22	467,665	201,846	1,326	0.28 %	0.66 %
Ramseur	25	1,774	216,895	1,774	100.00 %	0.82 %
Randleman	25	4,595	216,895	4,595	100.00 %	2.12 %
	29	4,595	216,220	0	0.00 %	0.00 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-173.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:21 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Ranlo	43	4,511	211,229	4,511	100.00 %	2.14 %
Raynham	24	60	202,786	60	100.00 %	0.03 %
Red Cross	33	762	209,379	762	100.00 %	0.36 %
Red Oak	11	3,342	206,121	3,342	100.00 %	1.62 %
Red Springs	24	3,087	202,786	3,087	100.00 %	1.52 %
Reidsville	26	14,583	201,897	14,583	100.00 %	7.22 %
Rennert	24	275	202,786	275	100.00 %	0.14 %
Rhodhiss	45	997	209,349	358	35.91 %	0.17 %
	46	997	200,575	639	64.09 %	0.32 %
Richfield	33	582	209,379	582	100.00 %	0.28 %
Richlands	6	2,287	204,576	2,287	100.00 %	1.12 %
Rich Square	1	894	199,623	894	100.00 %	0.45 %
River Bend	3	2,902	200,494	2,902	100.00 %	1.45 %
Roanoke Rapids	2	15,229	198,557	15,229	100.00 %	7.67 %
Robbins	21	1,168	217,984	1,168	100.00 %	0.54 %
Robbinsville	50	597	213,909	597	100.00 %	0.28 %
Robersonville	2	1,269	198,557	1,269	100.00 %	0.64 %
Rockingham	29	9,243	216,220	9,243	100.00 %	4.27 %
Rockwell	33	2,302	209,379	2,302	100.00 %	1.10 %
Rocky Mount	5	54,341	219,143	15,414	28.37 %	7.03 %
	11	54,341	206,121	38,927	71.63 %	18.89 %
Rolesville	13	9,475	198,354	9,475	100.00 %	4.78 %
Ronda	36	438	210,986	438	100.00 %	0.21 %
Roper	2	485	198,557	485	100.00 %	0.24 %
Roseboro	9	1,163	204,809	1,163	100.00 %	0.57 %
Rose Hill	9	1,371	204,809	1,371	100.00 %	0.67 %
Rosman	50	701	213,909	701	100.00 %	0.33 %
Rowland	24	885	202,786	885	100.00 %	0.44 %
Roxboro	23	8,134	210,529	8,134	100.00 %	3.86 %
Roxobel	1	187	199,623	187	100.00 %	0.09 %
Rural Hall	31	3,351	212,299	3,351	100.00 %	1.58 %
Ruth	48	347	200,053	347	100.00 %	0.17 %
Rutherford College	45	1,226	209,349	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	46	1,226	200,575	1,226	100.00 %	0.61 %
Rutherfordton	48	3,640	200,053	3,640	100.00 %	1.82 %
St. Helena	9	417	204,809	417	100.00 %	0.20 %
St. James	8	6,529	200,436	6,529	100.00 %	3.26 %
St. Pauls	24	2,045	202,786	2,045	100.00 %	1.01 %
Salemburg	9	457	204,809	457	100.00 %	0.22 %
Salisbury	33	35,540	209,379	35,540	100.00 %	16.97 %
Saluda	48	631	200,053	631	100.00 %	0.32 %
Sandy Creek	8	248	200,436	248	100.00 %	0.12 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-173.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:21 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Sandyfield	8	430	200,436	430	100.00 %	0.21 %
Sanford	12	30,261	198,776	30,261	100.00 %	15.22 %
Saratoga	4	353	216,568	353	100.00 %	0.16 %
Sawmills	45	5,020	209,349	5,020	100.00 %	2.40 %
Scotland Neck	2	1,640	198,557	1,640	100.00 %	0.83 %
Seaboard	1	542	199,623	542	100.00 %	0.27 %
Seagrove	25	235	216,895	235	100.00 %	0.11 %
Sedalia	26	676	201,897	676	100.00 %	0.33 %
	28	676	213,202	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Selma	10	6,317	215,999	6,317	100.00 %	2.92 %
Seven Devils	47	313	219,135	313	100.00 %	0.14 %
Seven Springs	4	55	216,568	55	100.00 %	0.03 %
Severn	1	191	199,623	191	100.00 %	0.10 %
Shallotte	8	4,185	200,436	4,185	100.00 %	2.09 %
Sharpsburg	4	1,697	216,568	421	24.81 %	0.19 %
	5	1,697	219,143	215	12.67 %	0.10 %
	11	1,697	206,121	1,061	62.52 %	0.51 %
Shelby	44	21,918	203,043	21,918	100.00 %	10.79 %
Siler City	20	7,702	199,272	7,702	100.00 %	3.87 %
Simpson	5	390	219,143	390	100.00 %	0.18 %
Sims	4	275	216,568	275	100.00 %	0.13 %
Smithfield	10	11,292	215,999	11,292	100.00 %	5.23 %
Snow Hill	4	1,481	216,568	1,481	100.00 %	0.68 %
Southern Pines	21	15,545	217,984	15,545	100.00 %	7.13 %
Southern Shores	1	3,090	199,623	3,090	100.00 %	1.55 %
Southport	8	3,971	200,436	3,971	100.00 %	1.98 %
Sparta	47	1,834	219,135	1,834	100.00 %	0.84 %
Speed	5	63	219,143	63	100.00 %	0.03 %
Spencer	33	3,308	209,379	3,308	100.00 %	1.58 %
Spencer Mountain	43	0	211,229	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Spindale	48	4,225	200,053	4,225	100.00 %	2.11 %
Spring Hope	11	1,309	206,121	1,309	100.00 %	0.64 %
Spring Lake	21	11,660	217,984	11,660	100.00 %	5.35 %
Spruce Pine	47	2,194	219,135	2,194	100.00 %	1.00 %
Staley	25	397	216,895	397	100.00 %	0.18 %
Stallings	35	16,112	218,398	15,728	97.62 %	7.20 %
	41	16,112	216,686	384	2.38 %	0.18 %
Stanfield	33	1,585	209,379	1,585	100.00 %	0.76 %
Stanley	43	3,963	211,229	3,963	100.00 %	1.88 %
Stantonsburg	4	762	216,568	762	100.00 %	0.35 %
Star	29	806	216,220	806	100.00 %	0.37 %
Statesville	37	28,419	212,852	28,419	100.00 %	13.35 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-173.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:21 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Stedman	21	1,277	217,984	1,277	100.00 %	0.59 %
Stem	13	960	198,354	960	100.00 %	0.48 %
Stokesdale	26	5,924	201,897	5,924	100.00 %	2.93 %
Stoneville	26	1,308	201,897	1,308	100.00 %	0.65 %
Stonewall	2	214	198,557	214	100.00 %	0.11 %
Stovall	13	324	198,354	324	100.00 %	0.16 %
Sugar Mountain	47	371	219,135	371	100.00 %	0.17 %
Summerfield	26	10,951	201,897	10,951	100.00 %	5.42 %
Sunset Beach	8	4,175	200,436	4,175	100.00 %	2.08 %
Surf City	6	3,867	204,576	334	8.64 %	0.16 %
	9	3,867	204,809	3,533	91.36 %	1.73 %
Swansboro	6	3,744	204,576	3,744	100.00 %	1.83 %
Sweepsonville	25	2,445	216,895	2,445	100.00 %	1.13 %
Sylva	50	2,578	213,909	2,578	100.00 %	1.21 %
Tabor City	8	3,781	200,436	3,781	100.00 %	1.89 %
Tarboro	5	10,721	219,143	10,721	100.00 %	4.89 %
Tar Heel	9	90	204,809	90	100.00 %	0.04 %
Taylorsville	36	2,320	210,986	2,320	100.00 %	1.10 %
Taylortown	21	634	217,984	634	100.00 %	0.29 %
Teachey	9	448	204,809	448	100.00 %	0.22 %
Thomasville	29	27,183	216,220	521	1.92 %	0.24 %
	30	27,183	211,642	26,662	98.08 %	12.60 %
Tobaccoville	31	2,578	212,299	2,578	100.00 %	1.21 %
Topsail Beach	9	461	204,809	461	100.00 %	0.23 %
Trenton	9	238	204,809	238	100.00 %	0.12 %
Trent Woods	3	4,074	200,494	4,074	100.00 %	2.03 %
Trinity	29	7,006	216,220	7,006	100.00 %	3.24 %
Troutman	37	3,698	212,852	3,698	100.00 %	1.74 %
Troy	29	2,850	216,220	2,850	100.00 %	1.32 %
Tryon	48	1,562	200,053	1,562	100.00 %	0.78 %
Turkey	9	213	204,809	213	100.00 %	0.10 %
Unionville	35	6,643	218,398	6,643	100.00 %	3.04 %
Valdese	46	4,689	200,575	4,689	100.00 %	2.34 %
Vanceboro	3	869	200,494	869	100.00 %	0.43 %
Vandemere	2	246	198,557	246	100.00 %	0.12 %
Varnamtown	8	525	200,436	525	100.00 %	0.26 %
Vass	21	952	217,984	952	100.00 %	0.44 %
Waco	44	310	203,043	310	100.00 %	0.15 %
Wade	21	638	217,984	638	100.00 %	0.29 %
Wadesboro	29	5,008	216,220	5,008	100.00 %	2.32 %
Wagram	24	615	202,786	615	100.00 %	0.30 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-173.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:21 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Wake Forest	11	47,601	206,121	1,504	3.16 %	0.73 %
	13	47,601	198,354	46,097	96.84 %	23.24 %
	18	47,601	198,354	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Walkertown	31	5,692	212,299	5,692	100.00 %	2.68 %
Wallace	9	3,413	204,809	3,413	100.00 %	1.67 %
Wallburg	30	3,051	211,642	3,051	100.00 %	1.44 %
Walnut Cove	31	1,586	212,299	1,586	100.00 %	0.75 %
Walnut Creek	4	1,084	216,568	1,084	100.00 %	0.50 %
Walstonburg	4	193	216,568	193	100.00 %	0.09 %
Warrenton	2	851	198,557	851	100.00 %	0.43 %
Warsaw	9	2,733	204,809	2,733	100.00 %	1.33 %
Washington	3	9,875	200,494	9,875	100.00 %	4.93 %
Washington Park	3	392	200,494	392	100.00 %	0.20 %
Watha	9	181	204,809	181	100.00 %	0.09 %
Waxhaw	29	20,534	216,220	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	35	20,534	218,398	20,534	100.00 %	9.40 %
Waynesville	50	10,140	213,909	10,140	100.00 %	4.74 %
Weaverville	49	4,567	201,025	4,567	100.00 %	2.27 %
Webster	50	372	213,909	372	100.00 %	0.17 %
Weddington	35	13,181	218,398	13,176	99.96 %	6.03 %
	41	13,181	216,686	5	0.04 %	0.00 %
Weldon	2	1,444	198,557	1,444	100.00 %	0.73 %
Wendell	13	9,793	198,354	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	14	9,793	198,506	9,793	100.00 %	4.93 %
Wentworth	26	2,662	201,897	2,662	100.00 %	1.32 %
Wesley Chapel	35	8,681	218,398	8,681	100.00 %	3.97 %
West Jefferson	47	1,279	219,135	1,279	100.00 %	0.58 %
Whispering Pines	21	4,987	217,984	4,987	100.00 %	2.29 %
Whitakers	5	627	219,143	290	46.25 %	0.13 %
	11	627	206,121	337	53.75 %	0.16 %
White Lake	9	843	204,809	843	100.00 %	0.41 %
Whiteville	8	4,766	200,436	4,766	100.00 %	2.38 %
Whitsett	26	584	201,897	584	100.00 %	0.29 %
Wilkesboro	36	3,687	210,986	3,687	100.00 %	1.75 %
Williamston	2	5,248	198,557	5,248	100.00 %	2.64 %
Wilmington	7	115,451	212,582	115,451	100.00 %	54.31 %
	8	115,451	200,436	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Wilson	4	47,851	216,568	47,851	100.00 %	22.10 %
Wilson's Mills	10	2,534	215,999	2,534	100.00 %	1.17 %
Windsor	1	3,582	199,623	3,582	100.00 %	1.79 %
Winfall	1	555	199,623	555	100.00 %	0.28 %
Wingate	29	4,055	216,220	4,055	100.00 %	1.88 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-173.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:21 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Winston-Salem	31	249,545	212,299	40,795	16.35 %	19.22 %
	32	249,545	214,811	208,750	83.65 %	97.18 %
Winterville	5	10,462	219,143	10,462	100.00 %	4.77 %
Winton	1	629	199,623	629	100.00 %	0.32 %
Woodfin	49	7,936	201,025	7,936	100.00 %	3.95 %
Woodland	1	557	199,623	557	100.00 %	0.28 %
Wrightsville Beach	7	2,473	212,582	2,473	100.00 %	1.16 %
Yadkinville	36	2,995	210,986	2,995	100.00 %	1.42 %
Yanceyville	23	1,937	210,529	1,937	100.00 %	0.92 %
Youngsville	11	2,016	206,121	2,016	100.00 %	0.98 %
Zebulon	10	6,903	215,999	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	13	6,903	198,354	6,903	100.00 %	3.48 %
Assigned Geography Total:				6,017,605		

Report display: all municipalities

Total Municipalities Statewide: 553

Fully Assigned Municipalities: 553

Partially Assigned Municipalities: 0

Fully Unassigned Municipalities: 0

Total Districts Assigned: 50

Split Municipalities: 65

Splits Involving Population: 37

Municipality by County - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Aberdeen	21	8,516	217,984	8,516	100.00 %	3.91 %
Ahoskie	1	4,891	199,623	4,891	100.00 %	2.45 %
Alamance	25	988	216,895	988	100.00 %	0.46 %
Albemarle	33	16,432	209,379	16,432	100.00 %	7.85 %
Alliance	2	733	198,557	733	100.00 %	0.37 %
Andrews	50	1,667	213,909	1,667	100.00 %	0.78 %
Angier (Harnett)	12	4,709	198,776	4,709	100.00 %	2.37 %
Angier (Wake)	17	556	198,391	556	100.00 %	0.28 %
Ansonville	29	440	216,220	440	100.00 %	0.20 %
Apex	16	58,780	198,412	26,547	45.16 %	13.38 %
	17	58,780	198,391	32,233	54.84 %	16.25 %
Arapahoe	2	416	198,557	416	100.00 %	0.21 %
Archdale (Guilford)	27	380	217,296	380	100.00 %	0.17 %
Archdale (Randolph)	29	11,527	216,220	11,527	100.00 %	5.33 %
Archer Lodge	10	4,797	215,999	4,797	100.00 %	2.22 %
Asheboro	25	27,156	216,895	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	29	27,156	216,220	27,156	100.00 %	12.56 %
Asheville	46	94,589	200,575	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	49	94,589	201,025	94,589	100.00 %	47.05 %
Askewville	1	184	199,623	184	100.00 %	0.09 %
Atkinson	9	296	204,809	296	100.00 %	0.14 %
Atlantic Beach	2	1,364	198,557	1,364	100.00 %	0.69 %
Aulander	1	763	199,623	763	100.00 %	0.38 %
Aurora	3	455	200,494	455	100.00 %	0.23 %
Autryville	9	167	204,809	167	100.00 %	0.08 %
Ayden	5	4,977	219,143	4,977	100.00 %	2.27 %
Badin	33	2,024	209,379	2,024	100.00 %	0.97 %
Bailey	11	568	206,121	568	100.00 %	0.28 %
Bakersville	47	450	219,135	450	100.00 %	0.21 %
Bald Head Island	8	268	200,436	268	100.00 %	0.13 %
Banner Elk	47	1,049	219,135	1,049	100.00 %	0.48 %
Bath	3	245	200,494	245	100.00 %	0.12 %
Bayboro	2	1,161	198,557	1,161	100.00 %	0.58 %
Bear Grass	2	89	198,557	89	100.00 %	0.04 %
Beaufort	2	4,464	198,557	4,464	100.00 %	2.25 %
Beech Mountain (Avery)	47	62	219,135	62	100.00 %	0.03 %
Beech Mountain (Watauga)	47	613	219,135	613	100.00 %	0.28 %
Belhaven	3	1,410	200,494	1,410	100.00 %	0.70 %
Belmont	43	15,010	211,229	15,010	100.00 %	7.11 %
Belville	8	2,406	200,436	2,406	100.00 %	1.20 %
Belwood	44	857	203,043	857	100.00 %	0.42 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-173.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:21 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality by County - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Benson (Harnett)	12	0	198,776	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Benson (Johnston)	10	3,967	215,999	3,967	100.00 %	1.84 %
Bermuda Run	30	3,120	211,642	3,120	100.00 %	1.47 %
Bessemer City	43	5,428	211,229	5,428	100.00 %	2.57 %
	44	5,428	203,043	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Bethania	31	344	212,299	344	100.00 %	0.16 %
Bethel	5	1,373	219,143	1,373	100.00 %	0.63 %
Beulaville	9	1,116	204,809	1,116	100.00 %	0.54 %
Biltmore Forest	49	1,409	201,025	1,409	100.00 %	0.70 %
Biscoe	29	1,848	216,220	1,848	100.00 %	0.85 %
Black Creek	4	692	216,568	692	100.00 %	0.32 %
Black Mountain	46	8,426	200,575	8,426	100.00 %	4.20 %
Bladenboro	9	1,648	204,809	1,648	100.00 %	0.80 %
Blowing Rock (Caldwell)	47	91	219,135	91	100.00 %	0.04 %
Blowing Rock (Watauga)	47	1,285	219,135	1,285	100.00 %	0.59 %
Boardman	8	166	200,436	166	100.00 %	0.08 %
Bogue	2	695	198,557	695	100.00 %	0.35 %
Boiling Spring Lakes	8	5,943	200,436	5,943	100.00 %	2.97 %
Boiling Springs	44	4,615	203,043	4,615	100.00 %	2.27 %
Bolivia	8	149	200,436	149	100.00 %	0.07 %
Bolton	8	519	200,436	519	100.00 %	0.26 %
Boone	47	19,092	219,135	19,092	100.00 %	8.71 %
Boonville	36	1,185	210,986	1,185	100.00 %	0.56 %
Bostic	48	355	200,053	355	100.00 %	0.18 %
Brevard	50	7,744	213,909	7,744	100.00 %	3.62 %
Bridgeton	3	349	200,494	349	100.00 %	0.17 %
Broadway (Harnett)	12	0	198,776	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Broadway (Lee)	12	1,267	198,776	1,267	100.00 %	0.64 %
Brookford	45	442	209,349	442	100.00 %	0.21 %
Brunswick	8	973	200,436	973	100.00 %	0.49 %
Bryson City	50	1,558	213,909	1,558	100.00 %	0.73 %
Bunn	11	327	206,121	327	100.00 %	0.16 %
Burgaw	9	3,088	204,809	3,088	100.00 %	1.51 %
Burlington (Alamance)	25	55,481	216,895	55,481	100.00 %	25.58 %
Burlington (Guilford)	26	1,822	201,897	1,822	100.00 %	0.90 %
Burnsville	47	1,614	219,135	1,614	100.00 %	0.74 %
Butner	13	8,397	198,354	8,397	100.00 %	4.23 %
Cajah's Mountain	45	2,722	209,349	2,722	100.00 %	1.30 %
	47	2,722	219,135	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Calabash	8	2,011	200,436	2,011	100.00 %	1.00 %
Calypso	9	327	204,809	327	100.00 %	0.16 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-173.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:21 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality by County - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Cameron	21	244	217,984	244	100.00 %	0.11 %
Candor (Montgomery)	29	813	216,220	813	100.00 %	0.38 %
Candor (Moore)	21	0	217,984	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Canton	47	4,422	219,135	4,422	100.00 %	2.02 %
Cape Carteret	2	2,224	198,557	2,224	100.00 %	1.12 %
Carolina Beach	7	6,564	212,582	6,564	100.00 %	3.09 %
Carolina Shores	8	4,588	200,436	4,588	100.00 %	2.29 %
Carrboro	23	21,295	210,529	21,295	100.00 %	10.11 %
Carthage	21	2,775	217,984	2,775	100.00 %	1.27 %
Cary (Chatham)	20	3,709	199,272	3,709	100.00 %	1.86 %
Cary (Wake)	15	171,012	198,385	23,315	13.63 %	11.75 %
	16	171,012	198,412	136,584	79.87 %	68.84 %
	17	171,012	198,391	11,113	6.50 %	5.60 %
Casar	44	305	203,043	305	100.00 %	0.15 %
Castalia	11	264	206,121	264	100.00 %	0.13 %
Caswell Beach	8	395	200,436	395	100.00 %	0.20 %
Catawba	45	702	209,349	702	100.00 %	0.34 %
Cedar Point	2	1,764	198,557	1,764	100.00 %	0.89 %
Cedar Rock	45	301	209,349	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	47	301	219,135	301	100.00 %	0.14 %
Cerro Gordo	8	131	200,436	131	100.00 %	0.07 %
Chadbourn	8	1,574	200,436	1,574	100.00 %	0.79 %
Chapel Hill (Durham)	20	2,906	199,272	2,906	100.00 %	1.46 %
Chapel Hill (Orange)	23	59,054	210,529	59,054	100.00 %	28.05 %
Charlotte	38	874,579	218,466	118,479	13.55 %	54.23 %
	39	874,579	219,067	176,791	20.21 %	80.70 %
	40	874,579	218,411	209,480	23.95 %	95.91 %
	41	874,579	216,686	153,144	17.51 %	70.68 %
	42	874,579	216,693	216,685	24.78 %	100.00 %
Cherryville	44	6,078	203,043	6,078	100.00 %	2.99 %
Chimney Rock Village	48	140	200,053	140	100.00 %	0.07 %
China Grove	33	4,434	209,379	4,434	100.00 %	2.12 %
Chocowinity	3	722	200,494	722	100.00 %	0.36 %
Claremont	45	1,692	209,349	1,692	100.00 %	0.81 %
Clarkton	9	614	204,809	614	100.00 %	0.30 %
Clayton (Johnston)	10	26,307	215,999	26,307	100.00 %	12.18 %
Clayton (Wake)	14	0	198,506	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Clemmons	31	21,163	212,299	21,163	100.00 %	9.97 %
Cleveland	33	846	209,379	846	100.00 %	0.40 %
Clinton	9	8,383	204,809	8,383	100.00 %	4.09 %
Clyde	47	1,368	219,135	1,368	100.00 %	0.62 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-173.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:21 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Coats	12	2,155	198,776	2,155	100.00 %	1.08 %
Cofield	1	267	199,623	267	100.00 %	0.13 %
Colerain	1	217	199,623	217	100.00 %	0.11 %
Columbia	1	610	199,623	610	100.00 %	0.31 %
Columbus	48	1,060	200,053	1,060	100.00 %	0.53 %
Como	1	67	199,623	67	100.00 %	0.03 %
Concord	34	105,240	218,896	105,240	100.00 %	48.08 %
Conetoe	5	198	219,143	198	100.00 %	0.09 %
Connelly Springs	46	1,529	200,575	1,529	100.00 %	0.76 %
Conover	45	8,421	209,349	8,421	100.00 %	4.02 %
Conway	1	752	199,623	752	100.00 %	0.38 %
Cooleemee	30	940	211,642	940	100.00 %	0.44 %
Cornelius	37	31,412	212,852	10,223	32.54 %	4.80 %
	38	31,412	218,466	21,189	67.46 %	9.70 %
Cove City	3	378	200,494	378	100.00 %	0.19 %
Cramerton	43	5,296	211,229	5,296	100.00 %	2.51 %
Creedmoor	13	4,866	198,354	4,866	100.00 %	2.45 %
Creswell	2	207	198,557	207	100.00 %	0.10 %
Crossnore	47	143	219,135	143	100.00 %	0.07 %
Dallas	43	5,927	211,229	5,927	100.00 %	2.81 %
Danbury	31	189	212,299	189	100.00 %	0.09 %
Davidson (Iredell)	37	378	212,852	378	100.00 %	0.18 %
Davidson (Mecklenburg)	37	14,728	212,852	14,728	100.00 %	6.92 %
Dellview	44	6	203,043	6	100.00 %	0.00 %
Denton	30	1,494	211,642	1,494	100.00 %	0.71 %
Dillsboro	50	213	213,909	213	100.00 %	0.10 %
Dobbins Heights	29	687	216,220	687	100.00 %	0.32 %
Dobson	36	1,462	210,986	1,462	100.00 %	0.69 %
Dortches	11	1,082	206,121	1,082	100.00 %	0.52 %
Dover	3	349	200,494	349	100.00 %	0.17 %
Drexel	46	1,760	200,575	1,760	100.00 %	0.88 %
Dublin	9	267	204,809	267	100.00 %	0.13 %
Duck	1	742	199,623	742	100.00 %	0.37 %
Dunn	12	8,446	198,776	8,446	100.00 %	4.25 %
Durham (Durham)	20	283,093	199,272	115,188	40.69 %	57.80 %
	22	283,093	201,846	167,905	59.31 %	83.18 %
Durham (Orange)	23	144	210,529	144	100.00 %	0.07 %
Durham (Wake)	15	269	198,385	269	100.00 %	0.14 %
	16	269	198,412	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Earl	44	198	203,043	198	100.00 %	0.10 %
East Arcadia	9	418	204,809	418	100.00 %	0.20 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-173.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:21 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
East Bend	36	634	210,986	634	100.00 %	0.30 %
East Laurinburg	24	234	202,786	234	100.00 %	0.12 %
East Spencer	33	1,567	209,379	1,567	100.00 %	0.75 %
Eastover	21	3,656	217,984	3,656	100.00 %	1.68 %
Eden	26	15,421	201,897	15,421	100.00 %	7.64 %
Edenton	2	4,460	198,557	4,460	100.00 %	2.25 %
Elizabeth City (Camden)	1	38	199,623	38	100.00 %	0.02 %
Elizabeth City (Pasquotank)	1	18,593	199,623	18,593	100.00 %	9.31 %
Elizabethtown	9	3,296	204,809	3,296	100.00 %	1.61 %
Elk Park	47	542	219,135	542	100.00 %	0.25 %
Elkin (Surry)	36	4,049	210,986	4,049	100.00 %	1.92 %
Elkin (Wilkes)	36	73	210,986	73	100.00 %	0.03 %
Ellenboro	48	723	200,053	723	100.00 %	0.36 %
Ellerbe	29	864	216,220	864	100.00 %	0.40 %
Elm City (Nash)	11	0	206,121	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Elm City (Wilson)	4	1,218	216,568	1,218	100.00 %	0.56 %
Elon	25	11,336	216,895	11,336	100.00 %	5.23 %
Emerald Isle	2	3,847	198,557	3,847	100.00 %	1.94 %
Enfield	2	1,865	198,557	1,865	100.00 %	0.94 %
Erwin	12	4,542	198,776	4,542	100.00 %	2.28 %
Eureka	4	214	216,568	214	100.00 %	0.10 %
Everetts	2	150	198,557	150	100.00 %	0.08 %
Fair Bluff	8	709	200,436	709	100.00 %	0.35 %
Fairmont	24	2,191	202,786	2,191	100.00 %	1.08 %
Fairview	35	3,456	218,398	3,456	100.00 %	1.58 %
Faison (Duplin)	9	784	204,809	784	100.00 %	0.38 %
Faison (Sampson)	9	0	204,809	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Faith	33	819	209,379	819	100.00 %	0.39 %
Falcon (Cumberland)	21	324	217,984	324	100.00 %	0.15 %
Falcon (Sampson)	9	0	204,809	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Falkland	5	47	219,143	47	100.00 %	0.02 %
Fallston	44	627	203,043	627	100.00 %	0.31 %
Farmville	5	4,461	219,143	4,461	100.00 %	2.04 %
Fayetteville	19	208,501	216,471	183,928	88.21 %	84.97 %
	21	208,501	217,984	24,573	11.79 %	11.27 %
Flat Rock	48	3,486	200,053	3,486	100.00 %	1.74 %
Fletcher	48	7,987	200,053	7,987	100.00 %	3.99 %
Fontana Dam	50	13	213,909	13	100.00 %	0.01 %
Forest City	48	7,377	200,053	7,377	100.00 %	3.69 %
Forest Hills	50	303	213,909	303	100.00 %	0.14 %
Fountain	5	385	219,143	385	100.00 %	0.18 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-173.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:21 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Four Oaks	10	2,158	215,999	2,158	100.00 %	1.00 %
Foxfire	21	1,288	217,984	1,288	100.00 %	0.59 %
Franklin	50	4,175	213,909	4,175	100.00 %	1.95 %
Franklinton	11	2,456	206,121	2,456	100.00 %	1.19 %
Franklinville	25	1,197	216,895	1,197	100.00 %	0.55 %
Fremont	4	1,196	216,568	1,196	100.00 %	0.55 %
Fuquay-Varina (Harnett)	12	0	198,776	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Fuquay-Varina (Wake)	17	34,152	198,391	34,152	100.00 %	17.21 %
Gamewell	45	3,702	209,349	3,702	100.00 %	1.77 %
	47	3,702	219,135	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Garland	9	595	204,809	595	100.00 %	0.29 %
Garner	14	31,159	198,506	31,159	100.00 %	15.70 %
	17	31,159	198,391	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Garysburg	1	904	199,623	904	100.00 %	0.45 %
Gaston	1	1,008	199,623	1,008	100.00 %	0.50 %
Gastonia	43	80,411	211,229	80,411	100.00 %	38.07 %
	44	80,411	203,043	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Gatesville	1	267	199,623	267	100.00 %	0.13 %
Gibson	24	449	202,786	449	100.00 %	0.22 %
Gibsonville (Alamance)	25	4,278	216,895	4,278	100.00 %	1.97 %
Gibsonville (Guilford)	26	4,642	201,897	4,642	100.00 %	2.30 %
Glen Alpine	46	1,529	200,575	1,529	100.00 %	0.76 %
Godwin	21	128	217,984	128	100.00 %	0.06 %
Goldsboro	4	33,657	216,568	33,657	100.00 %	15.54 %
Goldston	20	234	199,272	234	100.00 %	0.12 %
Graham	25	17,157	216,895	17,157	100.00 %	7.91 %
Grandfather Village	47	95	219,135	95	100.00 %	0.04 %
Granite Falls	45	4,965	209,349	4,965	100.00 %	2.37 %
Granite Quarry	33	2,984	209,379	2,984	100.00 %	1.43 %
Grantsboro	2	692	198,557	692	100.00 %	0.35 %
Green Level	25	3,152	216,895	3,152	100.00 %	1.45 %
Greenevers	9	567	204,809	567	100.00 %	0.28 %
Greensboro	26	299,035	201,897	12,873	4.30 %	6.38 %
	27	299,035	217,296	92,205	30.83 %	42.43 %
	28	299,035	213,202	193,957	64.86 %	90.97 %
Greenville	5	87,521	219,143	87,521	100.00 %	39.94 %
Grifton (Lenoir)	3	147	200,494	147	100.00 %	0.07 %
Grifton (Pitt)	5	2,301	219,143	2,301	100.00 %	1.05 %
Grimesland	5	386	219,143	386	100.00 %	0.18 %
Grover	44	802	203,043	802	100.00 %	0.39 %
Halifax	2	170	198,557	170	100.00 %	0.09 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-173.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:21 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality by County - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Hamilton	2	306	198,557	306	100.00 %	0.15 %
Hamlet	29	6,025	216,220	6,025	100.00 %	2.79 %
Harmony	37	543	212,852	543	100.00 %	0.26 %
Harrells (Duplin)	9	0	204,809	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Harrells (Sampson)	9	160	204,809	160	100.00 %	0.08 %
Harrellsville	1	85	199,623	85	100.00 %	0.04 %
Harrisburg	34	18,967	218,896	18,967	100.00 %	8.66 %
Hassell	2	49	198,557	49	100.00 %	0.02 %
Havelock	3	16,621	200,494	16,621	100.00 %	8.29 %
Haw River	25	2,252	216,895	2,252	100.00 %	1.04 %
Hayesville	50	461	213,909	461	100.00 %	0.22 %
Hemby Bridge	35	1,614	218,398	1,614	100.00 %	0.74 %
Henderson	11	15,060	206,121	15,060	100.00 %	7.31 %
Hendersonville	48	15,137	200,053	15,137	100.00 %	7.57 %
Hertford	1	1,934	199,623	1,934	100.00 %	0.97 %
Hickory (Burke)	46	79	200,575	79	100.00 %	0.04 %
Hickory (Caldwell)	45	32	209,349	32	100.00 %	0.02 %
Hickory (Catawba)	45	43,379	209,349	43,379	100.00 %	20.72 %
High Point (Davidson)	30	6,646	211,642	6,646	100.00 %	3.14 %
High Point (Forsyth)	31	84	212,299	84	100.00 %	0.04 %
High Point (Guilford)	27	107,321	217,296	107,321	100.00 %	49.39 %
High Point (Randolph)	29	8	216,220	8	100.00 %	0.00 %
High Shoals	43	595	211,229	595	100.00 %	0.28 %
	44	595	203,043	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Highlands (Jackson)	50	12	213,909	12	100.00 %	0.01 %
Highlands (Macon)	50	1,060	213,909	1,060	100.00 %	0.50 %
Hildebran	46	1,679	200,575	1,679	100.00 %	0.84 %
Hillsborough	23	9,660	210,529	9,660	100.00 %	4.59 %
Hobgood	2	268	198,557	268	100.00 %	0.13 %
Hoffman	29	418	216,220	418	100.00 %	0.19 %
Holden Beach	8	921	200,436	921	100.00 %	0.46 %
Holly Ridge	6	4,171	204,576	4,171	100.00 %	2.04 %
Holly Springs	17	41,239	198,391	41,239	100.00 %	20.79 %
Hookerton	4	413	216,568	413	100.00 %	0.19 %
Hope Mills	19	17,808	216,471	2,593	14.56 %	1.20 %
	21	17,808	217,984	15,215	85.44 %	6.98 %
Hot Springs	47	520	219,135	520	100.00 %	0.24 %
Hudson	45	3,780	209,349	3,780	100.00 %	1.81 %
	47	3,780	219,135	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Huntersville	38	61,376	218,466	61,376	100.00 %	28.09 %
Indian Beach	2	223	198,557	223	100.00 %	0.11 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-173.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:21 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality by County - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Indian Trail	35	39,997	218,398	39,997	100.00 %	18.31 %
Jackson	1	430	199,623	430	100.00 %	0.22 %
Jacksonville	6	72,723	204,576	72,723	100.00 %	35.55 %
Jamestown	27	3,668	217,296	3,668	100.00 %	1.69 %
Jamesville	2	424	198,557	424	100.00 %	0.21 %
Jefferson	47	1,622	219,135	1,622	100.00 %	0.74 %
Jonesville	36	2,308	210,986	2,308	100.00 %	1.09 %
Kannapolis (Cabarrus)	34	42,846	218,896	42,846	100.00 %	19.57 %
Kannapolis (Rowan)	33	10,268	209,379	10,268	100.00 %	4.90 %
Kelford	1	203	199,623	203	100.00 %	0.10 %
Kenansville	9	770	204,809	770	100.00 %	0.38 %
Kenly (Johnston)	10	1,293	215,999	1,293	100.00 %	0.60 %
Kenly (Wilson)	4	198	216,568	198	100.00 %	0.09 %
Kernersville (Forsyth)	31	25,947	212,299	25,947	100.00 %	12.22 %
Kernersville (Guilford)	26	502	201,897	502	100.00 %	0.25 %
Kill Devil Hills	1	7,656	199,623	7,656	100.00 %	3.84 %
King (Forsyth)	31	591	212,299	591	100.00 %	0.28 %
King (Stokes)	31	6,606	212,299	6,606	100.00 %	3.11 %
Kings Mountain (Cleveland)	44	10,032	203,043	10,032	100.00 %	4.94 %
Kings Mountain (Gaston)	43	1,110	211,229	1,110	100.00 %	0.53 %
Kingstown	44	656	203,043	656	100.00 %	0.32 %
Kinston	3	19,900	200,494	19,900	100.00 %	9.93 %
Kittrell	11	132	206,121	132	100.00 %	0.06 %
Kitty Hawk	1	3,689	199,623	3,689	100.00 %	1.85 %
Knightdale	13	19,435	198,354	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	14	19,435	198,506	19,435	100.00 %	9.79 %
Kure Beach	7	2,191	212,582	2,191	100.00 %	1.03 %
La Grange	3	2,595	200,494	2,595	100.00 %	1.29 %
Lake Lure	48	1,365	200,053	1,365	100.00 %	0.68 %
Lake Park	35	3,269	218,398	3,269	100.00 %	1.50 %
Lake Santeetlah	50	38	213,909	38	100.00 %	0.02 %
Lake Waccamaw	8	1,296	200,436	1,296	100.00 %	0.65 %
Landis	33	3,690	209,379	3,690	100.00 %	1.76 %
Lansing	47	126	219,135	126	100.00 %	0.06 %
Lasker	1	64	199,623	64	100.00 %	0.03 %
Lattimore	44	406	203,043	406	100.00 %	0.20 %
Laurel Park	48	2,250	200,053	2,250	100.00 %	1.12 %
Laurinburg	24	14,978	202,786	14,978	100.00 %	7.39 %
Lawndale	44	570	203,043	570	100.00 %	0.28 %
Leggett	5	37	219,143	37	100.00 %	0.02 %
Leland	8	22,908	200,436	22,908	100.00 %	11.43 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-173.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:21 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Lenoir	45	18,352	209,349	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	47	18,352	219,135	18,352	100.00 %	8.37 %
Lewiston Woodville	1	426	199,623	426	100.00 %	0.21 %
Lewisville	31	13,381	212,299	13,381	100.00 %	6.30 %
Lexington	30	19,632	211,642	19,632	100.00 %	9.28 %
Liberty	25	2,655	216,895	2,655	100.00 %	1.22 %
Lilesville	29	395	216,220	395	100.00 %	0.18 %
Lillington	12	4,735	198,776	4,735	100.00 %	2.38 %
Lincolnton	44	11,091	203,043	11,091	100.00 %	5.46 %
Linden	21	136	217,984	136	100.00 %	0.06 %
Littleton	2	559	198,557	559	100.00 %	0.28 %
Locust (Cabarrus)	34	541	218,896	423	78.19 %	0.19 %
	35	541	218,398	118	21.81 %	0.05 %
Locust (Stanly)	33	3,996	209,379	3,996	100.00 %	1.91 %
Long View (Burke)	46	735	200,575	735	100.00 %	0.37 %
Long View (Catawba)	45	4,353	209,349	4,353	100.00 %	2.08 %
Louisburg	11	3,064	206,121	3,064	100.00 %	1.49 %
Love Valley	37	154	212,852	154	100.00 %	0.07 %
Lowell	43	3,654	211,229	3,654	100.00 %	1.73 %
Lucama	4	1,036	216,568	1,036	100.00 %	0.48 %
Lumber Bridge	24	82	202,786	82	100.00 %	0.04 %
Lumberton	24	19,025	202,786	19,025	100.00 %	9.38 %
Macclesfield	5	413	219,143	413	100.00 %	0.19 %
Macon	2	110	198,557	110	100.00 %	0.06 %
Madison	26	2,129	201,897	2,129	100.00 %	1.05 %
Maggie Valley	50	1,687	213,909	1,687	100.00 %	0.79 %
Magnolia	9	831	204,809	831	100.00 %	0.41 %
Maiden (Catawba)	45	3,736	209,349	3,736	100.00 %	1.78 %
Maiden (Lincoln)	44	0	203,043	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Manteo	1	1,600	199,623	1,600	100.00 %	0.80 %
Marietta	24	111	202,786	111	100.00 %	0.05 %
Marion	46	7,717	200,575	7,717	100.00 %	3.85 %
Mars Hill	47	2,007	219,135	2,007	100.00 %	0.92 %
Marshall	47	777	219,135	777	100.00 %	0.35 %
Marshville	29	2,522	216,220	2,522	100.00 %	1.17 %
Marvin	35	6,358	218,398	6,358	100.00 %	2.91 %
Matthews	41	29,435	216,686	29,435	100.00 %	13.58 %
Maxton (Robeson)	24	1,902	202,786	1,902	100.00 %	0.94 %
Maxton (Scotland)	24	208	202,786	208	100.00 %	0.10 %
Mayodan	26	2,418	201,897	2,418	100.00 %	1.20 %
Maysville	9	818	204,809	818	100.00 %	0.40 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-173.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:21 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality by County - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
McAdenville	43	890	211,229	890	100.00 %	0.42 %
McDonald	24	94	202,786	94	100.00 %	0.05 %
McFarlan	29	94	216,220	94	100.00 %	0.04 %
Mebane (Alamance)	25	14,626	216,895	14,626	100.00 %	6.74 %
Mebane (Orange)	23	3,171	210,529	3,171	100.00 %	1.51 %
Mesic	2	144	198,557	144	100.00 %	0.07 %
Micro	10	458	215,999	458	100.00 %	0.21 %
Middleburg	11	101	206,121	101	100.00 %	0.05 %
Middlesex	11	912	206,121	912	100.00 %	0.44 %
Midland (Cabarrus)	34	4,684	218,896	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	35	4,684	218,398	4,684	100.00 %	2.14 %
Midland (Mecklenburg)	41	0	216,686	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Midway	30	4,742	211,642	4,742	100.00 %	2.24 %
Mills River	48	7,078	200,053	7,078	100.00 %	3.54 %
Milton	23	155	210,529	155	100.00 %	0.07 %
Mineral Springs	35	3,159	218,398	3,159	100.00 %	1.45 %
Minnesott Beach	2	530	198,557	530	100.00 %	0.27 %
Mint Hill (Mecklenburg)	40	26,444	218,411	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	41	26,444	216,686	26,444	100.00 %	12.20 %
Mint Hill (Union)	35	6	218,398	6	100.00 %	0.00 %
Misenheimer	33	650	209,379	650	100.00 %	0.31 %
Mocksville	30	5,900	211,642	5,900	100.00 %	2.79 %
Momeyer	11	277	206,121	277	100.00 %	0.13 %
Monroe	35	34,562	218,398	34,562	100.00 %	15.83 %
Montreat	46	901	200,575	901	100.00 %	0.45 %
Mooresboro	44	293	203,043	293	100.00 %	0.14 %
Mooresville	37	50,193	212,852	50,193	100.00 %	23.58 %
Morehead City	2	9,556	198,557	9,556	100.00 %	4.81 %
Morganton	46	17,474	200,575	17,474	100.00 %	8.71 %
Morrisville (Durham)	20	207	199,272	207	100.00 %	0.10 %
Morrisville (Wake)	16	29,423	198,412	29,423	100.00 %	14.83 %
Morven	29	329	216,220	329	100.00 %	0.15 %
Mount Airy	36	10,676	210,986	10,676	100.00 %	5.06 %
Mount Gilead	29	1,171	216,220	1,171	100.00 %	0.54 %
Mount Holly	43	17,703	211,229	17,703	100.00 %	8.38 %
Mount Olive (Duplin)	9	5	204,809	5	100.00 %	0.00 %
Mount Olive (Wayne)	4	4,193	216,568	4,193	100.00 %	1.94 %
Mount Pleasant	34	1,671	218,896	1,671	100.00 %	0.76 %
Murfreesboro	1	2,619	199,623	2,619	100.00 %	1.31 %
Murphy	50	1,608	213,909	1,608	100.00 %	0.75 %
Nags Head	1	3,168	199,623	3,168	100.00 %	1.59 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-173.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:21 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality by County - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Nashville	11	5,632	206,121	5,632	100.00 %	2.73 %
Navassa	8	1,367	200,436	1,367	100.00 %	0.68 %
New Bern	3	31,291	200,494	31,291	100.00 %	15.61 %
New London	33	607	209,379	607	100.00 %	0.29 %
Newland	47	715	219,135	715	100.00 %	0.33 %
Newport	2	4,364	198,557	4,364	100.00 %	2.20 %
Newton	45	13,148	209,349	13,148	100.00 %	6.28 %
Newton Grove	9	585	204,809	585	100.00 %	0.29 %
Norlina	2	920	198,557	920	100.00 %	0.46 %
Norman	29	100	216,220	100	100.00 %	0.05 %
North Topsail Beach	6	1,005	204,576	1,005	100.00 %	0.49 %
North Wilkesboro	36	4,382	210,986	4,382	100.00 %	2.08 %
Northwest	8	703	200,436	703	100.00 %	0.35 %
Norwood	33	2,367	209,379	2,367	100.00 %	1.13 %
Oak City	2	266	198,557	266	100.00 %	0.13 %
Oak Island	8	8,396	200,436	8,396	100.00 %	4.19 %
Oak Ridge	26	7,474	201,897	7,474	100.00 %	3.70 %
Oakboro	33	2,128	209,379	2,128	100.00 %	1.02 %
Ocean Isle Beach	8	867	200,436	867	100.00 %	0.43 %
Old Fort	46	811	200,575	811	100.00 %	0.40 %
Oriental	2	880	198,557	880	100.00 %	0.44 %
Orrum	24	59	202,786	59	100.00 %	0.03 %
Ossipee	25	536	216,895	536	100.00 %	0.25 %
Oxford	13	8,628	198,354	8,628	100.00 %	4.35 %
Pantego	3	164	200,494	164	100.00 %	0.08 %
Parkton	24	504	202,786	504	100.00 %	0.25 %
Parmelee	2	243	198,557	243	100.00 %	0.12 %
Patterson Springs	44	571	203,043	571	100.00 %	0.28 %
Peachland	29	390	216,220	390	100.00 %	0.18 %
Peletier	2	769	198,557	769	100.00 %	0.39 %
Pembroke	24	2,823	202,786	2,823	100.00 %	1.39 %
Pikeville	4	712	216,568	712	100.00 %	0.33 %
Pilot Mountain	36	1,440	210,986	1,440	100.00 %	0.68 %
Pine Knoll Shores	2	1,388	198,557	1,388	100.00 %	0.70 %
Pine Level	10	2,046	215,999	2,046	100.00 %	0.95 %
Pinebluff	21	1,473	217,984	1,473	100.00 %	0.68 %
Pinehurst	21	17,581	217,984	17,581	100.00 %	8.07 %
Pinetops	5	1,200	219,143	1,200	100.00 %	0.55 %
Pineville	39	10,602	219,067	10,602	100.00 %	4.84 %
	41	10,602	216,686	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Pink Hill	3	451	200,494	451	100.00 %	0.22 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-173.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:21 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality by County - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Pittsboro	20	4,537	199,272	4,537	100.00 %	2.28 %
Pleasant Garden	26	5,000	201,897	5,000	100.00 %	2.48 %
Plymouth	2	3,320	198,557	3,320	100.00 %	1.67 %
Polkton	29	2,250	216,220	2,250	100.00 %	1.04 %
Polkville	44	516	203,043	516	100.00 %	0.25 %
Pollocksville	9	268	204,809	268	100.00 %	0.13 %
Powellsville	1	189	199,623	189	100.00 %	0.09 %
Princeton	10	1,315	215,999	1,315	100.00 %	0.61 %
Princeville	5	1,254	219,143	1,254	100.00 %	0.57 %
Proctorville	24	121	202,786	121	100.00 %	0.06 %
Raeford	24	4,559	202,786	4,559	100.00 %	2.25 %
Raleigh (Durham)	20	1,559	199,272	233	14.95 %	0.12 %
	22	1,559	201,846	1,326	85.05 %	0.66 %
Raleigh (Wake)	13	466,106	198,354	8,083	1.73 %	4.08 %
	14	466,106	198,506	98,578	21.15 %	49.66 %
	15	466,106	198,385	167,598	35.96 %	84.48 %
	16	466,106	198,412	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	17	466,106	198,391	1	0.00 %	0.00 %
	18	466,106	198,354	191,846	41.16 %	96.72 %
Ramseur	25	1,774	216,895	1,774	100.00 %	0.82 %
Randleman	25	4,595	216,895	4,595	100.00 %	2.12 %
	29	4,595	216,220	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Ranlo	43	4,511	211,229	4,511	100.00 %	2.14 %
Raynham	24	60	202,786	60	100.00 %	0.03 %
Red Cross	33	762	209,379	762	100.00 %	0.36 %
Red Oak	11	3,342	206,121	3,342	100.00 %	1.62 %
Red Springs (Hoke)	24	0	202,786	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Red Springs (Robeson)	24	3,087	202,786	3,087	100.00 %	1.52 %
Reidsville	26	14,583	201,897	14,583	100.00 %	7.22 %
Rennert	24	275	202,786	275	100.00 %	0.14 %
Rhodhiss (Burke)	46	639	200,575	639	100.00 %	0.32 %
Rhodhiss (Caldwell)	45	358	209,349	358	100.00 %	0.17 %
Rich Square	1	894	199,623	894	100.00 %	0.45 %
Richfield	33	582	209,379	582	100.00 %	0.28 %
Richlands	6	2,287	204,576	2,287	100.00 %	1.12 %
River Bend	3	2,902	200,494	2,902	100.00 %	1.45 %
Roanoke Rapids	2	15,229	198,557	15,229	100.00 %	7.67 %
Robbins	21	1,168	217,984	1,168	100.00 %	0.54 %
Robbinsville	50	597	213,909	597	100.00 %	0.28 %
Robersonville	2	1,269	198,557	1,269	100.00 %	0.64 %
Rockingham	29	9,243	216,220	9,243	100.00 %	4.27 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-173.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:21 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality by County - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Rockwell	33	2,302	209,379	2,302	100.00 %	1.10 %
Rocky Mount (Edgecombe)	5	15,414	219,143	15,414	100.00 %	7.03 %
Rocky Mount (Nash)	11	38,927	206,121	38,927	100.00 %	18.89 %
Rolesville	13	9,475	198,354	9,475	100.00 %	4.78 %
Ronda	36	438	210,986	438	100.00 %	0.21 %
Roper	2	485	198,557	485	100.00 %	0.24 %
Rose Hill	9	1,371	204,809	1,371	100.00 %	0.67 %
Roseboro	9	1,163	204,809	1,163	100.00 %	0.57 %
Rosman	50	701	213,909	701	100.00 %	0.33 %
Rowland	24	885	202,786	885	100.00 %	0.44 %
Roxboro	23	8,134	210,529	8,134	100.00 %	3.86 %
Roxobel	1	187	199,623	187	100.00 %	0.09 %
Rural Hall	31	3,351	212,299	3,351	100.00 %	1.58 %
Ruth	48	347	200,053	347	100.00 %	0.17 %
Rutherford College (Burke)	46	1,226	200,575	1,226	100.00 %	0.61 %
Rutherford College (Caldwell)	45	0	209,349	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Rutherfordton	48	3,640	200,053	3,640	100.00 %	1.82 %
Salemburg	9	457	204,809	457	100.00 %	0.22 %
Salisbury	33	35,540	209,379	35,540	100.00 %	16.97 %
Saluda (Henderson)	48	11	200,053	11	100.00 %	0.01 %
Saluda (Polk)	48	620	200,053	620	100.00 %	0.31 %
Sandy Creek	8	248	200,436	248	100.00 %	0.12 %
Sandyfield	8	430	200,436	430	100.00 %	0.21 %
Sanford	12	30,261	198,776	30,261	100.00 %	15.22 %
Saratoga	4	353	216,568	353	100.00 %	0.16 %
Sawmills	45	5,020	209,349	5,020	100.00 %	2.40 %
Scotland Neck	2	1,640	198,557	1,640	100.00 %	0.83 %
Seaboard	1	542	199,623	542	100.00 %	0.27 %
Seagrove	25	235	216,895	235	100.00 %	0.11 %
Sedalia	26	676	201,897	676	100.00 %	0.33 %
	28	676	213,202	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Selma	10	6,317	215,999	6,317	100.00 %	2.92 %
Seven Devils (Avery)	47	38	219,135	38	100.00 %	0.02 %
Seven Devils (Watauga)	47	275	219,135	275	100.00 %	0.13 %
Seven Springs	4	55	216,568	55	100.00 %	0.03 %
Severn	1	191	199,623	191	100.00 %	0.10 %
Shallotte	8	4,185	200,436	4,185	100.00 %	2.09 %
Sharpsburg (Edgecombe)	5	215	219,143	215	100.00 %	0.10 %
Sharpsburg (Nash)	11	1,061	206,121	1,061	100.00 %	0.51 %
Sharpsburg (Wilson)	4	421	216,568	421	100.00 %	0.19 %
Shelby	44	21,918	203,043	21,918	100.00 %	10.79 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-173.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:21 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality by County - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Siler City	20	7,702	199,272	7,702	100.00 %	3.87 %
Simpson	5	390	219,143	390	100.00 %	0.18 %
Sims	4	275	216,568	275	100.00 %	0.13 %
Smithfield	10	11,292	215,999	11,292	100.00 %	5.23 %
Snow Hill	4	1,481	216,568	1,481	100.00 %	0.68 %
Southern Pines	21	15,545	217,984	15,545	100.00 %	7.13 %
Southern Shores	1	3,090	199,623	3,090	100.00 %	1.55 %
Southport	8	3,971	200,436	3,971	100.00 %	1.98 %
Sparta	47	1,834	219,135	1,834	100.00 %	0.84 %
Speed	5	63	219,143	63	100.00 %	0.03 %
Spencer	33	3,308	209,379	3,308	100.00 %	1.58 %
Spencer Mountain	43	0	211,229	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Spindale	48	4,225	200,053	4,225	100.00 %	2.11 %
Spring Hope	11	1,309	206,121	1,309	100.00 %	0.64 %
Spring Lake	21	11,660	217,984	11,660	100.00 %	5.35 %
Spruce Pine	47	2,194	219,135	2,194	100.00 %	1.00 %
St. Helena	9	417	204,809	417	100.00 %	0.20 %
St. James	8	6,529	200,436	6,529	100.00 %	3.26 %
St. Pauls	24	2,045	202,786	2,045	100.00 %	1.01 %
Staley	25	397	216,895	397	100.00 %	0.18 %
Stallings (Mecklenburg)	41	384	216,686	384	100.00 %	0.18 %
Stallings (Union)	35	15,728	218,398	15,728	100.00 %	7.20 %
Stanfield	33	1,585	209,379	1,585	100.00 %	0.76 %
Stanley	43	3,963	211,229	3,963	100.00 %	1.88 %
Stantonsburg	4	762	216,568	762	100.00 %	0.35 %
Star	29	806	216,220	806	100.00 %	0.37 %
Statesville	37	28,419	212,852	28,419	100.00 %	13.35 %
Stedman	21	1,277	217,984	1,277	100.00 %	0.59 %
Stem	13	960	198,354	960	100.00 %	0.48 %
Stokesdale	26	5,924	201,897	5,924	100.00 %	2.93 %
Stoneville	26	1,308	201,897	1,308	100.00 %	0.65 %
Stonewall	2	214	198,557	214	100.00 %	0.11 %
Stovall	13	324	198,354	324	100.00 %	0.16 %
Sugar Mountain	47	371	219,135	371	100.00 %	0.17 %
Summerfield	26	10,951	201,897	10,951	100.00 %	5.42 %
Sunset Beach	8	4,175	200,436	4,175	100.00 %	2.08 %
Surf City (Onslow)	6	334	204,576	334	100.00 %	0.16 %
Surf City (Pender)	9	3,533	204,809	3,533	100.00 %	1.73 %
Swansboro	6	3,744	204,576	3,744	100.00 %	1.83 %
Sweptonville	25	2,445	216,895	2,445	100.00 %	1.13 %
Sylva	50	2,578	213,909	2,578	100.00 %	1.21 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-173.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:21 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality by County - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Tabor City	8	3,781	200,436	3,781	100.00 %	1.89 %
Tar Heel	9	90	204,809	90	100.00 %	0.04 %
Tarboro	5	10,721	219,143	10,721	100.00 %	4.89 %
Taylorsville	36	2,320	210,986	2,320	100.00 %	1.10 %
Taylortown	21	634	217,984	634	100.00 %	0.29 %
Teachey	9	448	204,809	448	100.00 %	0.22 %
Thomasville (Davidson)	30	26,662	211,642	26,662	100.00 %	12.60 %
Thomasville (Randolph)	29	521	216,220	521	100.00 %	0.24 %
Tobaccoville (Forsyth)	31	2,578	212,299	2,578	100.00 %	1.21 %
Tobaccoville (Stokes)	31	0	212,299	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Topsail Beach	9	461	204,809	461	100.00 %	0.23 %
Trent Woods	3	4,074	200,494	4,074	100.00 %	2.03 %
Trenton	9	238	204,809	238	100.00 %	0.12 %
Trinity	29	7,006	216,220	7,006	100.00 %	3.24 %
Troutman	37	3,698	212,852	3,698	100.00 %	1.74 %
Troy	29	2,850	216,220	2,850	100.00 %	1.32 %
Tryon	48	1,562	200,053	1,562	100.00 %	0.78 %
Turkey	9	213	204,809	213	100.00 %	0.10 %
Unionville	35	6,643	218,398	6,643	100.00 %	3.04 %
Valdese	46	4,689	200,575	4,689	100.00 %	2.34 %
Vanceboro	3	869	200,494	869	100.00 %	0.43 %
Vandemere	2	246	198,557	246	100.00 %	0.12 %
Varnamtown	8	525	200,436	525	100.00 %	0.26 %
Vass	21	952	217,984	952	100.00 %	0.44 %
Waco	44	310	203,043	310	100.00 %	0.15 %
Wade	21	638	217,984	638	100.00 %	0.29 %
Wadesboro	29	5,008	216,220	5,008	100.00 %	2.32 %
Wagram	24	615	202,786	615	100.00 %	0.30 %
Wake Forest (Franklin)	11	1,504	206,121	1,504	100.00 %	0.73 %
Wake Forest (Wake)	13	46,097	198,354	46,097	100.00 %	23.24 %
	18	46,097	198,354	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Walkertown	31	5,692	212,299	5,692	100.00 %	2.68 %
Wallace (Duplin)	9	3,413	204,809	3,413	100.00 %	1.67 %
Wallace (Pender)	9	0	204,809	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Wallburg	30	3,051	211,642	3,051	100.00 %	1.44 %
Walnut Cove	31	1,586	212,299	1,586	100.00 %	0.75 %
Walnut Creek	4	1,084	216,568	1,084	100.00 %	0.50 %
Walstonburg	4	193	216,568	193	100.00 %	0.09 %
Warrenton	2	851	198,557	851	100.00 %	0.43 %
Warsaw	9	2,733	204,809	2,733	100.00 %	1.33 %
Washington	3	9,875	200,494	9,875	100.00 %	4.93 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-173.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:21 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality by County - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Washington Park	3	392	200,494	392	100.00 %	0.20 %
Watha	9	181	204,809	181	100.00 %	0.09 %
Waxhaw	29	20,534	216,220	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	35	20,534	218,398	20,534	100.00 %	9.40 %
Waynesville	50	10,140	213,909	10,140	100.00 %	4.74 %
Weaverville	49	4,567	201,025	4,567	100.00 %	2.27 %
Webster	50	372	213,909	372	100.00 %	0.17 %
Weddington (Mecklenburg)	41	5	216,686	5	100.00 %	0.00 %
Weddington (Union)	35	13,176	218,398	13,176	100.00 %	6.03 %
Weldon	2	1,444	198,557	1,444	100.00 %	0.73 %
Wendell	13	9,793	198,354	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	14	9,793	198,506	9,793	100.00 %	4.93 %
Wentworth	26	2,662	201,897	2,662	100.00 %	1.32 %
Wesley Chapel	35	8,681	218,398	8,681	100.00 %	3.97 %
West Jefferson	47	1,279	219,135	1,279	100.00 %	0.58 %
Whispering Pines	21	4,987	217,984	4,987	100.00 %	2.29 %
Whitakers (Edgecombe)	5	290	219,143	290	100.00 %	0.13 %
Whitakers (Nash)	11	337	206,121	337	100.00 %	0.16 %
White Lake	9	843	204,809	843	100.00 %	0.41 %
Whiteville	8	4,766	200,436	4,766	100.00 %	2.38 %
Whitsett	26	584	201,897	584	100.00 %	0.29 %
Wilkesboro	36	3,687	210,986	3,687	100.00 %	1.75 %
Williamston	2	5,248	198,557	5,248	100.00 %	2.64 %
Wilmington	7	115,451	212,582	115,451	100.00 %	54.31 %
	8	115,451	200,436	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Wilson	4	47,851	216,568	47,851	100.00 %	22.10 %
Wilson's Mills	10	2,534	215,999	2,534	100.00 %	1.17 %
Windsor	1	3,582	199,623	3,582	100.00 %	1.79 %
Winfall	1	555	199,623	555	100.00 %	0.28 %
Wingate	29	4,055	216,220	4,055	100.00 %	1.88 %
Winston-Salem	31	249,545	212,299	40,795	16.35 %	19.22 %
	32	249,545	214,811	208,750	83.65 %	97.18 %
Winterville	5	10,462	219,143	10,462	100.00 %	4.77 %
Winton	1	629	199,623	629	100.00 %	0.32 %
Woodfin	49	7,936	201,025	7,936	100.00 %	3.95 %
Woodland	1	557	199,623	557	100.00 %	0.28 %
Wrightsville Beach	7	2,473	212,582	2,473	100.00 %	1.16 %
Yadkinville	36	2,995	210,986	2,995	100.00 %	1.42 %
Yanceyville	23	1,937	210,529	1,937	100.00 %	0.92 %
Youngsville	11	2,016	206,121	2,016	100.00 %	0.98 %
Zebulon (Johnston)	10	0	215,999	0	0.00 %	0.00 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-173.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:21 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Zebulon (Wake)	13	6,903	198,354	6,903	100.00 %	3.48 %
Assigned Geography Total:				6,017,605		

Report display: all municipalities

Total Municipalities (by County) Statewide: 614

Fully Assigned Municipalities: 614

Partially Assigned Municipalities: 0

Fully Unassigned Municipalities: 0

Total Districts Assigned: 50

Split Municipalities: 34

Splits Involving Population: 12

District - Municipality by County Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173**

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
1	Ahoskie	199,623	4,891	4,891	2.45 %	100.00 %
	Askewville	199,623	184	184	0.09 %	100.00 %
	Aulander	199,623	763	763	0.38 %	100.00 %
	Cofield	199,623	267	267	0.13 %	100.00 %
	Colerain	199,623	217	217	0.11 %	100.00 %
	Columbia	199,623	610	610	0.31 %	100.00 %
	Como	199,623	67	67	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Conway	199,623	752	752	0.38 %	100.00 %
	Duck	199,623	742	742	0.37 %	100.00 %
	Elizabeth City (Camden)	199,623	38	38	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Elizabeth City (Pasquotank)	199,623	18,593	18,593	9.31 %	100.00 %
	Garysburg	199,623	904	904	0.45 %	100.00 %
	Gaston	199,623	1,008	1,008	0.50 %	100.00 %
	Gatesville	199,623	267	267	0.13 %	100.00 %
	Harrellsville	199,623	85	85	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Hertford	199,623	1,934	1,934	0.97 %	100.00 %
	Jackson	199,623	430	430	0.22 %	100.00 %
	Kelford	199,623	203	203	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Kill Devil Hills	199,623	7,656	7,656	3.84 %	100.00 %
	Kitty Hawk	199,623	3,689	3,689	1.85 %	100.00 %
	Lasker	199,623	64	64	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Lewiston Woodville	199,623	426	426	0.21 %	100.00 %
	Manteo	199,623	1,600	1,600	0.80 %	100.00 %
	Murfreesboro	199,623	2,619	2,619	1.31 %	100.00 %
	Nags Head	199,623	3,168	3,168	1.59 %	100.00 %
	Powellsville	199,623	189	189	0.09 %	100.00 %
	Rich Square	199,623	894	894	0.45 %	100.00 %
	Roxobel	199,623	187	187	0.09 %	100.00 %
	Seaboard	199,623	542	542	0.27 %	100.00 %
	Severn	199,623	191	191	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Southern Shores	199,623	3,090	3,090	1.55 %	100.00 %
	Windsor	199,623	3,582	3,582	1.79 %	100.00 %
	Winfall	199,623	555	555	0.28 %	100.00 %
	Winton	199,623	629	629	0.32 %	100.00 %
	Woodland	199,623	557	557	0.28 %	100.00 %
2	Alliance	198,557	733	733	0.37 %	100.00 %
	Arapahoe	198,557	416	416	0.21 %	100.00 %
	Atlantic Beach	198,557	1,364	1,364	0.69 %	100.00 %
	Bayboro	198,557	1,161	1,161	0.58 %	100.00 %
	Bear Grass	198,557	89	89	0.04 %	100.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
2	Beaufort	198,557	4,464	4,464	2.25 %	100.00 %
	Bogue	198,557	695	695	0.35 %	100.00 %
	Cape Carteret	198,557	2,224	2,224	1.12 %	100.00 %
	Cedar Point	198,557	1,764	1,764	0.89 %	100.00 %
	Creswell	198,557	207	207	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Edenton	198,557	4,460	4,460	2.25 %	100.00 %
	Emerald Isle	198,557	3,847	3,847	1.94 %	100.00 %
	Enfield	198,557	1,865	1,865	0.94 %	100.00 %
	Everetts	198,557	150	150	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Grantsboro	198,557	692	692	0.35 %	100.00 %
	Halifax	198,557	170	170	0.09 %	100.00 %
	Hamilton	198,557	306	306	0.15 %	100.00 %
	Hassell	198,557	49	49	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Hobgood	198,557	268	268	0.13 %	100.00 %
	Indian Beach	198,557	223	223	0.11 %	100.00 %
	Jamesville	198,557	424	424	0.21 %	100.00 %
	Littleton	198,557	559	559	0.28 %	100.00 %
	Macon	198,557	110	110	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Mesic	198,557	144	144	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Minnesott Beach	198,557	530	530	0.27 %	100.00 %
	Morehead City	198,557	9,556	9,556	4.81 %	100.00 %
	Newport	198,557	4,364	4,364	2.20 %	100.00 %
	Norlina	198,557	920	920	0.46 %	100.00 %
	Oak City	198,557	266	266	0.13 %	100.00 %
	Oriental	198,557	880	880	0.44 %	100.00 %
	Parmelee	198,557	243	243	0.12 %	100.00 %
	Peletier	198,557	769	769	0.39 %	100.00 %
	Pine Knoll Shores	198,557	1,388	1,388	0.70 %	100.00 %
	Plymouth	198,557	3,320	3,320	1.67 %	100.00 %
	Roanoke Rapids	198,557	15,229	15,229	7.67 %	100.00 %
	Robersonville	198,557	1,269	1,269	0.64 %	100.00 %
	Roper	198,557	485	485	0.24 %	100.00 %
	Scotland Neck	198,557	1,640	1,640	0.83 %	100.00 %
	Stonewall	198,557	214	214	0.11 %	100.00 %
	Vandemere	198,557	246	246	0.12 %	100.00 %
	Warrenton	198,557	851	851	0.43 %	100.00 %
	Weldon	198,557	1,444	1,444	0.73 %	100.00 %
	Williamston	198,557	5,248	5,248	2.64 %	100.00 %
3	Aurora	200,494	455	455	0.23 %	100.00 %
	Bath	200,494	245	245	0.12 %	100.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173**

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
3	Belhaven	200,494	1,410	1,410	0.70 %	100.00 %
	Bridgeton	200,494	349	349	0.17 %	100.00 %
	Chocowinity	200,494	722	722	0.36 %	100.00 %
	Cove City	200,494	378	378	0.19 %	100.00 %
	Dover	200,494	349	349	0.17 %	100.00 %
	Grifton (Lenoir)	200,494	147	147	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Havelock	200,494	16,621	16,621	8.29 %	100.00 %
	Kinston	200,494	19,900	19,900	9.93 %	100.00 %
	La Grange	200,494	2,595	2,595	1.29 %	100.00 %
	New Bern	200,494	31,291	31,291	15.61 %	100.00 %
	Pantego	200,494	164	164	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Pink Hill	200,494	451	451	0.22 %	100.00 %
	River Bend	200,494	2,902	2,902	1.45 %	100.00 %
	Trent Woods	200,494	4,074	4,074	2.03 %	100.00 %
	Vanceboro	200,494	869	869	0.43 %	100.00 %
	Washington	200,494	9,875	9,875	4.93 %	100.00 %
	Washington Park	200,494	392	392	0.20 %	100.00 %
4	Black Creek	216,568	692	692	0.32 %	100.00 %
	Elm City (Wilson)	216,568	1,218	1,218	0.56 %	100.00 %
	Eureka	216,568	214	214	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Fremont	216,568	1,196	1,196	0.55 %	100.00 %
	Goldsboro	216,568	33,657	33,657	15.54 %	100.00 %
	Hookerton	216,568	413	413	0.19 %	100.00 %
	Kenly (Wilson)	216,568	198	198	0.09 %	100.00 %
	Lucama	216,568	1,036	1,036	0.48 %	100.00 %
	Mount Olive (Wayne)	216,568	4,193	4,193	1.94 %	100.00 %
	Pikeville	216,568	712	712	0.33 %	100.00 %
	Saratoga	216,568	353	353	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Seven Springs	216,568	55	55	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Sharpsburg (Wilson)	216,568	421	421	0.19 %	100.00 %
	Sims	216,568	275	275	0.13 %	100.00 %
	Snow Hill	216,568	1,481	1,481	0.68 %	100.00 %
	Stantonsburg	216,568	762	762	0.35 %	100.00 %
	Walnut Creek	216,568	1,084	1,084	0.50 %	100.00 %
	Walstonburg	216,568	193	193	0.09 %	100.00 %
	Wilson	216,568	47,851	47,851	22.10 %	100.00 %
5	Ayden	219,143	4,977	4,977	2.27 %	100.00 %
	Bethel	219,143	1,373	1,373	0.63 %	100.00 %
	Conetoe	219,143	198	198	0.09 %	100.00 %
	Falkland	219,143	47	47	0.02 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-173.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:21 PM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 3 of 17

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173**

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
5	Farmville	219,143	4,461	4,461	2.04 %	100.00 %
	Fountain	219,143	385	385	0.18 %	100.00 %
	Greenville	219,143	87,521	87,521	39.94 %	100.00 %
	Grifton (Pitt)	219,143	2,301	2,301	1.05 %	100.00 %
	Grimesland	219,143	386	386	0.18 %	100.00 %
	Leggett	219,143	37	37	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Macclesfield	219,143	413	413	0.19 %	100.00 %
	Pinetops	219,143	1,200	1,200	0.55 %	100.00 %
	Princeville	219,143	1,254	1,254	0.57 %	100.00 %
	Rocky Mount (Edgecombe)	219,143	15,414	15,414	7.03 %	100.00 %
	Sharpsburg (Edgecombe)	219,143	215	215	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Simpson	219,143	390	390	0.18 %	100.00 %
	Speed	219,143	63	63	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Tarboro	219,143	10,721	10,721	4.89 %	100.00 %
	Whitakers (Edgecombe)	219,143	290	290	0.13 %	100.00 %
	Winterville	219,143	10,462	10,462	4.77 %	100.00 %
6	Holly Ridge	204,576	4,171	4,171	2.04 %	100.00 %
	Jacksonville	204,576	72,723	72,723	35.55 %	100.00 %
	North Topsail Beach	204,576	1,005	1,005	0.49 %	100.00 %
	Richlands	204,576	2,287	2,287	1.12 %	100.00 %
	Surf City (Onslow)	204,576	334	334	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Swansboro	204,576	3,744	3,744	1.83 %	100.00 %
7	Carolina Beach	212,582	6,564	6,564	3.09 %	100.00 %
	Kure Beach	212,582	2,191	2,191	1.03 %	100.00 %
	Wilmington	212,582	115,451	115,451	54.31 %	100.00 %
	Wrightsville Beach	212,582	2,473	2,473	1.16 %	100.00 %
8	Bald Head Island	200,436	268	268	0.13 %	100.00 %
	Belville	200,436	2,406	2,406	1.20 %	100.00 %
	Boardman	200,436	166	166	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Boiling Spring Lakes	200,436	5,943	5,943	2.97 %	100.00 %
	Bolivia	200,436	149	149	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Bolton	200,436	519	519	0.26 %	100.00 %
	Brunswick	200,436	973	973	0.49 %	100.00 %
	Calabash	200,436	2,011	2,011	1.00 %	100.00 %
	Carolina Shores	200,436	4,588	4,588	2.29 %	100.00 %
	Caswell Beach	200,436	395	395	0.20 %	100.00 %
	Cerro Gordo	200,436	131	131	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Chadbourn	200,436	1,574	1,574	0.79 %	100.00 %
	Fair Bluff	200,436	709	709	0.35 %	100.00 %
	Holden Beach	200,436	921	921	0.46 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-173.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:21 PM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 4 of 17

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173**

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
8	Lake Waccamaw	200,436	1,296	1,296	0.65 %	100.00 %
	Leland	200,436	22,908	22,908	11.43 %	100.00 %
	Navassa	200,436	1,367	1,367	0.68 %	100.00 %
	Northwest	200,436	703	703	0.35 %	100.00 %
	Oak Island	200,436	8,396	8,396	4.19 %	100.00 %
	Ocean Isle Beach	200,436	867	867	0.43 %	100.00 %
	Sandy Creek	200,436	248	248	0.12 %	100.00 %
	Sandyfield	200,436	430	430	0.21 %	100.00 %
	Shallotte	200,436	4,185	4,185	2.09 %	100.00 %
	Southport	200,436	3,971	3,971	1.98 %	100.00 %
	St. James	200,436	6,529	6,529	3.26 %	100.00 %
	Sunset Beach	200,436	4,175	4,175	2.08 %	100.00 %
	Tabor City	200,436	3,781	3,781	1.89 %	100.00 %
	Varnamtown	200,436	525	525	0.26 %	100.00 %
	Whiteville	200,436	4,766	4,766	2.38 %	100.00 %
	Wilmington	200,436	115,451	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
9	Atkinson	204,809	296	296	0.14 %	100.00 %
	Autryville	204,809	167	167	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Beulaville	204,809	1,116	1,116	0.54 %	100.00 %
	Bladenboro	204,809	1,648	1,648	0.80 %	100.00 %
	Burgaw	204,809	3,088	3,088	1.51 %	100.00 %
	Calypso	204,809	327	327	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Clarkton	204,809	614	614	0.30 %	100.00 %
	Clinton	204,809	8,383	8,383	4.09 %	100.00 %
	Dublin	204,809	267	267	0.13 %	100.00 %
	East Arcadia	204,809	418	418	0.20 %	100.00 %
	Elizabethtown	204,809	3,296	3,296	1.61 %	100.00 %
	Faison (Duplin)	204,809	784	784	0.38 %	100.00 %
	Faison (Sampson)	204,809	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Falcon (Sampson)	204,809	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Garland	204,809	595	595	0.29 %	100.00 %
	Greenevers	204,809	567	567	0.28 %	100.00 %
	Harrells (Duplin)	204,809	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Harrells (Sampson)	204,809	160	160	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Kenansville	204,809	770	770	0.38 %	100.00 %
	Magnolia	204,809	831	831	0.41 %	100.00 %
	Maysville	204,809	818	818	0.40 %	100.00 %
	Mount Olive (Duplin)	204,809	5	5	0.00 %	100.00 %
	Newton Grove	204,809	585	585	0.29 %	100.00 %
	Pollocksville	204,809	268	268	0.13 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-173.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:21 PM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 5 of 17

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173**

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
9	Rose Hill	204,809	1,371	1,371	0.67 %	100.00 %
	Roseboro	204,809	1,163	1,163	0.57 %	100.00 %
	Salemburg	204,809	457	457	0.22 %	100.00 %
	St. Helena	204,809	417	417	0.20 %	100.00 %
	Surf City (Pender)	204,809	3,533	3,533	1.73 %	100.00 %
	Tar Heel	204,809	90	90	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Teachey	204,809	448	448	0.22 %	100.00 %
	Topsail Beach	204,809	461	461	0.23 %	100.00 %
	Trenton	204,809	238	238	0.12 %	100.00 %
	Turkey	204,809	213	213	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Wallace (Duplin)	204,809	3,413	3,413	1.67 %	100.00 %
	Wallace (Pender)	204,809	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Warsaw	204,809	2,733	2,733	1.33 %	100.00 %
	Watha	204,809	181	181	0.09 %	100.00 %
	White Lake	204,809	843	843	0.41 %	100.00 %
10	Archer Lodge	215,999	4,797	4,797	2.22 %	100.00 %
	Benson (Johnston)	215,999	3,967	3,967	1.84 %	100.00 %
	Clayton (Johnston)	215,999	26,307	26,307	12.18 %	100.00 %
	Four Oaks	215,999	2,158	2,158	1.00 %	100.00 %
	Kenly (Johnston)	215,999	1,293	1,293	0.60 %	100.00 %
	Micro	215,999	458	458	0.21 %	100.00 %
	Pine Level	215,999	2,046	2,046	0.95 %	100.00 %
	Princeton	215,999	1,315	1,315	0.61 %	100.00 %
	Selma	215,999	6,317	6,317	2.92 %	100.00 %
	Smithfield	215,999	11,292	11,292	5.23 %	100.00 %
	Wilson's Mills	215,999	2,534	2,534	1.17 %	100.00 %
	Zebulon (Johnston)	215,999	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
11	Bailey	206,121	568	568	0.28 %	100.00 %
	Bunn	206,121	327	327	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Castalia	206,121	264	264	0.13 %	100.00 %
	Dortches	206,121	1,082	1,082	0.52 %	100.00 %
	Elm City (Nash)	206,121	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Franklinton	206,121	2,456	2,456	1.19 %	100.00 %
	Henderson	206,121	15,060	15,060	7.31 %	100.00 %
	Kittrell	206,121	132	132	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Louisburg	206,121	3,064	3,064	1.49 %	100.00 %
	Middleburg	206,121	101	101	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Middlesex	206,121	912	912	0.44 %	100.00 %
	Momeyer	206,121	277	277	0.13 %	100.00 %
	Nashville	206,121	5,632	5,632	2.73 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-173.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:21 PM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 6 of 17

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173**

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
11	Red Oak	206,121	3,342	3,342	1.62 %	100.00 %
	Rocky Mount (Nash)	206,121	38,927	38,927	18.89 %	100.00 %
	Sharpsburg (Nash)	206,121	1,061	1,061	0.51 %	100.00 %
	Spring Hope	206,121	1,309	1,309	0.64 %	100.00 %
	Wake Forest (Franklin)	206,121	1,504	1,504	0.73 %	100.00 %
	Whitakers (Nash)	206,121	337	337	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Youngsville	206,121	2,016	2,016	0.98 %	100.00 %
12	Angier (Harnett)	198,776	4,709	4,709	2.37 %	100.00 %
	Benson (Harnett)	198,776	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Broadway (Harnett)	198,776	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Broadway (Lee)	198,776	1,267	1,267	0.64 %	100.00 %
	Coats	198,776	2,155	2,155	1.08 %	100.00 %
	Dunn	198,776	8,446	8,446	4.25 %	100.00 %
	Erwin	198,776	4,542	4,542	2.28 %	100.00 %
	Fuquay-Varina (Harnett)	198,776	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Lillington	198,776	4,735	4,735	2.38 %	100.00 %
	Sanford	198,776	30,261	30,261	15.22 %	100.00 %
13	Butner	198,354	8,397	8,397	4.23 %	100.00 %
	Creedmoor	198,354	4,866	4,866	2.45 %	100.00 %
	Knightdale	198,354	19,435	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Oxford	198,354	8,628	8,628	4.35 %	100.00 %
	Raleigh (Wake)	198,354	466,106	8,083	4.08 %	1.73 %
	Rolesville	198,354	9,475	9,475	4.78 %	100.00 %
	Stem	198,354	960	960	0.48 %	100.00 %
	Stovall	198,354	324	324	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Wake Forest (Wake)	198,354	46,097	46,097	23.24 %	100.00 %
	Wendell	198,354	9,793	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Zebulon (Wake)	198,354	6,903	6,903	3.48 %	100.00 %
14	Clayton (Wake)	198,506	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Garner	198,506	31,159	31,159	15.70 %	100.00 %
	Knightdale	198,506	19,435	19,435	9.79 %	100.00 %
	Raleigh (Wake)	198,506	466,106	98,578	49.66 %	21.15 %
	Wendell	198,506	9,793	9,793	4.93 %	100.00 %
15	Cary (Wake)	198,385	171,012	23,315	11.75 %	13.63 %
	Durham (Wake)	198,385	269	269	0.14 %	100.00 %
	Raleigh (Wake)	198,385	466,106	167,598	84.48 %	35.96 %
16	Apex	198,412	58,780	26,547	13.38 %	45.16 %
	Cary (Wake)	198,412	171,012	136,584	68.84 %	79.87 %
	Durham (Wake)	198,412	269	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Morrisville (Wake)	198,412	29,423	29,423	14.83 %	100.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
16	Raleigh (Wake)	198,412	466,106	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
17	Angier (Wake)	198,391	556	556	0.28 %	100.00 %
	Apex	198,391	58,780	32,233	16.25 %	54.84 %
	Cary (Wake)	198,391	171,012	11,113	5.60 %	6.50 %
	Fuquay-Varina (Wake)	198,391	34,152	34,152	17.21 %	100.00 %
	Garner	198,391	31,159	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Holly Springs	198,391	41,239	41,239	20.79 %	100.00 %
	Raleigh (Wake)	198,391	466,106	1	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Raleigh (Wake)	198,354	466,106	191,846	96.72 %	41.16 %
18	Wake Forest (Wake)	198,354	46,097	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
19	Fayetteville	216,471	208,501	183,928	84.97 %	88.21 %
	Hope Mills	216,471	17,808	2,593	1.20 %	14.56 %
20	Cary (Chatham)	199,272	3,709	3,709	1.86 %	100.00 %
	Chapel Hill (Durham)	199,272	2,906	2,906	1.46 %	100.00 %
	Durham (Durham)	199,272	283,093	115,188	57.80 %	40.69 %
	Goldston	199,272	234	234	0.12 %	100.00 %
	Morrisville (Durham)	199,272	207	207	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Pittsboro	199,272	4,537	4,537	2.28 %	100.00 %
	Raleigh (Durham)	199,272	1,559	233	0.12 %	14.95 %
	Siler City	199,272	7,702	7,702	3.87 %	100.00 %
21	Aberdeen	217,984	8,516	8,516	3.91 %	100.00 %
	Cameron	217,984	244	244	0.11 %	100.00 %
	Candor (Moore)	217,984	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Carthage	217,984	2,775	2,775	1.27 %	100.00 %
	Eastover	217,984	3,656	3,656	1.68 %	100.00 %
	Falcon (Cumberland)	217,984	324	324	0.15 %	100.00 %
	Fayetteville	217,984	208,501	24,573	11.27 %	11.79 %
	Foxfire	217,984	1,288	1,288	0.59 %	100.00 %
	Godwin	217,984	128	128	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Hope Mills	217,984	17,808	15,215	6.98 %	85.44 %
	Linden	217,984	136	136	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Pinebluff	217,984	1,473	1,473	0.68 %	100.00 %
	Pinehurst	217,984	17,581	17,581	8.07 %	100.00 %
	Robbins	217,984	1,168	1,168	0.54 %	100.00 %
	Southern Pines	217,984	15,545	15,545	7.13 %	100.00 %
	Spring Lake	217,984	11,660	11,660	5.35 %	100.00 %
	Stedman	217,984	1,277	1,277	0.59 %	100.00 %
	Taylortown	217,984	634	634	0.29 %	100.00 %
	Vass	217,984	952	952	0.44 %	100.00 %
	Wade	217,984	638	638	0.29 %	100.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
21	Whispering Pines	217,984	4,987	4,987	2.29 %	100.00 %
22	Durham (Durham)	201,846	283,093	167,905	83.18 %	59.31 %
	Raleigh (Durham)	201,846	1,559	1,326	0.66 %	85.05 %
23	Carrboro	210,529	21,295	21,295	10.11 %	100.00 %
	Chapel Hill (Orange)	210,529	59,054	59,054	28.05 %	100.00 %
	Durham (Orange)	210,529	144	144	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Hillsborough	210,529	9,660	9,660	4.59 %	100.00 %
	Mebane (Orange)	210,529	3,171	3,171	1.51 %	100.00 %
	Milton	210,529	155	155	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Roxboro	210,529	8,134	8,134	3.86 %	100.00 %
	Yanceyville	210,529	1,937	1,937	0.92 %	100.00 %
24	East Laurinburg	202,786	234	234	0.12 %	100.00 %
	Fairmont	202,786	2,191	2,191	1.08 %	100.00 %
	Gibson	202,786	449	449	0.22 %	100.00 %
	Laurinburg	202,786	14,978	14,978	7.39 %	100.00 %
	Lumber Bridge	202,786	82	82	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Lumberton	202,786	19,025	19,025	9.38 %	100.00 %
	Marietta	202,786	111	111	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Maxton (Robeson)	202,786	1,902	1,902	0.94 %	100.00 %
	Maxton (Scotland)	202,786	208	208	0.10 %	100.00 %
	McDonald	202,786	94	94	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Orrum	202,786	59	59	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Parkton	202,786	504	504	0.25 %	100.00 %
	Pembroke	202,786	2,823	2,823	1.39 %	100.00 %
	Proctorville	202,786	121	121	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Raeford	202,786	4,559	4,559	2.25 %	100.00 %
	Raynham	202,786	60	60	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Red Springs (Hoke)	202,786	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Red Springs (Robeson)	202,786	3,087	3,087	1.52 %	100.00 %
	Rennert	202,786	275	275	0.14 %	100.00 %
	Rowland	202,786	885	885	0.44 %	100.00 %
	St. Pauls	202,786	2,045	2,045	1.01 %	100.00 %
	Wagram	202,786	615	615	0.30 %	100.00 %
25	Alamance	216,895	988	988	0.46 %	100.00 %
	Asheboro	216,895	27,156	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Burlington (Alamance)	216,895	55,481	55,481	25.58 %	100.00 %
	Elon	216,895	11,336	11,336	5.23 %	100.00 %
	Franklinville	216,895	1,197	1,197	0.55 %	100.00 %
	Gibsonville (Alamance)	216,895	4,278	4,278	1.97 %	100.00 %
	Graham	216,895	17,157	17,157	7.91 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-173.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:21 PM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 9 of 17

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
25	Green Level	216,895	3,152	3,152	1.45 %	100.00 %
	Haw River	216,895	2,252	2,252	1.04 %	100.00 %
	Liberty	216,895	2,655	2,655	1.22 %	100.00 %
	Mebane (Alamance)	216,895	14,626	14,626	6.74 %	100.00 %
	Ossipee	216,895	536	536	0.25 %	100.00 %
	Ramseur	216,895	1,774	1,774	0.82 %	100.00 %
	Randleman	216,895	4,595	4,595	2.12 %	100.00 %
	Seagrove	216,895	235	235	0.11 %	100.00 %
	Staley	216,895	397	397	0.18 %	100.00 %
	Swepsonville	216,895	2,445	2,445	1.13 %	100.00 %
26	Burlington (Guilford)	201,897	1,822	1,822	0.90 %	100.00 %
	Eden	201,897	15,421	15,421	7.64 %	100.00 %
	Gibsonville (Guilford)	201,897	4,642	4,642	2.30 %	100.00 %
	Greensboro	201,897	299,035	12,873	6.38 %	4.30 %
	Kernersville (Guilford)	201,897	502	502	0.25 %	100.00 %
	Madison	201,897	2,129	2,129	1.05 %	100.00 %
	Mayodan	201,897	2,418	2,418	1.20 %	100.00 %
	Oak Ridge	201,897	7,474	7,474	3.70 %	100.00 %
	Pleasant Garden	201,897	5,000	5,000	2.48 %	100.00 %
	Reidsville	201,897	14,583	14,583	7.22 %	100.00 %
	Sedalia	201,897	676	676	0.33 %	100.00 %
	Stokesdale	201,897	5,924	5,924	2.93 %	100.00 %
	Stoneville	201,897	1,308	1,308	0.65 %	100.00 %
	Summerfield	201,897	10,951	10,951	5.42 %	100.00 %
	Wentworth	201,897	2,662	2,662	1.32 %	100.00 %
	Whitsett	201,897	584	584	0.29 %	100.00 %
27	Archdale (Guilford)	217,296	380	380	0.17 %	100.00 %
	Greensboro	217,296	299,035	92,205	42.43 %	30.83 %
	High Point (Guilford)	217,296	107,321	107,321	49.39 %	100.00 %
	Jamestown	217,296	3,668	3,668	1.69 %	100.00 %
28	Greensboro	213,202	299,035	193,957	90.97 %	64.86 %
	Sedalia	213,202	676	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
29	Ansonville	216,220	440	440	0.20 %	100.00 %
	Archdale (Randolph)	216,220	11,527	11,527	5.33 %	100.00 %
	Asheboro	216,220	27,156	27,156	12.56 %	100.00 %
	Biscoe	216,220	1,848	1,848	0.85 %	100.00 %
	Candor (Montgomery)	216,220	813	813	0.38 %	100.00 %
	Dobbins Heights	216,220	687	687	0.32 %	100.00 %
	Ellerbe	216,220	864	864	0.40 %	100.00 %
	Hamlet	216,220	6,025	6,025	2.79 %	100.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173**

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
29	High Point (Randolph)	216,220	8	8	0.00 %	100.00 %
	Hoffman	216,220	418	418	0.19 %	100.00 %
	Lilesville	216,220	395	395	0.18 %	100.00 %
	Marshville	216,220	2,522	2,522	1.17 %	100.00 %
	McFarlan	216,220	94	94	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Morven	216,220	329	329	0.15 %	100.00 %
	Mount Gilead	216,220	1,171	1,171	0.54 %	100.00 %
	Norman	216,220	100	100	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Peachland	216,220	390	390	0.18 %	100.00 %
	Polkton	216,220	2,250	2,250	1.04 %	100.00 %
	Randleman	216,220	4,595	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Rockingham	216,220	9,243	9,243	4.27 %	100.00 %
	Star	216,220	806	806	0.37 %	100.00 %
	Thomasville (Randolph)	216,220	521	521	0.24 %	100.00 %
	Trinity	216,220	7,006	7,006	3.24 %	100.00 %
	Troy	216,220	2,850	2,850	1.32 %	100.00 %
	Wadesboro	216,220	5,008	5,008	2.32 %	100.00 %
	Waxhaw	216,220	20,534	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Wingate	216,220	4,055	4,055	1.88 %	100.00 %
30	Bermuda Run	211,642	3,120	3,120	1.47 %	100.00 %
	Cooleemee	211,642	940	940	0.44 %	100.00 %
	Denton	211,642	1,494	1,494	0.71 %	100.00 %
	High Point (Davidson)	211,642	6,646	6,646	3.14 %	100.00 %
	Lexington	211,642	19,632	19,632	9.28 %	100.00 %
	Midway	211,642	4,742	4,742	2.24 %	100.00 %
	Mocksville	211,642	5,900	5,900	2.79 %	100.00 %
	Thomasville (Davidson)	211,642	26,662	26,662	12.60 %	100.00 %
	Wallburg	211,642	3,051	3,051	1.44 %	100.00 %
31	Bethania	212,299	344	344	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Clemmons	212,299	21,163	21,163	9.97 %	100.00 %
	Danbury	212,299	189	189	0.09 %	100.00 %
	High Point (Forsyth)	212,299	84	84	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Kernersville (Forsyth)	212,299	25,947	25,947	12.22 %	100.00 %
	King (Forsyth)	212,299	591	591	0.28 %	100.00 %
	King (Stokes)	212,299	6,606	6,606	3.11 %	100.00 %
	Lewisville	212,299	13,381	13,381	6.30 %	100.00 %
	Rural Hall	212,299	3,351	3,351	1.58 %	100.00 %
	Tobaccoville (Forsyth)	212,299	2,578	2,578	1.21 %	100.00 %
	Tobaccoville (Stokes)	212,299	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Walkertown	212,299	5,692	5,692	2.68 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-173.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:21 PM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 11 of 17

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
31	Walnut Cove	212,299	1,586	1,586	0.75 %	100.00 %
	Winston-Salem	212,299	249,545	40,795	19.22 %	16.35 %
32	Winston-Salem	214,811	249,545	208,750	97.18 %	83.65 %
33	Albemarle	209,379	16,432	16,432	7.85 %	100.00 %
	Badin	209,379	2,024	2,024	0.97 %	100.00 %
	China Grove	209,379	4,434	4,434	2.12 %	100.00 %
	Cleveland	209,379	846	846	0.40 %	100.00 %
	East Spencer	209,379	1,567	1,567	0.75 %	100.00 %
	Faith	209,379	819	819	0.39 %	100.00 %
	Granite Quarry	209,379	2,984	2,984	1.43 %	100.00 %
	Kannapolis (Rowan)	209,379	10,268	10,268	4.90 %	100.00 %
	Landis	209,379	3,690	3,690	1.76 %	100.00 %
	Locust (Stanly)	209,379	3,996	3,996	1.91 %	100.00 %
	Misenheimer	209,379	650	650	0.31 %	100.00 %
	New London	209,379	607	607	0.29 %	100.00 %
	Norwood	209,379	2,367	2,367	1.13 %	100.00 %
	Oakboro	209,379	2,128	2,128	1.02 %	100.00 %
	Red Cross	209,379	762	762	0.36 %	100.00 %
	Richfield	209,379	582	582	0.28 %	100.00 %
	Rockwell	209,379	2,302	2,302	1.10 %	100.00 %
	Salisbury	209,379	35,540	35,540	16.97 %	100.00 %
	Spencer	209,379	3,308	3,308	1.58 %	100.00 %
	Stanfield	209,379	1,585	1,585	0.76 %	100.00 %
34	Concord	218,896	105,240	105,240	48.08 %	100.00 %
	Harrisburg	218,896	18,967	18,967	8.66 %	100.00 %
	Kannapolis (Cabarrus)	218,896	42,846	42,846	19.57 %	100.00 %
	Locust (Cabarrus)	218,896	541	423	0.19 %	78.19 %
	Midland (Cabarrus)	218,896	4,684	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Mount Pleasant	218,896	1,671	1,671	0.76 %	100.00 %
35	Fairview	218,398	3,456	3,456	1.58 %	100.00 %
	Hemby Bridge	218,398	1,614	1,614	0.74 %	100.00 %
	Indian Trail	218,398	39,997	39,997	18.31 %	100.00 %
	Lake Park	218,398	3,269	3,269	1.50 %	100.00 %
	Locust (Cabarrus)	218,398	541	118	0.05 %	21.81 %
	Marvin	218,398	6,358	6,358	2.91 %	100.00 %
	Midland (Cabarrus)	218,398	4,684	4,684	2.14 %	100.00 %
	Mineral Springs	218,398	3,159	3,159	1.45 %	100.00 %
	Mint Hill (Union)	218,398	6	6	0.00 %	100.00 %
	Monroe	218,398	34,562	34,562	15.83 %	100.00 %
	Stallings (Union)	218,398	15,728	15,728	7.20 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-173.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:21 PM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 12 of 17

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173**

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
35	Unionville	218,398	6,643	6,643	3.04 %	100.00 %
	Waxhaw	218,398	20,534	20,534	9.40 %	100.00 %
	Weddington (Union)	218,398	13,176	13,176	6.03 %	100.00 %
	Wesley Chapel	218,398	8,681	8,681	3.97 %	100.00 %
36	Boonville	210,986	1,185	1,185	0.56 %	100.00 %
	Dobson	210,986	1,462	1,462	0.69 %	100.00 %
	East Bend	210,986	634	634	0.30 %	100.00 %
	Elkin (Surry)	210,986	4,049	4,049	1.92 %	100.00 %
	Elkin (Wilkes)	210,986	73	73	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Jonesville	210,986	2,308	2,308	1.09 %	100.00 %
	Mount Airy	210,986	10,676	10,676	5.06 %	100.00 %
	North Wilkesboro	210,986	4,382	4,382	2.08 %	100.00 %
	Pilot Mountain	210,986	1,440	1,440	0.68 %	100.00 %
	Ronda	210,986	438	438	0.21 %	100.00 %
	Taylorsville	210,986	2,320	2,320	1.10 %	100.00 %
	Wilkesboro	210,986	3,687	3,687	1.75 %	100.00 %
	Yadkinville	210,986	2,995	2,995	1.42 %	100.00 %
37	Cornelius	212,852	31,412	10,223	4.80 %	32.54 %
	Davidson (Iredell)	212,852	378	378	0.18 %	100.00 %
	Davidson (Mecklenburg)	212,852	14,728	14,728	6.92 %	100.00 %
	Harmony	212,852	543	543	0.26 %	100.00 %
	Love Valley	212,852	154	154	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Mooresville	212,852	50,193	50,193	23.58 %	100.00 %
	Statesville	212,852	28,419	28,419	13.35 %	100.00 %
	Troutman	212,852	3,698	3,698	1.74 %	100.00 %
38	Charlotte	218,466	874,579	118,479	54.23 %	13.55 %
	Cornelius	218,466	31,412	21,189	9.70 %	67.46 %
	Huntersville	218,466	61,376	61,376	28.09 %	100.00 %
39	Charlotte	219,067	874,579	176,791	80.70 %	20.21 %
	Pineville	219,067	10,602	10,602	4.84 %	100.00 %
40	Charlotte	218,411	874,579	209,480	95.91 %	23.95 %
	Mint Hill (Mecklenburg)	218,411	26,444	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
41	Charlotte	216,686	874,579	153,144	70.68 %	17.51 %
	Matthews	216,686	29,435	29,435	13.58 %	100.00 %
	Midland (Mecklenburg)	216,686	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Mint Hill (Mecklenburg)	216,686	26,444	26,444	12.20 %	100.00 %
	Pineville	216,686	10,602	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Stallings (Mecklenburg)	216,686	384	384	0.18 %	100.00 %
	Weddington (Mecklenburg)	216,686	5	5	0.00 %	100.00 %
42	Charlotte	216,693	874,579	216,685	100.00 %	24.78 %

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
43	Belmont	211,229	15,010	15,010	7.11 %	100.00 %
	Bessemer City	211,229	5,428	5,428	2.57 %	100.00 %
	Cramerton	211,229	5,296	5,296	2.51 %	100.00 %
	Dallas	211,229	5,927	5,927	2.81 %	100.00 %
	Gastonia	211,229	80,411	80,411	38.07 %	100.00 %
	High Shoals	211,229	595	595	0.28 %	100.00 %
	Kings Mountain (Gaston)	211,229	1,110	1,110	0.53 %	100.00 %
	Lowell	211,229	3,654	3,654	1.73 %	100.00 %
	McAdenville	211,229	890	890	0.42 %	100.00 %
	Mount Holly	211,229	17,703	17,703	8.38 %	100.00 %
	Ranlo	211,229	4,511	4,511	2.14 %	100.00 %
	Spencer Mountain	211,229	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Stanley	211,229	3,963	3,963	1.88 %	100.00 %
44	Belwood	203,043	857	857	0.42 %	100.00 %
	Bessemer City	203,043	5,428	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Boiling Springs	203,043	4,615	4,615	2.27 %	100.00 %
	Casar	203,043	305	305	0.15 %	100.00 %
	Cherryville	203,043	6,078	6,078	2.99 %	100.00 %
	Dellview	203,043	6	6	0.00 %	100.00 %
	Earl	203,043	198	198	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Fallston	203,043	627	627	0.31 %	100.00 %
	Gastonia	203,043	80,411	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Grover	203,043	802	802	0.39 %	100.00 %
	High Shoals	203,043	595	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Kings Mountain (Cleveland)	203,043	10,032	10,032	4.94 %	100.00 %
	Kingstown	203,043	656	656	0.32 %	100.00 %
	Lattimore	203,043	406	406	0.20 %	100.00 %
	Lawndale	203,043	570	570	0.28 %	100.00 %
	Lincolnton	203,043	11,091	11,091	5.46 %	100.00 %
	Maiden (Lincoln)	203,043	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Mooresboro	203,043	293	293	0.14 %	100.00 %
	Patterson Springs	203,043	571	571	0.28 %	100.00 %
	Polkville	203,043	516	516	0.25 %	100.00 %
	Shelby	203,043	21,918	21,918	10.79 %	100.00 %
	Waco	203,043	310	310	0.15 %	100.00 %
45	Brookford	209,349	442	442	0.21 %	100.00 %
	Cajah's Mountain	209,349	2,722	2,722	1.30 %	100.00 %
	Catawba	209,349	702	702	0.34 %	100.00 %
	Cedar Rock	209,349	301	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Claremont	209,349	1,692	1,692	0.81 %	100.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173**

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
45	Conover	209,349	8,421	8,421	4.02 %	100.00 %
	Gamewell	209,349	3,702	3,702	1.77 %	100.00 %
	Granite Falls	209,349	4,965	4,965	2.37 %	100.00 %
	Hickory (Caldwell)	209,349	32	32	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Hickory (Catawba)	209,349	43,379	43,379	20.72 %	100.00 %
	Hudson	209,349	3,780	3,780	1.81 %	100.00 %
	Lenoir	209,349	18,352	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Long View (Catawba)	209,349	4,353	4,353	2.08 %	100.00 %
	Maiden (Catawba)	209,349	3,736	3,736	1.78 %	100.00 %
	Newton	209,349	13,148	13,148	6.28 %	100.00 %
	Rhodhiss (Caldwell)	209,349	358	358	0.17 %	100.00 %
	Rutherford College (Caldwell)	209,349	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Sawmills	209,349	5,020	5,020	2.40 %	100.00 %
46	Asheville	200,575	94,589	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Black Mountain	200,575	8,426	8,426	4.20 %	100.00 %
	Connelly Springs	200,575	1,529	1,529	0.76 %	100.00 %
	Drexel	200,575	1,760	1,760	0.88 %	100.00 %
	Glen Alpine	200,575	1,529	1,529	0.76 %	100.00 %
	Hickory (Burke)	200,575	79	79	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Hildebran	200,575	1,679	1,679	0.84 %	100.00 %
	Long View (Burke)	200,575	735	735	0.37 %	100.00 %
	Marion	200,575	7,717	7,717	3.85 %	100.00 %
	Montreat	200,575	901	901	0.45 %	100.00 %
	Morganton	200,575	17,474	17,474	8.71 %	100.00 %
	Old Fort	200,575	811	811	0.40 %	100.00 %
	Rhodhiss (Burke)	200,575	639	639	0.32 %	100.00 %
	Rutherford College (Burke)	200,575	1,226	1,226	0.61 %	100.00 %
	Valdese	200,575	4,689	4,689	2.34 %	100.00 %
47	Bakersville	219,135	450	450	0.21 %	100.00 %
	Banner Elk	219,135	1,049	1,049	0.48 %	100.00 %
	Beech Mountain (Avery)	219,135	62	62	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Beech Mountain (Watauga)	219,135	613	613	0.28 %	100.00 %
	Blowing Rock (Caldwell)	219,135	91	91	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Blowing Rock (Watauga)	219,135	1,285	1,285	0.59 %	100.00 %
	Boone	219,135	19,092	19,092	8.71 %	100.00 %
	Burnsville	219,135	1,614	1,614	0.74 %	100.00 %
	Cajah's Mountain	219,135	2,722	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Canton	219,135	4,422	4,422	2.02 %	100.00 %
	Cedar Rock	219,135	301	301	0.14 %	100.00 %
	Clyde	219,135	1,368	1,368	0.62 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-173.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:21 PM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 15 of 17

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
47	Crossnore	219,135	143	143	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Elk Park	219,135	542	542	0.25 %	100.00 %
	Gamewell	219,135	3,702	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Grandfather Village	219,135	95	95	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Hot Springs	219,135	520	520	0.24 %	100.00 %
	Hudson	219,135	3,780	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Jefferson	219,135	1,622	1,622	0.74 %	100.00 %
	Lansing	219,135	126	126	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Lenoir	219,135	18,352	18,352	8.37 %	100.00 %
	Mars Hill	219,135	2,007	2,007	0.92 %	100.00 %
	Marshall	219,135	777	777	0.35 %	100.00 %
	Newland	219,135	715	715	0.33 %	100.00 %
	Seven Devils (Avery)	219,135	38	38	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Seven Devils (Watauga)	219,135	275	275	0.13 %	100.00 %
	Sparta	219,135	1,834	1,834	0.84 %	100.00 %
	Spruce Pine	219,135	2,194	2,194	1.00 %	100.00 %
	Sugar Mountain	219,135	371	371	0.17 %	100.00 %
	West Jefferson	219,135	1,279	1,279	0.58 %	100.00 %
48	Bostic	200,053	355	355	0.18 %	100.00 %
	Chimney Rock Village	200,053	140	140	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Columbus	200,053	1,060	1,060	0.53 %	100.00 %
	Ellenboro	200,053	723	723	0.36 %	100.00 %
	Flat Rock	200,053	3,486	3,486	1.74 %	100.00 %
	Fletcher	200,053	7,987	7,987	3.99 %	100.00 %
	Forest City	200,053	7,377	7,377	3.69 %	100.00 %
	Hendersonville	200,053	15,137	15,137	7.57 %	100.00 %
	Lake Lure	200,053	1,365	1,365	0.68 %	100.00 %
	Laurel Park	200,053	2,250	2,250	1.12 %	100.00 %
	Mills River	200,053	7,078	7,078	3.54 %	100.00 %
	Ruth	200,053	347	347	0.17 %	100.00 %
	Rutherfordton	200,053	3,640	3,640	1.82 %	100.00 %
	Saluda (Henderson)	200,053	11	11	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Saluda (Polk)	200,053	620	620	0.31 %	100.00 %
	Spindale	200,053	4,225	4,225	2.11 %	100.00 %
	Tryon	200,053	1,562	1,562	0.78 %	100.00 %
49	Asheville	201,025	94,589	94,589	47.05 %	100.00 %
	Biltmore Forest	201,025	1,409	1,409	0.70 %	100.00 %
	Weaverville	201,025	4,567	4,567	2.27 %	100.00 %
	Woodfin	201,025	7,936	7,936	3.95 %	100.00 %
50	Andrews	213,909	1,667	1,667	0.78 %	100.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
50	Brevard	213,909	7,744	7,744	3.62 %	100.00 %
	Bryson City	213,909	1,558	1,558	0.73 %	100.00 %
	Dillsboro	213,909	213	213	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Fontana Dam	213,909	13	13	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Forest Hills	213,909	303	303	0.14 %	100.00 %
	Franklin	213,909	4,175	4,175	1.95 %	100.00 %
	Hayesville	213,909	461	461	0.22 %	100.00 %
	Highlands (Jackson)	213,909	12	12	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Highlands (Macon)	213,909	1,060	1,060	0.50 %	100.00 %
	Lake Santeetlah	213,909	38	38	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Maggie Valley	213,909	1,687	1,687	0.79 %	100.00 %
	Murphy	213,909	1,608	1,608	0.75 %	100.00 %
	Robbinsville	213,909	597	597	0.28 %	100.00 %
	Rosman	213,909	701	701	0.33 %	100.00 %
	Sylva	213,909	2,578	2,578	1.21 %	100.00 %
	Waynesville	213,909	10,140	10,140	4.74 %	100.00 %
	Webster	213,909	372	372	0.17 %	100.00 %
Total:				6,017,605		

Total Districts Assigned: 50

Total Municipalities (by County) Statewide: 614

Fully Assigned Municipalities: 614

Partially Assigned Municipalities: 0

Fully Unassigned Municipalities: 0

Split Municipalities: 34

Splits Involving Population: 12

Whole-Split VTD Counts by District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173**

District	County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
1	Bertie	12	0
	Camden	3	0
	Currituck	11	0
	Dare	16	0
	Gates	6	0
	Hertford	13	0
	Northampton	13	0
	Pasquotank	9	0
	Perquimans	7	0
	Tyrrell	6	0
2	Carteret	28	0
	Chowan	6	0
	Halifax	23	0
	Hyde	7	0
	Martin	13	0
	Pamlico	10	0
	Warren	14	0
	Washington	6	0
3	Beaufort	21	0
	Craven	21	0
	Lenoir	22	0
4	Greene	10	0
	Wayne	28	0
	Wilson	24	0
5	Edgecombe	21	0
	Pitt	40	0
6	Onslow	24	0
7	New Hanover	40	0
8	Brunswick	25	0
	Columbus	26	0
	New Hanover	3	0
9	Bladen	17	0
	Duplin	19	0
	Jones	7	0
	Pender	20	0
	Sampson	21	2
10	Johnston	36	0
11	Franklin	18	0
	Nash	24	0
	Vance	12	0
12	Harnett	13	0
	Lee	10	0
	Sampson	0	2

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-173.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:21 PM

Based on TIGER 2020 VTDs

[G20-VTD-SbD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Whole-Split VTD Counts by District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173**

District	County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
13	Granville	15	0
	Wake	24	3
14	Wake	30	7
15	Wake	40	2
16	Wake	32	2
17	Wake	24	4
18	Wake	44	2
19	Cumberland	56	0
20	Chatham	18	0
	Durham	22	0
21	Cumberland	20	0
	Moore	26	0
22	Durham	35	0
23	Caswell	9	0
	Orange	41	0
	Person	11	0
24	Hoke	15	0
	Robeson	39	0
	Scotland	7	0
25	Alamance	37	0
	Randolph	8	1
26	Guilford	30	1
	Rockingham	15	0
27	Guilford	73	1
28	Guilford	61	0
29	Anson	9	0
	Montgomery	14	0
	Randolph	13	1
	Richmond	16	0
	Union	8	0
30	Davidson	43	0
	Davie	14	0
31	Forsyth	40	0
	Stokes	18	0
32	Forsyth	61	0
33	Rowan	41	0
	Stanly	22	0
34	Cabarrus	38	2
35	Cabarrus	0	2
	Union	44	0

Whole-Split VTD Counts by District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173**

District	County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
36	Alexander	10	0
	Surry	24	0
	Wilkes	27	0
	Yadkin	12	0
37	Iredell	29	0
	Mecklenburg	4	0
38	Mecklenburg	22	0
39	Mecklenburg	31	0
40	Mecklenburg	40	0
41	Mecklenburg	42	0
42	Mecklenburg	56	0
43	Gaston	41	0
44	Cleveland	21	0
	Gaston	5	0
	Lincoln	23	0
45	Caldwell	10	2
	Catawba	40	0
46	Buncombe	21	1
	Burke	33	0
	McDowell	17	0
47	Alleghany	4	0
	Ashe	17	0
	Avery	19	0
	Caldwell	8	2
	Haywood	12	0
	Madison	12	0
	Mitchell	9	0
	Watauga	20	0
	Yancey	11	0
48	Henderson	34	0
	Polk	7	0
	Rutherford	17	0
49	Buncombe	57	1
50	Cherokee	16	0
	Clay	9	0
	Graham	4	0
	Haywood	17	0
	Jackson	13	0
	Macon	15	0
	Swain	5	0
	Transylvania	15	0
Total:		2,647	

Whole-Split VTD Counts by District Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

Total Districts Assigned: 50

Total VTDs Statewide: 2666

Fully Assigned VTDs: 2666

Partially Assigned VTDs: 0

Fully Unassigned VTDs: 0

Split VTDs: 19

Splits Involving Population: 19

Whole-Split VTD Counts by County Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173**

County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
Alamance	37	0
Alexander	10	0
Alleghany	4	0
Anson	9	0
Ashe	17	0
Avery	19	0
Beaufort	21	0
Bertie	12	0
Bladen	17	0
Brunswick	25	0
Buncombe	78	1
Burke	33	0
Cabarrus	38	2
Caldwell	18	2
Camden	3	0
Carteret	28	0
Caswell	9	0
Catawba	40	0
Chatham	18	0
Cherokee	16	0
Chowan	6	0
Clay	9	0
Cleveland	21	0
Columbus	26	0
Craven	21	0
Cumberland	76	0
Currituck	11	0
Dare	16	0
Davidson	43	0
Davie	14	0
Duplin	19	0
Durham	57	0
Edgecombe	21	0
Forsyth	101	0
Franklin	18	0
Gaston	46	0
Gates	6	0
Graham	4	0
Granville	15	0
Greene	10	0
Guilford	164	1
Halifax	23	0
Harnett	13	0

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-173.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:21 PM

Based on TIGER 2020 VTDs

[G20-VTD-SbC] - Generated 2/17/2022

Whole-Split VTD Counts by County Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173**

County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
Haywood	29	0
Henderson	34	0
Hertford	13	0
Hoke	15	0
Hyde	7	0
Iredell	29	0
Jackson	13	0
Johnston	36	0
Jones	7	0
Lee	10	0
Lenoir	22	0
Lincoln	23	0
Macon	15	0
Madison	12	0
Martin	13	0
McDowell	17	0
Mecklenburg	195	0
Mitchell	9	0
Montgomery	14	0
Moore	26	0
Nash	24	0
New Hanover	43	0
Northampton	13	0
Onslow	24	0
Orange	41	0
Pamlico	10	0
Pasquotank	9	0
Pender	20	0
Perquimans	7	0
Person	11	0
Pitt	40	0
Polk	7	0
Randolph	21	1
Richmond	16	0
Robeson	39	0
Rockingham	15	0
Rowan	41	0
Rutherford	17	0
Sampson	21	2
Scotland	7	0
Stanly	22	0
Stokes	18	0
Surry	24	0

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-173.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:21 PM

Based on TIGER 2020 VTDs

[G20-VTD-SbC] - Generated 2/17/2022

Whole-Split VTD Counts by County Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173**

County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
Swain	5	0
Transylvania	15	0
Tyrrell	6	0
Union	52	0
Vance	12	0
Wake	194	10
Warren	14	0
Washington	6	0
Watauga	20	0
Wayne	28	0
Wilkes	27	0
Wilson	24	0
Yadkin	12	0
Yancey	11	0
Totals:	2,647	19

Total VTDs Statewide: 2666

Fully Assigned VTDs: 2666

Partially Assigned VTDs: 0

Fully Unassigned VTDs: 0

Total Districts Assigned: 50

Split VTDs: 19

Splits Involving Population: 19

Split VTD Detail Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

County	VTD	District	Total VTD Population	VTD Pop in District	Percent of VTD Pop in District
Buncombe	41.1	46	4,941	4,898	99.13 %
		49	4,941	43	0.87 %
Cabarrus	01-02	34	4,425	4,421	99.91 %
		35	4,425	4	0.09 %
	10-00	34	8,241	1,337	16.22 %
		35	8,241	6,904	83.78 %
	Caldwell	PR29	45	5,041	54
47			5,041	4,987	98.93 %
PR33		45	8,538	7,182	84.12 %
		47	8,538	1,356	15.88 %
Guilford	SDRI	26	8,139	469	5.76 %
		27	8,139	7,670	94.24 %
Randolph	RN	25	9,167	7,286	79.48 %
		29	9,167	1,881	20.52 %
Sampson	MING	9	3,942	3,662	92.90 %
		12	3,942	280	7.10 %
	PLVW	9	3,941	2,298	58.31 %
		12	3,941	1,643	41.69 %
Wake	01-28	14	7,107	6,732	94.72 %
		15	7,107	375	5.28 %
	04-02	15	5,125	181	3.53 %
		16	5,125	4,944	96.47 %
	10-01	13	2,168	2,149	99.12 %
		14	2,168	19	0.88 %
	10-02	13	7,693	4,404	57.25 %
		14	7,693	3,289	42.75 %
	15-02	14	9,513	5,019	52.76 %
		17	9,513	4,494	47.24 %
	15-04	14	3,257	1,041	31.96 %
		17	3,257	2,216	68.04 %
	17-04	14	11,877	11,733	98.79 %
		18	11,877	144	1.21 %
	18-04	14	6,758	492	7.28 %
		17	6,758	6,266	92.72 %
	19-15	13	4,425	1,630	36.84 %
		18	4,425	2,795	63.16 %
	20-01	16	7,187	2,139	29.76 %
		17	7,187	5,048	70.24 %
Assigned Geography Total:				121,485	

Split VTD Detail Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

Total VTDs Statewide: 2666

Fully Assigned VTDs: 2666

Partially Assigned VTDs: 0

Fully Unassigned VTDs: 0

Total Districts Assigned: 50

Split VTDs: 19

Splits Involving Population: 19

Incumbent-District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173****Residence Set: NC Senate - 2/12/2022**

Last Name	First Name	Party	Current District	District in this Plan
Alexander	W. Ted	R	44	44
Ballard	Deanna	R	45	47
Barnes	Lisa	R	11	11
Batch	Sydney	D	17	17
Bazemore	Ernestine	D	3	1
Berger	Philip	R	30	26
Blue	Daniel	D	14	14
Britt	Danny	R	13	24
Burgin	James	R	12	12
Chaudhuri	Jay	D	15	15
Clark	Robert	D	21	24
Corbin	Harold	R	50	50
Craven	David	R	26	29
Crawford	Sarah	D	18	18
Daniel	Warren	R	46	46
Davis	Donald	D	5	5
deViere	Kirk	D	19	19
Edwards	Charles	R	48	48
Fitch	Milton	D	4	4
Ford	Carl	R	33	33
Foushee	Valerie	D	23	23
Galey	Amy	R	24	25
Garrett	Michael	D	27	27
Harrington	Kathryn	R	43	43
Hise	Ralph	R	47	47
Jackson	Brent	R	10	9
Jackson	Jeffrey	D	37	41
Jarvis	Steven	R	29	30
Johnson	Matthew	R	35	35
Krawiec	Joyce	R	31	31
Lazzara	Michael	R	6	6
Lee	Michael	R	9	7
Lowe	Paul	D	32	32
Marcus	Natasha	D	41	37
Mayfield	Julie	D	49	49
McInnis	Thomas	R	25	21
Mohammed	Mujtaba	D	38	38
Murdock	Natalie	D	20	20
Newton	Paul	R	36	34
Nickel	George	D	16	16
Perry	Jim	R	7	3
Proctor	Dean	R	42	45

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-173.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:21 PM

Row shading indicates that the district in this plan is shared by more than one incumbent.

[G20-IncDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

Incumbent-District Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

Residence Set: NC Senate - 2/12/2022

Last Name	First Name	Party	Current District	District in this Plan
Rabon	William	R	8	8
Robinson	Gladys	D	28	28
Salvador	DeAndrea	D	39	39
Sanderson	Norman	R	2	2
Sawyer	Vickie	R	34	37
Steinburg	Bob	R	1	2
Waddell	Joyce	D	40	40
Woodard	Mike	D	22	22

District-Incumbent Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

Residence Set: NC Senate - 2/12/2022

District in this Plan	Last Name	First Name	Party	Current District
1	Bazemore	Ernestine	D	3
2	Sanderson	Norman	R	2
	Steinburg	Bob	R	1
3	Perry	Jim	R	7
4	Fitch	Milton	D	4
5	Davis	Donald	D	5
6	Lazzara	Michael	R	6
7	Lee	Michael	R	9
8	Rabon	William	R	8
9	Jackson	Brent	R	10
10				
11	Barnes	Lisa	R	11
12	Burgin	James	R	12
13				
14	Blue	Daniel	D	14
15	Chaudhuri	Jay	D	15
16	Nickel	George	D	16
17	Batch	Sydney	D	17
18	Crawford	Sarah	D	18
19	deViere	Kirk	D	19
20	Murdock	Natalie	D	20
21	McInnis	Thomas	R	25
22	Woodard	Mike	D	22
23	Foushee	Valerie	D	23
24	Britt	Danny	R	13
	Clark	Robert	D	21
25	Galey	Amy	R	24
26	Berger	Philip	R	30
27	Garrett	Michael	D	27
28	Robinson	Gladys	D	28
29	Craven	David	R	26
30	Jarvis	Steven	R	29
31	Krawiec	Joyce	R	31
32	Lowe	Paul	D	32
33	Ford	Carl	R	33
34	Newton	Paul	R	36
35	Johnson	Matthew	R	35
36				
37	Marcus	Natasha	D	41
	Sawyer	Vickie	R	34
38	Mohammed	Mujtaba	D	38
39	Salvador	DeAndrea	D	39

District-Incumbent Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-173

Residence Set: NC Senate - 2/12/2022

District in this Plan	Last Name	First Name	Party	Current District
40	Waddell	Joyce	D	40
41	Jackson	Jeffrey	D	37
42				
43	Harrington	Kathryn	R	43
44	Alexander	W. Ted	R	44
45	Proctor	Dean	R	42
46	Daniel	Warren	R	46
47	Ballard	Deanna	R	45
	Hise	Ralph	R	47
48	Edwards	Charles	R	48
49	Mayfield	Julie	D	49
50	Corbin	Harold	R	50

Population Deviation Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174**

District	Seats	Ideal Pop	Actual Pop	Deviation	Deviation %
1	1	745,671	745,670	-1	0.00%
2	1	745,671	745,670	-1	0.00%
3	1	745,671	745,671	0	0.00%
4	1	745,671	745,671	0	0.00%
5	1	745,671	745,671	0	0.00%
6	1	745,671	745,671	0	0.00%
7	1	745,671	745,671	0	0.00%
8	1	745,671	745,670	-1	0.00%
9	1	745,671	745,670	-1	0.00%
10	1	745,671	745,671	0	0.00%
11	1	745,671	745,671	0	0.00%
12	1	745,671	745,670	-1	0.00%
13	1	745,671	745,671	0	0.00%
14	1	745,671	745,670	-1	0.00%
Totals:	14		10,439,388		

Deviation range: 0.00% to 0.00%

2020 Election Contest Report - US President-15213-

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib	Grn	% Grn	Cnst	% Cnst	W-I	% W-I
1	215,459	56.75%	158,226	41.67%	3,791	1.00%	679	0.18%	783	0.21%	739	0.19%
2	187,650	48.51%	195,189	50.46%	2,172	0.56%	584	0.15%	697	0.18%	517	0.13%
3	233,004	57.75%	164,850	40.86%	3,555	0.88%	755	0.19%	593	0.15%	710	0.18%
4	182,014	52.55%	158,621	45.79%	3,661	1.06%	788	0.23%	587	0.17%	708	0.20%
5	142,825	34.32%	265,213	63.73%	4,803	1.15%	1,092	0.26%	673	0.16%	1,536	0.37%
6	104,996	25.28%	303,381	73.05%	3,915	0.94%	1,104	0.27%	598	0.14%	1,339	0.32%
7	226,873	57.24%	163,607	41.28%	3,464	0.87%	861	0.22%	729	0.18%	801	0.20%
8	229,229	57.25%	165,528	41.34%	3,354	0.84%	724	0.18%	641	0.16%	932	0.23%
9	87,662	24.50%	263,732	73.71%	3,369	0.94%	1,115	0.31%	633	0.18%	1,308	0.37%
10	236,623	59.70%	153,718	38.78%	3,440	0.87%	850	0.21%	746	0.19%	1,005	0.25%
11	221,297	56.41%	165,895	42.29%	2,797	0.71%	713	0.18%	739	0.19%	827	0.21%
12	220,724	55.80%	169,040	42.73%	3,243	0.82%	870	0.22%	754	0.19%	961	0.24%
13	234,903	59.45%	154,848	39.19%	3,115	0.79%	786	0.20%	667	0.17%	822	0.21%
14	231,040	52.86%	198,657	45.45%	3,961	0.91%	1,265	0.29%	1,068	0.24%	1,109	0.25%
Total:	2,754,299	49.91%	2,680,505	48.57%	48,640	0.88%	12,186	0.22%	9,908	0.18%	13,314	0.24%

Candidates: Trump (Rep), Biden (Dem), Jorgensen (Lib), Hawkins (Grn), Blankenship (Cst)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-174.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:41 PM

[EL20-PRS-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - US Senate -15214-

NC General Assembly

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib	Cnst	% Cnst
1	206,067	54.88%	152,699	40.67%	11,734	3.13%	4,971	1.32%
2	176,931	46.15%	192,646	50.24%	9,034	2.36%	4,805	1.25%
3	219,883	55.25%	158,755	39.89%	13,673	3.44%	5,678	1.43%
4	172,755	50.35%	153,030	44.60%	12,075	3.52%	5,234	1.53%
5	146,097	35.36%	249,248	60.33%	14,481	3.50%	3,329	0.81%
6	110,038	26.67%	287,687	69.72%	12,105	2.93%	2,804	0.68%
7	217,245	55.22%	159,364	40.51%	11,903	3.03%	4,895	1.24%
8	224,244	56.57%	155,485	39.22%	11,789	2.97%	4,903	1.24%
9	92,619	26.08%	245,905	69.24%	12,891	3.63%	3,724	1.05%
10	226,840	57.72%	147,039	37.42%	13,149	3.35%	5,953	1.51%
11	208,764	53.72%	162,850	41.91%	11,577	2.98%	5,397	1.39%
12	211,960	54.04%	161,952	41.29%	12,369	3.15%	5,982	1.52%
13	225,854	57.73%	148,381	37.93%	11,622	2.97%	5,348	1.37%
14	222,072	51.29%	192,469	44.45%	12,996	3.00%	5,436	1.26%
Total:	2,661,369	48.67%	2,567,510	46.95%	171,398	3.13%	68,459	1.25%

Candidates: Tillis (Rep), Cunningham (Dem), Bray (Lib), Hayes (Cst)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-174.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:41 PM

[EL20-SEN-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Governor15215-

NC General Assembly

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep	Lib	% Lib	Cnst	% Cnst
1	166,322	44.01%	205,714	54.43%	4,126	1.09%	1,795	0.47%
2	206,882	53.60%	175,211	45.40%	2,551	0.66%	1,320	0.34%
3	178,211	44.44%	216,708	54.04%	4,350	1.08%	1,769	0.44%
4	169,194	49.02%	169,953	49.24%	4,248	1.23%	1,731	0.50%
5	275,331	66.39%	132,719	32.00%	5,179	1.25%	1,506	0.36%
6	311,980	75.31%	96,371	23.26%	4,576	1.10%	1,324	0.32%
7	178,515	45.19%	211,303	53.49%	3,789	0.96%	1,442	0.37%
8	176,345	44.22%	216,614	54.32%	4,138	1.04%	1,650	0.41%
9	265,498	74.53%	83,405	23.41%	5,549	1.56%	1,763	0.49%
10	165,414	41.95%	222,735	56.48%	4,451	1.13%	1,755	0.45%
11	180,407	46.19%	204,886	52.46%	3,777	0.97%	1,507	0.39%
12	180,889	45.88%	207,313	52.59%	4,254	1.08%	1,779	0.45%
13	165,507	42.08%	222,072	56.47%	4,038	1.03%	1,655	0.42%
14	210,206	48.32%	217,458	49.99%	5,382	1.24%	1,960	0.45%
Total:	2,830,701	51.50%	2,582,462	46.98%	60,408	1.10%	22,956	0.42%

Candidates: Cooper (Dem), Forest (Rep), DiFiore (Lib), Pisano (Cst)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-174.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:41 PM

[EL20-GOV-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Lieutenant Governor

NC General Assembly

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
1	217,170	58.43%	154,530	41.57%
2	187,243	49.12%	193,981	50.88%
3	231,436	58.93%	161,276	41.07%
4	182,225	53.58%	157,901	46.42%
5	151,162	36.94%	258,089	63.06%
6	113,649	27.82%	294,807	72.18%
7	230,136	58.89%	160,641	41.11%
8	231,910	59.27%	159,389	40.73%
9	95,774	27.22%	256,061	72.78%
10	239,679	61.55%	149,748	38.45%
11	222,579	57.70%	163,148	42.30%
12	224,160	57.67%	164,556	42.33%
13	235,585	60.95%	150,925	39.05%
14	234,268	54.62%	194,674	45.38%
Total:	2,796,976	51.64%	2,619,726	48.36%

Candidates: Robinson (Rep), Holley (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-174.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:41 PM

[EL20-LG-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Attorney General

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
1	160,110	43.23%	210,236	56.77%
2	202,876	53.37%	177,257	46.63%
3	168,603	43.07%	222,848	56.93%
4	163,787	48.32%	175,163	51.68%
5	265,364	64.88%	143,632	35.12%
6	300,100	73.50%	108,184	26.50%
7	168,671	43.29%	220,983	56.71%
8	165,878	42.45%	224,867	57.55%
9	258,367	73.55%	92,908	26.45%
10	157,275	40.47%	231,321	59.53%
11	171,046	44.45%	213,782	55.55%
12	170,240	43.76%	218,762	56.24%
13	157,617	40.73%	229,386	59.27%
14	200,841	46.95%	226,968	53.05%
Total:	2,710,775	50.13%	2,696,297	49.87%

Candidates: Stein (Dem), O'Neill (Rep)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-174.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:41 PM

[EL20-AG-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Auditor -15218-

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
1	167,491	45.50%	200,639	54.50%
2	210,543	55.62%	167,967	44.38%
3	168,789	43.62%	218,177	56.38%
4	166,025	49.23%	171,193	50.77%
5	266,930	65.93%	137,932	34.07%
6	300,443	74.26%	104,158	25.74%
7	169,169	43.77%	217,284	56.23%
8	165,381	42.73%	221,616	57.27%
9	257,027	73.79%	91,315	26.21%
10	156,974	40.75%	228,261	59.25%
11	170,682	44.81%	210,255	55.19%
12	171,491	44.50%	213,845	55.50%
13	155,798	40.74%	226,657	59.26%
14	200,630	47.34%	223,195	52.66%
Total:	2,727,373	50.89%	2,632,494	49.11%

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Commissioner of Agriculture

NC General Assembly

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
1	219,224	59.43%	149,638	40.57%
2	194,790	51.23%	185,407	48.77%
3	231,827	59.73%	156,312	40.27%
4	189,502	55.88%	149,607	44.12%
5	173,660	42.69%	233,091	57.31%
6	129,333	31.94%	275,608	68.06%
7	241,667	62.09%	147,577	37.91%
8	235,192	60.61%	152,821	39.39%
9	99,495	28.51%	249,548	71.49%
10	244,967	63.37%	141,612	36.63%
11	232,513	60.59%	151,213	39.41%
12	229,980	59.47%	156,724	40.53%
13	237,006	61.68%	147,242	38.32%
14	238,844	56.07%	187,143	43.93%
Total:	2,898,000	53.85%	2,483,543	46.15%

Candidates: Troxler (Rep), Wadsworth (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-174.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:41 PM

[EL20-COA-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Commissioner of Labor

NC General Assembly

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
1	208,622	56.73%	159,105	43.27%
2	181,932	48.06%	196,644	51.94%
3	222,052	57.31%	165,409	42.69%
4	177,786	52.67%	159,778	47.33%
5	147,741	36.64%	255,523	63.36%
6	110,452	27.37%	293,172	72.63%
7	224,394	58.09%	161,884	41.91%
8	226,709	58.62%	160,067	41.38%
9	93,669	26.89%	254,643	73.11%
10	234,046	60.81%	150,820	39.19%
11	216,510	56.81%	164,615	43.19%
12	219,479	56.99%	165,628	43.01%
13	231,428	60.37%	151,904	39.63%
14	228,286	53.82%	195,853	46.18%
Total:	2,723,106	50.82%	2,635,045	49.18%

Candidates: Dobson (Rep), Holmes (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-174.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:41 PM

[EL20-COL-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Secretary of State

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
1	165,923	44.98%	202,997	55.02%
2	208,152	54.81%	171,596	45.19%
3	172,689	44.35%	216,665	55.65%
4	169,920	50.17%	168,741	49.83%
5	268,302	65.99%	138,303	34.01%
6	301,175	74.20%	104,733	25.80%
7	171,694	44.26%	216,208	55.74%
8	167,643	43.12%	221,123	56.88%
9	259,615	74.21%	90,231	25.79%
10	158,654	41.08%	227,600	58.92%
11	173,444	45.35%	209,022	54.65%
12	173,446	44.92%	212,646	55.08%
13	159,066	41.41%	225,049	58.59%
14	203,040	47.72%	222,401	52.28%
Total:	2,752,763	51.17%	2,627,315	48.83%

Candidates: Marshall (Dem), Sykes (Rep)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-174.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:41 PM

[EL20-SOS-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Treasurer15222-

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
1	213,788	58.38%	152,442	41.62%
2	186,828	49.58%	190,007	50.42%
3	227,571	59.09%	157,551	40.91%
4	182,740	54.43%	152,982	45.57%
5	159,264	39.43%	244,639	60.57%
6	121,117	30.03%	282,176	69.97%
7	226,834	58.75%	159,266	41.25%
8	232,660	60.36%	152,825	39.64%
9	106,366	30.61%	241,173	69.39%
10	237,842	61.94%	146,134	38.06%
11	218,902	57.50%	161,796	42.50%
12	225,959	58.69%	159,058	41.31%
13	235,163	61.66%	146,251	38.34%
14	234,169	55.43%	188,281	44.57%
Total:	2,809,203	52.57%	2,534,581	47.43%

Candidates: Folwell (Rep), Chatterji (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-174.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:41 PM

[EL20-TRS-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2016 Election Contest Report - US President-15223-

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib	W-I	% W-I
1	188,752	56.33%	134,580	40.16%	8,595	2.57%	3,148	0.94%
2	163,774	45.85%	185,013	51.79%	5,927	1.66%	2,492	0.70%
3	189,959	56.68%	133,214	39.75%	8,765	2.62%	3,218	0.96%
4	149,222	52.08%	127,207	44.40%	7,381	2.58%	2,695	0.94%
5	125,704	35.28%	211,906	59.48%	12,430	3.49%	6,237	1.75%
6	92,497	25.72%	249,565	69.39%	11,349	3.16%	6,245	1.74%
7	191,457	58.09%	125,619	38.12%	8,934	2.71%	3,558	1.08%
8	194,304	57.66%	129,249	38.35%	9,598	2.85%	3,835	1.14%
9	75,350	25.22%	209,322	70.07%	9,342	3.13%	4,713	1.58%
10	200,951	61.21%	114,597	34.90%	9,117	2.78%	3,659	1.11%
11	195,242	54.77%	148,288	41.60%	8,730	2.45%	4,215	1.18%
12	189,983	55.31%	139,884	40.72%	9,447	2.75%	4,195	1.22%
13	199,234	60.73%	116,188	35.42%	8,853	2.70%	3,773	1.15%
14	203,320	53.81%	155,684	41.20%	11,461	3.03%	7,414	1.96%
Total:	2,359,749	49.90%	2,180,316	46.10%	129,929	2.75%	59,397	1.26%

2016 Election Contest Report - NC Lieutenant Governor

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib
1	184,821	56.77%	131,911	40.52%	8,809	2.71%
2	162,051	46.35%	181,727	51.98%	5,826	1.67%
3	184,026	57.02%	129,122	40.01%	9,615	2.98%
4	148,461	53.07%	123,357	44.10%	7,909	2.83%
5	139,771	39.97%	199,225	56.97%	10,713	3.06%
6	106,377	30.26%	234,744	66.78%	10,386	2.95%
7	192,753	59.78%	120,924	37.50%	8,782	2.72%
8	198,802	60.70%	119,633	36.53%	9,089	2.78%
9	87,715	30.15%	193,178	66.40%	10,057	3.46%
10	201,527	63.03%	108,568	33.96%	9,632	3.01%
11	193,666	55.78%	144,242	41.54%	9,313	2.68%
12	193,626	57.78%	132,065	39.41%	9,409	2.81%
13	200,145	62.65%	110,198	34.49%	9,124	2.86%
14	196,878	53.70%	156,081	42.57%	13,696	3.74%
Total:	2,390,619	51.88%	2,084,975	45.25%	132,360	2.87%

Candidates: Forest (Rep), Coleman (Dem), Cole (Lib)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-174.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:41 PM

[EL20-LG-16G] - Generated 2/17/2022

Election Contest Report - 2016/2020 Composite

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
1	154,415	42.35%	206,124	56.53%
2	195,756	51.99%	177,769	47.21%
3	159,565	41.79%	217,846	57.06%
4	154,284	46.66%	172,480	52.16%
5	249,405	62.43%	144,901	36.27%
6	286,237	71.67%	108,492	27.17%
7	157,244	41.44%	218,095	57.48%
8	155,854	40.85%	221,439	58.04%
9	246,172	71.96%	91,376	26.71%
10	145,879	38.59%	227,699	60.23%
11	163,136	42.98%	212,285	55.93%
12	162,081	42.59%	214,036	56.24%
13	146,994	39.06%	225,207	59.84%
14	190,297	45.42%	223,242	53.28%
Total:	2,567,319	48.54%	2,660,991	50.31%

Values represent average vote count from 12 contests: 2016 President and Lieutenant Governor; 2020 President, US Senate, Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Attorney General, Auditor, Commissioner of Agriculture, Commissioner of Labor, Secretary of State, and Treasurer.

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' files, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-174.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:41 PM

[EL20-CMP-1620G] - Generated 2/17/2022

County - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174**

County	District	Total County Population	Total District Population	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Alamance	7	171,415	745,671	171,415	100.00 %	22.99 %
Alexander	11	36,444	745,671	36,444	100.00 %	4.89 %
Alleghany	11	10,888	745,671	10,888	100.00 %	1.46 %
Anson	8	22,055	745,670	22,055	100.00 %	2.96 %
Ashe	11	26,577	745,671	26,577	100.00 %	3.56 %
Avery	14	17,806	745,670	17,806	100.00 %	2.39 %
Beaufort	1	44,652	745,670	44,652	100.00 %	5.99 %
Bertie	2	17,934	745,670	17,934	100.00 %	2.41 %
Bladen	3	29,606	745,671	29,606	100.00 %	3.97 %
Brunswick	3	136,693	745,671	136,693	100.00 %	18.33 %
Buncombe	14	269,452	745,670	269,452	100.00 %	36.14 %
Burke	13	87,570	745,671	87,570	100.00 %	11.74 %
Cabarrus	10	225,804	745,671	225,804	100.00 %	30.28 %
Caldwell	11	80,652	745,671	80,652	100.00 %	10.82 %
Camden	1	10,355	745,670	10,355	100.00 %	1.39 %
Carteret	1	67,686	745,670	67,686	100.00 %	9.08 %
Caswell	2	22,736	745,670	22,736	100.00 %	3.05 %
Catawba	12	160,610	745,670	160,610	100.00 %	21.54 %
Chatham	7	76,285	745,671	76,285	100.00 %	10.23 %
Cherokee	14	28,774	745,670	28,774	100.00 %	3.86 %
Chowan	1	13,708	745,670	13,708	100.00 %	1.84 %
Clay	14	11,089	745,670	11,089	100.00 %	1.49 %
Cleveland	13	99,519	745,671	99,519	100.00 %	13.35 %
Columbus	3	50,623	745,671	50,623	100.00 %	6.79 %
Craven	1	100,720	745,670	100,720	100.00 %	13.51 %
Cumberland	4	334,728	745,671	334,728	100.00 %	44.89 %
Currituck	1	28,100	745,670	28,100	100.00 %	3.77 %
Dare	1	36,915	745,670	36,915	100.00 %	4.95 %
Davidson	7	168,930	745,671	89,642	53.06 %	12.02 %
	10	168,930	745,671	79,288	46.94 %	10.63 %
Davie	10	42,712	745,671	42,712	100.00 %	5.73 %
Duplin	3	48,715	745,671	48,715	100.00 %	6.53 %
Durham	6	324,833	745,671	324,833	100.00 %	43.56 %
Edgecombe	2	48,900	745,670	48,900	100.00 %	6.56 %
Forsyth	12	382,590	745,670	382,590	100.00 %	51.31 %
Franklin	2	68,573	745,670	68,573	100.00 %	9.20 %
Gaston	13	227,943	745,671	227,943	100.00 %	30.57 %
Gates	1	10,478	745,670	10,478	100.00 %	1.41 %
Graham	14	8,030	745,670	8,030	100.00 %	1.08 %
Granville	2	60,992	745,670	60,992	100.00 %	8.18 %
Greene	2	20,451	745,670	20,451	100.00 %	2.74 %

County - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174**

County	District	Total County Population	Total District Population	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Guilford	7	541,299	745,671	84,117	15.54 %	11.28 %
	10	541,299	745,671	142,745	26.37 %	19.14 %
	11	541,299	745,671	314,437	58.09 %	42.17 %
Halifax	2	48,622	745,670	48,622	100.00 %	6.52 %
Harnett	4	133,568	745,671	128,409	96.14 %	17.22 %
	7	133,568	745,671	5,159	3.86 %	0.69 %
Haywood	14	62,089	745,670	62,089	100.00 %	8.33 %
Henderson	14	116,281	745,670	116,281	100.00 %	15.59 %
Hertford	2	21,552	745,670	21,552	100.00 %	2.89 %
Hoke	8	52,082	745,670	52,082	100.00 %	6.98 %
Hyde	1	4,589	745,670	4,589	100.00 %	0.62 %
Iredell	10	186,693	745,671	108,247	57.98 %	14.52 %
	12	186,693	745,670	78,446	42.02 %	10.52 %
Jackson	14	43,109	745,670	43,109	100.00 %	5.78 %
Johnston	4	215,999	745,671	215,999	100.00 %	28.97 %
Jones	1	9,172	745,670	9,172	100.00 %	1.23 %
Lee	7	63,285	745,671	63,285	100.00 %	8.49 %
Lenoir	1	55,122	745,670	55,122	100.00 %	7.39 %
Lincoln	12	86,810	745,670	86,810	100.00 %	11.64 %
Macon	14	37,014	745,670	37,014	100.00 %	4.96 %
Madison	14	21,193	745,670	21,193	100.00 %	2.84 %
Martin	2	22,031	745,670	22,031	100.00 %	2.95 %
McDowell	13	44,578	745,671	44,578	100.00 %	5.98 %
Mecklenburg	8	1,115,482	745,670	167,523	15.02 %	22.47 %
	9	1,115,482	745,670	745,670	66.85 %	100.00 %
	13	1,115,482	745,671	202,289	18.13 %	27.13 %
Mitchell	14	14,903	745,670	14,903	100.00 %	2.00 %
Montgomery	8	25,751	745,670	25,751	100.00 %	3.45 %
Moore	8	99,727	745,670	99,727	100.00 %	13.37 %
Nash	2	94,970	745,670	94,970	100.00 %	12.74 %
New Hanover	3	225,702	745,671	225,702	100.00 %	30.27 %
Northampton	2	17,471	745,670	17,471	100.00 %	2.34 %
Onslow	1	204,576	745,670	126,336	61.76 %	16.94 %
	3	204,576	745,671	78,240	38.24 %	10.49 %
Orange	6	148,696	745,671	148,696	100.00 %	19.94 %
Pamlico	1	12,276	745,670	12,276	100.00 %	1.65 %
Pasquotank	1	40,568	745,670	40,568	100.00 %	5.44 %
Pender	3	60,203	745,671	60,203	100.00 %	8.07 %
Perquimans	1	13,005	745,670	13,005	100.00 %	1.74 %
Person	2	39,097	745,670	39,097	100.00 %	5.24 %
Pitt	1	170,243	745,670	168,743	99.12 %	22.63 %
	2	170,243	745,670	1,500	0.88 %	0.20 %

County - District Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174

County	District	Total County Population	Total District Population	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Polk	13	19,328	745,671	19,328	100.00 %	2.59 %
Randolph	7	144,171	745,671	144,171	100.00 %	19.33 %
Richmond	8	42,946	745,670	42,946	100.00 %	5.76 %
Robeson	3	116,530	745,671	115,889	99.45 %	15.54 %
	8	116,530	745,670	641	0.55 %	0.09 %
Rockingham	11	91,096	745,671	91,096	100.00 %	12.22 %
Rowan	10	146,875	745,671	146,875	100.00 %	19.70 %
Rutherford	13	64,444	745,671	64,444	100.00 %	8.64 %
Sampson	4	59,036	745,671	59,036	100.00 %	7.92 %
Scotland	8	34,174	745,670	34,174	100.00 %	4.58 %
Stanly	8	62,504	745,670	62,504	100.00 %	8.38 %
Stokes	11	44,520	745,671	44,520	100.00 %	5.97 %
Surry	11	71,359	745,671	71,359	100.00 %	9.57 %
Swain	14	14,117	745,670	14,117	100.00 %	1.89 %
Transylvania	14	32,986	745,670	32,986	100.00 %	4.42 %
Tyrrell	1	3,245	745,670	3,245	100.00 %	0.44 %
Union	8	238,267	745,670	238,267	100.00 %	31.95 %
Vance	2	42,578	745,670	42,578	100.00 %	5.71 %
Wake	5	1,129,410	745,671	745,671	66.02 %	100.00 %
	6	1,129,410	745,671	272,142	24.10 %	36.50 %
	7	1,129,410	745,671	111,597	9.88 %	14.97 %
Warren	2	18,642	745,670	18,642	100.00 %	2.50 %
Washington	2	11,003	745,670	11,003	100.00 %	1.48 %
Watauga	11	54,086	745,671	3,729	6.89 %	0.50 %
	14	54,086	745,670	50,357	93.11 %	6.75 %
Wayne	2	117,333	745,670	109,834	93.61 %	14.73 %
	4	117,333	745,671	7,499	6.39 %	1.01 %
Wilkes	11	65,969	745,671	65,969	100.00 %	8.85 %
Wilson	2	78,784	745,670	78,784	100.00 %	10.57 %
Yadkin	12	37,214	745,670	37,214	100.00 %	4.99 %
Yancey	14	18,470	745,670	18,470	100.00 %	2.48 %
Assigned Geography Total:				10,439,388		

Report display: all assigned counties

Total Counties Statewide: 100

Fully Assigned Counties: 100

Partially Assigned Counties: 0

Fully Unassigned Counties: 0

Total Districts Assigned: 14

Split Counties: 11

District - County Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174

District	County	Total District Population	Total County Population	District Pop in County	Percent of District Pop in County	Percent of County Pop in District
1	Beaufort	745,670	44,652	44,652	5.99 %	100.00 %
	Camden	745,670	10,355	10,355	1.39 %	100.00 %
	Carteret	745,670	67,686	67,686	9.08 %	100.00 %
	Chowan	745,670	13,708	13,708	1.84 %	100.00 %
	Craven	745,670	100,720	100,720	13.51 %	100.00 %
	Currituck	745,670	28,100	28,100	3.77 %	100.00 %
	Dare	745,670	36,915	36,915	4.95 %	100.00 %
	Gates	745,670	10,478	10,478	1.41 %	100.00 %
	Hyde	745,670	4,589	4,589	0.62 %	100.00 %
	Jones	745,670	9,172	9,172	1.23 %	100.00 %
	Lenoir	745,670	55,122	55,122	7.39 %	100.00 %
	Onslow	745,670	204,576	126,336	16.94 %	61.76 %
	Pamlico	745,670	12,276	12,276	1.65 %	100.00 %
	Pasquotank	745,670	40,568	40,568	5.44 %	100.00 %
	Perquimans	745,670	13,005	13,005	1.74 %	100.00 %
	Pitt	745,670	170,243	168,743	22.63 %	99.12 %
	Tyrrell	745,670	3,245	3,245	0.44 %	100.00 %
2	Bertie	745,670	17,934	17,934	2.41 %	100.00 %
	Caswell	745,670	22,736	22,736	3.05 %	100.00 %
	Edgecombe	745,670	48,900	48,900	6.56 %	100.00 %
	Franklin	745,670	68,573	68,573	9.20 %	100.00 %
	Granville	745,670	60,992	60,992	8.18 %	100.00 %
	Greene	745,670	20,451	20,451	2.74 %	100.00 %
	Halifax	745,670	48,622	48,622	6.52 %	100.00 %
	Hertford	745,670	21,552	21,552	2.89 %	100.00 %
	Martin	745,670	22,031	22,031	2.95 %	100.00 %
	Nash	745,670	94,970	94,970	12.74 %	100.00 %
	Northampton	745,670	17,471	17,471	2.34 %	100.00 %
	Person	745,670	39,097	39,097	5.24 %	100.00 %
	Pitt	745,670	170,243	1,500	0.20 %	0.88 %
	Vance	745,670	42,578	42,578	5.71 %	100.00 %
	Warren	745,670	18,642	18,642	2.50 %	100.00 %
	Washington	745,670	11,003	11,003	1.48 %	100.00 %
	Wayne	745,670	117,333	109,834	14.73 %	93.61 %
	Wilson	745,670	78,784	78,784	10.57 %	100.00 %

District - County Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174

District	County	Total District Population	Total County Population	District Pop in County	Percent of District Pop in County	Percent of County Pop in District
3	Bladen	745,671	29,606	29,606	3.97 %	100.00 %
	Brunswick	745,671	136,693	136,693	18.33 %	100.00 %
	Columbus	745,671	50,623	50,623	6.79 %	100.00 %
	Duplin	745,671	48,715	48,715	6.53 %	100.00 %
	New Hanover	745,671	225,702	225,702	30.27 %	100.00 %
	Onslow	745,671	204,576	78,240	10.49 %	38.24 %
	Pender	745,671	60,203	60,203	8.07 %	100.00 %
	Robeson	745,671	116,530	115,889	15.54 %	99.45 %
4	Cumberland	745,671	334,728	334,728	44.89 %	100.00 %
	Harnett	745,671	133,568	128,409	17.22 %	96.14 %
	Johnston	745,671	215,999	215,999	28.97 %	100.00 %
	Sampson	745,671	59,036	59,036	7.92 %	100.00 %
	Wayne	745,671	117,333	7,499	1.01 %	6.39 %
5	Wake	745,671	1,129,410	745,671	100.00 %	66.02 %
6	Durham	745,671	324,833	324,833	43.56 %	100.00 %
	Orange	745,671	148,696	148,696	19.94 %	100.00 %
	Wake	745,671	1,129,410	272,142	36.50 %	24.10 %
7	Alamance	745,671	171,415	171,415	22.99 %	100.00 %
	Chatham	745,671	76,285	76,285	10.23 %	100.00 %
	Davidson	745,671	168,930	89,642	12.02 %	53.06 %
	Guilford	745,671	541,299	84,117	11.28 %	15.54 %
	Harnett	745,671	133,568	5,159	0.69 %	3.86 %
	Lee	745,671	63,285	63,285	8.49 %	100.00 %
	Randolph	745,671	144,171	144,171	19.33 %	100.00 %
	Wake	745,671	1,129,410	111,597	14.97 %	9.88 %
8	Anson	745,670	22,055	22,055	2.96 %	100.00 %
	Hoke	745,670	52,082	52,082	6.98 %	100.00 %
	Mecklenburg	745,670	1,115,482	167,523	22.47 %	15.02 %
	Montgomery	745,670	25,751	25,751	3.45 %	100.00 %
	Moore	745,670	99,727	99,727	13.37 %	100.00 %
	Richmond	745,670	42,946	42,946	5.76 %	100.00 %
	Robeson	745,670	116,530	641	0.09 %	0.55 %
	Scotland	745,670	34,174	34,174	4.58 %	100.00 %
	Stanly	745,670	62,504	62,504	8.38 %	100.00 %
	Union	745,670	238,267	238,267	31.95 %	100.00 %
9	Mecklenburg	745,670	1,115,482	745,670	100.00 %	66.85 %
10	Cabarrus	745,671	225,804	225,804	30.28 %	100.00 %
	Davidson	745,671	168,930	79,288	10.63 %	46.94 %
	Davie	745,671	42,712	42,712	5.73 %	100.00 %
	Guilford	745,671	541,299	142,745	19.14 %	26.37 %
	Iredell	745,671	186,693	108,247	14.52 %	57.98 %
	Rowan	745,671	146,875	146,875	19.70 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-174.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:41 PM

Data Source: 2020 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File - North Carolina

[G20-DistCnty] - Generated 2/17/2022

District - County Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174

District	County	Total District Population	Total County Population	District Pop in County	Percent of District Pop in County	Percent of County Pop in District
11	Alexander	745,671	36,444	36,444	4.89 %	100.00 %
	Alleghany	745,671	10,888	10,888	1.46 %	100.00 %
	Ashe	745,671	26,577	26,577	3.56 %	100.00 %
	Caldwell	745,671	80,652	80,652	10.82 %	100.00 %
	Guilford	745,671	541,299	314,437	42.17 %	58.09 %
	Rockingham	745,671	91,096	91,096	12.22 %	100.00 %
	Stokes	745,671	44,520	44,520	5.97 %	100.00 %
	Surry	745,671	71,359	71,359	9.57 %	100.00 %
	Watauga	745,671	54,086	3,729	0.50 %	6.89 %
	Wilkes	745,671	65,969	65,969	8.85 %	100.00 %
12	Catawba	745,670	160,610	160,610	21.54 %	100.00 %
	Forsyth	745,670	382,590	382,590	51.31 %	100.00 %
	Iredell	745,670	186,693	78,446	10.52 %	42.02 %
	Lincoln	745,670	86,810	86,810	11.64 %	100.00 %
	Yadkin	745,670	37,214	37,214	4.99 %	100.00 %
13	Burke	745,671	87,570	87,570	11.74 %	100.00 %
	Cleveland	745,671	99,519	99,519	13.35 %	100.00 %
	Gaston	745,671	227,943	227,943	30.57 %	100.00 %
	McDowell	745,671	44,578	44,578	5.98 %	100.00 %
	Mecklenburg	745,671	1,115,482	202,289	27.13 %	18.13 %
	Polk	745,671	19,328	19,328	2.59 %	100.00 %
	Rutherford	745,671	64,444	64,444	8.64 %	100.00 %
14	Avery	745,670	17,806	17,806	2.39 %	100.00 %
	Buncombe	745,670	269,452	269,452	36.14 %	100.00 %
	Cherokee	745,670	28,774	28,774	3.86 %	100.00 %
	Clay	745,670	11,089	11,089	1.49 %	100.00 %
	Graham	745,670	8,030	8,030	1.08 %	100.00 %
	Haywood	745,670	62,089	62,089	8.33 %	100.00 %
	Henderson	745,670	116,281	116,281	15.59 %	100.00 %
	Jackson	745,670	43,109	43,109	5.78 %	100.00 %
	Macon	745,670	37,014	37,014	4.96 %	100.00 %
	Madison	745,670	21,193	21,193	2.84 %	100.00 %
	Mitchell	745,670	14,903	14,903	2.00 %	100.00 %
	Swain	745,670	14,117	14,117	1.89 %	100.00 %
	Transylvania	745,670	32,986	32,986	4.42 %	100.00 %
	Watauga	745,670	54,086	50,357	6.75 %	93.11 %
	Yancey	745,670	18,470	18,470	2.48 %	100.00 %
Total:				10,439,388		

District - County Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174

Total Districts Assigned: 14

Total Counties Statewide: 100

Fully Assigned Counties: 100

Partially Assigned Counties: 0

Fully Unassigned Counties: 0

Split Counties: 11

Municipality - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Aberdeen	8	8,516	745,670	8,516	100.00 %	1.14 %
Ahoskie	2	4,891	745,670	4,891	100.00 %	0.66 %
Alamance	7	988	745,671	988	100.00 %	0.13 %
Albemarle	8	16,432	745,670	16,432	100.00 %	2.20 %
Alliance	1	733	745,670	733	100.00 %	0.10 %
Andrews	14	1,667	745,670	1,667	100.00 %	0.22 %
Angier	4	5,265	745,671	4,709	89.44 %	0.63 %
	7	5,265	745,671	556	10.56 %	0.07 %
Ansonville	8	440	745,670	440	100.00 %	0.06 %
Apex	6	58,780	745,671	58,780	100.00 %	7.88 %
	7	58,780	745,671	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Arapahoe	1	416	745,670	416	100.00 %	0.06 %
Archdale	7	11,907	745,671	11,527	96.81 %	1.55 %
	10	11,907	745,671	380	3.19 %	0.05 %
Archer Lodge	4	4,797	745,671	4,797	100.00 %	0.64 %
Asheboro	7	27,156	745,671	27,156	100.00 %	3.64 %
Asheville	14	94,589	745,670	94,589	100.00 %	12.69 %
Askewville	2	184	745,670	184	100.00 %	0.02 %
Atkinson	3	296	745,671	296	100.00 %	0.04 %
Atlantic Beach	1	1,364	745,670	1,364	100.00 %	0.18 %
Aulander	2	763	745,670	763	100.00 %	0.10 %
Aurora	1	455	745,670	455	100.00 %	0.06 %
Autryville	4	167	745,671	167	100.00 %	0.02 %
Ayden	1	4,977	745,670	4,977	100.00 %	0.67 %
Badin	8	2,024	745,670	2,024	100.00 %	0.27 %
Bailey	2	568	745,670	568	100.00 %	0.08 %
Bakersville	14	450	745,670	450	100.00 %	0.06 %
Bald Head Island	3	268	745,671	268	100.00 %	0.04 %
Banner Elk	14	1,049	745,670	1,049	100.00 %	0.14 %
Bath	1	245	745,670	245	100.00 %	0.03 %
Bayboro	1	1,161	745,670	1,161	100.00 %	0.16 %
Bear Grass	2	89	745,670	89	100.00 %	0.01 %
Beaufort	1	4,464	745,670	4,464	100.00 %	0.60 %
Beech Mountain	14	675	745,670	675	100.00 %	0.09 %
Belhaven	1	1,410	745,670	1,410	100.00 %	0.19 %
Belmont	13	15,010	745,671	15,010	100.00 %	2.01 %
Belville	3	2,406	745,671	2,406	100.00 %	0.32 %
Belwood	13	857	745,671	857	100.00 %	0.11 %
Benson	4	3,967	745,671	3,967	100.00 %	0.53 %
Bermuda Run	10	3,120	745,671	3,120	100.00 %	0.42 %
Bessemer City	13	5,428	745,671	5,428	100.00 %	0.73 %
Bethania	12	344	745,670	344	100.00 %	0.05 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-174.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:41 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

Page 1 of 15

Municipality - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Bethel	2	1,373	745,670	1,373	100.00 %	0.18 %
Beulaville	3	1,116	745,671	1,116	100.00 %	0.15 %
Biltmore Forest	14	1,409	745,670	1,409	100.00 %	0.19 %
Biscoe	8	1,848	745,670	1,848	100.00 %	0.25 %
Black Creek	2	692	745,670	692	100.00 %	0.09 %
Black Mountain	14	8,426	745,670	8,426	100.00 %	1.13 %
Bladenboro	3	1,648	745,671	1,648	100.00 %	0.22 %
Blowing Rock	11	1,376	745,671	91	6.61 %	0.01 %
	14	1,376	745,670	1,285	93.39 %	0.17 %
Boardman	3	166	745,671	166	100.00 %	0.02 %
Bogue	1	695	745,670	695	100.00 %	0.09 %
Boiling Spring Lakes	3	5,943	745,671	5,943	100.00 %	0.80 %
Boiling Springs	13	4,615	745,671	4,615	100.00 %	0.62 %
Bolivia	3	149	745,671	149	100.00 %	0.02 %
Bolton	3	519	745,671	519	100.00 %	0.07 %
Boone	14	19,092	745,670	19,092	100.00 %	2.56 %
Boonville	12	1,185	745,670	1,185	100.00 %	0.16 %
Bostic	13	355	745,671	355	100.00 %	0.05 %
Brevard	14	7,744	745,670	7,744	100.00 %	1.04 %
Bridgeton	1	349	745,670	349	100.00 %	0.05 %
Broadway	4	1,267	745,671	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	7	1,267	745,671	1,267	100.00 %	0.17 %
Brookford	12	442	745,670	442	100.00 %	0.06 %
Brunswick	3	973	745,671	973	100.00 %	0.13 %
Bryson City	14	1,558	745,670	1,558	100.00 %	0.21 %
Bunn	2	327	745,670	327	100.00 %	0.04 %
Burgaw	3	3,088	745,671	3,088	100.00 %	0.41 %
Burlington	7	57,303	745,671	57,303	100.00 %	7.68 %
Burnsville	14	1,614	745,670	1,614	100.00 %	0.22 %
Butner	2	8,397	745,670	8,397	100.00 %	1.13 %
Cajah's Mountain	11	2,722	745,671	2,722	100.00 %	0.37 %
Calabash	3	2,011	745,671	2,011	100.00 %	0.27 %
Calypso	3	327	745,671	327	100.00 %	0.04 %
Cameron	8	244	745,670	244	100.00 %	0.03 %
Candor	8	813	745,670	813	100.00 %	0.11 %
Canton	14	4,422	745,670	4,422	100.00 %	0.59 %
Cape Carteret	1	2,224	745,670	2,224	100.00 %	0.30 %
Carolina Beach	3	6,564	745,671	6,564	100.00 %	0.88 %
Carolina Shores	3	4,588	745,671	4,588	100.00 %	0.62 %
Carrboro	6	21,295	745,671	21,295	100.00 %	2.86 %
Carthage	8	2,775	745,670	2,775	100.00 %	0.37 %

Municipality - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Cary	5	174,721	745,671	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	6	174,721	745,671	171,012	97.88 %	22.93 %
	7	174,721	745,671	3,709	2.12 %	0.50 %
Casar	13	305	745,671	305	100.00 %	0.04 %
Castalia	2	264	745,670	264	100.00 %	0.04 %
Caswell Beach	3	395	745,671	395	100.00 %	0.05 %
Catawba	12	702	745,670	702	100.00 %	0.09 %
Cedar Point	1	1,764	745,670	1,764	100.00 %	0.24 %
Cedar Rock	11	301	745,671	301	100.00 %	0.04 %
Cerro Gordo	3	131	745,671	131	100.00 %	0.02 %
Chadbourn	3	1,574	745,671	1,574	100.00 %	0.21 %
Chapel Hill	6	61,960	745,671	61,960	100.00 %	8.31 %
Charlotte	8	874,579	745,670	103,002	11.78 %	13.81 %
	9	874,579	745,670	722,091	82.56 %	96.84 %
	13	874,579	745,671	49,486	5.66 %	6.64 %
Cherryville	13	6,078	745,671	6,078	100.00 %	0.82 %
Chimney Rock Village	13	140	745,671	140	100.00 %	0.02 %
China Grove	10	4,434	745,671	4,434	100.00 %	0.59 %
Chocowinity	1	722	745,670	722	100.00 %	0.10 %
Claremont	12	1,692	745,670	1,692	100.00 %	0.23 %
Clarkton	3	614	745,671	614	100.00 %	0.08 %
Clayton	4	26,307	745,671	26,307	100.00 %	3.53 %
	5	26,307	745,671	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Clemmons	12	21,163	745,670	21,163	100.00 %	2.84 %
Cleveland	10	846	745,671	846	100.00 %	0.11 %
Clinton	4	8,383	745,671	8,383	100.00 %	1.12 %
Clyde	14	1,368	745,670	1,368	100.00 %	0.18 %
Coats	4	2,155	745,671	2,155	100.00 %	0.29 %
Cofield	2	267	745,670	267	100.00 %	0.04 %
Colerain	2	217	745,670	217	100.00 %	0.03 %
Columbia	1	610	745,670	610	100.00 %	0.08 %
Columbus	13	1,060	745,671	1,060	100.00 %	0.14 %
Como	2	67	745,670	67	100.00 %	0.01 %
Concord	10	105,240	745,671	105,240	100.00 %	14.11 %
Conetoe	2	198	745,670	198	100.00 %	0.03 %
Connelly Springs	13	1,529	745,671	1,529	100.00 %	0.21 %
Conover	12	8,421	745,670	8,421	100.00 %	1.13 %
Conway	2	752	745,670	752	100.00 %	0.10 %
Cooleemee	10	940	745,671	940	100.00 %	0.13 %
Cornelius	13	31,412	745,671	31,412	100.00 %	4.21 %
Cove City	1	378	745,670	378	100.00 %	0.05 %
Cramerton	13	5,296	745,671	5,296	100.00 %	0.71 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-174.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:41 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Creedmoor	2	4,866	745,670	4,866	100.00 %	0.65 %
Creswell	2	207	745,670	207	100.00 %	0.03 %
Crossnore	14	143	745,670	143	100.00 %	0.02 %
Dallas	13	5,927	745,671	5,927	100.00 %	0.79 %
Danbury	11	189	745,671	189	100.00 %	0.03 %
Davidson	10	15,106	745,671	378	2.50 %	0.05 %
	13	15,106	745,671	14,728	97.50 %	1.98 %
Dellview	13	6	745,671	6	100.00 %	0.00 %
Denton	7	1,494	745,671	1,494	100.00 %	0.20 %
	10	1,494	745,671	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Dillsboro	14	213	745,670	213	100.00 %	0.03 %
Dobbins Heights	8	687	745,670	687	100.00 %	0.09 %
Dobson	11	1,462	745,671	1,462	100.00 %	0.20 %
Dortches	2	1,082	745,670	1,082	100.00 %	0.15 %
Dover	1	349	745,670	349	100.00 %	0.05 %
Drexel	13	1,760	745,671	1,760	100.00 %	0.24 %
Dublin	3	267	745,671	267	100.00 %	0.04 %
Duck	1	742	745,670	742	100.00 %	0.10 %
Dunn	4	8,446	745,671	8,446	100.00 %	1.13 %
Durham	5	283,506	745,671	269	0.09 %	0.04 %
	6	283,506	745,671	283,237	99.91 %	37.98 %
Earl	13	198	745,671	198	100.00 %	0.03 %
East Arcadia	3	418	745,671	418	100.00 %	0.06 %
East Bend	12	634	745,670	634	100.00 %	0.09 %
East Laurinburg	8	234	745,670	234	100.00 %	0.03 %
Eastover	4	3,656	745,671	3,656	100.00 %	0.49 %
East Spencer	10	1,567	745,671	1,567	100.00 %	0.21 %
Eden	11	15,421	745,671	15,421	100.00 %	2.07 %
Edenton	1	4,460	745,670	4,460	100.00 %	0.60 %
Elizabeth City	1	18,631	745,670	18,631	100.00 %	2.50 %
Elizabethtown	3	3,296	745,671	3,296	100.00 %	0.44 %
Elkin	11	4,122	745,671	4,122	100.00 %	0.55 %
Elk Park	14	542	745,670	542	100.00 %	0.07 %
Ellenboro	13	723	745,671	723	100.00 %	0.10 %
Ellerbe	8	864	745,670	864	100.00 %	0.12 %
Elm City	2	1,218	745,670	1,218	100.00 %	0.16 %
Elon	7	11,336	745,671	11,336	100.00 %	1.52 %
Emerald Isle	1	3,847	745,670	3,847	100.00 %	0.52 %
Enfield	2	1,865	745,670	1,865	100.00 %	0.25 %
Erwin	4	4,542	745,671	4,542	100.00 %	0.61 %
Eureka	2	214	745,670	214	100.00 %	0.03 %
Everetts	2	150	745,670	150	100.00 %	0.02 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-174.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:41 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Fair Bluff	3	709	745,671	709	100.00 %	0.10 %
Fairmont	3	2,191	745,671	2,191	100.00 %	0.29 %
Fairview	8	3,456	745,670	3,456	100.00 %	0.46 %
Faison	3	784	745,671	784	100.00 %	0.11 %
	4	784	745,671	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Faith	10	819	745,671	819	100.00 %	0.11 %
Falcon	4	324	745,671	324	100.00 %	0.04 %
Falkland	1	47	745,670	47	100.00 %	0.01 %
Fallston	13	627	745,671	627	100.00 %	0.08 %
Farmville	1	4,461	745,670	4,461	100.00 %	0.60 %
Fayetteville	4	208,501	745,671	208,501	100.00 %	27.96 %
Flat Rock	14	3,486	745,670	3,486	100.00 %	0.47 %
Fletcher	14	7,987	745,670	7,987	100.00 %	1.07 %
Fontana Dam	14	13	745,670	13	100.00 %	0.00 %
Forest City	13	7,377	745,671	7,377	100.00 %	0.99 %
Forest Hills	14	303	745,670	303	100.00 %	0.04 %
Fountain	1	385	745,670	385	100.00 %	0.05 %
Four Oaks	4	2,158	745,671	2,158	100.00 %	0.29 %
Foxfire	8	1,288	745,670	1,288	100.00 %	0.17 %
Franklin	14	4,175	745,670	4,175	100.00 %	0.56 %
Franklinton	2	2,456	745,670	2,456	100.00 %	0.33 %
Franklinville	7	1,197	745,671	1,197	100.00 %	0.16 %
Fremont	2	1,196	745,670	1,196	100.00 %	0.16 %
Fuquay-Varina	5	34,152	745,671	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	7	34,152	745,671	34,152	100.00 %	4.58 %
Gamewell	11	3,702	745,671	3,702	100.00 %	0.50 %
Garland	4	595	745,671	595	100.00 %	0.08 %
Garner	5	31,159	745,671	31,159	100.00 %	4.18 %
	7	31,159	745,671	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Garysburg	2	904	745,670	904	100.00 %	0.12 %
Gaston	2	1,008	745,670	1,008	100.00 %	0.14 %
Gastonia	13	80,411	745,671	80,411	100.00 %	10.78 %
Gatesville	1	267	745,670	267	100.00 %	0.04 %
Gibson	8	449	745,670	449	100.00 %	0.06 %
Gibsonville	7	8,920	745,671	8,920	100.00 %	1.20 %
Glen Alpine	13	1,529	745,671	1,529	100.00 %	0.21 %
Godwin	4	128	745,671	128	100.00 %	0.02 %
Goldsboro	2	33,657	745,670	33,657	100.00 %	4.51 %
Goldston	7	234	745,671	234	100.00 %	0.03 %
Graham	7	17,157	745,671	17,157	100.00 %	2.30 %
Grandfather Village	14	95	745,670	95	100.00 %	0.01 %
Granite Falls	11	4,965	745,671	4,965	100.00 %	0.67 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-174.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:41 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Granite Quarry	10	2,984	745,671	2,984	100.00 %	0.40 %
Grantsboro	1	692	745,670	692	100.00 %	0.09 %
Greenevers	3	567	745,671	567	100.00 %	0.08 %
Green Level	7	3,152	745,671	3,152	100.00 %	0.42 %
Greensboro	7	299,035	745,671	16,830	5.63 %	2.26 %
	10	299,035	745,671	10,196	3.41 %	1.37 %
	11	299,035	745,671	272,009	90.96 %	36.48 %
Greenville	1	87,521	745,670	87,521	100.00 %	11.74 %
Gritton	1	2,448	745,670	2,448	100.00 %	0.33 %
Grimesland	1	386	745,670	386	100.00 %	0.05 %
Grover	13	802	745,671	802	100.00 %	0.11 %
Halifax	2	170	745,670	170	100.00 %	0.02 %
Hamilton	2	306	745,670	306	100.00 %	0.04 %
Hamlet	8	6,025	745,670	6,025	100.00 %	0.81 %
Harmony	12	543	745,670	543	100.00 %	0.07 %
Harrells	3	160	745,671	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	4	160	745,671	160	100.00 %	0.02 %
Harrellsville	2	85	745,670	85	100.00 %	0.01 %
Harrisburg	10	18,967	745,671	18,967	100.00 %	2.54 %
Hassell	2	49	745,670	49	100.00 %	0.01 %
Havelock	1	16,621	745,670	16,621	100.00 %	2.23 %
Haw River	7	2,252	745,671	2,252	100.00 %	0.30 %
Hayesville	14	461	745,670	461	100.00 %	0.06 %
Hemby Bridge	8	1,614	745,670	1,614	100.00 %	0.22 %
Henderson	2	15,060	745,670	15,060	100.00 %	2.02 %
Hendersonville	14	15,137	745,670	15,137	100.00 %	2.03 %
Hertford	1	1,934	745,670	1,934	100.00 %	0.26 %
Hickory	11	43,490	745,671	32	0.07 %	0.00 %
	12	43,490	745,670	43,379	99.74 %	5.82 %
	13	43,490	745,671	79	0.18 %	0.01 %
Highlands	14	1,072	745,670	1,072	100.00 %	0.14 %
High Point	7	114,059	745,671	8	0.01 %	0.00 %
	10	114,059	745,671	113,967	99.92 %	15.28 %
	12	114,059	745,670	84	0.07 %	0.01 %
High Shoals	13	595	745,671	595	100.00 %	0.08 %
Hildebran	13	1,679	745,671	1,679	100.00 %	0.23 %
Hillsborough	6	9,660	745,671	9,660	100.00 %	1.30 %
Hobgood	2	268	745,670	268	100.00 %	0.04 %
Hoffman	8	418	745,670	418	100.00 %	0.06 %
Holden Beach	3	921	745,671	921	100.00 %	0.12 %
Holly Ridge	3	4,171	745,671	4,171	100.00 %	0.56 %
Holly Springs	7	41,239	745,671	41,239	100.00 %	5.53 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-174.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:41 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

Page 6 of 15

Municipality - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Hookerton	2	413	745,670	413	100.00 %	0.06 %
Hope Mills	4	17,808	745,671	17,808	100.00 %	2.39 %
Hot Springs	14	520	745,670	520	100.00 %	0.07 %
Hudson	11	3,780	745,671	3,780	100.00 %	0.51 %
Huntersville	13	61,376	745,671	61,376	100.00 %	8.23 %
Indian Beach	1	223	745,670	223	100.00 %	0.03 %
Indian Trail	8	39,997	745,670	39,997	100.00 %	5.36 %
Jackson	2	430	745,670	430	100.00 %	0.06 %
Jacksonville	1	72,723	745,670	72,723	100.00 %	9.75 %
	3	72,723	745,671	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Jamestown	10	3,668	745,671	3,668	100.00 %	0.49 %
Jamesville	2	424	745,670	424	100.00 %	0.06 %
Jefferson	11	1,622	745,671	1,622	100.00 %	0.22 %
Jonesville	12	2,308	745,670	2,308	100.00 %	0.31 %
Kannapolis	10	53,114	745,671	53,114	100.00 %	7.12 %
Kelford	2	203	745,670	203	100.00 %	0.03 %
Kenansville	3	770	745,671	770	100.00 %	0.10 %
Kenly	2	1,491	745,670	198	13.28 %	0.03 %
	4	1,491	745,671	1,293	86.72 %	0.17 %
Kernersville	10	26,449	745,671	502	1.90 %	0.07 %
	12	26,449	745,670	25,947	98.10 %	3.48 %
Kill Devil Hills	1	7,656	745,670	7,656	100.00 %	1.03 %
King	11	7,197	745,671	6,606	91.79 %	0.89 %
	12	7,197	745,670	591	8.21 %	0.08 %
Kings Mountain	13	11,142	745,671	11,142	100.00 %	1.49 %
Kingstown	13	656	745,671	656	100.00 %	0.09 %
Kinston	1	19,900	745,670	19,900	100.00 %	2.67 %
Kittrell	2	132	745,670	132	100.00 %	0.02 %
Kitty Hawk	1	3,689	745,670	3,689	100.00 %	0.49 %
Knightdale	5	19,435	745,671	19,435	100.00 %	2.61 %
Kure Beach	3	2,191	745,671	2,191	100.00 %	0.29 %
La Grange	1	2,595	745,670	2,595	100.00 %	0.35 %
Lake Lure	13	1,365	745,671	1,365	100.00 %	0.18 %
Lake Park	8	3,269	745,670	3,269	100.00 %	0.44 %
Lake Santeetlah	14	38	745,670	38	100.00 %	0.01 %
Lake Waccamaw	3	1,296	745,671	1,296	100.00 %	0.17 %
Landis	10	3,690	745,671	3,690	100.00 %	0.49 %
Lansing	11	126	745,671	126	100.00 %	0.02 %
Lasker	2	64	745,670	64	100.00 %	0.01 %
Lattimore	13	406	745,671	406	100.00 %	0.05 %
Laurel Park	14	2,250	745,670	2,250	100.00 %	0.30 %
Laurinburg	8	14,978	745,670	14,978	100.00 %	2.01 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-174.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:41 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Lawndale	13	570	745,671	570	100.00 %	0.08 %
Leggett	2	37	745,670	37	100.00 %	0.00 %
Leland	3	22,908	745,671	22,908	100.00 %	3.07 %
Lenoir	11	18,352	745,671	18,352	100.00 %	2.46 %
Lewiston Woodville	2	426	745,670	426	100.00 %	0.06 %
Lewisville	12	13,381	745,670	13,381	100.00 %	1.79 %
Lexington	7	19,632	745,671	19,632	100.00 %	2.63 %
	10	19,632	745,671	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Liberty	7	2,655	745,671	2,655	100.00 %	0.36 %
Lilesville	8	395	745,670	395	100.00 %	0.05 %
Lillington	4	4,735	745,671	4,735	100.00 %	0.63 %
Lincolnton	12	11,091	745,670	11,091	100.00 %	1.49 %
Linden	4	136	745,671	136	100.00 %	0.02 %
Littleton	2	559	745,670	559	100.00 %	0.07 %
Locust	8	4,537	745,670	3,996	88.08 %	0.54 %
	10	4,537	745,671	541	11.92 %	0.07 %
Long View	12	5,088	745,670	4,353	85.55 %	0.58 %
	13	5,088	745,671	735	14.45 %	0.10 %
Louisburg	2	3,064	745,670	3,064	100.00 %	0.41 %
Love Valley	12	154	745,670	154	100.00 %	0.02 %
Lowell	13	3,654	745,671	3,654	100.00 %	0.49 %
Lucama	2	1,036	745,670	1,036	100.00 %	0.14 %
Lumber Bridge	3	82	745,671	82	100.00 %	0.01 %
Lumberton	3	19,025	745,671	19,025	100.00 %	2.55 %
McAdenville	13	890	745,671	890	100.00 %	0.12 %
Macclesfield	2	413	745,670	413	100.00 %	0.06 %
McDonald	3	94	745,671	94	100.00 %	0.01 %
McFarlan	8	94	745,670	94	100.00 %	0.01 %
Macon	2	110	745,670	110	100.00 %	0.01 %
Madison	11	2,129	745,671	2,129	100.00 %	0.29 %
Maggie Valley	14	1,687	745,670	1,687	100.00 %	0.23 %
Magnolia	3	831	745,671	831	100.00 %	0.11 %
Maiden	12	3,736	745,670	3,736	100.00 %	0.50 %
Manteo	1	1,600	745,670	1,600	100.00 %	0.21 %
Marietta	3	111	745,671	111	100.00 %	0.01 %
Marion	13	7,717	745,671	7,717	100.00 %	1.03 %
Marshall	14	777	745,670	777	100.00 %	0.10 %
Mars Hill	14	2,007	745,670	2,007	100.00 %	0.27 %
Marshville	8	2,522	745,670	2,522	100.00 %	0.34 %
Marvin	8	6,358	745,670	6,358	100.00 %	0.85 %
Matthews	8	29,435	745,670	29,435	100.00 %	3.95 %

Municipality - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Maxton	3	2,110	745,671	1,902	90.14 %	0.26 %
	8	2,110	745,670	208	9.86 %	0.03 %
Mayodan	11	2,418	745,671	2,418	100.00 %	0.32 %
Maysville	1	818	745,670	818	100.00 %	0.11 %
Mebane	6	17,797	745,671	3,171	17.82 %	0.43 %
	7	17,797	745,671	14,626	82.18 %	1.96 %
Mesic	1	144	745,670	144	100.00 %	0.02 %
Micro	4	458	745,671	458	100.00 %	0.06 %
Middleburg	2	101	745,670	101	100.00 %	0.01 %
Middlesex	2	912	745,670	912	100.00 %	0.12 %
Midland	8	4,684	745,670	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	10	4,684	745,671	4,684	100.00 %	0.63 %
Midway	10	4,742	745,671	4,742	100.00 %	0.64 %
Mills River	14	7,078	745,670	7,078	100.00 %	0.95 %
Milton	2	155	745,670	155	100.00 %	0.02 %
Mineral Springs	8	3,159	745,670	3,159	100.00 %	0.42 %
Minnesott Beach	1	530	745,670	530	100.00 %	0.07 %
Mint Hill	8	26,450	745,670	26,450	100.00 %	3.55 %
	9	26,450	745,670	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Misenheimer	8	650	745,670	650	100.00 %	0.09 %
Mocksville	10	5,900	745,671	5,900	100.00 %	0.79 %
Momeyer	2	277	745,670	277	100.00 %	0.04 %
Monroe	8	34,562	745,670	34,562	100.00 %	4.64 %
Montreat	14	901	745,670	901	100.00 %	0.12 %
Mooresboro	13	293	745,671	293	100.00 %	0.04 %
Mooresville	10	50,193	745,671	50,193	100.00 %	6.73 %
Morehead City	1	9,556	745,670	9,556	100.00 %	1.28 %
Morganton	13	17,474	745,671	17,474	100.00 %	2.34 %
Morrisville	6	29,630	745,671	29,630	100.00 %	3.97 %
Morven	8	329	745,670	329	100.00 %	0.04 %
Mount Airy	11	10,676	745,671	10,676	100.00 %	1.43 %
Mount Gilead	8	1,171	745,670	1,171	100.00 %	0.16 %
Mount Holly	13	17,703	745,671	17,703	100.00 %	2.37 %
Mount Olive	2	4,198	745,670	4,193	99.88 %	0.56 %
	3	4,198	745,671	5	0.12 %	0.00 %
Mount Pleasant	10	1,671	745,671	1,671	100.00 %	0.22 %
Murfreesboro	2	2,619	745,670	2,619	100.00 %	0.35 %
Murphy	14	1,608	745,670	1,608	100.00 %	0.22 %
Nags Head	1	3,168	745,670	3,168	100.00 %	0.42 %
Nashville	2	5,632	745,670	5,632	100.00 %	0.76 %
Navassa	3	1,367	745,671	1,367	100.00 %	0.18 %
New Bern	1	31,291	745,670	31,291	100.00 %	4.20 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-174.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:41 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Newland	14	715	745,670	715	100.00 %	0.10 %
New London	8	607	745,670	607	100.00 %	0.08 %
Newport	1	4,364	745,670	4,364	100.00 %	0.59 %
Newton	12	13,148	745,670	13,148	100.00 %	1.76 %
Newton Grove	4	585	745,671	585	100.00 %	0.08 %
Norlina	2	920	745,670	920	100.00 %	0.12 %
Norman	8	100	745,670	100	100.00 %	0.01 %
North Topsail Beach	3	1,005	745,671	1,005	100.00 %	0.13 %
Northwest	3	703	745,671	703	100.00 %	0.09 %
North Wilkesboro	11	4,382	745,671	4,382	100.00 %	0.59 %
Norwood	8	2,367	745,670	2,367	100.00 %	0.32 %
Oakboro	8	2,128	745,670	2,128	100.00 %	0.29 %
Oak City	2	266	745,670	266	100.00 %	0.04 %
Oak Island	3	8,396	745,671	8,396	100.00 %	1.13 %
Oak Ridge	11	7,474	745,671	7,474	100.00 %	1.00 %
Ocean Isle Beach	3	867	745,671	867	100.00 %	0.12 %
Old Fort	13	811	745,671	811	100.00 %	0.11 %
Oriental	1	880	745,670	880	100.00 %	0.12 %
Orrum	3	59	745,671	59	100.00 %	0.01 %
Ossipee	7	536	745,671	536	100.00 %	0.07 %
Oxford	2	8,628	745,670	8,628	100.00 %	1.16 %
Pantego	1	164	745,670	164	100.00 %	0.02 %
Parkton	3	504	745,671	504	100.00 %	0.07 %
Parmelee	2	243	745,670	243	100.00 %	0.03 %
Patterson Springs	13	571	745,671	571	100.00 %	0.08 %
Peachland	8	390	745,670	390	100.00 %	0.05 %
Peletier	1	769	745,670	769	100.00 %	0.10 %
Pembroke	3	2,823	745,671	2,823	100.00 %	0.38 %
Pikeville	2	712	745,670	712	100.00 %	0.10 %
Pilot Mountain	11	1,440	745,671	1,440	100.00 %	0.19 %
Pinebluff	8	1,473	745,670	1,473	100.00 %	0.20 %
Pinehurst	8	17,581	745,670	17,581	100.00 %	2.36 %
Pine Knoll Shores	1	1,388	745,670	1,388	100.00 %	0.19 %
Pine Level	4	2,046	745,671	2,046	100.00 %	0.27 %
Pinetops	2	1,200	745,670	1,200	100.00 %	0.16 %
Pineville	8	10,602	745,670	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	9	10,602	745,670	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	13	10,602	745,671	10,602	100.00 %	1.42 %
Pink Hill	1	451	745,670	451	100.00 %	0.06 %
Pittsboro	7	4,537	745,671	4,537	100.00 %	0.61 %
Pleasant Garden	7	5,000	745,671	5,000	100.00 %	0.67 %
	10	5,000	745,671	0	0.00 %	0.00 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-174.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:41 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Plymouth	2	3,320	745,670	3,320	100.00 %	0.45 %
Polkton	8	2,250	745,670	2,250	100.00 %	0.30 %
Polkville	13	516	745,671	516	100.00 %	0.07 %
Pollocksville	1	268	745,670	268	100.00 %	0.04 %
Powellsville	2	189	745,670	189	100.00 %	0.03 %
Princeton	4	1,315	745,671	1,315	100.00 %	0.18 %
Princeville	2	1,254	745,670	1,254	100.00 %	0.17 %
Proctorville	3	121	745,671	121	100.00 %	0.02 %
Raeford	8	4,559	745,670	4,559	100.00 %	0.61 %
Raleigh	5	467,665	745,671	466,106	99.67 %	62.51 %
	6	467,665	745,671	1,559	0.33 %	0.21 %
Ramseur	7	1,774	745,671	1,774	100.00 %	0.24 %
Randleman	7	4,595	745,671	4,595	100.00 %	0.62 %
Ranlo	13	4,511	745,671	4,511	100.00 %	0.60 %
Raynham	3	60	745,671	60	100.00 %	0.01 %
Red Cross	8	762	745,670	762	100.00 %	0.10 %
Red Oak	2	3,342	745,670	3,342	100.00 %	0.45 %
Red Springs	3	3,087	745,671	3,087	100.00 %	0.41 %
	8	3,087	745,670	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Reidsville	11	14,583	745,671	14,583	100.00 %	1.96 %
Rennert	3	275	745,671	275	100.00 %	0.04 %
Rhodhiss	11	997	745,671	358	35.91 %	0.05 %
	13	997	745,671	639	64.09 %	0.09 %
Richfield	8	582	745,670	582	100.00 %	0.08 %
Richlands	3	2,287	745,671	2,287	100.00 %	0.31 %
Rich Square	2	894	745,670	894	100.00 %	0.12 %
River Bend	1	2,902	745,670	2,902	100.00 %	0.39 %
Roanoke Rapids	2	15,229	745,670	15,229	100.00 %	2.04 %
Robbins	8	1,168	745,670	1,168	100.00 %	0.16 %
Robbinsville	14	597	745,670	597	100.00 %	0.08 %
Robersonville	2	1,269	745,670	1,269	100.00 %	0.17 %
Rockingham	8	9,243	745,670	9,243	100.00 %	1.24 %
Rockwell	10	2,302	745,671	2,302	100.00 %	0.31 %
Rocky Mount	2	54,341	745,670	54,341	100.00 %	7.29 %
Rolesville	5	9,475	745,671	9,475	100.00 %	1.27 %
Ronda	11	438	745,671	438	100.00 %	0.06 %
Roper	2	485	745,670	485	100.00 %	0.07 %
Roseboro	4	1,163	745,671	1,163	100.00 %	0.16 %
Rose Hill	3	1,371	745,671	1,371	100.00 %	0.18 %
Rosman	14	701	745,670	701	100.00 %	0.09 %
Rowland	3	885	745,671	885	100.00 %	0.12 %
Roxboro	2	8,134	745,670	8,134	100.00 %	1.09 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-174.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:41 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Roxobel	2	187	745,670	187	100.00 %	0.03 %
Rural Hall	12	3,351	745,670	3,351	100.00 %	0.45 %
Ruth	13	347	745,671	347	100.00 %	0.05 %
Rutherford College	11	1,226	745,671	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	13	1,226	745,671	1,226	100.00 %	0.16 %
Rutherfordton	13	3,640	745,671	3,640	100.00 %	0.49 %
St. Helena	3	417	745,671	417	100.00 %	0.06 %
St. James	3	6,529	745,671	6,529	100.00 %	0.88 %
St. Pauls	3	2,045	745,671	2,045	100.00 %	0.27 %
Salemburg	4	457	745,671	457	100.00 %	0.06 %
Salisbury	10	35,540	745,671	35,540	100.00 %	4.77 %
Saluda	13	631	745,671	620	98.26 %	0.08 %
	14	631	745,670	11	1.74 %	0.00 %
Sandy Creek	3	248	745,671	248	100.00 %	0.03 %
Sandyfield	3	430	745,671	430	100.00 %	0.06 %
Sanford	7	30,261	745,671	30,261	100.00 %	4.06 %
Saratoga	2	353	745,670	353	100.00 %	0.05 %
Sawmills	11	5,020	745,671	5,020	100.00 %	0.67 %
Scotland Neck	2	1,640	745,670	1,640	100.00 %	0.22 %
Seaboard	2	542	745,670	542	100.00 %	0.07 %
Seagrove	7	235	745,671	235	100.00 %	0.03 %
Sedalia	7	676	745,671	676	100.00 %	0.09 %
Selma	4	6,317	745,671	6,317	100.00 %	0.85 %
Seven Devils	11	313	745,671	275	87.86 %	0.04 %
	14	313	745,670	38	12.14 %	0.01 %
Seven Springs	2	55	745,670	55	100.00 %	0.01 %
Severn	2	191	745,670	191	100.00 %	0.03 %
Shallotte	3	4,185	745,671	4,185	100.00 %	0.56 %
Sharpsburg	2	1,697	745,670	1,697	100.00 %	0.23 %
Shelby	13	21,918	745,671	21,918	100.00 %	2.94 %
Siler City	7	7,702	745,671	7,702	100.00 %	1.03 %
Simpson	1	390	745,670	390	100.00 %	0.05 %
Sims	2	275	745,670	275	100.00 %	0.04 %
Smithfield	4	11,292	745,671	11,292	100.00 %	1.51 %
Snow Hill	2	1,481	745,670	1,481	100.00 %	0.20 %
Southern Pines	8	15,545	745,670	15,545	100.00 %	2.08 %
Southern Shores	1	3,090	745,670	3,090	100.00 %	0.41 %
Southport	3	3,971	745,671	3,971	100.00 %	0.53 %
Sparta	11	1,834	745,671	1,834	100.00 %	0.25 %
Speed	2	63	745,670	63	100.00 %	0.01 %
Spencer	10	3,308	745,671	3,308	100.00 %	0.44 %
Spencer Mountain	13	0	745,671	0	0.00 %	0.00 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-174.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:41 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Spindale	13	4,225	745,671	4,225	100.00 %	0.57 %
Spring Hope	2	1,309	745,670	1,309	100.00 %	0.18 %
Spring Lake	4	11,660	745,671	11,660	100.00 %	1.56 %
Spruce Pine	14	2,194	745,670	2,194	100.00 %	0.29 %
Staley	7	397	745,671	397	100.00 %	0.05 %
Stallings	8	16,112	745,670	16,112	100.00 %	2.16 %
Stanfield	8	1,585	745,670	1,585	100.00 %	0.21 %
Stanley	13	3,963	745,671	3,963	100.00 %	0.53 %
Stantonsburg	2	762	745,670	762	100.00 %	0.10 %
Star	8	806	745,670	806	100.00 %	0.11 %
Statesville	10	28,419	745,671	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	12	28,419	745,670	28,419	100.00 %	3.81 %
Stedman	4	1,277	745,671	1,277	100.00 %	0.17 %
Stem	2	960	745,670	960	100.00 %	0.13 %
Stokesdale	11	5,924	745,671	5,924	100.00 %	0.79 %
Stoneville	11	1,308	745,671	1,308	100.00 %	0.18 %
Stonewall	1	214	745,670	214	100.00 %	0.03 %
Stovall	2	324	745,670	324	100.00 %	0.04 %
Sugar Mountain	14	371	745,670	371	100.00 %	0.05 %
Summerfield	11	10,951	745,671	10,951	100.00 %	1.47 %
Sunset Beach	3	4,175	745,671	4,175	100.00 %	0.56 %
Surf City	3	3,867	745,671	3,867	100.00 %	0.52 %
Swansboro	1	3,744	745,670	3,744	100.00 %	0.50 %
Sweepsonville	7	2,445	745,671	2,445	100.00 %	0.33 %
Sylva	14	2,578	745,670	2,578	100.00 %	0.35 %
Tabor City	3	3,781	745,671	3,781	100.00 %	0.51 %
Tarboro	2	10,721	745,670	10,721	100.00 %	1.44 %
Tar Heel	3	90	745,671	90	100.00 %	0.01 %
Taylorsville	11	2,320	745,671	2,320	100.00 %	0.31 %
Taylortown	8	634	745,670	634	100.00 %	0.09 %
Teachey	3	448	745,671	448	100.00 %	0.06 %
Thomasville	7	27,183	745,671	27,183	100.00 %	3.65 %
Tobaccoville	11	2,578	745,671	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	12	2,578	745,670	2,578	100.00 %	0.35 %
Topsail Beach	3	461	745,671	461	100.00 %	0.06 %
Trenton	1	238	745,670	238	100.00 %	0.03 %
Trent Woods	1	4,074	745,670	4,074	100.00 %	0.55 %
Trinity	7	7,006	745,671	7,006	100.00 %	0.94 %
Troutman	10	3,698	745,671	3,698	100.00 %	0.50 %
Troy	8	2,850	745,670	2,850	100.00 %	0.38 %
Tryon	13	1,562	745,671	1,562	100.00 %	0.21 %
Turkey	4	213	745,671	213	100.00 %	0.03 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-174.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:41 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

Page 13 of 15

Municipality - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Unionville	8	6,643	745,670	6,643	100.00 %	0.89 %
Valdese	13	4,689	745,671	4,689	100.00 %	0.63 %
Vanceboro	1	869	745,670	869	100.00 %	0.12 %
Vandemere	1	246	745,670	246	100.00 %	0.03 %
Varnantown	3	525	745,671	525	100.00 %	0.07 %
Vass	8	952	745,670	952	100.00 %	0.13 %
Waco	13	310	745,671	310	100.00 %	0.04 %
Wade	4	638	745,671	638	100.00 %	0.09 %
Wadesboro	8	5,008	745,670	5,008	100.00 %	0.67 %
Wagram	8	615	745,670	615	100.00 %	0.08 %
Wake Forest	2	47,601	745,670	1,504	3.16 %	0.20 %
	5	47,601	745,671	46,097	96.84 %	6.18 %
Walkertown	12	5,692	745,670	5,692	100.00 %	0.76 %
Wallace	3	3,413	745,671	3,413	100.00 %	0.46 %
Wallburg	10	3,051	745,671	3,051	100.00 %	0.41 %
Walnut Cove	11	1,586	745,671	1,586	100.00 %	0.21 %
Walnut Creek	2	1,084	745,670	1,084	100.00 %	0.15 %
Walstonburg	2	193	745,670	193	100.00 %	0.03 %
Warrenton	2	851	745,670	851	100.00 %	0.11 %
Warsaw	3	2,733	745,671	2,733	100.00 %	0.37 %
Washington	1	9,875	745,670	9,875	100.00 %	1.32 %
Washington Park	1	392	745,670	392	100.00 %	0.05 %
Watha	3	181	745,671	181	100.00 %	0.02 %
Waxhaw	8	20,534	745,670	20,534	100.00 %	2.75 %
Waynesville	14	10,140	745,670	10,140	100.00 %	1.36 %
Weaverville	14	4,567	745,670	4,567	100.00 %	0.61 %
Webster	14	372	745,670	372	100.00 %	0.05 %
Weddington	8	13,181	745,670	13,181	100.00 %	1.77 %
Weldon	2	1,444	745,670	1,444	100.00 %	0.19 %
Wendell	5	9,793	745,671	9,793	100.00 %	1.31 %
Wentworth	11	2,662	745,671	2,662	100.00 %	0.36 %
Wesley Chapel	8	8,681	745,670	8,681	100.00 %	1.16 %
West Jefferson	11	1,279	745,671	1,279	100.00 %	0.17 %
Whispering Pines	8	4,987	745,670	4,987	100.00 %	0.67 %
Whitakers	2	627	745,670	627	100.00 %	0.08 %
White Lake	3	843	745,671	843	100.00 %	0.11 %
Whiteville	3	4,766	745,671	4,766	100.00 %	0.64 %
Whitsett	7	584	745,671	584	100.00 %	0.08 %
Wilkesboro	11	3,687	745,671	3,687	100.00 %	0.49 %
Williamston	2	5,248	745,670	5,248	100.00 %	0.70 %
Wilmington	3	115,451	745,671	115,451	100.00 %	15.48 %
Wilson	2	47,851	745,670	47,851	100.00 %	6.42 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-174.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:41 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Wilson's Mills	4	2,534	745,671	2,534	100.00 %	0.34 %
Windsor	2	3,582	745,670	3,582	100.00 %	0.48 %
Winfall	1	555	745,670	555	100.00 %	0.07 %
Wingate	8	4,055	745,670	4,055	100.00 %	0.54 %
Winston-Salem	12	249,545	745,670	249,545	100.00 %	33.47 %
Winterville	1	10,462	745,670	10,462	100.00 %	1.40 %
Winton	2	629	745,670	629	100.00 %	0.08 %
Woodfin	14	7,936	745,670	7,936	100.00 %	1.06 %
Woodland	2	557	745,670	557	100.00 %	0.07 %
Wrightsville Beach	3	2,473	745,671	2,473	100.00 %	0.33 %
Yadkinville	12	2,995	745,670	2,995	100.00 %	0.40 %
Yanceyville	2	1,937	745,670	1,937	100.00 %	0.26 %
Youngsville	2	2,016	745,670	2,016	100.00 %	0.27 %
Zebulon	4	6,903	745,671	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	5	6,903	745,671	6,903	100.00 %	0.93 %
Assigned Geography Total:				6,017,605		

Report display: all municipalities

Total Municipalities Statewide: 553

Fully Assigned Municipalities: 553

Partially Assigned Municipalities: 0

Fully Unassigned Municipalities: 0

Total Districts Assigned: 14

Split Municipalities: 42

Splits Involving Population: 23

Municipality by County - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Aberdeen	8	8,516	745,670	8,516	100.00 %	1.14 %
Ahoskie	2	4,891	745,670	4,891	100.00 %	0.66 %
Alamance	7	988	745,671	988	100.00 %	0.13 %
Albemarle	8	16,432	745,670	16,432	100.00 %	2.20 %
Alliance	1	733	745,670	733	100.00 %	0.10 %
Andrews	14	1,667	745,670	1,667	100.00 %	0.22 %
Angier (Harnett)	4	4,709	745,671	4,709	100.00 %	0.63 %
Angier (Wake)	7	556	745,671	556	100.00 %	0.07 %
Ansonville	8	440	745,670	440	100.00 %	0.06 %
Apex	6	58,780	745,671	58,780	100.00 %	7.88 %
	7	58,780	745,671	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Arapahoe	1	416	745,670	416	100.00 %	0.06 %
Archdale (Guilford)	10	380	745,671	380	100.00 %	0.05 %
Archdale (Randolph)	7	11,527	745,671	11,527	100.00 %	1.55 %
Archer Lodge	4	4,797	745,671	4,797	100.00 %	0.64 %
Asheboro	7	27,156	745,671	27,156	100.00 %	3.64 %
Asheville	14	94,589	745,670	94,589	100.00 %	12.69 %
Askewville	2	184	745,670	184	100.00 %	0.02 %
Atkinson	3	296	745,671	296	100.00 %	0.04 %
Atlantic Beach	1	1,364	745,670	1,364	100.00 %	0.18 %
Aulander	2	763	745,670	763	100.00 %	0.10 %
Aurora	1	455	745,670	455	100.00 %	0.06 %
Autryville	4	167	745,671	167	100.00 %	0.02 %
Ayden	1	4,977	745,670	4,977	100.00 %	0.67 %
Badin	8	2,024	745,670	2,024	100.00 %	0.27 %
Bailey	2	568	745,670	568	100.00 %	0.08 %
Bakersville	14	450	745,670	450	100.00 %	0.06 %
Bald Head Island	3	268	745,671	268	100.00 %	0.04 %
Banner Elk	14	1,049	745,670	1,049	100.00 %	0.14 %
Bath	1	245	745,670	245	100.00 %	0.03 %
Bayboro	1	1,161	745,670	1,161	100.00 %	0.16 %
Bear Grass	2	89	745,670	89	100.00 %	0.01 %
Beaufort	1	4,464	745,670	4,464	100.00 %	0.60 %
Beech Mountain (Avery)	14	62	745,670	62	100.00 %	0.01 %
Beech Mountain (Watauga)	14	613	745,670	613	100.00 %	0.08 %
Belhaven	1	1,410	745,670	1,410	100.00 %	0.19 %
Belmont	13	15,010	745,671	15,010	100.00 %	2.01 %
Belville	3	2,406	745,671	2,406	100.00 %	0.32 %
Belwood	13	857	745,671	857	100.00 %	0.11 %
Benson (Harnett)	4	0	745,671	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Benson (Johnston)	4	3,967	745,671	3,967	100.00 %	0.53 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-174.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:41 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality by County - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Bermuda Run	10	3,120	745,671	3,120	100.00 %	0.42 %
Bessemer City	13	5,428	745,671	5,428	100.00 %	0.73 %
Bethania	12	344	745,670	344	100.00 %	0.05 %
Bethel	2	1,373	745,670	1,373	100.00 %	0.18 %
Beulaville	3	1,116	745,671	1,116	100.00 %	0.15 %
Biltmore Forest	14	1,409	745,670	1,409	100.00 %	0.19 %
Biscoe	8	1,848	745,670	1,848	100.00 %	0.25 %
Black Creek	2	692	745,670	692	100.00 %	0.09 %
Black Mountain	14	8,426	745,670	8,426	100.00 %	1.13 %
Bladenboro	3	1,648	745,671	1,648	100.00 %	0.22 %
Blowing Rock (Caldwell)	11	91	745,671	91	100.00 %	0.01 %
Blowing Rock (Watauga)	14	1,285	745,670	1,285	100.00 %	0.17 %
Boardman	3	166	745,671	166	100.00 %	0.02 %
Bogue	1	695	745,670	695	100.00 %	0.09 %
Boiling Spring Lakes	3	5,943	745,671	5,943	100.00 %	0.80 %
Boiling Springs	13	4,615	745,671	4,615	100.00 %	0.62 %
Bolivia	3	149	745,671	149	100.00 %	0.02 %
Bolton	3	519	745,671	519	100.00 %	0.07 %
Boone	14	19,092	745,670	19,092	100.00 %	2.56 %
Boonville	12	1,185	745,670	1,185	100.00 %	0.16 %
Bostic	13	355	745,671	355	100.00 %	0.05 %
Brevard	14	7,744	745,670	7,744	100.00 %	1.04 %
Bridgeton	1	349	745,670	349	100.00 %	0.05 %
Broadway (Harnett)	4	0	745,671	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Broadway (Lee)	7	1,267	745,671	1,267	100.00 %	0.17 %
Brookford	12	442	745,670	442	100.00 %	0.06 %
Brunswick	3	973	745,671	973	100.00 %	0.13 %
Bryson City	14	1,558	745,670	1,558	100.00 %	0.21 %
Bunn	2	327	745,670	327	100.00 %	0.04 %
Burgaw	3	3,088	745,671	3,088	100.00 %	0.41 %
Burlington (Alamance)	7	55,481	745,671	55,481	100.00 %	7.44 %
Burlington (Guilford)	7	1,822	745,671	1,822	100.00 %	0.24 %
Burnsville	14	1,614	745,670	1,614	100.00 %	0.22 %
Butner	2	8,397	745,670	8,397	100.00 %	1.13 %
Cajah's Mountain	11	2,722	745,671	2,722	100.00 %	0.37 %
Calabash	3	2,011	745,671	2,011	100.00 %	0.27 %
Calypso	3	327	745,671	327	100.00 %	0.04 %
Cameron	8	244	745,670	244	100.00 %	0.03 %
Candor (Montgomery)	8	813	745,670	813	100.00 %	0.11 %
Candor (Moore)	8	0	745,670	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Canton	14	4,422	745,670	4,422	100.00 %	0.59 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-174.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:41 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality by County - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Cape Carteret	1	2,224	745,670	2,224	100.00 %	0.30 %
Carolina Beach	3	6,564	745,671	6,564	100.00 %	0.88 %
Carolina Shores	3	4,588	745,671	4,588	100.00 %	0.62 %
Carrboro	6	21,295	745,671	21,295	100.00 %	2.86 %
Carthage	8	2,775	745,670	2,775	100.00 %	0.37 %
Cary (Chatham)	7	3,709	745,671	3,709	100.00 %	0.50 %
Cary (Wake)	5	171,012	745,671	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	6	171,012	745,671	171,012	100.00 %	22.93 %
	7	171,012	745,671	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Casar	13	305	745,671	305	100.00 %	0.04 %
Castalia	2	264	745,670	264	100.00 %	0.04 %
Caswell Beach	3	395	745,671	395	100.00 %	0.05 %
Catawba	12	702	745,670	702	100.00 %	0.09 %
Cedar Point	1	1,764	745,670	1,764	100.00 %	0.24 %
Cedar Rock	11	301	745,671	301	100.00 %	0.04 %
Cerro Gordo	3	131	745,671	131	100.00 %	0.02 %
Chadbourn	3	1,574	745,671	1,574	100.00 %	0.21 %
Chapel Hill (Durham)	6	2,906	745,671	2,906	100.00 %	0.39 %
Chapel Hill (Orange)	6	59,054	745,671	59,054	100.00 %	7.92 %
Charlotte	8	874,579	745,670	103,002	11.78 %	13.81 %
	9	874,579	745,670	722,091	82.56 %	96.84 %
	13	874,579	745,671	49,486	5.66 %	6.64 %
Cherryville	13	6,078	745,671	6,078	100.00 %	0.82 %
Chimney Rock Village	13	140	745,671	140	100.00 %	0.02 %
China Grove	10	4,434	745,671	4,434	100.00 %	0.59 %
Chocowinity	1	722	745,670	722	100.00 %	0.10 %
Claremont	12	1,692	745,670	1,692	100.00 %	0.23 %
Clarkton	3	614	745,671	614	100.00 %	0.08 %
Clayton (Johnston)	4	26,307	745,671	26,307	100.00 %	3.53 %
Clayton (Wake)	5	0	745,671	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Clemmons	12	21,163	745,670	21,163	100.00 %	2.84 %
Cleveland	10	846	745,671	846	100.00 %	0.11 %
Clinton	4	8,383	745,671	8,383	100.00 %	1.12 %
Clyde	14	1,368	745,670	1,368	100.00 %	0.18 %
Coats	4	2,155	745,671	2,155	100.00 %	0.29 %
Cofield	2	267	745,670	267	100.00 %	0.04 %
Colerain	2	217	745,670	217	100.00 %	0.03 %
Columbia	1	610	745,670	610	100.00 %	0.08 %
Columbus	13	1,060	745,671	1,060	100.00 %	0.14 %
Como	2	67	745,670	67	100.00 %	0.01 %
Concord	10	105,240	745,671	105,240	100.00 %	14.11 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-174.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:41 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality by County - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Conetoe	2	198	745,670	198	100.00 %	0.03 %
Connelly Springs	13	1,529	745,671	1,529	100.00 %	0.21 %
Conover	12	8,421	745,670	8,421	100.00 %	1.13 %
Conway	2	752	745,670	752	100.00 %	0.10 %
Cooleemee	10	940	745,671	940	100.00 %	0.13 %
Cornelius	13	31,412	745,671	31,412	100.00 %	4.21 %
Cove City	1	378	745,670	378	100.00 %	0.05 %
Cramerton	13	5,296	745,671	5,296	100.00 %	0.71 %
Creedmoor	2	4,866	745,670	4,866	100.00 %	0.65 %
Creswell	2	207	745,670	207	100.00 %	0.03 %
Crossnore	14	143	745,670	143	100.00 %	0.02 %
Dallas	13	5,927	745,671	5,927	100.00 %	0.79 %
Danbury	11	189	745,671	189	100.00 %	0.03 %
Davidson (Iredell)	10	378	745,671	378	100.00 %	0.05 %
Davidson (Mecklenburg)	13	14,728	745,671	14,728	100.00 %	1.98 %
Dellview	13	6	745,671	6	100.00 %	0.00 %
Denton	7	1,494	745,671	1,494	100.00 %	0.20 %
	10	1,494	745,671	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Dillsboro	14	213	745,670	213	100.00 %	0.03 %
Dobbins Heights	8	687	745,670	687	100.00 %	0.09 %
Dobson	11	1,462	745,671	1,462	100.00 %	0.20 %
Dortches	2	1,082	745,670	1,082	100.00 %	0.15 %
Dover	1	349	745,670	349	100.00 %	0.05 %
Drexel	13	1,760	745,671	1,760	100.00 %	0.24 %
Dublin	3	267	745,671	267	100.00 %	0.04 %
Duck	1	742	745,670	742	100.00 %	0.10 %
Dunn	4	8,446	745,671	8,446	100.00 %	1.13 %
Durham (Durham)	6	283,093	745,671	283,093	100.00 %	37.96 %
Durham (Orange)	6	144	745,671	144	100.00 %	0.02 %
Durham (Wake)	5	269	745,671	269	100.00 %	0.04 %
	6	269	745,671	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Earl	13	198	745,671	198	100.00 %	0.03 %
East Arcadia	3	418	745,671	418	100.00 %	0.06 %
East Bend	12	634	745,670	634	100.00 %	0.09 %
East Laurinburg	8	234	745,670	234	100.00 %	0.03 %
East Spencer	10	1,567	745,671	1,567	100.00 %	0.21 %
Eastover	4	3,656	745,671	3,656	100.00 %	0.49 %
Eden	11	15,421	745,671	15,421	100.00 %	2.07 %
Edenton	1	4,460	745,670	4,460	100.00 %	0.60 %
Elizabeth City (Camden)	1	38	745,670	38	100.00 %	0.01 %
Elizabeth City (Pasquotank)	1	18,593	745,670	18,593	100.00 %	2.49 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-174.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:41 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Elizabethtown	3	3,296	745,671	3,296	100.00 %	0.44 %
Elk Park	14	542	745,670	542	100.00 %	0.07 %
Elkin (Surry)	11	4,049	745,671	4,049	100.00 %	0.54 %
Elkin (Wilkes)	11	73	745,671	73	100.00 %	0.01 %
Ellenboro	13	723	745,671	723	100.00 %	0.10 %
Ellerbe	8	864	745,670	864	100.00 %	0.12 %
Elm City (Nash)	2	0	745,670	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Elm City (Wilson)	2	1,218	745,670	1,218	100.00 %	0.16 %
Elon	7	11,336	745,671	11,336	100.00 %	1.52 %
Emerald Isle	1	3,847	745,670	3,847	100.00 %	0.52 %
Enfield	2	1,865	745,670	1,865	100.00 %	0.25 %
Erwin	4	4,542	745,671	4,542	100.00 %	0.61 %
Eureka	2	214	745,670	214	100.00 %	0.03 %
Everetts	2	150	745,670	150	100.00 %	0.02 %
Fair Bluff	3	709	745,671	709	100.00 %	0.10 %
Fairmont	3	2,191	745,671	2,191	100.00 %	0.29 %
Fairview	8	3,456	745,670	3,456	100.00 %	0.46 %
Faison (Duplin)	3	784	745,671	784	100.00 %	0.11 %
Faison (Sampson)	4	0	745,671	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Faith	10	819	745,671	819	100.00 %	0.11 %
Falcon (Cumberland)	4	324	745,671	324	100.00 %	0.04 %
Falcon (Sampson)	4	0	745,671	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Falkland	1	47	745,670	47	100.00 %	0.01 %
Fallston	13	627	745,671	627	100.00 %	0.08 %
Farmville	1	4,461	745,670	4,461	100.00 %	0.60 %
Fayetteville	4	208,501	745,671	208,501	100.00 %	27.96 %
Flat Rock	14	3,486	745,670	3,486	100.00 %	0.47 %
Fletcher	14	7,987	745,670	7,987	100.00 %	1.07 %
Fontana Dam	14	13	745,670	13	100.00 %	0.00 %
Forest City	13	7,377	745,671	7,377	100.00 %	0.99 %
Forest Hills	14	303	745,670	303	100.00 %	0.04 %
Fountain	1	385	745,670	385	100.00 %	0.05 %
Four Oaks	4	2,158	745,671	2,158	100.00 %	0.29 %
Foxfire	8	1,288	745,670	1,288	100.00 %	0.17 %
Franklin	14	4,175	745,670	4,175	100.00 %	0.56 %
Franklinton	2	2,456	745,670	2,456	100.00 %	0.33 %
Franklinville	7	1,197	745,671	1,197	100.00 %	0.16 %
Fremont	2	1,196	745,670	1,196	100.00 %	0.16 %
Fuquay-Varina (Harnett)	7	0	745,671	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Fuquay-Varina (Wake)	5	34,152	745,671	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	7	34,152	745,671	34,152	100.00 %	4.58 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-174.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:41 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Gamewell	11	3,702	745,671	3,702	100.00 %	0.50 %
Garland	4	595	745,671	595	100.00 %	0.08 %
Garner	5	31,159	745,671	31,159	100.00 %	4.18 %
	7	31,159	745,671	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Garysburg	2	904	745,670	904	100.00 %	0.12 %
Gaston	2	1,008	745,670	1,008	100.00 %	0.14 %
Gastonia	13	80,411	745,671	80,411	100.00 %	10.78 %
Gatesville	1	267	745,670	267	100.00 %	0.04 %
Gibson	8	449	745,670	449	100.00 %	0.06 %
Gibsonville (Alamance)	7	4,278	745,671	4,278	100.00 %	0.57 %
Gibsonville (Guilford)	7	4,642	745,671	4,642	100.00 %	0.62 %
Glen Alpine	13	1,529	745,671	1,529	100.00 %	0.21 %
Godwin	4	128	745,671	128	100.00 %	0.02 %
Goldsboro	2	33,657	745,670	33,657	100.00 %	4.51 %
Goldston	7	234	745,671	234	100.00 %	0.03 %
Graham	7	17,157	745,671	17,157	100.00 %	2.30 %
Grandfather Village	14	95	745,670	95	100.00 %	0.01 %
Granite Falls	11	4,965	745,671	4,965	100.00 %	0.67 %
Granite Quarry	10	2,984	745,671	2,984	100.00 %	0.40 %
Grantsboro	1	692	745,670	692	100.00 %	0.09 %
Green Level	7	3,152	745,671	3,152	100.00 %	0.42 %
Greenevers	3	567	745,671	567	100.00 %	0.08 %
Greensboro	7	299,035	745,671	16,830	5.63 %	2.26 %
	10	299,035	745,671	10,196	3.41 %	1.37 %
	11	299,035	745,671	272,009	90.96 %	36.48 %
Greenville	1	87,521	745,670	87,521	100.00 %	11.74 %
Grifton (Lenoir)	1	147	745,670	147	100.00 %	0.02 %
Grifton (Pitt)	1	2,301	745,670	2,301	100.00 %	0.31 %
Grimesland	1	386	745,670	386	100.00 %	0.05 %
Grover	13	802	745,671	802	100.00 %	0.11 %
Halifax	2	170	745,670	170	100.00 %	0.02 %
Hamilton	2	306	745,670	306	100.00 %	0.04 %
Hamlet	8	6,025	745,670	6,025	100.00 %	0.81 %
Harmony	12	543	745,670	543	100.00 %	0.07 %
Harrells (Duplin)	3	0	745,671	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Harrells (Sampson)	4	160	745,671	160	100.00 %	0.02 %
Harrellsville	2	85	745,670	85	100.00 %	0.01 %
Harrisburg	10	18,967	745,671	18,967	100.00 %	2.54 %
Hassell	2	49	745,670	49	100.00 %	0.01 %
Havelock	1	16,621	745,670	16,621	100.00 %	2.23 %
Haw River	7	2,252	745,671	2,252	100.00 %	0.30 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-174.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:41 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality by County - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Hayesville	14	461	745,670	461	100.00 %	0.06 %
Hemby Bridge	8	1,614	745,670	1,614	100.00 %	0.22 %
Henderson	2	15,060	745,670	15,060	100.00 %	2.02 %
Hendersonville	14	15,137	745,670	15,137	100.00 %	2.03 %
Hertford	1	1,934	745,670	1,934	100.00 %	0.26 %
Hickory (Burke)	13	79	745,671	79	100.00 %	0.01 %
Hickory (Caldwell)	11	32	745,671	32	100.00 %	0.00 %
Hickory (Catawba)	12	43,379	745,670	43,379	100.00 %	5.82 %
High Point (Davidson)	10	6,646	745,671	6,646	100.00 %	0.89 %
High Point (Forsyth)	12	84	745,670	84	100.00 %	0.01 %
High Point (Guilford)	10	107,321	745,671	107,321	100.00 %	14.39 %
High Point (Randolph)	7	8	745,671	8	100.00 %	0.00 %
High Shoals	13	595	745,671	595	100.00 %	0.08 %
Highlands (Jackson)	14	12	745,670	12	100.00 %	0.00 %
Highlands (Macon)	14	1,060	745,670	1,060	100.00 %	0.14 %
Hildebran	13	1,679	745,671	1,679	100.00 %	0.23 %
Hillsborough	6	9,660	745,671	9,660	100.00 %	1.30 %
Hobgood	2	268	745,670	268	100.00 %	0.04 %
Hoffman	8	418	745,670	418	100.00 %	0.06 %
Holden Beach	3	921	745,671	921	100.00 %	0.12 %
Holly Ridge	3	4,171	745,671	4,171	100.00 %	0.56 %
Holly Springs	7	41,239	745,671	41,239	100.00 %	5.53 %
Hookerton	2	413	745,670	413	100.00 %	0.06 %
Hope Mills	4	17,808	745,671	17,808	100.00 %	2.39 %
Hot Springs	14	520	745,670	520	100.00 %	0.07 %
Hudson	11	3,780	745,671	3,780	100.00 %	0.51 %
Huntersville	13	61,376	745,671	61,376	100.00 %	8.23 %
Indian Beach	1	223	745,670	223	100.00 %	0.03 %
Indian Trail	8	39,997	745,670	39,997	100.00 %	5.36 %
Jackson	2	430	745,670	430	100.00 %	0.06 %
Jacksonville	1	72,723	745,670	72,723	100.00 %	9.75 %
	3	72,723	745,671	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Jamestown	10	3,668	745,671	3,668	100.00 %	0.49 %
Jamesville	2	424	745,670	424	100.00 %	0.06 %
Jefferson	11	1,622	745,671	1,622	100.00 %	0.22 %
Jonesville	12	2,308	745,670	2,308	100.00 %	0.31 %
Kannapolis (Cabarrus)	10	42,846	745,671	42,846	100.00 %	5.75 %
Kannapolis (Rowan)	10	10,268	745,671	10,268	100.00 %	1.38 %
Kelford	2	203	745,670	203	100.00 %	0.03 %
Kenansville	3	770	745,671	770	100.00 %	0.10 %
Kenly (Johnston)	4	1,293	745,671	1,293	100.00 %	0.17 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-174.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:41 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality by County - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Kenly (Wilson)	2	198	745,670	198	100.00 %	0.03 %
Kernersville (Forsyth)	12	25,947	745,670	25,947	100.00 %	3.48 %
Kernersville (Guilford)	10	502	745,671	502	100.00 %	0.07 %
Kill Devil Hills	1	7,656	745,670	7,656	100.00 %	1.03 %
King (Forsyth)	12	591	745,670	591	100.00 %	0.08 %
King (Stokes)	11	6,606	745,671	6,606	100.00 %	0.89 %
Kings Mountain (Cleveland)	13	10,032	745,671	10,032	100.00 %	1.35 %
Kings Mountain (Gaston)	13	1,110	745,671	1,110	100.00 %	0.15 %
Kingstown	13	656	745,671	656	100.00 %	0.09 %
Kinston	1	19,900	745,670	19,900	100.00 %	2.67 %
Kittrell	2	132	745,670	132	100.00 %	0.02 %
Kitty Hawk	1	3,689	745,670	3,689	100.00 %	0.49 %
Knightdale	5	19,435	745,671	19,435	100.00 %	2.61 %
Kure Beach	3	2,191	745,671	2,191	100.00 %	0.29 %
La Grange	1	2,595	745,670	2,595	100.00 %	0.35 %
Lake Lure	13	1,365	745,671	1,365	100.00 %	0.18 %
Lake Park	8	3,269	745,670	3,269	100.00 %	0.44 %
Lake Santeetlah	14	38	745,670	38	100.00 %	0.01 %
Lake Waccamaw	3	1,296	745,671	1,296	100.00 %	0.17 %
Landis	10	3,690	745,671	3,690	100.00 %	0.49 %
Lansing	11	126	745,671	126	100.00 %	0.02 %
Lasker	2	64	745,670	64	100.00 %	0.01 %
Lattimore	13	406	745,671	406	100.00 %	0.05 %
Laurel Park	14	2,250	745,670	2,250	100.00 %	0.30 %
Laurinburg	8	14,978	745,670	14,978	100.00 %	2.01 %
Lawndale	13	570	745,671	570	100.00 %	0.08 %
Leggett	2	37	745,670	37	100.00 %	0.00 %
Leland	3	22,908	745,671	22,908	100.00 %	3.07 %
Lenoir	11	18,352	745,671	18,352	100.00 %	2.46 %
Lewiston Woodville	2	426	745,670	426	100.00 %	0.06 %
Lewisville	12	13,381	745,670	13,381	100.00 %	1.79 %
Lexington	7	19,632	745,671	19,632	100.00 %	2.63 %
	10	19,632	745,671	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Liberty	7	2,655	745,671	2,655	100.00 %	0.36 %
Lilesville	8	395	745,670	395	100.00 %	0.05 %
Lillington	4	4,735	745,671	4,735	100.00 %	0.63 %
Lincolnton	12	11,091	745,670	11,091	100.00 %	1.49 %
Linden	4	136	745,671	136	100.00 %	0.02 %
Littleton	2	559	745,670	559	100.00 %	0.07 %
Locust (Cabarrus)	10	541	745,671	541	100.00 %	0.07 %
Locust (Stanly)	8	3,996	745,670	3,996	100.00 %	0.54 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-174.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:41 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality by County - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Long View (Burke)	13	735	745,671	735	100.00 %	0.10 %
Long View (Catawba)	12	4,353	745,670	4,353	100.00 %	0.58 %
Louisburg	2	3,064	745,670	3,064	100.00 %	0.41 %
Love Valley	12	154	745,670	154	100.00 %	0.02 %
Lowell	13	3,654	745,671	3,654	100.00 %	0.49 %
Lucama	2	1,036	745,670	1,036	100.00 %	0.14 %
Lumber Bridge	3	82	745,671	82	100.00 %	0.01 %
Lumberton	3	19,025	745,671	19,025	100.00 %	2.55 %
Macclesfield	2	413	745,670	413	100.00 %	0.06 %
Macon	2	110	745,670	110	100.00 %	0.01 %
Madison	11	2,129	745,671	2,129	100.00 %	0.29 %
Maggie Valley	14	1,687	745,670	1,687	100.00 %	0.23 %
Magnolia	3	831	745,671	831	100.00 %	0.11 %
Maiden (Catawba)	12	3,736	745,670	3,736	100.00 %	0.50 %
Maiden (Lincoln)	12	0	745,670	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Manteo	1	1,600	745,670	1,600	100.00 %	0.21 %
Marietta	3	111	745,671	111	100.00 %	0.01 %
Marion	13	7,717	745,671	7,717	100.00 %	1.03 %
Mars Hill	14	2,007	745,670	2,007	100.00 %	0.27 %
Marshall	14	777	745,670	777	100.00 %	0.10 %
Marshville	8	2,522	745,670	2,522	100.00 %	0.34 %
Marvin	8	6,358	745,670	6,358	100.00 %	0.85 %
Matthews	8	29,435	745,670	29,435	100.00 %	3.95 %
Maxton (Robeson)	3	1,902	745,671	1,902	100.00 %	0.26 %
Maxton (Scotland)	8	208	745,670	208	100.00 %	0.03 %
Mayodan	11	2,418	745,671	2,418	100.00 %	0.32 %
Maysville	1	818	745,670	818	100.00 %	0.11 %
McAdenville	13	890	745,671	890	100.00 %	0.12 %
McDonald	3	94	745,671	94	100.00 %	0.01 %
McFarlan	8	94	745,670	94	100.00 %	0.01 %
Mebane (Alamance)	7	14,626	745,671	14,626	100.00 %	1.96 %
Mebane (Orange)	6	3,171	745,671	3,171	100.00 %	0.43 %
Mesic	1	144	745,670	144	100.00 %	0.02 %
Micro	4	458	745,671	458	100.00 %	0.06 %
Middleburg	2	101	745,670	101	100.00 %	0.01 %
Middlesex	2	912	745,670	912	100.00 %	0.12 %
Midland (Cabarrus)	10	4,684	745,671	4,684	100.00 %	0.63 %
Midland (Mecklenburg)	8	0	745,670	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Midway	10	4,742	745,671	4,742	100.00 %	0.64 %
Mills River	14	7,078	745,670	7,078	100.00 %	0.95 %
Milton	2	155	745,670	155	100.00 %	0.02 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-174.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:41 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality by County - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Mineral Springs	8	3,159	745,670	3,159	100.00 %	0.42 %
Minnesott Beach	1	530	745,670	530	100.00 %	0.07 %
Mint Hill (Mecklenburg)	8	26,444	745,670	26,444	100.00 %	3.55 %
	9	26,444	745,670	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Mint Hill (Union)	8	6	745,670	6	100.00 %	0.00 %
Misenheimer	8	650	745,670	650	100.00 %	0.09 %
Mocksville	10	5,900	745,671	5,900	100.00 %	0.79 %
Momeyer	2	277	745,670	277	100.00 %	0.04 %
Monroe	8	34,562	745,670	34,562	100.00 %	4.64 %
Montreat	14	901	745,670	901	100.00 %	0.12 %
Mooreboro	13	293	745,671	293	100.00 %	0.04 %
Mooreville	10	50,193	745,671	50,193	100.00 %	6.73 %
Morehead City	1	9,556	745,670	9,556	100.00 %	1.28 %
Morganton	13	17,474	745,671	17,474	100.00 %	2.34 %
Morrisville (Durham)	6	207	745,671	207	100.00 %	0.03 %
Morrisville (Wake)	6	29,423	745,671	29,423	100.00 %	3.95 %
Morven	8	329	745,670	329	100.00 %	0.04 %
Mount Airy	11	10,676	745,671	10,676	100.00 %	1.43 %
Mount Gilead	8	1,171	745,670	1,171	100.00 %	0.16 %
Mount Holly	13	17,703	745,671	17,703	100.00 %	2.37 %
Mount Olive (Duplin)	3	5	745,671	5	100.00 %	0.00 %
Mount Olive (Wayne)	2	4,193	745,670	4,193	100.00 %	0.56 %
Mount Pleasant	10	1,671	745,671	1,671	100.00 %	0.22 %
Murfreesboro	2	2,619	745,670	2,619	100.00 %	0.35 %
Murphy	14	1,608	745,670	1,608	100.00 %	0.22 %
Nags Head	1	3,168	745,670	3,168	100.00 %	0.42 %
Nashville	2	5,632	745,670	5,632	100.00 %	0.76 %
Navassa	3	1,367	745,671	1,367	100.00 %	0.18 %
New Bern	1	31,291	745,670	31,291	100.00 %	4.20 %
New London	8	607	745,670	607	100.00 %	0.08 %
Newland	14	715	745,670	715	100.00 %	0.10 %
Newport	1	4,364	745,670	4,364	100.00 %	0.59 %
Newton	12	13,148	745,670	13,148	100.00 %	1.76 %
Newton Grove	4	585	745,671	585	100.00 %	0.08 %
Norlina	2	920	745,670	920	100.00 %	0.12 %
Norman	8	100	745,670	100	100.00 %	0.01 %
North Topsail Beach	3	1,005	745,671	1,005	100.00 %	0.13 %
North Wilkesboro	11	4,382	745,671	4,382	100.00 %	0.59 %
Northwest	3	703	745,671	703	100.00 %	0.09 %
Norwood	8	2,367	745,670	2,367	100.00 %	0.32 %
Oak City	2	266	745,670	266	100.00 %	0.04 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-174.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:41 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Oak Island	3	8,396	745,671	8,396	100.00 %	1.13 %
Oak Ridge	11	7,474	745,671	7,474	100.00 %	1.00 %
Oakboro	8	2,128	745,670	2,128	100.00 %	0.29 %
Ocean Isle Beach	3	867	745,671	867	100.00 %	0.12 %
Old Fort	13	811	745,671	811	100.00 %	0.11 %
Oriental	1	880	745,670	880	100.00 %	0.12 %
Orrum	3	59	745,671	59	100.00 %	0.01 %
Ossipee	7	536	745,671	536	100.00 %	0.07 %
Oxford	2	8,628	745,670	8,628	100.00 %	1.16 %
Pantego	1	164	745,670	164	100.00 %	0.02 %
Parkton	3	504	745,671	504	100.00 %	0.07 %
Parmelee	2	243	745,670	243	100.00 %	0.03 %
Patterson Springs	13	571	745,671	571	100.00 %	0.08 %
Peachland	8	390	745,670	390	100.00 %	0.05 %
Peletier	1	769	745,670	769	100.00 %	0.10 %
Pembroke	3	2,823	745,671	2,823	100.00 %	0.38 %
Pikeville	2	712	745,670	712	100.00 %	0.10 %
Pilot Mountain	11	1,440	745,671	1,440	100.00 %	0.19 %
Pine Knoll Shores	1	1,388	745,670	1,388	100.00 %	0.19 %
Pine Level	4	2,046	745,671	2,046	100.00 %	0.27 %
Pinebluff	8	1,473	745,670	1,473	100.00 %	0.20 %
Pinehurst	8	17,581	745,670	17,581	100.00 %	2.36 %
Pinetops	2	1,200	745,670	1,200	100.00 %	0.16 %
Pineville	8	10,602	745,670	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	9	10,602	745,670	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	13	10,602	745,671	10,602	100.00 %	1.42 %
Pink Hill	1	451	745,670	451	100.00 %	0.06 %
Pittsboro	7	4,537	745,671	4,537	100.00 %	0.61 %
Pleasant Garden	7	5,000	745,671	5,000	100.00 %	0.67 %
	10	5,000	745,671	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Plymouth	2	3,320	745,670	3,320	100.00 %	0.45 %
Polkton	8	2,250	745,670	2,250	100.00 %	0.30 %
Polkville	13	516	745,671	516	100.00 %	0.07 %
Pollocksville	1	268	745,670	268	100.00 %	0.04 %
Powellsville	2	189	745,670	189	100.00 %	0.03 %
Princeton	4	1,315	745,671	1,315	100.00 %	0.18 %
Princeville	2	1,254	745,670	1,254	100.00 %	0.17 %
Proctorville	3	121	745,671	121	100.00 %	0.02 %
Raeford	8	4,559	745,670	4,559	100.00 %	0.61 %
Raleigh (Durham)	6	1,559	745,671	1,559	100.00 %	0.21 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-174.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:41 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Raleigh (Wake)	5	466,106	745,671	466,106	100.00 %	62.51 %
	6	466,106	745,671	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Ramseur	7	1,774	745,671	1,774	100.00 %	0.24 %
Randleman	7	4,595	745,671	4,595	100.00 %	0.62 %
Ranlo	13	4,511	745,671	4,511	100.00 %	0.60 %
Raynham	3	60	745,671	60	100.00 %	0.01 %
Red Cross	8	762	745,670	762	100.00 %	0.10 %
Red Oak	2	3,342	745,670	3,342	100.00 %	0.45 %
Red Springs (Hoke)	8	0	745,670	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Red Springs (Robeson)	3	3,087	745,671	3,087	100.00 %	0.41 %
Reidsville	11	14,583	745,671	14,583	100.00 %	1.96 %
Rennert	3	275	745,671	275	100.00 %	0.04 %
Rhodhiss (Burke)	13	639	745,671	639	100.00 %	0.09 %
Rhodhiss (Caldwell)	11	358	745,671	358	100.00 %	0.05 %
Rich Square	2	894	745,670	894	100.00 %	0.12 %
Richfield	8	582	745,670	582	100.00 %	0.08 %
Richlands	3	2,287	745,671	2,287	100.00 %	0.31 %
River Bend	1	2,902	745,670	2,902	100.00 %	0.39 %
Roanoke Rapids	2	15,229	745,670	15,229	100.00 %	2.04 %
Robbins	8	1,168	745,670	1,168	100.00 %	0.16 %
Robbinsville	14	597	745,670	597	100.00 %	0.08 %
Robersonville	2	1,269	745,670	1,269	100.00 %	0.17 %
Rockingham	8	9,243	745,670	9,243	100.00 %	1.24 %
Rockwell	10	2,302	745,671	2,302	100.00 %	0.31 %
Rocky Mount (Edgecombe)	2	15,414	745,670	15,414	100.00 %	2.07 %
Rocky Mount (Nash)	2	38,927	745,670	38,927	100.00 %	5.22 %
Rolesville	5	9,475	745,671	9,475	100.00 %	1.27 %
Ronda	11	438	745,671	438	100.00 %	0.06 %
Roper	2	485	745,670	485	100.00 %	0.07 %
Rose Hill	3	1,371	745,671	1,371	100.00 %	0.18 %
Roseboro	4	1,163	745,671	1,163	100.00 %	0.16 %
Rosman	14	701	745,670	701	100.00 %	0.09 %
Rowland	3	885	745,671	885	100.00 %	0.12 %
Roxboro	2	8,134	745,670	8,134	100.00 %	1.09 %
Roxobel	2	187	745,670	187	100.00 %	0.03 %
Rural Hall	12	3,351	745,670	3,351	100.00 %	0.45 %
Ruth	13	347	745,671	347	100.00 %	0.05 %
Rutherford College (Burke)	13	1,226	745,671	1,226	100.00 %	0.16 %
Rutherford College (Caldwell)	11	0	745,671	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Rutherfordton	13	3,640	745,671	3,640	100.00 %	0.49 %
Salemburg	4	457	745,671	457	100.00 %	0.06 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-174.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:41 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Salisbury	10	35,540	745,671	35,540	100.00 %	4.77 %
Saluda (Henderson)	14	11	745,670	11	100.00 %	0.00 %
Saluda (Polk)	13	620	745,671	620	100.00 %	0.08 %
Sandy Creek	3	248	745,671	248	100.00 %	0.03 %
Sandyfield	3	430	745,671	430	100.00 %	0.06 %
Sanford	7	30,261	745,671	30,261	100.00 %	4.06 %
Saratoga	2	353	745,670	353	100.00 %	0.05 %
Sawmills	11	5,020	745,671	5,020	100.00 %	0.67 %
Scotland Neck	2	1,640	745,670	1,640	100.00 %	0.22 %
Seaboard	2	542	745,670	542	100.00 %	0.07 %
Seagrove	7	235	745,671	235	100.00 %	0.03 %
Sedalia	7	676	745,671	676	100.00 %	0.09 %
Selma	4	6,317	745,671	6,317	100.00 %	0.85 %
Seven Devils (Avery)	14	38	745,670	38	100.00 %	0.01 %
Seven Devils (Watauga)	11	275	745,671	275	100.00 %	0.04 %
Seven Springs	2	55	745,670	55	100.00 %	0.01 %
Severn	2	191	745,670	191	100.00 %	0.03 %
Shallotte	3	4,185	745,671	4,185	100.00 %	0.56 %
Sharpsburg (Edgecombe)	2	215	745,670	215	100.00 %	0.03 %
Sharpsburg (Nash)	2	1,061	745,670	1,061	100.00 %	0.14 %
Sharpsburg (Wilson)	2	421	745,670	421	100.00 %	0.06 %
Shelby	13	21,918	745,671	21,918	100.00 %	2.94 %
Siler City	7	7,702	745,671	7,702	100.00 %	1.03 %
Simpson	1	390	745,670	390	100.00 %	0.05 %
Sims	2	275	745,670	275	100.00 %	0.04 %
Smithfield	4	11,292	745,671	11,292	100.00 %	1.51 %
Snow Hill	2	1,481	745,670	1,481	100.00 %	0.20 %
Southern Pines	8	15,545	745,670	15,545	100.00 %	2.08 %
Southern Shores	1	3,090	745,670	3,090	100.00 %	0.41 %
Southport	3	3,971	745,671	3,971	100.00 %	0.53 %
Sparta	11	1,834	745,671	1,834	100.00 %	0.25 %
Speed	2	63	745,670	63	100.00 %	0.01 %
Spencer	10	3,308	745,671	3,308	100.00 %	0.44 %
Spencer Mountain	13	0	745,671	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Spindale	13	4,225	745,671	4,225	100.00 %	0.57 %
Spring Hope	2	1,309	745,670	1,309	100.00 %	0.18 %
Spring Lake	4	11,660	745,671	11,660	100.00 %	1.56 %
Spruce Pine	14	2,194	745,670	2,194	100.00 %	0.29 %
St. Helena	3	417	745,671	417	100.00 %	0.06 %
St. James	3	6,529	745,671	6,529	100.00 %	0.88 %
St. Pauls	3	2,045	745,671	2,045	100.00 %	0.27 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-174.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:41 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality by County - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Staley	7	397	745,671	397	100.00 %	0.05 %
Stallings (Mecklenburg)	8	384	745,670	384	100.00 %	0.05 %
Stallings (Union)	8	15,728	745,670	15,728	100.00 %	2.11 %
Stanfield	8	1,585	745,670	1,585	100.00 %	0.21 %
Stanley	13	3,963	745,671	3,963	100.00 %	0.53 %
Stantonsburg	2	762	745,670	762	100.00 %	0.10 %
Star	8	806	745,670	806	100.00 %	0.11 %
Statesville	10	28,419	745,671	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	12	28,419	745,670	28,419	100.00 %	3.81 %
Stedman	4	1,277	745,671	1,277	100.00 %	0.17 %
Stem	2	960	745,670	960	100.00 %	0.13 %
Stokesdale	11	5,924	745,671	5,924	100.00 %	0.79 %
Stoneville	11	1,308	745,671	1,308	100.00 %	0.18 %
Stonewall	1	214	745,670	214	100.00 %	0.03 %
Stovall	2	324	745,670	324	100.00 %	0.04 %
Sugar Mountain	14	371	745,670	371	100.00 %	0.05 %
Summerfield	11	10,951	745,671	10,951	100.00 %	1.47 %
Sunset Beach	3	4,175	745,671	4,175	100.00 %	0.56 %
Surf City (Onslow)	3	334	745,671	334	100.00 %	0.04 %
Surf City (Pender)	3	3,533	745,671	3,533	100.00 %	0.47 %
Swansboro	1	3,744	745,670	3,744	100.00 %	0.50 %
Sweepsonville	7	2,445	745,671	2,445	100.00 %	0.33 %
Sylva	14	2,578	745,670	2,578	100.00 %	0.35 %
Tabor City	3	3,781	745,671	3,781	100.00 %	0.51 %
Tar Heel	3	90	745,671	90	100.00 %	0.01 %
Tarboro	2	10,721	745,670	10,721	100.00 %	1.44 %
Taylorsville	11	2,320	745,671	2,320	100.00 %	0.31 %
Taylortown	8	634	745,670	634	100.00 %	0.09 %
Teachey	3	448	745,671	448	100.00 %	0.06 %
Thomasville (Davidson)	7	26,662	745,671	26,662	100.00 %	3.58 %
Thomasville (Randolph)	7	521	745,671	521	100.00 %	0.07 %
Tobaccoville (Forsyth)	12	2,578	745,670	2,578	100.00 %	0.35 %
Tobaccoville (Stokes)	11	0	745,671	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Topsail Beach	3	461	745,671	461	100.00 %	0.06 %
Trent Woods	1	4,074	745,670	4,074	100.00 %	0.55 %
Trenton	1	238	745,670	238	100.00 %	0.03 %
Trinity	7	7,006	745,671	7,006	100.00 %	0.94 %
Troutman	10	3,698	745,671	3,698	100.00 %	0.50 %
Troy	8	2,850	745,670	2,850	100.00 %	0.38 %
Tryon	13	1,562	745,671	1,562	100.00 %	0.21 %
Turkey	4	213	745,671	213	100.00 %	0.03 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-174.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:41 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Unionville	8	6,643	745,670	6,643	100.00 %	0.89 %
Valdese	13	4,689	745,671	4,689	100.00 %	0.63 %
Vanceboro	1	869	745,670	869	100.00 %	0.12 %
Vandemere	1	246	745,670	246	100.00 %	0.03 %
Varnamtown	3	525	745,671	525	100.00 %	0.07 %
Vass	8	952	745,670	952	100.00 %	0.13 %
Waco	13	310	745,671	310	100.00 %	0.04 %
Wade	4	638	745,671	638	100.00 %	0.09 %
Wadesboro	8	5,008	745,670	5,008	100.00 %	0.67 %
Wagram	8	615	745,670	615	100.00 %	0.08 %
Wake Forest (Franklin)	2	1,504	745,670	1,504	100.00 %	0.20 %
Wake Forest (Wake)	5	46,097	745,671	46,097	100.00 %	6.18 %
Walkertown	12	5,692	745,670	5,692	100.00 %	0.76 %
Wallace (Duplin)	3	3,413	745,671	3,413	100.00 %	0.46 %
Wallace (Pender)	3	0	745,671	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Wallburg	10	3,051	745,671	3,051	100.00 %	0.41 %
Walnut Cove	11	1,586	745,671	1,586	100.00 %	0.21 %
Walnut Creek	2	1,084	745,670	1,084	100.00 %	0.15 %
Walstonburg	2	193	745,670	193	100.00 %	0.03 %
Warrenton	2	851	745,670	851	100.00 %	0.11 %
Warsaw	3	2,733	745,671	2,733	100.00 %	0.37 %
Washington	1	9,875	745,670	9,875	100.00 %	1.32 %
Washington Park	1	392	745,670	392	100.00 %	0.05 %
Watha	3	181	745,671	181	100.00 %	0.02 %
Waxhaw	8	20,534	745,670	20,534	100.00 %	2.75 %
Waynesville	14	10,140	745,670	10,140	100.00 %	1.36 %
Weaverville	14	4,567	745,670	4,567	100.00 %	0.61 %
Webster	14	372	745,670	372	100.00 %	0.05 %
Weddington (Mecklenburg)	8	5	745,670	5	100.00 %	0.00 %
Weddington (Union)	8	13,176	745,670	13,176	100.00 %	1.77 %
Weldon	2	1,444	745,670	1,444	100.00 %	0.19 %
Wendell	5	9,793	745,671	9,793	100.00 %	1.31 %
Wentworth	11	2,662	745,671	2,662	100.00 %	0.36 %
Wesley Chapel	8	8,681	745,670	8,681	100.00 %	1.16 %
West Jefferson	11	1,279	745,671	1,279	100.00 %	0.17 %
Whispering Pines	8	4,987	745,670	4,987	100.00 %	0.67 %
Whitakers (Edgecombe)	2	290	745,670	290	100.00 %	0.04 %
Whitakers (Nash)	2	337	745,670	337	100.00 %	0.05 %
White Lake	3	843	745,671	843	100.00 %	0.11 %
Whiteville	3	4,766	745,671	4,766	100.00 %	0.64 %
Whitsett	7	584	745,671	584	100.00 %	0.08 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-174.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:41 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Wilkesboro	11	3,687	745,671	3,687	100.00 %	0.49 %
Williamston	2	5,248	745,670	5,248	100.00 %	0.70 %
Wilmington	3	115,451	745,671	115,451	100.00 %	15.48 %
Wilson	2	47,851	745,670	47,851	100.00 %	6.42 %
Wilson's Mills	4	2,534	745,671	2,534	100.00 %	0.34 %
Windsor	2	3,582	745,670	3,582	100.00 %	0.48 %
Winfall	1	555	745,670	555	100.00 %	0.07 %
Wingate	8	4,055	745,670	4,055	100.00 %	0.54 %
Winston-Salem	12	249,545	745,670	249,545	100.00 %	33.47 %
Winterville	1	10,462	745,670	10,462	100.00 %	1.40 %
Winton	2	629	745,670	629	100.00 %	0.08 %
Woodfin	14	7,936	745,670	7,936	100.00 %	1.06 %
Woodland	2	557	745,670	557	100.00 %	0.07 %
Wrightsville Beach	3	2,473	745,671	2,473	100.00 %	0.33 %
Yadkinville	12	2,995	745,670	2,995	100.00 %	0.40 %
Yanceyville	2	1,937	745,670	1,937	100.00 %	0.26 %
Youngsville	2	2,016	745,670	2,016	100.00 %	0.27 %
Zebulon (Johnston)	4	0	745,671	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Zebulon (Wake)	5	6,903	745,671	6,903	100.00 %	0.93 %
Assigned Geography Total:				6,017,605		

Report display: all municipalities

Total Municipalities (by County) Statewide: 614

Fully Assigned Municipalities: 614

Partially Assigned Municipalities: 0

Fully Unassigned Municipalities: 0

Total Districts Assigned: 14

Split Municipalities: 15

Splits Involving Population: 2

District - Municipality by County Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174**

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
1	Alliance	745,670	733	733	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Arapahoe	745,670	416	416	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Atlantic Beach	745,670	1,364	1,364	0.18 %	100.00 %
	Aurora	745,670	455	455	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Ayden	745,670	4,977	4,977	0.67 %	100.00 %
	Bath	745,670	245	245	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Bayboro	745,670	1,161	1,161	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Beaufort	745,670	4,464	4,464	0.60 %	100.00 %
	Belhaven	745,670	1,410	1,410	0.19 %	100.00 %
	Bogue	745,670	695	695	0.09 %	100.00 %
	Bridgeton	745,670	349	349	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Cape Carteret	745,670	2,224	2,224	0.30 %	100.00 %
	Cedar Point	745,670	1,764	1,764	0.24 %	100.00 %
	Chocowinity	745,670	722	722	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Columbia	745,670	610	610	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Cove City	745,670	378	378	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Dover	745,670	349	349	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Duck	745,670	742	742	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Edenton	745,670	4,460	4,460	0.60 %	100.00 %
	Elizabeth City (Camden)	745,670	38	38	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Elizabeth City (Pasquotank)	745,670	18,593	18,593	2.49 %	100.00 %
	Emerald Isle	745,670	3,847	3,847	0.52 %	100.00 %
	Falkland	745,670	47	47	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Farmville	745,670	4,461	4,461	0.60 %	100.00 %
	Fountain	745,670	385	385	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Gatesville	745,670	267	267	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Grantsboro	745,670	692	692	0.09 %	100.00 %
	Greenville	745,670	87,521	87,521	11.74 %	100.00 %
	Grifton (Lenoir)	745,670	147	147	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Grifton (Pitt)	745,670	2,301	2,301	0.31 %	100.00 %
	Grimesland	745,670	386	386	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Havelock	745,670	16,621	16,621	2.23 %	100.00 %
	Hertford	745,670	1,934	1,934	0.26 %	100.00 %
	Indian Beach	745,670	223	223	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Jacksonville	745,670	72,723	72,723	9.75 %	100.00 %
	Kill Devil Hills	745,670	7,656	7,656	1.03 %	100.00 %
	Kinston	745,670	19,900	19,900	2.67 %	100.00 %
	Kitty Hawk	745,670	3,689	3,689	0.49 %	100.00 %
	La Grange	745,670	2,595	2,595	0.35 %	100.00 %
	Manteo	745,670	1,600	1,600	0.21 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-174.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:41 PM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 1 of 17

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174**

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
1	Maysville	745,670	818	818	0.11 %	100.00 %
	Mesic	745,670	144	144	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Minnesott Beach	745,670	530	530	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Morehead City	745,670	9,556	9,556	1.28 %	100.00 %
	Nags Head	745,670	3,168	3,168	0.42 %	100.00 %
	New Bern	745,670	31,291	31,291	4.20 %	100.00 %
	Newport	745,670	4,364	4,364	0.59 %	100.00 %
	Oriental	745,670	880	880	0.12 %	100.00 %
	Pantego	745,670	164	164	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Peletier	745,670	769	769	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Pine Knoll Shores	745,670	1,388	1,388	0.19 %	100.00 %
	Pink Hill	745,670	451	451	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Pollocksville	745,670	268	268	0.04 %	100.00 %
	River Bend	745,670	2,902	2,902	0.39 %	100.00 %
	Simpson	745,670	390	390	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Southern Shores	745,670	3,090	3,090	0.41 %	100.00 %
	Stonewall	745,670	214	214	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Swansboro	745,670	3,744	3,744	0.50 %	100.00 %
	Trent Woods	745,670	4,074	4,074	0.55 %	100.00 %
	Trenton	745,670	238	238	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Vanceboro	745,670	869	869	0.12 %	100.00 %
	Vandemere	745,670	246	246	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Washington	745,670	9,875	9,875	1.32 %	100.00 %
	Washington Park	745,670	392	392	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Winfall	745,670	555	555	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Winterville	745,670	10,462	10,462	1.40 %	100.00 %
2	Ahoskie	745,670	4,891	4,891	0.66 %	100.00 %
	Askewville	745,670	184	184	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Aulander	745,670	763	763	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Bailey	745,670	568	568	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Bear Grass	745,670	89	89	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Bethel	745,670	1,373	1,373	0.18 %	100.00 %
	Black Creek	745,670	692	692	0.09 %	100.00 %
	Bunn	745,670	327	327	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Butner	745,670	8,397	8,397	1.13 %	100.00 %
	Castalia	745,670	264	264	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Cofield	745,670	267	267	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Colerain	745,670	217	217	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Como	745,670	67	67	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Conetoe	745,670	198	198	0.03 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-174.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:41 PM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 2 of 17

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
2	Conway	745,670	752	752	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Creedmoor	745,670	4,866	4,866	0.65 %	100.00 %
	Creswell	745,670	207	207	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Dortches	745,670	1,082	1,082	0.15 %	100.00 %
	Elm City (Nash)	745,670	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Elm City (Wilson)	745,670	1,218	1,218	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Enfield	745,670	1,865	1,865	0.25 %	100.00 %
	Eureka	745,670	214	214	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Everetts	745,670	150	150	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Franklinton	745,670	2,456	2,456	0.33 %	100.00 %
	Fremont	745,670	1,196	1,196	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Garysburg	745,670	904	904	0.12 %	100.00 %
	Gaston	745,670	1,008	1,008	0.14 %	100.00 %
	Goldsboro	745,670	33,657	33,657	4.51 %	100.00 %
	Halifax	745,670	170	170	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Hamilton	745,670	306	306	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Harrellsville	745,670	85	85	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Hassell	745,670	49	49	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Henderson	745,670	15,060	15,060	2.02 %	100.00 %
	Hobgood	745,670	268	268	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Hookerton	745,670	413	413	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Jackson	745,670	430	430	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Jamesville	745,670	424	424	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Kelford	745,670	203	203	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Kenly (Wilson)	745,670	198	198	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Kittrell	745,670	132	132	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Lasker	745,670	64	64	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Leggett	745,670	37	37	0.00 %	100.00 %
	Lewiston Woodville	745,670	426	426	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Littleton	745,670	559	559	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Louisburg	745,670	3,064	3,064	0.41 %	100.00 %
	Lucama	745,670	1,036	1,036	0.14 %	100.00 %
	Macclesfield	745,670	413	413	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Macon	745,670	110	110	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Middleburg	745,670	101	101	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Middlesex	745,670	912	912	0.12 %	100.00 %
	Milton	745,670	155	155	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Momeyer	745,670	277	277	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Mount Olive (Wayne)	745,670	4,193	4,193	0.56 %	100.00 %
	Murfreesboro	745,670	2,619	2,619	0.35 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-174.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:41 PM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 3 of 17

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
2	Nashville	745,670	5,632	5,632	0.76 %	100.00 %
	Norlina	745,670	920	920	0.12 %	100.00 %
	Oak City	745,670	266	266	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Oxford	745,670	8,628	8,628	1.16 %	100.00 %
	Parmelee	745,670	243	243	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Pikeville	745,670	712	712	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Pinetops	745,670	1,200	1,200	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Plymouth	745,670	3,320	3,320	0.45 %	100.00 %
	Powellsville	745,670	189	189	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Princeville	745,670	1,254	1,254	0.17 %	100.00 %
	Red Oak	745,670	3,342	3,342	0.45 %	100.00 %
	Rich Square	745,670	894	894	0.12 %	100.00 %
	Roanoke Rapids	745,670	15,229	15,229	2.04 %	100.00 %
	Robersonville	745,670	1,269	1,269	0.17 %	100.00 %
	Rocky Mount (Edgecombe)	745,670	15,414	15,414	2.07 %	100.00 %
	Rocky Mount (Nash)	745,670	38,927	38,927	5.22 %	100.00 %
	Roper	745,670	485	485	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Roxboro	745,670	8,134	8,134	1.09 %	100.00 %
	Roxobel	745,670	187	187	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Saratoga	745,670	353	353	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Scotland Neck	745,670	1,640	1,640	0.22 %	100.00 %
	Seaboard	745,670	542	542	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Seven Springs	745,670	55	55	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Severn	745,670	191	191	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Sharpsburg (Edgecombe)	745,670	215	215	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Sharpsburg (Nash)	745,670	1,061	1,061	0.14 %	100.00 %
	Sharpsburg (Wilson)	745,670	421	421	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Sims	745,670	275	275	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Snow Hill	745,670	1,481	1,481	0.20 %	100.00 %
	Speed	745,670	63	63	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Spring Hope	745,670	1,309	1,309	0.18 %	100.00 %
	Stantonsburg	745,670	762	762	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Stem	745,670	960	960	0.13 %	100.00 %
	Stovall	745,670	324	324	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Tarboro	745,670	10,721	10,721	1.44 %	100.00 %
	Wake Forest (Franklin)	745,670	1,504	1,504	0.20 %	100.00 %
	Walnut Creek	745,670	1,084	1,084	0.15 %	100.00 %
	Walstonburg	745,670	193	193	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Warrenton	745,670	851	851	0.11 %	100.00 %
	Weldon	745,670	1,444	1,444	0.19 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-174.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:41 PM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 4 of 17

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
2	Whitakers (Edgecombe)	745,670	290	290	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Whitakers (Nash)	745,670	337	337	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Williamston	745,670	5,248	5,248	0.70 %	100.00 %
	Wilson	745,670	47,851	47,851	6.42 %	100.00 %
	Windsor	745,670	3,582	3,582	0.48 %	100.00 %
	Winton	745,670	629	629	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Woodland	745,670	557	557	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Yanceyville	745,670	1,937	1,937	0.26 %	100.00 %
	Youngsville	745,670	2,016	2,016	0.27 %	100.00 %
3	Atkinson	745,671	296	296	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Bald Head Island	745,671	268	268	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Belville	745,671	2,406	2,406	0.32 %	100.00 %
	Beulaville	745,671	1,116	1,116	0.15 %	100.00 %
	Bladenboro	745,671	1,648	1,648	0.22 %	100.00 %
	Boardman	745,671	166	166	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Boiling Spring Lakes	745,671	5,943	5,943	0.80 %	100.00 %
	Bolivia	745,671	149	149	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Bolton	745,671	519	519	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Brunswick	745,671	973	973	0.13 %	100.00 %
	Burgaw	745,671	3,088	3,088	0.41 %	100.00 %
	Calabash	745,671	2,011	2,011	0.27 %	100.00 %
	Calypso	745,671	327	327	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Carolina Beach	745,671	6,564	6,564	0.88 %	100.00 %
	Carolina Shores	745,671	4,588	4,588	0.62 %	100.00 %
	Caswell Beach	745,671	395	395	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Cerro Gordo	745,671	131	131	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Chadbourn	745,671	1,574	1,574	0.21 %	100.00 %
	Clarkton	745,671	614	614	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Dublin	745,671	267	267	0.04 %	100.00 %
	East Arcadia	745,671	418	418	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Elizabethtown	745,671	3,296	3,296	0.44 %	100.00 %
	Fair Bluff	745,671	709	709	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Fairmont	745,671	2,191	2,191	0.29 %	100.00 %
	Faison (Duplin)	745,671	784	784	0.11 %	100.00 %
	Greenevers	745,671	567	567	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Harrells (Duplin)	745,671	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Holden Beach	745,671	921	921	0.12 %	100.00 %
	Holly Ridge	745,671	4,171	4,171	0.56 %	100.00 %
	Jacksonville	745,671	72,723	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Kenansville	745,671	770	770	0.10 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-174.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:41 PM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 5 of 17

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174**

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
3	Kure Beach	745,671	2,191	2,191	0.29 %	100.00 %
	Lake Waccamaw	745,671	1,296	1,296	0.17 %	100.00 %
	Leland	745,671	22,908	22,908	3.07 %	100.00 %
	Lumber Bridge	745,671	82	82	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Lumberton	745,671	19,025	19,025	2.55 %	100.00 %
	Magnolia	745,671	831	831	0.11 %	100.00 %
	Marietta	745,671	111	111	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Maxton (Robeson)	745,671	1,902	1,902	0.26 %	100.00 %
	McDonald	745,671	94	94	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Mount Olive (Duplin)	745,671	5	5	0.00 %	100.00 %
	Navassa	745,671	1,367	1,367	0.18 %	100.00 %
	North Topsail Beach	745,671	1,005	1,005	0.13 %	100.00 %
	Northwest	745,671	703	703	0.09 %	100.00 %
	Oak Island	745,671	8,396	8,396	1.13 %	100.00 %
	Ocean Isle Beach	745,671	867	867	0.12 %	100.00 %
	Orrum	745,671	59	59	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Parkton	745,671	504	504	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Pembroke	745,671	2,823	2,823	0.38 %	100.00 %
	Proctorville	745,671	121	121	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Raynham	745,671	60	60	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Red Springs (Robeson)	745,671	3,087	3,087	0.41 %	100.00 %
	Rennert	745,671	275	275	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Richlands	745,671	2,287	2,287	0.31 %	100.00 %
	Rose Hill	745,671	1,371	1,371	0.18 %	100.00 %
	Rowland	745,671	885	885	0.12 %	100.00 %
	Sandy Creek	745,671	248	248	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Sandyfield	745,671	430	430	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Shallotte	745,671	4,185	4,185	0.56 %	100.00 %
	Southport	745,671	3,971	3,971	0.53 %	100.00 %
	St. Helena	745,671	417	417	0.06 %	100.00 %
	St. James	745,671	6,529	6,529	0.88 %	100.00 %
	St. Pauls	745,671	2,045	2,045	0.27 %	100.00 %
	Sunset Beach	745,671	4,175	4,175	0.56 %	100.00 %
	Surf City (Onslow)	745,671	334	334	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Surf City (Pender)	745,671	3,533	3,533	0.47 %	100.00 %
	Tabor City	745,671	3,781	3,781	0.51 %	100.00 %
	Tar Heel	745,671	90	90	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Teachey	745,671	448	448	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Topsail Beach	745,671	461	461	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Varnamtown	745,671	525	525	0.07 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-174.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:41 PM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 6 of 17

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
3	Wallace (Duplin)	745,671	3,413	3,413	0.46 %	100.00 %
	Wallace (Pender)	745,671	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Warsaw	745,671	2,733	2,733	0.37 %	100.00 %
	Watha	745,671	181	181	0.02 %	100.00 %
	White Lake	745,671	843	843	0.11 %	100.00 %
	Whiteville	745,671	4,766	4,766	0.64 %	100.00 %
	Wilmington	745,671	115,451	115,451	15.48 %	100.00 %
	Wrightsville Beach	745,671	2,473	2,473	0.33 %	100.00 %
4	Angier (Harnett)	745,671	4,709	4,709	0.63 %	100.00 %
	Archer Lodge	745,671	4,797	4,797	0.64 %	100.00 %
	Autryville	745,671	167	167	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Benson (Harnett)	745,671	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Benson (Johnston)	745,671	3,967	3,967	0.53 %	100.00 %
	Broadway (Harnett)	745,671	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Clayton (Johnston)	745,671	26,307	26,307	3.53 %	100.00 %
	Clinton	745,671	8,383	8,383	1.12 %	100.00 %
	Coats	745,671	2,155	2,155	0.29 %	100.00 %
	Dunn	745,671	8,446	8,446	1.13 %	100.00 %
	Eastover	745,671	3,656	3,656	0.49 %	100.00 %
	Erwin	745,671	4,542	4,542	0.61 %	100.00 %
	Faison (Sampson)	745,671	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Falcon (Cumberland)	745,671	324	324	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Falcon (Sampson)	745,671	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Fayetteville	745,671	208,501	208,501	27.96 %	100.00 %
	Four Oaks	745,671	2,158	2,158	0.29 %	100.00 %
	Garland	745,671	595	595	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Godwin	745,671	128	128	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Harrells (Sampson)	745,671	160	160	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Hope Mills	745,671	17,808	17,808	2.39 %	100.00 %
	Kenly (Johnston)	745,671	1,293	1,293	0.17 %	100.00 %
	Lillington	745,671	4,735	4,735	0.63 %	100.00 %
	Linden	745,671	136	136	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Micro	745,671	458	458	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Newton Grove	745,671	585	585	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Pine Level	745,671	2,046	2,046	0.27 %	100.00 %
	Princeton	745,671	1,315	1,315	0.18 %	100.00 %
	Roseboro	745,671	1,163	1,163	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Salemburg	745,671	457	457	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Selma	745,671	6,317	6,317	0.85 %	100.00 %
	Smithfield	745,671	11,292	11,292	1.51 %	100.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
4	Spring Lake	745,671	11,660	11,660	1.56 %	100.00 %
	Stedman	745,671	1,277	1,277	0.17 %	100.00 %
	Turkey	745,671	213	213	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Wade	745,671	638	638	0.09 %	100.00 %
	Wilson's Mills	745,671	2,534	2,534	0.34 %	100.00 %
	Zebulon (Johnston)	745,671	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
5	Cary (Wake)	745,671	171,012	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Clayton (Wake)	745,671	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Durham (Wake)	745,671	269	269	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Fuquay-Varina (Wake)	745,671	34,152	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Garner	745,671	31,159	31,159	4.18 %	100.00 %
	Knightdale	745,671	19,435	19,435	2.61 %	100.00 %
	Raleigh (Wake)	745,671	466,106	466,106	62.51 %	100.00 %
	Rolesville	745,671	9,475	9,475	1.27 %	100.00 %
	Wake Forest (Wake)	745,671	46,097	46,097	6.18 %	100.00 %
	Wendell	745,671	9,793	9,793	1.31 %	100.00 %
6	Zebulon (Wake)	745,671	6,903	6,903	0.93 %	100.00 %
	Apex	745,671	58,780	58,780	7.88 %	100.00 %
	Carrboro	745,671	21,295	21,295	2.86 %	100.00 %
	Cary (Wake)	745,671	171,012	171,012	22.93 %	100.00 %
	Chapel Hill (Durham)	745,671	2,906	2,906	0.39 %	100.00 %
	Chapel Hill (Orange)	745,671	59,054	59,054	7.92 %	100.00 %
	Durham (Durham)	745,671	283,093	283,093	37.96 %	100.00 %
	Durham (Orange)	745,671	144	144	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Durham (Wake)	745,671	269	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Hillsborough	745,671	9,660	9,660	1.30 %	100.00 %
	Mebane (Orange)	745,671	3,171	3,171	0.43 %	100.00 %
	Morrisville (Durham)	745,671	207	207	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Morrisville (Wake)	745,671	29,423	29,423	3.95 %	100.00 %
	Raleigh (Durham)	745,671	1,559	1,559	0.21 %	100.00 %
	Raleigh (Wake)	745,671	466,106	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
7	Alamance	745,671	988	988	0.13 %	100.00 %
	Angier (Wake)	745,671	556	556	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Apex	745,671	58,780	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Archdale (Randolph)	745,671	11,527	11,527	1.55 %	100.00 %
	Asheboro	745,671	27,156	27,156	3.64 %	100.00 %
	Broadway (Lee)	745,671	1,267	1,267	0.17 %	100.00 %
	Burlington (Alamance)	745,671	55,481	55,481	7.44 %	100.00 %
	Burlington (Guilford)	745,671	1,822	1,822	0.24 %	100.00 %
	Cary (Chatham)	745,671	3,709	3,709	0.50 %	100.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
7	Cary (Wake)	745,671	171,012	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Denton	745,671	1,494	1,494	0.20 %	100.00 %
	Elon	745,671	11,336	11,336	1.52 %	100.00 %
	Franklinville	745,671	1,197	1,197	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Fuquay-Varina (Harnett)	745,671	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Fuquay-Varina (Wake)	745,671	34,152	34,152	4.58 %	100.00 %
	Garner	745,671	31,159	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Gibsonville (Alamance)	745,671	4,278	4,278	0.57 %	100.00 %
	Gibsonville (Guilford)	745,671	4,642	4,642	0.62 %	100.00 %
	Goldston	745,671	234	234	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Graham	745,671	17,157	17,157	2.30 %	100.00 %
	Green Level	745,671	3,152	3,152	0.42 %	100.00 %
	Greensboro	745,671	299,035	16,830	2.26 %	5.63 %
	Haw River	745,671	2,252	2,252	0.30 %	100.00 %
	High Point (Randolph)	745,671	8	8	0.00 %	100.00 %
	Holly Springs	745,671	41,239	41,239	5.53 %	100.00 %
	Lexington	745,671	19,632	19,632	2.63 %	100.00 %
	Liberty	745,671	2,655	2,655	0.36 %	100.00 %
	Mebane (Alamance)	745,671	14,626	14,626	1.96 %	100.00 %
	Ossipee	745,671	536	536	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Pittsboro	745,671	4,537	4,537	0.61 %	100.00 %
	Pleasant Garden	745,671	5,000	5,000	0.67 %	100.00 %
	Ramseur	745,671	1,774	1,774	0.24 %	100.00 %
	Randleman	745,671	4,595	4,595	0.62 %	100.00 %
	Sanford	745,671	30,261	30,261	4.06 %	100.00 %
	Seagrove	745,671	235	235	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Sedalia	745,671	676	676	0.09 %	100.00 %
	Siler City	745,671	7,702	7,702	1.03 %	100.00 %
	Staley	745,671	397	397	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Swepsonville	745,671	2,445	2,445	0.33 %	100.00 %
	Thomasville (Davidson)	745,671	26,662	26,662	3.58 %	100.00 %
	Thomasville (Randolph)	745,671	521	521	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Trinity	745,671	7,006	7,006	0.94 %	100.00 %
	Whitsett	745,671	584	584	0.08 %	100.00 %
8	Aberdeen	745,670	8,516	8,516	1.14 %	100.00 %
	Albemarle	745,670	16,432	16,432	2.20 %	100.00 %
	Ansonville	745,670	440	440	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Badin	745,670	2,024	2,024	0.27 %	100.00 %
	Biscoe	745,670	1,848	1,848	0.25 %	100.00 %
	Cameron	745,670	244	244	0.03 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-174.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:41 PM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 9 of 17

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
8	Candor (Montgomery)	745,670	813	813	0.11 %	100.00 %
	Candor (Moore)	745,670	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Carthage	745,670	2,775	2,775	0.37 %	100.00 %
	Charlotte	745,670	874,579	103,002	13.81 %	11.78 %
	Dobbins Heights	745,670	687	687	0.09 %	100.00 %
	East Laurinburg	745,670	234	234	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Ellerbe	745,670	864	864	0.12 %	100.00 %
	Fairview	745,670	3,456	3,456	0.46 %	100.00 %
	Foxfire	745,670	1,288	1,288	0.17 %	100.00 %
	Gibson	745,670	449	449	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Hamlet	745,670	6,025	6,025	0.81 %	100.00 %
	Hemby Bridge	745,670	1,614	1,614	0.22 %	100.00 %
	Hoffman	745,670	418	418	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Indian Trail	745,670	39,997	39,997	5.36 %	100.00 %
	Lake Park	745,670	3,269	3,269	0.44 %	100.00 %
	Laurinburg	745,670	14,978	14,978	2.01 %	100.00 %
	Lilesville	745,670	395	395	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Locust (Stanly)	745,670	3,996	3,996	0.54 %	100.00 %
	Marshville	745,670	2,522	2,522	0.34 %	100.00 %
	Marvin	745,670	6,358	6,358	0.85 %	100.00 %
	Matthews	745,670	29,435	29,435	3.95 %	100.00 %
	Maxton (Scotland)	745,670	208	208	0.03 %	100.00 %
	McFarlan	745,670	94	94	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Midland (Mecklenburg)	745,670	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Mineral Springs	745,670	3,159	3,159	0.42 %	100.00 %
	Mint Hill (Mecklenburg)	745,670	26,444	26,444	3.55 %	100.00 %
	Mint Hill (Union)	745,670	6	6	0.00 %	100.00 %
	Misenheimer	745,670	650	650	0.09 %	100.00 %
	Monroe	745,670	34,562	34,562	4.64 %	100.00 %
	Morven	745,670	329	329	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Mount Gilead	745,670	1,171	1,171	0.16 %	100.00 %
	New London	745,670	607	607	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Norman	745,670	100	100	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Norwood	745,670	2,367	2,367	0.32 %	100.00 %
	Oakboro	745,670	2,128	2,128	0.29 %	100.00 %
	Peachland	745,670	390	390	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Pinebluff	745,670	1,473	1,473	0.20 %	100.00 %
	Pinehurst	745,670	17,581	17,581	2.36 %	100.00 %
	Pineville	745,670	10,602	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Polkton	745,670	2,250	2,250	0.30 %	100.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174**

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
8	Raeford	745,670	4,559	4,559	0.61 %	100.00 %
	Red Cross	745,670	762	762	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Red Springs (Hoke)	745,670	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Richfield	745,670	582	582	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Robbins	745,670	1,168	1,168	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Rockingham	745,670	9,243	9,243	1.24 %	100.00 %
	Southern Pines	745,670	15,545	15,545	2.08 %	100.00 %
	Stallings (Mecklenburg)	745,670	384	384	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Stallings (Union)	745,670	15,728	15,728	2.11 %	100.00 %
	Stanfield	745,670	1,585	1,585	0.21 %	100.00 %
	Star	745,670	806	806	0.11 %	100.00 %
	Taylortown	745,670	634	634	0.09 %	100.00 %
	Troy	745,670	2,850	2,850	0.38 %	100.00 %
	Unionville	745,670	6,643	6,643	0.89 %	100.00 %
	Vass	745,670	952	952	0.13 %	100.00 %
	Wadesboro	745,670	5,008	5,008	0.67 %	100.00 %
	Wagram	745,670	615	615	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Waxhaw	745,670	20,534	20,534	2.75 %	100.00 %
	Weddington (Mecklenburg)	745,670	5	5	0.00 %	100.00 %
	Weddington (Union)	745,670	13,176	13,176	1.77 %	100.00 %
9	Wesley Chapel	745,670	8,681	8,681	1.16 %	100.00 %
	Whispering Pines	745,670	4,987	4,987	0.67 %	100.00 %
	Wingate	745,670	4,055	4,055	0.54 %	100.00 %
9	Charlotte	745,670	874,579	722,091	96.84 %	82.56 %
	Mint Hill (Mecklenburg)	745,670	26,444	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Pineville	745,670	10,602	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
10	Archdale (Guilford)	745,671	380	380	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Bermuda Run	745,671	3,120	3,120	0.42 %	100.00 %
	China Grove	745,671	4,434	4,434	0.59 %	100.00 %
	Cleveland	745,671	846	846	0.11 %	100.00 %
	Concord	745,671	105,240	105,240	14.11 %	100.00 %
	Cooleemee	745,671	940	940	0.13 %	100.00 %
	Davidson (Iredell)	745,671	378	378	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Denton	745,671	1,494	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	East Spencer	745,671	1,567	1,567	0.21 %	100.00 %
	Faith	745,671	819	819	0.11 %	100.00 %
	Granite Quarry	745,671	2,984	2,984	0.40 %	100.00 %
	Greensboro	745,671	299,035	10,196	1.37 %	3.41 %
	Harrisburg	745,671	18,967	18,967	2.54 %	100.00 %
	High Point (Davidson)	745,671	6,646	6,646	0.89 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-174.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:41 PM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 11 of 17

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174**

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
10	High Point (Guilford)	745,671	107,321	107,321	14.39 %	100.00 %
	Jamestown	745,671	3,668	3,668	0.49 %	100.00 %
	Kannapolis (Cabarrus)	745,671	42,846	42,846	5.75 %	100.00 %
	Kannapolis (Rowan)	745,671	10,268	10,268	1.38 %	100.00 %
	Kernersville (Guilford)	745,671	502	502	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Landis	745,671	3,690	3,690	0.49 %	100.00 %
	Lexington	745,671	19,632	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Locust (Cabarrus)	745,671	541	541	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Midland (Cabarrus)	745,671	4,684	4,684	0.63 %	100.00 %
	Midway	745,671	4,742	4,742	0.64 %	100.00 %
	Mocksville	745,671	5,900	5,900	0.79 %	100.00 %
	Mooreville	745,671	50,193	50,193	6.73 %	100.00 %
	Mount Pleasant	745,671	1,671	1,671	0.22 %	100.00 %
	Pleasant Garden	745,671	5,000	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Rockwell	745,671	2,302	2,302	0.31 %	100.00 %
	Salisbury	745,671	35,540	35,540	4.77 %	100.00 %
	Spencer	745,671	3,308	3,308	0.44 %	100.00 %
	Statesville	745,671	28,419	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Troutman	745,671	3,698	3,698	0.50 %	100.00 %
	Wallburg	745,671	3,051	3,051	0.41 %	100.00 %
11	Blowing Rock (Caldwell)	745,671	91	91	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Cajah's Mountain	745,671	2,722	2,722	0.37 %	100.00 %
	Cedar Rock	745,671	301	301	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Danbury	745,671	189	189	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Dobson	745,671	1,462	1,462	0.20 %	100.00 %
	Eden	745,671	15,421	15,421	2.07 %	100.00 %
	Elkin (Surry)	745,671	4,049	4,049	0.54 %	100.00 %
	Elkin (Wilkes)	745,671	73	73	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Gamewell	745,671	3,702	3,702	0.50 %	100.00 %
	Granite Falls	745,671	4,965	4,965	0.67 %	100.00 %
	Greensboro	745,671	299,035	272,009	36.48 %	90.96 %
	Hickory (Caldwell)	745,671	32	32	0.00 %	100.00 %
	Hudson	745,671	3,780	3,780	0.51 %	100.00 %
	Jefferson	745,671	1,622	1,622	0.22 %	100.00 %
	King (Stokes)	745,671	6,606	6,606	0.89 %	100.00 %
	Lansing	745,671	126	126	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Lenoir	745,671	18,352	18,352	2.46 %	100.00 %
	Madison	745,671	2,129	2,129	0.29 %	100.00 %
	Mayodan	745,671	2,418	2,418	0.32 %	100.00 %
	Mount Airy	745,671	10,676	10,676	1.43 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-174.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:41 PM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 12 of 17

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174**

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
11	North Wilkesboro	745,671	4,382	4,382	0.59 %	100.00 %
	Oak Ridge	745,671	7,474	7,474	1.00 %	100.00 %
	Pilot Mountain	745,671	1,440	1,440	0.19 %	100.00 %
	Reidsville	745,671	14,583	14,583	1.96 %	100.00 %
	Rhodhiss (Caldwell)	745,671	358	358	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Ronda	745,671	438	438	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Rutherford College (Caldwell)	745,671	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Sawmills	745,671	5,020	5,020	0.67 %	100.00 %
	Seven Devils (Watauga)	745,671	275	275	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Sparta	745,671	1,834	1,834	0.25 %	100.00 %
	Stokesdale	745,671	5,924	5,924	0.79 %	100.00 %
	Stoneville	745,671	1,308	1,308	0.18 %	100.00 %
	Summerfield	745,671	10,951	10,951	1.47 %	100.00 %
	Taylorsville	745,671	2,320	2,320	0.31 %	100.00 %
	Tobaccoville (Stokes)	745,671	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Walnut Cove	745,671	1,586	1,586	0.21 %	100.00 %
	Wentworth	745,671	2,662	2,662	0.36 %	100.00 %
	West Jefferson	745,671	1,279	1,279	0.17 %	100.00 %
	Wilkesboro	745,671	3,687	3,687	0.49 %	100.00 %
12	Bethania	745,670	344	344	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Boonville	745,670	1,185	1,185	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Brookford	745,670	442	442	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Catawba	745,670	702	702	0.09 %	100.00 %
	Claremont	745,670	1,692	1,692	0.23 %	100.00 %
	Clemmons	745,670	21,163	21,163	2.84 %	100.00 %
	Conover	745,670	8,421	8,421	1.13 %	100.00 %
	East Bend	745,670	634	634	0.09 %	100.00 %
	Harmony	745,670	543	543	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Hickory (Catawba)	745,670	43,379	43,379	5.82 %	100.00 %
	High Point (Forsyth)	745,670	84	84	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Jonesville	745,670	2,308	2,308	0.31 %	100.00 %
	Kernersville (Forsyth)	745,670	25,947	25,947	3.48 %	100.00 %
	King (Forsyth)	745,670	591	591	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Lewisville	745,670	13,381	13,381	1.79 %	100.00 %
	Lincolnton	745,670	11,091	11,091	1.49 %	100.00 %
	Long View (Catawba)	745,670	4,353	4,353	0.58 %	100.00 %
	Love Valley	745,670	154	154	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Maiden (Catawba)	745,670	3,736	3,736	0.50 %	100.00 %
	Maiden (Lincoln)	745,670	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Newton	745,670	13,148	13,148	1.76 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-174.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:41 PM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 13 of 17

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174**

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
12	Rural Hall	745,670	3,351	3,351	0.45 %	100.00 %
	Statesville	745,670	28,419	28,419	3.81 %	100.00 %
	Tobaccoville (Forsyth)	745,670	2,578	2,578	0.35 %	100.00 %
	Walkertown	745,670	5,692	5,692	0.76 %	100.00 %
	Winston-Salem	745,670	249,545	249,545	33.47 %	100.00 %
	Yadkinville	745,670	2,995	2,995	0.40 %	100.00 %
13	Belmont	745,671	15,010	15,010	2.01 %	100.00 %
	Belwood	745,671	857	857	0.11 %	100.00 %
	Bessemer City	745,671	5,428	5,428	0.73 %	100.00 %
	Boiling Springs	745,671	4,615	4,615	0.62 %	100.00 %
	Bostic	745,671	355	355	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Casar	745,671	305	305	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Charlotte	745,671	874,579	49,486	6.64 %	5.66 %
	Cherryville	745,671	6,078	6,078	0.82 %	100.00 %
	Chimney Rock Village	745,671	140	140	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Columbus	745,671	1,060	1,060	0.14 %	100.00 %
	Connelly Springs	745,671	1,529	1,529	0.21 %	100.00 %
	Cornelius	745,671	31,412	31,412	4.21 %	100.00 %
	Cramerton	745,671	5,296	5,296	0.71 %	100.00 %
	Dallas	745,671	5,927	5,927	0.79 %	100.00 %
	Davidson (Mecklenburg)	745,671	14,728	14,728	1.98 %	100.00 %
	Dellview	745,671	6	6	0.00 %	100.00 %
	Drexel	745,671	1,760	1,760	0.24 %	100.00 %
	Earl	745,671	198	198	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Ellenboro	745,671	723	723	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Fallston	745,671	627	627	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Forest City	745,671	7,377	7,377	0.99 %	100.00 %
	Gastonia	745,671	80,411	80,411	10.78 %	100.00 %
	Glen Alpine	745,671	1,529	1,529	0.21 %	100.00 %
	Grover	745,671	802	802	0.11 %	100.00 %
	Hickory (Burke)	745,671	79	79	0.01 %	100.00 %
	High Shoals	745,671	595	595	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Hildebran	745,671	1,679	1,679	0.23 %	100.00 %
	Huntersville	745,671	61,376	61,376	8.23 %	100.00 %
	Kings Mountain (Cleveland)	745,671	10,032	10,032	1.35 %	100.00 %
	Kings Mountain (Gaston)	745,671	1,110	1,110	0.15 %	100.00 %
	Kingstown	745,671	656	656	0.09 %	100.00 %
	Lake Lure	745,671	1,365	1,365	0.18 %	100.00 %
	Lattimore	745,671	406	406	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Lawndale	745,671	570	570	0.08 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-174.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:41 PM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 14 of 17

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174**

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
13	Long View (Burke)	745,671	735	735	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Lowell	745,671	3,654	3,654	0.49 %	100.00 %
	Marion	745,671	7,717	7,717	1.03 %	100.00 %
	McAdenville	745,671	890	890	0.12 %	100.00 %
	Mooresboro	745,671	293	293	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Morganton	745,671	17,474	17,474	2.34 %	100.00 %
	Mount Holly	745,671	17,703	17,703	2.37 %	100.00 %
	Old Fort	745,671	811	811	0.11 %	100.00 %
	Patterson Springs	745,671	571	571	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Pineville	745,671	10,602	10,602	1.42 %	100.00 %
	Polkville	745,671	516	516	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Ranlo	745,671	4,511	4,511	0.60 %	100.00 %
	Rhodhiss (Burke)	745,671	639	639	0.09 %	100.00 %
	Ruth	745,671	347	347	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Rutherford College (Burke)	745,671	1,226	1,226	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Rutherfordton	745,671	3,640	3,640	0.49 %	100.00 %
	Saluda (Polk)	745,671	620	620	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Shelby	745,671	21,918	21,918	2.94 %	100.00 %
	Spencer Mountain	745,671	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Spindale	745,671	4,225	4,225	0.57 %	100.00 %
	Stanley	745,671	3,963	3,963	0.53 %	100.00 %
	Tryon	745,671	1,562	1,562	0.21 %	100.00 %
	Valdese	745,671	4,689	4,689	0.63 %	100.00 %
	Waco	745,671	310	310	0.04 %	100.00 %
14	Andrews	745,670	1,667	1,667	0.22 %	100.00 %
	Asheville	745,670	94,589	94,589	12.69 %	100.00 %
	Bakersville	745,670	450	450	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Banner Elk	745,670	1,049	1,049	0.14 %	100.00 %
	Beech Mountain (Avery)	745,670	62	62	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Beech Mountain (Watauga)	745,670	613	613	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Biltmore Forest	745,670	1,409	1,409	0.19 %	100.00 %
	Black Mountain	745,670	8,426	8,426	1.13 %	100.00 %
	Blowing Rock (Watauga)	745,670	1,285	1,285	0.17 %	100.00 %
	Boone	745,670	19,092	19,092	2.56 %	100.00 %
	Brevard	745,670	7,744	7,744	1.04 %	100.00 %
	Bryson City	745,670	1,558	1,558	0.21 %	100.00 %
	Burnsville	745,670	1,614	1,614	0.22 %	100.00 %
	Canton	745,670	4,422	4,422	0.59 %	100.00 %
	Clyde	745,670	1,368	1,368	0.18 %	100.00 %
	Crossnore	745,670	143	143	0.02 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-174.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:41 PM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 15 of 17

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
14	Dillsboro	745,670	213	213	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Elk Park	745,670	542	542	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Flat Rock	745,670	3,486	3,486	0.47 %	100.00 %
	Fletcher	745,670	7,987	7,987	1.07 %	100.00 %
	Fontana Dam	745,670	13	13	0.00 %	100.00 %
	Forest Hills	745,670	303	303	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Franklin	745,670	4,175	4,175	0.56 %	100.00 %
	Grandfather Village	745,670	95	95	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Hayesville	745,670	461	461	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Hendersonville	745,670	15,137	15,137	2.03 %	100.00 %
	Highlands (Jackson)	745,670	12	12	0.00 %	100.00 %
	Highlands (Macon)	745,670	1,060	1,060	0.14 %	100.00 %
	Hot Springs	745,670	520	520	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Lake Santeetlah	745,670	38	38	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Laurel Park	745,670	2,250	2,250	0.30 %	100.00 %
	Maggie Valley	745,670	1,687	1,687	0.23 %	100.00 %
	Mars Hill	745,670	2,007	2,007	0.27 %	100.00 %
	Marshall	745,670	777	777	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Mills River	745,670	7,078	7,078	0.95 %	100.00 %
	Montreat	745,670	901	901	0.12 %	100.00 %
	Murphy	745,670	1,608	1,608	0.22 %	100.00 %
	Newland	745,670	715	715	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Robbinsville	745,670	597	597	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Rosman	745,670	701	701	0.09 %	100.00 %
	Saluda (Henderson)	745,670	11	11	0.00 %	100.00 %
	Seven Devils (Avery)	745,670	38	38	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Spruce Pine	745,670	2,194	2,194	0.29 %	100.00 %
	Sugar Mountain	745,670	371	371	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Sylva	745,670	2,578	2,578	0.35 %	100.00 %
	Waynesville	745,670	10,140	10,140	1.36 %	100.00 %
	Weaverville	745,670	4,567	4,567	0.61 %	100.00 %
	Webster	745,670	372	372	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Woodfin	745,670	7,936	7,936	1.06 %	100.00 %
Total:				6,017,605		

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174

Total Districts Assigned: 14

Total Municipalities (by County) Statewide: 614

Fully Assigned Municipalities: 614

Partially Assigned Municipalities: 0

Fully Unassigned Municipalities: 0

Split Municipalities: 15

Splits Involving Population: 2

Whole-Split VTD Counts by District Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174

District	County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
1	Beaufort	21	0
	Camden	3	0
	Carteret	28	0
	Chowan	6	0
	Craven	21	0
	Currituck	11	0
	Dare	16	0
	Gates	6	0
	Hyde	7	0
	Jones	7	0
	Lenoir	22	0
	Onslow	11	1
	Pamlico	10	0
	Pasquotank	9	0
	Perquimans	7	0
	Pitt	39	1
	Tyrrell	6	0
2	Bertie	12	0
	Caswell	9	0
	Edgecombe	21	0
	Franklin	18	0
	Granville	15	0
	Greene	10	0
	Halifax	23	0
	Hertford	13	0
	Martin	13	0
	Nash	24	0
	Northampton	13	0
	Person	11	0
	Pitt	0	1
	Vance	12	0
	Warren	14	0
	Washington	6	0
	Wayne	26	1
	Wilson	24	0
3	Bladen	17	0
	Brunswick	25	0
	Columbus	26	0
	Duplin	19	0
	New Hanover	43	0
	Onslow	12	1
	Pender	20	0
	Robeson	38	1

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-174.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:41 PM

Based on TIGER 2020 VTDs

[G20-VTD-SbD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Whole-Split VTD Counts by District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174**

District	County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
4	Cumberland	76	0
	Harnett	12	1
	Johnston	36	0
	Sampson	23	0
	Wayne	1	1
5	Wake	141	6
6	Durham	57	0
	Orange	41	0
	Wake	41	9
7	Alamance	37	0
	Chatham	18	0
	Davidson	26	2
	Guilford	23	0
	Harnett	0	1
	Lee	10	0
	Randolph	22	0
	Wake	11	8
8	Anson	9	0
	Hoke	15	0
	Mecklenburg	27	1
	Montgomery	14	0
	Moore	26	0
	Richmond	16	0
	Robeson	0	1
	Scotland	7	0
	Stanly	22	0
	Union	52	0
9	Mecklenburg	144	2
10	Cabarrus	40	0
	Davidson	15	2
	Davie	14	0
	Guilford	43	1
	Iredell	10	2
	Rowan	41	0

Whole-Split VTD Counts by District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174**

District	County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
11	Alexander	10	0
	Alleghany	4	0
	Ashe	17	0
	Caldwell	20	0
	Guilford	98	1
	Rockingham	15	0
	Stokes	18	0
	Surry	24	0
	Watauga	0	1
	Wilkes	27	0
12	Catawba	40	0
	Forsyth	101	0
	Iredell	17	2
	Lincoln	23	0
	Yadkin	12	0
13	Burke	33	0
	Cleveland	21	0
	Gaston	46	0
	McDowell	17	0
	Mecklenburg	22	1
	Polk	7	0
	Rutherford	17	0
14	Avery	19	0
	Buncombe	79	0
	Cherokee	16	0
	Clay	9	0
	Graham	4	0
	Haywood	29	0
	Henderson	34	0
	Jackson	13	0
	Macon	15	0
	Madison	12	0
	Mitchell	9	0
	Swain	5	0
	Transylvania	15	0
	Watauga	19	1
	Yancey	11	0
Total:		2,642	

Whole-Split VTD Counts by District Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174

Total Districts Assigned: 14

Total VTDs Statewide: 2666

Fully Assigned VTDs: 2666

Partially Assigned VTDs: 0

Fully Unassigned VTDs: 0

Split VTDs: 24

Splits Involving Population: 24

Whole-Split VTD Counts by County Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174

County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
Alamance	37	0
Alexander	10	0
Alleghany	4	0
Anson	9	0
Ashe	17	0
Avery	19	0
Beaufort	21	0
Bertie	12	0
Bladen	17	0
Brunswick	25	0
Buncombe	79	0
Burke	33	0
Cabarrus	40	0
Caldwell	20	0
Camden	3	0
Carteret	28	0
Caswell	9	0
Catawba	40	0
Chatham	18	0
Cherokee	16	0
Chowan	6	0
Clay	9	0
Cleveland	21	0
Columbus	26	0
Craven	21	0
Cumberland	76	0
Currituck	11	0
Dare	16	0
Davidson	41	2
Davie	14	0
Duplin	19	0
Durham	57	0
Edgecombe	21	0
Forsyth	101	0
Franklin	18	0
Gaston	46	0
Gates	6	0
Graham	4	0
Granville	15	0
Greene	10	0
Guilford	164	1
Halifax	23	0
Harnett	12	1

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-174.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:41 PM

Based on TIGER 2020 VTDs

[G20-VTD-Sbc] - Generated 2/17/2022

Whole-Split VTD Counts by County Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174**

County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
Haywood	29	0
Henderson	34	0
Hertford	13	0
Hoke	15	0
Hyde	7	0
Iredell	27	2
Jackson	13	0
Johnston	36	0
Jones	7	0
Lee	10	0
Lenoir	22	0
Lincoln	23	0
Macon	15	0
Madison	12	0
Martin	13	0
McDowell	17	0
Mecklenburg	193	2
Mitchell	9	0
Montgomery	14	0
Moore	26	0
Nash	24	0
New Hanover	43	0
Northampton	13	0
Onslow	23	1
Orange	41	0
Pamlico	10	0
Pasquotank	9	0
Pender	20	0
Perquimans	7	0
Person	11	0
Pitt	39	1
Polk	7	0
Randolph	22	0
Richmond	16	0
Robeson	38	1
Rockingham	15	0
Rowan	41	0
Rutherford	17	0
Sampson	23	0
Scotland	7	0
Stanly	22	0
Stokes	18	0
Surry	24	0

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-174.csv', modified 2/17/2022 9:41 PM

Based on TIGER 2020 VTDs

[G20-VTD-SbC] - Generated 2/17/2022

Whole-Split VTD Counts by County Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174

County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
Swain	5	0
Transylvania	15	0
Tyrrell	6	0
Union	52	0
Vance	12	0
Wake	193	11
Warren	14	0
Washington	6	0
Watauga	19	1
Wayne	27	1
Wilkes	27	0
Wilson	24	0
Yadkin	12	0
Yancey	11	0
Totals:	2,642	24

Total VTDs Statewide: 2666

Fully Assigned VTDs: 2666

Partially Assigned VTDs: 0

Fully Unassigned VTDs: 0

Total Districts Assigned: 14

Split VTDs: 24

Splits Involving Population: 24

Split VTD Detail Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174

County	VTD	District	Total VTD Population	VTD Pop in District	Percent of VTD Pop in District
Davidson	010	7	3,916	36	0.92 %
		10	3,916	3,880	99.08 %
	072	7	4,124	3,149	76.36 %
		10	4,124	975	23.64 %
Guilford	NDRI	10	3,981	3,505	88.04 %
		11	3,981	476	11.96 %
Harnett	PR28	4	8,924	3,765	42.19 %
		7	8,924	5,159	57.81 %
Iredell	CH-A	10	3,552	172	4.84 %
		12	3,552	3,380	95.16 %
	CH-B	10	4,956	4,892	98.71 %
		12	4,956	64	1.29 %
Mecklenburg	201	8	12,575	979	7.79 %
		9	12,575	11,596	92.21 %
	230	9	16,146	2,476	15.34 %
		13	16,146	13,670	84.66 %
Onslow	VR15	1	3,790	1,014	26.75 %
		3	3,790	2,776	73.25 %
Pitt	401	1	2,204	704	31.94 %
		2	2,204	1,500	68.06 %
Robeson	034	3	2,795	2,154	77.07 %
		8	2,795	641	22.93 %
Wake	03-00	6	10,670	8,425	78.96 %
		7	10,670	2,245	21.04 %
	04-05	5	5,069	970	19.14 %
		6	5,069	4,099	80.86 %
	05-05	5	12,050	12,022	99.77 %
		6	12,050	28	0.23 %
	06-07	6	5,380	2,498	46.43 %
		7	5,380	2,882	53.57 %
	06-09	6	12,143	26	0.21 %
		7	12,143	12,117	99.79 %
	12-04	5	8,474	6,075	71.69 %
		7	8,474	2,399	28.31 %
	12-05	6	12,886	2,018	15.66 %
		7	12,886	10,868	84.34 %
	18-02	5	6,578	2,407	36.59 %
		6	6,578	3,250	49.41 %
		7	6,578	921	14.00 %
	18-07	5	5,085	2,553	50.21 %
		7	5,085	2,532	49.79 %

Split VTD Detail Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174**

County	VTD	District	Total VTD Population	VTD Pop in District	Percent of VTD Pop in District
Wake	18-08	5	6,727	10	0.15 %
		6	6,727	6,717	99.85 %
	20-01	6	7,187	5,389	74.98 %
		7	7,187	1,798	25.02 %
Watauga	019	11	3,898	3,729	95.66 %
		14	3,898	169	4.34 %
Wayne	008	2	4,364	683	15.65 %
		4	4,364	3,681	84.35 %
Assigned Geography Total:				167,474	

Total VTDs Statewide: 2666

Fully Assigned VTDs: 2666

Partially Assigned VTDs: 0

Fully Unassigned VTDs: 0

Total Districts Assigned: 14

Split VTDs: 24

Splits Involving Population: 24

Incumbent-District Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174

Residence Set: Congress - 9/22/2021

Last Name	First Name	Party	Current District	District in this Plan
Adams	Alma	Democratic	12	9
Bishop	Dan	Republican	9	9
Budd	Ted	Republican	13	10
Butterfield	GK	Democratic	1	2
Cawthorn	Madison	Republican	11	14
Foxx	Virginia	Republican	5	11
Hudson	Richard	Republican	8	10
Manning	Kathy	Democratic	6	11
McHenry	Patrick	Republican	10	12
Murphy	Greg	Republican	3	1
Price	David	Democratic	4	6
Ross	Deborah	Democratic	2	5
Rouzer	David	Republican	7	3

District-Incumbent Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-174****Residence Set: Congress - 9/22/2021**

District in this Plan	Last Name	First Name	Party	Current District
1	Murphy	Greg	Republican	3
2	Butterfield	GK	Democratic	1
3	Rouzer	David	Republican	7
4				
5	Ross	Deborah	Democratic	2
6	Price	David	Democratic	4
7				
8				
9	Adams	Alma	Democratic	12
	Bishop	Dan	Republican	9
10	Budd	Ted	Republican	13
	Hudson	Richard	Republican	8
11	Foxx	Virginia	Republican	5
	Manning	Kathy	Democratic	6
12	McHenry	Patrick	Republican	10
13				
14	Cawthorn	Madison	Republican	11

Population Deviation Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175**

District	Seats	Ideal Pop	Actual Pop	Deviation	Deviation %
1	1	86,995	84,330	-2,665	-3.06%
2	1	86,995	90,793	3,798	4.37%
3	1	86,995	85,099	-1,896	-2.18%
4	1	86,995	83,095	-3,900	-4.48%
5	1	86,995	82,953	-4,042	-4.65%
6	1	86,995	87,332	337	0.39%
7	1	86,995	83,510	-3,485	-4.01%
8	1	86,995	85,793	-1,202	-1.38%
9	1	86,995	84,450	-2,545	-2.93%
10	1	86,995	82,953	-4,042	-4.65%
11	1	86,995	86,298	-697	-0.80%
12	1	86,995	84,745	-2,250	-2.59%
13	1	86,995	83,307	-3,688	-4.24%
14	1	86,995	86,538	-457	-0.53%
15	1	86,995	87,578	583	0.67%
16	1	86,995	90,663	3,668	4.22%
17	1	86,995	89,763	2,768	3.18%
18	1	86,995	91,245	4,250	4.89%
19	1	86,995	91,041	4,046	4.65%
20	1	86,995	90,346	3,351	3.85%
21	1	86,995	86,179	-816	-0.94%
22	1	86,995	88,642	1,647	1.89%
23	1	86,995	88,865	1,870	2.15%
24	1	86,995	87,220	225	0.26%
25	1	86,995	86,534	-461	-0.53%
26	1	86,995	89,947	2,952	3.39%
27	1	86,995	84,735	-2,260	-2.60%
28	1	86,995	85,389	-1,606	-1.85%
29	1	86,995	91,212	4,217	4.85%
30	1	86,995	91,165	4,170	4.79%
31	1	86,995	90,760	3,765	4.33%
32	1	86,995	88,633	1,638	1.88%
33	1	86,995	83,049	-3,946	-4.54%
34	1	86,995	83,679	-3,316	-3.81%
35	1	86,995	88,374	1,379	1.59%
36	1	86,995	90,166	3,171	3.65%
37	1	86,995	90,867	3,872	4.45%
38	1	86,995	88,226	1,231	1.42%
39	1	86,995	90,164	3,169	3.64%
40	1	86,995	83,175	-3,820	-4.39%
41	1	86,995	89,887	2,892	3.32%
42	1	86,995	85,537	-1,458	-1.68%
43	1	86,995	82,956	-4,039	-4.64%

Population Deviation Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175**

District	Seats	Ideal Pop	Actual Pop	Deviation	Deviation %
44	1	86,995	83,297	-3,698	-4.25%
45	1	86,995	82,938	-4,057	-4.66%
46	1	86,995	83,445	-3,550	-4.08%
47	1	86,995	83,708	-3,287	-3.78%
48	1	86,995	86,256	-739	-0.85%
49	1	86,995	86,157	-838	-0.96%
50	1	86,995	85,345	-1,650	-1.90%
51	1	86,995	83,073	-3,922	-4.51%
52	1	86,995	84,383	-2,612	-3.00%
53	1	86,995	86,899	-96	-0.11%
54	1	86,995	83,475	-3,520	-4.05%
55	1	86,995	87,005	10	0.01%
56	1	86,995	86,087	-908	-1.04%
57	1	86,995	90,615	3,620	4.16%
58	1	86,995	90,808	3,813	4.38%
59	1	86,995	90,361	3,366	3.87%
60	1	86,995	89,735	2,740	3.15%
61	1	86,995	90,201	3,206	3.69%
62	1	86,995	89,579	2,584	2.97%
63	1	86,995	86,399	-596	-0.69%
64	1	86,995	85,016	-1,979	-2.27%
65	1	86,995	91,096	4,101	4.71%
66	1	86,995	83,189	-3,806	-4.37%
67	1	86,995	88,255	1,260	1.45%
68	1	86,995	88,138	1,143	1.31%
69	1	86,995	85,179	-1,816	-2.09%
70	1	86,995	89,118	2,123	2.44%
71	1	86,995	84,874	-2,121	-2.44%
72	1	86,995	86,949	-46	-0.05%
73	1	86,995	90,649	3,654	4.20%
74	1	86,995	84,857	-2,138	-2.46%
75	1	86,995	84,220	-2,775	-3.19%
76	1	86,995	89,815	2,820	3.24%
77	1	86,995	90,628	3,633	4.18%
78	1	86,995	86,365	-630	-0.72%
79	1	86,995	83,163	-3,832	-4.40%
80	1	86,995	84,864	-2,131	-2.45%
81	1	86,995	84,066	-2,929	-3.37%
82	1	86,995	90,771	3,776	4.34%
83	1	86,995	90,742	3,747	4.31%
84	1	86,995	86,773	-222	-0.26%
85	1	86,995	90,863	3,868	4.45%
86	1	86,995	87,570	575	0.66%

Population Deviation Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175**

District	Seats	Ideal Pop	Actual Pop	Deviation	Deviation %
87	1	86,995	85,758	-1,237	-1.42%
88	1	86,995	82,834	-4,161	-4.78%
89	1	86,995	85,577	-1,418	-1.63%
90	1	86,995	82,937	-4,058	-4.66%
91	1	86,995	86,210	-785	-0.90%
92	1	86,995	85,031	-1,964	-2.26%
93	1	86,995	86,445	-550	-0.63%
94	1	86,995	90,835	3,840	4.41%
95	1	86,995	85,366	-1,629	-1.87%
96	1	86,995	89,587	2,592	2.98%
97	1	86,995	86,810	-185	-0.21%
98	1	86,995	86,827	-168	-0.19%
99	1	86,995	87,647	652	0.75%
100	1	86,995	87,197	202	0.23%
101	1	86,995	86,426	-569	-0.65%
102	1	86,995	86,179	-816	-0.94%
103	1	86,995	87,132	137	0.16%
104	1	86,995	86,520	-475	-0.55%
105	1	86,995	85,822	-1,173	-1.35%
106	1	86,995	82,824	-4,171	-4.79%
107	1	86,995	88,237	1,242	1.43%
108	1	86,995	86,263	-732	-0.84%
109	1	86,995	87,762	767	0.88%
110	1	86,995	88,397	1,402	1.61%
111	1	86,995	89,894	2,899	3.33%
112	1	86,995	82,806	-4,189	-4.82%
113	1	86,995	89,058	2,063	2.37%
114	1	86,995	89,685	2,690	3.09%
115	1	86,995	90,262	3,267	3.76%
116	1	86,995	89,505	2,510	2.89%
117	1	86,995	91,035	4,040	4.64%
118	1	86,995	83,282	-3,713	-4.27%
119	1	86,995	90,212	3,217	3.70%
120	1	86,995	84,907	-2,088	-2.40%
Totals:	120		10,439,388		

Deviation range: -4.82% to 4.89%

2020 Election Contest Report - US President-15295-

NC General Assembly

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib	Grn	% Grn	Cnst	% Cnst	W-I	% W-I
1	30,549	61.42%	18,491	37.18%	416	0.84%	78	0.16%	118	0.24%	83	0.17%
2	25,461	46.43%	28,651	52.24%	431	0.79%	101	0.18%	95	0.17%	104	0.19%
3	27,012	58.58%	18,363	39.83%	497	1.08%	79	0.17%	76	0.16%	81	0.18%
4	22,748	60.04%	14,816	39.10%	175	0.46%	57	0.15%	53	0.14%	39	0.10%
5	20,932	49.27%	21,024	49.49%	306	0.72%	69	0.16%	65	0.15%	84	0.20%
6	21,553	59.60%	13,891	38.41%	524	1.45%	85	0.24%	51	0.14%	60	0.17%
7	26,510	57.14%	19,161	41.30%	413	0.89%	90	0.19%	110	0.24%	107	0.23%
8	14,003	35.39%	24,955	63.06%	344	0.87%	91	0.23%	93	0.24%	87	0.22%
9	24,740	52.17%	21,926	46.23%	444	0.94%	118	0.25%	76	0.16%	120	0.25%
10	21,675	53.90%	18,066	44.92%	287	0.71%	68	0.17%	65	0.16%	54	0.13%
11	12,435	27.60%	31,508	69.94%	695	1.54%	172	0.38%	71	0.16%	168	0.37%
12	22,745	53.22%	19,633	45.94%	186	0.44%	42	0.10%	90	0.21%	42	0.10%
13	34,048	68.49%	14,878	29.93%	502	1.01%	77	0.15%	112	0.23%	93	0.19%
14	20,216	58.81%	13,256	38.56%	714	2.08%	66	0.19%	54	0.16%	69	0.20%
15	16,471	66.05%	7,781	31.20%	541	2.17%	46	0.18%	38	0.15%	61	0.24%
16	31,347	66.53%	14,952	31.74%	580	1.23%	87	0.18%	77	0.16%	71	0.15%
17	34,687	60.64%	21,863	38.22%	422	0.74%	78	0.14%	57	0.10%	98	0.17%
18	18,989	39.11%	28,561	58.83%	640	1.32%	180	0.37%	59	0.12%	118	0.24%
19	36,065	60.29%	22,976	38.41%	499	0.83%	96	0.16%	68	0.11%	114	0.19%
20	29,363	52.19%	25,929	46.09%	601	1.07%	127	0.23%	97	0.17%	140	0.25%
21	23,103	43.26%	29,216	54.71%	662	1.24%	116	0.22%	97	0.18%	212	0.40%
22	27,078	59.16%	18,286	39.95%	211	0.46%	41	0.09%	92	0.20%	63	0.14%
23	19,515	40.88%	27,868	58.38%	184	0.39%	61	0.13%	70	0.15%	39	0.08%
24	22,228	49.47%	22,227	49.47%	283	0.63%	62	0.14%	67	0.15%	65	0.14%
25	23,180	48.18%	24,474	50.87%	249	0.52%	69	0.14%	69	0.14%	72	0.15%
26	27,585	56.57%	20,310	41.65%	579	1.19%	117	0.24%	74	0.15%	101	0.21%
27	17,514	39.82%	26,098	59.34%	154	0.35%	69	0.16%	106	0.24%	39	0.09%
28	26,628	66.61%	12,846	32.13%	333	0.83%	60	0.15%	42	0.11%	68	0.17%
29	6,351	12.49%	43,706	85.95%	373	0.73%	159	0.31%	82	0.16%	177	0.35%
30	5,297	11.34%	40,704	87.16%	354	0.76%	143	0.31%	63	0.13%	138	0.30%
31	8,487	17.28%	39,768	80.98%	488	0.99%	158	0.32%	59	0.12%	146	0.30%
32	19,429	44.54%	23,710	54.36%	258	0.59%	64	0.15%	92	0.21%	64	0.15%
33	6,017	15.19%	32,889	83.06%	366	0.92%	135	0.34%	64	0.16%	128	0.32%
34	15,285	31.52%	32,222	66.45%	575	1.19%	133	0.27%	77	0.16%	195	0.40%
35	26,603	49.04%	26,512	48.88%	676	1.25%	107	0.20%	100	0.18%	246	0.45%
36	20,600	40.38%	29,358	57.54%	704	1.38%	109	0.21%	59	0.12%	189	0.37%
37	27,431	51.42%	24,771	46.44%	747	1.40%	128	0.24%	90	0.17%	177	0.33%
38	10,849	24.19%	33,199	74.02%	466	1.04%	139	0.31%	77	0.17%	121	0.27%
39	18,486	38.59%	28,613	59.72%	485	1.01%	96	0.20%	79	0.16%	150	0.31%
40	21,678	38.92%	32,896	59.06%	668	1.20%	122	0.22%	94	0.17%	244	0.44%
41	14,458	31.67%	30,454	66.70%	441	0.97%	112	0.25%	52	0.11%	141	0.31%
42	9,382	32.09%	19,227	65.76%	398	1.36%	103	0.35%	46	0.16%	80	0.27%
43	20,828	49.70%	20,392	48.66%	385	0.92%	100	0.24%	111	0.26%	94	0.22%
44	10,036	27.52%	25,707	70.50%	437	1.20%	119	0.33%	88	0.24%	76	0.21%
45	19,786	49.97%	19,143	48.35%	425	1.07%	101	0.26%	54	0.14%	87	0.22%
46	25,674	62.09%	15,375	37.18%	133	0.32%	37	0.09%	89	0.22%	40	0.10%
47	18,962	58.66%	13,091	40.50%	116	0.36%	59	0.18%	48	0.15%	51	0.16%
48	16,926	46.47%	18,990	52.14%	316	0.87%	81	0.22%	53	0.15%	56	0.15%

Candidates: Trump (Rep), Biden (Dem), Jorgensen (Lib), Hawkins (Grn), Blankenship (Cst)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

[EL20-PRS-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - US President-15296-

NC General Assembly

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib	Grn	% Grn	Cnst	% Cnst	W-I	% W-I
49	14,839	30.85%	32,312	67.17%	613	1.27%	126	0.26%	53	0.11%	162	0.34%
50	21,540	42.24%	28,793	56.46%	381	0.75%	96	0.19%	84	0.16%	106	0.21%
51	23,774	60.28%	15,116	38.33%	338	0.86%	81	0.21%	70	0.18%	59	0.15%
52	24,769	56.84%	18,241	41.86%	350	0.80%	69	0.16%	66	0.15%	83	0.19%
53	27,764	62.05%	16,303	36.44%	436	0.97%	78	0.17%	63	0.14%	99	0.22%
54	23,857	45.55%	27,826	53.13%	387	0.74%	95	0.18%	95	0.18%	115	0.22%
55	26,702	59.59%	17,563	39.19%	305	0.68%	66	0.15%	104	0.23%	72	0.16%
56	5,725	12.41%	39,659	86.00%	336	0.73%	140	0.30%	75	0.16%	181	0.39%
57	14,225	29.95%	32,557	68.55%	353	0.74%	92	0.19%	121	0.25%	149	0.31%
58	10,336	25.03%	30,341	73.48%	318	0.77%	129	0.31%	70	0.17%	95	0.23%
59	28,134	52.17%	25,076	46.50%	394	0.73%	115	0.21%	95	0.18%	115	0.21%
60	14,224	34.61%	26,226	63.81%	322	0.78%	122	0.30%	100	0.24%	106	0.26%
61	11,253	24.25%	34,427	74.20%	361	0.78%	139	0.30%	78	0.17%	141	0.30%
62	29,123	53.51%	24,460	44.94%	484	0.89%	107	0.20%	115	0.21%	140	0.26%
63	20,997	49.20%	21,040	49.30%	356	0.83%	106	0.25%	92	0.22%	87	0.20%
64	25,059	57.70%	17,785	40.95%	330	0.76%	117	0.27%	78	0.18%	63	0.15%
65	31,301	65.47%	15,992	33.45%	312	0.65%	75	0.16%	55	0.12%	74	0.15%
66	14,413	32.35%	29,386	65.96%	416	0.93%	117	0.26%	68	0.15%	154	0.35%
67	33,869	72.35%	12,456	26.61%	303	0.65%	45	0.10%	83	0.18%	56	0.12%
68	30,900	58.67%	20,904	39.69%	484	0.92%	104	0.20%	81	0.15%	195	0.37%
69	28,102	62.75%	16,047	35.83%	388	0.87%	82	0.18%	61	0.14%	102	0.23%
70	33,424	75.84%	10,146	23.02%	310	0.70%	78	0.18%	60	0.14%	55	0.12%
71	11,028	28.60%	26,953	69.89%	289	0.75%	130	0.34%	63	0.16%	102	0.26%
72	12,302	26.65%	33,022	71.55%	418	0.91%	132	0.29%	120	0.26%	160	0.35%
73	28,141	56.62%	20,771	41.79%	479	0.96%	108	0.22%	67	0.13%	136	0.27%
74	26,361	51.56%	23,910	46.77%	508	0.99%	104	0.20%	80	0.16%	164	0.32%
75	27,019	59.25%	17,921	39.30%	410	0.90%	84	0.18%	59	0.13%	106	0.23%
76	26,943	61.11%	16,534	37.50%	337	0.76%	103	0.23%	84	0.19%	89	0.20%
77	38,630	75.25%	11,973	23.32%	386	0.75%	94	0.18%	133	0.26%	118	0.23%
78	37,320	73.71%	12,751	25.18%	341	0.67%	75	0.15%	55	0.11%	89	0.18%
79	30,867	61.27%	18,891	37.50%	330	0.66%	73	0.14%	133	0.26%	86	0.17%
80	33,169	74.44%	10,747	24.12%	358	0.80%	93	0.21%	121	0.27%	71	0.16%
81	31,459	71.55%	11,880	27.02%	345	0.78%	94	0.21%	122	0.28%	69	0.16%
82	23,601	53.18%	20,064	45.21%	416	0.94%	98	0.22%	67	0.15%	132	0.30%
83	29,381	63.22%	16,406	35.30%	399	0.86%	85	0.18%	67	0.14%	135	0.29%
84	29,577	66.25%	14,481	32.44%	343	0.77%	74	0.17%	82	0.18%	89	0.20%
85	36,527	73.01%	12,867	25.72%	347	0.69%	90	0.18%	114	0.23%	85	0.17%
86	31,019	69.43%	13,118	29.36%	270	0.60%	83	0.19%	117	0.26%	69	0.15%
87	33,856	73.08%	11,908	25.70%	316	0.68%	68	0.15%	85	0.18%	94	0.20%
88	14,082	29.88%	32,093	68.09%	546	1.16%	127	0.27%	69	0.15%	216	0.46%
89	35,214	74.02%	11,749	24.70%	344	0.72%	86	0.18%	83	0.17%	96	0.20%
90	29,453	75.69%	9,046	23.25%	251	0.65%	46	0.12%	54	0.14%	63	0.16%
91	28,488	62.46%	16,511	36.20%	340	0.75%	79	0.17%	100	0.22%	93	0.20%
92	11,642	28.32%	28,776	69.99%	429	1.04%	128	0.31%	48	0.12%	91	0.22%
93	28,683	56.61%	21,106	41.66%	504	0.99%	133	0.26%	110	0.22%	132	0.26%
94	38,020	77.41%	10,573	21.53%	301	0.61%	51	0.10%	93	0.19%	76	0.15%
95	30,916	63.26%	17,150	35.09%	497	1.02%	95	0.19%	86	0.18%	126	0.26%
96	27,891	62.28%	16,197	36.17%	375	0.84%	117	0.26%	106	0.24%	99	0.22%

Candidates: Trump (Rep), Biden (Dem), Jorgensen (Lib), Hawkins (Grn), Blankenship (Cst)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

[EL20-PRS-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - US President-15297-

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib	Grn	% Grn	Cnst	% Cnst	W-I	% W-I
97	36,341	72.33%	13,274	26.42%	373	0.74%	87	0.17%	84	0.17%	83	0.17%
98	25,635	48.45%	26,458	50.01%	480	0.91%	100	0.19%	68	0.13%	168	0.32%
99	8,481	20.92%	31,420	77.50%	297	0.73%	127	0.31%	84	0.21%	132	0.33%
100	9,003	24.89%	26,497	73.24%	341	0.94%	131	0.36%	83	0.23%	123	0.34%
101	11,224	25.91%	31,374	72.44%	373	0.86%	150	0.35%	64	0.15%	126	0.29%
102	6,769	16.52%	33,467	81.66%	394	0.96%	133	0.32%	77	0.19%	144	0.35%
103	25,160	48.68%	25,628	49.58%	505	0.98%	121	0.23%	101	0.20%	173	0.33%
104	23,219	42.08%	30,961	56.11%	572	1.04%	102	0.18%	97	0.18%	224	0.41%
105	18,568	41.45%	25,505	56.94%	423	0.94%	115	0.26%	58	0.13%	127	0.28%
106	5,792	17.45%	26,808	80.78%	309	0.93%	114	0.34%	53	0.16%	110	0.33%
107	10,714	23.42%	34,304	74.97%	372	0.81%	129	0.28%	71	0.16%	165	0.36%
108	25,481	61.18%	15,611	37.48%	334	0.80%	88	0.21%	54	0.13%	78	0.19%
109	28,376	59.87%	18,320	38.65%	415	0.88%	106	0.22%	72	0.15%	108	0.23%
110	32,020	70.63%	12,832	28.31%	270	0.60%	56	0.12%	82	0.18%	73	0.16%
111	31,469	69.25%	13,456	29.61%	294	0.65%	74	0.16%	82	0.18%	66	0.15%
112	8,926	25.94%	24,766	71.97%	385	1.12%	133	0.39%	64	0.19%	136	0.40%
113	33,872	64.91%	17,617	33.76%	379	0.73%	113	0.22%	89	0.17%	113	0.22%
114	14,702	26.88%	39,075	71.43%	449	0.82%	218	0.40%	108	0.20%	153	0.28%
115	21,494	37.87%	34,252	60.35%	530	0.93%	196	0.35%	126	0.22%	159	0.28%
116	26,216	52.22%	23,183	46.18%	481	0.96%	128	0.25%	95	0.19%	103	0.21%
117	30,344	57.35%	21,637	40.89%	543	1.03%	133	0.25%	136	0.26%	116	0.22%
118	30,814	62.02%	18,044	36.32%	437	0.88%	126	0.25%	140	0.28%	122	0.25%
119	27,153	55.49%	20,815	42.53%	509	1.04%	171	0.35%	148	0.30%	141	0.29%
120	35,662	73.07%	12,414	25.44%	336	0.69%	99	0.20%	168	0.34%	124	0.25%
Total:	2,754,299	49.91%	2,680,505	48.57%	48,640	0.88%	12,186	0.22%	9,908	0.18%	13,314	0.24%

Candidates: Trump (Rep), Biden (Dem), Jorgensen (Lib), Hawkins (Grn), Blankenship (Cst)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

[EL20-PRS-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - US Senate -15298-

NC General Assembly

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib	Cnst	% Cnst
1	29,668	60.43%	17,553	35.75%	1,327	2.70%	546	1.11%
2	24,576	45.25%	27,608	50.84%	1,536	2.83%	586	1.08%
3	25,798	56.52%	17,708	38.80%	1,472	3.23%	663	1.45%
4	21,497	57.40%	14,576	38.92%	814	2.17%	562	1.50%
5	20,178	48.30%	20,128	48.18%	1,007	2.41%	462	1.11%
6	20,356	56.67%	13,454	37.45%	1,501	4.18%	611	1.70%
7	25,019	54.28%	18,813	40.82%	1,553	3.37%	704	1.53%
8	13,438	34.28%	24,154	61.61%	1,196	3.05%	415	1.06%
9	24,271	51.49%	21,115	44.80%	1,300	2.76%	448	0.95%
10	20,557	51.69%	17,554	44.14%	1,079	2.71%	582	1.46%
11	12,802	28.64%	29,672	66.38%	1,864	4.17%	365	0.82%
12	21,536	50.86%	19,285	45.55%	962	2.27%	557	1.32%
13	32,236	65.59%	14,562	29.63%	1,612	3.28%	736	1.50%
14	18,737	55.28%	12,709	37.50%	1,753	5.17%	694	2.05%
15	15,439	62.81%	7,479	30.42%	1,255	5.11%	409	1.66%
16	29,352	63.12%	14,442	31.06%	1,893	4.07%	813	1.75%
17	32,825	58.07%	21,137	37.39%	1,823	3.22%	745	1.32%
18	17,944	37.42%	26,934	56.17%	2,297	4.79%	774	1.61%
19	34,351	58.05%	21,861	36.94%	2,172	3.67%	795	1.34%
20	29,196	52.43%	23,843	42.82%	2,102	3.78%	540	0.97%
21	23,759	44.78%	27,058	50.99%	1,816	3.42%	429	0.81%
22	25,476	56.27%	18,119	40.02%	1,034	2.28%	642	1.42%
23	18,175	38.39%	27,687	58.48%	919	1.94%	562	1.19%
24	21,116	47.38%	21,949	49.25%	993	2.23%	510	1.14%
25	22,245	46.57%	23,985	50.21%	1,009	2.11%	532	1.11%
26	26,251	54.41%	19,364	40.14%	1,908	3.95%	720	1.49%
27	16,389	37.49%	26,051	59.60%	812	1.86%	459	1.05%
28	25,068	63.33%	12,682	32.04%	1,213	3.06%	621	1.57%
29	7,085	14.01%	41,751	82.58%	1,392	2.75%	329	0.65%
30	5,920	12.76%	39,035	84.13%	1,156	2.49%	289	0.62%
31	8,719	17.85%	38,208	78.20%	1,547	3.17%	385	0.79%
32	18,197	42.07%	23,479	54.28%	1,055	2.44%	521	1.20%
33	6,633	16.88%	31,165	79.31%	1,250	3.18%	246	0.63%
34	16,267	33.80%	29,905	62.14%	1,639	3.41%	314	0.65%
35	26,915	49.98%	24,659	45.79%	1,836	3.41%	440	0.82%
36	21,546	42.57%	26,748	52.85%	1,921	3.80%	396	0.78%
37	27,135	51.23%	23,107	43.62%	2,220	4.19%	509	0.96%
38	10,504	23.57%	31,993	71.79%	1,603	3.60%	462	1.04%
39	17,903	37.64%	27,398	57.60%	1,737	3.65%	526	1.11%
40	23,104	41.76%	30,097	54.39%	1,842	3.33%	288	0.52%
41	15,319	33.87%	28,231	62.42%	1,411	3.12%	265	0.59%
42	8,928	30.89%	18,352	63.50%	1,201	4.16%	421	1.46%
43	19,904	47.99%	19,582	47.22%	1,363	3.29%	624	1.50%
44	9,512	26.32%	24,575	68.00%	1,465	4.05%	587	1.62%
45	18,777	47.86%	18,505	47.17%	1,350	3.44%	600	1.53%
46	23,621	58.19%	15,588	38.40%	759	1.87%	626	1.54%
47	17,151	54.46%	13,173	41.83%	712	2.26%	456	1.45%
48	15,704	43.80%	18,321	51.10%	1,231	3.43%	599	1.67%

Candidates: Tillis (Rep), Cunningham (Dem), Bray (Lib), Hayes (Cst)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

[EL20-SEN-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - US Senate -15299-

NC General Assembly

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib	Cnst	% Cnst
49	15,910	33.29%	30,028	62.83%	1,567	3.28%	285	0.60%
50	20,930	41.28%	28,050	55.32%	1,274	2.51%	452	0.89%
51	22,354	57.24%	14,780	37.85%	1,306	3.34%	612	1.57%
52	23,582	54.85%	17,321	40.29%	1,401	3.26%	687	1.60%
53	26,468	59.68%	15,794	35.61%	1,459	3.29%	626	1.41%
54	23,545	45.22%	26,752	51.38%	1,286	2.47%	489	0.94%
55	25,636	57.76%	16,984	38.27%	1,163	2.62%	600	1.35%
56	6,575	14.35%	38,104	83.14%	965	2.11%	189	0.41%
57	14,059	29.87%	31,178	66.23%	1,377	2.93%	458	0.97%
58	9,822	24.00%	29,264	71.51%	1,379	3.37%	458	1.12%
59	26,953	50.33%	24,415	45.59%	1,573	2.94%	615	1.15%
60	13,588	33.43%	25,256	62.13%	1,315	3.23%	491	1.21%
61	11,664	25.33%	32,720	71.05%	1,309	2.84%	356	0.77%
62	28,821	53.30%	23,051	42.63%	1,637	3.03%	562	1.04%
63	20,049	47.28%	20,660	48.72%	1,200	2.83%	496	1.17%
64	24,197	56.11%	17,383	40.31%	1,102	2.56%	439	1.02%
65	28,971	61.23%	16,189	34.22%	1,473	3.11%	680	1.44%
66	14,591	33.01%	27,693	62.64%	1,524	3.45%	400	0.90%
67	31,632	68.33%	12,445	26.88%	1,285	2.78%	930	2.01%
68	31,525	60.38%	18,804	36.01%	1,463	2.80%	423	0.81%
69	27,465	61.85%	15,107	34.02%	1,343	3.02%	488	1.10%
70	31,396	71.95%	10,281	23.56%	1,295	2.97%	662	1.52%
71	10,474	27.42%	25,889	67.79%	1,287	3.37%	542	1.42%
72	13,022	28.49%	30,752	67.28%	1,445	3.16%	491	1.07%
73	27,202	55.22%	19,502	39.59%	1,826	3.71%	728	1.48%
74	25,871	51.01%	22,621	44.61%	1,629	3.21%	593	1.17%
75	25,799	57.00%	17,292	38.21%	1,553	3.43%	615	1.36%
76	25,360	58.07%	16,087	36.84%	1,376	3.15%	848	1.94%
77	36,438	71.53%	12,108	23.77%	1,492	2.93%	902	1.77%
78	35,624	70.97%	12,584	25.07%	1,285	2.56%	700	1.39%
79	29,258	58.76%	18,425	37.00%	1,383	2.78%	727	1.46%
80	31,373	70.67%	11,130	25.07%	1,241	2.80%	652	1.47%
81	29,286	66.86%	12,554	28.66%	1,255	2.87%	704	1.61%
82	22,488	51.23%	18,908	43.08%	1,701	3.88%	798	1.82%
83	28,403	61.61%	15,546	33.72%	1,455	3.16%	694	1.51%
84	27,844	62.99%	14,053	31.79%	1,391	3.15%	914	2.07%
85	34,487	69.67%	13,102	26.47%	1,177	2.38%	737	1.49%
86	28,934	65.39%	13,180	29.79%	1,309	2.96%	822	1.86%
87	31,713	69.21%	11,859	25.88%	1,405	3.07%	843	1.84%
88	16,658	35.57%	28,364	60.56%	1,494	3.19%	317	0.68%
89	33,443	70.78%	11,445	24.22%	1,444	3.06%	917	1.94%
90	27,255	70.67%	9,670	25.08%	1,067	2.77%	572	1.48%
91	26,654	59.02%	16,357	36.22%	1,431	3.17%	719	1.59%
92	11,547	28.31%	27,230	66.75%	1,555	3.81%	462	1.13%
93	27,164	54.23%	20,517	40.96%	1,682	3.36%	724	1.45%
94	35,139	72.34%	11,158	22.97%	1,332	2.74%	944	1.94%
95	30,243	62.53%	15,727	32.52%	1,802	3.73%	596	1.23%
96	26,793	60.21%	15,551	34.95%	1,400	3.15%	756	1.70%

Candidates: Tillis (Rep), Cunningham (Dem), Bray (Lib), Hayes (Cst)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

[EL20-SEN-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - US Senate -15300-

NC General Assembly

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib	Cnst	% Cnst
97	34,673	69.64%	12,871	25.85%	1,482	2.98%	763	1.53%
98	26,606	50.73%	23,798	45.38%	1,620	3.09%	423	0.81%
99	8,110	20.15%	30,093	74.79%	1,500	3.73%	536	1.33%
100	9,373	26.11%	24,646	68.65%	1,499	4.18%	383	1.07%
101	10,906	25.37%	29,972	69.72%	1,571	3.65%	538	1.25%
102	7,373	18.14%	31,285	76.97%	1,539	3.79%	447	1.10%
103	25,785	50.26%	23,469	45.75%	1,606	3.13%	440	0.86%
104	25,247	46.12%	27,541	50.31%	1,608	2.94%	347	0.63%
105	19,162	43.16%	23,371	52.64%	1,486	3.35%	382	0.86%
106	5,668	17.20%	25,652	77.84%	1,289	3.91%	345	1.05%
107	10,898	24.00%	32,377	71.31%	1,612	3.55%	514	1.13%
108	24,056	58.50%	15,025	36.54%	1,380	3.36%	657	1.60%
109	27,341	58.26%	17,594	37.49%	1,462	3.12%	536	1.14%
110	30,121	67.20%	12,786	28.52%	1,137	2.54%	780	1.74%
111	29,816	66.30%	13,369	29.73%	1,092	2.43%	694	1.54%
112	9,352	27.38%	23,025	67.42%	1,385	4.06%	390	1.14%
113	32,688	63.22%	17,167	33.20%	1,192	2.31%	655	1.27%
114	14,235	26.26%	37,814	69.75%	1,702	3.14%	459	0.85%
115	21,057	37.44%	32,839	58.38%	1,766	3.14%	587	1.04%
116	25,396	51.13%	22,070	44.43%	1,586	3.19%	617	1.24%
117	29,774	56.70%	20,525	39.08%	1,615	3.08%	601	1.14%
118	28,901	58.63%	18,157	36.83%	1,444	2.93%	791	1.60%
119	25,818	53.30%	20,259	41.82%	1,638	3.38%	728	1.50%
120	33,709	69.91%	12,581	26.09%	1,162	2.41%	766	1.59%
Total:	2,661,369	48.67%	2,567,510	46.95%	171,398	3.13%	68,459	1.25%

Candidates: Tillis (Rep), Cunningham (Dem), Bray (Lib), Hayes (Cst)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

[EL20-SEN-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Governor15301-

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep	Lib	% Lib	Cnst	% Cnst
1	19,335	39.12%	29,354	59.39%	517	1.05%	219	0.44%
2	30,463	55.67%	23,644	43.21%	445	0.81%	164	0.30%
3	19,479	42.40%	25,796	56.15%	472	1.03%	198	0.43%
4	15,628	41.39%	21,780	57.69%	221	0.59%	127	0.34%
5	21,550	51.04%	20,093	47.59%	395	0.94%	187	0.44%
6	14,998	41.65%	20,267	56.28%	558	1.55%	186	0.52%
7	21,032	45.36%	24,678	53.22%	471	1.02%	187	0.40%
8	25,560	64.82%	13,266	33.64%	434	1.10%	171	0.43%
9	23,042	48.64%	23,716	50.06%	461	0.97%	157	0.33%
10	19,021	47.49%	20,497	51.18%	345	0.86%	189	0.47%
11	32,390	72.27%	11,434	25.51%	795	1.77%	201	0.45%
12	20,533	48.14%	21,713	50.91%	255	0.60%	152	0.36%
13	16,250	32.83%	32,507	65.68%	500	1.01%	235	0.47%
14	13,971	41.03%	19,090	56.06%	724	2.13%	265	0.78%
15	8,189	33.25%	15,737	63.89%	518	2.10%	188	0.76%
16	16,092	34.37%	29,865	63.78%	610	1.30%	259	0.55%
17	24,044	42.26%	32,022	56.28%	563	0.99%	269	0.47%
18	29,480	61.06%	17,684	36.63%	870	1.80%	245	0.51%
19	25,058	42.04%	33,653	56.46%	633	1.06%	263	0.44%
20	27,666	49.32%	27,582	49.17%	629	1.12%	215	0.38%
21	31,052	58.30%	21,412	40.20%	610	1.15%	186	0.35%
22	19,668	43.14%	25,492	55.91%	279	0.61%	152	0.33%
23	29,071	61.00%	18,255	38.30%	201	0.42%	132	0.28%
24	23,632	52.66%	20,800	46.35%	294	0.66%	151	0.34%
25	26,074	54.27%	21,567	44.89%	274	0.57%	130	0.27%
26	22,007	45.28%	25,859	53.21%	533	1.10%	202	0.42%
27	27,191	61.93%	16,317	37.16%	240	0.55%	158	0.36%
28	14,352	35.94%	25,075	62.80%	357	0.89%	144	0.36%
29	44,252	87.10%	5,874	11.56%	514	1.01%	167	0.33%
30	40,858	87.86%	4,970	10.69%	518	1.11%	158	0.34%
31	40,523	82.60%	7,750	15.80%	617	1.26%	172	0.35%
32	25,306	58.13%	17,742	40.76%	325	0.75%	158	0.36%
33	33,204	84.13%	5,626	14.25%	514	1.30%	124	0.31%
34	33,463	69.25%	14,064	29.10%	619	1.28%	179	0.37%
35	28,131	52.05%	25,126	46.49%	593	1.10%	191	0.35%
36	30,790	60.55%	19,211	37.78%	680	1.34%	171	0.34%
37	26,687	50.17%	25,576	48.08%	725	1.36%	205	0.39%
38	34,269	76.63%	9,691	21.67%	548	1.23%	213	0.48%
39	29,866	62.50%	17,191	35.97%	553	1.16%	177	0.37%
40	34,482	62.10%	20,253	36.48%	636	1.15%	154	0.28%
41	32,026	70.48%	12,765	28.09%	502	1.10%	145	0.32%
42	19,825	68.24%	8,500	29.26%	519	1.79%	206	0.71%
43	21,664	51.90%	19,340	46.33%	522	1.25%	216	0.52%
44	26,432	72.79%	9,006	24.80%	615	1.69%	259	0.71%
45	20,357	51.62%	18,351	46.54%	512	1.30%	214	0.54%
46	17,069	41.72%	23,481	57.40%	211	0.52%	149	0.36%
47	15,520	48.58%	16,118	50.45%	208	0.65%	103	0.32%
48	20,268	56.02%	15,296	42.28%	437	1.21%	179	0.49%

Candidates: Cooper (Dem), Forest (Rep), DiFiore (Lib), Pisano (Cst)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

[EL20-GOV-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Governor15302-

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep	Lib	% Lib	Cnst	% Cnst
49	33,537	69.92%	13,686	28.53%	602	1.26%	141	0.29%
50	30,249	59.38%	20,113	39.48%	439	0.86%	140	0.27%
51	16,881	43.03%	21,773	55.50%	409	1.04%	166	0.42%
52	19,810	45.72%	22,819	52.66%	485	1.12%	215	0.50%
53	17,795	39.88%	26,158	58.63%	460	1.03%	205	0.46%
54	29,317	56.07%	22,432	42.90%	380	0.73%	159	0.30%
55	18,645	41.74%	25,412	56.89%	417	0.93%	197	0.44%
56	40,078	87.24%	5,331	11.60%	416	0.91%	113	0.25%
57	33,571	71.21%	12,825	27.20%	532	1.13%	218	0.46%
58	31,119	76.00%	9,027	22.05%	592	1.45%	209	0.51%
59	26,837	50.00%	26,108	48.64%	535	1.00%	191	0.36%
60	27,322	67.08%	12,635	31.02%	527	1.29%	246	0.60%
61	34,990	75.91%	10,356	22.47%	554	1.20%	194	0.42%
62	26,320	48.60%	27,020	49.90%	565	1.04%	247	0.46%
63	22,618	53.06%	19,445	45.62%	418	0.98%	147	0.34%
64	19,361	44.69%	23,476	54.18%	338	0.78%	152	0.35%
65	18,197	38.19%	28,891	60.63%	415	0.87%	149	0.31%
66	30,489	68.72%	13,148	29.63%	551	1.24%	182	0.41%
67	14,482	31.03%	31,644	67.81%	360	0.77%	178	0.38%
68	21,708	41.40%	29,974	57.17%	567	1.08%	181	0.35%
69	17,069	38.25%	26,896	60.27%	463	1.04%	197	0.44%
70	12,108	27.61%	31,204	71.17%	364	0.83%	171	0.39%
71	27,661	72.13%	9,986	26.04%	508	1.32%	192	0.50%
72	33,808	73.63%	11,340	24.70%	545	1.19%	226	0.49%
73	21,849	44.25%	26,699	54.07%	617	1.25%	210	0.43%
74	25,982	51.00%	24,250	47.60%	539	1.06%	176	0.35%
75	19,536	43.01%	25,171	55.41%	523	1.15%	194	0.43%
76	17,964	40.84%	25,335	57.60%	457	1.04%	226	0.51%
77	14,347	28.00%	36,301	70.84%	405	0.79%	194	0.38%
78	15,058	29.85%	34,876	69.13%	358	0.71%	158	0.31%
79	20,163	40.18%	29,409	58.61%	373	0.74%	232	0.46%
80	12,665	28.45%	31,283	70.28%	400	0.90%	163	0.37%
81	13,921	31.70%	29,465	67.09%	397	0.90%	138	0.31%
82	21,072	47.90%	22,083	50.19%	615	1.40%	225	0.51%
83	17,584	38.05%	27,955	60.49%	499	1.08%	175	0.38%
84	15,796	35.48%	28,005	62.90%	523	1.17%	198	0.44%
85	14,685	29.45%	34,549	69.28%	414	0.83%	218	0.44%
86	15,028	33.74%	28,898	64.88%	364	0.82%	253	0.57%
87	13,677	29.64%	31,886	69.10%	409	0.89%	176	0.38%
88	31,728	67.66%	14,362	30.63%	643	1.37%	159	0.34%
89	13,109	27.62%	33,693	70.99%	462	0.97%	195	0.41%
90	11,267	28.98%	27,222	70.02%	283	0.73%	107	0.28%
91	18,241	40.16%	26,569	58.49%	430	0.95%	185	0.41%
92	29,296	71.67%	10,719	26.22%	647	1.58%	212	0.52%
93	22,783	45.15%	26,835	53.18%	614	1.22%	229	0.45%
94	13,106	26.77%	35,324	72.16%	360	0.74%	163	0.33%
95	18,144	37.31%	29,648	60.97%	615	1.26%	223	0.46%
96	17,593	39.36%	26,418	59.10%	455	1.02%	234	0.52%

Candidates: Cooper (Dem), Forest (Rep), DiFiore (Lib), Pisano (Cst)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

[EL20-GOV-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Governor15303-

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep	Lib	% Lib	Cnst	% Cnst
97	14,730	29.39%	34,711	69.25%	449	0.90%	237	0.47%
98	26,963	51.27%	24,813	47.18%	636	1.21%	179	0.34%
99	31,972	79.16%	7,500	18.57%	634	1.57%	284	0.70%
100	26,739	74.29%	8,375	23.27%	644	1.79%	237	0.66%
101	31,825	73.80%	10,413	24.15%	661	1.53%	227	0.53%
102	33,349	81.80%	6,506	15.96%	740	1.82%	176	0.43%
103	26,457	51.37%	24,210	47.00%	600	1.16%	240	0.47%
104	31,333	57.04%	22,802	41.51%	605	1.10%	196	0.36%
105	26,218	58.83%	17,632	39.56%	557	1.25%	161	0.36%
106	27,088	81.97%	5,266	15.93%	547	1.66%	146	0.44%
107	34,685	76.09%	10,053	22.05%	621	1.36%	228	0.50%
108	16,617	40.11%	24,157	58.30%	451	1.09%	208	0.50%
109	19,656	41.63%	26,840	56.85%	530	1.12%	189	0.40%
110	14,248	31.59%	30,311	67.21%	376	0.83%	162	0.36%
111	14,982	33.12%	29,767	65.80%	342	0.76%	146	0.32%
112	25,027	73.03%	8,465	24.70%	611	1.78%	168	0.49%
113	19,248	37.01%	32,147	61.82%	419	0.81%	189	0.36%
114	39,679	73.08%	13,600	25.05%	800	1.47%	220	0.41%
115	35,405	62.79%	19,982	35.44%	749	1.33%	251	0.45%
116	24,312	48.77%	24,569	49.29%	723	1.45%	242	0.49%
117	23,142	43.88%	28,730	54.48%	636	1.21%	230	0.44%
118	20,269	40.91%	28,538	57.59%	528	1.07%	216	0.44%
119	22,675	46.52%	25,166	51.63%	657	1.35%	241	0.49%
120	13,696	28.19%	34,169	70.32%	476	0.98%	252	0.52%
Total:	2,830,701	51.50%	2,582,462	46.98%	60,408	1.10%	22,956	0.42%

Candidates: Cooper (Dem), Forest (Rep), DiFiore (Lib), Pisano (Cst)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

[EL20-GOV-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Lieutenant Governor

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
1	30,680	63.09%	17,952	36.91%
2	25,814	48.02%	27,939	51.98%
3	27,341	60.52%	17,833	39.48%
4	22,667	60.93%	14,533	39.07%
5	20,907	50.26%	20,690	49.74%
6	21,652	60.90%	13,903	39.10%
7	26,626	58.21%	19,117	41.79%
8	14,361	36.91%	24,546	63.09%
9	25,598	54.69%	21,208	45.31%
10	21,635	54.68%	17,929	45.32%
11	13,487	30.51%	30,712	69.49%
12	22,795	54.11%	19,333	45.89%
13	34,010	70.16%	14,462	29.84%
14	20,199	60.64%	13,110	39.36%
15	16,416	68.30%	7,619	31.70%
16	31,235	68.00%	14,702	32.00%
17	34,298	61.77%	21,227	38.23%
18	19,412	40.96%	27,982	59.04%
19	36,304	62.10%	22,157	37.90%
20	30,311	55.31%	24,494	44.69%
21	24,403	46.56%	28,004	53.44%
22	26,810	59.65%	18,137	40.35%
23	19,406	41.22%	27,668	58.78%
24	22,264	50.14%	22,142	49.86%
25	23,394	49.11%	24,240	50.89%
26	27,769	58.30%	19,863	41.70%
27	17,331	39.86%	26,148	60.14%
28	26,519	67.66%	12,676	32.34%
29	7,324	14.59%	42,864	85.41%
30	6,111	13.29%	39,876	86.71%
31	9,300	19.18%	39,193	80.82%
32	19,261	44.82%	23,714	55.18%
33	6,855	17.59%	32,125	82.41%
34	16,591	34.87%	30,995	65.13%
35	27,806	52.14%	25,525	47.86%
36	22,257	44.58%	27,670	55.42%
37	28,464	54.27%	23,984	45.73%
38	11,085	25.03%	33,196	74.97%
39	18,823	39.82%	28,450	60.18%
40	23,511	43.04%	31,114	56.96%
41	15,518	34.75%	29,144	65.25%
42	9,495	33.07%	19,220	66.93%
43	20,896	50.74%	20,283	49.26%
44	10,149	28.25%	25,782	71.75%
45	19,759	50.72%	19,200	49.28%
46	24,730	61.42%	15,537	38.58%
47	17,466	56.38%	13,511	43.62%
48	16,538	46.51%	19,018	53.49%

Candidates: Robinson (Rep), Holley (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

[EL20-LG-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Lieutenant Governor

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
49	16,185	34.31%	30,982	65.69%
50	22,107	43.96%	28,179	56.04%
51	23,532	60.96%	15,068	39.04%
52	24,597	58.04%	17,784	41.96%
53	27,726	63.16%	16,173	36.84%
54	24,516	47.64%	26,946	52.36%
55	26,542	60.46%	17,356	39.54%
56	6,740	14.88%	38,543	85.12%
57	15,022	32.15%	31,707	67.85%
58	10,551	25.92%	30,158	74.08%
59	28,633	53.83%	24,555	46.17%
60	14,561	36.12%	25,757	63.88%
61	12,304	26.91%	33,414	73.09%
62	30,283	56.64%	23,179	43.36%
63	21,368	50.51%	20,935	49.49%
64	25,523	59.34%	17,486	40.66%
65	31,170	66.26%	15,871	33.74%
66	15,138	34.54%	28,685	65.46%
67	33,459	73.10%	12,312	26.90%
68	31,953	62.32%	19,323	37.68%
69	28,186	64.47%	15,531	35.53%
70	33,380	76.85%	10,058	23.15%
71	11,248	29.70%	26,619	70.30%
72	13,604	30.13%	31,554	69.87%
73	28,594	58.58%	20,215	41.42%
74	27,336	54.53%	22,794	45.47%
75	27,422	61.15%	17,422	38.85%
76	26,960	62.20%	16,382	37.80%
77	38,953	76.83%	11,746	23.17%
78	37,247	75.01%	12,411	24.99%
79	30,818	62.58%	18,431	37.42%
80	33,480	75.66%	10,772	24.34%
81	31,697	72.68%	11,913	27.32%
82	23,812	54.71%	19,715	45.29%
83	29,771	65.23%	15,867	34.77%
84	29,417	67.17%	14,375	32.83%
85	36,304	73.99%	12,761	26.01%
86	30,728	69.97%	13,191	30.03%
87	33,634	74.08%	11,766	25.92%
88	16,641	36.10%	29,453	63.90%
89	35,271	75.08%	11,705	24.92%
90	29,195	76.10%	9,169	23.90%
91	28,577	63.88%	16,155	36.12%
92	11,983	29.62%	28,468	70.38%
93	28,655	58.10%	20,665	41.90%
94	37,557	77.94%	10,627	22.06%
95	31,254	65.67%	16,335	34.33%
96	28,310	63.91%	15,987	36.09%

Candidates: Robinson (Rep), Holley (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

[EL20-LG-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Lieutenant Governor

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
97	36,359	73.84%	12,883	26.16%
98	27,213	52.74%	24,387	47.26%
99	8,590	21.47%	31,428	78.53%
100	9,723	27.38%	25,783	72.62%
101	11,456	26.80%	31,295	73.20%
102	7,679	19.07%	32,588	80.93%
103	26,611	52.38%	24,190	47.62%
104	25,922	48.01%	28,076	51.99%
105	19,689	44.82%	24,241	55.18%
106	5,995	18.31%	26,752	81.69%
107	11,287	25.02%	33,818	74.98%
108	25,147	62.13%	15,328	37.87%
109	28,414	61.55%	17,748	38.45%
110	31,322	70.94%	12,829	29.06%
111	31,050	69.73%	13,481	30.27%
112	9,742	28.83%	24,050	71.17%
113	34,125	66.41%	17,264	33.59%
114	15,070	28.07%	38,619	71.93%
115	22,070	39.71%	33,512	60.29%
116	26,703	54.34%	22,436	45.66%
117	31,291	59.93%	20,922	40.07%
118	30,851	63.04%	18,084	36.96%
119	27,651	57.52%	20,418	42.48%
120	35,489	74.16%	12,367	25.84%
Total:	2,796,976	51.64%	2,619,726	48.36%

Candidates: Robinson (Rep), Holley (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

[EL20-LG-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Attorney General

NC General Assembly

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
1	18,391	38.00%	30,011	62.00%
2	29,140	54.42%	24,404	45.58%
3	18,450	41.19%	26,338	58.81%
4	15,175	41.03%	21,812	58.97%
5	20,957	50.77%	20,319	49.23%
6	14,512	40.94%	20,933	59.06%
7	20,291	44.42%	25,390	55.58%
8	25,195	64.86%	13,651	35.14%
9	22,280	47.81%	24,322	52.19%
10	18,575	47.04%	20,911	52.96%
11	31,496	71.26%	12,705	28.74%
12	20,228	48.20%	21,742	51.80%
13	15,258	31.50%	33,185	68.50%
14	13,377	40.11%	19,972	59.89%
15	7,887	32.77%	16,184	67.23%
16	15,417	33.67%	30,365	66.33%
17	21,950	39.57%	33,521	60.43%
18	28,873	61.05%	18,424	38.95%
19	23,224	39.83%	35,088	60.17%
20	25,853	47.18%	28,942	52.82%
21	29,123	55.54%	23,312	44.46%
22	19,037	42.60%	25,647	57.40%
23	28,819	61.43%	18,094	38.57%
24	23,278	52.54%	21,026	47.46%
25	25,687	53.99%	21,890	46.01%
26	20,854	43.99%	26,549	56.01%
27	26,887	62.09%	16,416	37.91%
28	13,770	35.36%	25,168	64.64%
29	43,113	85.93%	7,059	14.07%
30	40,107	87.30%	5,834	12.70%
31	39,554	81.69%	8,864	18.31%
32	24,820	57.78%	18,133	42.22%
33	32,608	83.68%	6,360	16.32%
34	32,213	67.57%	15,464	32.43%
35	26,421	49.66%	26,784	50.34%
36	28,507	57.21%	21,323	42.79%
37	24,994	47.76%	27,336	52.24%
38	33,709	76.21%	10,525	23.79%
39	29,169	61.90%	17,953	38.10%
40	32,226	58.96%	22,433	41.04%
41	29,796	66.76%	14,836	33.24%
42	19,486	68.05%	9,149	31.95%
43	21,153	51.46%	19,949	48.54%
44	25,960	72.48%	9,857	27.52%
45	19,702	50.64%	19,202	49.36%
46	16,436	41.08%	23,576	58.92%
47	14,246	46.31%	16,517	53.69%
48	19,351	54.66%	16,050	45.34%

Candidates: Stein (Dem), O'Neill (Rep)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

[EL20-AG-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Attorney General

NC General Assembly

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
49	32,010	67.78%	15,215	32.22%
50	29,379	58.47%	20,863	41.53%
51	16,035	41.66%	22,451	58.34%
52	18,531	43.86%	23,719	56.14%
53	17,000	38.88%	26,729	61.12%
54	27,902	54.25%	23,527	45.75%
55	18,282	41.64%	25,620	58.36%
56	39,018	86.12%	6,286	13.88%
57	32,352	69.42%	14,248	30.58%
58	30,571	75.29%	10,032	24.71%
59	25,595	48.31%	27,387	51.69%
60	26,365	65.56%	13,849	34.44%
61	33,930	74.45%	11,647	25.55%
62	24,184	45.34%	29,152	54.66%
63	21,827	51.76%	20,344	48.24%
64	18,298	42.74%	24,515	57.26%
65	16,993	36.19%	29,959	63.81%
66	29,338	67.02%	14,435	32.98%
67	13,617	29.89%	31,936	70.11%
68	20,004	38.98%	31,319	61.02%
69	16,220	37.03%	27,580	62.97%
70	10,984	25.40%	32,268	74.60%
71	26,842	70.64%	11,154	29.36%
72	31,352	69.03%	14,066	30.97%
73	21,152	43.48%	27,496	56.52%
74	23,191	46.15%	27,065	53.85%
75	18,064	40.24%	26,829	59.76%
76	17,449	40.33%	25,813	59.67%
77	12,878	25.44%	37,740	74.56%
78	13,348	26.97%	36,150	73.03%
79	19,302	39.33%	29,781	60.67%
80	11,715	26.51%	32,480	73.49%
81	12,815	29.41%	30,763	70.59%
82	20,688	47.60%	22,773	52.40%
83	16,810	36.90%	28,742	63.10%
84	15,195	34.81%	28,455	65.19%
85	13,784	28.17%	35,155	71.83%
86	14,313	32.58%	29,620	67.42%
87	13,024	28.74%	32,289	71.26%
88	29,875	64.92%	16,145	35.08%
89	12,742	27.15%	34,187	72.85%
90	10,024	26.17%	28,277	73.83%
91	16,926	37.81%	27,840	62.19%
92	28,585	70.82%	11,778	29.18%
93	21,665	43.99%	27,590	56.01%
94	12,050	25.08%	36,005	74.92%
95	16,933	35.68%	30,523	64.32%
96	16,976	38.34%	27,301	61.66%

Candidates: Stein (Dem), O'Neill (Rep)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

[EL20-AG-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Attorney General

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
97	14,212	28.95%	34,874	71.05%
98	25,022	48.48%	26,596	51.52%
99	31,625	79.07%	8,373	20.93%
100	26,026	73.43%	9,419	26.57%
101	31,437	73.71%	11,215	26.29%
102	32,773	81.48%	7,448	18.52%
103	25,008	49.29%	25,727	50.71%
104	29,169	54.04%	24,806	45.96%
105	24,669	56.29%	19,158	43.71%
106	26,817	82.11%	5,844	17.89%
107	33,953	75.42%	11,067	24.58%
108	16,157	39.57%	24,676	60.43%
109	18,815	40.50%	27,647	59.50%
110	13,811	31.17%	30,502	68.83%
111	14,198	31.99%	30,187	68.01%
112	24,203	71.75%	9,530	28.25%
113	17,807	34.72%	33,483	65.28%
114	39,095	72.99%	14,466	27.01%
115	34,110	61.51%	21,345	38.49%
116	23,230	47.43%	25,751	52.57%
117	21,463	41.23%	30,594	58.77%
118	19,157	39.23%	29,674	60.77%
119	21,335	44.52%	26,589	55.48%
120	12,995	27.24%	34,703	72.76%
Total:	2,710,775	50.13%	2,696,297	49.87%

Candidates: Stein (Dem), O'Neill (Rep)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

[EL20-AG-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Auditor -15310-

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
1	19,142	39.81%	28,946	60.19%
2	29,634	55.81%	23,463	44.19%
3	20,024	44.75%	24,720	55.25%
4	15,673	42.55%	21,157	57.45%
5	21,582	52.37%	19,632	47.63%
6	14,809	41.98%	20,464	58.02%
7	20,910	46.04%	24,503	53.96%
8	25,811	66.68%	12,896	33.32%
9	23,788	51.20%	22,675	48.80%
10	18,850	48.05%	20,384	51.95%
11	31,541	72.19%	12,152	27.81%
12	21,088	50.44%	20,721	49.56%
13	15,979	33.39%	31,882	66.61%
14	13,738	41.76%	19,162	58.24%
15	8,030	33.90%	15,658	66.10%
16	15,641	34.47%	29,737	65.53%
17	21,624	39.65%	32,913	60.35%
18	28,512	61.07%	18,175	38.93%
19	23,079	40.14%	34,423	59.86%
20	25,345	47.11%	28,455	52.89%
21	29,561	57.03%	22,274	42.97%
22	19,354	43.39%	25,249	56.61%
23	29,950	64.00%	16,849	36.00%
24	23,877	54.16%	20,211	45.84%
25	29,045	61.28%	18,356	38.72%
26	21,439	45.47%	25,710	54.53%
27	27,455	63.37%	15,871	36.63%
28	14,523	37.39%	24,319	62.61%
29	43,093	86.44%	6,758	13.56%
30	40,073	87.73%	5,604	12.27%
31	39,539	82.16%	8,587	17.84%
32	25,056	58.70%	17,628	41.30%
33	32,354	83.87%	6,221	16.13%
34	32,409	68.79%	14,707	31.21%
35	26,856	51.01%	25,794	48.99%
36	28,735	58.40%	20,470	41.60%
37	25,493	49.21%	26,314	50.79%
38	33,821	76.99%	10,109	23.01%
39	29,531	63.14%	17,238	36.86%
40	32,636	60.47%	21,332	39.53%
41	29,871	67.69%	14,259	32.31%
42	19,451	68.30%	9,027	31.70%
43	21,099	51.71%	19,705	48.29%
44	25,902	72.70%	9,726	27.30%
45	19,640	50.88%	18,957	49.12%
46	16,669	41.85%	23,164	58.15%
47	14,790	48.29%	15,838	51.71%
48	19,799	56.18%	15,444	43.82%

Candidates: Wood (Dem), Street (Rep)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

[EL20-AUD-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Auditor -15311-

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
49	32,010	68.70%	14,585	31.30%
50	29,231	58.68%	20,587	41.32%
51	16,327	42.72%	21,892	57.28%
52	18,859	45.04%	23,013	54.96%
53	17,592	40.40%	25,952	59.60%
54	28,174	55.32%	22,751	44.68%
55	17,972	41.25%	25,594	58.75%
56	38,706	86.26%	6,166	13.74%
57	32,373	70.18%	13,756	29.82%
58	30,462	75.58%	9,842	24.42%
59	25,596	48.82%	26,832	51.18%
60	26,401	66.15%	13,509	33.85%
61	34,026	75.44%	11,079	24.56%
62	24,457	46.47%	28,167	53.53%
63	21,643	51.72%	20,205	48.28%
64	18,153	42.73%	24,329	57.27%
65	16,900	36.32%	29,631	63.68%
66	29,407	67.79%	13,973	32.21%
67	13,384	29.49%	32,001	70.51%
68	19,751	39.05%	30,826	60.95%
69	15,910	36.74%	27,393	63.26%
70	10,872	25.31%	32,075	74.69%
71	27,033	71.79%	10,624	28.21%
72	32,140	71.89%	12,570	28.11%
73	20,890	43.42%	27,220	56.58%
74	23,700	47.86%	25,824	52.14%
75	18,248	41.11%	26,137	58.89%
76	17,171	39.96%	25,798	60.04%
77	13,031	25.96%	37,160	74.04%
78	13,314	27.17%	35,695	72.83%
79	20,180	41.37%	28,599	58.63%
80	11,752	26.72%	32,226	73.28%
81	13,129	30.30%	30,202	69.70%
82	20,464	47.49%	22,631	52.51%
83	16,635	36.86%	28,493	63.14%
84	15,315	35.22%	28,166	64.78%
85	13,676	28.37%	34,532	71.63%
86	14,098	32.33%	29,506	67.67%
87	12,666	28.18%	32,277	71.82%
88	29,698	65.40%	15,712	34.60%
89	12,461	26.71%	34,191	73.29%
90	10,135	26.71%	27,815	73.29%
91	17,141	38.71%	27,139	61.29%
92	28,472	71.04%	11,605	28.96%
93	21,453	44.22%	27,060	55.78%
94	11,764	24.75%	35,765	75.25%
95	16,975	36.10%	30,043	63.90%
96	16,768	38.10%	27,239	61.90%

Candidates: Wood (Dem), Street (Rep)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

[EL20-AUD-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Auditor -15312-

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
97	13,988	28.70%	34,749	71.30%
98	24,819	48.86%	25,979	51.14%
99	31,482	79.09%	8,325	20.91%
100	25,956	73.81%	9,210	26.19%
101	31,331	73.89%	11,072	26.11%
102	32,522	81.54%	7,363	18.46%
103	24,821	49.50%	25,326	50.50%
104	28,851	54.22%	24,360	45.78%
105	24,594	56.74%	18,753	43.26%
106	26,660	82.12%	5,806	17.88%
107	33,921	75.81%	10,823	24.19%
108	15,777	39.35%	24,321	60.65%
109	18,389	40.31%	27,231	59.69%
110	13,503	30.84%	30,274	69.16%
111	14,096	31.92%	30,066	68.08%
112	24,106	72.15%	9,303	27.85%
113	17,793	34.98%	33,074	65.02%
114	38,941	73.23%	14,232	26.77%
115	34,030	61.94%	20,906	38.06%
116	23,123	47.62%	25,435	52.38%
117	21,476	41.59%	30,165	58.41%
118	19,183	39.57%	29,292	60.43%
119	21,452	45.16%	26,054	54.84%
120	13,223	27.91%	34,149	72.09%
Total:	2,727,373	50.89%	2,632,494	49.11%

Candidates: Wood (Dem), Street (Rep)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

[EL20-AUD-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Commissioner of Agriculture

NC General Assembly

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
1	30,683	63.72%	17,469	36.28%
2	27,767	51.93%	25,698	48.07%
3	27,533	61.40%	17,307	38.60%
4	23,071	62.25%	13,989	37.75%
5	21,057	51.02%	20,215	48.98%
6	22,334	63.05%	13,089	36.95%
7	28,060	61.65%	17,457	38.35%
8	14,625	37.82%	24,041	62.18%
9	26,149	56.41%	20,203	43.59%
10	22,377	56.76%	17,049	43.24%
11	16,066	36.59%	27,843	63.41%
12	23,094	54.99%	18,905	45.01%
13	34,678	71.82%	13,608	28.18%
14	19,982	60.71%	12,933	39.29%
15	16,284	68.65%	7,438	31.35%
16	31,142	68.51%	14,317	31.49%
17	34,376	63.01%	20,183	36.99%
18	19,464	41.56%	27,367	58.44%
19	36,410	63.18%	21,220	36.82%
20	30,793	56.91%	23,316	43.09%
21	27,601	53.00%	24,479	47.00%
22	27,427	61.22%	17,377	38.78%
23	19,929	42.44%	27,025	57.56%
24	23,172	52.30%	21,133	47.70%
25	24,385	51.24%	23,201	48.76%
26	29,497	62.02%	18,067	37.98%
27	17,911	41.26%	25,494	58.74%
28	27,837	70.91%	11,419	29.09%
29	8,922	17.95%	40,791	82.05%
30	7,304	16.03%	38,255	83.97%
31	10,524	21.90%	37,534	78.10%
32	20,406	47.60%	22,467	52.40%
33	8,857	22.90%	29,817	77.10%
34	20,318	42.89%	27,058	57.11%
35	29,912	56.57%	22,964	43.43%
36	24,307	49.17%	25,132	50.83%
37	30,860	59.23%	21,243	40.77%
38	12,901	29.27%	31,169	70.73%
39	20,886	44.38%	26,179	55.62%
40	27,494	50.64%	26,804	49.36%
41	17,176	38.82%	27,068	61.18%
42	9,820	34.39%	18,738	65.61%
43	21,460	52.32%	19,560	47.68%
44	10,352	29.00%	25,339	71.00%
45	20,094	51.84%	18,671	48.16%
46	24,575	61.51%	15,376	38.49%
47	17,306	56.49%	13,329	43.51%
48	16,761	47.54%	18,498	52.46%

Candidates: Troxler (Rep), Wadsworth (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

[EL20-COA-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Commissioner of Agriculture

NC General Assembly

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
49	19,156	40.91%	27,667	59.09%
50	23,983	47.87%	26,119	52.13%
51	24,815	64.41%	13,711	35.59%
52	25,163	59.88%	16,857	40.12%
53	29,288	66.76%	14,583	33.24%
54	26,368	51.45%	24,878	48.55%
55	26,736	61.24%	16,924	38.76%
56	8,097	18.09%	36,655	81.91%
57	16,866	36.29%	29,604	63.71%
58	11,610	28.69%	28,857	71.31%
59	30,885	58.12%	22,253	41.88%
60	15,337	38.22%	24,790	61.78%
61	14,205	31.29%	31,189	68.71%
62	31,904	60.08%	21,198	39.92%
63	22,433	53.23%	19,714	46.77%
64	26,777	62.55%	16,029	37.45%
65	32,616	69.49%	14,323	30.51%
66	17,003	39.06%	26,524	60.94%
67	34,043	74.51%	11,647	25.49%
68	31,809	62.84%	18,813	37.16%
69	28,384	65.46%	14,975	34.54%
70	33,966	78.53%	9,288	21.47%
71	11,764	31.20%	25,944	68.80%
72	14,865	33.19%	29,917	66.81%
73	28,979	60.04%	19,290	39.96%
74	28,745	57.76%	21,017	42.24%
75	28,305	63.40%	16,342	36.60%
76	27,716	64.36%	15,345	35.64%
77	40,057	79.28%	10,467	20.72%
78	38,320	77.55%	11,095	22.45%
79	31,210	63.84%	17,676	36.16%
80	34,335	77.70%	9,857	22.30%
81	32,710	75.18%	10,797	24.82%
82	24,306	56.22%	18,927	43.78%
83	30,131	66.69%	15,052	33.31%
84	29,903	68.45%	13,786	31.55%
85	36,572	75.04%	12,166	24.96%
86	30,950	70.83%	12,744	29.17%
87	33,909	75.34%	11,101	24.66%
88	17,463	38.35%	28,067	61.65%
89	35,615	76.12%	11,175	23.88%
90	29,920	78.21%	8,336	21.79%
91	29,245	65.77%	15,222	34.23%
92	12,093	30.15%	28,019	69.85%
93	29,609	60.47%	19,353	39.53%
94	37,981	79.30%	9,912	20.70%
95	31,190	66.30%	15,854	33.70%
96	28,731	65.13%	15,383	34.87%

Candidates: Troxler (Rep), Wadsworth (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

[EL20-COA-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Commissioner of Agriculture

NC General Assembly

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
97	36,248	74.16%	12,633	25.84%
98	27,341	53.70%	23,571	46.30%
99	8,781	22.04%	31,059	77.96%
100	10,145	28.80%	25,081	71.20%
101	11,658	27.44%	30,827	72.56%
102	8,132	20.33%	31,873	79.67%
103	27,019	53.79%	23,214	46.21%
104	26,915	50.48%	26,407	49.52%
105	19,937	45.98%	23,420	54.02%
106	6,204	19.06%	26,341	80.94%
107	11,497	25.68%	33,277	74.32%
108	25,201	62.30%	15,251	37.70%
109	28,536	62.07%	17,439	37.93%
110	31,622	71.53%	12,585	28.47%
111	31,274	70.57%	13,043	29.43%
112	10,102	30.15%	23,407	69.85%
113	34,417	67.48%	16,586	32.52%
114	15,600	29.25%	37,725	70.75%
115	22,885	41.46%	32,314	58.54%
116	27,294	55.91%	21,526	44.09%
117	32,081	61.89%	19,758	38.11%
118	31,917	65.36%	16,915	34.64%
119	27,955	58.56%	19,779	41.44%
120	35,232	74.22%	12,236	25.78%
Total:	2,898,000	53.85%	2,483,543	46.15%

Candidates: Troxler (Rep), Wadsworth (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

[EL20-COA-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Commissioner of Labor

NC General Assembly

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
1	29,661	61.81%	18,328	38.19%
2	24,962	47.08%	28,055	52.92%
3	26,292	58.83%	18,402	41.17%
4	21,950	59.45%	14,969	40.55%
5	20,059	48.75%	21,087	51.25%
6	21,138	59.88%	14,162	40.12%
7	25,882	57.09%	19,454	42.91%
8	13,668	35.36%	24,989	64.64%
9	24,421	52.65%	21,960	47.35%
10	21,175	53.92%	18,099	46.08%
11	13,034	29.93%	30,518	70.07%
12	21,914	52.31%	19,981	47.69%
13	32,940	68.84%	14,907	31.16%
14	19,262	58.67%	13,568	41.33%
15	15,699	66.54%	7,895	33.46%
16	29,868	65.92%	15,444	34.08%
17	33,266	60.83%	21,422	39.17%
18	18,487	39.45%	28,376	60.55%
19	35,189	61.12%	22,389	38.88%
20	29,274	54.30%	24,635	45.70%
21	23,927	46.37%	27,671	53.63%
22	26,008	58.29%	18,610	41.71%
23	18,672	39.84%	28,196	60.16%
24	21,739	49.29%	22,365	50.71%
25	22,931	48.41%	24,436	51.59%
26	27,072	57.45%	20,053	42.55%
27	16,884	39.00%	26,411	61.00%
28	25,860	66.60%	12,970	33.40%
29	7,125	14.31%	42,668	85.69%
30	5,970	13.09%	39,650	86.91%
31	8,934	18.55%	39,215	81.45%
32	18,739	43.90%	23,951	56.10%
33	6,688	17.38%	31,801	82.62%
34	16,356	34.94%	30,451	65.06%
35	27,175	51.81%	25,274	48.19%
36	21,404	43.70%	27,580	56.30%
37	27,834	53.93%	23,776	46.07%
38	10,661	24.34%	33,143	75.66%
39	18,246	39.11%	28,406	60.89%
40	23,213	43.24%	30,467	56.76%
41	14,983	34.14%	28,906	65.86%
42	9,180	32.15%	19,377	67.85%
43	20,387	49.84%	20,517	50.16%
44	9,792	27.41%	25,932	72.59%
45	19,300	49.83%	19,433	50.17%
46	23,558	59.15%	16,268	40.85%
47	16,281	53.17%	14,342	46.83%
48	15,833	44.90%	19,428	55.10%

Candidates: Dobson (Rep), Holmes (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

[EL20-COL-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Commissioner of Labor

NC General Assembly

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
49	15,726	33.90%	30,661	66.10%
50	21,537	43.21%	28,310	56.79%
51	22,894	60.07%	15,221	39.93%
52	23,813	56.95%	18,002	43.05%
53	27,167	62.41%	16,364	37.59%
54	24,003	47.05%	27,009	52.95%
55	26,071	59.80%	17,528	40.20%
56	6,590	14.71%	38,218	85.29%
57	14,422	31.26%	31,709	68.74%
58	10,067	24.99%	30,222	75.01%
59	27,735	52.86%	24,733	47.14%
60	13,990	35.04%	25,934	64.96%
61	11,932	26.50%	33,098	73.50%
62	29,313	55.77%	23,251	44.23%
63	20,752	49.53%	21,146	50.47%
64	24,947	58.65%	17,592	41.35%
65	30,328	65.17%	16,206	34.83%
66	14,824	34.29%	28,407	65.71%
67	32,803	72.24%	12,606	27.76%
68	31,305	61.97%	19,211	38.03%
69	27,713	64.01%	15,580	35.99%
70	32,525	75.87%	10,343	24.13%
71	10,788	28.67%	26,840	71.33%
72	13,304	29.86%	31,251	70.14%
73	27,799	57.90%	20,209	42.10%
74	26,700	54.02%	22,728	45.98%
75	26,743	60.27%	17,626	39.73%
76	26,439	61.54%	16,524	38.46%
77	38,257	76.14%	11,991	23.86%
78	36,487	74.53%	12,468	25.47%
79	29,599	60.71%	19,156	39.29%
80	32,969	74.92%	11,035	25.08%
81	31,147	71.93%	12,156	28.07%
82	23,181	53.92%	19,811	46.08%
83	29,080	64.55%	15,969	35.45%
84	28,846	66.22%	14,712	33.78%
85	36,317	74.31%	12,553	25.69%
86	30,191	69.09%	13,504	30.91%
87	32,900	73.15%	12,078	26.85%
88	16,600	36.58%	28,775	63.42%
89	34,796	74.56%	11,873	25.44%
90	28,543	75.11%	9,461	24.89%
91	27,796	62.82%	16,450	37.18%
92	11,687	29.14%	28,425	70.86%
93	28,004	57.59%	20,620	42.41%
94	36,567	76.80%	11,047	23.20%
95	30,553	65.10%	16,380	34.90%
96	27,868	63.29%	16,163	36.71%

Candidates: Dobson (Rep), Holmes (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

[EL20-COL-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Commissioner of Labor

NC General Assembly

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
97	35,586	73.04%	13,133	26.96%
98	26,526	52.28%	24,212	47.72%
99	8,301	20.85%	31,516	79.15%
100	9,474	26.93%	25,700	73.07%
101	11,142	26.26%	31,290	73.74%
102	7,537	18.89%	32,363	81.11%
103	26,014	51.92%	24,088	48.08%
104	25,374	47.79%	27,718	52.21%
105	19,129	44.23%	24,124	55.77%
106	5,787	17.80%	26,716	82.20%
107	10,934	24.45%	33,794	75.55%
108	24,656	61.21%	15,627	38.79%
109	27,824	60.77%	17,965	39.23%
110	30,865	70.20%	13,104	29.80%
111	30,493	68.99%	13,709	31.01%
112	9,531	28.51%	23,895	71.49%
113	33,579	65.99%	17,308	34.01%
114	14,626	27.51%	38,534	72.49%
115	21,493	39.14%	33,425	60.86%
116	25,971	53.52%	22,553	46.48%
117	30,668	59.39%	20,972	40.61%
118	29,870	61.68%	18,554	38.32%
119	26,681	56.14%	20,844	43.86%
120	34,534	72.95%	12,808	27.05%
Total:	2,723,106	50.82%	2,635,045	49.18%

Candidates: Dobson (Rep), Holmes (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

[EL20-COL-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Secretary of State

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
1	19,171	39.78%	29,017	60.22%
2	29,661	55.66%	23,628	44.34%
3	19,168	42.82%	25,598	57.18%
4	15,931	43.08%	21,045	56.92%
5	21,675	52.47%	19,631	47.53%
6	15,282	43.18%	20,107	56.82%
7	20,964	46.02%	24,587	53.98%
8	25,571	66.06%	13,135	33.94%
9	23,075	49.65%	23,403	50.35%
10	19,212	48.78%	20,177	51.22%
11	31,615	72.03%	12,279	27.97%
12	21,082	50.27%	20,859	49.73%
13	15,934	33.20%	32,063	66.80%
14	13,749	41.62%	19,284	58.38%
15	8,186	34.39%	15,615	65.61%
16	15,859	34.81%	29,699	65.19%
17	22,005	40.03%	32,972	59.97%
18	29,040	61.72%	18,009	38.28%
19	23,487	40.50%	34,506	59.50%
20	26,049	47.99%	28,231	52.01%
21	29,473	56.66%	22,545	43.34%
22	20,046	44.77%	24,733	55.23%
23	29,408	62.65%	17,532	37.35%
24	23,930	54.05%	20,340	45.95%
25	26,041	54.83%	21,449	45.17%
26	21,504	45.49%	25,766	54.51%
27	27,367	63.02%	16,059	36.98%
28	15,154	38.82%	23,887	61.18%
29	43,312	86.67%	6,664	13.33%
30	40,222	87.89%	5,543	12.11%
31	39,744	82.35%	8,520	17.65%
32	25,555	59.62%	17,307	40.38%
33	32,637	84.28%	6,087	15.72%
34	32,672	69.00%	14,682	31.00%
35	26,814	50.67%	26,101	49.33%
36	28,628	57.97%	20,753	42.03%
37	25,487	49.05%	26,472	50.95%
38	34,065	77.33%	9,988	22.67%
39	29,718	63.29%	17,238	36.71%
40	32,655	60.20%	21,592	39.80%
41	29,967	67.69%	14,301	32.31%
42	19,739	68.99%	8,873	31.01%
43	21,550	52.49%	19,507	47.51%
44	26,296	73.47%	9,497	26.53%
45	20,014	51.59%	18,779	48.41%
46	17,224	43.13%	22,713	56.87%
47	15,286	49.83%	15,389	50.17%
48	19,968	56.51%	15,366	43.49%

Candidates: Marshall (Dem), Sykes (Rep)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

[EL20-SOS-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Secretary of State

NC General Assembly

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
49	32,223	68.82%	14,601	31.18%
50	29,478	58.88%	20,583	41.12%
51	16,904	44.02%	21,495	55.98%
52	19,192	45.66%	22,840	54.34%
53	18,440	42.18%	25,282	57.82%
54	28,237	55.20%	22,914	44.80%
55	18,299	41.78%	25,502	58.22%
56	38,882	86.40%	6,121	13.60%
57	32,597	70.36%	13,729	29.64%
58	30,698	76.02%	9,682	23.98%
59	25,952	49.29%	26,703	50.71%
60	26,598	66.48%	13,413	33.52%
61	34,202	75.56%	11,064	24.44%
62	24,672	46.68%	28,180	53.32%
63	22,100	52.55%	19,956	47.45%
64	18,640	43.67%	24,044	56.33%
65	17,342	37.14%	29,355	62.86%
66	29,596	67.94%	13,969	32.06%
67	13,906	30.59%	31,546	69.41%
68	19,926	39.10%	31,035	60.90%
69	16,194	37.15%	27,402	62.85%
70	11,133	25.85%	31,936	74.15%
71	27,149	72.10%	10,504	27.90%
72	32,339	72.27%	12,408	27.73%
73	21,133	43.79%	27,130	56.21%
74	23,872	48.10%	25,754	51.90%
75	18,451	41.45%	26,064	58.55%
76	17,658	40.96%	25,456	59.04%
77	13,265	26.34%	37,097	73.66%
78	13,516	27.46%	35,705	72.54%
79	20,248	41.35%	28,719	58.65%
80	11,891	26.97%	32,191	73.03%
81	13,161	30.30%	30,277	69.70%
82	20,683	47.86%	22,531	52.14%
83	16,782	37.10%	28,455	62.90%
84	15,485	35.54%	28,091	64.46%
85	14,063	28.93%	34,555	71.07%
86	14,649	33.49%	29,090	66.51%
87	13,082	29.02%	31,998	70.98%
88	29,964	65.59%	15,718	34.41%
89	12,708	27.19%	34,038	72.81%
90	10,419	27.32%	27,714	72.68%
91	17,364	39.12%	27,027	60.88%
92	28,769	71.52%	11,456	28.48%
93	22,066	45.19%	26,759	54.81%
94	12,233	25.64%	35,482	74.36%
95	17,050	36.22%	30,018	63.78%
96	17,092	38.72%	27,045	61.28%

Candidates: Marshall (Dem), Sykes (Rep)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

[EL20-SOS-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Secretary of State

NC General Assembly

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
97	14,388	29.45%	34,460	70.55%
98	25,121	49.14%	25,999	50.86%
99	31,811	79.71%	8,098	20.29%
100	26,237	74.26%	9,096	25.74%
101	31,637	74.36%	10,907	25.64%
102	32,828	81.97%	7,223	18.03%
103	25,039	49.74%	25,304	50.26%
104	29,225	54.56%	24,338	45.44%
105	24,760	56.93%	18,734	43.07%
106	26,890	82.51%	5,699	17.49%
107	34,211	76.25%	10,655	23.75%
108	16,083	39.92%	24,205	60.08%
109	18,843	41.07%	27,041	58.93%
110	13,945	31.69%	30,055	68.31%
111	14,484	32.72%	29,782	67.28%
112	24,372	72.56%	9,217	27.44%
113	18,118	35.54%	32,860	64.46%
114	39,159	73.50%	14,118	26.50%
115	34,197	62.02%	20,940	37.98%
116	23,204	47.70%	25,438	52.30%
117	21,813	42.07%	30,037	57.93%
118	19,607	40.36%	28,977	59.64%
119	21,805	45.67%	25,935	54.33%
120	13,491	28.39%	34,035	71.61%
Total:	2,752,763	51.17%	2,627,315	48.83%

Candidates: Marshall (Dem), Sykes (Rep)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

[EL20-SOS-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Treasurer15322-

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
1	30,250	63.28%	17,551	36.72%
2	25,704	48.70%	27,081	51.30%
3	26,733	60.23%	17,652	39.77%
4	22,192	60.55%	14,459	39.45%
5	20,833	50.85%	20,136	49.15%
6	21,619	61.52%	13,522	38.48%
7	26,495	58.61%	18,708	41.39%
8	14,559	37.84%	23,915	62.16%
9	25,012	54.15%	21,177	45.85%
10	21,642	55.43%	17,404	44.57%
11	14,426	33.08%	29,178	66.92%
12	22,520	53.96%	19,211	46.04%
13	33,223	69.71%	14,434	30.29%
14	19,853	60.59%	12,913	39.41%
15	16,017	68.02%	7,532	31.98%
16	30,552	67.58%	14,655	32.42%
17	33,795	62.30%	20,453	37.70%
18	19,913	42.80%	26,614	57.20%
19	35,921	62.78%	21,296	37.22%
20	30,323	56.62%	23,234	43.38%
21	25,251	48.86%	26,432	51.14%
22	26,117	58.88%	18,241	41.12%
23	19,309	41.40%	27,336	58.60%
24	22,374	50.93%	21,557	49.07%
25	23,551	49.91%	23,639	50.09%
26	27,612	59.02%	19,174	40.98%
27	17,456	40.48%	25,668	59.52%
28	25,952	67.32%	12,600	32.68%
29	8,577	17.26%	41,118	82.74%
30	7,145	15.71%	38,333	84.29%
31	10,464	21.82%	37,484	78.18%
32	19,572	46.00%	22,980	54.00%
33	7,877	20.46%	30,616	79.54%
34	17,800	37.89%	29,178	62.11%
35	28,373	54.06%	24,114	45.94%
36	22,839	46.57%	26,206	53.43%
37	28,909	55.96%	22,748	44.04%
38	12,043	27.48%	31,786	72.52%
39	19,528	41.84%	27,142	58.16%
40	24,699	45.85%	29,175	54.15%
41	16,027	36.41%	27,996	63.59%
42	10,035	35.32%	18,375	64.68%
43	21,064	51.71%	19,667	48.29%
44	11,039	31.07%	24,493	68.93%
45	20,025	51.93%	18,536	48.07%
46	23,775	60.02%	15,837	39.98%
47	16,734	55.01%	13,684	44.99%
48	16,560	47.21%	18,519	52.79%

Candidates: Folwell (Rep), Chatterji (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

[EL20-TRS-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Treasurer15323-

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
49	17,269	37.12%	29,247	62.88%
50	22,180	44.64%	27,505	55.36%
51	23,415	61.62%	14,586	38.38%
52	24,572	59.03%	17,051	40.97%
53	27,482	63.49%	15,806	36.51%
54	24,624	48.51%	26,138	51.49%
55	26,497	61.00%	16,940	39.00%
56	7,815	17.47%	36,917	82.53%
57	15,218	32.98%	30,929	67.02%
58	11,047	27.44%	29,218	72.56%
59	27,908	53.18%	24,568	46.82%
60	14,659	36.71%	25,269	63.29%
61	12,819	28.43%	32,263	71.57%
62	29,545	56.11%	23,114	43.89%
63	21,069	50.29%	20,826	49.71%
64	25,093	58.97%	17,460	41.03%
65	30,302	65.18%	16,191	34.82%
66	15,944	36.84%	27,340	63.16%
67	32,736	72.48%	12,427	27.52%
68	32,009	63.52%	18,386	36.48%
69	28,239	65.45%	14,910	34.55%
70	32,229	75.08%	10,699	24.92%
71	11,884	31.61%	25,706	68.39%
72	15,172	33.89%	29,591	66.11%
73	28,721	59.95%	19,189	40.05%
74	27,758	55.90%	21,899	44.10%
75	27,223	61.23%	17,235	38.77%
76	26,817	62.78%	15,902	37.22%
77	38,103	75.86%	12,128	24.14%
78	36,311	74.23%	12,606	25.77%
79	30,349	62.48%	18,224	37.52%
80	32,546	73.95%	11,465	26.05%
81	30,913	71.27%	12,463	28.73%
82	24,208	56.46%	18,666	43.54%
83	29,460	65.66%	15,410	34.34%
84	29,224	67.46%	14,095	32.54%
85	35,145	72.99%	13,005	27.01%
86	30,299	69.77%	13,127	30.23%
87	33,212	74.18%	11,558	25.82%
88	18,203	40.11%	27,182	59.89%
89	35,124	75.44%	11,432	24.56%
90	28,491	74.99%	9,501	25.01%
91	28,235	63.66%	16,116	36.34%
92	12,889	32.25%	27,076	67.75%
93	28,476	58.88%	19,884	41.12%
94	36,191	76.23%	11,288	23.77%
95	31,222	66.91%	15,439	33.09%
96	28,589	65.06%	15,356	34.94%

Candidates: Folwell (Rep), Chatterji (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

[EL20-TRS-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Treasurer15324-

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
97	35,799	73.96%	12,602	26.04%
98	27,896	55.13%	22,708	44.87%
99	9,697	24.44%	29,975	75.56%
100	10,756	30.67%	24,312	69.33%
101	12,583	29.73%	29,736	70.27%
102	9,067	22.78%	30,743	77.22%
103	27,432	54.86%	22,568	45.14%
104	27,284	51.45%	25,745	48.55%
105	20,430	47.31%	22,756	52.69%
106	6,952	21.46%	25,442	78.54%
107	12,408	27.81%	32,217	72.19%
108	25,089	62.57%	15,007	37.43%
109	28,334	62.16%	17,245	37.84%
110	30,876	70.59%	12,866	29.41%
111	30,615	69.53%	13,415	30.47%
112	10,854	32.54%	22,498	67.46%
113	33,829	66.77%	16,834	33.23%
114	15,907	30.07%	36,993	69.93%
115	22,716	41.51%	32,009	58.49%
116	26,801	55.44%	21,542	44.56%
117	31,568	61.26%	19,967	38.74%
118	30,445	63.07%	17,828	36.93%
119	27,499	57.99%	19,918	42.01%
120	34,641	73.39%	12,563	26.61%
Total:	2,809,203	52.57%	2,534,581	47.43%

Candidates: Folwell (Rep), Chatterji (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

[EL20-TRS-20G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2016 Election Contest Report - US President-15325-

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib	W-I	% W-I
1	25,434	59.77%	15,567	36.59%	1,181	2.78%	368	0.86%
2	22,171	47.02%	23,161	49.12%	1,203	2.55%	617	1.31%
3	24,225	59.12%	15,352	37.46%	1,025	2.50%	375	0.92%
4	20,340	58.40%	13,809	39.65%	493	1.42%	187	0.54%
5	17,620	46.59%	19,115	50.54%	826	2.18%	258	0.68%
6	16,342	59.86%	9,778	35.82%	882	3.23%	297	1.09%
7	20,622	55.28%	15,236	40.84%	992	2.66%	456	1.22%
8	13,094	34.56%	23,455	61.91%	970	2.56%	368	0.97%
9	22,553	53.07%	18,273	43.00%	1,190	2.80%	482	1.13%
10	19,420	52.89%	16,245	44.24%	730	1.99%	325	0.89%
11	12,238	30.02%	25,772	63.22%	1,885	4.62%	868	2.13%
12	20,836	52.78%	17,864	45.26%	543	1.38%	231	0.59%
13	30,060	68.66%	12,213	27.90%	1,093	2.50%	414	0.95%
14	16,729	60.40%	9,706	35.04%	966	3.49%	296	1.07%
15	13,034	67.22%	5,477	28.25%	671	3.46%	209	1.08%
16	25,001	65.91%	11,684	30.80%	972	2.56%	276	0.73%
17	26,027	61.35%	14,993	35.34%	1,025	2.42%	376	0.89%
18	16,691	39.60%	23,293	55.26%	1,516	3.60%	653	1.55%
19	28,577	61.31%	16,130	34.61%	1,349	2.89%	553	1.19%
20	26,751	54.56%	19,819	40.42%	1,776	3.62%	683	1.39%
21	20,833	45.69%	22,232	48.76%	1,743	3.82%	790	1.73%
22	23,395	55.93%	17,602	42.08%	605	1.45%	227	0.54%
23	17,584	38.18%	27,744	60.23%	517	1.12%	215	0.47%
24	19,768	47.44%	20,872	50.09%	731	1.75%	298	0.72%
25	21,085	47.77%	22,026	49.91%	686	1.55%	337	0.76%
26	21,323	59.59%	12,933	36.14%	1,122	3.14%	405	1.13%
27	15,717	35.38%	27,991	63.01%	520	1.17%	192	0.43%
28	22,101	66.15%	10,390	31.10%	683	2.04%	238	0.71%
29	5,690	12.13%	39,301	83.79%	1,163	2.48%	751	1.60%
30	4,908	11.55%	35,919	84.54%	949	2.23%	714	1.68%
31	6,685	17.36%	30,102	78.18%	1,091	2.83%	626	1.63%
32	16,669	41.27%	22,776	56.39%	675	1.67%	272	0.67%
33	5,987	15.69%	30,365	79.59%	1,218	3.19%	581	1.52%
34	13,933	32.18%	26,939	62.22%	1,569	3.62%	854	1.97%
35	21,118	51.74%	17,342	42.49%	1,470	3.60%	886	2.17%
36	15,700	43.91%	17,601	49.23%	1,779	4.98%	671	1.88%
37	22,643	53.97%	17,044	40.63%	1,589	3.79%	677	1.61%
38	9,153	23.77%	27,861	72.35%	999	2.59%	495	1.29%
39	15,396	40.75%	20,756	54.93%	1,108	2.93%	526	1.39%
40	20,579	41.41%	26,148	52.62%	1,981	3.99%	986	1.98%
41	12,547	34.02%	22,349	60.60%	1,342	3.64%	642	1.74%
42	8,169	31.39%	16,817	64.61%	746	2.87%	295	1.13%
43	18,219	48.25%	18,216	48.24%	970	2.57%	356	0.94%
44	8,617	27.19%	21,954	69.28%	802	2.53%	318	1.00%
45	16,259	50.77%	14,617	45.64%	855	2.67%	294	0.92%
46	20,840	57.14%	14,999	41.12%	489	1.34%	147	0.40%
47	14,078	50.66%	12,883	46.36%	612	2.20%	214	0.77%
48	14,006	43.57%	17,044	53.02%	831	2.59%	266	0.83%

Candidates: Trump (Rep), Clinton (Dem), Johnson (Lib)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

[EL20-PRS-16G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2016 Election Contest Report - US President-15326-

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib	W-I	% W-I
49	13,147	32.68%	24,779	61.60%	1,553	3.86%	748	1.86%
50	18,367	41.44%	24,248	54.71%	1,189	2.68%	519	1.17%
51	19,456	57.96%	12,925	38.51%	904	2.69%	282	0.84%
52	21,073	54.95%	15,958	41.61%	971	2.53%	345	0.90%
53	22,219	62.62%	12,003	33.83%	912	2.57%	350	0.99%
54	19,421	45.00%	21,973	50.91%	1,190	2.76%	573	1.33%
55	22,286	57.23%	15,401	39.55%	934	2.40%	319	0.82%
56	6,214	12.66%	40,462	82.44%	1,429	2.91%	975	1.99%
57	13,012	30.74%	27,728	65.50%	1,028	2.43%	565	1.33%
58	9,703	25.34%	27,185	70.98%	935	2.44%	474	1.24%
59	24,539	54.64%	18,832	41.93%	1,068	2.38%	473	1.05%
60	12,749	34.83%	22,538	61.58%	923	2.52%	389	1.06%
61	11,130	23.52%	34,094	72.05%	1,304	2.76%	792	1.67%
62	26,683	56.57%	18,381	38.97%	1,473	3.12%	634	1.34%
63	17,764	50.36%	16,282	46.16%	889	2.52%	337	0.96%
64	21,040	58.66%	13,547	37.77%	906	2.53%	377	1.05%
65	26,834	63.46%	14,231	33.65%	871	2.06%	349	0.83%
66	12,804	33.52%	23,545	61.64%	1,224	3.20%	622	1.63%
67	29,091	70.18%	11,244	27.12%	867	2.09%	252	0.61%
68	25,097	62.36%	13,076	32.49%	1,432	3.56%	642	1.60%
69	23,797	64.26%	11,714	31.63%	1,090	2.94%	429	1.16%
70	29,047	75.02%	8,443	21.80%	875	2.26%	356	0.92%
71	9,732	27.30%	24,621	69.06%	919	2.58%	382	1.07%
72	11,614	27.19%	29,047	68.00%	1,315	3.08%	738	1.73%
73	23,769	61.09%	13,407	34.46%	1,242	3.19%	492	1.26%
74	23,406	54.03%	17,732	40.93%	1,468	3.39%	714	1.65%
75	23,706	61.27%	13,430	34.71%	1,136	2.94%	422	1.09%
76	23,657	60.02%	14,395	36.52%	939	2.38%	425	1.08%
77	33,328	74.63%	9,728	21.78%	1,126	2.52%	473	1.06%
78	32,128	73.45%	10,258	23.45%	965	2.21%	389	0.89%
79	26,874	60.42%	16,221	36.47%	980	2.20%	400	0.90%
80	28,541	74.15%	8,737	22.70%	920	2.39%	291	0.76%
81	25,760	70.85%	9,377	25.79%	939	2.58%	280	0.77%
82	20,692	56.01%	14,858	40.22%	980	2.65%	414	1.12%
83	24,652	66.46%	10,955	29.53%	1,045	2.82%	440	1.19%
84	24,878	65.40%	12,004	31.56%	811	2.13%	347	0.91%
85	31,291	72.49%	10,464	24.24%	906	2.10%	504	1.17%
86	26,224	67.41%	11,248	28.91%	988	2.54%	443	1.14%
87	28,245	71.78%	9,673	24.58%	944	2.40%	490	1.25%
88	10,923	28.97%	24,420	64.78%	1,620	4.30%	736	1.95%
89	29,515	72.81%	9,661	23.83%	988	2.44%	371	0.92%
90	28,262	74.71%	8,363	22.11%	850	2.25%	352	0.93%
91	24,665	60.88%	14,292	35.28%	1,107	2.73%	449	1.11%
92	8,785	28.68%	20,548	67.09%	938	3.06%	357	1.17%
93	25,285	55.36%	17,695	38.74%	1,701	3.72%	995	2.18%
94	32,921	75.21%	9,508	21.72%	967	2.21%	379	0.87%
95	24,366	65.87%	10,955	29.62%	1,199	3.24%	470	1.27%
96	24,419	61.86%	13,347	33.81%	1,161	2.94%	545	1.38%

Candidates: Trump (Rep), Clinton (Dem), Johnson (Lib)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

[EL20-PRS-16G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2016 Election Contest Report - US President-15327-

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib	W-I	% W-I
97	28,706	71.96%	9,865	24.73%	970	2.43%	348	0.87%
98	22,092	51.87%	18,199	42.73%	1,654	3.88%	645	1.51%
99	7,108	21.20%	25,213	75.21%	789	2.35%	412	1.23%
100	7,323	23.78%	21,921	71.18%	1,023	3.32%	530	1.72%
101	10,044	28.37%	24,020	67.84%	894	2.52%	449	1.27%
102	4,844	14.83%	26,309	80.57%	1,051	3.22%	451	1.38%
103	21,934	52.03%	18,074	42.87%	1,439	3.41%	713	1.69%
104	21,821	45.62%	23,195	48.49%	1,841	3.85%	973	2.03%
105	16,601	44.91%	18,515	50.09%	1,285	3.48%	565	1.53%
106	5,757	19.88%	21,886	75.59%	828	2.86%	484	1.67%
107	9,133	25.14%	25,728	70.83%	967	2.66%	497	1.37%
108	21,526	62.16%	11,872	34.28%	881	2.54%	353	1.02%
109	24,205	61.20%	13,709	34.66%	1,150	2.91%	485	1.23%
110	26,680	69.16%	10,911	28.29%	707	1.83%	277	0.72%
111	27,161	68.23%	11,519	28.94%	750	1.88%	379	0.95%
112	7,550	25.95%	20,073	68.98%	1,043	3.58%	434	1.49%
113	30,263	65.84%	14,046	30.56%	1,062	2.31%	592	1.29%
114	13,218	27.63%	31,739	66.35%	1,416	2.96%	1,464	3.06%
115	19,789	39.84%	27,102	54.56%	1,595	3.21%	1,184	2.38%
116	22,711	54.80%	16,606	40.07%	1,276	3.08%	847	2.04%
117	27,115	60.28%	15,836	35.20%	1,321	2.94%	712	1.58%
118	25,726	61.23%	14,406	34.29%	1,241	2.95%	644	1.53%
119	23,870	56.13%	16,402	38.57%	1,462	3.44%	793	1.86%
120	30,694	72.91%	9,872	23.45%	1,030	2.45%	501	1.19%
Total:	2,359,749	49.90%	2,180,316	46.10%	129,929	2.75%	59,397	1.26%

Candidates: Trump (Rep), Clinton (Dem), Johnson (Lib)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

[EL20-PRS-16G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2016 Election Contest Report - NC Lieutenant Governor

NC General Assembly

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib
1	24,488	59.44%	15,586	37.83%	1,123	2.73%
2	22,913	49.73%	22,126	48.02%	1,038	2.25%
3	23,975	60.04%	14,961	37.47%	996	2.49%
4	19,910	58.84%	13,360	39.48%	569	1.68%
5	16,951	46.24%	18,868	51.47%	839	2.29%
6	16,303	60.67%	9,694	36.07%	875	3.26%
7	20,794	56.61%	15,058	40.99%	881	2.40%
8	13,278	36.14%	22,535	61.33%	928	2.53%
9	23,102	55.60%	17,391	41.85%	1,061	2.55%
10	19,376	54.17%	15,671	43.81%	720	2.01%
11	13,676	34.45%	24,208	60.97%	1,818	4.58%
12	20,258	52.55%	17,663	45.82%	629	1.63%
13	29,299	68.68%	12,140	28.46%	1,223	2.87%
14	15,985	59.97%	9,499	35.64%	1,171	4.39%
15	12,530	67.38%	5,293	28.46%	772	4.15%
16	24,289	66.30%	11,261	30.74%	1,087	2.97%
17	25,555	62.30%	14,392	35.09%	1,073	2.62%
18	16,662	41.12%	22,067	54.46%	1,792	4.42%
19	28,460	62.93%	15,288	33.80%	1,479	3.27%
20	27,499	58.21%	18,044	38.20%	1,695	3.59%
21	22,807	51.07%	20,522	45.95%	1,331	2.98%
22	22,328	55.10%	17,532	43.27%	661	1.63%
23	16,999	37.88%	27,264	60.75%	617	1.37%
24	19,800	48.30%	20,539	50.10%	653	1.59%
25	21,238	48.70%	21,731	49.83%	641	1.47%
26	21,679	61.87%	12,353	35.25%	1,010	2.88%
27	15,277	35.05%	27,754	63.67%	560	1.28%
28	22,053	67.36%	9,970	30.45%	717	2.19%
29	7,352	15.94%	37,657	81.65%	1,113	2.41%
30	6,202	14.98%	34,161	82.52%	1,034	2.50%
31	7,707	20.34%	29,062	76.71%	1,119	2.95%
32	16,381	41.51%	22,346	56.63%	736	1.87%
33	7,382	19.81%	28,657	76.90%	1,226	3.29%
34	16,199	38.07%	25,013	58.79%	1,335	3.14%
35	23,241	57.96%	15,774	39.34%	1,086	2.71%
36	17,472	50.30%	16,008	46.08%	1,256	3.62%
37	23,746	57.78%	16,058	39.08%	1,291	3.14%
38	9,748	25.68%	27,202	71.67%	1,004	2.65%
39	15,981	42.92%	20,315	54.56%	937	2.52%
40	23,601	48.32%	23,748	48.63%	1,490	3.05%
41	14,405	40.21%	20,269	56.59%	1,146	3.20%
42	8,325	32.84%	16,146	63.69%	880	3.47%
43	18,059	49.26%	17,558	47.89%	1,047	2.86%
44	8,601	27.89%	21,170	68.64%	1,071	3.47%
45	15,747	50.60%	14,249	45.79%	1,122	3.61%
46	18,912	54.20%	15,379	44.07%	604	1.73%
47	12,122	46.11%	13,556	51.57%	611	2.32%
48	12,997	42.19%	16,854	54.70%	958	3.11%

Candidates: Forest (Rep), Coleman (Dem), Cole (Lib)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

[EL20-LG-16G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2016 Election Contest Report - NC Lieutenant Governor

NC General Assembly

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib
49	15,220	38.74%	22,650	57.65%	1,421	3.62%
50	19,129	44.04%	23,265	53.57%	1,038	2.39%
51	19,218	58.70%	12,676	38.72%	846	2.58%
52	20,297	54.96%	15,597	42.23%	1,037	2.81%
53	22,208	63.67%	11,863	34.01%	809	2.32%
54	20,283	47.78%	21,180	49.89%	988	2.33%
55	22,388	59.15%	14,600	38.57%	864	2.28%
56	8,381	17.60%	37,766	79.29%	1,483	3.11%
57	13,810	33.43%	26,433	63.98%	1,072	2.59%
58	10,030	26.85%	26,123	69.94%	1,200	3.21%
59	24,664	56.01%	18,268	41.49%	1,101	2.50%
60	12,919	36.43%	21,436	60.44%	1,109	3.13%
61	12,361	26.82%	32,261	69.99%	1,474	3.20%
62	27,675	60.20%	17,003	36.99%	1,293	2.81%
63	17,922	51.89%	15,582	45.12%	1,032	2.99%
64	21,470	61.06%	12,663	36.01%	1,029	2.93%
65	25,691	62.43%	14,470	35.16%	992	2.41%
66	14,294	38.11%	22,124	58.99%	1,088	2.90%
67	28,404	70.19%	11,091	27.41%	971	2.40%
68	26,940	68.67%	11,161	28.45%	1,129	2.88%
69	24,326	67.56%	10,611	29.47%	1,069	2.97%
70	28,456	75.24%	8,383	22.17%	980	2.59%
71	9,899	28.48%	23,832	68.56%	1,029	2.96%
72	13,465	32.32%	27,020	64.86%	1,173	2.82%
73	24,172	63.70%	12,599	33.20%	1,176	3.10%
74	24,964	58.89%	16,295	38.44%	1,134	2.67%
75	23,795	62.94%	12,898	34.12%	1,112	2.94%
76	23,329	60.76%	13,938	36.30%	1,131	2.95%
77	33,021	75.76%	9,480	21.75%	1,085	2.49%
78	31,935	74.56%	9,962	23.26%	935	2.18%
79	25,801	59.85%	16,271	37.74%	1,037	2.41%
80	27,918	74.40%	8,690	23.16%	914	2.44%
81	25,271	71.25%	9,224	26.01%	972	2.74%
82	20,793	57.64%	14,095	39.07%	1,184	3.28%
83	24,881	68.72%	10,223	28.23%	1,104	3.05%
84	24,572	66.29%	11,505	31.04%	989	2.67%
85	29,527	70.79%	11,021	26.42%	1,162	2.79%
86	25,656	67.66%	11,334	29.89%	930	2.45%
87	28,195	73.28%	9,341	24.28%	938	2.44%
88	14,137	38.70%	21,087	57.72%	1,309	3.58%
89	29,224	74.14%	9,096	23.08%	1,098	2.79%
90	27,047	73.74%	8,794	23.98%	838	2.28%
91	24,310	61.59%	14,023	35.53%	1,136	2.88%
92	9,481	31.91%	19,095	64.27%	1,136	3.82%
93	24,923	56.77%	17,167	39.10%	1,814	4.13%
94	31,986	75.15%	9,585	22.52%	991	2.33%
95	24,575	68.65%	9,961	27.83%	1,260	3.52%
96	24,809	64.52%	12,425	32.31%	1,217	3.17%

Candidates: Forest (Rep), Coleman (Dem), Cole (Lib)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

[EL20-LG-16G] - Generated 2/17/2022

2016 Election Contest Report - NC Lieutenant Governor

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib
97	28,590	73.46%	9,253	23.77%	1,077	2.77%
98	24,124	58.41%	15,805	38.27%	1,375	3.33%
99	7,629	23.27%	24,137	73.64%	1,012	3.09%
100	8,501	28.45%	20,148	67.44%	1,228	4.11%
101	10,564	30.52%	22,948	66.30%	1,101	3.18%
102	5,870	18.53%	24,530	77.45%	1,271	4.01%
103	24,017	58.32%	15,926	38.67%	1,239	3.01%
104	25,776	55.04%	19,693	42.05%	1,364	2.91%
105	18,700	52.06%	15,994	44.53%	1,226	3.41%
106	6,395	22.69%	20,725	73.53%	1,064	3.78%
107	10,161	28.60%	24,312	68.43%	1,056	2.97%
108	21,642	63.94%	11,202	33.10%	1,002	2.96%
109	25,102	64.92%	12,564	32.49%	1,003	2.59%
110	26,317	69.74%	10,666	28.26%	755	2.00%
111	26,439	68.12%	11,478	29.57%	893	2.30%
112	8,751	31.00%	18,335	64.96%	1,139	4.04%
113	29,391	65.75%	14,027	31.38%	1,285	2.87%
114	12,839	27.59%	31,656	68.02%	2,044	4.39%
115	19,685	40.66%	26,705	55.16%	2,020	4.17%
116	22,032	54.70%	16,632	41.30%	1,612	4.00%
117	27,394	62.39%	15,198	34.61%	1,318	3.00%
118	24,010	58.91%	15,207	37.31%	1,540	3.78%
119	22,955	55.48%	16,811	40.63%	1,611	3.89%
120	28,299	69.92%	10,904	26.94%	1,271	3.14%
Total:	2,390,619	51.88%	2,084,975	45.25%	132,360	2.87%

Candidates: Forest (Rep), Coleman (Dem), Cole (Lib)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

[EL20-LG-16G] - Generated 2/17/2022

Election Contest Report - 2016/2020 Composite

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
1	17,878	37.69%	29,062	61.26%
2	27,435	52.25%	24,542	46.74%
3	17,892	40.36%	25,947	58.53%
4	14,743	40.17%	21,681	59.08%
5	20,586	50.44%	19,851	48.64%
6	13,425	39.31%	20,256	59.32%
7	18,850	42.57%	24,931	56.31%
8	24,561	63.55%	13,665	35.36%
9	21,287	46.34%	24,164	52.60%
10	17,806	45.66%	20,819	53.39%
11	29,704	68.27%	13,061	30.02%
12	19,567	47.03%	21,728	52.23%
13	14,552	30.56%	32,511	68.28%
14	12,711	39.34%	19,039	58.92%
15	7,401	31.88%	15,424	66.43%
16	14,539	32.69%	29,371	66.05%
17	20,441	38.44%	32,188	60.53%
18	27,258	58.82%	18,321	39.54%
19	21,514	38.24%	34,079	60.57%
20	24,019	44.79%	28,893	53.88%
21	27,069	52.90%	23,436	45.80%
22	18,501	41.75%	25,480	57.50%
23	28,170	60.16%	18,360	39.21%
24	22,292	50.81%	21,237	48.41%
25	24,548	52.24%	22,106	47.04%
26	18,993	41.64%	26,056	57.12%
27	26,710	61.29%	16,595	38.08%
28	12,779	33.46%	25,039	65.56%
29	41,969	84.70%	7,065	14.26%
30	38,933	85.96%	5,901	13.03%
31	37,494	80.22%	8,712	18.64%
32	23,847	56.13%	18,289	43.05%
33	31,520	81.40%	6,716	17.34%
34	30,210	64.54%	15,972	34.12%
35	24,199	47.37%	26,246	51.38%
36	26,080	55.02%	20,657	43.58%
37	22,949	45.41%	26,893	53.21%
38	32,118	74.29%	10,605	24.53%
39	27,129	59.54%	17,906	39.30%
40	30,204	56.24%	22,791	42.44%
41	28,006	64.77%	14,716	34.03%
42	18,729	66.39%	9,074	32.16%
43	20,103	49.60%	19,943	49.21%
44	24,962	71.06%	9,682	27.56%
45	18,506	49.05%	18,753	49.71%
46	15,980	40.48%	23,218	58.82%
47	13,951	45.92%	16,164	53.21%
48	18,838	54.01%	15,623	44.79%

Values represent average vote count from 12 contests: 2016 President and Lieutenant Governor; 2020 President, US Senate, Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Attorney General, Auditor, Commissioner of Agriculture, Commissioner of Labor, Secretary of State, and Treasurer.

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' files, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

[EL20-CMP-1620G] - Generated 2/17/2022

Election Contest Report - 2016/2020 Composite

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
49	29,842	65.00%	15,462	33.68%
50	27,734	56.37%	20,993	42.67%
51	15,019	39.84%	22,256	59.04%
52	17,767	42.71%	23,355	56.15%
53	15,810	37.23%	26,204	61.70%
54	26,361	52.69%	23,187	46.35%
55	17,208	39.98%	25,416	59.05%
56	38,584	84.28%	6,670	14.57%
57	31,062	67.78%	14,266	31.13%
58	29,518	73.52%	10,146	25.27%
59	23,890	46.28%	27,207	52.71%
60	25,324	63.98%	13,786	34.83%
61	33,385	72.96%	11,818	25.83%
62	22,773	43.63%	28,822	55.22%
63	20,364	49.69%	20,192	49.27%
64	17,033	40.90%	24,206	58.12%
65	16,075	34.86%	29,587	64.16%
66	27,711	64.77%	14,545	34.00%
67	12,635	28.07%	31,930	70.94%
68	18,422	37.31%	30,391	61.56%
69	14,989	35.19%	27,124	63.69%
70	10,228	24.07%	31,826	74.91%
71	26,257	70.08%	10,757	28.71%
72	30,983	69.33%	13,144	29.41%
73	19,184	40.87%	27,160	57.87%
74	22,145	45.28%	26,170	53.51%
75	17,039	38.95%	26,184	59.86%
76	16,279	38.23%	25,802	60.59%
77	11,929	24.07%	37,090	74.85%
78	12,448	25.64%	35,650	73.44%
79	18,599	38.47%	29,274	60.54%
80	10,871	25.17%	31,876	73.82%
81	11,949	28.24%	29,913	70.71%
82	18,996	44.90%	22,758	53.79%
83	15,270	34.66%	28,284	64.19%
84	14,234	33.26%	28,082	65.62%
85	12,846	26.82%	34,580	72.18%
86	13,295	30.90%	29,260	68.01%
87	11,811	26.66%	32,010	72.26%
88	28,392	63.73%	15,554	34.91%
89	11,596	25.32%	33,693	73.57%
90	9,515	24.94%	28,266	74.08%
91	16,233	36.93%	27,212	61.91%
92	26,897	69.50%	11,305	29.21%
93	20,415	42.05%	27,420	56.47%
94	11,071	23.41%	35,745	75.59%
95	15,575	34.08%	29,546	64.65%
96	15,737	36.27%	27,118	62.49%

Values represent average vote count from 12 contests: 2016 President and Lieutenant Governor; 2020 President, US Senate, Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Attorney General, Auditor, Commissioner of Agriculture, Commissioner of Labor, Secretary of State, and Treasurer.

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' files, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

[EL20-CMP-1620G] - Generated 2/17/2022

Election Contest Report - 2016/2020 Composite

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
97	12,819	26.95%	34,258	72.01%
98	23,422	46.90%	25,902	51.87%
99	30,144	77.53%	8,249	21.22%
100	24,921	71.94%	9,200	26.56%
101	29,808	71.97%	11,099	26.80%
102	31,219	80.24%	7,151	18.38%
103	23,207	47.19%	25,378	51.60%
104	27,326	51.74%	24,822	47.00%
105	23,181	54.43%	18,874	44.32%
106	25,648	80.10%	5,930	18.52%
107	32,216	74.00%	10,803	24.81%
108	14,963	37.79%	24,180	61.06%
109	17,357	38.48%	27,241	60.40%
110	12,841	29.65%	30,080	69.45%
111	13,436	30.76%	29,843	68.32%
112	23,146	70.32%	9,277	28.19%
113	16,985	33.77%	32,811	65.23%
114	37,419	71.20%	14,384	27.37%
115	32,492	59.67%	21,197	38.93%
116	21,701	45.49%	25,360	53.16%
117	20,226	39.80%	29,980	58.99%
118	17,951	37.68%	29,085	61.05%
119	20,209	43.00%	26,111	55.56%
120	12,429	26.60%	33,776	72.29%
Total:	2,567,324	48.54%	2,661,001	50.31%

Values represent average vote count from 12 contests: 2016 President and Lieutenant Governor; 2020 President, US Senate, Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Attorney General, Auditor, Commissioner of Agriculture, Commissioner of Labor, Secretary of State, and Treasurer.

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' files, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

[EL20-CMP-1620G] - Generated 2/17/2022

County - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175**

County	District	Total County Population	Total District Population	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Alamance	63	171,415	86,399	86,399	50.40 %	100.00 %
	64	171,415	85,016	85,016	49.60 %	100.00 %
Alexander	94	36,444	90,835	36,444	100.00 %	40.12 %
Alleghany	93	10,888	86,445	10,888	100.00 %	12.60 %
Anson	55	22,055	87,005	22,055	100.00 %	25.35 %
Ashe	93	26,577	86,445	26,577	100.00 %	30.74 %
Avery	85	17,806	90,863	17,806	100.00 %	19.60 %
Beaufort	79	44,652	83,163	44,652	100.00 %	53.69 %
Bertie	23	17,934	88,865	17,934	100.00 %	20.18 %
Bladen	22	29,606	88,642	29,606	100.00 %	33.40 %
Brunswick	17	136,693	89,763	89,763	65.67 %	100.00 %
	19	136,693	91,041	46,930	34.33 %	51.55 %
Buncombe	114	269,452	89,685	89,685	33.28 %	100.00 %
	115	269,452	90,262	90,262	33.50 %	100.00 %
	116	269,452	89,505	89,505	33.22 %	100.00 %
Burke	86	87,570	87,570	87,570	100.00 %	100.00 %
Cabarrus	73	225,804	90,649	90,649	40.14 %	100.00 %
	82	225,804	90,771	90,771	40.20 %	100.00 %
	83	225,804	90,742	44,384	19.66 %	48.91 %
Caldwell	87	80,652	85,758	80,652	100.00 %	94.05 %
Camden	5	10,355	82,953	10,355	100.00 %	12.48 %
Carteret	13	67,686	83,307	67,686	100.00 %	81.25 %
Caswell	50	22,736	85,345	22,736	100.00 %	26.64 %
Catawba	89	160,610	85,577	71,023	44.22 %	82.99 %
	96	160,610	89,587	89,587	55.78 %	100.00 %
Chatham	54	76,285	83,475	76,285	100.00 %	91.39 %
Cherokee	120	28,774	84,907	28,774	100.00 %	33.89 %
Chowan	1	13,708	84,330	13,708	100.00 %	16.26 %
Clay	120	11,089	84,907	11,089	100.00 %	13.06 %
Cleveland	110	99,519	88,397	34,479	34.65 %	39.00 %
	111	99,519	89,894	65,040	65.35 %	72.35 %
Columbus	46	50,623	83,445	50,623	100.00 %	60.67 %
Craven	3	100,720	85,099	85,099	84.49 %	100.00 %
	13	100,720	83,307	15,621	15.51 %	18.75 %
Cumberland	42	334,728	85,537	85,537	25.55 %	100.00 %
	43	334,728	82,956	82,956	24.78 %	100.00 %
	44	334,728	83,297	83,297	24.88 %	100.00 %
	45	334,728	82,938	82,938	24.78 %	100.00 %
Currituck	1	28,100	84,330	28,100	100.00 %	33.32 %
Dare	1	36,915	84,330	15,269	41.36 %	18.11 %
	79	36,915	83,163	21,646	58.64 %	26.03 %

County - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175**

County	District	Total County Population	Total District Population	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Davidson	80	168,930	84,864	84,864	50.24 %	100.00 %
	81	168,930	84,066	84,066	49.76 %	100.00 %
Davie	77	42,712	90,628	42,712	100.00 %	47.13 %
Duplin	4	48,715	83,095	48,715	100.00 %	58.63 %
Durham	2	324,833	90,793	51,696	15.91 %	56.94 %
	29	324,833	91,212	91,212	28.08 %	100.00 %
	30	324,833	91,165	91,165	28.07 %	100.00 %
	31	324,833	90,760	90,760	27.94 %	100.00 %
Edgecombe	23	48,900	88,865	48,900	100.00 %	55.03 %
Forsyth	71	382,590	84,874	84,874	22.18 %	100.00 %
	72	382,590	86,949	86,949	22.73 %	100.00 %
	74	382,590	84,857	84,857	22.18 %	100.00 %
	75	382,590	84,220	84,220	22.01 %	100.00 %
	91	382,590	86,210	41,690	10.90 %	48.36 %
Franklin	7	68,573	83,510	68,573	100.00 %	82.11 %
Gaston	108	227,943	86,263	86,263	37.84 %	100.00 %
	109	227,943	87,762	87,762	38.50 %	100.00 %
	110	227,943	88,397	53,918	23.65 %	61.00 %
Gates	5	10,478	82,953	10,478	100.00 %	12.63 %
Graham	120	8,030	84,907	8,030	100.00 %	9.46 %
Granville	7	60,992	83,510	14,937	24.49 %	17.89 %
	32	60,992	88,633	46,055	75.51 %	51.96 %
Greene	12	20,451	84,745	20,451	100.00 %	24.13 %
Guilford	57	541,299	90,615	90,615	16.74 %	100.00 %
	58	541,299	90,808	90,808	16.78 %	100.00 %
	59	541,299	90,361	90,361	16.69 %	100.00 %
	60	541,299	89,735	89,735	16.58 %	100.00 %
	61	541,299	90,201	90,201	16.66 %	100.00 %
	62	541,299	89,579	89,579	16.55 %	100.00 %
Halifax	27	48,622	84,735	48,622	100.00 %	57.38 %
Harnett	6	133,568	87,332	87,332	65.38 %	100.00 %
	53	133,568	86,899	46,236	34.62 %	53.21 %
Haywood	118	62,089	83,282	62,089	100.00 %	74.55 %
Henderson	113	116,281	89,058	25,246	21.71 %	28.35 %
	117	116,281	91,035	91,035	78.29 %	100.00 %
Hertford	5	21,552	82,953	21,552	100.00 %	25.98 %
Hoke	48	52,082	86,256	52,082	100.00 %	60.38 %
Hyde	79	4,589	83,163	4,589	100.00 %	5.52 %
Iredell	84	186,693	86,773	86,773	46.48 %	100.00 %
	89	186,693	85,577	14,554	7.80 %	17.01 %
	95	186,693	85,366	85,366	45.73 %	100.00 %
Jackson	119	43,109	90,212	43,109	100.00 %	47.79 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

Data Source: 2020 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File - North Carolina

[G20-CntyDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

County - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175**

County	District	Total County Population	Total District Population	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Johnston	26	215,999	89,947	89,947	41.64 %	100.00 %
	28	215,999	85,389	85,389	39.53 %	100.00 %
	53	215,999	86,899	40,663	18.83 %	46.79 %
Jones	12	9,172	84,745	9,172	100.00 %	10.82 %
Lee	51	63,285	83,073	63,285	100.00 %	76.18 %
Lenoir	12	55,122	84,745	55,122	100.00 %	65.04 %
Lincoln	97	86,810	86,810	86,810	100.00 %	100.00 %
Macon	120	37,014	84,907	37,014	100.00 %	43.59 %
Madison	118	21,193	83,282	21,193	100.00 %	25.45 %
Martin	23	22,031	88,865	22,031	100.00 %	24.79 %
McDowell	85	44,578	90,863	39,684	89.02 %	43.67 %
	113	44,578	89,058	4,894	10.98 %	5.50 %
Mecklenburg	88	1,115,482	82,834	82,834	7.43 %	100.00 %
	92	1,115,482	85,031	85,031	7.62 %	100.00 %
	98	1,115,482	86,827	86,827	7.78 %	100.00 %
	99	1,115,482	87,647	87,647	7.86 %	100.00 %
	100	1,115,482	87,197	87,197	7.82 %	100.00 %
	101	1,115,482	86,426	86,426	7.75 %	100.00 %
	102	1,115,482	86,179	86,179	7.73 %	100.00 %
	103	1,115,482	87,132	87,132	7.81 %	100.00 %
	104	1,115,482	86,520	86,520	7.76 %	100.00 %
	105	1,115,482	85,822	85,822	7.69 %	100.00 %
	106	1,115,482	82,824	82,824	7.42 %	100.00 %
	107	1,115,482	88,237	88,237	7.91 %	100.00 %
	112	1,115,482	82,806	82,806	7.42 %	100.00 %
Mitchell	85	14,903	90,863	14,903	100.00 %	16.40 %
Montgomery	67	25,751	88,255	25,751	100.00 %	29.18 %
Moore	51	99,727	83,073	19,788	19.84 %	23.82 %
	52	99,727	84,383	41,437	41.55 %	49.11 %
	78	99,727	86,365	38,502	38.61 %	44.58 %
Nash	24	94,970	87,220	8,436	8.88 %	9.67 %
	25	94,970	86,534	86,534	91.12 %	100.00 %
New Hanover	18	225,702	91,245	91,245	40.43 %	100.00 %
	19	225,702	91,041	44,111	19.54 %	48.45 %
	20	225,702	90,346	90,346	40.03 %	100.00 %
Northampton	27	17,471	84,735	17,471	100.00 %	20.62 %
Onslow	14	204,576	86,538	86,538	42.30 %	100.00 %
	15	204,576	87,578	87,578	42.81 %	100.00 %
	16	204,576	90,663	30,460	14.89 %	33.60 %
Orange	50	148,696	85,345	62,609	42.11 %	73.36 %
	56	148,696	86,087	86,087	57.89 %	100.00 %
Pamlico	79	12,276	83,163	12,276	100.00 %	14.76 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

Data Source: 2020 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File - North Carolina

[G20-CntyDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

County - District Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

County	District	Total County Population	Total District Population	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Pasquotank	5	40,568	82,953	40,568	100.00 %	48.90 %
Pender	16	60,203	90,663	60,203	100.00 %	66.40 %
Perquimans	1	13,005	84,330	13,005	100.00 %	15.42 %
Person	2	39,097	90,793	39,097	100.00 %	43.06 %
Pitt	8	170,243	85,793	85,793	50.39 %	100.00 %
	9	170,243	84,450	84,450	49.61 %	100.00 %
Polk	113	19,328	89,058	19,328	100.00 %	21.70 %
Randolph	54	144,171	83,475	7,190	4.99 %	8.61 %
	70	144,171	89,118	89,118	61.81 %	100.00 %
	78	144,171	86,365	47,863	33.20 %	55.42 %
Richmond	52	42,946	84,383	42,946	100.00 %	50.89 %
Robeson	46	116,530	83,445	32,822	28.17 %	39.33 %
	47	116,530	83,708	83,708	71.83 %	100.00 %
Rockingham	65	91,096	91,096	91,096	100.00 %	100.00 %
Rowan	76	146,875	89,815	89,815	61.15 %	100.00 %
	77	146,875	90,628	10,702	7.29 %	11.81 %
	83	146,875	90,742	46,358	31.56 %	51.09 %
Rutherford	111	64,444	89,894	24,854	38.57 %	27.65 %
	113	64,444	89,058	39,590	61.43 %	44.45 %
Sampson	22	59,036	88,642	59,036	100.00 %	66.60 %
Scotland	48	34,174	86,256	34,174	100.00 %	39.62 %
Stanly	67	62,504	88,255	62,504	100.00 %	70.82 %
Stokes	91	44,520	86,210	44,520	100.00 %	51.64 %
Surry	90	71,359	82,937	71,359	100.00 %	86.04 %
Swain	119	14,117	90,212	14,117	100.00 %	15.65 %
Transylvania	119	32,986	90,212	32,986	100.00 %	36.56 %
Tyrrell	1	3,245	84,330	3,245	100.00 %	3.85 %
Union	55	238,267	87,005	64,950	27.26 %	74.65 %
	68	238,267	88,138	88,138	36.99 %	100.00 %
	69	238,267	85,179	85,179	35.75 %	100.00 %
Vance	32	42,578	88,633	42,578	100.00 %	48.04 %

County - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175**

County	District	Total County Population	Total District Population	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Wake	11	1,129,410	86,298	86,298	7.64 %	100.00 %
	21	1,129,410	86,179	86,179	7.63 %	100.00 %
	33	1,129,410	83,049	83,049	7.35 %	100.00 %
	34	1,129,410	83,679	83,679	7.41 %	100.00 %
	35	1,129,410	88,374	88,374	7.82 %	100.00 %
	36	1,129,410	90,166	90,166	7.98 %	100.00 %
	37	1,129,410	90,867	90,867	8.05 %	100.00 %
	38	1,129,410	88,226	88,226	7.81 %	100.00 %
	39	1,129,410	90,164	90,164	7.98 %	100.00 %
	40	1,129,410	83,175	83,175	7.36 %	100.00 %
	41	1,129,410	89,887	89,887	7.96 %	100.00 %
	49	1,129,410	86,157	86,157	7.63 %	100.00 %
	66	1,129,410	83,189	83,189	7.37 %	100.00 %
Warren	27	18,642	84,735	18,642	100.00 %	22.00 %
Washington	1	11,003	84,330	11,003	100.00 %	13.05 %
Watauga	87	54,086	85,758	5,106	9.44 %	5.95 %
	93	54,086	86,445	48,980	90.56 %	56.66 %
Wayne	4	117,333	83,095	34,380	29.30 %	41.37 %
	10	117,333	82,953	82,953	70.70 %	100.00 %
Wilkes	90	65,969	82,937	11,578	17.55 %	13.96 %
	94	65,969	90,835	54,391	82.45 %	59.88 %
Wilson	24	78,784	87,220	78,784	100.00 %	90.33 %
Yadkin	77	37,214	90,628	37,214	100.00 %	41.06 %
Yancey	85	18,470	90,863	18,470	100.00 %	20.33 %
Assigned Geography Total:				10,439,388		

Report display: all assigned counties

Total Counties Statewide: 100

Fully Assigned Counties: 100

Partially Assigned Counties: 0

Fully Unassigned Counties: 0

Total Districts Assigned: 120

Split Counties: 36

District - County Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

District	County	Total District Population	Total County Population	District Pop in County	Percent of District Pop in County	Percent of County Pop in District
1	Chowan	84,330	13,708	13,708	16.26 %	100.00 %
	Currituck	84,330	28,100	28,100	33.32 %	100.00 %
	Dare	84,330	36,915	15,269	18.11 %	41.36 %
	Perquimans	84,330	13,005	13,005	15.42 %	100.00 %
	Tyrrell	84,330	3,245	3,245	3.85 %	100.00 %
	Washington	84,330	11,003	11,003	13.05 %	100.00 %
2	Durham	90,793	324,833	51,696	56.94 %	15.91 %
	Person	90,793	39,097	39,097	43.06 %	100.00 %
3	Craven	85,099	100,720	85,099	100.00 %	84.49 %
4	Duplin	83,095	48,715	48,715	58.63 %	100.00 %
	Wayne	83,095	117,333	34,380	41.37 %	29.30 %
5	Camden	82,953	10,355	10,355	12.48 %	100.00 %
	Gates	82,953	10,478	10,478	12.63 %	100.00 %
	Hertford	82,953	21,552	21,552	25.98 %	100.00 %
	Pasquotank	82,953	40,568	40,568	48.90 %	100.00 %
6	Harnett	87,332	133,568	87,332	100.00 %	65.38 %
7	Franklin	83,510	68,573	68,573	82.11 %	100.00 %
	Granville	83,510	60,992	14,937	17.89 %	24.49 %
8	Pitt	85,793	170,243	85,793	100.00 %	50.39 %
9	Pitt	84,450	170,243	84,450	100.00 %	49.61 %
10	Wayne	82,953	117,333	82,953	100.00 %	70.70 %
11	Wake	86,298	1,129,410	86,298	100.00 %	7.64 %
12	Greene	84,745	20,451	20,451	24.13 %	100.00 %
	Jones	84,745	9,172	9,172	10.82 %	100.00 %
	Lenoir	84,745	55,122	55,122	65.04 %	100.00 %
13	Carteret	83,307	67,686	67,686	81.25 %	100.00 %
	Craven	83,307	100,720	15,621	18.75 %	15.51 %
14	Onslow	86,538	204,576	86,538	100.00 %	42.30 %
15	Onslow	87,578	204,576	87,578	100.00 %	42.81 %
16	Onslow	90,663	204,576	30,460	33.60 %	14.89 %
	Pender	90,663	60,203	60,203	66.40 %	100.00 %
17	Brunswick	89,763	136,693	89,763	100.00 %	65.67 %
18	New Hanover	91,245	225,702	91,245	100.00 %	40.43 %
19	Brunswick	91,041	136,693	46,930	51.55 %	34.33 %
	New Hanover	91,041	225,702	44,111	48.45 %	19.54 %
20	New Hanover	90,346	225,702	90,346	100.00 %	40.03 %
21	Wake	86,179	1,129,410	86,179	100.00 %	7.63 %
22	Bladen	88,642	29,606	29,606	33.40 %	100.00 %
	Sampson	88,642	59,036	59,036	66.60 %	100.00 %
23	Bertie	88,865	17,934	17,934	20.18 %	100.00 %
	Edgecombe	88,865	48,900	48,900	55.03 %	100.00 %
	Martin	88,865	22,031	22,031	24.79 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

Data Source: 2020 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File - North Carolina

[G20-DistCnty] - Generated 2/17/2022

District - County Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175**

District	County	Total District Population	Total County Population	District Pop in County	Percent of District Pop in County	Percent of County Pop in District
24	Nash	87,220	94,970	8,436	9.67 %	8.88 %
	Wilson	87,220	78,784	78,784	90.33 %	100.00 %
25	Nash	86,534	94,970	86,534	100.00 %	91.12 %
26	Johnston	89,947	215,999	89,947	100.00 %	41.64 %
27	Halifax	84,735	48,622	48,622	57.38 %	100.00 %
	Northampton	84,735	17,471	17,471	20.62 %	100.00 %
	Warren	84,735	18,642	18,642	22.00 %	100.00 %
28	Johnston	85,389	215,999	85,389	100.00 %	39.53 %
29	Durham	91,212	324,833	91,212	100.00 %	28.08 %
30	Durham	91,165	324,833	91,165	100.00 %	28.07 %
31	Durham	90,760	324,833	90,760	100.00 %	27.94 %
32	Granville	88,633	60,992	46,055	51.96 %	75.51 %
	Vance	88,633	42,578	42,578	48.04 %	100.00 %
33	Wake	83,049	1,129,410	83,049	100.00 %	7.35 %
34	Wake	83,679	1,129,410	83,679	100.00 %	7.41 %
35	Wake	88,374	1,129,410	88,374	100.00 %	7.82 %
36	Wake	90,166	1,129,410	90,166	100.00 %	7.98 %
37	Wake	90,867	1,129,410	90,867	100.00 %	8.05 %
38	Wake	88,226	1,129,410	88,226	100.00 %	7.81 %
39	Wake	90,164	1,129,410	90,164	100.00 %	7.98 %
40	Wake	83,175	1,129,410	83,175	100.00 %	7.36 %
41	Wake	89,887	1,129,410	89,887	100.00 %	7.96 %
42	Cumberland	85,537	334,728	85,537	100.00 %	25.55 %
43	Cumberland	82,956	334,728	82,956	100.00 %	24.78 %
44	Cumberland	83,297	334,728	83,297	100.00 %	24.88 %
45	Cumberland	82,938	334,728	82,938	100.00 %	24.78 %
46	Columbus	83,445	50,623	50,623	60.67 %	100.00 %
	Robeson	83,445	116,530	32,822	39.33 %	28.17 %
47	Robeson	83,708	116,530	83,708	100.00 %	71.83 %
48	Hoke	86,256	52,082	52,082	60.38 %	100.00 %
	Scotland	86,256	34,174	34,174	39.62 %	100.00 %
49	Wake	86,157	1,129,410	86,157	100.00 %	7.63 %
50	Caswell	85,345	22,736	22,736	26.64 %	100.00 %
	Orange	85,345	148,696	62,609	73.36 %	42.11 %
51	Lee	83,073	63,285	63,285	76.18 %	100.00 %
	Moore	83,073	99,727	19,788	23.82 %	19.84 %
52	Moore	84,383	99,727	41,437	49.11 %	41.55 %
	Richmond	84,383	42,946	42,946	50.89 %	100.00 %
53	Harnett	86,899	133,568	46,236	53.21 %	34.62 %
	Johnston	86,899	215,999	40,663	46.79 %	18.83 %
54	Chatham	83,475	76,285	76,285	91.39 %	100.00 %
	Randolph	83,475	144,171	7,190	8.61 %	4.99 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

Data Source: 2020 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File - North Carolina

[G20-DistCnty] - Generated 2/17/2022

District - County Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175**

District	County	Total District Population	Total County Population	District Pop in County	Percent of District Pop in County	Percent of County Pop in District
55	Anson	87,005	22,055	22,055	25.35 %	100.00 %
	Union	87,005	238,267	64,950	74.65 %	27.26 %
56	Orange	86,087	148,696	86,087	100.00 %	57.89 %
57	Guilford	90,615	541,299	90,615	100.00 %	16.74 %
58	Guilford	90,808	541,299	90,808	100.00 %	16.78 %
59	Guilford	90,361	541,299	90,361	100.00 %	16.69 %
60	Guilford	89,735	541,299	89,735	100.00 %	16.58 %
61	Guilford	90,201	541,299	90,201	100.00 %	16.66 %
62	Guilford	89,579	541,299	89,579	100.00 %	16.55 %
63	Alamance	86,399	171,415	86,399	100.00 %	50.40 %
64	Alamance	85,016	171,415	85,016	100.00 %	49.60 %
65	Rockingham	91,096	91,096	91,096	100.00 %	100.00 %
66	Wake	83,189	1,129,410	83,189	100.00 %	7.37 %
67	Montgomery	88,255	25,751	25,751	29.18 %	100.00 %
	Stanly	88,255	62,504	62,504	70.82 %	100.00 %
68	Union	88,138	238,267	88,138	100.00 %	36.99 %
69	Union	85,179	238,267	85,179	100.00 %	35.75 %
70	Randolph	89,118	144,171	89,118	100.00 %	61.81 %
71	Forsyth	84,874	382,590	84,874	100.00 %	22.18 %
72	Forsyth	86,949	382,590	86,949	100.00 %	22.73 %
73	Cabarrus	90,649	225,804	90,649	100.00 %	40.14 %
74	Forsyth	84,857	382,590	84,857	100.00 %	22.18 %
75	Forsyth	84,220	382,590	84,220	100.00 %	22.01 %
76	Rowan	89,815	146,875	89,815	100.00 %	61.15 %
77	Davie	90,628	42,712	42,712	47.13 %	100.00 %
	Rowan	90,628	146,875	10,702	11.81 %	7.29 %
	Yadkin	90,628	37,214	37,214	41.06 %	100.00 %
78	Moore	86,365	99,727	38,502	44.58 %	38.61 %
	Randolph	86,365	144,171	47,863	55.42 %	33.20 %
79	Beaufort	83,163	44,652	44,652	53.69 %	100.00 %
	Dare	83,163	36,915	21,646	26.03 %	58.64 %
	Hyde	83,163	4,589	4,589	5.52 %	100.00 %
	Pamlico	83,163	12,276	12,276	14.76 %	100.00 %
80	Davidson	84,864	168,930	84,864	100.00 %	50.24 %
81	Davidson	84,066	168,930	84,066	100.00 %	49.76 %
82	Cabarrus	90,771	225,804	90,771	100.00 %	40.20 %
83	Cabarrus	90,742	225,804	44,384	48.91 %	19.66 %
	Rowan	90,742	146,875	46,358	51.09 %	31.56 %
84	Iredell	86,773	186,693	86,773	100.00 %	46.48 %

District - County Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

District	County	Total District Population	Total County Population	District Pop in County	Percent of District Pop in County	Percent of County Pop in District
85	Avery	90,863	17,806	17,806	19.60 %	100.00 %
	McDowell	90,863	44,578	39,684	43.67 %	89.02 %
	Mitchell	90,863	14,903	14,903	16.40 %	100.00 %
	Yancey	90,863	18,470	18,470	20.33 %	100.00 %
86	Burke	87,570	87,570	87,570	100.00 %	100.00 %
87	Caldwell	85,758	80,652	80,652	94.05 %	100.00 %
	Watauga	85,758	54,086	5,106	5.95 %	9.44 %
88	Mecklenburg	82,834	1,115,482	82,834	100.00 %	7.43 %
89	Catawba	85,577	160,610	71,023	82.99 %	44.22 %
	Iredell	85,577	186,693	14,554	17.01 %	7.80 %
90	Surry	82,937	71,359	71,359	86.04 %	100.00 %
	Wilkes	82,937	65,969	11,578	13.96 %	17.55 %
91	Forsyth	86,210	382,590	41,690	48.36 %	10.90 %
	Stokes	86,210	44,520	44,520	51.64 %	100.00 %
92	Mecklenburg	85,031	1,115,482	85,031	100.00 %	7.62 %
93	Alleghany	86,445	10,888	10,888	12.60 %	100.00 %
	Ashe	86,445	26,577	26,577	30.74 %	100.00 %
	Watauga	86,445	54,086	48,980	56.66 %	90.56 %
94	Alexander	90,835	36,444	36,444	40.12 %	100.00 %
	Wilkes	90,835	65,969	54,391	59.88 %	82.45 %
95	Iredell	85,366	186,693	85,366	100.00 %	45.73 %
96	Catawba	89,587	160,610	89,587	100.00 %	55.78 %
97	Lincoln	86,810	86,810	86,810	100.00 %	100.00 %
98	Mecklenburg	86,827	1,115,482	86,827	100.00 %	7.78 %
99	Mecklenburg	87,647	1,115,482	87,647	100.00 %	7.86 %
100	Mecklenburg	87,197	1,115,482	87,197	100.00 %	7.82 %
101	Mecklenburg	86,426	1,115,482	86,426	100.00 %	7.75 %
102	Mecklenburg	86,179	1,115,482	86,179	100.00 %	7.73 %
103	Mecklenburg	87,132	1,115,482	87,132	100.00 %	7.81 %
104	Mecklenburg	86,520	1,115,482	86,520	100.00 %	7.76 %
105	Mecklenburg	85,822	1,115,482	85,822	100.00 %	7.69 %
106	Mecklenburg	82,824	1,115,482	82,824	100.00 %	7.42 %
107	Mecklenburg	88,237	1,115,482	88,237	100.00 %	7.91 %
108	Gaston	86,263	227,943	86,263	100.00 %	37.84 %
109	Gaston	87,762	227,943	87,762	100.00 %	38.50 %
110	Cleveland	88,397	99,519	34,479	39.00 %	34.65 %
	Gaston	88,397	227,943	53,918	61.00 %	23.65 %
111	Cleveland	89,894	99,519	65,040	72.35 %	65.35 %
	Rutherford	89,894	64,444	24,854	27.65 %	38.57 %
112	Mecklenburg	82,806	1,115,482	82,806	100.00 %	7.42 %

District - County Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175**

District	County	Total District Population	Total County Population	District Pop in County	Percent of District Pop in County	Percent of County Pop in District
113	Henderson	89,058	116,281	25,246	28.35 %	21.71 %
	McDowell	89,058	44,578	4,894	5.50 %	10.98 %
	Polk	89,058	19,328	19,328	21.70 %	100.00 %
	Rutherford	89,058	64,444	39,590	44.45 %	61.43 %
114	Buncombe	89,685	269,452	89,685	100.00 %	33.28 %
115	Buncombe	90,262	269,452	90,262	100.00 %	33.50 %
116	Buncombe	89,505	269,452	89,505	100.00 %	33.22 %
117	Henderson	91,035	116,281	91,035	100.00 %	78.29 %
118	Haywood	83,282	62,089	62,089	74.55 %	100.00 %
	Madison	83,282	21,193	21,193	25.45 %	100.00 %
119	Jackson	90,212	43,109	43,109	47.79 %	100.00 %
	Swain	90,212	14,117	14,117	15.65 %	100.00 %
	Transylvania	90,212	32,986	32,986	36.56 %	100.00 %
120	Cherokee	84,907	28,774	28,774	33.89 %	100.00 %
	Clay	84,907	11,089	11,089	13.06 %	100.00 %
	Graham	84,907	8,030	8,030	9.46 %	100.00 %
	Macon	84,907	37,014	37,014	43.59 %	100.00 %
Total:				10,439,388		

Total Districts Assigned: 120

Total Counties Statewide: 100

Fully Assigned Counties: 100

Partially Assigned Counties: 0

Fully Unassigned Counties: 0

Split Counties: 36

Municipality - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Aberdeen	52	8,516	84,383	8,516	100.00 %	10.09 %
	78	8,516	86,365	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Ahoskie	5	4,891	82,953	4,891	100.00 %	5.90 %
Alamance	64	988	85,016	988	100.00 %	1.16 %
Albemarle	67	16,432	88,255	16,432	100.00 %	18.62 %
Alliance	79	733	83,163	733	100.00 %	0.88 %
Andrews	120	1,667	84,907	1,667	100.00 %	1.96 %
Angier	6	5,265	87,332	4,709	89.44 %	5.39 %
	37	5,265	90,867	556	10.56 %	0.61 %
Ansonville	55	440	87,005	440	100.00 %	0.51 %
Apex	11	58,780	86,298	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	21	58,780	86,179	556	0.95 %	0.65 %
	36	58,780	90,166	57,843	98.41 %	64.15 %
	41	58,780	89,887	381	0.65 %	0.42 %
Arapahoe	79	416	83,163	416	100.00 %	0.50 %
Archdale	60	11,907	89,735	380	3.19 %	0.42 %
	70	11,907	89,118	11,527	96.81 %	12.93 %
Archer Lodge	26	4,797	89,947	4,797	100.00 %	5.33 %
Asheboro	70	27,156	89,118	25,890	95.34 %	29.05 %
	78	27,156	86,365	1,266	4.66 %	1.47 %
Asheville	114	94,589	89,685	52,596	55.60 %	58.65 %
	115	94,589	90,262	29,236	30.91 %	32.39 %
	116	94,589	89,505	12,757	13.49 %	14.25 %
Askewville	23	184	88,865	184	100.00 %	0.21 %
Atkinson	16	296	90,663	296	100.00 %	0.33 %
Atlantic Beach	13	1,364	83,307	1,364	100.00 %	1.64 %
Aulander	23	763	88,865	763	100.00 %	0.86 %
Aurora	79	455	83,163	455	100.00 %	0.55 %
Autryville	22	167	88,642	167	100.00 %	0.19 %
Ayden	9	4,977	84,450	4,977	100.00 %	5.89 %
Badin	67	2,024	88,255	2,024	100.00 %	2.29 %
Bailey	24	568	87,220	568	100.00 %	0.65 %
Bakersville	85	450	90,863	450	100.00 %	0.50 %
Bald Head Island	19	268	91,041	268	100.00 %	0.29 %
Banner Elk	85	1,049	90,863	1,049	100.00 %	1.15 %
Bath	79	245	83,163	245	100.00 %	0.29 %
Bayboro	79	1,161	83,163	1,161	100.00 %	1.40 %
Bear Grass	23	89	88,865	89	100.00 %	0.10 %
Beaufort	13	4,464	83,307	4,464	100.00 %	5.36 %
Beech Mountain	85	675	90,863	62	9.19 %	0.07 %
	93	675	86,445	613	90.81 %	0.71 %
Belhaven	79	1,410	83,163	1,410	100.00 %	1.70 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Belmont	108	15,010	86,263	1,868	12.45 %	2.17 %
	109	15,010	87,762	13,142	87.55 %	14.97 %
Belville	17	2,406	89,763	2,406	100.00 %	2.68 %
Belwood	110	857	88,397	857	100.00 %	0.97 %
Benson	28	3,967	85,389	3,967	100.00 %	4.65 %
	53	3,967	86,899	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Bermuda Run	77	3,120	90,628	3,120	100.00 %	3.44 %
Bessemer City	110	5,428	88,397	5,428	100.00 %	6.14 %
Bethania	74	344	84,857	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	91	344	86,210	344	100.00 %	0.40 %
Bethel	8	1,373	85,793	1,373	100.00 %	1.60 %
Beulaville	4	1,116	83,095	1,116	100.00 %	1.34 %
Biltmore Forest	116	1,409	89,505	1,409	100.00 %	1.57 %
Biscoe	67	1,848	88,255	1,848	100.00 %	2.09 %
Black Creek	24	692	87,220	692	100.00 %	0.79 %
Black Mountain	115	8,426	90,262	8,426	100.00 %	9.34 %
Bladenboro	22	1,648	88,642	1,648	100.00 %	1.86 %
Blowing Rock	87	1,376	85,758	96	6.98 %	0.11 %
	93	1,376	86,445	1,280	93.02 %	1.48 %
Boardman	46	166	83,445	166	100.00 %	0.20 %
Bogue	13	695	83,307	695	100.00 %	0.83 %
Boiling Spring Lakes	19	5,943	91,041	5,943	100.00 %	6.53 %
Boiling Springs	111	4,615	89,894	4,615	100.00 %	5.13 %
Bolivia	19	149	91,041	149	100.00 %	0.16 %
Bolton	46	519	83,445	519	100.00 %	0.62 %
Boone	87	19,092	85,758	595	3.12 %	0.69 %
	93	19,092	86,445	18,497	96.88 %	21.40 %
Boonville	77	1,185	90,628	1,185	100.00 %	1.31 %
Bostic	111	355	89,894	355	100.00 %	0.39 %
Brevard	119	7,744	90,212	7,744	100.00 %	8.58 %
Bridgeton	3	349	85,099	349	100.00 %	0.41 %
Broadway	6	1,267	87,332	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	51	1,267	83,073	1,267	100.00 %	1.53 %
Brookford	96	442	89,587	442	100.00 %	0.49 %
Brunswick	46	973	83,445	973	100.00 %	1.17 %
Bryson City	119	1,558	90,212	1,558	100.00 %	1.73 %
Bunn	7	327	83,510	327	100.00 %	0.39 %
Burgaw	16	3,088	90,663	3,088	100.00 %	3.41 %
Burlington	59	57,303	90,361	1,822	3.18 %	2.02 %
	63	57,303	86,399	25,917	45.23 %	30.00 %
	64	57,303	85,016	29,564	51.59 %	34.77 %
Burnsville	85	1,614	90,863	1,614	100.00 %	1.78 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Butner	32	8,397	88,633	8,397	100.00 %	9.47 %
Cajah's Mountain	87	2,722	85,758	2,722	100.00 %	3.17 %
Calabash	17	2,011	89,763	2,011	100.00 %	2.24 %
Calypso	4	327	83,095	327	100.00 %	0.39 %
Cameron	51	244	83,073	244	100.00 %	0.29 %
Candor	67	813	88,255	813	100.00 %	0.92 %
	78	813	86,365	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Canton	118	4,422	83,282	4,422	100.00 %	5.31 %
Cape Carteret	13	2,224	83,307	2,224	100.00 %	2.67 %
Carolina Beach	19	6,564	91,041	6,564	100.00 %	7.21 %
Carolina Shores	17	4,588	89,763	4,588	100.00 %	5.11 %
Carrboro	50	21,295	85,345	174	0.82 %	0.20 %
	56	21,295	86,087	21,121	99.18 %	24.53 %
Carthage	51	2,775	83,073	2,747	98.99 %	3.31 %
	52	2,775	84,383	28	1.01 %	0.03 %
Cary	11	174,721	86,298	43,537	24.92 %	50.45 %
	21	174,721	86,179	30,622	17.53 %	35.53 %
	36	174,721	90,166	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	37	174,721	90,867	2,012	1.15 %	2.21 %
	41	174,721	89,887	74,074	42.40 %	82.41 %
	49	174,721	86,157	20,767	11.89 %	24.10 %
	54	174,721	83,475	3,709	2.12 %	4.44 %
Casar	110	305	88,397	305	100.00 %	0.35 %
Castalia	25	264	86,534	264	100.00 %	0.31 %
Caswell Beach	19	395	91,041	395	100.00 %	0.43 %
Catawba	89	702	85,577	702	100.00 %	0.82 %
Cedar Point	13	1,764	83,307	1,764	100.00 %	2.12 %
Cedar Rock	87	301	85,758	301	100.00 %	0.35 %
Cerro Gordo	46	131	83,445	131	100.00 %	0.16 %
Chadbourn	46	1,574	83,445	1,574	100.00 %	1.89 %
Chapel Hill	29	61,960	91,212	2,906	4.69 %	3.19 %
	56	61,960	86,087	59,054	95.31 %	68.60 %

Municipality - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Charlotte	88	874,579	82,834	82,834	9.47 %	100.00 %
	92	874,579	85,031	63,762	7.29 %	74.99 %
	99	874,579	87,647	79,113	9.05 %	90.26 %
	100	874,579	87,197	87,197	9.97 %	100.00 %
	101	874,579	86,426	64,526	7.38 %	74.66 %
	102	874,579	86,179	86,179	9.85 %	100.00 %
	103	874,579	87,132	23,590	2.70 %	27.07 %
	104	874,579	86,520	86,520	9.89 %	100.00 %
	105	874,579	85,822	71,156	8.14 %	82.91 %
	106	874,579	82,824	79,717	9.11 %	96.25 %
	107	874,579	88,237	67,298	7.69 %	76.27 %
	112	874,579	82,806	82,687	9.45 %	99.86 %
Cherryville	110	6,078	88,397	6,078	100.00 %	6.88 %
Chimney Rock Village	113	140	89,058	140	100.00 %	0.16 %
China Grove	83	4,434	90,742	4,434	100.00 %	4.89 %
Chocowinity	79	722	83,163	722	100.00 %	0.87 %
Claremont	89	1,692	85,577	1,692	100.00 %	1.98 %
Clarkton	22	614	88,642	614	100.00 %	0.69 %
Clayton	26	26,307	89,947	26,307	100.00 %	29.25 %
	38	26,307	88,226	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	39	26,307	90,164	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Clemmons	74	21,163	84,857	21,163	100.00 %	24.94 %
Cleveland	77	846	90,628	846	100.00 %	0.93 %
Clinton	22	8,383	88,642	8,383	100.00 %	9.46 %
Clyde	118	1,368	83,282	1,368	100.00 %	1.64 %
Coats	53	2,155	86,899	2,155	100.00 %	2.48 %
Cofield	5	267	82,953	267	100.00 %	0.32 %
Colerain	23	217	88,865	217	100.00 %	0.24 %
Columbia	1	610	84,330	610	100.00 %	0.72 %
Columbus	113	1,060	89,058	1,060	100.00 %	1.19 %
Como	5	67	82,953	67	100.00 %	0.08 %
Concord	73	105,240	90,649	32,447	30.83 %	35.79 %
	82	105,240	90,771	48,723	46.30 %	53.68 %
	83	105,240	90,742	24,070	22.87 %	26.53 %
Conetoe	23	198	88,865	198	100.00 %	0.22 %
Connelly Springs	86	1,529	87,570	1,529	100.00 %	1.75 %
Conover	89	8,421	85,577	424	5.04 %	0.50 %
	96	8,421	89,587	7,997	94.96 %	8.93 %
Conway	27	752	84,735	752	100.00 %	0.89 %
Cooleemee	77	940	90,628	940	100.00 %	1.04 %
Cornelius	98	31,412	86,827	31,412	100.00 %	36.18 %
Cove City	3	378	85,099	378	100.00 %	0.44 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Cramerton	108	5,296	86,263	96	1.81 %	0.11 %
	109	5,296	87,762	5,200	98.19 %	5.93 %
Creedmoor	7	4,866	83,510	2,065	42.44 %	2.47 %
	32	4,866	88,633	2,801	57.56 %	3.16 %
Creswell	1	207	84,330	207	100.00 %	0.25 %
Crossnore	85	143	90,863	143	100.00 %	0.16 %
Dallas	110	5,927	88,397	5,927	100.00 %	6.70 %
Danbury	91	189	86,210	189	100.00 %	0.22 %
Davidson	95	15,106	85,366	378	2.50 %	0.44 %
	98	15,106	86,827	14,728	97.50 %	16.96 %
Dellview	110	6	88,397	6	100.00 %	0.01 %
Denton	80	1,494	84,864	1,494	100.00 %	1.76 %
Dillsboro	119	213	90,212	213	100.00 %	0.24 %
Dobbins Heights	52	687	84,383	687	100.00 %	0.81 %
Dobson	90	1,462	82,937	1,462	100.00 %	1.76 %
Dortches	25	1,082	86,534	1,082	100.00 %	1.25 %
Dover	3	349	85,099	349	100.00 %	0.41 %
Drexel	86	1,760	87,570	1,760	100.00 %	2.01 %
Dublin	22	267	88,642	267	100.00 %	0.30 %
Duck	1	742	84,330	742	100.00 %	0.88 %
Dunn	53	8,446	86,899	8,446	100.00 %	9.72 %
Durham	2	283,506	90,793	25,167	8.88 %	27.72 %
	29	283,506	91,212	87,035	30.70 %	95.42 %
	30	283,506	91,165	89,671	31.63 %	98.36 %
	31	283,506	90,760	81,220	28.65 %	89.49 %
	40	283,506	83,175	269	0.09 %	0.32 %
	49	283,506	86,157	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	50	283,506	85,345	144	0.05 %	0.17 %
Earl	111	198	89,894	198	100.00 %	0.22 %
East Arcadia	22	418	88,642	418	100.00 %	0.47 %
East Bend	77	634	90,628	634	100.00 %	0.70 %
East Laurinburg	48	234	86,256	234	100.00 %	0.27 %
Eastover	43	3,656	82,956	3,656	100.00 %	4.41 %
East Spencer	76	1,567	89,815	1,567	100.00 %	1.74 %
Eden	65	15,421	91,096	15,421	100.00 %	16.93 %
Edenton	1	4,460	84,330	4,460	100.00 %	5.29 %
Elizabeth City	5	18,631	82,953	18,631	100.00 %	22.46 %
Elizabethtown	22	3,296	88,642	3,296	100.00 %	3.72 %
Elkin	90	4,122	82,937	4,122	100.00 %	4.97 %
Elk Park	85	542	90,863	542	100.00 %	0.60 %
Ellenboro	111	723	89,894	723	100.00 %	0.80 %
Ellerbe	52	864	84,383	864	100.00 %	1.02 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

Page 5 of 18

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Elm City	24	1,218	87,220	1,218	100.00 %	1.40 %
	25	1,218	86,534	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Elon	64	11,336	85,016	11,336	100.00 %	13.33 %
Emerald Isle	13	3,847	83,307	3,847	100.00 %	4.62 %
Enfield	27	1,865	84,735	1,865	100.00 %	2.20 %
Erwin	53	4,542	86,899	4,542	100.00 %	5.23 %
Eureka	10	214	82,953	214	100.00 %	0.26 %
Everetts	23	150	88,865	150	100.00 %	0.17 %
Fair Bluff	46	709	83,445	709	100.00 %	0.85 %
Fairmont	46	2,191	83,445	2,191	100.00 %	2.63 %
	47	2,191	83,708	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Fairview	69	3,456	85,179	3,456	100.00 %	4.06 %
Faison	4	784	83,095	784	100.00 %	0.94 %
	22	784	88,642	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Faith	76	819	89,815	819	100.00 %	0.91 %
Falcon	22	324	88,642	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	43	324	82,956	324	100.00 %	0.39 %
Falkland	8	47	85,793	47	100.00 %	0.05 %
Fallston	110	627	88,397	627	100.00 %	0.71 %
Farmville	8	4,461	85,793	4,461	100.00 %	5.20 %
Fayetteville	42	208,501	85,537	65,401	31.37 %	76.46 %
	43	208,501	82,956	44,532	21.36 %	53.68 %
	44	208,501	83,297	83,293	39.95 %	100.00 %
	45	208,501	82,938	15,275	7.33 %	18.42 %
Flat Rock	113	3,486	89,058	3,486	100.00 %	3.91 %
Fletcher	117	7,987	91,035	7,987	100.00 %	8.77 %
Fontana Dam	120	13	84,907	13	100.00 %	0.02 %
Forest City	111	7,377	89,894	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	113	7,377	89,058	7,377	100.00 %	8.28 %
Forest Hills	119	303	90,212	303	100.00 %	0.34 %
Fountain	8	385	85,793	385	100.00 %	0.45 %
Four Oaks	28	2,158	85,389	2,158	100.00 %	2.53 %
Foxfire	52	1,288	84,383	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	78	1,288	86,365	1,288	100.00 %	1.49 %
Franklin	120	4,175	84,907	4,175	100.00 %	4.92 %
Franklinton	7	2,456	83,510	2,456	100.00 %	2.94 %
Franklinville	78	1,197	86,365	1,197	100.00 %	1.39 %
Fremont	10	1,196	82,953	1,196	100.00 %	1.44 %
Fuquay-Varina	6	34,152	87,332	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	21	34,152	86,179	30	0.09 %	0.03 %
	36	34,152	90,166	16	0.05 %	0.02 %
	37	34,152	90,867	34,106	99.87 %	37.53 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Gamewell	87	3,702	85,758	3,702	100.00 %	4.32 %
Garland	22	595	88,642	595	100.00 %	0.67 %
Garner	21	31,159	86,179	11,789	37.83 %	13.68 %
	33	31,159	83,049	14	0.04 %	0.02 %
	37	31,159	90,867	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	38	31,159	88,226	19,356	62.12 %	21.94 %
Garysburg	27	904	84,735	904	100.00 %	1.07 %
Gaston	27	1,008	84,735	1,008	100.00 %	1.19 %
Gastonia	108	80,411	86,263	28,480	35.42 %	33.02 %
	109	80,411	87,762	44,448	55.28 %	50.65 %
	110	80,411	88,397	7,483	9.31 %	8.47 %
Gatesville	5	267	82,953	267	100.00 %	0.32 %
Gibson	48	449	86,256	449	100.00 %	0.52 %
Gibsonville	59	8,920	90,361	4,642	52.04 %	5.14 %
	64	8,920	85,016	4,278	47.96 %	5.03 %
Glen Alpine	86	1,529	87,570	1,529	100.00 %	1.75 %
Godwin	43	128	82,956	128	100.00 %	0.15 %
Goldsboro	4	33,657	83,095	5	0.01 %	0.01 %
	10	33,657	82,953	33,652	99.99 %	40.57 %
Goldston	54	234	83,475	234	100.00 %	0.28 %
Graham	63	17,157	86,399	17,157	100.00 %	19.86 %
Grandfather Village	85	95	90,863	95	100.00 %	0.10 %
Granite Falls	87	4,965	85,758	4,965	100.00 %	5.79 %
Granite Quarry	76	2,984	89,815	2,984	100.00 %	3.32 %
Grantsboro	79	692	83,163	692	100.00 %	0.83 %
Greenevers	4	567	83,095	567	100.00 %	0.68 %
Green Level	63	3,152	86,399	3,152	100.00 %	3.65 %
Greensboro	57	299,035	90,615	83,540	27.94 %	92.19 %
	58	299,035	90,808	84,725	28.33 %	93.30 %
	59	299,035	90,361	13,852	4.63 %	15.33 %
	60	299,035	89,735	8,829	2.95 %	9.84 %
	61	299,035	90,201	90,201	30.16 %	100.00 %
	62	299,035	89,579	17,888	5.98 %	19.97 %
Greenville	8	87,521	85,793	52,881	60.42 %	61.64 %
	9	87,521	84,450	34,640	39.58 %	41.02 %
Grifton	9	2,448	84,450	2,301	94.00 %	2.72 %
	12	2,448	84,745	147	6.00 %	0.17 %
Grimesland	9	386	84,450	386	100.00 %	0.46 %
Grover	111	802	89,894	802	100.00 %	0.89 %
Halifax	27	170	84,735	170	100.00 %	0.20 %
Hamilton	23	306	88,865	306	100.00 %	0.34 %
Hamlet	52	6,025	84,383	6,025	100.00 %	7.14 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Harmony	84	543	86,773	543	100.00 %	0.63 %
Harrells	4	160	83,095	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	22	160	88,642	160	100.00 %	0.18 %
Harrellsville	5	85	82,953	85	100.00 %	0.10 %
Harrisburg	73	18,967	90,649	18,967	100.00 %	20.92 %
Hassell	23	49	88,865	49	100.00 %	0.06 %
Havelock	3	16,621	85,099	5,986	36.01 %	7.03 %
	13	16,621	83,307	10,635	63.99 %	12.77 %
Haw River	63	2,252	86,399	2,252	100.00 %	2.61 %
Hayesville	120	461	84,907	461	100.00 %	0.54 %
Hemby Bridge	69	1,614	85,179	1,614	100.00 %	1.89 %
Henderson	32	15,060	88,633	15,060	100.00 %	16.99 %
Hendersonville	113	15,137	89,058	623	4.12 %	0.70 %
	117	15,137	91,035	14,514	95.88 %	15.94 %
Hertford	1	1,934	84,330	1,934	100.00 %	2.29 %
Hickory	86	43,490	87,570	79	0.18 %	0.09 %
	87	43,490	85,758	32	0.07 %	0.04 %
	89	43,490	85,577	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	96	43,490	89,587	43,379	99.74 %	48.42 %
Highlands	119	1,072	90,212	12	1.12 %	0.01 %
	120	1,072	84,907	1,060	98.88 %	1.25 %
High Point	60	114,059	89,735	66,033	57.89 %	73.59 %
	62	114,059	89,579	41,288	36.20 %	46.09 %
	70	114,059	89,118	8	0.01 %	0.01 %
	75	114,059	84,220	84	0.07 %	0.10 %
	80	114,059	84,864	6,646	5.83 %	7.83 %
High Shoals	110	595	88,397	595	100.00 %	0.67 %
Hildebran	86	1,679	87,570	1,679	100.00 %	1.92 %
Hillsborough	50	9,660	85,345	9,660	100.00 %	11.32 %
Hobgood	27	268	84,735	268	100.00 %	0.32 %
Hoffman	52	418	84,383	418	100.00 %	0.50 %
Holden Beach	17	921	89,763	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	19	921	91,041	921	100.00 %	1.01 %
Holly Ridge	15	4,171	87,578	4,171	100.00 %	4.76 %
Holly Springs	21	41,239	86,179	11,892	28.84 %	13.80 %
	36	41,239	90,166	17,734	43.00 %	19.67 %
	37	41,239	90,867	11,613	28.16 %	12.78 %
Hookerton	12	413	84,745	413	100.00 %	0.49 %
Hope Mills	43	17,808	82,956	64	0.36 %	0.08 %
	45	17,808	82,938	17,744	99.64 %	21.39 %
Hot Springs	118	520	83,282	520	100.00 %	0.62 %
Hudson	87	3,780	85,758	3,780	100.00 %	4.41 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

Page 8 of 18

Municipality - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Huntersville	98	61,376	86,827	38,677	63.02 %	44.54 %
	101	61,376	86,426	5,893	9.60 %	6.82 %
	107	61,376	88,237	16,806	27.38 %	19.05 %
Indian Beach	13	223	83,307	223	100.00 %	0.27 %
Indian Trail	55	39,997	87,005	2,376	5.94 %	2.73 %
	68	39,997	88,138	15,036	37.59 %	17.06 %
	69	39,997	85,179	22,585	56.47 %	26.51 %
Jackson	27	430	84,735	430	100.00 %	0.51 %
Jacksonville	14	72,723	86,538	28,456	39.13 %	32.88 %
	15	72,723	87,578	44,267	60.87 %	50.55 %
Jamestown	60	3,668	89,735	3,668	100.00 %	4.09 %
Jamesville	23	424	88,865	424	100.00 %	0.48 %
Jefferson	93	1,622	86,445	1,622	100.00 %	1.88 %
Jonesville	77	2,308	90,628	2,308	100.00 %	2.55 %
Kannapolis	82	53,114	90,771	33,907	63.84 %	37.35 %
	83	53,114	90,742	19,207	36.16 %	21.17 %
Kelford	23	203	88,865	203	100.00 %	0.23 %
Kenansville	4	770	83,095	770	100.00 %	0.93 %
Kenly	24	1,491	87,220	198	13.28 %	0.23 %
	28	1,491	85,389	1,293	86.72 %	1.51 %
Kernersville	62	26,449	89,579	502	1.90 %	0.56 %
	71	26,449	84,874	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	75	26,449	84,220	25,947	98.10 %	30.81 %
Kill Devil Hills	1	7,656	84,330	7,118	92.97 %	8.44 %
	79	7,656	83,163	538	7.03 %	0.65 %
King	91	7,197	86,210	7,197	100.00 %	8.35 %
Kings Mountain	110	11,142	88,397	1,118	10.03 %	1.26 %
	111	11,142	89,894	10,024	89.97 %	11.15 %
Kingstown	110	656	88,397	656	100.00 %	0.74 %
Kinston	12	19,900	84,745	19,900	100.00 %	23.48 %
Kittrell	32	132	88,633	132	100.00 %	0.15 %
Kitty Hawk	1	3,689	84,330	3,689	100.00 %	4.37 %
Knightdale	38	19,435	88,226	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	39	19,435	90,164	19,435	100.00 %	21.56 %
Kure Beach	19	2,191	91,041	2,191	100.00 %	2.41 %
La Grange	12	2,595	84,745	2,595	100.00 %	3.06 %
Lake Lure	113	1,365	89,058	1,365	100.00 %	1.53 %
Lake Park	69	3,269	85,179	3,269	100.00 %	3.84 %
Lake Santeetlah	120	38	84,907	38	100.00 %	0.04 %
Lake Waccamaw	46	1,296	83,445	1,296	100.00 %	1.55 %
Landis	83	3,690	90,742	3,690	100.00 %	4.07 %
Lansing	93	126	86,445	126	100.00 %	0.15 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Lasker	27	64	84,735	64	100.00 %	0.08 %
Lattimore	111	406	89,894	406	100.00 %	0.45 %
Laurel Park	113	2,250	89,058	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	117	2,250	91,035	2,250	100.00 %	2.47 %
Laurinburg	48	14,978	86,256	14,978	100.00 %	17.36 %
Lawndale	110	570	88,397	570	100.00 %	0.64 %
Leggett	23	37	88,865	37	100.00 %	0.04 %
Leland	17	22,908	89,763	22,908	100.00 %	25.52 %
Lenoir	87	18,352	85,758	18,352	100.00 %	21.40 %
Lewiston Woodville	23	426	88,865	426	100.00 %	0.48 %
Lewisville	74	13,381	84,857	13,381	100.00 %	15.77 %
Lexington	80	19,632	84,864	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	81	19,632	84,066	19,632	100.00 %	23.35 %
Liberty	54	2,655	83,475	2,655	100.00 %	3.18 %
Lilesville	55	395	87,005	395	100.00 %	0.45 %
Lillington	6	4,735	87,332	882	18.63 %	1.01 %
	53	4,735	86,899	3,853	81.37 %	4.43 %
Lincolnton	97	11,091	86,810	11,091	100.00 %	12.78 %
Linden	43	136	82,956	136	100.00 %	0.16 %
Littleton	27	559	84,735	559	100.00 %	0.66 %
Locust	67	4,537	88,255	3,996	88.08 %	4.53 %
	73	4,537	90,649	541	11.92 %	0.60 %
Long View	86	5,088	87,570	735	14.45 %	0.84 %
	96	5,088	89,587	4,353	85.55 %	4.86 %
Louisburg	7	3,064	83,510	3,064	100.00 %	3.67 %
Love Valley	84	154	86,773	154	100.00 %	0.18 %
Lowell	108	3,654	86,263	3,654	100.00 %	4.24 %
	109	3,654	87,762	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Lucama	24	1,036	87,220	1,036	100.00 %	1.19 %
Lumber Bridge	47	82	83,708	82	100.00 %	0.10 %
Lumberton	46	19,025	83,445	350	1.84 %	0.42 %
	47	19,025	83,708	18,675	98.16 %	22.31 %
McAdenville	108	890	86,263	890	100.00 %	1.03 %
Macclesfield	23	413	88,865	413	100.00 %	0.46 %
McDonald	46	94	83,445	94	100.00 %	0.11 %
McFarlan	55	94	87,005	94	100.00 %	0.11 %
Macon	27	110	84,735	110	100.00 %	0.13 %
Madison	65	2,129	91,096	2,129	100.00 %	2.34 %
Maggie Valley	118	1,687	83,282	1,687	100.00 %	2.03 %
Magnolia	4	831	83,095	831	100.00 %	1.00 %
Maiden	89	3,736	85,577	3,736	100.00 %	4.37 %
	97	3,736	86,810	0	0.00 %	0.00 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Manteo	79	1,600	83,163	1,600	100.00 %	1.92 %
Marietta	46	111	83,445	111	100.00 %	0.13 %
Marion	85	7,717	90,863	7,717	100.00 %	8.49 %
Marshall	118	777	83,282	777	100.00 %	0.93 %
Mars Hill	118	2,007	83,282	2,007	100.00 %	2.41 %
Marshville	55	2,522	87,005	2,522	100.00 %	2.90 %
Marvin	68	6,358	88,138	6,358	100.00 %	7.21 %
Matthews	103	29,435	87,132	29,435	100.00 %	33.78 %
Maxton	46	2,110	83,445	1,902	90.14 %	2.28 %
	48	2,110	86,256	208	9.86 %	0.24 %
Mayodan	65	2,418	91,096	2,418	100.00 %	2.65 %
Maysville	12	818	84,745	818	100.00 %	0.97 %
Mebane	50	17,797	85,345	3,171	17.82 %	3.72 %
	63	17,797	86,399	14,626	82.18 %	16.93 %
Mesic	79	144	83,163	144	100.00 %	0.17 %
Micro	28	458	85,389	458	100.00 %	0.54 %
Middleburg	32	101	88,633	101	100.00 %	0.11 %
Middlesex	24	912	87,220	912	100.00 %	1.05 %
Midland	73	4,684	90,649	4,684	100.00 %	5.17 %
	103	4,684	87,132	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Midway	80	4,742	84,864	3,469	73.15 %	4.09 %
	81	4,742	84,066	1,273	26.85 %	1.51 %
Mills River	117	7,078	91,035	7,078	100.00 %	7.78 %
Milton	50	155	85,345	155	100.00 %	0.18 %
Mineral Springs	55	3,159	87,005	2,293	72.59 %	2.64 %
	68	3,159	88,138	866	27.41 %	0.98 %
Minnesott Beach	79	530	83,163	530	100.00 %	0.64 %
Mint Hill	69	26,450	85,179	6	0.02 %	0.01 %
	99	26,450	87,647	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	103	26,450	87,132	26,444	99.98 %	30.35 %
Misenheimer	67	650	88,255	650	100.00 %	0.74 %
Mocksville	77	5,900	90,628	5,900	100.00 %	6.51 %
Momeyer	25	277	86,534	277	100.00 %	0.32 %
Monroe	55	34,562	87,005	12,650	36.60 %	14.54 %
	69	34,562	85,179	21,912	63.40 %	25.72 %
Montreat	115	901	90,262	901	100.00 %	1.00 %
Mooreboro	111	293	89,894	293	100.00 %	0.33 %
Mooresville	84	50,193	86,773	205	0.41 %	0.24 %
	95	50,193	85,366	49,988	99.59 %	58.56 %
Morehead City	13	9,556	83,307	9,556	100.00 %	11.47 %
Morganton	86	17,474	87,570	17,474	100.00 %	19.95 %

Municipality - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Morrisville	11	29,630	86,298	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	31	29,630	90,760	207	0.70 %	0.23 %
	41	29,630	89,887	14,239	48.06 %	15.84 %
	49	29,630	86,157	15,184	51.25 %	17.62 %
Morven	55	329	87,005	329	100.00 %	0.38 %
Mount Airy	90	10,676	82,937	10,676	100.00 %	12.87 %
Mount Gilead	67	1,171	88,255	1,171	100.00 %	1.33 %
Mount Holly	108	17,703	86,263	17,703	100.00 %	20.52 %
Mount Olive	4	4,198	83,095	4,198	100.00 %	5.05 %
Mount Pleasant	73	1,671	90,649	1,671	100.00 %	1.84 %
Murfreesboro	5	2,619	82,953	2,619	100.00 %	3.16 %
Murphy	120	1,608	84,907	1,608	100.00 %	1.89 %
Nags Head	79	3,168	83,163	3,168	100.00 %	3.81 %
Nashville	25	5,632	86,534	5,632	100.00 %	6.51 %
Navassa	17	1,367	89,763	1,367	100.00 %	1.52 %
New Bern	3	31,291	85,099	31,291	100.00 %	36.77 %
Newland	85	715	90,863	715	100.00 %	0.79 %
New London	67	607	88,255	607	100.00 %	0.69 %
Newport	13	4,364	83,307	4,364	100.00 %	5.24 %
Newton	89	13,148	85,577	13,148	100.00 %	15.36 %
	96	13,148	89,587	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Newton Grove	22	585	88,642	585	100.00 %	0.66 %
Norlina	27	920	84,735	920	100.00 %	1.09 %
Norman	52	100	84,383	100	100.00 %	0.12 %
North Topsail Beach	15	1,005	87,578	1,005	100.00 %	1.15 %
Northwest	17	703	89,763	703	100.00 %	0.78 %
North Wilkesboro	94	4,382	90,835	4,382	100.00 %	4.82 %
Norwood	67	2,367	88,255	2,367	100.00 %	2.68 %
Oakboro	67	2,128	88,255	2,128	100.00 %	2.41 %
Oak City	23	266	88,865	266	100.00 %	0.30 %
Oak Island	19	8,396	91,041	8,396	100.00 %	9.22 %
Oak Ridge	62	7,474	89,579	7,474	100.00 %	8.34 %
Ocean Isle Beach	17	867	89,763	867	100.00 %	0.97 %
Old Fort	85	811	90,863	811	100.00 %	0.89 %
Oriental	79	880	83,163	880	100.00 %	1.06 %
Orrum	46	59	83,445	59	100.00 %	0.07 %
Ossipee	64	536	85,016	536	100.00 %	0.63 %
Oxford	32	8,628	88,633	8,628	100.00 %	9.73 %
Pantego	79	164	83,163	164	100.00 %	0.20 %
Parkton	47	504	83,708	504	100.00 %	0.60 %
Parmelee	23	243	88,865	243	100.00 %	0.27 %
Patterson Springs	111	571	89,894	571	100.00 %	0.64 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Peachland	55	390	87,005	390	100.00 %	0.45 %
Peletier	13	769	83,307	769	100.00 %	0.92 %
Pembroke	47	2,823	83,708	2,823	100.00 %	3.37 %
Pikeville	10	712	82,953	712	100.00 %	0.86 %
Pilot Mountain	90	1,440	82,937	1,440	100.00 %	1.74 %
Pinebluff	52	1,473	84,383	1,473	100.00 %	1.75 %
Pinehurst	52	17,581	84,383	8	0.05 %	0.01 %
	78	17,581	86,365	17,573	99.95 %	20.35 %
Pine Knoll Shores	13	1,388	83,307	1,388	100.00 %	1.67 %
Pine Level	28	2,046	85,389	2,046	100.00 %	2.40 %
Pinetops	23	1,200	88,865	1,200	100.00 %	1.35 %
Pineville	105	10,602	85,822	10,602	100.00 %	12.35 %
	112	10,602	82,806	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Pink Hill	12	451	84,745	451	100.00 %	0.53 %
Pittsboro	54	4,537	83,475	4,537	100.00 %	5.44 %
Pleasant Garden	59	5,000	90,361	5,000	100.00 %	5.53 %
Plymouth	1	3,320	84,330	3,320	100.00 %	3.94 %
Polkton	55	2,250	87,005	2,250	100.00 %	2.59 %
Polkville	110	516	88,397	516	100.00 %	0.58 %
Pollocksville	12	268	84,745	268	100.00 %	0.32 %
Powellsville	23	189	88,865	189	100.00 %	0.21 %
Princeton	28	1,315	85,389	1,315	100.00 %	1.54 %
Princeville	23	1,254	88,865	1,254	100.00 %	1.41 %
Proctorville	46	121	83,445	121	100.00 %	0.15 %
Raeford	48	4,559	86,256	4,559	100.00 %	5.29 %
Raleigh	2	467,665	90,793	1,326	0.28 %	1.46 %
	11	467,665	86,298	40,792	8.72 %	47.27 %
	21	467,665	86,179	13	0.00 %	0.02 %
	31	467,665	90,760	233	0.05 %	0.26 %
	33	467,665	83,049	82,480	17.64 %	99.31 %
	34	467,665	83,679	83,503	17.86 %	99.79 %
	35	467,665	88,374	6,171	1.32 %	6.98 %
	38	467,665	88,226	56,840	12.15 %	64.43 %
	39	467,665	90,164	13,011	2.78 %	14.43 %
	40	467,665	83,175	57,345	12.26 %	68.94 %
	49	467,665	86,157	47,783	10.22 %	55.46 %
	66	467,665	83,189	78,168	16.71 %	93.96 %
Ramseur	78	1,774	86,365	1,774	100.00 %	2.05 %
Randleman	70	4,595	89,118	4,595	100.00 %	5.16 %
Ranlo	108	4,511	86,263	4,500	99.76 %	5.22 %
	110	4,511	88,397	11	0.24 %	0.01 %
Raynham	46	60	83,445	60	100.00 %	0.07 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Red Cross	67	762	88,255	762	100.00 %	0.86 %
Red Oak	25	3,342	86,534	3,342	100.00 %	3.86 %
Red Springs	47	3,087	83,708	3,087	100.00 %	3.69 %
	48	3,087	86,256	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Reidsville	65	14,583	91,096	14,583	100.00 %	16.01 %
Rennert	47	275	83,708	275	100.00 %	0.33 %
Rhodhiss	86	997	87,570	639	64.09 %	0.73 %
	87	997	85,758	358	35.91 %	0.42 %
Richfield	67	582	88,255	582	100.00 %	0.66 %
Richlands	16	2,287	90,663	2,287	100.00 %	2.52 %
Rich Square	27	894	84,735	894	100.00 %	1.06 %
River Bend	3	2,902	85,099	2,902	100.00 %	3.41 %
Roanoke Rapids	27	15,229	84,735	15,229	100.00 %	17.97 %
Robbins	78	1,168	86,365	1,168	100.00 %	1.35 %
Robbinsville	120	597	84,907	597	100.00 %	0.70 %
Robersonville	23	1,269	88,865	1,269	100.00 %	1.43 %
Rockingham	52	9,243	84,383	9,243	100.00 %	10.95 %
Rockwell	76	2,302	89,815	2,302	100.00 %	2.56 %
Rocky Mount	23	54,341	88,865	15,414	28.37 %	17.35 %
	25	54,341	86,534	38,927	71.63 %	44.98 %
Rolesville	35	9,475	88,374	9,467	99.92 %	10.71 %
	39	9,475	90,164	8	0.08 %	0.01 %
Ronda	90	438	82,937	438	100.00 %	0.53 %
Roper	1	485	84,330	485	100.00 %	0.58 %
Roseboro	22	1,163	88,642	1,163	100.00 %	1.31 %
Rose Hill	4	1,371	83,095	1,371	100.00 %	1.65 %
Rosman	119	701	90,212	701	100.00 %	0.78 %
Rowland	46	885	83,445	885	100.00 %	1.06 %
Roxboro	2	8,134	90,793	8,134	100.00 %	8.96 %
Roxobel	23	187	88,865	187	100.00 %	0.21 %
Rural Hall	91	3,351	86,210	3,351	100.00 %	3.89 %
Ruth	113	347	89,058	347	100.00 %	0.39 %
Rutherford College	86	1,226	87,570	1,226	100.00 %	1.40 %
	87	1,226	85,758	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Rutherfordton	113	3,640	89,058	3,640	100.00 %	4.09 %
St. Helena	16	417	90,663	417	100.00 %	0.46 %
St. James	19	6,529	91,041	6,529	100.00 %	7.17 %
St. Pauls	47	2,045	83,708	2,045	100.00 %	2.44 %
Salemburg	22	457	88,642	457	100.00 %	0.52 %
Salisbury	76	35,540	89,815	35,540	100.00 %	39.57 %
Saluda	113	631	89,058	631	100.00 %	0.71 %
Sandy Creek	17	248	89,763	248	100.00 %	0.28 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Sandyfield	46	430	83,445	430	100.00 %	0.52 %
Sanford	51	30,261	83,073	30,261	100.00 %	36.43 %
Saratoga	24	353	87,220	353	100.00 %	0.40 %
Sawmills	87	5,020	85,758	5,020	100.00 %	5.85 %
Scotland Neck	27	1,640	84,735	1,640	100.00 %	1.94 %
Seaboard	27	542	84,735	542	100.00 %	0.64 %
Seagrove	78	235	86,365	235	100.00 %	0.27 %
Sedalia	59	676	90,361	676	100.00 %	0.75 %
Selma	28	6,317	85,389	6,317	100.00 %	7.40 %
Seven Devils	85	313	90,863	38	12.14 %	0.04 %
	93	313	86,445	275	87.86 %	0.32 %
Seven Springs	4	55	83,095	55	100.00 %	0.07 %
Severn	27	191	84,735	191	100.00 %	0.23 %
Shallotte	17	4,185	89,763	4,185	100.00 %	4.66 %
Sharpsburg	23	1,697	88,865	215	12.67 %	0.24 %
	24	1,697	87,220	421	24.81 %	0.48 %
	25	1,697	86,534	1,061	62.52 %	1.23 %
Shelby	110	21,918	88,397	4,409	20.12 %	4.99 %
	111	21,918	89,894	17,509	79.88 %	19.48 %
Siler City	54	7,702	83,475	7,702	100.00 %	9.23 %
Simpson	9	390	84,450	390	100.00 %	0.46 %
Sims	24	275	87,220	275	100.00 %	0.32 %
Smithfield	28	11,292	85,389	11,292	100.00 %	13.22 %
Snow Hill	12	1,481	84,745	1,481	100.00 %	1.75 %
Southern Pines	52	15,545	84,383	15,545	100.00 %	18.42 %
	78	15,545	86,365	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Southern Shores	1	3,090	84,330	3,090	100.00 %	3.66 %
Southport	19	3,971	91,041	3,971	100.00 %	4.36 %
Sparta	93	1,834	86,445	1,834	100.00 %	2.12 %
Speed	23	63	88,865	63	100.00 %	0.07 %
Spencer	76	3,308	89,815	3,308	100.00 %	3.68 %
Spencer Mountain	108	0	86,263	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Spindale	113	4,225	89,058	4,225	100.00 %	4.74 %
Spring Hope	25	1,309	86,534	1,309	100.00 %	1.51 %
Spring Lake	42	11,660	85,537	11,660	100.00 %	13.63 %
Spruce Pine	85	2,194	90,863	2,194	100.00 %	2.41 %
Staley	54	397	83,475	397	100.00 %	0.48 %
Stallings	68	16,112	88,138	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	69	16,112	85,179	15,728	97.62 %	18.46 %
	103	16,112	87,132	384	2.38 %	0.44 %
Stanfield	67	1,585	88,255	1,585	100.00 %	1.80 %
Stanley	108	3,963	86,263	3,963	100.00 %	4.59 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

Page 15 of 18

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Stantonsburg	24	762	87,220	762	100.00 %	0.87 %
Star	67	806	88,255	806	100.00 %	0.91 %
Statesville	84	28,419	86,773	28,415	99.99 %	32.75 %
	89	28,419	85,577	4	0.01 %	0.00 %
Stedman	43	1,277	82,956	1,277	100.00 %	1.54 %
Stem	32	960	88,633	960	100.00 %	1.08 %
Stokesdale	62	5,924	89,579	5,924	100.00 %	6.61 %
Stoneville	65	1,308	91,096	1,308	100.00 %	1.44 %
Stonewall	79	214	83,163	214	100.00 %	0.26 %
Stovall	32	324	88,633	324	100.00 %	0.37 %
Sugar Mountain	85	371	90,863	371	100.00 %	0.41 %
Summerfield	57	10,951	90,615	746	6.81 %	0.82 %
	59	10,951	90,361	2,509	22.91 %	2.78 %
	62	10,951	89,579	7,696	70.28 %	8.59 %
Sunset Beach	17	4,175	89,763	4,175	100.00 %	4.65 %
Surf City	15	3,867	87,578	334	8.64 %	0.38 %
	16	3,867	90,663	3,533	91.36 %	3.90 %
Swansboro	14	3,744	86,538	3,744	100.00 %	4.33 %
Sweepsonville	63	2,445	86,399	2,445	100.00 %	2.83 %
Sylva	119	2,578	90,212	2,578	100.00 %	2.86 %
Tabor City	46	3,781	83,445	3,781	100.00 %	4.53 %
Tarboro	23	10,721	88,865	10,721	100.00 %	12.06 %
Tar Heel	22	90	88,642	90	100.00 %	0.10 %
Taylorsville	94	2,320	90,835	2,320	100.00 %	2.55 %
Taylortown	52	634	84,383	4	0.63 %	0.00 %
	78	634	86,365	630	99.37 %	0.73 %
Teachey	4	448	83,095	448	100.00 %	0.54 %
Thomasville	70	27,183	89,118	521	1.92 %	0.58 %
	80	27,183	84,864	26,662	98.08 %	31.42 %
Tobaccoville	74	2,578	84,857	824	31.96 %	0.97 %
	91	2,578	86,210	1,754	68.04 %	2.03 %
Topsail Beach	16	461	90,663	461	100.00 %	0.51 %
Trenton	12	238	84,745	238	100.00 %	0.28 %
Trent Woods	3	4,074	85,099	4,074	100.00 %	4.79 %
Trinity	70	7,006	89,118	7,006	100.00 %	7.86 %
Troutman	84	3,698	86,773	885	23.93 %	1.02 %
	89	3,698	85,577	2,813	76.07 %	3.29 %
Troy	67	2,850	88,255	2,850	100.00 %	3.23 %
Tryon	113	1,562	89,058	1,562	100.00 %	1.75 %
Turkey	22	213	88,642	213	100.00 %	0.24 %
Unionville	69	6,643	85,179	6,643	100.00 %	7.80 %
Valdese	86	4,689	87,570	4,689	100.00 %	5.35 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

Page 16 of 18

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Vanceboro	3	869	85,099	869	100.00 %	1.02 %
Vandemere	79	246	83,163	246	100.00 %	0.30 %
Varnamtown	19	525	91,041	525	100.00 %	0.58 %
Vass	51	952	83,073	952	100.00 %	1.15 %
Waco	110	310	88,397	310	100.00 %	0.35 %
Wade	43	638	82,956	638	100.00 %	0.77 %
Wadesboro	55	5,008	87,005	5,008	100.00 %	5.76 %
Wagram	48	615	86,256	615	100.00 %	0.71 %
Wake Forest	7	47,601	83,510	1,504	3.16 %	1.80 %
	35	47,601	88,374	46,097	96.84 %	52.16 %
	66	47,601	83,189	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Walkertown	71	5,692	84,874	3,176	55.80 %	3.74 %
	75	5,692	84,220	2,516	44.20 %	2.99 %
Wallace	4	3,413	83,095	3,413	100.00 %	4.11 %
	16	3,413	90,663	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Wallburg	80	3,051	84,864	3,051	100.00 %	3.60 %
Walnut Cove	91	1,586	86,210	1,586	100.00 %	1.84 %
Walnut Creek	4	1,084	83,095	1,084	100.00 %	1.30 %
Walstonburg	12	193	84,745	193	100.00 %	0.23 %
Warrenton	27	851	84,735	851	100.00 %	1.00 %
Warsaw	4	2,733	83,095	2,733	100.00 %	3.29 %
Washington	79	9,875	83,163	9,875	100.00 %	11.87 %
Washington Park	79	392	83,163	392	100.00 %	0.47 %
Watha	16	181	90,663	181	100.00 %	0.20 %
Waxhaw	55	20,534	87,005	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	68	20,534	88,138	20,534	100.00 %	23.30 %
Waynesville	118	10,140	83,282	10,140	100.00 %	12.18 %
Weaverville	114	4,567	89,685	4,567	100.00 %	5.09 %
Webster	119	372	90,212	372	100.00 %	0.41 %
Weddington	68	13,181	88,138	13,172	99.93 %	14.94 %
	69	13,181	85,179	4	0.03 %	0.00 %
	103	13,181	87,132	5	0.04 %	0.01 %
Weldon	27	1,444	84,735	1,444	100.00 %	1.70 %
Wendell	39	9,793	90,164	9,793	100.00 %	10.86 %
Wentworth	65	2,662	91,096	2,662	100.00 %	2.92 %
Wesley Chapel	55	8,681	87,005	3,868	44.56 %	4.45 %
	68	8,681	88,138	4,813	55.44 %	5.46 %
West Jefferson	93	1,279	86,445	1,279	100.00 %	1.48 %
Whispering Pines	52	4,987	84,383	4,987	100.00 %	5.91 %
Whitakers	23	627	88,865	290	46.25 %	0.33 %
	25	627	86,534	337	53.75 %	0.39 %
White Lake	22	843	88,642	843	100.00 %	0.95 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Whiteville	46	4,766	83,445	4,766	100.00 %	5.71 %
Whitsett	59	584	90,361	584	100.00 %	0.65 %
Wilkesboro	94	3,687	90,835	3,687	100.00 %	4.06 %
Williamston	23	5,248	88,865	5,248	100.00 %	5.91 %
Wilmington	18	115,451	91,245	48,680	42.17 %	53.35 %
	19	115,451	91,041	8,207	7.11 %	9.01 %
	20	115,451	90,346	58,564	50.73 %	64.82 %
Wilson	24	47,851	87,220	47,851	100.00 %	54.86 %
Wilson's Mills	26	2,534	89,947	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	28	2,534	85,389	2,534	100.00 %	2.97 %
Windsor	23	3,582	88,865	3,582	100.00 %	4.03 %
Winfall	1	555	84,330	555	100.00 %	0.66 %
Wingate	55	4,055	87,005	4,055	100.00 %	4.66 %
Winston-Salem	71	249,545	84,874	77,631	31.11 %	91.47 %
	72	249,545	86,949	86,867	34.81 %	99.91 %
	74	249,545	84,857	32,409	12.99 %	38.19 %
	75	249,545	84,220	22,818	9.14 %	27.09 %
	91	249,545	86,210	29,820	11.95 %	34.59 %
Winterville	8	10,462	85,793	44	0.42 %	0.05 %
	9	10,462	84,450	10,418	99.58 %	12.34 %
Winton	5	629	82,953	629	100.00 %	0.76 %
Woodfin	114	7,936	89,685	7,648	96.37 %	8.53 %
	116	7,936	89,505	288	3.63 %	0.32 %
Woodland	27	557	84,735	557	100.00 %	0.66 %
Wrightsville Beach	20	2,473	90,346	2,473	100.00 %	2.74 %
Yadkinville	77	2,995	90,628	2,995	100.00 %	3.30 %
Yanceyville	50	1,937	85,345	1,937	100.00 %	2.27 %
Youngsville	7	2,016	83,510	2,016	100.00 %	2.41 %
Zebulon	26	6,903	89,947	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	39	6,903	90,164	6,903	100.00 %	7.66 %
Assigned Geography Total:				6,017,605		

Report display: all municipalities

Total Municipalities Statewide: 553

Fully Assigned Municipalities: 553

Partially Assigned Municipalities: 0

Fully Unassigned Municipalities: 0

Total Districts Assigned: 120

Split Municipalities: 112

Splits Involving Population: 83

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Aberdeen	52	8,516	84,383	8,516	100.00 %	10.09 %
	78	8,516	86,365	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Ahoskie	5	4,891	82,953	4,891	100.00 %	5.90 %
Alamance	64	988	85,016	988	100.00 %	1.16 %
Albemarle	67	16,432	88,255	16,432	100.00 %	18.62 %
Alliance	79	733	83,163	733	100.00 %	0.88 %
Andrews	120	1,667	84,907	1,667	100.00 %	1.96 %
Angier (Harnett)	6	4,709	87,332	4,709	100.00 %	5.39 %
Angier (Wake)	37	556	90,867	556	100.00 %	0.61 %
Ansonville	55	440	87,005	440	100.00 %	0.51 %
Apex	11	58,780	86,298	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	21	58,780	86,179	556	0.95 %	0.65 %
	36	58,780	90,166	57,843	98.41 %	64.15 %
	41	58,780	89,887	381	0.65 %	0.42 %
Arapahoe	79	416	83,163	416	100.00 %	0.50 %
Archdale (Guilford)	60	380	89,735	380	100.00 %	0.42 %
Archdale (Randolph)	70	11,527	89,118	11,527	100.00 %	12.93 %
Archer Lodge	26	4,797	89,947	4,797	100.00 %	5.33 %
Asheboro	70	27,156	89,118	25,890	95.34 %	29.05 %
	78	27,156	86,365	1,266	4.66 %	1.47 %
Asheville	114	94,589	89,685	52,596	55.60 %	58.65 %
	115	94,589	90,262	29,236	30.91 %	32.39 %
	116	94,589	89,505	12,757	13.49 %	14.25 %
Askewville	23	184	88,865	184	100.00 %	0.21 %
Atkinson	16	296	90,663	296	100.00 %	0.33 %
Atlantic Beach	13	1,364	83,307	1,364	100.00 %	1.64 %
Aulander	23	763	88,865	763	100.00 %	0.86 %
Aurora	79	455	83,163	455	100.00 %	0.55 %
Autryville	22	167	88,642	167	100.00 %	0.19 %
Ayden	9	4,977	84,450	4,977	100.00 %	5.89 %
Badin	67	2,024	88,255	2,024	100.00 %	2.29 %
Bailey	24	568	87,220	568	100.00 %	0.65 %
Bakersville	85	450	90,863	450	100.00 %	0.50 %
Bald Head Island	19	268	91,041	268	100.00 %	0.29 %
Banner Elk	85	1,049	90,863	1,049	100.00 %	1.15 %
Bath	79	245	83,163	245	100.00 %	0.29 %
Bayboro	79	1,161	83,163	1,161	100.00 %	1.40 %
Bear Grass	23	89	88,865	89	100.00 %	0.10 %
Beaufort	13	4,464	83,307	4,464	100.00 %	5.36 %
Beech Mountain (Avery)	85	62	90,863	62	100.00 %	0.07 %
Beech Mountain (Watauga)	93	613	86,445	613	100.00 %	0.71 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Belhaven	79	1,410	83,163	1,410	100.00 %	1.70 %
Belmont	108	15,010	86,263	1,868	12.45 %	2.17 %
	109	15,010	87,762	13,142	87.55 %	14.97 %
Belville	17	2,406	89,763	2,406	100.00 %	2.68 %
Belwood	110	857	88,397	857	100.00 %	0.97 %
Benson (Harnett)	53	0	86,899	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Benson (Johnston)	28	3,967	85,389	3,967	100.00 %	4.65 %
Bermuda Run	77	3,120	90,628	3,120	100.00 %	3.44 %
Bessemer City	110	5,428	88,397	5,428	100.00 %	6.14 %
Bethania	74	344	84,857	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	91	344	86,210	344	100.00 %	0.40 %
Bethel	8	1,373	85,793	1,373	100.00 %	1.60 %
Beulaville	4	1,116	83,095	1,116	100.00 %	1.34 %
Biltmore Forest	116	1,409	89,505	1,409	100.00 %	1.57 %
Biscoe	67	1,848	88,255	1,848	100.00 %	2.09 %
Black Creek	24	692	87,220	692	100.00 %	0.79 %
Black Mountain	115	8,426	90,262	8,426	100.00 %	9.34 %
Bladenboro	22	1,648	88,642	1,648	100.00 %	1.86 %
Blowing Rock (Caldwell)	87	91	85,758	91	100.00 %	0.11 %
Blowing Rock (Watauga)	87	1,285	85,758	5	0.39 %	0.01 %
	93	1,285	86,445	1,280	99.61 %	1.48 %
Boardman	46	166	83,445	166	100.00 %	0.20 %
Bogue	13	695	83,307	695	100.00 %	0.83 %
Boiling Spring Lakes	19	5,943	91,041	5,943	100.00 %	6.53 %
Boiling Springs	111	4,615	89,894	4,615	100.00 %	5.13 %
Bolivia	19	149	91,041	149	100.00 %	0.16 %
Bolton	46	519	83,445	519	100.00 %	0.62 %
Boone	87	19,092	85,758	595	3.12 %	0.69 %
	93	19,092	86,445	18,497	96.88 %	21.40 %
Boonville	77	1,185	90,628	1,185	100.00 %	1.31 %
Bostic	111	355	89,894	355	100.00 %	0.39 %
Brevard	119	7,744	90,212	7,744	100.00 %	8.58 %
Bridgeton	3	349	85,099	349	100.00 %	0.41 %
Broadway (Harnett)	6	0	87,332	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Broadway (Lee)	51	1,267	83,073	1,267	100.00 %	1.53 %
Brookford	96	442	89,587	442	100.00 %	0.49 %
Brunswick	46	973	83,445	973	100.00 %	1.17 %
Bryson City	119	1,558	90,212	1,558	100.00 %	1.73 %
Bunn	7	327	83,510	327	100.00 %	0.39 %
Burgaw	16	3,088	90,663	3,088	100.00 %	3.41 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Burlington (Alamance)	63	55,481	86,399	25,917	46.71 %	30.00 %
	64	55,481	85,016	29,564	53.29 %	34.77 %
Burlington (Guilford)	59	1,822	90,361	1,822	100.00 %	2.02 %
Burnsville	85	1,614	90,863	1,614	100.00 %	1.78 %
Butner	32	8,397	88,633	8,397	100.00 %	9.47 %
Cajah's Mountain	87	2,722	85,758	2,722	100.00 %	3.17 %
Calabash	17	2,011	89,763	2,011	100.00 %	2.24 %
Calypso	4	327	83,095	327	100.00 %	0.39 %
Cameron	51	244	83,073	244	100.00 %	0.29 %
Candor (Montgomery)	67	813	88,255	813	100.00 %	0.92 %
Candor (Moore)	78	0	86,365	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Canton	118	4,422	83,282	4,422	100.00 %	5.31 %
Cape Carteret	13	2,224	83,307	2,224	100.00 %	2.67 %
Carolina Beach	19	6,564	91,041	6,564	100.00 %	7.21 %
Carolina Shores	17	4,588	89,763	4,588	100.00 %	5.11 %
Carrboro	50	21,295	85,345	174	0.82 %	0.20 %
	56	21,295	86,087	21,121	99.18 %	24.53 %
Carthage	51	2,775	83,073	2,747	98.99 %	3.31 %
	52	2,775	84,383	28	1.01 %	0.03 %
Cary (Chatham)	54	3,709	83,475	3,709	100.00 %	4.44 %
Cary (Wake)	11	171,012	86,298	43,537	25.46 %	50.45 %
	21	171,012	86,179	30,622	17.91 %	35.53 %
	36	171,012	90,166	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	37	171,012	90,867	2,012	1.18 %	2.21 %
	41	171,012	89,887	74,074	43.32 %	82.41 %
	49	171,012	86,157	20,767	12.14 %	24.10 %
Casar	110	305	88,397	305	100.00 %	0.35 %
Castalia	25	264	86,534	264	100.00 %	0.31 %
Caswell Beach	19	395	91,041	395	100.00 %	0.43 %
Catawba	89	702	85,577	702	100.00 %	0.82 %
Cedar Point	13	1,764	83,307	1,764	100.00 %	2.12 %
Cedar Rock	87	301	85,758	301	100.00 %	0.35 %
Cerro Gordo	46	131	83,445	131	100.00 %	0.16 %
Chadbourn	46	1,574	83,445	1,574	100.00 %	1.89 %
Chapel Hill (Durham)	29	2,906	91,212	2,906	100.00 %	3.19 %
Chapel Hill (Orange)	56	59,054	86,087	59,054	100.00 %	68.60 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Charlotte	88	874,579	82,834	82,834	9.47 %	100.00 %
	92	874,579	85,031	63,762	7.29 %	74.99 %
	99	874,579	87,647	79,113	9.05 %	90.26 %
	100	874,579	87,197	87,197	9.97 %	100.00 %
	101	874,579	86,426	64,526	7.38 %	74.66 %
	102	874,579	86,179	86,179	9.85 %	100.00 %
	103	874,579	87,132	23,590	2.70 %	27.07 %
	104	874,579	86,520	86,520	9.89 %	100.00 %
	105	874,579	85,822	71,156	8.14 %	82.91 %
	106	874,579	82,824	79,717	9.11 %	96.25 %
	107	874,579	88,237	67,298	7.69 %	76.27 %
	112	874,579	82,806	82,687	9.45 %	99.86 %
Cherryville	110	6,078	88,397	6,078	100.00 %	6.88 %
Chimney Rock Village	113	140	89,058	140	100.00 %	0.16 %
China Grove	83	4,434	90,742	4,434	100.00 %	4.89 %
Chocowinity	79	722	83,163	722	100.00 %	0.87 %
Claremont	89	1,692	85,577	1,692	100.00 %	1.98 %
Clarkton	22	614	88,642	614	100.00 %	0.69 %
Clayton (Johnston)	26	26,307	89,947	26,307	100.00 %	29.25 %
Clayton (Wake)	38	0	88,226	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	39	0	90,164	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Clemmons	74	21,163	84,857	21,163	100.00 %	24.94 %
Cleveland	77	846	90,628	846	100.00 %	0.93 %
Clinton	22	8,383	88,642	8,383	100.00 %	9.46 %
Clyde	118	1,368	83,282	1,368	100.00 %	1.64 %
Coats	53	2,155	86,899	2,155	100.00 %	2.48 %
Cofield	5	267	82,953	267	100.00 %	0.32 %
Colerain	23	217	88,865	217	100.00 %	0.24 %
Columbia	1	610	84,330	610	100.00 %	0.72 %
Columbus	113	1,060	89,058	1,060	100.00 %	1.19 %
Como	5	67	82,953	67	100.00 %	0.08 %
Concord	73	105,240	90,649	32,447	30.83 %	35.79 %
	82	105,240	90,771	48,723	46.30 %	53.68 %
	83	105,240	90,742	24,070	22.87 %	26.53 %
Conetoe	23	198	88,865	198	100.00 %	0.22 %
Connelly Springs	86	1,529	87,570	1,529	100.00 %	1.75 %
Conover	89	8,421	85,577	424	5.04 %	0.50 %
	96	8,421	89,587	7,997	94.96 %	8.93 %
Conway	27	752	84,735	752	100.00 %	0.89 %
Cooleemee	77	940	90,628	940	100.00 %	1.04 %
Cornelius	98	31,412	86,827	31,412	100.00 %	36.18 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Cove City	3	378	85,099	378	100.00 %	0.44 %
Cramerton	108	5,296	86,263	96	1.81 %	0.11 %
	109	5,296	87,762	5,200	98.19 %	5.93 %
Creedmoor	7	4,866	83,510	2,065	42.44 %	2.47 %
	32	4,866	88,633	2,801	57.56 %	3.16 %
Creswell	1	207	84,330	207	100.00 %	0.25 %
Crossnore	85	143	90,863	143	100.00 %	0.16 %
Dallas	110	5,927	88,397	5,927	100.00 %	6.70 %
Danbury	91	189	86,210	189	100.00 %	0.22 %
Davidson (Iredell)	95	378	85,366	378	100.00 %	0.44 %
Davidson (Mecklenburg)	98	14,728	86,827	14,728	100.00 %	16.96 %
Dellview	110	6	88,397	6	100.00 %	0.01 %
Denton	80	1,494	84,864	1,494	100.00 %	1.76 %
Dillsboro	119	213	90,212	213	100.00 %	0.24 %
Dobbins Heights	52	687	84,383	687	100.00 %	0.81 %
Dobson	90	1,462	82,937	1,462	100.00 %	1.76 %
Dortches	25	1,082	86,534	1,082	100.00 %	1.25 %
Dover	3	349	85,099	349	100.00 %	0.41 %
Drexel	86	1,760	87,570	1,760	100.00 %	2.01 %
Dublin	22	267	88,642	267	100.00 %	0.30 %
Duck	1	742	84,330	742	100.00 %	0.88 %
Dunn	53	8,446	86,899	8,446	100.00 %	9.72 %
Durham (Durham)	2	283,093	90,793	25,167	8.89 %	27.72 %
	29	283,093	91,212	87,035	30.74 %	95.42 %
	30	283,093	91,165	89,671	31.68 %	98.36 %
	31	283,093	90,760	81,220	28.69 %	89.49 %
Durham (Orange)	50	144	85,345	144	100.00 %	0.17 %
Durham (Wake)	40	269	83,175	269	100.00 %	0.32 %
	49	269	86,157	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Earl	111	198	89,894	198	100.00 %	0.22 %
East Arcadia	22	418	88,642	418	100.00 %	0.47 %
East Bend	77	634	90,628	634	100.00 %	0.70 %
East Laurinburg	48	234	86,256	234	100.00 %	0.27 %
East Spencer	76	1,567	89,815	1,567	100.00 %	1.74 %
Eastover	43	3,656	82,956	3,656	100.00 %	4.41 %
Eden	65	15,421	91,096	15,421	100.00 %	16.93 %
Edenton	1	4,460	84,330	4,460	100.00 %	5.29 %
Elizabeth City (Camden)	5	38	82,953	38	100.00 %	0.05 %
Elizabeth City (Pasquotank)	5	18,593	82,953	18,593	100.00 %	22.41 %
Elizabethtown	22	3,296	88,642	3,296	100.00 %	3.72 %
Elk Park	85	542	90,863	542	100.00 %	0.60 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality by County - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Elkin (Surry)	90	4,049	82,937	4,049	100.00 %	4.88 %
Elkin (Wilkes)	90	73	82,937	73	100.00 %	0.09 %
Ellenboro	111	723	89,894	723	100.00 %	0.80 %
Ellerbe	52	864	84,383	864	100.00 %	1.02 %
Elm City (Nash)	25	0	86,534	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Elm City (Wilson)	24	1,218	87,220	1,218	100.00 %	1.40 %
Elon	64	11,336	85,016	11,336	100.00 %	13.33 %
Emerald Isle	13	3,847	83,307	3,847	100.00 %	4.62 %
Enfield	27	1,865	84,735	1,865	100.00 %	2.20 %
Erwin	53	4,542	86,899	4,542	100.00 %	5.23 %
Eureka	10	214	82,953	214	100.00 %	0.26 %
Everetts	23	150	88,865	150	100.00 %	0.17 %
Fair Bluff	46	709	83,445	709	100.00 %	0.85 %
Fairmont	46	2,191	83,445	2,191	100.00 %	2.63 %
	47	2,191	83,708	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Fairview	69	3,456	85,179	3,456	100.00 %	4.06 %
Faison (Duplin)	4	784	83,095	784	100.00 %	0.94 %
Faison (Sampson)	22	0	88,642	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Faith	76	819	89,815	819	100.00 %	0.91 %
Falcon (Cumberland)	43	324	82,956	324	100.00 %	0.39 %
Falcon (Sampson)	22	0	88,642	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Falkland	8	47	85,793	47	100.00 %	0.05 %
Fallston	110	627	88,397	627	100.00 %	0.71 %
Farmville	8	4,461	85,793	4,461	100.00 %	5.20 %
Fayetteville	42	208,501	85,537	65,401	31.37 %	76.46 %
	43	208,501	82,956	44,532	21.36 %	53.68 %
	44	208,501	83,297	83,293	39.95 %	100.00 %
	45	208,501	82,938	15,275	7.33 %	18.42 %
Flat Rock	113	3,486	89,058	3,486	100.00 %	3.91 %
Fletcher	117	7,987	91,035	7,987	100.00 %	8.77 %
Fontana Dam	120	13	84,907	13	100.00 %	0.02 %
Forest City	111	7,377	89,894	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	113	7,377	89,058	7,377	100.00 %	8.28 %
Forest Hills	119	303	90,212	303	100.00 %	0.34 %
Fountain	8	385	85,793	385	100.00 %	0.45 %
Four Oaks	28	2,158	85,389	2,158	100.00 %	2.53 %
Foxfire	52	1,288	84,383	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	78	1,288	86,365	1,288	100.00 %	1.49 %
Franklin	120	4,175	84,907	4,175	100.00 %	4.92 %
Franklinton	7	2,456	83,510	2,456	100.00 %	2.94 %
Franklinville	78	1,197	86,365	1,197	100.00 %	1.39 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Fremont	10	1,196	82,953	1,196	100.00 %	1.44 %
Fuquay-Varina (Harnett)	6	0	87,332	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Fuquay-Varina (Wake)	21	34,152	86,179	30	0.09 %	0.03 %
	36	34,152	90,166	16	0.05 %	0.02 %
	37	34,152	90,867	34,106	99.87 %	37.53 %
Gamewell	87	3,702	85,758	3,702	100.00 %	4.32 %
Garland	22	595	88,642	595	100.00 %	0.67 %
Garner	21	31,159	86,179	11,789	37.83 %	13.68 %
	33	31,159	83,049	14	0.04 %	0.02 %
	37	31,159	90,867	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	38	31,159	88,226	19,356	62.12 %	21.94 %
Garysburg	27	904	84,735	904	100.00 %	1.07 %
Gaston	27	1,008	84,735	1,008	100.00 %	1.19 %
Gastonia	108	80,411	86,263	28,480	35.42 %	33.02 %
	109	80,411	87,762	44,448	55.28 %	50.65 %
	110	80,411	88,397	7,483	9.31 %	8.47 %
Gatesville	5	267	82,953	267	100.00 %	0.32 %
Gibson	48	449	86,256	449	100.00 %	0.52 %
Gibsonville (Alamance)	64	4,278	85,016	4,278	100.00 %	5.03 %
Gibsonville (Guilford)	59	4,642	90,361	4,642	100.00 %	5.14 %
Glen Alpine	86	1,529	87,570	1,529	100.00 %	1.75 %
Godwin	43	128	82,956	128	100.00 %	0.15 %
Goldsboro	4	33,657	83,095	5	0.01 %	0.01 %
	10	33,657	82,953	33,652	99.99 %	40.57 %
Goldston	54	234	83,475	234	100.00 %	0.28 %
Graham	63	17,157	86,399	17,157	100.00 %	19.86 %
Grandfather Village	85	95	90,863	95	100.00 %	0.10 %
Granite Falls	87	4,965	85,758	4,965	100.00 %	5.79 %
Granite Quarry	76	2,984	89,815	2,984	100.00 %	3.32 %
Grantsboro	79	692	83,163	692	100.00 %	0.83 %
Green Level	63	3,152	86,399	3,152	100.00 %	3.65 %
Greenevers	4	567	83,095	567	100.00 %	0.68 %
Greensboro	57	299,035	90,615	83,540	27.94 %	92.19 %
	58	299,035	90,808	84,725	28.33 %	93.30 %
	59	299,035	90,361	13,852	4.63 %	15.33 %
	60	299,035	89,735	8,829	2.95 %	9.84 %
	61	299,035	90,201	90,201	30.16 %	100.00 %
	62	299,035	89,579	17,888	5.98 %	19.97 %
Greenville	8	87,521	85,793	52,881	60.42 %	61.64 %
	9	87,521	84,450	34,640	39.58 %	41.02 %
Grifton (Lenoir)	12	147	84,745	147	100.00 %	0.17 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Grifton (Pitt)	9	2,301	84,450	2,301	100.00 %	2.72 %
Grimesland	9	386	84,450	386	100.00 %	0.46 %
Grover	111	802	89,894	802	100.00 %	0.89 %
Halifax	27	170	84,735	170	100.00 %	0.20 %
Hamilton	23	306	88,865	306	100.00 %	0.34 %
Hamlet	52	6,025	84,383	6,025	100.00 %	7.14 %
Harmony	84	543	86,773	543	100.00 %	0.63 %
Harrells (Duplin)	4	0	83,095	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Harrells (Sampson)	22	160	88,642	160	100.00 %	0.18 %
Harrellsville	5	85	82,953	85	100.00 %	0.10 %
Harrisburg	73	18,967	90,649	18,967	100.00 %	20.92 %
Hassell	23	49	88,865	49	100.00 %	0.06 %
Havelock	3	16,621	85,099	5,986	36.01 %	7.03 %
	13	16,621	83,307	10,635	63.99 %	12.77 %
Haw River	63	2,252	86,399	2,252	100.00 %	2.61 %
Hayesville	120	461	84,907	461	100.00 %	0.54 %
Hemby Bridge	69	1,614	85,179	1,614	100.00 %	1.89 %
Henderson	32	15,060	88,633	15,060	100.00 %	16.99 %
Hendersonville	113	15,137	89,058	623	4.12 %	0.70 %
	117	15,137	91,035	14,514	95.88 %	15.94 %
Hertford	1	1,934	84,330	1,934	100.00 %	2.29 %
Hickory (Burke)	86	79	87,570	79	100.00 %	0.09 %
Hickory (Caldwell)	87	32	85,758	32	100.00 %	0.04 %
Hickory (Catawba)	89	43,379	85,577	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	96	43,379	89,587	43,379	100.00 %	48.42 %
High Point (Davidson)	80	6,646	84,864	6,646	100.00 %	7.83 %
High Point (Forsyth)	75	84	84,220	84	100.00 %	0.10 %
High Point (Guilford)	60	107,321	89,735	66,033	61.53 %	73.59 %
	62	107,321	89,579	41,288	38.47 %	46.09 %
High Point (Randolph)	70	8	89,118	8	100.00 %	0.01 %
High Shoals	110	595	88,397	595	100.00 %	0.67 %
Highlands (Jackson)	119	12	90,212	12	100.00 %	0.01 %
Highlands (Macon)	120	1,060	84,907	1,060	100.00 %	1.25 %
Hildebran	86	1,679	87,570	1,679	100.00 %	1.92 %
Hillsborough	50	9,660	85,345	9,660	100.00 %	11.32 %
Hobgood	27	268	84,735	268	100.00 %	0.32 %
Hoffman	52	418	84,383	418	100.00 %	0.50 %
Holden Beach	17	921	89,763	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	19	921	91,041	921	100.00 %	1.01 %
Holly Ridge	15	4,171	87,578	4,171	100.00 %	4.76 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Holly Springs	21	41,239	86,179	11,892	28.84 %	13.80 %
	36	41,239	90,166	17,734	43.00 %	19.67 %
	37	41,239	90,867	11,613	28.16 %	12.78 %
Hookerton	12	413	84,745	413	100.00 %	0.49 %
Hope Mills	43	17,808	82,956	64	0.36 %	0.08 %
	45	17,808	82,938	17,744	99.64 %	21.39 %
Hot Springs	118	520	83,282	520	100.00 %	0.62 %
Hudson	87	3,780	85,758	3,780	100.00 %	4.41 %
Huntersville	98	61,376	86,827	38,677	63.02 %	44.54 %
	101	61,376	86,426	5,893	9.60 %	6.82 %
	107	61,376	88,237	16,806	27.38 %	19.05 %
Indian Beach	13	223	83,307	223	100.00 %	0.27 %
Indian Trail	55	39,997	87,005	2,376	5.94 %	2.73 %
	68	39,997	88,138	15,036	37.59 %	17.06 %
	69	39,997	85,179	22,585	56.47 %	26.51 %
Jackson	27	430	84,735	430	100.00 %	0.51 %
Jacksonville	14	72,723	86,538	28,456	39.13 %	32.88 %
	15	72,723	87,578	44,267	60.87 %	50.55 %
Jamestown	60	3,668	89,735	3,668	100.00 %	4.09 %
Jamesville	23	424	88,865	424	100.00 %	0.48 %
Jefferson	93	1,622	86,445	1,622	100.00 %	1.88 %
Jonesville	77	2,308	90,628	2,308	100.00 %	2.55 %
Kannapolis (Cabarrus)	82	42,846	90,771	33,907	79.14 %	37.35 %
	83	42,846	90,742	8,939	20.86 %	9.85 %
Kannapolis (Rowan)	83	10,268	90,742	10,268	100.00 %	11.32 %
Kelford	23	203	88,865	203	100.00 %	0.23 %
Kenansville	4	770	83,095	770	100.00 %	0.93 %
Kenly (Johnston)	28	1,293	85,389	1,293	100.00 %	1.51 %
Kenly (Wilson)	24	198	87,220	198	100.00 %	0.23 %
Kernersville (Forsyth)	71	25,947	84,874	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	75	25,947	84,220	25,947	100.00 %	30.81 %
Kernersville (Guilford)	62	502	89,579	502	100.00 %	0.56 %
Kill Devil Hills	1	7,656	84,330	7,118	92.97 %	8.44 %
	79	7,656	83,163	538	7.03 %	0.65 %
King (Forsyth)	91	591	86,210	591	100.00 %	0.69 %
King (Stokes)	91	6,606	86,210	6,606	100.00 %	7.66 %
Kings Mountain (Cleveland)	110	10,032	88,397	8	0.08 %	0.01 %
	111	10,032	89,894	10,024	99.92 %	11.15 %
Kings Mountain (Gaston)	110	1,110	88,397	1,110	100.00 %	1.26 %
Kingstown	110	656	88,397	656	100.00 %	0.74 %
Kinston	12	19,900	84,745	19,900	100.00 %	23.48 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Kittrell	32	132	88,633	132	100.00 %	0.15 %
Kitty Hawk	1	3,689	84,330	3,689	100.00 %	4.37 %
Knightdale	38	19,435	88,226	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	39	19,435	90,164	19,435	100.00 %	21.56 %
Kure Beach	19	2,191	91,041	2,191	100.00 %	2.41 %
La Grange	12	2,595	84,745	2,595	100.00 %	3.06 %
Lake Lure	113	1,365	89,058	1,365	100.00 %	1.53 %
Lake Park	69	3,269	85,179	3,269	100.00 %	3.84 %
Lake Santeetlah	120	38	84,907	38	100.00 %	0.04 %
Lake Waccamaw	46	1,296	83,445	1,296	100.00 %	1.55 %
Landis	83	3,690	90,742	3,690	100.00 %	4.07 %
Lansing	93	126	86,445	126	100.00 %	0.15 %
Lasker	27	64	84,735	64	100.00 %	0.08 %
Lattimore	111	406	89,894	406	100.00 %	0.45 %
Laurel Park	113	2,250	89,058	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	117	2,250	91,035	2,250	100.00 %	2.47 %
Laurinburg	48	14,978	86,256	14,978	100.00 %	17.36 %
Lawndale	110	570	88,397	570	100.00 %	0.64 %
Leggett	23	37	88,865	37	100.00 %	0.04 %
Leland	17	22,908	89,763	22,908	100.00 %	25.52 %
Lenoir	87	18,352	85,758	18,352	100.00 %	21.40 %
Lewiston Woodville	23	426	88,865	426	100.00 %	0.48 %
Lewisville	74	13,381	84,857	13,381	100.00 %	15.77 %
Lexington	80	19,632	84,864	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	81	19,632	84,066	19,632	100.00 %	23.35 %
Liberty	54	2,655	83,475	2,655	100.00 %	3.18 %
Lilesville	55	395	87,005	395	100.00 %	0.45 %
Lillington	6	4,735	87,332	882	18.63 %	1.01 %
	53	4,735	86,899	3,853	81.37 %	4.43 %
Lincolnton	97	11,091	86,810	11,091	100.00 %	12.78 %
Linden	43	136	82,956	136	100.00 %	0.16 %
Littleton	27	559	84,735	559	100.00 %	0.66 %
Locust (Cabarrus)	73	541	90,649	541	100.00 %	0.60 %
Locust (Stanly)	67	3,996	88,255	3,996	100.00 %	4.53 %
Long View (Burke)	86	735	87,570	735	100.00 %	0.84 %
Long View (Catawba)	96	4,353	89,587	4,353	100.00 %	4.86 %
Louisburg	7	3,064	83,510	3,064	100.00 %	3.67 %
Love Valley	84	154	86,773	154	100.00 %	0.18 %
Lowell	108	3,654	86,263	3,654	100.00 %	4.24 %
	109	3,654	87,762	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Lucama	24	1,036	87,220	1,036	100.00 %	1.19 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality by County - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Lumber Bridge	47	82	83,708	82	100.00 %	0.10 %
Lumberton	46	19,025	83,445	350	1.84 %	0.42 %
	47	19,025	83,708	18,675	98.16 %	22.31 %
Macclesfield	23	413	88,865	413	100.00 %	0.46 %
Macon	27	110	84,735	110	100.00 %	0.13 %
Madison	65	2,129	91,096	2,129	100.00 %	2.34 %
Maggie Valley	118	1,687	83,282	1,687	100.00 %	2.03 %
Magnolia	4	831	83,095	831	100.00 %	1.00 %
Maiden (Catawba)	89	3,736	85,577	3,736	100.00 %	4.37 %
Maiden (Lincoln)	97	0	86,810	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Manteo	79	1,600	83,163	1,600	100.00 %	1.92 %
Marietta	46	111	83,445	111	100.00 %	0.13 %
Marion	85	7,717	90,863	7,717	100.00 %	8.49 %
Mars Hill	118	2,007	83,282	2,007	100.00 %	2.41 %
Marshall	118	777	83,282	777	100.00 %	0.93 %
Marshville	55	2,522	87,005	2,522	100.00 %	2.90 %
Marvin	68	6,358	88,138	6,358	100.00 %	7.21 %
Matthews	103	29,435	87,132	29,435	100.00 %	33.78 %
Maxton (Robeson)	46	1,902	83,445	1,902	100.00 %	2.28 %
Maxton (Scotland)	48	208	86,256	208	100.00 %	0.24 %
Mayodan	65	2,418	91,096	2,418	100.00 %	2.65 %
Maysville	12	818	84,745	818	100.00 %	0.97 %
McAdenville	108	890	86,263	890	100.00 %	1.03 %
McDonald	46	94	83,445	94	100.00 %	0.11 %
McFarlan	55	94	87,005	94	100.00 %	0.11 %
Mebane (Alamance)	63	14,626	86,399	14,626	100.00 %	16.93 %
Mebane (Orange)	50	3,171	85,345	3,171	100.00 %	3.72 %
Mesic	79	144	83,163	144	100.00 %	0.17 %
Micro	28	458	85,389	458	100.00 %	0.54 %
Middleburg	32	101	88,633	101	100.00 %	0.11 %
Middlesex	24	912	87,220	912	100.00 %	1.05 %
Midland (Cabarrus)	73	4,684	90,649	4,684	100.00 %	5.17 %
Midland (Mecklenburg)	103	0	87,132	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Midway	80	4,742	84,864	3,469	73.15 %	4.09 %
	81	4,742	84,066	1,273	26.85 %	1.51 %
Mills River	117	7,078	91,035	7,078	100.00 %	7.78 %
Milton	50	155	85,345	155	100.00 %	0.18 %
Mineral Springs	55	3,159	87,005	2,293	72.59 %	2.64 %
	68	3,159	88,138	866	27.41 %	0.98 %
Minnesott Beach	79	530	83,163	530	100.00 %	0.64 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Mint Hill (Mecklenburg)	99	26,444	87,647	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	103	26,444	87,132	26,444	100.00 %	30.35 %
Mint Hill (Union)	69	6	85,179	6	100.00 %	0.01 %
Misenheimer	67	650	88,255	650	100.00 %	0.74 %
Mocksville	77	5,900	90,628	5,900	100.00 %	6.51 %
Momeyer	25	277	86,534	277	100.00 %	0.32 %
Monroe	55	34,562	87,005	12,650	36.60 %	14.54 %
	69	34,562	85,179	21,912	63.40 %	25.72 %
Montreat	115	901	90,262	901	100.00 %	1.00 %
Mooresboro	111	293	89,894	293	100.00 %	0.33 %
Mooresville	84	50,193	86,773	205	0.41 %	0.24 %
	95	50,193	85,366	49,988	99.59 %	58.56 %
Morehead City	13	9,556	83,307	9,556	100.00 %	11.47 %
Morganton	86	17,474	87,570	17,474	100.00 %	19.95 %
Morrisville (Durham)	31	207	90,760	207	100.00 %	0.23 %
Morrisville (Wake)	11	29,423	86,298	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	41	29,423	89,887	14,239	48.39 %	15.84 %
	49	29,423	86,157	15,184	51.61 %	17.62 %
Morven	55	329	87,005	329	100.00 %	0.38 %
Mount Airy	90	10,676	82,937	10,676	100.00 %	12.87 %
Mount Gilead	67	1,171	88,255	1,171	100.00 %	1.33 %
Mount Holly	108	17,703	86,263	17,703	100.00 %	20.52 %
Mount Olive (Duplin)	4	5	83,095	5	100.00 %	0.01 %
Mount Olive (Wayne)	4	4,193	83,095	4,193	100.00 %	5.05 %
Mount Pleasant	73	1,671	90,649	1,671	100.00 %	1.84 %
Murfreesboro	5	2,619	82,953	2,619	100.00 %	3.16 %
Murphy	120	1,608	84,907	1,608	100.00 %	1.89 %
Nags Head	79	3,168	83,163	3,168	100.00 %	3.81 %
Nashville	25	5,632	86,534	5,632	100.00 %	6.51 %
Navassa	17	1,367	89,763	1,367	100.00 %	1.52 %
New Bern	3	31,291	85,099	31,291	100.00 %	36.77 %
New London	67	607	88,255	607	100.00 %	0.69 %
Newland	85	715	90,863	715	100.00 %	0.79 %
Newport	13	4,364	83,307	4,364	100.00 %	5.24 %
Newton	89	13,148	85,577	13,148	100.00 %	15.36 %
	96	13,148	89,587	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Newton Grove	22	585	88,642	585	100.00 %	0.66 %
Norlina	27	920	84,735	920	100.00 %	1.09 %
Norman	52	100	84,383	100	100.00 %	0.12 %
North Topsail Beach	15	1,005	87,578	1,005	100.00 %	1.15 %
North Wilkesboro	94	4,382	90,835	4,382	100.00 %	4.82 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality by County - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Northwest	17	703	89,763	703	100.00 %	0.78 %
Norwood	67	2,367	88,255	2,367	100.00 %	2.68 %
Oak City	23	266	88,865	266	100.00 %	0.30 %
Oak Island	19	8,396	91,041	8,396	100.00 %	9.22 %
Oak Ridge	62	7,474	89,579	7,474	100.00 %	8.34 %
Oakboro	67	2,128	88,255	2,128	100.00 %	2.41 %
Ocean Isle Beach	17	867	89,763	867	100.00 %	0.97 %
Old Fort	85	811	90,863	811	100.00 %	0.89 %
Oriental	79	880	83,163	880	100.00 %	1.06 %
Orrum	46	59	83,445	59	100.00 %	0.07 %
Ossipee	64	536	85,016	536	100.00 %	0.63 %
Oxford	32	8,628	88,633	8,628	100.00 %	9.73 %
Pantego	79	164	83,163	164	100.00 %	0.20 %
Parkton	47	504	83,708	504	100.00 %	0.60 %
Parmelee	23	243	88,865	243	100.00 %	0.27 %
Patterson Springs	111	571	89,894	571	100.00 %	0.64 %
Peachland	55	390	87,005	390	100.00 %	0.45 %
Peletier	13	769	83,307	769	100.00 %	0.92 %
Pembroke	47	2,823	83,708	2,823	100.00 %	3.37 %
Pikeville	10	712	82,953	712	100.00 %	0.86 %
Pilot Mountain	90	1,440	82,937	1,440	100.00 %	1.74 %
Pine Knoll Shores	13	1,388	83,307	1,388	100.00 %	1.67 %
Pine Level	28	2,046	85,389	2,046	100.00 %	2.40 %
Pinebluff	52	1,473	84,383	1,473	100.00 %	1.75 %
Pinehurst	52	17,581	84,383	8	0.05 %	0.01 %
	78	17,581	86,365	17,573	99.95 %	20.35 %
Pinetops	23	1,200	88,865	1,200	100.00 %	1.35 %
Pineville	105	10,602	85,822	10,602	100.00 %	12.35 %
	112	10,602	82,806	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Pink Hill	12	451	84,745	451	100.00 %	0.53 %
Pittsboro	54	4,537	83,475	4,537	100.00 %	5.44 %
Pleasant Garden	59	5,000	90,361	5,000	100.00 %	5.53 %
Plymouth	1	3,320	84,330	3,320	100.00 %	3.94 %
Polkton	55	2,250	87,005	2,250	100.00 %	2.59 %
Polkville	110	516	88,397	516	100.00 %	0.58 %
Pollocksville	12	268	84,745	268	100.00 %	0.32 %
Powellsville	23	189	88,865	189	100.00 %	0.21 %
Princeton	28	1,315	85,389	1,315	100.00 %	1.54 %
Princeville	23	1,254	88,865	1,254	100.00 %	1.41 %
Proctorville	46	121	83,445	121	100.00 %	0.15 %
Raeford	48	4,559	86,256	4,559	100.00 %	5.29 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Raleigh (Durham)	2	1,559	90,793	1,326	85.05 %	1.46 %
	31	1,559	90,760	233	14.95 %	0.26 %
Raleigh (Wake)	11	466,106	86,298	40,792	8.75 %	47.27 %
	21	466,106	86,179	13	0.00 %	0.02 %
	33	466,106	83,049	82,480	17.70 %	99.31 %
	34	466,106	83,679	83,503	17.92 %	99.79 %
	35	466,106	88,374	6,171	1.32 %	6.98 %
	38	466,106	88,226	56,840	12.19 %	64.43 %
	39	466,106	90,164	13,011	2.79 %	14.43 %
	40	466,106	83,175	57,345	12.30 %	68.94 %
	49	466,106	86,157	47,783	10.25 %	55.46 %
	66	466,106	83,189	78,168	16.77 %	93.96 %
Ramseur	78	1,774	86,365	1,774	100.00 %	2.05 %
Randleman	70	4,595	89,118	4,595	100.00 %	5.16 %
Ranlo	108	4,511	86,263	4,500	99.76 %	5.22 %
	110	4,511	88,397	11	0.24 %	0.01 %
Raynham	46	60	83,445	60	100.00 %	0.07 %
Red Cross	67	762	88,255	762	100.00 %	0.86 %
Red Oak	25	3,342	86,534	3,342	100.00 %	3.86 %
Red Springs (Hoke)	48	0	86,256	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Red Springs (Robeson)	47	3,087	83,708	3,087	100.00 %	3.69 %
Reidsville	65	14,583	91,096	14,583	100.00 %	16.01 %
Rennert	47	275	83,708	275	100.00 %	0.33 %
Rhodhiss (Burke)	86	639	87,570	639	100.00 %	0.73 %
Rhodhiss (Caldwell)	87	358	85,758	358	100.00 %	0.42 %
Rich Square	27	894	84,735	894	100.00 %	1.06 %
Richfield	67	582	88,255	582	100.00 %	0.66 %
Richlands	16	2,287	90,663	2,287	100.00 %	2.52 %
River Bend	3	2,902	85,099	2,902	100.00 %	3.41 %
Roanoke Rapids	27	15,229	84,735	15,229	100.00 %	17.97 %
Robbins	78	1,168	86,365	1,168	100.00 %	1.35 %
Robbinsville	120	597	84,907	597	100.00 %	0.70 %
Robersonville	23	1,269	88,865	1,269	100.00 %	1.43 %
Rockingham	52	9,243	84,383	9,243	100.00 %	10.95 %
Rockwell	76	2,302	89,815	2,302	100.00 %	2.56 %
Rocky Mount (Edgecombe)	23	15,414	88,865	15,414	100.00 %	17.35 %
Rocky Mount (Nash)	25	38,927	86,534	38,927	100.00 %	44.98 %
Rolesville	35	9,475	88,374	9,467	99.92 %	10.71 %
	39	9,475	90,164	8	0.08 %	0.01 %
Ronda	90	438	82,937	438	100.00 %	0.53 %
Roper	1	485	84,330	485	100.00 %	0.58 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality by County - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Rose Hill	4	1,371	83,095	1,371	100.00 %	1.65 %
Roseboro	22	1,163	88,642	1,163	100.00 %	1.31 %
Rosman	119	701	90,212	701	100.00 %	0.78 %
Rowland	46	885	83,445	885	100.00 %	1.06 %
Roxboro	2	8,134	90,793	8,134	100.00 %	8.96 %
Roxobel	23	187	88,865	187	100.00 %	0.21 %
Rural Hall	91	3,351	86,210	3,351	100.00 %	3.89 %
Ruth	113	347	89,058	347	100.00 %	0.39 %
Rutherford College (Burke)	86	1,226	87,570	1,226	100.00 %	1.40 %
Rutherford College (Caldwell)	87	0	85,758	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Rutherfordton	113	3,640	89,058	3,640	100.00 %	4.09 %
Salemburg	22	457	88,642	457	100.00 %	0.52 %
Salisbury	76	35,540	89,815	35,540	100.00 %	39.57 %
Saluda (Henderson)	113	11	89,058	11	100.00 %	0.01 %
Saluda (Polk)	113	620	89,058	620	100.00 %	0.70 %
Sandy Creek	17	248	89,763	248	100.00 %	0.28 %
Sandyfield	46	430	83,445	430	100.00 %	0.52 %
Sanford	51	30,261	83,073	30,261	100.00 %	36.43 %
Saratoga	24	353	87,220	353	100.00 %	0.40 %
Sawmills	87	5,020	85,758	5,020	100.00 %	5.85 %
Scotland Neck	27	1,640	84,735	1,640	100.00 %	1.94 %
Seaboard	27	542	84,735	542	100.00 %	0.64 %
Seagrove	78	235	86,365	235	100.00 %	0.27 %
Sedalia	59	676	90,361	676	100.00 %	0.75 %
Selma	28	6,317	85,389	6,317	100.00 %	7.40 %
Seven Devils (Avery)	85	38	90,863	38	100.00 %	0.04 %
Seven Devils (Watauga)	93	275	86,445	275	100.00 %	0.32 %
Seven Springs	4	55	83,095	55	100.00 %	0.07 %
Severn	27	191	84,735	191	100.00 %	0.23 %
Shallotte	17	4,185	89,763	4,185	100.00 %	4.66 %
Sharpsburg (Edgecombe)	23	215	88,865	215	100.00 %	0.24 %
Sharpsburg (Nash)	25	1,061	86,534	1,061	100.00 %	1.23 %
Sharpsburg (Wilson)	24	421	87,220	421	100.00 %	0.48 %
Shelby	110	21,918	88,397	4,409	20.12 %	4.99 %
	111	21,918	89,894	17,509	79.88 %	19.48 %
Siler City	54	7,702	83,475	7,702	100.00 %	9.23 %
Simpson	9	390	84,450	390	100.00 %	0.46 %
Sims	24	275	87,220	275	100.00 %	0.32 %
Smithfield	28	11,292	85,389	11,292	100.00 %	13.22 %
Snow Hill	12	1,481	84,745	1,481	100.00 %	1.75 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality by County - District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Southern Pines	52	15,545	84,383	15,545	100.00 %	18.42 %
	78	15,545	86,365	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Southern Shores	1	3,090	84,330	3,090	100.00 %	3.66 %
Southport	19	3,971	91,041	3,971	100.00 %	4.36 %
Sparta	93	1,834	86,445	1,834	100.00 %	2.12 %
Speed	23	63	88,865	63	100.00 %	0.07 %
Spencer	76	3,308	89,815	3,308	100.00 %	3.68 %
Spencer Mountain	108	0	86,263	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Spindale	113	4,225	89,058	4,225	100.00 %	4.74 %
Spring Hope	25	1,309	86,534	1,309	100.00 %	1.51 %
Spring Lake	42	11,660	85,537	11,660	100.00 %	13.63 %
Spruce Pine	85	2,194	90,863	2,194	100.00 %	2.41 %
St. Helena	16	417	90,663	417	100.00 %	0.46 %
St. James	19	6,529	91,041	6,529	100.00 %	7.17 %
St. Pauls	47	2,045	83,708	2,045	100.00 %	2.44 %
Staley	54	397	83,475	397	100.00 %	0.48 %
Stallings (Mecklenburg)	103	384	87,132	384	100.00 %	0.44 %
Stallings (Union)	68	15,728	88,138	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	69	15,728	85,179	15,728	100.00 %	18.46 %
Stanfield	67	1,585	88,255	1,585	100.00 %	1.80 %
Stanley	108	3,963	86,263	3,963	100.00 %	4.59 %
Stantonsburg	24	762	87,220	762	100.00 %	0.87 %
Star	67	806	88,255	806	100.00 %	0.91 %
Statesville	84	28,419	86,773	28,415	99.99 %	32.75 %
	89	28,419	85,577	4	0.01 %	0.00 %
Stedman	43	1,277	82,956	1,277	100.00 %	1.54 %
Stem	32	960	88,633	960	100.00 %	1.08 %
Stokesdale	62	5,924	89,579	5,924	100.00 %	6.61 %
Stoneville	65	1,308	91,096	1,308	100.00 %	1.44 %
Stonewall	79	214	83,163	214	100.00 %	0.26 %
Stovall	32	324	88,633	324	100.00 %	0.37 %
Sugar Mountain	85	371	90,863	371	100.00 %	0.41 %
Summerfield	57	10,951	90,615	746	6.81 %	0.82 %
	59	10,951	90,361	2,509	22.91 %	2.78 %
	62	10,951	89,579	7,696	70.28 %	8.59 %
Sunset Beach	17	4,175	89,763	4,175	100.00 %	4.65 %
Surf City (Onslow)	15	334	87,578	334	100.00 %	0.38 %
Surf City (Pender)	16	3,533	90,663	3,533	100.00 %	3.90 %
Swansboro	14	3,744	86,538	3,744	100.00 %	4.33 %
Sweptsonville	63	2,445	86,399	2,445	100.00 %	2.83 %
Sylva	119	2,578	90,212	2,578	100.00 %	2.86 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Tabor City	46	3,781	83,445	3,781	100.00 %	4.53 %
Tar Heel	22	90	88,642	90	100.00 %	0.10 %
Tarboro	23	10,721	88,865	10,721	100.00 %	12.06 %
Taylorsville	94	2,320	90,835	2,320	100.00 %	2.55 %
Taylortown	52	634	84,383	4	0.63 %	0.00 %
	78	634	86,365	630	99.37 %	0.73 %
Teachey	4	448	83,095	448	100.00 %	0.54 %
Thomasville (Davidson)	80	26,662	84,864	26,662	100.00 %	31.42 %
Thomasville (Randolph)	70	521	89,118	521	100.00 %	0.58 %
Tobaccoville (Forsyth)	74	2,578	84,857	824	31.96 %	0.97 %
	91	2,578	86,210	1,754	68.04 %	2.03 %
Tobaccoville (Stokes)	91	0	86,210	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Topsail Beach	16	461	90,663	461	100.00 %	0.51 %
Trent Woods	3	4,074	85,099	4,074	100.00 %	4.79 %
Trenton	12	238	84,745	238	100.00 %	0.28 %
Trinity	70	7,006	89,118	7,006	100.00 %	7.86 %
Troutman	84	3,698	86,773	885	23.93 %	1.02 %
	89	3,698	85,577	2,813	76.07 %	3.29 %
Troy	67	2,850	88,255	2,850	100.00 %	3.23 %
Tryon	113	1,562	89,058	1,562	100.00 %	1.75 %
Turkey	22	213	88,642	213	100.00 %	0.24 %
Unionville	69	6,643	85,179	6,643	100.00 %	7.80 %
Valdese	86	4,689	87,570	4,689	100.00 %	5.35 %
Vanceboro	3	869	85,099	869	100.00 %	1.02 %
Vandemere	79	246	83,163	246	100.00 %	0.30 %
Varnamtown	19	525	91,041	525	100.00 %	0.58 %
Vass	51	952	83,073	952	100.00 %	1.15 %
Waco	110	310	88,397	310	100.00 %	0.35 %
Wade	43	638	82,956	638	100.00 %	0.77 %
Wadesboro	55	5,008	87,005	5,008	100.00 %	5.76 %
Wagram	48	615	86,256	615	100.00 %	0.71 %
Wake Forest (Franklin)	7	1,504	83,510	1,504	100.00 %	1.80 %
Wake Forest (Wake)	35	46,097	88,374	46,097	100.00 %	52.16 %
	66	46,097	83,189	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Walkertown	71	5,692	84,874	3,176	55.80 %	3.74 %
	75	5,692	84,220	2,516	44.20 %	2.99 %
Wallace (Duplin)	4	3,413	83,095	3,413	100.00 %	4.11 %
Wallace (Pender)	16	0	90,663	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Wallburg	80	3,051	84,864	3,051	100.00 %	3.60 %
Walnut Cove	91	1,586	86,210	1,586	100.00 %	1.84 %
Walnut Creek	4	1,084	83,095	1,084	100.00 %	1.30 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Walstonburg	12	193	84,745	193	100.00 %	0.23 %
Warrenton	27	851	84,735	851	100.00 %	1.00 %
Warsaw	4	2,733	83,095	2,733	100.00 %	3.29 %
Washington	79	9,875	83,163	9,875	100.00 %	11.87 %
Washington Park	79	392	83,163	392	100.00 %	0.47 %
Watha	16	181	90,663	181	100.00 %	0.20 %
Waxhaw	55	20,534	87,005	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	68	20,534	88,138	20,534	100.00 %	23.30 %
Waynesville	118	10,140	83,282	10,140	100.00 %	12.18 %
Weaverville	114	4,567	89,685	4,567	100.00 %	5.09 %
Webster	119	372	90,212	372	100.00 %	0.41 %
Weddington (Mecklenburg)	103	5	87,132	5	100.00 %	0.01 %
Weddington (Union)	68	13,176	88,138	13,172	99.97 %	14.94 %
	69	13,176	85,179	4	0.03 %	0.00 %
Weldon	27	1,444	84,735	1,444	100.00 %	1.70 %
Wendell	39	9,793	90,164	9,793	100.00 %	10.86 %
Wentworth	65	2,662	91,096	2,662	100.00 %	2.92 %
Wesley Chapel	55	8,681	87,005	3,868	44.56 %	4.45 %
	68	8,681	88,138	4,813	55.44 %	5.46 %
West Jefferson	93	1,279	86,445	1,279	100.00 %	1.48 %
Whispering Pines	52	4,987	84,383	4,987	100.00 %	5.91 %
Whitakers (Edgecombe)	23	290	88,865	290	100.00 %	0.33 %
Whitakers (Nash)	25	337	86,534	337	100.00 %	0.39 %
White Lake	22	843	88,642	843	100.00 %	0.95 %
Whiteville	46	4,766	83,445	4,766	100.00 %	5.71 %
Whitsett	59	584	90,361	584	100.00 %	0.65 %
Wilkesboro	94	3,687	90,835	3,687	100.00 %	4.06 %
Williamston	23	5,248	88,865	5,248	100.00 %	5.91 %
Wilmington	18	115,451	91,245	48,680	42.17 %	53.35 %
	19	115,451	91,041	8,207	7.11 %	9.01 %
	20	115,451	90,346	58,564	50.73 %	64.82 %
Wilson	24	47,851	87,220	47,851	100.00 %	54.86 %
Wilson's Mills	26	2,534	89,947	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	28	2,534	85,389	2,534	100.00 %	2.97 %
Windsor	23	3,582	88,865	3,582	100.00 %	4.03 %
Winfall	1	555	84,330	555	100.00 %	0.66 %
Wingate	55	4,055	87,005	4,055	100.00 %	4.66 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Winston-Salem	71	249,545	84,874	77,631	31.11 %	91.47 %
	72	249,545	86,949	86,867	34.81 %	99.91 %
	74	249,545	84,857	32,409	12.99 %	38.19 %
	75	249,545	84,220	22,818	9.14 %	27.09 %
	91	249,545	86,210	29,820	11.95 %	34.59 %
Winterville	8	10,462	85,793	44	0.42 %	0.05 %
	9	10,462	84,450	10,418	99.58 %	12.34 %
Winton	5	629	82,953	629	100.00 %	0.76 %
Woodfin	114	7,936	89,685	7,648	96.37 %	8.53 %
	116	7,936	89,505	288	3.63 %	0.32 %
Woodland	27	557	84,735	557	100.00 %	0.66 %
Wrightsville Beach	20	2,473	90,346	2,473	100.00 %	2.74 %
Yadkinville	77	2,995	90,628	2,995	100.00 %	3.30 %
Yanceyville	50	1,937	85,345	1,937	100.00 %	2.27 %
Youngsville	7	2,016	83,510	2,016	100.00 %	2.41 %
Zebulon (Johnston)	26	0	89,947	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Zebulon (Wake)	39	6,903	90,164	6,903	100.00 %	7.66 %
Assigned Geography Total:				6,017,605		

Report display: all municipalities

Total Municipalities (by County) Statewide: 614

Fully Assigned Municipalities: 614

Partially Assigned Municipalities: 0

Fully Unassigned Municipalities: 0

Total Districts Assigned: 120

Split Municipalities: 81

Splits Involving Population: 59

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
1	Columbia	84,330	610	610	0.72 %	100.00 %
	Creswell	84,330	207	207	0.25 %	100.00 %
	Duck	84,330	742	742	0.88 %	100.00 %
	Edenton	84,330	4,460	4,460	5.29 %	100.00 %
	Hertford	84,330	1,934	1,934	2.29 %	100.00 %
	Kill Devil Hills	84,330	7,656	7,118	8.44 %	92.97 %
	Kitty Hawk	84,330	3,689	3,689	4.37 %	100.00 %
	Plymouth	84,330	3,320	3,320	3.94 %	100.00 %
	Roper	84,330	485	485	0.58 %	100.00 %
	Southern Shores	84,330	3,090	3,090	3.66 %	100.00 %
	Winfall	84,330	555	555	0.66 %	100.00 %
2	Durham (Durham)	90,793	283,093	25,167	27.72 %	8.89 %
	Raleigh (Durham)	90,793	1,559	1,326	1.46 %	85.05 %
	Roxboro	90,793	8,134	8,134	8.96 %	100.00 %
3	Bridgeton	85,099	349	349	0.41 %	100.00 %
	Cove City	85,099	378	378	0.44 %	100.00 %
	Dover	85,099	349	349	0.41 %	100.00 %
	Havelock	85,099	16,621	5,986	7.03 %	36.01 %
	New Bern	85,099	31,291	31,291	36.77 %	100.00 %
	River Bend	85,099	2,902	2,902	3.41 %	100.00 %
	Trent Woods	85,099	4,074	4,074	4.79 %	100.00 %
	Vanceboro	85,099	869	869	1.02 %	100.00 %
4	Beulaville	83,095	1,116	1,116	1.34 %	100.00 %
	Calypso	83,095	327	327	0.39 %	100.00 %
	Faison (Duplin)	83,095	784	784	0.94 %	100.00 %
	Goldsboro	83,095	33,657	5	0.01 %	0.01 %
	Greenevers	83,095	567	567	0.68 %	100.00 %
	Harrells (Duplin)	83,095	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Kenansville	83,095	770	770	0.93 %	100.00 %
	Magnolia	83,095	831	831	1.00 %	100.00 %
	Mount Olive (Duplin)	83,095	5	5	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Mount Olive (Wayne)	83,095	4,193	4,193	5.05 %	100.00 %
	Rose Hill	83,095	1,371	1,371	1.65 %	100.00 %
	Seven Springs	83,095	55	55	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Teachey	83,095	448	448	0.54 %	100.00 %
	Wallace (Duplin)	83,095	3,413	3,413	4.11 %	100.00 %
	Walnut Creek	83,095	1,084	1,084	1.30 %	100.00 %
	Warsaw	83,095	2,733	2,733	3.29 %	100.00 %
5	Ahoskie	82,953	4,891	4,891	5.90 %	100.00 %
	Cofield	82,953	267	267	0.32 %	100.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
5	Como	82,953	67	67	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Elizabeth City (Camden)	82,953	38	38	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Elizabeth City (Pasquotank)	82,953	18,593	18,593	22.41 %	100.00 %
	Gatesville	82,953	267	267	0.32 %	100.00 %
	Harrellsville	82,953	85	85	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Murfreesboro	82,953	2,619	2,619	3.16 %	100.00 %
	Winton	82,953	629	629	0.76 %	100.00 %
6	Angier (Harnett)	87,332	4,709	4,709	5.39 %	100.00 %
	Broadway (Harnett)	87,332	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Fuquay-Varina (Harnett)	87,332	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Lillington	87,332	4,735	882	1.01 %	18.63 %
7	Bunn	83,510	327	327	0.39 %	100.00 %
	Creedmoor	83,510	4,866	2,065	2.47 %	42.44 %
	Franklinton	83,510	2,456	2,456	2.94 %	100.00 %
	Louisburg	83,510	3,064	3,064	3.67 %	100.00 %
	Wake Forest (Franklin)	83,510	1,504	1,504	1.80 %	100.00 %
	Youngsville	83,510	2,016	2,016	2.41 %	100.00 %
8	Bethel	85,793	1,373	1,373	1.60 %	100.00 %
	Falkland	85,793	47	47	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Farmville	85,793	4,461	4,461	5.20 %	100.00 %
	Fountain	85,793	385	385	0.45 %	100.00 %
	Greenville	85,793	87,521	52,881	61.64 %	60.42 %
	Winterville	85,793	10,462	44	0.05 %	0.42 %
9	Ayden	84,450	4,977	4,977	5.89 %	100.00 %
	Greenville	84,450	87,521	34,640	41.02 %	39.58 %
	Grifton (Pitt)	84,450	2,301	2,301	2.72 %	100.00 %
	Grimesland	84,450	386	386	0.46 %	100.00 %
	Simpson	84,450	390	390	0.46 %	100.00 %
	Winterville	84,450	10,462	10,418	12.34 %	99.58 %
10	Eureka	82,953	214	214	0.26 %	100.00 %
	Fremont	82,953	1,196	1,196	1.44 %	100.00 %
	Goldsboro	82,953	33,657	33,652	40.57 %	99.99 %
	Pikeville	82,953	712	712	0.86 %	100.00 %
11	Apex	86,298	58,780	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Cary (Wake)	86,298	171,012	43,537	50.45 %	25.46 %
	Morrisville (Wake)	86,298	29,423	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Raleigh (Wake)	86,298	466,106	40,792	47.27 %	8.75 %
12	Grifton (Lenoir)	84,745	147	147	0.17 %	100.00 %
	Hookerton	84,745	413	413	0.49 %	100.00 %
	Kinston	84,745	19,900	19,900	23.48 %	100.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
12	La Grange	84,745	2,595	2,595	3.06 %	100.00 %
	Maysville	84,745	818	818	0.97 %	100.00 %
	Pink Hill	84,745	451	451	0.53 %	100.00 %
	Pollocksville	84,745	268	268	0.32 %	100.00 %
	Snow Hill	84,745	1,481	1,481	1.75 %	100.00 %
	Trenton	84,745	238	238	0.28 %	100.00 %
	Walstonburg	84,745	193	193	0.23 %	100.00 %
13	Atlantic Beach	83,307	1,364	1,364	1.64 %	100.00 %
	Beaufort	83,307	4,464	4,464	5.36 %	100.00 %
	Bogue	83,307	695	695	0.83 %	100.00 %
	Cape Carteret	83,307	2,224	2,224	2.67 %	100.00 %
	Cedar Point	83,307	1,764	1,764	2.12 %	100.00 %
	Emerald Isle	83,307	3,847	3,847	4.62 %	100.00 %
	Havelock	83,307	16,621	10,635	12.77 %	63.99 %
	Indian Beach	83,307	223	223	0.27 %	100.00 %
	Morehead City	83,307	9,556	9,556	11.47 %	100.00 %
	Newport	83,307	4,364	4,364	5.24 %	100.00 %
	Peletier	83,307	769	769	0.92 %	100.00 %
	Pine Knoll Shores	83,307	1,388	1,388	1.67 %	100.00 %
14	Jacksonville	86,538	72,723	28,456	32.88 %	39.13 %
	Swansboro	86,538	3,744	3,744	4.33 %	100.00 %
15	Holly Ridge	87,578	4,171	4,171	4.76 %	100.00 %
	Jacksonville	87,578	72,723	44,267	50.55 %	60.87 %
	North Topsail Beach	87,578	1,005	1,005	1.15 %	100.00 %
	Surf City (Onslow)	87,578	334	334	0.38 %	100.00 %
16	Atkinson	90,663	296	296	0.33 %	100.00 %
	Burgaw	90,663	3,088	3,088	3.41 %	100.00 %
	Richlands	90,663	2,287	2,287	2.52 %	100.00 %
	St. Helena	90,663	417	417	0.46 %	100.00 %
	Surf City (Pender)	90,663	3,533	3,533	3.90 %	100.00 %
	Topsail Beach	90,663	461	461	0.51 %	100.00 %
	Wallace (Pender)	90,663	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Watha	90,663	181	181	0.20 %	100.00 %
17	Belville	89,763	2,406	2,406	2.68 %	100.00 %
	Calabash	89,763	2,011	2,011	2.24 %	100.00 %
	Carolina Shores	89,763	4,588	4,588	5.11 %	100.00 %
	Holden Beach	89,763	921	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Leland	89,763	22,908	22,908	25.52 %	100.00 %
	Navassa	89,763	1,367	1,367	1.52 %	100.00 %
	Northwest	89,763	703	703	0.78 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 3 of 19

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175**

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
17	Ocean Isle Beach	89,763	867	867	0.97 %	100.00 %
	Sandy Creek	89,763	248	248	0.28 %	100.00 %
	Shallotte	89,763	4,185	4,185	4.66 %	100.00 %
	Sunset Beach	89,763	4,175	4,175	4.65 %	100.00 %
18	Wilmington	91,245	115,451	48,680	53.35 %	42.17 %
19	Bald Head Island	91,041	268	268	0.29 %	100.00 %
	Boiling Spring Lakes	91,041	5,943	5,943	6.53 %	100.00 %
	Bolivia	91,041	149	149	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Carolina Beach	91,041	6,564	6,564	7.21 %	100.00 %
	Caswell Beach	91,041	395	395	0.43 %	100.00 %
	Holden Beach	91,041	921	921	1.01 %	100.00 %
	Kure Beach	91,041	2,191	2,191	2.41 %	100.00 %
	Oak Island	91,041	8,396	8,396	9.22 %	100.00 %
	Southport	91,041	3,971	3,971	4.36 %	100.00 %
	St. James	91,041	6,529	6,529	7.17 %	100.00 %
	Varnamtown	91,041	525	525	0.58 %	100.00 %
	Wilmington	91,041	115,451	8,207	9.01 %	7.11 %
20	Wilmington	90,346	115,451	58,564	64.82 %	50.73 %
	Wrightsville Beach	90,346	2,473	2,473	2.74 %	100.00 %
21	Apex	86,179	58,780	556	0.65 %	0.95 %
	Cary (Wake)	86,179	171,012	30,622	35.53 %	17.91 %
	Fuquay-Varina (Wake)	86,179	34,152	30	0.03 %	0.09 %
	Garner	86,179	31,159	11,789	13.68 %	37.83 %
	Holly Springs	86,179	41,239	11,892	13.80 %	28.84 %
	Raleigh (Wake)	86,179	466,106	13	0.02 %	0.00 %
22	Autryville	88,642	167	167	0.19 %	100.00 %
	Bladenboro	88,642	1,648	1,648	1.86 %	100.00 %
	Clarkton	88,642	614	614	0.69 %	100.00 %
	Clinton	88,642	8,383	8,383	9.46 %	100.00 %
	Dublin	88,642	267	267	0.30 %	100.00 %
	East Arcadia	88,642	418	418	0.47 %	100.00 %
	Elizabethtown	88,642	3,296	3,296	3.72 %	100.00 %
	Faison (Sampson)	88,642	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Falcon (Sampson)	88,642	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Garland	88,642	595	595	0.67 %	100.00 %
	Harrells (Sampson)	88,642	160	160	0.18 %	100.00 %
	Newton Grove	88,642	585	585	0.66 %	100.00 %
	Roseboro	88,642	1,163	1,163	1.31 %	100.00 %
	Salemburg	88,642	457	457	0.52 %	100.00 %
	Tar Heel	88,642	90	90	0.10 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 4 of 19

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175**

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
22	Turkey	88,642	213	213	0.24 %	100.00 %
	White Lake	88,642	843	843	0.95 %	100.00 %
23	Askewville	88,865	184	184	0.21 %	100.00 %
	Aulander	88,865	763	763	0.86 %	100.00 %
	Bear Grass	88,865	89	89	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Colerain	88,865	217	217	0.24 %	100.00 %
	Conetoe	88,865	198	198	0.22 %	100.00 %
	Everetts	88,865	150	150	0.17 %	100.00 %
	Hamilton	88,865	306	306	0.34 %	100.00 %
	Hassell	88,865	49	49	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Jamesville	88,865	424	424	0.48 %	100.00 %
	Kelford	88,865	203	203	0.23 %	100.00 %
	Leggett	88,865	37	37	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Lewiston Woodville	88,865	426	426	0.48 %	100.00 %
	Macclesfield	88,865	413	413	0.46 %	100.00 %
	Oak City	88,865	266	266	0.30 %	100.00 %
	Parmelee	88,865	243	243	0.27 %	100.00 %
	Pinetops	88,865	1,200	1,200	1.35 %	100.00 %
	Powellsville	88,865	189	189	0.21 %	100.00 %
	Princeville	88,865	1,254	1,254	1.41 %	100.00 %
	Robersonville	88,865	1,269	1,269	1.43 %	100.00 %
	Rocky Mount (Edgecombe)	88,865	15,414	15,414	17.35 %	100.00 %
	Roxobel	88,865	187	187	0.21 %	100.00 %
	Sharpsburg (Edgecombe)	88,865	215	215	0.24 %	100.00 %
	Speed	88,865	63	63	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Tarboro	88,865	10,721	10,721	12.06 %	100.00 %
	Whitakers (Edgecombe)	88,865	290	290	0.33 %	100.00 %
	Williamston	88,865	5,248	5,248	5.91 %	100.00 %
	Windsor	88,865	3,582	3,582	4.03 %	100.00 %
24	Bailey	87,220	568	568	0.65 %	100.00 %
	Black Creek	87,220	692	692	0.79 %	100.00 %
	Elm City (Wilson)	87,220	1,218	1,218	1.40 %	100.00 %
	Kenly (Wilson)	87,220	198	198	0.23 %	100.00 %
	Lucama	87,220	1,036	1,036	1.19 %	100.00 %
	Middlesex	87,220	912	912	1.05 %	100.00 %
	Saratoga	87,220	353	353	0.40 %	100.00 %
	Sharpsburg (Wilson)	87,220	421	421	0.48 %	100.00 %
	Sims	87,220	275	275	0.32 %	100.00 %
	Stantonsburg	87,220	762	762	0.87 %	100.00 %
	Wilson	87,220	47,851	47,851	54.86 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 5 of 19

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
25	Castalia	86,534	264	264	0.31 %	100.00 %
	Dortches	86,534	1,082	1,082	1.25 %	100.00 %
	Elm City (Nash)	86,534	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Momeyer	86,534	277	277	0.32 %	100.00 %
	Nashville	86,534	5,632	5,632	6.51 %	100.00 %
	Red Oak	86,534	3,342	3,342	3.86 %	100.00 %
	Rocky Mount (Nash)	86,534	38,927	38,927	44.98 %	100.00 %
	Sharpsburg (Nash)	86,534	1,061	1,061	1.23 %	100.00 %
	Spring Hope	86,534	1,309	1,309	1.51 %	100.00 %
	Whitakers (Nash)	86,534	337	337	0.39 %	100.00 %
26	Archer Lodge	89,947	4,797	4,797	5.33 %	100.00 %
	Clayton (Johnston)	89,947	26,307	26,307	29.25 %	100.00 %
	Wilson's Mills	89,947	2,534	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Zebulon (Johnston)	89,947	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
27	Conway	84,735	752	752	0.89 %	100.00 %
	Enfield	84,735	1,865	1,865	2.20 %	100.00 %
	Garysburg	84,735	904	904	1.07 %	100.00 %
	Gaston	84,735	1,008	1,008	1.19 %	100.00 %
	Halifax	84,735	170	170	0.20 %	100.00 %
	Hobgood	84,735	268	268	0.32 %	100.00 %
	Jackson	84,735	430	430	0.51 %	100.00 %
	Lasker	84,735	64	64	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Littleton	84,735	559	559	0.66 %	100.00 %
	Macon	84,735	110	110	0.13 %	100.00 %
	Norlina	84,735	920	920	1.09 %	100.00 %
	Rich Square	84,735	894	894	1.06 %	100.00 %
	Roanoke Rapids	84,735	15,229	15,229	17.97 %	100.00 %
	Scotland Neck	84,735	1,640	1,640	1.94 %	100.00 %
	Seaboard	84,735	542	542	0.64 %	100.00 %
	Severn	84,735	191	191	0.23 %	100.00 %
	Warrenton	84,735	851	851	1.00 %	100.00 %
	Weldon	84,735	1,444	1,444	1.70 %	100.00 %
	Woodland	84,735	557	557	0.66 %	100.00 %
28	Benson (Johnston)	85,389	3,967	3,967	4.65 %	100.00 %
	Four Oaks	85,389	2,158	2,158	2.53 %	100.00 %
	Kenly (Johnston)	85,389	1,293	1,293	1.51 %	100.00 %
	Micro	85,389	458	458	0.54 %	100.00 %
	Pine Level	85,389	2,046	2,046	2.40 %	100.00 %
	Princeton	85,389	1,315	1,315	1.54 %	100.00 %
	Selma	85,389	6,317	6,317	7.40 %	100.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175**

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
28	Smithfield	85,389	11,292	11,292	13.22 %	100.00 %
	Wilson's Mills	85,389	2,534	2,534	2.97 %	100.00 %
29	Chapel Hill (Durham)	91,212	2,906	2,906	3.19 %	100.00 %
	Durham (Durham)	91,212	283,093	87,035	95.42 %	30.74 %
30	Durham (Durham)	91,165	283,093	89,671	98.36 %	31.68 %
31	Durham (Durham)	90,760	283,093	81,220	89.49 %	28.69 %
	Morrisville (Durham)	90,760	207	207	0.23 %	100.00 %
	Raleigh (Durham)	90,760	1,559	233	0.26 %	14.95 %
32	Butner	88,633	8,397	8,397	9.47 %	100.00 %
	Creedmoor	88,633	4,866	2,801	3.16 %	57.56 %
	Henderson	88,633	15,060	15,060	16.99 %	100.00 %
	Kittrell	88,633	132	132	0.15 %	100.00 %
	Middleburg	88,633	101	101	0.11 %	100.00 %
	Oxford	88,633	8,628	8,628	9.73 %	100.00 %
	Stem	88,633	960	960	1.08 %	100.00 %
	Stovall	88,633	324	324	0.37 %	100.00 %
33	Garner	83,049	31,159	14	0.02 %	0.04 %
	Raleigh (Wake)	83,049	466,106	82,480	99.31 %	17.70 %
34	Raleigh (Wake)	83,679	466,106	83,503	99.79 %	17.92 %
35	Raleigh (Wake)	88,374	466,106	6,171	6.98 %	1.32 %
	Rolesville	88,374	9,475	9,467	10.71 %	99.92 %
	Wake Forest (Wake)	88,374	46,097	46,097	52.16 %	100.00 %
36	Apex	90,166	58,780	57,843	64.15 %	98.41 %
	Cary (Wake)	90,166	171,012	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Fuquay-Varina (Wake)	90,166	34,152	16	0.02 %	0.05 %
	Holly Springs	90,166	41,239	17,734	19.67 %	43.00 %
37	Angier (Wake)	90,867	556	556	0.61 %	100.00 %
	Cary (Wake)	90,867	171,012	2,012	2.21 %	1.18 %
	Fuquay-Varina (Wake)	90,867	34,152	34,106	37.53 %	99.87 %
	Garner	90,867	31,159	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Holly Springs	90,867	41,239	11,613	12.78 %	28.16 %
38	Clayton (Wake)	88,226	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Garner	88,226	31,159	19,356	21.94 %	62.12 %
	Knightdale	88,226	19,435	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Raleigh (Wake)	88,226	466,106	56,840	64.43 %	12.19 %
39	Clayton (Wake)	90,164	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Knightdale	90,164	19,435	19,435	21.56 %	100.00 %
	Raleigh (Wake)	90,164	466,106	13,011	14.43 %	2.79 %
	Rolesville	90,164	9,475	8	0.01 %	0.08 %
	Wendell	90,164	9,793	9,793	10.86 %	100.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
39	Zebulon (Wake)	90,164	6,903	6,903	7.66 %	100.00 %
40	Durham (Wake)	83,175	269	269	0.32 %	100.00 %
	Raleigh (Wake)	83,175	466,106	57,345	68.94 %	12.30 %
41	Apex	89,887	58,780	381	0.42 %	0.65 %
	Cary (Wake)	89,887	171,012	74,074	82.41 %	43.32 %
	Morrisville (Wake)	89,887	29,423	14,239	15.84 %	48.39 %
42	Fayetteville	85,537	208,501	65,401	76.46 %	31.37 %
	Spring Lake	85,537	11,660	11,660	13.63 %	100.00 %
43	Eastover	82,956	3,656	3,656	4.41 %	100.00 %
	Falcon (Cumberland)	82,956	324	324	0.39 %	100.00 %
	Fayetteville	82,956	208,501	44,532	53.68 %	21.36 %
	Godwin	82,956	128	128	0.15 %	100.00 %
	Hope Mills	82,956	17,808	64	0.08 %	0.36 %
	Linden	82,956	136	136	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Stedman	82,956	1,277	1,277	1.54 %	100.00 %
	Wade	82,956	638	638	0.77 %	100.00 %
44	Fayetteville	83,297	208,501	83,293	100.00 %	39.95 %
45	Fayetteville	82,938	208,501	15,275	18.42 %	7.33 %
	Hope Mills	82,938	17,808	17,744	21.39 %	99.64 %
46	Boardman	83,445	166	166	0.20 %	100.00 %
	Bolton	83,445	519	519	0.62 %	100.00 %
	Brunswick	83,445	973	973	1.17 %	100.00 %
	Cerro Gordo	83,445	131	131	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Chadbourn	83,445	1,574	1,574	1.89 %	100.00 %
	Fair Bluff	83,445	709	709	0.85 %	100.00 %
	Fairmont	83,445	2,191	2,191	2.63 %	100.00 %
	Lake Waccamaw	83,445	1,296	1,296	1.55 %	100.00 %
	Lumberton	83,445	19,025	350	0.42 %	1.84 %
	Marietta	83,445	111	111	0.13 %	100.00 %
	Maxton (Robeson)	83,445	1,902	1,902	2.28 %	100.00 %
	McDonald	83,445	94	94	0.11 %	100.00 %
	Orrum	83,445	59	59	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Proctorville	83,445	121	121	0.15 %	100.00 %
	Raynham	83,445	60	60	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Rowland	83,445	885	885	1.06 %	100.00 %
	Sandyfield	83,445	430	430	0.52 %	100.00 %
	Tabor City	83,445	3,781	3,781	4.53 %	100.00 %
	Whiteville	83,445	4,766	4,766	5.71 %	100.00 %
47	Fairmont	83,708	2,191	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Lumber Bridge	83,708	82	82	0.10 %	100.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
47	Lumberton	83,708	19,025	18,675	22.31 %	98.16 %
	Parkton	83,708	504	504	0.60 %	100.00 %
	Pembroke	83,708	2,823	2,823	3.37 %	100.00 %
	Red Springs (Robeson)	83,708	3,087	3,087	3.69 %	100.00 %
	Rennert	83,708	275	275	0.33 %	100.00 %
	St. Pauls	83,708	2,045	2,045	2.44 %	100.00 %
48	East Laurinburg	86,256	234	234	0.27 %	100.00 %
	Gibson	86,256	449	449	0.52 %	100.00 %
	Laurinburg	86,256	14,978	14,978	17.36 %	100.00 %
	Maxton (Scotland)	86,256	208	208	0.24 %	100.00 %
	Raeford	86,256	4,559	4,559	5.29 %	100.00 %
	Red Springs (Hoke)	86,256	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Wagram	86,256	615	615	0.71 %	100.00 %
49	Cary (Wake)	86,157	171,012	20,767	24.10 %	12.14 %
	Durham (Wake)	86,157	269	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Morrisville (Wake)	86,157	29,423	15,184	17.62 %	51.61 %
	Raleigh (Wake)	86,157	466,106	47,783	55.46 %	10.25 %
50	Carrboro	85,345	21,295	174	0.20 %	0.82 %
	Durham (Orange)	85,345	144	144	0.17 %	100.00 %
	Hillsborough	85,345	9,660	9,660	11.32 %	100.00 %
	Mebane (Orange)	85,345	3,171	3,171	3.72 %	100.00 %
	Milton	85,345	155	155	0.18 %	100.00 %
	Yanceyville	85,345	1,937	1,937	2.27 %	100.00 %
51	Broadway (Lee)	83,073	1,267	1,267	1.53 %	100.00 %
	Cameron	83,073	244	244	0.29 %	100.00 %
	Carthage	83,073	2,775	2,747	3.31 %	98.99 %
	Sanford	83,073	30,261	30,261	36.43 %	100.00 %
	Vass	83,073	952	952	1.15 %	100.00 %
52	Aberdeen	84,383	8,516	8,516	10.09 %	100.00 %
	Carthage	84,383	2,775	28	0.03 %	1.01 %
	Dobbins Heights	84,383	687	687	0.81 %	100.00 %
	Ellerbe	84,383	864	864	1.02 %	100.00 %
	Foxfire	84,383	1,288	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Hamlet	84,383	6,025	6,025	7.14 %	100.00 %
	Hoffman	84,383	418	418	0.50 %	100.00 %
	Norman	84,383	100	100	0.12 %	100.00 %
	Pinebluff	84,383	1,473	1,473	1.75 %	100.00 %
	Pinehurst	84,383	17,581	8	0.01 %	0.05 %
	Rockingham	84,383	9,243	9,243	10.95 %	100.00 %
	Southern Pines	84,383	15,545	15,545	18.42 %	100.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175**

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
52	Taylortown	84,383	634	4	0.00 %	0.63 %
	Whispering Pines	84,383	4,987	4,987	5.91 %	100.00 %
53	Benson (Harnett)	86,899	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Coats	86,899	2,155	2,155	2.48 %	100.00 %
	Dunn	86,899	8,446	8,446	9.72 %	100.00 %
	Erwin	86,899	4,542	4,542	5.23 %	100.00 %
	Lillington	86,899	4,735	3,853	4.43 %	81.37 %
54	Cary (Chatham)	83,475	3,709	3,709	4.44 %	100.00 %
	Goldston	83,475	234	234	0.28 %	100.00 %
	Liberty	83,475	2,655	2,655	3.18 %	100.00 %
	Pittsboro	83,475	4,537	4,537	5.44 %	100.00 %
	Siler City	83,475	7,702	7,702	9.23 %	100.00 %
	Staley	83,475	397	397	0.48 %	100.00 %
55	Ansonville	87,005	440	440	0.51 %	100.00 %
	Indian Trail	87,005	39,997	2,376	2.73 %	5.94 %
	Lilesville	87,005	395	395	0.45 %	100.00 %
	Marshville	87,005	2,522	2,522	2.90 %	100.00 %
	McFarlan	87,005	94	94	0.11 %	100.00 %
	Mineral Springs	87,005	3,159	2,293	2.64 %	72.59 %
	Monroe	87,005	34,562	12,650	14.54 %	36.60 %
	Morven	87,005	329	329	0.38 %	100.00 %
	Peachland	87,005	390	390	0.45 %	100.00 %
	Polkton	87,005	2,250	2,250	2.59 %	100.00 %
	Wadesboro	87,005	5,008	5,008	5.76 %	100.00 %
	Waxhaw	87,005	20,534	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Wesley Chapel	87,005	8,681	3,868	4.45 %	44.56 %
	Wingate	87,005	4,055	4,055	4.66 %	100.00 %
56	Carrboro	86,087	21,295	21,121	24.53 %	99.18 %
	Chapel Hill (Orange)	86,087	59,054	59,054	68.60 %	100.00 %
57	Greensboro	90,615	299,035	83,540	92.19 %	27.94 %
	Summerfield	90,615	10,951	746	0.82 %	6.81 %
58	Greensboro	90,808	299,035	84,725	93.30 %	28.33 %
59	Burlington (Guilford)	90,361	1,822	1,822	2.02 %	100.00 %
	Gibsonville (Guilford)	90,361	4,642	4,642	5.14 %	100.00 %
	Greensboro	90,361	299,035	13,852	15.33 %	4.63 %
	Pleasant Garden	90,361	5,000	5,000	5.53 %	100.00 %
	Sedalia	90,361	676	676	0.75 %	100.00 %
	Summerfield	90,361	10,951	2,509	2.78 %	22.91 %
	Whitsett	90,361	584	584	0.65 %	100.00 %
60	Archdale (Guilford)	89,735	380	380	0.42 %	100.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
60	Greensboro	89,735	299,035	8,829	9.84 %	2.95 %
	High Point (Guilford)	89,735	107,321	66,033	73.59 %	61.53 %
	Jamestown	89,735	3,668	3,668	4.09 %	100.00 %
61	Greensboro	90,201	299,035	90,201	100.00 %	30.16 %
62	Greensboro	89,579	299,035	17,888	19.97 %	5.98 %
	High Point (Guilford)	89,579	107,321	41,288	46.09 %	38.47 %
	Kernersville (Guilford)	89,579	502	502	0.56 %	100.00 %
	Oak Ridge	89,579	7,474	7,474	8.34 %	100.00 %
	Stokesdale	89,579	5,924	5,924	6.61 %	100.00 %
	Summerfield	89,579	10,951	7,696	8.59 %	70.28 %
63	Burlington (Alamance)	86,399	55,481	25,917	30.00 %	46.71 %
	Graham	86,399	17,157	17,157	19.86 %	100.00 %
	Green Level	86,399	3,152	3,152	3.65 %	100.00 %
	Haw River	86,399	2,252	2,252	2.61 %	100.00 %
	Mebane (Alamance)	86,399	14,626	14,626	16.93 %	100.00 %
	Swepsonville	86,399	2,445	2,445	2.83 %	100.00 %
64	Alamance	85,016	988	988	1.16 %	100.00 %
	Burlington (Alamance)	85,016	55,481	29,564	34.77 %	53.29 %
	Elon	85,016	11,336	11,336	13.33 %	100.00 %
	Gibsonville (Alamance)	85,016	4,278	4,278	5.03 %	100.00 %
	Ossipee	85,016	536	536	0.63 %	100.00 %
65	Eden	91,096	15,421	15,421	16.93 %	100.00 %
	Madison	91,096	2,129	2,129	2.34 %	100.00 %
	Mayodan	91,096	2,418	2,418	2.65 %	100.00 %
	Reidsville	91,096	14,583	14,583	16.01 %	100.00 %
	Stoneville	91,096	1,308	1,308	1.44 %	100.00 %
	Wentworth	91,096	2,662	2,662	2.92 %	100.00 %
66	Raleigh (Wake)	83,189	466,106	78,168	93.96 %	16.77 %
	Wake Forest (Wake)	83,189	46,097	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
67	Albemarle	88,255	16,432	16,432	18.62 %	100.00 %
	Badin	88,255	2,024	2,024	2.29 %	100.00 %
	Biscoe	88,255	1,848	1,848	2.09 %	100.00 %
	Candor (Montgomery)	88,255	813	813	0.92 %	100.00 %
	Locust (Stanly)	88,255	3,996	3,996	4.53 %	100.00 %
	Misenheimer	88,255	650	650	0.74 %	100.00 %
	Mount Gilead	88,255	1,171	1,171	1.33 %	100.00 %
	New London	88,255	607	607	0.69 %	100.00 %
	Norwood	88,255	2,367	2,367	2.68 %	100.00 %
	Oakboro	88,255	2,128	2,128	2.41 %	100.00 %
	Red Cross	88,255	762	762	0.86 %	100.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175**

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
67	Richfield	88,255	582	582	0.66 %	100.00 %
	Stanfield	88,255	1,585	1,585	1.80 %	100.00 %
	Star	88,255	806	806	0.91 %	100.00 %
	Troy	88,255	2,850	2,850	3.23 %	100.00 %
68	Indian Trail	88,138	39,997	15,036	17.06 %	37.59 %
	Marvin	88,138	6,358	6,358	7.21 %	100.00 %
	Mineral Springs	88,138	3,159	866	0.98 %	27.41 %
	Stallings (Union)	88,138	15,728	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Waxhaw	88,138	20,534	20,534	23.30 %	100.00 %
	Weddington (Union)	88,138	13,176	13,172	14.94 %	99.97 %
	Wesley Chapel	88,138	8,681	4,813	5.46 %	55.44 %
69	Fairview	85,179	3,456	3,456	4.06 %	100.00 %
	Hemby Bridge	85,179	1,614	1,614	1.89 %	100.00 %
	Indian Trail	85,179	39,997	22,585	26.51 %	56.47 %
	Lake Park	85,179	3,269	3,269	3.84 %	100.00 %
	Mint Hill (Union)	85,179	6	6	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Monroe	85,179	34,562	21,912	25.72 %	63.40 %
	Stallings (Union)	85,179	15,728	15,728	18.46 %	100.00 %
	Unionville	85,179	6,643	6,643	7.80 %	100.00 %
	Weddington (Union)	85,179	13,176	4	0.00 %	0.03 %
70	Archdale (Randolph)	89,118	11,527	11,527	12.93 %	100.00 %
	Asheboro	89,118	27,156	25,890	29.05 %	95.34 %
	High Point (Randolph)	89,118	8	8	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Randleman	89,118	4,595	4,595	5.16 %	100.00 %
	Thomasville (Randolph)	89,118	521	521	0.58 %	100.00 %
	Trinity	89,118	7,006	7,006	7.86 %	100.00 %
71	Kernersville (Forsyth)	84,874	25,947	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Walkertown	84,874	5,692	3,176	3.74 %	55.80 %
	Winston-Salem	84,874	249,545	77,631	91.47 %	31.11 %
72	Winston-Salem	86,949	249,545	86,867	99.91 %	34.81 %
73	Concord	90,649	105,240	32,447	35.79 %	30.83 %
	Harrisburg	90,649	18,967	18,967	20.92 %	100.00 %
	Locust (Cabarrus)	90,649	541	541	0.60 %	100.00 %
	Midland (Cabarrus)	90,649	4,684	4,684	5.17 %	100.00 %
	Mount Pleasant	90,649	1,671	1,671	1.84 %	100.00 %
74	Bethania	84,857	344	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Clemmons	84,857	21,163	21,163	24.94 %	100.00 %
	Lewisville	84,857	13,381	13,381	15.77 %	100.00 %
	Tobaccoville (Forsyth)	84,857	2,578	824	0.97 %	31.96 %
	Winston-Salem	84,857	249,545	32,409	38.19 %	12.99 %

District - Municipality by County Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175**

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
75	High Point (Forsyth)	84,220	84	84	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Kernersville (Forsyth)	84,220	25,947	25,947	30.81 %	100.00 %
	Walkertown	84,220	5,692	2,516	2.99 %	44.20 %
	Winston-Salem	84,220	249,545	22,818	27.09 %	9.14 %
76	East Spencer	89,815	1,567	1,567	1.74 %	100.00 %
	Faith	89,815	819	819	0.91 %	100.00 %
	Granite Quarry	89,815	2,984	2,984	3.32 %	100.00 %
	Rockwell	89,815	2,302	2,302	2.56 %	100.00 %
	Salisbury	89,815	35,540	35,540	39.57 %	100.00 %
	Spencer	89,815	3,308	3,308	3.68 %	100.00 %
77	Bermuda Run	90,628	3,120	3,120	3.44 %	100.00 %
	Boonville	90,628	1,185	1,185	1.31 %	100.00 %
	Cleveland	90,628	846	846	0.93 %	100.00 %
	Cooleemee	90,628	940	940	1.04 %	100.00 %
	East Bend	90,628	634	634	0.70 %	100.00 %
	Jonesville	90,628	2,308	2,308	2.55 %	100.00 %
	Mocksville	90,628	5,900	5,900	6.51 %	100.00 %
	Yadkinville	90,628	2,995	2,995	3.30 %	100.00 %
78	Aberdeen	86,365	8,516	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Asheboro	86,365	27,156	1,266	1.47 %	4.66 %
	Candor (Moore)	86,365	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Foxfire	86,365	1,288	1,288	1.49 %	100.00 %
	Franklinville	86,365	1,197	1,197	1.39 %	100.00 %
	Pinehurst	86,365	17,581	17,573	20.35 %	99.95 %
	Ramseur	86,365	1,774	1,774	2.05 %	100.00 %
	Robbins	86,365	1,168	1,168	1.35 %	100.00 %
	Seagrove	86,365	235	235	0.27 %	100.00 %
	Southern Pines	86,365	15,545	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
79	Taylortown	86,365	634	630	0.73 %	99.37 %
	Alliance	83,163	733	733	0.88 %	100.00 %
	Arapahoe	83,163	416	416	0.50 %	100.00 %
	Aurora	83,163	455	455	0.55 %	100.00 %
	Bath	83,163	245	245	0.29 %	100.00 %
	Bayboro	83,163	1,161	1,161	1.40 %	100.00 %
	Belhaven	83,163	1,410	1,410	1.70 %	100.00 %
	Chocowinity	83,163	722	722	0.87 %	100.00 %
	Grantsboro	83,163	692	692	0.83 %	100.00 %
	Kill Devil Hills	83,163	7,656	538	0.65 %	7.03 %
	Manteo	83,163	1,600	1,600	1.92 %	100.00 %
	Mesic	83,163	144	144	0.17 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 2/17/2022

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 13 of 19

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
79	Minnesott Beach	83,163	530	530	0.64 %	100.00 %
	Nags Head	83,163	3,168	3,168	3.81 %	100.00 %
	Oriental	83,163	880	880	1.06 %	100.00 %
	Pantego	83,163	164	164	0.20 %	100.00 %
	Stonewall	83,163	214	214	0.26 %	100.00 %
	Vandemere	83,163	246	246	0.30 %	100.00 %
	Washington	83,163	9,875	9,875	11.87 %	100.00 %
	Washington Park	83,163	392	392	0.47 %	100.00 %
80	Denton	84,864	1,494	1,494	1.76 %	100.00 %
	High Point (Davidson)	84,864	6,646	6,646	7.83 %	100.00 %
	Lexington	84,864	19,632	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Midway	84,864	4,742	3,469	4.09 %	73.15 %
	Thomasville (Davidson)	84,864	26,662	26,662	31.42 %	100.00 %
	Wallburg	84,864	3,051	3,051	3.60 %	100.00 %
81	Lexington	84,066	19,632	19,632	23.35 %	100.00 %
	Midway	84,066	4,742	1,273	1.51 %	26.85 %
82	Concord	90,771	105,240	48,723	53.68 %	46.30 %
	Kannapolis (Cabarrus)	90,771	42,846	33,907	37.35 %	79.14 %
83	China Grove	90,742	4,434	4,434	4.89 %	100.00 %
	Concord	90,742	105,240	24,070	26.53 %	22.87 %
	Kannapolis (Cabarrus)	90,742	42,846	8,939	9.85 %	20.86 %
	Kannapolis (Rowan)	90,742	10,268	10,268	11.32 %	100.00 %
	Landis	90,742	3,690	3,690	4.07 %	100.00 %
84	Harmony	86,773	543	543	0.63 %	100.00 %
	Love Valley	86,773	154	154	0.18 %	100.00 %
	Mooresville	86,773	50,193	205	0.24 %	0.41 %
	Statesville	86,773	28,419	28,415	32.75 %	99.99 %
	Troutman	86,773	3,698	885	1.02 %	23.93 %
85	Bakersville	90,863	450	450	0.50 %	100.00 %
	Banner Elk	90,863	1,049	1,049	1.15 %	100.00 %
	Beech Mountain (Avery)	90,863	62	62	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Burnsville	90,863	1,614	1,614	1.78 %	100.00 %
	Crossnore	90,863	143	143	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Elk Park	90,863	542	542	0.60 %	100.00 %
	Grandfather Village	90,863	95	95	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Marion	90,863	7,717	7,717	8.49 %	100.00 %
	Newland	90,863	715	715	0.79 %	100.00 %
	Old Fort	90,863	811	811	0.89 %	100.00 %
	Seven Devils (Avery)	90,863	38	38	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Spruce Pine	90,863	2,194	2,194	2.41 %	100.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175**

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
85	Sugar Mountain	90,863	371	371	0.41 %	100.00 %
86	Connelly Springs	87,570	1,529	1,529	1.75 %	100.00 %
	Drexel	87,570	1,760	1,760	2.01 %	100.00 %
	Glen Alpine	87,570	1,529	1,529	1.75 %	100.00 %
	Hickory (Burke)	87,570	79	79	0.09 %	100.00 %
	Hildebran	87,570	1,679	1,679	1.92 %	100.00 %
	Long View (Burke)	87,570	735	735	0.84 %	100.00 %
	Morganton	87,570	17,474	17,474	19.95 %	100.00 %
	Rhodhiss (Burke)	87,570	639	639	0.73 %	100.00 %
	Rutherford College (Burke)	87,570	1,226	1,226	1.40 %	100.00 %
	Valdese	87,570	4,689	4,689	5.35 %	100.00 %
	Blowing Rock (Caldwell)	85,758	91	91	0.11 %	100.00 %
87	Blowing Rock (Watauga)	85,758	1,285	5	0.01 %	0.39 %
	Boone	85,758	19,092	595	0.69 %	3.12 %
	Cajah's Mountain	85,758	2,722	2,722	3.17 %	100.00 %
	Cedar Rock	85,758	301	301	0.35 %	100.00 %
	Gamewell	85,758	3,702	3,702	4.32 %	100.00 %
	Granite Falls	85,758	4,965	4,965	5.79 %	100.00 %
	Hickory (Caldwell)	85,758	32	32	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Hudson	85,758	3,780	3,780	4.41 %	100.00 %
	Lenoir	85,758	18,352	18,352	21.40 %	100.00 %
	Rhodhiss (Caldwell)	85,758	358	358	0.42 %	100.00 %
	Rutherford College (Caldwell)	85,758	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Sawmills	85,758	5,020	5,020	5.85 %	100.00 %
88	Charlotte	82,834	874,579	82,834	100.00 %	9.47 %
89	Catawba	85,577	702	702	0.82 %	100.00 %
	Claremont	85,577	1,692	1,692	1.98 %	100.00 %
	Conover	85,577	8,421	424	0.50 %	5.04 %
	Hickory (Catawba)	85,577	43,379	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Maiden (Catawba)	85,577	3,736	3,736	4.37 %	100.00 %
	Newton	85,577	13,148	13,148	15.36 %	100.00 %
	Statesville	85,577	28,419	4	0.00 %	0.01 %
	Troutman	85,577	3,698	2,813	3.29 %	76.07 %
90	Dobson	82,937	1,462	1,462	1.76 %	100.00 %
	Elkin (Surry)	82,937	4,049	4,049	4.88 %	100.00 %
	Elkin (Wilkes)	82,937	73	73	0.09 %	100.00 %
	Mount Airy	82,937	10,676	10,676	12.87 %	100.00 %
	Pilot Mountain	82,937	1,440	1,440	1.74 %	100.00 %
	Ronda	82,937	438	438	0.53 %	100.00 %
91	Bethania	86,210	344	344	0.40 %	100.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175**

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
91	Danbury	86,210	189	189	0.22 %	100.00 %
	King (Forsyth)	86,210	591	591	0.69 %	100.00 %
	King (Stokes)	86,210	6,606	6,606	7.66 %	100.00 %
	Rural Hall	86,210	3,351	3,351	3.89 %	100.00 %
	Tobaccoville (Forsyth)	86,210	2,578	1,754	2.03 %	68.04 %
	Tobaccoville (Stokes)	86,210	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Walnut Cove	86,210	1,586	1,586	1.84 %	100.00 %
	Winston-Salem	86,210	249,545	29,820	34.59 %	11.95 %
92	Charlotte	85,031	874,579	63,762	74.99 %	7.29 %
93	Beech Mountain (Watauga)	86,445	613	613	0.71 %	100.00 %
	Blowing Rock (Watauga)	86,445	1,285	1,280	1.48 %	99.61 %
	Boone	86,445	19,092	18,497	21.40 %	96.88 %
	Jefferson	86,445	1,622	1,622	1.88 %	100.00 %
	Lansing	86,445	126	126	0.15 %	100.00 %
	Seven Devils (Watauga)	86,445	275	275	0.32 %	100.00 %
	Sparta	86,445	1,834	1,834	2.12 %	100.00 %
	West Jefferson	86,445	1,279	1,279	1.48 %	100.00 %
94	North Wilkesboro	90,835	4,382	4,382	4.82 %	100.00 %
	Taylorsville	90,835	2,320	2,320	2.55 %	100.00 %
	Wilkesboro	90,835	3,687	3,687	4.06 %	100.00 %
95	Davidson (Iredell)	85,366	378	378	0.44 %	100.00 %
	Mooreville	85,366	50,193	49,988	58.56 %	99.59 %
96	Brookford	89,587	442	442	0.49 %	100.00 %
	Conover	89,587	8,421	7,997	8.93 %	94.96 %
	Hickory (Catawba)	89,587	43,379	43,379	48.42 %	100.00 %
	Long View (Catawba)	89,587	4,353	4,353	4.86 %	100.00 %
	Newton	89,587	13,148	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
97	Lincolnton	86,810	11,091	11,091	12.78 %	100.00 %
	Maiden (Lincoln)	86,810	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
98	Cornelius	86,827	31,412	31,412	36.18 %	100.00 %
	Davidson (Mecklenburg)	86,827	14,728	14,728	16.96 %	100.00 %
	Huntersville	86,827	61,376	38,677	44.54 %	63.02 %
99	Charlotte	87,647	874,579	79,113	90.26 %	9.05 %
	Mint Hill (Mecklenburg)	87,647	26,444	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
100	Charlotte	87,197	874,579	87,197	100.00 %	9.97 %
101	Charlotte	86,426	874,579	64,526	74.66 %	7.38 %
	Huntersville	86,426	61,376	5,893	6.82 %	9.60 %
102	Charlotte	86,179	874,579	86,179	100.00 %	9.85 %
103	Charlotte	87,132	874,579	23,590	27.07 %	2.70 %
	Matthews	87,132	29,435	29,435	33.78 %	100.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175**

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
103	Midland (Mecklenburg)	87,132	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Mint Hill (Mecklenburg)	87,132	26,444	26,444	30.35 %	100.00 %
	Stallings (Mecklenburg)	87,132	384	384	0.44 %	100.00 %
	Weddington (Mecklenburg)	87,132	5	5	0.01 %	100.00 %
104	Charlotte	86,520	874,579	86,520	100.00 %	9.89 %
105	Charlotte	85,822	874,579	71,156	82.91 %	8.14 %
	Pineville	85,822	10,602	10,602	12.35 %	100.00 %
106	Charlotte	82,824	874,579	79,717	96.25 %	9.11 %
107	Charlotte	88,237	874,579	67,298	76.27 %	7.69 %
	Huntersville	88,237	61,376	16,806	19.05 %	27.38 %
108	Belmont	86,263	15,010	1,868	2.17 %	12.45 %
	Cramerton	86,263	5,296	96	0.11 %	1.81 %
	Gastonia	86,263	80,411	28,480	33.02 %	35.42 %
	Lowell	86,263	3,654	3,654	4.24 %	100.00 %
	McAdenville	86,263	890	890	1.03 %	100.00 %
	Mount Holly	86,263	17,703	17,703	20.52 %	100.00 %
	Ranlo	86,263	4,511	4,500	5.22 %	99.76 %
	Spencer Mountain	86,263	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Stanley	86,263	3,963	3,963	4.59 %	100.00 %
109	Belmont	87,762	15,010	13,142	14.97 %	87.55 %
	Cramerton	87,762	5,296	5,200	5.93 %	98.19 %
	Gastonia	87,762	80,411	44,448	50.65 %	55.28 %
	Lowell	87,762	3,654	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
110	Belwood	88,397	857	857	0.97 %	100.00 %
	Bessemer City	88,397	5,428	5,428	6.14 %	100.00 %
	Casar	88,397	305	305	0.35 %	100.00 %
	Cherryville	88,397	6,078	6,078	6.88 %	100.00 %
	Dallas	88,397	5,927	5,927	6.70 %	100.00 %
	Dellview	88,397	6	6	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Fallston	88,397	627	627	0.71 %	100.00 %
	Gastonia	88,397	80,411	7,483	8.47 %	9.31 %
	High Shoals	88,397	595	595	0.67 %	100.00 %
	Kings Mountain (Cleveland)	88,397	10,032	8	0.01 %	0.08 %
	Kings Mountain (Gaston)	88,397	1,110	1,110	1.26 %	100.00 %
	Kingstown	88,397	656	656	0.74 %	100.00 %
	Lawndale	88,397	570	570	0.64 %	100.00 %
	Polkville	88,397	516	516	0.58 %	100.00 %
	Ranlo	88,397	4,511	11	0.01 %	0.24 %
	Shelby	88,397	21,918	4,409	4.99 %	20.12 %
	Waco	88,397	310	310	0.35 %	100.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
111	Boiling Springs	89,894	4,615	4,615	5.13 %	100.00 %
	Bostic	89,894	355	355	0.39 %	100.00 %
	Earl	89,894	198	198	0.22 %	100.00 %
	Ellenboro	89,894	723	723	0.80 %	100.00 %
	Forest City	89,894	7,377	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Grover	89,894	802	802	0.89 %	100.00 %
	Kings Mountain (Cleveland)	89,894	10,032	10,024	11.15 %	99.92 %
	Lattimore	89,894	406	406	0.45 %	100.00 %
	Mooresboro	89,894	293	293	0.33 %	100.00 %
	Patterson Springs	89,894	571	571	0.64 %	100.00 %
	Shelby	89,894	21,918	17,509	19.48 %	79.88 %
112	Charlotte	82,806	874,579	82,687	99.86 %	9.45 %
	Pineville	82,806	10,602	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
113	Chimney Rock Village	89,058	140	140	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Columbus	89,058	1,060	1,060	1.19 %	100.00 %
	Flat Rock	89,058	3,486	3,486	3.91 %	100.00 %
	Forest City	89,058	7,377	7,377	8.28 %	100.00 %
	Hendersonville	89,058	15,137	623	0.70 %	4.12 %
	Lake Lure	89,058	1,365	1,365	1.53 %	100.00 %
	Laurel Park	89,058	2,250	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Ruth	89,058	347	347	0.39 %	100.00 %
	Rutherfordton	89,058	3,640	3,640	4.09 %	100.00 %
	Saluda (Henderson)	89,058	11	11	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Saluda (Polk)	89,058	620	620	0.70 %	100.00 %
	Spindale	89,058	4,225	4,225	4.74 %	100.00 %
	Tryon	89,058	1,562	1,562	1.75 %	100.00 %
114	Asheville	89,685	94,589	52,596	58.65 %	55.60 %
	Weaverville	89,685	4,567	4,567	5.09 %	100.00 %
	Woodfin	89,685	7,936	7,648	8.53 %	96.37 %
115	Asheville	90,262	94,589	29,236	32.39 %	30.91 %
	Black Mountain	90,262	8,426	8,426	9.34 %	100.00 %
	Montreat	90,262	901	901	1.00 %	100.00 %
116	Asheville	89,505	94,589	12,757	14.25 %	13.49 %
	Biltmore Forest	89,505	1,409	1,409	1.57 %	100.00 %
	Woodfin	89,505	7,936	288	0.32 %	3.63 %
117	Fletcher	91,035	7,987	7,987	8.77 %	100.00 %
	Hendersonville	91,035	15,137	14,514	15.94 %	95.88 %
	Laurel Park	91,035	2,250	2,250	2.47 %	100.00 %
	Mills River	91,035	7,078	7,078	7.78 %	100.00 %
118	Canton	83,282	4,422	4,422	5.31 %	100.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
118	Clyde	83,282	1,368	1,368	1.64 %	100.00 %
	Hot Springs	83,282	520	520	0.62 %	100.00 %
	Maggie Valley	83,282	1,687	1,687	2.03 %	100.00 %
	Mars Hill	83,282	2,007	2,007	2.41 %	100.00 %
	Marshall	83,282	777	777	0.93 %	100.00 %
	Waynesville	83,282	10,140	10,140	12.18 %	100.00 %
119	Brevard	90,212	7,744	7,744	8.58 %	100.00 %
	Bryson City	90,212	1,558	1,558	1.73 %	100.00 %
	Dillsboro	90,212	213	213	0.24 %	100.00 %
	Forest Hills	90,212	303	303	0.34 %	100.00 %
	Highlands (Jackson)	90,212	12	12	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Rosman	90,212	701	701	0.78 %	100.00 %
	Sylva	90,212	2,578	2,578	2.86 %	100.00 %
	Webster	90,212	372	372	0.41 %	100.00 %
120	Andrews	84,907	1,667	1,667	1.96 %	100.00 %
	Fontana Dam	84,907	13	13	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Franklin	84,907	4,175	4,175	4.92 %	100.00 %
	Hayesville	84,907	461	461	0.54 %	100.00 %
	Highlands (Macon)	84,907	1,060	1,060	1.25 %	100.00 %
	Lake Santeetlah	84,907	38	38	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Murphy	84,907	1,608	1,608	1.89 %	100.00 %
	Robbinsville	84,907	597	597	0.70 %	100.00 %
Total:				6,017,605		

Total Districts Assigned: 120

Total Municipalities (by County) Statewide: 614

Fully Assigned Municipalities: 614

Partially Assigned Municipalities: 0

Fully Unassigned Municipalities: 0

Split Municipalities: 81

Splits Involving Population: 59

Whole-Split VTD Counts by District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175**

District	County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
1	Chowan	6	0
	Currituck	11	0
	Dare	3	1
	Perquimans	7	0
	Tyrrell	6	0
	Washington	6	0
2	Durham	8	2
	Person	11	0
3	Craven	19	1
4	Duplin	19	0
	Wayne	7	1
5	Camden	3	0
	Gates	6	0
	Hertford	13	0
	Pasquotank	9	0
6	Harnett	6	0
7	Franklin	18	0
	Granville	2	0
8	Pitt	21	0
9	Pitt	19	0
10	Wayne	20	1
11	Wake	19	0
12	Greene	10	0
	Jones	7	0
	Lenoir	22	0
13	Carteret	28	0
	Craven	1	1
14	Onslow	10	0
15	Onslow	9	0
16	Onslow	5	0
	Pender	20	0
17	Brunswick	14	0
18	New Hanover	19	0
19	Brunswick	11	0
	New Hanover	7	0
20	New Hanover	17	0
21	Wake	16	0
22	Bladen	17	0
	Sampson	23	0
23	Bertie	12	0
	Edgecombe	21	0
	Martin	13	0

Whole-Split VTD Counts by District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175**

District	County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
24	Nash	2	0
	Wilson	24	0
25	Nash	22	0
26	Johnston	12	0
27	Halifax	23	0
	Northampton	13	0
	Warren	14	0
28	Johnston	18	0
29	Durham	21	1
30	Durham	17	1
31	Durham	8	2
32	Granville	13	0
	Vance	12	0
33	Wake	19	0
34	Wake	24	0
35	Wake	14	0
36	Wake	12	0
37	Wake	12	0
38	Wake	13	0
39	Wake	14	0
40	Wake	20	0
41	Wake	11	0
42	Cumberland	13	0
43	Cumberland	28	0
44	Cumberland	19	0
45	Cumberland	16	0
46	Columbus	26	0
	Robeson	14	0
47	Robeson	25	0
48	Hoke	15	0
	Scotland	7	0
49	Wake	15	0
50	Caswell	9	0
	Orange	18	0
51	Lee	10	0
	Moore	4	0
52	Moore	10	0
	Richmond	16	0
53	Harnett	7	0
	Johnston	6	0
54	Chatham	18	0
	Randolph	2	0

Whole-Split VTD Counts by District Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

District	County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
55	Anson	9	0
	Union	17	0
56	Orange	23	0
57	Guilford	27	0
58	Guilford	24	0
59	Guilford	24	0
60	Guilford	27	0
61	Guilford	34	0
62	Guilford	29	0
63	Alamance	19	0
64	Alamance	18	0
65	Rockingham	15	0
66	Wake	15	0
67	Montgomery	14	0
	Stanly	22	0
68	Union	16	0
69	Union	19	0
70	Randolph	12	0
71	Forsyth	20	0
72	Forsyth	32	0
73	Cabarrus	15	0
74	Forsyth	19	0
75	Forsyth	19	0
76	Rowan	25	0
77	Davie	14	0
	Rowan	5	0
	Yadkin	12	0
78	Moore	12	0
	Randolph	8	0
79	Beaufort	21	0
	Dare	12	1
	Hyde	7	0
	Pamlico	10	0
80	Davidson	22	0
81	Davidson	21	0
82	Cabarrus	20	0
83	Cabarrus	5	0
	Rowan	11	0
84	Iredell	19	0
85	Avery	19	0
	McDowell	15	0
	Mitchell	9	0
	Yancey	11	0

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

Based on TIGER 2020 VTDs

[G20-VTD-SbD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Whole-Split VTD Counts by District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175**

District	County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
86	Burke	33	0
87	Caldwell	20	0
	Watauga	2	0
88	Mecklenburg	18	0
89	Catawba	17	0
	Iredell	2	0
90	Surry	24	0
	Wilkes	6	0
91	Forsyth	11	0
	Stokes	18	0
92	Mecklenburg	9	0
93	Alleghany	4	0
	Ashe	17	0
	Watauga	18	0
94	Alexander	10	0
	Wilkes	21	0
95	Iredell	8	0
96	Catawba	23	0
97	Lincoln	23	0
98	Mecklenburg	10	1
99	Mecklenburg	15	0
100	Mecklenburg	21	0
101	Mecklenburg	10	0
102	Mecklenburg	19	0
103	Mecklenburg	16	0
104	Mecklenburg	26	0
105	Mecklenburg	12	0
106	Mecklenburg	10	0
107	Mecklenburg	11	1
108	Gaston	20	0
109	Gaston	14	0
110	Cleveland	10	0
	Gaston	12	0
111	Cleveland	11	0
	Rutherford	6	0
112	Mecklenburg	17	0
113	Henderson	8	0
	McDowell	2	0
	Polk	7	0
	Rutherford	11	0
114	Buncombe	29	0
115	Buncombe	32	0
116	Buncombe	18	0

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

Based on TIGER 2020 VTDs

[G20-VTD-SbD] - Generated 2/17/2022

Whole-Split VTD Counts by District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175**

District	County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
117	Henderson	26	0
118	Haywood	29	0
	Madison	12	0
119	Jackson	13	0
	Swain	5	0
	Transylvania	15	0
120	Cherokee	16	0
	Clay	9	0
	Graham	4	0
	Macon	15	0
Total:		2,659	

Total Districts Assigned: 120

Total VTDs Statewide: 2666

Fully Assigned VTDs: 2666

Partially Assigned VTDs: 0

Fully Unassigned VTDs: 0

Split VTDs: 7

Splits Involving Population: 7

Whole-Split VTD Counts by County Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175**

County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
Alamance	37	0
Alexander	10	0
Alleghany	4	0
Anson	9	0
Ashe	17	0
Avery	19	0
Beaufort	21	0
Bertie	12	0
Bladen	17	0
Brunswick	25	0
Buncombe	79	0
Burke	33	0
Cabarrus	40	0
Caldwell	20	0
Camden	3	0
Carteret	28	0
Caswell	9	0
Catawba	40	0
Chatham	18	0
Cherokee	16	0
Chowan	6	0
Clay	9	0
Cleveland	21	0
Columbus	26	0
Craven	20	1
Cumberland	76	0
Currituck	11	0
Dare	15	1
Davidson	43	0
Davie	14	0
Duplin	19	0
Durham	54	3
Edgecombe	21	0
Forsyth	101	0
Franklin	18	0
Gaston	46	0
Gates	6	0
Graham	4	0
Granville	15	0
Greene	10	0
Guilford	165	0
Halifax	23	0
Harnett	13	0

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

Based on TIGER 2020 VTDs

[G20-VTD-SbC] - Generated 2/17/2022

Whole-Split VTD Counts by County Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175**

County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
Haywood	29	0
Henderson	34	0
Hertford	13	0
Hoke	15	0
Hyde	7	0
Iredell	29	0
Jackson	13	0
Johnston	36	0
Jones	7	0
Lee	10	0
Lenoir	22	0
Lincoln	23	0
Macon	15	0
Madison	12	0
Martin	13	0
McDowell	17	0
Mecklenburg	194	1
Mitchell	9	0
Montgomery	14	0
Moore	26	0
Nash	24	0
New Hanover	43	0
Northampton	13	0
Onslow	24	0
Orange	41	0
Pamlico	10	0
Pasquotank	9	0
Pender	20	0
Perquimans	7	0
Person	11	0
Pitt	40	0
Polk	7	0
Randolph	22	0
Richmond	16	0
Robeson	39	0
Rockingham	15	0
Rowan	41	0
Rutherford	17	0
Sampson	23	0
Scotland	7	0
Stanly	22	0
Stokes	18	0
Surry	24	0

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

Based on TIGER 2020 VTDs

[G20-VTD-SbC] - Generated 2/17/2022

Whole-Split VTD Counts by County Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
Swain	5	0
Transylvania	15	0
Tyrrell	6	0
Union	52	0
Vance	12	0
Wake	204	0
Warren	14	0
Washington	6	0
Watauga	20	0
Wayne	27	1
Wilkes	27	0
Wilson	24	0
Yadkin	12	0
Yancey	11	0
Totals:	2,659	7

Total VTDs Statewide: 2666

Fully Assigned VTDs: 2666

Partially Assigned VTDs: 0

Fully Unassigned VTDs: 0

Total Districts Assigned: 120

Split VTDs: 7

Splits Involving Population: 7

Split VTD Detail Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

County	VTD	District	Total VTD Population	VTD Pop in District	Percent of VTD Pop in District
Craven	002	3	18,203	6,483	35.62 %
		13	18,203	11,720	64.38 %
Dare	KDH	1	7,656	7,118	92.97 %
		79	7,656	538	7.03 %
Durham	014	29	4,535	4,232	93.32 %
		31	4,535	303	6.68 %
	023	2	10,357	1,533	14.80 %
		30	10,357	8,824	85.20 %
	30-2	2	10,654	958	8.99 %
		31	10,654	9,696	91.01 %
Mecklenburg	134	98	11,104	4,537	40.86 %
		107	11,104	6,567	59.14 %
Wayne	016	4	3,810	992	26.04 %
		10	3,810	2,818	73.96 %
Assigned Geography Total:				66,319	

Total VTDs Statewide: 2666

Fully Assigned VTDs: 2666

Partially Assigned VTDs: 0

Fully Unassigned VTDs: 0

Total Districts Assigned: 120

Split VTDs: 7

Splits Involving Population: 7

Incumbent-District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175****Residence Set: NC House - 2/10/2022**

Last Name	First Name	Party	Current District	District in this Plan
Adams	James	Republican	96	96
Adcock	Gale	Democratic	41	41
Ager	John	Democratic	115	115
Alexander	Kelly	Democratic	107	107
Alston	Vernetta	Democratic	29	29
Arp	Larry	Republican	69	69
Autry	Johnnie	Democratic	100	100
Baker	Amber	Democratic	72	72
Baker	Kristin	Republican	82	82
Ball	Cynthia	Democratic	49	49
Belk	Mary	Democratic	88	88
Bell	John	Republican	10	10
Blackwell	Hugh	Republican	86	86
Boles	James	Republican	52	52
Bradford	John	Republican	98	98
Brisson	William	Republican	22	22
Brockman	Cecil	Democratic	60	60
Brody	Mark	Republican	55	55
Brown	Terry	Democratic	92	92
Butler	Deborah	Democratic	18	18
Carney	Becky	Democratic	102	102
Clampitt	James	Republican	119	119
Clemmons	Ashton	Democratic	57	57
Cleveland	George	Republican	14	14
Cooper-Suggs	Linda	Democratic	24	24
Cunningham	Carla	Democratic	106	106
Dahle	Allison	Democratic	11	11
Davis	Robert	Republican	20	20
Dixon	James	Republican	4	4
Elmore	Jeffrey	Republican	94	94
Everitt	Terence	Democratic	35	35
Faircloth	Joseph	Republican	62	62
Farkas	Brian	Democratic	9	9
Gailliard	James	Democratic	25	25
Garrison	Terry	Democratic	32	32
Gill	Rosa	Democratic	33	33
Gillespie	Karl	Republican	120	120
Goodwin	Edward	Republican	1	1
Graham	Charles	Democratic	47	47
Greene	Edwin	Republican	85	85
Hall	Destin	Republican	87	87
Hall	Kyle	Republican	91	91

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

Row shading indicates that the district in this plan is shared by more than one incumbent.

[G20-IncDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

Incumbent-District Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

Residence Set: NC House - 2/10/2022

Last Name	First Name	Party	Current District	District in this Plan
Hanig	Robert	Republican	6	1
Hardister	Jonathan	Republican	59	59
Harris	Wesley	Democratic	105	105
Harrison	Mary	Democratic	61	61
Hastings	Kelly	Republican	110	110
Hawkins	Zack	Democratic	31	31
Howard	Julia	Republican	77	77
Humphrey	Thomas	Republican	12	12
Hunt	Rachel	Democratic	103	103
Hunter	Howard	Democratic	5	5
Hurley	Patricia	Republican	70	70
Hurtado	Ricardo	Democratic	63	63
Iler	Francis	Republican	17	17
Insko	Verla	Democratic	56	56
John	Joseph	Democratic	40	40
Johnson	Jake	Republican	113	113
Jones	Abraham	Democratic	38	38
Jones	Brenden	Republican	46	46
Kidwell	Keith	Republican	79	79
Lambeth	Donny	Republican	75	75
Loftis	Donnie	Republican	109	109
Lofton	Brandon	Democratic	104	104
Logan	Carolyn	Democratic	101	101
Lucas	Marvin	Democratic	42	42
Majeed	Nasif	Democratic	99	99
Martin	David	Democratic	34	34
McElraft	Patricia	Republican	13	13
McNeely	Jeffrey	Republican	84	84
McNeill	Allen	Republican	78	78
Meyer	Graig	Democratic	50	50
Miller	Charles	Republican	19	19
Mills	Paul	Republican	95	95
Moffitt	Timothy	Republican	117	117
Moore	Timothy	Republican	111	111
Morey	Marcia	Democratic	30	30
Moss	Ben	Republican	66	52
Paré	Erin	Republican	37	37
Penny	Howard	Republican	53	53
Pickett	Phillip	Republican	93	93
Pierce	Garland	Democratic	48	48
Pittman	Larry	Republican	83	82
Pless	Steven	Republican	118	118

District plan definition file: 'Plan_SL2021-175.csv', modified 2/17/2022 7:32 PM

Row shading indicates that the district in this plan is shared by more than one incumbent.

[G20-IncDist] - Generated 2/17/2022

Incumbent-District Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175****Residence Set: NC House - 2/10/2022**

Last Name	First Name	Party	Current District	District in this Plan
Potts	Larry	Republican	81	81
Pyrtle	Armor	Republican	65	65
Quick	Amos	Democratic	58	58
Reives	Robert	Democratic	54	54
Richardson	William	Democratic	44	44
Riddell	Dennis	Republican	64	64
Roberson	James	Democratic	39	39
Rogers	David	Republican	112	113
Rudow	Caleb	Democratic	114	114
Saine	Jason	Republican	97	97
Sasser	Clayton	Republican	67	67
Sauls	John	Republican	51	51
Setzer	Mitchell	Republican	89	89
Shepard	Phillip	Republican	15	15
Smith	Carson	Republican	16	16
Smith	Kandie	Democratic	8	8
Smith	Raymond	Democratic	21	10
Stevens	Sarah	Republican	90	90
Strickland	Larry	Republican	28	28
Szoka	John	Republican	45	45
Terry	Evelyn	Democratic	71	71
Torbett	John	Republican	108	108
Turner	Brian	Democratic	116	116
Tyson	John	Republican	3	3
von Haefen	Julie	Democratic	36	36
Warren	Harry	Republican	76	76
Watford	Samuel	Republican	80	80
Wheatley	Diane	Republican	43	43
White	Donna	Republican	26	26
Willingham	Shelly	Democratic	23	23
Willis	David	Republican	68	68
Winslow	Matthew	Republican	7	7
Wray	Michael	Democratic	27	27
Yarborough	Lawrence	Republican	2	2
Zachary	Walter	Republican	73	77
Zenger	Jeffrey	Republican	74	74

District-Incumbent Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175****Residence Set: NC House - 2/10/2022**

District in this Plan	Last Name	First Name	Party	Current District
1	Goodwin	Edward	Republican	1
	Hanig	Robert	Republican	6
2	Yarborough	Lawrence	Republican	2
3	Tyson	John	Republican	3
4	Dixon	James	Republican	4
5	Hunter	Howard	Democratic	5
6				
7	Winslow	Matthew	Republican	7
8	Smith	Kandie	Democratic	8
9	Farkas	Brian	Democratic	9
10	Bell	John	Republican	10
	Smith	Raymond	Democratic	21
11	Dahle	Allison	Democratic	11
12	Humphrey	Thomas	Republican	12
13	McElraft	Patricia	Republican	13
14	Cleveland	George	Republican	14
15	Shepard	Phillip	Republican	15
16	Smith	Carson	Republican	16
17	Iler	Francis	Republican	17
18	Butler	Deborah	Democratic	18
19	Miller	Charles	Republican	19
20	Davis	Robert	Republican	20
21				
22	Brisson	William	Republican	22
23	Willingham	Shelly	Democratic	23
24	Cooper-Suggs	Linda	Democratic	24
25	Gailliard	James	Democratic	25
26	White	Donna	Republican	26
27	Wray	Michael	Democratic	27
28	Strickland	Larry	Republican	28
29	Alston	Vernetta	Democratic	29
30	Morey	Marcia	Democratic	30
31	Hawkins	Zack	Democratic	31
32	Garrison	Terry	Democratic	32
33	Gill	Rosa	Democratic	33
34	Martin	David	Democratic	34
35	Everitt	Terence	Democratic	35
36	von Haefen	Julie	Democratic	36
37	Paré	Erin	Republican	37
38	Jones	Abraham	Democratic	38
39	Roberson	James	Democratic	39
40	John	Joseph	Democratic	40

District-Incumbent Report

District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175

Residence Set: NC House - 2/10/2022

District in this Plan	Last Name	First Name	Party	Current District
41	Adcock	Gale	Democratic	41
42	Lucas	Marvin	Democratic	42
43	Wheatley	Diane	Republican	43
44	Richardson	William	Democratic	44
45	Szoka	John	Republican	45
46	Jones	Brenden	Republican	46
47	Graham	Charles	Democratic	47
48	Pierce	Garland	Democratic	48
49	Ball	Cynthia	Democratic	49
50	Meyer	Graig	Democratic	50
51	Sauls	John	Republican	51
52	Boles	James	Republican	52
	Moss	Ben	Republican	66
53	Penny	Howard	Republican	53
54	Reives	Robert	Democratic	54
55	Brody	Mark	Republican	55
56	Insko	Verla	Democratic	56
57	Clemmons	Ashton	Democratic	57
58	Quick	Amos	Democratic	58
59	Hardister	Jonathan	Republican	59
60	Brockman	Cecil	Democratic	60
61	Harrison	Mary	Democratic	61
62	Faircloth	Joseph	Republican	62
63	Hurtado	Ricardo	Democratic	63
64	Riddell	Dennis	Republican	64
65	Pyrtle	Armor	Republican	65
66				
67	Sasser	Clayton	Republican	67
68	Willis	David	Republican	68
69	Arp	Larry	Republican	69
70	Hurley	Patricia	Republican	70
71	Terry	Evelyn	Democratic	71
72	Baker	Amber	Democratic	72
73				
74	Zenger	Jeffrey	Republican	74
75	Lambeth	Donny	Republican	75
76	Warren	Harry	Republican	76
77	Howard	Julia	Republican	77
	Zachary	Walter	Republican	73
78	McNeill	Allen	Republican	78
79	Kidwell	Keith	Republican	79
80	Watford	Samuel	Republican	80

District-Incumbent Report**District Plan: Plan_SL2021-175****Residence Set: NC House - 2/10/2022**

District in this Plan	Last Name	First Name	Party	Current District
81	Potts	Larry	Republican	81
82	Baker	Kristin	Republican	82
	Pittman	Larry	Republican	83
83				
84	McNeely	Jeffrey	Republican	84
85	Greene	Edwin	Republican	85
86	Blackwell	Hugh	Republican	86
87	Hall	Destin	Republican	87
88	Belk	Mary	Democratic	88
89	Setzer	Mitchell	Republican	89
90	Stevens	Sarah	Republican	90
91	Hall	Kyle	Republican	91
92	Brown	Terry	Democratic	92
93	Pickett	Phillip	Republican	93
94	Elmore	Jeffrey	Republican	94
95	Mills	Paul	Republican	95
96	Adams	James	Republican	96
97	Saine	Jason	Republican	97
98	Bradford	John	Republican	98
99	Majeed	Nasif	Democratic	99
100	Autry	Johnnie	Democratic	100
101	Logan	Carolyn	Democratic	101
102	Carney	Becky	Democratic	102
103	Hunt	Rachel	Democratic	103
104	Lofton	Brandon	Democratic	104
105	Harris	Wesley	Democratic	105
106	Cunningham	Carla	Democratic	106
107	Alexander	Kelly	Democratic	107
108	Torbett	John	Republican	108
109	Loftis	Donnie	Republican	109
110	Hastings	Kelly	Republican	110
111	Moore	Timothy	Republican	111
112				
113	Johnson	Jake	Republican	113
	Rogers	David	Republican	112
114	Rudow	Caleb	Democratic	114
115	Ager	John	Democratic	115
116	Turner	Brian	Democratic	116
117	Moffitt	Timothy	Republican	117
118	Pless	Steven	Republican	118
119	Clampitt	James	Republican	119
120	Gillespie	Karl	Republican	120

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA
COUNTY OF WAKE

IN THE GENERAL COURT OF JUSTICE
SUPERIOR COURT DIVISION
FILE NO. 21 CVS 015426

NORTH CAROLINA LEAGUE OF
CONSERVATION VOTERS, INC, *et al.*,
Plaintiffs,

COMMON CAUSE; *et al.*
Plaintiff-Intervenor

v.

REPRESENTATIVE DESTIN HALL, in his official
capacity as Chair of the House Standing Committee
on Redistricting, *et al.*

Defendants.

AFFIDAVIT OF R. ERIKA CHURCHILL

The undersigned being duly sworn, deposes and says:

1. My name is R. Erika Churchill. I have personal knowledge of the matters explained below.

2. I am currently employed by the North Carolina General Assembly as a Principal Legislative Analyst. I have been employed by the North Carolina General Assembly since 2000, and in that capacity I have served as committee counsel to the standing and select committees of the General Assembly hearing redistricting matters, including the House Redistricting and Senate Redistricting and Elections Committees of the 2021-2022 Biennium.

3. In addition to the sum of total vote counts for all 12 specified election contests below, described as "All," the 2022 redistricting database in Maptitude contained individual election results for 12 specified election contests as follows:

- a. 2016 Presidential.
- b. 2016 Lieutenant Governor.
- c. 2020 Presidential.
- d. 2020 US Senate.
- e. 2020 Governor.
- f. 2020 Lieutenant Governor.
- g. 2020 Attorney General.
- h. 2020 Auditor.
- i. 2020 Commissioner of Agriculture.
- j. 2020 Commissioner of Labor.
- k. 2020 Secretary of State.
- l. 2020 Treasurer.

4. As a standard report, Maptitude produces reports on Measures of Political Asymmetry and Efficiency Gap, both of which can be run with the sum of total vote counts for all 12 specified election contests. The Maptitude reports function has not been modified by the NCGA, other than the inclusion of the 12 specified election contests as described in the Affidavit of Raleigh Myers dated February 18, 2022, in this matter.

5. Attached as Exhibit 1 is the Measures of Political Asymmetry, All, report for "S.L. 2022-2" which is date and time stamped Thursday, February, 17, 2022,

at 8:09 pm. Attached as Exhibit 2 is the Efficiency Gap, All, report for "S.L. 2022-2" which is date and time stamped Thursday, February 17, at 8:02 p.m. "S.L. 2022-2" is the Senate plan enacted Thursday, February 17, 2022, by the North Carolina General Assembly.

6. Attached as Exhibit 3 is the Measures of Political Asymmetry, All, report for "S.L. 2022-3" which is date and time stamped Thursday, February, 17, 2022, at 8:28 pm. Attached as Exhibit 4 is the Efficiency Gap, All, report for "S.L. 2022-3" which is date and time stamped Thursday, February 17, at 8:22 p.m. "S.L. 2022-3" is the Congressional plan enacted Thursday, February 17, 2022, by the North Carolina General Assembly.

7. Attached as Exhibit 5 is the Measures of Political Asymmetry, All, report for "S.L. 2022-4" which is date and time stamped Thursday, February, 17, 2022, at 7:41 pm. Attached as Exhibit 6 is the Efficiency Gap, All, report for "S.L. 2022-4" which is date and time stamped Thursday, February 17, at 7:47 p.m. "S.L. 2022-4" is the House plan enacted Thursday, February 17, 2022, by the North Carolina General Assembly.

8. In preparing and comparing the reports, I was assisted by Jessica A. Sammons, Senior Legislative Analyst with the North Carolina General Assembly and


committee co-counsel to the House Redistricting and Senate Redistricting and Elections
Committees of the 2021-2022 Biennium.

This the 21st day of February, 2022.



R. Erika Churchill

Sworn and subscribed before me
this the 21st day of February, 2022.



Notary Public Amy C. Darden

My commission expires: 8-23-25




Exhibit 1

User:

Plan Name: SL 2022-2

Plan Type: Senate

Measures of Political Asymmetry

Thursday, February 17, 2022

8:09 PM

Declination 0.09**Mean-Median Difference 0.63%**

District	Votes Cast			Winner
	All_D	All_R	Total	
1	523,693	824,338	1,348,031	All_R
2	524,271	713,323	1,237,594	All_R
3	650,452	585,706	1,236,158	All_D
4	582,979	634,073	1,217,052	All_R
5	746,038	557,838	1,303,876	All_D
6	279,219	518,288	797,507	All_R
7	681,351	702,262	1,383,613	All_R
8	554,218	846,204	1,400,422	All_R
9	484,570	727,204	1,211,774	All_R
10	472,409	773,210	1,245,619	All_R
11	651,045	625,284	1,276,329	All_D
12	409,349	602,184	1,011,533	All_R
13	835,040	491,732	1,326,772	All_D
14	816,636	328,371	1,145,007	All_D
15	837,117	416,153	1,253,270	All_D
16	782,128	428,100	1,210,228	All_D
17	642,402	629,341	1,271,743	All_D
18	661,236	642,860	1,304,096	All_D
19	647,141	517,782	1,164,923	All_D
20	973,682	388,376	1,362,058	All_D
21	575,722	594,278	1,170,000	All_R
22	978,471	266,878	1,245,349	All_D
23	897,636	478,847	1,376,483	All_D
24	468,441	473,374	941,815	All_R
25	507,107	745,154	1,252,261	All_R
26	594,175	805,663	1,399,838	All_R
27	692,682	524,156	1,216,838	All_D
28	897,460	297,765	1,195,225	All_D
29	415,884	846,644	1,262,528	All_R
30	352,260	953,004	1,305,264	All_R
31	559,664	702,570	1,262,234	All_R
32	792,222	539,039	1,331,261	All_D
33	372,021	854,616	1,226,637	All_R
34	566,392	695,062	1,261,454	All_R
35	498,452	849,148	1,347,600	All_R

Measures of Political Asymmetry

SL 2022-2

36	293,904	950,381	1,244,285	All_R
37	468,878	885,778	1,354,656	All_R
38	922,248	236,012	1,158,260	All_D
39	812,149	457,996	1,270,145	All_D
40	766,207	326,544	1,092,751	All_D
41	850,482	415,696	1,266,178	All_D
42	757,957	646,989	1,404,946	All_D
43	451,463	756,626	1,208,089	All_R
44	376,606	870,996	1,247,602	All_R
45	387,858	923,707	1,311,565	All_R
46	485,091	778,603	1,263,694	All_R
47	506,107	879,610	1,385,717	All_R
48	466,781	847,798	1,314,579	All_R
49	843,968	495,959	1,339,927	All_D
50	494,549	880,367	1,374,916	All_R
Total	30,807,813	31,931,889	62,739,702	
Seats	22	28	50	
Pct of Seats	44.00%	56.00%		
Pct of Votes	49.10%	50.90%		

Exhibit 2

User:

Plan Name: **SL 2022-2**

Plan Type: **Senate**

Efficiency Gap

Thursday, February 17, 2022

8:02 PM

Efficiency Gap 3.98%

District	Votes Cast		Total	Votes Wasted		Winner
	All_D	All_R		All_D	All_R	
1	523,693	824,338	1,348,031	523,693	150,322	All_R
2	524,271	713,323	1,237,594	524,271	94,525	All_R
3	650,452	585,706	1,236,158	32,372	585,706	All_D
4	582,979	634,073	1,217,052	582,979	25,546	All_R
5	746,038	557,838	1,303,876	94,099	557,838	All_D
6	279,219	518,288	797,507	279,219	119,534	All_R
7	681,351	702,262	1,383,613	681,351	10,455	All_R
8	554,218	846,204	1,400,422	554,218	145,992	All_R
9	484,570	727,204	1,211,774	484,570	121,316	All_R
10	472,409	773,210	1,245,619	472,409	150,400	All_R
11	651,045	625,284	1,276,329	12,880	625,284	All_D
12	409,349	602,184	1,011,533	409,349	96,417	All_R
13	835,040	491,732	1,326,772	171,653	491,732	All_D
14	816,636	328,371	1,145,007	244,132	328,371	All_D
15	837,117	416,153	1,253,270	210,481	416,153	All_D
16	782,128	428,100	1,210,228	177,013	428,100	All_D
17	642,402	629,341	1,271,743	6,530	629,341	All_D
18	661,236	642,860	1,304,096	9,187	642,860	All_D
19	647,141	517,782	1,164,923	64,679	517,782	All_D
20	973,682	388,376	1,362,058	292,652	388,376	All_D
21	575,722	594,278	1,170,000	575,722	9,277	All_R
22	978,471	266,878	1,245,349	355,796	266,878	All_D
23	897,636	478,847	1,376,483	209,394	478,847	All_D
24	468,441	473,374	941,815	468,441	2,466	All_R
25	507,107	745,154	1,252,261	507,107	119,023	All_R
26	594,175	805,663	1,399,838	594,175	105,743	All_R
27	692,682	524,156	1,216,838	84,262	524,156	All_D
28	897,460	297,765	1,195,225	299,847	297,765	All_D
29	415,884	846,644	1,262,528	415,884	215,379	All_R
30	352,260	953,004	1,305,264	352,260	300,371	All_R
31	559,664	702,570	1,262,234	559,664	71,452	All_R
32	792,222	539,039	1,331,261	126,591	539,039	All_D
33	372,021	854,616	1,226,637	372,021	241,297	All_R
34	566,392	695,062	1,261,454	566,392	64,334	All_R
35	498,452	849,148	1,347,600	498,452	175,347	All_R

Efficiency Gap

SL 2022-2

District	Votes Cast		Total	Votes Wasted		Winner
	All_D	All_R		All_D	All_R	
36	293,904	950,381	1,244,285	293,904	328,238	All_R
37	468,878	885,778	1,354,656	468,878	208,449	All_R
38	922,248	236,012	1,158,260	343,117	236,012	All_D
39	812,149	457,996	1,270,145	177,076	457,996	All_D
40	766,207	326,544	1,092,751	219,831	326,544	All_D
41	850,482	415,696	1,266,178	217,392	415,696	All_D
42	757,957	646,989	1,404,946	55,483	646,989	All_D
43	451,463	756,626	1,208,089	451,463	152,581	All_R
44	376,606	870,996	1,247,602	376,606	247,194	All_R
45	387,858	923,707	1,311,565	387,858	267,924	All_R
46	485,091	778,603	1,263,694	485,091	146,755	All_R
47	506,107	879,610	1,385,717	506,107	186,751	All_R
48	466,781	847,798	1,314,579	466,781	190,508	All_R
49	843,968	495,959	1,339,927	174,004	495,959	All_D
50	494,549	880,367	1,374,916	494,549	192,908	All_R
Total	30,807,813	31,931,889	62,739,702	16,931,885	14,437,928	

Summary	All_D	All_R	Total
Seats	22	28	50
Pct of Seats	44.00%	56.00%	
Pct of Votes	49.10%	50.90%	

Exhibit 3

User:

Plan Name: SL 2022-3

Plan Type: Congressional

Measures of Political Asymmetry

Thursday, February 17, 2022

8:28 PM

Declination 0.07**Mean-Median Difference 0.61%**

District	Votes Cast		Total	Winner
	All_D	All_R		
1	2,428,655	2,038,033	4,466,688	All_D
2	3,043,597	1,701,559	4,745,156	All_D
3	1,669,295	2,623,827	4,293,122	All_R
4	3,099,498	1,535,447	4,634,945	All_D
5	1,994,671	2,534,345	4,529,016	All_R
6	2,175,278	2,167,272	4,342,550	All_D
7	2,252,688	2,222,132	4,474,820	All_D
8	1,843,129	2,564,638	4,407,767	All_R
9	1,651,614	2,638,368	4,289,982	All_R
10	1,340,680	3,242,871	4,583,551	All_R
11	2,216,635	2,744,117	4,960,752	All_R
12	2,851,759	1,407,069	4,258,828	All_D
13	2,147,774	2,293,003	4,440,777	All_R
14	2,092,540	2,219,208	4,311,748	All_R
Total	30,807,813	31,931,889	62,739,702	
Seats	6	8	14	
Pct of Seats	42.86%	57.14%		
Pct of Votes	49.10%	50.90%		

Exhibit 4

User:

Plan Name: **SL 2022-3**

Plan Type: **Congressional**

Efficiency Gap

Thursday, February 17, 2022

8:22 PM

Efficiency Gap 5.30%

District	Votes Cast		Total	Votes Wasted		Winner
	All_D	All_R		All_D	All_R	
1	2,428,655	2,038,033	4,466,688	195,310	2,038,033	All_D
2	3,043,597	1,701,559	4,745,156	671,018	1,701,559	All_D
3	1,669,295	2,623,827	4,293,122	1,669,295	477,265	All_R
4	3,099,498	1,535,447	4,634,945	782,025	1,535,447	All_D
5	1,994,671	2,534,345	4,529,016	1,994,671	269,836	All_R
6	2,175,278	2,167,272	4,342,550	4,002	2,167,272	All_D
7	2,252,688	2,222,132	4,474,820	15,277	2,222,132	All_D
8	1,843,129	2,564,638	4,407,767	1,843,129	360,754	All_R
9	1,651,614	2,638,368	4,289,982	1,651,614	493,376	All_R
10	1,340,680	3,242,871	4,583,551	1,340,680	951,095	All_R
11	2,216,635	2,744,117	4,960,752	2,216,635	263,740	All_R
12	2,851,759	1,407,069	4,258,828	722,344	1,407,069	All_D
13	2,147,774	2,293,003	4,440,777	2,147,774	72,614	All_R
14	2,092,540	2,219,208	4,311,748	2,092,540	63,333	All_R
Total	30,807,813	31,931,889	62,739,702	17,346,314	14,023,525	

Summary	All_D	All_R	Total
Seats	6	8	14
Pct of Seats	42.86%	57.14%	
Pct of Votes	49.10%	50.90%	

Exhibit 5

User:

Plan Name: SL 2022-4

Plan Type: House

Measures of Political Asymmetry

Thursday, February 17, 2022

7:41 PM

Declination 0.03

Mean-Median Difference 0.71%

District	Votes Cast		Total	Winner
	All_D	All_R		
1	214,536	348,741	563,277	All_R
2	325,176	258,937	584,113	All_D
3	214,699	311,361	526,060	All_R
4	176,811	259,413	436,224	All_R
5	247,027	238,212	485,239	All_D
6	157,898	206,402	364,300	All_R
7	235,613	307,620	543,233	All_R
8	280,409	201,827	482,236	All_D
9	269,756	252,109	521,865	All_D
10	213,782	250,582	464,364	All_R
11	317,582	167,752	485,334	All_D
12	234,806	260,733	495,539	All_R
13	174,625	390,131	564,756	All_R
14	100,067	166,809	266,876	All_R
15	147,050	256,692	403,742	All_R
16	168,684	342,506	511,190	All_R
17	245,293	386,257	631,550	All_R
18	320,242	264,481	584,723	All_D
19	258,165	408,947	667,112	All_R
20	295,084	302,093	597,177	All_R
21	300,833	151,946	452,779	All_D
22	222,009	305,760	527,769	All_R
23	338,036	220,319	558,355	All_D
24	260,419	243,984	504,403	All_D
25	301,661	276,125	577,786	All_D
26	229,146	312,207	541,353	All_R
27	320,515	199,142	519,657	All_D
28	153,352	300,467	453,819	All_R
29	529,444	108,446	637,890	All_D
30	470,279	83,290	553,569	All_D
31	425,063	103,964	529,027	All_D
32	276,748	211,010	487,758	All_D
33	337,490	203,383	540,873	All_D
34	377,691	241,448	619,139	All_D
35	291,455	282,625	574,080	All_D

Measures of Political Asymmetry

SL 2022-4

36	315,392	251,720	567,112	All_D
37	271,283	306,890	578,173	All_R
38	428,387	78,667	507,054	All_D
39	318,659	203,362	522,021	All_D
40	366,534	313,170	679,704	All_D
41	365,018	217,784	582,802	All_D
42	228,720	94,241	322,961	All_D
43	240,755	246,897	487,652	All_R
44	275,975	168,027	444,002	All_D
45	242,153	180,256	422,409	All_D
46	174,860	283,485	458,345	All_R
47	184,308	189,096	373,404	All_R
48	226,058	187,481	413,539	All_D
49	374,643	185,900	560,543	All_D
50	332,806	251,919	584,725	All_D
51	180,230	267,069	447,299	All_R
52	213,203	280,257	493,460	All_R
53	191,687	351,574	543,261	All_R
54	316,332	278,241	594,573	All_D
55	193,026	276,082	469,108	All_R
56	463,008	80,041	543,049	All_D
57	345,131	259,975	605,106	All_D
58	360,459	136,573	497,032	All_D
59	287,628	284,115	571,743	All_D
60	296,373	181,222	477,595	All_D
61	388,000	96,994	484,994	All_D
62	313,821	313,656	627,477	All_D
63	237,380	218,474	455,854	All_D
64	211,390	314,300	525,690	All_R
65	192,905	355,049	547,954	All_R
66	335,927	143,404	479,331	All_D
67	151,617	383,164	534,781	All_R
68	218,596	352,674	571,270	All_R
69	195,807	366,405	562,212	All_R
70	122,738	381,906	504,644	All_R
71	319,829	132,618	452,447	All_D
72	344,653	116,751	461,404	All_D
73	254,345	243,312	497,657	All_D
74	289,000	321,396	610,396	All_R
75	228,551	287,623	516,174	All_R
76	195,349	309,623	504,972	All_R
77	143,142	445,085	588,227	All_R
78	149,371	427,798	577,169	All_R
79	223,188	351,284	574,472	All_R
80	130,456	382,511	512,967	All_R

Measures of Political Asymmetry

SL 2022-4

81	143,390	358,950	502,340	All_R
82	241,835	280,881	522,716	All_R
83	145,216	414,232	559,448	All_R
84	169,642	333,672	503,314	All_R
85	154,662	411,419	566,081	All_R
86	159,534	351,115	510,649	All_R
87	139,551	380,915	520,466	All_R
88	328,882	153,616	482,498	All_D
89	139,156	404,311	543,467	All_R
90	114,185	339,194	453,379	All_R
91	169,853	383,221	553,074	All_R
92	328,452	147,413	475,865	All_D
93	247,156	332,242	579,398	All_R
94	132,851	428,938	561,789	All_R
95	188,063	357,857	545,920	All_R
96	188,838	325,413	514,251	All_R
97	153,832	411,096	564,928	All_R
98	269,620	291,160	560,780	All_R
99	301,307	57,897	359,204	All_D
100	281,431	93,471	374,902	All_D
101	339,336	105,561	444,897	All_D
102	393,147	112,184	505,331	All_D
103	303,463	296,661	600,124	All_D
104	312,073	274,779	586,852	All_D
105	298,012	237,929	535,941	All_D
106	353,747	159,990	513,737	All_D
107	391,771	84,757	476,528	All_D
108	158,371	319,588	477,959	All_R
109	216,495	316,078	532,573	All_R
110	165,479	336,224	501,703	All_R
111	162,815	364,242	527,057	All_R
112	293,080	187,111	480,191	All_D
113	196,303	383,295	579,598	All_R
114	415,700	220,170	635,870	All_D
115	317,134	258,920	576,054	All_D
116	366,512	252,202	618,714	All_D
117	249,706	373,736	623,442	All_R
118	215,411	349,015	564,426	All_R
119	242,513	313,326	555,839	All_R
120	149,150	405,316	554,466	All_R
Total	30,807,813	31,931,889	62,739,702	
Seats	57	63	120	
Pct of Seats	47.50%	52.50%		
Pct of Votes	49.10%	50.90%		

Exhibit 6

User:

Plan Name: **SL 2022-4**Plan Type: **House****Efficiency Gap**

Thursday, February 17, 2022

7:47 PM

Efficiency Gap 0.84%

District	Votes Cast		Total	Votes Wasted		Winner
	All_D	All_R		All_D	All_R	
1	214,536	348,741	563,277	214,536	67,102	All_R
2	325,176	258,937	584,113	33,119	258,937	All_D
3	214,699	311,361	526,060	214,699	48,330	All_R
4	176,811	259,413	436,224	176,811	41,300	All_R
5	247,027	238,212	485,239	4,407	238,212	All_D
6	157,898	206,402	364,300	157,898	24,251	All_R
7	235,613	307,620	543,233	235,613	36,003	All_R
8	280,409	201,827	482,236	39,290	201,827	All_D
9	269,756	252,109	521,865	8,823	252,109	All_D
10	213,782	250,582	464,364	213,782	18,399	All_R
11	317,582	167,752	485,334	74,914	167,752	All_D
12	234,806	260,733	495,539	234,806	12,963	All_R
13	174,625	390,131	564,756	174,625	107,752	All_R
14	100,067	166,809	266,876	100,067	33,370	All_R
15	147,050	256,692	403,742	147,050	54,820	All_R
16	168,684	342,506	511,190	168,684	86,910	All_R
17	245,293	386,257	631,550	245,293	70,481	All_R
18	320,242	264,481	584,723	27,880	264,481	All_D
19	258,165	408,947	667,112	258,165	75,390	All_R
20	295,084	302,093	597,177	295,084	3,504	All_R
21	300,833	151,946	452,779	74,443	151,946	All_D
22	222,009	305,760	527,769	222,009	41,875	All_R
23	338,036	220,319	558,355	58,858	220,319	All_D
24	260,419	243,984	504,403	8,217	243,984	All_D
25	301,661	276,125	577,786	12,767	276,125	All_D
26	229,146	312,207	541,353	229,146	41,530	All_R
27	320,515	199,142	519,657	60,686	199,142	All_D
28	153,352	300,467	453,819	153,352	73,557	All_R
29	529,444	108,446	637,890	210,498	108,446	All_D
30	470,279	83,290	553,569	193,494	83,290	All_D
31	425,063	103,964	529,027	160,549	103,964	All_D
32	276,748	211,010	487,758	32,868	211,010	All_D
33	337,490	203,383	540,873	67,053	203,383	All_D
34	377,691	241,448	619,139	68,121	241,448	All_D
35	291,455	282,625	574,080	4,414	282,625	All_D

Efficiency Gap

SL 2022-4

District	Votes Cast		Total	Votes Wasted		Winner
	All_D	All_R		All_D	All_R	
36	315,392	251,720	567,112	31,835	251,720	All_D
37	271,283	306,890	578,173	271,283	17,803	All_R
38	428,387	78,667	507,054	174,859	78,667	All_D
39	318,659	203,362	522,021	57,648	203,362	All_D
40	366,534	313,170	679,704	26,681	313,170	All_D
41	365,018	217,784	582,802	73,616	217,784	All_D
42	228,720	94,241	322,961	67,239	94,241	All_D
43	240,755	246,897	487,652	240,755	3,070	All_R
44	275,975	168,027	444,002	53,973	168,027	All_D
45	242,153	180,256	422,409	30,948	180,256	All_D
46	174,860	283,485	458,345	174,860	54,312	All_R
47	184,308	189,096	373,404	184,308	2,393	All_R
48	226,058	187,481	413,539	19,288	187,481	All_D
49	374,643	185,900	560,543	94,371	185,900	All_D
50	332,806	251,919	584,725	40,443	251,919	All_D
51	180,230	267,069	447,299	180,230	43,419	All_R
52	213,203	280,257	493,460	213,203	33,526	All_R
53	191,687	351,574	543,261	191,687	79,943	All_R
54	316,332	278,241	594,573	19,045	278,241	All_D
55	193,026	276,082	469,108	193,026	41,527	All_R
56	463,008	80,041	543,049	191,483	80,041	All_D
57	345,131	259,975	605,106	42,577	259,975	All_D
58	360,459	136,573	497,032	111,942	136,573	All_D
59	287,628	284,115	571,743	1,756	284,115	All_D
60	296,373	181,222	477,595	57,575	181,222	All_D
61	388,000	96,994	484,994	145,502	96,994	All_D
62	313,821	313,656	627,477	82	313,656	All_D
63	237,380	218,474	455,854	9,452	218,474	All_D
64	211,390	314,300	525,690	211,390	51,454	All_R
65	192,905	355,049	547,954	192,905	81,071	All_R
66	335,927	143,404	479,331	96,261	143,404	All_D
67	151,617	383,164	534,781	151,617	115,773	All_R
68	218,596	352,674	571,270	218,596	67,038	All_R
69	195,807	366,405	562,212	195,807	85,298	All_R
70	122,738	381,906	504,644	122,738	129,583	All_R
71	319,829	132,618	452,447	93,605	132,618	All_D
72	344,653	116,751	461,404	113,950	116,751	All_D
73	254,345	243,312	497,657	5,516	243,312	All_D
74	289,000	321,396	610,396	289,000	16,197	All_R
75	228,551	287,623	516,174	228,551	29,535	All_R
76	195,349	309,623	504,972	195,349	57,136	All_R
77	143,142	445,085	588,227	143,142	150,971	All_R

Efficiency Gap

SL 2022-4

District	Votes Cast		Total	Votes Wasted		Winner
	All_D	All_R		All_D	All_R	
78	149,371	427,798	577,169	149,371	139,213	All_R
79	223,188	351,284	574,472	223,188	64,047	All_R
80	130,456	382,511	512,967	130,456	126,027	All_R
81	143,390	358,950	502,340	143,390	107,779	All_R
82	241,835	280,881	522,716	241,835	19,522	All_R
83	145,216	414,232	559,448	145,216	134,507	All_R
84	169,642	333,672	503,314	169,642	82,014	All_R
85	154,662	411,419	566,081	154,662	128,378	All_R
86	159,534	351,115	510,649	159,534	95,790	All_R
87	139,551	380,915	520,466	139,551	120,681	All_R
88	328,882	153,616	482,498	87,632	153,616	All_D
89	139,156	404,311	543,467	139,156	132,577	All_R
90	114,185	339,194	453,379	114,185	112,504	All_R
91	169,853	383,221	553,074	169,853	106,683	All_R
92	328,452	147,413	475,865	90,519	147,413	All_D
93	247,156	332,242	579,398	247,156	42,542	All_R
94	132,851	428,938	561,789	132,851	148,043	All_R
95	188,063	357,857	545,920	188,063	84,896	All_R
96	188,838	325,413	514,251	188,838	68,287	All_R
97	153,832	411,096	564,928	153,832	128,631	All_R
98	269,620	291,160	560,780	269,620	10,769	All_R
99	301,307	57,897	359,204	121,704	57,897	All_D
100	281,431	93,471	374,902	93,979	93,471	All_D
101	339,336	105,561	444,897	116,887	105,561	All_D
102	393,147	112,184	505,331	140,481	112,184	All_D
103	303,463	296,661	600,124	3,400	296,661	All_D
104	312,073	274,779	586,852	18,646	274,779	All_D
105	298,012	237,929	535,941	30,041	237,929	All_D
106	353,747	159,990	513,737	96,878	159,990	All_D
107	391,771	84,757	476,528	153,506	84,757	All_D
108	158,371	319,588	477,959	158,371	80,608	All_R
109	216,495	316,078	532,573	216,495	49,791	All_R
110	165,479	336,224	501,703	165,479	85,372	All_R
111	162,815	364,242	527,057	162,815	100,713	All_R
112	293,080	187,111	480,191	52,984	187,111	All_D
113	196,303	383,295	579,598	196,303	93,495	All_R
114	415,700	220,170	635,870	97,764	220,170	All_D
115	317,134	258,920	576,054	29,106	258,920	All_D
116	366,512	252,202	618,714	57,154	252,202	All_D
117	249,706	373,736	623,442	249,706	62,014	All_R
118	215,411	349,015	564,426	215,411	66,801	All_R
119	242,513	313,326	555,839	242,513	35,406	All_R

Efficiency Gap

SL 2022-4

District	Votes Cast		Total	Votes Wasted		Winner
	All_D	All_R		All_D	All_R	
120	149,150	405,316	554,466	149,150	128,082	All_R
Total	30,807,813	31,931,889	62,739,702	15,947,438	15,422,322	
Summary	All_D	All_R	Total			
Seats	57	63	120			
Pct of Seats	47.50%	52.50%				
Pct of Votes	49.10%	50.90%				

NCLCV Congressional Map Block Assignment File (Exhibit D to NCLCV
Plaintiffs' Brief on Proposed Remedial Plans)*†

* Corresponding csv files and shapefiles are submitted to the Court in native file via flash drive.

† Maptitude or an equivalent program is required to open these files.

NCLCV Senate Map Block Assignment File (Exhibit E to NCLCV Plaintiffs'
Brief on Proposed Remedial Plans)*†

* Corresponding csv files and shapefiles are submitted to the Court in native file via flash drive.

† Maptitude or an equivalent program is required to open these files.

NCLCV Congressional Map Shapefile (Exhibit G to NCLCV Plaintiffs' Brief
on Proposed Remedial Plans)*†

* Corresponding csv files and shapefiles are submitted to the Court in native file via flash drive.

† Maptitude or an equivalent program is required to open these files.

NCLCV Senate Map Shapefile (Exhibit H to NCLCV Plaintiffs' Brief on
Proposed Remedial Plans)*†

* Corresponding csv files and shapefiles are submitted to the Court in native file via flash drive.

† Maptitude or an equivalent program is required to open these files.

EXHIBIT J

User:

Plan Name: **NCLCV Congressional Map**

Plan Type:

Population Summary

Tuesday, February 15, 2022

2:35 PM

District	Population	Deviation	% Devn.
1	745,671	0	0.00%
2	745,670	-1	0.00%
3	745,671	0	0.00%
4	745,671	0	0.00%
5	745,671	0	0.00%
6	745,671	0	0.00%
7	745,671	0	0.00%
8	745,670	-1	0.00%
9	745,670	-1	0.00%
10	745,670	-1	0.00%
11	745,671	0	0.00%
12	745,670	-1	0.00%
13	745,671	0	0.00%
14	745,670	-1	0.00%

Total Population: 10,439,388

Ideal District Population: 745,671

Summary Statistics:

Population Range: 745,670 to 745,671

Ratio Range: 0.00

Absolute Range: -1 to

Absolute Overall Range: 1

Relative Range: 0.00% to 0.00%

Relative Overall Range: 0.00%

Absolute Mean Deviation: 0.43

Relative Mean Deviation: 0.00%

Standard Deviation: 0.49

EXHIBIT K

User:

Plan Name: **NCLCV Senate Map**

Plan Type:

Population Summary

Tuesday, February 15, 2022

2:38 PM

District	Population	Deviation	% Devn.
1	198,430	-10,358	-4.96%
2	199,750	-9,038	-4.33%
3	200,494	-8,294	-3.97%
4	216,568	7,780	3.73%
5	219,143	10,355	4.96%
6	204,576	-4,212	-2.02%
7	198,465	-10,323	-4.94%
8	214,553	5,765	2.76%
9	202,791	-5,997	-2.87%
10	215,999	7,211	3.45%
11	206,121	-2,667	-1.28%
12	200,794	-7,994	-3.83%
13	198,376	-10,412	-4.99%
14	198,394	-10,394	-4.98%
15	198,361	-10,427	-4.99%
16	198,366	-10,422	-4.99%
17	198,465	-10,323	-4.94%
18	198,440	-10,348	-4.96%
19	216,471	7,683	3.68%
20	201,264	-7,524	-3.60%
21	217,984	9,196	4.40%
22	199,854	-8,934	-4.28%
23	210,529	1,741	0.83%
24	202,786	-6,002	-2.87%
25	217,906	9,118	4.37%
26	208,430	-358	-0.17%
27	207,951	-837	-0.40%
28	216,014	7,226	3.46%
29	217,124	8,336	3.99%
30	211,642	2,854	1.37%
31	210,312	1,524	0.73%
32	209,492	704	0.34%
33	209,379	591	0.28%
34	216,895	8,107	3.88%
35	218,484	9,696	4.64%
36	218,292	9,504	4.55%
37	215,170	6,382	3.06%
38	218,872	10,084	4.83%

Population Summary

NCLCV Senate

District	Population	Deviation	% Devn.
39	217,776	8,988	4.30%
40	217,840	9,052	4.34%
41	216,594	7,806	3.74%
42	215,923	7,135	3.42%
43	201,611	-7,177	-3.44%
44	208,541	-247	-0.12%
45	217,416	8,628	4.13%
46	200,712	-8,076	-3.87%
47	211,521	2,733	1.31%
48	202,689	-6,099	-2.92%
49	202,372	-6,416	-3.07%
50	213,456	4,668	2.24%

Total Population: 10,439,388

Ideal District Population: 208,788

Summary Statistics:

Population Range: 198,361 to 219,143

Ratio Range: 0.10

Absolute Range: -10,427 to 10,355

Absolute Overall Range: 20,782

Relative Range: -4.00% to 4.96%

Relative Overall Range: 9.95%

Absolute Mean Deviation: 6,914.92

Relative Mean Deviation: 3.31%

Standard Deviation: 7,604.51

EXHIBIT M

NCLCV Congressional Map
Statistical Reports

County-District Report

County	District	Total County Population	Total District Population	County_Pop_in_District	% County Pop in District	% District Pop in County
ALAMANCE	6	171415	745671	171415	100.0	22.99
ALEXANDER	12	36444	745670	36444	100.0	4.89
ALLEGHANY	12	10888	745670	10888	100.0	1.46
ANSON	8	22055	745670	22055	100.0	2.96
ASHE	12	26577	745670	26577	100.0	3.56
AVERY	12	17806	745670	17806	100.0	2.39
BEAUFORT	1	44652	745671	44652	100.0	5.99
BERTIE	1	17934	745671	17934	100.0	2.41
BLADEN	4	29606	745671	29606	100.0	3.97
BRUNSWICK	3	136693	745671	136693	100.0	18.33
BUNCOMBE	14	269452	745670	269452	100.0	36.14
BURKE	13	87570	745671	87570	100.0	11.74
CABARRUS	8	225804	745670	35841	15.87	4.81
CABARRUS	10	225804	745670	189963	84.13	25.48
CALDWELL	12	80652	745670	57620	71.44	7.73
CALDWELL	13	80652	745671	23032	28.56	3.09
CAMDEN	1	10355	745671	10355	100.0	1.39
CARTERET	3	67686	745671	67686	100.0	9.08
CASWELL	6	22736	745671	22736	100.0	3.05
CATAWBA	13	160610	745671	160610	100.0	21.54
CHATHAM	7	76285	745671	76285	100.0	10.23
CHEROKEE	14	28774	745670	28774	100.0	3.86
CHOWAN	1	13708	745671	13708	100.0	1.84
CLAY	14	11089	745670	11089	100.0	1.49
CLEVELAND	13	99519	745671	99519	100.0	13.35
COLUMBUS	3	50623	745671	50623	100.0	6.79
CRAVEN	1	100720	745671	100532	99.81	13.48
CRAVEN	3	100720	745671	188	0.19	0.03
CUMBERLAND	4	334728	745671	334728	100.0	44.89
CURRITUCK	1	28100	745671	28100	100.0	3.77
DARE	1	36915	745671	36915	100.0	4.95
DAVIDSON	8	168930	745670	168930	100.0	22.65
DAVIE	8	42712	745670	42712	100.0	5.73
DUPLIN	4	48715	745671	48715	100.0	6.53

DURHAM	2	324833	745670	52202	16.07	7.0
DURHAM	6	324833	745671	272631	83.93	36.56
EDGECOMBE	1	48900	745671	2063	4.22	0.28
EDGECOMBE	2	48900	745670	46837	95.78	6.28
FORSYTH	11	382590	745671	60201	15.74	8.07
FORSYTH	12	382590	745670	322389	84.26	43.23
FRANKLIN	2	68573	745670	68573	100.0	9.2
GASTON	13	227943	745671	227943	100.0	30.57
GATES	1	10478	745671	10478	100.0	1.41
GRAHAM	14	8030	745670	8030	100.0	1.08
GRANVILLE	2	60992	745670	60992	100.0	8.18
GREENE	1	20451	745671	20451	100.0	2.74
GUILFORD	11	541299	745671	541299	100.0	72.59
HALIFAX	2	48622	745670	48622	100.0	6.52
HARNETT	4	133568	745671	10933	8.19	1.47
HARNETT	7	133568	745671	122635	91.81	16.45
HAYWOOD	14	62089	745670	62089	100.0	8.33
HENDERSON	14	116281	745670	116281	100.0	15.59
HERTFORD	1	21552	745671	21552	100.0	2.89
HOKE	4	52082	745671	52082	100.0	6.98
HYDE	1	4589	745671	4589	100.0	0.62
IREDELL	10	186693	745670	185895	99.57	24.93
IREDELL	12	186693	745670	798	0.43	0.11
JACKSON	14	43109	745670	43109	100.0	5.78
JOHNSTON	2	215999	745670	215999	100.0	28.97
JONES	1	9172	745671	9172	100.0	1.23
LEE	7	63285	745671	63285	100.0	8.49
LENOIR	1	55122	745671	55122	100.0	7.39
LINCOLN	13	86810	745671	86810	100.0	11.64
MACON	14	37014	745670	37014	100.0	4.96
MADISON	14	21193	745670	21193	100.0	2.84
MARTIN	1	22031	745671	22031	100.0	2.95
MCDOWELL	14	44578	745670	44578	100.0	5.98
MECKLENBURG	9	1115482	745670	745670	66.85	100.0
MECKLENBURG	10	1115482	745670	369812	33.15	49.59
MITCHELL	14	14903	745670	14903	100.0	2.0
MONTGOMERY	8	25751	745670	25751	100.0	3.45
MOORE	7	99727	745671	99727	100.0	13.37

NASH	2	94970	745670	94970	100.0	12.74
NEW HANOVER	3	225702	745671	225702	100.0	30.27
NORTHAMPTON	2	17471	745670	17471	100.0	2.34
ONSLOW	3	204576	745671	204576	100.0	27.44
ORANGE	6	148696	745671	148696	100.0	19.94
PAMLICO	1	12276	745671	12276	100.0	1.65
PASQUOTANK	1	40568	745671	40568	100.0	5.44
PENDER	3	60203	745671	60203	100.0	8.07
PERQUIMANS	1	13005	745671	13005	100.0	1.74
PERSON	6	39097	745671	39097	100.0	5.24
PITT	1	170243	745671	170243	100.0	22.83
POLK	14	19328	745670	19328	100.0	2.59
RANDOLPH	11	144171	745671	144171	100.0	19.33
RICHMOND	4	42946	745671	40211	93.63	5.39
RICHMOND	8	42946	745670	2735	6.37	0.37
ROBESON	4	116530	745671	116530	100.0	15.63
ROCKINGHAM	6	91096	745671	91096	100.0	12.22
ROWAN	8	146875	745670	146875	100.0	19.7
RUTHERFORD	13	64444	745671	60187	93.39	8.07
RUTHERFORD	14	64444	745670	4257	6.61	0.57
SAMPSON	4	59036	745671	59036	100.0	7.92
SCOTLAND	4	34174	745671	34174	100.0	4.58
STANLY	8	62504	745670	62504	100.0	8.38
STOKES	12	44520	745670	44520	100.0	5.97
SURRY	12	71359	745670	71359	100.0	9.57
SWAIN	14	14117	745670	14117	100.0	1.89
TRANSYLVANIA	14	32986	745670	32986	100.0	4.42
TYRRELL	1	3245	745671	3245	100.0	0.44
UNION	8	238267	745670	238267	100.0	31.95
VANCE	2	42578	745670	42578	100.0	5.71
WAKE	5	1129410	745671	745671	66.02	100.0
WAKE	7	1129410	745671	383739	33.98	51.46
WARREN	2	18642	745670	18642	100.0	2.5
WASHINGTON	1	11003	745671	11003	100.0	1.48
WATAUGA	12	54086	745670	54086	100.0	7.25
WAYNE	1	117333	745671	97677	83.25	13.1
WAYNE	4	117333	745671	19656	16.75	2.64
WILKES	12	65969	745670	65969	100.0	8.85

WILSON	2	78784	745670	78784	100.0	10.57
YADKIN	12	37214	745670	37214	100.0	4.99
YANCEY	14	18470	745670	18470	100.0	2.48

District-County Report

District	County	Total District Population	Total County Population	District Pop in County	% District Pop in County	% County Pop in District
1	BEAUFORT	745671	44652	44652	5.99	100.0
1	BERTIE	745671	17934	17934	2.41	100.0
1	CAMDEN	745671	10355	10355	1.39	100.0
1	CHOWAN	745671	13708	13708	1.84	100.0
1	CRAVEN	745671	100720	100532	13.48	99.81
1	CURRITUCK	745671	28100	28100	3.77	100.0
1	DARE	745671	36915	36915	4.95	100.0
1	EDGECOMBE	745671	48900	2063	0.28	4.22
1	GATES	745671	10478	10478	1.41	100.0
1	GREENE	745671	20451	20451	2.74	100.0
1	HERTFORD	745671	21552	21552	2.89	100.0
1	HYDE	745671	4589	4589	0.62	100.0
1	JONES	745671	9172	9172	1.23	100.0
1	LENOIR	745671	55122	55122	7.39	100.0
1	MARTIN	745671	22031	22031	2.95	100.0
1	PAMLICO	745671	12276	12276	1.65	100.0
1	PASQUOTANK	745671	40568	40568	5.44	100.0
1	PERQUIMANS	745671	13005	13005	1.74	100.0
1	PITT	745671	170243	170243	22.83	100.0
1	TYRRELL	745671	3245	3245	0.44	100.0
1	WASHINGTON	745671	11003	11003	1.48	100.0
1	WAYNE	745671	117333	97677	13.1	83.25
2	DURHAM	745670	324833	52202	7.0	16.07
2	EDGECOMBE	745670	48900	46837	6.28	95.78
2	FRANKLIN	745670	68573	68573	9.2	100.0
2	GRANVILLE	745670	60992	60992	8.18	100.0
2	HALIFAX	745670	48622	48622	6.52	100.0
2	JOHNSTON	745670	215999	215999	28.97	100.0
2	NASH	745670	94970	94970	12.74	100.0
2	NORTHAMPTON	745670	17471	17471	2.34	100.0
2	VANCE	745670	42578	42578	5.71	100.0
2	WARREN	745670	18642	18642	2.5	100.0
2	WILSON	745670	78784	78784	10.57	100.0
3	BRUNSWICK	745671	136693	136693	18.33	100.0

3	CARTERET	745671	67686	67686	9.08	100.0
3	COLUMBUS	745671	50623	50623	6.79	100.0
3	CRAVEN	745671	100720	188	0.03	0.19
3	NEW HANOVER	745671	225702	225702	30.27	100.0
3	ONSLOW	745671	204576	204576	27.44	100.0
3	PENDER	745671	60203	60203	8.07	100.0
4	BLADEN	745671	29606	29606	3.97	100.0
4	CUMBERLAND	745671	334728	334728	44.89	100.0
4	DUPLIN	745671	48715	48715	6.53	100.0
4	HARNETT	745671	133568	10933	1.47	8.19
4	HOKE	745671	52082	52082	6.98	100.0
4	RICHMOND	745671	42946	40211	5.39	93.63
4	ROBESON	745671	116530	116530	15.63	100.0
4	SAMPSON	745671	59036	59036	7.92	100.0
4	SCOTLAND	745671	34174	34174	4.58	100.0
4	WAYNE	745671	117333	19656	2.64	16.75
5	WAKE	745671	1129410	745671	100.0	66.02
6	ALAMANCE	745671	171415	171415	22.99	100.0
6	CASWELL	745671	22736	22736	3.05	100.0
6	DURHAM	745671	324833	272631	36.56	83.93
6	ORANGE	745671	148696	148696	19.94	100.0
6	PERSON	745671	39097	39097	5.24	100.0
6	ROCKINGHAM	745671	91096	91096	12.22	100.0
7	CHATHAM	745671	76285	76285	10.23	100.0
7	HARNETT	745671	133568	122635	16.45	91.81
7	LEE	745671	63285	63285	8.49	100.0
7	MOORE	745671	99727	99727	13.37	100.0
7	WAKE	745671	1129410	383739	51.46	33.98
8	ANSON	745670	22055	22055	2.96	100.0
8	CABARRUS	745670	225804	35841	4.81	15.87
8	DAVIDSON	745670	168930	168930	22.65	100.0
8	DAVIE	745670	42712	42712	5.73	100.0
8	MONTGOMERY	745670	25751	25751	3.45	100.0
8	RICHMOND	745670	42946	2735	0.37	6.37
8	ROWAN	745670	146875	146875	19.7	100.0
8	STANLY	745670	62504	62504	8.38	100.0
8	UNION	745670	238267	238267	31.95	100.0
9	MECKLENBURG	745670	1115482	745670	100.0	66.85

10	CABARRUS	745670	225804	189963	25.48	84.13
10	IREDELL	745670	186693	185895	24.93	99.57
10	MECKLENBURG	745670	1115482	369812	49.59	33.15
11	FORSYTH	745671	382590	60201	8.07	15.74
11	GUILFORD	745671	541299	541299	72.59	100.0
11	RANDOLPH	745671	144171	144171	19.33	100.0
12	ALEXANDER	745670	36444	36444	4.89	100.0
12	ALLEGHANY	745670	10888	10888	1.46	100.0
12	ASHE	745670	26577	26577	3.56	100.0
12	AVERY	745670	17806	17806	2.39	100.0
12	CALDWELL	745670	80652	57620	7.73	71.44
12	FORSYTH	745670	382590	322389	43.23	84.26
12	IREDELL	745670	186693	798	0.11	0.43
12	STOKES	745670	44520	44520	5.97	100.0
12	SURRY	745670	71359	71359	9.57	100.0
12	WATAUGA	745670	54086	54086	7.25	100.0
12	WILKES	745670	65969	65969	8.85	100.0
12	YADKIN	745670	37214	37214	4.99	100.0
13	BURKE	745671	87570	87570	11.74	100.0
13	CALDWELL	745671	80652	23032	3.09	28.56
13	CATAWBA	745671	160610	160610	21.54	100.0
13	CLEVELAND	745671	99519	99519	13.35	100.0
13	GASTON	745671	227943	227943	30.57	100.0
13	LINCOLN	745671	86810	86810	11.64	100.0
13	RUTHERFORD	745671	64444	60187	8.07	93.39
14	BUNCOMBE	745670	269452	269452	36.14	100.0
14	CHEROKEE	745670	28774	28774	3.86	100.0
14	CLAY	745670	11089	11089	1.49	100.0
14	GRAHAM	745670	8030	8030	1.08	100.0
14	HAYWOOD	745670	62089	62089	8.33	100.0
14	HENDERSON	745670	116281	116281	15.59	100.0
14	JACKSON	745670	43109	43109	5.78	100.0
14	MACON	745670	37014	37014	4.96	100.0
14	MADISON	745670	21193	21193	2.84	100.0
14	MCDOWELL	745670	44578	44578	5.98	100.0
14	MITCHELL	745670	14903	14903	2.0	100.0
14	POLK	745670	19328	19328	2.59	100.0
14	RUTHERFORD	745670	64444	4257	0.57	6.61

14	SWAIN	745670	14117	14117	1.89	100.0
14	TRANSYLVANIA	745670	32986	32986	4.42	100.0
14	YANCEY	745670	18470	18470	2.48	100.0

Municipality - District Report

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	% Muni Pop in District	% District Pop in Muni
Aberdeen town	7	8516	745671	8516	100.0	1.14
Ahoskie town	1	4891	745671	4891	100.0	0.66
Alamance village	6	988	745671	988	100.0	0.13
Albemarle city	8	16432	745670	16432	100.0	2.2
Alliance town	1	733	745671	733	100.0	0.1
Andrews town	14	1667	745670	1667	100.0	0.22
Angier town	7	5265	745671	5265	100.0	0.71
Ansonville town	8	440	745670	440	100.0	0.06
Apex town	7	58780	745671	58780	100.0	7.88
Arapahoe town	1	416	745671	416	100.0	0.06
Archdale city	11	11907	745671	11907	100.0	1.6
Archer Lodge town	2	4797	745670	4797	100.0	0.64
Asheboro city	11	27156	745671	27156	100.0	3.64
Asheville city	14	94589	745670	94589	100.0	12.69
Askewville town	1	184	745671	184	100.0	0.02
Atkinson town	3	296	745671	296	100.0	0.04
Atlantic Beach town	3	1364	745671	1364	100.0	0.18
Aulander town	1	763	745671	763	100.0	0.1
Aurora town	1	455	745671	455	100.0	0.06
Autryville town	4	167	745671	167	100.0	0.02
Ayden town	1	4977	745671	4977	100.0	0.67
Badin town	8	2024	745670	2024	100.0	0.27
Bailey town	2	568	745670	568	100.0	0.08
Bakersville town	14	450	745670	450	100.0	0.06
Bald Head Island village	3	268	745671	268	100.0	0.04
Banner Elk town	12	1049	745670	1049	100.0	0.14
Bath town	1	245	745671	245	100.0	0.03
Bayboro town	1	1161	745671	1161	100.0	0.16
Bear Grass town	1	89	745671	89	100.0	0.01
Beaufort town	3	4464	745671	4464	100.0	0.6
Beech Mountain town	12	675	745670	675	100.0	0.09
Belhaven town	1	1410	745671	1410	100.0	0.19
Belmont city	13	15010	745671	15010	100.0	2.01
Belville town	3	2406	745671	2406	100.0	0.32

Belwood town	13	857	745671	857	100.0	0.11
Benson town	2	3967	745670	3967	100.0	0.53
Benson town	7	3967	745671	0	0.0	0.0
Bermuda Run town	8	3120	745670	3120	100.0	0.42
Bessemer City city	13	5428	745671	5428	100.0	0.73
Bethania town	12	344	745670	344	100.0	0.05
Bethel town	1	1373	745671	1373	100.0	0.18
Beulaville town	4	1116	745671	1116	100.0	0.15
Biltmore Forest town	14	1409	745670	1409	100.0	0.19
Biscoe town	8	1848	745670	1848	100.0	0.25
Black Creek town	2	692	745670	692	100.0	0.09
Black Mountain town	14	8426	745670	8426	100.0	1.13
Bladenboro town	4	1648	745671	1648	100.0	0.22
Blowing Rock town	12	1376	745670	1376	100.0	0.18
Boardman town	3	166	745671	166	100.0	0.02
Bogue town	3	695	745671	695	100.0	0.09
Boiling Spring Lakes city	3	5943	745671	5943	100.0	0.8
Boiling Springs town	13	4615	745671	4615	100.0	0.62
Bolivia town	3	149	745671	149	100.0	0.02
Bolton town	3	519	745671	519	100.0	0.07
Boone town	12	19092	745670	19092	100.0	2.56
Boonville town	12	1185	745670	1185	100.0	0.16
Bostic town	13	355	745671	355	100.0	0.05
Brevard city	14	7744	745670	7744	100.0	1.04
Bridgeton town	1	349	745671	349	100.0	0.05
Broadway town	7	1267	745671	1267	100.0	0.17
Brookford town	13	442	745671	442	100.0	0.06
Brunswick town	3	973	745671	973	100.0	0.13
Bryson City town	14	1558	745670	1558	100.0	0.21
Bunn town	2	327	745670	327	100.0	0.04
Burgaw town	3	3088	745671	3088	100.0	0.41
Burlington city	6	57303	745671	55481	96.82	7.44
Burlington city	11	57303	745671	1822	3.18	0.24
Burnsville town	14	1614	745670	1614	100.0	0.22
Butner town	2	8397	745670	8397	100.0	1.13
Cajah's Mountain town	12	2722	745670	2722	100.0	0.37
Calabash town	3	2011	745671	2011	100.0	0.27
Calypso town	4	327	745671	327	100.0	0.04

Cameron town	7	244	745671	244	100.0	0.03
Candor town	7	813	745671	0	0.0	0.0
Candor town	8	813	745670	813	100.0	0.11
Canton town	14	4422	745670	4422	100.0	0.59
Cape Carteret town	3	2224	745671	2224	100.0	0.3
Carolina Beach town	3	6564	745671	6564	100.0	0.88
Carolina Shores town	3	4588	745671	4588	100.0	0.62
Carrboro town	6	21295	745671	21295	100.0	2.86
Carthage town	7	2775	745671	2775	100.0	0.37
Cary town	5	174721	745671	30544	17.48	4.1
Cary town	7	174721	745671	144177	82.52	19.34
Casar town	13	305	745671	305	100.0	0.04
Castalia town	2	264	745670	264	100.0	0.04
Caswell Beach town	3	395	745671	395	100.0	0.05
Catawba town	13	702	745671	702	100.0	0.09
Cedar Point town	3	1764	745671	1764	100.0	0.24
Cedar Rock village	12	301	745670	301	100.0	0.04
Cerro Gordo town	3	131	745671	131	100.0	0.02
Chadbourn town	3	1574	745671	1574	100.0	0.21
Chapel Hill town	6	61960	745671	61960	100.0	8.31
Charlotte city	9	874579	745670	663590	75.88	88.99
Charlotte city	10	874579	745670	210989	24.12	28.3
Cherryville city	13	6078	745671	6078	100.0	0.82
Chimney Rock Village village	14	140	745670	140	100.0	0.02
China Grove town	8	4434	745670	4434	100.0	0.59
Chocowinity town	1	722	745671	722	100.0	0.1
Claremont city	13	1692	745671	1692	100.0	0.23
Clarkton town	4	614	745671	614	100.0	0.08
Clayton town	2	26307	745670	26307	100.0	3.53
Clayton town	5	26307	745671	0	0.0	0.0
Clemmons village	12	21163	745670	21163	100.0	2.84
Cleveland town	8	846	745670	846	100.0	0.11
Clinton city	4	8383	745671	8383	100.0	1.12
Clyde town	14	1368	745670	1368	100.0	0.18
Coats town	7	2155	745671	2155	100.0	0.29
Cofield village	1	267	745671	267	100.0	0.04
Colerain town	1	217	745671	217	100.0	0.03
Columbia town	1	610	745671	610	100.0	0.08

Columbus town	14	1060	745670	1060	100.0	0.14
Como town	1	67	745671	67	100.0	0.01
Concord city	8	105240	745670	2448	2.33	0.33
Concord city	10	105240	745670	102792	97.67	13.79
Conetoe town	2	198	745670	198	100.0	0.03
Connelly Springs town	13	1529	745671	1529	100.0	0.21
Conover city	13	8421	745671	8421	100.0	1.13
Conway town	2	752	745670	752	100.0	0.1
Cooleemee town	8	940	745670	940	100.0	0.13
Cornelius town	10	31412	745670	31412	100.0	4.21
Cove City town	1	378	745671	378	100.0	0.05
Cramerton town	13	5296	745671	5296	100.0	0.71
Creedmoor city	2	4866	745670	4866	100.0	0.65
Creswell town	1	207	745671	207	100.0	0.03
Crossnore town	12	143	745670	143	100.0	0.02
Dallas town	13	5927	745671	5927	100.0	0.79
Danbury town	12	189	745670	189	100.0	0.03
Davidson town	10	15106	745670	15106	100.0	2.03
Dellview town	13	6	745671	6	100.0	0.0
Denton town	8	1494	745670	1494	100.0	0.2
Dillsboro town	14	213	745670	213	100.0	0.03
Dobbins Heights town	4	687	745671	687	100.0	0.09
Dobson town	12	1462	745670	1462	100.0	0.2
Dortches town	2	1082	745670	1082	100.0	0.15
Dover town	1	349	745671	349	100.0	0.05
Drexel town	13	1760	745671	1760	100.0	0.24
Dublin town	4	267	745671	267	100.0	0.04
Duck town	1	742	745671	742	100.0	0.1
Dunn city	4	8446	745671	8446	100.0	1.13
Durham city	2	283506	745670	41474	14.63	5.56
Durham city	5	283506	745671	269	0.09	0.04
Durham city	6	283506	745671	241763	85.28	32.42
Durham city	7	283506	745671	0	0.0	0.0
Earl town	13	198	745671	198	100.0	0.03
East Arcadia town	4	418	745671	418	100.0	0.06
East Bend town	12	634	745670	634	100.0	0.09
East Laurinburg town	4	234	745671	234	100.0	0.03
East Spencer town	8	1567	745670	1567	100.0	0.21

Eastover town	4	3656	745671	3656	100.0	0.49
Eden city	6	15421	745671	15421	100.0	2.07
Edenton town	1	4460	745671	4460	100.0	0.6
Elizabeth City city	1	18631	745671	18631	100.0	2.5
Elizabethtown town	4	3296	745671	3296	100.0	0.44
Elk Park town	12	542	745670	542	100.0	0.07
Elkin town	12	4122	745670	4122	100.0	0.55
Ellenboro town	13	723	745671	723	100.0	0.1
Ellerbe town	4	864	745671	864	100.0	0.12
Elm City town	2	1218	745670	1218	100.0	0.16
Elon town	6	11336	745671	11336	100.0	1.52
Emerald Isle town	3	3847	745671	3847	100.0	0.52
Enfield town	2	1865	745670	1865	100.0	0.25
Erwin town	4	4542	745671	0	0.0	0.0
Erwin town	7	4542	745671	4542	100.0	0.61
Eureka town	1	214	745671	214	100.0	0.03
Everetts town	1	150	745671	150	100.0	0.02
Fair Bluff town	3	709	745671	709	100.0	0.1
Fairmont town	4	2191	745671	2191	100.0	0.29
Fairview town	8	3456	745670	3456	100.0	0.46
Faison town	4	784	745671	784	100.0	0.11
Faith town	8	819	745670	819	100.0	0.11
Falcon town	4	324	745671	324	100.0	0.04
Falkland town	1	47	745671	47	100.0	0.01
Fallston town	13	627	745671	627	100.0	0.08
Farmville town	1	4461	745671	4461	100.0	0.6
Fayetteville city	4	208501	745671	208501	100.0	27.96
Flat Rock village	14	3486	745670	3486	100.0	0.47
Fletcher town	14	7987	745670	7987	100.0	1.07
Fontana Dam town	14	13	745670	13	100.0	0.0
Forest City town	13	7377	745671	7377	100.0	0.99
Forest Hills village	14	303	745670	303	100.0	0.04
Fountain town	1	385	745671	385	100.0	0.05
Four Oaks town	2	2158	745670	2158	100.0	0.29
Foxfire village	7	1288	745671	1288	100.0	0.17
Franklin town	14	4175	745670	4175	100.0	0.56
Franklinton town	2	2456	745670	2456	100.0	0.33
Franklinville town	11	1197	745671	1197	100.0	0.16

Fremont town	1	1196	745671	1196	100.0	0.16
Fuquay-Varina town	7	34152	745671	34152	100.0	4.58
Gamewell town	12	3702	745670	3702	100.0	0.5
Garland town	4	595	745671	595	100.0	0.08
Garner town	5	31159	745671	28321	90.89	3.8
Garner town	7	31159	745671	2838	9.11	0.38
Garysburg town	2	904	745670	904	100.0	0.12
Gaston town	2	1008	745670	1008	100.0	0.14
Gastonia city	13	80411	745671	80411	100.0	10.78
Gatesville town	1	267	745671	267	100.0	0.04
Gibson town	4	449	745671	449	100.0	0.06
Gibsonville town	6	8920	745671	4278	47.96	0.57
Gibsonville town	11	8920	745671	4642	52.04	0.62
Glen Alpine town	13	1529	745671	1529	100.0	0.21
Godwin town	4	128	745671	128	100.0	0.02
Goldsboro city	1	33657	745671	33657	100.0	4.51
Goldston town	7	234	745671	234	100.0	0.03
Graham city	6	17157	745671	17157	100.0	2.3
Grandfather Village village	12	95	745670	95	100.0	0.01
Granite Falls town	13	4965	745671	4965	100.0	0.67
Granite Quarry town	8	2984	745670	2984	100.0	0.4
Grantsboro town	1	692	745671	692	100.0	0.09
Green Level town	6	3152	745671	3152	100.0	0.42
Greenevers town	4	567	745671	567	100.0	0.08
Greensboro city	11	299035	745671	299035	100.0	40.1
Greenville city	1	87521	745671	87521	100.0	11.74
Grifton town	1	2448	745671	2448	100.0	0.33
Grimesland town	1	386	745671	386	100.0	0.05
Grover town	13	802	745671	802	100.0	0.11
Halifax town	2	170	745670	170	100.0	0.02
Hamilton town	1	306	745671	306	100.0	0.04
Hamlet city	4	6025	745671	6025	100.0	0.81
Harmony town	10	543	745670	543	100.0	0.07
Harrells town	4	160	745671	160	100.0	0.02
Harrellsville town	1	85	745671	85	100.0	0.01
Harrisburg town	10	18967	745670	18967	100.0	2.54
Hassell town	1	49	745671	49	100.0	0.01
Havelock city	1	16621	745671	16621	100.0	2.23

Haw River town	6	2252	745671	2252	100.0	0.3
Hayesville town	14	461	745670	461	100.0	0.06
Hemby Bridge town	8	1614	745670	1614	100.0	0.22
Henderson city	2	15060	745670	15060	100.0	2.02
Hendersonville city	14	15137	745670	15137	100.0	2.03
Hertford town	1	1934	745671	1934	100.0	0.26
Hickory city	13	43490	745671	43490	100.0	5.83
High Point city	8	114059	745670	6646	5.83	0.89
High Point city	11	114059	745671	107413	94.17	14.4
High Shoals city	13	595	745671	595	100.0	0.08
Highlands town	14	1072	745670	1072	100.0	0.14
Hildebran town	13	1679	745671	1679	100.0	0.23
Hillsborough town	6	9660	745671	9660	100.0	1.3
Hobgood town	2	268	745670	268	100.0	0.04
Hoffman town	4	418	745671	418	100.0	0.06
Holden Beach town	3	921	745671	921	100.0	0.12
Holly Ridge town	3	4171	745671	4171	100.0	0.56
Holly Springs town	7	41239	745671	41239	100.0	5.53
Hookerton town	1	413	745671	413	100.0	0.06
Hope Mills town	4	17808	745671	17808	100.0	2.39
Hot Springs town	14	520	745670	520	100.0	0.07
Hudson town	12	3780	745670	3780	100.0	0.51
Huntersville town	10	61376	745670	61376	100.0	8.23
Indian Beach town	3	223	745671	223	100.0	0.03
Indian Trail town	8	39997	745670	39997	100.0	5.36
Jackson town	2	430	745670	430	100.0	0.06
Jacksonville city	3	72723	745671	72723	100.0	9.75
Jamestown town	11	3668	745671	3668	100.0	0.49
Jamesville town	1	424	745671	424	100.0	0.06
Jefferson town	12	1622	745670	1622	100.0	0.22
Jonesville town	12	2308	745670	2308	100.0	0.31
Kannapolis city	8	53114	745670	15379	28.95	2.06
Kannapolis city	10	53114	745670	37735	71.05	5.06
Kelford town	1	203	745671	203	100.0	0.03
Kenansville town	4	770	745671	770	100.0	0.1
Kenly town	2	1491	745670	1491	100.0	0.2
Kernersville town	11	26449	745671	12739	48.16	1.71
Kernersville town	12	26449	745670	13710	51.84	1.84

Kill Devil Hills town	1	7656	745671	7656	100.0	1.03
King city	12	7197	745670	7197	100.0	0.97
Kings Mountain city	13	11142	745671	11142	100.0	1.49
Kingstown town	13	656	745671	656	100.0	0.09
Kinston city	1	19900	745671	19900	100.0	2.67
Kittrell town	2	132	745670	132	100.0	0.02
Kitty Hawk town	1	3689	745671	3689	100.0	0.49
Knightdale town	5	19435	745671	19435	100.0	2.61
Kure Beach town	3	2191	745671	2191	100.0	0.29
La Grange town	1	2595	745671	2595	100.0	0.35
Lake Lure town	14	1365	745670	1365	100.0	0.18
Lake Park village	8	3269	745670	3269	100.0	0.44
Lake Santeetlah town	14	38	745670	38	100.0	0.01
Lake Waccamaw town	3	1296	745671	1296	100.0	0.17
Landis town	8	3690	745670	3690	100.0	0.49
Lansing town	12	126	745670	126	100.0	0.02
Lasker town	2	64	745670	64	100.0	0.01
Lattimore town	13	406	745671	406	100.0	0.05
Laurel Park town	14	2250	745670	2250	100.0	0.3
Laurinburg city	4	14978	745671	14978	100.0	2.01
Lawndale town	13	570	745671	570	100.0	0.08
Leggett town	2	37	745670	37	100.0	0.0
Leland town	3	22908	745671	22908	100.0	3.07
Lenoir city	12	18352	745670	18352	100.0	2.46
Lenoir city	13	18352	745671	0	0.0	0.0
Lewiston Woodville town	1	426	745671	426	100.0	0.06
Lewisville town	12	13381	745670	13381	100.0	1.79
Lexington city	8	19632	745670	19632	100.0	2.63
Liberty town	11	2655	745671	2655	100.0	0.36
Lilesville town	8	395	745670	395	100.0	0.05
Lillington town	7	4735	745671	4735	100.0	0.63
Lincolnton city	13	11091	745671	11091	100.0	1.49
Linden town	4	136	745671	136	100.0	0.02
Littleton town	2	559	745670	559	100.0	0.07
Locust city	8	4537	745670	4537	100.0	0.61
Long View town	13	5088	745671	5088	100.0	0.68
Louisburg town	2	3064	745670	3064	100.0	0.41
Love Valley town	10	154	745670	154	100.0	0.02

Lowell city	13	3654	745671	3654	100.0	0.49
Lucama town	2	1036	745670	1036	100.0	0.14
Lumber Bridge town	4	82	745671	82	100.0	0.01
Lumberton city	4	19025	745671	19025	100.0	2.55
Macclesfield town	1	413	745671	413	100.0	0.06
Macon town	2	110	745670	110	100.0	0.01
Madison town	6	2129	745671	2129	100.0	0.29
Maggie Valley town	14	1687	745670	1687	100.0	0.23
Magnolia town	4	831	745671	831	100.0	0.11
Maiden town	13	3736	745671	3736	100.0	0.5
Manteo town	1	1600	745671	1600	100.0	0.21
Marietta town	4	111	745671	111	100.0	0.01
Marion city	14	7717	745670	7717	100.0	1.03
Mars Hill town	14	2007	745670	2007	100.0	0.27
Marshall town	14	777	745670	777	100.0	0.1
Marshville town	8	2522	745670	2522	100.0	0.34
Marvin village	8	6358	745670	6358	100.0	0.85
Matthews town	9	29435	745670	29435	100.0	3.95
Maxton town	4	2110	745671	2110	100.0	0.28
Mayodan town	6	2418	745671	2418	100.0	0.32
Maysville town	1	818	745671	818	100.0	0.11
McAdenville town	13	890	745671	890	100.0	0.12
McDonald town	4	94	745671	94	100.0	0.01
McFarlan town	8	94	745670	94	100.0	0.01
Mebane city	6	17797	745671	17797	100.0	2.39
Mesic town	1	144	745671	144	100.0	0.02
Micro town	2	458	745670	458	100.0	0.06
Middleburg town	2	101	745670	101	100.0	0.01
Middlesex town	2	912	745670	912	100.0	0.12
Midland town	8	4684	745670	4684	100.0	0.63
Midland town	10	4684	745670	0	0.0	0.0
Midway town	8	4742	745670	4742	100.0	0.64
Mills River town	14	7078	745670	7078	100.0	0.95
Milton town	6	155	745671	155	100.0	0.02
Mineral Springs town	8	3159	745670	3159	100.0	0.42
Minnesott Beach town	1	530	745671	530	100.0	0.07
Mint Hill town	8	26450	745670	6	0.02	0.0
Mint Hill town	10	26450	745670	26444	99.98	3.55

Misenheimer village	8	650	745670	650	100.0	0.09
Mocksville town	8	5900	745670	5900	100.0	0.79
Momeyer town	2	277	745670	277	100.0	0.04
Monroe city	8	34562	745670	34562	100.0	4.64
Montreat town	14	901	745670	901	100.0	0.12
Mooresboro town	13	293	745671	293	100.0	0.04
Mooresville town	10	50193	745670	50193	100.0	6.73
Morehead City town	3	9556	745671	9556	100.0	1.28
Morganton city	13	17474	745671	17474	100.0	2.34
Morrisville town	6	29630	745671	207	0.7	0.03
Morrisville town	7	29630	745671	29423	99.3	3.95
Morven town	8	329	745670	329	100.0	0.04
Mount Airy city	12	10676	745670	10676	100.0	1.43
Mount Gilead town	8	1171	745670	1171	100.0	0.16
Mount Holly city	13	17703	745671	17703	100.0	2.37
Mount Olive town	4	4198	745671	4198	100.0	0.56
Mount Pleasant town	8	1671	745670	1671	100.0	0.22
Murfreesboro town	1	2619	745671	2619	100.0	0.35
Murphy town	14	1608	745670	1608	100.0	0.22
Nags Head town	1	3168	745671	3168	100.0	0.42
Nashville town	2	5632	745670	5632	100.0	0.76
Navassa town	3	1367	745671	1367	100.0	0.18
New Bern city	1	31291	745671	31291	100.0	4.2
New London town	8	607	745670	607	100.0	0.08
Newland town	12	715	745670	715	100.0	0.1
Newport town	3	4364	745671	4364	100.0	0.59
Newton Grove town	4	585	745671	585	100.0	0.08
Newton city	13	13148	745671	13148	100.0	1.76
Norlina town	2	920	745670	920	100.0	0.12
Norman town	8	100	745670	100	100.0	0.01
North Topsail Beach town	3	1005	745671	1005	100.0	0.13
North Wilkesboro town	12	4382	745670	4382	100.0	0.59
Northwest city	3	703	745671	703	100.0	0.09
Norwood town	8	2367	745670	2367	100.0	0.32
Oak City town	1	266	745671	266	100.0	0.04
Oak Island town	3	8396	745671	8396	100.0	1.13
Oak Ridge town	11	7474	745671	7474	100.0	1.0
Oakboro town	8	2128	745670	2128	100.0	0.29

Ocean Isle Beach town	3	867	745671	867	100.0	0.12
Old Fort town	14	811	745670	811	100.0	0.11
Oriental town	1	880	745671	880	100.0	0.12
Orrum town	4	59	745671	59	100.0	0.01
Ossipee town	6	536	745671	536	100.0	0.07
Oxford city	2	8628	745670	8628	100.0	1.16
Pantego town	1	164	745671	164	100.0	0.02
Parkton town	4	504	745671	504	100.0	0.07
Parmelee town	1	243	745671	243	100.0	0.03
Patterson Springs town	13	571	745671	571	100.0	0.08
Peachland town	8	390	745670	390	100.0	0.05
Peletier town	3	769	745671	769	100.0	0.1
Pembroke town	4	2823	745671	2823	100.0	0.38
Pikeville town	1	712	745671	712	100.0	0.1
Pilot Mountain town	12	1440	745670	1440	100.0	0.19
Pine Knoll Shores town	3	1388	745671	1388	100.0	0.19
Pine Level town	2	2046	745670	2046	100.0	0.27
Pinebluff town	7	1473	745671	1473	100.0	0.2
Pinehurst village	7	17581	745671	17581	100.0	2.36
Pinetops town	2	1200	745670	1200	100.0	0.16
Pineville town	9	10602	745670	10602	100.0	1.42
Pink Hill town	1	451	745671	451	100.0	0.06
Pittsboro town	7	4537	745671	4537	100.0	0.61
Pleasant Garden town	11	5000	745671	5000	100.0	0.67
Plymouth town	1	3320	745671	3320	100.0	0.45
Polkton town	8	2250	745670	2250	100.0	0.3
Polkville city	13	516	745671	516	100.0	0.07
Pollocksville town	1	268	745671	268	100.0	0.04
Powellsville town	1	189	745671	189	100.0	0.03
Princeton town	2	1315	745670	1315	100.0	0.18
Princeville town	2	1254	745670	1254	100.0	0.17
Proctorville town	4	121	745671	121	100.0	0.02
Raeford city	4	4559	745671	4559	100.0	0.61
Raleigh city	2	467665	745670	1326	0.28	0.18
Raleigh city	5	467665	745671	466106	99.67	62.51
Raleigh city	6	467665	745671	233	0.05	0.03
Ramseur town	11	1774	745671	1774	100.0	0.24
Randleman city	11	4595	745671	4595	100.0	0.62

Ranlo town	13	4511	745671	4511	100.0	0.6
Raynham town	4	60	745671	60	100.0	0.01
Red Cross town	8	762	745670	762	100.0	0.1
Red Oak town	2	3342	745670	3342	100.0	0.45
Red Springs town	4	3087	745671	3087	100.0	0.41
Reidsville city	6	14583	745671	14583	100.0	1.96
Rennert town	4	275	745671	275	100.0	0.04
Rhodhiss town	13	997	745671	997	100.0	0.13
Rich Square town	2	894	745670	894	100.0	0.12
Richfield town	8	582	745670	582	100.0	0.08
Richlands town	3	2287	745671	2287	100.0	0.31
River Bend town	1	2902	745671	2902	100.0	0.39
Roanoke Rapids city	2	15229	745670	15229	100.0	2.04
Robbins town	7	1168	745671	1168	100.0	0.16
Robbinsville town	14	597	745670	597	100.0	0.08
Robersonville town	1	1269	745671	1269	100.0	0.17
Rockingham city	4	9243	745671	9243	100.0	1.24
Rockwell town	8	2302	745670	2302	100.0	0.31
Rocky Mount city	2	54341	745670	54341	100.0	7.29
Rolesville town	5	9475	745671	9475	100.0	1.27
Ronda town	12	438	745670	438	100.0	0.06
Roper town	1	485	745671	485	100.0	0.07
Rose Hill town	4	1371	745671	1371	100.0	0.18
Roseboro town	4	1163	745671	1163	100.0	0.16
Rosman town	14	701	745670	701	100.0	0.09
Rowland town	4	885	745671	885	100.0	0.12
Roxboro city	6	8134	745671	8134	100.0	1.09
Roxobel town	1	187	745671	187	100.0	0.03
Rural Hall town	12	3351	745670	3351	100.0	0.45
Ruth town	13	347	745671	347	100.0	0.05
Rutherford College town	13	1226	745671	1226	100.0	0.16
Rutherfordton town	13	3640	745671	3640	100.0	0.49
Salemburg town	4	457	745671	457	100.0	0.06
Salisbury city	8	35540	745670	35540	100.0	4.77
Saluda city	14	631	745670	631	100.0	0.08
Sandy Creek town	3	248	745671	248	100.0	0.03
Sandyfield town	3	430	745671	430	100.0	0.06
Sanford city	7	30261	745671	30261	100.0	4.06

Saratoga town	2	353	745670	353	100.0	0.05
Sawmills town	12	5020	745670	20	0.4	0.0
Sawmills town	13	5020	745671	5000	99.6	0.67
Scotland Neck town	2	1640	745670	1640	100.0	0.22
Seaboard town	2	542	745670	542	100.0	0.07
Seagrove town	11	235	745671	235	100.0	0.03
Sedalia town	11	676	745671	676	100.0	0.09
Selma town	2	6317	745670	6317	100.0	0.85
Seven Devils town	12	313	745670	313	100.0	0.04
Seven Springs town	1	55	745671	55	100.0	0.01
Severn town	2	191	745670	191	100.0	0.03
Shallotte town	3	4185	745671	4185	100.0	0.56
Sharpsburg town	2	1697	745670	1697	100.0	0.23
Shelby city	13	21918	745671	21918	100.0	2.94
Siler City town	7	7702	745671	7702	100.0	1.03
Simpson village	1	390	745671	390	100.0	0.05
Sims town	2	275	745670	275	100.0	0.04
Smithfield town	2	11292	745670	11292	100.0	1.51
Snow Hill town	1	1481	745671	1481	100.0	0.2
Southern Pines town	7	15545	745671	15545	100.0	2.08
Southern Shores town	1	3090	745671	3090	100.0	0.41
Southport city	3	3971	745671	3971	100.0	0.53
Sparta town	12	1834	745670	1834	100.0	0.25
Speed town	2	63	745670	63	100.0	0.01
Spencer Mountain town	13	0	745671	0	0.0	0.0
Spencer town	8	3308	745670	3308	100.0	0.44
Spindale town	13	4225	745671	4225	100.0	0.57
Spring Hope town	2	1309	745670	1309	100.0	0.18
Spring Lake town	4	11660	745671	11660	100.0	1.56
Spruce Pine town	14	2194	745670	2194	100.0	0.29
St. Helena village	3	417	745671	417	100.0	0.06
St. James town	3	6529	745671	6529	100.0	0.88
St. Pauls town	4	2045	745671	2045	100.0	0.27
Staley town	11	397	745671	397	100.0	0.05
Stallings town	8	16112	745670	15728	97.62	2.11
Stallings town	9	16112	745670	11	0.07	0.0
Stallings town	10	16112	745670	373	2.32	0.05
Stanfield town	8	1585	745670	1585	100.0	0.21

Stanley town	13	3963	745671	3963	100.0	0.53
Stantonsburg town	2	762	745670	762	100.0	0.1
Star town	8	806	745670	806	100.0	0.11
Statesville city	10	28419	745670	28419	100.0	3.81
Stedman town	4	1277	745671	1277	100.0	0.17
Stem town	2	960	745670	960	100.0	0.13
Stokesdale town	11	5924	745671	5924	100.0	0.79
Stoneville town	6	1308	745671	1308	100.0	0.18
Stonewall town	1	214	745671	214	100.0	0.03
Stovall town	2	324	745670	324	100.0	0.04
Sugar Mountain village	12	371	745670	371	100.0	0.05
Summerfield town	11	10951	745671	10951	100.0	1.47
Sunset Beach town	3	4175	745671	4175	100.0	0.56
Surf City town	3	3867	745671	3867	100.0	0.52
Swansboro town	3	3744	745671	3744	100.0	0.5
Sweptsonville town	6	2445	745671	2445	100.0	0.33
Sylva town	14	2578	745670	2578	100.0	0.35
Tabor City town	3	3781	745671	3781	100.0	0.51
Tar Heel town	4	90	745671	90	100.0	0.01
Tarboro town	2	10721	745670	10721	100.0	1.44
Taylorsville town	12	2320	745670	2320	100.0	0.31
Taylortown town	7	634	745671	634	100.0	0.09
Teachey town	4	448	745671	448	100.0	0.06
Thomasville city	8	27183	745670	26662	98.08	3.58
Thomasville city	11	27183	745671	521	1.92	0.07
Tobaccoville village	12	2578	745670	2578	100.0	0.35
Topsail Beach town	3	461	745671	461	100.0	0.06
Trent Woods town	1	4074	745671	4074	100.0	0.55
Trenton town	1	238	745671	238	100.0	0.03
Trinity city	11	7006	745671	7006	100.0	0.94
Troutman town	10	3698	745670	3698	100.0	0.5
Troy town	8	2850	745670	2850	100.0	0.38
Tryon town	14	1562	745670	1562	100.0	0.21
Turkey town	4	213	745671	213	100.0	0.03
Unionville town	8	6643	745670	6643	100.0	0.89
Valdese town	13	4689	745671	4689	100.0	0.63
Vanceboro town	1	869	745671	869	100.0	0.12
Vandemere town	1	246	745671	246	100.0	0.03

Varnamtown town	3	525	745671	525	100.0	0.07
Vass town	7	952	745671	952	100.0	0.13
Waco town	13	310	745671	310	100.0	0.04
Wade town	4	638	745671	638	100.0	0.09
Wadesboro town	8	5008	745670	5008	100.0	0.67
Wagram town	4	615	745671	615	100.0	0.08
Wake Forest town	2	47601	745670	1504	3.16	0.2
Wake Forest town	5	47601	745671	46097	96.84	6.18
Walkertown town	12	5692	745670	5692	100.0	0.76
Wallace town	3	3413	745671	0	0.0	0.0
Wallace town	4	3413	745671	3413	100.0	0.46
Wallburg town	8	3051	745670	3051	100.0	0.41
Walnut Cove town	12	1586	745670	1586	100.0	0.21
Walnut Creek village	1	1084	745671	1084	100.0	0.15
Walstonburg town	1	193	745671	193	100.0	0.03
Warrenton town	2	851	745670	851	100.0	0.11
Warsaw town	4	2733	745671	2733	100.0	0.37
Washington Park town	1	392	745671	392	100.0	0.05
Washington city	1	9875	745671	9875	100.0	1.32
Watha town	3	181	745671	181	100.0	0.02
Waxhaw town	8	20534	745670	20534	100.0	2.75
Waynesville town	14	10140	745670	10140	100.0	1.36
Weaverville town	14	4567	745670	4567	100.0	0.61
Webster town	14	372	745670	372	100.0	0.05
Weddington town	8	13181	745670	13176	99.96	1.77
Weddington town	9	13181	745670	5	0.04	0.0
Weldon town	2	1444	745670	1444	100.0	0.19
Wendell town	5	9793	745671	9793	100.0	1.31
Wentworth town	6	2662	745671	2662	100.0	0.36
Wesley Chapel village	8	8681	745670	8681	100.0	1.16
West Jefferson town	12	1279	745670	1279	100.0	0.17
Whispering Pines village	7	4987	745671	4987	100.0	0.67
Whitakers town	2	627	745670	627	100.0	0.08
White Lake town	4	843	745671	843	100.0	0.11
Whiteville city	3	4766	745671	4766	100.0	0.64
Whitsett town	11	584	745671	584	100.0	0.08
Wilkesboro town	12	3687	745670	3687	100.0	0.49
Williamston town	1	5248	745671	5248	100.0	0.7

Wilmington city	3	115451	745671	115451	100.0	15.48
Wilson city	2	47851	745670	47851	100.0	6.42
Wilson's Mills town	2	2534	745670	2534	100.0	0.34
Windsor town	1	3582	745671	3582	100.0	0.48
Winfall town	1	555	745671	555	100.0	0.07
Wingate town	8	4055	745670	4055	100.0	0.54
Winston-Salem city	11	249545	745671	40352	16.17	5.41
Winston-Salem city	12	249545	745670	209193	83.83	28.05
Winterville town	1	10462	745671	10462	100.0	1.4
Winton town	1	629	745671	629	100.0	0.08
Woodfin town	14	7936	745670	7936	100.0	1.06
Woodland town	2	557	745670	557	100.0	0.07
Wrightsville Beach town	3	2473	745671	2473	100.0	0.33
Yadkinville town	12	2995	745670	2995	100.0	0.4
Yanceyville town	6	1937	745671	1937	100.0	0.26
Youngsville town	2	2016	745670	2016	100.0	0.27
Zebulon town	2	6903	745670	0	0.0	0.0
Zebulon town	5	6903	745671	6903	100.0	0.93

Municipality by County-District Report

Municipality (County)	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	% Muni Pop in District	% District Pop in Muni
Aberdeen town	7	8516	745671	8516	100.0	1.14
Ahoskie town	1	4891	745671	4891	100.0	0.66
Alamance village	6	988	745671	988	100.0	0.13
Albemarle city	8	16432	745670	16432	100.0	2.2
Alliance town	1	733	745671	733	100.0	0.1
Andrews town	14	1667	745670	1667	100.0	0.22
Angier town (HARNETT)	7	4709	745671	4709	100.0	0.63
Angier town (WAKE)	7	556	745671	556	100.0	0.07
Ansonville town	8	440	745670	440	100.0	0.06
Apex town	7	58780	745671	58780	100.0	7.88
Arapahoe town	1	416	745671	416	100.0	0.06
Archdale city (GUILFORD)	11	380	745671	380	100.0	0.05
Archdale city (RANDOLPH)	11	11527	745671	11527	100.0	1.55
Archer Lodge town	2	4797	745670	4797	100.0	0.64
Asheboro city	11	27156	745671	27156	100.0	3.64
Asheville city	14	94589	745670	94589	100.0	12.69
Askewville town	1	184	745671	184	100.0	0.02
Atkinson town	3	296	745671	296	100.0	0.04
Atlantic Beach town	3	1364	745671	1364	100.0	0.18
Aulander town	1	763	745671	763	100.0	0.1
Aurora town	1	455	745671	455	100.0	0.06
Autryville town	4	167	745671	167	100.0	0.02
Ayden town	1	4977	745671	4977	100.0	0.67
Badin town	8	2024	745670	2024	100.0	0.27
Bailey town	2	568	745670	568	100.0	0.08
Bakersville town	14	450	745670	450	100.0	0.06
Bald Head Island village	3	268	745671	268	100.0	0.04
Banner Elk town	12	1049	745670	1049	100.0	0.14
Bath town	1	245	745671	245	100.0	0.03
Bayboro town	1	1161	745671	1161	100.0	0.16
Bear Grass town	1	89	745671	89	100.0	0.01
Beaufort town	3	4464	745671	4464	100.0	0.6
Beech Mountain town (AVERY)	12	62	745670	62	100.0	0.01
Beech Mountain town (WATAUGA)	12	613	745670	613	100.0	0.08

Belhaven town	1	1410	745671	1410	100.0	0.19
Belmont city	13	15010	745671	15010	100.0	2.01
Belville town	3	2406	745671	2406	100.0	0.32
Belwood town	13	857	745671	857	100.0	0.11
Benson town (HARNETT)	7	0	745671	0	0.0	0.0
Benson town (JOHNSTON)	2	3967	745670	3967	100.0	0.53
Bermuda Run town	8	3120	745670	3120	100.0	0.42
Bessemer City city	13	5428	745671	5428	100.0	0.73
Bethania town	12	344	745670	344	100.0	0.05
Bethel town	1	1373	745671	1373	100.0	0.18
Beulaville town	4	1116	745671	1116	100.0	0.15
Biltmore Forest town	14	1409	745670	1409	100.0	0.19
Biscoe town	8	1848	745670	1848	100.0	0.25
Black Creek town	2	692	745670	692	100.0	0.09
Black Mountain town	14	8426	745670	8426	100.0	1.13
Bladenboro town	4	1648	745671	1648	100.0	0.22
Blowing Rock town (CALDWELL)	12	91	745670	91	100.0	0.01
Blowing Rock town (WATAUGA)	12	1285	745670	1285	100.0	0.17
Boardman town	3	166	745671	166	100.0	0.02
Bogue town	3	695	745671	695	100.0	0.09
Boiling Spring Lakes city	3	5943	745671	5943	100.0	0.8
Boiling Springs town	13	4615	745671	4615	100.0	0.62
Bolivia town	3	149	745671	149	100.0	0.02
Bolton town	3	519	745671	519	100.0	0.07
Boone town	12	19092	745670	19092	100.0	2.56
Boonville town	12	1185	745670	1185	100.0	0.16
Bostic town	13	355	745671	355	100.0	0.05
Brevard city	14	7744	745670	7744	100.0	1.04
Bridgeton town	1	349	745671	349	100.0	0.05
Broadway town (HARNETT)	7	0	745671	0	0.0	0.0
Broadway town (LEE)	7	1267	745671	1267	100.0	0.17
Brookford town	13	442	745671	442	100.0	0.06
Brunswick town	3	973	745671	973	100.0	0.13
Bryson City town	14	1558	745670	1558	100.0	0.21
Bunn town	2	327	745670	327	100.0	0.04
Burgaw town	3	3088	745671	3088	100.0	0.41
Burlington city (ALAMANCE)	6	55481	745671	55481	100.0	7.44
Burlington city (GUILFORD)	11	1822	745671	1822	100.0	0.24

Burnsville town	14	1614	745670	1614	100.0	0.22
Butner town	2	8397	745670	8397	100.0	1.13
Cajah's Mountain town	12	2722	745670	2722	100.0	0.37
Calabash town	3	2011	745671	2011	100.0	0.27
Calypso town	4	327	745671	327	100.0	0.04
Cameron town	7	244	745671	244	100.0	0.03
Candor town (MONTGOMERY)	8	813	745670	813	100.0	0.11
Candor town (MOORE)	7	0	745671	0	0.0	0.0
Canton town	14	4422	745670	4422	100.0	0.59
Cape Carteret town	3	2224	745671	2224	100.0	0.3
Carolina Beach town	3	6564	745671	6564	100.0	0.88
Carolina Shores town	3	4588	745671	4588	100.0	0.62
Carrboro town	6	21295	745671	21295	100.0	2.86
Carthage town	7	2775	745671	2775	100.0	0.37
Cary town (CHATHAM)	7	3709	745671	3709	100.0	0.5
Cary town (WAKE)	5	171012	745671	30544	17.86	4.1
Cary town (WAKE)	7	171012	745671	140468	82.14	18.84
Casar town	13	305	745671	305	100.0	0.04
Castalia town	2	264	745670	264	100.0	0.04
Caswell Beach town	3	395	745671	395	100.0	0.05
Catawba town	13	702	745671	702	100.0	0.09
Cedar Point town	3	1764	745671	1764	100.0	0.24
Cedar Rock village	12	301	745670	301	100.0	0.04
Cerro Gordo town	3	131	745671	131	100.0	0.02
Chadbourn town	3	1574	745671	1574	100.0	0.21
Chapel Hill town (DURHAM)	6	2906	745671	2906	100.0	0.39
Chapel Hill town (ORANGE)	6	59054	745671	59054	100.0	7.92
Charlotte city	9	874579	745670	663590	75.88	88.99
Charlotte city	10	874579	745670	210989	24.12	28.3
Cherryville city	13	6078	745671	6078	100.0	0.82
Chimney Rock Village village	14	140	745670	140	100.0	0.02
China Grove town	8	4434	745670	4434	100.0	0.59
Chocowinity town	1	722	745671	722	100.0	0.1
Claremont city	13	1692	745671	1692	100.0	0.23
Clarkton town	4	614	745671	614	100.0	0.08
Clayton town (JOHNSTON)	2	26307	745670	26307	100.0	3.53
Clayton town (WAKE)	5	0	745671	0	0.0	0.0
Clemmons village	12	21163	745670	21163	100.0	2.84

Cleveland town	8	846	745670	846	100.0	0.11
Clinton city	4	8383	745671	8383	100.0	1.12
Clyde town	14	1368	745670	1368	100.0	0.18
Coats town	7	2155	745671	2155	100.0	0.29
Cofield village	1	267	745671	267	100.0	0.04
Colerain town	1	217	745671	217	100.0	0.03
Columbia town	1	610	745671	610	100.0	0.08
Columbus town	14	1060	745670	1060	100.0	0.14
Como town	1	67	745671	67	100.0	0.01
Concord city	8	105240	745670	2448	2.33	0.33
Concord city	10	105240	745670	102792	97.67	13.79
Conetoe town	2	198	745670	198	100.0	0.03
Connelly Springs town	13	1529	745671	1529	100.0	0.21
Conover city	13	8421	745671	8421	100.0	1.13
Conway town	2	752	745670	752	100.0	0.1
Cooleemee town	8	940	745670	940	100.0	0.13
Cornelius town	10	31412	745670	31412	100.0	4.21
Cove City town	1	378	745671	378	100.0	0.05
Cramerton town	13	5296	745671	5296	100.0	0.71
Creedmoor city	2	4866	745670	4866	100.0	0.65
Creswell town	1	207	745671	207	100.0	0.03
Crossnore town	12	143	745670	143	100.0	0.02
Dallas town	13	5927	745671	5927	100.0	0.79
Danbury town	12	189	745670	189	100.0	0.03
Davidson town (IREDELL)	10	378	745670	378	100.0	0.05
Davidson town (MECKLENBURG)	10	14728	745670	14728	100.0	1.98
Dellview town	13	6	745671	6	100.0	0.0
Denton town	8	1494	745670	1494	100.0	0.2
Dillsboro town	14	213	745670	213	100.0	0.03
Dobbins Heights town	4	687	745671	687	100.0	0.09
Dobson town	12	1462	745670	1462	100.0	0.2
Dortches town	2	1082	745670	1082	100.0	0.15
Dover town	1	349	745671	349	100.0	0.05
Drexel town	13	1760	745671	1760	100.0	0.24
Dublin town	4	267	745671	267	100.0	0.04
Duck town	1	742	745671	742	100.0	0.1
Dunn city	4	8446	745671	8446	100.0	1.13
Durham city (DURHAM)	2	283093	745670	41474	14.65	5.56

Durham city (DURHAM)	6	283093	745671	241619	85.35	32.4
Durham city (ORANGE)	6	144	745671	144	100.0	0.02
Durham city (WAKE)	5	269	745671	269	100.0	0.04
Durham city (WAKE)	7	269	745671	0	0.0	0.0
Earl town	13	198	745671	198	100.0	0.03
East Arcadia town	4	418	745671	418	100.0	0.06
East Bend town	12	634	745670	634	100.0	0.09
East Laurinburg town	4	234	745671	234	100.0	0.03
East Spencer town	8	1567	745670	1567	100.0	0.21
Eastover town	4	3656	745671	3656	100.0	0.49
Eden city	6	15421	745671	15421	100.0	2.07
Edenton town	1	4460	745671	4460	100.0	0.6
Elizabeth City city (CAMDEN)	1	38	745671	38	100.0	0.01
Elizabeth City city (PASQUOTANK)	1	18593	745671	18593	100.0	2.49
Elizabethtown town	4	3296	745671	3296	100.0	0.44
Elk Park town	12	542	745670	542	100.0	0.07
Elkin town (SURRY)	12	4049	745670	4049	100.0	0.54
Elkin town (WILKES)	12	73	745670	73	100.0	0.01
Ellenboro town	13	723	745671	723	100.0	0.1
Ellerbe town	4	864	745671	864	100.0	0.12
Elm City town (NASH)	2	0	745670	0	0.0	0.0
Elm City town (WILSON)	2	1218	745670	1218	100.0	0.16
Elon town	6	11336	745671	11336	100.0	1.52
Emerald Isle town	3	3847	745671	3847	100.0	0.52
Enfield town	2	1865	745670	1865	100.0	0.25
Erwin town	4	4542	745671	0	0.0	0.0
Erwin town	7	4542	745671	4542	100.0	0.61
Eureka town	1	214	745671	214	100.0	0.03
Everetts town	1	150	745671	150	100.0	0.02
Fair Bluff town	3	709	745671	709	100.0	0.1
Fairmont town	4	2191	745671	2191	100.0	0.29
Fairview town	8	3456	745670	3456	100.0	0.46
Faison town (DUPLIN)	4	784	745671	784	100.0	0.11
Faison town (SAMPSON)	4	0	745671	0	0.0	0.0
Faith town	8	819	745670	819	100.0	0.11
Falcon town (CUMBERLAND)	4	324	745671	324	100.0	0.04
Falcon town (SAMPSON)	4	0	745671	0	0.0	0.0
Falkland town	1	47	745671	47	100.0	0.01

Fallston town	13	627	745671	627	100.0	0.08
Farmville town	1	4461	745671	4461	100.0	0.6
Fayetteville city	4	208501	745671	208501	100.0	27.96
Flat Rock village	14	3486	745670	3486	100.0	0.47
Fletcher town	14	7987	745670	7987	100.0	1.07
Fontana Dam town	14	13	745670	13	100.0	0.0
Forest City town	13	7377	745671	7377	100.0	0.99
Forest Hills village	14	303	745670	303	100.0	0.04
Fountain town	1	385	745671	385	100.0	0.05
Four Oaks town	2	2158	745670	2158	100.0	0.29
Foxfire village	7	1288	745671	1288	100.0	0.17
Franklin town	14	4175	745670	4175	100.0	0.56
Franklinton town	2	2456	745670	2456	100.0	0.33
Franklinville town	11	1197	745671	1197	100.0	0.16
Fremont town	1	1196	745671	1196	100.0	0.16
Fuquay-Varina town (HARNETT)	7	0	745671	0	0.0	0.0
Fuquay-Varina town (WAKE)	7	34152	745671	34152	100.0	4.58
Gamewell town	12	3702	745670	3702	100.0	0.5
Garland town	4	595	745671	595	100.0	0.08
Garner town	5	31159	745671	28321	90.89	3.8
Garner town	7	31159	745671	2838	9.11	0.38
Garysburg town	2	904	745670	904	100.0	0.12
Gaston town	2	1008	745670	1008	100.0	0.14
Gastonia city	13	80411	745671	80411	100.0	10.78
Gatesville town	1	267	745671	267	100.0	0.04
Gibson town	4	449	745671	449	100.0	0.06
Gibsonville town (ALAMANCE)	6	4278	745671	4278	100.0	0.57
Gibsonville town (GUILFORD)	11	4642	745671	4642	100.0	0.62
Glen Alpine town	13	1529	745671	1529	100.0	0.21
Godwin town	4	128	745671	128	100.0	0.02
Goldsboro city	1	33657	745671	33657	100.0	4.51
Goldston town	7	234	745671	234	100.0	0.03
Graham city	6	17157	745671	17157	100.0	2.3
Grandfather Village village	12	95	745670	95	100.0	0.01
Granite Falls town	13	4965	745671	4965	100.0	0.67
Granite Quarry town	8	2984	745670	2984	100.0	0.4
Grantsboro town	1	692	745671	692	100.0	0.09
Green Level town	6	3152	745671	3152	100.0	0.42

Greenevers town	4	567	745671	567	100.0	0.08
Greensboro city	11	299035	745671	299035	100.0	40.1
Greenville city	1	87521	745671	87521	100.0	11.74
Grifton town (LENOIR)	1	147	745671	147	100.0	0.02
Grifton town (PITT)	1	2301	745671	2301	100.0	0.31
Grimesland town	1	386	745671	386	100.0	0.05
Grover town	13	802	745671	802	100.0	0.11
Halifax town	2	170	745670	170	100.0	0.02
Hamilton town	1	306	745671	306	100.0	0.04
Hamlet city	4	6025	745671	6025	100.0	0.81
Harmony town	10	543	745670	543	100.0	0.07
Harrells town (DUPLIN)	4	0	745671	0	0.0	0.0
Harrells town (SAMPSON)	4	160	745671	160	100.0	0.02
Harrellsville town	1	85	745671	85	100.0	0.01
Harrisburg town	10	18967	745670	18967	100.0	2.54
Hassell town	1	49	745671	49	100.0	0.01
Havelock city	1	16621	745671	16621	100.0	2.23
Haw River town	6	2252	745671	2252	100.0	0.3
Hayesville town	14	461	745670	461	100.0	0.06
Hemby Bridge town	8	1614	745670	1614	100.0	0.22
Henderson city	2	15060	745670	15060	100.0	2.02
Hendersonville city	14	15137	745670	15137	100.0	2.03
Hertford town	1	1934	745671	1934	100.0	0.26
Hickory city (BURKE)	13	79	745671	79	100.0	0.01
Hickory city (CALDWELL)	13	32	745671	32	100.0	0.0
Hickory city (CATAWBA)	13	43379	745671	43379	100.0	5.82
High Point city (DAVIDSON)	8	6646	745670	6646	100.0	0.89
High Point city (FORSYTH)	11	84	745671	84	100.0	0.01
High Point city (GUILFORD)	11	107321	745671	107321	100.0	14.39
High Point city (RANDOLPH)	11	8	745671	8	100.0	0.0
High Shoals city	13	595	745671	595	100.0	0.08
Highlands town (JACKSON)	14	12	745670	12	100.0	0.0
Highlands town (MACON)	14	1060	745670	1060	100.0	0.14
Hildebran town	13	1679	745671	1679	100.0	0.23
Hillsborough town	6	9660	745671	9660	100.0	1.3
Hobgood town	2	268	745670	268	100.0	0.04
Hoffman town	4	418	745671	418	100.0	0.06
Holden Beach town	3	921	745671	921	100.0	0.12

Holly Ridge town	3	4171	745671	4171	100.0	0.56
Holly Springs town	7	41239	745671	41239	100.0	5.53
Hookerton town	1	413	745671	413	100.0	0.06
Hope Mills town	4	17808	745671	17808	100.0	2.39
Hot Springs town	14	520	745670	520	100.0	0.07
Hudson town	12	3780	745670	3780	100.0	0.51
Huntersville town	10	61376	745670	61376	100.0	8.23
Indian Beach town	3	223	745671	223	100.0	0.03
Indian Trail town	8	39997	745670	39997	100.0	5.36
Jackson town	2	430	745670	430	100.0	0.06
Jacksonville city	3	72723	745671	72723	100.0	9.75
Jamestown town	11	3668	745671	3668	100.0	0.49
Jamesville town	1	424	745671	424	100.0	0.06
Jefferson town	12	1622	745670	1622	100.0	0.22
Jonesville town	12	2308	745670	2308	100.0	0.31
Kannapolis city (CABARRUS)	8	42846	745670	5111	11.93	0.69
Kannapolis city (CABARRUS)	10	42846	745670	37735	88.07	5.06
Kannapolis city (ROWAN)	8	10268	745670	10268	100.0	1.38
Kelford town	1	203	745671	203	100.0	0.03
Kenansville town	4	770	745671	770	100.0	0.1
Kenly town (JOHNSTON)	2	1293	745670	1293	100.0	0.17
Kenly town (WILSON)	2	198	745670	198	100.0	0.03
Kernersville town (FORSYTH)	11	25947	745671	12237	47.16	1.64
Kernersville town (FORSYTH)	12	25947	745670	13710	52.84	1.84
Kernersville town (GUILFORD)	11	502	745671	502	100.0	0.07
Kill Devil Hills town	1	7656	745671	7656	100.0	1.03
King city (FORSYTH)	12	591	745670	591	100.0	0.08
King city (STOKES)	12	6606	745670	6606	100.0	0.89
Kings Mountain city (CLEVELAND)	13	10032	745671	10032	100.0	1.35
Kings Mountain city (GASTON)	13	1110	745671	1110	100.0	0.15
Kingstown town	13	656	745671	656	100.0	0.09
Kinston city	1	19900	745671	19900	100.0	2.67
Kittrell town	2	132	745670	132	100.0	0.02
Kitty Hawk town	1	3689	745671	3689	100.0	0.49
Knightdale town	5	19435	745671	19435	100.0	2.61
Kure Beach town	3	2191	745671	2191	100.0	0.29
La Grange town	1	2595	745671	2595	100.0	0.35
Lake Lure town	14	1365	745670	1365	100.0	0.18

Lake Park village	8	3269	745670	3269	100.0	0.44
Lake Santeeelah town	14	38	745670	38	100.0	0.01
Lake Waccamaw town	3	1296	745671	1296	100.0	0.17
Landis town	8	3690	745670	3690	100.0	0.49
Lansing town	12	126	745670	126	100.0	0.02
Lasker town	2	64	745670	64	100.0	0.01
Lattimore town	13	406	745671	406	100.0	0.05
Laurel Park town	14	2250	745670	2250	100.0	0.3
Laurinburg city	4	14978	745671	14978	100.0	2.01
Lawndale town	13	570	745671	570	100.0	0.08
Leggett town	2	37	745670	37	100.0	0.0
Leland town	3	22908	745671	22908	100.0	3.07
Lenoir city	12	18352	745670	18352	100.0	2.46
Lenoir city	13	18352	745671	0	0.0	0.0
Lewiston Woodville town	1	426	745671	426	100.0	0.06
Lewisville town	12	13381	745670	13381	100.0	1.79
Lexington city	8	19632	745670	19632	100.0	2.63
Liberty town	11	2655	745671	2655	100.0	0.36
Lilesville town	8	395	745670	395	100.0	0.05
Lillington town	7	4735	745671	4735	100.0	0.63
Lincolnton city	13	11091	745671	11091	100.0	1.49
Linden town	4	136	745671	136	100.0	0.02
Littleton town	2	559	745670	559	100.0	0.07
Locust city (CABARRUS)	8	541	745670	541	100.0	0.07
Locust city (STANLY)	8	3996	745670	3996	100.0	0.54
Long View town (BURKE)	13	735	745671	735	100.0	0.1
Long View town (CATAWBA)	13	4353	745671	4353	100.0	0.58
Louisburg town	2	3064	745670	3064	100.0	0.41
Love Valley town	10	154	745670	154	100.0	0.02
Lowell city	13	3654	745671	3654	100.0	0.49
Lucama town	2	1036	745670	1036	100.0	0.14
Lumber Bridge town	4	82	745671	82	100.0	0.01
Lumberton city	4	19025	745671	19025	100.0	2.55
Macclesfield town	1	413	745671	413	100.0	0.06
Macon town	2	110	745670	110	100.0	0.01
Madison town	6	2129	745671	2129	100.0	0.29
Maggie Valley town	14	1687	745670	1687	100.0	0.23
Magnolia town	4	831	745671	831	100.0	0.11

Maiden town (CATAWBA)	13	3736	745671	3736	100.0	0.5
Maiden town (LINCOLN)	13	0	745671	0	0.0	0.0
Manteo town	1	1600	745671	1600	100.0	0.21
Marietta town	4	111	745671	111	100.0	0.01
Marion city	14	7717	745670	7717	100.0	1.03
Mars Hill town	14	2007	745670	2007	100.0	0.27
Marshall town	14	777	745670	777	100.0	0.1
Marshville town	8	2522	745670	2522	100.0	0.34
Marvin village	8	6358	745670	6358	100.0	0.85
Matthews town	9	29435	745670	29435	100.0	3.95
Maxton town (ROBESON)	4	1902	745671	1902	100.0	0.26
Maxton town (SCOTLAND)	4	208	745671	208	100.0	0.03
Mayodan town	6	2418	745671	2418	100.0	0.32
Maysville town	1	818	745671	818	100.0	0.11
McAdenville town	13	890	745671	890	100.0	0.12
McDonald town	4	94	745671	94	100.0	0.01
McFarlan town	8	94	745670	94	100.0	0.01
Mebane city (ALAMANCE)	6	14626	745671	14626	100.0	1.96
Mebane city (ORANGE)	6	3171	745671	3171	100.0	0.43
Mesic town	1	144	745671	144	100.0	0.02
Micro town	2	458	745670	458	100.0	0.06
Middleburg town	2	101	745670	101	100.0	0.01
Middlesex town	2	912	745670	912	100.0	0.12
Midland town (CABARRUS)	8	4684	745670	4684	100.0	0.63
Midland town (MECKLENBURG)	10	0	745670	0	0.0	0.0
Midway town	8	4742	745670	4742	100.0	0.64
Mills River town	14	7078	745670	7078	100.0	0.95
Milton town	6	155	745671	155	100.0	0.02
Mineral Springs town	8	3159	745670	3159	100.0	0.42
Minnesott Beach town	1	530	745671	530	100.0	0.07
Mint Hill town (MECKLENBURG)	10	26444	745670	26444	100.0	3.55
Mint Hill town (UNION)	8	6	745670	6	100.0	0.0
Misenheimer village	8	650	745670	650	100.0	0.09
Mocksville town	8	5900	745670	5900	100.0	0.79
Momeyer town	2	277	745670	277	100.0	0.04
Monroe city	8	34562	745670	34562	100.0	4.64
Montreat town	14	901	745670	901	100.0	0.12
Mooresboro town	13	293	745671	293	100.0	0.04

Mooreville town	10	50193	745670	50193	100.0	6.73
Morehead City town	3	9556	745671	9556	100.0	1.28
Morganton city	13	17474	745671	17474	100.0	2.34
Morrisville town (DURHAM)	6	207	745671	207	100.0	0.03
Morrisville town (WAKE)	7	29423	745671	29423	100.0	3.95
Morven town	8	329	745670	329	100.0	0.04
Mount Airy city	12	10676	745670	10676	100.0	1.43
Mount Gilead town	8	1171	745670	1171	100.0	0.16
Mount Holly city	13	17703	745671	17703	100.0	2.37
Mount Olive town (DUPLIN)	4	5	745671	5	100.0	0.0
Mount Olive town (WAYNE)	4	4193	745671	4193	100.0	0.56
Mount Pleasant town	8	1671	745670	1671	100.0	0.22
Murfreesboro town	1	2619	745671	2619	100.0	0.35
Murphy town	14	1608	745670	1608	100.0	0.22
Nags Head town	1	3168	745671	3168	100.0	0.42
Nashville town	2	5632	745670	5632	100.0	0.76
Navassa town	3	1367	745671	1367	100.0	0.18
New Bern city	1	31291	745671	31291	100.0	4.2
New London town	8	607	745670	607	100.0	0.08
Newland town	12	715	745670	715	100.0	0.1
Newport town	3	4364	745671	4364	100.0	0.59
Newton Grove town	4	585	745671	585	100.0	0.08
Newton city	13	13148	745671	13148	100.0	1.76
Norlina town	2	920	745670	920	100.0	0.12
Norman town	8	100	745670	100	100.0	0.01
North Topsail Beach town	3	1005	745671	1005	100.0	0.13
North Wilkesboro town	12	4382	745670	4382	100.0	0.59
Northwest city	3	703	745671	703	100.0	0.09
Norwood town	8	2367	745670	2367	100.0	0.32
Oak City town	1	266	745671	266	100.0	0.04
Oak Island town	3	8396	745671	8396	100.0	1.13
Oak Ridge town	11	7474	745671	7474	100.0	1.0
Oakboro town	8	2128	745670	2128	100.0	0.29
Ocean Isle Beach town	3	867	745671	867	100.0	0.12
Old Fort town	14	811	745670	811	100.0	0.11
Oriental town	1	880	745671	880	100.0	0.12
Orrum town	4	59	745671	59	100.0	0.01
Ossipee town	6	536	745671	536	100.0	0.07

Oxford city	2	8628	745670	8628	100.0	1.16
Pantego town	1	164	745671	164	100.0	0.02
Parkton town	4	504	745671	504	100.0	0.07
Parmele town	1	243	745671	243	100.0	0.03
Patterson Springs town	13	571	745671	571	100.0	0.08
Peachland town	8	390	745670	390	100.0	0.05
Peletier town	3	769	745671	769	100.0	0.1
Pembroke town	4	2823	745671	2823	100.0	0.38
Pikeville town	1	712	745671	712	100.0	0.1
Pilot Mountain town	12	1440	745670	1440	100.0	0.19
Pine Knoll Shores town	3	1388	745671	1388	100.0	0.19
Pine Level town	2	2046	745670	2046	100.0	0.27
Pinebluff town	7	1473	745671	1473	100.0	0.2
Pinehurst village	7	17581	745671	17581	100.0	2.36
Pinetops town	2	1200	745670	1200	100.0	0.16
Pineville town	9	10602	745670	10602	100.0	1.42
Pink Hill town	1	451	745671	451	100.0	0.06
Pittsboro town	7	4537	745671	4537	100.0	0.61
Pleasant Garden town	11	5000	745671	5000	100.0	0.67
Plymouth town	1	3320	745671	3320	100.0	0.45
Polkton town	8	2250	745670	2250	100.0	0.3
Polkville city	13	516	745671	516	100.0	0.07
Pollocksville town	1	268	745671	268	100.0	0.04
Powellsville town	1	189	745671	189	100.0	0.03
Princeton town	2	1315	745670	1315	100.0	0.18
Princeville town	2	1254	745670	1254	100.0	0.17
Proctorville town	4	121	745671	121	100.0	0.02
Raeford city	4	4559	745671	4559	100.0	0.61
Raleigh city (DURHAM)	2	1559	745670	1326	85.05	0.18
Raleigh city (DURHAM)	6	1559	745671	233	14.95	0.03
Raleigh city (WAKE)	5	466106	745671	466106	100.0	62.51
Ramseur town	11	1774	745671	1774	100.0	0.24
Randleman city	11	4595	745671	4595	100.0	0.62
Ranlo town	13	4511	745671	4511	100.0	0.6
Raynham town	4	60	745671	60	100.0	0.01
Red Cross town	8	762	745670	762	100.0	0.1
Red Oak town	2	3342	745670	3342	100.0	0.45
Red Springs town (HOKE)	4	0	745671	0	0.0	0.0

Red Springs town (ROBESON)	4	3087	745671	3087	100.0	0.41
Reidsville city	6	14583	745671	14583	100.0	1.96
Rennert town	4	275	745671	275	100.0	0.04
Rhodhiss town (BURKE)	13	639	745671	639	100.0	0.09
Rhodhiss town (CALDWELL)	13	358	745671	358	100.0	0.05
Rich Square town	2	894	745670	894	100.0	0.12
Richfield town	8	582	745670	582	100.0	0.08
Richlands town	3	2287	745671	2287	100.0	0.31
River Bend town	1	2902	745671	2902	100.0	0.39
Roanoke Rapids city	2	15229	745670	15229	100.0	2.04
Robbins town	7	1168	745671	1168	100.0	0.16
Robbinsville town	14	597	745670	597	100.0	0.08
Robersonville town	1	1269	745671	1269	100.0	0.17
Rockingham city	4	9243	745671	9243	100.0	1.24
Rockwell town	8	2302	745670	2302	100.0	0.31
Rocky Mount city (EDGECOMBE)	2	15414	745670	15414	100.0	2.07
Rocky Mount city (NASH)	2	38927	745670	38927	100.0	5.22
Rolesville town	5	9475	745671	9475	100.0	1.27
Ronda town	12	438	745670	438	100.0	0.06
Roper town	1	485	745671	485	100.0	0.07
Rose Hill town	4	1371	745671	1371	100.0	0.18
Roseboro town	4	1163	745671	1163	100.0	0.16
Rosman town	14	701	745670	701	100.0	0.09
Rowland town	4	885	745671	885	100.0	0.12
Roxboro city	6	8134	745671	8134	100.0	1.09
Roxobel town	1	187	745671	187	100.0	0.03
Rural Hall town	12	3351	745670	3351	100.0	0.45
Ruth town	13	347	745671	347	100.0	0.05
Rutherford College town (BURKE)	13	1226	745671	1226	100.0	0.16
Rutherford College town (CALDWELL)	13	0	745671	0	0.0	0.0
Rutherfordton town	13	3640	745671	3640	100.0	0.49
Salemburg town	4	457	745671	457	100.0	0.06
Salisbury city	8	35540	745670	35540	100.0	4.77
Saluda city (HENDERSON)	14	11	745670	11	100.0	0.0
Saluda city (POLK)	14	620	745670	620	100.0	0.08
Sandy Creek town	3	248	745671	248	100.0	0.03
Sandyfield town	3	430	745671	430	100.0	0.06
Sanford city	7	30261	745671	30261	100.0	4.06

Saratoga town	2	353	745670	353	100.0	0.05
Sawmills town	12	5020	745670	20	0.4	0.0
Sawmills town	13	5020	745671	5000	99.6	0.67
Scotland Neck town	2	1640	745670	1640	100.0	0.22
Seaboard town	2	542	745670	542	100.0	0.07
Seagrove town	11	235	745671	235	100.0	0.03
Sedalia town	11	676	745671	676	100.0	0.09
Selma town	2	6317	745670	6317	100.0	0.85
Seven Devils town (AVERY)	12	38	745670	38	100.0	0.01
Seven Devils town (WATAUGA)	12	275	745670	275	100.0	0.04
Seven Springs town	1	55	745671	55	100.0	0.01
Severn town	2	191	745670	191	100.0	0.03
Shallotte town	3	4185	745671	4185	100.0	0.56
Sharpsburg town (EDGECOMBE)	2	215	745670	215	100.0	0.03
Sharpsburg town (NASH)	2	1061	745670	1061	100.0	0.14
Sharpsburg town (WILSON)	2	421	745670	421	100.0	0.06
Shelby city	13	21918	745671	21918	100.0	2.94
Siler City town	7	7702	745671	7702	100.0	1.03
Simpson village	1	390	745671	390	100.0	0.05
Sims town	2	275	745670	275	100.0	0.04
Smithfield town	2	11292	745670	11292	100.0	1.51
Snow Hill town	1	1481	745671	1481	100.0	0.2
Southern Pines town	7	15545	745671	15545	100.0	2.08
Southern Shores town	1	3090	745671	3090	100.0	0.41
Southport city	3	3971	745671	3971	100.0	0.53
Sparta town	12	1834	745670	1834	100.0	0.25
Speed town	2	63	745670	63	100.0	0.01
Spencer Mountain town	13	0	745671	0	0.0	0.0
Spencer town	8	3308	745670	3308	100.0	0.44
Spindale town	13	4225	745671	4225	100.0	0.57
Spring Hope town	2	1309	745670	1309	100.0	0.18
Spring Lake town	4	11660	745671	11660	100.0	1.56
Spruce Pine town	14	2194	745670	2194	100.0	0.29
St. Helena village	3	417	745671	417	100.0	0.06
St. James town	3	6529	745671	6529	100.0	0.88
St. Pauls town	4	2045	745671	2045	100.0	0.27
Staley town	11	397	745671	397	100.0	0.05
Stallings town (MECKLENBURG)	9	384	745670	11	2.86	0.0

Stallings town (MECKLENBURG)	10	384	745670	373	97.14	0.05
Stallings town (UNION)	8	15728	745670	15728	100.0	2.11
Stanfield town	8	1585	745670	1585	100.0	0.21
Stanley town	13	3963	745671	3963	100.0	0.53
Stantonsburg town	2	762	745670	762	100.0	0.1
Star town	8	806	745670	806	100.0	0.11
Statesville city	10	28419	745670	28419	100.0	3.81
Stedman town	4	1277	745671	1277	100.0	0.17
Stem town	2	960	745670	960	100.0	0.13
Stokesdale town	11	5924	745671	5924	100.0	0.79
Stoneville town	6	1308	745671	1308	100.0	0.18
Stonewall town	1	214	745671	214	100.0	0.03
Stovall town	2	324	745670	324	100.0	0.04
Sugar Mountain village	12	371	745670	371	100.0	0.05
Summerfield town	11	10951	745671	10951	100.0	1.47
Sunset Beach town	3	4175	745671	4175	100.0	0.56
Surf City town (ONSLOW)	3	334	745671	334	100.0	0.04
Surf City town (PENDER)	3	3533	745671	3533	100.0	0.47
Swansboro town	3	3744	745671	3744	100.0	0.5
Sweptsonville town	6	2445	745671	2445	100.0	0.33
Sylva town	14	2578	745670	2578	100.0	0.35
Tabor City town	3	3781	745671	3781	100.0	0.51
Tar Heel town	4	90	745671	90	100.0	0.01
Tarboro town	2	10721	745670	10721	100.0	1.44
Taylorsville town	12	2320	745670	2320	100.0	0.31
Taylortown town	7	634	745671	634	100.0	0.09
Teachey town	4	448	745671	448	100.0	0.06
Thomasville city (DAVIDSON)	8	26662	745670	26662	100.0	3.58
Thomasville city (RANDOLPH)	11	521	745671	521	100.0	0.07
Tobaccoville village (FORSYTH)	12	2578	745670	2578	100.0	0.35
Tobaccoville village (STOKES)	12	0	745670	0	0.0	0.0
Topsail Beach town	3	461	745671	461	100.0	0.06
Trent Woods town	1	4074	745671	4074	100.0	0.55
Trenton town	1	238	745671	238	100.0	0.03
Trinity city	11	7006	745671	7006	100.0	0.94
Troutman town	10	3698	745670	3698	100.0	0.5
Troy town	8	2850	745670	2850	100.0	0.38
Tryon town	14	1562	745670	1562	100.0	0.21

Turkey town	4	213	745671	213	100.0	0.03
Unionville town	8	6643	745670	6643	100.0	0.89
Valdese town	13	4689	745671	4689	100.0	0.63
Vanceboro town	1	869	745671	869	100.0	0.12
Vandemere town	1	246	745671	246	100.0	0.03
Varnamtown town	3	525	745671	525	100.0	0.07
Vass town	7	952	745671	952	100.0	0.13
Waco town	13	310	745671	310	100.0	0.04
Wade town	4	638	745671	638	100.0	0.09
Wadesboro town	8	5008	745670	5008	100.0	0.67
Wagram town	4	615	745671	615	100.0	0.08
Wake Forest town (FRANKLIN)	2	1504	745670	1504	100.0	0.2
Wake Forest town (WAKE)	5	46097	745671	46097	100.0	6.18
Walkertown town	12	5692	745670	5692	100.0	0.76
Wallace town (DUPLIN)	4	3413	745671	3413	100.0	0.46
Wallace town (PENDER)	3	0	745671	0	0.0	0.0
Wallburg town	8	3051	745670	3051	100.0	0.41
Walnut Cove town	12	1586	745670	1586	100.0	0.21
Walnut Creek village	1	1084	745671	1084	100.0	0.15
Walstonburg town	1	193	745671	193	100.0	0.03
Warrenton town	2	851	745670	851	100.0	0.11
Warsaw town	4	2733	745671	2733	100.0	0.37
Washington Park town	1	392	745671	392	100.0	0.05
Washington city	1	9875	745671	9875	100.0	1.32
Watha town	3	181	745671	181	100.0	0.02
Waxhaw town	8	20534	745670	20534	100.0	2.75
Waynesville town	14	10140	745670	10140	100.0	1.36
Weaverville town	14	4567	745670	4567	100.0	0.61
Webster town	14	372	745670	372	100.0	0.05
Weddington town (MECKLENBURG)	9	5	745670	5	100.0	0.0
Weddington town (UNION)	8	13176	745670	13176	100.0	1.77
Weldon town	2	1444	745670	1444	100.0	0.19
Wendell town	5	9793	745671	9793	100.0	1.31
Wentworth town	6	2662	745671	2662	100.0	0.36
Wesley Chapel village	8	8681	745670	8681	100.0	1.16
West Jefferson town	12	1279	745670	1279	100.0	0.17
Whispering Pines village	7	4987	745671	4987	100.0	0.67
Whitakers town (EDGECOMBE)	2	290	745670	290	100.0	0.04

Whitakers town (NASH)	2	337	745670	337	100.0	0.05
White Lake town	4	843	745671	843	100.0	0.11
Whiteville city	3	4766	745671	4766	100.0	0.64
Whitsett town	11	584	745671	584	100.0	0.08
Wilkesboro town	12	3687	745670	3687	100.0	0.49
Williamston town	1	5248	745671	5248	100.0	0.7
Wilmington city	3	115451	745671	115451	100.0	15.48
Wilson city	2	47851	745670	47851	100.0	6.42
Wilson's Mills town	2	2534	745670	2534	100.0	0.34
Windsor town	1	3582	745671	3582	100.0	0.48
Winfall town	1	555	745671	555	100.0	0.07
Wingate town	8	4055	745670	4055	100.0	0.54
Winston-Salem city	11	249545	745671	40352	16.17	5.41
Winston-Salem city	12	249545	745670	209193	83.83	28.05
Winterville town	1	10462	745671	10462	100.0	1.4
Winton town	1	629	745671	629	100.0	0.08
Woodfin town	14	7936	745670	7936	100.0	1.06
Woodland town	2	557	745670	557	100.0	0.07
Wrightsville Beach town	3	2473	745671	2473	100.0	0.33
Yadkinville town	12	2995	745670	2995	100.0	0.4
Yanceyville town	6	1937	745671	1937	100.0	0.26
Youngsville town	2	2016	745670	2016	100.0	0.27
Zebulon town (JOHNSTON)	2	0	745670	0	0.0	0.0
Zebulon town (WAKE)	5	6903	745671	6903	100.0	0.93

District-Municipality by County Report

District	Municipality (County)	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District pop in Muni	% District Pop in Muni	% Muni Pop in District
1	Ahoskie town	745671	4891	4891	0.66	100.0
1	Alliance town	745671	733	733	0.1	100.0
1	Arapahoe town	745671	416	416	0.06	100.0
1	Askewville town	745671	184	184	0.02	100.0
1	Aulander town	745671	763	763	0.1	100.0
1	Aurora town	745671	455	455	0.06	100.0
1	Ayden town	745671	4977	4977	0.67	100.0
1	Bath town	745671	245	245	0.03	100.0
1	Bayboro town	745671	1161	1161	0.16	100.0
1	Bear Grass town	745671	89	89	0.01	100.0
1	Belhaven town	745671	1410	1410	0.19	100.0
1	Bethel town	745671	1373	1373	0.18	100.0
1	Bridgeton town	745671	349	349	0.05	100.0
1	Chocowinity town	745671	722	722	0.1	100.0
1	Cofield village	745671	267	267	0.04	100.0
1	Colerain town	745671	217	217	0.03	100.0
1	Columbia town	745671	610	610	0.08	100.0
1	Como town	745671	67	67	0.01	100.0
1	Cove City town	745671	378	378	0.05	100.0
1	Creswell town	745671	207	207	0.03	100.0
1	Dover town	745671	349	349	0.05	100.0
1	Duck town	745671	742	742	0.1	100.0
1	Edenton town	745671	4460	4460	0.6	100.0
1	Elizabeth City city (CAMDEN)	745671	38	38	0.01	100.0
1	Elizabeth City city (PASQUOTANK)	745671	18593	18593	2.49	100.0
1	Eureka town	745671	214	214	0.03	100.0
1	Everetts town	745671	150	150	0.02	100.0
1	Falkland town	745671	47	47	0.01	100.0
1	Farmville town	745671	4461	4461	0.6	100.0
1	Fountain town	745671	385	385	0.05	100.0
1	Fremont town	745671	1196	1196	0.16	100.0
1	Gatesville town	745671	267	267	0.04	100.0
1	Goldsboro city	745671	33657	33657	4.51	100.0
1	Grantsboro town	745671	692	692	0.09	100.0

1	Greenville city	745671	87521	87521	11.74	100.0
1	Grifton town (LENOIR)	745671	147	147	0.02	100.0
1	Grifton town (PITT)	745671	2301	2301	0.31	100.0
1	Grimesland town	745671	386	386	0.05	100.0
1	Hamilton town	745671	306	306	0.04	100.0
1	Harrellsville town	745671	85	85	0.01	100.0
1	Hassell town	745671	49	49	0.01	100.0
1	Havelock city	745671	16621	16621	2.23	100.0
1	Hertford town	745671	1934	1934	0.26	100.0
1	Hookerton town	745671	413	413	0.06	100.0
1	Jamesville town	745671	424	424	0.06	100.0
1	Kelford town	745671	203	203	0.03	100.0
1	Kill Devil Hills town	745671	7656	7656	1.03	100.0
1	Kinston city	745671	19900	19900	2.67	100.0
1	Kitty Hawk town	745671	3689	3689	0.49	100.0
1	La Grange town	745671	2595	2595	0.35	100.0
1	Lewiston Woodville town	745671	426	426	0.06	100.0
1	Macclesfield town	745671	413	413	0.06	100.0
1	Manteo town	745671	1600	1600	0.21	100.0
1	Maysville town	745671	818	818	0.11	100.0
1	Mesic town	745671	144	144	0.02	100.0
1	Minnesott Beach town	745671	530	530	0.07	100.0
1	Murfreesboro town	745671	2619	2619	0.35	100.0
1	Nags Head town	745671	3168	3168	0.42	100.0
1	New Bern city	745671	31291	31291	4.2	100.0
1	Oak City town	745671	266	266	0.04	100.0
1	Oriental town	745671	880	880	0.12	100.0
1	Pantego town	745671	164	164	0.02	100.0
1	Parmele town	745671	243	243	0.03	100.0
1	Pikeville town	745671	712	712	0.1	100.0
1	Pink Hill town	745671	451	451	0.06	100.0
1	Plymouth town	745671	3320	3320	0.45	100.0
1	Pollocksville town	745671	268	268	0.04	100.0
1	Powellsville town	745671	189	189	0.03	100.0
1	River Bend town	745671	2902	2902	0.39	100.0
1	Robersonville town	745671	1269	1269	0.17	100.0
1	Roper town	745671	485	485	0.07	100.0
1	Roxobel town	745671	187	187	0.03	100.0

1	Seven Springs town	745671	55	55	0.01	100.0
1	Simpson village	745671	390	390	0.05	100.0
1	Snow Hill town	745671	1481	1481	0.2	100.0
1	Southern Shores town	745671	3090	3090	0.41	100.0
1	Stonewall town	745671	214	214	0.03	100.0
1	Trent Woods town	745671	4074	4074	0.55	100.0
1	Trenton town	745671	238	238	0.03	100.0
1	Vanceboro town	745671	869	869	0.12	100.0
1	Vandemere town	745671	246	246	0.03	100.0
1	Walnut Creek village	745671	1084	1084	0.15	100.0
1	Walstonburg town	745671	193	193	0.03	100.0
1	Washington Park town	745671	392	392	0.05	100.0
1	Washington city	745671	9875	9875	1.32	100.0
1	Williamston town	745671	5248	5248	0.7	100.0
1	Windsor town	745671	3582	3582	0.48	100.0
1	Winfall town	745671	555	555	0.07	100.0
1	Winterville town	745671	10462	10462	1.4	100.0
1	Winton town	745671	629	629	0.08	100.0
2	Archer Lodge town	745670	4797	4797	0.64	100.0
2	Bailey town	745670	568	568	0.08	100.0
2	Benson town (JOHNSTON)	745670	3967	3967	0.53	100.0
2	Black Creek town	745670	692	692	0.09	100.0
2	Bunn town	745670	327	327	0.04	100.0
2	Butner town	745670	8397	8397	1.13	100.0
2	Castalia town	745670	264	264	0.04	100.0
2	Clayton town (JOHNSTON)	745670	26307	26307	3.53	100.0
2	Conetoe town	745670	198	198	0.03	100.0
2	Conway town	745670	752	752	0.1	100.0
2	Creedmoor city	745670	4866	4866	0.65	100.0
2	Dortches town	745670	1082	1082	0.15	100.0
2	Durham city (DURHAM)	745670	283093	41474	5.56	14.65
2	Elm City town (NASH)	745670	0	0	0.0	0.0
2	Elm City town (WILSON)	745670	1218	1218	0.16	100.0
2	Enfield town	745670	1865	1865	0.25	100.0
2	Four Oaks town	745670	2158	2158	0.29	100.0
2	Franklinton town	745670	2456	2456	0.33	100.0
2	Garysburg town	745670	904	904	0.12	100.0
2	Gaston town	745670	1008	1008	0.14	100.0

2	Halifax town	745670	170	170	0.02	100.0
2	Henderson city	745670	15060	15060	2.02	100.0
2	Hobgood town	745670	268	268	0.04	100.0
2	Jackson town	745670	430	430	0.06	100.0
2	Kenly town (JOHNSTON)	745670	1293	1293	0.17	100.0
2	Kenly town (WILSON)	745670	198	198	0.03	100.0
2	Kittrell town	745670	132	132	0.02	100.0
2	Lasker town	745670	64	64	0.01	100.0
2	Leggett town	745670	37	37	0.0	100.0
2	Littleton town	745670	559	559	0.07	100.0
2	Louisburg town	745670	3064	3064	0.41	100.0
2	Lucama town	745670	1036	1036	0.14	100.0
2	Macon town	745670	110	110	0.01	100.0
2	Micro town	745670	458	458	0.06	100.0
2	Middleburg town	745670	101	101	0.01	100.0
2	Middlesex town	745670	912	912	0.12	100.0
2	Momeyer town	745670	277	277	0.04	100.0
2	Nashville town	745670	5632	5632	0.76	100.0
2	Norlina town	745670	920	920	0.12	100.0
2	Oxford city	745670	8628	8628	1.16	100.0
2	Pine Level town	745670	2046	2046	0.27	100.0
2	Pinetops town	745670	1200	1200	0.16	100.0
2	Princeton town	745670	1315	1315	0.18	100.0
2	Princeville town	745670	1254	1254	0.17	100.0
2	Raleigh city (DURHAM)	745670	1559	1326	0.18	85.05
2	Red Oak town	745670	3342	3342	0.45	100.0
2	Rich Square town	745670	894	894	0.12	100.0
2	Roanoke Rapids city	745670	15229	15229	2.04	100.0
2	Rocky Mount city (EDGECOMBE)	745670	15414	15414	2.07	100.0
2	Rocky Mount city (NASH)	745670	38927	38927	5.22	100.0
2	Saratoga town	745670	353	353	0.05	100.0
2	Scotland Neck town	745670	1640	1640	0.22	100.0
2	Seaboard town	745670	542	542	0.07	100.0
2	Selma town	745670	6317	6317	0.85	100.0
2	Severn town	745670	191	191	0.03	100.0
2	Sharpsburg town (EDGECOMBE)	745670	215	215	0.03	100.0
2	Sharpsburg town (NASH)	745670	1061	1061	0.14	100.0
2	Sharpsburg town (WILSON)	745670	421	421	0.06	100.0

2	Sims town	745670	275	275	0.04	100.0
2	Smithfield town	745670	11292	11292	1.51	100.0
2	Speed town	745670	63	63	0.01	100.0
2	Spring Hope town	745670	1309	1309	0.18	100.0
2	Stantonsburg town	745670	762	762	0.1	100.0
2	Stem town	745670	960	960	0.13	100.0
2	Stovall town	745670	324	324	0.04	100.0
2	Tarboro town	745670	10721	10721	1.44	100.0
2	Wake Forest town (FRANKLIN)	745670	1504	1504	0.2	100.0
2	Warrenton town	745670	851	851	0.11	100.0
2	Weldon town	745670	1444	1444	0.19	100.0
2	Whitakers town (EDGECOMBE)	745670	290	290	0.04	100.0
2	Whitakers town (NASH)	745670	337	337	0.05	100.0
2	Wilson city	745670	47851	47851	6.42	100.0
2	Wilson's Mills town	745670	2534	2534	0.34	100.0
2	Woodland town	745670	557	557	0.07	100.0
2	Youngsville town	745670	2016	2016	0.27	100.0
2	Zebulon town (JOHNSTON)	745670	0	0	0.0	0.0
3	Atkinson town	745671	296	296	0.04	100.0
3	Atlantic Beach town	745671	1364	1364	0.18	100.0
3	Bald Head Island village	745671	268	268	0.04	100.0
3	Beaufort town	745671	4464	4464	0.6	100.0
3	Belville town	745671	2406	2406	0.32	100.0
3	Boardman town	745671	166	166	0.02	100.0
3	Bogue town	745671	695	695	0.09	100.0
3	Boiling Spring Lakes city	745671	5943	5943	0.8	100.0
3	Bolivia town	745671	149	149	0.02	100.0
3	Bolton town	745671	519	519	0.07	100.0
3	Brunswick town	745671	973	973	0.13	100.0
3	Burgaw town	745671	3088	3088	0.41	100.0
3	Calabash town	745671	2011	2011	0.27	100.0
3	Cape Carteret town	745671	2224	2224	0.3	100.0
3	Carolina Beach town	745671	6564	6564	0.88	100.0
3	Carolina Shores town	745671	4588	4588	0.62	100.0
3	Caswell Beach town	745671	395	395	0.05	100.0
3	Cedar Point town	745671	1764	1764	0.24	100.0
3	Cerro Gordo town	745671	131	131	0.02	100.0
3	Chadbourn town	745671	1574	1574	0.21	100.0

3	Emerald Isle town	745671	3847	3847	0.52	100.0
3	Fair Bluff town	745671	709	709	0.1	100.0
3	Holden Beach town	745671	921	921	0.12	100.0
3	Holly Ridge town	745671	4171	4171	0.56	100.0
3	Indian Beach town	745671	223	223	0.03	100.0
3	Jacksonville city	745671	72723	72723	9.75	100.0
3	Kure Beach town	745671	2191	2191	0.29	100.0
3	Lake Waccamaw town	745671	1296	1296	0.17	100.0
3	Leland town	745671	22908	22908	3.07	100.0
3	Morehead City town	745671	9556	9556	1.28	100.0
3	Navassa town	745671	1367	1367	0.18	100.0
3	Newport town	745671	4364	4364	0.59	100.0
3	North Topsail Beach town	745671	1005	1005	0.13	100.0
3	Northwest city	745671	703	703	0.09	100.0
3	Oak Island town	745671	8396	8396	1.13	100.0
3	Ocean Isle Beach town	745671	867	867	0.12	100.0
3	Peletier town	745671	769	769	0.1	100.0
3	Pine Knoll Shores town	745671	1388	1388	0.19	100.0
3	Richlands town	745671	2287	2287	0.31	100.0
3	Sandy Creek town	745671	248	248	0.03	100.0
3	Sandyfield town	745671	430	430	0.06	100.0
3	Shallotte town	745671	4185	4185	0.56	100.0
3	Southport city	745671	3971	3971	0.53	100.0
3	St. Helena village	745671	417	417	0.06	100.0
3	St. James town	745671	6529	6529	0.88	100.0
3	Sunset Beach town	745671	4175	4175	0.56	100.0
3	Surf City town (ONSLOW)	745671	334	334	0.04	100.0
3	Surf City town (PENDER)	745671	3533	3533	0.47	100.0
3	Swansboro town	745671	3744	3744	0.5	100.0
3	Tabor City town	745671	3781	3781	0.51	100.0
3	Topsail Beach town	745671	461	461	0.06	100.0
3	Varnamtown town	745671	525	525	0.07	100.0
3	Wallace town (PENDER)	745671	0	0	0.0	0.0
3	Watha town	745671	181	181	0.02	100.0
3	Whiteville city	745671	4766	4766	0.64	100.0
3	Wilmington city	745671	115451	115451	15.48	100.0
3	Wrightsville Beach town	745671	2473	2473	0.33	100.0
4	Autryville town	745671	167	167	0.02	100.0

4	Beulaville town	745671	1116	1116	0.15	100.0
4	Bladenboro town	745671	1648	1648	0.22	100.0
4	Calypso town	745671	327	327	0.04	100.0
4	Clarkton town	745671	614	614	0.08	100.0
4	Clinton city	745671	8383	8383	1.12	100.0
4	Dobbins Heights town	745671	687	687	0.09	100.0
4	Dublin town	745671	267	267	0.04	100.0
4	Dunn city	745671	8446	8446	1.13	100.0
4	East Arcadia town	745671	418	418	0.06	100.0
4	East Laurinburg town	745671	234	234	0.03	100.0
4	Eastover town	745671	3656	3656	0.49	100.0
4	Elizabethtown town	745671	3296	3296	0.44	100.0
4	Ellerbe town	745671	864	864	0.12	100.0
4	Erwin town	745671	4542	0	0.0	0.0
4	Fairmont town	745671	2191	2191	0.29	100.0
4	Faison town (DUPLIN)	745671	784	784	0.11	100.0
4	Faison town (SAMPSON)	745671	0	0	0.0	0.0
4	Falcon town (CUMBERLAND)	745671	324	324	0.04	100.0
4	Falcon town (SAMPSON)	745671	0	0	0.0	0.0
4	Fayetteville city	745671	208501	208501	27.96	100.0
4	Garland town	745671	595	595	0.08	100.0
4	Gibson town	745671	449	449	0.06	100.0
4	Godwin town	745671	128	128	0.02	100.0
4	Greenevers town	745671	567	567	0.08	100.0
4	Hamlet city	745671	6025	6025	0.81	100.0
4	Harrells town (DUPLIN)	745671	0	0	0.0	0.0
4	Harrells town (SAMPSON)	745671	160	160	0.02	100.0
4	Hoffman town	745671	418	418	0.06	100.0
4	Hope Mills town	745671	17808	17808	2.39	100.0
4	Kenansville town	745671	770	770	0.1	100.0
4	Laurinburg city	745671	14978	14978	2.01	100.0
4	Linden town	745671	136	136	0.02	100.0
4	Lumber Bridge town	745671	82	82	0.01	100.0
4	Lumberton city	745671	19025	19025	2.55	100.0
4	Magnolia town	745671	831	831	0.11	100.0
4	Marietta town	745671	111	111	0.01	100.0
4	Maxton town (ROBESON)	745671	1902	1902	0.26	100.0
4	Maxton town (SCOTLAND)	745671	208	208	0.03	100.0

4	McDonald town	745671	94	94	0.01	100.0
4	Mount Olive town (DUPLIN)	745671	5	5	0.0	100.0
4	Mount Olive town (WAYNE)	745671	4193	4193	0.56	100.0
4	Newton Grove town	745671	585	585	0.08	100.0
4	Orrum town	745671	59	59	0.01	100.0
4	Parkton town	745671	504	504	0.07	100.0
4	Pembroke town	745671	2823	2823	0.38	100.0
4	Proctorville town	745671	121	121	0.02	100.0
4	Raeford city	745671	4559	4559	0.61	100.0
4	Raynham town	745671	60	60	0.01	100.0
4	Red Springs town (HOKE)	745671	0	0	0.0	0.0
4	Red Springs town (ROBESON)	745671	3087	3087	0.41	100.0
4	Rennert town	745671	275	275	0.04	100.0
4	Rockingham city	745671	9243	9243	1.24	100.0
4	Rose Hill town	745671	1371	1371	0.18	100.0
4	Roseboro town	745671	1163	1163	0.16	100.0
4	Rowland town	745671	885	885	0.12	100.0
4	Salemburg town	745671	457	457	0.06	100.0
4	Spring Lake town	745671	11660	11660	1.56	100.0
4	St. Pauls town	745671	2045	2045	0.27	100.0
4	Stedman town	745671	1277	1277	0.17	100.0
4	Tar Heel town	745671	90	90	0.01	100.0
4	Teachey town	745671	448	448	0.06	100.0
4	Turkey town	745671	213	213	0.03	100.0
4	Wade town	745671	638	638	0.09	100.0
4	Wagram town	745671	615	615	0.08	100.0
4	Wallace town (DUPLIN)	745671	3413	3413	0.46	100.0
4	Warsaw town	745671	2733	2733	0.37	100.0
4	White Lake town	745671	843	843	0.11	100.0
5	Cary town (WAKE)	745671	171012	30544	4.1	17.86
5	Clayton town (WAKE)	745671	0	0	0.0	0.0
5	Durham city (WAKE)	745671	269	269	0.04	100.0
5	Garner town	745671	31159	28321	3.8	90.89
5	Knightdale town	745671	19435	19435	2.61	100.0
5	Raleigh city (WAKE)	745671	466106	466106	62.51	100.0
5	Rolesville town	745671	9475	9475	1.27	100.0
5	Wake Forest town (WAKE)	745671	46097	46097	6.18	100.0
5	Wendell town	745671	9793	9793	1.31	100.0

5	Zebulon town (WAKE)	745671	6903	6903	0.93	100.0
6	Alamance village	745671	988	988	0.13	100.0
6	Burlington city (ALAMANCE)	745671	55481	55481	7.44	100.0
6	Carrboro town	745671	21295	21295	2.86	100.0
6	Chapel Hill town (DURHAM)	745671	2906	2906	0.39	100.0
6	Chapel Hill town (ORANGE)	745671	59054	59054	7.92	100.0
6	Durham city (DURHAM)	745671	283093	241619	32.4	85.35
6	Durham city (ORANGE)	745671	144	144	0.02	100.0
6	Eden city	745671	15421	15421	2.07	100.0
6	Elon town	745671	11336	11336	1.52	100.0
6	Gibsonville town (ALAMANCE)	745671	4278	4278	0.57	100.0
6	Graham city	745671	17157	17157	2.3	100.0
6	Green Level town	745671	3152	3152	0.42	100.0
6	Haw River town	745671	2252	2252	0.3	100.0
6	Hillsborough town	745671	9660	9660	1.3	100.0
6	Madison town	745671	2129	2129	0.29	100.0
6	Mayodan town	745671	2418	2418	0.32	100.0
6	Mebane city (ALAMANCE)	745671	14626	14626	1.96	100.0
6	Mebane city (ORANGE)	745671	3171	3171	0.43	100.0
6	Milton town	745671	155	155	0.02	100.0
6	Morrisville town (DURHAM)	745671	207	207	0.03	100.0
6	Ossipee town	745671	536	536	0.07	100.0
6	Raleigh city (DURHAM)	745671	1559	233	0.03	14.95
6	Reidsville city	745671	14583	14583	1.96	100.0
6	Roxboro city	745671	8134	8134	1.09	100.0
6	Stoneville town	745671	1308	1308	0.18	100.0
6	Sweepsonville town	745671	2445	2445	0.33	100.0
6	Wentworth town	745671	2662	2662	0.36	100.0
6	Yanceyville town	745671	1937	1937	0.26	100.0
7	Aberdeen town	745671	8516	8516	1.14	100.0
7	Angier town (HARNETT)	745671	4709	4709	0.63	100.0
7	Angier town (WAKE)	745671	556	556	0.07	100.0
7	Apex town	745671	58780	58780	7.88	100.0
7	Benson town (HARNETT)	745671	0	0	0.0	0.0
7	Broadway town (HARNETT)	745671	0	0	0.0	0.0
7	Broadway town (LEE)	745671	1267	1267	0.17	100.0
7	Cameron town	745671	244	244	0.03	100.0
7	Candor town (MOORE)	745671	0	0	0.0	0.0

7	Carthage town	745671	2775	2775	0.37	100.0
7	Cary town (CHATHAM)	745671	3709	3709	0.5	100.0
7	Cary town (WAKE)	745671	171012	140468	18.84	82.14
7	Coats town	745671	2155	2155	0.29	100.0
7	Durham city (WAKE)	745671	269	0	0.0	0.0
7	Erwin town	745671	4542	4542	0.61	100.0
7	Foxfire village	745671	1288	1288	0.17	100.0
7	Fuquay-Varina town (HARNETT)	745671	0	0	0.0	0.0
7	Fuquay-Varina town (WAKE)	745671	34152	34152	4.58	100.0
7	Garner town	745671	31159	2838	0.38	9.11
7	Goldston town	745671	234	234	0.03	100.0
7	Holly Springs town	745671	41239	41239	5.53	100.0
7	Lillington town	745671	4735	4735	0.63	100.0
7	Morrisville town (WAKE)	745671	29423	29423	3.95	100.0
7	Pinebluff town	745671	1473	1473	0.2	100.0
7	Pinehurst village	745671	17581	17581	2.36	100.0
7	Pittsboro town	745671	4537	4537	0.61	100.0
7	Robbins town	745671	1168	1168	0.16	100.0
7	Sanford city	745671	30261	30261	4.06	100.0
7	Siler City town	745671	7702	7702	1.03	100.0
7	Southern Pines town	745671	15545	15545	2.08	100.0
7	Taylortown town	745671	634	634	0.09	100.0
7	Vass town	745671	952	952	0.13	100.0
7	Whispering Pines village	745671	4987	4987	0.67	100.0
8	Albemarle city	745670	16432	16432	2.2	100.0
8	Ansonville town	745670	440	440	0.06	100.0
8	Badin town	745670	2024	2024	0.27	100.0
8	Bermuda Run town	745670	3120	3120	0.42	100.0
8	Biscoe town	745670	1848	1848	0.25	100.0
8	Candor town (MONTGOMERY)	745670	813	813	0.11	100.0
8	China Grove town	745670	4434	4434	0.59	100.0
8	Cleveland town	745670	846	846	0.11	100.0
8	Concord city	745670	105240	2448	0.33	2.33
8	Cooleemee town	745670	940	940	0.13	100.0
8	Denton town	745670	1494	1494	0.2	100.0
8	East Spencer town	745670	1567	1567	0.21	100.0
8	Fairview town	745670	3456	3456	0.46	100.0
8	Faith town	745670	819	819	0.11	100.0

8	Granite Quarry town	745670	2984	2984	0.4	100.0
8	Hemby Bridge town	745670	1614	1614	0.22	100.0
8	High Point city (DAVIDSON)	745670	6646	6646	0.89	100.0
8	Indian Trail town	745670	39997	39997	5.36	100.0
8	Kannapolis city (CABARRUS)	745670	42846	5111	0.69	11.93
8	Kannapolis city (ROWAN)	745670	10268	10268	1.38	100.0
8	Lake Park village	745670	3269	3269	0.44	100.0
8	Landis town	745670	3690	3690	0.49	100.0
8	Lexington city	745670	19632	19632	2.63	100.0
8	Lilesville town	745670	395	395	0.05	100.0
8	Locust city (CABARRUS)	745670	541	541	0.07	100.0
8	Locust city (STANLY)	745670	3996	3996	0.54	100.0
8	Marshville town	745670	2522	2522	0.34	100.0
8	Marvin village	745670	6358	6358	0.85	100.0
8	McFarlan town	745670	94	94	0.01	100.0
8	Midland town (CABARRUS)	745670	4684	4684	0.63	100.0
8	Midway town	745670	4742	4742	0.64	100.0
8	Mineral Springs town	745670	3159	3159	0.42	100.0
8	Mint Hill town (UNION)	745670	6	6	0.0	100.0
8	Misenheimer village	745670	650	650	0.09	100.0
8	Mocksville town	745670	5900	5900	0.79	100.0
8	Monroe city	745670	34562	34562	4.64	100.0
8	Morven town	745670	329	329	0.04	100.0
8	Mount Gilead town	745670	1171	1171	0.16	100.0
8	Mount Pleasant town	745670	1671	1671	0.22	100.0
8	New London town	745670	607	607	0.08	100.0
8	Norman town	745670	100	100	0.01	100.0
8	Norwood town	745670	2367	2367	0.32	100.0
8	Oakboro town	745670	2128	2128	0.29	100.0
8	Peachland town	745670	390	390	0.05	100.0
8	Polkton town	745670	2250	2250	0.3	100.0
8	Red Cross town	745670	762	762	0.1	100.0
8	Richfield town	745670	582	582	0.08	100.0
8	Rockwell town	745670	2302	2302	0.31	100.0
8	Salisbury city	745670	35540	35540	4.77	100.0
8	Spencer town	745670	3308	3308	0.44	100.0
8	Stallings town (UNION)	745670	15728	15728	2.11	100.0
8	Stanfield town	745670	1585	1585	0.21	100.0

8	Star town	745670	806	806	0.11	100.0
8	Thomasville city (DAVIDSON)	745670	26662	26662	3.58	100.0
8	Troy town	745670	2850	2850	0.38	100.0
8	Unionville town	745670	6643	6643	0.89	100.0
8	Wadesboro town	745670	5008	5008	0.67	100.0
8	Wallburg town	745670	3051	3051	0.41	100.0
8	Waxhaw town	745670	20534	20534	2.75	100.0
8	Weddington town (UNION)	745670	13176	13176	1.77	100.0
8	Wesley Chapel village	745670	8681	8681	1.16	100.0
8	Wingate town	745670	4055	4055	0.54	100.0
9	Charlotte city	745670	874579	663590	88.99	75.88
9	Matthews town	745670	29435	29435	3.95	100.0
9	Pineville town	745670	10602	10602	1.42	100.0
9	Stallings town (MECKLENBURG)	745670	384	11	0.0	2.86
9	Weddington town (MECKLENBURG)	745670	5	5	0.0	100.0
10	Charlotte city	745670	874579	210989	28.3	24.12
10	Concord city	745670	105240	102792	13.79	97.67
10	Cornelius town	745670	31412	31412	4.21	100.0
10	Davidson town (IREDELL)	745670	378	378	0.05	100.0
10	Davidson town (MECKLENBURG)	745670	14728	14728	1.98	100.0
10	Harmony town	745670	543	543	0.07	100.0
10	Harrisburg town	745670	18967	18967	2.54	100.0
10	Huntersville town	745670	61376	61376	8.23	100.0
10	Kannapolis city (CABARRUS)	745670	42846	37735	5.06	88.07
10	Love Valley town	745670	154	154	0.02	100.0
10	Midland town (MECKLENBURG)	745670	0	0	0.0	0.0
10	Mint Hill town (MECKLENBURG)	745670	26444	26444	3.55	100.0
10	Mooresville town	745670	50193	50193	6.73	100.0
10	Stallings town (MECKLENBURG)	745670	384	373	0.05	97.14
10	Statesville city	745670	28419	28419	3.81	100.0
10	Troutman town	745670	3698	3698	0.5	100.0
11	Archdale city (GUILFORD)	745671	380	380	0.05	100.0
11	Archdale city (RANDOLPH)	745671	11527	11527	1.55	100.0
11	Asheboro city	745671	27156	27156	3.64	100.0
11	Burlington city (GUILFORD)	745671	1822	1822	0.24	100.0
11	Franklinville town	745671	1197	1197	0.16	100.0
11	Gibsonville town (GUILFORD)	745671	4642	4642	0.62	100.0
11	Greensboro city	745671	299035	299035	40.1	100.0

11	High Point city (FORSYTH)	745671	84	84	0.01	100.0
11	High Point city (GUILFORD)	745671	107321	107321	14.39	100.0
11	High Point city (RANDOLPH)	745671	8	8	0.0	100.0
11	Jamestown town	745671	3668	3668	0.49	100.0
11	Kernersville town (FORSYTH)	745671	25947	12237	1.64	47.16
11	Kernersville town (GUILFORD)	745671	502	502	0.07	100.0
11	Liberty town	745671	2655	2655	0.36	100.0
11	Oak Ridge town	745671	7474	7474	1.0	100.0
11	Pleasant Garden town	745671	5000	5000	0.67	100.0
11	Ramseur town	745671	1774	1774	0.24	100.0
11	Randleman city	745671	4595	4595	0.62	100.0
11	Seagrove town	745671	235	235	0.03	100.0
11	Sedalia town	745671	676	676	0.09	100.0
11	Staley town	745671	397	397	0.05	100.0
11	Stokesdale town	745671	5924	5924	0.79	100.0
11	Summerfield town	745671	10951	10951	1.47	100.0
11	Thomasville city (RANDOLPH)	745671	521	521	0.07	100.0
11	Trinity city	745671	7006	7006	0.94	100.0
11	Whitsett town	745671	584	584	0.08	100.0
11	Winston-Salem city	745671	249545	40352	5.41	16.17
12	Banner Elk town	745670	1049	1049	0.14	100.0
12	Beech Mountain town (AVERY)	745670	62	62	0.01	100.0
12	Beech Mountain town (WATAUGA)	745670	613	613	0.08	100.0
12	Bethania town	745670	344	344	0.05	100.0
12	Blowing Rock town (CALDWELL)	745670	91	91	0.01	100.0
12	Blowing Rock town (WATAUGA)	745670	1285	1285	0.17	100.0
12	Boone town	745670	19092	19092	2.56	100.0
12	Boonville town	745670	1185	1185	0.16	100.0
12	Cajah's Mountain town	745670	2722	2722	0.37	100.0
12	Cedar Rock village	745670	301	301	0.04	100.0
12	Clemmons village	745670	21163	21163	2.84	100.0
12	Crossnore town	745670	143	143	0.02	100.0
12	Danbury town	745670	189	189	0.03	100.0
12	Dobson town	745670	1462	1462	0.2	100.0
12	East Bend town	745670	634	634	0.09	100.0
12	Elk Park town	745670	542	542	0.07	100.0
12	Elkin town (SURRY)	745670	4049	4049	0.54	100.0
12	Elkin town (WILKES)	745670	73	73	0.01	100.0

12	Gamewell town	745670	3702	3702	0.5	100.0
12	Grandfather Village village	745670	95	95	0.01	100.0
12	Hudson town	745670	3780	3780	0.51	100.0
12	Jefferson town	745670	1622	1622	0.22	100.0
12	Jonesville town	745670	2308	2308	0.31	100.0
12	Kernersville town (FORSYTH)	745670	25947	13710	1.84	52.84
12	King city (FORSYTH)	745670	591	591	0.08	100.0
12	King city (STOKES)	745670	6606	6606	0.89	100.0
12	Lansing town	745670	126	126	0.02	100.0
12	Lenoir city	745670	18352	18352	2.46	100.0
12	Lewisville town	745670	13381	13381	1.79	100.0
12	Mount Airy city	745670	10676	10676	1.43	100.0
12	Newland town	745670	715	715	0.1	100.0
12	North Wilkesboro town	745670	4382	4382	0.59	100.0
12	Pilot Mountain town	745670	1440	1440	0.19	100.0
12	Ronda town	745670	438	438	0.06	100.0
12	Rural Hall town	745670	3351	3351	0.45	100.0
12	Sawmills town	745670	5020	20	0.0	0.4
12	Seven Devils town (AVERY)	745670	38	38	0.01	100.0
12	Seven Devils town (WATAUGA)	745670	275	275	0.04	100.0
12	Sparta town	745670	1834	1834	0.25	100.0
12	Sugar Mountain village	745670	371	371	0.05	100.0
12	Taylorsville town	745670	2320	2320	0.31	100.0
12	Tobaccoville village (FORSYTH)	745670	2578	2578	0.35	100.0
12	Tobaccoville village (STOKES)	745670	0	0	0.0	0.0
12	Walkertown town	745670	5692	5692	0.76	100.0
12	Walnut Cove town	745670	1586	1586	0.21	100.0
12	West Jefferson town	745670	1279	1279	0.17	100.0
12	Wilkesboro town	745670	3687	3687	0.49	100.0
12	Winston-Salem city	745670	249545	209193	28.05	83.83
12	Yadkinville town	745670	2995	2995	0.4	100.0
13	Belmont city	745671	15010	15010	2.01	100.0
13	Belwood town	745671	857	857	0.11	100.0
13	Bessemer City city	745671	5428	5428	0.73	100.0
13	Boiling Springs town	745671	4615	4615	0.62	100.0
13	Bostic town	745671	355	355	0.05	100.0
13	Brookford town	745671	442	442	0.06	100.0
13	Casar town	745671	305	305	0.04	100.0

13	Catawba town	745671	702	702	0.09	100.0
13	Cherryville city	745671	6078	6078	0.82	100.0
13	Claremont city	745671	1692	1692	0.23	100.0
13	Connelly Springs town	745671	1529	1529	0.21	100.0
13	Conover city	745671	8421	8421	1.13	100.0
13	Cramerton town	745671	5296	5296	0.71	100.0
13	Dallas town	745671	5927	5927	0.79	100.0
13	Dellview town	745671	6	6	0.0	100.0
13	Drexel town	745671	1760	1760	0.24	100.0
13	Earl town	745671	198	198	0.03	100.0
13	Ellenboro town	745671	723	723	0.1	100.0
13	Fallston town	745671	627	627	0.08	100.0
13	Forest City town	745671	7377	7377	0.99	100.0
13	Gastonia city	745671	80411	80411	10.78	100.0
13	Glen Alpine town	745671	1529	1529	0.21	100.0
13	Granite Falls town	745671	4965	4965	0.67	100.0
13	Grover town	745671	802	802	0.11	100.0
13	Hickory city (BURKE)	745671	79	79	0.01	100.0
13	Hickory city (CALDWELL)	745671	32	32	0.0	100.0
13	Hickory city (CATAWBA)	745671	43379	43379	5.82	100.0
13	High Shoals city	745671	595	595	0.08	100.0
13	Hildebran town	745671	1679	1679	0.23	100.0
13	Kings Mountain city (CLEVELAND)	745671	10032	10032	1.35	100.0
13	Kings Mountain city (GASTON)	745671	1110	1110	0.15	100.0
13	Kingstown town	745671	656	656	0.09	100.0
13	Lattimore town	745671	406	406	0.05	100.0
13	Lawndale town	745671	570	570	0.08	100.0
13	Lenoir city	745671	18352	0	0.0	0.0
13	Lincolnton city	745671	11091	11091	1.49	100.0
13	Long View town (BURKE)	745671	735	735	0.1	100.0
13	Long View town (CATAWBA)	745671	4353	4353	0.58	100.0
13	Lowell city	745671	3654	3654	0.49	100.0
13	Maiden town (CATAWBA)	745671	3736	3736	0.5	100.0
13	Maiden town (LINCOLN)	745671	0	0	0.0	0.0
13	McAdenville town	745671	890	890	0.12	100.0
13	Mooresboro town	745671	293	293	0.04	100.0
13	Morganton city	745671	17474	17474	2.34	100.0
13	Mount Holly city	745671	17703	17703	2.37	100.0

13	Newton city	745671	13148	13148	1.76	100.0
13	Patterson Springs town	745671	571	571	0.08	100.0
13	Polkville city	745671	516	516	0.07	100.0
13	Ranlo town	745671	4511	4511	0.6	100.0
13	Rhodhiss town (BURKE)	745671	639	639	0.09	100.0
13	Rhodhiss town (CALDWELL)	745671	358	358	0.05	100.0
13	Ruth town	745671	347	347	0.05	100.0
13	Rutherford College town (BURKE)	745671	1226	1226	0.16	100.0
13	Rutherford College town (CALDWELL)	745671	0	0	0.0	0.0
13	Rutherfordton town	745671	3640	3640	0.49	100.0
13	Sawmills town	745671	5020	5000	0.67	99.6
13	Shelby city	745671	21918	21918	2.94	100.0
13	Spencer Mountain town	745671	0	0	0.0	0.0
13	Spindale town	745671	4225	4225	0.57	100.0
13	Stanley town	745671	3963	3963	0.53	100.0
13	Valdese town	745671	4689	4689	0.63	100.0
13	Waco town	745671	310	310	0.04	100.0
14	Andrews town	745670	1667	1667	0.22	100.0
14	Asheville city	745670	94589	94589	12.69	100.0
14	Bakersville town	745670	450	450	0.06	100.0
14	Biltmore Forest town	745670	1409	1409	0.19	100.0
14	Black Mountain town	745670	8426	8426	1.13	100.0
14	Brevard city	745670	7744	7744	1.04	100.0
14	Bryson City town	745670	1558	1558	0.21	100.0
14	Burnsville town	745670	1614	1614	0.22	100.0
14	Canton town	745670	4422	4422	0.59	100.0
14	Chimney Rock Village village	745670	140	140	0.02	100.0
14	Clyde town	745670	1368	1368	0.18	100.0
14	Columbus town	745670	1060	1060	0.14	100.0
14	Dillsboro town	745670	213	213	0.03	100.0
14	Flat Rock village	745670	3486	3486	0.47	100.0
14	Fletcher town	745670	7987	7987	1.07	100.0
14	Fontana Dam town	745670	13	13	0.0	100.0
14	Forest Hills village	745670	303	303	0.04	100.0
14	Franklin town	745670	4175	4175	0.56	100.0
14	Hayesville town	745670	461	461	0.06	100.0
14	Hendersonville city	745670	15137	15137	2.03	100.0
14	Highlands town (JACKSON)	745670	12	12	0.0	100.0

14	Highlands town (MACON)	745670	1060	1060	0.14	100.0
14	Hot Springs town	745670	520	520	0.07	100.0
14	Lake Lure town	745670	1365	1365	0.18	100.0
14	Lake Santeetlah town	745670	38	38	0.01	100.0
14	Laurel Park town	745670	2250	2250	0.3	100.0
14	Maggie Valley town	745670	1687	1687	0.23	100.0
14	Marion city	745670	7717	7717	1.03	100.0
14	Mars Hill town	745670	2007	2007	0.27	100.0
14	Marshall town	745670	777	777	0.1	100.0
14	Mills River town	745670	7078	7078	0.95	100.0
14	Montreat town	745670	901	901	0.12	100.0
14	Murphy town	745670	1608	1608	0.22	100.0
14	Old Fort town	745670	811	811	0.11	100.0
14	Robbinsville town	745670	597	597	0.08	100.0
14	Rosman town	745670	701	701	0.09	100.0
14	Saluda city (HENDERSON)	745670	11	11	0.0	100.0
14	Saluda city (POLK)	745670	620	620	0.08	100.0
14	Spruce Pine town	745670	2194	2194	0.29	100.0
14	Sylva town	745670	2578	2578	0.35	100.0
14	Tryon town	745670	1562	1562	0.21	100.0
14	Waynesville town	745670	10140	10140	1.36	100.0
14	Weaverville town	745670	4567	4567	0.61	100.0
14	Webster town	745670	372	372	0.05	100.0
14	Woodfin town	745670	7936	7936	1.06	100.0

Whole-Split VTD Counts by District Report

District	County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
1	BEAUFORT	21	0
1	BERTIE	12	0
1	CAMDEN	3	0
1	CHOWAN	6	0
1	CRAVEN	20	1
1	CURRITUCK	11	0
1	DARE	16	0
1	EDGECOMBE	1	1
1	GATES	6	0
1	GREENE	10	0
1	HERTFORD	13	0
1	HYDE	7	0
1	JONES	7	0
1	LENOIR	22	0
1	MARTIN	13	0
1	PAMLICO	10	0
1	PASQUOTANK	9	0
1	PERQUIMANS	7	0
1	PITT	40	0
1	TYRRELL	6	0
1	WASHINGTON	6	0
1	WAYNE	23	3
2	DURHAM	9	1
2	EDGECOMBE	19	1
2	FRANKLIN	18	0
2	GRANVILLE	15	0
2	HALIFAX	23	0
2	JOHNSTON	36	0
2	NASH	24	0
2	NORTHAMPTON	13	0
2	VANCE	12	0
2	WARREN	14	0
2	WILSON	24	0
3	BRUNSWICK	25	0
3	CARTERET	28	0

3	COLUMBUS	26	0
3	CRAVEN	0	1
3	NEW HANOVER	43	0
3	ONSLOW	24	0
3	PENDER	20	0
4	BLADEN	17	0
4	CUMBERLAND	76	0
4	DUPLIN	19	0
4	HARNETT	1	2
4	HOKE	15	0
4	RICHMOND	11	1
4	ROBESON	39	0
4	SAMPSON	23	0
4	SCOTLAND	7	0
4	WAYNE	2	3
5	WAKE	147	1
6	ALAMANCE	37	0
6	CASWELL	9	0
6	DURHAM	47	1
6	ORANGE	41	0
6	PERSON	11	0
6	ROCKINGHAM	15	0
7	CHATHAM	18	0
7	HARNETT	10	2
7	LEE	10	0
7	MOORE	26	0
7	WAKE	56	1
8	ANSON	9	0
8	CABARRUS	8	1
8	DAVIDSON	43	0
8	DAVIE	14	0
8	MONTGOMERY	14	0
8	RICHMOND	4	1
8	ROWAN	41	0
8	STANLY	22	0
8	UNION	52	0
9	MECKLENBURG	143	1
10	CABARRUS	31	1

10	IREDELL	28	1
10	MECKLENBURG	51	1
11	FORSYTH	14	1
11	GUILFORD	165	0
11	RANDOLPH	22	0
12	ALEXANDER	10	0
12	ALLEGHANY	4	0
12	ASHE	17	0
12	AVERY	19	0
12	CALDWELL	14	1
12	FORSYTH	86	1
12	IREDELL	0	1
12	STOKES	18	0
12	SURRY	24	0
12	WATAUGA	20	0
12	WILKES	27	0
12	YADKIN	12	0
13	BURKE	33	0
13	CALDWELL	5	1
13	CATAWBA	40	0
13	CLEVELAND	21	0
13	GASTON	46	0
13	LINCOLN	23	0
13	RUTHERFORD	15	1
14	BUNCOMBE	79	0
14	CHEROKEE	16	0
14	CLAY	9	0
14	GRAHAM	4	0
14	HAYWOOD	29	0
14	HENDERSON	34	0
14	JACKSON	13	0
14	MACON	15	0
14	MADISON	12	0
14	MCDOWELL	17	0
14	MITCHELL	9	0
14	POLK	7	0
14	RUTHERFORD	1	1
14	SWAIN	5	0

14	TRANSYLVANIA	15	0
14	YANCEY	11	0

Whole-Split VTD Counts by County Report

County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
ALAMANCE	37	0
ALEXANDER	10	0
ALLEGHANY	4	0
ANSON	9	0
ASHE	17	0
AVERY	19	0
BEAUFORT	21	0
BERTIE	12	0
BLADEN	17	0
BRUNSWICK	25	0
BUNCOMBE	79	0
BURKE	33	0
CABARRUS	39	1
CALDWELL	19	1
CAMDEN	3	0
CARTERET	28	0
CASWELL	9	0
CATAWBA	40	0
CHATHAM	18	0
CHEROKEE	16	0
CHOWAN	6	0
CLAY	9	0
CLEVELAND	21	0
COLUMBUS	26	0
CRAVEN	20	1
CUMBERLAND	76	0
CURRITUCK	11	0
DARE	16	0
DAVIDSON	43	0
DAVIE	14	0
DUPLIN	19	0
DURHAM	56	1
EDGECOMBE	20	1
FORSYTH	100	1
FRANKLIN	18	0

GASTON	46	0
GATES	6	0
GRAHAM	4	0
GRANVILLE	15	0
GREENE	10	0
GUILFORD	165	0
HALIFAX	23	0
HARNETT	11	2
HAYWOOD	29	0
HENDERSON	34	0
HERTFORD	13	0
HOKE	15	0
HYDE	7	0
IREDELL	28	1
JACKSON	13	0
JOHNSTON	36	0
JONES	7	0
LEE	10	0
LENOIR	22	0
LINCOLN	23	0
MACON	15	0
MADISON	12	0
MARTIN	13	0
MCDOWELL	17	0
MECKLENBURG	194	1
MITCHELL	9	0
MONTGOMERY	14	0
MOORE	26	0
NASH	24	0
NEW HANOVER	43	0
NORTHAMPTON	13	0
ONslow	24	0
ORANGE	41	0
PAMLICO	10	0
PASQUOTANK	9	0
PENDER	20	0
PERQUIMANS	7	0
PERSON	11	0

PITT	40	0
POLK	7	0
RANDOLPH	22	0
RICHMOND	15	1
ROBESON	39	0
ROCKINGHAM	15	0
ROWAN	41	0
RUTHERFORD	16	1
SAMPSON	23	0
SCOTLAND	7	0
STANLY	22	0
STOKES	18	0
SURRY	24	0
SWAIN	5	0
TRANSYLVANIA	15	0
TYRRELL	6	0
UNION	52	0
VANCE	12	0
WAKE	203	1
WARREN	14	0
WASHINGTON	6	0
WATAUGA	20	0
WAYNE	25	3
WILKES	27	0
WILSON	24	0
YADKIN	12	0
YANCEY	11	0

Split VTD Detail Report

County	VTD	District	Total VTD Population	VTD Population in District	% VTD Population in District
CABARRUS	1-02	8	4425	712	16.09
CABARRUS	1-02	10	4425	3713	83.91
CALDWELL	PR21	12	4138	1822	44.03
CALDWELL	PR21	13	4138	2316	55.97
CRAVEN	19	1	3901	3713	95.18
CRAVEN	19	3	3901	188	4.82
DURHAM	30-1	2	14985	1097	7.32
DURHAM	30-1	6	14985	13888	92.68
EDGECOMBE	801	1	2249	476	21.16
EDGECOMBE	801	2	2249	1773	78.84
FORSYTH	503	11	3180	1410	44.34
FORSYTH	503	12	3180	1770	55.66
HARNETT	PR26	4	6206	7	0.11
HARNETT	PR26	7	6206	6199	99.89
HARNETT	PR29	4	6817	5999	88.0
HARNETT	PR29	7	6817	818	12.0
IREDELL	NH	10	1738	940	54.09
IREDELL	NH	12	1738	798	45.91
MECKLENBURG	28	9	3414	812	23.78
MECKLENBURG	28	10	3414	2602	76.22
RICHMOND	2	4	6905	6209	89.92
RICHMOND	2	8	6905	696	10.08
RUTHERFORD	18	13	2692	1502	55.79
RUTHERFORD	18	14	2692	1190	44.21
WAKE	15-01	5	6482	2274	35.08
WAKE	15-01	7	6482	4208	64.92
WAYNE	16	1	3810	2849	74.78
WAYNE	16	4	3810	961	25.22
WAYNE	27	1	2795	215	7.69
WAYNE	27	4	2795	2580	92.31
WAYNE	28	1	6744	476	7.06
WAYNE	28	4	6744	6268	92.94

Incumbent-District Report

Last Name	First Name	Party	New District	Old District
Murphy	Greg	R	1	3
Butterfield	Gk	D	2	1
Rouzer	David	R	3	7
Ross	Deborah	D	5	2
Price	David	D	6	4
Budd	Ted	R	8	13
Adams	Alma	D	9	12
Bishop	James	R	9	9
Hudson	Richard	R	10	8
Manning	Kathy	D	11	6
Foxx	Virginia	R	12	5
Mchenry	Patrick	R	13	10
Cawthorn	David	R	14	11

District-Incumbent Report

New District	Last Name	First Name	Party	Old District
1	Murphy	Greg	R	3
2	Butterfield	Gk	D	1
3	Rouzer	David	R	7
5	Ross	Deborah	D	2
6	Price	David	D	4
8	Budd	Ted	R	13
9	Adams	Alma	D	12
9	Bishop	James	R	9
10	Hudson	Richard	R	8
11	Manning	Kathy	D	6
12	Foxx	Virginia	R	5
13	Mchenry	Patrick	R	10
14	Cawthorn	David	R	11

User:

Plan Name: **NCLCV Congressional Map**

Plan Type:

Contiguity Report

Tuesday, February 15, 2022

2:35 PM

District	Number of Distinct Areas
1	1
2	1
3	1
4	1
5	1
6	1
7	1
8	1
9	1
10	1
11	1
12	1
13	1
14	1

User:

Plan Name: **NCLCV Congressional Map**

Plan Type:

Measures of Compactness Report

Tuesday, February 15, 2022

2:34 PM

	Reock	Polsby-Popper	Population Polygon	Area/Convex Hull	Population Circle
Sum	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Min	0.21	0.23	0.44	0.61	0.26
Max	0.67	0.53	0.97	0.91	0.93
Mean	0.47	0.38	0.80	0.81	0.51
Std. Dev.	0.13	0.09	0.16	0.08	0.20
District	Reock	Polsby-Popper	Population Polygon	Area/Convex Hull	Population Circle
1	0.54	0.40	0.87	0.86	0.50
2	0.47	0.32	0.44	0.81	0.28
3	0.21	0.23	0.90	0.61	0.32
4	0.42	0.30	0.86	0.80	0.37
5	0.58	0.51	0.96	0.91	0.71
6	0.47	0.48	0.72	0.84	0.47
7	0.67	0.43	0.86	0.85	0.56
8	0.52	0.40	0.47	0.81	0.26
9	0.58	0.43	0.89	0.80	0.73
10	0.28	0.25	0.75	0.68	0.38
11	0.55	0.53	0.86	0.86	0.65

Measures of Compactness Report

NCLCV Congressional

	Reock	Polsby-Popper	Population Polygon	Area/Convex Hull	Population Circle
Sum	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Min	0.21	0.23	0.44	0.61	0.26
Max	0.67	0.53	0.97	0.91	0.93
Mean	0.47	0.38	0.80	0.81	0.51
Std. Dev.	0.13	0.09	0.16	0.08	0.20
District	Reock	Polsby-Popper	Population Polygon	Area/Convex Hull	Population Circle
12	0.39	0.37	0.84	0.86	0.42
13	0.56	0.38	0.86	0.83	0.61
14	0.35	0.31	0.97	0.87	0.93

Measures of Compactness Report

NCLCV Congressional

Measures of Compactness Summary

Reock	The measure is always between 0 and 1, with 1 being the most compact.
Polsby-Popper	The measure is always between 0 and 1, with 1 being the most compact.
Population Polygon	The measure is always between 0 and 1, with 1 being the most compact.
Area / Convex Hull	The measure is always between 0 and 1, with 1 being the most compact.
Population Circle	The measure is always between 0 and 1, with 1 being the most compact.

EXHIBIT N

NCLCV Senate Map
Statistical Reports

County-District Report

County	District	Total County Population	Total District Population	County_Pop_in_District	% County Pop in District	% District Pop in County
ALAMANCE	25	171415	217906	171415	100.0	78.66
ALEXANDER	36	36444	218292	36444	100.0	16.7
ALLEGHANY	47	10888	211521	10888	100.0	5.15
ANSON	29	22055	217124	22055	100.0	10.16
ASHE	47	26577	211521	26577	100.0	12.56
AVERY	47	17806	211521	17806	100.0	8.42
BEAUFORT	3	44652	200494	44652	100.0	22.27
BERTIE	1	17934	198430	17934	100.0	9.04
BLADEN	9	29606	202791	29606	100.0	14.6
BRUNSWICK	8	136693	214553	136693	100.0	63.71
BUNCOMBE	48	269452	202689	67080	24.89	33.1
BUNCOMBE	49	269452	202372	202372	75.11	100.0
BURKE	46	87570	200712	87570	100.0	43.63
CABARRUS	34	225804	216895	216895	96.05	100.0
CABARRUS	35	225804	218484	8909	3.95	4.08
CALDWELL	45	80652	217416	56806	70.43	26.13
CALDWELL	47	80652	211521	23846	29.57	11.27
CAMDEN	1	10355	198430	10355	100.0	5.22
CARTERET	2	67686	199750	67686	100.0	33.89
CASWELL	23	22736	210529	22736	100.0	10.8
CATAWBA	45	160610	217416	160610	100.0	73.87
CHATHAM	20	76285	201264	76285	100.0	37.9
CHEROKEE	50	28774	213456	28774	100.0	13.48
CHOWAN	2	13708	199750	13708	100.0	6.86
CLAY	50	11089	213456	11089	100.0	5.19
CLEVELAND	44	99519	208541	99519	100.0	47.72
COLUMBUS	8	50623	214553	50623	100.0	23.59
CRAVEN	3	100720	200494	100720	100.0	50.24
CUMBERLAND	19	334728	216471	216471	64.67	100.0
CUMBERLAND	21	334728	217984	118257	35.33	54.25
CURRITUCK	1	28100	198430	28100	100.0	14.16
DARE	2	36915	199750	36915	100.0	18.48
DAVIDSON	30	168930	211642	168930	100.0	79.82
DAVIE	30	42712	211642	42712	100.0	20.18

DUPLIN	9	48715	202791	48715	100.0	24.02
DURHAM	20	324833	201264	124979	38.47	62.1
DURHAM	22	324833	199854	199854	61.53	100.0
EDGEcombe	5	48900	219143	48900	100.0	22.31
FORSYTH	31	382590	210312	173098	45.24	82.31
FORSYTH	32	382590	209492	209492	54.76	100.0
FRANKLIN	11	68573	206121	68573	100.0	33.27
GASTON	43	227943	201611	201611	88.45	100.0
GASTON	46	227943	200712	26332	11.55	13.12
GATES	1	10478	198430	10478	100.0	5.28
GRAHAM	47	8030	211521	8030	100.0	3.8
GRANVILLE	13	60992	198376	60992	100.0	30.75
GREENE	4	20451	216568	20451	100.0	9.44
GUILFORD	26	541299	208430	117334	21.68	56.29
GUILFORD	27	541299	207951	207951	38.42	100.0
GUILFORD	28	541299	216014	216014	39.91	100.0
HALIFAX	1	48622	198430	48622	100.0	24.5
HARNETT	12	133568	200794	133568	100.0	66.52
HAYWOOD	47	62089	211521	1605	2.58	0.76
HAYWOOD	50	62089	213456	60484	97.42	28.34
HENDERSON	48	116281	202689	116281	100.0	57.37
HERTFORD	1	21552	198430	21552	100.0	10.86
HOKE	24	52082	202786	52082	100.0	25.68
HYDE	2	4589	199750	4589	100.0	2.3
IREDELL	37	186693	215170	186693	100.0	86.77
JACKSON	50	43109	213456	43109	100.0	20.2
JOHNSTON	10	215999	215999	215999	100.0	100.0
JONES	9	9172	202791	9172	100.0	4.52
LEE	12	63285	200794	63285	100.0	31.52
LENOIR	3	55122	200494	55122	100.0	27.49
LINCOLN	46	86810	200712	86810	100.0	43.25
MACON	50	37014	213456	37014	100.0	17.34
MADISON	47	21193	211521	21193	100.0	10.02
MARTIN	1	22031	198430	22031	100.0	11.1
MCDOWELL	44	44578	208541	44578	100.0	21.38
MECKLENBURG	37	1115482	215170	28477	2.55	13.23
MECKLENBURG	38	1115482	218872	218872	19.62	100.0
MECKLENBURG	39	1115482	217776	217776	19.52	100.0

MECKLENBURG	40	1115482	217840	217840	19.53	100.0
MECKLENBURG	41	1115482	216594	216594	19.42	100.0
MECKLENBURG	42	1115482	215923	215923	19.36	100.0
MITCHELL	47	14903	211521	14903	100.0	7.05
MONTGOMERY	29	25751	217124	25751	100.0	11.86
MOORE	21	99727	217984	99727	100.0	45.75
NASH	11	94970	206121	94970	100.0	46.07
NEW HANOVER	7	225702	198465	198465	87.93	100.0
NEW HANOVER	8	225702	214553	27237	12.07	12.69
NORTHAMPTON	1	17471	198430	17471	100.0	8.8
ONslow	6	204576	204576	204576	100.0	100.0
ORANGE	23	148696	210529	148696	100.0	70.63
PAMLICO	2	12276	199750	12276	100.0	6.15
PASQUOTANK	2	40568	199750	40568	100.0	20.31
PENDER	9	60203	202791	60203	100.0	29.69
PERQUIMANS	2	13005	199750	13005	100.0	6.51
PERSON	23	39097	210529	39097	100.0	18.57
PITT	5	170243	219143	170243	100.0	77.69
POLK	48	19328	202689	19328	100.0	9.54
RANDOLPH	25	144171	217906	46491	32.25	21.34
RANDOLPH	29	144171	217124	97680	67.75	44.99
RICHMOND	29	42946	217124	42946	100.0	19.78
ROBESON	24	116530	202786	116530	100.0	57.46
ROCKINGHAM	26	91096	208430	91096	100.0	43.71
ROWAN	33	146875	209379	146875	100.0	70.15
RUTHERFORD	44	64444	208541	64444	100.0	30.9
SAMPSON	9	59036	202791	55095	93.32	27.17
SAMPSON	12	59036	200794	3941	6.68	1.96
SCOTLAND	24	34174	202786	34174	100.0	16.85
STANLY	33	62504	209379	62504	100.0	29.85
STOKES	36	44520	218292	44520	100.0	20.39
SURRY	36	71359	218292	71359	100.0	32.69
SWAIN	47	14117	211521	14117	100.0	6.67
TRANSYLVANIA	50	32986	213456	32986	100.0	15.45
TYRRELL	1	3245	198430	3245	100.0	1.64
UNION	29	238267	217124	28692	12.04	13.21
UNION	35	238267	218484	209575	87.96	95.92
VANCE	11	42578	206121	42578	100.0	20.66

WAKE	13	1129410	198376	137384	12.16	69.25
WAKE	14	1129410	198394	198394	17.57	100.0
WAKE	15	1129410	198361	198361	17.56	100.0
WAKE	16	1129410	198366	198366	17.56	100.0
WAKE	17	1129410	198465	198465	17.57	100.0
WAKE	18	1129410	198440	198440	17.57	100.0
WARREN	1	18642	198430	18642	100.0	9.39
WASHINGTON	2	11003	199750	11003	100.0	5.51
WATAUGA	47	54086	211521	54086	100.0	25.57
WAYNE	4	117333	216568	117333	100.0	54.18
WILKES	36	65969	218292	65969	100.0	30.22
WILSON	4	78784	216568	78784	100.0	36.38
YADKIN	31	37214	210312	37214	100.0	17.69
YANCEY	47	18470	211521	18470	100.0	8.73

District-County Report

District	County	Total District Population	Total County Population	District Pop in County	% District Pop in County	% County Pop in District
1	BERTIE	198430	17934	17934	9.04	100.0
1	CAMDEN	198430	10355	10355	5.22	100.0
1	CURRITUCK	198430	28100	28100	14.16	100.0
1	GATES	198430	10478	10478	5.28	100.0
1	HALIFAX	198430	48622	48622	24.5	100.0
1	HERTFORD	198430	21552	21552	10.86	100.0
1	MARTIN	198430	22031	22031	11.1	100.0
1	NORTHAMPTON	198430	17471	17471	8.8	100.0
1	TYRRELL	198430	3245	3245	1.64	100.0
1	WARREN	198430	18642	18642	9.39	100.0
2	CARTERET	199750	67686	67686	33.89	100.0
2	CHOWAN	199750	13708	13708	6.86	100.0
2	DARE	199750	36915	36915	18.48	100.0
2	HYDE	199750	4589	4589	2.3	100.0
2	PAMLICO	199750	12276	12276	6.15	100.0
2	PASQUOTANK	199750	40568	40568	20.31	100.0
2	PERQUIMANS	199750	13005	13005	6.51	100.0
2	WASHINGTON	199750	11003	11003	5.51	100.0
3	BEAUFORT	200494	44652	44652	22.27	100.0
3	CRAVEN	200494	100720	100720	50.24	100.0
3	LENOIR	200494	55122	55122	27.49	100.0
4	GREENE	216568	20451	20451	9.44	100.0
4	WAYNE	216568	117333	117333	54.18	100.0
4	WILSON	216568	78784	78784	36.38	100.0
5	EDGECOMBE	219143	48900	48900	22.31	100.0
5	PITT	219143	170243	170243	77.69	100.0
6	ONslow	204576	204576	204576	100.0	100.0
7	NEW HANOVER	198465	225702	198465	100.0	87.93
8	BRUNSWICK	214553	136693	136693	63.71	100.0
8	COLUMBUS	214553	50623	50623	23.59	100.0
8	NEW HANOVER	214553	225702	27237	12.69	12.07
9	BLADEN	202791	29606	29606	14.6	100.0
9	DUPLIN	202791	48715	48715	24.02	100.0
9	JONES	202791	9172	9172	4.52	100.0

9	PENDER	202791	60203	60203	29.69	100.0
9	SAMPSON	202791	59036	55095	27.17	93.32
10	JOHNSTON	215999	215999	215999	100.0	100.0
11	FRANKLIN	206121	68573	68573	33.27	100.0
11	NASH	206121	94970	94970	46.07	100.0
11	VANCE	206121	42578	42578	20.66	100.0
12	HARNETT	200794	133568	133568	66.52	100.0
12	LEE	200794	63285	63285	31.52	100.0
12	SAMPSON	200794	59036	3941	1.96	6.68
13	GRANVILLE	198376	60992	60992	30.75	100.0
13	WAKE	198376	1129410	137384	69.25	12.16
14	WAKE	198394	1129410	198394	100.0	17.57
15	WAKE	198361	1129410	198361	100.0	17.56
16	WAKE	198366	1129410	198366	100.0	17.56
17	WAKE	198465	1129410	198465	100.0	17.57
18	WAKE	198440	1129410	198440	100.0	17.57
19	CUMBERLAND	216471	334728	216471	100.0	64.67
20	CHATHAM	201264	76285	76285	37.9	100.0
20	DURHAM	201264	324833	124979	62.1	38.47
21	CUMBERLAND	217984	334728	118257	54.25	35.33
21	MOORE	217984	99727	99727	45.75	100.0
22	DURHAM	199854	324833	199854	100.0	61.53
23	CASWELL	210529	22736	22736	10.8	100.0
23	ORANGE	210529	148696	148696	70.63	100.0
23	PERSON	210529	39097	39097	18.57	100.0
24	HOKE	202786	52082	52082	25.68	100.0
24	ROBESON	202786	116530	116530	57.46	100.0
24	SCOTLAND	202786	34174	34174	16.85	100.0
25	ALAMANCE	217906	171415	171415	78.66	100.0
25	RANDOLPH	217906	144171	46491	21.34	32.25
26	GUILFORD	208430	541299	117334	56.29	21.68
26	ROCKINGHAM	208430	91096	91096	43.71	100.0
27	GUILFORD	207951	541299	207951	100.0	38.42
28	GUILFORD	216014	541299	216014	100.0	39.91
29	ANSON	217124	22055	22055	10.16	100.0
29	MONTGOMERY	217124	25751	25751	11.86	100.0
29	RANDOLPH	217124	144171	97680	44.99	67.75
29	RICHMOND	217124	42946	42946	19.78	100.0

29	UNION	217124	238267	28692	13.21	12.04
30	DAVIDSON	211642	168930	168930	79.82	100.0
30	DAVIE	211642	42712	42712	20.18	100.0
31	FORSYTH	210312	382590	173098	82.31	45.24
31	YADKIN	210312	37214	37214	17.69	100.0
32	FORSYTH	209492	382590	209492	100.0	54.76
33	ROWAN	209379	146875	146875	70.15	100.0
33	STANLY	209379	62504	62504	29.85	100.0
34	CABARRUS	216895	225804	216895	100.0	96.05
35	CABARRUS	218484	225804	8909	4.08	3.95
35	UNION	218484	238267	209575	95.92	87.96
36	ALEXANDER	218292	36444	36444	16.7	100.0
36	STOKES	218292	44520	44520	20.39	100.0
36	SURRY	218292	71359	71359	32.69	100.0
36	WILKES	218292	65969	65969	30.22	100.0
37	IREDELL	215170	186693	186693	86.77	100.0
37	MECKLENBURG	215170	1115482	28477	13.23	2.55
38	MECKLENBURG	218872	1115482	218872	100.0	19.62
39	MECKLENBURG	217776	1115482	217776	100.0	19.52
40	MECKLENBURG	217840	1115482	217840	100.0	19.53
41	MECKLENBURG	216594	1115482	216594	100.0	19.42
42	MECKLENBURG	215923	1115482	215923	100.0	19.36
43	GASTON	201611	227943	201611	100.0	88.45
44	CLEVELAND	208541	99519	99519	47.72	100.0
44	MCDOWELL	208541	44578	44578	21.38	100.0
44	RUTHERFORD	208541	64444	64444	30.9	100.0
45	CALDWELL	217416	80652	56806	26.13	70.43
45	CATAWBA	217416	160610	160610	73.87	100.0
46	BURKE	200712	87570	87570	43.63	100.0
46	GASTON	200712	227943	26332	13.12	11.55
46	LINCOLN	200712	86810	86810	43.25	100.0
47	ALLEGHANY	211521	10888	10888	5.15	100.0
47	ASHE	211521	26577	26577	12.56	100.0
47	AVERY	211521	17806	17806	8.42	100.0
47	CALDWELL	211521	80652	23846	11.27	29.57
47	GRAHAM	211521	8030	8030	3.8	100.0
47	HAYWOOD	211521	62089	1605	0.76	2.58
47	MADISON	211521	21193	21193	10.02	100.0

47	MITCHELL	211521	14903	14903	7.05	100.0
47	SWAIN	211521	14117	14117	6.67	100.0
47	WATAUGA	211521	54086	54086	25.57	100.0
47	YANCEY	211521	18470	18470	8.73	100.0
48	BUNCOMBE	202689	269452	67080	33.1	24.89
48	HENDERSON	202689	116281	116281	57.37	100.0
48	POLK	202689	19328	19328	9.54	100.0
49	BUNCOMBE	202372	269452	202372	100.0	75.11
50	CHEROKEE	213456	28774	28774	13.48	100.0
50	CLAY	213456	11089	11089	5.19	100.0
50	HAYWOOD	213456	62089	60484	28.34	97.42
50	JACKSON	213456	43109	43109	20.2	100.0
50	MACON	213456	37014	37014	17.34	100.0
50	TRANSYLVANIA	213456	32986	32986	15.45	100.0

Municipality - District Report

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	% Muni Pop in District	% District Pop in Muni
Aberdeen town	21	8516	217984	8516	100.0	3.91
Ahoskie town	1	4891	198430	4891	100.0	2.46
Alamance village	25	988	217906	988	100.0	0.45
Albemarle city	33	16432	209379	16432	100.0	7.85
Alliance town	2	733	199750	733	100.0	0.37
Andrews town	50	1667	213456	1667	100.0	0.78
Angier town	12	5265	200794	4709	89.44	2.35
Angier town	17	5265	198465	556	10.56	0.28
Ansonville town	29	440	217124	440	100.0	0.2
Apex town	17	58780	198465	58780	100.0	29.62
Arapahoe town	2	416	199750	416	100.0	0.21
Archdale city	27	11907	207951	380	3.19	0.18
Archdale city	29	11907	217124	11527	96.81	5.31
Archer Lodge town	10	4797	215999	4797	100.0	2.22
Asheboro city	29	27156	217124	27156	100.0	12.51
Asheville city	48	94589	202689	40477	42.79	19.97
Asheville city	49	94589	202372	54112	57.21	26.74
Askewville town	1	184	198430	184	100.0	0.09
Atkinson town	9	296	202791	296	100.0	0.15
Atlantic Beach town	2	1364	199750	1364	100.0	0.68
Aulander town	1	763	198430	763	100.0	0.38
Aurora town	3	455	200494	455	100.0	0.23
Autryville town	9	167	202791	167	100.0	0.08
Ayden town	5	4977	219143	4977	100.0	2.27
Badin town	33	2024	209379	2024	100.0	0.97
Bailey town	11	568	206121	568	100.0	0.28
Bakersville town	47	450	211521	450	100.0	0.21
Bald Head Island village	8	268	214553	268	100.0	0.12
Banner Elk town	47	1049	211521	1049	100.0	0.5
Bath town	3	245	200494	245	100.0	0.12
Bayboro town	2	1161	199750	1161	100.0	0.58
Bear Grass town	1	89	198430	89	100.0	0.04
Beaufort town	2	4464	199750	4464	100.0	2.23
Beech Mountain town	47	675	211521	675	100.0	0.32

Belhaven town	3	1410	200494	1410	100.0	0.7
Belmont city	43	15010	201611	15010	100.0	7.45
Belville town	8	2406	214553	2406	100.0	1.12
Belwood town	44	857	208541	857	100.0	0.41
Benson town	10	3967	215999	3967	100.0	1.84
Benson town	12	3967	200794	0	0.0	0.0
Bermuda Run town	30	3120	211642	3120	100.0	1.47
Bessemer City city	43	5428	201611	5428	100.0	2.69
Bethania town	32	344	209492	344	100.0	0.16
Bethel town	5	1373	219143	1373	100.0	0.63
Beulaville town	9	1116	202791	1116	100.0	0.55
Biltmore Forest town	48	1409	202689	1409	100.0	0.7
Biscoe town	29	1848	217124	1848	100.0	0.85
Black Creek town	4	692	216568	692	100.0	0.32
Black Mountain town	49	8426	202372	8426	100.0	4.16
Bladenboro town	9	1648	202791	1648	100.0	0.81
Blowing Rock town	47	1376	211521	1376	100.0	0.65
Boardman town	8	166	214553	166	100.0	0.08
Bogue town	2	695	199750	695	100.0	0.35
Boiling Spring Lakes city	8	5943	214553	5943	100.0	2.77
Boiling Springs town	44	4615	208541	4615	100.0	2.21
Bolivia town	8	149	214553	149	100.0	0.07
Bolton town	8	519	214553	519	100.0	0.24
Boone town	47	19092	211521	19092	100.0	9.03
Boonville town	31	1185	210312	1185	100.0	0.56
Bostic town	44	355	208541	355	100.0	0.17
Brevard city	50	7744	213456	7744	100.0	3.63
Bridgeton town	3	349	200494	349	100.0	0.17
Broadway town	12	1267	200794	1267	100.0	0.63
Brookford town	45	442	217416	442	100.0	0.2
Brunswick town	8	973	214553	973	100.0	0.45
Bryson City town	47	1558	211521	1558	100.0	0.74
Bunn town	11	327	206121	327	100.0	0.16
Burgaw town	9	3088	202791	3088	100.0	1.52
Burlington city	25	57303	217906	55481	96.82	25.46
Burlington city	26	57303	208430	1822	3.18	0.87
Burnsville town	47	1614	211521	1614	100.0	0.76
Butner town	13	8397	198376	8397	100.0	4.23

Cajah's Mountain town	45	2722	217416	2722	100.0	1.25
Calabash town	8	2011	214553	2011	100.0	0.94
Calypso town	9	327	202791	327	100.0	0.16
Cameron town	21	244	217984	244	100.0	0.11
Candor town	21	813	217984	0	0.0	0.0
Candor town	29	813	217124	813	100.0	0.37
Canton town	50	4422	213456	4422	100.0	2.07
Cape Carteret town	2	2224	199750	2224	100.0	1.11
Carolina Beach town	8	6564	214553	6564	100.0	3.06
Carolina Shores town	8	4588	214553	4588	100.0	2.14
Carrboro town	23	21295	210529	21295	100.0	10.11
Carthage town	21	2775	217984	2775	100.0	1.27
Cary town	14	174721	198394	0	0.0	0.0
Cary town	15	174721	198361	0	0.0	0.0
Cary town	16	174721	198366	163624	93.65	82.49
Cary town	17	174721	198465	7388	4.23	3.72
Cary town	20	174721	201264	3709	2.12	1.84
Casar town	44	305	208541	305	100.0	0.15
Castalia town	11	264	206121	264	100.0	0.13
Caswell Beach town	8	395	214553	395	100.0	0.18
Catawba town	45	702	217416	702	100.0	0.32
Cedar Point town	2	1764	199750	1764	100.0	0.88
Cedar Rock village	45	301	217416	301	100.0	0.14
Cerro Gordo town	8	131	214553	131	100.0	0.06
Chadbourn town	8	1574	214553	1574	100.0	0.73
Chapel Hill town	20	61960	201264	2906	4.69	1.44
Chapel Hill town	23	61960	210529	59054	95.31	28.05
Charlotte city	38	874579	218872	127802	14.61	58.39
Charlotte city	39	874579	217776	174926	20.0	80.32
Charlotte city	40	874579	217840	173961	19.89	79.86
Charlotte city	41	874579	216594	181967	20.81	84.01
Charlotte city	42	874579	215923	215923	24.69	100.0
Cherryville city	43	6078	201611	6078	100.0	3.01
Chimney Rock Village village	44	140	208541	140	100.0	0.07
China Grove town	33	4434	209379	4434	100.0	2.12
Chocowinity town	3	722	200494	722	100.0	0.36
Claremont city	45	1692	217416	1692	100.0	0.78
Clarkton town	9	614	202791	614	100.0	0.3

Clayton town	10	26307	215999	26307	100.0	12.18
Clayton town	14	26307	198394	0	0.0	0.0
Clayton town	18	26307	198440	0	0.0	0.0
Clemmons village	31	21163	210312	21163	100.0	10.06
Cleveland town	33	846	209379	846	100.0	0.4
Clinton city	9	8383	202791	8383	100.0	4.13
Clyde town	50	1368	213456	1368	100.0	0.64
Coats town	12	2155	200794	2155	100.0	1.07
Cofield village	1	267	198430	267	100.0	0.13
Colerain town	1	217	198430	217	100.0	0.11
Columbia town	1	610	198430	610	100.0	0.31
Columbus town	48	1060	202689	1060	100.0	0.52
Como town	1	67	198430	67	100.0	0.03
Concord city	34	105240	216895	105240	100.0	48.52
Conetoe town	5	198	219143	198	100.0	0.09
Connelly Springs town	46	1529	200712	1529	100.0	0.76
Conover city	45	8421	217416	8421	100.0	3.87
Conway town	1	752	198430	752	100.0	0.38
Cooleemee town	30	940	211642	940	100.0	0.44
Cornelius town	37	31412	215170	12421	39.54	5.77
Cornelius town	38	31412	218872	18991	60.46	8.68
Cove City town	3	378	200494	378	100.0	0.19
Cramerton town	43	5296	201611	5296	100.0	2.63
Creedmoor city	13	4866	198376	4866	100.0	2.45
Creswell town	2	207	199750	207	100.0	0.1
Crossnore town	47	143	211521	143	100.0	0.07
Dallas town	43	5927	201611	5927	100.0	2.94
Danbury town	36	189	218292	189	100.0	0.09
Davidson town	37	15106	215170	15106	100.0	7.02
Dellview town	43	6	201611	6	100.0	0.0
Denton town	30	1494	211642	1494	100.0	0.71
Dillsboro town	50	213	213456	213	100.0	0.1
Dobbins Heights town	29	687	217124	687	100.0	0.32
Dobson town	36	1462	218292	1462	100.0	0.67
Dortches town	11	1082	206121	1082	100.0	0.52
Dover town	3	349	200494	349	100.0	0.17
Drexel town	46	1760	200712	1760	100.0	0.88
Dublin town	9	267	202791	267	100.0	0.13

Duck town	2	742	199750	742	100.0	0.37
Dunn city	12	8446	200794	8446	100.0	4.21
Durham city	15	283506	198361	269	0.09	0.14
Durham city	16	283506	198366	0	0.0	0.0
Durham city	20	283506	201264	116178	40.98	57.72
Durham city	22	283506	199854	166915	58.88	83.52
Durham city	23	283506	210529	144	0.05	0.07
Earl town	44	198	208541	198	100.0	0.09
East Arcadia town	9	418	202791	418	100.0	0.21
East Bend town	31	634	210312	634	100.0	0.3
East Laurinburg town	24	234	202786	234	100.0	0.12
East Spencer town	33	1567	209379	1567	100.0	0.75
Eastover town	21	3656	217984	3656	100.0	1.68
Eden city	26	15421	208430	15421	100.0	7.4
Edenton town	2	4460	199750	4460	100.0	2.23
Elizabeth City city	1	18631	198430	38	0.2	0.02
Elizabeth City city	2	18631	199750	18593	99.8	9.31
Elizabethtown town	9	3296	202791	3296	100.0	1.63
Elk Park town	47	542	211521	542	100.0	0.26
Elkin town	36	4122	218292	4122	100.0	1.89
Ellenboro town	44	723	208541	723	100.0	0.35
Ellerbe town	29	864	217124	864	100.0	0.4
Elm City town	4	1218	216568	1218	100.0	0.56
Elm City town	11	1218	206121	0	0.0	0.0
Elon town	25	11336	217906	11336	100.0	5.2
Emerald Isle town	2	3847	199750	3847	100.0	1.93
Enfield town	1	1865	198430	1865	100.0	0.94
Erwin town	12	4542	200794	4542	100.0	2.26
Eureka town	4	214	216568	214	100.0	0.1
Everetts town	1	150	198430	150	100.0	0.08
Fair Bluff town	8	709	214553	709	100.0	0.33
Fairmont town	24	2191	202786	2191	100.0	1.08
Fairview town	35	3456	218484	3456	100.0	1.58
Faison town	9	784	202791	784	100.0	0.39
Faith town	33	819	209379	819	100.0	0.39
Falcon town	9	324	202791	0	0.0	0.0
Falcon town	21	324	217984	324	100.0	0.15
Falkland town	5	47	219143	47	100.0	0.02

Fallston town	44	627	208541	627	100.0	0.3
Farmville town	5	4461	219143	4461	100.0	2.04
Fayetteville city	19	208501	216471	183928	88.21	84.97
Fayetteville city	21	208501	217984	24573	11.79	11.27
Flat Rock village	48	3486	202689	3486	100.0	1.72
Fletcher town	48	7987	202689	7987	100.0	3.94
Fontana Dam town	47	13	211521	13	100.0	0.01
Forest City town	44	7377	208541	7377	100.0	3.54
Forest Hills village	50	303	213456	303	100.0	0.14
Fountain town	5	385	219143	385	100.0	0.18
Four Oaks town	10	2158	215999	2158	100.0	1.0
Foxfire village	21	1288	217984	1288	100.0	0.59
Franklin town	50	4175	213456	4175	100.0	1.96
Franklinton town	11	2456	206121	2456	100.0	1.19
Franklinville town	25	1197	217906	1197	100.0	0.55
Fremont town	4	1196	216568	1196	100.0	0.55
Fuquay-Varina town	12	34152	200794	0	0.0	0.0
Fuquay-Varina town	17	34152	198465	34152	100.0	17.21
Gamewell town	47	3702	211521	3702	100.0	1.75
Garland town	9	595	202791	595	100.0	0.29
Garner town	14	31159	198394	31159	100.0	15.71
Garysburg town	1	904	198430	904	100.0	0.46
Gaston town	1	1008	198430	1008	100.0	0.51
Gastonia city	43	80411	201611	80411	100.0	39.88
Gatesville town	1	267	198430	267	100.0	0.13
Gibson town	24	449	202786	449	100.0	0.22
Gibsonville town	25	8920	217906	4278	47.96	1.96
Gibsonville town	26	8920	208430	4642	52.04	2.23
Glen Alpine town	46	1529	200712	1529	100.0	0.76
Godwin town	21	128	217984	128	100.0	0.06
Goldsboro city	4	33657	216568	33657	100.0	15.54
Goldston town	20	234	201264	234	100.0	0.12
Graham city	25	17157	217906	17157	100.0	7.87
Grandfather Village village	47	95	211521	95	100.0	0.04
Granite Falls town	45	4965	217416	4965	100.0	2.28
Granite Quarry town	33	2984	209379	2984	100.0	1.43
Grantsboro town	2	692	199750	692	100.0	0.35
Green Level town	25	3152	217906	3152	100.0	1.45

Greenevers town	9	567	202791	567	100.0	0.28
Greensboro city	26	299035	208430	58750	19.65	28.19
Greensboro city	27	299035	207951	60994	20.4	29.33
Greensboro city	28	299035	216014	179291	59.96	83.0
Greenville city	5	87521	219143	87521	100.0	39.94
Grifton town	3	2448	200494	147	6.0	0.07
Grifton town	5	2448	219143	2301	94.0	1.05
Grimesland town	5	386	219143	386	100.0	0.18
Grover town	44	802	208541	802	100.0	0.38
Halifax town	1	170	198430	170	100.0	0.09
Hamilton town	1	306	198430	306	100.0	0.15
Hamlet city	29	6025	217124	6025	100.0	2.77
Harmony town	37	543	215170	543	100.0	0.25
Harrells town	9	160	202791	160	100.0	0.08
Harrellsville town	1	85	198430	85	100.0	0.04
Harrisburg town	34	18967	216895	18967	100.0	8.74
Hassell town	1	49	198430	49	100.0	0.02
Havelock city	3	16621	200494	16621	100.0	8.29
Haw River town	25	2252	217906	2252	100.0	1.03
Hayesville town	50	461	213456	461	100.0	0.22
Hemby Bridge town	35	1614	218484	1614	100.0	0.74
Henderson city	11	15060	206121	15060	100.0	7.31
Hendersonville city	48	15137	202689	15137	100.0	7.47
Hertford town	2	1934	199750	1934	100.0	0.97
Hickory city	45	43490	217416	43411	99.82	19.97
Hickory city	46	43490	200712	79	0.18	0.04
High Point city	27	114059	207951	107321	94.09	51.61
High Point city	29	114059	217124	8	0.01	0.0
High Point city	30	114059	211642	6646	5.83	3.14
High Point city	32	114059	209492	84	0.07	0.04
High Shoals city	46	595	200712	595	100.0	0.3
Highlands town	50	1072	213456	1072	100.0	0.5
Hildebran town	46	1679	200712	1679	100.0	0.84
Hillsborough town	23	9660	210529	9660	100.0	4.59
Hobgood town	1	268	198430	268	100.0	0.14
Hoffman town	29	418	217124	418	100.0	0.19
Holden Beach town	8	921	214553	921	100.0	0.43
Holly Ridge town	6	4171	204576	4171	100.0	2.04

Holly Springs town	17	41239	198465	41239	100.0	20.78
Hookerton town	4	413	216568	413	100.0	0.19
Hope Mills town	19	17808	216471	2593	14.56	1.2
Hope Mills town	21	17808	217984	15215	85.44	6.98
Hot Springs town	47	520	211521	520	100.0	0.25
Hudson town	45	3780	217416	3780	100.0	1.74
Huntersville town	38	61376	218872	61376	100.0	28.04
Indian Beach town	2	223	199750	223	100.0	0.11
Indian Trail town	35	39997	218484	39997	100.0	18.31
Jackson town	1	430	198430	430	100.0	0.22
Jacksonville city	6	72723	204576	72723	100.0	35.55
Jamestown town	27	3668	207951	3668	100.0	1.76
Jamesville town	1	424	198430	424	100.0	0.21
Jefferson town	47	1622	211521	1622	100.0	0.77
Jonesville town	31	2308	210312	2308	100.0	1.1
Kannapolis city	33	53114	209379	10268	19.33	4.9
Kannapolis city	34	53114	216895	42846	80.67	19.75
Kelford town	1	203	198430	203	100.0	0.1
Kenansville town	9	770	202791	770	100.0	0.38
Kenly town	4	1491	216568	198	13.28	0.09
Kenly town	10	1491	215999	1293	86.72	0.6
Kernersville town	27	26449	207951	502	1.9	0.24
Kernersville town	32	26449	209492	25947	98.1	12.39
Kill Devil Hills town	2	7656	199750	7656	100.0	3.83
King city	32	7197	209492	591	8.21	0.28
King city	36	7197	218292	6606	91.79	3.03
Kings Mountain city	43	11142	201611	1110	9.96	0.55
Kings Mountain city	44	11142	208541	10032	90.04	4.81
Kingstown town	44	656	208541	656	100.0	0.31
Kinston city	3	19900	200494	19900	100.0	9.93
Kittrell town	11	132	206121	132	100.0	0.06
Kitty Hawk town	2	3689	199750	3689	100.0	1.85
Knightdale town	18	19435	198440	19435	100.0	9.79
Kure Beach town	8	2191	214553	2191	100.0	1.02
La Grange town	3	2595	200494	2595	100.0	1.29
Lake Lure town	44	1365	208541	1365	100.0	0.65
Lake Park village	35	3269	218484	3269	100.0	1.5
Lake Santeetlah town	47	38	211521	38	100.0	0.02

Lake Waccamaw town	8	1296	214553	1296	100.0	0.6
Landis town	33	3690	209379	3690	100.0	1.76
Lansing town	47	126	211521	126	100.0	0.06
Lasker town	1	64	198430	64	100.0	0.03
Lattimore town	44	406	208541	406	100.0	0.19
Laurel Park town	48	2250	202689	2250	100.0	1.11
Laurinburg city	24	14978	202786	14978	100.0	7.39
Lawndale town	44	570	208541	570	100.0	0.27
Leggett town	5	37	219143	37	100.0	0.02
Leland town	8	22908	214553	22908	100.0	10.68
Lenoir city	45	18352	217416	11250	61.3	5.17
Lenoir city	47	18352	211521	7102	38.7	3.36
Lewiston Woodville town	1	426	198430	426	100.0	0.21
Lewisville town	31	13381	210312	13381	100.0	6.36
Lexington city	30	19632	211642	19632	100.0	9.28
Liberty town	25	2655	217906	2655	100.0	1.22
Lilesville town	29	395	217124	395	100.0	0.18
Lillington town	12	4735	200794	4735	100.0	2.36
Lincolnton city	46	11091	200712	11091	100.0	5.53
Linden town	21	136	217984	136	100.0	0.06
Littleton town	1	559	198430	559	100.0	0.28
Locust city	33	4537	209379	3996	88.08	1.91
Locust city	34	4537	216895	423	9.32	0.2
Locust city	35	4537	218484	118	2.6	0.05
Long View town	45	5088	217416	4353	85.55	2.0
Long View town	46	5088	200712	735	14.45	0.37
Louisburg town	11	3064	206121	3064	100.0	1.49
Love Valley town	37	154	215170	154	100.0	0.07
Lowell city	43	3654	201611	3654	100.0	1.81
Lucama town	4	1036	216568	1036	100.0	0.48
Lumber Bridge town	24	82	202786	82	100.0	0.04
Lumberton city	24	19025	202786	19025	100.0	9.38
Macclesfield town	5	413	219143	413	100.0	0.19
Macon town	1	110	198430	110	100.0	0.06
Madison town	26	2129	208430	2129	100.0	1.02
Maggie Valley town	50	1687	213456	1687	100.0	0.79
Magnolia town	9	831	202791	831	100.0	0.41
Maiden town	45	3736	217416	3736	100.0	1.72

Maiden town	46	3736	200712	0	0.0	0.0
Manteo town	2	1600	199750	1600	100.0	0.8
Marietta town	24	111	202786	111	100.0	0.05
Marion city	44	7717	208541	7717	100.0	3.7
Mars Hill town	47	2007	211521	2007	100.0	0.95
Marshall town	47	777	211521	777	100.0	0.37
Marshville town	29	2522	217124	2522	100.0	1.16
Marvin village	35	6358	218484	6358	100.0	2.91
Matthews town	41	29435	216594	29435	100.0	13.59
Maxton town	24	2110	202786	2110	100.0	1.04
Mayodan town	26	2418	208430	2418	100.0	1.16
Maysville town	9	818	202791	818	100.0	0.4
McAdenville town	43	890	201611	890	100.0	0.44
McDonald town	24	94	202786	94	100.0	0.05
McFarlan town	29	94	217124	94	100.0	0.04
Mebane city	23	17797	210529	3171	17.82	1.51
Mebane city	25	17797	217906	14626	82.18	6.71
Mesic town	2	144	199750	144	100.0	0.07
Micro town	10	458	215999	458	100.0	0.21
Middleburg town	11	101	206121	101	100.0	0.05
Middlesex town	11	912	206121	912	100.0	0.44
Midland town	35	4684	218484	4684	100.0	2.14
Midland town	40	4684	217840	0	0.0	0.0
Midway town	30	4742	211642	4742	100.0	2.24
Mills River town	48	7078	202689	7078	100.0	3.49
Milton town	23	155	210529	155	100.0	0.07
Mineral Springs town	35	3159	218484	3159	100.0	1.45
Minnesott Beach town	2	530	199750	530	100.0	0.27
Mint Hill town	35	26450	218484	6	0.02	0.0
Mint Hill town	40	26450	217840	26444	99.98	12.14
Misenheimer village	33	650	209379	650	100.0	0.31
Mocksville town	30	5900	211642	5900	100.0	2.79
Momeyer town	11	277	206121	277	100.0	0.13
Monroe city	35	34562	218484	34562	100.0	15.82
Montreat town	49	901	202372	901	100.0	0.45
Mooresboro town	44	293	208541	293	100.0	0.14
Mooresville town	37	50193	215170	50193	100.0	23.33
Morehead City town	2	9556	199750	9556	100.0	4.78

Morganton city	46	17474	200712	17474	100.0	8.71
Morrisville town	16	29630	198366	29423	99.3	14.83
Morrisville town	20	29630	201264	207	0.7	0.1
Morven town	29	329	217124	329	100.0	0.15
Mount Airy city	36	10676	218292	10676	100.0	4.89
Mount Gilead town	29	1171	217124	1171	100.0	0.54
Mount Holly city	43	17703	201611	17703	100.0	8.78
Mount Olive town	4	4198	216568	4193	99.88	1.94
Mount Olive town	9	4198	202791	5	0.12	0.0
Mount Pleasant town	34	1671	216895	1671	100.0	0.77
Murfreesboro town	1	2619	198430	2619	100.0	1.32
Murphy town	50	1608	213456	1608	100.0	0.75
Nags Head town	2	3168	199750	3168	100.0	1.59
Nashville town	11	5632	206121	5632	100.0	2.73
Navassa town	8	1367	214553	1367	100.0	0.64
New Bern city	3	31291	200494	31291	100.0	15.61
New London town	33	607	209379	607	100.0	0.29
Newland town	47	715	211521	715	100.0	0.34
Newport town	2	4364	199750	4364	100.0	2.18
Newton Grove town	9	585	202791	585	100.0	0.29
Newton city	45	13148	217416	13148	100.0	6.05
Norlina town	1	920	198430	920	100.0	0.46
Norman town	29	100	217124	100	100.0	0.05
North Topsail Beach town	6	1005	204576	1005	100.0	0.49
North Wilkesboro town	36	4382	218292	4382	100.0	2.01
Northwest city	8	703	214553	703	100.0	0.33
Norwood town	33	2367	209379	2367	100.0	1.13
Oak City town	1	266	198430	266	100.0	0.13
Oak Island town	8	8396	214553	8396	100.0	3.91
Oak Ridge town	27	7474	207951	7474	100.0	3.59
Oakboro town	33	2128	209379	2128	100.0	1.02
Ocean Isle Beach town	8	867	214553	867	100.0	0.4
Old Fort town	44	811	208541	811	100.0	0.39
Oriental town	2	880	199750	880	100.0	0.44
Orrum town	24	59	202786	59	100.0	0.03
Ossipee town	25	536	217906	536	100.0	0.25
Oxford city	13	8628	198376	8628	100.0	4.35
Pantego town	3	164	200494	164	100.0	0.08

Parkton town	24	504	202786	504	100.0	0.25
Parmelee town	1	243	198430	243	100.0	0.12
Patterson Springs town	44	571	208541	571	100.0	0.27
Peachland town	29	390	217124	390	100.0	0.18
Peletier town	2	769	199750	769	100.0	0.38
Pembroke town	24	2823	202786	2823	100.0	1.39
Pikeville town	4	712	216568	712	100.0	0.33
Pilot Mountain town	36	1440	218292	1440	100.0	0.66
Pine Knoll Shores town	2	1388	199750	1388	100.0	0.69
Pine Level town	10	2046	215999	2046	100.0	0.95
Pinebluff town	21	1473	217984	1473	100.0	0.68
Pinehurst village	21	17581	217984	17581	100.0	8.07
Pinetops town	5	1200	219143	1200	100.0	0.55
Pineville town	39	10602	217776	10602	100.0	4.87
Pink Hill town	3	451	200494	451	100.0	0.22
Pittsboro town	20	4537	201264	4537	100.0	2.25
Pleasant Garden town	26	5000	208430	5000	100.0	2.4
Plymouth town	2	3320	199750	3320	100.0	1.66
Polkton town	29	2250	217124	2250	100.0	1.04
Polkville city	44	516	208541	516	100.0	0.25
Pollocksville town	9	268	202791	268	100.0	0.13
Powellsville town	1	189	198430	189	100.0	0.1
Princeton town	10	1315	215999	1315	100.0	0.61
Princeville town	5	1254	219143	1254	100.0	0.57
Proctorville town	24	121	202786	121	100.0	0.06
Raeford city	24	4559	202786	4559	100.0	2.25
Raleigh city	13	467665	198376	57488	12.29	28.98
Raleigh city	14	467665	198394	126300	27.01	63.66
Raleigh city	15	467665	198361	185266	39.62	93.4
Raleigh city	16	467665	198366	10	0.0	0.01
Raleigh city	18	467665	198440	97042	20.75	48.9
Raleigh city	20	467665	201264	233	0.05	0.12
Raleigh city	22	467665	199854	1326	0.28	0.66
Ramseur town	25	1774	217906	1774	100.0	0.81
Randleman city	25	4595	217906	4595	100.0	2.11
Ranlo town	43	4511	201611	4511	100.0	2.24
Raynham town	24	60	202786	60	100.0	0.03
Red Cross town	33	762	209379	762	100.0	0.36

Red Oak town	11	3342	206121	3342	100.0	1.62
Red Springs town	24	3087	202786	3087	100.0	1.52
Reidsville city	26	14583	208430	14583	100.0	7.0
Rennert town	24	275	202786	275	100.0	0.14
Rhodhiss town	45	997	217416	358	35.91	0.16
Rhodhiss town	46	997	200712	639	64.09	0.32
Rich Square town	1	894	198430	894	100.0	0.45
Richfield town	33	582	209379	582	100.0	0.28
Richlands town	6	2287	204576	2287	100.0	1.12
River Bend town	3	2902	200494	2902	100.0	1.45
Roanoke Rapids city	1	15229	198430	15229	100.0	7.67
Robbins town	21	1168	217984	1168	100.0	0.54
Robbinsville town	47	597	211521	597	100.0	0.28
Robersonville town	1	1269	198430	1269	100.0	0.64
Rockingham city	29	9243	217124	9243	100.0	4.26
Rockwell town	33	2302	209379	2302	100.0	1.1
Rocky Mount city	5	54341	219143	15414	28.37	7.03
Rocky Mount city	11	54341	206121	38927	71.63	18.89
Rolesville town	18	9475	198440	9475	100.0	4.77
Ronda town	36	438	218292	438	100.0	0.2
Roper town	2	485	199750	485	100.0	0.24
Rose Hill town	9	1371	202791	1371	100.0	0.68
Roseboro town	9	1163	202791	1163	100.0	0.57
Rosman town	50	701	213456	701	100.0	0.33
Rowland town	24	885	202786	885	100.0	0.44
Roxboro city	23	8134	210529	8134	100.0	3.86
Roxobel town	1	187	198430	187	100.0	0.09
Rural Hall town	32	3351	209492	3351	100.0	1.6
Ruth town	44	347	208541	347	100.0	0.17
Rutherford College town	45	1226	217416	0	0.0	0.0
Rutherford College town	46	1226	200712	1226	100.0	0.61
Rutherfordton town	44	3640	208541	3640	100.0	1.75
Salemburg town	9	457	202791	457	100.0	0.23
Salisbury city	33	35540	209379	35540	100.0	16.97
Saluda city	48	631	202689	631	100.0	0.31
Sandy Creek town	8	248	214553	248	100.0	0.12
Sandyfield town	8	430	214553	430	100.0	0.2
Sanford city	12	30261	200794	30261	100.0	15.07

Saratoga town	4	353	216568	353	100.0	0.16
Sawmills town	45	5020	217416	5020	100.0	2.31
Scotland Neck town	1	1640	198430	1640	100.0	0.83
Seaboard town	1	542	198430	542	100.0	0.27
Seagrove town	29	235	217124	235	100.0	0.11
Sedalia town	26	676	208430	676	100.0	0.32
Selma town	10	6317	215999	6317	100.0	2.92
Seven Devils town	47	313	211521	313	100.0	0.15
Seven Springs town	4	55	216568	55	100.0	0.03
Severn town	1	191	198430	191	100.0	0.1
Shallotte town	8	4185	214553	4185	100.0	1.95
Sharpsburg town	4	1697	216568	421	24.81	0.19
Sharpsburg town	5	1697	219143	215	12.67	0.1
Sharpsburg town	11	1697	206121	1061	62.52	0.51
Shelby city	44	21918	208541	21918	100.0	10.51
Siler City town	20	7702	201264	7702	100.0	3.83
Simpson village	5	390	219143	390	100.0	0.18
Sims town	4	275	216568	275	100.0	0.13
Smithfield town	10	11292	215999	11292	100.0	5.23
Snow Hill town	4	1481	216568	1481	100.0	0.68
Southern Pines town	21	15545	217984	15545	100.0	7.13
Southern Shores town	2	3090	199750	3090	100.0	1.55
Southport city	8	3971	214553	3971	100.0	1.85
Sparta town	47	1834	211521	1834	100.0	0.87
Speed town	5	63	219143	63	100.0	0.03
Spencer Mountain town	43	0	201611	0	0.0	0.0
Spencer town	33	3308	209379	3308	100.0	1.58
Spindale town	44	4225	208541	4225	100.0	2.03
Spring Hope town	11	1309	206121	1309	100.0	0.64
Spring Lake town	21	11660	217984	11660	100.0	5.35
Spruce Pine town	47	2194	211521	2194	100.0	1.04
St. Helena village	9	417	202791	417	100.0	0.21
St. James town	8	6529	214553	6529	100.0	3.04
St. Pauls town	24	2045	202786	2045	100.0	1.01
Staley town	25	397	217906	397	100.0	0.18
Stallings town	35	16112	218484	15728	97.62	7.2
Stallings town	40	16112	217840	373	2.32	0.17
Stallings town	41	16112	216594	11	0.07	0.01

Stanfield town	33	1585	209379	1585	100.0	0.76
Stanley town	46	3963	200712	3963	100.0	1.97
Stantonsburg town	4	762	216568	762	100.0	0.35
Star town	29	806	217124	806	100.0	0.37
Statesville city	37	28419	215170	28419	100.0	13.21
Stedman town	21	1277	217984	1277	100.0	0.59
Stem town	13	960	198376	960	100.0	0.48
Stokesdale town	27	5924	207951	5924	100.0	2.85
Stoneville town	26	1308	208430	1308	100.0	0.63
Stonewall town	2	214	199750	214	100.0	0.11
Stovall town	13	324	198376	324	100.0	0.16
Sugar Mountain village	47	371	211521	371	100.0	0.18
Summerfield town	28	10951	216014	10951	100.0	5.07
Sunset Beach town	8	4175	214553	4175	100.0	1.95
Surf City town	6	3867	204576	334	8.64	0.16
Surf City town	9	3867	202791	3533	91.36	1.74
Swansboro town	6	3744	204576	3744	100.0	1.83
Sweptsonville town	25	2445	217906	2445	100.0	1.12
Sylva town	50	2578	213456	2578	100.0	1.21
Tabor City town	8	3781	214553	3781	100.0	1.76
Tar Heel town	9	90	202791	90	100.0	0.04
Tarboro town	5	10721	219143	10721	100.0	4.89
Taylorsville town	36	2320	218292	2320	100.0	1.06
Taylortown town	21	634	217984	634	100.0	0.29
Teachey town	9	448	202791	448	100.0	0.22
Thomasville city	29	27183	217124	521	1.92	0.24
Thomasville city	30	27183	211642	26662	98.08	12.6
Tobaccoville village	31	2578	210312	824	31.96	0.39
Tobaccoville village	32	2578	209492	1754	68.04	0.84
Tobaccoville village	36	2578	218292	0	0.0	0.0
Topsail Beach town	9	461	202791	461	100.0	0.23
Trent Woods town	3	4074	200494	4074	100.0	2.03
Trenton town	9	238	202791	238	100.0	0.12
Trinity city	29	7006	217124	7006	100.0	3.23
Troutman town	37	3698	215170	3698	100.0	1.72
Troy town	29	2850	217124	2850	100.0	1.31
Tryon town	48	1562	202689	1562	100.0	0.77
Turkey town	9	213	202791	213	100.0	0.11

Unionville town	35	6643	218484	6643	100.0	3.04
Valdese town	46	4689	200712	4689	100.0	2.34
Vanceboro town	3	869	200494	869	100.0	0.43
Vandemere town	2	246	199750	246	100.0	0.12
Varnamtown town	8	525	214553	525	100.0	0.24
Vass town	21	952	217984	952	100.0	0.44
Waco town	44	310	208541	310	100.0	0.15
Wade town	21	638	217984	638	100.0	0.29
Wadesboro town	29	5008	217124	5008	100.0	2.31
Wagram town	24	615	202786	615	100.0	0.3
Wake Forest town	11	47601	206121	1504	3.16	0.73
Wake Forest town	13	47601	198376	41553	87.29	20.95
Wake Forest town	18	47601	198440	4544	9.55	2.29
Walkertown town	32	5692	209492	5692	100.0	2.72
Wallace town	9	3413	202791	3413	100.0	1.68
Wallburg town	30	3051	211642	3051	100.0	1.44
Walnut Cove town	36	1586	218292	1586	100.0	0.73
Walnut Creek village	4	1084	216568	1084	100.0	0.5
Walstonburg town	4	193	216568	193	100.0	0.09
Warrenton town	1	851	198430	851	100.0	0.43
Warsaw town	9	2733	202791	2733	100.0	1.35
Washington Park town	3	392	200494	392	100.0	0.2
Washington city	3	9875	200494	9875	100.0	4.93
Watha town	9	181	202791	181	100.0	0.09
Waxhaw town	35	20534	218484	20534	100.0	9.4
Waynesville town	50	10140	213456	10140	100.0	4.75
Weaverville town	49	4567	202372	4567	100.0	2.26
Webster town	50	372	213456	372	100.0	0.17
Weddington town	35	13181	218484	13176	99.96	6.03
Weddington town	41	13181	216594	5	0.04	0.0
Weldon town	1	1444	198430	1444	100.0	0.73
Wendell town	18	9793	198440	9793	100.0	4.93
Wentworth town	26	2662	208430	2662	100.0	1.28
Wesley Chapel village	35	8681	218484	8681	100.0	3.97
West Jefferson town	47	1279	211521	1279	100.0	0.6
Whispering Pines village	21	4987	217984	4987	100.0	2.29
Whitakers town	5	627	219143	290	46.25	0.13
Whitakers town	11	627	206121	337	53.75	0.16

White Lake town	9	843	202791	843	100.0	0.42
Whiteville city	8	4766	214553	4766	100.0	2.22
Whitsett town	26	584	208430	584	100.0	0.28
Wilkesboro town	36	3687	218292	3687	100.0	1.69
Williamston town	1	5248	198430	5248	100.0	2.64
Wilmington city	7	115451	198465	115451	100.0	58.17
Wilson city	4	47851	216568	47851	100.0	22.1
Wilson's Mills town	10	2534	215999	2534	100.0	1.17
Windsor town	1	3582	198430	3582	100.0	1.81
Winfall town	2	555	199750	555	100.0	0.28
Wingate town	29	4055	217124	4055	100.0	1.87
Winston-Salem city	31	249545	210312	119010	47.69	56.59
Winston-Salem city	32	249545	209492	130535	52.31	62.31
Winterville town	5	10462	219143	10462	100.0	4.77
Winton town	1	629	198430	629	100.0	0.32
Woodfin town	49	7936	202372	7936	100.0	3.92
Woodland town	1	557	198430	557	100.0	0.28
Wrightsville Beach town	7	2473	198465	2473	100.0	1.25
Yadkinville town	31	2995	210312	2995	100.0	1.42
Yanceyville town	23	1937	210529	1937	100.0	0.92
Youngsville town	11	2016	206121	2016	100.0	0.98
Zebulon town	10	6903	215999	0	0.0	0.0
Zebulon town	18	6903	198440	6903	100.0	3.48

Municipality by County-District Report

Municipality (County)	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	% Muni Pop in District	% District Pop in Muni
Aberdeen town	21	8516	217984	8516	100.0	3.91
Ahoskie town	1	4891	198430	4891	100.0	2.46
Alamance village	25	988	217906	988	100.0	0.45
Albemarle city	33	16432	209379	16432	100.0	7.85
Alliance town	2	733	199750	733	100.0	0.37
Andrews town	50	1667	213456	1667	100.0	0.78
Angier town (HARNETT)	12	4709	200794	4709	100.0	2.35
Angier town (WAKE)	17	556	198465	556	100.0	0.28
Ansonville town	29	440	217124	440	100.0	0.2
Apex town	17	58780	198465	58780	100.0	29.62
Arapahoe town	2	416	199750	416	100.0	0.21
Archdale city (GUILFORD)	27	380	207951	380	100.0	0.18
Archdale city (RANDOLPH)	29	11527	217124	11527	100.0	5.31
Archer Lodge town	10	4797	215999	4797	100.0	2.22
Asheboro city	29	27156	217124	27156	100.0	12.51
Asheville city	48	94589	202689	40477	42.79	19.97
Asheville city	49	94589	202372	54112	57.21	26.74
Askewville town	1	184	198430	184	100.0	0.09
Atkinson town	9	296	202791	296	100.0	0.15
Atlantic Beach town	2	1364	199750	1364	100.0	0.68
Aulander town	1	763	198430	763	100.0	0.38
Aurora town	3	455	200494	455	100.0	0.23
Autryville town	9	167	202791	167	100.0	0.08
Ayden town	5	4977	219143	4977	100.0	2.27
Badin town	33	2024	209379	2024	100.0	0.97
Bailey town	11	568	206121	568	100.0	0.28
Bakersville town	47	450	211521	450	100.0	0.21
Bald Head Island village	8	268	214553	268	100.0	0.12
Banner Elk town	47	1049	211521	1049	100.0	0.5
Bath town	3	245	200494	245	100.0	0.12
Bayboro town	2	1161	199750	1161	100.0	0.58
Bear Grass town	1	89	198430	89	100.0	0.04
Beaufort town	2	4464	199750	4464	100.0	2.23
Beech Mountain town (AVERY)	47	62	211521	62	100.0	0.03

Beech Mountain town (WATAUGA)	47	613	211521	613	100.0	0.29
Belhaven town	3	1410	200494	1410	100.0	0.7
Belmont city	43	15010	201611	15010	100.0	7.45
Belville town	8	2406	214553	2406	100.0	1.12
Belwood town	44	857	208541	857	100.0	0.41
Benson town (HARNETT)	12	0	200794	0	0.0	0.0
Benson town (JOHNSTON)	10	3967	215999	3967	100.0	1.84
Bermuda Run town	30	3120	211642	3120	100.0	1.47
Bessemer City city	43	5428	201611	5428	100.0	2.69
Bethania town	32	344	209492	344	100.0	0.16
Bethel town	5	1373	219143	1373	100.0	0.63
Beulaville town	9	1116	202791	1116	100.0	0.55
Biltmore Forest town	48	1409	202689	1409	100.0	0.7
Biscoe town	29	1848	217124	1848	100.0	0.85
Black Creek town	4	692	216568	692	100.0	0.32
Black Mountain town	49	8426	202372	8426	100.0	4.16
Bladenboro town	9	1648	202791	1648	100.0	0.81
Blowing Rock town (CALDWELL)	47	91	211521	91	100.0	0.04
Blowing Rock town (WATAUGA)	47	1285	211521	1285	100.0	0.61
Boardman town	8	166	214553	166	100.0	0.08
Bogue town	2	695	199750	695	100.0	0.35
Boiling Spring Lakes city	8	5943	214553	5943	100.0	2.77
Boiling Springs town	44	4615	208541	4615	100.0	2.21
Bolivia town	8	149	214553	149	100.0	0.07
Bolton town	8	519	214553	519	100.0	0.24
Boone town	47	19092	211521	19092	100.0	9.03
Boonville town	31	1185	210312	1185	100.0	0.56
Bostic town	44	355	208541	355	100.0	0.17
Brevard city	50	7744	213456	7744	100.0	3.63
Bridgeton town	3	349	200494	349	100.0	0.17
Broadway town (HARNETT)	12	0	200794	0	0.0	0.0
Broadway town (LEE)	12	1267	200794	1267	100.0	0.63
Brookford town	45	442	217416	442	100.0	0.2
Brunswick town	8	973	214553	973	100.0	0.45
Bryson City town	47	1558	211521	1558	100.0	0.74
Bunn town	11	327	206121	327	100.0	0.16
Burgaw town	9	3088	202791	3088	100.0	1.52
Burlington city (ALAMANCE)	25	55481	217906	55481	100.0	25.46

Burlington city (GUILFORD)	26	1822	208430	1822	100.0	0.87
Burnsville town	47	1614	211521	1614	100.0	0.76
Butner town	13	8397	198376	8397	100.0	4.23
Cajah's Mountain town	45	2722	217416	2722	100.0	1.25
Calabash town	8	2011	214553	2011	100.0	0.94
Calypso town	9	327	202791	327	100.0	0.16
Cameron town	21	244	217984	244	100.0	0.11
Candor town (MONTGOMERY)	29	813	217124	813	100.0	0.37
Candor town (MOORE)	21	0	217984	0	0.0	0.0
Canton town	50	4422	213456	4422	100.0	2.07
Cape Carteret town	2	2224	199750	2224	100.0	1.11
Carolina Beach town	8	6564	214553	6564	100.0	3.06
Carolina Shores town	8	4588	214553	4588	100.0	2.14
Carrboro town	23	21295	210529	21295	100.0	10.11
Carthage town	21	2775	217984	2775	100.0	1.27
Cary town (CHATHAM)	20	3709	201264	3709	100.0	1.84
Cary town (WAKE)	14	171012	198394	0	0.0	0.0
Cary town (WAKE)	15	171012	198361	0	0.0	0.0
Cary town (WAKE)	16	171012	198366	163624	95.68	82.49
Cary town (WAKE)	17	171012	198465	7388	4.32	3.72
Casar town	44	305	208541	305	100.0	0.15
Castalia town	11	264	206121	264	100.0	0.13
Caswell Beach town	8	395	214553	395	100.0	0.18
Catawba town	45	702	217416	702	100.0	0.32
Cedar Point town	2	1764	199750	1764	100.0	0.88
Cedar Rock village	45	301	217416	301	100.0	0.14
Cerro Gordo town	8	131	214553	131	100.0	0.06
Chadbourn town	8	1574	214553	1574	100.0	0.73
Chapel Hill town (DURHAM)	20	2906	201264	2906	100.0	1.44
Chapel Hill town (ORANGE)	23	59054	210529	59054	100.0	28.05
Charlotte city	38	874579	218872	127802	14.61	58.39
Charlotte city	39	874579	217776	174926	20.0	80.32
Charlotte city	40	874579	217840	173961	19.89	79.86
Charlotte city	41	874579	216594	181967	20.81	84.01
Charlotte city	42	874579	215923	215923	24.69	100.0
Cherryville city	43	6078	201611	6078	100.0	3.01
Chimney Rock Village village	44	140	208541	140	100.0	0.07
China Grove town	33	4434	209379	4434	100.0	2.12

Chocowinity town	3	722	200494	722	100.0	0.36
Claremont city	45	1692	217416	1692	100.0	0.78
Clarkton town	9	614	202791	614	100.0	0.3
Clayton town (JOHNSTON)	10	26307	215999	26307	100.0	12.18
Clayton town (WAKE)	14	0	198394	0	0.0	0.0
Clayton town (WAKE)	18	0	198440	0	0.0	0.0
Clemmons village	31	21163	210312	21163	100.0	10.06
Cleveland town	33	846	209379	846	100.0	0.4
Clinton city	9	8383	202791	8383	100.0	4.13
Clyde town	50	1368	213456	1368	100.0	0.64
Coats town	12	2155	200794	2155	100.0	1.07
Cofield village	1	267	198430	267	100.0	0.13
Colerain town	1	217	198430	217	100.0	0.11
Columbia town	1	610	198430	610	100.0	0.31
Columbus town	48	1060	202689	1060	100.0	0.52
Como town	1	67	198430	67	100.0	0.03
Concord city	34	105240	216895	105240	100.0	48.52
Conetoe town	5	198	219143	198	100.0	0.09
Connelly Springs town	46	1529	200712	1529	100.0	0.76
Conover city	45	8421	217416	8421	100.0	3.87
Conway town	1	752	198430	752	100.0	0.38
Cooleemee town	30	940	211642	940	100.0	0.44
Cornelius town	37	31412	215170	12421	39.54	5.77
Cornelius town	38	31412	218872	18991	60.46	8.68
Cove City town	3	378	200494	378	100.0	0.19
Cramerton town	43	5296	201611	5296	100.0	2.63
Creedmoor city	13	4866	198376	4866	100.0	2.45
Creswell town	2	207	199750	207	100.0	0.1
Crossnore town	47	143	211521	143	100.0	0.07
Dallas town	43	5927	201611	5927	100.0	2.94
Danbury town	36	189	218292	189	100.0	0.09
Davidson town (IREDELL)	37	378	215170	378	100.0	0.18
Davidson town (MECKLENBURG)	37	14728	215170	14728	100.0	6.84
Dellview town	43	6	201611	6	100.0	0.0
Denton town	30	1494	211642	1494	100.0	0.71
Dillsboro town	50	213	213456	213	100.0	0.1
Dobbins Heights town	29	687	217124	687	100.0	0.32
Dobson town	36	1462	218292	1462	100.0	0.67

Dortches town	11	1082	206121	1082	100.0	0.52
Dover town	3	349	200494	349	100.0	0.17
Drexel town	46	1760	200712	1760	100.0	0.88
Dublin town	9	267	202791	267	100.0	0.13
Duck town	2	742	199750	742	100.0	0.37
Dunn city	12	8446	200794	8446	100.0	4.21
Durham city (DURHAM)	20	283093	201264	116178	41.04	57.72
Durham city (DURHAM)	22	283093	199854	166915	58.96	83.52
Durham city (ORANGE)	23	144	210529	144	100.0	0.07
Durham city (WAKE)	15	269	198361	269	100.0	0.14
Durham city (WAKE)	16	269	198366	0	0.0	0.0
Earl town	44	198	208541	198	100.0	0.09
East Arcadia town	9	418	202791	418	100.0	0.21
East Bend town	31	634	210312	634	100.0	0.3
East Laurinburg town	24	234	202786	234	100.0	0.12
East Spencer town	33	1567	209379	1567	100.0	0.75
Eastover town	21	3656	217984	3656	100.0	1.68
Eden city	26	15421	208430	15421	100.0	7.4
Edenton town	2	4460	199750	4460	100.0	2.23
Elizabeth City city (CAMDEN)	1	38	198430	38	100.0	0.02
Elizabeth City city (PASQUOTANK)	2	18593	199750	18593	100.0	9.31
Elizabethtown town	9	3296	202791	3296	100.0	1.63
Elk Park town	47	542	211521	542	100.0	0.26
Elkin town (SURRY)	36	4049	218292	4049	100.0	1.85
Elkin town (WILKES)	36	73	218292	73	100.0	0.03
Ellenboro town	44	723	208541	723	100.0	0.35
Ellerbe town	29	864	217124	864	100.0	0.4
Elm City town (NASH)	11	0	206121	0	0.0	0.0
Elm City town (WILSON)	4	1218	216568	1218	100.0	0.56
Elon town	25	11336	217906	11336	100.0	5.2
Emerald Isle town	2	3847	199750	3847	100.0	1.93
Enfield town	1	1865	198430	1865	100.0	0.94
Erwin town	12	4542	200794	4542	100.0	2.26
Eureka town	4	214	216568	214	100.0	0.1
Everetts town	1	150	198430	150	100.0	0.08
Fair Bluff town	8	709	214553	709	100.0	0.33
Fairmont town	24	2191	202786	2191	100.0	1.08
Fairview town	35	3456	218484	3456	100.0	1.58

Faison town (DUPLIN)	9	784	202791	784	100.0	0.39
Faison town (SAMPSON)	9	0	202791	0	0.0	0.0
Faith town	33	819	209379	819	100.0	0.39
Falcon town (CUMBERLAND)	21	324	217984	324	100.0	0.15
Falcon town (SAMPSON)	9	0	202791	0	0.0	0.0
Falkland town	5	47	219143	47	100.0	0.02
Fallston town	44	627	208541	627	100.0	0.3
Farmville town	5	4461	219143	4461	100.0	2.04
Fayetteville city	19	208501	216471	183928	88.21	84.97
Fayetteville city	21	208501	217984	24573	11.79	11.27
Flat Rock village	48	3486	202689	3486	100.0	1.72
Fletcher town	48	7987	202689	7987	100.0	3.94
Fontana Dam town	47	13	211521	13	100.0	0.01
Forest City town	44	7377	208541	7377	100.0	3.54
Forest Hills village	50	303	213456	303	100.0	0.14
Fountain town	5	385	219143	385	100.0	0.18
Four Oaks town	10	2158	215999	2158	100.0	1.0
Foxfire village	21	1288	217984	1288	100.0	0.59
Franklin town	50	4175	213456	4175	100.0	1.96
Franklinton town	11	2456	206121	2456	100.0	1.19
Franklinville town	25	1197	217906	1197	100.0	0.55
Fremont town	4	1196	216568	1196	100.0	0.55
Fuquay-Varina town (HARNETT)	12	0	200794	0	0.0	0.0
Fuquay-Varina town (WAKE)	17	34152	198465	34152	100.0	17.21
Gamewell town	47	3702	211521	3702	100.0	1.75
Garland town	9	595	202791	595	100.0	0.29
Garner town	14	31159	198394	31159	100.0	15.71
Garysburg town	1	904	198430	904	100.0	0.46
Gaston town	1	1008	198430	1008	100.0	0.51
Gastonia city	43	80411	201611	80411	100.0	39.88
Gatesville town	1	267	198430	267	100.0	0.13
Gibson town	24	449	202786	449	100.0	0.22
Gibsonville town (ALAMANCE)	25	4278	217906	4278	100.0	1.96
Gibsonville town (GUILFORD)	26	4642	208430	4642	100.0	2.23
Glen Alpine town	46	1529	200712	1529	100.0	0.76
Godwin town	21	128	217984	128	100.0	0.06
Goldsboro city	4	33657	216568	33657	100.0	15.54
Goldston town	20	234	201264	234	100.0	0.12

Graham city	25	17157	217906	17157	100.0	7.87
Grandfather Village village	47	95	211521	95	100.0	0.04
Granite Falls town	45	4965	217416	4965	100.0	2.28
Granite Quarry town	33	2984	209379	2984	100.0	1.43
Grantsboro town	2	692	199750	692	100.0	0.35
Green Level town	25	3152	217906	3152	100.0	1.45
Greenevers town	9	567	202791	567	100.0	0.28
Greensboro city	26	299035	208430	58750	19.65	28.19
Greensboro city	27	299035	207951	60994	20.4	29.33
Greensboro city	28	299035	216014	179291	59.96	83.0
Greenville city	5	87521	219143	87521	100.0	39.94
Grifton town (LENOIR)	3	147	200494	147	100.0	0.07
Grifton town (PITT)	5	2301	219143	2301	100.0	1.05
Grimesland town	5	386	219143	386	100.0	0.18
Grover town	44	802	208541	802	100.0	0.38
Halifax town	1	170	198430	170	100.0	0.09
Hamilton town	1	306	198430	306	100.0	0.15
Hamlet city	29	6025	217124	6025	100.0	2.77
Harmony town	37	543	215170	543	100.0	0.25
Harrells town (DUPLIN)	9	0	202791	0	0.0	0.0
Harrells town (SAMPSON)	9	160	202791	160	100.0	0.08
Harrellsville town	1	85	198430	85	100.0	0.04
Harrisburg town	34	18967	216895	18967	100.0	8.74
Hassell town	1	49	198430	49	100.0	0.02
Havelock city	3	16621	200494	16621	100.0	8.29
Haw River town	25	2252	217906	2252	100.0	1.03
Hayesville town	50	461	213456	461	100.0	0.22
Hemby Bridge town	35	1614	218484	1614	100.0	0.74
Henderson city	11	15060	206121	15060	100.0	7.31
Hendersonville city	48	15137	202689	15137	100.0	7.47
Hertford town	2	1934	199750	1934	100.0	0.97
Hickory city (BURKE)	46	79	200712	79	100.0	0.04
Hickory city (CALDWELL)	45	32	217416	32	100.0	0.01
Hickory city (CATAWBA)	45	43379	217416	43379	100.0	19.95
High Point city (DAVIDSON)	30	6646	211642	6646	100.0	3.14
High Point city (FORSYTH)	32	84	209492	84	100.0	0.04
High Point city (GUILFORD)	27	107321	207951	107321	100.0	51.61
High Point city (RANDOLPH)	29	8	217124	8	100.0	0.0

High Shoals city	46	595	200712	595	100.0	0.3
Highlands town (JACKSON)	50	12	213456	12	100.0	0.01
Highlands town (MACON)	50	1060	213456	1060	100.0	0.5
Hildebran town	46	1679	200712	1679	100.0	0.84
Hillsborough town	23	9660	210529	9660	100.0	4.59
Hobgood town	1	268	198430	268	100.0	0.14
Hoffman town	29	418	217124	418	100.0	0.19
Holden Beach town	8	921	214553	921	100.0	0.43
Holly Ridge town	6	4171	204576	4171	100.0	2.04
Holly Springs town	17	41239	198465	41239	100.0	20.78
Hookerton town	4	413	216568	413	100.0	0.19
Hope Mills town	19	17808	216471	2593	14.56	1.2
Hope Mills town	21	17808	217984	15215	85.44	6.98
Hot Springs town	47	520	211521	520	100.0	0.25
Hudson town	45	3780	217416	3780	100.0	1.74
Huntersville town	38	61376	218872	61376	100.0	28.04
Indian Beach town	2	223	199750	223	100.0	0.11
Indian Trail town	35	39997	218484	39997	100.0	18.31
Jackson town	1	430	198430	430	100.0	0.22
Jacksonville city	6	72723	204576	72723	100.0	35.55
Jamestown town	27	3668	207951	3668	100.0	1.76
Jamesville town	1	424	198430	424	100.0	0.21
Jefferson town	47	1622	211521	1622	100.0	0.77
Jonesville town	31	2308	210312	2308	100.0	1.1
Kannapolis city (CABARRUS)	34	42846	216895	42846	100.0	19.75
Kannapolis city (ROWAN)	33	10268	209379	10268	100.0	4.9
Kelford town	1	203	198430	203	100.0	0.1
Kenansville town	9	770	202791	770	100.0	0.38
Kenly town (JOHNSTON)	10	1293	215999	1293	100.0	0.6
Kenly town (WILSON)	4	198	216568	198	100.0	0.09
Kernersville town (FORSYTH)	32	25947	209492	25947	100.0	12.39
Kernersville town (GUILFORD)	27	502	207951	502	100.0	0.24
Kill Devil Hills town	2	7656	199750	7656	100.0	3.83
King city (FORSYTH)	32	591	209492	591	100.0	0.28
King city (STOKES)	36	6606	218292	6606	100.0	3.03
Kings Mountain city (CLEVELAND)	44	10032	208541	10032	100.0	4.81
Kings Mountain city (GASTON)	43	1110	201611	1110	100.0	0.55
Kingstown town	44	656	208541	656	100.0	0.31

Kinston city	3	19900	200494	19900	100.0	9.93
Kittrell town	11	132	206121	132	100.0	0.06
Kitty Hawk town	2	3689	199750	3689	100.0	1.85
Knightdale town	18	19435	198440	19435	100.0	9.79
Kure Beach town	8	2191	214553	2191	100.0	1.02
La Grange town	3	2595	200494	2595	100.0	1.29
Lake Lure town	44	1365	208541	1365	100.0	0.65
Lake Park village	35	3269	218484	3269	100.0	1.5
Lake Santeetlah town	47	38	211521	38	100.0	0.02
Lake Waccamaw town	8	1296	214553	1296	100.0	0.6
Landis town	33	3690	209379	3690	100.0	1.76
Lansing town	47	126	211521	126	100.0	0.06
Lasker town	1	64	198430	64	100.0	0.03
Lattimore town	44	406	208541	406	100.0	0.19
Laurel Park town	48	2250	202689	2250	100.0	1.11
Laurinburg city	24	14978	202786	14978	100.0	7.39
Lawndale town	44	570	208541	570	100.0	0.27
Leggett town	5	37	219143	37	100.0	0.02
Leland town	8	22908	214553	22908	100.0	10.68
Lenoir city	45	18352	217416	11250	61.3	5.17
Lenoir city	47	18352	211521	7102	38.7	3.36
Lewiston Woodville town	1	426	198430	426	100.0	0.21
Lewisville town	31	13381	210312	13381	100.0	6.36
Lexington city	30	19632	211642	19632	100.0	9.28
Liberty town	25	2655	217906	2655	100.0	1.22
Lilesville town	29	395	217124	395	100.0	0.18
Lillington town	12	4735	200794	4735	100.0	2.36
Lincolnton city	46	11091	200712	11091	100.0	5.53
Linden town	21	136	217984	136	100.0	0.06
Littleton town	1	559	198430	559	100.0	0.28
Locust city (CABARRUS)	34	541	216895	423	78.19	0.2
Locust city (CABARRUS)	35	541	218484	118	21.81	0.05
Locust city (STANLY)	33	3996	209379	3996	100.0	1.91
Long View town (BURKE)	46	735	200712	735	100.0	0.37
Long View town (CATAWBA)	45	4353	217416	4353	100.0	2.0
Louisburg town	11	3064	206121	3064	100.0	1.49
Love Valley town	37	154	215170	154	100.0	0.07
Lowell city	43	3654	201611	3654	100.0	1.81

Lucama town	4	1036	216568	1036	100.0	0.48
Lumber Bridge town	24	82	202786	82	100.0	0.04
Lumberton city	24	19025	202786	19025	100.0	9.38
Macclesfield town	5	413	219143	413	100.0	0.19
Macon town	1	110	198430	110	100.0	0.06
Madison town	26	2129	208430	2129	100.0	1.02
Maggie Valley town	50	1687	213456	1687	100.0	0.79
Magnolia town	9	831	202791	831	100.0	0.41
Maiden town (CATAWBA)	45	3736	217416	3736	100.0	1.72
Maiden town (LINCOLN)	46	0	200712	0	0.0	0.0
Manteo town	2	1600	199750	1600	100.0	0.8
Marietta town	24	111	202786	111	100.0	0.05
Marion city	44	7717	208541	7717	100.0	3.7
Mars Hill town	47	2007	211521	2007	100.0	0.95
Marshall town	47	777	211521	777	100.0	0.37
Marshville town	29	2522	217124	2522	100.0	1.16
Marvin village	35	6358	218484	6358	100.0	2.91
Matthews town	41	29435	216594	29435	100.0	13.59
Maxton town (ROBESON)	24	1902	202786	1902	100.0	0.94
Maxton town (SCOTLAND)	24	208	202786	208	100.0	0.1
Mayodan town	26	2418	208430	2418	100.0	1.16
Maysville town	9	818	202791	818	100.0	0.4
McAdenville town	43	890	201611	890	100.0	0.44
McDonald town	24	94	202786	94	100.0	0.05
McFarlan town	29	94	217124	94	100.0	0.04
Mebane city (ALAMANCE)	25	14626	217906	14626	100.0	6.71
Mebane city (ORANGE)	23	3171	210529	3171	100.0	1.51
Mesic town	2	144	199750	144	100.0	0.07
Micro town	10	458	215999	458	100.0	0.21
Middleburg town	11	101	206121	101	100.0	0.05
Middlesex town	11	912	206121	912	100.0	0.44
Midland town (CABARRUS)	35	4684	218484	4684	100.0	2.14
Midland town (MECKLENBURG)	40	0	217840	0	0.0	0.0
Midway town	30	4742	211642	4742	100.0	2.24
Mills River town	48	7078	202689	7078	100.0	3.49
Milton town	23	155	210529	155	100.0	0.07
Mineral Springs town	35	3159	218484	3159	100.0	1.45
Minnesott Beach town	2	530	199750	530	100.0	0.27

Mint Hill town (MECKLENBURG)	40	26444	217840	26444	100.0	12.14
Mint Hill town (UNION)	35	6	218484	6	100.0	0.0
Misenheimer village	33	650	209379	650	100.0	0.31
Mocksville town	30	5900	211642	5900	100.0	2.79
Momeyer town	11	277	206121	277	100.0	0.13
Monroe city	35	34562	218484	34562	100.0	15.82
Montreat town	49	901	202372	901	100.0	0.45
Mooresboro town	44	293	208541	293	100.0	0.14
Mooresville town	37	50193	215170	50193	100.0	23.33
Morehead City town	2	9556	199750	9556	100.0	4.78
Morganton city	46	17474	200712	17474	100.0	8.71
Morrisville town (DURHAM)	20	207	201264	207	100.0	0.1
Morrisville town (WAKE)	16	29423	198366	29423	100.0	14.83
Morven town	29	329	217124	329	100.0	0.15
Mount Airy city	36	10676	218292	10676	100.0	4.89
Mount Gilead town	29	1171	217124	1171	100.0	0.54
Mount Holly city	43	17703	201611	17703	100.0	8.78
Mount Olive town (DUPLIN)	9	5	202791	5	100.0	0.0
Mount Olive town (WAYNE)	4	4193	216568	4193	100.0	1.94
Mount Pleasant town	34	1671	216895	1671	100.0	0.77
Murfreesboro town	1	2619	198430	2619	100.0	1.32
Murphy town	50	1608	213456	1608	100.0	0.75
Nags Head town	2	3168	199750	3168	100.0	1.59
Nashville town	11	5632	206121	5632	100.0	2.73
Navassa town	8	1367	214553	1367	100.0	0.64
New Bern city	3	31291	200494	31291	100.0	15.61
New London town	33	607	209379	607	100.0	0.29
Newland town	47	715	211521	715	100.0	0.34
Newport town	2	4364	199750	4364	100.0	2.18
Newton Grove town	9	585	202791	585	100.0	0.29
Newton city	45	13148	217416	13148	100.0	6.05
Norlina town	1	920	198430	920	100.0	0.46
Norman town	29	100	217124	100	100.0	0.05
North Topsail Beach town	6	1005	204576	1005	100.0	0.49
North Wilkesboro town	36	4382	218292	4382	100.0	2.01
Northwest city	8	703	214553	703	100.0	0.33
Norwood town	33	2367	209379	2367	100.0	1.13
Oak City town	1	266	198430	266	100.0	0.13

Oak Island town	8	8396	214553	8396	100.0	3.91
Oak Ridge town	27	7474	207951	7474	100.0	3.59
Oakboro town	33	2128	209379	2128	100.0	1.02
Ocean Isle Beach town	8	867	214553	867	100.0	0.4
Old Fort town	44	811	208541	811	100.0	0.39
Oriental town	2	880	199750	880	100.0	0.44
Orrum town	24	59	202786	59	100.0	0.03
Ossipee town	25	536	217906	536	100.0	0.25
Oxford city	13	8628	198376	8628	100.0	4.35
Pantego town	3	164	200494	164	100.0	0.08
Parkton town	24	504	202786	504	100.0	0.25
Parmele town	1	243	198430	243	100.0	0.12
Patterson Springs town	44	571	208541	571	100.0	0.27
Peachland town	29	390	217124	390	100.0	0.18
Peletier town	2	769	199750	769	100.0	0.38
Pembroke town	24	2823	202786	2823	100.0	1.39
Pikeville town	4	712	216568	712	100.0	0.33
Pilot Mountain town	36	1440	218292	1440	100.0	0.66
Pine Knoll Shores town	2	1388	199750	1388	100.0	0.69
Pine Level town	10	2046	215999	2046	100.0	0.95
Pinebluff town	21	1473	217984	1473	100.0	0.68
Pinehurst village	21	17581	217984	17581	100.0	8.07
Pinetops town	5	1200	219143	1200	100.0	0.55
Pineville town	39	10602	217776	10602	100.0	4.87
Pink Hill town	3	451	200494	451	100.0	0.22
Pittsboro town	20	4537	201264	4537	100.0	2.25
Pleasant Garden town	26	5000	208430	5000	100.0	2.4
Plymouth town	2	3320	199750	3320	100.0	1.66
Polkton town	29	2250	217124	2250	100.0	1.04
Polkville city	44	516	208541	516	100.0	0.25
Pollocksville town	9	268	202791	268	100.0	0.13
Powellsville town	1	189	198430	189	100.0	0.1
Princeton town	10	1315	215999	1315	100.0	0.61
Princeville town	5	1254	219143	1254	100.0	0.57
Proctorville town	24	121	202786	121	100.0	0.06
Raeford city	24	4559	202786	4559	100.0	2.25
Raleigh city (DURHAM)	20	1559	201264	233	14.95	0.12
Raleigh city (DURHAM)	22	1559	199854	1326	85.05	0.66

Raleigh city (WAKE)	13	466106	198376	57488	12.33	28.98
Raleigh city (WAKE)	14	466106	198394	126300	27.1	63.66
Raleigh city (WAKE)	15	466106	198361	185266	39.75	93.4
Raleigh city (WAKE)	16	466106	198366	10	0.0	0.01
Raleigh city (WAKE)	18	466106	198440	97042	20.82	48.9
Ramseur town	25	1774	217906	1774	100.0	0.81
Randleman city	25	4595	217906	4595	100.0	2.11
Ranlo town	43	4511	201611	4511	100.0	2.24
Raynham town	24	60	202786	60	100.0	0.03
Red Cross town	33	762	209379	762	100.0	0.36
Red Oak town	11	3342	206121	3342	100.0	1.62
Red Springs town (HOKE)	24	0	202786	0	0.0	0.0
Red Springs town (ROBESON)	24	3087	202786	3087	100.0	1.52
Reidsville city	26	14583	208430	14583	100.0	7.0
Rennert town	24	275	202786	275	100.0	0.14
Rhodhiss town (BURKE)	46	639	200712	639	100.0	0.32
Rhodhiss town (CALDWELL)	45	358	217416	358	100.0	0.16
Rich Square town	1	894	198430	894	100.0	0.45
Richfield town	33	582	209379	582	100.0	0.28
Richlands town	6	2287	204576	2287	100.0	1.12
River Bend town	3	2902	200494	2902	100.0	1.45
Roanoke Rapids city	1	15229	198430	15229	100.0	7.67
Robbins town	21	1168	217984	1168	100.0	0.54
Robbinsville town	47	597	211521	597	100.0	0.28
Robersonville town	1	1269	198430	1269	100.0	0.64
Rockingham city	29	9243	217124	9243	100.0	4.26
Rockwell town	33	2302	209379	2302	100.0	1.1
Rocky Mount city (EDGECOMBE)	5	15414	219143	15414	100.0	7.03
Rocky Mount city (NASH)	11	38927	206121	38927	100.0	18.89
Rolesville town	18	9475	198440	9475	100.0	4.77
Ronda town	36	438	218292	438	100.0	0.2
Roper town	2	485	199750	485	100.0	0.24
Rose Hill town	9	1371	202791	1371	100.0	0.68
Roseboro town	9	1163	202791	1163	100.0	0.57
Rosman town	50	701	213456	701	100.0	0.33
Rowland town	24	885	202786	885	100.0	0.44
Roxboro city	23	8134	210529	8134	100.0	3.86
Roxobel town	1	187	198430	187	100.0	0.09

Rural Hall town	32	3351	209492	3351	100.0	1.6
Ruth town	44	347	208541	347	100.0	0.17
Rutherford College town (BURKE)	46	1226	200712	1226	100.0	0.61
Rutherford College town (CALDWELL)	45	0	217416	0	0.0	0.0
Rutherfordton town	44	3640	208541	3640	100.0	1.75
Salemburg town	9	457	202791	457	100.0	0.23
Salisbury city	33	35540	209379	35540	100.0	16.97
Saluda city (HENDERSON)	48	11	202689	11	100.0	0.01
Saluda city (POLK)	48	620	202689	620	100.0	0.31
Sandy Creek town	8	248	214553	248	100.0	0.12
Sandyfield town	8	430	214553	430	100.0	0.2
Sanford city	12	30261	200794	30261	100.0	15.07
Saratoga town	4	353	216568	353	100.0	0.16
Sawmills town	45	5020	217416	5020	100.0	2.31
Scotland Neck town	1	1640	198430	1640	100.0	0.83
Seaboard town	1	542	198430	542	100.0	0.27
Seagrove town	29	235	217124	235	100.0	0.11
Sedalia town	26	676	208430	676	100.0	0.32
Selma town	10	6317	215999	6317	100.0	2.92
Seven Devils town (AVERY)	47	38	211521	38	100.0	0.02
Seven Devils town (WATAUGA)	47	275	211521	275	100.0	0.13
Seven Springs town	4	55	216568	55	100.0	0.03
Severn town	1	191	198430	191	100.0	0.1
Shallotte town	8	4185	214553	4185	100.0	1.95
Sharpsburg town (EDGECOMBE)	5	215	219143	215	100.0	0.1
Sharpsburg town (NASH)	11	1061	206121	1061	100.0	0.51
Sharpsburg town (WILSON)	4	421	216568	421	100.0	0.19
Shelby city	44	21918	208541	21918	100.0	10.51
Siler City town	20	7702	201264	7702	100.0	3.83
Simpson village	5	390	219143	390	100.0	0.18
Sims town	4	275	216568	275	100.0	0.13
Smithfield town	10	11292	215999	11292	100.0	5.23
Snow Hill town	4	1481	216568	1481	100.0	0.68
Southern Pines town	21	15545	217984	15545	100.0	7.13
Southern Shores town	2	3090	199750	3090	100.0	1.55
Southport city	8	3971	214553	3971	100.0	1.85
Sparta town	47	1834	211521	1834	100.0	0.87
Speed town	5	63	219143	63	100.0	0.03

Spencer Mountain town	43	0	201611	0	0.0	0.0
Spencer town	33	3308	209379	3308	100.0	1.58
Spindale town	44	4225	208541	4225	100.0	2.03
Spring Hope town	11	1309	206121	1309	100.0	0.64
Spring Lake town	21	11660	217984	11660	100.0	5.35
Spruce Pine town	47	2194	211521	2194	100.0	1.04
St. Helena village	9	417	202791	417	100.0	0.21
St. James town	8	6529	214553	6529	100.0	3.04
St. Pauls town	24	2045	202786	2045	100.0	1.01
Staley town	25	397	217906	397	100.0	0.18
Stallings town (MECKLENBURG)	40	384	217840	373	97.14	0.17
Stallings town (MECKLENBURG)	41	384	216594	11	2.86	0.01
Stallings town (UNION)	35	15728	218484	15728	100.0	7.2
Stanfield town	33	1585	209379	1585	100.0	0.76
Stanley town	46	3963	200712	3963	100.0	1.97
Stantonsburg town	4	762	216568	762	100.0	0.35
Star town	29	806	217124	806	100.0	0.37
Statesville city	37	28419	215170	28419	100.0	13.21
Stedman town	21	1277	217984	1277	100.0	0.59
Stem town	13	960	198376	960	100.0	0.48
Stokesdale town	27	5924	207951	5924	100.0	2.85
Stoneville town	26	1308	208430	1308	100.0	0.63
Stonewall town	2	214	199750	214	100.0	0.11
Stovall town	13	324	198376	324	100.0	0.16
Sugar Mountain village	47	371	211521	371	100.0	0.18
Summerfield town	28	10951	216014	10951	100.0	5.07
Sunset Beach town	8	4175	214553	4175	100.0	1.95
Surf City town (ONSLOW)	6	334	204576	334	100.0	0.16
Surf City town (PENDER)	9	3533	202791	3533	100.0	1.74
Swansboro town	6	3744	204576	3744	100.0	1.83
Sweepsonville town	25	2445	217906	2445	100.0	1.12
Sylva town	50	2578	213456	2578	100.0	1.21
Tabor City town	8	3781	214553	3781	100.0	1.76
Tar Heel town	9	90	202791	90	100.0	0.04
Tarboro town	5	10721	219143	10721	100.0	4.89
Taylorsville town	36	2320	218292	2320	100.0	1.06
Taylortown town	21	634	217984	634	100.0	0.29
Teachey town	9	448	202791	448	100.0	0.22

Thomasville city (DAVIDSON)	30	26662	211642	26662	100.0	12.6
Thomasville city (RANDOLPH)	29	521	217124	521	100.0	0.24
Tobaccoville village (FORSYTH)	31	2578	210312	824	31.96	0.39
Tobaccoville village (FORSYTH)	32	2578	209492	1754	68.04	0.84
Tobaccoville village (STOKES)	36	0	218292	0	0.0	0.0
Topsail Beach town	9	461	202791	461	100.0	0.23
Trent Woods town	3	4074	200494	4074	100.0	2.03
Trenton town	9	238	202791	238	100.0	0.12
Trinity city	29	7006	217124	7006	100.0	3.23
Troutman town	37	3698	215170	3698	100.0	1.72
Troy town	29	2850	217124	2850	100.0	1.31
Tryon town	48	1562	202689	1562	100.0	0.77
Turkey town	9	213	202791	213	100.0	0.11
Unionville town	35	6643	218484	6643	100.0	3.04
Valdese town	46	4689	200712	4689	100.0	2.34
Vanceboro town	3	869	200494	869	100.0	0.43
Vandemere town	2	246	199750	246	100.0	0.12
Varnamtown town	8	525	214553	525	100.0	0.24
Vass town	21	952	217984	952	100.0	0.44
Waco town	44	310	208541	310	100.0	0.15
Wade town	21	638	217984	638	100.0	0.29
Wadesboro town	29	5008	217124	5008	100.0	2.31
Wagram town	24	615	202786	615	100.0	0.3
Wake Forest town (FRANKLIN)	11	1504	206121	1504	100.0	0.73
Wake Forest town (WAKE)	13	46097	198376	41553	90.14	20.95
Wake Forest town (WAKE)	18	46097	198440	4544	9.86	2.29
Walkertown town	32	5692	209492	5692	100.0	2.72
Wallace town (DUPLIN)	9	3413	202791	3413	100.0	1.68
Wallace town (PENDER)	9	0	202791	0	0.0	0.0
Wallburg town	30	3051	211642	3051	100.0	1.44
Walnut Cove town	36	1586	218292	1586	100.0	0.73
Walnut Creek village	4	1084	216568	1084	100.0	0.5
Walstonburg town	4	193	216568	193	100.0	0.09
Warrenton town	1	851	198430	851	100.0	0.43
Warsaw town	9	2733	202791	2733	100.0	1.35
Washington Park town	3	392	200494	392	100.0	0.2
Washington city	3	9875	200494	9875	100.0	4.93
Watha town	9	181	202791	181	100.0	0.09

Waxhaw town	35	20534	218484	20534	100.0	9.4
Waynesville town	50	10140	213456	10140	100.0	4.75
Weaverville town	49	4567	202372	4567	100.0	2.26
Webster town	50	372	213456	372	100.0	0.17
Weddington town (MECKLENBURG)	41	5	216594	5	100.0	0.0
Weddington town (UNION)	35	13176	218484	13176	100.0	6.03
Weldon town	1	1444	198430	1444	100.0	0.73
Wendell town	18	9793	198440	9793	100.0	4.93
Wentworth town	26	2662	208430	2662	100.0	1.28
Wesley Chapel village	35	8681	218484	8681	100.0	3.97
West Jefferson town	47	1279	211521	1279	100.0	0.6
Whispering Pines village	21	4987	217984	4987	100.0	2.29
Whitakers town (EDGECOMBE)	5	290	219143	290	100.0	0.13
Whitakers town (NASH)	11	337	206121	337	100.0	0.16
White Lake town	9	843	202791	843	100.0	0.42
Whiteville city	8	4766	214553	4766	100.0	2.22
Whitsett town	26	584	208430	584	100.0	0.28
Wilkesboro town	36	3687	218292	3687	100.0	1.69
Williamston town	1	5248	198430	5248	100.0	2.64
Wilmington city	7	115451	198465	115451	100.0	58.17
Wilson city	4	47851	216568	47851	100.0	22.1
Wilson's Mills town	10	2534	215999	2534	100.0	1.17
Windsor town	1	3582	198430	3582	100.0	1.81
Winfall town	2	555	199750	555	100.0	0.28
Wingate town	29	4055	217124	4055	100.0	1.87
Winston-Salem city	31	249545	210312	119010	47.69	56.59
Winston-Salem city	32	249545	209492	130535	52.31	62.31
Winterville town	5	10462	219143	10462	100.0	4.77
Winton town	1	629	198430	629	100.0	0.32
Woodfin town	49	7936	202372	7936	100.0	3.92
Woodland town	1	557	198430	557	100.0	0.28
Wrightsville Beach town	7	2473	198465	2473	100.0	1.25
Yadkinville town	31	2995	210312	2995	100.0	1.42
Yanceyville town	23	1937	210529	1937	100.0	0.92
Youngsville town	11	2016	206121	2016	100.0	0.98
Zebulon town (JOHNSTON)	10	0	215999	0	0.0	0.0
Zebulon town (WAKE)	18	6903	198440	6903	100.0	3.48

District-Municipality by County Report

District	Municipality (County)	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District pop in Muni	% District Pop in Muni	% Muni Pop in District
1	Ahoskie town	198430	4891	4891	2.46	100.0
1	Askewville town	198430	184	184	0.09	100.0
1	Aulander town	198430	763	763	0.38	100.0
1	Bear Grass town	198430	89	89	0.04	100.0
1	Cofield village	198430	267	267	0.13	100.0
1	Colerain town	198430	217	217	0.11	100.0
1	Columbia town	198430	610	610	0.31	100.0
1	Como town	198430	67	67	0.03	100.0
1	Conway town	198430	752	752	0.38	100.0
1	Elizabeth City city (CAMDEN)	198430	38	38	0.02	100.0
1	Enfield town	198430	1865	1865	0.94	100.0
1	Everetts town	198430	150	150	0.08	100.0
1	Garysburg town	198430	904	904	0.46	100.0
1	Gaston town	198430	1008	1008	0.51	100.0
1	Gatesville town	198430	267	267	0.13	100.0
1	Halifax town	198430	170	170	0.09	100.0
1	Hamilton town	198430	306	306	0.15	100.0
1	Harrellsville town	198430	85	85	0.04	100.0
1	Hassell town	198430	49	49	0.02	100.0
1	Hobgood town	198430	268	268	0.14	100.0
1	Jackson town	198430	430	430	0.22	100.0
1	Jamesville town	198430	424	424	0.21	100.0
1	Kelford town	198430	203	203	0.1	100.0
1	Lasker town	198430	64	64	0.03	100.0
1	Lewiston Woodville town	198430	426	426	0.21	100.0
1	Littleton town	198430	559	559	0.28	100.0
1	Macon town	198430	110	110	0.06	100.0
1	Murfreesboro town	198430	2619	2619	1.32	100.0
1	Norlina town	198430	920	920	0.46	100.0
1	Oak City town	198430	266	266	0.13	100.0
1	Parmele town	198430	243	243	0.12	100.0
1	Powellsville town	198430	189	189	0.1	100.0
1	Rich Square town	198430	894	894	0.45	100.0
1	Roanoke Rapids city	198430	15229	15229	7.67	100.0

1	Robersonville town	198430	1269	1269	0.64	100.0
1	Roxobel town	198430	187	187	0.09	100.0
1	Scotland Neck town	198430	1640	1640	0.83	100.0
1	Seaboard town	198430	542	542	0.27	100.0
1	Severn town	198430	191	191	0.1	100.0
1	Warrenton town	198430	851	851	0.43	100.0
1	Weldon town	198430	1444	1444	0.73	100.0
1	Williamston town	198430	5248	5248	2.64	100.0
1	Windsor town	198430	3582	3582	1.81	100.0
1	Winton town	198430	629	629	0.32	100.0
1	Woodland town	198430	557	557	0.28	100.0
2	Alliance town	199750	733	733	0.37	100.0
2	Arapahoe town	199750	416	416	0.21	100.0
2	Atlantic Beach town	199750	1364	1364	0.68	100.0
2	Bayboro town	199750	1161	1161	0.58	100.0
2	Beaufort town	199750	4464	4464	2.23	100.0
2	Bogue town	199750	695	695	0.35	100.0
2	Cape Carteret town	199750	2224	2224	1.11	100.0
2	Cedar Point town	199750	1764	1764	0.88	100.0
2	Creswell town	199750	207	207	0.1	100.0
2	Duck town	199750	742	742	0.37	100.0
2	Edenton town	199750	4460	4460	2.23	100.0
2	Elizabeth City city (PASQUOTANK)	199750	18593	18593	9.31	100.0
2	Emerald Isle town	199750	3847	3847	1.93	100.0
2	Grantsboro town	199750	692	692	0.35	100.0
2	Hertford town	199750	1934	1934	0.97	100.0
2	Indian Beach town	199750	223	223	0.11	100.0
2	Kill Devil Hills town	199750	7656	7656	3.83	100.0
2	Kitty Hawk town	199750	3689	3689	1.85	100.0
2	Manteo town	199750	1600	1600	0.8	100.0
2	Mesic town	199750	144	144	0.07	100.0
2	Minnesott Beach town	199750	530	530	0.27	100.0
2	Morehead City town	199750	9556	9556	4.78	100.0
2	Nags Head town	199750	3168	3168	1.59	100.0
2	Newport town	199750	4364	4364	2.18	100.0
2	Oriental town	199750	880	880	0.44	100.0
2	Peletier town	199750	769	769	0.38	100.0
2	Pine Knoll Shores town	199750	1388	1388	0.69	100.0

2	Plymouth town	199750	3320	3320	1.66	100.0
2	Roper town	199750	485	485	0.24	100.0
2	Southern Shores town	199750	3090	3090	1.55	100.0
2	Stonewall town	199750	214	214	0.11	100.0
2	Vandemere town	199750	246	246	0.12	100.0
2	Winfall town	199750	555	555	0.28	100.0
3	Aurora town	200494	455	455	0.23	100.0
3	Bath town	200494	245	245	0.12	100.0
3	Belhaven town	200494	1410	1410	0.7	100.0
3	Bridgeton town	200494	349	349	0.17	100.0
3	Chocowinity town	200494	722	722	0.36	100.0
3	Cove City town	200494	378	378	0.19	100.0
3	Dover town	200494	349	349	0.17	100.0
3	Grifton town (LENOIR)	200494	147	147	0.07	100.0
3	Havelock city	200494	16621	16621	8.29	100.0
3	Kinston city	200494	19900	19900	9.93	100.0
3	La Grange town	200494	2595	2595	1.29	100.0
3	New Bern city	200494	31291	31291	15.61	100.0
3	Pantego town	200494	164	164	0.08	100.0
3	Pink Hill town	200494	451	451	0.22	100.0
3	River Bend town	200494	2902	2902	1.45	100.0
3	Trent Woods town	200494	4074	4074	2.03	100.0
3	Vanceboro town	200494	869	869	0.43	100.0
3	Washington Park town	200494	392	392	0.2	100.0
3	Washington city	200494	9875	9875	4.93	100.0
4	Black Creek town	216568	692	692	0.32	100.0
4	Elm City town (WILSON)	216568	1218	1218	0.56	100.0
4	Eureka town	216568	214	214	0.1	100.0
4	Fremont town	216568	1196	1196	0.55	100.0
4	Goldsboro city	216568	33657	33657	15.54	100.0
4	Hookerton town	216568	413	413	0.19	100.0
4	Kenly town (WILSON)	216568	198	198	0.09	100.0
4	Lucama town	216568	1036	1036	0.48	100.0
4	Mount Olive town (WAYNE)	216568	4193	4193	1.94	100.0
4	Pikeville town	216568	712	712	0.33	100.0
4	Saratoga town	216568	353	353	0.16	100.0
4	Seven Springs town	216568	55	55	0.03	100.0
4	Sharpsburg town (WILSON)	216568	421	421	0.19	100.0

4	Sims town	216568	275	275	0.13	100.0
4	Snow Hill town	216568	1481	1481	0.68	100.0
4	Stantonsburg town	216568	762	762	0.35	100.0
4	Walnut Creek village	216568	1084	1084	0.5	100.0
4	Walstonburg town	216568	193	193	0.09	100.0
4	Wilson city	216568	47851	47851	22.1	100.0
5	Ayden town	219143	4977	4977	2.27	100.0
5	Bethel town	219143	1373	1373	0.63	100.0
5	Conetoe town	219143	198	198	0.09	100.0
5	Falkland town	219143	47	47	0.02	100.0
5	Farmville town	219143	4461	4461	2.04	100.0
5	Fountain town	219143	385	385	0.18	100.0
5	Greenville city	219143	87521	87521	39.94	100.0
5	Grifton town (PITT)	219143	2301	2301	1.05	100.0
5	Grimesland town	219143	386	386	0.18	100.0
5	Leggett town	219143	37	37	0.02	100.0
5	Macclesfield town	219143	413	413	0.19	100.0
5	Pinetops town	219143	1200	1200	0.55	100.0
5	Princeville town	219143	1254	1254	0.57	100.0
5	Rocky Mount city (EDGECOMBE)	219143	15414	15414	7.03	100.0
5	Sharpsburg town (EDGECOMBE)	219143	215	215	0.1	100.0
5	Simpson village	219143	390	390	0.18	100.0
5	Speed town	219143	63	63	0.03	100.0
5	Tarboro town	219143	10721	10721	4.89	100.0
5	Whitakers town (EDGECOMBE)	219143	290	290	0.13	100.0
5	Winterville town	219143	10462	10462	4.77	100.0
6	Holly Ridge town	204576	4171	4171	2.04	100.0
6	Jacksonville city	204576	72723	72723	35.55	100.0
6	North Topsail Beach town	204576	1005	1005	0.49	100.0
6	Richlands town	204576	2287	2287	1.12	100.0
6	Surf City town (ONSLOW)	204576	334	334	0.16	100.0
6	Swansboro town	204576	3744	3744	1.83	100.0
7	Wilmington city	198465	115451	115451	58.17	100.0
7	Wrightsville Beach town	198465	2473	2473	1.25	100.0
8	Bald Head Island village	214553	268	268	0.12	100.0
8	Belville town	214553	2406	2406	1.12	100.0
8	Boardman town	214553	166	166	0.08	100.0
8	Boiling Spring Lakes city	214553	5943	5943	2.77	100.0

8	Bolivia town	214553	149	149	0.07	100.0
8	Bolton town	214553	519	519	0.24	100.0
8	Brunswick town	214553	973	973	0.45	100.0
8	Calabash town	214553	2011	2011	0.94	100.0
8	Carolina Beach town	214553	6564	6564	3.06	100.0
8	Carolina Shores town	214553	4588	4588	2.14	100.0
8	Caswell Beach town	214553	395	395	0.18	100.0
8	Cerro Gordo town	214553	131	131	0.06	100.0
8	Chadbourn town	214553	1574	1574	0.73	100.0
8	Fair Bluff town	214553	709	709	0.33	100.0
8	Holden Beach town	214553	921	921	0.43	100.0
8	Kure Beach town	214553	2191	2191	1.02	100.0
8	Lake Waccamaw town	214553	1296	1296	0.6	100.0
8	Leland town	214553	22908	22908	10.68	100.0
8	Navassa town	214553	1367	1367	0.64	100.0
8	Northwest city	214553	703	703	0.33	100.0
8	Oak Island town	214553	8396	8396	3.91	100.0
8	Ocean Isle Beach town	214553	867	867	0.4	100.0
8	Sandy Creek town	214553	248	248	0.12	100.0
8	Sandyfield town	214553	430	430	0.2	100.0
8	Shallotte town	214553	4185	4185	1.95	100.0
8	Southport city	214553	3971	3971	1.85	100.0
8	St. James town	214553	6529	6529	3.04	100.0
8	Sunset Beach town	214553	4175	4175	1.95	100.0
8	Tabor City town	214553	3781	3781	1.76	100.0
8	Varnamtown town	214553	525	525	0.24	100.0
8	Whiteville city	214553	4766	4766	2.22	100.0
9	Atkinson town	202791	296	296	0.15	100.0
9	Autryville town	202791	167	167	0.08	100.0
9	Beulaville town	202791	1116	1116	0.55	100.0
9	Bladenboro town	202791	1648	1648	0.81	100.0
9	Burgaw town	202791	3088	3088	1.52	100.0
9	Calypso town	202791	327	327	0.16	100.0
9	Clarkton town	202791	614	614	0.3	100.0
9	Clinton city	202791	8383	8383	4.13	100.0
9	Dublin town	202791	267	267	0.13	100.0
9	East Arcadia town	202791	418	418	0.21	100.0
9	Elizabethtown town	202791	3296	3296	1.63	100.0

9	Faison town (DUPLIN)	202791	784	784	0.39	100.0
9	Faison town (SAMPSON)	202791	0	0	0.0	0.0
9	Falcon town (SAMPSON)	202791	0	0	0.0	0.0
9	Garland town	202791	595	595	0.29	100.0
9	Greenevers town	202791	567	567	0.28	100.0
9	Harrells town (DUPLIN)	202791	0	0	0.0	0.0
9	Harrells town (SAMPSON)	202791	160	160	0.08	100.0
9	Kenansville town	202791	770	770	0.38	100.0
9	Magnolia town	202791	831	831	0.41	100.0
9	Maysville town	202791	818	818	0.4	100.0
9	Mount Olive town (DUPLIN)	202791	5	5	0.0	100.0
9	Newton Grove town	202791	585	585	0.29	100.0
9	Pollocksville town	202791	268	268	0.13	100.0
9	Rose Hill town	202791	1371	1371	0.68	100.0
9	Roseboro town	202791	1163	1163	0.57	100.0
9	Salemburg town	202791	457	457	0.23	100.0
9	St. Helena village	202791	417	417	0.21	100.0
9	Surf City town (PENDER)	202791	3533	3533	1.74	100.0
9	Tar Heel town	202791	90	90	0.04	100.0
9	Teachey town	202791	448	448	0.22	100.0
9	Topsail Beach town	202791	461	461	0.23	100.0
9	Trenton town	202791	238	238	0.12	100.0
9	Turkey town	202791	213	213	0.11	100.0
9	Wallace town (DUPLIN)	202791	3413	3413	1.68	100.0
9	Wallace town (PENDER)	202791	0	0	0.0	0.0
9	Warsaw town	202791	2733	2733	1.35	100.0
9	Watha town	202791	181	181	0.09	100.0
9	White Lake town	202791	843	843	0.42	100.0
10	Archer Lodge town	215999	4797	4797	2.22	100.0
10	Benson town (JOHNSTON)	215999	3967	3967	1.84	100.0
10	Clayton town (JOHNSTON)	215999	26307	26307	12.18	100.0
10	Four Oaks town	215999	2158	2158	1.0	100.0
10	Kenly town (JOHNSTON)	215999	1293	1293	0.6	100.0
10	Micro town	215999	458	458	0.21	100.0
10	Pine Level town	215999	2046	2046	0.95	100.0
10	Princeton town	215999	1315	1315	0.61	100.0
10	Selma town	215999	6317	6317	2.92	100.0
10	Smithfield town	215999	11292	11292	5.23	100.0

10	Wilson's Mills town	215999	2534	2534	1.17	100.0
10	Zebulon town (JOHNSTON)	215999	0	0	0.0	0.0
11	Bailey town	206121	568	568	0.28	100.0
11	Bunn town	206121	327	327	0.16	100.0
11	Castalia town	206121	264	264	0.13	100.0
11	Dortches town	206121	1082	1082	0.52	100.0
11	Elm City town (NASH)	206121	0	0	0.0	0.0
11	Franklinton town	206121	2456	2456	1.19	100.0
11	Henderson city	206121	15060	15060	7.31	100.0
11	Kittrell town	206121	132	132	0.06	100.0
11	Louisburg town	206121	3064	3064	1.49	100.0
11	Middleburg town	206121	101	101	0.05	100.0
11	Middlesex town	206121	912	912	0.44	100.0
11	Momeyer town	206121	277	277	0.13	100.0
11	Nashville town	206121	5632	5632	2.73	100.0
11	Red Oak town	206121	3342	3342	1.62	100.0
11	Rocky Mount city (NASH)	206121	38927	38927	18.89	100.0
11	Sharpsburg town (NASH)	206121	1061	1061	0.51	100.0
11	Spring Hope town	206121	1309	1309	0.64	100.0
11	Wake Forest town (FRANKLIN)	206121	1504	1504	0.73	100.0
11	Whitakers town (NASH)	206121	337	337	0.16	100.0
11	Youngsville town	206121	2016	2016	0.98	100.0
12	Angier town (HARNETT)	200794	4709	4709	2.35	100.0
12	Benson town (HARNETT)	200794	0	0	0.0	0.0
12	Broadway town (HARNETT)	200794	0	0	0.0	0.0
12	Broadway town (LEE)	200794	1267	1267	0.63	100.0
12	Coats town	200794	2155	2155	1.07	100.0
12	Dunn city	200794	8446	8446	4.21	100.0
12	Erwin town	200794	4542	4542	2.26	100.0
12	Fuquay-Varina town (HARNETT)	200794	0	0	0.0	0.0
12	Lillington town	200794	4735	4735	2.36	100.0
12	Sanford city	200794	30261	30261	15.07	100.0
13	Butner town	198376	8397	8397	4.23	100.0
13	Creedmoor city	198376	4866	4866	2.45	100.0
13	Oxford city	198376	8628	8628	4.35	100.0
13	Raleigh city (WAKE)	198376	466106	57488	28.98	12.33
13	Stem town	198376	960	960	0.48	100.0
13	Stovall town	198376	324	324	0.16	100.0

13	Wake Forest town (WAKE)	198376	46097	41553	20.95	90.14
14	Cary town (WAKE)	198394	171012	0	0.0	0.0
14	Clayton town (WAKE)	198394	0	0	0.0	0.0
14	Garner town	198394	31159	31159	15.71	100.0
14	Raleigh city (WAKE)	198394	466106	126300	63.66	27.1
15	Cary town (WAKE)	198361	171012	0	0.0	0.0
15	Durham city (WAKE)	198361	269	269	0.14	100.0
15	Raleigh city (WAKE)	198361	466106	185266	93.4	39.75
16	Cary town (WAKE)	198366	171012	163624	82.49	95.68
16	Durham city (WAKE)	198366	269	0	0.0	0.0
16	Morrisville town (WAKE)	198366	29423	29423	14.83	100.0
16	Raleigh city (WAKE)	198366	466106	10	0.01	0.0
17	Angier town (WAKE)	198465	556	556	0.28	100.0
17	Apex town	198465	58780	58780	29.62	100.0
17	Cary town (WAKE)	198465	171012	7388	3.72	4.32
17	Fuquay-Varina town (WAKE)	198465	34152	34152	17.21	100.0
17	Holly Springs town	198465	41239	41239	20.78	100.0
18	Clayton town (WAKE)	198440	0	0	0.0	0.0
18	Knightdale town	198440	19435	19435	9.79	100.0
18	Raleigh city (WAKE)	198440	466106	97042	48.9	20.82
18	Rolesville town	198440	9475	9475	4.77	100.0
18	Wake Forest town (WAKE)	198440	46097	4544	2.29	9.86
18	Wendell town	198440	9793	9793	4.93	100.0
18	Zebulon town (WAKE)	198440	6903	6903	3.48	100.0
19	Fayetteville city	216471	208501	183928	84.97	88.21
19	Hope Mills town	216471	17808	2593	1.2	14.56
20	Cary town (CHATHAM)	201264	3709	3709	1.84	100.0
20	Chapel Hill town (DURHAM)	201264	2906	2906	1.44	100.0
20	Durham city (DURHAM)	201264	283093	116178	57.72	41.04
20	Goldston town	201264	234	234	0.12	100.0
20	Morrisville town (DURHAM)	201264	207	207	0.1	100.0
20	Pittsboro town	201264	4537	4537	2.25	100.0
20	Raleigh city (DURHAM)	201264	1559	233	0.12	14.95
20	Siler City town	201264	7702	7702	3.83	100.0
21	Aberdeen town	217984	8516	8516	3.91	100.0
21	Cameron town	217984	244	244	0.11	100.0
21	Candor town (MOORE)	217984	0	0	0.0	0.0
21	Carthage town	217984	2775	2775	1.27	100.0

21	Eastover town	217984	3656	3656	1.68	100.0
21	Falcon town (CUMBERLAND)	217984	324	324	0.15	100.0
21	Fayetteville city	217984	208501	24573	11.27	11.79
21	Foxfire village	217984	1288	1288	0.59	100.0
21	Godwin town	217984	128	128	0.06	100.0
21	Hope Mills town	217984	17808	15215	6.98	85.44
21	Linden town	217984	136	136	0.06	100.0
21	Pinebluff town	217984	1473	1473	0.68	100.0
21	Pinehurst village	217984	17581	17581	8.07	100.0
21	Robbins town	217984	1168	1168	0.54	100.0
21	Southern Pines town	217984	15545	15545	7.13	100.0
21	Spring Lake town	217984	11660	11660	5.35	100.0
21	Stedman town	217984	1277	1277	0.59	100.0
21	Taylortown town	217984	634	634	0.29	100.0
21	Vass town	217984	952	952	0.44	100.0
21	Wade town	217984	638	638	0.29	100.0
21	Whispering Pines village	217984	4987	4987	2.29	100.0
22	Durham city (DURHAM)	199854	283093	166915	83.52	58.96
22	Raleigh city (DURHAM)	199854	1559	1326	0.66	85.05
23	Carrboro town	210529	21295	21295	10.11	100.0
23	Chapel Hill town (ORANGE)	210529	59054	59054	28.05	100.0
23	Durham city (ORANGE)	210529	144	144	0.07	100.0
23	Hillsborough town	210529	9660	9660	4.59	100.0
23	Mebane city (ORANGE)	210529	3171	3171	1.51	100.0
23	Milton town	210529	155	155	0.07	100.0
23	Roxboro city	210529	8134	8134	3.86	100.0
23	Yanceyville town	210529	1937	1937	0.92	100.0
24	East Laurinburg town	202786	234	234	0.12	100.0
24	Fairmont town	202786	2191	2191	1.08	100.0
24	Gibson town	202786	449	449	0.22	100.0
24	Laurinburg city	202786	14978	14978	7.39	100.0
24	Lumber Bridge town	202786	82	82	0.04	100.0
24	Lumberton city	202786	19025	19025	9.38	100.0
24	Marietta town	202786	111	111	0.05	100.0
24	Maxton town (ROBESON)	202786	1902	1902	0.94	100.0
24	Maxton town (SCOTLAND)	202786	208	208	0.1	100.0
24	McDonald town	202786	94	94	0.05	100.0
24	Orrum town	202786	59	59	0.03	100.0

24	Parkton town	202786	504	504	0.25	100.0
24	Pembroke town	202786	2823	2823	1.39	100.0
24	Proctorville town	202786	121	121	0.06	100.0
24	Raeford city	202786	4559	4559	2.25	100.0
24	Raynham town	202786	60	60	0.03	100.0
24	Red Springs town (HOKE)	202786	0	0	0.0	0.0
24	Red Springs town (ROBESON)	202786	3087	3087	1.52	100.0
24	Rennert town	202786	275	275	0.14	100.0
24	Rowland town	202786	885	885	0.44	100.0
24	St. Pauls town	202786	2045	2045	1.01	100.0
24	Wagram town	202786	615	615	0.3	100.0
25	Alamance village	217906	988	988	0.45	100.0
25	Burlington city (ALAMANCE)	217906	55481	55481	25.46	100.0
25	Elon town	217906	11336	11336	5.2	100.0
25	Franklinville town	217906	1197	1197	0.55	100.0
25	Gibsonville town (ALAMANCE)	217906	4278	4278	1.96	100.0
25	Graham city	217906	17157	17157	7.87	100.0
25	Green Level town	217906	3152	3152	1.45	100.0
25	Haw River town	217906	2252	2252	1.03	100.0
25	Liberty town	217906	2655	2655	1.22	100.0
25	Mebane city (ALAMANCE)	217906	14626	14626	6.71	100.0
25	Ossipee town	217906	536	536	0.25	100.0
25	Ramseur town	217906	1774	1774	0.81	100.0
25	Randleman city	217906	4595	4595	2.11	100.0
25	Staley town	217906	397	397	0.18	100.0
25	Sweptsonville town	217906	2445	2445	1.12	100.0
26	Burlington city (GUILFORD)	208430	1822	1822	0.87	100.0
26	Eden city	208430	15421	15421	7.4	100.0
26	Gibsonville town (GUILFORD)	208430	4642	4642	2.23	100.0
26	Greensboro city	208430	299035	58750	28.19	19.65
26	Madison town	208430	2129	2129	1.02	100.0
26	Mayodan town	208430	2418	2418	1.16	100.0
26	Pleasant Garden town	208430	5000	5000	2.4	100.0
26	Reidsville city	208430	14583	14583	7.0	100.0
26	Sedalia town	208430	676	676	0.32	100.0
26	Stoneville town	208430	1308	1308	0.63	100.0
26	Wentworth town	208430	2662	2662	1.28	100.0
26	Whitsett town	208430	584	584	0.28	100.0

27	Archdale city (GUILFORD)	207951	380	380	0.18	100.0
27	Greensboro city	207951	299035	60994	29.33	20.4
27	High Point city (GUILFORD)	207951	107321	107321	51.61	100.0
27	Jamestown town	207951	3668	3668	1.76	100.0
27	Kernersville town (GUILFORD)	207951	502	502	0.24	100.0
27	Oak Ridge town	207951	7474	7474	3.59	100.0
27	Stokesdale town	207951	5924	5924	2.85	100.0
28	Greensboro city	216014	299035	179291	83.0	59.96
28	Summerfield town	216014	10951	10951	5.07	100.0
29	Ansonville town	217124	440	440	0.2	100.0
29	Archdale city (RANDOLPH)	217124	11527	11527	5.31	100.0
29	Asheboro city	217124	27156	27156	12.51	100.0
29	Biscoe town	217124	1848	1848	0.85	100.0
29	Candor town (MONTGOMERY)	217124	813	813	0.37	100.0
29	Dobbins Heights town	217124	687	687	0.32	100.0
29	Ellerbe town	217124	864	864	0.4	100.0
29	Hamlet city	217124	6025	6025	2.77	100.0
29	High Point city (RANDOLPH)	217124	8	8	0.0	100.0
29	Hoffman town	217124	418	418	0.19	100.0
29	Lilesville town	217124	395	395	0.18	100.0
29	Marshville town	217124	2522	2522	1.16	100.0
29	McFarlan town	217124	94	94	0.04	100.0
29	Morven town	217124	329	329	0.15	100.0
29	Mount Gilead town	217124	1171	1171	0.54	100.0
29	Norman town	217124	100	100	0.05	100.0
29	Peachland town	217124	390	390	0.18	100.0
29	Polkton town	217124	2250	2250	1.04	100.0
29	Rockingham city	217124	9243	9243	4.26	100.0
29	Seagrove town	217124	235	235	0.11	100.0
29	Star town	217124	806	806	0.37	100.0
29	Thomasville city (RANDOLPH)	217124	521	521	0.24	100.0
29	Trinity city	217124	7006	7006	3.23	100.0
29	Troy town	217124	2850	2850	1.31	100.0
29	Wadesboro town	217124	5008	5008	2.31	100.0
29	Wingate town	217124	4055	4055	1.87	100.0
30	Bermuda Run town	211642	3120	3120	1.47	100.0
30	Cooleemee town	211642	940	940	0.44	100.0
30	Denton town	211642	1494	1494	0.71	100.0

30	High Point city (DAVIDSON)	211642	6646	6646	3.14	100.0
30	Lexington city	211642	19632	19632	9.28	100.0
30	Midway town	211642	4742	4742	2.24	100.0
30	Mocksville town	211642	5900	5900	2.79	100.0
30	Thomasville city (DAVIDSON)	211642	26662	26662	12.6	100.0
30	Wallburg town	211642	3051	3051	1.44	100.0
31	Boonville town	210312	1185	1185	0.56	100.0
31	Clemmons village	210312	21163	21163	10.06	100.0
31	East Bend town	210312	634	634	0.3	100.0
31	Jonesville town	210312	2308	2308	1.1	100.0
31	Lewisville town	210312	13381	13381	6.36	100.0
31	Tobaccoville village (FORSYTH)	210312	2578	824	0.39	31.96
31	Winston-Salem city	210312	249545	119010	56.59	47.69
31	Yadkinville town	210312	2995	2995	1.42	100.0
32	Bethania town	209492	344	344	0.16	100.0
32	High Point city (FORSYTH)	209492	84	84	0.04	100.0
32	Kernersville town (FORSYTH)	209492	25947	25947	12.39	100.0
32	King city (FORSYTH)	209492	591	591	0.28	100.0
32	Rural Hall town	209492	3351	3351	1.6	100.0
32	Tobaccoville village (FORSYTH)	209492	2578	1754	0.84	68.04
32	Walkertown town	209492	5692	5692	2.72	100.0
32	Winston-Salem city	209492	249545	130535	62.31	52.31
33	Albemarle city	209379	16432	16432	7.85	100.0
33	Badin town	209379	2024	2024	0.97	100.0
33	China Grove town	209379	4434	4434	2.12	100.0
33	Cleveland town	209379	846	846	0.4	100.0
33	East Spencer town	209379	1567	1567	0.75	100.0
33	Faith town	209379	819	819	0.39	100.0
33	Granite Quarry town	209379	2984	2984	1.43	100.0
33	Kannapolis city (ROWAN)	209379	10268	10268	4.9	100.0
33	Landis town	209379	3690	3690	1.76	100.0
33	Locust city (STANLY)	209379	3996	3996	1.91	100.0
33	Misenheimer village	209379	650	650	0.31	100.0
33	New London town	209379	607	607	0.29	100.0
33	Norwood town	209379	2367	2367	1.13	100.0
33	Oakboro town	209379	2128	2128	1.02	100.0
33	Red Cross town	209379	762	762	0.36	100.0
33	Richfield town	209379	582	582	0.28	100.0

33	Rockwell town	209379	2302	2302	1.1	100.0
33	Salisbury city	209379	35540	35540	16.97	100.0
33	Spencer town	209379	3308	3308	1.58	100.0
33	Stanfield town	209379	1585	1585	0.76	100.0
34	Concord city	216895	105240	105240	48.52	100.0
34	Harrisburg town	216895	18967	18967	8.74	100.0
34	Kannapolis city (CABARRUS)	216895	42846	42846	19.75	100.0
34	Locust city (CABARRUS)	216895	541	423	0.2	78.19
34	Mount Pleasant town	216895	1671	1671	0.77	100.0
35	Fairview town	218484	3456	3456	1.58	100.0
35	Hemby Bridge town	218484	1614	1614	0.74	100.0
35	Indian Trail town	218484	39997	39997	18.31	100.0
35	Lake Park village	218484	3269	3269	1.5	100.0
35	Locust city (CABARRUS)	218484	541	118	0.05	21.81
35	Marvin village	218484	6358	6358	2.91	100.0
35	Midland town (CABARRUS)	218484	4684	4684	2.14	100.0
35	Mineral Springs town	218484	3159	3159	1.45	100.0
35	Mint Hill town (UNION)	218484	6	6	0.0	100.0
35	Monroe city	218484	34562	34562	15.82	100.0
35	Stallings town (UNION)	218484	15728	15728	7.2	100.0
35	Unionville town	218484	6643	6643	3.04	100.0
35	Waxhaw town	218484	20534	20534	9.4	100.0
35	Weddington town (UNION)	218484	13176	13176	6.03	100.0
35	Wesley Chapel village	218484	8681	8681	3.97	100.0
36	Danbury town	218292	189	189	0.09	100.0
36	Dobson town	218292	1462	1462	0.67	100.0
36	Elkin town (SURRY)	218292	4049	4049	1.85	100.0
36	Elkin town (WILKES)	218292	73	73	0.03	100.0
36	King city (STOKES)	218292	6606	6606	3.03	100.0
36	Mount Airy city	218292	10676	10676	4.89	100.0
36	North Wilkesboro town	218292	4382	4382	2.01	100.0
36	Pilot Mountain town	218292	1440	1440	0.66	100.0
36	Ronda town	218292	438	438	0.2	100.0
36	Taylorsville town	218292	2320	2320	1.06	100.0
36	Tobaccoville village (STOKES)	218292	0	0	0.0	0.0
36	Walnut Cove town	218292	1586	1586	0.73	100.0
36	Wilkesboro town	218292	3687	3687	1.69	100.0
37	Cornelius town	215170	31412	12421	5.77	39.54

37	Davidson town (IREDELL)	215170	378	378	0.18	100.0
37	Davidson town (MECKLENBURG)	215170	14728	14728	6.84	100.0
37	Harmony town	215170	543	543	0.25	100.0
37	Love Valley town	215170	154	154	0.07	100.0
37	Mooresville town	215170	50193	50193	23.33	100.0
37	Statesville city	215170	28419	28419	13.21	100.0
37	Troutman town	215170	3698	3698	1.72	100.0
38	Charlotte city	218872	874579	127802	58.39	14.61
38	Cornelius town	218872	31412	18991	8.68	60.46
38	Huntersville town	218872	61376	61376	28.04	100.0
39	Charlotte city	217776	874579	174926	80.32	20.0
39	Pineville town	217776	10602	10602	4.87	100.0
40	Charlotte city	217840	874579	173961	79.86	19.89
40	Midland town (MECKLENBURG)	217840	0	0	0.0	0.0
40	Mint Hill town (MECKLENBURG)	217840	26444	26444	12.14	100.0
40	Stallings town (MECKLENBURG)	217840	384	373	0.17	97.14
41	Charlotte city	216594	874579	181967	84.01	20.81
41	Matthews town	216594	29435	29435	13.59	100.0
41	Stallings town (MECKLENBURG)	216594	384	11	0.01	2.86
41	Weddington town (MECKLENBURG)	216594	5	5	0.0	100.0
42	Charlotte city	215923	874579	215923	100.0	24.69
43	Belmont city	201611	15010	15010	7.45	100.0
43	Bessemer City city	201611	5428	5428	2.69	100.0
43	Cherryville city	201611	6078	6078	3.01	100.0
43	Cramerton town	201611	5296	5296	2.63	100.0
43	Dallas town	201611	5927	5927	2.94	100.0
43	Dellview town	201611	6	6	0.0	100.0
43	Gastonia city	201611	80411	80411	39.88	100.0
43	Kings Mountain city (GASTON)	201611	1110	1110	0.55	100.0
43	Lowell city	201611	3654	3654	1.81	100.0
43	McAdenville town	201611	890	890	0.44	100.0
43	Mount Holly city	201611	17703	17703	8.78	100.0
43	Ranlo town	201611	4511	4511	2.24	100.0
43	Spencer Mountain town	201611	0	0	0.0	0.0
44	Belwood town	208541	857	857	0.41	100.0
44	Boiling Springs town	208541	4615	4615	2.21	100.0
44	Bostic town	208541	355	355	0.17	100.0
44	Casar town	208541	305	305	0.15	100.0

44	Chimney Rock Village village	208541	140	140	0.07	100.0
44	Earl town	208541	198	198	0.09	100.0
44	Ellenboro town	208541	723	723	0.35	100.0
44	Fallston town	208541	627	627	0.3	100.0
44	Forest City town	208541	7377	7377	3.54	100.0
44	Grover town	208541	802	802	0.38	100.0
44	Kings Mountain city (CLEVELAND)	208541	10032	10032	4.81	100.0
44	Kingstown town	208541	656	656	0.31	100.0
44	Lake Lure town	208541	1365	1365	0.65	100.0
44	Lattimore town	208541	406	406	0.19	100.0
44	Lawndale town	208541	570	570	0.27	100.0
44	Marion city	208541	7717	7717	3.7	100.0
44	Mooresboro town	208541	293	293	0.14	100.0
44	Old Fort town	208541	811	811	0.39	100.0
44	Patterson Springs town	208541	571	571	0.27	100.0
44	Polkville city	208541	516	516	0.25	100.0
44	Ruth town	208541	347	347	0.17	100.0
44	Rutherfordton town	208541	3640	3640	1.75	100.0
44	Shelby city	208541	21918	21918	10.51	100.0
44	Spindale town	208541	4225	4225	2.03	100.0
44	Waco town	208541	310	310	0.15	100.0
45	Brookford town	217416	442	442	0.2	100.0
45	Cajah's Mountain town	217416	2722	2722	1.25	100.0
45	Catawba town	217416	702	702	0.32	100.0
45	Cedar Rock village	217416	301	301	0.14	100.0
45	Claremont city	217416	1692	1692	0.78	100.0
45	Conover city	217416	8421	8421	3.87	100.0
45	Granite Falls town	217416	4965	4965	2.28	100.0
45	Hickory city (CALDWELL)	217416	32	32	0.01	100.0
45	Hickory city (CATAWBA)	217416	43379	43379	19.95	100.0
45	Hudson town	217416	3780	3780	1.74	100.0
45	Lenoir city	217416	18352	11250	5.17	61.3
45	Long View town (CATAWBA)	217416	4353	4353	2.0	100.0
45	Maiden town (CATAWBA)	217416	3736	3736	1.72	100.0
45	Newton city	217416	13148	13148	6.05	100.0
45	Rhodhiss town (CALDWELL)	217416	358	358	0.16	100.0
45	Rutherford College town (CALDWELL)	217416	0	0	0.0	0.0
45	Sawmills town	217416	5020	5020	2.31	100.0

46	Connelly Springs town	200712	1529	1529	0.76	100.0
46	Drexel town	200712	1760	1760	0.88	100.0
46	Glen Alpine town	200712	1529	1529	0.76	100.0
46	Hickory city (BURKE)	200712	79	79	0.04	100.0
46	High Shoals city	200712	595	595	0.3	100.0
46	Hildebran town	200712	1679	1679	0.84	100.0
46	Lincolnton city	200712	11091	11091	5.53	100.0
46	Long View town (BURKE)	200712	735	735	0.37	100.0
46	Maiden town (LINCOLN)	200712	0	0	0.0	0.0
46	Morganton city	200712	17474	17474	8.71	100.0
46	Rhodhiss town (BURKE)	200712	639	639	0.32	100.0
46	Rutherford College town (BURKE)	200712	1226	1226	0.61	100.0
46	Stanley town	200712	3963	3963	1.97	100.0
46	Valdese town	200712	4689	4689	2.34	100.0
47	Bakersville town	211521	450	450	0.21	100.0
47	Banner Elk town	211521	1049	1049	0.5	100.0
47	Beech Mountain town (AVERY)	211521	62	62	0.03	100.0
47	Beech Mountain town (WATAUGA)	211521	613	613	0.29	100.0
47	Blowing Rock town (CALDWELL)	211521	91	91	0.04	100.0
47	Blowing Rock town (WATAUGA)	211521	1285	1285	0.61	100.0
47	Boone town	211521	19092	19092	9.03	100.0
47	Bryson City town	211521	1558	1558	0.74	100.0
47	Burnsville town	211521	1614	1614	0.76	100.0
47	Crossnore town	211521	143	143	0.07	100.0
47	Elk Park town	211521	542	542	0.26	100.0
47	Fontana Dam town	211521	13	13	0.01	100.0
47	Gamewell town	211521	3702	3702	1.75	100.0
47	Grandfather Village village	211521	95	95	0.04	100.0
47	Hot Springs town	211521	520	520	0.25	100.0
47	Jefferson town	211521	1622	1622	0.77	100.0
47	Lake Santeetlah town	211521	38	38	0.02	100.0
47	Lansing town	211521	126	126	0.06	100.0
47	Lenoir city	211521	18352	7102	3.36	38.7
47	Mars Hill town	211521	2007	2007	0.95	100.0
47	Marshall town	211521	777	777	0.37	100.0
47	Newland town	211521	715	715	0.34	100.0
47	Robbinsville town	211521	597	597	0.28	100.0
47	Seven Devils town (AVERY)	211521	38	38	0.02	100.0

47	Seven Devils town (WATAUGA)	211521	275	275	0.13	100.0
47	Sparta town	211521	1834	1834	0.87	100.0
47	Spruce Pine town	211521	2194	2194	1.04	100.0
47	Sugar Mountain village	211521	371	371	0.18	100.0
47	West Jefferson town	211521	1279	1279	0.6	100.0
48	Asheville city	202689	94589	40477	19.97	42.79
48	Biltmore Forest town	202689	1409	1409	0.7	100.0
48	Columbus town	202689	1060	1060	0.52	100.0
48	Flat Rock village	202689	3486	3486	1.72	100.0
48	Fletcher town	202689	7987	7987	3.94	100.0
48	Hendersonville city	202689	15137	15137	7.47	100.0
48	Laurel Park town	202689	2250	2250	1.11	100.0
48	Mills River town	202689	7078	7078	3.49	100.0
48	Saluda city (HENDERSON)	202689	11	11	0.01	100.0
48	Saluda city (POLK)	202689	620	620	0.31	100.0
48	Tryon town	202689	1562	1562	0.77	100.0
49	Asheville city	202372	94589	54112	26.74	57.21
49	Black Mountain town	202372	8426	8426	4.16	100.0
49	Montreat town	202372	901	901	0.45	100.0
49	Weaverville town	202372	4567	4567	2.26	100.0
49	Woodfin town	202372	7936	7936	3.92	100.0
50	Andrews town	213456	1667	1667	0.78	100.0
50	Brevard city	213456	7744	7744	3.63	100.0
50	Canton town	213456	4422	4422	2.07	100.0
50	Clyde town	213456	1368	1368	0.64	100.0
50	Dillsboro town	213456	213	213	0.1	100.0
50	Forest Hills village	213456	303	303	0.14	100.0
50	Franklin town	213456	4175	4175	1.96	100.0
50	Hayesville town	213456	461	461	0.22	100.0
50	Highlands town (JACKSON)	213456	12	12	0.01	100.0
50	Highlands town (MACON)	213456	1060	1060	0.5	100.0
50	Maggie Valley town	213456	1687	1687	0.79	100.0
50	Murphy town	213456	1608	1608	0.75	100.0
50	Rosman town	213456	701	701	0.33	100.0
50	Sylva town	213456	2578	2578	1.21	100.0
50	Waynesville town	213456	10140	10140	4.75	100.0
50	Webster town	213456	372	372	0.17	100.0

Whole-Split VTD Counts by County Report

County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
ALAMANCE	37	0
ALEXANDER	10	0
ALLEGHANY	4	0
ANSON	9	0
ASHE	17	0
AVERY	19	0
BEAUFORT	21	0
BERTIE	12	0
BLADEN	17	0
BRUNSWICK	25	0
BUNCOMBE	77	2
BURKE	33	0
CABARRUS	39	1
CALDWELL	18	2
CAMDEN	3	0
CARTERET	28	0
CASWELL	9	0
CATAWBA	40	0
CHATHAM	18	0
CHEROKEE	16	0
CHOWAN	6	0
CLAY	9	0
CLEVELAND	21	0
COLUMBUS	26	0
CRAVEN	21	0
CUMBERLAND	76	0
CURRITUCK	11	0
DARE	16	0
DAVIDSON	43	0
DAVIE	14	0
DUPLIN	19	0
DURHAM	56	1
EDGECOMBE	21	0
FORSYTH	99	2
FRANKLIN	18	0

GASTON	44	2
GATES	6	0
GRAHAM	4	0
GRANVILLE	15	0
GREENE	10	0
GUILFORD	160	5
HALIFAX	23	0
HARNETT	13	0
HAYWOOD	29	0
HENDERSON	34	0
HERTFORD	13	0
HOKE	15	0
HYDE	7	0
IREDELL	29	0
JACKSON	13	0
JOHNSTON	36	0
JONES	7	0
LEE	10	0
LENOIR	22	0
LINCOLN	23	0
MACON	15	0
MADISON	12	0
MARTIN	13	0
MCDOWELL	17	0
MECKLENBURG	189	6
MITCHELL	9	0
MONTGOMERY	14	0
MOORE	26	0
NASH	24	0
NEW HANOVER	42	1
NORTHAMPTON	13	0
ONslow	24	0
ORANGE	41	0
PAMLICO	10	0
PASQUOTANK	9	0
PENDER	20	0
PERQUIMANS	7	0
PERSON	11	0

PITT	40	0
POLK	7	0
RANDOLPH	19	3
RICHMOND	16	0
ROBESON	39	0
ROCKINGHAM	15	0
ROWAN	41	0
RUTHERFORD	17	0
SAMPSON	23	0
SCOTLAND	7	0
STANLY	22	0
STOKES	18	0
SURRY	24	0
SWAIN	5	0
TRANSYLVANIA	15	0
TYRRELL	6	0
UNION	50	2
VANCE	12	0
WAKE	182	22
WARREN	14	0
WASHINGTON	6	0
WATAUGA	20	0
WAYNE	28	0
WILKES	27	0
WILSON	24	0
YADKIN	12	0
YANCEY	11	0

Whole-Split VTD Counts by District Report

District	County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
1	BERTIE	12	0
1	CAMDEN	3	0
1	CURRITUCK	11	0
1	GATES	6	0
1	HALIFAX	23	0
1	HERTFORD	13	0
1	MARTIN	13	0
1	NORTHAMPTON	13	0
1	TYRRELL	6	0
1	WARREN	14	0
2	CARTERET	28	0
2	CHOWAN	6	0
2	DARE	16	0
2	HYDE	7	0
2	PAMLICO	10	0
2	PASQUOTANK	9	0
2	PERQUIMANS	7	0
2	WASHINGTON	6	0
3	BEAUFORT	21	0
3	CRAVEN	21	0
3	LENOIR	22	0
4	GREENE	10	0
4	WAYNE	28	0
4	WILSON	24	0
5	EDGECOMBE	21	0
5	PITT	40	0
6	ONSLOW	24	0
7	NEW HANOVER	38	1
8	BRUNSWICK	25	0
8	COLUMBUS	26	0
8	NEW HANOVER	4	1
9	BLADEN	17	0
9	DUPLIN	19	0
9	JONES	7	0
9	PENDER	20	0

9	SAMPSON	22	0
10	JOHNSTON	36	0
11	FRANKLIN	18	0
11	NASH	24	0
11	VANCE	12	0
12	HARNETT	13	0
12	LEE	10	0
12	SAMPSON	1	0
13	GRANVILLE	15	0
13	WAKE	27	5
14	WAKE	32	6
15	WAKE	44	6
16	WAKE	28	11
17	WAKE	24	10
18	WAKE	27	6
19	CUMBERLAND	56	0
20	CHATHAM	18	0
20	DURHAM	19	1
21	CUMBERLAND	20	0
21	MOORE	26	0
22	DURHAM	37	1
23	CASWELL	9	0
23	ORANGE	41	0
23	PERSON	11	0
24	HOKE	15	0
24	ROBESON	39	0
24	SCOTLAND	7	0
25	ALAMANCE	37	0
25	RANDOLPH	6	3
26	GUILFORD	32	1
26	ROCKINGHAM	15	0
27	GUILFORD	61	4
28	GUILFORD	67	5
29	ANSON	9	0
29	MONTGOMERY	14	0
29	RANDOLPH	13	3
29	RICHMOND	16	0
29	UNION	7	2

30	DAVIDSON	43	0
30	DAVIE	14	0
31	FORSYTH	47	2
31	YADKIN	12	0
32	FORSYTH	52	2
33	ROWAN	41	0
33	STANLY	22	0
34	CABARRUS	38	1
35	CABARRUS	1	1
35	UNION	43	2
36	ALEXANDER	10	0
36	STOKES	18	0
36	SURRY	24	0
36	WILKES	27	0
37	IREDELL	29	0
37	MECKLENBURG	2	2
38	MECKLENBURG	24	4
39	MECKLENBURG	30	3
40	MECKLENBURG	38	1
41	MECKLENBURG	43	2
42	MECKLENBURG	52	0
43	GASTON	40	2
44	CLEVELAND	21	0
44	MCDOWELL	17	0
44	RUTHERFORD	17	0
45	CALDWELL	11	2
45	CATAWBA	40	0
46	BURKE	33	0
46	GASTON	4	2
46	LINCOLN	23	0
47	ALLEGHANY	4	0
47	ASHE	17	0
47	AVERY	19	0
47	CALDWELL	7	2
47	GRAHAM	4	0
47	HAYWOOD	4	0
47	MADISON	12	0
47	MITCHELL	9	0

47	SWAIN	5	0
47	WATAUGA	20	0
47	YANCEY	11	0
48	BUNCOMBE	20	2
48	HENDERSON	34	0
48	POLK	7	0
49	BUNCOMBE	57	2
50	CHEROKEE	16	0
50	CLAY	9	0
50	HAYWOOD	25	0
50	JACKSON	13	0
50	MACON	15	0
50	TRANSYLVANIA	15	0

Split VTD Detail Report

County	VTD	District	Total VTD Population	VTD Population in District	% VTD Population in District
BUNCOMBE	18.2	48	6719	0	0.0
BUNCOMBE	18.2	49	6719	6719	100.0
BUNCOMBE	54.2	48	7290	15	0.21
BUNCOMBE	54.2	49	7290	7275	99.79
CABARRUS	1-02	34	4425	3757	84.9
CABARRUS	1-02	35	4425	668	15.1
CALDWELL	PR22	45	4807	4665	97.05
CALDWELL	PR22	47	4807	142	2.95
CALDWELL	PR29	45	5041	5041	100.0
CALDWELL	PR29	47	5041	0	0.0
DURHAM	9	20	3417	1250	36.58
DURHAM	9	22	3417	2167	63.42
FORSYTH	122	31	9793	2143	21.88
FORSYTH	122	32	9793	7650	78.12
FORSYTH	132	31	5783	5783	100.0
FORSYTH	132	32	5783	0	0.0
GASTON	42	43	3660	1609	43.96
GASTON	42	46	3660	2051	56.04
GASTON	43	43	6437	1986	30.85
GASTON	43	46	6437	4451	69.15
GUILFORD	FR4	27	1884	0	0.0
GUILFORD	FR4	28	1884	1884	100.0
GUILFORD	FR5A	27	3119	643	20.62
GUILFORD	FR5A	28	3119	2476	79.38
GUILFORD	FR5B	27	1983	505	25.47
GUILFORD	FR5B	28	1983	1478	74.53
GUILFORD	MON1	26	4940	30	0.61
GUILFORD	MON1	28	4940	4910	99.39
GUILFORD	SF1	27	4711	29	0.62
GUILFORD	SF1	28	4711	4682	99.38
MECKLENBURG	133	37	7343	6	0.08
MECKLENBURG	133	38	7343	7337	99.92
MECKLENBURG	202	37	13079	12535	95.84
MECKLENBURG	202	38	13079	544	4.16

MECKLENBURG	212	38	21153	15475	73.16
MECKLENBURG	212	40	21153	5678	26.84
MECKLENBURG	222	38	11323	90	0.79
MECKLENBURG	222	39	11323	11233	99.21
MECKLENBURG	231	39	8345	4281	51.3
MECKLENBURG	231	41	8345	4064	48.7
MECKLENBURG	87	39	4363	0	0.0
MECKLENBURG	87	41	4363	4363	100.0
NEW HANOVER	FP04	7	7573	2167	28.61
NEW HANOVER	FP04	8	7573	5406	71.39
RANDOLPH	DR	25	6971	6971	100.0
RANDOLPH	DR	29	6971	0	0.0
RANDOLPH	NM	25	6356	6225	97.94
RANDOLPH	NM	29	6356	131	2.06
RANDOLPH	RN	25	9167	7286	79.48
RANDOLPH	RN	29	9167	1881	20.52
UNION	25	29	2882	2464	85.5
UNION	25	35	2882	418	14.5
UNION	34	29	5144	2711	52.7
UNION	34	35	5144	2433	47.3
WAKE	1-02	14	3245	1145	35.29
WAKE	1-02	15	3245	2100	64.71
WAKE	1-28	14	7107	5392	75.87
WAKE	1-28	18	7107	1715	24.13
WAKE	1-46	15	7536	254	3.37
WAKE	1-46	18	7536	7282	96.63
WAKE	13-05	13	4236	1797	42.42
WAKE	13-05	18	4236	2439	57.58
WAKE	15-03	14	7621	6595	86.54
WAKE	15-03	17	7621	1026	13.46
WAKE	18-01	14	8732	8732	100.0
WAKE	18-01	15	8732	0	0.0
WAKE	18-04	14	6758	5733	84.83
WAKE	18-04	16	6758	1025	15.17
WAKE	18-05	16	6614	4813	72.77
WAKE	18-05	17	6614	1801	27.23
WAKE	18-07	14	5085	0	0.0
WAKE	18-07	17	5085	5085	100.0

WAKE	19-18	13	5353	4599	85.91
WAKE	19-18	18	5353	754	14.09
WAKE	19-19	13	10113	5797	57.32
WAKE	19-19	18	10113	4316	42.68
WAKE	19-20	13	5182	2317	44.71
WAKE	19-20	18	5182	2865	55.29
WAKE	20-04	16	6090	5968	98.0
WAKE	20-04	17	6090	122	2.0
WAKE	20-05	16	5376	4763	88.6
WAKE	20-05	17	5376	613	11.4
WAKE	20-09	16	3914	4	0.1
WAKE	20-09	17	3914	3910	99.9
WAKE	20-14	16	12056	12028	99.77
WAKE	20-14	17	12056	28	0.23
WAKE	4-05	15	5069	974	19.21
WAKE	4-05	16	5069	4095	80.79
WAKE	4-07	16	3509	3509	100.0
WAKE	4-07	17	3509	0	0.0
WAKE	4-10	16	3964	3964	100.0
WAKE	4-10	17	3964	0	0.0
WAKE	4-13	16	6415	6109	95.23
WAKE	4-13	17	6415	306	4.77
WAKE	5-05	15	12050	12022	99.77
WAKE	5-05	16	12050	28	0.23
WAKE	7-07	13	5893	949	16.1
WAKE	7-07	15	5893	4944	83.9

Incumbent-District Report

Last Name	First Name	Party	New District	Old District
Alexander	W. Ted	R	44	44
Ballard	Deanna	R	47	45
Barnes	Lisa	R	11	11
Batch	Sydney	D	17	17
Bazemore	Ernestine	D	1	3
Berger	Philip	R	26	30
Blue	Daniel	D	18	14
Britt	Danny	R	24	13
Burgin	James	R	12	12
Chaudhuri	Jay	D	14	15
Clark	Robert	D	24	21
Corbin	Harold	R	50	50
Craven	David	R	29	26
Crawford	Sarah	D	18	18
Daniel	Warren	R	46	46
Davis	Donald	D	5	5
Deviere	Kirk	D	19	19
Edwards	Charles	R	48	48
Fitch	Milton	D	4	4
Ford	Carl	R	33	33
Foushee	Valerie	D	23	23
Galey	Amy	R	25	24
Garrett	Michael	D	28	27
Harrington	Kathryn	R	43	43
Hise	Ralph	R	47	47
Jackson	Brent	R	9	10
Jackson	Jeffrey	D	41	37
Jarvis	Steven	R	30	29
Johnson	Matthew	R	35	35
Krawiec	Joyce	R	32	31
Lazzara	Michael	R	6	6
Lee	Michael	R	7	9
Lowe	Paul	D	32	32
Marcus	Natasha	D	37	41
Mayfield	Julie	D	48	49

Mcinnis	Thomas	R	29	25
Mohammed	Mujtaba	D	38	38
Murdock	Natalie	D	20	20
Newton	Paul	R	34	36
Nickel	George	D	16	16
Perry	Jim	R	3	7
Proctor	Dean	R	45	42
Rabon	William	R	8	8
Robinson	Gladys	D	28	28
Salvador	Deandrea	D	39	39
Sanderson	Norman	R	2	2
Sawyer	Vickie	R	37	34
Steinburg	Bob	R	2	1
Waddell	Joyce	D	40	40
Woodard	Mike	D	22	22

District-Incumbent Report

New District	Last Name	First Name	Party	Old District
1	Bazemore	Ernestine	D	3
2	Sanderson	Norman	R	2
2	Steinburg	Bob	R	1
3	Perry	Jim	R	7
4	Fitch	Milton	D	4
5	Davis	Donald	D	5
6	Lazzara	Michael	R	6
7	Lee	Michael	R	9
8	Rabon	William	R	8
9	Jackson	Brent	R	10
11	Barnes	Lisa	R	11
12	Burgin	James	R	12
14	Chaudhuri	Jay	D	15
16	Nickel	George	D	16
17	Batch	Sydney	D	17
18	Blue	Daniel	D	14
18	Crawford	Sarah	D	18
19	Deviere	Kirk	D	19
20	Murdock	Natalie	D	20
22	Woodard	Mike	D	22
23	Foushee	Valerie	D	23
24	Britt	Danny	R	13
24	Clark	Robert	D	21
25	Galey	Amy	R	24
26	Berger	Philip	R	30
28	Garrett	Michael	D	27
28	Robinson	Gladys	D	28
29	Craven	David	R	26
29	McCinnis	Thomas	R	25
30	Jarvis	Steven	R	29
32	Krawiec	Joyce	R	31
32	Lowe	Paul	D	32
33	Ford	Carl	R	33
34	Newton	Paul	R	36
35	Johnson	Matthew	R	35

37	Marcus	Natasha	D	41
37	Sawyer	Vickie	R	34
38	Mohammed	Mujtaba	D	38
39	Salvador	Deandrea	D	39
40	Waddell	Joyce	D	40
41	Jackson	Jeffrey	D	37
43	Harrington	Kathryn	R	43
44	Alexander	W. Ted	R	44
45	Proctor	Dean	R	42
46	Daniel	Warren	R	46
47	Ballard	Deanna	R	45
47	Hise	Ralph	R	47
48	Edwards	Charles	R	48
48	Mayfield	Julie	D	49
50	Corbin	Harold	R	50

User:

Plan Name: **NCLCV Senate Map**

Plan Type:

Contiguity Report

Tuesday, February 15, 2022

2:37 PM

District	Number of Distinct Areas
1	1
2	1
3	1
4	1
5	1
6	1
7	1
8	1
9	1
10	1
11	1
12	1
13	1
14	1
15	1
16	1
17	1
18	1
19	1
20	1
21	1
22	1
23	1
24	1
25	1
26	1
27	1
28	1
29	1
30	1
31	1
32	1
33	1
34	1
35	1
36	1
37	1
38	1

District	Number of Distinct Areas
39	1
40	1
41	1
42	1
43	1
44	1
45	1
46	1
47	1
48	1
49	1
50	1

User:

Plan Name: **NCLCV Senate Map**

Plan Type:

Measures of Compactness Report

Tuesday, February 15, 2022

2:42 PM

	Reock	Polsby-Popper	Population Polygon	Area/Convex Hull	Population Circle
Sum	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Min	0.12	0.11	0.38	0.55	0.10
Max	0.65	0.61	0.99	0.95	0.91
Mean	0.43	0.37	0.76	0.78	0.44
Std. Dev.	0.11	0.12	0.16	0.10	0.20
District	Reock	Polsby-Popper	Population Polygon	Area/Convex Hull	Population Circle
1	0.30	0.17	0.66	0.70	0.27
2	0.40	0.18	0.67	0.68	0.24
3	0.41	0.18	0.55	0.59	0.40
4	0.57	0.41	0.84	0.77	0.62
5	0.40	0.34	0.96	0.87	0.52
6	0.62	0.59	0.99	0.95	0.91
7	0.55	0.41	0.95	0.84	0.78
8	0.46	0.48	0.82	0.89	0.55
9	0.44	0.23	0.41	0.71	0.20
10	0.62	0.61	0.96	0.93	0.49
11	0.46	0.38	0.82	0.75	0.39

Measures of Compactness Report

NCLCV Senate

	Reock	Polsby-Popper	Population Polygon	Area/Convex Hull	Population Circle
Sum	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Min	0.12	0.11	0.38	0.55	0.10
Max	0.65	0.61	0.99	0.95	0.91
Mean	0.43	0.37	0.76	0.78	0.44
Std. Dev.	0.11	0.12	0.16	0.10	0.20
District	Reock	Polsby-Popper	Population Polygon	Area/Convex Hull	Population Circle
12	0.39	0.40	0.92	0.83	0.24
13	0.36	0.40	0.77	0.81	0.29
14	0.52	0.45	0.87	0.87	0.56
15	0.52	0.40	0.79	0.78	0.56
16	0.51	0.39	0.83	0.77	0.63
17	0.54	0.51	0.90	0.91	0.52
18	0.65	0.51	0.89	0.92	0.62
19	0.53	0.34	0.95	0.80	0.76
20	0.39	0.34	0.44	0.70	0.22
21	0.22	0.14	0.38	0.57	0.18
22	0.46	0.52	0.91	0.85	0.59
23	0.50	0.53	0.59	0.81	0.29
24	0.52	0.45	0.77	0.91	0.36
25	0.33	0.28	0.64	0.57	0.28

Measures of Compactness Report

	Reock	Polsby-Popper	Population Polygon	Area/Convex Hull	Population Circle
Sum	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Min	0.12	0.11	0.38	0.55	0.10
Max	0.65	0.61	0.99	0.95	0.91
Mean	0.43	0.37	0.76	0.78	0.44
Std. Dev.	0.11	0.12	0.16	0.10	0.20
District	Reock	Polsby-Popper	Population Polygon	Area/Convex Hull	Population Circle
26	0.40	0.33	0.41	0.75	0.23
27	0.36	0.32	0.72	0.76	0.37
28	0.55	0.46	0.96	0.92	0.65
29	0.38	0.25	0.61	0.70	0.11
30	0.40	0.46	0.76	0.83	0.28
31	0.43	0.36	0.80	0.82	0.53
32	0.46	0.35	0.68	0.82	0.48
33	0.32	0.29	0.58	0.72	0.18
34	0.48	0.49	0.89	0.89	0.55
35	0.34	0.35	0.70	0.76	0.20
36	0.31	0.29	0.59	0.67	0.19
37	0.40	0.44	0.86	0.81	0.45
38	0.57	0.44	0.84	0.82	0.65
39	0.39	0.37	0.81	0.78	0.39

Measures of Compactness Report

NCLCV Senate

	Reock	Polsby-Popper	Population Polygon	Area/Convex Hull	Population Circle
Sum	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Min	0.12	0.11	0.38	0.55	0.10
Max	0.65	0.61	0.99	0.95	0.91
Mean	0.43	0.37	0.76	0.78	0.44
Std. Dev.	0.11	0.12	0.16	0.10	0.20
District	Reock	Polsby-Popper	Population Polygon	Area/Convex Hull	Population Circle
40	0.45	0.54	0.85	0.82	0.51
41	0.52	0.53	0.91	0.91	0.62
42	0.40	0.47	0.86	0.82	0.48
43	0.34	0.27	0.76	0.67	0.55
44	0.43	0.36	0.84	0.79	0.35
45	0.39	0.30	0.81	0.74	0.51
46	0.25	0.21	0.61	0.66	0.23
47	0.12	0.11	0.39	0.55	0.10
48	0.37	0.26	0.72	0.78	0.50
49	0.43	0.22	0.70	0.72	0.52
50	0.31	0.33	0.89	0.80	0.86

Measures of Compactness Report

Measures of Compactness Summary

Reock	The measure is always between 0 and 1, with 1 being the most compact.
Polsby-Popper	The measure is always between 0 and 1, with 1 being the most compact.
Population Polygon	The measure is always between 0 and 1, with 1 being the most compact.
Area / Convex Hull	The measure is always between 0 and 1, with 1 being the most compact.
Population Circle	The measure is always between 0 and 1, with 1 being the most compact.

EXHIBIT Q

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA
COUNTY OF WAKE

IN THE GENERAL COURT OF JUSTICE
SUPERIOR COURT DIVISION
Case No. 18 CVS 014001

COMMON CAUSE, *et al.*

Plaintiffs,

v.

DAVID R. LEWIS, *et al.*

Defendants.

Expert Supplemental Report of Douglas Johnson, Ph.D.

Pursuant to the North Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure and the Case Management Orders of the Court in the above-captioned matter, I, Douglas Johnson, provide the following written report:

1. I am over 18 years of age and I have personal knowledge of the facts stated herein. My qualifications are stated in my original report.

Task Description

2. For this supplemental report, I was asked to review and comment how plaintiffs' alternative maps selectively employ allegedly non-partisan criteria to achieve partisan goals; and
3. The unusual nature of North Carolina's treatment of Voting District (VTDs) in redistricting.

Opinions and Analysis

Mecklenburg County Analysis

4. As noted in my original report, North Carolina has a strict-criteria system for mapping legislative districts, as the state has both the strict federal equal-population requirement and a strict mathematically-calculated "county groupings" requirement. Down to the County level, the "county groupings" requirement is a strict limitation on the legislature's line-drawing discretion. In 2017, the legislature also adopted a set of criteria for their mapping decisions within "county groupings" where there are more than one district in the group: equal population; contiguity; compactness; avoiding split precincts; consider municipal boundaries; incumbency protection; election data; and no racial data.


5. The Senate districts in Mecklenburg County provide an insightful illustration of how the state and the plaintiffs applied these criteria in differing ways, with each side's decisions having elements that raise questions and have highly predictable partisan benefits for one party or the other. Similar choices were made in multi-district county groupings elsewhere in the state, but I focus on Mecklenburg because the impacts of these choices are much clearer to see at the local level than when looking at an entire statewide map all at once.

6. Adopted 2017 Senate District 41 is, by a large margin, the least compact of the adopted districts in Mecklenburg County, with a Reock score of 0.19 and a Polsby-Popper score of 0.13. As discussed in my original report, bringing District 41 south along the western border makes it a more-Republican district than keeping it more isolated in the northern part of the County. But, as also discussed in my original report, following the criterion of avoiding VTD (precinct)

divisions significantly limits the Republican gain and a version of District 41 that splits VTDs and is less compact could have generated more than a 10 percent gain


7. But bringing Senate District 41 south along the western edge of the District achieves another goal: creating a suburban district and keeping Charlotte united as much as possible while using whole VTDs (except for one VTD split to avoid pairing incumbent Senators). In figures 1 and 2, the area shown in red is the city of Charlotte, and the labels indicate the district number and the “Republican Advantage” score for the district (detailed in my original report):

Supplemental Figure 1



8. Where the 2017 map creates a District 41 that stays out of Charlotte as much as possible, and a District 39 unites the southern suburbs, Senator Jackson’s alternative¹ fails to “consider municipal boundaries,” instead slicing up the city in a “pinwheel” configuration:

Supplemental Figure 2




¹ Senator Jeff Jackson’s Amendment 4 to SB691, available online here: <https://www.ncleg.gov/Legislation/SupplementalDocs/2017/S691maps/S691maps> and accessed May 4, 2019.

9. This “pinwheel” maps scores relatively well on compactness measurements, but provides no consideration to either the City border or the neighborhoods in the city: the northern tip of District 37 reaches in and takes Central Charlotte, the area in and immediately around the 77 / 277 Freeway loop,² while Districts 38, 39 and 40 slice up neighborhoods surrounding the Center City.

10. At this point, the stark partisan preference differences between Charlotte and its suburbs are well known to everyone involved in this process, and clearly shown in the following map, with strongly Republican areas in red and strongly Democratic areas in blue:

Supplemental Figure 1



² A map of Charlotte’s “Center City” neighborhood is online at <https://www.charlottecentercity.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/01/Center-City-MASTER-Map-August-2017.pdf>, accessed May 5, 2019.

11. The decision by advocates of Senator Jackson’s map to ignore the city border and the clear community of interest differences between the city and the suburbs had an entirely predictable result, which the table below summarizes from the labels on Supplemental Figures 1 and 2 above:

Supplemental Table 1

District	Republican Advantage measure in 2017 Adopted Map	Republican Advantage measure in Senator Jackson’s Map
37	-52.5%	-12.4%
38	-54.5%	-47.1%
39	+22.8%	10.2%
40	-46.3%	-54.0%
41	+6.9%	-11.3%

North Carolina’s Use of VTDs in Redistricting

12. North Carolina’s emphasis on preserving VTDs when redistricting is unusual, and may be unique. Voting Districts, or VTDs, are often mistakenly described as precincts, but that is incorrect. In most, but not all, states, each precinct has just one ballot type in a given election, so every voter who comes into that precinct receives the same ballot. This greatly simplifies precinct worker training and avoids the possibility that a voter either casts a vote in an election contest the voter is not allowed to vote in, or is unable to vote in an election contest the voter should be allowed to vote in. For example, a VTD that contains territory that is in and out of a city would have to either divide into sub-precincts (one containing the residents who are in the city and using ballots including city council elections, and one containing the residents who are not in the city and using ballots not including the city council elections). And city council is but one possible level of overlapping election contests: every state has a variety of local offices that are elected at the sub-county level, such as school boards, water districts, and so on. North Carolina is unusual in how few local officials are elected, as my understanding is the state has only county-wide and city officials and no school board or other sub-county jurisdiction elections. But even in North Carolina, many cities (including Charlotte) are divided up into City Council election districts, and those city council election districts represent another level of election geography that divides VTDs and generates new ballot types (a voter in District 1 would get a ballot with the District 1 election on it, and so on).

13. A VTD does not represent a level of geography that means anything to residents, and thus does not represent any “community of interest” as defined in traditional redistricting principles: precinct lines are drawn solely for election administration purposes, not as representations of neighborhoods or other communities. And VTDs represent a collection of one or more of those purely-administrative election precincts. VTDs are an administrative tool used for the matching of decennial Census population data with state historical election data. Some states do not even bother forming official precinct-based VTDs, drawing what the Census Bureau labels “pseudo-Voting Districts” instead.³

14. Even if state legislative district boundaries were absolutely required to follow VTD borders (which they are not by any state law or legislative criterion), the VTDs would still be required to be subdivided in every decennial redistricting by the redistricting of congressional, county and city by-district election borders. While it is technically possible to use the allowed population deviation to follow VTD borders, congressional districts do not have that range of allowed population deviation, and many county supervisor districts and city council districts will be too small to fit the deviation required to avoid splitting VTDs within their allowable population ranges.

15. In North Carolina, as noted in the Forsyth County Elections website, “Precinct lines are re-drawn, if necessary, after every census.”⁴ Even if legislative redistricting is artificially restricted to avoid dividing VTDs, congressional and local redistricting almost always is forced by equal population requirements to divide VTDs. County elections officials also redraw precincts as new construction occurs or other factors change the number of voters in a given area. North Carolina is unusual, and possibly unique, in requiring the new precincts to be tabulated back up to the historical VTD level of geography. Most, and possibly all, other states simply accept re-precincting as a normal part of the election administration process.⁵

³ US Census Bureau, Census Bureau Geography, Chapter 14, “Voting Districts,” pages 14-1 through 14-8. <https://www2.census.gov/geo/pdfs/reference/GARM/Ch14GARM.pdf>, accessed May 6, 2019.

⁴ <http://www.forsyth.cc/Elections/precincts.aspx>, accessed May 6, 2019.

⁵ As one example, California collects and posts new precinct geography every two years, and some precincts change between the primary and general elections in the same year: <https://statewidedatabase.org/election.html>, accessed May 6, 2019.

16. Because VTDs are the smallest level of geography at which election results are typically matched to decennial Census data, those drawing redistricting lines do not know which voters in a given VTD voted strongly for one party or the other – only the VTD-level results are typically available to the line-drawer, not lower-level data such as at the Census Block.

17. As a result, dividing a VTD is unlikely to provide a reliable partisan gain, except in one unusual situation: where (for example) a pro-Republican district is being drawn and a narrow geographic ‘neck’ is being drawn to connect one pro-Republican area with another pro-Republican area and the line-drawer wants to minimize the number of voters from the pro-Democratic VTD in the connecting ‘neck’ (or vice versa from the partisan perspective). And, as shown by the 2017 Adopted Senate map and my earlier “Maximum Republican Test” map, the Legislature avoiding making ‘bridging’ VTD splits in its adopted map, even where doing so would have provided significant partisan advantage to the Republicans.


18. In the parts of the statewide map I have reviewed (New Hanover and its surrounding counties; in Mecklenburg County; and in Wake County), it appears that every VTD split was to either avoid pairing incumbents, or to ensure each incumbent stayed in a district that leaned toward the incumbent’s party, not to increase or decrease the partisan leanings of any district.

Conclusion


19. Just as the unusual Legislative criterion to minimize VTD splits reduced the partisan gain in the adopted map, consideration for the Charlotte city border should have limited the partisan gain (on the other side of the partisan scale) in Senator Jackson’s map. But Senator Jackson’s map intentionally sliced up Charlotte among all of the districts in the County, intentionally submerging all of the suburban communities in districts dominated by Charlotte city voters with a partisan and pro-Democratic result that can be a surprise to no one with any experience drawing election districts in North Carolina. While this analysis focuses on the Senate Districts in Mecklenburg County as a detailed illustration of the impact of the proposed map changes, similar impacts and decisions can be found in the alternative House maps and in other regions of the alternative Senate maps. Few, if any, VTD splits resulted in partisan gain. Most, and possibly all, were to avoid pairing incumbents and to avoid removing incumbents from their ‘home’ districts.

CERTIFICATION

I certify that the statements and opinions provided in this report are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief.



Douglas Mark Johnson, Ph.D.



Date

President, National Demographics Corporation
1520 N Pacific Avenue
Glendale, California 91202
PO Box 5271
Glendale, California 91221
Phone: (310) 200-2018
FAX: (818) 254-1221
E-mail: djohnson@NDCresearch.com

EXHIBIT R

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

COUNTY OF WAKE

FILED

IN THE GENERAL COURT OF JUSTICE
SUPERIOR COURT DIVISION

2021 NOV -5 P 4: 50

21 CVS 014476

NORTH CAROLINA STATE CONFERENCE
OF THE NAACP, COMMON CAUSE,
MARILYN HARRIS, GARY GRANT, JOYAH
BULLUCK, and THOMASINA WILLIAMS,

Plaintiffs,

v.

PHILIP E. BERGER *in his official capacity as President Pro Tempore of the North Carolina Senate*; TIMOTHY K. MOORE *in his official capacity as Speaker of the North Carolina House of Representatives*; RALPH E. HISE, JR., WARREN DANIEL, PAUL NEWTON, *in their official capacities as Co-Chairmen of the Senate Committee on Redistricting and Elections*; DESTIN HALL, *in his official capacity as Chairman of the House Standing Committee on Redistricting*; THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA; THE NORTH CAROLINA STATE BOARD OF ELECTIONS; DAMON CIRCOSTA, *in his official capacity as Chair of the State Board of Elections*; STELLA ANDERSON, *in her official capacity as Secretary of the State Board of Elections*; STACY EGGERS IV, *in his official capacity as Member of the State Board of Elections*; JEFF CARMON III, *in his official capacity as Member of the State Board of Elections*; TOMMY TUCKER, *in his official capacity as Member of the State Board of Elections*; KAREN BRINSON BELL, *in her official capacity as Executive Director of the State Board of Elections*

Defendants.

AFFIDAVIT OF GARY BARTLETT

I, Gary Bartlett, hereby declare as follows:

1. I am a United States citizen and a resident of Wayne County, North Carolina. I am currently an independent consultant based out of Goldsboro, North Carolina. I am President and Executive Director of the Elections Administration Resource Center 501(c)(3) d/b/a Ranked Choice Voting Resource Center. I am a 1976 graduate of University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, having earned a B.A. in history.

2. I have prepared this affidavit in support of Plaintiffs' Motion for a Preliminary Injunction.

3. From 1993 to May 15, 2013, I served as the Executive Director of the North Carolina State Board of Elections (hereinafter "State Board of Elections" or "State Board"). Before serving as Executive Director, I served as a legislative assistant to North Carolina Congressman H. Martin Lancaster. I have appended my full curriculum vitae as Exhibit 1 to this Declaration.

4. My responsibilities as Executive Director of the State Board were designated in Chapter 163 of the North Carolina General Statutes. In this role, I was responsible for staffing, administering, and executing the State Board's decisions and orders, as well as other responsibilities assigned to me by the State Board, and was the chief state elections official in North Carolina. My responsibilities also included overseeing North Carolina's 100 county election boards to ensure that they correctly managed all primary and general elections at the state, county, and local levels. All officials involved in election procedure in North Carolina either directly or indirectly reported to me.

5. There is tremendous variation between the budgets, tax bases, and resources of the 100 North Carolina counties. County elections officials likewise bring a range of experience to their role in overseeing local and county elections. The North Carolina State Board of Elections

provides a second pair of eyes for county officials with respect to administering elections. For example, State Board staff help county staff ensure that ballots are laid out correctly and that voting equipment is properly tested in advance of an election. Sufficient time before a general or primary election day is necessary to allow state and county officials to work together to cure any potential errors and maintain election integrity.

6. During my tenure as Executive Director, I oversaw dramatic changes in North Carolina's voting practices. These included: (i) bringing North Carolina into compliance with the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 by implementing agency voter registration and management systems; (ii) the 2000 initiation of early voting options; (iii) the 2001 expansion of absentee ballots to all voters without requiring a qualifying excuse; (iv) offering a system for voters to check their registration status online prior to an election; and (v) allowing for same-day registration during early voting starting in 2007. I was also personally involved with ensuring that voters with disabilities had the means to cast their ballots, both with absentee voting procedures and ensuring that polling places would be handicap-accessible to the extent possible. Also, with the assistance of staff, I developed and implemented an election certification program to train and educate election officials. I implemented innovations including a procedure and policy manual covering every part of election duties and responsibilities, an online elections library, and a self-audit program for counties to ensure that they are compliant and up-to-date.

7. North Carolina's voter turnout increased dramatically under my leadership. Shortly after the beginning of my tenure, in 1996, North Carolina ranked almost last (fortieth) of all states.¹ By the end of my tenure, in 2012, North Carolina ranked twelfth nationally in voter turnout.²

8. During my tenure as Executive Director of the State Board of Elections, I was an active member in the National Association of State Election Directors (better known as NASED). I am a former board member of the Election Center, which is an association of election officials from across the United States and some areas of Canada that work together to help resolve election issues, expand educational opportunities, and explore new or better ways to administer elections. I have also been involved with the National Task Force on Election Reform, and served as the national co-chair of the National Task Force on Elections Accessibility for four years. I also served on the Federal Elections Commission Advisory Panel and the Standards Board of the United States Election Assistance Commission.

9. I have served as an expert witness in *Gilbert v. Guilford County*, Case No. 13 CVS 3227 (Guilford Cty. Super. Ct), *Third Sector Development, Inc. v. Kemp*, Civil Action No. 2014CV252546 (GA Super. Ct), and *Ga. State Conf. of the NAACP v. Georgia*, No. 1:17-cv-1427 (N.D. Ga.). I also provided testimony relevant to my position as former Executive Director of the State Board of Elections in *Democracy N.C. v. N.C. State Board of Elections*, No. 1:20-cv-00457 (M.D.N.C. 2020). I will be paid a fee of \$2,500 for preparing reports in this case, with additional compensation should my testimony be required in this case.

¹ See Voter Registration and Turnout – 1996, United States Election Assistance Commission, https://www.eac.gov/sites/default/files/eac_assets/1/6/1996%20Voter%20Registration%20and%20Turnout%20by%20State.pdf.

² See The 2012 Election Administration and Voting Survey at p. 9, United States Election Assistance Commission, https://www.eac.gov/sites/default/files/eac_assets/1/6/2012ElectionAdministrationandVoterSurvey.pdf.

Concerns About the Legislature's Delayed Redistricting Process in 2021

10. Even-numbered years are major election years in North Carolina because of the number of federal, state, and county offices on the ballot. In 2022, all state legislative races will be on the ballot. The primary is currently scheduled for Tuesday March 8, 2022, with an early voting period set from February 17, 2022 to March 5, 2022. The current candidate filing period is set to begin on December 6, 2021 and close on December 17, 2021. Sections 6 and 7 of Article II of the North Carolina Constitution require Senators and Representatives to have lived in their districts for one year immediately preceding their election, and North Carolina Senate candidates must also have been residents of the state for at least two years. This would require candidates to be residents of their districts no later than November 8, 2021, one year prior to the scheduled general election day on November 8, 2022.

11. Since the 1990s, North Carolina has required additional time before administering primary elections due to redistricting litigation and preclearance requirements. As the Executive Director of the State Board of Elections, I experienced multiple delayed primaries due to redistricting lawsuits. I oversaw delayed primaries in the 1990s, in 2002, and in 2004. In the 2002 election cycle, following the 2000 Census, the North Carolina Legislature passed a State Senate and House district plan on November, 13, 2001. In that instance, the federal Voting Rights Act of 1965 required preclearance of the districting plan. To provide adequate time for preclearance to be granted and for litigation to be resolved, the primary date was scheduled for May 7, 2002. Although preclearance was granted on February 11, 2002, the Supreme Court of North Carolina enjoined the primary elections for the State Senate and House on March 7, 2002 after a trial court concluded the legislative redistricting plans violated the North Carolina Constitution. *See Stephenson v. Bartlett*, 355 N.C. 281 (2002). On March 12, 2002, the State Board, under my direction, voluntarily

postponed primaries for all other offices. It was a necessary step because, historically, standalone elections have had very low voter turnout. I believe the North Carolina Supreme Court's decision to enjoin the primaries was important to ensure that the litigation was resolved with enough time remaining to then provide notice of district assignments to voters and potential candidates. Those same considerations are at issue again now, as fully described below.

12. The United States Census Bureau released block-level 2020 Census Data on August 12, 2021.³ This release was five months later than the data was released last cycle, and I understand that delay was due to the COVID-19 pandemic. I also understand that the first joint meeting of the Senate Committee on Redistricting and Elections and the House Committee on Redistricting was not until August 5, 2021, and that these committees thereafter adopted redistricting criteria (on August 12) and a public hearing schedule (on September 1).

13. Although I cannot comment on the reasons for the committees' timing on these matters, based on my experience, I believe that an earlier start to this process would have benefited all participants in the election process, including voters, candidates, political parties, and elections officials. Having adequate time to prepare for and conduct an election, following redistricting, helps elections officials ensure that the election runs smoothly and it gives other participants the time they need to learn about the newly redrawn districts.

14. Finally, I understand that leadership of the Senate and House redistricting committees initiated the map-drawing process on October 5, 2021, without setting any deadlines for the Legislature to finish drawing the maps or setting a deadline for a vote on proposed maps. As of the date of this Declaration, I understand the Senate and House redistricting committees

³ See August 12, 2021 Joint Meeting of Committees, <https://ncleg.gov/documents/sites/committees/Senate2021-154/2021/08-12-2021/Criteria.adopted.8.12.pdf>.

jointly heard public comment on Congressional maps on Monday, August 25, and on Senate maps on Tuesday, August 26.

15. At this time, I foresee many likely disruptions to the upcoming primary elections that could result from failing to delay the December 2021 candidate filing period and the March 8, 2022 primary date at this time. Such disruptions could harm the ability of voters and candidates to participate in the primaries. These harms include a shortened absentee voting period, having to rush ballot preparation and machine programming, shortening the time to canvass for elections, dissuading potential candidates from running, and creating uncertainty for all campaigns, potential candidates, and their supporters. Additional challenges are likely if judicial intervention is necessary to ensure any enacted maps comport with applicable law.

Ensuring Accurate District Assignments

16. For state legislative seats, redistricting requires state and county elections staff to assign voters to new districts and to inform voters of their new districts. Officials in all 100 counties must assure that every voter is properly assigned to the correct districts.

17. Reassignment because of redistricting requires the work of information technology personnel from both state and county elections staff. For example, someone from the state information technology staff has to reassign voters to new districts. Staff must change all address geocode ranges in their databases to reflect district changes. Geocoding is the process by which block-level census data for every district, precinct, and other boundary, such as for local school boards, is entered into the districting software being used by state and county elections officials. After voters are assigned to districts via the software, an auditing process is necessary to ensure accuracy. This is a critical step to ensure that voters are assigned to their correct districts.

18. The reassignment process is more complicated, and takes additional time and resources, when districts have split precincts. For example, if a county's precincts are split, then it takes additional time by one of the State Board's staff members for each county, in addition to the normal course of work that county staff must perform, to reassign voters in split precincts. Issues arise during this process. Such issues primarily arise in districts where there is a higher population of African American or other minority voters. But such issues can be addressed when elections officials have adequate time to review and audit district assignments.

19. If a potential candidate for the state legislature brings a challenge based on their district assignment, this also would then require additional time for the State Board or a county board to hold a hearing. Candidate challenges must be filed within ten days of the close of the candidate filing period. There are two types of challenges that can occur: (i) those before a county board of elections, and (ii) those before the State Board. If the elected office sits within one county, that county's board of elections will hold the hearing. However, if the elected office covers multiple counties, the State Board will oversee the hearing. Because challenges before the State Board often take more time than those before county boards, timing issues arise. For example, although other elections can move forward while candidate challenges are pursued, such challenges can be disrupted, and may even be disputed following election day. Also, if candidate challenges are not timely filed, then they have to be filed as an election protest after the election date.

20. Thus, the time for state and county elections officials to process the new districts and to ensure their accuracy is already extremely limited between now and the December 6, 2021 opening of the candidate filing period, even assuming maps were enacted immediately and did not require any judicial review.

Ballot and Equipment Preparation

21. Following the close of the candidate filing period, state and county elections officials must prepare and print ballots, review the ballots for any errors, and then prepare and test the voting equipment. In some populous counties, there can be several different ballot styles. For example, there can be multiple ballots styles used by voters in one precinct to ensure a voter votes the ballot for the offices that they are eligible to cast. Elections officials need time to ensure that the correct ballots are going to the correct voters. Typically, state and county officials require at least 21 days to prepare and review ballots.

Mailing Absentee Ballots

22. North Carolina must have adequate time for absentee ballots to be mailed to members of the armed services, their dependents living overseas, and other overseas citizens, and those voters must have adequate time to return their completed ballots. Foreign mail services can delay the delivery and return of absentee ballots. To overcome these potential challenges, and to comply with the Federal Voting Assistance Program, North Carolina has enacted particular requirements for the timing of the absentee voter period. State law requires absentee ballots for armed services members and other overseas voters to be ready 60 days before a general election and 50 days before a primary. N.C. Gen. Stat. § 163-258.9(a). However, the State Board may be authorized to reduce this time for primary elections to 45 days. N.C. Gen. Stat. § 163-22(k). Thus, in calculating an election schedule, at least 45 days for absentee voting must be allowed before the primary. Even so, the United States Department of Defense recommends 60 days for absentee balloting in order to reach defense personnel in remote locations.

Candidate Residency Requirement

23. As noted above, candidates for State Senate and House must have resided in their district for one year prior to the general election, which is currently scheduled to be held on November 8, 2022 for this election cycle. If the new districts are finalized after November 8, 2021, candidates who have been drawn into a new district will not have the opportunity to meet the one-year residency requirement prior to the November 8 deadline, absent an order from the court modifying that requirement.

24. These potential candidates for the state legislature, who are not eligible because they cannot meet the residency requirement as a result of circumstances out of their control, i.e., the delayed finalization of districts, may bring a legal challenge. Such legal intervention would further delay the process.

Districts of Potential Candidates

25. Creating districts so close to the candidate filing period creates a number of other problems for individuals considering running for an office in the North Carolina state legislature. Registered voters interested in running for a public office need to know the configuration of new legislative districts to determine their potential for success. A potential candidate must confirm whether they are a resident of a newly drawn district as part of determining whether to file for a given seat. In order to campaign effectively, a candidate must know the parameters of the district they are seeking to represent. Knowing the constituency is essential to evaluating the prospects of a candidacy, as are factors such as political or grassroots support, fundraising potential, and the ability to communicate with voters.

26. Any delays in establishing district boundaries creates an unfair and uneven playing field with a decisive advantage to wealthy candidates and incumbents. The creation of districts

shortly before the candidate filing period can have a chilling effect on potential new candidates, or can result in litigation, as discussed above. Without adequate time to prepare, raise money, and campaign, potential candidates may forego seeking election. And if the current primary schedule remains, delays caused by litigation may result in an abbreviated candidate filing period. In my tenure as Executive Director of the State Board of Elections, my office received calls from such candidates who expressed their frustration with issues like these.

Voter Education

27. Redistricting that is close in time to candidate filing deadlines can also impact voters who support a particular candidate. Their candidate's district may be carved up such that their preferred candidate has no chance to win. And voters must be educated early and often by candidates and elections officials about the districts to which they have been assigned and the candidates for office in those districts. North Carolina has approximately 7 million registered voters,⁴ and providing adequate public information about election changes such as redistricting is an arduous task. As a result of the 2020 Census, districts will have been redrawn not just for state legislative offices and the United States Congress, but for school boards, county commissions, and municipal offices as well. Because of this necessary, widespread redistricting, education about reassignments is most important in the first election following the census. An abbreviated primary cycle can also shorten the time for voters to familiarize themselves with new candidates if they find themselves in a new district.

28. In summary, significantly shortening the time period for completion of elections tasks undermines the ability of elections officials to address the challenges posed by the first

⁴ See N.C. Voter Turnout Statistics 2020 General Election, https://s3.amazonaws.com/dl.ncsbe.gov/Press/NC%20Voter%20Turnout%20Statistics/voter_turnout_stats_20201103.pdf.

election following redistricting. And this in turn can negatively impact voters, candidates, and political parties.

Timing of Candidate Filing Periods and Primary Days

29. Recent past election cycles in North Carolina have been successfully conducted with candidate filing periods in February and primary days in May. The 2018 election cycle had a candidate filing period from February 12 to February 28, 2018, and a primary day on May 8, 2018. The 2014 election cycle had a candidate filing period from February 10 to February 28, 2014, and a primary day on May 6, 2014. The 2012 election cycle had a candidate filing period from February 13 to February 29, 2012, and a primary day on May 8, 2012. Likewise, North Carolina had its primary day in May for the 2010, 2008, 2006, and 2000 election years. These are first round primaries, with second round primaries taking place in the case of runoffs when no candidate meets the vote threshold. Typically, about seven weeks are required to ensure that there is sufficient time to hold second-round primary elections. Holding the first-round primary in May leaves plenty of time for second-round primaries, if needed, and for the general election in November.

30. Of particular relevance here, for the past two post-Census election cycles, which I oversaw as Executive Director of the State Board, the primary dates were originally set in May. Most recently, the 2012 primary date, following the 2010 Census results, occurred in May. And, as discussed above, the 2002 primary day was also originally set for May, but was then delayed due to ongoing litigation. A May primary date is normal practice for an election year following a decennial census, and does not have a concerning impact on the general election in November.

31. Due to the delayed release of the 2020 Census results, the current March 8 primary date poses a challenge for the State Board and county elections officials. In light of this situation, it is critical to delay the primary dates and candidate filing period as soon as possible to establish

certainty and stability in the process, and to ensure that the 2022 elections run as smoothly as possible.

32. The more time every participant in the election process has to prepare for the election, the better the process will be for election board staff, voters, and potential candidates. Voters need time to learn about what district they are voting in, just as elections officials, candidates, and political parties need time to conduct outreach and voter education regarding new districts. Potential candidates need to know what district they are in with enough time to assess their chances of winning in that district. And elections officials need time to implement the safeguards required to minimize errors in the election process and ensure that whoever gets the most eligible votes wins. Elections officials and the public alike benefit when elections officials have time to correct errors and ensure smooth elections. This allows elections officials to serve as good and faithful public servants in the democratic process.

33. In light of the above precedents, there is no question that a primary date in May 2022 is feasible. An abbreviated time period can be managed, if necessary, but it invites more room for errors at every step of the process. Additional time following the delayed 2020 Census results would ensure fewer errors. And it would allow all participants in the election process to have sufficient notice of, and time to prepare for, the election under newly redrawn district maps, whether they be voters, activists, candidates, political parties, or elections officials.


I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Executed November 3, 2021

Gary Bartlett
Gary Bartlett

Subscribed and sworn to before me this the 20th day of January, 2021.

Cindy Pendergraph
exp. 2-14-2026



Population Deviation Report**District Plan: S738 First Edition**

District	Seats	Ideal Pop	Actual Pop	Deviation	Deviation %
1	1	745,671	745,670	-1	0.00%
2	1	745,671	745,670	-1	0.00%
3	1	745,671	745,671	0	0.00%
4	1	745,671	745,671	0	0.00%
5	1	745,671	745,670	-1	0.00%
6	1	745,671	745,670	-1	0.00%
7	1	745,671	745,671	0	0.00%
8	1	745,671	745,671	0	0.00%
9	1	745,671	745,670	-1	0.00%
10	1	745,671	745,670	-1	0.00%
11	1	745,671	745,671	0	0.00%
12	1	745,671	745,671	0	0.00%
13	1	745,671	745,671	0	0.00%
14	1	745,671	745,671	0	0.00%
Totals:	14		10,439,388		

County - District Report

District Plan: S738 First Edition

County	District	Total County Population	Total District Population	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Alamance	4	171,415	745,671	171,415	100.00 %	22.99 %
Alexander	5	36,444	745,670	36,444	100.00 %	4.89 %
Alleghany	5	10,888	745,670	10,888	100.00 %	1.46 %
Anson	14	22,055	745,671	22,055	100.00 %	2.96 %
Ashe	5	26,577	745,670	26,577	100.00 %	3.56 %
Avery	5	17,806	745,670	17,806	100.00 %	2.39 %
Beaufort	3	44,652	745,671	44,652	100.00 %	5.99 %
Bertie	1	17,934	745,670	17,934	100.00 %	2.41 %
Bladen	7	29,606	745,671	11,928	40.29 %	1.60 %
	14	29,606	745,671	17,678	59.71 %	2.37 %
Brunswick	7	136,693	745,671	136,693	100.00 %	18.33 %
Buncombe	11	269,452	745,671	269,452	100.00 %	36.14 %
Burke	5	87,570	745,670	71,394	81.53 %	9.57 %
	10	87,570	745,670	16,176	18.47 %	2.17 %
Cabarrus	8	225,804	745,671	150,716	66.75 %	20.21 %
	9	225,804	745,670	75,088	33.25 %	10.07 %
Caldwell	5	80,652	745,670	80,652	100.00 %	10.82 %
Camden	3	10,355	745,671	10,355	100.00 %	1.39 %
Carteret	3	67,686	745,671	67,686	100.00 %	9.08 %
Caswell	4	22,736	745,671	22,736	100.00 %	3.05 %
Catawba	10	160,610	745,670	160,610	100.00 %	21.54 %
Chatham	13	76,285	745,671	76,285	100.00 %	10.23 %
Cherokee	11	28,774	745,671	28,774	100.00 %	3.86 %
Chowan	1	13,708	745,670	13,708	100.00 %	1.84 %
Clay	11	11,089	745,671	11,089	100.00 %	1.49 %
Cleveland	10	99,519	745,670	99,519	100.00 %	13.35 %
Columbus	7	50,623	745,671	50,623	100.00 %	6.79 %
Craven	3	100,720	745,671	100,720	100.00 %	13.51 %
Cumberland	14	334,728	745,671	334,728	100.00 %	44.89 %
Currituck	3	28,100	745,671	28,100	100.00 %	3.77 %
Dare	3	36,915	745,671	36,915	100.00 %	4.95 %
Davidson	8	168,930	745,671	168,930	100.00 %	22.65 %
Davie	8	42,712	745,671	42,712	100.00 %	5.73 %
Duplin	3	48,715	745,671	48,715	100.00 %	6.53 %
Durham	4	324,833	745,671	323,173	99.49 %	43.34 %
	13	324,833	745,671	1,660	0.51 %	0.22 %
Edgecombe	1	48,900	745,670	48,900	100.00 %	6.56 %
Forsyth	5	382,590	745,670	178,219	46.58 %	23.90 %
	6	382,590	745,670	204,371	53.42 %	27.41 %
Franklin	1	68,573	745,670	68,573	100.00 %	9.20 %
Gaston	10	227,943	745,670	227,943	100.00 %	30.57 %
Gates	1	10,478	745,670	10,478	100.00 %	1.41 %

District plan definition file: 'S738 First Edition.csv', modified 10/30/2021 10:24 AM

Data Source: 2020 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File - North Carolina

Printed 10/30/2021 [G20-CntyDist]

County - District Report

District Plan: S738 First Edition

County	District	Total County Population	Total District Population	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Graham	11	8,030	745,671	8,030	100.00 %	1.08 %
Granville	1	60,992	745,670	60,992	100.00 %	8.18 %
Greene	1	20,451	745,670	20,451	100.00 %	2.74 %
Guilford	6	541,299	745,670	541,299	100.00 %	72.59 %
Halifax	1	48,622	745,670	48,622	100.00 %	6.52 %
Harnett	13	133,568	745,671	133,568	100.00 %	17.91 %
Haywood	11	62,089	745,671	62,089	100.00 %	8.33 %
Henderson	11	116,281	745,671	116,281	100.00 %	15.59 %
Hertford	1	21,552	745,670	21,552	100.00 %	2.89 %
Hoke	14	52,082	745,671	52,082	100.00 %	6.98 %
Hyde	3	4,589	745,671	4,589	100.00 %	0.62 %
Iredell	8	186,693	745,671	92,267	49.42 %	12.37 %
	10	186,693	745,670	94,426	50.58 %	12.66 %
Jackson	11	43,109	745,671	43,109	100.00 %	5.78 %
Johnston	7	215,999	745,671	128,866	59.66 %	17.28 %
	13	215,999	745,671	87,133	40.34 %	11.69 %
Jones	3	9,172	745,671	9,172	100.00 %	1.23 %
Lee	13	63,285	745,671	63,285	100.00 %	8.49 %
Lenoir	3	55,122	745,671	55,122	100.00 %	7.39 %
Lincoln	10	86,810	745,670	86,810	100.00 %	11.64 %
Macon	11	37,014	745,671	37,014	100.00 %	4.96 %
Madison	11	21,193	745,671	21,193	100.00 %	2.84 %
Martin	1	22,031	745,670	22,031	100.00 %	2.95 %
McDowell	11	44,578	745,671	44,578	100.00 %	5.98 %
Mecklenburg	9	1,115,482	745,670	369,811	33.15 %	49.59 %
	12	1,115,482	745,671	745,671	66.85 %	100.00 %
Mitchell	11	14,903	745,671	14,903	100.00 %	2.00 %
Montgomery	14	25,751	745,671	25,751	100.00 %	3.45 %
Moore	14	99,727	745,671	99,727	100.00 %	13.37 %
Nash	1	94,970	745,670	94,970	100.00 %	12.74 %
New Hanover	7	225,702	745,671	225,702	100.00 %	30.27 %
Northampton	1	17,471	745,670	17,471	100.00 %	2.34 %
Onslow	3	204,576	745,671	204,576	100.00 %	27.44 %
Orange	4	148,696	745,671	148,696	100.00 %	19.94 %
Pamlico	3	12,276	745,671	12,276	100.00 %	1.65 %
Pasquotank	1	40,568	745,670	40,568	100.00 %	5.44 %
Pender	3	60,203	745,671	27,018	44.88 %	3.62 %
	7	60,203	745,671	33,185	55.12 %	4.45 %
Perquimans	1	13,005	745,670	13,005	100.00 %	1.74 %
Person	4	39,097	745,671	39,097	100.00 %	5.24 %
Pitt	1	170,243	745,670	77,713	45.65 %	10.42 %
	3	170,243	745,671	92,530	54.35 %	12.41 %

District plan definition file: 'S738 First Edition.csv', modified 10/30/2021 10:24 AM

Data Source: 2020 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File - North Carolina

Printed 10/30/2021 [G20-CntyDist]

County - District Report

District Plan: S738 First Edition

County	District	Total County Population	Total District Population	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Polk	11	19,328	745,671	19,328	100.00 %	2.59 %
Randolph	8	144,171	745,671	144,171	100.00 %	19.33 %
Richmond	14	42,946	745,671	42,946	100.00 %	5.76 %
Robeson	14	116,530	745,671	116,530	100.00 %	15.63 %
Rockingham	4	91,096	745,671	40,554	44.52 %	5.44 %
	5	91,096	745,670	50,542	55.48 %	6.78 %
Rowan	8	146,875	745,671	146,875	100.00 %	19.70 %
Rutherford	10	64,444	745,670	60,186	93.39 %	8.07 %
	11	64,444	745,671	4,258	6.61 %	0.57 %
Sampson	7	59,036	745,671	59,036	100.00 %	7.92 %
Scotland	14	34,174	745,671	34,174	100.00 %	4.58 %
Stanly	9	62,504	745,670	62,504	100.00 %	8.38 %
Stokes	5	44,520	745,670	44,520	100.00 %	5.97 %
Surry	5	71,359	745,670	71,359	100.00 %	9.57 %
Swain	11	14,117	745,671	14,117	100.00 %	1.89 %
Transylvania	11	32,986	745,671	32,986	100.00 %	4.42 %
Tyrrell	3	3,245	745,671	3,245	100.00 %	0.44 %
Union	9	238,267	745,670	238,267	100.00 %	31.95 %
Vance	1	42,578	745,670	42,578	100.00 %	5.71 %
Wake	2	1,129,410	745,670	745,670	66.02 %	100.00 %
	13	1,129,410	745,671	383,740	33.98 %	51.46 %
Warren	1	18,642	745,670	18,642	100.00 %	2.50 %
Washington	1	11,003	745,670	11,003	100.00 %	1.48 %
Watauga	5	54,086	745,670	54,086	100.00 %	7.25 %
Wayne	1	117,333	745,670	17,695	15.08 %	2.37 %
	7	117,333	745,671	99,638	84.92 %	13.36 %
Wilkes	5	65,969	745,670	65,969	100.00 %	8.85 %
Wilson	1	78,784	745,670	78,784	100.00 %	10.57 %
Yadkin	5	37,214	745,670	37,214	100.00 %	4.99 %
Yancey	11	18,470	745,671	18,470	100.00 %	2.48 %

Total: 10,439,388

Number of split counties: 14

Display: all counties

District - County Report

District Plan: S738 First Edition

District	County	Total District Population	Total County Population	District Pop in County	Percent of District Pop in County	Percent of County Pop in District
1	Bertie	745,670	17,934	17,934	2.41 %	100.00 %
	Chowan	745,670	13,708	13,708	1.84 %	100.00 %
	Edgecombe	745,670	48,900	48,900	6.56 %	100.00 %
	Franklin	745,670	68,573	68,573	9.20 %	100.00 %
	Gates	745,670	10,478	10,478	1.41 %	100.00 %
	Granville	745,670	60,992	60,992	8.18 %	100.00 %
	Greene	745,670	20,451	20,451	2.74 %	100.00 %
	Halifax	745,670	48,622	48,622	6.52 %	100.00 %
	Hertford	745,670	21,552	21,552	2.89 %	100.00 %
	Martin	745,670	22,031	22,031	2.95 %	100.00 %
	Nash	745,670	94,970	94,970	12.74 %	100.00 %
	Northampton	745,670	17,471	17,471	2.34 %	100.00 %
	Pasquotank	745,670	40,568	40,568	5.44 %	100.00 %
	Perquimans	745,670	13,005	13,005	1.74 %	100.00 %
	Pitt	745,670	170,243	77,713	10.42 %	45.65 %
	Vance	745,670	42,578	42,578	5.71 %	100.00 %
	Warren	745,670	18,642	18,642	2.50 %	100.00 %
	Washington	745,670	11,003	11,003	1.48 %	100.00 %
	Wayne	745,670	117,333	17,695	2.37 %	15.08 %
	Wilson	745,670	78,784	78,784	10.57 %	100.00 %
2	Wake	745,670	1,129,410	745,670	100.00 %	66.02 %
3	Beaufort	745,671	44,652	44,652	5.99 %	100.00 %
	Camden	745,671	10,355	10,355	1.39 %	100.00 %
	Carteret	745,671	67,686	67,686	9.08 %	100.00 %
	Craven	745,671	100,720	100,720	13.51 %	100.00 %
	Currituck	745,671	28,100	28,100	3.77 %	100.00 %
	Dare	745,671	36,915	36,915	4.95 %	100.00 %
	Duplin	745,671	48,715	48,715	6.53 %	100.00 %
	Hyde	745,671	4,589	4,589	0.62 %	100.00 %
	Jones	745,671	9,172	9,172	1.23 %	100.00 %
	Lenoir	745,671	55,122	55,122	7.39 %	100.00 %
	Onslow	745,671	204,576	204,576	27.44 %	100.00 %
	Pamlico	745,671	12,276	12,276	1.65 %	100.00 %
	Pender	745,671	60,203	27,018	3.62 %	44.88 %
	Pitt	745,671	170,243	92,530	12.41 %	54.35 %
	Tyrrell	745,671	3,245	3,245	0.44 %	100.00 %
4	Alamance	745,671	171,415	171,415	22.99 %	100.00 %
	Caswell	745,671	22,736	22,736	3.05 %	100.00 %
	Durham	745,671	324,833	323,173	43.34 %	99.49 %
	Orange	745,671	148,696	148,696	19.94 %	100.00 %
	Person	745,671	39,097	39,097	5.24 %	100.00 %
	Rockingham	745,671	91,096	40,554	5.44 %	44.52 %

District plan definition file: 'S738 First Edition.csv', modified 10/30/2021 10:24 AM

Data Source: 2020 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File - North Carolina

[G20-DistCnty] - Generated 10/30/2021

District - County Report

District Plan: S738 First Edition

District	County	Total District Population	Total County Population	District Pop in County	Percent of District Pop in County	Percent of County Pop in District
5	Alexander	745,670	36,444	36,444	4.89 %	100.00 %
	Alleghany	745,670	10,888	10,888	1.46 %	100.00 %
	Ashe	745,670	26,577	26,577	3.56 %	100.00 %
	Avery	745,670	17,806	17,806	2.39 %	100.00 %
	Burke	745,670	87,570	71,394	9.57 %	81.53 %
	Caldwell	745,670	80,652	80,652	10.82 %	100.00 %
	Forsyth	745,670	382,590	178,219	23.90 %	46.58 %
	Rockingham	745,670	91,096	50,542	6.78 %	55.48 %
	Stokes	745,670	44,520	44,520	5.97 %	100.00 %
	Surry	745,670	71,359	71,359	9.57 %	100.00 %
	Watauga	745,670	54,086	54,086	7.25 %	100.00 %
	Wilkes	745,670	65,969	65,969	8.85 %	100.00 %
	Yadkin	745,670	37,214	37,214	4.99 %	100.00 %
6	Forsyth	745,670	382,590	204,371	27.41 %	53.42 %
	Guilford	745,670	541,299	541,299	72.59 %	100.00 %
7	Bladen	745,671	29,606	11,928	1.60 %	40.29 %
	Brunswick	745,671	136,693	136,693	18.33 %	100.00 %
	Columbus	745,671	50,623	50,623	6.79 %	100.00 %
	Johnston	745,671	215,999	128,866	17.28 %	59.66 %
	New Hanover	745,671	225,702	225,702	30.27 %	100.00 %
	Pender	745,671	60,203	33,185	4.45 %	55.12 %
	Sampson	745,671	59,036	59,036	7.92 %	100.00 %
	Wayne	745,671	117,333	99,638	13.36 %	84.92 %
8	Cabarrus	745,671	225,804	150,716	20.21 %	66.75 %
	Davidson	745,671	168,930	168,930	22.65 %	100.00 %
	Davie	745,671	42,712	42,712	5.73 %	100.00 %
	Iredell	745,671	186,693	92,267	12.37 %	49.42 %
	Randolph	745,671	144,171	144,171	19.33 %	100.00 %
	Rowan	745,671	146,875	146,875	19.70 %	100.00 %
9	Cabarrus	745,670	225,804	75,088	10.07 %	33.25 %
	Mecklenburg	745,670	1,115,482	369,811	49.59 %	33.15 %
	Stanly	745,670	62,504	62,504	8.38 %	100.00 %
	Union	745,670	238,267	238,267	31.95 %	100.00 %
10	Burke	745,670	87,570	16,176	2.17 %	18.47 %
	Catawba	745,670	160,610	160,610	21.54 %	100.00 %
	Cleveland	745,670	99,519	99,519	13.35 %	100.00 %
	Gaston	745,670	227,943	227,943	30.57 %	100.00 %
	Iredell	745,670	186,693	94,426	12.66 %	50.58 %
	Lincoln	745,670	86,810	86,810	11.64 %	100.00 %
	Rutherford	745,670	64,444	60,186	8.07 %	93.39 %

District - County Report**District Plan: S738 First Edition**

District	County	Total District Population	Total County Population	District Pop in County	Percent of District Pop in County	Percent of County Pop in District
11	Buncombe	745,671	269,452	269,452	36.14 %	100.00 %
	Cherokee	745,671	28,774	28,774	3.86 %	100.00 %
	Clay	745,671	11,089	11,089	1.49 %	100.00 %
	Graham	745,671	8,030	8,030	1.08 %	100.00 %
	Haywood	745,671	62,089	62,089	8.33 %	100.00 %
	Henderson	745,671	116,281	116,281	15.59 %	100.00 %
	Jackson	745,671	43,109	43,109	5.78 %	100.00 %
	Macon	745,671	37,014	37,014	4.96 %	100.00 %
	Madison	745,671	21,193	21,193	2.84 %	100.00 %
	McDowell	745,671	44,578	44,578	5.98 %	100.00 %
	Mitchell	745,671	14,903	14,903	2.00 %	100.00 %
	Polk	745,671	19,328	19,328	2.59 %	100.00 %
	Rutherford	745,671	64,444	4,258	0.57 %	6.61 %
	Swain	745,671	14,117	14,117	1.89 %	100.00 %
	Transylvania	745,671	32,986	32,986	4.42 %	100.00 %
	Yancey	745,671	18,470	18,470	2.48 %	100.00 %
12	Mecklenburg	745,671	1,115,482	745,671	100.00 %	66.85 %
13	Chatham	745,671	76,285	76,285	10.23 %	100.00 %
	Durham	745,671	324,833	1,660	0.22 %	0.51 %
	Harnett	745,671	133,568	133,568	17.91 %	100.00 %
	Johnston	745,671	215,999	87,133	11.69 %	40.34 %
	Lee	745,671	63,285	63,285	8.49 %	100.00 %
	Wake	745,671	1,129,410	383,740	51.46 %	33.98 %
14	Anson	745,671	22,055	22,055	2.96 %	100.00 %
	Bladen	745,671	29,606	17,678	2.37 %	59.71 %
	Cumberland	745,671	334,728	334,728	44.89 %	100.00 %
	Hoke	745,671	52,082	52,082	6.98 %	100.00 %
	Montgomery	745,671	25,751	25,751	3.45 %	100.00 %
	Moore	745,671	99,727	99,727	13.37 %	100.00 %
	Richmond	745,671	42,946	42,946	5.76 %	100.00 %
	Robeson	745,671	116,530	116,530	15.63 %	100.00 %
	Scotland	745,671	34,174	34,174	4.58 %	100.00 %
Total:				10,439,388		

Municipality - District Report**District Plan: S738 First Edition**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Aberdeen	14	8,516	745,671	8,516	100.00 %	1.14 %
Ahoskie	1	4,891	745,670	4,891	100.00 %	0.66 %
Alamance	4	988	745,671	988	100.00 %	0.13 %
Albemarle	9	16,432	745,670	16,432	100.00 %	2.20 %
Alliance	3	733	745,671	733	100.00 %	0.10 %
Andrews	11	1,667	745,671	1,667	100.00 %	0.22 %
Angier	13	5,265	745,671	5,265	100.00 %	0.71 %
Ansonville	14	440	745,671	440	100.00 %	0.06 %
Apex	13	58,780	745,671	58,780	100.00 %	7.88 %
Arapahoe	3	416	745,671	416	100.00 %	0.06 %
Archdale	6	11,907	745,670	380	3.19 %	0.05 %
	8	11,907	745,671	11,527	96.81 %	1.55 %
Archer Lodge	7	4,797	745,671	4,797	100.00 %	0.64 %
Asheboro	8	27,156	745,671	27,156	100.00 %	3.64 %
Asheville	11	94,589	745,671	94,589	100.00 %	12.69 %
Askewville	1	184	745,670	184	100.00 %	0.02 %
Atkinson	7	296	745,671	296	100.00 %	0.04 %
Atlantic Beach	3	1,364	745,671	1,364	100.00 %	0.18 %
Aulander	1	763	745,670	763	100.00 %	0.10 %
Aurora	3	455	745,671	455	100.00 %	0.06 %
Autryville	7	167	745,671	167	100.00 %	0.02 %
Ayden	3	4,977	745,671	4,977	100.00 %	0.67 %
Badin	9	2,024	745,670	2,024	100.00 %	0.27 %
Bailey	1	568	745,670	568	100.00 %	0.08 %
Bakersville	11	450	745,671	450	100.00 %	0.06 %
Bald Head Island	7	268	745,671	268	100.00 %	0.04 %
Banner Elk	5	1,049	745,670	1,049	100.00 %	0.14 %
Bath	3	245	745,671	245	100.00 %	0.03 %
Bayboro	3	1,161	745,671	1,161	100.00 %	0.16 %
Bear Grass	1	89	745,670	89	100.00 %	0.01 %
Beaufort	3	4,464	745,671	4,464	100.00 %	0.60 %
Beech Mountain	5	675	745,670	675	100.00 %	0.09 %
Belhaven	3	1,410	745,671	1,410	100.00 %	0.19 %
Belmont	10	15,010	745,670	15,010	100.00 %	2.01 %
Belville	7	2,406	745,671	2,406	100.00 %	0.32 %
Belwood	10	857	745,670	857	100.00 %	0.11 %
Benson	7	3,967	745,671	3,967	100.00 %	0.53 %
	13	3,967	745,671	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Bermuda Run	8	3,120	745,671	3,120	100.00 %	0.42 %
Bessemer City	10	5,428	745,670	5,428	100.00 %	0.73 %
Bethania	5	344	745,670	344	100.00 %	0.05 %
Bethel	1	1,373	745,670	1,373	100.00 %	0.18 %

District plan definition file: 'S738 First Edition.csv', modified 10/30/2021 10:24 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 10/30/2021

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: S738 First Edition

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Beulaville	3	1,116	745,671	1,116	100.00 %	0.15 %
Biltmore Forest	11	1,409	745,671	1,409	100.00 %	0.19 %
Biscoe	14	1,848	745,671	1,848	100.00 %	0.25 %
Black Creek	1	692	745,670	692	100.00 %	0.09 %
Black Mountain	11	8,426	745,671	8,426	100.00 %	1.13 %
Bladenboro	14	1,648	745,671	1,648	100.00 %	0.22 %
Blowing Rock	5	1,376	745,670	1,376	100.00 %	0.18 %
Boardman	7	166	745,671	166	100.00 %	0.02 %
Bogue	3	695	745,671	695	100.00 %	0.09 %
Boiling Spring Lakes	7	5,943	745,671	5,943	100.00 %	0.80 %
Boiling Springs	10	4,615	745,670	4,615	100.00 %	0.62 %
Bolivia	7	149	745,671	149	100.00 %	0.02 %
Bolton	7	519	745,671	519	100.00 %	0.07 %
Boone	5	19,092	745,670	19,092	100.00 %	2.56 %
Boonville	5	1,185	745,670	1,185	100.00 %	0.16 %
Bostic	10	355	745,670	355	100.00 %	0.05 %
Brevard	11	7,744	745,671	7,744	100.00 %	1.04 %
Bridgeton	3	349	745,671	349	100.00 %	0.05 %
Broadway	13	1,267	745,671	1,267	100.00 %	0.17 %
Brookford	10	442	745,670	442	100.00 %	0.06 %
Brunswick	7	973	745,671	973	100.00 %	0.13 %
Bryson City	11	1,558	745,671	1,558	100.00 %	0.21 %
Bunn	1	327	745,670	327	100.00 %	0.04 %
Burgaw	7	3,088	745,671	3,088	100.00 %	0.41 %
Burlington	4	57,303	745,671	55,481	96.82 %	7.44 %
	6	57,303	745,670	1,822	3.18 %	0.24 %
Burnsville	11	1,614	745,671	1,614	100.00 %	0.22 %
Butner	1	8,397	745,670	8,397	100.00 %	1.13 %
Cajah's Mountain	5	2,722	745,670	2,722	100.00 %	0.37 %
Calabash	7	2,011	745,671	2,011	100.00 %	0.27 %
Calypso	3	327	745,671	327	100.00 %	0.04 %
Cameron	14	244	745,671	244	100.00 %	0.03 %
Candor	14	813	745,671	813	100.00 %	0.11 %
Canton	11	4,422	745,671	4,422	100.00 %	0.59 %
Cape Carteret	3	2,224	745,671	2,224	100.00 %	0.30 %
Carolina Beach	7	6,564	745,671	6,564	100.00 %	0.88 %
Carolina Shores	7	4,588	745,671	4,588	100.00 %	0.62 %
Carrboro	4	21,295	745,671	21,295	100.00 %	2.86 %
Carthage	14	2,775	745,671	2,775	100.00 %	0.37 %
Cary	2	174,721	745,670	6,689	3.83 %	0.90 %
	13	174,721	745,671	168,032	96.17 %	22.53 %
Casar	10	305	745,670	305	100.00 %	0.04 %

District plan definition file: 'S738 First Edition.csv', modified 10/30/2021 10:24 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 10/30/2021

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: S738 First Edition

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Castalia	1	264	745,670	264	100.00 %	0.04 %
Caswell Beach	7	395	745,671	395	100.00 %	0.05 %
Catawba	10	702	745,670	702	100.00 %	0.09 %
Cedar Point	3	1,764	745,671	1,764	100.00 %	0.24 %
Cedar Rock	5	301	745,670	301	100.00 %	0.04 %
Cerro Gordo	7	131	745,671	131	100.00 %	0.02 %
Chadbourn	7	1,574	745,671	1,574	100.00 %	0.21 %
Chapel Hill	4	61,960	745,671	61,960	100.00 %	8.31 %
Charlotte	9	874,579	745,670	297,095	33.97 %	39.84 %
	12	874,579	745,671	577,484	66.03 %	77.44 %
Cherryville	10	6,078	745,670	6,078	100.00 %	0.82 %
Chimney Rock Village	11	140	745,671	140	100.00 %	0.02 %
China Grove	8	4,434	745,671	4,434	100.00 %	0.59 %
Chocowinity	3	722	745,671	722	100.00 %	0.10 %
Claremont	10	1,692	745,670	1,692	100.00 %	0.23 %
Clarkton	7	614	745,671	614	100.00 %	0.08 %
Clayton	2	26,307	745,670	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	7	26,307	745,671	4,268	16.22 %	0.57 %
	13	26,307	745,671	22,039	83.78 %	2.96 %
Clemmons	5	21,163	745,670	21,163	100.00 %	2.84 %
Cleveland	8	846	745,671	846	100.00 %	0.11 %
Clinton	7	8,383	745,671	8,383	100.00 %	1.12 %
Clyde	11	1,368	745,671	1,368	100.00 %	0.18 %
Coats	13	2,155	745,671	2,155	100.00 %	0.29 %
Cofield	1	267	745,670	267	100.00 %	0.04 %
Colerain	1	217	745,670	217	100.00 %	0.03 %
Columbia	3	610	745,671	610	100.00 %	0.08 %
Columbus	11	1,060	745,671	1,060	100.00 %	0.14 %
Como	1	67	745,670	67	100.00 %	0.01 %
Concord	8	105,240	745,671	80,520	76.51 %	10.80 %
	9	105,240	745,670	24,720	23.49 %	3.32 %
Conetoe	1	198	745,670	198	100.00 %	0.03 %
Connelly Springs	5	1,529	745,670	1,529	100.00 %	0.21 %
Conover	10	8,421	745,670	8,421	100.00 %	1.13 %
Conway	1	752	745,670	752	100.00 %	0.10 %
Cooleemee	8	940	745,671	940	100.00 %	0.13 %
Cornelius	12	31,412	745,671	31,412	100.00 %	4.21 %
Cove City	3	378	745,671	378	100.00 %	0.05 %
Cramerton	10	5,296	745,670	5,296	100.00 %	0.71 %
Creedmoor	1	4,866	745,670	4,866	100.00 %	0.65 %
Creswell	1	207	745,670	207	100.00 %	0.03 %
Crossnore	5	143	745,670	143	100.00 %	0.02 %

District plan definition file: 'S738 First Edition.csv', modified 10/30/2021 10:24 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 10/30/2021

Municipality - District Report**District Plan: S738 First Edition**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Dallas	10	5,927	745,670	5,927	100.00 %	0.79 %
Danbury	5	189	745,670	189	100.00 %	0.03 %
Davidson	8	15,106	745,671	378	2.50 %	0.05 %
	12	15,106	745,671	14,728	97.50 %	1.98 %
Dellview	10	6	745,670	6	100.00 %	0.00 %
Denton	8	1,494	745,671	1,494	100.00 %	0.20 %
Dillsboro	11	213	745,671	213	100.00 %	0.03 %
Dobbins Heights	14	687	745,671	687	100.00 %	0.09 %
Dobson	5	1,462	745,670	1,462	100.00 %	0.20 %
Dortches	1	1,082	745,670	1,082	100.00 %	0.15 %
Dover	3	349	745,671	349	100.00 %	0.05 %
Drexel	5	1,760	745,670	1,760	100.00 %	0.24 %
Dublin	14	267	745,671	267	100.00 %	0.04 %
Duck	3	742	745,671	742	100.00 %	0.10 %
Dunn	13	8,446	745,671	8,446	100.00 %	1.13 %
Durham	2	283,506	745,670	269	0.09 %	0.04 %
	4	283,506	745,671	281,683	99.36 %	37.78 %
	13	283,506	745,671	1,554	0.55 %	0.21 %
Earl	10	198	745,670	198	100.00 %	0.03 %
East Arcadia	7	418	745,671	418	100.00 %	0.06 %
East Bend	5	634	745,670	634	100.00 %	0.09 %
East Laurinburg	14	234	745,671	234	100.00 %	0.03 %
Eastover	14	3,656	745,671	3,656	100.00 %	0.49 %
East Spencer	8	1,567	745,671	1,567	100.00 %	0.21 %
Eden	4	15,421	745,671	3,158	20.48 %	0.42 %
	5	15,421	745,670	12,263	79.52 %	1.64 %
Edenton	1	4,460	745,670	4,460	100.00 %	0.60 %
Elizabeth City	1	18,631	745,670	18,593	99.80 %	2.49 %
	3	18,631	745,671	38	0.20 %	0.01 %
Elizabethtown	7	3,296	745,671	1,481	44.93 %	0.20 %
	14	3,296	745,671	1,815	55.07 %	0.24 %
Elkin	5	4,122	745,670	4,122	100.00 %	0.55 %
Elk Park	5	542	745,670	542	100.00 %	0.07 %
Ellenboro	10	723	745,670	723	100.00 %	0.10 %
Ellerbe	14	864	745,671	864	100.00 %	0.12 %
Elm City	1	1,218	745,670	1,218	100.00 %	0.16 %
Elon	4	11,336	745,671	11,336	100.00 %	1.52 %
Emerald Isle	3	3,847	745,671	3,847	100.00 %	0.52 %
Enfield	1	1,865	745,670	1,865	100.00 %	0.25 %
Erwin	13	4,542	745,671	4,542	100.00 %	0.61 %
Eureka	1	214	745,670	175	81.78 %	0.02 %
	7	214	745,671	39	18.22 %	0.01 %

District plan definition file: 'S738 First Edition.csv', modified 10/30/2021 10:24 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 10/30/2021

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: S738 First Edition

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Everetts	1	150	745,670	150	100.00 %	0.02 %
Fair Bluff	7	709	745,671	709	100.00 %	0.10 %
Fairmont	14	2,191	745,671	2,191	100.00 %	0.29 %
Fairview	9	3,456	745,670	3,456	100.00 %	0.46 %
Faison	3	784	745,671	784	100.00 %	0.11 %
	7	784	745,671	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Faith	8	819	745,671	819	100.00 %	0.11 %
Falcon	7	324	745,671	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	14	324	745,671	324	100.00 %	0.04 %
Falkland	1	47	745,670	47	100.00 %	0.01 %
Fallston	10	627	745,670	627	100.00 %	0.08 %
Farmville	1	4,461	745,670	4,461	100.00 %	0.60 %
Fayetteville	14	208,501	745,671	208,501	100.00 %	27.96 %
Flat Rock	11	3,486	745,671	3,486	100.00 %	0.47 %
Fletcher	11	7,987	745,671	7,987	100.00 %	1.07 %
Fontana Dam	11	13	745,671	13	100.00 %	0.00 %
Forest City	10	7,377	745,670	7,377	100.00 %	0.99 %
Forest Hills	11	303	745,671	303	100.00 %	0.04 %
Fountain	1	385	745,670	385	100.00 %	0.05 %
Four Oaks	7	2,158	745,671	2,158	100.00 %	0.29 %
Foxfire	14	1,288	745,671	1,288	100.00 %	0.17 %
Franklin	11	4,175	745,671	4,175	100.00 %	0.56 %
Franklinton	1	2,456	745,670	2,456	100.00 %	0.33 %
Franklinville	8	1,197	745,671	1,197	100.00 %	0.16 %
Fremont	7	1,196	745,671	1,196	100.00 %	0.16 %
Fuquay-Varina	2	34,152	745,670	1,373	4.02 %	0.18 %
	13	34,152	745,671	32,779	95.98 %	4.40 %
Gamewell	5	3,702	745,670	3,702	100.00 %	0.50 %
Garland	7	595	745,671	595	100.00 %	0.08 %
Garner	2	31,159	745,670	31,159	100.00 %	4.18 %
Garysburg	1	904	745,670	904	100.00 %	0.12 %
Gaston	1	1,008	745,670	1,008	100.00 %	0.14 %
Gastonia	10	80,411	745,670	80,411	100.00 %	10.78 %
Gatesville	1	267	745,670	267	100.00 %	0.04 %
Gibson	14	449	745,671	449	100.00 %	0.06 %
Gibsonville	4	8,920	745,671	4,278	47.96 %	0.57 %
	6	8,920	745,670	4,642	52.04 %	0.62 %
Glen Alpine	5	1,529	745,670	1,152	75.34 %	0.15 %
	10	1,529	745,670	377	24.66 %	0.05 %
Godwin	14	128	745,671	128	100.00 %	0.02 %
Goldsboro	1	33,657	745,670	6,282	18.66 %	0.84 %
	7	33,657	745,671	27,375	81.34 %	3.67 %

District plan definition file: 'S738 First Edition.csv', modified 10/30/2021 10:24 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 10/30/2021

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: S738 First Edition

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Goldston	13	234	745,671	234	100.00 %	0.03 %
Graham	4	17,157	745,671	17,157	100.00 %	2.30 %
Grandfather Village	5	95	745,670	95	100.00 %	0.01 %
Granite Falls	5	4,965	745,670	4,965	100.00 %	0.67 %
Granite Quarry	8	2,984	745,671	2,984	100.00 %	0.40 %
Grantsboro	3	692	745,671	692	100.00 %	0.09 %
Greenevers	3	567	745,671	567	100.00 %	0.08 %
Green Level	4	3,152	745,671	3,152	100.00 %	0.42 %
Greensboro	6	299,035	745,670	299,035	100.00 %	40.10 %
Greenville	1	87,521	745,670	45,905	52.45 %	6.16 %
	3	87,521	745,671	41,616	47.55 %	5.58 %
Grifton	3	2,448	745,671	2,448	100.00 %	0.33 %
Grimesland	3	386	745,671	386	100.00 %	0.05 %
Grover	10	802	745,670	802	100.00 %	0.11 %
Halifax	1	170	745,670	170	100.00 %	0.02 %
Hamilton	1	306	745,670	306	100.00 %	0.04 %
Hamlet	14	6,025	745,671	6,025	100.00 %	0.81 %
Harmony	10	543	745,670	543	100.00 %	0.07 %
Harrells	3	160	745,671	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	7	160	745,671	160	100.00 %	0.02 %
Harrellsville	1	85	745,670	85	100.00 %	0.01 %
Harrisburg	9	18,967	745,670	18,967	100.00 %	2.54 %
Hassell	1	49	745,670	49	100.00 %	0.01 %
Havelock	3	16,621	745,671	16,621	100.00 %	2.23 %
Haw River	4	2,252	745,671	2,252	100.00 %	0.30 %
Hayesville	11	461	745,671	461	100.00 %	0.06 %
Hemby Bridge	9	1,614	745,670	1,614	100.00 %	0.22 %
Henderson	1	15,060	745,670	15,060	100.00 %	2.02 %
Hendersonville	11	15,137	745,671	15,137	100.00 %	2.03 %
Hertford	1	1,934	745,670	1,934	100.00 %	0.26 %
Hickory	5	43,490	745,670	111	0.26 %	0.01 %
	10	43,490	745,670	43,379	99.74 %	5.82 %
Highlands	11	1,072	745,671	1,072	100.00 %	0.14 %
High Point	6	114,059	745,670	107,405	94.17 %	14.40 %
	8	114,059	745,671	6,654	5.83 %	0.89 %
High Shoals	10	595	745,670	595	100.00 %	0.08 %
Hildebran	5	1,679	745,670	1,679	100.00 %	0.23 %
Hillsborough	4	9,660	745,671	9,660	100.00 %	1.30 %
Hobgood	1	268	745,670	268	100.00 %	0.04 %
Hoffman	14	418	745,671	418	100.00 %	0.06 %
Holden Beach	7	921	745,671	921	100.00 %	0.12 %
Holly Ridge	3	4,171	745,671	4,171	100.00 %	0.56 %

District plan definition file: 'S738 First Edition.csv', modified 10/30/2021 10:24 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 10/30/2021

Page 6 of 15

Municipality - District Report**District Plan: S738 First Edition**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Holly Springs	2	41,239	745,670	1,675	4.06 %	0.22 %
	13	41,239	745,671	39,564	95.94 %	5.31 %
Hookerton	1	413	745,670	413	100.00 %	0.06 %
Hope Mills	14	17,808	745,671	17,808	100.00 %	2.39 %
Hot Springs	11	520	745,671	520	100.00 %	0.07 %
Hudson	5	3,780	745,670	3,780	100.00 %	0.51 %
Huntersville	12	61,376	745,671	61,376	100.00 %	8.23 %
Indian Beach	3	223	745,671	223	100.00 %	0.03 %
Indian Trail	9	39,997	745,670	39,997	100.00 %	5.36 %
Jackson	1	430	745,670	430	100.00 %	0.06 %
Jacksonville	3	72,723	745,671	72,723	100.00 %	9.75 %
Jamestown	6	3,668	745,670	3,668	100.00 %	0.49 %
Jamesville	1	424	745,670	424	100.00 %	0.06 %
Jefferson	5	1,622	745,670	1,622	100.00 %	0.22 %
Jonesville	5	2,308	745,670	2,308	100.00 %	0.31 %
Kannapolis	8	53,114	745,671	53,114	100.00 %	7.12 %
Kelford	1	203	745,670	203	100.00 %	0.03 %
Kenansville	3	770	745,671	770	100.00 %	0.10 %
Kenly	1	1,491	745,670	198	13.28 %	0.03 %
	7	1,491	745,671	1,293	86.72 %	0.17 %
Kernersville	6	26,449	745,670	26,449	100.00 %	3.55 %
Kill Devil Hills	3	7,656	745,671	7,656	100.00 %	1.03 %
King	5	7,197	745,670	7,197	100.00 %	0.97 %
Kings Mountain	10	11,142	745,670	11,142	100.00 %	1.49 %
Kingstown	10	656	745,670	656	100.00 %	0.09 %
Kinston	3	19,900	745,671	19,900	100.00 %	2.67 %
Kittrell	1	132	745,670	132	100.00 %	0.02 %
Kitty Hawk	3	3,689	745,671	3,689	100.00 %	0.49 %
Knightdale	2	19,435	745,670	19,435	100.00 %	2.61 %
Kure Beach	7	2,191	745,671	2,191	100.00 %	0.29 %
La Grange	3	2,595	745,671	2,595	100.00 %	0.35 %
Lake Lure	11	1,365	745,671	1,365	100.00 %	0.18 %
Lake Park	9	3,269	745,670	3,269	100.00 %	0.44 %
Lake Santeetlah	11	38	745,671	38	100.00 %	0.01 %
Lake Waccamaw	7	1,296	745,671	1,296	100.00 %	0.17 %
Landis	8	3,690	745,671	3,690	100.00 %	0.49 %
Lansing	5	126	745,670	126	100.00 %	0.02 %
Lasker	1	64	745,670	64	100.00 %	0.01 %
Lattimore	10	406	745,670	406	100.00 %	0.05 %
Laurel Park	11	2,250	745,671	2,250	100.00 %	0.30 %
Laurinburg	14	14,978	745,671	14,978	100.00 %	2.01 %
Lawndale	10	570	745,670	570	100.00 %	0.08 %

District plan definition file: 'S738 First Edition.csv', modified 10/30/2021 10:24 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 10/30/2021

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: S738 First Edition

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Leggett	1	37	745,670	37	100.00 %	0.00 %
Leland	7	22,908	745,671	22,908	100.00 %	3.07 %
Lenoir	5	18,352	745,670	18,352	100.00 %	2.46 %
Lewiston Woodville	1	426	745,670	426	100.00 %	0.06 %
Lewisville	5	13,381	745,670	13,381	100.00 %	1.79 %
Lexington	8	19,632	745,671	19,632	100.00 %	2.63 %
Liberty	8	2,655	745,671	2,655	100.00 %	0.36 %
Lilesville	14	395	745,671	395	100.00 %	0.05 %
Lillington	13	4,735	745,671	4,735	100.00 %	0.63 %
Lincolnton	10	11,091	745,670	11,091	100.00 %	1.49 %
Linden	14	136	745,671	136	100.00 %	0.02 %
Littleton	1	559	745,670	559	100.00 %	0.07 %
Locust	9	4,537	745,670	4,537	100.00 %	0.61 %
Long View	5	5,088	745,670	735	14.45 %	0.10 %
	10	5,088	745,670	4,353	85.55 %	0.58 %
Louisburg	1	3,064	745,670	3,064	100.00 %	0.41 %
Love Valley	10	154	745,670	154	100.00 %	0.02 %
Lowell	10	3,654	745,670	3,654	100.00 %	0.49 %
Lucama	1	1,036	745,670	1,036	100.00 %	0.14 %
Lumber Bridge	14	82	745,671	82	100.00 %	0.01 %
Lumberton	14	19,025	745,671	19,025	100.00 %	2.55 %
McAdenville	10	890	745,670	890	100.00 %	0.12 %
Macclesfield	1	413	745,670	413	100.00 %	0.06 %
McDonald	14	94	745,671	94	100.00 %	0.01 %
McFarlan	14	94	745,671	94	100.00 %	0.01 %
Macon	1	110	745,670	110	100.00 %	0.01 %
Madison	5	2,129	745,670	2,129	100.00 %	0.29 %
Maggie Valley	11	1,687	745,671	1,687	100.00 %	0.23 %
Magnolia	3	831	745,671	831	100.00 %	0.11 %
Maiden	10	3,736	745,670	3,736	100.00 %	0.50 %
Manteo	3	1,600	745,671	1,600	100.00 %	0.21 %
Marietta	14	111	745,671	111	100.00 %	0.01 %
Marion	11	7,717	745,671	7,717	100.00 %	1.03 %
Marshall	11	777	745,671	777	100.00 %	0.10 %
Mars Hill	11	2,007	745,671	2,007	100.00 %	0.27 %
Marshville	9	2,522	745,670	2,522	100.00 %	0.34 %
Marvin	9	6,358	745,670	6,358	100.00 %	0.85 %
Matthews	9	29,435	745,670	29,435	100.00 %	3.95 %
Maxton	14	2,110	745,671	2,110	100.00 %	0.28 %
Mayodan	5	2,418	745,670	2,418	100.00 %	0.32 %
Maysville	3	818	745,671	818	100.00 %	0.11 %
Mebane	4	17,797	745,671	17,797	100.00 %	2.39 %

District plan definition file: 'S738 First Edition.csv', modified 10/30/2021 10:24 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 10/30/2021

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: S738 First Edition

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Mesic	3	144	745,671	144	100.00 %	0.02 %
Micro	7	458	745,671	458	100.00 %	0.06 %
Middleburg	1	101	745,670	101	100.00 %	0.01 %
Middlesex	1	912	745,670	912	100.00 %	0.12 %
Midland	9	4,684	745,670	4,684	100.00 %	0.63 %
Midway	8	4,742	745,671	4,742	100.00 %	0.64 %
Mills River	11	7,078	745,671	7,078	100.00 %	0.95 %
Milton	4	155	745,671	155	100.00 %	0.02 %
Mineral Springs	9	3,159	745,670	3,159	100.00 %	0.42 %
Minnesott Beach	3	530	745,671	530	100.00 %	0.07 %
Mint Hill	9	26,450	745,670	26,450	100.00 %	3.55 %
Misenheimer	9	650	745,670	650	100.00 %	0.09 %
Mocksville	8	5,900	745,671	5,900	100.00 %	0.79 %
Momeyer	1	277	745,670	277	100.00 %	0.04 %
Monroe	9	34,562	745,670	34,562	100.00 %	4.64 %
Montreat	11	901	745,671	901	100.00 %	0.12 %
Mooresboro	10	293	745,670	293	100.00 %	0.04 %
Mooresville	8	50,193	745,671	50,193	100.00 %	6.73 %
Morehead City	3	9,556	745,671	9,556	100.00 %	1.28 %
Morganton	5	17,474	745,670	16,963	97.08 %	2.27 %
	10	17,474	745,670	511	2.92 %	0.07 %
Morrisville	4	29,630	745,671	207	0.70 %	0.03 %
	13	29,630	745,671	29,423	99.30 %	3.95 %
Morven	14	329	745,671	329	100.00 %	0.04 %
Mount Airy	5	10,676	745,670	10,676	100.00 %	1.43 %
Mount Gilead	14	1,171	745,671	1,171	100.00 %	0.16 %
Mount Holly	10	17,703	745,670	17,703	100.00 %	2.37 %
Mount Olive	3	4,198	745,671	5	0.12 %	0.00 %
	7	4,198	745,671	4,193	99.88 %	0.56 %
Mount Pleasant	8	1,671	745,671	1,666	99.70 %	0.22 %
	9	1,671	745,670	5	0.30 %	0.00 %
Murfreesboro	1	2,619	745,670	2,619	100.00 %	0.35 %
Murphy	11	1,608	745,671	1,608	100.00 %	0.22 %
Nags Head	3	3,168	745,671	3,168	100.00 %	0.42 %
Nashville	1	5,632	745,670	5,632	100.00 %	0.76 %
Navassa	7	1,367	745,671	1,367	100.00 %	0.18 %
New Bern	3	31,291	745,671	31,291	100.00 %	4.20 %
Newland	5	715	745,670	715	100.00 %	0.10 %
New London	9	607	745,670	607	100.00 %	0.08 %
Newport	3	4,364	745,671	4,364	100.00 %	0.59 %
Newton	10	13,148	745,670	13,148	100.00 %	1.76 %
Newton Grove	7	585	745,671	585	100.00 %	0.08 %

District plan definition file: 'S738 First Edition.csv', modified 10/30/2021 10:24 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 10/30/2021

Municipality - District Report**District Plan: S738 First Edition**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Norlina	1	920	745,670	920	100.00 %	0.12 %
Norman	14	100	745,671	100	100.00 %	0.01 %
North Topsail Beach	3	1,005	745,671	1,005	100.00 %	0.13 %
Northwest	7	703	745,671	703	100.00 %	0.09 %
North Wilkesboro	5	4,382	745,670	4,382	100.00 %	0.59 %
Norwood	9	2,367	745,670	2,367	100.00 %	0.32 %
Oakboro	9	2,128	745,670	2,128	100.00 %	0.29 %
Oak City	1	266	745,670	266	100.00 %	0.04 %
Oak Island	7	8,396	745,671	8,396	100.00 %	1.13 %
Oak Ridge	6	7,474	745,670	7,474	100.00 %	1.00 %
Ocean Isle Beach	7	867	745,671	867	100.00 %	0.12 %
Old Fort	11	811	745,671	811	100.00 %	0.11 %
Oriental	3	880	745,671	880	100.00 %	0.12 %
Orrum	14	59	745,671	59	100.00 %	0.01 %
Ossipee	4	536	745,671	536	100.00 %	0.07 %
Oxford	1	8,628	745,670	8,628	100.00 %	1.16 %
Pantego	3	164	745,671	164	100.00 %	0.02 %
Parkton	14	504	745,671	504	100.00 %	0.07 %
Parmelee	1	243	745,670	243	100.00 %	0.03 %
Patterson Springs	10	571	745,670	571	100.00 %	0.08 %
Peachland	14	390	745,671	390	100.00 %	0.05 %
Peletier	3	769	745,671	769	100.00 %	0.10 %
Pembroke	14	2,823	745,671	2,823	100.00 %	0.38 %
Pikeville	7	712	745,671	712	100.00 %	0.10 %
Pilot Mountain	5	1,440	745,670	1,440	100.00 %	0.19 %
Pinebluff	14	1,473	745,671	1,473	100.00 %	0.20 %
Pinehurst	14	17,581	745,671	17,581	100.00 %	2.36 %
Pine Knoll Shores	3	1,388	745,671	1,388	100.00 %	0.19 %
Pine Level	7	2,046	745,671	2,046	100.00 %	0.27 %
Pinetops	1	1,200	745,670	1,200	100.00 %	0.16 %
Pineville	12	10,602	745,671	10,602	100.00 %	1.42 %
Pink Hill	3	451	745,671	451	100.00 %	0.06 %
Pittsboro	13	4,537	745,671	4,537	100.00 %	0.61 %
Pleasant Garden	6	5,000	745,670	5,000	100.00 %	0.67 %
Plymouth	1	3,320	745,670	3,320	100.00 %	0.45 %
Polkton	14	2,250	745,671	2,250	100.00 %	0.30 %
Polkville	10	516	745,670	516	100.00 %	0.07 %
Pollocksville	3	268	745,671	268	100.00 %	0.04 %
Powellsville	1	189	745,670	189	100.00 %	0.03 %
Princeton	7	1,315	745,671	1,315	100.00 %	0.18 %
Princeville	1	1,254	745,670	1,254	100.00 %	0.17 %
Proctorville	14	121	745,671	121	100.00 %	0.02 %

District plan definition file: 'S738 First Edition.csv', modified 10/30/2021 10:24 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 10/30/2021

Municipality - District Report**District Plan: S738 First Edition**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Raeford	14	4,559	745,671	4,559	100.00 %	0.61 %
Raleigh	2	467,665	745,670	460,066	98.38 %	61.70 %
	4	467,665	745,671	1,559	0.33 %	0.21 %
	13	467,665	745,671	6,040	1.29 %	0.81 %
Ramseur	8	1,774	745,671	1,774	100.00 %	0.24 %
Randleman	8	4,595	745,671	4,595	100.00 %	0.62 %
Ranlo	10	4,511	745,670	4,511	100.00 %	0.60 %
Raynham	14	60	745,671	60	100.00 %	0.01 %
Red Cross	9	762	745,670	762	100.00 %	0.10 %
Red Oak	1	3,342	745,670	3,342	100.00 %	0.45 %
Red Springs	14	3,087	745,671	3,087	100.00 %	0.41 %
Reidsville	4	14,583	745,671	14,583	100.00 %	1.96 %
Rennert	14	275	745,671	275	100.00 %	0.04 %
Rhodhiss	5	997	745,670	997	100.00 %	0.13 %
Richfield	9	582	745,670	582	100.00 %	0.08 %
Richlands	3	2,287	745,671	2,287	100.00 %	0.31 %
Rich Square	1	894	745,670	894	100.00 %	0.12 %
River Bend	3	2,902	745,671	2,902	100.00 %	0.39 %
Roanoke Rapids	1	15,229	745,670	15,229	100.00 %	2.04 %
Robbins	14	1,168	745,671	1,168	100.00 %	0.16 %
Robbinsville	11	597	745,671	597	100.00 %	0.08 %
Robersonville	1	1,269	745,670	1,269	100.00 %	0.17 %
Rockingham	14	9,243	745,671	9,243	100.00 %	1.24 %
Rockwell	8	2,302	745,671	2,302	100.00 %	0.31 %
Rocky Mount	1	54,341	745,670	54,341	100.00 %	7.29 %
Rolesville	2	9,475	745,670	9,475	100.00 %	1.27 %
Ronda	5	438	745,670	438	100.00 %	0.06 %
Roper	1	485	745,670	485	100.00 %	0.07 %
Roseboro	7	1,163	745,671	1,163	100.00 %	0.16 %
Rose Hill	3	1,371	745,671	1,371	100.00 %	0.18 %
Rosman	11	701	745,671	701	100.00 %	0.09 %
Rowland	14	885	745,671	885	100.00 %	0.12 %
Roxboro	4	8,134	745,671	8,134	100.00 %	1.09 %
Roxobel	1	187	745,670	187	100.00 %	0.03 %
Rural Hall	5	3,351	745,670	3,351	100.00 %	0.45 %
Ruth	10	347	745,670	347	100.00 %	0.05 %
Rutherford College	5	1,226	745,670	1,226	100.00 %	0.16 %
Rutherfordton	10	3,640	745,670	3,640	100.00 %	0.49 %
St. Helena	7	417	745,671	417	100.00 %	0.06 %
St. James	7	6,529	745,671	6,529	100.00 %	0.88 %
St. Pauls	14	2,045	745,671	2,045	100.00 %	0.27 %
Salemburg	7	457	745,671	457	100.00 %	0.06 %

District plan definition file: 'S738 First Edition.csv', modified 10/30/2021 10:24 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 10/30/2021

Municipality - District Report**District Plan: S738 First Edition**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Salisbury	8	35,540	745,671	35,540	100.00 %	4.77 %
Saluda	11	631	745,671	631	100.00 %	0.08 %
Sandy Creek	7	248	745,671	248	100.00 %	0.03 %
Sandyfield	7	430	745,671	430	100.00 %	0.06 %
Sanford	13	30,261	745,671	30,261	100.00 %	4.06 %
Saratoga	1	353	745,670	353	100.00 %	0.05 %
Sawmills	5	5,020	745,670	5,020	100.00 %	0.67 %
Scotland Neck	1	1,640	745,670	1,640	100.00 %	0.22 %
Seaboard	1	542	745,670	542	100.00 %	0.07 %
Seagrove	8	235	745,671	235	100.00 %	0.03 %
Sedalia	6	676	745,670	676	100.00 %	0.09 %
Selma	7	6,317	745,671	6,317	100.00 %	0.85 %
Seven Devils	5	313	745,670	313	100.00 %	0.04 %
Seven Springs	7	55	745,671	55	100.00 %	0.01 %
Severn	1	191	745,670	191	100.00 %	0.03 %
Shallotte	7	4,185	745,671	4,185	100.00 %	0.56 %
Sharpsburg	1	1,697	745,670	1,697	100.00 %	0.23 %
Shelby	10	21,918	745,670	21,918	100.00 %	2.94 %
Siler City	13	7,702	745,671	7,702	100.00 %	1.03 %
Simpson	3	390	745,671	390	100.00 %	0.05 %
Sims	1	275	745,670	275	100.00 %	0.04 %
Smithfield	7	11,292	745,671	11,292	100.00 %	1.51 %
Snow Hill	1	1,481	745,670	1,481	100.00 %	0.20 %
Southern Pines	14	15,545	745,671	15,545	100.00 %	2.08 %
Southern Shores	3	3,090	745,671	3,090	100.00 %	0.41 %
Southport	7	3,971	745,671	3,971	100.00 %	0.53 %
Sparta	5	1,834	745,670	1,834	100.00 %	0.25 %
Speed	1	63	745,670	63	100.00 %	0.01 %
Spencer	8	3,308	745,671	3,308	100.00 %	0.44 %
Spencer Mountain	10	0	745,670	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Spindale	10	4,225	745,670	4,225	100.00 %	0.57 %
Spring Hope	1	1,309	745,670	1,309	100.00 %	0.18 %
Spring Lake	14	11,660	745,671	11,660	100.00 %	1.56 %
Spruce Pine	11	2,194	745,671	2,194	100.00 %	0.29 %
Staley	8	397	745,671	397	100.00 %	0.05 %
Stallings	9	16,112	745,670	16,112	100.00 %	2.16 %
Stanfield	9	1,585	745,670	1,585	100.00 %	0.21 %
Stanley	10	3,963	745,670	3,963	100.00 %	0.53 %
Stantonsburg	1	762	745,670	762	100.00 %	0.10 %
Star	14	806	745,671	806	100.00 %	0.11 %
Statesville	10	28,419	745,670	28,419	100.00 %	3.81 %
Stedman	14	1,277	745,671	1,277	100.00 %	0.17 %

District plan definition file: 'S738 First Edition.csv', modified 10/30/2021 10:24 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 10/30/2021

Municipality - District Report**District Plan: S738 First Edition**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Stem	1	960	745,670	960	100.00 %	0.13 %
Stokesdale	6	5,924	745,670	5,924	100.00 %	0.79 %
Stoneville	5	1,308	745,670	1,308	100.00 %	0.18 %
Stonewall	3	214	745,671	214	100.00 %	0.03 %
Stovall	1	324	745,670	324	100.00 %	0.04 %
Sugar Mountain	5	371	745,670	371	100.00 %	0.05 %
Summerfield	6	10,951	745,670	10,951	100.00 %	1.47 %
Sunset Beach	7	4,175	745,671	4,175	100.00 %	0.56 %
Surf City	3	3,867	745,671	3,867	100.00 %	0.52 %
Swansboro	3	3,744	745,671	3,744	100.00 %	0.50 %
Sweepsonville	4	2,445	745,671	2,445	100.00 %	0.33 %
Sylva	11	2,578	745,671	2,578	100.00 %	0.35 %
Tabor City	7	3,781	745,671	3,781	100.00 %	0.51 %
Tarboro	1	10,721	745,670	10,721	100.00 %	1.44 %
Tar Heel	14	90	745,671	90	100.00 %	0.01 %
Taylorsville	5	2,320	745,670	2,320	100.00 %	0.31 %
Taylortown	14	634	745,671	634	100.00 %	0.09 %
Teachey	3	448	745,671	448	100.00 %	0.06 %
Thomasville	8	27,183	745,671	27,183	100.00 %	3.65 %
Tobaccoville	5	2,578	745,670	2,578	100.00 %	0.35 %
Topsail Beach	3	461	745,671	461	100.00 %	0.06 %
Trenton	3	238	745,671	238	100.00 %	0.03 %
Trent Woods	3	4,074	745,671	4,074	100.00 %	0.55 %
Trinity	8	7,006	745,671	7,006	100.00 %	0.94 %
Troutman	8	3,698	745,671	807	21.82 %	0.11 %
	10	3,698	745,670	2,891	78.18 %	0.39 %
Troy	14	2,850	745,671	2,850	100.00 %	0.38 %
Tryon	11	1,562	745,671	1,562	100.00 %	0.21 %
Turkey	7	213	745,671	213	100.00 %	0.03 %
Unionville	9	6,643	745,670	6,643	100.00 %	0.89 %
Valdese	5	4,689	745,670	4,689	100.00 %	0.63 %
Vanceboro	3	869	745,671	869	100.00 %	0.12 %
Vandemere	3	246	745,671	246	100.00 %	0.03 %
Varnamtown	7	525	745,671	525	100.00 %	0.07 %
Vass	14	952	745,671	952	100.00 %	0.13 %
Waco	10	310	745,670	310	100.00 %	0.04 %
Wade	14	638	745,671	638	100.00 %	0.09 %
Wadesboro	14	5,008	745,671	5,008	100.00 %	0.67 %
Wagram	14	615	745,671	615	100.00 %	0.08 %
Wake Forest	1	47,601	745,670	1,504	3.16 %	0.20 %
	2	47,601	745,670	46,097	96.84 %	6.18 %
Walkertown	6	5,692	745,670	5,692	100.00 %	0.76 %

District plan definition file: 'S738 First Edition.csv', modified 10/30/2021 10:24 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 10/30/2021

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: S738 First Edition

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Wallace	3	3,413	745,671	3,413	100.00 %	0.46 %
	7	3,413	745,671	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Wallburg	8	3,051	745,671	3,051	100.00 %	0.41 %
Walnut Cove	5	1,586	745,670	1,586	100.00 %	0.21 %
Walnut Creek	7	1,084	745,671	1,084	100.00 %	0.15 %
Walstonburg	1	193	745,670	193	100.00 %	0.03 %
Warrenton	1	851	745,670	851	100.00 %	0.11 %
Warsaw	3	2,733	745,671	2,733	100.00 %	0.37 %
Washington	3	9,875	745,671	9,875	100.00 %	1.32 %
Washington Park	3	392	745,671	392	100.00 %	0.05 %
Watha	7	181	745,671	181	100.00 %	0.02 %
Waxhaw	9	20,534	745,670	20,534	100.00 %	2.75 %
Waynesville	11	10,140	745,671	10,140	100.00 %	1.36 %
Weaverville	11	4,567	745,671	4,567	100.00 %	0.61 %
Webster	11	372	745,671	372	100.00 %	0.05 %
Weddington	9	13,181	745,670	13,181	100.00 %	1.77 %
Weldon	1	1,444	745,670	1,444	100.00 %	0.19 %
Wendell	2	9,793	745,670	9,793	100.00 %	1.31 %
Wentworth	4	2,662	745,671	921	34.60 %	0.12 %
	5	2,662	745,670	1,741	65.40 %	0.23 %
Wesley Chapel	9	8,681	745,670	8,681	100.00 %	1.16 %
West Jefferson	5	1,279	745,670	1,279	100.00 %	0.17 %
Whispering Pines	14	4,987	745,671	4,987	100.00 %	0.67 %
Whitakers	1	627	745,670	627	100.00 %	0.08 %
White Lake	7	843	745,671	843	100.00 %	0.11 %
Whiteville	7	4,766	745,671	4,766	100.00 %	0.64 %
Whitsett	6	584	745,670	584	100.00 %	0.08 %
Wilkesboro	5	3,687	745,670	3,687	100.00 %	0.49 %
Williamston	1	5,248	745,670	5,248	100.00 %	0.70 %
Wilmington	7	115,451	745,671	115,451	100.00 %	15.48 %
Wilson	1	47,851	745,670	47,851	100.00 %	6.42 %
Wilson's Mills	7	2,534	745,671	2,534	100.00 %	0.34 %
Windsor	1	3,582	745,670	3,582	100.00 %	0.48 %
Winfall	1	555	745,670	555	100.00 %	0.07 %
Wingate	9	4,055	745,670	4,055	100.00 %	0.54 %
Winston-Salem	5	249,545	745,670	111,539	44.70 %	14.96 %
	6	249,545	745,670	138,006	55.30 %	18.51 %
Winterville	3	10,462	745,671	10,462	100.00 %	1.40 %
Winton	1	629	745,670	629	100.00 %	0.08 %
Woodfin	11	7,936	745,671	7,936	100.00 %	1.06 %
Woodland	1	557	745,670	557	100.00 %	0.07 %
Wrightsville Beach	7	2,473	745,671	2,473	100.00 %	0.33 %

District plan definition file: 'S738 First Edition.csv', modified 10/30/2021 10:24 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 10/30/2021

Page 14 of 15

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: S738 First Edition

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Yadkinville	5	2,995	745,670	2,995	100.00 %	0.40 %
Yanceyville	4	1,937	745,671	1,937	100.00 %	0.26 %
Youngsville	1	2,016	745,670	2,016	100.00 %	0.27 %
Zebulon	2	6,903	745,670	6,903	100.00 %	0.93 %
	7	6,903	745,671	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Total:				6,017,605		

Number of split municipalities: 37

Display: all municipalities

Municipality by County - District Report**District Plan: S738 First Edition**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Aberdeen	14	8,516	745,671	8,516	100.00 %	1.14 %
Ahoskie	1	4,891	745,670	4,891	100.00 %	0.66 %
Alamance	4	988	745,671	988	100.00 %	0.13 %
Albemarle	9	16,432	745,670	16,432	100.00 %	2.20 %
Alliance	3	733	745,671	733	100.00 %	0.10 %
Andrews	11	1,667	745,671	1,667	100.00 %	0.22 %
Angier (Harnett)	13	4,709	745,671	4,709	100.00 %	0.63 %
Angier (Wake)	13	556	745,671	556	100.00 %	0.07 %
Ansonville	14	440	745,671	440	100.00 %	0.06 %
Apex	13	58,780	745,671	58,780	100.00 %	7.88 %
Arapahoe	3	416	745,671	416	100.00 %	0.06 %
Archdale (Guilford)	6	380	745,670	380	100.00 %	0.05 %
Archdale (Randolph)	8	11,527	745,671	11,527	100.00 %	1.55 %
Archer Lodge	7	4,797	745,671	4,797	100.00 %	0.64 %
Asheboro	8	27,156	745,671	27,156	100.00 %	3.64 %
Asheville	11	94,589	745,671	94,589	100.00 %	12.69 %
Askewville	1	184	745,670	184	100.00 %	0.02 %
Atkinson	7	296	745,671	296	100.00 %	0.04 %
Atlantic Beach	3	1,364	745,671	1,364	100.00 %	0.18 %
Aulander	1	763	745,670	763	100.00 %	0.10 %
Aurora	3	455	745,671	455	100.00 %	0.06 %
Autryville	7	167	745,671	167	100.00 %	0.02 %
Ayden	3	4,977	745,671	4,977	100.00 %	0.67 %
Badin	9	2,024	745,670	2,024	100.00 %	0.27 %
Bailey	1	568	745,670	568	100.00 %	0.08 %
Bakersville	11	450	745,671	450	100.00 %	0.06 %
Bald Head Island	7	268	745,671	268	100.00 %	0.04 %
Banner Elk	5	1,049	745,670	1,049	100.00 %	0.14 %
Bath	3	245	745,671	245	100.00 %	0.03 %
Bayboro	3	1,161	745,671	1,161	100.00 %	0.16 %
Bear Grass	1	89	745,670	89	100.00 %	0.01 %
Beaufort	3	4,464	745,671	4,464	100.00 %	0.60 %
Beech Mountain (Avery)	5	62	745,670	62	100.00 %	0.01 %
Beech Mountain (Watauga)	5	613	745,670	613	100.00 %	0.08 %
Belhaven	3	1,410	745,671	1,410	100.00 %	0.19 %
Belmont	10	15,010	745,670	15,010	100.00 %	2.01 %
Belville	7	2,406	745,671	2,406	100.00 %	0.32 %
Belwood	10	857	745,670	857	100.00 %	0.11 %
Benson (Harnett)	13	0	745,671	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Benson (Johnston)	7	3,967	745,671	3,967	100.00 %	0.53 %
Bermuda Run	8	3,120	745,671	3,120	100.00 %	0.42 %

District plan definition file: 'S738 First Edition.csv', modified 10/30/2021 10:24 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 10/30/2021

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: S738 First Edition

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Bessemer City	10	5,428	745,670	5,428	100.00 %	0.73 %
Bethania	5	344	745,670	344	100.00 %	0.05 %
Bethel	1	1,373	745,670	1,373	100.00 %	0.18 %
Beulaville	3	1,116	745,671	1,116	100.00 %	0.15 %
Biltmore Forest	11	1,409	745,671	1,409	100.00 %	0.19 %
Biscoe	14	1,848	745,671	1,848	100.00 %	0.25 %
Black Creek	1	692	745,670	692	100.00 %	0.09 %
Black Mountain	11	8,426	745,671	8,426	100.00 %	1.13 %
Bladenboro	14	1,648	745,671	1,648	100.00 %	0.22 %
Blowing Rock (Caldwell)	5	91	745,670	91	100.00 %	0.01 %
Blowing Rock (Watauga)	5	1,285	745,670	1,285	100.00 %	0.17 %
Boardman	7	166	745,671	166	100.00 %	0.02 %
Bogue	3	695	745,671	695	100.00 %	0.09 %
Boiling Spring Lakes	7	5,943	745,671	5,943	100.00 %	0.80 %
Boiling Springs	10	4,615	745,670	4,615	100.00 %	0.62 %
Bolivia	7	149	745,671	149	100.00 %	0.02 %
Bolton	7	519	745,671	519	100.00 %	0.07 %
Boone	5	19,092	745,670	19,092	100.00 %	2.56 %
Boonville	5	1,185	745,670	1,185	100.00 %	0.16 %
Bostic	10	355	745,670	355	100.00 %	0.05 %
Brevard	11	7,744	745,671	7,744	100.00 %	1.04 %
Bridgeton	3	349	745,671	349	100.00 %	0.05 %
Broadway (Harnett)	13	0	745,671	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Broadway (Lee)	13	1,267	745,671	1,267	100.00 %	0.17 %
Brookford	10	442	745,670	442	100.00 %	0.06 %
Brunswick	7	973	745,671	973	100.00 %	0.13 %
Bryson City	11	1,558	745,671	1,558	100.00 %	0.21 %
Bunn	1	327	745,670	327	100.00 %	0.04 %
Burgaw	7	3,088	745,671	3,088	100.00 %	0.41 %
Burlington (Alamance)	4	55,481	745,671	55,481	100.00 %	7.44 %
Burlington (Guilford)	6	1,822	745,670	1,822	100.00 %	0.24 %
Burnsville	11	1,614	745,671	1,614	100.00 %	0.22 %
Butner	1	8,397	745,670	8,397	100.00 %	1.13 %
Cajah's Mountain	5	2,722	745,670	2,722	100.00 %	0.37 %
Calabash	7	2,011	745,671	2,011	100.00 %	0.27 %
Calypso	3	327	745,671	327	100.00 %	0.04 %
Cameron	14	244	745,671	244	100.00 %	0.03 %
Candor (Montgomery)	14	813	745,671	813	100.00 %	0.11 %
Candor (Moore)	14	0	745,671	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Canton	11	4,422	745,671	4,422	100.00 %	0.59 %
Cape Carteret	3	2,224	745,671	2,224	100.00 %	0.30 %

District plan definition file: 'S738 First Edition.csv', modified 10/30/2021 10:24 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 10/30/2021

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: S738 First Edition

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Carolina Beach	7	6,564	745,671	6,564	100.00 %	0.88 %
Carolina Shores	7	4,588	745,671	4,588	100.00 %	0.62 %
Carrboro	4	21,295	745,671	21,295	100.00 %	2.86 %
Carthage	14	2,775	745,671	2,775	100.00 %	0.37 %
Cary (Chatham)	13	3,709	745,671	3,709	100.00 %	0.50 %
Cary (Wake)	2	171,012	745,670	6,689	3.91 %	0.90 %
	13	171,012	745,671	164,323	96.09 %	22.04 %
Casar	10	305	745,670	305	100.00 %	0.04 %
Castalia	1	264	745,670	264	100.00 %	0.04 %
Caswell Beach	7	395	745,671	395	100.00 %	0.05 %
Catawba	10	702	745,670	702	100.00 %	0.09 %
Cedar Point	3	1,764	745,671	1,764	100.00 %	0.24 %
Cedar Rock	5	301	745,670	301	100.00 %	0.04 %
Cerro Gordo	7	131	745,671	131	100.00 %	0.02 %
Chadbourn	7	1,574	745,671	1,574	100.00 %	0.21 %
Chapel Hill (Durham)	4	2,906	745,671	2,906	100.00 %	0.39 %
Chapel Hill (Orange)	4	59,054	745,671	59,054	100.00 %	7.92 %
Charlotte	9	874,579	745,670	297,095	33.97 %	39.84 %
	12	874,579	745,671	577,484	66.03 %	77.44 %
Cherryville	10	6,078	745,670	6,078	100.00 %	0.82 %
Chimney Rock Village	11	140	745,671	140	100.00 %	0.02 %
China Grove	8	4,434	745,671	4,434	100.00 %	0.59 %
Chocowinity	3	722	745,671	722	100.00 %	0.10 %
Claremont	10	1,692	745,670	1,692	100.00 %	0.23 %
Clarkton	7	614	745,671	614	100.00 %	0.08 %
Clayton (Johnston)	7	26,307	745,671	4,268	16.22 %	0.57 %
	13	26,307	745,671	22,039	83.78 %	2.96 %
Clayton (Wake)	2	0	745,670	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Clemmons	5	21,163	745,670	21,163	100.00 %	2.84 %
Cleveland	8	846	745,671	846	100.00 %	0.11 %
Clinton	7	8,383	745,671	8,383	100.00 %	1.12 %
Clyde	11	1,368	745,671	1,368	100.00 %	0.18 %
Coats	13	2,155	745,671	2,155	100.00 %	0.29 %
Cofield	1	267	745,670	267	100.00 %	0.04 %
Colerain	1	217	745,670	217	100.00 %	0.03 %
Columbia	3	610	745,671	610	100.00 %	0.08 %
Columbus	11	1,060	745,671	1,060	100.00 %	0.14 %
Como	1	67	745,670	67	100.00 %	0.01 %
Concord	8	105,240	745,671	80,520	76.51 %	10.80 %
	9	105,240	745,670	24,720	23.49 %	3.32 %
Conetoe	1	198	745,670	198	100.00 %	0.03 %

District plan definition file: 'S738 First Edition.csv', modified 10/30/2021 10:24 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 10/30/2021

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: S738 First Edition

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Connelly Springs	5	1,529	745,670	1,529	100.00 %	0.21 %
Conover	10	8,421	745,670	8,421	100.00 %	1.13 %
Conway	1	752	745,670	752	100.00 %	0.10 %
Cooleemee	8	940	745,671	940	100.00 %	0.13 %
Cornelius	12	31,412	745,671	31,412	100.00 %	4.21 %
Cove City	3	378	745,671	378	100.00 %	0.05 %
Cramerton	10	5,296	745,670	5,296	100.00 %	0.71 %
Creedmoor	1	4,866	745,670	4,866	100.00 %	0.65 %
Creswell	1	207	745,670	207	100.00 %	0.03 %
Crossnore	5	143	745,670	143	100.00 %	0.02 %
Dallas	10	5,927	745,670	5,927	100.00 %	0.79 %
Danbury	5	189	745,670	189	100.00 %	0.03 %
Davidson (Iredell)	8	378	745,671	378	100.00 %	0.05 %
Davidson (Mecklenburg)	12	14,728	745,671	14,728	100.00 %	1.98 %
Dellview	10	6	745,670	6	100.00 %	0.00 %
Denton	8	1,494	745,671	1,494	100.00 %	0.20 %
Dillsboro	11	213	745,671	213	100.00 %	0.03 %
Dobbins Heights	14	687	745,671	687	100.00 %	0.09 %
Dobson	5	1,462	745,670	1,462	100.00 %	0.20 %
Dortches	1	1,082	745,670	1,082	100.00 %	0.15 %
Dover	3	349	745,671	349	100.00 %	0.05 %
Drexel	5	1,760	745,670	1,760	100.00 %	0.24 %
Dublin	14	267	745,671	267	100.00 %	0.04 %
Duck	3	742	745,671	742	100.00 %	0.10 %
Dunn	13	8,446	745,671	8,446	100.00 %	1.13 %
Durham (Durham)	4	283,093	745,671	281,539	99.45 %	37.76 %
	13	283,093	745,671	1,554	0.55 %	0.21 %
Durham (Orange)	4	144	745,671	144	100.00 %	0.02 %
Durham (Wake)	2	269	745,670	269	100.00 %	0.04 %
	13	269	745,671	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Earl	10	198	745,670	198	100.00 %	0.03 %
East Arcadia	7	418	745,671	418	100.00 %	0.06 %
East Bend	5	634	745,670	634	100.00 %	0.09 %
East Laurinburg	14	234	745,671	234	100.00 %	0.03 %
East Spencer	8	1,567	745,671	1,567	100.00 %	0.21 %
Eastover	14	3,656	745,671	3,656	100.00 %	0.49 %
Eden	4	15,421	745,671	3,158	20.48 %	0.42 %
	5	15,421	745,670	12,263	79.52 %	1.64 %
Edenton	1	4,460	745,670	4,460	100.00 %	0.60 %
Elizabeth City (Camden)	3	38	745,671	38	100.00 %	0.01 %
Elizabeth City (Pasquotank)	1	18,593	745,670	18,593	100.00 %	2.49 %

District plan definition file: 'S738 First Edition.csv', modified 10/30/2021 10:24 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Municipality by County - District Report**District Plan: S738 First Edition**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Elizabethtown	7	3,296	745,671	1,481	44.93 %	0.20 %
	14	3,296	745,671	1,815	55.07 %	0.24 %
Elk Park	5	542	745,670	542	100.00 %	0.07 %
Elkin (Surry)	5	4,049	745,670	4,049	100.00 %	0.54 %
Elkin (Wilkes)	5	73	745,670	73	100.00 %	0.01 %
Ellenboro	10	723	745,670	723	100.00 %	0.10 %
Ellerbe	14	864	745,671	864	100.00 %	0.12 %
Elm City (Nash)	1	0	745,670	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Elm City (Wilson)	1	1,218	745,670	1,218	100.00 %	0.16 %
Elon	4	11,336	745,671	11,336	100.00 %	1.52 %
Emerald Isle	3	3,847	745,671	3,847	100.00 %	0.52 %
Enfield	1	1,865	745,670	1,865	100.00 %	0.25 %
Erwin	13	4,542	745,671	4,542	100.00 %	0.61 %
Eureka	1	214	745,670	175	81.78 %	0.02 %
	7	214	745,671	39	18.22 %	0.01 %
Everetts	1	150	745,670	150	100.00 %	0.02 %
Fair Bluff	7	709	745,671	709	100.00 %	0.10 %
Fairmont	14	2,191	745,671	2,191	100.00 %	0.29 %
Fairview	9	3,456	745,670	3,456	100.00 %	0.46 %
Faison (Duplin)	3	784	745,671	784	100.00 %	0.11 %
Faison (Sampson)	7	0	745,671	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Faith	8	819	745,671	819	100.00 %	0.11 %
Falcon (Cumberland)	14	324	745,671	324	100.00 %	0.04 %
Falcon (Sampson)	7	0	745,671	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Falkland	1	47	745,670	47	100.00 %	0.01 %
Fallston	10	627	745,670	627	100.00 %	0.08 %
Farmville	1	4,461	745,670	4,461	100.00 %	0.60 %
Fayetteville	14	208,501	745,671	208,501	100.00 %	27.96 %
Flat Rock	11	3,486	745,671	3,486	100.00 %	0.47 %
Fletcher	11	7,987	745,671	7,987	100.00 %	1.07 %
Fontana Dam	11	13	745,671	13	100.00 %	0.00 %
Forest City	10	7,377	745,670	7,377	100.00 %	0.99 %
Forest Hills	11	303	745,671	303	100.00 %	0.04 %
Fountain	1	385	745,670	385	100.00 %	0.05 %
Four Oaks	7	2,158	745,671	2,158	100.00 %	0.29 %
Foxfire	14	1,288	745,671	1,288	100.00 %	0.17 %
Franklin	11	4,175	745,671	4,175	100.00 %	0.56 %
Franklinton	1	2,456	745,670	2,456	100.00 %	0.33 %
Franklinville	8	1,197	745,671	1,197	100.00 %	0.16 %
Fremont	7	1,196	745,671	1,196	100.00 %	0.16 %
Fuquay-Varina (Harnett)	13	0	745,671	0	0.00 %	0.00 %

District plan definition file: 'S738 First Edition.csv', modified 10/30/2021 10:24 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 10/30/2021

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: S738 First Edition

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Fuquay-Varina (Wake)	2	34,152	745,670	1,373	4.02 %	0.18 %
	13	34,152	745,671	32,779	95.98 %	4.40 %
Gamewell	5	3,702	745,670	3,702	100.00 %	0.50 %
Garland	7	595	745,671	595	100.00 %	0.08 %
Garner	2	31,159	745,670	31,159	100.00 %	4.18 %
Garysburg	1	904	745,670	904	100.00 %	0.12 %
Gaston	1	1,008	745,670	1,008	100.00 %	0.14 %
Gastonia	10	80,411	745,670	80,411	100.00 %	10.78 %
Gatesville	1	267	745,670	267	100.00 %	0.04 %
Gibson	14	449	745,671	449	100.00 %	0.06 %
Gibsonville (Alamance)	4	4,278	745,671	4,278	100.00 %	0.57 %
Gibsonville (Guilford)	6	4,642	745,670	4,642	100.00 %	0.62 %
Glen Alpine	5	1,529	745,670	1,152	75.34 %	0.15 %
	10	1,529	745,670	377	24.66 %	0.05 %
Godwin	14	128	745,671	128	100.00 %	0.02 %
Goldsboro	1	33,657	745,670	6,282	18.66 %	0.84 %
	7	33,657	745,671	27,375	81.34 %	3.67 %
Goldston	13	234	745,671	234	100.00 %	0.03 %
Graham	4	17,157	745,671	17,157	100.00 %	2.30 %
Grandfather Village	5	95	745,670	95	100.00 %	0.01 %
Granite Falls	5	4,965	745,670	4,965	100.00 %	0.67 %
Granite Quarry	8	2,984	745,671	2,984	100.00 %	0.40 %
Grantsboro	3	692	745,671	692	100.00 %	0.09 %
Green Level	4	3,152	745,671	3,152	100.00 %	0.42 %
Greenevers	3	567	745,671	567	100.00 %	0.08 %
Greensboro	6	299,035	745,670	299,035	100.00 %	40.10 %
Greenville	1	87,521	745,670	45,905	52.45 %	6.16 %
	3	87,521	745,671	41,616	47.55 %	5.58 %
Grifton (Lenoir)	3	147	745,671	147	100.00 %	0.02 %
Grifton (Pitt)	3	2,301	745,671	2,301	100.00 %	0.31 %
Grimesland	3	386	745,671	386	100.00 %	0.05 %
Grover	10	802	745,670	802	100.00 %	0.11 %
Halifax	1	170	745,670	170	100.00 %	0.02 %
Hamilton	1	306	745,670	306	100.00 %	0.04 %
Hamlet	14	6,025	745,671	6,025	100.00 %	0.81 %
Harmony	10	543	745,670	543	100.00 %	0.07 %
Harrells (Duplin)	3	0	745,671	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Harrells (Sampson)	7	160	745,671	160	100.00 %	0.02 %
Harrellsville	1	85	745,670	85	100.00 %	0.01 %
Harrisburg	9	18,967	745,670	18,967	100.00 %	2.54 %
Hassell	1	49	745,670	49	100.00 %	0.01 %

District plan definition file: 'S738 First Edition.csv', modified 10/30/2021 10:24 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 10/30/2021

Municipality by County - District Report**District Plan: S738 First Edition**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Havelock	3	16,621	745,671	16,621	100.00 %	2.23 %
Haw River	4	2,252	745,671	2,252	100.00 %	0.30 %
Hayesville	11	461	745,671	461	100.00 %	0.06 %
Hemby Bridge	9	1,614	745,670	1,614	100.00 %	0.22 %
Henderson	1	15,060	745,670	15,060	100.00 %	2.02 %
Hendersonville	11	15,137	745,671	15,137	100.00 %	2.03 %
Hertford	1	1,934	745,670	1,934	100.00 %	0.26 %
Hickory (Burke)	5	79	745,670	79	100.00 %	0.01 %
Hickory (Caldwell)	5	32	745,670	32	100.00 %	0.00 %
Hickory (Catawba)	10	43,379	745,670	43,379	100.00 %	5.82 %
High Point (Davidson)	8	6,646	745,671	6,646	100.00 %	0.89 %
High Point (Forsyth)	6	84	745,670	84	100.00 %	0.01 %
High Point (Guilford)	6	107,321	745,670	107,321	100.00 %	14.39 %
High Point (Randolph)	8	8	745,671	8	100.00 %	0.00 %
High Shoals	10	595	745,670	595	100.00 %	0.08 %
Highlands (Jackson)	11	12	745,671	12	100.00 %	0.00 %
Highlands (Macon)	11	1,060	745,671	1,060	100.00 %	0.14 %
Hildebran	5	1,679	745,670	1,679	100.00 %	0.23 %
Hillsborough	4	9,660	745,671	9,660	100.00 %	1.30 %
Hobgood	1	268	745,670	268	100.00 %	0.04 %
Hoffman	14	418	745,671	418	100.00 %	0.06 %
Holden Beach	7	921	745,671	921	100.00 %	0.12 %
Holly Ridge	3	4,171	745,671	4,171	100.00 %	0.56 %
Holly Springs	2	41,239	745,670	1,675	4.06 %	0.22 %
	13	41,239	745,671	39,564	95.94 %	5.31 %
Hookerton	1	413	745,670	413	100.00 %	0.06 %
Hope Mills	14	17,808	745,671	17,808	100.00 %	2.39 %
Hot Springs	11	520	745,671	520	100.00 %	0.07 %
Hudson	5	3,780	745,670	3,780	100.00 %	0.51 %
Huntersville	12	61,376	745,671	61,376	100.00 %	8.23 %
Indian Beach	3	223	745,671	223	100.00 %	0.03 %
Indian Trail	9	39,997	745,670	39,997	100.00 %	5.36 %
Jackson	1	430	745,670	430	100.00 %	0.06 %
Jacksonville	3	72,723	745,671	72,723	100.00 %	9.75 %
Jamestown	6	3,668	745,670	3,668	100.00 %	0.49 %
Jamesville	1	424	745,670	424	100.00 %	0.06 %
Jefferson	5	1,622	745,670	1,622	100.00 %	0.22 %
Jonesville	5	2,308	745,670	2,308	100.00 %	0.31 %
Kannapolis (Cabarrus)	8	42,846	745,671	42,846	100.00 %	5.75 %
Kannapolis (Rowan)	8	10,268	745,671	10,268	100.00 %	1.38 %
Kelford	1	203	745,670	203	100.00 %	0.03 %

District plan definition file: 'S738 First Edition.csv', modified 10/30/2021 10:24 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 10/30/2021

Municipality by County - District Report**District Plan: S738 First Edition**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Kenansville	3	770	745,671	770	100.00 %	0.10 %
Kenly (Johnston)	7	1,293	745,671	1,293	100.00 %	0.17 %
Kenly (Wilson)	1	198	745,670	198	100.00 %	0.03 %
Kernersville (Forsyth)	6	25,947	745,670	25,947	100.00 %	3.48 %
Kernersville (Guilford)	6	502	745,670	502	100.00 %	0.07 %
Kill Devil Hills	3	7,656	745,671	7,656	100.00 %	1.03 %
King (Forsyth)	5	591	745,670	591	100.00 %	0.08 %
King (Stokes)	5	6,606	745,670	6,606	100.00 %	0.89 %
Kings Mountain (Cleveland)	10	10,032	745,670	10,032	100.00 %	1.35 %
Kings Mountain (Gaston)	10	1,110	745,670	1,110	100.00 %	0.15 %
Kingstown	10	656	745,670	656	100.00 %	0.09 %
Kinston	3	19,900	745,671	19,900	100.00 %	2.67 %
Kittrell	1	132	745,670	132	100.00 %	0.02 %
Kitty Hawk	3	3,689	745,671	3,689	100.00 %	0.49 %
Knightdale	2	19,435	745,670	19,435	100.00 %	2.61 %
Kure Beach	7	2,191	745,671	2,191	100.00 %	0.29 %
La Grange	3	2,595	745,671	2,595	100.00 %	0.35 %
Lake Lure	11	1,365	745,671	1,365	100.00 %	0.18 %
Lake Park	9	3,269	745,670	3,269	100.00 %	0.44 %
Lake Santeetlah	11	38	745,671	38	100.00 %	0.01 %
Lake Waccamaw	7	1,296	745,671	1,296	100.00 %	0.17 %
Landis	8	3,690	745,671	3,690	100.00 %	0.49 %
Lansing	5	126	745,670	126	100.00 %	0.02 %
Lasker	1	64	745,670	64	100.00 %	0.01 %
Lattimore	10	406	745,670	406	100.00 %	0.05 %
Laurel Park	11	2,250	745,671	2,250	100.00 %	0.30 %
Laurinburg	14	14,978	745,671	14,978	100.00 %	2.01 %
Lawndale	10	570	745,670	570	100.00 %	0.08 %
Leggett	1	37	745,670	37	100.00 %	0.00 %
Leland	7	22,908	745,671	22,908	100.00 %	3.07 %
Lenoir	5	18,352	745,670	18,352	100.00 %	2.46 %
Lewiston Woodville	1	426	745,670	426	100.00 %	0.06 %
Lewisville	5	13,381	745,670	13,381	100.00 %	1.79 %
Lexington	8	19,632	745,671	19,632	100.00 %	2.63 %
Liberty	8	2,655	745,671	2,655	100.00 %	0.36 %
Lilesville	14	395	745,671	395	100.00 %	0.05 %
Lillington	13	4,735	745,671	4,735	100.00 %	0.63 %
Lincolnton	10	11,091	745,670	11,091	100.00 %	1.49 %
Linden	14	136	745,671	136	100.00 %	0.02 %
Littleton	1	559	745,670	559	100.00 %	0.07 %
Locust (Cabarrus)	9	541	745,670	541	100.00 %	0.07 %

District plan definition file: 'S738 First Edition.csv', modified 10/30/2021 10:24 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 10/30/2021

Municipality by County - District Report**District Plan: S738 First Edition**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Locust (Stanly)	9	3,996	745,670	3,996	100.00 %	0.54 %
Long View (Burke)	5	735	745,670	735	100.00 %	0.10 %
Long View (Catawba)	10	4,353	745,670	4,353	100.00 %	0.58 %
Louisburg	1	3,064	745,670	3,064	100.00 %	0.41 %
Love Valley	10	154	745,670	154	100.00 %	0.02 %
Lowell	10	3,654	745,670	3,654	100.00 %	0.49 %
Lucama	1	1,036	745,670	1,036	100.00 %	0.14 %
Lumber Bridge	14	82	745,671	82	100.00 %	0.01 %
Lumberton	14	19,025	745,671	19,025	100.00 %	2.55 %
Macclesfield	1	413	745,670	413	100.00 %	0.06 %
Macon	1	110	745,670	110	100.00 %	0.01 %
Madison	5	2,129	745,670	2,129	100.00 %	0.29 %
Maggie Valley	11	1,687	745,671	1,687	100.00 %	0.23 %
Magnolia	3	831	745,671	831	100.00 %	0.11 %
Maiden (Catawba)	10	3,736	745,670	3,736	100.00 %	0.50 %
Maiden (Lincoln)	10	0	745,670	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Manteo	3	1,600	745,671	1,600	100.00 %	0.21 %
Marietta	14	111	745,671	111	100.00 %	0.01 %
Marion	11	7,717	745,671	7,717	100.00 %	1.03 %
Mars Hill	11	2,007	745,671	2,007	100.00 %	0.27 %
Marshall	11	777	745,671	777	100.00 %	0.10 %
Marshville	9	2,522	745,670	2,522	100.00 %	0.34 %
Marvin	9	6,358	745,670	6,358	100.00 %	0.85 %
Matthews	9	29,435	745,670	29,435	100.00 %	3.95 %
Maxton (Robeson)	14	1,902	745,671	1,902	100.00 %	0.26 %
Maxton (Scotland)	14	208	745,671	208	100.00 %	0.03 %
Mayodan	5	2,418	745,670	2,418	100.00 %	0.32 %
Maysville	3	818	745,671	818	100.00 %	0.11 %
McAdenville	10	890	745,670	890	100.00 %	0.12 %
McDonald	14	94	745,671	94	100.00 %	0.01 %
McFarlan	14	94	745,671	94	100.00 %	0.01 %
Mebane (Alamance)	4	14,626	745,671	14,626	100.00 %	1.96 %
Mebane (Orange)	4	3,171	745,671	3,171	100.00 %	0.43 %
Mesic	3	144	745,671	144	100.00 %	0.02 %
Micro	7	458	745,671	458	100.00 %	0.06 %
Middleburg	1	101	745,670	101	100.00 %	0.01 %
Middlesex	1	912	745,670	912	100.00 %	0.12 %
Midland (Cabarrus)	9	4,684	745,670	4,684	100.00 %	0.63 %
Midland (Mecklenburg)	9	0	745,670	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Midway	8	4,742	745,671	4,742	100.00 %	0.64 %
Mills River	11	7,078	745,671	7,078	100.00 %	0.95 %

District plan definition file: 'S738 First Edition.csv', modified 10/30/2021 10:24 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 10/30/2021

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: S738 First Edition

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Milton	4	155	745,671	155	100.00 %	0.02 %
Mineral Springs	9	3,159	745,670	3,159	100.00 %	0.42 %
Minnesott Beach	3	530	745,671	530	100.00 %	0.07 %
Mint Hill (Mecklenburg)	9	26,444	745,670	26,444	100.00 %	3.55 %
Mint Hill (Union)	9	6	745,670	6	100.00 %	0.00 %
Misenheimer	9	650	745,670	650	100.00 %	0.09 %
Mocksville	8	5,900	745,671	5,900	100.00 %	0.79 %
Momeyer	1	277	745,670	277	100.00 %	0.04 %
Monroe	9	34,562	745,670	34,562	100.00 %	4.64 %
Montreat	11	901	745,671	901	100.00 %	0.12 %
Mooresboro	10	293	745,670	293	100.00 %	0.04 %
Mooresville	8	50,193	745,671	50,193	100.00 %	6.73 %
Morehead City	3	9,556	745,671	9,556	100.00 %	1.28 %
Morganton	5	17,474	745,670	16,963	97.08 %	2.27 %
	10	17,474	745,670	511	2.92 %	0.07 %
Morrisville (Durham)	4	207	745,671	207	100.00 %	0.03 %
Morrisville (Wake)	13	29,423	745,671	29,423	100.00 %	3.95 %
Morven	14	329	745,671	329	100.00 %	0.04 %
Mount Airy	5	10,676	745,670	10,676	100.00 %	1.43 %
Mount Gilead	14	1,171	745,671	1,171	100.00 %	0.16 %
Mount Holly	10	17,703	745,670	17,703	100.00 %	2.37 %
Mount Olive (Duplin)	3	5	745,671	5	100.00 %	0.00 %
Mount Olive (Wayne)	7	4,193	745,671	4,193	100.00 %	0.56 %
Mount Pleasant	8	1,671	745,671	1,666	99.70 %	0.22 %
	9	1,671	745,670	5	0.30 %	0.00 %
Murfreesboro	1	2,619	745,670	2,619	100.00 %	0.35 %
Murphy	11	1,608	745,671	1,608	100.00 %	0.22 %
Nags Head	3	3,168	745,671	3,168	100.00 %	0.42 %
Nashville	1	5,632	745,670	5,632	100.00 %	0.76 %
Navassa	7	1,367	745,671	1,367	100.00 %	0.18 %
New Bern	3	31,291	745,671	31,291	100.00 %	4.20 %
New London	9	607	745,670	607	100.00 %	0.08 %
Newland	5	715	745,670	715	100.00 %	0.10 %
Newport	3	4,364	745,671	4,364	100.00 %	0.59 %
Newton	10	13,148	745,670	13,148	100.00 %	1.76 %
Newton Grove	7	585	745,671	585	100.00 %	0.08 %
Norlina	1	920	745,670	920	100.00 %	0.12 %
Norman	14	100	745,671	100	100.00 %	0.01 %
North Topsail Beach	3	1,005	745,671	1,005	100.00 %	0.13 %
North Wilkesboro	5	4,382	745,670	4,382	100.00 %	0.59 %
Northwest	7	703	745,671	703	100.00 %	0.09 %

District plan definition file: 'S738 First Edition.csv', modified 10/30/2021 10:24 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 10/30/2021

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: S738 First Edition

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Norwood	9	2,367	745,670	2,367	100.00 %	0.32 %
Oak City	1	266	745,670	266	100.00 %	0.04 %
Oak Island	7	8,396	745,671	8,396	100.00 %	1.13 %
Oak Ridge	6	7,474	745,670	7,474	100.00 %	1.00 %
Oakboro	9	2,128	745,670	2,128	100.00 %	0.29 %
Ocean Isle Beach	7	867	745,671	867	100.00 %	0.12 %
Old Fort	11	811	745,671	811	100.00 %	0.11 %
Oriental	3	880	745,671	880	100.00 %	0.12 %
Orrum	14	59	745,671	59	100.00 %	0.01 %
Ossipee	4	536	745,671	536	100.00 %	0.07 %
Oxford	1	8,628	745,670	8,628	100.00 %	1.16 %
Pantego	3	164	745,671	164	100.00 %	0.02 %
Parkton	14	504	745,671	504	100.00 %	0.07 %
Parmelee	1	243	745,670	243	100.00 %	0.03 %
Patterson Springs	10	571	745,670	571	100.00 %	0.08 %
Peachland	14	390	745,671	390	100.00 %	0.05 %
Peletier	3	769	745,671	769	100.00 %	0.10 %
Pembroke	14	2,823	745,671	2,823	100.00 %	0.38 %
Pikeville	7	712	745,671	712	100.00 %	0.10 %
Pilot Mountain	5	1,440	745,670	1,440	100.00 %	0.19 %
Pine Knoll Shores	3	1,388	745,671	1,388	100.00 %	0.19 %
Pine Level	7	2,046	745,671	2,046	100.00 %	0.27 %
Pinebluff	14	1,473	745,671	1,473	100.00 %	0.20 %
Pinehurst	14	17,581	745,671	17,581	100.00 %	2.36 %
Pinetops	1	1,200	745,670	1,200	100.00 %	0.16 %
Pineville	12	10,602	745,671	10,602	100.00 %	1.42 %
Pink Hill	3	451	745,671	451	100.00 %	0.06 %
Pittsboro	13	4,537	745,671	4,537	100.00 %	0.61 %
Pleasant Garden	6	5,000	745,670	5,000	100.00 %	0.67 %
Plymouth	1	3,320	745,670	3,320	100.00 %	0.45 %
Polkton	14	2,250	745,671	2,250	100.00 %	0.30 %
Polkville	10	516	745,670	516	100.00 %	0.07 %
Pollocksville	3	268	745,671	268	100.00 %	0.04 %
Powellsville	1	189	745,670	189	100.00 %	0.03 %
Princeton	7	1,315	745,671	1,315	100.00 %	0.18 %
Princeville	1	1,254	745,670	1,254	100.00 %	0.17 %
Proctorville	14	121	745,671	121	100.00 %	0.02 %
Raeford	14	4,559	745,671	4,559	100.00 %	0.61 %
Raleigh (Durham)	4	1,559	745,671	1,559	100.00 %	0.21 %
Raleigh (Wake)	2	466,106	745,670	460,066	98.70 %	61.70 %
	13	466,106	745,671	6,040	1.30 %	0.81 %

District plan definition file: 'S738 First Edition.csv', modified 10/30/2021 10:24 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: S738 First Edition

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Ramseur	8	1,774	745,671	1,774	100.00 %	0.24 %
Randleman	8	4,595	745,671	4,595	100.00 %	0.62 %
Ranlo	10	4,511	745,670	4,511	100.00 %	0.60 %
Raynham	14	60	745,671	60	100.00 %	0.01 %
Red Cross	9	762	745,670	762	100.00 %	0.10 %
Red Oak	1	3,342	745,670	3,342	100.00 %	0.45 %
Red Springs (Hoke)	14	0	745,671	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Red Springs (Robeson)	14	3,087	745,671	3,087	100.00 %	0.41 %
Reidsville	4	14,583	745,671	14,583	100.00 %	1.96 %
Rennert	14	275	745,671	275	100.00 %	0.04 %
Rhodhiss (Burke)	5	639	745,670	639	100.00 %	0.09 %
Rhodhiss (Caldwell)	5	358	745,670	358	100.00 %	0.05 %
Rich Square	1	894	745,670	894	100.00 %	0.12 %
Richfield	9	582	745,670	582	100.00 %	0.08 %
Richlands	3	2,287	745,671	2,287	100.00 %	0.31 %
River Bend	3	2,902	745,671	2,902	100.00 %	0.39 %
Roanoke Rapids	1	15,229	745,670	15,229	100.00 %	2.04 %
Robbins	14	1,168	745,671	1,168	100.00 %	0.16 %
Robbinsville	11	597	745,671	597	100.00 %	0.08 %
Robersonville	1	1,269	745,670	1,269	100.00 %	0.17 %
Rockingham	14	9,243	745,671	9,243	100.00 %	1.24 %
Rockwell	8	2,302	745,671	2,302	100.00 %	0.31 %
Rocky Mount (Edgecombe)	1	15,414	745,670	15,414	100.00 %	2.07 %
Rocky Mount (Nash)	1	38,927	745,670	38,927	100.00 %	5.22 %
Rolesville	2	9,475	745,670	9,475	100.00 %	1.27 %
Ronda	5	438	745,670	438	100.00 %	0.06 %
Roper	1	485	745,670	485	100.00 %	0.07 %
Rose Hill	3	1,371	745,671	1,371	100.00 %	0.18 %
Roseboro	7	1,163	745,671	1,163	100.00 %	0.16 %
Rosman	11	701	745,671	701	100.00 %	0.09 %
Rowland	14	885	745,671	885	100.00 %	0.12 %
Roxboro	4	8,134	745,671	8,134	100.00 %	1.09 %
Roxobel	1	187	745,670	187	100.00 %	0.03 %
Rural Hall	5	3,351	745,670	3,351	100.00 %	0.45 %
Ruth	10	347	745,670	347	100.00 %	0.05 %
Rutherford College (Burke)	5	1,226	745,670	1,226	100.00 %	0.16 %
Rutherford College (Caldwell)	5	0	745,670	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Rutherfordton	10	3,640	745,670	3,640	100.00 %	0.49 %
Salemburg	7	457	745,671	457	100.00 %	0.06 %
Salisbury	8	35,540	745,671	35,540	100.00 %	4.77 %
Saluda (Henderson)	11	11	745,671	11	100.00 %	0.00 %

District plan definition file: 'S738 First Edition.csv', modified 10/30/2021 10:24 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 10/30/2021

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: S738 First Edition

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Saluda (Polk)	11	620	745,671	620	100.00 %	0.08 %
Sandy Creek	7	248	745,671	248	100.00 %	0.03 %
Sandyfield	7	430	745,671	430	100.00 %	0.06 %
Sanford	13	30,261	745,671	30,261	100.00 %	4.06 %
Saratoga	1	353	745,670	353	100.00 %	0.05 %
Sawmills	5	5,020	745,670	5,020	100.00 %	0.67 %
Scotland Neck	1	1,640	745,670	1,640	100.00 %	0.22 %
Seaboard	1	542	745,670	542	100.00 %	0.07 %
Seagrove	8	235	745,671	235	100.00 %	0.03 %
Sedalia	6	676	745,670	676	100.00 %	0.09 %
Selma	7	6,317	745,671	6,317	100.00 %	0.85 %
Seven Devils (Avery)	5	38	745,670	38	100.00 %	0.01 %
Seven Devils (Watauga)	5	275	745,670	275	100.00 %	0.04 %
Seven Springs	7	55	745,671	55	100.00 %	0.01 %
Severn	1	191	745,670	191	100.00 %	0.03 %
Shallotte	7	4,185	745,671	4,185	100.00 %	0.56 %
Sharpsburg (Edgecombe)	1	215	745,670	215	100.00 %	0.03 %
Sharpsburg (Nash)	1	1,061	745,670	1,061	100.00 %	0.14 %
Sharpsburg (Wilson)	1	421	745,670	421	100.00 %	0.06 %
Shelby	10	21,918	745,670	21,918	100.00 %	2.94 %
Siler City	13	7,702	745,671	7,702	100.00 %	1.03 %
Simpson	3	390	745,671	390	100.00 %	0.05 %
Sims	1	275	745,670	275	100.00 %	0.04 %
Smithfield	7	11,292	745,671	11,292	100.00 %	1.51 %
Snow Hill	1	1,481	745,670	1,481	100.00 %	0.20 %
Southern Pines	14	15,545	745,671	15,545	100.00 %	2.08 %
Southern Shores	3	3,090	745,671	3,090	100.00 %	0.41 %
Southport	7	3,971	745,671	3,971	100.00 %	0.53 %
Sparta	5	1,834	745,670	1,834	100.00 %	0.25 %
Speed	1	63	745,670	63	100.00 %	0.01 %
Spencer	8	3,308	745,671	3,308	100.00 %	0.44 %
Spencer Mountain	10	0	745,670	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Spindale	10	4,225	745,670	4,225	100.00 %	0.57 %
Spring Hope	1	1,309	745,670	1,309	100.00 %	0.18 %
Spring Lake	14	11,660	745,671	11,660	100.00 %	1.56 %
Spruce Pine	11	2,194	745,671	2,194	100.00 %	0.29 %
St. Helena	7	417	745,671	417	100.00 %	0.06 %
St. James	7	6,529	745,671	6,529	100.00 %	0.88 %
St. Pauls	14	2,045	745,671	2,045	100.00 %	0.27 %
Staley	8	397	745,671	397	100.00 %	0.05 %
Stallings (Mecklenburg)	9	384	745,670	384	100.00 %	0.05 %

District plan definition file: 'S738 First Edition.csv', modified 10/30/2021 10:24 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Municipality by County - District Report**District Plan: S738 First Edition**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Stallings (Union)	9	15,728	745,670	15,728	100.00 %	2.11 %
Stanfield	9	1,585	745,670	1,585	100.00 %	0.21 %
Stanley	10	3,963	745,670	3,963	100.00 %	0.53 %
Stantonsburg	1	762	745,670	762	100.00 %	0.10 %
Star	14	806	745,671	806	100.00 %	0.11 %
Statesville	10	28,419	745,670	28,419	100.00 %	3.81 %
Stedman	14	1,277	745,671	1,277	100.00 %	0.17 %
Stem	1	960	745,670	960	100.00 %	0.13 %
Stokesdale	6	5,924	745,670	5,924	100.00 %	0.79 %
Stoneville	5	1,308	745,670	1,308	100.00 %	0.18 %
Stonewall	3	214	745,671	214	100.00 %	0.03 %
Stovall	1	324	745,670	324	100.00 %	0.04 %
Sugar Mountain	5	371	745,670	371	100.00 %	0.05 %
Summerfield	6	10,951	745,670	10,951	100.00 %	1.47 %
Sunset Beach	7	4,175	745,671	4,175	100.00 %	0.56 %
Surf City (Onslow)	3	334	745,671	334	100.00 %	0.04 %
Surf City (Pender)	3	3,533	745,671	3,533	100.00 %	0.47 %
Swansboro	3	3,744	745,671	3,744	100.00 %	0.50 %
Sweepsonville	4	2,445	745,671	2,445	100.00 %	0.33 %
Sylva	11	2,578	745,671	2,578	100.00 %	0.35 %
Tabor City	7	3,781	745,671	3,781	100.00 %	0.51 %
Tar Heel	14	90	745,671	90	100.00 %	0.01 %
Tarboro	1	10,721	745,670	10,721	100.00 %	1.44 %
Taylorsville	5	2,320	745,670	2,320	100.00 %	0.31 %
Taylortown	14	634	745,671	634	100.00 %	0.09 %
Teachey	3	448	745,671	448	100.00 %	0.06 %
Thomasville (Davidson)	8	26,662	745,671	26,662	100.00 %	3.58 %
Thomasville (Randolph)	8	521	745,671	521	100.00 %	0.07 %
Tobaccoville (Forsyth)	5	2,578	745,670	2,578	100.00 %	0.35 %
Tobaccoville (Stokes)	5	0	745,670	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Topsail Beach	3	461	745,671	461	100.00 %	0.06 %
Trent Woods	3	4,074	745,671	4,074	100.00 %	0.55 %
Trenton	3	238	745,671	238	100.00 %	0.03 %
Trinity	8	7,006	745,671	7,006	100.00 %	0.94 %
Troutman	8	3,698	745,671	807	21.82 %	0.11 %
	10	3,698	745,670	2,891	78.18 %	0.39 %
Troy	14	2,850	745,671	2,850	100.00 %	0.38 %
Tryon	11	1,562	745,671	1,562	100.00 %	0.21 %
Turkey	7	213	745,671	213	100.00 %	0.03 %
Unionville	9	6,643	745,670	6,643	100.00 %	0.89 %
Valdese	5	4,689	745,670	4,689	100.00 %	0.63 %

District plan definition file: 'S738 First Edition.csv', modified 10/30/2021 10:24 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 10/30/2021

Municipality by County - District Report**District Plan: S738 First Edition**

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Vanceboro	3	869	745,671	869	100.00 %	0.12 %
Vandemere	3	246	745,671	246	100.00 %	0.03 %
Varnantown	7	525	745,671	525	100.00 %	0.07 %
Vass	14	952	745,671	952	100.00 %	0.13 %
Waco	10	310	745,670	310	100.00 %	0.04 %
Wade	14	638	745,671	638	100.00 %	0.09 %
Wadesboro	14	5,008	745,671	5,008	100.00 %	0.67 %
Wagram	14	615	745,671	615	100.00 %	0.08 %
Wake Forest (Franklin)	1	1,504	745,670	1,504	100.00 %	0.20 %
Wake Forest (Wake)	2	46,097	745,670	46,097	100.00 %	6.18 %
Walkertown	6	5,692	745,670	5,692	100.00 %	0.76 %
Wallace (Duplin)	3	3,413	745,671	3,413	100.00 %	0.46 %
Wallace (Pender)	7	0	745,671	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Wallburg	8	3,051	745,671	3,051	100.00 %	0.41 %
Walnut Cove	5	1,586	745,670	1,586	100.00 %	0.21 %
Walnut Creek	7	1,084	745,671	1,084	100.00 %	0.15 %
Walstonburg	1	193	745,670	193	100.00 %	0.03 %
Warrenton	1	851	745,670	851	100.00 %	0.11 %
Warsaw	3	2,733	745,671	2,733	100.00 %	0.37 %
Washington	3	9,875	745,671	9,875	100.00 %	1.32 %
Washington Park	3	392	745,671	392	100.00 %	0.05 %
Watha	7	181	745,671	181	100.00 %	0.02 %
Waxhaw	9	20,534	745,670	20,534	100.00 %	2.75 %
Waynesville	11	10,140	745,671	10,140	100.00 %	1.36 %
Weaverville	11	4,567	745,671	4,567	100.00 %	0.61 %
Webster	11	372	745,671	372	100.00 %	0.05 %
Weddington (Mecklenburg)	9	5	745,670	5	100.00 %	0.00 %
Weddington (Union)	9	13,176	745,670	13,176	100.00 %	1.77 %
Weldon	1	1,444	745,670	1,444	100.00 %	0.19 %
Wendell	2	9,793	745,670	9,793	100.00 %	1.31 %
Wentworth	4	2,662	745,671	921	34.60 %	0.12 %
	5	2,662	745,670	1,741	65.40 %	0.23 %
Wesley Chapel	9	8,681	745,670	8,681	100.00 %	1.16 %
West Jefferson	5	1,279	745,670	1,279	100.00 %	0.17 %
Whispering Pines	14	4,987	745,671	4,987	100.00 %	0.67 %
Whitakers (Edgecombe)	1	290	745,670	290	100.00 %	0.04 %
Whitakers (Nash)	1	337	745,670	337	100.00 %	0.05 %
White Lake	7	843	745,671	843	100.00 %	0.11 %
Whiteville	7	4,766	745,671	4,766	100.00 %	0.64 %
Whitsett	6	584	745,670	584	100.00 %	0.08 %
Wilkesboro	5	3,687	745,670	3,687	100.00 %	0.49 %

District plan definition file: 'S738 First Edition.csv', modified 10/30/2021 10:24 AM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 10/30/2021

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: S738 First Edition

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Williamston	1	5,248	745,670	5,248	100.00 %	0.70 %
Wilmington	7	115,451	745,671	115,451	100.00 %	15.48 %
Wilson	1	47,851	745,670	47,851	100.00 %	6.42 %
Wilson's Mills	7	2,534	745,671	2,534	100.00 %	0.34 %
Windsor	1	3,582	745,670	3,582	100.00 %	0.48 %
Winfall	1	555	745,670	555	100.00 %	0.07 %
Wingate	9	4,055	745,670	4,055	100.00 %	0.54 %
Winston-Salem	5	249,545	745,670	111,539	44.70 %	14.96 %
	6	249,545	745,670	138,006	55.30 %	18.51 %
Winterville	3	10,462	745,671	10,462	100.00 %	1.40 %
Winton	1	629	745,670	629	100.00 %	0.08 %
Woodfin	11	7,936	745,671	7,936	100.00 %	1.06 %
Woodland	1	557	745,670	557	100.00 %	0.07 %
Wrightsville Beach	7	2,473	745,671	2,473	100.00 %	0.33 %
Yadkinville	5	2,995	745,670	2,995	100.00 %	0.40 %
Yanceyville	4	1,937	745,671	1,937	100.00 %	0.26 %
Youngsville	1	2,016	745,670	2,016	100.00 %	0.27 %
Zebulon (Johnston)	7	0	745,671	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Zebulon (Wake)	2	6,903	745,670	6,903	100.00 %	0.93 %
Total:				6,017,605		

Number of municipalities split within counties: 20

Display: all municipalities

District - Municipality by County Report**District Plan: S738 First Edition**

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
1	Ahoskie	745,670	4,891	4,891	0.66 %	100.00 %
	Askewville	745,670	184	184	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Aulander	745,670	763	763	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Bailey	745,670	568	568	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Bear Grass	745,670	89	89	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Bethel	745,670	1,373	1,373	0.18 %	100.00 %
	Black Creek	745,670	692	692	0.09 %	100.00 %
	Bunn	745,670	327	327	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Butner	745,670	8,397	8,397	1.13 %	100.00 %
	Castalia	745,670	264	264	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Cofield	745,670	267	267	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Colerain	745,670	217	217	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Como	745,670	67	67	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Conetoe	745,670	198	198	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Conway	745,670	752	752	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Creedmoor	745,670	4,866	4,866	0.65 %	100.00 %
	Creswell	745,670	207	207	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Dortches	745,670	1,082	1,082	0.15 %	100.00 %
	Edenton	745,670	4,460	4,460	0.60 %	100.00 %
	Elizabeth City (Pasquotank)	745,670	18,593	18,593	2.49 %	100.00 %
	Elm City (Nash)	745,670	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Elm City (Wilson)	745,670	1,218	1,218	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Enfield	745,670	1,865	1,865	0.25 %	100.00 %
	Eureka	745,670	214	175	0.02 %	81.78 %
	Everetts	745,670	150	150	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Falkland	745,670	47	47	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Farmville	745,670	4,461	4,461	0.60 %	100.00 %
	Fountain	745,670	385	385	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Franklinton	745,670	2,456	2,456	0.33 %	100.00 %
	Garysburg	745,670	904	904	0.12 %	100.00 %
	Gaston	745,670	1,008	1,008	0.14 %	100.00 %
	Gatesville	745,670	267	267	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Goldsboro	745,670	33,657	6,282	0.84 %	18.66 %
	Greenville	745,670	87,521	45,905	6.16 %	52.45 %
	Halifax	745,670	170	170	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Hamilton	745,670	306	306	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Harrellsville	745,670	85	85	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Hassell	745,670	49	49	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Henderson	745,670	15,060	15,060	2.02 %	100.00 %
	Hertford	745,670	1,934	1,934	0.26 %	100.00 %
	Hobgood	745,670	268	268	0.04 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'S738 First Edition.csv', modified 10/30/2021 10:24 AM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 10/30/2021

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 1 of 16

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: S738 First Edition

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
1	Hookerton	745,670	413	413	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Jackson	745,670	430	430	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Jamesville	745,670	424	424	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Kelford	745,670	203	203	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Kenly (Wilson)	745,670	198	198	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Kittrell	745,670	132	132	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Lasker	745,670	64	64	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Leggett	745,670	37	37	0.00 %	100.00 %
	Lewiston Woodville	745,670	426	426	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Littleton	745,670	559	559	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Louisburg	745,670	3,064	3,064	0.41 %	100.00 %
	Lucama	745,670	1,036	1,036	0.14 %	100.00 %
	Macclesfield	745,670	413	413	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Macon	745,670	110	110	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Middleburg	745,670	101	101	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Middlesex	745,670	912	912	0.12 %	100.00 %
	Momeyer	745,670	277	277	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Murfreesboro	745,670	2,619	2,619	0.35 %	100.00 %
	Nashville	745,670	5,632	5,632	0.76 %	100.00 %
	Norlina	745,670	920	920	0.12 %	100.00 %
	Oak City	745,670	266	266	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Oxford	745,670	8,628	8,628	1.16 %	100.00 %
	Parmelee	745,670	243	243	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Pinetops	745,670	1,200	1,200	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Plymouth	745,670	3,320	3,320	0.45 %	100.00 %
	Powellsville	745,670	189	189	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Princeville	745,670	1,254	1,254	0.17 %	100.00 %
	Red Oak	745,670	3,342	3,342	0.45 %	100.00 %
	Rich Square	745,670	894	894	0.12 %	100.00 %
	Roanoke Rapids	745,670	15,229	15,229	2.04 %	100.00 %
	Robersonville	745,670	1,269	1,269	0.17 %	100.00 %
	Rocky Mount (Edgecombe)	745,670	15,414	15,414	2.07 %	100.00 %
	Rocky Mount (Nash)	745,670	38,927	38,927	5.22 %	100.00 %
	Roper	745,670	485	485	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Roxobel	745,670	187	187	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Saratoga	745,670	353	353	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Scotland Neck	745,670	1,640	1,640	0.22 %	100.00 %
	Seaboard	745,670	542	542	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Severn	745,670	191	191	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Sharpsburg (Edgecombe)	745,670	215	215	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Sharpsburg (Nash)	745,670	1,061	1,061	0.14 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'S738 First Edition.csv', modified 10/30/2021 10:24 AM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 10/30/2021

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 2 of 16

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: S738 First Edition

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
1	Sharpsburg (Wilson)	745,670	421	421	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Sims	745,670	275	275	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Snow Hill	745,670	1,481	1,481	0.20 %	100.00 %
	Speed	745,670	63	63	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Spring Hope	745,670	1,309	1,309	0.18 %	100.00 %
	Stantonsburg	745,670	762	762	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Stem	745,670	960	960	0.13 %	100.00 %
	Stovall	745,670	324	324	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Tarboro	745,670	10,721	10,721	1.44 %	100.00 %
	Wake Forest (Franklin)	745,670	1,504	1,504	0.20 %	100.00 %
	Walstonburg	745,670	193	193	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Warrenton	745,670	851	851	0.11 %	100.00 %
	Weldon	745,670	1,444	1,444	0.19 %	100.00 %
	Whitakers (Edgecombe)	745,670	290	290	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Whitakers (Nash)	745,670	337	337	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Williamston	745,670	5,248	5,248	0.70 %	100.00 %
	Wilson	745,670	47,851	47,851	6.42 %	100.00 %
	Windsor	745,670	3,582	3,582	0.48 %	100.00 %
	Winfall	745,670	555	555	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Winton	745,670	629	629	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Woodland	745,670	557	557	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Youngsville	745,670	2,016	2,016	0.27 %	100.00 %
2	Cary (Wake)	745,670	171,012	6,689	0.90 %	3.91 %
	Clayton (Wake)	745,670	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Durham (Wake)	745,670	269	269	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Fuquay-Varina (Wake)	745,670	34,152	1,373	0.18 %	4.02 %
	Garner	745,670	31,159	31,159	4.18 %	100.00 %
	Holly Springs	745,670	41,239	1,675	0.22 %	4.06 %
	Knightdale	745,670	19,435	19,435	2.61 %	100.00 %
	Raleigh (Wake)	745,670	466,106	460,066	61.70 %	98.70 %
	Rolesville	745,670	9,475	9,475	1.27 %	100.00 %
	Wake Forest (Wake)	745,670	46,097	46,097	6.18 %	100.00 %
	Wendell	745,670	9,793	9,793	1.31 %	100.00 %
	Zebulon (Wake)	745,670	6,903	6,903	0.93 %	100.00 %
3	Alliance	745,671	733	733	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Arapahoe	745,671	416	416	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Atlantic Beach	745,671	1,364	1,364	0.18 %	100.00 %
	Aurora	745,671	455	455	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Ayden	745,671	4,977	4,977	0.67 %	100.00 %
	Bath	745,671	245	245	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Bayboro	745,671	1,161	1,161	0.16 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'S738 First Edition.csv', modified 10/30/2021 10:24 AM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 10/30/2021

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 3 of 16

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: S738 First Edition

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
3	Beaufort	745,671	4,464	4,464	0.60 %	100.00 %
	Belhaven	745,671	1,410	1,410	0.19 %	100.00 %
	Beulaville	745,671	1,116	1,116	0.15 %	100.00 %
	Bogue	745,671	695	695	0.09 %	100.00 %
	Bridgeton	745,671	349	349	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Calypso	745,671	327	327	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Cape Carteret	745,671	2,224	2,224	0.30 %	100.00 %
	Cedar Point	745,671	1,764	1,764	0.24 %	100.00 %
	Chocowinity	745,671	722	722	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Columbia	745,671	610	610	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Cove City	745,671	378	378	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Dover	745,671	349	349	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Duck	745,671	742	742	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Elizabeth City (Camden)	745,671	38	38	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Emerald Isle	745,671	3,847	3,847	0.52 %	100.00 %
	Faison (Duplin)	745,671	784	784	0.11 %	100.00 %
	Grantsboro	745,671	692	692	0.09 %	100.00 %
	Greenevers	745,671	567	567	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Greenville	745,671	87,521	41,616	5.58 %	47.55 %
	Grifton (Lenoir)	745,671	147	147	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Grifton (Pitt)	745,671	2,301	2,301	0.31 %	100.00 %
	Grimesland	745,671	386	386	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Harrells (Duplin)	745,671	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Havelock	745,671	16,621	16,621	2.23 %	100.00 %
	Holly Ridge	745,671	4,171	4,171	0.56 %	100.00 %
	Indian Beach	745,671	223	223	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Jacksonville	745,671	72,723	72,723	9.75 %	100.00 %
	Kenansville	745,671	770	770	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Kill Devil Hills	745,671	7,656	7,656	1.03 %	100.00 %
	Kinston	745,671	19,900	19,900	2.67 %	100.00 %
	Kitty Hawk	745,671	3,689	3,689	0.49 %	100.00 %
	La Grange	745,671	2,595	2,595	0.35 %	100.00 %
	Magnolia	745,671	831	831	0.11 %	100.00 %
	Manteo	745,671	1,600	1,600	0.21 %	100.00 %
	Maysville	745,671	818	818	0.11 %	100.00 %
	Mesic	745,671	144	144	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Minnesott Beach	745,671	530	530	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Morehead City	745,671	9,556	9,556	1.28 %	100.00 %
	Mount Olive (Duplin)	745,671	5	5	0.00 %	100.00 %
	Nags Head	745,671	3,168	3,168	0.42 %	100.00 %
	New Bern	745,671	31,291	31,291	4.20 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'S738 First Edition.csv', modified 10/30/2021 10:24 AM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 10/30/2021

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 4 of 16

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report**District Plan: S738 First Edition**

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
3	Newport	745,671	4,364	4,364	0.59 %	100.00 %
	North Topsail Beach	745,671	1,005	1,005	0.13 %	100.00 %
	Oriental	745,671	880	880	0.12 %	100.00 %
	Pantego	745,671	164	164	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Peletier	745,671	769	769	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Pine Knoll Shores	745,671	1,388	1,388	0.19 %	100.00 %
	Pink Hill	745,671	451	451	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Pollocksville	745,671	268	268	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Richlands	745,671	2,287	2,287	0.31 %	100.00 %
	River Bend	745,671	2,902	2,902	0.39 %	100.00 %
	Rose Hill	745,671	1,371	1,371	0.18 %	100.00 %
	Simpson	745,671	390	390	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Southern Shores	745,671	3,090	3,090	0.41 %	100.00 %
	Stonewall	745,671	214	214	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Surf City (Onslow)	745,671	334	334	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Surf City (Pender)	745,671	3,533	3,533	0.47 %	100.00 %
	Swansboro	745,671	3,744	3,744	0.50 %	100.00 %
	Teachey	745,671	448	448	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Topsail Beach	745,671	461	461	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Trent Woods	745,671	4,074	4,074	0.55 %	100.00 %
	Trenton	745,671	238	238	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Vanceboro	745,671	869	869	0.12 %	100.00 %
	Vandemere	745,671	246	246	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Wallace (Duplin)	745,671	3,413	3,413	0.46 %	100.00 %
	Warsaw	745,671	2,733	2,733	0.37 %	100.00 %
	Washington	745,671	9,875	9,875	1.32 %	100.00 %
	Washington Park	745,671	392	392	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Winterville	745,671	10,462	10,462	1.40 %	100.00 %
4	Alamance	745,671	988	988	0.13 %	100.00 %
	Burlington (Alamance)	745,671	55,481	55,481	7.44 %	100.00 %
	Carrboro	745,671	21,295	21,295	2.86 %	100.00 %
	Chapel Hill (Durham)	745,671	2,906	2,906	0.39 %	100.00 %
	Chapel Hill (Orange)	745,671	59,054	59,054	7.92 %	100.00 %
	Durham (Durham)	745,671	283,093	281,539	37.76 %	99.45 %
	Durham (Orange)	745,671	144	144	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Eden	745,671	15,421	3,158	0.42 %	20.48 %
	Elon	745,671	11,336	11,336	1.52 %	100.00 %
	Gibsonville (Alamance)	745,671	4,278	4,278	0.57 %	100.00 %
	Graham	745,671	17,157	17,157	2.30 %	100.00 %
	Green Level	745,671	3,152	3,152	0.42 %	100.00 %
	Haw River	745,671	2,252	2,252	0.30 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'S738 First Edition.csv', modified 10/30/2021 10:24 AM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 10/30/2021

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 5 of 16

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: S738 First Edition

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
4	Hillsborough	745,671	9,660	9,660	1.30 %	100.00 %
	Mebane (Alamance)	745,671	14,626	14,626	1.96 %	100.00 %
	Mebane (Orange)	745,671	3,171	3,171	0.43 %	100.00 %
	Milton	745,671	155	155	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Morrisville (Durham)	745,671	207	207	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Ossipee	745,671	536	536	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Raleigh (Durham)	745,671	1,559	1,559	0.21 %	100.00 %
	Reidsville	745,671	14,583	14,583	1.96 %	100.00 %
	Roxboro	745,671	8,134	8,134	1.09 %	100.00 %
	Swepsonville	745,671	2,445	2,445	0.33 %	100.00 %
	Wentworth	745,671	2,662	921	0.12 %	34.60 %
	Yanceyville	745,671	1,937	1,937	0.26 %	100.00 %
5	Banner Elk	745,670	1,049	1,049	0.14 %	100.00 %
	Beech Mountain (Avery)	745,670	62	62	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Beech Mountain (Watauga)	745,670	613	613	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Bethania	745,670	344	344	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Blowing Rock (Caldwell)	745,670	91	91	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Blowing Rock (Watauga)	745,670	1,285	1,285	0.17 %	100.00 %
	Boone	745,670	19,092	19,092	2.56 %	100.00 %
	Boonville	745,670	1,185	1,185	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Cajah's Mountain	745,670	2,722	2,722	0.37 %	100.00 %
	Cedar Rock	745,670	301	301	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Clemmons	745,670	21,163	21,163	2.84 %	100.00 %
	Connelly Springs	745,670	1,529	1,529	0.21 %	100.00 %
	Crossnore	745,670	143	143	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Danbury	745,670	189	189	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Dobson	745,670	1,462	1,462	0.20 %	100.00 %
	Drexel	745,670	1,760	1,760	0.24 %	100.00 %
	East Bend	745,670	634	634	0.09 %	100.00 %
	Eden	745,670	15,421	12,263	1.64 %	79.52 %
	Elk Park	745,670	542	542	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Elkin (Surry)	745,670	4,049	4,049	0.54 %	100.00 %
	Elkin (Wilkes)	745,670	73	73	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Gamewell	745,670	3,702	3,702	0.50 %	100.00 %
	Glen Alpine	745,670	1,529	1,152	0.15 %	75.34 %
	Grandfather Village	745,670	95	95	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Granite Falls	745,670	4,965	4,965	0.67 %	100.00 %
	Hickory (Burke)	745,670	79	79	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Hickory (Caldwell)	745,670	32	32	0.00 %	100.00 %
	Hildebran	745,670	1,679	1,679	0.23 %	100.00 %
	Hudson	745,670	3,780	3,780	0.51 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'S738 First Edition.csv', modified 10/30/2021 10:24 AM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 10/30/2021

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 6 of 16

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: S738 First Edition

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
5	Jefferson	745,670	1,622	1,622	0.22 %	100.00 %
	Jonesville	745,670	2,308	2,308	0.31 %	100.00 %
	King (Forsyth)	745,670	591	591	0.08 %	100.00 %
	King (Stokes)	745,670	6,606	6,606	0.89 %	100.00 %
	Lansing	745,670	126	126	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Lenoir	745,670	18,352	18,352	2.46 %	100.00 %
	Lewisville	745,670	13,381	13,381	1.79 %	100.00 %
	Long View (Burke)	745,670	735	735	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Madison	745,670	2,129	2,129	0.29 %	100.00 %
	Mayodan	745,670	2,418	2,418	0.32 %	100.00 %
	Morganton	745,670	17,474	16,963	2.27 %	97.08 %
	Mount Airy	745,670	10,676	10,676	1.43 %	100.00 %
	Newland	745,670	715	715	0.10 %	100.00 %
	North Wilkesboro	745,670	4,382	4,382	0.59 %	100.00 %
	Pilot Mountain	745,670	1,440	1,440	0.19 %	100.00 %
	Rhodhiss (Burke)	745,670	639	639	0.09 %	100.00 %
	Rhodhiss (Caldwell)	745,670	358	358	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Ronda	745,670	438	438	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Rural Hall	745,670	3,351	3,351	0.45 %	100.00 %
	Rutherford College (Burke)	745,670	1,226	1,226	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Rutherford College (Caldwell)	745,670	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Sawmills	745,670	5,020	5,020	0.67 %	100.00 %
	Seven Devils (Avery)	745,670	38	38	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Seven Devils (Watauga)	745,670	275	275	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Sparta	745,670	1,834	1,834	0.25 %	100.00 %
	Stoneville	745,670	1,308	1,308	0.18 %	100.00 %
	Sugar Mountain	745,670	371	371	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Taylorsville	745,670	2,320	2,320	0.31 %	100.00 %
	Tobaccoville (Forsyth)	745,670	2,578	2,578	0.35 %	100.00 %
	Tobaccoville (Stokes)	745,670	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Valdese	745,670	4,689	4,689	0.63 %	100.00 %
	Walnut Cove	745,670	1,586	1,586	0.21 %	100.00 %
	Wentworth	745,670	2,662	1,741	0.23 %	65.40 %
	West Jefferson	745,670	1,279	1,279	0.17 %	100.00 %
	Wilkesboro	745,670	3,687	3,687	0.49 %	100.00 %
	Winston-Salem	745,670	249,545	111,539	14.96 %	44.70 %
	Yadkinville	745,670	2,995	2,995	0.40 %	100.00 %
6	Archdale (Guilford)	745,670	380	380	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Burlington (Guilford)	745,670	1,822	1,822	0.24 %	100.00 %
	Gibsonville (Guilford)	745,670	4,642	4,642	0.62 %	100.00 %
	Greensboro	745,670	299,035	299,035	40.10 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'S738 First Edition.csv', modified 10/30/2021 10:24 AM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 10/30/2021

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 7 of 16

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: S738 First Edition

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
6	High Point (Forsyth)	745,670	84	84	0.01 %	100.00 %
	High Point (Guilford)	745,670	107,321	107,321	14.39 %	100.00 %
	Jamestown	745,670	3,668	3,668	0.49 %	100.00 %
	Kernersville (Forsyth)	745,670	25,947	25,947	3.48 %	100.00 %
	Kernersville (Guilford)	745,670	502	502	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Oak Ridge	745,670	7,474	7,474	1.00 %	100.00 %
	Pleasant Garden	745,670	5,000	5,000	0.67 %	100.00 %
	Sedalia	745,670	676	676	0.09 %	100.00 %
	Stokesdale	745,670	5,924	5,924	0.79 %	100.00 %
	Summerfield	745,670	10,951	10,951	1.47 %	100.00 %
	Walkertown	745,670	5,692	5,692	0.76 %	100.00 %
	Whitsett	745,670	584	584	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Winston-Salem	745,670	249,545	138,006	18.51 %	55.30 %
7	Archer Lodge	745,671	4,797	4,797	0.64 %	100.00 %
	Atkinson	745,671	296	296	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Autryville	745,671	167	167	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Bald Head Island	745,671	268	268	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Belville	745,671	2,406	2,406	0.32 %	100.00 %
	Benson (Johnston)	745,671	3,967	3,967	0.53 %	100.00 %
	Boardman	745,671	166	166	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Boiling Spring Lakes	745,671	5,943	5,943	0.80 %	100.00 %
	Bolivia	745,671	149	149	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Bolton	745,671	519	519	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Brunswick	745,671	973	973	0.13 %	100.00 %
	Burgaw	745,671	3,088	3,088	0.41 %	100.00 %
	Calabash	745,671	2,011	2,011	0.27 %	100.00 %
	Carolina Beach	745,671	6,564	6,564	0.88 %	100.00 %
	Carolina Shores	745,671	4,588	4,588	0.62 %	100.00 %
	Caswell Beach	745,671	395	395	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Cerro Gordo	745,671	131	131	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Chadbourn	745,671	1,574	1,574	0.21 %	100.00 %
	Clarkton	745,671	614	614	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Clayton (Johnston)	745,671	26,307	4,268	0.57 %	16.22 %
	Clinton	745,671	8,383	8,383	1.12 %	100.00 %
	East Arcadia	745,671	418	418	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Elizabethtown	745,671	3,296	1,481	0.20 %	44.93 %
	Eureka	745,671	214	39	0.01 %	18.22 %
	Fair Bluff	745,671	709	709	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Faison (Sampson)	745,671	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Falcon (Sampson)	745,671	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Four Oaks	745,671	2,158	2,158	0.29 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'S738 First Edition.csv', modified 10/30/2021 10:24 AM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 10/30/2021

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 8 of 16

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: S738 First Edition

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
7	Fremont	745,671	1,196	1,196	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Garland	745,671	595	595	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Goldsboro	745,671	33,657	27,375	3.67 %	81.34 %
	Harrells (Sampson)	745,671	160	160	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Holden Beach	745,671	921	921	0.12 %	100.00 %
	Kenly (Johnston)	745,671	1,293	1,293	0.17 %	100.00 %
	Kure Beach	745,671	2,191	2,191	0.29 %	100.00 %
	Lake Waccamaw	745,671	1,296	1,296	0.17 %	100.00 %
	Leland	745,671	22,908	22,908	3.07 %	100.00 %
	Micro	745,671	458	458	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Mount Olive (Wayne)	745,671	4,193	4,193	0.56 %	100.00 %
	Navassa	745,671	1,367	1,367	0.18 %	100.00 %
	Newton Grove	745,671	585	585	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Northwest	745,671	703	703	0.09 %	100.00 %
	Oak Island	745,671	8,396	8,396	1.13 %	100.00 %
	Ocean Isle Beach	745,671	867	867	0.12 %	100.00 %
	Pikeville	745,671	712	712	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Pine Level	745,671	2,046	2,046	0.27 %	100.00 %
	Princeton	745,671	1,315	1,315	0.18 %	100.00 %
	Roseboro	745,671	1,163	1,163	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Salemburg	745,671	457	457	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Sandy Creek	745,671	248	248	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Sandyfield	745,671	430	430	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Selma	745,671	6,317	6,317	0.85 %	100.00 %
	Seven Springs	745,671	55	55	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Shallotte	745,671	4,185	4,185	0.56 %	100.00 %
	Smithfield	745,671	11,292	11,292	1.51 %	100.00 %
	Southport	745,671	3,971	3,971	0.53 %	100.00 %
	St. Helena	745,671	417	417	0.06 %	100.00 %
	St. James	745,671	6,529	6,529	0.88 %	100.00 %
	Sunset Beach	745,671	4,175	4,175	0.56 %	100.00 %
	Tabor City	745,671	3,781	3,781	0.51 %	100.00 %
	Turkey	745,671	213	213	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Varnamtown	745,671	525	525	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Wallace (Pender)	745,671	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Walnut Creek	745,671	1,084	1,084	0.15 %	100.00 %
	Watha	745,671	181	181	0.02 %	100.00 %
	White Lake	745,671	843	843	0.11 %	100.00 %
	Whiteville	745,671	4,766	4,766	0.64 %	100.00 %
	Wilmington	745,671	115,451	115,451	15.48 %	100.00 %
	Wilson's Mills	745,671	2,534	2,534	0.34 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'S738 First Edition.csv', modified 10/30/2021 10:24 AM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 10/30/2021

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 9 of 16

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: S738 First Edition

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
7	Wrightsville Beach	745,671	2,473	2,473	0.33 %	100.00 %
	Zebulon (Johnston)	745,671	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
8	Archdale (Randolph)	745,671	11,527	11,527	1.55 %	100.00 %
	Asheboro	745,671	27,156	27,156	3.64 %	100.00 %
	Bermuda Run	745,671	3,120	3,120	0.42 %	100.00 %
	China Grove	745,671	4,434	4,434	0.59 %	100.00 %
	Cleveland	745,671	846	846	0.11 %	100.00 %
	Concord	745,671	105,240	80,520	10.80 %	76.51 %
	Cooleemee	745,671	940	940	0.13 %	100.00 %
	Davidson (Iredell)	745,671	378	378	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Denton	745,671	1,494	1,494	0.20 %	100.00 %
	East Spencer	745,671	1,567	1,567	0.21 %	100.00 %
	Faith	745,671	819	819	0.11 %	100.00 %
	Franklinville	745,671	1,197	1,197	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Granite Quarry	745,671	2,984	2,984	0.40 %	100.00 %
	High Point (Davidson)	745,671	6,646	6,646	0.89 %	100.00 %
	High Point (Randolph)	745,671	8	8	0.00 %	100.00 %
	Kannapolis (Cabarrus)	745,671	42,846	42,846	5.75 %	100.00 %
	Kannapolis (Rowan)	745,671	10,268	10,268	1.38 %	100.00 %
	Landis	745,671	3,690	3,690	0.49 %	100.00 %
	Lexington	745,671	19,632	19,632	2.63 %	100.00 %
	Liberty	745,671	2,655	2,655	0.36 %	100.00 %
	Midway	745,671	4,742	4,742	0.64 %	100.00 %
	Mocksville	745,671	5,900	5,900	0.79 %	100.00 %
	Mooresville	745,671	50,193	50,193	6.73 %	100.00 %
	Mount Pleasant	745,671	1,671	1,666	0.22 %	99.70 %
	Ramseur	745,671	1,774	1,774	0.24 %	100.00 %
	Randleman	745,671	4,595	4,595	0.62 %	100.00 %
	Rockwell	745,671	2,302	2,302	0.31 %	100.00 %
	Salisbury	745,671	35,540	35,540	4.77 %	100.00 %
	Seagrove	745,671	235	235	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Spencer	745,671	3,308	3,308	0.44 %	100.00 %
	Staley	745,671	397	397	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Thomasville (Davidson)	745,671	26,662	26,662	3.58 %	100.00 %
	Thomasville (Randolph)	745,671	521	521	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Trinity	745,671	7,006	7,006	0.94 %	100.00 %
	Troutman	745,671	3,698	807	0.11 %	21.82 %
	Wallburg	745,671	3,051	3,051	0.41 %	100.00 %
9	Albemarle	745,670	16,432	16,432	2.20 %	100.00 %
	Badin	745,670	2,024	2,024	0.27 %	100.00 %
	Charlotte	745,670	874,579	297,095	39.84 %	33.97 %

District plan definition file: 'S738 First Edition.csv', modified 10/30/2021 10:24 AM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 10/30/2021

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 10 of 16

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report**District Plan: S738 First Edition**

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
9	Concord	745,670	105,240	24,720	3.32 %	23.49 %
	Fairview	745,670	3,456	3,456	0.46 %	100.00 %
	Harrisburg	745,670	18,967	18,967	2.54 %	100.00 %
	Hemby Bridge	745,670	1,614	1,614	0.22 %	100.00 %
	Indian Trail	745,670	39,997	39,997	5.36 %	100.00 %
	Lake Park	745,670	3,269	3,269	0.44 %	100.00 %
	Locust (Cabarrus)	745,670	541	541	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Locust (Stanly)	745,670	3,996	3,996	0.54 %	100.00 %
	Marshville	745,670	2,522	2,522	0.34 %	100.00 %
	Marvin	745,670	6,358	6,358	0.85 %	100.00 %
	Matthews	745,670	29,435	29,435	3.95 %	100.00 %
	Midland (Cabarrus)	745,670	4,684	4,684	0.63 %	100.00 %
	Midland (Mecklenburg)	745,670	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Mineral Springs	745,670	3,159	3,159	0.42 %	100.00 %
	Mint Hill (Mecklenburg)	745,670	26,444	26,444	3.55 %	100.00 %
	Mint Hill (Union)	745,670	6	6	0.00 %	100.00 %
	Misenheimer	745,670	650	650	0.09 %	100.00 %
	Monroe	745,670	34,562	34,562	4.64 %	100.00 %
	Mount Pleasant	745,670	1,671	5	0.00 %	0.30 %
	New London	745,670	607	607	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Norwood	745,670	2,367	2,367	0.32 %	100.00 %
	Oakboro	745,670	2,128	2,128	0.29 %	100.00 %
	Red Cross	745,670	762	762	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Richfield	745,670	582	582	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Stallings (Mecklenburg)	745,670	384	384	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Stallings (Union)	745,670	15,728	15,728	2.11 %	100.00 %
	Stanfield	745,670	1,585	1,585	0.21 %	100.00 %
	Unionville	745,670	6,643	6,643	0.89 %	100.00 %
	Waxhaw	745,670	20,534	20,534	2.75 %	100.00 %
	Weddington (Mecklenburg)	745,670	5	5	0.00 %	100.00 %
	Weddington (Union)	745,670	13,176	13,176	1.77 %	100.00 %
	Wesley Chapel	745,670	8,681	8,681	1.16 %	100.00 %
	Wingate	745,670	4,055	4,055	0.54 %	100.00 %
10	Belmont	745,670	15,010	15,010	2.01 %	100.00 %
	Belwood	745,670	857	857	0.11 %	100.00 %
	Bessemer City	745,670	5,428	5,428	0.73 %	100.00 %
	Boiling Springs	745,670	4,615	4,615	0.62 %	100.00 %
	Bostic	745,670	355	355	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Brookford	745,670	442	442	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Casar	745,670	305	305	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Catawba	745,670	702	702	0.09 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'S738 First Edition.csv', modified 10/30/2021 10:24 AM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 10/30/2021

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 11 of 16

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report**District Plan: S738 First Edition**

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
10	Cherryville	745,670	6,078	6,078	0.82 %	100.00 %
	Claremont	745,670	1,692	1,692	0.23 %	100.00 %
	Conover	745,670	8,421	8,421	1.13 %	100.00 %
	Cramerton	745,670	5,296	5,296	0.71 %	100.00 %
	Dallas	745,670	5,927	5,927	0.79 %	100.00 %
	Dellview	745,670	6	6	0.00 %	100.00 %
	Earl	745,670	198	198	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Ellenboro	745,670	723	723	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Fallston	745,670	627	627	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Forest City	745,670	7,377	7,377	0.99 %	100.00 %
	Gastonia	745,670	80,411	80,411	10.78 %	100.00 %
	Glen Alpine	745,670	1,529	377	0.05 %	24.66 %
	Grover	745,670	802	802	0.11 %	100.00 %
	Harmony	745,670	543	543	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Hickory (Catawba)	745,670	43,379	43,379	5.82 %	100.00 %
	High Shoals	745,670	595	595	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Kings Mountain (Cleveland)	745,670	10,032	10,032	1.35 %	100.00 %
	Kings Mountain (Gaston)	745,670	1,110	1,110	0.15 %	100.00 %
	Kingstown	745,670	656	656	0.09 %	100.00 %
	Lattimore	745,670	406	406	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Lawndale	745,670	570	570	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Lincolnton	745,670	11,091	11,091	1.49 %	100.00 %
	Long View (Catawba)	745,670	4,353	4,353	0.58 %	100.00 %
	Love Valley	745,670	154	154	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Lowell	745,670	3,654	3,654	0.49 %	100.00 %
	Maiden (Catawba)	745,670	3,736	3,736	0.50 %	100.00 %
	Maiden (Lincoln)	745,670	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	McAdenville	745,670	890	890	0.12 %	100.00 %
	Moorestown	745,670	293	293	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Morganton	745,670	17,474	511	0.07 %	2.92 %
	Mount Holly	745,670	17,703	17,703	2.37 %	100.00 %
	Newton	745,670	13,148	13,148	1.76 %	100.00 %
	Patterson Springs	745,670	571	571	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Polkville	745,670	516	516	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Ranlo	745,670	4,511	4,511	0.60 %	100.00 %
	Ruth	745,670	347	347	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Rutherfordton	745,670	3,640	3,640	0.49 %	100.00 %
	Shelby	745,670	21,918	21,918	2.94 %	100.00 %
	Spencer Mountain	745,670	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Spindale	745,670	4,225	4,225	0.57 %	100.00 %
	Stanley	745,670	3,963	3,963	0.53 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'S738 First Edition.csv', modified 10/30/2021 10:24 AM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 10/30/2021

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 12 of 16

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: S738 First Edition

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
10	Statesville	745,670	28,419	28,419	3.81 %	100.00 %
	Troutman	745,670	3,698	2,891	0.39 %	78.18 %
	Waco	745,670	310	310	0.04 %	100.00 %
11	Andrews	745,671	1,667	1,667	0.22 %	100.00 %
	Asheville	745,671	94,589	94,589	12.69 %	100.00 %
	Bakersville	745,671	450	450	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Biltmore Forest	745,671	1,409	1,409	0.19 %	100.00 %
	Black Mountain	745,671	8,426	8,426	1.13 %	100.00 %
	Brevard	745,671	7,744	7,744	1.04 %	100.00 %
	Bryson City	745,671	1,558	1,558	0.21 %	100.00 %
	Burnsville	745,671	1,614	1,614	0.22 %	100.00 %
	Canton	745,671	4,422	4,422	0.59 %	100.00 %
	Chimney Rock Village	745,671	140	140	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Clyde	745,671	1,368	1,368	0.18 %	100.00 %
	Columbus	745,671	1,060	1,060	0.14 %	100.00 %
	Dillsboro	745,671	213	213	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Flat Rock	745,671	3,486	3,486	0.47 %	100.00 %
	Fletcher	745,671	7,987	7,987	1.07 %	100.00 %
	Fontana Dam	745,671	13	13	0.00 %	100.00 %
	Forest Hills	745,671	303	303	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Franklin	745,671	4,175	4,175	0.56 %	100.00 %
	Hayesville	745,671	461	461	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Hendersonville	745,671	15,137	15,137	2.03 %	100.00 %
	Highlands (Jackson)	745,671	12	12	0.00 %	100.00 %
	Highlands (Macon)	745,671	1,060	1,060	0.14 %	100.00 %
	Hot Springs	745,671	520	520	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Lake Lure	745,671	1,365	1,365	0.18 %	100.00 %
	Lake Santeetlah	745,671	38	38	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Laurel Park	745,671	2,250	2,250	0.30 %	100.00 %
	Maggie Valley	745,671	1,687	1,687	0.23 %	100.00 %
	Marion	745,671	7,717	7,717	1.03 %	100.00 %
	Mars Hill	745,671	2,007	2,007	0.27 %	100.00 %
	Marshall	745,671	777	777	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Mills River	745,671	7,078	7,078	0.95 %	100.00 %
	Montreat	745,671	901	901	0.12 %	100.00 %
	Murphy	745,671	1,608	1,608	0.22 %	100.00 %
	Old Fort	745,671	811	811	0.11 %	100.00 %
	Robbinsville	745,671	597	597	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Rosman	745,671	701	701	0.09 %	100.00 %
	Saluda (Henderson)	745,671	11	11	0.00 %	100.00 %
	Saluda (Polk)	745,671	620	620	0.08 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'S738 First Edition.csv', modified 10/30/2021 10:24 AM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 10/30/2021

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 13 of 16

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: S738 First Edition

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
11	Spruce Pine	745,671	2,194	2,194	0.29 %	100.00 %
	Sylva	745,671	2,578	2,578	0.35 %	100.00 %
	Tryon	745,671	1,562	1,562	0.21 %	100.00 %
	Waynesville	745,671	10,140	10,140	1.36 %	100.00 %
	Weaverville	745,671	4,567	4,567	0.61 %	100.00 %
	Webster	745,671	372	372	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Woodfin	745,671	7,936	7,936	1.06 %	100.00 %
12	Charlotte	745,671	874,579	577,484	77.44 %	66.03 %
	Cornelius	745,671	31,412	31,412	4.21 %	100.00 %
	Davidson (Mecklenburg)	745,671	14,728	14,728	1.98 %	100.00 %
	Huntersville	745,671	61,376	61,376	8.23 %	100.00 %
	Pineville	745,671	10,602	10,602	1.42 %	100.00 %
13	Angier (Harnett)	745,671	4,709	4,709	0.63 %	100.00 %
	Angier (Wake)	745,671	556	556	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Apex	745,671	58,780	58,780	7.88 %	100.00 %
	Benson (Harnett)	745,671	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Broadway (Harnett)	745,671	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Broadway (Lee)	745,671	1,267	1,267	0.17 %	100.00 %
	Cary (Chatham)	745,671	3,709	3,709	0.50 %	100.00 %
	Cary (Wake)	745,671	171,012	164,323	22.04 %	96.09 %
	Clayton (Johnston)	745,671	26,307	22,039	2.96 %	83.78 %
	Coats	745,671	2,155	2,155	0.29 %	100.00 %
	Dunn	745,671	8,446	8,446	1.13 %	100.00 %
	Durham (Durham)	745,671	283,093	1,554	0.21 %	0.55 %
	Durham (Wake)	745,671	269	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Erwin	745,671	4,542	4,542	0.61 %	100.00 %
	Fuquay-Varina (Harnett)	745,671	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Fuquay-Varina (Wake)	745,671	34,152	32,779	4.40 %	95.98 %
	Goldston	745,671	234	234	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Holly Springs	745,671	41,239	39,564	5.31 %	95.94 %
	Lillington	745,671	4,735	4,735	0.63 %	100.00 %
	Morrisville (Wake)	745,671	29,423	29,423	3.95 %	100.00 %
	Pittsboro	745,671	4,537	4,537	0.61 %	100.00 %
	Raleigh (Wake)	745,671	466,106	6,040	0.81 %	1.30 %
	Sanford	745,671	30,261	30,261	4.06 %	100.00 %
	Siler City	745,671	7,702	7,702	1.03 %	100.00 %
14	Aberdeen	745,671	8,516	8,516	1.14 %	100.00 %
	Ansonville	745,671	440	440	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Biscoe	745,671	1,848	1,848	0.25 %	100.00 %
	Bladenboro	745,671	1,648	1,648	0.22 %	100.00 %
	Cameron	745,671	244	244	0.03 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'S738 First Edition.csv', modified 10/30/2021 10:24 AM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 10/30/2021

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 14 of 16

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: S738 First Edition

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
14	Candor (Montgomery)	745,671	813	813	0.11 %	100.00 %
	Candor (Moore)	745,671	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Carthage	745,671	2,775	2,775	0.37 %	100.00 %
	Dobbins Heights	745,671	687	687	0.09 %	100.00 %
	Dublin	745,671	267	267	0.04 %	100.00 %
	East Laurinburg	745,671	234	234	0.03 %	100.00 %
	Eastover	745,671	3,656	3,656	0.49 %	100.00 %
	Elizabethtown	745,671	3,296	1,815	0.24 %	55.07 %
	Ellerbe	745,671	864	864	0.12 %	100.00 %
	Fairmont	745,671	2,191	2,191	0.29 %	100.00 %
	Falcon (Cumberland)	745,671	324	324	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Fayetteville	745,671	208,501	208,501	27.96 %	100.00 %
	Foxfire	745,671	1,288	1,288	0.17 %	100.00 %
	Gibson	745,671	449	449	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Godwin	745,671	128	128	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Hamlet	745,671	6,025	6,025	0.81 %	100.00 %
	Hoffman	745,671	418	418	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Hope Mills	745,671	17,808	17,808	2.39 %	100.00 %
	Laurinburg	745,671	14,978	14,978	2.01 %	100.00 %
	Lilesville	745,671	395	395	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Linden	745,671	136	136	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Lumber Bridge	745,671	82	82	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Lumberton	745,671	19,025	19,025	2.55 %	100.00 %
	Marietta	745,671	111	111	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Maxton (Robeson)	745,671	1,902	1,902	0.26 %	100.00 %
	Maxton (Scotland)	745,671	208	208	0.03 %	100.00 %
	McDonald	745,671	94	94	0.01 %	100.00 %
	McFarlan	745,671	94	94	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Morven	745,671	329	329	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Mount Gilead	745,671	1,171	1,171	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Norman	745,671	100	100	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Orrum	745,671	59	59	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Parkton	745,671	504	504	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Peachland	745,671	390	390	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Pembroke	745,671	2,823	2,823	0.38 %	100.00 %
	Pinebluff	745,671	1,473	1,473	0.20 %	100.00 %
	Pinehurst	745,671	17,581	17,581	2.36 %	100.00 %
	Polkton	745,671	2,250	2,250	0.30 %	100.00 %
	Proctorville	745,671	121	121	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Raeford	745,671	4,559	4,559	0.61 %	100.00 %
	Raynham	745,671	60	60	0.01 %	100.00 %

District plan definition file: 'S738 First Edition.csv', modified 10/30/2021 10:24 AM

[G20-DMbC] - Generated 10/30/2021

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Page 15 of 16

Districts included: All

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: S738 First Edition

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
14	Red Springs (Hoke)	745,671	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Red Springs (Robeson)	745,671	3,087	3,087	0.41 %	100.00 %
	Rennert	745,671	275	275	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Robbins	745,671	1,168	1,168	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Rockingham	745,671	9,243	9,243	1.24 %	100.00 %
	Rowland	745,671	885	885	0.12 %	100.00 %
	Southern Pines	745,671	15,545	15,545	2.08 %	100.00 %
	Spring Lake	745,671	11,660	11,660	1.56 %	100.00 %
	St. Pauls	745,671	2,045	2,045	0.27 %	100.00 %
	Star	745,671	806	806	0.11 %	100.00 %
	Stedman	745,671	1,277	1,277	0.17 %	100.00 %
	Tar Heel	745,671	90	90	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Taylortown	745,671	634	634	0.09 %	100.00 %
	Troy	745,671	2,850	2,850	0.38 %	100.00 %
	Vass	745,671	952	952	0.13 %	100.00 %
	Wade	745,671	638	638	0.09 %	100.00 %
	Wadesboro	745,671	5,008	5,008	0.67 %	100.00 %
	Wagram	745,671	615	615	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Whispering Pines	745,671	4,987	4,987	0.67 %	100.00 %
Total:				6,017,605		

Whole-Split VTD Counts by District Report**District Plan: S738 First Edition**

District	County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
1	Bertie	12	0
	Chowan	6	0
	Edgecombe	21	0
	Franklin	18	0
	Gates	6	0
	Granville	15	0
	Greene	10	0
	Halifax	23	0
	Hertford	13	0
	Martin	13	0
	Nash	24	0
	Northampton	13	0
	Pasquotank	9	0
	Perquimans	7	0
	Pitt	20	1
	Vance	12	0
	Warren	14	0
	Washington	6	0
	Wayne	3	1
	Wilson	24	0
2	Wake	143	1
3	Beaufort	21	0
	Camden	3	0
	Carteret	28	0
	Craven	21	0
	Currituck	11	0
	Dare	16	0
	Duplin	19	0
	Hyde	7	0
	Jones	7	0
	Lenoir	22	0
	Onslow	24	0
	Pamlico	10	0
	Pender	6	1
	Pitt	19	1
	Tyrrell	6	0
4	Alamance	37	0
	Caswell	9	0
	Durham	56	1
	Orange	41	0
	Person	11	0
	Rockingham	6	1

Whole-Split VTD Counts by District Report**District Plan: S738 First Edition**

District	County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
5	Alexander	10	0
	Alleghany	4	0
	Ashe	17	0
	Avery	19	0
	Burke	26	1
	Caldwell	20	0
	Forsyth	42	1
	Rockingham	8	1
	Stokes	18	0
	Surry	24	0
	Watauga	20	0
	Wilkes	27	0
	Yadkin	12	0
6	Forsyth	58	1
	Guilford	165	0
7	Bladen	8	1
	Brunswick	25	0
	Columbus	26	0
	Johnston	23	1
	New Hanover	43	0
	Pender	13	1
	Sampson	23	0
	Wayne	24	1
8	Cabarrus	28	1
	Davidson	43	0
	Davie	14	0
	Iredell	8	1
	Randolph	22	0
	Rowan	41	0
9	Cabarrus	11	1
	Mecklenburg	80	1
	Stanly	22	0
	Union	52	0
10	Burke	6	1
	Catawba	40	0
	Cleveland	21	0
	Gaston	46	0
	Iredell	20	1
	Lincoln	23	0
	Rutherford	15	1

Whole-Split VTD Counts by District Report**District Plan: S738 First Edition**

District	County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
11	Buncombe	79	0
	Cherokee	16	0
	Clay	9	0
	Graham	4	0
	Haywood	29	0
	Henderson	34	0
	Jackson	13	0
	Macon	15	0
	Madison	12	0
	McDowell	17	0
	Mitchell	9	0
	Polk	7	0
	Rutherford	1	1
	Swain	5	0
	Transylvania	15	0
	Yancey	11	0
12	Mecklenburg	114	1
13	Chatham	18	0
	Durham	0	1
	Harnett	13	0
	Johnston	12	1
	Lee	10	0
	Wake	60	1
14	Anson	9	0
	Bladen	8	1
	Cumberland	76	0
	Hoke	15	0
	Montgomery	14	0
	Moore	26	0
	Richmond	16	0
	Robeson	39	0
	Scotland	7	0
Total:		2,652	14

Whole-Split VTD Counts by County Report

District Plan: S738 First Edition

County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
Alamance	37	0
Alexander	10	0
Alleghany	4	0
Anson	9	0
Ashe	17	0
Avery	19	0
Beaufort	21	0
Bertie	12	0
Bladen	16	1
Brunswick	25	0
Buncombe	79	0
Burke	32	1
Cabarrus	39	1
Caldwell	20	0
Camden	3	0
Carteret	28	0
Caswell	9	0
Catawba	40	0
Chatham	18	0
Cherokee	16	0
Chowan	6	0
Clay	9	0
Cleveland	21	0
Columbus	26	0
Craven	21	0
Cumberland	76	0
Currituck	11	0
Dare	16	0
Davidson	43	0
Davie	14	0
Duplin	19	0
Durham	56	1
Edgecombe	21	0
Forsyth	100	1
Franklin	18	0
Gaston	46	0
Gates	6	0
Graham	4	0
Granville	15	0
Greene	10	0
Guilford	165	0
Halifax	23	0
Harnett	13	0

District plan definition file: 'S738 First Edition.csv', modified 10/30/2021 10:24 AM

Based on TIGER 2020 VTDs

[G20-VTD-SbC] - Generated 10/30/2021

Whole-Split VTD Counts by County Report**District Plan: S738 First Edition**

County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
Haywood	29	0
Henderson	34	0
Hertford	13	0
Hoke	15	0
Hyde	7	0
Iredell	28	1
Jackson	13	0
Johnston	35	1
Jones	7	0
Lee	10	0
Lenoir	22	0
Lincoln	23	0
Macon	15	0
Madison	12	0
Martin	13	0
McDowell	17	0
Mecklenburg	194	1
Mitchell	9	0
Montgomery	14	0
Moore	26	0
Nash	24	0
New Hanover	43	0
Northampton	13	0
Onslow	24	0
Orange	41	0
Pamlico	10	0
Pasquotank	9	0
Pender	19	1
Perquimans	7	0
Person	11	0
Pitt	39	1
Polk	7	0
Randolph	22	0
Richmond	16	0
Robeson	39	0
Rockingham	14	1
Rowan	41	0
Rutherford	16	1
Sampson	23	0
Scotland	7	0
Stanly	22	0
Stokes	18	0
Surry	24	0

District plan definition file: 'S738 First Edition.csv', modified 10/30/2021 10:24 AM

Based on TIGER 2020 VTDs

[G20-VTD-SbC] - Generated 10/30/2021

Whole-Split VTD Counts by County Report

District Plan: S738 First Edition

County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
Swain	5	0
Transylvania	15	0
Tyrrell	6	0
Union	52	0
Vance	12	0
Wake	203	1
Warren	14	0
Washington	6	0
Watauga	20	0
Wayne	27	1
Wilkes	27	0
Wilson	24	0
Yadkin	12	0
Yancey	11	0
Totals:	2,652	14

Split VTD Detail Report

District Plan: S738 First Edition

County	VTD	District	Total VTD Population	VTD Pop in District	Percent of VTD Pop in District
Bladen	P10	7	939	805	85.73 %
		14	939	134	14.27 %
Burke	051	5	4,802	1,404	29.24 %
		10	4,802	3,398	70.76 %
Cabarrus	09-00	8	3,896	156	4.00 %
		9	3,896	3,740	96.00 %
Durham	35.3	4	12,272	10,612	86.47 %
		13	12,272	1,660	13.53 %
Forsyth	206	5	2,823	619	21.93 %
		6	2,823	2,204	78.07 %
Iredell	BA	8	7,790	6,901	88.59 %
		10	7,790	889	11.41 %
Johnston	PR09	7	8,227	1,638	19.91 %
		13	8,227	6,589	80.09 %
Mecklenburg	060	9	2,998	760	25.35 %
		12	2,998	2,238	74.65 %
Pender	LT18	3	6,377	4,184	65.61 %
		7	6,377	2,193	34.39 %
Pitt	1512A	1	9,256	86	0.93 %
		3	9,256	9,170	99.07 %
Rockingham	RC	4	6,600	3,068	46.48 %
		5	6,600	3,532	53.52 %
Rutherford	16A	10	3,603	2,412	66.94 %
		11	3,603	1,191	33.06 %
Wake	12-05	2	12,886	9,160	71.08 %
		13	12,886	3,726	28.92 %
Wayne	002	1	5,146	2,588	50.29 %
		7	5,146	2,558	49.71 %
Total:				87,615	

Number of split VTDs: 14

Incumbent-District Report

District Plan: S738 First Edition

Residence Set: Congress - 9/22/2021

Last Name	First Name	Party	Current District	District in this Plan
Adams	Alma	Democratic	12	12
Bishop	Dan	Republican	9	9
Budd	Ted	Republican	13	8
Butterfield	GK	Democratic	1	1
Cawthorn	Madison	Republican	11	11
Foxx	Virginia	Republican	5	5
Hudson	Richard	Republican	8	8
Manning	Kathy	Democratic	6	6
McHenry	Patrick	Republican	10	10
Murphy	Greg	Republican	3	3
Price	David	Democratic	4	4
Ross	Deborah	Democratic	2	2
Rouzer	David	Republican	7	7

District-Incumbent Report

District Plan: S738 First Edition

Residence Set: Congress - 9/22/2021

District in this Plan	Last Name	First Name	Party	Current District
1	Butterfield	GK	Democratic	1
2	Ross	Deborah	Democratic	2
3	Murphy	Greg	Republican	3
4	Price	David	Democratic	4
5	Foxx	Virginia	Republican	5
6	Manning	Kathy	Democratic	6
7	Rouzer	David	Republican	7
8	Budd	Ted	Republican	13
	Hudson	Richard	Republican	8
9	Bishop	Dan	Republican	9
10	McHenry	Patrick	Republican	10
11	Cawthorn	Madison	Republican	11
12	Adams	Alma	Democratic	12
13				
14				

User:

Plan Name: **S738 First Edition**

Plan Type: **Congressional**

Measures of Compactness Report

Saturday, October 30, 2021

10:22 AM

	Reock	Polsby-Popper
Sum	N/A	N/A
Min	0.34	0.22
Max	0.59	0.54
Mean	0.45	0.36
Std. Dev.	0.08	0.09

District	Reock	Polsby-Popper
1	0.43	0.39
2	0.56	0.43
3	0.39	0.29
4	0.59	0.51
5	0.34	0.32
6	0.50	0.54
7	0.34	0.22
8	0.45	0.43
9	0.50	0.36
10	0.39	0.31
11	0.36	0.32

Measures of Compactness Report

S738 First Edition

	Reock	Polsby-Popper
Sum	N/A	N/A
Min	0.34	0.22
Max	0.59	0.54
Mean	0.45	0.36
Std. Dev.	0.08	0.09
District	Reock	Polsby-Popper
12	0.39	0.30
13	0.53	0.33
14	0.51	0.35

Measures of Compactness Report

S738 First Edition

Measures of Compactness Summary

Reock	The measure is always between 0 and 1, with 1 being the most compact.
Polsby-Popper	The measure is always between 0 and 1, with 1 being the most compact.

Harper Plaintiffs' Congressional Map Shapefile (submitted with Harper
Plaintiffs' Submission Regarding Proposed Remedial Plans for
Court Review)*†


* Corresponding csv files and shapefiles are submitted to the Court in native file via flash drive.


† Maptitude or an equivalent program is required to open these files.

Harper Plaintiffs' Congressional Map Block Assignment File (submitted with
Harper Plaintiffs' Submission Regarding Proposed Remedial Plans for
Court Review)*†


* Corresponding csv files and shapefiles are submitted to the Court in native file via flash drive.

† Mapititude or an equivalent program is required to open these files.





-15698-



39

42

38

Mecklenburg

41

Gaston

43

Cleveland

Polk

Henderson

48

Rutherford

44

Burke

McDowell

Buncombe

49

Lincoln

45

Catawba

46

Iredell

37


Alexander


Wilkes


Yadkin


36


Surry













-15704-





-15705-

30

37

Iredell

Davidson

Randolph

Rowan

Catawba

33

34

Cabarrus

Stanly

41

38

Mecklenburg

40

29

42

Union

Anson


Richmond


39

Moore

Lincoln

Gaston





-15707-

Franklin
11

Halifax

3

Bertie

Chowan

Nash

Edgecombe

Martin

Washington

5

Wilson

Pitt

Johnston

4

Greene


Wayne


Lenoir


Craven

Beaufort

2







-15711-

Jones

Craven


Duplin


6


Onslow


Carteret


Pender














id	attributes			
	District	Population	To Target	Dev%
0	0	0	-208788	-100.00%
1	1	199750	-9038	-4.33%
2	2	200494	-8294	-3.97%
3	3	198430	-10358	-4.96%
4	4	216568	7780	3.73%
5	5	219143	10355	4.96%
6	6	204576	-4212	-2.02%
7	7	202930	-5858	-2.81%
8	8	210088	1300	0.62%
9	9	202791	-5997	-2.87%
10	10	215999	7211	3.45%
11	11	206121	-2667	-1.28%
12	12	200794	-7994	-3.83%
13	17	198415	15	0.01%
14	18	198362	-38	-0.02%
15	15	198375	-25	-0.01%
16	13	198423	23	0.01%
17	14	198427	27	0.01%
18	16	198400	0	0.00%
19	19	218439	9651	4.62%
20	20	200910	-7878	-3.77%
21	21	216016	7228	3.46%
22	22	200208	-8580	-4.11%
23	23	210529	1741	0.83%
24	24	202786	-6002	-2.87%
25	25	218259	9471	4.54%
26	26	201202	-7586	-3.63%
27	27	217781	8993	4.31%
28	28	213412	4624	2.21%
29	29	217840	9052	4.34%
30	30	211642	2854	1.37%
31	31	205408	-3380	-1.62%
32	32	214396	5608	2.69%
33	33	209379	591	0.28%
34	34	217563	8775	4.20%
35	35	216747	7959	3.81%
36	36	218292	9504	4.55%
37	37	217674	8886	4.26%
38	38	218037	9249	4.43%
39	39	210902	2114	1.01%
40	40	218358	9570	4.58%
41	41	218135	9347	4.48%
42	42	219069	10281	4.92%
43	43	198976	-9812	-4.70%
44	44	208541	-247	-0.12%
45	45	208686	-102	-0.05%
46	46	203347	-5441	-2.61%
47	47	218754	9966	4.77%
48	48	201855	-6933	-3.32%
49	49	203206	-5582	-2.67%
50	50	214953	6165	2.95%

county	District	Population	% of county	% of District
ALAMANCE	25	171415	1	0.785374
ALEXANDER	36	36444	1	0.166951
ALLEGHANY	47	10888	1	0.049773
ANSON	29	22055	1	0.101244
ASHE	47	26577	1	0.121493
AVERY	47	17806	1	0.081397
BEAUFORT	2	44652	1	0.22271
BERTIE	3	17934	1	0.090379
BLADEN	9	29606	1	0.145993
BRUNSWICK	8	136693	1	0.650646
BUNCOMBE	48	66246	0.245855	0.328186
BUNCOMBE	49	203206	0.754145	1
BURKE	46	87570	1	0.430643
CABARRUS	34	217563	0.963504	1
CABARRUS	35	8241	0.036496	0.038021
CALDWELL	45	48076	0.596092	0.230375
CALDWELL	47	32576	0.403908	0.148916
CAMDEN	3	10355	1	0.052185
CARTERET	1	67686	1	0.338854
CASWELL	23	22736	1	0.107995
CATAWBA	45	160610	1	0.769625
CHATHAM	22	76285	1	0.381029
CHEROKEE	50	28774	1	0.133862
CHOWAN	1	13708	1	0.068626
CLAY	50	11089	1	0.051588
CLEVELAND	44	99519	1	0.477216
COLUMBUS	8	50623	1	0.240961
CRAVEN	2	100720	1	0.502359
CUMBERLAND	19	218439	0.652587	1
CUMBERLAND	21	116289	0.347413	0.538335
CURRITUCK	3	28100	1	0.141612
DARE	1	36915	1	0.184806
DAVIDSON	30	168930	1	0.798188
DAVIE	30	42712	1	0.201812
DUPLIN	9	48715	1	0.240223
DURHAM	20	200910	0.618502	1
DURHAM	22	123923	0.381498	0.618971
EDGECOMBE	5	48900	1	0.223142
FORSYTH	31	205408	0.536888	1
FORSYTH	32	177182	0.463112	0.826424
FRANKLIN	11	68573	1	0.332683
GASTON	43	198976	0.87292	1
GASTON	46	28967	0.12708	0.142451
GATES	3	10478	1	0.052805
GRAHAM	50	8030	1	0.037357
GRANVILLE	18	60992	1	0.306679

GREENE	4	20451	1	0.094432
GUILFORD	26	110106	0.203411	0.547241
GUILFORD	27	217781	0.40233	1
GUILFORD	28	213412	0.394259	1
HALIFAX	3	48622	1	0.245034
HARNETT	12	133568	1	0.665199
HAYWOOD	47	22255	0.358437	0.101735
HAYWOOD	50	39834	0.641563	0.185315
HENDERSON	48	116281	1	0.576062
HERTFORD	3	21552	1	0.108613
HOKE	24	52082	1	0.256832
HYDE	1	4589	1	0.022974
IREDELL	37	186693	1	0.857672
JACKSON	50	43109	1	0.200551
JOHNSTON	10	215999	1	1
JONES	9	9172	1	0.045229
LEE	12	63285	1	0.315174
LENOIR	2	55122	1	0.274931
LINCOLN	46	86810	1	0.426906
MACON	50	37014	1	0.172196
MADISON	47	21193	1	0.096881
MARTIN	3	22031	1	0.111027
MCDOWELL	44	44578	1	0.213761
MECKLENBURG	37	30981	0.027774	0.142328
MECKLENBURG	38	218037	0.195464	1
MECKLENBURG	39	210902	0.189068	1
MECKLENBURG	40	218358	0.195752	1
MECKLENBURG	41	218135	0.195552	1
MECKLENBURG	42	219069	0.19639	1
MITCHELL	47	14903	1	0.068127
MONTGOMERY	29	25751	1	0.118211
MOORE	21	99727	1	0.461665
NASH	11	94970	1	0.460749
NEW HANOVER	7	202930	0.899106	1
NEW HANOVER	8	22772	0.100894	0.108393
NORTHAMPTON	3	17471	1	0.088046
ONSLOW	6	204576	1	1
ORANGE	23	148696	1	0.706297
PAMLICO	1	12276	1	0.061457
PASQUOTANK	1	40568	1	0.203094
PENDER	9	60203	1	0.296872
PERQUIMANS	1	13005	1	0.065106
PERSON	23	39097	1	0.185708
PITT	5	170243	1	0.776858
POLK	48	19328	1	0.095752
RANDOLPH	25	46844	0.32492	0.214626
RANDOLPH	29	97327	0.67508	0.446782

RICHMOND	29	42946	1	0.197145
ROBESON	24	116530	1	0.574645
ROCKINGHAM	26	91096	1	0.452759
ROWAN	33	146875	1	0.701479
RUTHERFORD	44	64444	1	0.309023
SAMPSON	12	3941	0.066756	0.019627
SAMPSON	9	55095	0.933244	0.271684
SCOTLAND	24	34174	1	0.168522
STANLY	33	62504	1	0.298521
STOKES	36	44520	1	0.203947
SURRY	36	71359	1	0.326897
SWAIN	50	14117	1	0.065675
TRANSYLVANIA	50	32986	1	0.153457
TYRRELL	3	3245	1	0.016353
UNION	29	29761	0.124906	0.136619
UNION	35	208506	0.875094	0.961979
VANCE	11	42578	1	0.206568
WARREN	3	18642	1	0.093947
WASHINGTON	1	11003	1	0.055084
WATAUGA	47	54086	1	0.247246
WAYNE	4	117333	1	0.541784
WILKES	36	65969	1	0.302205
WILSON	4	78784	1	0.363784
YADKIN	32	37214	1	0.173576
YANCEY	47	18470	1	0.084433
GRANVILLE	18	60992	1	0.307478
WAKE	17	198415	0.17568	1
WAKE	18	137370	0.12163	0.692522
WAKE	15	198375	0.175645	1
WAKE	13	198423	0.175687	1
WAKE	14	198427	0.175691	1
WAKE	16	198400	0.175667	1

Harper Plaintiffs' Senate Map Shapefile (submitted with Harper Plaintiffs'
Submission Regarding Proposed Remedial Plans for Court Review)*†

* Corresponding csv files and shapefiles are submitted to the Court in native file via flash drive.

† Mapititude or an equivalent program is required to open these files.

Harper Plaintiffs' Senate Map Block Assignment File — Statewide
(submitted with Harper Plaintiffs' Submission Regarding Proposed Remedial
Plans for Court Review)*†

* Corresponding csv files and shapefiles are submitted to the Court in native file via flash drive.

† Maptitude or an equivalent program is required to open these files.

Harper Plaintiffs' Senate Map Block Assignment File — Wake County
(submitted with Harper Plaintiffs' Submission Regarding Proposed Remedial
Plans for Court Review)*†

* Corresponding csv files and shapefiles are submitted to the Court in native file via flash drive.

† Mapititude or an equivalent program is required to open these files.

Common Cause Remedial House District 10 Block Assignment File (Exhibit 5
to Ketchie Affidavit)*†

* Corresponding csv files and shapefiles are submitted to the Court in native file via flash drive.

† Mapititude or an equivalent program is required to open these files.

Common Cause Remedial Senate District 4 Block Assignment File (Exhibit 6
to Ketchie Affidavit)*†

* Corresponding csv files and shapefiles are submitted to the Court in native file via flash drive.

† Maptitude or an equivalent program is required to open these files.

Common Cause Remedial House District 10 Shapefile (Exhibit 7 to Ketchie Affidavit)*†

* Corresponding csv files and shapefiles are submitted to the Court in native file via flash drive.

† Mapititude or an equivalent program is required to open these files.

Common Cause Remedial Senate District 4 Shapefile (Exhibit 8 to Ketchie Affidavit)*†

* Corresponding csv files and shapefiles are submitted to the Court in native file via flash drive.

† Mapititude or an equivalent program is required to open these files.

District	Total Pop	Devation	Total VAP	White	Minority	Hispanic	Black	Asian	Native	Pacific
4	83360	-4.18%	63750	63.39%	36.61%	13.23%	21.12%	0.97%	2.12%	0.15%
10	82688	-4.95%	63795	45.88%	54.12%	11.89%	38.83%	2.28%	1.93%	0.23%

District	Total Pop	Devation	Total VAP	White	Minority	Hispanic	Black	Asian	Native	Pacific
4	216927	3.90%	167984	48.54%	51.46%	8.47%	40.56%	1.35%	1.91%	0.14%
5	218784	4.79%	170601	54.04%	45.96%	7.55%	34.89%	2.27%	1.79%	0.15%