IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA

MATHIS KEARSE WRIGHT, JR.,

Plaintiff,

vs.

SUMTER COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS AND REGISTRATION,

Defendant.

CIVIL ACTION

FILE NO. 1:14-CV-42 (WLS)

DEPOSITION OF

KAREN OWEN

Thursday, November 20, 2014

10:00 a.m.

1170 Peachtree Street
Suite 2200
Atlanta, Georgia

Mona Landry, CCR-B-1514

APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL

On behalf of the Plaintiff:

LAUGHLIN MCDONALD, Esq. ACLU Foundation, Inc. 2700 International Tower 229 Peachtree Street, NE Atlanta, Georgia 30303

404-500-1235

On behalf of the Defendant:

Sumter County:

BRYAN P. TYSON, Esq.

Strickland, Brockington, Lewis, LLP

Midtown Proscenium Suite 2200

1170 Peachtree Street, NE

Atlanta, Georgia 30309-7200

678-347-2200

Also Present:

Mathis Wright

- - -

	Page 3
TABLE OF CONTENTS	
Examination	Page
Cross-Examination by Mr. McDonald	4
Direct Examination by Mr. Tyson	27
Plaintiff	
Exhibit Description	Page
Exhibit 1 Karen L. Owen's Report	5
(Original Exhibit 1 has been attached to t	:he
original transcript.)	

```
Page 4
 1
                 (Reporter disclosure made pursuant to
          Article 10.B of the Rules and Regulations of the
 2.
          Board of Court Reporting of the Judicial Council
          of Georgia.)
 4
 5
                 MR. MCDONALD: I guess you reserve
 6
          objections until the --
 7
                 MR. TYSON: Yes, we will.
 8
                 MR. MCDONALD: And do you want to read and
          sign your deposition?
 9
                 MS. OWEN:
10
                            Yes.
11
                 MR. MCDONALD: Will you administer the
12
          oath, please.
13
                           KAREN OWEN,
14
    having been first duly sworn, was examined and
     testified as follows:
15
16
                        CROSS-EXAMINATION
17
     BY MR. MCDONALD:
18
                 Dr. Owen, my name is Laughlin McDonald and
          0.
19
     I'm one of the lawyers representing the plaintiff.
20
    And I want to ask you some questions and if I'm not
21
     clear in asking the questions or if you don't
22
     understand them, just say so and I'll try to do a
23
    better job. And please respond verbally to all the
24
     questions rather than just shaking your head. And if
25
     you need to take a break at any time, just let me know
```

Page 5 1 and we will, certainly, do that. 2. Α. Yes. Q. Let me hand you your expert report. Can 4 you identify that for me? 5 This is the expert report that I Yes. 6 wrote. 7 MR. MCDONALD: I'd like to attach that to 8 the deposition as Exhibit No. 1. (Plaintiff's Exhibit 1 was marked.) 9 10 (By Mr. McDonald) According to your expert Q. 11 report, on page 1, the main emphasis of your academic 12 work has been on women in electoral and legislative 13 politics; is that correct? 14 Yes. Α. 15 Q. And the main focus of your writing and publications has been on women in politics and the 16 17 judiciary; is that correct? 18 Α. Yes. 19 And the main focus of your current Q. 20 research and working papers is on women in politics; 2.1 is that correct? 22 Α. Yes. 23 0. And your conference participation, that 24 is, participation in conferences, has been focussed on 25 women in politics and the judiciary; is that also

Page 6 1 correct? 2. Α. Yes, and in southern politics. Southern politics? Q. Yes, sir. Α. 5 Explain what you mean by that? Q. So I have attended some conferences that 6 Α. 7 are particularly related just to southern politics and the study of the region. So elections in southern 8 politics and the Old Confederate South is kind of the focus of that study. 10 11 So the historical approach to southern Q. 12 politics? Historical and current politics. 13 Α. Have you ever been hired as an expert or 14 Q. 15 an expert witness in a vote dilution case under Section 2? 16 17 Α. No. I have not. 18 So this will be your first one? Q. 19 Α. Yes. 20 And I take it, then, you've never been Q. 21 deposed or testified as an expert witness in a vote 22 dilution case under Section 2 of the Voting Rights 23 Act? 24 No, I have not. Α. 25 Q. Have you ever written any papers on vote

- dilution under Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act?
- 2 A. No, I have not.
- 3 Q. Have you ever written any papers on the
- 4 three factors identified as probative of minority vote
- 5 dilution in Thornburg versus Gingles, that is to say,
- 6 minority geographic compactness, minority political
- 7 cohesion and bloc voting by whites?
- 8 A. No, I have not written anything.
- 9 Q. So your report in this case would be your
- 10 first effort at discussing the Gingles' factors?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. And I take it you've never given a
- 13 conference presentation on the three Gingles factors?
- 14 A. No, I have not.
- 15 Q. Have you ever taught the three Gingles
- 16 factors in any of your courses?
- 17 A. Yes, I have.
- 18 Q. Explain what you did.
- 19 A. So I teach a course in southern politics
- 20 at the undergraduate level and within that course, I
- 21 teach a whole entire unit on the Voting Rights Act.
- 22 Within the Voting Rights Act, we talk about different
- 23 case law pertaining to the Act. We also discuss
- 24 sections of the Voting Rights Act, so Section 2,
- 25 Section 5, Section 4. And I teach the case of

- 1 Thornburg V Gingles and the conditions. And I also
- 2 have taught sections in my southern politics class on
- 3 redistricting, so we talk a lot about free clearance
- 4 in Section 5.
- 5 Q. What is the status of Section 5 now that
- 6 you have knowledge of?
- 7 A. I have knowledge that last year 2013, with
- 8 the Shelby County case that the Supreme Court found
- 9 Section 4 unconstitutional and so that has an affect
- 10 on the states that were triggered to be -- to then go
- 11 to Section 5 and be pre-cleared.
- 12 Q. So Section 4 is the coverage formula; is
- 13 that correct?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. And do you know whether or not Congress is
- 16 considering responding to the Shelby County case by
- 17 adopting a coverage formula or making other amendments
- 18 to the Voting Rights Act?
- 19 A. I am not knowledgeable of that.
- 20 Q. In your report on page 3, you say that you
- 21 have knowledge and experience in using homogeneous
- 22 precinct analysis, and Bivariate Regression analysis
- 23 and Ecological Inference known as the EI or the King
- 24 method; is that correct?
- 25 A. Yes.

- 1 Q. And tell me when did you acquire knowledge
- 2 of these three methods.
- 3 A. I have used these methods when I was
- 4 working on my Ph.D. at the University of Georgia. So
- 5 I studied methodology as my minor field and so we
- 6 covered these courses within that requirements for
- 7 that field of study. We did maximum likelihood --
- 8 maximum likelihood estimation and we also had a course
- 9 on regression analysis.
- 10 Q. What was your dissertation on?
- 11 A. My dissertation looked at what influences
- 12 a woman to run for higher political office and do
- 13 female role models influence their decision to leave
- 14 the State legislature and run to Congress.
- 15 Q. So how did these analyses affect or were
- 16 useful in your analysis in this dissertation?
- 17 A. I used regression analysis in my
- 18 dissertation, uh-huh.
- 19 Q. In your report page 4, you define the word
- 20 quote, usually, end quote as used in the third Gingles
- 21 factor to mean a condition that occurs more often than
- 22 not; is that correct?
- 23 A. Yes.
- 24 Q. Is there any further explanation you'd
- 25 want to make of that definition?

- 1 A. No. I'm comfortable with that definition.
- 2 Q. And in your report, page 5, you say that
- 3 you assumed that McBride's data and estimations are
- 4 reliable and valid; is that correct?
- 5 A. I did write, yes, that -- I did write, but
- 6 yes, I assumed that they were reliable and valid.
- 7 Q. And you still assume they are?
- 8 A. Yes, I do assume.
- 9 Q. In your report, page 5, you acknowledge
- 10 that voting in Sumter County in some contest is
- 11 racially polarized; is that correct?
- 12 A. Yes, I state that.
- 13 Q. And in reaching that opinion, did you base
- it on Dr. McBride's report?
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. I want to ask you some questions about the
- 17 Gingles factor No. 2. In your report, you say that
- 18 there are inconclusive results from the plaintiff's
- 19 report for support of the Gingles prong 2 and 4 of the
- 20 12 elections, that is, 33 percent of the elections; is
- 21 that correct?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. And I take it you do not dispute that
- 24 blacks were politically cohesive in 8 of the 12
- 25 elections; is that correct?

- 1 A. Could you restate that, please.
- 2 Q. I take it you do not dispute that blacks
- 3 were politically cohesive in 8 of the 12 elections?
- 4 A. Yes, that's correct.
- 5 Q. That would be 66.6 percent, thus, in a
- 6 majority of the elections, a significant number of
- 7 minority group members usually, that is, more often
- 8 than not, voted for the same candidates, correct?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. And I want to ask you now some questions
- 11 about some of the specific elections you looked at,
- 12 the four specific elections you looked at. And one of
- 13 the four elections you identified, that is, Board of
- 14 Education District No. 3 contest in 2014. According
- 15 to the King analysis, the majority of blacks voted for
- 16 Willa Fitzpatrick, the black candidate, correct?
- 17 A. I do not have the exact graft or chart
- 18 from Dr. McBride's report.
- 19 Q. Well, let me --
- 20 A. But --
- 21 Q. Well, you do discuss the election in some
- detail in your own report, do you not?
- 23 A. Yes, on page 6.
- 24 O. Yeah.
- 25 A. Are you talking about Board of Education

Page 12 District No. 3? 1 2. Yeah. Q. Α. Yes. 4 Q. In 2014. You do acknowledge, do you not, 5 that the majority of blacks voted for Willa 6 Fitzpatrick, the black candidate, correct? 7 Α. I acknowledge that the McBride report does 8 show that 56.3 percent for the black vote did go for Ms. Fitzpatrick. 9 10 And whites voted as a bloc using both Bara Q. and the King analysis for the white candidate J.C. 11 12 Reid; is that correct? Yes, according to McBride's estimates. 13 Α. And re-defeated Fitzpatrick, correct? 14 Q. 15 Α. Yes. 16 Q. And you don't dispute that, do you? 17 I do not dispute that Reid won. Α. 18 In the second election you identify, that Q. 19 is, Board of Education District No. 2 election in 20 2014, using the King methods, the majority of blacks 21 voted for Sarah Pride, the black candidate, correct? 22 I'm sorry. Could you ask the question 23 again. 24 Yeah. In the second election you 0. 25 identify, that is, the Board of Education District No.

- 1 2 election in 2014, according to the King analysis,
- 2 the majority of blacks voted for Sarah Pride, the
- 3 black candidate, correct?
- 4 A. I would not -- no, I would not say that is
- 5 the majority of the blacks.
- 6 Q. 50.5 percentage; isn't that correct?
- 7 A. That is what is reported by Dr. McBride as
- 8 the King estimate, 50.5 percent, but I would argue in
- 9 my expert opinion that is an estimate. So with a
- 10 standard error and a confidence interval, it could be
- 11 lower or it could be higher. And if it's lower than
- 12 the 50.5 percent, I would not feel comfortable saying
- 13 that the majority of the vote went to Ms. Pride.
- 14 Q. But the King analysis indicates that they
- 15 did; isn't that correct?
- 16 A. It demonstrates right here as an estimate
- 17 that it's 50.5 percent. That is an estimate.
- 18 Q. And also Meda Krenson using both Bara and
- 19 King got, what, 73.3 percent or 60.2 percent of the
- white vote, correct?
- 21 A. Yes, that's what's reported.
- 22 Q. And Krenson defeated Pride; isn't that
- 23 correct?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. And Krenson using the King estimates got a

- 1 very small percent of the black vote; isn't that
- 2 correct, 8 percent?
- A. I'm sorry. Could you ask that again.
- 4 Q. Krenson got only 8 percent of the black
- 5 vote using the King analysis; is that correct?
- A. Yes, that's the estimate that's reported.
- 7 Q. In the third election you identify, that
- 8 is, the Board of Education District No. 3 election in
- 9 2006. According to the King estimate and the Bara
- 10 Ecological Regression estimates, the overwhelming
- 11 majority of blacks voted for the black candidate,
- 12 Darius Harris; is that correct?
- 13 A. I'm sorry. Could you say the --
- 14 Q. In that election, the Board of Education
- 15 District No. 3 election in 2006 --
- 16 A. Uh-huh.
- 17 O. -- according to the King estimate, 93.4 of
- 18 blacks voted for the black candidate, Darius Harris;
- 19 correct?
- 20 A. Yes, that is what's reported.
- 21 Q. Also using Bara analysis, 86 percent of
- 22 blacks voted for the black candidate?
- 23 A. Yes, that's what reported. And also,
- 24 what's reported is that Seay, the candidate Seay,
- 25 received 43.6 percent from the King estimate. When

- 1 added to the 93.4 percent, that's over a hundred
- 2 percent which is unreliable.
- 3 Q. And she got 18 percentage using the Bara
- 4 analysis of the black vote?
- 5 A. Yes, that's what is reported.
- 6 Q. And the white candidate, Donna Minich, got
- 7 very strong white support under both the Bara and the
- 8 King analysis, correct?
- 9 A. I would say what's reported at 80 percent
- 10 estimate on the Bara report is significant. The 57.7
- 11 percent under King, again, that's an estimate with a
- 12 standard error. We would need to see the standard
- 13 error to justify that that is a majority of the
- 14 non-black voters supporting Minich.
- 15 Q. And Minich won, correct?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. Now, let's look at Gingles factor No. 3.
- 18 In your report on page 7, you say there are seven
- 19 elections which show the black-preferred candidates
- 20 succeeding and thus no support for Gingles prong 3; is
- 21 that correct?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. Now, the third Gingles factor provides
- 24 that the minority must be able to demonstrate that the
- 25 white majority vote sufficiently as a bloc to enable

- 1 it in the absence of special circumstances such as a
- 2 minority candidate running unopposed usually to defeat
- 3 the minority's preferred candidates; is that correct?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. In the first election you identified in
- 6 your discussion of Gingles factor No. 3, that is,
- 7 Board of Education District No. 3 general election in
- 8 2002. The winning candidate, Donna Minich, did not
- 9 receive a majority of the black vote; isn't that
- 10 correct?
- 11 A. I'm sorry. Could you say the election
- 12 again.
- 13 Q. Board of Education District No. 3 general
- 14 election in 2002.
- 15 A. And then could you ask the --
- 16 Q. And Donna Minich did not receive a
- majority of the black vote, correct?
- 18 A. Minich did not receive over 50 percent.
- 19 Q. According to Bara, she got 30.8 percent;
- 20 is that correct?
- 21 A. Yes, that's what's reported by
- 22 Dr. McBride.
- Q. And according to the King analysis, she
- 24 got 41 percent; is that correct?
- 25 A. Yes, which is the largest number reported

- 1 of those candidates on the King estimate.
- 2 Q. But it still is not a majority as
- 3 reported?
- 4 A. It's not over 50 percent, yeah.
- 5 Q. In the third election you identify, that
- 6 is, Board of Education District No. 1 election in May
- 7 2014, blacks were 62.7 percent of the voting-age
- 8 population of the district; is that correct?
- 9 A. Which -- I'm sorry?
- 10 Q. That's Board of Education District No. 1
- 11 election in May 2014.
- 12 A. Yes, that's reported that the black
- voting-age population is 62.7 percent.
- 14 Q. 62.7 percent?
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. And there was no white majority by
- 17 definition, correct?
- 18 A. No.
- 19 Q. In the fourth election you identified, the
- 20 Board of Education District No. 5 election in May
- 21 2014, blacks were 70.6 percent of the voting-age
- 22 population in the district; is that correct?
- 23 A. Yes, that's what is reported.
- Q. And there was no white majority by
- 25 **definition**, correct?

Case 1:14-cv-00042-WLS Document 39 Filed 01/12/15 Page 18 of 40 Page 18 1 Α. No. 2. The white candidate in that election, Mark Q. 3 Griggs, got only 21.9 percent of the black vote using 4 the Bara analysis, correct? 5 Α. Yes. 6 And 33.2 percent of the black vote using 0. 7 the King analysis; is that correct? 8 Α. Yes. 9 0. In the fifth election you identified, that is, the Board of Education At-Large election in 2014, 10 11 there was no winner because the top two candidates, 12 Michael Coley who was black and Sylvia Roland who was 13 white, were forced into a runoff, correct? 14 I'm sorry. Could you ask that question Α. 15 again. 16 In the fifth election you identified, that Q.

- is, the Board of Education At-Large election in 2014,
- 18 there was no winner in that contest because the top
- 19 two candidates, Michael Coley who was black and Sylvia
- 20 Roland who was white, were forced into a runoff,
- 21 correct?
- 22 A. No. I would not say that there wasn't a
- 23 winner.
- 24 Q. Well, they won the primary, but they
- 25 didn't win the ultimate election?

- 1 A. But both wanted to walk away with a
- 2 success in that election and then they had to go and
- 3 compete in the runoff and then you would have a winner
- 4 or loser from the runoff.
- 5 Q. Do you know who actually won the election
- 6 in the runoff?
- 7 A. I believe Dr. McBride reports that Roland
- 8 won the election and that's what was reported.
- 9 Q. And Roland was white?
- 10 A. I don't know that.
- 11 Q. Well, do you deny that Roland was white?
- 12 A. I don't know. I don't know the race of
- 13 the candidates.
- Q. Well, Coley, according to Bara, got 86
- percent of the vote in the primary; is that correct?
- 16 A. Yeah, that's what's reported.
- 17 Q. And 68.2 percent based on the King
- 18 analysis, correct?
- 19 A. Yes, that's what's reported.
- 20 Q. And Roland got the largest number of white
- 21 votes; isn't that correct?
- 22 A. Roland received, yes, the largest
- 23 percentage.
- 24 Q. 54.9 percent using the Bara analysis,

JPA Reporting, LLC

25 correct?

Page 20 1 Yeah, that's the estimate. Α. 2. And 40.5 using the King analysis? Q. Yes, that's what the estimate is. Α. 4 Q. And how many candidates were there in that 5 primary election? 6 Α. There were four. 7 Q. It's not actually a primary because you're 8 not running in a political party's race, so I'm using that phrase with some distinction. 9 10 In the July 22, 2014 runoff, Coley was 11 defeated by Roland; isn't that correct? 12 Yes. Α. 13 And Coley got the majority of the black 0. vote; isn't that correct? 14 Yes. He received an estimate that's 15 Α. reported of 65.6 percent with the King. 16 17 And 95.3 percent using the Bara analysis? 0. 18 Α. Yes. 19 And Roland got the majority of the white Q. 20 vote; isn't that correct? 2.1 Α. Yes. 22 Q. 93.4 percent using Bara, correct? 23 Α. Yes. 24 And 76.2 percent using King, correct? Q. 25 Yes. Α.

- 1 Q. And in the sixth election you identify,
- 2 that is, the Board of Education District No. 3
- election in 2010, blacks were a majority of the total
- 4 population in District No. 3 at that time; isn't that
- 5 correct?
- 6 A. I do not know. I do not know their
- 7 percent and the total makeup of the district.
- 8 Q. Well, do you know whether or not there was
- 9 a white majority in that district?
- 10 A. I do not know.
- 11 Q. And do you know whether or not Kevin
- 12 Pless, the black candidate, got 99.5 percent of the
- 13 black vote using the King analysis?
- 14 A. It is reported, yes, by Dr. McBride.
- 15 Q. And Donna Minich got 73.6 percent using
- 16 the Bara analysis, correct?
- 17 A. Well, considering that we just used King
- 18 to look at Pless, I would look at King to look at
- 19 Minich and she received 60.8 percent of the non-black
- 20 in her estimate.
- 21 Q. So she got 60.8 percent of the white vote
- 22 using the King analysis; is that correct?
- 23 A. Yes.
- 24 Q. In the seventh election you identified,
- 25 that is, the Board of Education District No. 1

- 1 election in 2008, blacks were a majority of the total
- 2 population; isn't that correct?
- 3 A. I do not know in the total population.
- 4 Q. Do you dispute the fact that they were?
- 5 A. I can't say. I have not seen. I do not
- 6 know.
- 7 Q. Just have no opinion?
- 8 A. No opinion.
- 9 Q. But the fact is Carolyn Whitehead, who is
- 10 black, got 93.3 percent of the black vote using the
- 11 Bara analysis, correct?
- 12 A. Yes, that's what the estimate is.
- 13 Q. And she got 96.9 percent of the black vote
- 14 using the King analysis; is that correct?
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. And Stephanie McCook, the white candidate,
- 17 got a majority of the white votes; isn't that correct?
- 18 A. She received 54 percent of -- from -- the
- 19 estimate is 54.0 percent from the Bara estimates and
- 20 50.7 percent on the King. With a 50.7, arguably, you
- 21 could say that's majority. Arguably, if you put
- 22 standards errors with a confidence interval, it could
- 23 be less than the majority.
- 24 O. It could be less or it could be more?
- 25 A. It could be.

- 1 Q. Yeah. I take it given your study in state
- 2 history, you are aware that Georgia has a significant
- 3 history of racial discrimination in voting; isn't that
- 4 correct?
- 5 A. Yes, I'm aware.
- 6 Q. And it has a history of racial
- 7 discrimination in virtually all areas of life; isn't
- 8 that correct?
- 9 A. Yes. I mean, from my historical classes
- 10 I've heard, yes, uh-huh.
- 11 Q. That would include, what, education,
- 12 public accommodations, what else?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. And do you think that that history of
- 15 racial discrimination has any continuing affects
- 16 today?
- 17 A. I'm not an expert to say that. I assume,
- 18 yes, it still has an affect.
- 19 Q. Have you ever looked at modern census data
- 20 which compares the status of blacks in a number of
- 21 areas to whites such as socioeconomic conditions,
- income, housing, education?
- A. No, I have not.
- 24 O. You have not?
- 25 A. No, I have not.

Page 24 1 So that's covered in Dr. McBride's report, Q. 2. but you didn't really examine that in any way? I was not asked to. Α. No. 4 0. You are aware, I'm sure, that Georgia has 5 a history of racial discrimination in voting? 6 Yes, I'm aware. 7 Q. Are you familiar with what the reconstruction response was after passage of the 14th 8 and 15th Amendments? 9 10 No, I'm not aware specifically of that. 11 Are you aware of the fact that Georgia 0. 12 adopted things like literacy tests for voting after 13 the passage of the 14th and 15th Amendment? 14 Yes. Α. 15 Q. Good character and understanding tests? 16 Α. Yes. 17 All white primaries? 0. 18 Yes, I'm familiar with that. Α. 19 And excluding blacks from registering and Q. 20 voting? 21 Α. Yes. 22 Q. Aside from those legal measures, there 23 were, you know, efforts by the Ku Klux Klan and local 24 militia to prevent blacks from registering and voting? 25 I've heard of things, but I don't know Α.

- 1 specific information about that.
- 2 Q. And are you aware that Sumter County has a
- similar history of racial discrimination including in
- 4 voting?
- 5 A. I don't have specific knowledge on Sumter
- 6 County. I assume if it's like most other areas of the
- 7 south, it's had a history of discrimination.
- 8 Q. Have you ever visited Sumter County?
- 9 A. No, I have not.
- 10 Q. Never been there?
- 11 A. No, I have not.
- 12 Q. So it necessarily follows that you haven't
- discussed racially polarized voting with any residents
- of Sumter County?
- 15 A. No, I have not.
- 16 Q. In preparing your report, what did you do
- 17 other than examine the data that Dr. McBride provided
- 18 in his report?
- 19 A. I examined his data. And then I actually
- 20 went and started to collect and see what data would
- 21 have been available he could have used. So I went and
- 22 asked if the county had voter registration data for
- 23 the 2014 election so that you could determine turnout.
- 24 So I looked up that data to just ask voter
- 25 registration and if you could see who was registered

- 1 to vote in a certain precinct. I also examined the
- 2 Secretary of State's website to determine the winners
- 3 in the elections that he had chosen just to look at
- 4 the vote totals again.
- 5 Q. Did you find that his vote totals and his
- 6 identification of the winners of the elections was
- 7 correct?
- 8 A. Yes. I did question one election and I'm
- 9 not sure the year exactly, but I could not find that
- 10 data on the Secretary of State's website. And I
- 11 wasn't sure if he had collected it from the county.
- 12 Q. So did you look at any other voter
- 13 registration data other than that for the 2014
- 14 election?
- 15 A. No, I did not.
- 16 Q. And why not?
- 17 A. I wasn't asked to really look at that. I
- 18 was just looking to see if the data was available.
- 19 O. So what did you do with the voter
- 20 registration data from the 2014 election?
- 21 A. I examined it to see if you could look at
- 22 and find out which registered voter was in a precinct
- 23 to then determine if there was the ability to create
- 24 the turnout by race.
- Q. Were you able to do that?

Page 27 I did not go further in. I just collected 1 Α. the data to see if it was available, but I did not 2. code it or match it, parcel it out. 4 0. You did no analysis of it? 5 I did no analysis of it. Α. And I take it that your testimony in this 6 0. 7 case will be limited to what you say in your report? 8 Α. Yes. 9 MR. MCDONALD: Can you excuse us for a minute, I'm going to talk to Reverend Wright. 10 11 (Recess from 10:27 a.m. to 10:28 a.m.) 12 MR. MCDONALD: Thank you, very much. MR. TYSON: Could I ask one question, 13 14 Laughlin? Sure. 15 MR. MCDONALD: 16 DIRECT EXAMINATION 17 BY MR. TYSON: 18 Dr. Owen, Mr. McDonald asked you about the 0. 19 2014 Board of Education At Large two-year seat where 20 there was no winner, do you recall those questions? 21 Α. Yes. 22 Q. And you said there was some -- one and two 23 walked away with a success, but then you distinguished 24 between that and winning. Can you elaborate on that 25 for us?

Page 28 1 So in political science literature, we 2. talk about elections being somewhat in two stages. So 3 if we are in a state like Georgia where you have a system where it requires the majority vote to succeed 4 5 to win that election and candidates going into that 6 election would know that they have to get 50 percent 7 plus one to win. If not, they are jockeying for the 8 first seat or the second seat so that they can get into the runoff. So if we think about the current 9 10 gubernatorial election, there were a lot of 11 discussions here in Georgia about both candidates not 12 sure they could get over 50 percent, so they were 13 planning ahead for a runoff. Arguably, this contest 14 at-large, those two candidates who came out ahead could be classified as an electoral success for them 15 16 because they have then the opportunity to go to the 17 second stage of the election which is the runoff. 18 they can in that time period between the first 19 election and the second election, raise more money. 20 They can collect a bigger donor base. They can go to 21 the voters who supported the other candidates and try 22 to rally their support. And in doing that, they can 23 claim in their campaign that they had the most vote totals coming out of the first stage or if you want to 24 25 say like the primary how it is. So one of the

```
Page 29
     candidates could say yes, this was an electoral
 1
 2.
     success and then go onto the next stage.
                 Is there any social science literature on
          Q.
 4
     how you treat this type of scenario when someone is in
 5
     an initial election and then a runoff?
                 There is substantial articles and books
 6
 7
     written on runoffs. And to have a runoff, you have to
     have an initial win-loss at the first stage which
 8
     would be primaries. Bullock and Johnson have written
 9
     a book on runoffs and there's a whole discussion about
10
     when you get to the runoff, which candidate can win.
11
12
     If you polled -- in the first stage, if you were first
     or second place, then who is most likely to win in the
13
14
     second stage of the runoff.
15
                 MR. TYSON: All right.
16
                 MR. MCDONALD:
                                Thank you.
17
                 (Deposition concluded at 10:31 a.m.)
18
                 (Pursuant to Rule 30(e) of the Federal
19
    Rules of Civil Procedure and/or O.C.G.A. 9-11-30(e),
20
     signature of the witness has been reserved.)
2.1
22
23
24
25
```

	Page 30
1	CERTIFICATE OF COURT REPORTER
2	
3	STATE OF GEORGIA:
4	COUNTY OF FULTON:
5	I hereby certify that the foregoing
6	transcript was reported as stated in the caption and
7	the questions and answers thereto were reduced to writing by me; that the foregoing 29 pages represent a
8	true, correct, and complete transcript of the evidence given on Thursday, November 20, 2014, by the witness,
9	Karen Owen, who was first duly sworn by me.
10	I certify that I am not disqualified for a relationship of interest under
11	O.C.G.A. 9-11-28(c); I am a Georgia Certified Court Reporter here as an independent contractor of
12	JPA Reporting, LLC who was contacted by Laughlin McDonald to provide court reporting services
13	for the proceedings; I will not be taking these proceedings under any contract that is prohibited by
14	O.C.G.A. 15-14-37(a) and (b) or Article 7.C. of the Rules and Regulations of the Board; and by the
15	attached disclosure form I confirm that neither I nor
	JPA Reporting, LLC are a party to a contract prohibited by O.C.G.A. 15-14-37(a) and (b) or
16	Article 7.C. of the Rules and Regulations of the Board.
17	
18	This 10th day of December, 2014.
19	
20	
21	MONA LANDRY
22	CERTIFIED COURT REPORTER GEORGIA CERTIFICATE NO. CCR-B-1514
23	
24	
25	

	Page 31
1	DISCLOSURE OF NO CONTRACT
2	
3	I, Lynn Pyles, do hereby disclose pursuant
4	to Article 10.B of the Rules and Regulations of the
5	Board of Court Reporting of the Judicial Council of
6	Georgia that JPA Reporting, LLC was contacted by the
7	party taking the proceedings to provide court
8	reporting services for these proceedings and there is
9	no contract that is prohibited by O.C.G.A. 15-14-37(a)
10	and (b) or Article 7.C. of the Rules and Regulations
11	of the Board for the taking of these proceedings.
12	There is no contract to provide reporting
13	services between JPA Reporting, LLC or any person with
14	whom JPA Reporting, LLC has a principal and agency
15	relationship nor any attorney at law in this action,
16	party to this action, party having a financial interest
17	in this action, or agent for an attorney at law in
18	this action, party to this action, or party having a
19	financial interest in this action. Any and all
20	financial arrangements beyond our usual and customary
21	rates have been disclosed and offered to all parties.
22	This 10th day of December, 2014.
23	
24	LYNN PYLES, FIRM REPRESENTATIVE
25	JPA REPORTING, LLC

			Page 32	
1	DEPOSITION OF: KAREN OWEN /MRL			
2	I do hereby certify that I have read all			
3	questions propounded to me and all answers given by me on November 20, 2014, taken before Mona Landry, and			
4	that:	,		
5	•	re are no char following cha	anges are noted:	
6			of the Federal Rules of	
7	Annotated 9-1	1-30(e), both	Official Code of Georgia of which read in part: Any	
8	shall be ente	red upon the d	ce which you desire to make depositionwith a	
9	Accordingly,	to assist you	ivenfor making them. in effecting corrections,	
10	please use th	e form below:		
11	Page No.	Line No.	should read:	
12	Dana Ma	T NT-	-b1-dd.	
13	Page No.	Line No.	should read:	
14	Page No.	Line No.	should read:	
15	Page No.	Line No.	should read:	
16	rage no.	HINC NO.	Siloura read	
17	Page No.	Line No.	should read:	
18	Page No.	Line No.	should read:	
19	J			
20	Page No.	Line No.	should read:	
21	Page No.	Line No.	should read:	
22				
23	Page No.	Line No.	should read:	
24	Page No.	Line No.	should read:	
25				

```
Page 33
1
    DEPOSITION OF: KAREN OWEN /MRL
 2
                                  should read:
    Page No. Line No.
 3
                                  should read:
    Page No.
                   Line No.
 4
 5
                                  should read:
                   Line No.
    Page No.
 6
                                  should read:
                   Line No.
    Page No.
7
8
                                  should read:
    Page No.
                   Line No.
 9
                                  should read:
    Page No.
                   Line No.
10
                                 should read:
11
    Page No.
                   Line No.
12
                Line No. should read:
    Page No.
13
14
    If supplemental or additional pages are necessary,
    please furnish same in typewriting annexed to this
15
    deposition.
16
17
                    KAREN OWEN
18
    Sworn to and subscribed before me,
                                     , 20
19
    This the
                   day of
20
    Notary Public
21
    My commission expires:
2.2
    Please forward corrections to:
23
                      JPA Reporting, LLC
24
           1776 Peachtree Street, N.W., Suite 230-S
                    Atlanta, Georgia 30309
25
                         404-853-1811
```

A	aside 24:22	21:3 22:1 23:20	claim 28:23
ability 26:23	asked 24:3 25:22	24:19,24	class 8:2
able 15:24 26:25	26:17 27:18	bloc 7:7 12:10 15:25	classes 23:9
absence 16:1	asking 4:21	board 1:6 4:3 11:13	classified 28:15
academic 5:11	assist 32:9	11:25 12:19,25 14:8	clear 4:21
accommodations	assume 10:7,8 23:17	14:14 16:7,13 17:6	clearance 8:3
23:12	25:6	17:10,20 18:10,17	code 27:3 32:6
acknowledge 10:9	assumed 10:3,6	21:2,25 27:19 30:14	cohesion 7:7
12:4,7	atlanta 1:20 2:6,17	30:16 31:5,11	cohesive 10:24 11:3
aclu 2:4	33:24	book 29:10	coley 18:12,19 19:14
acquire 9:1	atlarge 18:10,17	books 29:6	20:10,13
act 6:23 7:1,21,22,23	28:14	break 4:25	collect 25:20 28:20
7:24 8:18	attach 5:7	brockington 2:14	collected 26:11 27:1
action 1:5 31:15,16	attached 3:24 30:14	bryan 2:13	comfortable 10:1
31:17,18,18,19	attended 6:6	bullock 29:9	13:12
added 15:1	attorney 31:15,17	$\overline{\mathbf{c}}$	coming 28:24
additional 33:14	available 25:21 26:18	c 12:11 29:19 30:10	commission 33:21
administer 4:11	27:2	30:10,13,13,15,16	compactness 7:6
adopted 24:12	aware 23:2,5 24:4,6	31:9,10	compares 23:20
adopting 8:17	24:10,11 25:2	campaign 28:23	compete 19:3
affect 8:9 9:15 23:18	B	campaign 28.23 candidate 11:16 12:6	complete 30:7
agency 31:14	b 4:2 30:13,15 31:4	12:11,21 13:3 14:11	concluded 29:17
agent 31:17	31:10	14:18,22,24 15:6	condition 9:21
ahead 28:13,14	bara 12:10 13:18	16:2,8 18:2 21:12	conditions 8:1 23:21
amendment 24:13	14:9,21 15:3,7,10	22:16 29:11	confederate 6:9
amendments 8:17	16:19 18:4 19:14,24	candidates 11:8	conference 5:23 7:13
24:9	20:17,22 21:16	15:19 16:3 17:1	conferences 5:24 6:6 confidence 13:10
analyses 9:15	22:11,19	18:11,19 19:13 20:4	22:22
analysis 8:22,22 9:9	base 10:13 28:20	28:5,11,14,21 29:1	confirm 30:14
9:16,17 11:15 12:11	based 19:17	cant 22:5	congress 8:15 9:14
13:1,14 14:5,21	behalf 2:3,10	caption 30:6	considering 8:16
15:4,8 16:23 18:4,7	believe 19:7	carolyn 22:9	21:17
19:18,24 20:2,17	better 4:23	case 6:15,22 7:9,23	contacted 30:11 31:6
21:13,16,22 22:11	beyond 31:20	7:25 8:8,16 27:7	contents 3:2
22:14 27:4,5	bigger 28:20	ccrb1514 1:25 30:22	contest 10:10 11:14
annexed 33:15	bivariate 8:22	census 23:19	18:18 28:13
annotated 32:7 answers 30:6 32:2	black 11:16 12:6,8,21	certain 26:1	continuing 23:15
	13:3 14:1,4,11,18	certainly 5:1	contract 30:13,15
appearances 2:1 approach 6:11	14:22 15:4 16:9,17	certificate 30:1,22	31:1,9,12
areas 23:7,21 25:6	17:12 18:3,6,12,19	certified 30:10,22	contractor 30:11
arguably 22:20,21	20:13 21:12,13	certify 30:5,9 32:2	correct 5:13,17,21
28:13	22:10,10,13	changes 32:4,5,7	6:1 8:13,24 9:22
argue 13:8	blackpreferred	character 24:15	10:4,11,21,25 11:4
arrangements 31:20	15:19	chart 11:17	11:8,16 12:6,12,14
article 4:2 30:13,16	blacks 10:24 11:2,15	chosen 26:3	12:21 13:3,6,15,20
31:4,10	12:5,20 13:2,5	circumstances 16:1	13:23 14:2,5,12,19
articles 29:6	14:11,18,22 17:7,21	civil 1:5 29:19 32:6	15:8,15,21 16:3,10
ui ticics 27.0			
	<u> </u>	I	1

examination 3:6,9 16:17,20,24 17:8,17 **deposition** 1:10 4:9 \mathbf{E} 17:22,25 18:4,7,13 5:8 29:17 32:1,8 27:16 **e** 29:18,19 32:6,7 18:21 19:15,18,21 33:1.15 **examine** 24:2 25:17 **ecological** 8:23 14:10 description 3:16 19:25 20:11,14,20 **examined** 4:14 25:19 **education** 11:14,25 desire 32:7 20:22,24 21:5,16,22 26:1.21 12:19,25 14:8,14 **detail** 11:22 excluding 24:19 22:2,11,14,17 23:4 16:7,13 17:6,10,20 23:8 26:7 30:7 **determine** 25:23 26:2 excuse 27:9 18:10,17 21:2,25 corrections 32:9 exhibit 3:16,19,24 26:23 23:11,22 27:19 33:22 didnt 18:25 24:2 5:8.9 effecting 32:9 **council** 4:3 31:5 different 7:22 experience 8:21 **effort** 7:10 **expert** 5:3,5,10 6:14 counsel 2:1 **dilution** 6:15.22 7:1.5 **efforts** 24:23 **county** 1:6 2:11 8:8 direct 3:9 27:16 6:15,21 13:9 23:17 ei 8:23 8:16 10:10 25:2.6.8 disclose 31:3 expires 33:21 elaborate 27:24 disclosed 31:21 **explain** 6:5 7:18 25:14,22 26:11 30:4 **election** 11:21 12:18 course 7:19,20 9:8 **disclosure** 4:1 30:14 explanation 9:24 12:19,24 13:1 14:7 **courses** 7:16 9:6 31:1 14:8,14,15 16:5,7 F discrimination 23:3 **court** 1:1 4:3 8:8 30:1 16:11,14 17:5,6,11 fact 22:4,9 24:11 30:10,12,22 31:5,7 23:7,15 24:5 25:3,7 17:19,20 18:2,9,10 **factor** 9:21 10:17 discuss 7:23 11:21 **coverage** 8:12,17 18:16,17,25 19:2,5 15:17,23 16:6 covered 9:6 24:1 discussed 25:13 19:8 20:5 21:1,3,24 **factors** 7:4,10,13,16 **create** 26:23 discussing 7:10 22:1 25:23 26:8,14 **familiar** 24:7,18 **discussion** 16:6 29:10 crossexamination 26:20 28:5,6,10,17 **federal** 29:18 32:6 3:8 4:16 discussions 28:11 28:19,19 29:5 **feel** 13:12 **current** 5:19 6:13 dispute 10:23 11:2 **elections** 1:7 6:8 **female** 9:13 28:9 12:16,17 22:4 10:20,20,25 11:3,6 **field** 9:5,7 customary 31:20 disqualified 30:9 11:11,12,13 15:19 **fifth** 18:9.16 dissertation 9:10,11 26:3,6 28:2 D **file** 1:6 9:16,18 **electoral** 5:12 28:15 **d** 9:4 **financial** 31:16,19,20 distinction 20:9 29:1 darius 14:12,18 **find** 26:5,9,22 distinguished 27:23 emphasis 5:11 data 10:3 23:19 **firm** 31:24 **district** 1:1,1 11:14 **enable** 15:25 25:17,19,20,22,24 **first** 4:14 6:18 7:10 12:1,19,25 14:8,15 entered 32:8 26:10,13,18,20 27:2 16:5 28:8,18,24 16:7,13 17:6,8,10 **entire** 7:21 day 30:18 31:22 29:8,12,12 30:8 17:20,22 21:2,4,7,9 **error** 13:10 15:12,13 33:19 fitzpatrick 11:16 21:25 **errors** 22:22 december 30:18 12:6,9,14 **doing** 28:22 **esq** 2:4,13 31:22 focus 5:15,19 6:10 donna 15:6 16:8,16 estimate 13:8,9,16,17 decision 9:13 focussed 5:24 21:15 14:6,9,17,25 15:10 defeat 16:2 following 32:5 **donor** 28:20 15:11 17:1 20:1,3 **defeated** 13:22 20:11 **follows** 4:15 25:12 dont 4:21 12:16 20:15 21:20 22:12 **defendant** 1:8 2:10 **forced** 18:13,20 19:10,12,12 24:25 22:19 **define** 9:19 foregoing 30:5,7 25:5 estimates 12:13 **definition** 9:25 10:1 **form** 30:14 32:7,9 **dr** 4:18 10:14 11:18 13:25 14:10 22:19 17:17,25 **formula** 8:12,17 13:7 16:22 19:7 estimation 9:8 demonstrate 15:24 **forward** 33:22 21:14 24:1 25:17 estimations 10:3 demonstrates 13:16 **found** 8:8 27:18 evidence 30:7 deny 19:11 foundation 2:4 **duly** 4:14 30:8 **exact** 11:17

deposed 6:21

exactly 26:9

four 11:12,13 20:6

fourth 17:19	identification 26:6	kearse 1:3	literacy 24:12
free 8:3	identified 7:4 11:13	kevin 21:11	literature 28:1 29:3
fulton 30:4	16:5 17:19 18:9,16	kind 6:9	
furnish 33:15	21:24		llc 30:11,15 31:6,13
		king 8:23 11:15	31:14,25 33:23
further 9:24 27:1	identify 5:4 12:18,25	12:11,20 13:1,8,14	llp 2:14
G	14:7 17:5 21:1	13:19,25 14:5,9,17	local 24:23
g 29:19 30:10,13,15	ill 4:22	14:25 15:8,11 16:23	look 15:17 21:18,18
31:9	im 4:19,20 10:1	17:1 18:7 19:17	21:18 26:3,12,17,21
general 16:7,13	12:22 14:3,13 16:11	20:2,16,24 21:13,17	looked 9:11 11:11,12
geographic 7:6	17:9 18:14 20:8	21:18,22 22:14,20	23:19 25:24
georgia 1:1,20 2:6,17	23:5,17 24:4,6,10	klan 24:23	looking 26:18
4:4 9:4 23:2 24:4	24:18 26:8 27:10	klux 24:23	loser 19:4
	include 23:11	know 4:25 8:15 19:5	lot 8:3 28:10
24:11 28:3,11 30:3	including 25:3	19:10,12,12 21:6,6	lower 13:11,11
30:10,22 31:6 32:6	income 23:22	21:8,10,11 22:3,6	lynn 31:3,24
33:24	inconclusive 10:18	24:23,25 28:6	
gingles 7:5,10,13,15	independent 30:11	knowledge 8:6,7,21	
8:1 9:20 10:17,19	indicates 13:14	9:1 25:5	m 1:14 27:11,11
15:17,20,23 16:6	inference 8:23	knowledgeable 8:19	29:17
given 7:12 23:1 30:8	influence 9:13	known 8:23	main 5:11,15,19
32:2,8	influences 9:11	krenson 13:18,22,25	majority 11:6,15
go 8:10 12:8 19:2	information 25:1	14:4	12:5,20 13:2,5,13
27:1 28:16,20 29:2	initial 29:5,8	ku 24:23	14:11 15:13,25 16:9
going 27:10 28:5	interest 30:10 31:16		16:17 17:2,16,24
good 24:15	31:19		20:13,19 21:3,9
graft 11:17	international 2:5	13:19	22:1,17,21,23 28:4
griggs 18:3	interval 13:10 22:22	landry 1:25 30:21	makeup 21:7
group 11:7	isnt 13:6,15,22 14:1	32:3	making 8:17 32:8
gubernatorial 28:10	16:9 19:21 20:11,14	large 27:19	mark 18:2
guess 4:5	20:20 21:4 22:2,17	largest 16:25 19:20	marked 5:9
H	23:3,7	19:22	match 27:3
hand 5:3	ive 23:10 24:25	laughlin 2:4 4:18	mathis 1:3 2:23
harris 14:12,18		27:14 30:12	maximum 9:7,8
havent 25:12		law 7:23 31:15,17	mcbride 12:7 13:7
head 4:24	j 12:11	lawyers 4:19	16:22 19:7 21:14
heard 23:10 24:25	job 4:23	leave 9:13	25:17
higher 9:12 13:11	jockeying 28:7	legal 24:22	mcbrides 10:3,14
hired 6:14	johnson 29:9	legislative 5:12	11:18 12:13 24:1
	jpa 30:11,15 31:6,13	legislature 9:14	mccook 22:16
historical 6:11,13 23:9	31:14,25 33:23	level 7:20	mcdonald 2:4 3:8 4:5
history 23:2,3,6,14	jr 1:3	lewis 2:14	4:8,11,17,18 5:7,10
24:5 25:3,7	judicial 4:3 31:5	life 23:7	27:9,12,15,18 29:16
homogeneous 8:21	judiciary 5:17,25	likelihood 9:7,8	30:12
housing 23:22	july 20:10	limited 27:7	mean 6:5 9:21 23:9
hundred 15:1	justify 15:13	line 32:11,12,14,15	measures 24:22
nunui eu 13.1	K	32:17,18,20,21,23	meda 13:18
I	karen 1:11 3:19 4:13	32:24 33:2,3,5,6,8,9	members 11:7
id 5:7	30:8 32:1 33:1,17	33:11,12	method 8:24
14.5.7	30.6 32.1 33.1,1/		

methodology 9:5	opinion 10:13 13:9	phrase 20:9	public 23:12 33:20
methods 9:2,3 12:20	22:7,8	place 29:13	publications 5:16
michael 18:12,19	opportunity 28:16	plaintiff 1:4 2:3 3:15	pursuant 4:1 29:18
middle 1:1	original 3:24,25	4:19	31:3 32:6
midtown 2:15	overwhelming 14:10	plaintiffs 5:9 10:18	put 22:21
militia 24:24	owen 1:11 4:10,13,18	planning 28:13	pyles 31:3,24
minich 15:6,14,15	27:18 30:8 32:1	please 4:12,23 11:1	
16:8,16,18 21:15,19	33:1,17	32:9 33:15,22	Q
minor 9:5	owens 3:19	pless 21:12,18	question 12:22 18:14
minority 7:4,6,6 11:7		plus 28:7	26:8 27:13
15:24 16:2	P	polarized 10:11	questions 4:20,21,24
minoritys 16:3	p 2:13	25:13	10:16 11:10 27:20
minute 27:10	page 3:6,16 5:11 8:20	political 7:6 9:12	30:6 32:2
models 9:13	9:19 10:2,9 11:23	20:8 28:1	quote 9:20,20
modern 23:19	15:18 32:11,12,14	politically 10:24 11:3	R
mona 1:25 30:21	32:15,17,18,20,21	politics 5:13,16,20,25	
32:3	32:23,24 33:2,3,5,6	6:2,3,7,9,12,13 7:19	race 19:12 20:8 26:24
money 28:19	33:8,9,11,12	8:2	racial 23:3,6,15 24:5
mrl 32:1 33:1	pages 30:7 33:14	polled 29:12	25:3
N	papers 5:20 6:25 7:3	population 17:8,13	racially 10:11 25:13 raise 28:19
	parcel 27:3	17:22 21:4 22:2,3	rally 28:22
n 33:24	part 32:7	precinct 8:22 26:1,22	rates 31:21
name 4:18	participation 5:23,24	precleared 8:11	reaching 10:13
ne 2:5,16	particularly 6:7 parties 31:21	preferred 16:3	read 4:8 32:2,7,11,12
necessarily 25:12 necessary 33:14	parties 31.21 party 30:15 31:7,16	preparing 25:16	32:14,15,17,18,20
need 4:25 15:12	31:16,18,18	present 2:21	32:21,23,24 33:2,3
neither 30:14	partys 20:8	presentation 7:13	33:5,6,8,9,11,12
never 6:20 7:12	partys 20.8 passage 24:8,13	prevent 24:24	really 24:2 26:17
25:10	peachtree 1:18 2:5	pride 12:21 13:2,13 13:22	reasons 32:8
nonblack 15:14	2:16 33:24	= :	recall 27:20
21:19	percent 10:20 11:5	primaries 24:17 29:9 primary 18:24 19:15	receive 16:9,16,18
notary 33:20	12:8 13:8,12,17,19	20:5,7 28:25	received 14:25 19:22
noted 32:4,5	13:19 14:1,2,4,21	principal 31:14	20:15 21:19 22:18
november 1:13 30:8	14:25 15:1,2,9,11	principal 31.14 probative 7:4	recess 27:11
32:3	16:18,19,24 17:4,7	procedure 29:19	reconstruction 24:8
number 11:6 16:25	17:13,14,21 18:3,6	32:6	redefeated 12:14
19:20 23:20	19:15,17,24 20:16	proceedings 30:12,13	redistricting 8:3
	20:17,22,24 21:7,12	31:7,8,11	reduced 30:6
0	21:15,19,21 22:10	prohibited 30:13,15	region 6:8
o 29:19 30:10,13,15	22:13,18,19,20 28:6	31:9	registered 25:25
31:9	28:12	prong 10:19 15:20	26:22
oath 4:12	percentage 13:6 15:3	propounded 32:2	registering 24:19,24
objections 4:6	19:23	proscenium 2:15	registration 1:7
occurs 9:21	period 28:18	provide 30:12 31:7	25:22,25 26:13,20
offered 31:21	person 31:13	31:12	regression 8:22 9:9
office 9:12	pertaining 7:23	provided 25:17	9:17 14:10
official 32:6	ph 9:4	provides 15:23	regulations 4:2 30:14
old 6:9		1	30:16 31:4,10

reid 12:12,17
related 6:7
relationship 30:10
31:15
reliable 10:4,6
report 3:19 5:3,5,11
7:9 8:20 9:19 10:2
10:9,14,17,19 11:18
11:22 12:7 15:10,18
24:1 25:16,18 27:7
reported 13:7,21
14:6,20,23,24 15:5
15:9 16:21,25 17:3
17:12,23 19:8,16,19
20:16 21:14 30:6
reporter 4:1 30:1,11
30:22
reporting 4:3 30:11
30:12,15 31:5,6,8
31:12,13,14,25
33:23
reports 19:7
represent 30:7
representative 31:24
representing 4:19
requirements 9:6
requires 28:4
-
research 5:20
reserve 4:5
reserved 29:20
residents 25:13
respond 4:23
responding 8:16
response 24:8
restate 11:1
results 10:18
reverend 27:10
right 13:16 29:15
rights 6:22 7:1,21,22
7:24 8:18
roland 18:12,20 19:7
19:9,11,20,22 20:11
20:19
role 9:13
rule 29:18 32:6
rules 4:2 29:19 30:14
30:16 31:4,10 32:6
run 9:12,14
1 UII 7.14,14

running 16:2 20:8
runoff 18:13,20 19:3
19:4,6 20:10 28:9
28:13,17 29:5,7,11
29:14
runoffs 29:7,10
S
sarah 12:21 13:2
saying 13:12
scenario 29:4
science 28:1 29:3
seat 27:19 28:8,8
seay 14:24,24
second 12:18,24 28:8
28:17,19 29:13,14
secretary 26:2,10
section 6:16,22 7:1
7:24,25,25 8:4,5,9
8:11,12
sections 7:24 8:2
see 15:12 25:20,25
26:18,21 27:2
seen 22:5
services 30:12 31:8
31:13
seven 15:18
seventh 21:24
shaking 4:24 shelby 8:8,16
show 12:8 15:19
sign 4:9
signature 29:20
significant 11:6
15:10 23:2
similar 25:3
sir 6:4
sixth 21:1
small 14:1
social 29:3
socioeconomic 23:21
somewhat 28:2
sorry 12:22 14:3,13
16:11 17:9 18:14
south 6:9 25:7
southern 6:2,3,7,8,11
7:19 8:2

special 16:1

specific 11:11,12 25:1.5 specifically 24:10 stage 28:17,24 29:2,8 29:12,14 stages 28:2 **standard** 13:10 15:12 15:12 standards 22:22 started 25:20 state 9:14 10:12 23:1 28:3 30:3 **stated** 30:6 statement 32:8 states 1:1 8:10 26:2 26:10 status 8:5 23:20 stephanie 22:16 street 1:18 2:5,16 33:24 strickland 2:14 strong 15:7 studied 9:5 study 6:8,10 9:7 23:1 subscribed 33:18 substance 32:7 substantial 29:6 succeed 28:4 succeeding 15:20 success 19:2 27:23 28:15 29:2 sufficiently 15:25 suite 1:19 2:15 33:24 sumter 1:6 2:11 10:10 25:2,5,8,14 supplemental 33:14 **support** 10:19 15:7 15:20 28:22 supported 28:21 supporting 15:14 supreme 8:8 **sure** 24:4 26:9,11 27:15 28:12 sworn 4:14 30:8 33:18 sylvia 18:12,19 **system** 28:4

T **table** 3:2 take 4:25 6:20 7:12 10:23 11:2 23:1 27:6 **taken** 32:3 talk 7:22 8:3 27:10 28:2 **talking** 11:25 taught 7:15 8:2 teach 7:19,21,25 tell 9:1 **testified** 4:15 6:21 testimony 27:6 tests 24:12,15 thank 27:12 29:16 thats 11:4 13:21 14:6 14:6,23 15:1,5,11 16:21 17:10,12,23 19:8,16,19 20:1,3 20:15 22:12,21 24:1 theres 29:10 thereto 30:6 things 24:12,25 think 23:14 28:9 **third** 9:20 14:7 15:23 17:5 **thornburg** 7:5 8:1 three 7:4,13,15 9:2 thursday 1:13 30:8 time 4:25 21:4 28:18 today 23:16 **top** 18:11,18 total 21:3,7 22:1,3 totals 26:4,5 28:24 tower 2:5 **transcript** 3:25 30:6 30:7 treat 29:4 triggered 8:10 **true** 30:7 try 4:22 28:21 turnout 25:23 26:24 **two** 18:11,19 27:22 28:2,14 twoyear 27:19 **type** 29:4 typewriting 33:15

tyson 2:13 3:9 4:7			22 20:10
27:13,17 29:15	-		2200 1:19 2:15
27.13,17 27.13	w 33:24	yeah 11:24 12:2,24	229 2:5
$\overline{\mathbf{U}}$	walk 19:1	17:4 19:16 20:1	230s 33:24
uhhuh 9:18 14:16	walked 27:23	23:1	27 3:9 27:11
23:10	want 4:8,20 9:25	year 8:7 26:9	27 3.9 27.11 2700 2:5
ultimate 18:25	10:16 11:10 28:24	youd 9:24	
unconstitutional 8:9	wanted 19:1	youre 20:7	28 27:11 29 30:7
undergraduate 7:20	wasnt 18:22 26:11,17	youve 6:20 7:12	29 30:7
understand 4:22	way 24:2	$\overline{\mathbf{z}}$	3
understand 4.22 understanding 24:15	website 26:2,10	L	3 8:20 11:14 12:1,8
unit 7:21	went 13:13 25:20,21	0	13:19 14:8,15 15:17
united 1:1	whats 13:21 14:20,24		15:20 16:6,7,13
university 9:4	15:9 16:21 19:16,19	0 22:19	20:17 21:2,4 22:10
	white 12:11 13:20	00 1:14	30 16:19 29:18 32:6
unopposed 16:2	15:6,7,25 17:16,24	1	
unreliable 15:2	18:2,13,20 19:9,11		30303 2:6
use 32:9	19:20 20:19 21:9,21	1 1:6 3:19,24 5:8,9,11 17:6,10 21:25 32:4	30309 33:24
useful 9:16	22:16,17 24:17	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	303097200 2:17
usual 31:20	whitehead 22:9	10 1:14 4:2 27:11,11	31 29:17
usually 9:20 11:7	whites 7:7 12:10	29:17 31:4	33 10:20 18:6
16:2	23:21	10th 30:18 31:22	4
v	willa 11:16 12:5	1170 1:18 2:16	
	win 18:25 28:5,7	12 10:20,24 11:3	43:87:258:9,129:19
v 8:1	29:11,13	14cv42 1:6	10:19 14:17 15:1
valid 10:4,6	winloss 29:8	14th 24:8,13	20:22
verbally 4:23	winner 18:11,18,23	151437 30:13,15 31:9	40 20:2
versus 7:5	19:3 27:20	15th 24:9,13	4045001235 2:7
virtually 23:7	winners 26:2,6	1776 33:24	4048531811 33:25
visited 25:8	winning 16:8 27:24	18 15:3	41 16:24
vote 6:15,21,25 7:4	witness 6:15,21 29:20	2	43 14:25
12:8 13:13,20 14:1	30:8		5
14:5 15:4,25 16:9	wls 1:6	2 6:16,22 7:1,24	5 3:19 7:25 8:4,5,11
16:17 18:3,6 19:15	woman 9:12	10:17,19 12:19 13:1	
20:14,20 21:13,21	women 5:12,16,20,25	13:19 18:6 19:17	10:2,9 13:6,8,12,17 17:20 20:2 21:12
22:10,13 26:1,4,5	won 12:17 15:15	20:24 32:5	
28:4,23	18:24 19:5,8	20 1:13 30:8 32:3	50 13:6,8,12,17 16:18
voted 11:8,15 12:5,10	word 9:19	33:19	17:4 22:20,20 28:6
12:21 13:2 14:11,18	work 5:12	2002 16:8,14	28:12
14:22	working 5:20 9:4	2006 14:9,15	54 19:24 22:18,19
voter 25:22,24 26:12	wright 1:3 2:23 27:10	2008 22:1	56 12:8
26:19,22	write 10:5,5	2010 21:3	57 15:10
voters 15:14 28:21	writing 5:15 30:7	2013 8:7	6
votes 19:21 22:17	written 6:25 7:3,8	2014 1:13 11:14 12:4	
voting 6:22 7:1,7,21	29:7,9	12:20 13:1 17:7,11	6 11:5,23 14:25 17:21
7:22,24 8:18 10:10	wrote 5:6	17:21 18:10,17	20:16 21:15
23:3 24:5,12,20,24	WIUL J.U	20:10 25:23 26:13	60 13:19 21:19,21
25:4,13	X	26:20 27:19 30:8,18	62 17:7,13,14
votingage 17:7,13,21		31:22 32:3	65 20:16
vs 1:5		21 18:3	66 11:5
	I	<u> </u>	I

Pag	ae	7