

# **Exhibit 24**

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2 FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
3 COLUMBIA DIVISION

4 THE SOUTH CAROLINA )  
5 STATE CONFERENCE OF )  
6 THE NAACP, et al., )

7 Plaintiffs, )

Case No. 3:21-CV-03302-MGL-  
TJH-RMG

8 vs. )

9 THOMAS C. )  
10 ALEXANDER, et al., )

11 Defendants. )  
12 )  
13 )

14 Videotaped Remote Deposition of  
15 SENATOR GEORGE EARLE CAMPSER, III  
16 (Taken by Plaintiffs)  
17 Isle of Palms, South Carolina  
18 Friday, August 5, 2022  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

24 Reported in Stenotype by  
25 Lauren M. McIntee, RPR, CRR  
Transcript produced by computer-aided transcription

1           A.     No.   It's a -- both of them said it.  
2     Unsubstantiated allegation.

3           Q.     Do you recall people testifying --

4           A.     I don't think it could be substantiated  
5     because I don't think the staff plan was shared with any  
6     members. I didn't see it before the staff plan came  
7     out. The chairman wanted -- let's just get something  
8     out there. We got to -- and we were -- we were in a  
9     rush because we were being sued. We were -- we were --  
10    and we were accused of being late, and we were late  
11    because the census data was -- was late.

12                   And yet there was -- there was a lawsuit,  
13    wanting -- asking the court to draw up a plan because  
14    we're not getting it done, and we were pushing it on the  
15    fast track so the staff got a plan, got a plan out there  
16    as a working document to start going, and it gets  
17    attacked. And I don't -- I never saw it. I don't think  
18    anyone saw it, any member saw it.

19                   And I may be wrong on that, but -- but -- but  
20    number one, I don't think that -- I don't think the  
21    staff took race into account when they produced their --  
22    their staff plan. I'm confident they didn't. And if  
23    no -- if other members didn't look at it, like I didn't  
24    have a chance to look at it, they had no basis for  
25    making a racial gerrymander accusation.

1           Q.     If people during the November 29th  
2           subcommittee hearing on that staff plan made claims of  
3           racial gerrymandering to that initial staff plan, did  
4           you associate that claim with the Democratic talking  
5           point?

6           A.     No. I associated it as an allegation, as a  
7           false allegation that -- because it probably was not --  
8           it couldn't -- I didn't think it could be substantiated.  
9           I don't -- I didn't think the analysis could have been  
10          done because none of us looked at the plan before the  
11          staff issued it out. So how can you make that  
12          allegation on a plan that you never even really  
13          analyzed? That was my point there.

14          Q.     If the plan was produced or the plan was  
15          publicized on November 23rd and the hearing was held on  
16          November 29th, is it your determination that members of  
17          the public could not conduct an analysis that would  
18          allow them to comment one way or another whether the  
19          proposal might implicate concerns of racial  
20          gerrymandering?

21                 MR. TRAYWICK: Object to the form of the  
22          question.

23                 THE WITNESS: Like do I -- you want me to  
24          answer that?

25                 MR. TRAYWICK: Oh, yeah, you can answer. I'm

1           sorry. Anytime I object, unless I instruct you not  
2           to answer, please just go ahead and answer.

3           A.     Okay. So could you restate the question?

4       BY MR. CUSICK:

5           Q.     Sure. So just so for the context. You  
6           mentioned that you couldn't understand how somebody  
7           could do an analysis or make a determination whether  
8           that staff plan might have had concerns of racial  
9           gerrymandering. Did I hear that right?

10                  MR. TRAYWICK: Object to the form.

11           A.     Yes. Yeah.

12       BY MR. CUSICK:

13           Q.     And so my question was, if the plan was  
14           released on November 23rd to members of the public and  
15           then six days later on November 29th the subcommittee  
16           held a hearing on that plan, would that have given  
17           enough time for members of the --

18           A.     Yeah, that could --

19           Q.     -- public --

20           A.     Well, that could give enough time. I didn't  
21           look at the plan, though. I didn't look at the plan  
22           until after it was presented at the subcommittee  
23           meeting.

24           Q.     Right. And so claims of racial  
25           gerrymandering by members of the public during that

1 November 29th hearing, you had no basis one way or  
2 another to discount those because you had not done any  
3 analysis or had not seen the plan?

4 A. Well -- well, I did have a basis because I  
5 knew that our staff would not have race as a predominant  
6 factor in drawing the plan. I did know that much. So  
7 could it -- could a -- could it have been theoretically?  
8 Yes. Would our -- would our staff have done that? Not  
9 a chance.

10 Q. Could it have been done inadvertently? Does  
11 it require an intent?

12 A. I think they are smart enough not to do that  
13 inadvertently because they understand the legal  
14 framework in which reapportionment -- that  
15 reapportionment is subject to.

16 Q. Did you ever ask --

17 A. It's really -- it's really a product of  
18 listening to other members. There's members that had  
19 unfettered access to the map room. Each member goes in,  
20 they tell the staff what they want, what they want to  
21 do, and they try to balance everyone's interests, and  
22 they come out with a plan. And if -- if the staff  
23 produced a racial gerrymandering -- the chances of the  
24 staff producing a racial gerrymandering plan out of that  
25 process is about zero.

1 Q. Did you ever ask for an analysis of racial  
2 gerrymandering or if there are ways to measure whether  
3 there might be ways of measuring racial gerrymandering?

4 A. At what point in time? At -- at this  
5 subcommittee?

6 Q. At all during the process?

7 A. Oh, yeah. I told the staff the whole  
8 process, I said, I want you to tell me if we are  
9 violating section -- the Voting Rights Act, if there's  
10 any -- if this could be alleged as racial  
11 gerrymandering, whether we're diminishing minority  
12 voting strength. I said I want y'all to let me know.

13 Q. Could you --

14 A. But I also told them I don't -- but I also  
15 told them I don't know -- I don't want to know the B --  
16 BVAP numbers and all these when we look at a precinct or  
17 we look at a -- I want y'all to be the -- I want y'all  
18 to tell me. I want to be colorblind.

19 Q. Why did you want to be colorblind?

20 A. Because I didn't want to run the risk of  
21 having someone allege that we -- that I or we drew these  
22 districts based upon race.

23 Q. Was it your understanding that if you looked  
24 at BVAP numbers in a plan, that you could be accused of  
25 that?

1           A.     No, but I -- but I wanted to just -- I just  
2     let -- let the staff who are good lawyers, who  
3     understand the -- the applicable laws that we are  
4     subject to and the case law, and I just looked at  
5     political numbers. I didn't look at the BVAP numbers.  
6     But I -- but I relied upon them to let me know if there  
7     was a -- a problem with a potential racial  
8     gerrymandering -- racially gerrymandered district of any  
9     decision along the way that we make, you let me know.  
10    But I want to let y'all be -- be the ones who keep an  
11    eye on that.

12           Q.     Is this --

13           A.     And race matters in communities of interest,  
14    for example. And I -- and I brought that to bear. Like  
15    I wanted to make sure that St. Helena Island was kept  
16    together, that Gullah-Geechee culture down there. And  
17    -- but I didn't have to look at BVAP numbers to know  
18    that St. Helena needed to be kept in place. I know -- I  
19    know -- I know it. I know the culture. I know -- I  
20    know, so yeah. I wanted them to -- I wanted the staff  
21    to let me know if we were getting in trouble.

22           Q.     Is it fair to say that most senators know the  
23    racial demographics of the districts that they  
24    represent?

25           A.     Probably. Close -- I mean, a general sense.



1 A. Yeah.

2 Q. And what was discussed on the call?

3 A. Just what went on, what district, you know  
4 whether we're going to be running under the new  
5 districts or the old district. And that was an issue up  
6 in the air for some period of time.

7 Q. Did she provide any feedback or input on how  
8 congressional maps should be drawn during your  
9 interactions?

10 A. Not really. I mean, she wanted -- not -- not  
11 really. Not -- not about particular areas.

12 Q. What did she want?

13 A. What's that? Well, the original House plan  
14 that she was concerned about, that the original plan  
15 that the House adopted and then they -- then they  
16 adopted a different plan, but she did, she was concerned  
17 about that and wanted to know what the House did. And I  
18 said I'm not sure what the House did or why. But the  
19 political numbers were not favorable for her, and that's  
20 what she was concerned about.

21 Q. Do you recall if the phone call occurred  
22 generally around the same time as the text message  
23 exchange?

24 A. Probably was earlier than that. Probably  
25 right after the House passed its first plan. Because

1       that's what -- that's what she expressed concern over.

2           Q.     And just to close it out, did you receive any  
3     other feedback from any members of her office or anybody  
4     representing or working on behalf of her office?

5           A.     I communicated with a chief -- with her chief  
6     of staff, you know, that -- and then her chief of staff  
7     resigned. I think it was a chief of staff, but it  
8     was -- she had a chief of staff or a staffer who was  
9     kind of a point person on reapportionment resigned. And  
10    so really I never -- never heard back, never heard back  
11    from her. She resigned shortly thereafter.

12          Q.     Did you ever have any interactions with  
13    anybody from Congress Member Wilson's office?

14          A.     No.

15          Q.     Did you ever speak with Congress Member  
16    Wilson about redistricting?

17          A.     No.

18          Q.     Did you ever receive feedback conveyed by  
19    Senate staff members or anything about input from  
20    Congressman Member Wilson's office?

21          A.     I had heard that he had, from staff that he  
22    was interested in keeping Fort Jackson in his district  
23    because he's -- you know, military base. He's on the  
24    Armed Services Committee and that's -- senior member,  
25    and that's very important. That's pretty much all I

1 recall with him.

2 Q. What about do you recall or did you have any  
3 interaction with anybody on behalf of representative --  
4 Congress Member Clyburn's office?

5 A. I didn't -- I heard from -- I know that the  
6 staff, the committee staff met with a staff member from  
7 Congressman Clyburn's office. That's all I -- that's  
8 all I'm aware of on that front.

9 Q. Did the staff convey any feedback or input on  
10 how that meeting would impact the maps that they were  
11 drawing or considering?

12 A. My recollection is that there was an  
13 expression of -- of being kind of okay with what the  
14 direction that we were heading in the Senate from their  
15 perspective, but that's hearsay. I mean, I may be wrong  
16 on that, but that's third -- thirdhand.

17 Q. And who conveyed that to you on the Senate  
18 staff side?

19 A. I think it was Andy Fiffick who met with  
20 Congressman Clyburn, had met more than once probably  
21 with Congressman Clyburn's representative.

22 Q. Did you ever meet with anyone from Congress  
23 Member Rice's office?

24 A. No.

25 Q. Did you ever speak with Congress Member Rice

1 plan came out.

2 Q. And so your concern was that it was a  
3 Democrat -- Democratic CD1 under that plan --

4 A. Yeah, the political --

5 Q. -- that additional --

6 A. The political numbers were -- were a slightly  
7 Democrat district, yeah. When I say "political," I  
8 mean, you're looking at the 2020 election, Trump/Biden  
9 vote.

10 Q. And so you were following the House  
11 congressional redistricting process, would it be fair to  
12 say?

13 A. The audio -- the audio, I lost the audio.

14 Q. Sorry. Would it -- would it be fair to say  
15 you were following what the House was doing for their  
16 congressional redistricting process?

17 A. I really wasn't following it closely at all,  
18 but it's just when they produced that plan, it -- it --  
19 that caught my attention. And this is very normal in  
20 the legislative process to talk to other leaders in the  
21 other chamber and, you know, are y'all, are y'all okay  
22 to considering something else? Because you're going to  
23 end up in conference committee at the end of the day.  
24 And so that -- that's -- that's really what I did in  
25 response to that.

1 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the record  
2 at 12:17 p.m.

3 BY MR. CUSICK:

4 Q. Senator Campsen, I want to talk now a bit  
5 more, just to fully delineate the roles of some of the  
6 Senate subcommittee staff members. How would you  
7 describe Mr. Terreni's role for your interactions with  
8 him for congressional redistricting?

9 A. Legal counsel, legal advice on pretty much  
10 everything having to do with redistricting.

11 Q. Was he the only person that you relied on for  
12 legal opinions for any maps that you were considering or  
13 discussing?

14 A. Well, I -- I would get the opinion of Andy  
15 Fiffick, although he's not as, really as much an expert  
16 as Charlie, but Charlie was always the final person that  
17 you go to as far as for real legal advice.

18 Q. How would you describe Mr. Roberts' role?

19 A. He was the cartographer, and very important  
20 role and is aware of -- but he's not a lawyer, but is  
21 aware of very -- very much aware of the law surrounding  
22 redistricting. And of course, we get his input on  
23 really just the demographic -- not the demographic, but  
24 census, the data for each precinct, the -- how many  
25 people, what the political numbers are, Biden -- you

1 know, Biden/Trump numbers. So he was the cartographer  
2 who provided that information.

3 Q. How about Breeden John?

4 A. Breeden was -- Breeden was really kind of  
5 assisting Charlie and Will, I guess I -- was my  
6 perception.

7 Q. And when you say "assisting Mr. Terreni,"  
8 that's for legal -- for legal advice?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. For your interactions with them, I know we  
11 talked before about BVAP, or black voting age  
12 population. Did you instruct them just not to discuss  
13 or tell you anything related to racial demographic  
14 numbers during your interactions with proposed maps --

15 A. No.

16 Q. -- or discussing proposed plans?

17 A. I told them I don't want -- I don't -- I told  
18 them -- I told them don't give me the BVAP numbers for  
19 any particular precinct we're looking at, but I want you  
20 to -- I want you to let me know if, whenever we run  
21 afoul of -- of any -- when we get into trouble making a  
22 decision or a -- or a potential, we're considering  
23 putting a precinct in the district or not, for example,  
24 are we -- are we -- let me know when we're getting in  
25 trouble when it comes to Voting Rights Act or any of

1           A.     No, and there's nothing in the guidelines to  
2     shore up a 5 to 2 Republican/Democrat split that Senator  
3     Harpootlian offered either.

4     BY MR. CUSICK:

5           Q.     Anything in the guidelines requiring CD1 to  
6     be less politically competitive for either party?

7           A.     No, that's not in the guidelines.

8           Q.     Do you recall shoring up a Republican  
9     advantage in CD1 as coming up in the map drawing  
10    process?

11          A.     Yes. I was -- I took political factors into  
12    account, and that was part of the process.

13          Q.     Was the partisan gains --

14          A.     It wasn't dominant. It didn't control  
15    everything, but it was part of the process. I could  
16    have drawn a map much more Republican.

17          Q.     So would you say partisan gain was something  
18    that motivated the map that you drew?

19                 MR. TRAYWICK: Object to the form.

20          A.     It was a fact- -- it was a factor.

21    BY MR. CUSICK:

22          Q.     During any of the times you presented the map  
23    publicly, did you ever state that?

24          A.     I -- I can't recall whether I did or not.

25          Q.     Would there be any reason you wouldn't state

1 did do that, but that was I think in looking -- in a  
2 look at the final product as I recall.

3 BY MR. CUSICK:

4 Q. And just about as familiar with the process  
5 of sponsoring an amendment, but as the lead -- would it  
6 -- would it be fair to say you were the lead sponsor or  
7 the sponsor?

8 A. Yes, you could say either.

9 Q. And so for any analyses or review that needed  
10 to be conducted, would that have been at your direction?

11 A. The staff would have done that as a matter of  
12 course.

13 Q. And they would have conducted the same types  
14 of reviews that we've already discussed today about  
15 other iterations of maps you've been involved in?

16 A. That's correct. And I certainly asked them,  
17 is it defensible or is it going to work? And, so. But  
18 I didn't really need to ask them. I knew they would do  
19 that analysis.

20 Q. Would you say one of the objectives for CD1  
21 was to make it more politically advantageous for  
22 Republicans?

23 A. To keep it a Republican district, that was  
24 one of the --

25 Q. And what was the process?



1 A. -- goals, it is.

2 Q. And what steps did you take to -- to  
3 determine whether it would remain a Republican district?

4 A. Looked at the political numbers as far as the  
5 vote counts and among the -- in the precincts for the  
6 district. And it really, it really moved the needle  
7 very, just very slightly actually. Could have made a  
8 lot more Republican, but also would have violated  
9 more -- perhaps run afoul of some of the federal law or  
10 the redistricting principles that we are subject to.

11 In fact, probably took a little -- probably a  
12 lot -- a lot of people say should have been -- been more  
13 Republican, but I wanted to honor those principles. And  
14 we -- we moved it like a point and a half, one and a  
15 half percentage points to the Republican side. It was  
16 basically a swing district, and we moved -- the  
17 Republican vote went up like one and a half percentage  
18 points.

19 Q. Did you consider CD1 a swing district before  
20 the new -- the new lines?

21 A. It was -- it was pretty -- pretty close to a  
22 swing district, yes. I mean, you had Joe Cunningham was  
23 elected and Nancy Mace was elected. It was pretty much  
24 a swing, or close to it anyway. The -- so still a  
25 Republican district, but close to being a swing, is what

1 I would say it was.

2 Q. And it would have been impossible to maintain  
3 it as a swing district, but also balance total  
4 population deviation?

5 A. Would that have been possible? I don't know.

6 Q. Anything else you think is helpful in  
7 understanding the process for the creation of Senate  
8 Amendment 1?

9 A. Is there anything -- could you restate the  
10 question?

11 Q. No, just anything else you think that's  
12 helpful in understanding what went into or factored into  
13 the creation of Senate Amendment 1?

14 A. Well, Senate Amendment 1 did a lot better job  
15 of following geographic boundaries versus other --  
16 other -- other proposals or iterations that like the  
17 House passed. We -- it was -- it was better on that  
18 front than what the House had passed.

19 It actually, after the fact, after we passed  
20 it learned this, but actually it kept the least numbers  
21 because, as staff do when we were accused of racial  
22 gerrymandering, but it actually slightly reduced the --  
23 it increased the B -- the black voting age population in  
24 the 1st and decreased it in the 6th. By small amounts,  
25 but so. So there wasn't any kind of packing or stacking

1 A. No.

2 Q. Regarding staff, you don't know at what point  
3 in the process they looked at race, right? So it could  
4 have been after they drew the plan?

5 A. When they looked at race?

6 Q. To determine compliance with federal law?

7 A. I -- well, I would say that they looked at it  
8 periodically throughout the whole process. Because you  
9 compare different proposals. You look at them. You  
10 have to -- you have to do some -- some level of  
11 comparison during that process.

12 Q. Sure, but did it predominate when they were  
13 drawing the maps themselves?

14 A. Yes. I mean, it was predominant at the end.

15 Q. -- did race predominate --

16 A. Excuse me?

17 Q. Did race predominate when they were drawing  
18 the maps?

19 MR. CUSICK: Just objection, form.

20 A. No.

21 BY MR. TRAYWICK:

22 Q. Earlier on Exhibit 4, would you mind turning  
23 to that, please, Senator Campsen? That was the -- or  
24 I'm sorry, not Exhibit 4. The submissions policy, yes,  
25 I'm sorry, Exhibit 4.