

PUBLIC HEARING
AD HOC REDISTRICTING COMMITTEE

held at the Richmond County Board of Education,
864 Broad Street, Augusta, Georgia,
on the 27th day of October, 2011,
commencing at approximately 4:00 p.m.

JUNE S. O'CONNOR
Certified Court Reporter
1747 Perkins Green Fork Road
Perkins, Georgia 30822
(706) 726-3337

APPEARANCES

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Mr. Alvin Mason, Chairman
Richmond County Commissioner, District 4

Mr. Jack Padgett, Vice Chairman
School Board Commissioner, District 6

Mr. Marion Barnes
School Board Commissioner, District 1

Mr. Frank Dolan
School Board Commissioner, District 7

Mr. Hardie Davis
Senator, District 22

Mr. Wayne Howard
Representative, House District 121

Mr. Bill Lockett
Richmond County Commissioner, District 5

Mr. Quincy Murphy
Representative, House District 120

Mr. Jerry Brigham
Richmond County Commissioner, District 7

Mr. Grady Smith
Richmond County Commissioner, District 10

Ms. Venus Cain
School Board Commissioner, District 9

Mr. Andrew McKinsey
Augusta Law Department

ALSO PRESENT

Ms. Lynn Bailey
Executive Director, Richmond County Board of Elections

Ms. Linda Meggers
Redistricting Consultant

AGENDA

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

- 1. Call Meeting to Order
- 2. Discussion of Meeting Protocol
- 3. Adoption of Agenda
- 4. Discussion of Comments from Public Hearings
- 5. Discussion of Plan Revisions
- 6. Set Next Meeting Date
- 7. Other Business
- 8. Adjourn

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 MR. MASON: I'll go ahead and call the meeting to
3 order. And for the sake of clarity we mentioned before at
4 the three public hearings that there was public input at
5 those particular hearings and today is not the forum for
6 public input; it's really more of a committee to do the
7 work that we need to do. And so we will look for a
8 motion, number one, to adopt the agenda that we have on
9 task.

10 MR. DOLAN: Move to adopt.

11 MR. HOWARD: Second.

12 MS. CAIN: Second.

13 MR. MASON: All right. The motion is seconded. Any
14 further discussion?

15 (No response was audible.)

16 We'll vote by yes. All those in favor.

17 (Committee members answered "yes".)

18 MR. MASON: All those opposed?

19 (No response was audible.)

20 MR. MASON: All right. Okay. We have Ms. Linda
21 Meggers back and, of course, we have Ms. Lynn Bailey here.
22 Through the public hearings we had comments that came from
23 the public hearings. And now, today, this would be the
24 opportunity, our first opportunity, to officially discuss
25 the comments that were made at the public hearings.

1 Now, which one of you will handle that; is that you,
2 ma'am (indicating)?

3 MS. BAILEY: I was going to start things off just by
4 talking about the main issues at the public hearing that I
5 took down as the committee consensus and then Ms. Meggers
6 will take it from there with an explanation if that's
7 agreeable.

8 MR. MASON: Great. We'll go in that order.

9 MS. BAILEY: Okay. One of the issues that was talked
10 about at the public hearing was to try to bring the black
11 population percentage in District 3 back to at least the
12 existing levels in District 3 so that is one thing that
13 was to be addressed. Another thing that was to be
14 addressed was reuniting the Sand Ridge neighborhood. The
15 other issue to be addressed was to look at the Goshen
16 neighborhood to see if we could find a fix for that
17 neighborhood as well. Other than that, I think those were
18 the three primary issues that came out as a result of the
19 public hearings. And so those will be some of the things
20 that we'll be looking at today.

21 MR. MASON: Does the committee -- because it sounds
22 like it was --

23 MR. DAVIS: Mr. Chairman.

24 MR. MASON: Senator.

25 MR. DAVIS: Ms. Bailey, can you reiterate the issue

1 around Goshen, help me understand what that is.

2 MS. BAILEY: Yes, I can. Right now under the
3 existing commission district, Precinct 805 is a voting
4 precinct that votes at Southside Baptist Church. The
5 voting precinct contains a portion of Goshen Road, that
6 portion of Goshen Road that goes from Mike Padgett Highway
7 to the creek. The creek there is, in fact, the dividing
8 line between the people who vote at Southside Baptist
9 Church and the people who vote at Crosscreek Church. They
10 are currently all in the 8th District; but they vote in
11 two different polling places because, again, the creek is
12 the dividing line.

13 There was a desire expressed by the Goshen Community
14 to reunite those precincts. And also furthermore,
15 Precinct 805, the Southside Baptist Church Precinct under
16 plan 1 was drawn into plan -- into District 6, which still
17 separates that section of Goshen Road. And I think there
18 are maybe ten or twelve parcels of land and homes in that
19 area. It's an area that you -- where the lots are a
20 little bit bigger. It's really before you get down into
21 the neighborhood-neighborhood. But I think they still
22 pretty much consider themselves part of Goshen
23 neighborhood. So that is the area that we were going to
24 try to remedy, is to bring those ten or twelve homes that
25 are on that stretch of Goshen Road into District 8 so that

1 they would be the same as the other people who live in
2 Goshen neighborhood.

3 Now, the challenge is: The way the census plots, and
4 Ms. Meggers will talk about that some more, but there are
5 challenges there and things to be looked at. So she'll
6 have more explanation with more detail as she goes into
7 her presentation.

8 MR. MASON: Before we go on, Representative, I want
9 the record to reflect that all ADHOC redistricting
10 committee members are present with the exception of
11 Representative Barbara Sims at this time.

12 Representative Howard.

13 MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Ms. Bailey,
14 will we -- can you supply us with a copy of the comments
15 that were made at the hearings as well as the -- I'm sure
16 you've probably got the emails that -- didn't you get
17 emailed and if so --

18 MS. BAILEY: I do. I am now in possession of the
19 transcripts as of today --

20 MR. HOWARD: Uh-huh. Okay.

21 MS. BAILEY: -- of all the public hearings so yes, I
22 can send those to you. Also, I was negligent in sending
23 out the minutes from the October 5th committee working
24 session so I'll be sending all that your way assuming that
25 the files aren't too big because some of those transcripts

1 are really long. Actually, as I think about it, I'm still
2 waiting on the Sue Reynolds transcript to come in; but I
3 do have the other two as well as those minutes from
4 October 5th and I will get those right out to you.

5 MR. HOWARD: Thank you.

6 MS. BAILEY: You're welcome.

7 MR. MASON: Do any other committee members, I know
8 she mentioned three issues, is there any other issues that
9 committee members know of or want to bring out at this
10 particular time as we're going through this?

11 MR. DAVIS: Mr. Chairman, just a comment. This is to
12 Lynn, once again, if the files are, in fact, too big could
13 we not drop them down from the website, if they're posted
14 on the website as .pdf files?

15 MS. BAILEY: Yes. In fact, we can post them out to
16 the website. And just remember that the redistricting
17 website can be accessed through Augusta, Georgia's main
18 webpage at www.augustaga.gov. In fact, I think that's an
19 excellent idea. Why don't we make that the plan. I'll
20 just put them out to the website and then they are there
21 for everyone to see.

22 MR. MASON: Excellent.

23 Representative Murphy.

24 MR. MURPHY: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

25 I was just going to inquire about the agenda as we

1 have outlined here. Ms. Bailey has already highlighted
2 the three items coming from some of the hearings; but will
3 there be any additional items that we will discuss related
4 to the public hearings other than the three that she's
5 already mentioned?

6 MR. MASON: Well, that's what I was trying to get
7 out, was there some other items out there because those
8 are the notes that she took. I'm not saying they're
9 inaccurate or anything like that; but was there any
10 discussion or any memories of anything else that we may --
11 that may have come out of those meetings and this would be
12 a time for committee members certainly to speak to those
13 if it was something that came out that perhaps wasn't
14 annotated. Do you --

15 MR. MURPHY: Yes. I recall at the last meeting at
16 Sue Reynolds, there was a concern from one of our
17 constituents about the difference in the percentages in
18 terms of overall population, 75, 78 percent in certain
19 districts. And I thought he made a very good point about
20 requiring us to work more -- to work closer together as a
21 community and as a result of that, I would like to see our
22 discussion about perhaps doing some things so that the
23 communities, so that the county can begin to work closer
24 together than having one swaying one far to the right or
25 perhaps far to the left. I think we need to consider some

1 of the thoughts that was presented to us during that
2 meeting.

3 MR. MASON: Do you want to speak to that?

4 MS. BAILEY: I will. I was just going to say perhaps
5 what we can do is: Ms. Meggers has come up with a
6 revision to plan 1, if you will, a new working draft that
7 takes into account those three issues that we -- that I
8 just mentioned. One way to proceed from here might be for
9 her to go over those type changes and then to take input
10 from the committee members. This is a working session and
11 so as you identify things that you think are areas that
12 are ways to remedy what you perceive as a problem then she
13 has the ability with her software to make those changes on
14 the fly and to quickly examine how those changes might
15 affect statistics, deviations, population figures and so
16 on.

17 MR. MASON: And this is -- just one second, Mr.
18 Lockett. And this is a working session, so I do want to
19 reiterate that and we're going to be a little less formal,
20 if you will, in terms of what we need to do here today
21 because it is a working session for us to, kind of, narrow
22 down and get to where we think we need to be or at least
23 get us in that right direction.

24 Commissioner Lockett.

25 MR. LOCKETT: Thank you, Mr. Mason.

1 I believe what Representative Murphy, his concern is
2 probably in the first issue that Ms. Bailey gave us. That
3 deals with District 3. I think that probably would be a
4 good time to discuss whatever his concern was.

5 MS. BAILEY: Okay. With that if it suits the
6 committee, maybe we can have Ms. Meggers to start going
7 into her presentation showing the new statistics and
8 proceed.

9 MR. MASON: I think that probably there are more
10 questions very quickly.

11 Mr. Dolan or both of you. Senator.

12 MR. DAVIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

13 In light of the comment that Representative Murphy
14 has certainly brought to the table, I, as I'm sure many of
15 us have, I've received numerous phone calls. I have once
16 again directed folks to the website that they can in turn
17 submit comments because that's the simplest option. But I
18 have consistently heard and as much as that, you know,
19 might intrigue all of us I think even our local paper of
20 record has spoken to this issue as it relates to the
21 disparity that we see in the districts. I think it's
22 something that as we look forward to arriving at a map
23 that is representative of our community today and for the
24 next decade at a minimum it's something that we want to
25 look at, not just for District 3, but rather for the

1 entire county. I think we will be remiss in our duties as
2 a committee to focus solely on District 3 as it relates to
3 this whole notion of demographics; but rather we need to
4 look at the entire county and how it's represented from a
5 map perspective and we would serve ourselves well as well
6 as future generations as we look at this process.

7 MR. MASON: Do we have any other questions at this
8 time from the committee members?

9 (No response was audible.)

10 MR. MASON: All right. Ms. Meggers

11 MS. MEGGERS: Okay. You have -- Ms. Bailey has
12 handed out, I think, a set of maps that has the overall
13 map of something called plan 2.

14 I'm sorry. Ms. Bailey's going to be handing those
15 out.

16 You have a new working plan, plan 2, where I've tried
17 to address at least several of the issues that were
18 mentioned at the public hearings and by some of the
19 members of the committee, et cetera. The maps that you
20 have, the dark line that you'll see overlaid on each of
21 the individual maps remember will be the current map while
22 we're working on the screen what I have -- I was going to
23 highlight for you are the changes from district -- from
24 plan 1 to plan 2.

25 And also in that packet you're going to see a report

1 that looks like this (indicating). And this is just a
2 comparison of -- for purposes of Section 5
3 non-retrogression analysis, a comparison by district of
4 the 2000 census numbers on the current plan, the 2010
5 census numbers on the current plan and then the numbers
6 from plan 1 and then plan 2 so that you can kind of see
7 the changes as they develop.

8 What I was going to do is just go district by
9 district and talk about the changes or where there weren't
10 any changes and how some of the changes address the issues
11 that we talked about.

12 District 1, you'll see the numbers are the same and
13 for all practical purposes there's no change except right
14 in this area (indicating). On the screen in front of you
15 you can see where I'm moving the mouse back and forth. As
16 we moved through the process, Ms. Bailey asked me, what is
17 that line, Linda? And I said, well, that's your precinct
18 line. But that is one of the last vestiges of the old
19 Augusta city limits lines that are left. So we moved this
20 out to the railroad so it would be consistent and that
21 would be a change that she made. There's no people there,
22 it's along the right-of-way, et cetera. So that is a
23 change in District 1, but there's no population so no
24 change in stats.

25 District 2, this goes back to the last committee

1 meeting as a working session when we talked about this
2 area in Precinct 508, 509 and we talked about again the
3 last, one of the last vestiges of the old city limits line
4 in that precinct, et cetera, and Gordon Highway. This
5 plan incorporates those precinct changes there so that
6 that could be taken care of in the future. This line
7 according to her lines jut really doesn't exist and it's
8 because it's based on old city limits lines. So that is
9 the only change in District 2 and that goes back to the
10 last committee meeting.

11 I'm going to come back to District 3 because I want
12 to talk about District 4 and 5 first.

13 Ms. Cain pointed out to me at the end of the first
14 public hearing that I had moved this precinct, I think
15 it's 403, at that point from District 4 into 5. And this
16 is part of the core, the heart of District 4, that she
17 said needed to stay in District 4. So I've replaced that,
18 placed that back in District 4 and we've made the changes
19 to compensate for that up in this area (indicating) in 402
20 area and in here (indicating) where we changed that
21 around. So you can see the red line was the original line
22 in plan -- in working plan 1. I've taken this area
23 (indicating) out of 402 and moved it over to District 5
24 and shifted some of this area of 4 into this (indicating)
25 to make everything contiguous.

1 Now, that was -- let's see Districts 4 and 5; 4 then
2 comes down slightly in total black percentage from
3 presently on the current plan under the 2010 census it was
4 78.76; it's become 76.94 -- 95 in this plan. It keeps
5 every -- pretty much intact.

6 Now, with making that change to put this area
7 (indicating) back into District 4, for the first time
8 District 5 comes out this way (indicating) if you're
9 following the cursor here, and touches for the first time
10 Fort Gordon. By taking Fort Gordon out of District 3,
11 where it presently is and moving that into 5, that allowed
12 me to put all of precinct -- well, almost all of it,
13 Precinct 310 back into 3. That was the heart of the area
14 that everyone was discussing I think at the meeting last
15 Thursday night. So when you do that, move Fort Gordon
16 this way (indicating) it does two things: First of all,
17 it still maintains Fort Gordon into three separate
18 commission, school board districts so that it doesn't --
19 they don't concentrate in any one commission, school board
20 district; but it also then took District 3 from plan 1,
21 which was at 37.83 up to 43.30, which is actually about a
22 percentage point higher than it is on the current plan.
23 So it addresses the issue of putting this key precinct
24 back into 3 and it also raises those numbers back to what
25 they are presently under the current plan.

1 District 7, of course, had no changes. It still
2 remains the same as it is on the current plan.

3 Now, the other key area that was Pine Ridge --

4 MS. BAILEY: Sand Ridge.

5 MS. MEGGERS: -- Sand Ridge, I'm sorry. I persist in
6 wanting to call that Pine Ridge.

7 Sand Ridge, we took this area that was discussed at
8 the hearing and moved that over into District 4. When we
9 did that the percentages for District 4 then -- although 8
10 was fine where we took it out of, District 4 was a plus 5
11 point something. So we had to find a way to balance that.
12 And I balanced it in this area right down here
13 (indicating). And let me turn on some street names here
14 for you. So this is Willis Foreman Road and I took that
15 area that was south of that and moved that back into
16 District 8 to balance the numbers.

17 So District 8 then, again, also, one of the comments
18 at the public hearing was that District 8 had gone down
19 slightly. That raises District 8 up above 32 percent
20 again. And the deviations for District 4 are a plus 1.78
21 and District 8 is at a .42 percent, so all of those fall
22 back into place from that standpoint.

23 MS. CAIN: Excuse me.

24 MS. MEGGERS: Yes, ma'am?

25 MS. CAIN: Ms. Meggers, could we all get a copy of

1 this one here?

2 MS. MEGGERS: It's in your folders.

3 MS. CAIN: That's the newest one? Okay. Thank you.
4 I'm sorry.

5 MS. MEGGERS: Now, you should have the full stat
6 sheet --

7 MS. BAILEY: Has everybody else found that okay?

8 MS. MEGGERS: Now, back to the other issue with
9 Goshen. On the working plan 2 that you see, I've left
10 that area as it was on plan 1, and it's because -- let me
11 zoom in here a little bit --

12 Here's my dilemma and I just need some guidance from
13 the committee in your wisdom. There's this one area right
14 here (indicating) that was talked about in the second
15 public hearing, I believe, that has about 17 persons in
16 there that can be moved from 6 to District 8. However, I
17 was also cautioned by Ms. Cain that she wanted to keep
18 communities together. And this is not all of the Goshen
19 community in this. If I go and actually take more of the
20 area and take all of what could be considered Goshen or
21 what has been explained to me is the Goshen area, I can't
22 do that and maintain the one-person, one-vote. Remember 6
23 was short and 8 was over. So I didn't know whether to
24 just take this partial area down here (indicating) with 17
25 people, which still does not resolve the Goshen community

1 questions and comments, or to leave the precinct intact.
2 So I've left that decision to bring back to this committee
3 to give me some guidance on it. This still splits the
4 community as I understand it.

5 MS. BAILEY: Let me just interject that the -- one of
6 the -- the solution that she's talking about would
7 actually move the precinct line from the creek where it is
8 now at the south end of the precinct boundary over to Mike
9 Padgett Highway going north to Goshen Road and then across
10 back down to the creek and it would take that triangle and
11 move it back down into 8. But the problem with doing that
12 is when you do that you only catch one side of Goshen
13 Road. So the people that live on the other side of Goshen
14 Road will still be in District 6 whereas their neighbors
15 across the street would be into 8. So you know, it's --
16 and if we go north because of the way the census tracts
17 are laid out then we're gathering -- we have to rope in
18 about 400 people, which is just too many. And that's --
19 it's one of those all or nothing situations that we looked
20 at before because the census tract is just so big. So
21 we're going to need to make a decision whether we leave
22 that entire section of Goshen Road in District 6 until you
23 get to the creek and then have it jump to District 8 or
24 whether we want to split Goshen Road and have part of them
25 in 6 and part in 8.

1 Now, I will say that the -- administratively, the
2 people who live on that section of Goshen Road, some might
3 say are accustomed to being a little different than their
4 counterparts across the creek because they have gone to a
5 different polling place than their neighbors across the
6 creek for years. The difference, though, now is we're
7 talking about moving them, not just to a different polling
8 place, but to a different commission district entirely.
9 There are, I think I counted, about 12 parcels on both
10 sides of Goshen Road there. If we go down Goshen Road
11 with the precinct boundary line or the district boundary
12 line we would still only capture about half of those
13 parcels.

14 MR. MASON: Senator Davis.

15 MR. DAVIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

16 To Ms. Meggers and Ms. Bailey, is it not true that in
17 this current arrangement or configuration we essentially
18 are proposing to do the same thing that we are hoping to
19 undo with Sand Ridge in that you put a portion of the
20 folks in District 6 and then a portion of the folks in
21 District 8? Is it further not true then, that maybe what
22 we should do is look at an alternative as opposed to just
23 assuming that 805 is the only way we can arrive at solving
24 this problem?

25 MS. BAILEY: I would say that's perhaps what the

1 committee would like to discuss. We have not been able to
2 -- we have not been able to find a solution that would not
3 require complete -- complete redraw and fairly drastic
4 alteration of the district configuration that we have in
5 place now. And the idea of going in, at least the plan
6 that was originally proposed, was a plan of minimal
7 change, a plan that would bring what we have now basically
8 into compliance with law as far as the district size and
9 whatnot goes and keeping the districts as much intact as
10 we could. So that was what was brought out here as a
11 working plan. But certainly that's one of the things that
12 could be looked at. There's lots of different ways to do
13 it.

14 MR. MASON: Mr. Padgett.

15 MR. PADGETT: Well, when you speak to the Goshen
16 neighborhood, particularly that along Goshen Road that's
17 not in the original development, I'm very familiar with
18 that because I've got a lot of friends that live on that
19 specific road on those parcels that we're talking about;
20 but then if you take anything beyond Goshen Road going
21 north, the Country Place area and all that, that really is
22 not connected in any manner road-wise or otherwise to
23 Goshen itself.

24 You mentioned the -- I'm sorry, you mentioned the
25 southern portion there of Goshen Road, what 14 people out

1 there.

2 MS. BAILEY: Seventeen.

3 MR. PADGETT: And I think the northern portion is a
4 little less, probably 10 or 12 so -- but, you know, I
5 don't know where you draw the line, but I guess a lot of
6 folks out there would consider themselves maybe Goshen
7 when they're not really. Where that Goshen Road does say
8 it's Goshen, but when you get on farther north that
9 certainly was --

10 MS. BAILEY: Well, the problem that we ran into when
11 we tried to bring in the other side of Goshen Road, again,
12 it was one of the situations where the census block
13 configuration didn't lend itself to an easy fix. It was
14 grabbing a big chunk of people or none at all. And so
15 that was the dilemma.

16 MR. MASON: Mr. Dolan.

17 MR. DOLAN: Thank you, Mr. Mason.

18 Ms. Bailey, what -- how many people are in section --
19 District 6 and District 8? How many in 6 and how many --

20 MS. BAILEY: In the particular Goshen area or just --

21 MS. MEGGERS: In that precinct.

22 MR. DOLAN: In that district.

23 MS. BAILEY: Are you talking about according to the
24 -- as the districts are configured now or according to
25 plan 2 or plan 1?

1 MR. DOLAN: As this yellow map is right here
2 (indicating).

3 MS. BAILEY: As the yellow map is right here, that is
4 plan 2. So right now District 6 has 24,880 people in it.
5 It is at a minus .75 in deviation. District 8 has 25,174
6 people and it is at a plus .42 percentage in deviation.

7 MR. DOLAN: If you have 17 people, you're talking
8 four points left of the decimal; it ain't going to make a
9 hill of beans.

10 MS. BAILEY: Well, it won't in terms of numbers; but
11 what you've done, if we take in just that half of the
12 road, and which is essentially what we would be doing is
13 we'd still be only providing a fix for the people who
14 lived on the south side of that portion of Goshen Road.
15 The people who lived on the north side of Goshen Road
16 still would not have a remedy because the proposed
17 district line would, in fact, then come straight down
18 Goshen Road.

19 MR. DOLAN: You lost the map.

20 MS. MEGGERS: I know. It's going to take me a
21 minute. I just realized that I wasn't going to be able to
22 play with numbers because when I hooked up to the big
23 screen it had taken away part of my tool boxes and I'm
24 just trying to fix that while you're talking.

25 MR. DOLAN: Well, I would think that the guys from

1 these two districts could give more input than anybody,
2 whoever that would be, which I don't know.

3 MR. MASON: Well, one is certainly Mr. Padgett,
4 right?

5 MR. PADGETT: Yes. Let me say this: And this is I
6 called -- and this is before Ms. Meggers brought back the
7 plan and everything, and certainly I've been doing this a
8 long time. The people that are moving from 8 to 6 already
9 vote in the same place that District 6 is located, which
10 is Southside Baptist Church. So, I mean, you've got two
11 precincts voting there so you're not changing where they
12 vote. You are changing their commission and school board
13 trustee positions. You're not changing District 10 in any
14 way because both of those districts make up District 10.
15 So I mean, I understand where the people are coming from
16 and I know these people very well. I've been in their
17 homes and everything. You know, I can understand what
18 they are saying. But to disrupt the whole plan just to
19 serve 12 or 14 people, you know, it doesn't make a whole
20 lot of sense, I don't think, personally. I mean, I need
21 to gain people and 8 needs to lose people and that seems
22 like an automatic almost to me.

23 MR. MASON: I also want to say this before I
24 recognize you there, Lynn. The senator made mention of
25 this being very similar to the Sand Ridge situation. I'm

1 not sure from the area that I've been in out in Goshen,
2 there is some slight differences in that this particular
3 neighborhood in terms of Sand Ridge is one way in and one
4 way out. So it is, in fact, a intact whole neighborhood.
5 You can't get in but one way and you can't get out but one
6 way. So --

7 MR. DAVIS: That's Country Place.

8 MR. MASON: No, no, no. That's Sand Ridge. So
9 there's some slight differences from that standpoint, but
10 that's truly a neighborhood when you talk about, you know,
11 one way in and then half of that belong to one and then
12 half belong to the other. It might be a little subtle,
13 but there are some differences in relation to that; and I
14 think that's probably one of the things when we talked
15 about it initially that was looked at as well, that there
16 were various ways that you could get to it.

17 Yes, sir.

18 MR. DAVIS: I certainly concur with that statement,
19 Mr. Chairman. I have been contacted by the school board
20 member who represents those individuals. I also live
21 there; and all of the information that has been
22 communicated up to this point in time has mirrored and is
23 accurate; but independent of it just being 12 families,
24 folks, homes, parcels, et cetera to the vice chairman, I
25 think it's something that we certainly want to give strong

1 consideration to in terms of how we do move forward. And
2 it may not be something that we just decide today, but
3 given the fact that we have a proposed plan 2 in front of
4 us in this working session, it may be an opportunity for
5 us really to go back and look at it closer ourselves
6 individual and then have another work session to be able
7 to think through it.

8 MR. MASON: Also, Lynn -- not Lynn, but Linda, you
9 mentioned that the census tract did not lend to the
10 numbers that we were looking for. Can you kind of -- kind
11 of clear that up for us a little bit --

12 MS. MEGGERS: Yes.

13 MR. MASON: -- in terms of, you know, what those
14 moves would mean in terms of the way that the map would
15 turn around end up looking or how we may have to do a
16 total revamp, what kind of numbers? And while you're
17 doing that, Mr. Padgett.

18 MR. PADGETT: The one thing there and Senator Davis
19 mentioned the fact that the community, I would bet, and
20 knowing most of these people, they do not go to their
21 homes through Goshen, they go to their homes off Highway
22 56 or Mike Padgett Highway. The other issue is that if
23 you leave them in 8, you're going to put them in a
24 precinct to vote that's not in District 8, it's in
25 District 6, because Southside Baptist Church is actually

1 there.

2 But the other issue is that we would be moving them
3 one way or the other if you put -- if we -- if we leave it
4 as is, you're not move -- you've moved them from a
5 district to a new district, but you're not moving them
6 from a precinct, as I understand it, the precinct would
7 stay the same. And when you look at neighborhoods, of
8 course, certainly, you can go in most neighborhoods except
9 Sand Ridge from a number of different directions, but that
10 area certainly is much closer to Highway 56 than it is Old
11 Waynesboro Road because you've got to go through a lot of
12 stop signs to get there.

13 MR. MASON: Mr. Brigham and then Ms. Cain.

14 MR. BRIGHAM: Mr. Chairman, I believe when the state
15 reapportioned Richmond County, they changed two precincts.
16 I was curious as to how many precincts that we're changing
17 while we're in the process of redoing --

18 MS. BAILEY: So far with this working plan 2, and I'm
19 going to exclude the two housekeeping cleanup measures
20 that I requested, that one being the nook in District 1
21 that straightens out -- that used to follow the old city
22 limit line where there are no voters involved. That is
23 technically a split, and also that area off of Gordon
24 Highway at Bayvale Road that followed the old city limit
25 line. Those are requests that I had made that have

1 nothing to do with this committee that helped bring
2 existing precinct lines off of nonexistent city of
3 Augusta, the old city limit lines and onto, in the case of
4 the Gordon Highway area, out of the neighborhood there off
5 of Bayvale Road and onto the Gordon Highway, so it
6 basically reestablishes that neighborhood. So excluding
7 those two, we're talking about the split in Precinct 402,
8 which is the big precinct that votes at McDuffie Woods,
9 and if you'll recall, the top portion of that precinct
10 would move to District 5 in order to provide for a bridge
11 for that Fort Gordon precinct to come into District 5.
12 Precinct 405, which is the Diamond Lakes precinct, that is
13 the precinct into which Sand Ridge would come. And we've
14 gone down to the bottom to the south side of Lewis Foreman
15 Road and taken a piece of District 4 and moved into
16 District 8 to accommodate for that change for the Sand
17 Ridge neighborhood. So there are those two. There's also
18 a little tip of Precinct 505 that would be moved into
19 District 4 in order to continue that same land bridge for
20 District 5 to bring the Fort Gordon precinct in. Very few
21 people living in that area, I think there were less than
22 20 or so, just very few people there. And then again, the
23 precinct in District 8 in which that portion of Sand Ridge
24 currently sits that would be moved then into District 4.
25 So we're talking about -- oh, and pardon me. I skipped

1 Precinct 310, which is that Sue Reynolds community. And
2 you will recall in Ms. Meggers' presentation that, again,
3 in order to provide contiguity between the district,
4 there's that little piece of Precinct 310 that borders
5 Wrightsboro Road, Barton Chapel Road, Bobby Jones that
6 would stay -- that would move to District 5. So to boil
7 it down, Mr. Brigham, we're talking about one, two, three,
8 four, five precincts that would be split excluding the
9 three that are split with those housekeeping issues. So
10 those three included, it would be a total of eight.

11 MR. BRIGHAM: How many did we have under plan 1 that
12 were split?

13 MS. BAILEY: Plan 1 had two? Two.

14 MS. MEGGERS: Had two, one of which was the Fort
15 Gordon --

16 MS. BAILEY: So we had 310 that was significantly
17 split in plan 1; and then we had, again, the same similar
18 housekeeping issues out there on the Gordon Highway.

19 MR. BRIGHAM: I would think that if the state can
20 manage to reapportion Richmond County and split two
21 precincts, that most voters are accustomed to the precinct
22 they've used for the last ten years, that if we can
23 eliminate a few cosmetic changes where we do the same
24 thing for the commission and the school board district, it
25 would be advantageous to not have numerous changes in

1 there, if at all possible. I would think that would be
2 possible. It looks to me that it could be possible. And
3 I, you know -- I'm looking for reactions, but I thought
4 that's what we were -- that we were trying to do as good a
5 job as the state did about not dividing up precincts.

6 MR. MASON: Well, I don't know if Ms. Meggers will
7 want to talk to that, but I remember you telling us from
8 the state's standpoint, of course, their numbers are a lot
9 larger, even though their percentages may be smaller, the
10 actual numbers were a lot larger; and we certainly have a
11 number of things that we had to take into account, you
12 know, here locally. So I guess I'm trying to understand
13 from you, Mr. Brigham, if that -- are you saying that
14 because of the changes that we had to make required some
15 of the precincts split, but are you saying that leave the
16 precincts where they are even though we made the split,
17 but leave those precincts.

18 MR. BRIGHAM: I understand the situation in Sand
19 Ridge, I understand that. I agree that's a community of
20 interest, they ought to vote together. But I think most
21 of the other precincts' changes -- we're going to have to
22 make some changes because we know some districts have got
23 to lose some people and we know other districts have to
24 make some gains. But we need to try to do it with, I
25 would think, in providing the least number of changes to

1 what people are accustomed to already is what I'm trying
2 to say.

3 MR. MASON: Ms. Cain.

4 MS. CAIN: Lynn, I just have one quick question
5 because it came across my mind. When you put on this form
6 that we had basically this -- we're looking at just one
7 split subdivision now or not?

8 MS. BAILEY: Oh, no, I'm sure there are others that
9 were existing splits, for instance, Highland Park over off
10 of -- over at Daniel Field. I can't recall if that entire
11 neighborhood goes back together or --

12 MS. CAIN: I'm sorry, what did you say? You say a
13 number of subdivisions split into more than one district.

14 MS. BAILEY: Oh, I'm sorry. That's -- but I'll let
15 Linda -- that's Ms. Meggers' report so why don't -- if you
16 don't mind, I'll let her.

17 MS. CAIN: Then we can wait until she gets there and
18 go ahead and address Mr. Brigham's concerns.

19 MR. MASON: Mr. Murphy.

20 MR. MURPHY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

21 I'm just trying to follow Commissioner Brigham's
22 question about the state splitting precincts. Can you
23 help me understand what you're --

24 MR. BRIGHAM: What I'm saying is: they used the
25 existing precincts with the exception of two that they

1 divided.

2 MS. MEGGERS: In the house, senate congressional --

3 MR. BRIGHAM: In the house, senate congressional,
4 they only changed two precincts out of the -- how many
5 have we got now, 90?

6 MS. BAILEY: 74.

7 MR. BRIGHAM: 74, okay. I'm sorry. I thought we had
8 a few more than that. But they only changed two out of
9 the 74 precincts.

10 MR. MURPHY: Okay. But --

11 MR. BRIGHAM: We're in the process, we've changed 10
12 percent of them to do the same thing that we're doing.

13 MR. MURPHY: Okay. Well, help me with this. We're
14 talking about 45,000 citizens for a house seat, and we're
15 talking roughly 25,000 for a board of education and a
16 county commission, and we directed Ms. Meggers to work
17 with the deviation of -- was it two or two and a half?

18 MS. MEGGERS: Two.

19 MR. MURPHY: Two. And in some cases under plan 2
20 where we're noticing 2.29, 2.62 and 2.62 and a 2.41. How
21 do we rectify that? Do we need to increase -- if we
22 wanted to eliminate the splitting of precincts and the
23 splitting of neighborhoods, we would have to increase the
24 deviations in order to do that or would we have to lower
25 it in order to achieve the elimination of splitting of

1 communities of interest, precincts, and so forth, to give
2 you more room to work to eliminate that. What would have
3 -- what would be the answer to that?

4 MS. MEGGERS: In order not to have any split
5 precincts? I'm not sure that it's an issue for one-
6 person, one-vote. I don't think your deviations are at
7 issue right here. I think it's more of a question of
8 meeting the needs. For example, if you put Sand Ridge
9 back together, then that is going to have to be a split
10 that the election's office is either going to have to move
11 those people over to the other precinct or have a ballot
12 combo, combination, in that area, et cetera. But that
13 precinct is probably big enough that you would disrupt a
14 lot of other people out of a neighborhood, that they are
15 happy being in 8. You just had this one small area in
16 that precinct that would rather be in 4. I will tell you
17 over 30 years of watching this; I mean, I think it's great
18 that the legislature has split so few precincts this go
19 around in these initial plans. That's the first time in a
20 long, long time that you've seen such few split precincts
21 in the state plans. But precincts most often get split at
22 the local level because of the smaller average size
23 district and because you have to meet these needs every
24 ten years of keeping communities or putting communities
25 back together or trying to remedy maybe an injustice or a

1 split that had happened ten years ago, saying okay, those
2 folks have been split, is there a way that we can put them
3 back together, which is what we did with Sand Ridge, et
4 cetera. I don't know that it's a function of your
5 deviation, but normally to keep everything intact you may
6 have to go somewhat larger, I don't know, but certainly
7 not smaller.

8 MR. MURPHY: Okay. But as a follow-up to that, one
9 of the reasons why perhaps in splitting neighborhoods or
10 precincts is because there might be a desire to stack
11 certain areas. Is that possible? Is that not true?

12 MS. MEGGERS: I don't think so. How are you using
13 the term stacking?

14 MR. MURPHY: I'm talking from the state's point of
15 view.

16 MR. MEGGERS: I have no idea why they -- how they
17 made their choices this go round. Thankfully, I wasn't
18 involved.

19 MR. MASON: And before I go to Mr. Brigham, I just
20 want to clear up something just for clarity. It's not
21 that Sand Ridge wants to be in District 4. Sand Ridge
22 wants to come together, being in District 4 or District 8.
23 So I just wanted to make sure for the record we're clear
24 on that.

25 Mr. Brigham.

1 MR. BRIGHAM: What I was trying to say is I believe
2 under plan 1 we were as close in deviation as we are now
3 in plan 2, and we had less precincts being split, is what
4 I was trying to say. I think that some credence needs to
5 be given to that. I think people know where they go vote
6 at; they are accustomed to going to vote at a particular
7 place; and the least amount of change and disruption is
8 the best amount of change and disruption. I think our
9 deviation under plan 1 is as good as -- I don't think
10 there's any great deviation between plan 1 or plan 2.

11 MS. MEGGERS: The deviations under --

12 MR. BRIGHAM: It pretty much is the same, is it not?

13 MS. MEGGERS: That's correct, sir.

14 MR. BRIGHAM: And what I'm saying is for convenience
15 sake, we have a historical preference of doing things a
16 certain way. You know, I could easily have said if we
17 want to talk about things that need to be changed, I've
18 got a dividing line on Henry Street that's a neighborhood,
19 that the left side of Henry Street is in one district and
20 the right side of Henry Street is in another district,
21 that people would love to be -- on both sides of Henry
22 Street would love to be in the same district. That's no
23 different than Sand Ridge, but it's historical that
24 they've already been split, is what I'm trying to say,
25 rather than tie up, let's try to work out the smaller

1 inconsistencies where we can, but let's -- I don't think
2 we want to go down and look at every street or every
3 people that thinks there's been an injustice in the way
4 the line has been drawn over the last ten or 20 years or
5 whatever, that, you know, I've been at this thing a long
6 time. I've seen districts where when the state got
7 through drawing them, they created the back property lines
8 of certain neighborhoods became a precinct because a
9 certain politician lived in that neighborhood and they
10 wanted to be in a certain district. I don't think that's
11 what we're trying to do here. At least I hope that's not
12 what we're trying to do.

13 MR. MASON: No, no, it doesn't appear that way. Let
14 me say this because I want to make sure that we're all
15 understanding where you're coming from. Are you saying
16 what you've said to say that that particular area in 6
17 where they were talking about between 6 and 8 to rectify
18 that or are you talking about going back to plan 1.

19 MR. BRIGHAM: I'm talking about in the overall scheme
20 that I'm not so sure that plan 2 is any better, maybe with
21 the exception of unifying Sand Ridge, than plan 1, is what
22 I'm trying to say.

23 MR. MASON: And I certainly appreciate your comments
24 in reference to that. Of course, from another aspect and
25 certainly from the aspect of my particular issue, and I'll

1 just talk about that in particular and everyone else can
2 talk about theirs if they so choose. 403, for instance,
3 was taken out of District 4, which is the heart of Tobacco
4 Road, which is the heart of the district. That's huge.
5 And so we'd have to cross over Bill's and Patsy Scott's
6 District 5 to pick up the other part of District 4, which
7 is up on Barton Chapel, which was drawn in, by the way,
8 because of a particular commissioner that you talked about
9 that wanted that there. That was one of those cases. It
10 didn't make sense when Barton Chapel, one side of the road
11 of Barton Chapel is District 5 and the other side is
12 District 4, and it was all District 5, but because of what
13 you're talking about. So we have to actually cross over a
14 road that he and I split, for instance, just to get back
15 over to 4. We have to go through 5 to get back over to 4;
16 and then you're talking about now taking a huge pie of
17 Tobacco Road, which is all of 4 from Windsor Spring and
18 then putting it in 5. So now, he's got to cross over
19 again, you know, to get back through 4 to get back over to
20 5. It's a little -- it's a little -- so I understand what
21 you're saying, but we've all got some concerns, none that
22 I'm saying outweighs anybody else's, but they're certainly
23 just as great, and that would be a concern, you know, as
24 far as taking out that heart of Tobacco Road, which is
25 known as District 4, no doubt about it. So everything is

1 up for discussion.

2 MS. MEGGERS: Okay. Before we move on, you've been
3 asking some questions when I was having some technical
4 difficulties. This is the area right here (indicates)
5 below Goshen Road on the south or west side of Mike
6 Padgett Highway. It has the 17 persons in it. Now, if we
7 go above to pick up the people on the other side of
8 Goshen, let's see how many -- what happens. You have to
9 take all of this in (indicates) plus all of that
10 (indicates), so you know, that's -- and I don't know
11 whether that cures the problem or not. Is that what you
12 were asking me, Mr. Chairman, as to what would happen with
13 the census geography --

14 MR. MASON: Right.

15 MS. MEGGERS: -- if we went to the northern side of
16 Goshen Road?

17 MR. MASON: Right.

18 MS. MEGGERS: Okay. If that works -- if we just take
19 that portion, I don't know whether that gets all of the
20 Goshen community or not. You would have to tell me that.
21 But District 8 would be a plus 2.15 and District 6 would
22 be a minus 2.49.

23 MR. MASON: I guess the question would be, and I
24 don't know that we found the answer here tonight, what is
25 Goshen? I mean, who -- what is considered Goshen because

1 that seems to be --

2 MR. PADGETT: That certainly isn't that --

3 MR. DAVIS: I can tell you that I live in Country
4 Place; I do not live in Goshen.

5 MR. MASON: All right.

6 MR. PADGETT: That's the answer then.

7 MR. MASON: And that's off of 56 where there is a
8 separate --

9 MR. DAVIS: And then that block that Linda's
10 suggesting --

11 MS. MEGGERS: We're taking your --

12 MR. DAVIS: You're taking me and putting me, quote,
13 in Goshen and I don't live in Goshen.

14 MS. MEGGERS: It's just a hard area. Once you go
15 above Goshen Road, then you're mixing communities.

16 MR. PADGETT: You're in another community.

17 MR. MEGGERS: It's not a clean division there.

18 MR. PADGETT: It's even got a different name, it's
19 Country Place.

20 MS. MEGGERS: Yes, sir.

21 MR. DAVIS: That's right. One way in, one way out.

22 MR. PADGETT: The chairman just asked me and, of
23 course, here again, as has been mentioned, I've been doing
24 this a long time, a long time before even Goshen was
25 built; and certainly those few people on Goshen Road

1 probably consider themselves Goshen, but they're a good
2 ways from the creek if you look at it from a geographic
3 standpoint; and I would say 90 percent of them go in
4 Highway 56, Mike Padgett Highway, to get to their homes.
5 I really see no problem in that one little sliver down
6 there, but to keep everything intact, if you move that
7 back into 8, you're going to move their voting place; and
8 as Jerry has mentioned, you're not moving any of these
9 people's voting place, all you're doing is giving them a
10 new commissioner and a new school board trustee, and
11 you're in the same exact -- they're going to still vote at
12 Southside assuming that that continues the precinct.

13 And to Senator Davis' comment, he doesn't live in
14 Goshen or anywhere really near Goshen. I mean, Goshen is
15 a separate subdivision. It's built there; we've got a
16 school there; we've got a lot of other things there. But
17 it is a distinct neighborhood. Now, there's a lot of area
18 right south of Goshen that would probably like to be
19 Goshen, but they're called something else, too. And I
20 mean, it is in and out. I mean, you can get in from two
21 ways and get out by two ways, but you can't -- once you
22 get in the subdivision, you can go south or north and get
23 into another area. You've got Goshen Road totally access
24 either way.

25 MR. MASON: So just so we're clear, so if they were

1 pulled in, they would actually move from where they have
2 been used to going to.

3 MR. PADGETT: Right.

4 MR. MASON: Which counteracts what you were saying,
5 Mr. Brigham, and if they remained, they actually just
6 become -- they'll have a different commissioner.

7 MR. PADGETT: And a different school board
8 representative.

9 MR. MASON: And a different school board
10 representative, but they will actually still be voting at
11 the same precinct.

12 MR. PADGETT: And that, to me, makes the most sense
13 of anything I looked at; and I looked at all the districts
14 before Ms. Meggers came in; and that was -- if you'll look
15 at 1900 plus and 1900 minus, if you can shift those exact
16 people, it makes two districts perfect.

17 MS. MEGGERS: I will point out to this as an
18 observation from an election standpoint, that if you --
19 these 17 persons, if you were to move those into District
20 8 and not change -- and move them to a new precinct, make
21 them go vote in another place, I don't know how many of
22 those 17 people are registered voters and how many of them
23 on any given election turnout, but you've almost taken
24 away their secret ballot with such a small number. See,
25 if you're taking just 17 people out of a precinct, that's

1 total, that's not voter age population, it's not
2 registered voters and it's not those that turn out. So
3 each time you go to one of those new categories, you get
4 smaller and smaller and smaller to the point that if you
5 have a SPLOST or some election where you have a low
6 turnout and you have four or five people and that's all
7 that vote, or three people, you have taken away their
8 secret ballot. You will know exactly how those people
9 voted.

10 MR. PADGETT: That validates everything I've said.

11 MR. MASON: I see your point there.

12 MR. BRIGHAM: I would certainly hope we wouldn't
13 create a voting precinct for 17 people.

14 MS. MEGGERS: Well, no, but you'd have to move them
15 across the creek and make them go all the way back up Mike
16 Padgett Highway down Goshen Road over into this other
17 precinct or --

18 MS. BAILEY: If we left them at Southside, which
19 could be an option, but I think Ms. Meggers has a very
20 good point; it would make an extremely small group of
21 registered voters going to Southside that are in District
22 8 and voting at Southside with everyone else would be
23 alike but for that small group. So I would have to --
24 that's a very good point.

25 And the other thing I was going to say earlier as we

1 were talking about the comparison, Sand Ridge to Goshen,
2 and I think somebody mentioned it, maybe Mr. Brigham, but
3 somebody over here mentioned it, but the other difference
4 between these two situations in Sand Ridge, not only were
5 they split between Commission Districts 4 and 8, but they
6 were also split then, because of that split, between the
7 Super Districts 9 and 10. So it really did give that
8 neighborhood four different commissioners and four
9 different school board members for that very small area.
10 This area would be a little bit different because 6 and 8
11 are also under the same umbrella of Super District 10. So
12 that does make them a little bit more cohesive.

13 MR. MASON: Mr. Padgett.

14 MR. PADGETT: Mr. Chairman, I would move that we move
15 away from 6 and 8 in this portion and leave 805 in
16 District 6 and add in its totality because I think Ms.
17 Meggers made the best point of all. Seventeen people, if
18 two vote, you know exactly who voted for who, and that's
19 not proper under any legislation. I would move that we do
20 that and move along.

21 MS. MEGGERS: Okay. I'm sorry. Am I interrupting?

22 MR. MASON: Jack, is that a motion?

23 MR. PADGETT: That's a motion.

24 MR. MASON: Is there a second to that?

25 MR. BRIGHAM: Would you repeat your motion?

1 MR. PADGETT: The motion is to --

2 MR. MASON: Now, you're basically talking about
3 moving on, but we don't need a motion to move on.

4 MR. PADGETT: Well --

5 MR. MASON: If you're ready to move on, I'm ready to
6 move on.

7 MR. PADGETT: I'm ready to move on, but I just as
8 soon take that and put that behind us if the group sees
9 fit to do so. I would move that we all --

10 MR. BARNES: As a point of clarification on this
11 motion.

12 MR. MASON: Yes, sir.

13 MR. BARNES: If we vote that way, is that a permanent
14 part of this thing or can it be changed in the final plan?

15 MR. MASON: Well, we haven't done a final plan, so it
16 would --

17 MR. BARNES: No, but I'm just asking if we vote --

18 MR. MASON: I don't see a reason to vote on that at
19 this particular time. If we talk about moving forward, we
20 can go ahead and move forward, but I don't think that
21 particular --

22 MR. BARNES: You understand what I'm saying.

23 MR. MASON: Right, I don't think we're going to vote
24 on portions of maps. If we start getting into that, we
25 might have some issues. But I'm with him in terms of if

1 we've talked this thing out and we're okay, we can move
2 on.

3 MR. PAGDETT: Mr. Chairman, I think we can move on;
4 and I would like to see what 3, since that was the last of
5 the latest appeals that we got at Sue Reynolds the other
6 night as to what 3 -- what happens to 3 with all the
7 changes.

8 MS. MEGGERS: Okay, let's go back to 3 and 5. This
9 was the area (indicating) that was the most contested in
10 this whole discussion about District 3 that -- you can see
11 the red line was from working plan 1. I have taken all of
12 that in this area (indicating) and moved it into District
13 5 to balance the shortfall there, and to take over the
14 large overage in District 3. Those folks were very
15 eloquent in saying that they wanted to be kept intact in
16 District 3. One of the ways that it became possible, more
17 possible, to do that was when we made the changes down
18 here (indicating) to put the Tobacco Road area back
19 together, for the first time, 5 was adjacent to Fort
20 Gordon. So pigging backing on the change that I made
21 putting the Tobacco Road area back together, I then moved
22 District 5 -- I mean, the Ft. Gordon precinct in District
23 3 into District 5. That gave me the room, number wise,
24 one-person, one-vote population. Then to put this
25 precinct back together, there is an area right over here

1 (indicating), that is still split off but it is really not
2 the heart of that precinct and it's what I'm using, as I
3 did on the first plan, a way to get up and pick up this
4 precinct here (indicating). So this is not very many
5 folks and Ms. Bailey could decide whether to leave that as
6 ballot combination. It's much larger than those 17 people
7 that we talked about in the Goshen area; or they might
8 even be able to be consolidated with this precinct here
9 (indicating). And then that did two things, it put this
10 community back together into District 3, it raised the
11 numbers, the total black population numbers, in District 3
12 to a 43.30, which is slightly 1 percent higher than under
13 the existing plan that's on the ground today. So it comes
14 up from on plan 1, I had reduced it down to 37.83 which
15 folks had also commented on, it goes back up to slightly
16 over what it was under the current plan. Now, overall,
17 when you look at the overall deviation, the average
18 deviation per district is 1.44 percent, which is very good
19 and your overall deviation is 5.02.

20 Remember, the courts will allow up to 10 percent, you
21 know, if we can explain it. So we've got very tight close
22 deviations here that Mr. Brigham with his comments at the
23 very first meeting has made me very conscious of that, and
24 I looked at that each time that I made a change. So we've
25 got so we've got very good numbers from that standpoint.

1 I think from the standpoint of the Voting Rights Act, if
2 you look at the plan comparison, I think we stand in very,
3 very good shape on Section 5 review at the Justice
4 Department.

5 MR. MASON: Let me add here because you did mention
6 the fact that 5 actually touched Fort Gordon for the first
7 time, but also was bringing up the black population in 3,
8 5 took a huge hit as well, I think about a 4 or 5 percent
9 drop. I mean, it's still up, but I mean, that's -- we
10 didn't put that out there.

11 MS. MEGGERS: Right. Actually, I thought that was
12 really kind of a positive direction to go in, because you
13 don't need those really high numbers in coming back down
14 so things are not quite so concentrated. In some areas,
15 it's very hard for me to reduce those numbers.

16 MR. MASON: Oh, no, I understand, but I wanted to
17 kind of get that out there because they did take a drop
18 though. We talked about the changes in all the other
19 districts, but we haven't mentioned the change in
20 population for 5, so just for fairness and equity, I
21 wanted to kind of throw that out there.

22 MS. MEGGERS: Right. If one goes down, the other one
23 is going to go up. It's that waterbed.

24 MR. MASON: Yes. So if there was anybody thinking
25 that they stayed where they were and, you know, this one

1 popped up, we're going to clear that up, that didn't
2 happen. You know, one dropped and one picked up.

3 MR. BRIGHAM: How many people are in the Fort Gordon
4 precinct?

5 MS. MEGGERS: Do you know a total?

6 MS. BAILEY: I do.

7 MR. BRIGHAM: Population, I'm not interested in
8 voters.

9 MS. MEGGERS: I want to say it's around 10,000.

10 MS. BAILEY: You mean total population?

11 MS. MEGGERS: Total population.

12 MR. BRIGHAM: Total population.

13 MS. BAILEY: Right at 10,000 total, and that splits,
14 existing split between 4, 8, and 3 commission and school
15 board districts.

16 MR. MASON: Senator Davis.

17 MR. DAVIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

18 I think going back to something that Ms. Meggers was
19 talking about in terms of you're using District 3 as
20 somewhat of a base line in terms of trying to maintain the
21 numbers as it relates to Section 5 and certainly making
22 sure that there's no retrogression, but I think this is
23 one of the things that was raised on the last meeting, at
24 the hearing at the last meeting and so I have received a
25 number of calls from constituents about it as well, and

1 that is this whole notion of being able to establish
2 multi-racial coalitions. When you look at these numbers,
3 and I think this is something that's been brought up at
4 more than one hearing and certainly in our meetings, is
5 this notion that we're going perhaps in the wrong
6 direction. When you have a district, I'll look at
7 District 2 and this is on using plan 2 that you have
8 presented today, I've got a district that's 74 percent
9 black, and why is that? Why are we maintaining a district
10 at 74 percent black, 74 percent white, that's not even
11 reflective of our community, as opposed to having coin
12 tossed districts, but more importantly allowing folks to
13 being able to establish multi-racial coalitions.

14 MS. MEGGERS: I think it's starting from the existing
15 plan to do something much -- a great deal different if
16 you're talking about -- I'd have to have some specific
17 guidelines, but we might have to toss out the whole map
18 and start from scratch and forget about where everybody
19 lives and just start drawing new district lines. Which,
20 you know, is up to you. I mean, I need some guidance as
21 to what you think is the benchmark that I should aim for.

22 MR. MASON: Well, I think you mentioned -- I'm sorry.

23 MR. DAVIS: I'm not suggesting that we throw out the
24 baby with the bath water, I just know that I've
25 consistently heard that, you know, in each of these

1 districts. We've heard at the last meeting, I think we
2 all acknowledge that, we heard it at the last meeting.
3 There's no reason why District 2 needs to be 75 percent
4 black. I'm just going to tell you. There's no reason why
5 District 5 needs to be 75 percent black. I think in our
6 community one of the things we have a unique opportunity,
7 certainly as a committee, I can't talk about the sins of
8 fathers of pasts of what took place in '96, 2000, or
9 anything, but I can talk about some of the challenges that
10 we as a community have largely faced. More importantly
11 over the last, you know, three or four years and that we
12 consistently keep facing and part of that is because we're
13 not established in those multi-racial coalitions to be
14 able to get us beyond this whole notion of black and
15 white. And we have a unique opportunity to continue what
16 we have historically done and do that or we can set the
17 tone for where we want this community to go. That's just
18 --

19 MS. MEGGERS: Are you suggesting --

20 MR. DAVIS: I'm suggesting that none of these
21 districts need to be 74 percent anything. When you look
22 at the demographics of our community, I mean that doesn't
23 even speak of who we are as a community.

24 MS. MEGGERS: So --

25 MR. DAVIS: I can't imagine any district being

1 greater than 65 percent, 60 to 64 percent anything. I
2 just can't, I don't understand it.

3 MS. MEGGERS: I need to see if a different approach --

4 MR. DAVIS: I mean, even going back to Commissioner
5 Brigham's point when you talk about the state when we
6 redrew districts this year that was certainly one of the
7 guiding principles. You have very few districts that have
8 gone into the 70th percentile, you've got some. I mean,
9 even my senate district is only 58, not even quite 60
10 percent African American. And I'm just talking as it
11 relates to -- and to your point, on the two precincts --

12 MR. BRIGHAM: And I agree with you, and --

13 MR. DAVIS: Yeah.

14 MR. BRIGHAM: But, you know, people just don't live
15 where they're supposed to live sometime.

16 MR. DAVIS: Well, I live in Country Place and I have
17 lived at 1026 Country Place for the past 17 years, you
18 know.

19 MR. MASON: Representative Howard.

20 MR. HOWARD: I would like to -- I think Senator Davis
21 makes a good point here and I was looking at these numbers
22 as well. And you know, I'll take the reverse position.
23 When you look at those districts where you have that high,
24 you know, like 74, 75, 70 whatever percent African
25 American black population, you know, what does that do to

1 that 30 percent or 35 percent that, you know, may want to
2 participate in electing a personal choice, a candidate of
3 choice, I guess you could say? And I think we can do a
4 little better job of getting the numbers crunched down. I
5 would like to see us move in that direction.

6 MR. MASON: All right, and there's a part on this
7 business where we're talking other business, and maybe
8 that will come in together with that.

9 Mr. Murphy, you have a comment.

10 MR. MURPHY: I'll make my comment later.

11 MR MASON: Okay, Mr. Padgett.

12 MR. PADGETT: Well, you look at that and the question
13 and here again, I'm not an expert on this, but I do know
14 if you present a plan to justice that takes District 2
15 down from much below 74, you're looking at a 77 percent
16 census one-man, one-vote and you're looking at 71.55 where
17 they were and you might reduce them one or two points, but
18 you start reducing eight or ten points down to 65 they're
19 going to come back at you. I mean, that's the way the
20 patterns have worked for the last 30 years that I've been
21 doing this and you look at the same thing, and I think
22 with the changes that have been proposed in plan 2, for
23 instance, District 3, I listened and I heard what the
24 people said out there, it represents the census count from
25 a 42.3 to a 43.3 is pretty close. And if you get into the

1 minority precincts, District 5 actually is below what the
2 census shows at 75.78 and it's only 72.52. And you get on
3 down and my district is probably the balancing act to the
4 whole thing, its 52.97 becomes 52.99, that's what, six or
5 eight people. I mean, that's -- I mean, you're getting
6 awfully close to where everything was and keeping in line
7 Section 5 and not reducing those numbers. And that's the
8 first thing, I guarantee you, justice is going to look at,
9 is those numbers, that every one that was reduced, they're
10 going to ask why.

11 MR. MASON: Senator Davis.

12 MR. DAVIS: I couldn't agree with you more, Vice
13 Chairman Padgett. And again, I think when you look at the
14 issues as it relates to the state of Georgia, you have
15 case law to refer back to and that was the whole premise
16 as it relates to that, that you do maintain one-man, one-
17 vote, one-person, one-vote, but more than anything as it
18 relates to Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act if -- it
19 tells us that you do not want to do anything that takes
20 that majority or minority voting below 50 percent. Okay.
21 And in this example or suggestion, you in no wise would be
22 taking it below 50 percent.

23 MR. MASON: Mr. Lockett.

24 MR. LOCKETT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

25 Ms. Meggers, will you, please, define retrogression?

1 MS. MEGGERS: Retrogression is the review that comes
2 under Section 5, remember we -- lets back up a little bit.
3 We talk about the fact that any plan that's adopted by
4 this committee and then the commission and school board
5 and later on the legislature goes to justice department
6 under Section 5 because we're a voting rights state. And
7 the Section 5 review is for non-retrogression where they
8 take and compare the plan that we presently have in
9 Richmond Augusta for school board and commission and
10 compare those numbers to what the proposed plan is to be
11 sure that there is no dilution of black voting strength in
12 that new plan. But I also told you, you don't have to
13 maintain exactly that same number for there not -- for
14 there to be no dilution. Senator -- correct in that you
15 don't have to have them in the 70's, they're talking
16 about, you know, 50 percent or more is considered a
17 majority, minority district. Now, that may not suit local
18 politics for turn out, et cetera. You may want something
19 better than 50 percent in all of your districts; I'm not
20 sure that, you know -- that certainly would create a lot
21 of biracial coalitions, to take all these districts and
22 have them at 50/50. But you don't have to maintain them
23 in the 70s, for example, that -- for it to still be a
24 strong viable minority seat.

25 MR. LOCKETT: Thank you.

1 MR. MASON: Are you prepared for --

2 MR. MURPHY: The information that I was going to
3 share has been --

4 MR. MASON: Oh, it's already been put out there.

5 All right. What else do you have for us?

6 MS. MEGGERS: To seek direction from the committee as
7 to where they would like for me to go next?

8 MS. CAIN: And that's for District 8, right?

9 MS. MEGGERS: Any of them.

10 MR. MASON: Representative Howard.

11 MR. HOWARD: Due to a medical reason, I missed the
12 second meeting and what I would like to -- and then, also,
13 there were -- you have a website where people were able to
14 make comments. I think it would -- for us to listen to
15 what people, what the constituents, what the citizens of
16 this county has said, then we need to have that
17 opportunity to maybe look over those comments, see those
18 emails, you know whatever may be out there and prepare for
19 a work session to finalize this, you know, whether it
20 takes -- you know, I know we're on a timeline and we would
21 like to get it done, you know; but I think in the spirit
22 of letting the public know that we are going to respond to
23 some of those things that they have given us; and I think
24 that those things that you gave us, Lynn, the three
25 things, the only one that I didn't hear was the one where

1 the -- at the third hearing, there was a couple of guys
2 that talked about, you know, the same thing that we're
3 talking about now, you know making -- trying to get those
4 numbers -- you know, not letting those numbers land so
5 high and if it's a way to work that out. And I don't know
6 if we've put any effort in that area, so I guess I'd like
7 to see us, if we do a work session or agree to do a second
8 work session, that we would look at some of those going in
9 that direction.

10 MR. MASON: Well, certainly this is discussion time.
11 Let me say this though, at this point is there -- I don't
12 think we're quite clear as far as a direction, so we'll
13 get that before we move forward; but while we're there,
14 we're talking about looking more closely at information
15 that may have come from these meetings. Are there -- at
16 this point, is there any other information to come into
17 play, other than what we've already heard publicly, and
18 I'm not talking about from a public standpoint, but now
19 we're hearing more from the committee's standpoint, is
20 there any other committee members -- at this point, is
21 there anything else that we've got to bring to the table
22 because we just brought a lot here tonight that could
23 potentially, depending on which direction we go in, change
24 the whole map. So what I would like to see at this point,
25 is there any other committee member who has a concern, a

1 suggestion, an issue, or anything else with what has been
2 presented either in plan 1 or 2?

3 MR. PADGETT: Mr. Chairman, just a comment and I went
4 to all the hearings and listened very intently and I think
5 plan 2 answers every question that was placed there.

6 Of course, previous to the public hearings we heard
7 from Sand Ridge community and we heard from the others,
8 but when I look at this and the question we had in -- at
9 Sue Reynolds was on District 3, and the cut of basically 4
10 and a half percent minority in that district has been
11 responded to. The district -- the other districts that
12 were involved in this, I thought 3 was the one that
13 probably the people made more sense on the idea. If they
14 started out at 42.3, they didn't want to go to 37.8, so we
15 gave them 43.3, which is a little better than what they
16 had. But then when you look at plan 2, first is the
17 population 2010, 2002 plan with the census and when you
18 see a deviation there of only 1 or 2 percent, I mean,
19 that's getting pretty close. I mean, you've got so many
20 of these that are almost on the nickel. I mean, District
21 10 is a good example, 39.3 is 39.33. I mean, I don't
22 think -- I don't see how you can argue with numbers that
23 are there. And I agree with Senator Davis that we'd like
24 to have these districts different, but when you do that,
25 you're going to totally destroy a lot of neighborhoods. I

1 mean, anyway slightly, people are -- as Jerry said, people
2 don't live where they it would be best to split the
3 population with. They live in sectors.

4 MR. MASON: Well, Mr. Padgett, based on the
5 information that was given when we first started this
6 committee and based on the guidelines that I think we
7 adopted that Senator Davis brought forth at that
8 particular time, I think a very credible job has been done
9 by Ms. Meggers for what we asked for initially and the
10 guidance that we gave her. So now, and we certainly have
11 you know, the rights or, you know, the will is there to
12 look at some other things. But, if you recall, we were
13 given a guideline, some facts that we took into
14 consideration and that we voted on that you brought
15 forward and then we also talked about some of these
16 federal guidelines that was on us, the Department of
17 Justice guidelines and so forth. So based on that
18 information, she set out to do what was done. And then,
19 of course, we had three public meetings and there were
20 some issues there. So the only the thing -- and I agree
21 with you, Mr. Howard, what I don't see now, right now, is
22 the last issue that was brought up, of course, that was
23 not something that she had guidance for at that particular
24 time. So now, I guess what she's looking for at this
25 point, from where I'm sitting, is guidance now on where to

1 move forward and is that a criteria or concern that we
2 want to address and should be addressing or at least
3 looking at it to see what it comes out to or how a map
4 would look. And I guess that's where we're sitting right
5 now so she'll know which way to go after we depart here
6 tonight. Obviously, it does not appear that we are going
7 to agree on a plan tonight.

8 MS. CAIN: Ms. Meggers, if you took into
9 consideration what Senator Davis and Representative Howard
10 said, would that cause us to totally redraw all of the
11 districts?

12 MS. MEGGERS: I don't know. I think that if we focus
13 on taking Districts 2, 4 and 5 and getting them out of the
14 70's, something below 70, of course, it affects more than
15 those three, so it's going to affect at least six out of
16 the eight, and it may affect all of them or at least seven
17 out of the eight.

18 MS. CAIN: Because -- let me make sure I understand
19 you. So doing that, you would have to pull those
20 districts you just gave me. That mean you would have to
21 basically end up really redoing the whole city because
22 you're going to have to reduce those populations, you're
23 going to have to pull people in from maybe District 3,
24 District 7, District 8 and kind of mix it up.

25 MS. MEGGERS: Yes.

1 MS. CAIN: So in actuality, we would end up looking
2 at totally redoing all the district lines.

3 MS. MEGGERS: I think it would affect at least six,
4 probably seven out of -- District 8 might be okay since it
5 sits down there by itself, et cetera, but it may affect at
6 least six out of the eight and maybe seven out of the
7 eight.

8 MS. CAIN: And one last question.

9 MS. MEGGERS: That's just a guess.

10 MS. CAIN: And I have one last question. And we also
11 look at really chopping up our districts as they are now
12 because I mean, I like district -- I mean, I went to all
13 the meetings myself and I heard the concerns of the people
14 and I think we've done a very good job and you've done a
15 very good job at addressing those needs. I think the only
16 one that's still left out there is Goshen. And I did, you
17 know -- I have been talking about what can we do to fix
18 that situation. From everything I heard from at the
19 meetings, everybody else is happy once we fix this.

20 MR. MASON: Senator Davis.

21 MR. DAVIS: Mr. Chairman, if I may, a couple of
22 things I want to make certain and want to clarify what I
23 said, so that everybody is very clear about what I said.
24 One, I am not establishing a 50 percent district as a
25 threshold. That's number one. What I am suggesting to

1 this body is that it makes no sense for us to have
2 districts that are 70 percent anything. It's not
3 reflective of our community. What that number is, I don't
4 know. It could be 60 percent, it could be 65. I don't
5 know what that number is. But what I do know that
6 consistent with Section 5 and Section 2 of the Voting
7 Rights Act, that the threshold is 50 percent plus 1. We
8 meet that if it's less than 70 percent, we do that. What
9 I have asked and I will clarify for the record so that Ms.
10 Meggers does have direction in terms of what to do is that
11 what I'm asking is that Ms. Meggers, along with proposal 2
12 that we have, is to craft a alternative proposal and bring
13 that back to us that has districts representative of this
14 community that meet the one-man, one-person vote
15 threshold, Section 5, that is consistent with the
16 principles and guidelines that we established in our first
17 organizational meeting. Nothing that I've said to date on
18 the record has changed any of that. Simply saying that we
19 should look at an alternative that provides us with an
20 opportunity to allow voters in our community to establish
21 multi-racial coalitions for the perspective of voting. I
22 have a few suggestions, I didn't bring any of that with
23 me, but I will be very happy to provide that to Mrs.
24 Meggers by way of Ms. Bailey so that she does have that
25 and she can, in turn, make that available to the members

1 of this committee as well. That is what I will do.

2 MR. MASON: Mr. Howard.

3 MR. HOWARD: I think if we make this investment every
4 ten years and this is a serious investment, you know, just
5 as if you were buying a house, buying a car, a large
6 investment and anything that you could do, it's nothing
7 wrong with looking at two houses or two cars or two plans.
8 So I agree with Senator Davis that, you know, it doesn't
9 mean that we're going to adopt -- we will adopt what -- if
10 it means scrapping this map and creating another, I think
11 Ms. Meggers is prepared and she has done a great job here
12 already, but those are just some things that you find out.
13 And in working with the reapportionment committee on the
14 state, what I did learn going through my first, and Jack,
15 you've been through a lot more, but as you said, is that
16 you have a starting point, which is what she gave us. And
17 in my understanding, that was a working -- work in
18 progress and you get to, you know -- get -- you -- we're
19 at that point where we want to decide, okay, is that a
20 finished product, what we want, and you look at the
21 numbers, and we say, okay, can we look at -- can we at
22 least look at two based on the things that have been
23 suggested. And I don't know if that would be painful, but
24 in the one -- or hopefully it won't be. But just
25 something to do and I don't think it would interfere with

1 the timeline. If it will, let's talk about that if that's
2 an issue.

3 MR. MASON: Ms. Bailey.

4 MS. BAILEY: A couple of things. I think as the
5 committee gives Ms. Meggers her directions it might be
6 helpful to her if you prioritize the criteria. For
7 instance, is it a must that the incumbent commissioners
8 and school board members remain in their existing
9 districts because that is a huge piece of the puzzle if
10 you -- I mean, you take District 4, for instance, where
11 you have Ms. Pulliam at the very top of the district and
12 Mr. Mason down at the very bottom of the district, you're
13 going to be kind of limited what you can do with District
14 4 just by virtue of where the incumbents live. So that's
15 an important piece of the puzzle to think about.

16 The other thing is, just for your information, around
17 the state we -- November 8th is election day for
18 municipalities and here locally, we'll have Hephzibah and
19 Blythe, but Ms. Meggers is obligated all week next week to
20 work with municipal elections and she will be unavailable
21 to do any work for this committee next week. And in fact,
22 she's not available again for us until the afternoon of
23 Wednesday, November 9th. So just for your information for
24 planning purposes.

25 MR. DAVIS: Mr. Chairman, if I may. I think that's

1 very helpful to know. We've talked about the medium of
2 exchange of information and obviously the website is a
3 very helpful tool to the degree that we can look at any of
4 these pieces of information by way of that. I wouldn't
5 rule that out in lieu of having a physical meeting. If
6 nothing else, it provides us an opportunity to be able to
7 have done our due diligence prior to coming to the
8 meeting.

9 And I agree with you, Lynn, in that we need to
10 prioritize, and part of that is making certain that the
11 guidelines, the principles that we've already established,
12 we're not deviating from them, that we've already codified
13 them, and that that's what we're doing, and all we're
14 simply saying is let's have an alternative.

15 I want to address the comment that was made earlier
16 and that is, are we completely drawing, redrawing the
17 districts? The very fact that we're redistricting or
18 going through that process is that we're redrawing
19 districts now. So we can't be fearful of that approach,
20 that's the very reason why we're sitting here at this
21 table.

22 MR. MASON: Mr. Padgett.

23 MR. PADGETT: One of the issues that I think Senator
24 Davis brought to us as far as the way we wanted to go
25 about operations and I recall that instructions that were

1 given to Ms. Meggers was to make as few changes as
2 possible to keep people where they were. And I think that
3 has been done and very, very, very much so. And you know,
4 I do recall that it's one of the instructions and the
5 other instruction was to keep the incumbents, as Ms.
6 Bailey said, in their positions and legally, of course,
7 the ones that won't be elected until 2014, you can't
8 change theirs. So I thought those two issues were the
9 starting instructions as well, is that we make as few
10 changes as possible and that we keep every incumbent in
11 their district, whether their term was expired in 2012 or
12 2014, as I recall.

13 MR. MASON: So having said that, Mr. Padgett, and
14 that's my recollection of that, but now what Senator Davis
15 with what you try to clarify from Ms. Meggers, are you
16 looking to potentially remove that as a guideline in terms
17 of --

18 MR. DAVIS: Absolutely not.

19 MR. MASON: Because I didn't hear you say that.
20 Okay. So there are some restrictions, it look like, you
21 still have with drawing the new one because the
22 incumbents, especially if their term limit -- and, you
23 know, I guess we don't have an issue there. I would think
24 legally that you have a requirement to protect those; is
25 that correct? If they're for voting in 2012?

1 MR. DAVIS: The Constitution doesn't provide for
2 protecting incumbents anyway.

3 MR. MASON: Period?

4 MS. MEGGERS: There's state law says we can't shorten
5 a term, those are the only ones.

6 MR. DAVIS: Right. Right. We can't shorten a term.

7 MR. MASON: Oh, shorten a term. Okay. Which is if
8 I'm out in 2014, you can't put me in District 8 if I'm not
9 no longer in 4.

10 MS. MEGGERS: Well, I could put you in District 8 as
11 long as the incumbent in District 8, his term is up in
12 2012.

13 MR. MASON: That sounds like a forcing out.

14 MS. MEGGERS: No, No, I just said you can.

15 MR. MASON: No, I'm just thinking. Okay. All right.
16 So that's not where it's going. I just wanted to make
17 sure we were clear on that.

18 Mr. Brigham.

19 MR. BRIGHAM: If we're going to do this, are we going
20 to ask her also to try to leave single members, elected
21 officials in single districts even though the district may
22 not look like they look today? Is that what we --

23 MR. DAVIS: Mr. Chairman.

24 MR. MASON: Yes, sir.

25 MR. DAVIS: I'm going to yield to you until you give

1 me the opportunity to speak.

2 MR. MASON: Right now would be a great time.

3 MR. DAVIS: Okay.

4 To Commissioner Brigham, the distinguished gentleman
5 from the 7th. We absolutely --

6 MR. BRIGHAM: We're not used to that down here in
7 Augusta; y'all talk that way in Atlanta.

8 MR. DAVIS: Absolutely. I think we've established
9 those as the principles that we will not be creating
10 multi-member districts, we will look for opportunities to
11 maintain the incumbents as they are and those are the
12 things that we've established from day one in our
13 organizational meeting. I don't think anything has been
14 said today that circumvents that or mitigates that, but
15 rather those are the guiding principles. The blossom, I
16 think, happened when we said, you know, we need to back
17 away from 70 percent districts, and that's when the 50
18 percent was thrown out. I, again, am not suggesting 50
19 percent districts as my friend from the, what, 5th has told
20 me. I would be killed if that happens.

21 MS. MEGGERS: Can I clarify in my mind now what we're
22 -- what I think I'm hearing?

23 MR. MASON: Well, let's add a little bit more to
24 that.

25 MS. MEGGERS: Okay.

1 MR. MASON: Commissioner Lockett.

2 MR. LOCKETT: Thank you. You know, District 1 last
3 election had over 60 something percent minority and a
4 Caucasian commissioner was elected. These numbers are
5 relatively high. Unfortunately, in this day and time, is
6 when it's oftentimes when the voters go out and choose a
7 candidate, not so much by his or her expertise and what he
8 -- she or he has done in the community, it's done -- it's
9 down a racial line. That's very unfortunate. If we had a
10 perfect society, I would say, hey, just everybody vote and
11 disregard, but it's necessary in a sense to have that.

12 And my other concern is, and if I'm wrong let me
13 know, we're talking about local districts, local school
14 boards, local commission districts. It was my
15 understanding and I was hoping that the local could get
16 together, we come up with a plan, and the delegation we
17 realize has pretty much got the final say, but then, they
18 tweak it. But from the way it sounds today, it appears to
19 me that the delegation is putting the plan in place.

20 MR. MASON: Mr. Padgett.

21 MR. PADGETT: Question on District 1. Probably when
22 the election was held, what, a year and a half ago for
23 District 1 Commissioner, District 1 probably at that time,
24 voting population was pretty close to 50/50 because you
25 had 4,165 people that were reduced in District 1, and I

1 can pretty well say that 98 percent of those from the two
2 projects were minorities. And, of course, they could not
3 vote in this district any longer, and that, you know, it
4 wasn't a 60 percent minority district at the time. And I
5 know Marion's been around this as long as I have, but I
6 mean, at that point in time, it was probably nearer 50 if
7 you look at the 20,000 people there. You take 4,000 out,
8 that's better than 20 percent of the population and that
9 would be 20 percent of the minority population would --
10 certainly would reduce 60 to close to 50 if not there.
11 And, you know, my understanding, we had a lot of
12 conversation about that, that that was one of the major
13 issues that needed to be addressed and particularly to get
14 it at least up to a 60. And we added 4,000 people and
15 probably 80 percent of those were a minority that we added
16 because they came out of District 2, which was a heavily
17 minority district. So, you know, if you look at that,
18 that was one of the issues that the media has addressed is
19 that that district probably would go back to a minority
20 representative as far as commissioner. And of course, the
21 school was already there, so -- but, I mean, those -- when
22 you look at those numbers that way, if you take that, I
23 think that has fixed the one problem we had with 4,000
24 people; and then, of course, the second problem with
25 District 2 needing 2,700. So you had to reach out to the

1 old county area to fix the city area again because the
2 city was losing dramatic population.

3 MR. MASON: Senator Davis.

4 MR. DAVIS: I almost feel like I need to defer to my
5 delegation chairman.

6 MR. MASON: Representative Howard.

7 MR. DAVIS: Do you want to speak to this now? I mean
8 -- to Commissioner Lockett, when we, I think, established
9 this ad hoc committee, we had state elected officials come
10 with the express purpose of being partners in this
11 process. While your approach is much different than I
12 think any of us came into this with, that you would come
13 up with a plan and then we would take it back to Atlanta
14 and tweak it. I don't think we came into it with that
15 perspective. We came into it with the perspective that we
16 would be doing just what we're doing today. And that is,
17 working together, bringing ideas all to the table as has
18 been done. You know, the notion or idea that you come up
19 with something and then, you know, we will go back to
20 Atlanta and perfect it. You might not like that. You may
21 like it, I don't know. But that was never the intent, but
22 rather for us to be partners in the process having the
23 types of discussions that we're having now.

24 MR. HOWARD: May I?

25 MR. MASON: Please.

1 MR. HOWARD: I thank you for those comments, too.
2 You know, we always get along well. But my thought in
3 this process as a -- and I'm going to -- I'll speak as the
4 delegation chairman in this particular comment, is that we
5 -- in talking to the members of the delegation, we're not
6 looking for a plan that we would have to make any major
7 changes or do very little, if any, -- no tweaking to, only
8 if there was some technicalities that needed to be taken
9 care of, you know, once it got to us. What I believe the
10 consensus of the delegation is, is to have a plan to come
11 that we could just pass through, but not to -- and let the
12 work go on here, not in Atlanta. I don't think that's our
13 role, to change something once it gets there. So we
14 respect these -- we respect everyone at this table, and
15 that's why the process that we have in place where we
16 have, you know, four delegation members, four board of
17 education, and four commissioners to have a dialogue here,
18 but not us to use any kind of power play, if you want to
19 use that word, once it gets to Atlanta. That's not --
20 that will not be the intent, I know, for myself, but I've
21 not heard of that, you know, from any member of the
22 delegation.

23 MR. MASON: Commissioner Lockett, if you respond and
24 then Commissioner Brigham.

25 MR. LOCKETT: To both Representative Howard and

1 Senator Davis, this is sort of the midnight hour coming up
2 on to make whole -- make the wholesale changes. We've had
3 quite a few hearings, and I think I was pretty much at all
4 of them; and we had suggestions and recommendations that
5 was made. We had plan 1 in front of us. We got
6 accustomed to working with plan 1, and then there was a
7 tweak in the plan 1 and they came up with plan 2, which
8 was good in a sense, but we are rushing -- we are running
9 against the clock now because we really don't have that
10 much time. And for us to go back, possibly go back, and
11 start up with something that's almost new in order to
12 reduce the percentages, I think maybe that might be good
13 for 2022, and not 2012.

14 MR. MASON: Mr. Brigham.

15 MR. BRIGHAM: Mr. Mason, thank you.

16 Senator Davis, Representative Howard, it was my
17 understanding the reason we had this group was pretty much
18 y'all's understanding, that we were going to try to reach
19 community census with everybody and try to work it out
20 what is best for Augusta in Augusta. And I thought that
21 was the purpose of this -- bringing this group together
22 because we all have faced the voters; we will probably all
23 face the voters at some point again in the future or maybe
24 not. I'm looking forward to it; I've only got 14 months.

25 But you know, I think what we're really trying to do

1 is we're trying to write a road map to where we're going
2 together in the future; and I'm not opposed to looking at
3 road maps that look different than what I'm used to
4 looking at, but I do think that we ought to have certain
5 guidelines. We are looking still at a very small
6 deviation; I think -- I think that's what this community
7 wants. I believe that this community wants us to look at
8 keeping communities of interest together, not necessarily
9 just the communities of interest that we've talked about.
10 I think there's other communities of interest that might
11 can benefit by a different map that's not been the way the
12 maps have been in the past. So I'm not opposed to waiting
13 and looking. I do feel like we have -- Christmas is
14 coming very quickly; and we need to get finished with our
15 shopping. And the people that's going to go to Atlanta is
16 going to open up this wonderful present that we're going
17 to present them and then they're going to comment on it.
18 But they're going to also have the ability to help select
19 what's in that box that they open.

20 MR. MASON: Representative Murphy.

21 MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman. Commissioner Lockett and
22 Commissioner Brigham have directed their responses to
23 Senator Davis and Representative Howard, but I want to be
24 on record that I support the position of my colleagues in
25 the delegation. We've had -- this is our, what, third

1 meeting. There is some additional information that we can
2 provide and with the technology that's available, it's not
3 going to delay that process for an extended period of
4 time. So it's my request that you be patient with us and
5 give us an opportunity to provide that information to you.
6 Ten years, that's what we're actually planning for. I
7 mean, we need to hear all the information, the whole facts
8 of that, which is good. So with that being said, Mr.
9 Chairman, that concludes my comments; and I would hope
10 that my fellow colleagues would accept what we have as
11 information and what we're trying to do is to join you in
12 the best interest of all of us. We represent the same
13 constituents that you do; and we're not here to do
14 anything that's going to hurt our community. So that's
15 where I stand, Mr. Chairman.

16 MR. MASON: Thank you.

17 Mr. Barnes.

18 MR. BARNES: Mr. Chairman, I've been sitting here
19 patiently listening to all of the comments.

20 MR. MASON: Yes, sir.

21 MR. BARNES: And all I need is a clarification before
22 I make a statement, and my clarification I need is from
23 Senator Davis. Are you asking that we do another plan
24 besides the 1 and 2 that we already have, using the same
25 guidelines with the exception -- or inception of reducing

1 numbers from 70 down to 60 or what have you? Is that
2 about right? That's what we're talking about. It's not
3 talking about legislators or board members or
4 commissioners. I just want to know exactly what you're
5 asking for.

6 MR. DAVIS: Mr. Barnes, I believe that that would be
7 an accurate statement.

8 MR. BARNES: Okay.

9 MR. DAVIS: That is all we've suggested, just having
10 again another plan to take a look at, no different than
11 the previous two that we have had.

12 And I might add this as a point of further
13 clarification as it was noted over here, that we had an
14 organizational meeting, we then had a second meeting at
15 which point in time the plan 1 was provided to us at the
16 meeting. There was some discussion about it, but again,
17 that was our first time looking at it. And we went from
18 that meeting then to public hearings, public hearings have
19 taken place and we now have a second plan, which we have
20 just seen today for the first time. And as a result of
21 that, additional comments have been generated. So this is
22 a very fluid process that is consistent with what those of
23 us who have been through this process takes place and it
24 in no way marginalizes or disenfranchises any of the
25 members of this committee from adding that input so that

1 we can, in fact, get to something that, while it may not
2 be perfect, it represents the community in which we all
3 love dearly.

4 MR. BARNES: Okay. The second part is in light of
5 what you are saying is and what I'm thinking you are
6 saying is, I don't see a problem with us doing another
7 plan providing that we follow those initial guidelines and
8 use that one that you are -- I didn't hear but one; it
9 might have been more in your talking, but I didn't hear
10 but one; use that one that we come back here, we look at
11 plan 1, plan 2, plan 3 and try to make a decision out of
12 those three plans with the adjustments that may need to be
13 made. I don't think it would hurt us to look at another
14 plan; it's not going to kill us. You shouldn't make up
15 your mind anyway before we finish what we're trying to do;
16 and if you've already made up your mind on a plan, then
17 you're wasting your time by sitting here.

18 MR. MASON: Well said. In fact, I don't know if you
19 were reading my paper or not, but that's where I was going
20 next, so you just saved me because I needed the clarity,
21 and then I needed to know were we going to do plan 1, 2,
22 and then 3. So we've already got that established that
23 that's going to be the -- that's going to be the case.
24 And that's the reason why I ask was there anything else at
25 this particular point that people wanted to bring out so

1 that we could include that in plan 3 or potentially look
2 at having to do a plan 3 and 4 if it doesn't meet with
3 plan 3. So here would be a good opportunity now if
4 there's any other outstanding issues or concerns that
5 anyone has to get those out here so that we can -- Ms.
6 Meggers is very busy and so we do want to give her as much
7 information as we can tonight to work with so that she can
8 do what she needs to do and then we can see the plans and
9 have some discussion and be prepared the next time that we
10 meet.

11 Any additional -- Representative Howard.

12 MR. HOWARD: I would like to suggest because I think
13 I heard Senator Davis say it and I have some, too, that
14 maybe we submit those thoughts that we have to get to that
15 point that we're trying to get to for potentially a third
16 plan to you, as Chairman, and you submit it to Ms. Bailey
17 so that we can get a time -- you know, prepare for another
18 meeting that we can move forward.

19 MR. MASON: And I have no problem with that, Mr.
20 Chairman -- that is, chairman of the delegation; but I
21 would want to put a suspense on that. In other words, I
22 wouldn't want to go another week and a half before
23 receiving any input, you know, because that delays the
24 process. So if we can -- you know, if you had an idea in
25 mind or I can give one, but we certainly would need some

1 sort of suspense on that. We don't want to go too far
2 along. Now, we know she's not available next week for us.
3 I don't know if that means that you are not available to,
4 you know, during your own time or whenever. I know you've
5 got to get paid, so is there going to be any time to do
6 any tweaking or revamping with all your other duties that
7 you have going on next week?

8 MS. MEGGERS: I can work on Richmond Augusta work, I
9 just can't come to Augusta next week.

10 MR. MASON: Well, good, good. And I believe that's
11 what he was saying because we do have an IT meeting that
12 we can utilize.

13 Mr. Dolan.

14 MR. DOLAN: Yes. Could she email the map to Lynn
15 Bailey and we can look at it on the computer like this or
16 not?

17 MS. MEGGERS: Whatever I come up with I can send to
18 Lynn and --

19 MS. BAILEY: Plan 3.

20 MS. MEGGERS: Plan 3, the working plan, that I can
21 send to Ms. Bailey and she can get it distributed either
22 online or however she sees best to do that.

23 MR. DOLAN: One more question.

24 MR. MASON: Yes, sir.

25 MR. DOLAN: If we go to plan 3 and you're not here,

1 can you please highlight some of the concerns that you may
2 see down the road with your experience that say, this
3 might be a -- or -- we can't look at this map in 30
4 minutes and come anywhere near seeing the difficulties
5 that you could see in just a second with your experience.

6 MS. MEGGERS: Okay. You're saying having a meeting
7 without my being here, but just sending --

8 MR. MASON: Perhaps if you send some points of
9 discussion or points of interest, you know.

10 MR. DOLAN: Just send some points that bother you
11 maybe.

12 MR. BARNES: And you can confer with Lynn and Lynn
13 can probably relay some things.

14 MR. MASON: Absolutely.

15 MS. MEGGERS: That will be fine.

16 MR. MASON: Lynn.

17 MS. MEGGERS: Now --

18 MR. MASON: Yes.

19 MS. MEGGERS: And it may not be the right time yet,
20 but I still really would like for you to clarify again
21 about the incumbents. Okay? I need that clarification.
22 I'm not quite clear.

23 MR. MASON: Okay.

24 MS. BAILEY: And if I might add, too, if we clarify
25 for Ms. Meggers, if I'm hearing correctly or understanding

1 correctly, we're talking about trying to get the districts
2 that are up into the 70s maybe more down to 70 percent,
3 high 60s. How low do we want to go?

4 MR. DAVIS: I don't think that should -- Mr.
5 Chairman?

6 MR. MASON: No, please.

7 MR. DAVIS: I think practice, that our practice or
8 mode of operation should be that there should be no
9 district, generally speaking, that is beyond 70 percent,
10 not one. I mean, that the base line should be a 65
11 percent district.

12 MR. MASON: Okay. So we're clear; we've got 65 as a
13 --

14 MR. DAVIS: I mean, is that a --

15 MS. BAILEY: Okay. I think that's quite helpful to
16 have that.

17 MR. MASON: And it may fluctuate one way or the other
18 a percentage point or two, right?

19 MR. DAVIS: I mean, in general speaking, yeah, 65 to
20 68, 69 percent.

21 MR. BARNES: Are we still -- we've still got to
22 consider the 2 percent deviation?

23 MR. DAVIS: And this is a very good point, Ms.
24 Meggers.

25 MR. BARNES: Because that was a part of the original

1 direction.

2 MR. DAVIS: And I think the thing that may be
3 confusing is that notion about 2 percent. What I think
4 everybody, pursuant to the principles that were
5 established, which includes Section 5 of the Voting Rights
6 Act and Section 2, is that that percent deviation is with
7 respect to population, with population; and that
8 population target is 25,069 people. That is the issue,
9 not demographics, but population. And that's the part
10 that everybody needs to clearly understand, that when we
11 talk about plus or minus 2 percent, we're talking about
12 plus or minus 2 percent of that 25,069 people.

13 MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman?

14 MR. MASON: Representative Murphy.

15 MR. MURPHY: I move that we adjourn.

16 MR. MASON: Well, I've got to make sure before we
17 adjourn though that there is clarity because she's got
18 some work to do, but she's got to make sure she knows the
19 work that she has to do. So I want to hear from her. Are
20 you --

21 MS. MEGGERS: I understand about what Senator Davis
22 just said. What I want some clarity is the only
23 incumbents that I really need -- I'm not going to just try
24 to wholesale move them around, but the ones that I need to
25 be concerned about are the ones that are still -- their

1 terms do not expire until 2014. The other ones, if they
2 have to be shifted to other districts or whatever, that
3 may happen.

4 MR. MASON: Are you including that?

5 MR. DAVIS: No.

6 MR. PADGETT: No.

7 MR. MASON: Okay.

8 MR. PADGETT: Protect incumbents.

9 MS. MEGGERS: So you want all the incumbents, whether
10 they're term limited or whatever, staying in the present
11 districts and still meet this criteria.

12 MR. MASON: Okay. What's your other concern?

13 MS. MEGGERS: That's it.

14 MR. MASON: Mr. Lockett, you have a comment.

15 MR. LOCKETT: Yeah. Maybe Mr. Dolan asked the
16 question, I'm not sure; but I believe Senator Davis said
17 any change in anything that occurs between now and the
18 next meeting, I believe he had said, send it to
19 Commissioner Mason. I would appreciate it, if we can, to
20 -- I'll send it to Mr. Mason or to Ms. Bailey, and have
21 everybody copied on it, so if -- if you are recommending a
22 change or Representative Howard or he is making a change,
23 at least I'll be aware of it before the meeting because I
24 saw, you know, the information that you sent in.

25 MR. MASON: And then here's what I would suggest in

1 reference to that, I would suggest that it goes to Ms.
2 Bailey and Ms. Bailey then will ensure that number one,
3 certainly that we all receive it and that I receive it in
4 a more timely fashion. And that would be my suggestion
5 and in a fairer process and understanding of what's going
6 on. I think that's the most -- best and most fairest way
7 to operate that.

8 Mr. Brigham.

9 MR. BRIGHAM: Mr. Mason, Ms. Meggers, is she going to
10 -- if she comes up with this plan 3 and she's going to
11 make comments on it of things that she sees that may
12 present problems.

13 MR. MASON: Check, which could be some points of
14 discussion for us.

15 MR. BRIGHAM: Is it -- are we going to be able to see
16 this plan 3 before we have our next meeting?

17 MR. MASON: Yes, and that's why we couldn't really
18 adjourn because we haven't set a next meeting, number one.

19 MR. BRIGHAM: Right. Well, I understand that.

20 MR. MASON: And that -- I think the intent is,
21 because we said we didn't have the time before.

22 MR. BRIGHAM: Is the plan to put this on Ms. Bailey's
23 site, is that the plan, with the comments?

24 MR. MASON: And I believe that's what you had
25 discussed was --

1 MS. BAILEY: I would love to have direction on that.
2 Speaking of the site, we were talking earlier about
3 putting the public hearing transcripts out there, so those
4 -- two of those will go out there tomorrow morning. The
5 third one, I expect at any moment, so just keep monitoring
6 the website for those. Plan 2 will also go out there
7 tomorrow with the PBS maps and statistics that you see
8 here; and I can follow suit with plan 3 when it gets here
9 in the exact same format. We have the technology to take
10 Ms. Meggers' files and put them into our own local GIS
11 mapping system. So we have that data in-house and we can
12 send it to you guys either through emails or through the
13 website, whatever your pleasure.

14 MR. BRIGHAM: I would prefer it be sent to me by an
15 email.

16 MR. PADGETT: I would, too. I mean, you know.

17 MR. MASON: And here's what I -- and here's what I
18 would say, too, and that's not to keep anybody out of the
19 loop, but it's important that the committee members get an
20 opportunity to view this before it's there for lardy-dardy
21 everybody because this is our, you know -- so from a
22 standpoint of an email, everybody's got email, well, I
23 don't know about you, you know, yours always comes back
24 when I send it to you; but make sure that we have good
25 email addresses for everyone, and I believe that that will

1 be the most appropriate way at this time for us to get
2 those maps.

3 MS. BAILEY: Well, then I will post plan 2
4 information tomorrow, the information that you've seen
5 today will go out on the website and you feel free to
6 scrutinize it, anyone can comment on it or whatever, and
7 also the things such as the transcripts from the public
8 hearings and whatnot. I'll stick all of that data out
9 there; and when plan 3 comes into me from Ms. Meggers, you
10 all will receive that information through email.

11 MR. MASON: Fantastic. And I haven't said that, but
12 we've got one order of business left. We do have to set
13 another meeting date, our next meeting date. We possibly
14 need to look at our calendars; we understand that Ms.
15 Meggers won't be here next week. Let me ask this before
16 we determine a date, how quickly, and I'm not rushing you,
17 but when do you think you would have something available
18 in terms of that plan 3?

19 MS. MEGGERS: Can we aim for Tuesday or Wednesday?
20 Is that reasonable?

21 MR. MASON: Tuesday or Wednesday of next -- oh, yeah.
22 Okay.

23 MR. PADGETT: Because I'm leaving; I've got a trip
24 planned for the 10th through the 17th, so I would like to
25 be here.

1 MR. MASON: Okay. Well, we're here tonight and here
2 is the time to -- given what everybody's heard to look at
3 a date. I know people said they wanted time to look at
4 the map before we actually met, so if we got it Tuesday,
5 you know, we're running out of days, Thursday. Thursday?
6 Next Thursday, the 3rd?

7 MS. BAILEY: Same time, same place?

8 MR. MASON: Four p.m., same time, same place?

9 MR. DAVIS: No, sir.

10 MR. MASON: No?

11 MR. DAVIS: No, sir. That's a terrible day.

12 MR. MASON: Thursday?

13 MR. PADGETT: Well, what's wrong with Tuesday?

14 MR. MASON: Well, we won't have the map.

15 MS. BAILEY: We may not have the map from her until
16 Tuesday or Wednesday.

17 MR. MASON: Right.

18 MS. BAILEY: So I think we have to assume that we
19 don't want to meet before Wednesday.

20 MR. MASON: Right.

21 (Discussion was held concerning schedules.)

22 MR. MASON: Can we get any type of consensus? I'm
23 hearing Thursday thrown out; I'm hearing Friday thrown
24 out. Friday is out. So it sounds like the majority is
25 saying Thursday. Wednesday, will we have the maps?

1 Budget hearings.

2 MR. PADGETT: The following Monday is the 7th, and
3 this room should be available. The 8th, we have a problem
4 because committee meetings -- committee meetings are on
5 the 8th, but the 7th, I see no problems with the 7th.

6 MR. MASON: What is the 7th?

7 MR. PADGETT: It's Monday week.

8 MS. BAILEY: Also committee meetings for the
9 commission, I believe.

10 MR. MASON: Yes. Yes. From -- well, from twelve
11 till, you know, six or eight, nine. Some people are
12 talking quite a bit now.

13 MS. CAIN: Who wants to come Thursday?

14 (Discussions were held concerning schedules.)

15 MS. BAILEY: Just as something to think about, if we
16 can't come to consensus Wednesday, the 9th, which is, you
17 know, a long ways down the road, but at that point, Ms.
18 Meggers will be free of her obligations and could be more
19 available.

20 MR. PADGETT: I think she should be here on the 9th,
21 for a second meeting.

22 MR. MASON: Now, when you say a second meeting.

23 MR. PADGETT: Well, if we come sit here on the 4th and
24 review it, we would have -- we've got all the information,
25 but then if there's any technicalities, having her to come

1 back on the 9th and do, hopefully, a finished product.

2 MR. MASON: We're going to have to come up with a
3 third consensus, whether it's a majority vote or what have
4 you, but obviously all of us have things that's going on
5 in our schedules. It's a little difficult to accommodate
6 everyone.

7 Yes.

8 MR. HOWARD: Just, you know, not saying we should
9 stretch this out or anything like that, but just so --
10 just for the record, we -- the General Assembly does not
11 convene until the -- what, the second Monday in January.
12 We won't -- we more than likely won't take this up until,
13 you know, the end of January, you know, or early February,
14 so I don't know how that timeline went the last time,
15 Lynn, and I think I remember reading something in the
16 minutes that you might have went up until late November,
17 maybe early December when you finalized it. But I'm just
18 saying from the previous --

19 MS. BAILEY: Ten years ago the committee, the local
20 committee, finished its work around the first of December,
21 end of November, first part of December. The problem that
22 we had ten years ago was once it got to the General
23 Assembly, it went on through without issue, but then it
24 kind of set around waiting for the governor. We didn't
25 get the approved bill until May. And so it -- but the

1 other thing that we have to be mindful of with this time
2 this go round is qualifying structure, qualifying period,
3 everything is changed. It used to be our qualifying
4 period for school board and commission wasn't until the
5 end of June, and now it's been moved to the middle of May.
6 Well, May the 23rd is when it opens and so our window has
7 become shorter on that end of things as well, which I
8 understand that the governor is very aware of the fact
9 that qualifying has been adjusted and that he has vowed to
10 make every effort to get the local bills on through as
11 quickly as he can. I'm sure that they will, but that is a
12 possible hiccough along the way that has to be considered.

13 MR. MASON: Ms. Meggers.

14 MS. MEGGERS: Going back ten years ago and even the
15 ten years before that, I would, from my experience as a
16 legislature, would urge the local delegation to -- if
17 there's a consensus and a plan comes up that everyone can
18 agree on, that you be prepared to drop that in the hopper
19 that first week of the session, to be able to take it up
20 that last week in January, et cetera, and because we've
21 got that other step at justice department that we have no
22 control over. And although I think any plan that we adopt
23 will not have any problems, we get caught in this train
24 wreck that's going on up there, that they're getting
25 submissions from all over the country. And what happens

1 when they get behind, they wait until that 58th, 59th day,
2 and they'll call and they'll think of some obscure piece
3 of information to ask for in order to give themselves some
4 breathing space for that second 60 days. And then that
5 takes you way into qualifying. So the safety thing is to
6 get this thing passed at the local delegation just to get
7 it through.

8 Now, ten years ago, the governor then decided for
9 whatever reason to hold all local bills for signing until
10 the session was over. Well, we were right upon
11 qualifying. A lot of those bills had a clause in them
12 that what I call the drop dead clause, it said if this --
13 if this plan is not pre-cleared by the first day of
14 qualifying, it's null and void; and we had to start all
15 over then the next year after that with the local leg. So
16 it would really be helpful from the legislative standpoint
17 to introduce this very early, for the local delegation to
18 get it through and then go to the governor to urge that he
19 sign it, so that that submission can immediately be sent
20 to justice department.

21 MR. MASON: Mr. Dolan.

22 MR. DOLAN: Can we please look at it Thursday, the
23 7th. I mean, the -- next Thursday.

24 MR. MASON: The 3rd.

25 MR. DOLAN: The 3rd, and be ready to vote on this

1 thing the 9th, the following week.

2 MR. BRIGHAM: That would be my suggestion.

3 MR. DOLAN: That is plenty of time for us to work
4 through these plans right here.

5 MR. MASON: So we're looking at the 3rd at --

6 MR. DOLAN: It gives you two weeks.

7 MR. MASON: -- 4:00. Okay. The 3rd at 4:00.

8 MR. LOCKETT: And then you said, vote on November the
9 9th?

10 MR. MASON: Well.

11 MR. DOLAN: That would be the target.

12 MR. MASON: That's the target. That's the target.

13 MR. MASON: With no further business --

14 MR. MURPHY: I vote we adjourn, Mr. Chairman.

15 MR. MASON: -- we stand adjourned.

16 (Meeting adjourned at approximately 6:15 p.m.)

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

C E R T I F I C A T E

STATE OF GEORGIA
COUNTY OF JENKINS

I, JUNE S. O'CONNOR, being a Certified Court Reporter,
hereby certify that the foregoing public hearing transcript was
taken down and was transcribed by me; that the foregoing pages,
1 through 91, represent, to the best of my ability, a true,
correct, and complete transcript of the proceedings.

I further certify that I am neither related to or counsel
to the parties herein nor have any interest in the outcome of
the above-styled proceeding.

Witness my hand and official seal this 21st day of
November, 2011.

June S. O'Connor, CCR
Certificate Number 2786