

Population Deviation Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Seats	Ideal Pop	Actual Pop	Deviation	Deviation %
1	1	86,995	82,812	-4,183	-4.81%
2	1	86,995	90,751	3,756	4.32%
3	1	86,995	84,906	-2,089	-2.40%
4	1	86,995	83,034	-3,961	-4.55%
5	1	86,995	82,953	-4,042	-4.65%
6	1	86,995	90,919	3,924	4.51%
7	1	86,995	83,541	-3,454	-3.97%
8	1	86,995	83,559	-3,436	-3.95%
9	1	86,995	86,684	-311	-0.36%
10	1	86,995	83,014	-3,981	-4.58%
11	1	86,995	86,381	-614	-0.71%
12	1	86,995	84,745	-2,250	-2.59%
13	1	86,995	83,500	-3,495	-4.02%
14	1	86,995	88,470	1,475	1.70%
15	1	86,995	91,212	4,217	4.85%
16	1	86,995	85,097	-1,898	-2.18%
17	1	86,995	90,514	3,519	4.05%
18	1	86,995	89,413	2,418	2.78%
19	1	86,995	91,288	4,293	4.93%
20	1	86,995	91,180	4,185	4.81%
21	1	86,995	87,764	769	0.88%
22	1	86,995	88,642	1,647	1.89%
23	1	86,995	88,865	1,870	2.15%
24	1	86,995	83,322	-3,673	-4.22%
25	1	86,995	90,432	3,437	3.95%
26	1	86,995	89,947	2,952	3.39%
27	1	86,995	84,735	-2,260	-2.60%
28	1	86,995	85,389	-1,606	-1.85%
29	1	86,995	90,900	3,905	4.49%
30	1	86,995	91,038	4,043	4.65%
31	1	86,995	91,241	4,246	4.88%
32	1	86,995	88,602	1,607	1.85%
33	1	86,995	85,001	-1,994	-2.29%
34	1	86,995	84,251	-2,744	-3.15%
35	1	86,995	83,094	-3,901	-4.48%
36	1	86,995	86,038	-957	-1.10%
37	1	86,995	90,307	3,312	3.81%
38	1	86,995	86,444	-551	-0.63%
39	1	86,995	85,371	-1,624	-1.87%
40	1	86,995	86,359	-636	-0.73%
41	1	86,995	89,876	2,881	3.31%
42	1	86,995	82,965	-4,030	-4.63%
43	1	86,995	85,335	-1,660	-1.91%

Population Deviation Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Seats	Ideal Pop	Actual Pop	Deviation	Deviation %
44	1	86,995	82,683	-4,312	-4.96%
45	1	86,995	83,745	-3,250	-3.74%
46	1	86,995	83,701	-3,294	-3.79%
47	1	86,995	83,452	-3,543	-4.07%
48	1	86,995	86,256	-739	-0.85%
49	1	86,995	89,807	2,812	3.23%
50	1	86,995	86,290	-705	-0.81%
51	1	86,995	83,073	-3,922	-4.51%
52	1	86,995	84,383	-2,612	-3.00%
53	1	86,995	83,312	-3,683	-4.23%
54	1	86,995	83,475	-3,520	-4.05%
55	1	86,995	82,927	-4,068	-4.68%
56	1	86,995	85,142	-1,853	-2.13%
57	1	86,995	90,259	3,264	3.75%
58	1	86,995	90,051	3,056	3.51%
59	1	86,995	90,829	3,834	4.41%
60	1	86,995	90,340	3,345	3.85%
61	1	86,995	90,183	3,188	3.66%
62	1	86,995	89,637	2,642	3.04%
63	1	86,995	83,847	-3,148	-3.62%
64	1	86,995	87,568	573	0.66%
65	1	86,995	91,096	4,101	4.71%
66	1	86,995	88,717	1,722	1.98%
67	1	86,995	88,255	1,260	1.45%
68	1	86,995	88,209	1,214	1.40%
69	1	86,995	89,186	2,191	2.52%
70	1	86,995	89,118	2,123	2.44%
71	1	86,995	88,823	1,828	2.10%
72	1	86,995	84,444	-2,551	-2.93%
73	1	86,995	90,036	3,041	3.50%
74	1	86,995	83,545	-3,450	-3.97%
75	1	86,995	87,378	383	0.44%
76	1	86,995	89,815	2,820	3.24%
77	1	86,995	90,628	3,633	4.18%
78	1	86,995	86,365	-630	-0.72%
79	1	86,995	84,681	-2,314	-2.66%
80	1	86,995	83,289	-3,706	-4.26%
81	1	86,995	85,641	-1,354	-1.56%
82	1	86,995	91,227	4,232	4.86%
83	1	86,995	90,899	3,904	4.49%
84	1	86,995	86,773	-222	-0.26%
85	1	86,995	90,770	3,775	4.34%
86	1	86,995	87,570	575	0.66%

Population Deviation Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Seats	Ideal Pop	Actual Pop	Deviation	Deviation %
87	1	86,995	85,009	-1,986	-2.28%
88	1	86,995	84,505	-2,490	-2.86%
89	1	86,995	85,577	-1,418	-1.63%
90	1	86,995	88,208	1,213	1.39%
91	1	86,995	82,920	-4,075	-4.68%
92	1	86,995	87,079	84	0.10%
93	1	86,995	87,194	199	0.23%
94	1	86,995	85,564	-1,431	-1.64%
95	1	86,995	85,366	-1,629	-1.87%
96	1	86,995	89,587	2,592	2.98%
97	1	86,995	86,810	-185	-0.21%
98	1	86,995	82,789	-4,206	-4.83%
99	1	86,995	84,406	-2,589	-2.98%
100	1	86,995	86,763	-232	-0.27%
101	1	86,995	84,368	-2,627	-3.02%
102	1	86,995	84,206	-2,789	-3.21%
103	1	86,995	89,354	2,359	2.71%
104	1	86,995	83,554	-3,441	-3.96%
105	1	86,995	85,671	-1,324	-1.52%
106	1	86,995	86,716	-279	-0.32%
107	1	86,995	88,854	1,859	2.14%
108	1	86,995	89,468	2,473	2.84%
109	1	86,995	88,881	1,886	2.17%
110	1	86,995	89,459	2,464	2.83%
111	1	86,995	84,508	-2,487	-2.86%
112	1	86,995	87,217	222	0.26%
113	1	86,995	89,151	2,156	2.48%
114	1	86,995	90,248	3,253	3.74%
115	1	86,995	89,747	2,752	3.16%
116	1	86,995	89,457	2,462	2.83%
117	1	86,995	91,035	4,040	4.64%
118	1	86,995	83,282	-3,713	-4.27%
119	1	86,995	90,212	3,217	3.70%
120	1	86,995	84,907	-2,088	-2.40%
Totals:	120		10,439,388		

Deviation range: -4.96% to 4.93%

2022 Election Contest Report - US Senate

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib	Grn	% Grn	W-I	% W-I
1	22,623	64.32%	11,715	33.31%	509	1.45%	286	0.81%	40	0.11%
2	15,734	43.26%	19,860	54.60%	514	1.41%	248	0.68%	18	0.05%
3	19,757	59.54%	12,624	38.04%	525	1.58%	251	0.76%	28	0.08%
4	14,824	62.57%	8,422	35.55%	295	1.25%	131	0.55%	19	0.08%
5	15,262	51.98%	13,333	45.41%	483	1.65%	235	0.80%	47	0.16%
6	13,898	60.00%	8,623	37.23%	420	1.81%	215	0.93%	8	0.03%
7	17,951	55.06%	13,930	42.72%	447	1.37%	257	0.79%	20	0.06%
8	7,915	36.01%	13,551	61.65%	297	1.35%	210	0.96%	8	0.04%
9	18,170	55.22%	14,091	42.82%	384	1.17%	236	0.72%	24	0.07%
10	15,751	58.58%	10,662	39.65%	309	1.15%	149	0.55%	16	0.06%
11	12,008	31.77%	24,815	65.66%	558	1.48%	395	1.05%	20	0.05%
12	16,352	57.10%	11,690	40.82%	362	1.26%	225	0.79%	7	0.02%
13	24,933	69.13%	10,327	28.63%	521	1.44%	264	0.73%	22	0.06%
14	8,903	63.54%	4,666	33.30%	273	1.95%	154	1.10%	16	0.11%
15	14,208	65.00%	6,964	31.86%	413	1.89%	243	1.11%	31	0.14%
16	21,461	67.69%	9,488	29.93%	505	1.59%	237	0.75%	13	0.04%
17	27,661	60.68%	17,002	37.30%	559	1.23%	330	0.72%	32	0.07%
18	11,000	35.80%	18,936	61.64%	426	1.39%	339	1.10%	21	0.07%
19	29,193	59.09%	19,125	38.71%	683	1.38%	374	0.76%	28	0.06%
20	22,067	53.29%	18,409	44.46%	578	1.40%	329	0.79%	24	0.06%
21	11,685	34.36%	21,444	63.07%	525	1.54%	331	0.97%	18	0.05%
22	18,319	61.73%	10,850	36.56%	303	1.02%	174	0.59%	29	0.10%
23	13,540	44.25%	16,540	54.05%	328	1.07%	177	0.58%	15	0.05%
24	14,522	51.85%	13,006	46.44%	291	1.04%	179	0.64%	10	0.04%
25	17,584	51.69%	15,915	46.79%	338	0.99%	168	0.49%	12	0.04%
26	18,927	55.47%	14,404	42.22%	517	1.52%	253	0.74%	18	0.05%
27	12,324	41.74%	16,809	56.93%	239	0.81%	133	0.45%	19	0.06%
28	17,864	67.49%	8,050	30.41%	357	1.35%	183	0.69%	17	0.06%
29	5,513	13.49%	34,637	84.76%	373	0.91%	325	0.80%	16	0.04%
30	4,157	11.97%	29,956	86.24%	312	0.90%	296	0.85%	16	0.05%
31	5,887	18.70%	24,964	79.31%	349	1.11%	253	0.80%	24	0.08%
32	14,731	48.68%	14,828	49.00%	481	1.59%	202	0.67%	20	0.07%
33	8,192	27.42%	20,940	70.09%	420	1.41%	312	1.04%	14	0.05%
34	7,459	25.82%	20,652	71.48%	393	1.36%	368	1.27%	18	0.06%
35	20,569	50.72%	19,122	47.15%	545	1.34%	290	0.72%	32	0.08%
36	16,935	42.66%	21,780	54.86%	639	1.61%	323	0.81%	22	0.06%
37	21,074	50.91%	19,288	46.60%	678	1.64%	326	0.79%	28	0.07%
38	3,862	14.58%	22,007	83.09%	337	1.27%	266	1.00%	14	0.05%
39	11,117	36.28%	18,828	61.44%	427	1.39%	259	0.85%	15	0.05%
40	14,452	35.16%	25,644	62.39%	638	1.55%	340	0.83%	27	0.07%
41	9,442	30.30%	21,021	67.47%	420	1.35%	266	0.85%	9	0.03%
42	2,979	21.03%	10,841	76.54%	202	1.43%	133	0.94%	9	0.06%
43	15,277	55.63%	11,596	42.23%	382	1.39%	192	0.70%	14	0.05%
44	8,731	40.79%	12,174	56.88%	287	1.34%	203	0.95%	9	0.04%
45	8,687	41.27%	11,877	56.42%	289	1.37%	182	0.86%	15	0.07%
46	17,036	63.25%	9,314	34.58%	339	1.26%	215	0.80%	31	0.12%
47	10,449	54.19%	8,393	43.53%	236	1.22%	183	0.95%	20	0.10%
48	10,516	46.49%	11,477	50.74%	396	1.75%	211	0.93%	19	0.08%

Candidates: Budd (Rep), Beasley (Dem), Bray (Lib), Hoh (Grn)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, Precinct Sorted Results file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-SEN-22G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2022 Election Contest Report - US Senate

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib	Grn	% Grn	W-I	% W-I
49	12,487	32.64%	24,821	64.88%	593	1.55%	328	0.86%	25	0.07%
50	15,133	39.01%	22,913	59.07%	456	1.18%	262	0.68%	24	0.06%
51	16,082	61.16%	9,648	36.69%	368	1.40%	182	0.69%	15	0.06%
52	16,560	57.70%	11,480	40.00%	445	1.55%	201	0.70%	14	0.05%
53	18,409	62.97%	10,185	34.84%	428	1.46%	194	0.66%	18	0.06%
54	18,086	43.07%	23,164	55.16%	459	1.09%	264	0.63%	23	0.05%
55	16,323	63.65%	8,817	34.38%	324	1.26%	170	0.66%	11	0.04%
56	3,946	10.98%	31,349	87.26%	277	0.77%	344	0.96%	10	0.03%
57	10,862	32.51%	21,825	65.32%	406	1.22%	292	0.87%	28	0.08%
58	5,537	23.06%	17,970	74.85%	266	1.11%	224	0.93%	10	0.04%
59	21,637	55.78%	16,328	42.09%	497	1.28%	278	0.72%	52	0.13%
60	8,960	36.85%	14,816	60.93%	310	1.27%	222	0.91%	9	0.04%
61	6,483	23.25%	20,729	74.33%	354	1.27%	305	1.09%	18	0.06%
62	21,063	54.08%	17,059	43.80%	509	1.31%	279	0.72%	41	0.11%
63	16,256	54.31%	13,080	43.70%	394	1.32%	191	0.64%	13	0.04%
64	16,610	55.17%	12,808	42.54%	443	1.47%	229	0.76%	19	0.06%
65	21,617	66.37%	10,114	31.05%	577	1.77%	223	0.68%	40	0.12%
66	11,536	34.61%	21,013	63.04%	461	1.38%	299	0.90%	24	0.07%
67	23,761	73.50%	7,847	24.27%	440	1.36%	265	0.82%	17	0.05%
68	22,673	60.55%	13,990	37.36%	481	1.28%	262	0.70%	36	0.10%
69	21,597	63.12%	11,894	34.76%	428	1.25%	251	0.73%	47	0.14%
70	21,688	76.73%	5,973	21.13%	405	1.43%	181	0.64%	20	0.07%
71	8,102	29.72%	18,504	67.87%	364	1.34%	282	1.03%	13	0.05%
72	6,794	25.17%	19,664	72.84%	308	1.14%	208	0.77%	21	0.08%
73	15,630	54.39%	12,356	43.00%	460	1.60%	272	0.95%	17	0.06%
74	20,409	53.41%	16,951	44.36%	557	1.46%	263	0.69%	29	0.08%
75	17,157	57.02%	12,254	40.73%	454	1.51%	211	0.70%	12	0.04%
76	17,831	61.86%	10,252	35.57%	459	1.59%	259	0.90%	24	0.08%
77	27,470	75.97%	7,873	21.77%	502	1.39%	283	0.78%	30	0.08%
78	27,121	73.74%	8,965	24.38%	469	1.28%	191	0.52%	32	0.09%
79	23,463	62.29%	13,304	35.32%	570	1.51%	253	0.67%	76	0.20%
80	21,957	75.51%	6,588	22.66%	354	1.22%	161	0.55%	19	0.07%
81	21,436	70.93%	8,091	26.77%	441	1.46%	236	0.78%	16	0.05%
82	17,768	54.46%	14,113	43.26%	488	1.50%	236	0.72%	22	0.07%
83	19,807	67.16%	9,004	30.53%	407	1.38%	256	0.87%	19	0.06%
84	20,286	68.55%	8,649	29.23%	418	1.41%	215	0.73%	25	0.08%
85	26,032	71.47%	9,479	26.03%	559	1.53%	326	0.90%	26	0.07%
86	20,456	68.14%	8,883	29.59%	426	1.42%	241	0.80%	14	0.05%
87	22,069	73.10%	7,469	24.74%	418	1.38%	212	0.70%	23	0.08%
88	6,873	27.37%	17,660	70.32%	352	1.40%	218	0.87%	11	0.04%
89	24,459	74.54%	7,641	23.29%	484	1.48%	207	0.63%	21	0.06%
90	23,587	75.95%	6,783	21.84%	447	1.44%	209	0.67%	31	0.10%
91	19,789	64.80%	9,987	32.70%	504	1.65%	227	0.74%	31	0.10%
92	7,265	28.75%	17,450	69.05%	294	1.16%	245	0.97%	17	0.07%
93	21,284	56.98%	15,063	40.32%	616	1.65%	365	0.98%	28	0.07%
94	25,841	77.18%	6,865	20.50%	495	1.48%	251	0.75%	29	0.09%
95	21,477	64.15%	11,222	33.52%	537	1.60%	227	0.68%	18	0.05%
96	18,628	63.41%	10,061	34.25%	414	1.41%	259	0.88%	14	0.05%

Candidates: Budd (Rep), Beasley (Dem), Bray (Lib), Hoh (Grn)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, Precinct Sorted Results file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-SEN-22G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2022 Election Contest Report - US Senate

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib	Grn	% Grn	W-I	% W-I
97	26,130	71.97%	9,440	26.00%	526	1.45%	196	0.54%	16	0.04%
98	17,437	48.01%	18,175	50.04%	448	1.23%	248	0.68%	15	0.04%
99	2,278	14.01%	13,580	83.54%	161	0.99%	224	1.38%	12	0.07%
100	8,627	35.43%	15,146	62.20%	314	1.29%	242	0.99%	22	0.09%
101	7,595	30.80%	16,476	66.81%	312	1.27%	264	1.07%	14	0.06%
102	6,240	21.37%	22,268	76.26%	371	1.27%	302	1.03%	18	0.06%
103	12,659	41.76%	16,978	56.01%	391	1.29%	275	0.91%	8	0.03%
104	14,835	39.59%	21,856	58.33%	454	1.21%	298	0.80%	25	0.07%
105	19,897	49.69%	19,344	48.31%	473	1.18%	295	0.74%	32	0.08%
106	6,693	23.76%	20,920	74.26%	262	0.93%	278	0.99%	20	0.07%
107	3,222	14.19%	18,977	83.59%	262	1.15%	229	1.01%	13	0.06%
108	18,424	65.59%	9,089	32.36%	368	1.31%	190	0.68%	18	0.06%
109	18,488	57.93%	12,756	39.97%	440	1.38%	213	0.67%	16	0.05%
110	17,783	65.52%	8,819	32.49%	345	1.27%	175	0.64%	21	0.08%
111	20,365	72.79%	7,017	25.08%	406	1.45%	177	0.63%	13	0.05%
112	4,121	20.04%	15,984	77.73%	234	1.14%	210	1.02%	14	0.07%
113	24,926	65.17%	12,430	32.50%	549	1.44%	321	0.84%	20	0.05%
114	16,864	40.93%	23,279	56.50%	611	1.48%	428	1.04%	20	0.05%
115	19,458	50.30%	18,284	47.26%	532	1.38%	396	1.02%	17	0.04%
116	6,899	17.12%	32,270	80.08%	508	1.26%	599	1.49%	22	0.05%
117	22,300	57.02%	15,872	40.58%	573	1.47%	356	0.91%	9	0.02%
118	21,875	59.27%	13,964	37.83%	657	1.78%	396	1.07%	17	0.05%
119	19,636	54.70%	15,150	42.20%	643	1.79%	451	1.26%	20	0.06%
120	27,059	73.06%	9,072	24.50%	572	1.54%	305	0.82%	28	0.08%
Total:	1,905,609	50.48%	1,784,690	47.28%	51,632	1.37%	30,678	0.81%	2,514	0.07%

Candidates: Budd (Rep), Beasley (Dem), Bray (Lib), Hoh (Grn)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, Precinct Sorted Results file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-SEN-22G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2022 Election Contest Report - NC Supreme Court Associate Justice Seat 03

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
1	23,034	65.98%	11,879	34.02%
2	15,984	44.33%	20,069	55.67%
3	20,759	62.86%	12,266	37.14%
4	15,104	64.10%	8,460	35.90%
5	15,486	53.33%	13,553	46.67%
6	14,175	61.40%	8,910	38.60%
7	18,010	55.57%	14,400	44.43%
8	8,438	38.65%	13,396	61.35%
9	18,933	57.86%	13,788	42.14%
10	15,933	59.55%	10,823	40.45%
11	12,622	33.65%	24,888	66.35%
12	16,929	59.55%	11,501	40.45%
13	25,716	71.57%	10,214	28.43%
14	9,240	66.49%	4,657	33.51%
15	14,692	67.93%	6,935	32.07%
16	22,039	69.83%	9,522	30.17%
17	28,697	63.15%	16,742	36.85%
18	11,644	38.21%	18,831	61.79%
19	30,267	61.57%	18,892	38.43%
20	22,922	55.77%	18,182	44.23%
21	12,302	36.41%	21,484	63.59%
22	18,536	62.92%	10,922	37.08%
23	13,997	46.02%	16,417	53.98%
24	14,651	52.56%	13,223	47.44%
25	17,685	52.24%	16,166	47.76%
26	19,206	56.64%	14,701	43.36%
27	12,335	42.03%	17,014	57.97%
28	17,922	68.24%	8,340	31.76%
29	5,973	14.70%	34,653	85.30%
30	4,578	13.27%	29,924	86.73%
31	6,324	20.21%	24,968	79.79%
32	14,912	49.60%	15,155	50.40%
33	8,484	28.56%	21,226	71.44%
34	7,844	27.36%	20,828	72.64%
35	21,127	52.36%	19,224	47.64%
36	17,640	44.75%	21,777	55.25%
37	21,568	52.45%	19,554	47.55%
38	4,167	15.85%	22,129	84.15%
39	11,470	37.63%	19,013	62.37%
40	15,155	37.11%	25,679	62.89%
41	9,908	32.01%	21,044	67.99%
42	3,183	22.60%	10,901	77.40%
43	15,509	56.79%	11,802	43.21%
44	8,901	41.95%	12,315	58.05%
45	8,937	42.67%	12,009	57.33%
46	17,275	64.60%	9,467	35.40%
47	10,414	55.38%	8,391	44.62%
48	10,709	47.90%	11,648	52.10%

Candidates: Dietz (Rep), Inman (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, Precinct Sorted Results file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-SCS3-22G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2022 Election Contest Report - NC Supreme Court Associate Justice Seat 03

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
49	12,934	34.00%	25,103	66.00%
50	15,518	40.20%	23,088	59.80%
51	16,159	61.81%	9,985	38.19%
52	16,908	59.48%	11,516	40.52%
53	18,610	63.94%	10,497	36.06%
54	18,446	44.21%	23,277	55.79%
55	16,699	65.48%	8,805	34.52%
56	4,301	12.03%	31,450	87.97%
57	11,595	34.87%	21,659	65.13%
58	5,905	24.76%	17,947	75.24%
59	22,291	57.68%	16,352	42.32%
60	9,447	39.08%	14,726	60.92%
61	7,044	25.44%	20,640	74.56%
62	21,759	56.18%	16,969	43.82%
63	16,752	56.19%	13,059	43.81%
64	17,120	57.03%	12,897	42.97%
65	22,301	68.89%	10,070	31.11%
66	11,984	36.14%	21,177	63.86%
67	24,231	75.33%	7,936	24.67%
68	23,383	62.82%	13,838	37.18%
69	22,151	65.06%	11,898	34.94%
70	22,108	78.51%	6,051	21.49%
71	8,691	32.12%	18,365	67.88%
72	7,456	27.84%	19,321	72.16%
73	16,267	57.00%	12,273	43.00%
74	21,263	55.92%	16,763	44.08%
75	17,787	59.36%	12,179	40.64%
76	18,455	64.44%	10,186	35.56%
77	28,108	77.96%	7,946	22.04%
78	27,451	75.04%	9,130	24.96%
79	24,158	64.64%	13,216	35.36%
80	22,423	77.20%	6,621	22.80%
81	22,037	73.00%	8,150	27.00%
82	18,377	56.78%	13,986	43.22%
83	20,310	69.21%	9,034	30.79%
84	20,809	70.65%	8,646	29.35%
85	26,610	73.63%	9,530	26.37%
86	20,937	70.13%	8,918	29.87%
87	22,572	75.19%	7,447	24.81%
88	7,463	29.90%	17,499	70.10%
89	25,150	76.84%	7,580	23.16%
90	24,104	77.81%	6,876	22.19%
91	20,322	66.90%	10,053	33.10%
92	7,789	30.93%	17,397	69.07%
93	21,817	58.95%	15,191	41.05%
94	26,317	79.20%	6,913	20.80%
95	22,112	66.43%	11,175	33.57%
96	19,433	66.26%	9,895	33.74%

Candidates: Dietz (Rep), Inman (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, Precinct Sorted Results file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-SCS3-22G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2022 Election Contest Report - NC Supreme Court Associate Justice Seat 03

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
97	26,815	74.12%	9,365	25.88%
98	18,252	50.47%	17,912	49.53%
99	2,517	15.54%	13,678	84.46%
100	9,169	37.76%	15,113	62.24%
101	8,101	32.92%	16,506	67.08%
102	6,870	23.64%	22,185	76.36%
103	13,360	44.27%	16,818	55.73%
104	16,026	43.00%	21,245	57.00%
105	20,979	52.60%	18,902	47.40%
106	7,181	25.58%	20,896	74.42%
107	3,541	15.64%	19,102	84.36%
108	18,942	67.70%	9,037	32.30%
109	19,153	60.35%	12,584	39.65%
110	18,184	67.42%	8,786	32.58%
111	20,747	74.55%	7,084	25.45%
112	4,498	21.93%	16,016	78.07%
113	25,530	67.04%	12,551	32.96%
114	17,776	43.38%	23,198	56.62%
115	20,095	52.15%	18,438	47.85%
116	7,540	18.83%	32,509	81.17%
117	23,220	59.56%	15,765	40.44%
118	22,666	61.72%	14,059	38.28%
119	20,498	57.31%	15,271	42.69%
120	27,544	75.04%	9,162	24.96%
Total:	1,966,404	52.39%	1,787,294	47.61%

Candidates: Dietz (Rep), Inman (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, Precinct Sorted Results file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-SCS3-22G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2022 Election Contest Report - NC Supreme Court Associate Justice Seat 05

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
1	22,917	65.58%	12,026	34.42%
2	16,141	44.79%	19,895	55.21%
3	20,563	62.26%	12,464	37.74%
4	15,025	63.77%	8,538	36.23%
5	15,415	52.99%	13,678	47.01%
6	14,255	61.77%	8,821	38.23%
7	18,273	56.44%	14,104	43.56%
8	8,289	38.00%	13,525	62.00%
9	18,633	56.98%	14,067	43.02%
10	16,035	59.93%	10,719	40.07%
11	12,601	33.67%	24,829	66.33%
12	16,754	58.92%	11,680	41.08%
13	25,550	71.06%	10,405	28.94%
14	9,192	65.98%	4,739	34.02%
15	14,681	67.60%	7,037	32.40%
16	22,098	70.02%	9,460	29.98%
17	28,728	63.38%	16,597	36.62%
18	11,578	38.05%	18,853	61.95%
19	30,224	61.59%	18,849	38.41%
20	22,829	55.58%	18,242	44.42%
21	12,383	36.74%	21,317	63.26%
22	18,646	63.43%	10,749	36.57%
23	13,809	45.36%	16,631	54.64%
24	14,629	52.54%	13,217	47.46%
25	17,810	52.63%	16,029	47.37%
26	19,438	57.39%	14,431	42.61%
27	12,387	42.27%	16,920	57.73%
28	17,963	68.38%	8,307	31.62%
29	5,942	14.65%	34,615	85.35%
30	4,505	13.07%	29,964	86.93%
31	6,387	20.44%	24,860	79.56%
32	15,127	50.36%	14,909	49.64%
33	8,637	29.15%	20,994	70.85%
34	7,721	27.02%	20,856	72.98%
35	21,201	52.63%	19,083	47.37%
36	17,661	44.92%	21,654	55.08%
37	21,747	53.03%	19,261	46.97%
38	4,262	16.24%	21,985	83.76%
39	11,553	37.97%	18,875	62.03%
40	15,070	36.99%	25,674	63.01%
41	9,953	32.24%	20,917	67.76%
42	3,216	22.88%	10,841	77.12%
43	15,604	57.16%	11,697	42.84%
44	8,918	42.08%	12,274	57.92%
45	9,020	43.16%	11,881	56.84%
46	17,419	65.08%	9,346	34.92%
47	10,652	56.63%	8,158	43.37%
48	10,835	48.47%	11,517	51.53%

Candidates: Allen (Rep), Ervin (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, Precinct Sorted Results file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-SCS5-22G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2022 Election Contest Report - NC Supreme Court Associate Justice Seat 05

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
49	12,947	34.12%	25,001	65.88%
50	15,548	40.29%	23,044	59.71%
51	16,191	61.95%	9,943	38.05%
52	16,977	59.76%	11,434	40.24%
53	18,709	64.33%	10,375	35.67%
54	18,473	44.19%	23,332	55.81%
55	16,641	65.26%	8,858	34.74%
56	4,292	12.02%	31,428	87.98%
57	11,498	34.65%	21,683	65.35%
58	5,955	25.01%	17,854	74.99%
59	22,277	57.72%	16,316	42.28%
60	9,385	38.90%	14,738	61.10%
61	6,955	25.15%	20,704	74.85%
62	21,758	56.28%	16,904	43.72%
63	16,759	56.13%	13,097	43.87%
64	17,162	57.12%	12,882	42.88%
65	22,318	68.94%	10,055	31.06%
66	12,087	36.52%	21,012	63.48%
67	24,272	75.41%	7,913	24.59%
68	23,362	62.85%	13,808	37.15%
69	22,179	65.15%	11,865	34.85%
70	22,191	78.79%	5,975	21.21%
71	8,593	31.80%	18,428	68.20%
72	7,219	27.02%	19,497	72.98%
73	16,176	56.73%	12,339	43.27%
74	21,077	55.47%	16,922	44.53%
75	17,699	59.15%	12,221	40.85%
76	18,309	63.96%	10,318	36.04%
77	28,055	77.78%	8,013	22.22%
78	27,575	75.41%	8,991	24.59%
79	23,947	64.07%	13,427	35.93%
80	22,394	77.09%	6,656	22.91%
81	22,064	73.09%	8,123	26.91%
82	18,305	56.57%	14,053	43.43%
83	20,268	69.06%	9,080	30.94%
84	20,615	70.05%	8,813	29.95%
85	26,086	72.01%	10,141	27.99%
86	19,794	66.05%	10,172	33.95%
87	22,091	73.52%	7,956	26.48%
88	7,395	29.65%	17,548	70.35%
89	24,813	75.74%	7,949	24.26%
90	24,012	77.55%	6,951	22.45%
91	20,336	66.96%	10,036	33.04%
92	7,804	30.98%	17,389	69.02%
93	21,592	58.35%	15,413	41.65%
94	26,004	78.22%	7,242	21.78%
95	22,003	66.26%	11,206	33.74%
96	19,015	64.83%	10,314	35.17%

Candidates: Allen (Rep), Ervin (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, Precinct Sorted Results file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-SCS5-22G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2022 Election Contest Report - NC Supreme Court Associate Justice Seat 05

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
97	26,559	73.46%	9,594	26.54%
98	18,108	50.09%	18,042	49.91%
99	2,570	15.88%	13,618	84.12%
100	9,111	37.55%	15,151	62.45%
101	8,083	32.85%	16,521	67.15%
102	6,766	23.30%	22,271	76.70%
103	13,289	44.06%	16,871	55.94%
104	15,570	41.81%	21,674	58.19%
105	20,762	52.09%	19,093	47.91%
106	7,195	25.62%	20,888	74.38%
107	3,602	15.91%	19,041	84.09%
108	18,801	67.34%	9,118	32.66%
109	18,865	59.53%	12,826	40.47%
110	18,022	66.83%	8,946	33.17%
111	20,645	74.16%	7,194	25.84%
112	4,509	21.99%	16,000	78.01%
113	25,187	66.14%	12,896	33.86%
114	17,450	42.57%	23,543	57.43%
115	19,758	51.28%	18,771	48.72%
116	7,354	18.36%	32,700	81.64%
117	22,820	58.50%	16,186	41.50%
118	22,248	60.53%	14,505	39.47%
119	20,031	55.97%	15,758	44.03%
120	27,307	74.41%	9,393	25.59%
Total:	1,958,065	52.19%	1,793,509	47.81%

Candidates: Allen (Rep), Ervin (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, Precinct Sorted Results file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-SCS5-22G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - US President

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib	Grn	% Grn	Cnst	% Cnst	W-I	% W-I
1	30,150	61.78%	17,959	36.80%	418	0.86%	72	0.15%	120	0.25%	83	0.17%
2	22,478	44.08%	27,859	54.63%	387	0.76%	106	0.21%	82	0.16%	85	0.17%
3	27,523	58.61%	18,682	39.78%	516	1.10%	80	0.17%	78	0.17%	83	0.18%
4	21,317	58.35%	14,925	40.85%	157	0.43%	59	0.16%	45	0.12%	31	0.08%
5	20,932	49.27%	21,024	49.49%	306	0.72%	69	0.16%	65	0.15%	84	0.20%
6	22,198	58.74%	14,857	39.32%	537	1.42%	85	0.22%	52	0.14%	60	0.16%
7	24,961	55.23%	19,564	43.29%	372	0.82%	83	0.18%	114	0.25%	100	0.22%
8	13,050	33.76%	24,962	64.57%	364	0.94%	100	0.26%	93	0.24%	87	0.23%
9	25,693	53.15%	21,919	45.34%	424	0.88%	109	0.23%	76	0.16%	120	0.25%
10	23,106	55.58%	17,957	43.20%	305	0.73%	66	0.16%	73	0.18%	62	0.15%
11	16,908	32.72%	33,687	65.19%	687	1.33%	140	0.27%	80	0.15%	174	0.34%
12	22,745	53.22%	19,633	45.94%	186	0.44%	42	0.10%	90	0.21%	42	0.10%
13	33,537	68.64%	14,559	29.80%	483	0.99%	76	0.16%	110	0.23%	91	0.19%
14	14,358	60.92%	8,548	36.27%	534	2.27%	44	0.19%	33	0.14%	52	0.22%
15	23,202	62.74%	12,830	34.70%	757	2.05%	72	0.19%	50	0.14%	68	0.18%
16	30,474	66.42%	14,611	31.85%	544	1.19%	83	0.18%	86	0.19%	81	0.18%
17	34,970	60.71%	21,974	38.15%	423	0.73%	78	0.14%	57	0.10%	98	0.17%
18	16,770	36.11%	28,771	61.96%	541	1.17%	172	0.37%	57	0.12%	124	0.27%
19	37,188	60.13%	23,829	38.53%	535	0.87%	98	0.16%	75	0.12%	119	0.19%
20	30,176	53.94%	24,755	44.25%	663	1.19%	133	0.24%	92	0.16%	129	0.23%
21	16,329	35.57%	28,686	62.49%	560	1.22%	122	0.27%	51	0.11%	156	0.34%
22	27,078	59.16%	18,286	39.95%	211	0.46%	41	0.09%	92	0.20%	63	0.14%
23	19,515	40.88%	27,868	58.38%	184	0.39%	61	0.13%	70	0.15%	39	0.08%
24	21,249	49.06%	21,608	49.89%	268	0.62%	60	0.14%	64	0.15%	60	0.14%
25	24,159	48.57%	25,093	50.45%	264	0.53%	71	0.14%	72	0.14%	77	0.15%
26	27,585	56.57%	20,310	41.65%	579	1.19%	117	0.24%	74	0.15%	101	0.21%
27	17,514	39.82%	26,098	59.34%	154	0.35%	69	0.16%	106	0.24%	39	0.09%
28	26,628	66.61%	12,846	32.13%	333	0.83%	60	0.15%	42	0.11%	68	0.17%
29	8,109	14.59%	46,533	83.75%	482	0.87%	169	0.30%	81	0.15%	190	0.34%
30	6,319	13.15%	41,036	85.37%	364	0.76%	137	0.29%	63	0.13%	147	0.31%
31	8,690	18.54%	37,401	79.80%	413	0.88%	149	0.32%	73	0.16%	143	0.31%
32	20,978	46.81%	23,307	52.01%	299	0.67%	71	0.16%	88	0.20%	71	0.16%
33	12,028	26.75%	32,081	71.36%	519	1.15%	132	0.29%	60	0.13%	138	0.31%
34	11,258	26.59%	30,121	71.15%	577	1.36%	165	0.39%	54	0.13%	160	0.38%
35	27,135	51.44%	24,563	46.56%	642	1.22%	80	0.15%	94	0.18%	237	0.45%
36	22,593	43.61%	28,115	54.27%	683	1.32%	110	0.21%	95	0.18%	213	0.41%
37	27,857	52.25%	24,287	45.56%	768	1.44%	124	0.23%	94	0.18%	180	0.34%
38	6,610	16.26%	33,382	82.12%	354	0.87%	127	0.31%	62	0.15%	117	0.29%
39	16,719	36.77%	27,976	61.54%	442	0.97%	105	0.23%	82	0.18%	139	0.31%
40	19,682	35.28%	34,916	62.59%	702	1.26%	134	0.24%	95	0.17%	254	0.46%
41	14,147	31.41%	30,139	66.92%	448	0.99%	105	0.23%	52	0.12%	143	0.32%
42	6,395	23.16%	20,630	74.70%	372	1.35%	91	0.33%	72	0.26%	58	0.21%
43	24,297	55.39%	18,899	43.08%	412	0.94%	96	0.22%	73	0.17%	89	0.20%
44	13,981	37.02%	23,020	60.96%	444	1.18%	114	0.30%	93	0.25%	111	0.29%
45	15,359	40.46%	21,920	57.75%	417	1.10%	122	0.32%	61	0.16%	79	0.21%
46	25,578	64.08%	14,030	35.15%	145	0.36%	41	0.10%	84	0.21%	38	0.10%
47	19,058	56.45%	14,436	42.76%	104	0.31%	55	0.16%	53	0.16%	53	0.16%
48	16,926	46.47%	18,990	52.14%	316	0.87%	81	0.22%	53	0.15%	56	0.15%

Candidates: Trump (Rep), Biden (Dem), Jorgensen (Lib), Hawkins (Grn), Blankenship (Cst)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-PRS-20G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - US President

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib	Grn	% Grn	Cnst	% Cnst	W-I	% W-I
49	17,565	33.31%	34,111	64.69%	631	1.20%	140	0.27%	95	0.18%	188	0.36%
50	21,473	41.89%	29,100	56.77%	397	0.77%	98	0.19%	86	0.17%	109	0.21%
51	23,774	60.28%	15,116	38.33%	338	0.86%	81	0.21%	70	0.18%	59	0.15%
52	24,769	56.84%	18,241	41.86%	350	0.80%	69	0.16%	66	0.15%	83	0.19%
53	27,119	62.89%	15,337	35.57%	423	0.98%	78	0.18%	62	0.14%	99	0.23%
54	23,857	45.55%	27,826	53.13%	387	0.74%	95	0.18%	95	0.18%	115	0.22%
55	23,348	58.96%	15,814	39.94%	234	0.59%	54	0.14%	90	0.23%	58	0.15%
56	5,792	12.63%	39,352	85.82%	320	0.70%	138	0.30%	73	0.16%	178	0.39%
57	15,603	31.43%	33,296	67.07%	381	0.77%	92	0.19%	118	0.24%	155	0.31%
58	9,517	22.59%	32,069	76.10%	253	0.60%	131	0.31%	68	0.16%	100	0.24%
59	29,969	55.15%	23,604	43.44%	429	0.79%	126	0.23%	91	0.17%	117	0.22%
60	14,315	34.98%	25,942	63.40%	319	0.78%	110	0.27%	118	0.29%	115	0.28%
61	9,414	21.60%	33,461	76.78%	354	0.81%	142	0.33%	75	0.17%	132	0.30%
62	28,477	52.71%	24,715	45.75%	496	0.92%	103	0.19%	109	0.20%	127	0.24%
63	22,644	52.59%	19,821	46.04%	319	0.74%	120	0.28%	85	0.20%	66	0.15%
64	23,412	54.38%	19,004	44.14%	367	0.85%	103	0.24%	85	0.20%	84	0.20%
65	31,301	65.47%	15,992	33.45%	312	0.65%	75	0.16%	55	0.12%	74	0.15%
66	17,366	35.07%	31,272	63.15%	501	1.01%	128	0.26%	67	0.14%	188	0.38%
67	33,869	72.35%	12,456	26.61%	303	0.65%	45	0.10%	83	0.18%	56	0.12%
68	31,030	59.23%	20,500	39.13%	487	0.93%	106	0.20%	89	0.17%	177	0.34%
69	31,326	62.31%	18,200	36.20%	456	0.91%	92	0.18%	67	0.13%	134	0.27%
70	33,424	75.84%	10,146	23.02%	310	0.70%	78	0.18%	60	0.14%	55	0.12%
71	13,021	29.81%	29,948	68.56%	369	0.84%	140	0.32%	83	0.19%	120	0.27%
72	9,526	23.00%	31,183	75.29%	344	0.83%	110	0.27%	108	0.26%	148	0.36%
73	24,061	53.09%	20,517	45.27%	445	0.98%	97	0.21%	72	0.16%	133	0.29%
74	27,807	54.12%	22,688	44.16%	518	1.01%	110	0.21%	85	0.17%	170	0.33%
75	25,492	56.08%	19,275	42.40%	426	0.94%	92	0.20%	57	0.13%	113	0.25%
76	26,943	61.11%	16,534	37.50%	337	0.76%	103	0.23%	84	0.19%	89	0.20%
77	38,630	75.25%	11,973	23.32%	386	0.75%	94	0.18%	133	0.26%	118	0.23%
78	37,320	73.71%	12,751	25.18%	341	0.67%	75	0.15%	55	0.11%	89	0.18%
79	31,266	60.93%	19,423	37.85%	328	0.64%	79	0.15%	131	0.26%	86	0.17%
80	32,573	74.50%	10,528	24.08%	352	0.81%	86	0.20%	116	0.27%	69	0.16%
81	32,055	71.54%	12,099	27.00%	351	0.78%	101	0.23%	127	0.28%	71	0.16%
82	27,052	54.66%	21,698	43.84%	435	0.88%	98	0.20%	61	0.12%	145	0.29%
83	30,010	65.61%	15,026	32.85%	414	0.91%	96	0.21%	68	0.15%	125	0.27%
84	29,577	66.25%	14,481	32.44%	343	0.77%	74	0.17%	82	0.18%	89	0.20%
85	36,462	72.72%	13,031	25.99%	356	0.71%	94	0.19%	115	0.23%	83	0.17%
86	31,019	69.43%	13,118	29.36%	270	0.60%	83	0.19%	117	0.26%	69	0.15%
87	33,590	73.26%	11,707	25.53%	309	0.67%	67	0.15%	84	0.18%	93	0.20%
88	10,452	26.99%	27,455	70.89%	461	1.19%	117	0.30%	71	0.18%	171	0.44%
89	35,214	74.02%	11,749	24.70%	344	0.72%	86	0.18%	83	0.17%	96	0.20%
90	31,666	76.31%	9,408	22.67%	255	0.61%	48	0.12%	58	0.14%	64	0.15%
91	29,352	65.05%	15,223	33.74%	308	0.68%	77	0.17%	89	0.20%	74	0.16%
92	12,237	29.04%	29,170	69.23%	450	1.07%	133	0.32%	45	0.11%	100	0.24%
93	28,949	56.60%	21,307	41.66%	511	1.00%	134	0.26%	111	0.22%	133	0.26%
94	35,807	76.96%	10,211	21.95%	297	0.64%	49	0.11%	89	0.19%	75	0.16%
95	30,916	63.26%	17,150	35.09%	497	1.02%	95	0.19%	86	0.18%	126	0.26%
96	27,891	62.28%	16,197	36.17%	375	0.84%	117	0.26%	106	0.24%	99	0.22%

Candidates: Trump (Rep), Biden (Dem), Jorgensen (Lib), Hawkins (Grn), Blankenship (Cst)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-PRS-20G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - US President

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib	Grn	% Grn	Cnst	% Cnst	W-I	% W-I
97	36,341	72.33%	13,274	26.42%	373	0.74%	87	0.17%	84	0.17%	83	0.17%
98	24,634	48.70%	25,190	49.80%	446	0.88%	91	0.18%	63	0.12%	163	0.32%
99	4,776	15.03%	26,453	83.24%	285	0.90%	117	0.37%	44	0.14%	106	0.33%
100	13,675	33.87%	25,978	64.34%	401	0.99%	104	0.26%	85	0.21%	133	0.33%
101	12,692	30.12%	28,704	68.11%	415	0.98%	144	0.34%	66	0.16%	120	0.28%
102	10,235	22.91%	33,559	75.13%	488	1.09%	127	0.28%	84	0.19%	174	0.39%
103	19,217	41.30%	26,567	57.09%	428	0.92%	119	0.26%	61	0.13%	143	0.31%
104	19,601	38.41%	30,494	59.75%	503	0.99%	122	0.24%	100	0.20%	214	0.42%
105	27,121	50.13%	26,041	48.13%	540	1.00%	117	0.22%	91	0.17%	193	0.36%
106	10,781	23.97%	33,497	74.46%	374	0.83%	116	0.26%	61	0.14%	156	0.35%
107	6,407	14.86%	35,927	83.31%	375	0.87%	174	0.40%	91	0.21%	148	0.34%
108	29,393	65.85%	14,670	32.87%	353	0.79%	84	0.19%	52	0.12%	81	0.18%
109	28,110	58.45%	19,250	40.03%	425	0.88%	110	0.23%	80	0.17%	114	0.24%
110	28,472	64.90%	14,926	34.02%	259	0.59%	62	0.14%	85	0.19%	69	0.16%
111	31,371	72.58%	11,373	26.31%	276	0.64%	68	0.16%	73	0.17%	61	0.14%
112	7,387	19.97%	29,022	78.47%	260	0.70%	129	0.35%	75	0.20%	114	0.31%
113	33,937	65.17%	17,453	33.52%	370	0.71%	109	0.21%	88	0.17%	115	0.22%
114	23,657	43.26%	30,044	54.94%	555	1.01%	173	0.32%	114	0.21%	145	0.27%
115	27,984	53.20%	23,774	45.20%	451	0.86%	152	0.29%	120	0.23%	117	0.22%
116	10,771	19.81%	42,692	78.50%	454	0.83%	217	0.40%	95	0.17%	153	0.28%
117	30,344	57.35%	21,637	40.89%	543	1.03%	133	0.25%	136	0.26%	116	0.22%
118	30,814	62.02%	18,044	36.32%	437	0.88%	126	0.25%	140	0.28%	122	0.25%
119	27,153	55.49%	20,815	42.53%	509	1.04%	171	0.35%	148	0.30%	141	0.29%
120	35,662	73.07%	12,414	25.44%	336	0.69%	99	0.20%	168	0.34%	124	0.25%
Total:	2,754,299	49.91%	2,680,505	48.57%	48,640	0.88%	12,186	0.22%	9,908	0.18%	13,314	0.24%

Candidates: Trump (Rep), Biden (Dem), Jorgensen (Lib), Hawkins (Grn), Blankenship (Cst)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-PRS-20G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - US Senate

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib	Cnst	% Cnst
1	29,297	60.81%	17,063	35.42%	1,282	2.66%	533	1.11%
2	21,455	42.48%	27,034	53.53%	1,447	2.87%	568	1.12%
3	26,274	56.53%	18,012	38.75%	1,513	3.26%	682	1.47%
4	20,030	55.52%	14,691	40.72%	800	2.22%	553	1.53%
5	20,178	48.30%	20,128	48.18%	1,007	2.41%	462	1.11%
6	20,932	55.78%	14,448	38.50%	1,519	4.05%	624	1.66%
7	23,445	52.25%	19,362	43.15%	1,410	3.14%	654	1.46%
8	12,632	32.99%	24,066	62.84%	1,214	3.17%	383	1.00%
9	25,077	52.20%	21,203	44.13%	1,282	2.67%	480	1.00%
10	22,024	53.53%	17,439	42.38%	1,093	2.66%	591	1.44%
11	17,500	34.12%	31,495	61.40%	1,907	3.72%	389	0.76%
12	21,536	50.86%	19,285	45.55%	962	2.27%	557	1.32%
13	31,760	65.75%	14,258	29.52%	1,571	3.25%	717	1.48%
14	13,271	57.13%	8,218	35.38%	1,250	5.38%	489	2.11%
15	21,550	59.17%	12,378	33.99%	1,802	4.95%	688	1.89%
16	28,707	63.33%	14,034	30.96%	1,849	4.08%	739	1.63%
17	33,086	58.13%	21,248	37.33%	1,837	3.23%	751	1.32%
18	16,239	35.45%	26,887	58.69%	2,071	4.52%	616	1.34%
19	35,584	58.13%	22,612	36.94%	2,217	3.62%	804	1.31%
20	29,407	53.09%	23,028	41.58%	2,269	4.10%	683	1.23%
21	17,260	37.92%	26,332	57.85%	1,608	3.53%	315	0.69%
22	25,476	56.27%	18,119	40.02%	1,034	2.28%	642	1.42%
23	18,175	38.39%	27,687	58.48%	919	1.94%	562	1.19%
24	20,223	47.06%	21,326	49.63%	940	2.19%	481	1.12%
25	23,138	46.87%	24,608	49.85%	1,062	2.15%	561	1.14%
26	26,251	54.41%	19,364	40.14%	1,908	3.95%	720	1.49%
27	16,389	37.49%	26,051	59.60%	812	1.86%	459	1.05%
28	25,068	63.33%	12,682	32.04%	1,213	3.06%	621	1.57%
29	9,041	16.35%	44,457	80.39%	1,486	2.69%	318	0.58%
30	6,977	14.61%	39,318	82.33%	1,168	2.45%	293	0.61%
31	8,827	18.96%	35,793	76.88%	1,530	3.29%	410	0.88%
32	19,771	44.46%	22,930	51.56%	1,198	2.69%	571	1.28%
33	11,707	26.22%	30,831	69.06%	1,667	3.73%	437	0.98%
34	12,207	29.04%	28,097	66.85%	1,469	3.50%	255	0.61%
35	27,675	52.80%	22,673	43.26%	1,654	3.16%	414	0.79%
36	23,443	45.58%	25,665	49.90%	1,920	3.73%	400	0.78%
37	27,457	51.85%	22,772	43.00%	2,182	4.12%	545	1.03%
38	6,728	16.68%	31,927	79.17%	1,333	3.31%	340	0.84%
39	16,186	35.87%	26,798	59.38%	1,651	3.66%	492	1.09%
40	21,041	37.98%	32,097	57.94%	1,947	3.51%	308	0.56%
41	15,007	33.58%	28,026	62.71%	1,385	3.10%	271	0.61%
42	6,031	22.08%	19,625	71.86%	1,193	4.37%	462	1.69%
43	23,087	53.09%	18,365	42.23%	1,387	3.19%	648	1.49%
44	13,427	35.98%	21,962	58.85%	1,390	3.72%	542	1.45%
45	14,576	38.74%	21,062	55.98%	1,409	3.74%	580	1.54%
46	23,718	60.29%	14,231	36.17%	769	1.95%	624	1.59%
47	17,054	52.08%	14,530	44.37%	702	2.14%	458	1.40%
48	15,704	43.80%	18,321	51.10%	1,231	3.43%	599	1.67%

Candidates: Tillis (Rep), Cunningham (Dem), Bray (Lib), Hayes (Cst)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-SEN-20G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - US Senate

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib	Cnst	% Cnst
49	18,627	35.60%	31,566	60.33%	1,785	3.41%	342	0.65%
50	20,881	40.98%	28,339	55.61%	1,286	2.52%	454	0.89%
51	22,354	57.24%	14,780	37.85%	1,306	3.34%	612	1.57%
52	23,582	54.85%	17,321	40.29%	1,401	3.26%	687	1.60%
53	25,892	60.57%	14,800	34.62%	1,441	3.37%	613	1.43%
54	23,545	45.22%	26,752	51.38%	1,286	2.47%	489	0.94%
55	22,273	56.77%	15,435	39.34%	963	2.45%	566	1.44%
56	6,624	14.53%	37,815	82.97%	953	2.09%	187	0.41%
57	15,614	31.73%	31,766	64.54%	1,384	2.81%	452	0.92%
58	8,865	21.23%	31,144	74.57%	1,270	3.04%	485	1.16%
59	28,621	53.10%	22,953	42.58%	1,711	3.17%	619	1.15%
60	13,802	34.08%	24,885	61.45%	1,290	3.19%	518	1.28%
61	9,712	22.45%	31,893	73.72%	1,305	3.02%	352	0.81%
62	28,293	52.71%	23,243	43.30%	1,630	3.04%	514	0.96%
63	21,880	51.17%	19,384	45.33%	1,083	2.53%	414	0.97%
64	22,366	52.30%	18,659	43.63%	1,219	2.85%	521	1.22%
65	28,971	61.23%	16,189	34.22%	1,473	3.11%	680	1.44%
66	17,550	35.70%	29,475	59.95%	1,722	3.50%	417	0.85%
67	31,632	68.33%	12,445	26.88%	1,285	2.78%	930	2.01%
68	31,539	60.75%	18,430	35.50%	1,510	2.91%	437	0.84%
69	30,814	61.82%	17,030	34.16%	1,496	3.00%	508	1.02%
70	31,396	71.95%	10,281	23.56%	1,295	2.97%	662	1.52%
71	12,676	29.30%	28,493	65.86%	1,520	3.51%	572	1.32%
72	10,173	24.83%	29,167	71.20%	1,198	2.92%	426	1.04%
73	23,087	51.46%	19,356	43.14%	1,697	3.78%	728	1.62%
74	27,382	53.70%	21,395	41.96%	1,621	3.18%	589	1.16%
75	24,367	54.01%	18,552	41.12%	1,573	3.49%	621	1.38%
76	25,360	58.07%	16,087	36.84%	1,376	3.15%	848	1.94%
77	36,438	71.53%	12,108	23.77%	1,492	2.93%	902	1.77%
78	35,624	70.97%	12,584	25.07%	1,285	2.56%	700	1.39%
79	29,629	58.43%	18,915	37.30%	1,428	2.82%	740	1.46%
80	30,822	70.75%	10,893	25.00%	1,210	2.78%	640	1.47%
81	29,837	66.85%	12,791	28.66%	1,286	2.88%	716	1.60%
82	26,425	53.90%	20,273	41.35%	1,706	3.48%	619	1.26%
83	28,581	63.01%	14,327	31.59%	1,579	3.48%	873	1.92%
84	27,844	62.99%	14,053	31.79%	1,391	3.15%	914	2.07%
85	34,433	69.40%	13,248	26.70%	1,199	2.42%	732	1.48%
86	28,934	65.39%	13,180	29.79%	1,309	2.96%	822	1.86%
87	31,444	69.34%	11,669	25.73%	1,393	3.07%	839	1.85%
88	11,521	29.94%	25,100	65.23%	1,491	3.88%	365	0.95%
89	33,443	70.78%	11,445	24.22%	1,444	3.06%	917	1.94%
90	29,279	71.21%	10,090	24.54%	1,127	2.74%	619	1.51%
91	27,222	60.88%	15,304	34.23%	1,433	3.21%	752	1.68%
92	12,161	29.10%	27,564	65.96%	1,629	3.90%	432	1.03%
93	27,433	54.26%	20,707	40.95%	1,694	3.35%	728	1.44%
94	33,115	71.95%	10,738	23.33%	1,272	2.76%	897	1.95%
95	30,243	62.53%	15,727	32.52%	1,802	3.73%	596	1.23%
96	26,793	60.21%	15,551	34.95%	1,400	3.15%	756	1.70%

Candidates: Tillis (Rep), Cunningham (Dem), Bray (Lib), Hayes (Cst)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-SEN-20G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - US Senate

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib	Cnst	% Cnst
97	34,673	69.64%	12,871	25.85%	1,482	2.98%	763	1.53%
98	25,602	51.07%	22,617	45.11%	1,517	3.03%	397	0.79%
99	4,610	14.61%	25,385	80.47%	1,196	3.79%	356	1.13%
100	13,770	34.39%	24,270	60.61%	1,551	3.87%	453	1.13%
101	12,413	29.68%	27,302	65.28%	1,566	3.74%	539	1.29%
102	11,621	26.22%	30,747	69.36%	1,626	3.67%	333	0.75%
103	19,885	43.08%	24,307	52.66%	1,560	3.38%	402	0.87%
104	22,063	43.55%	26,801	52.91%	1,490	2.94%	303	0.60%
105	28,236	52.57%	23,542	43.83%	1,537	2.86%	394	0.73%
106	10,940	24.50%	31,661	70.90%	1,613	3.61%	439	0.98%
107	6,715	15.69%	33,897	79.21%	1,578	3.69%	603	1.41%
108	27,768	62.98%	14,172	32.14%	1,450	3.29%	698	1.58%
109	27,126	56.96%	18,428	38.70%	1,528	3.21%	541	1.14%
110	26,754	61.72%	14,791	34.12%	1,056	2.44%	749	1.73%
111	29,686	69.38%	11,383	26.61%	1,037	2.42%	679	1.59%
112	7,148	19.48%	27,630	75.29%	1,410	3.84%	508	1.38%
113	32,742	63.46%	17,021	32.99%	1,170	2.27%	660	1.28%
114	23,323	43.04%	28,497	52.59%	1,774	3.27%	590	1.09%
115	26,760	51.41%	23,091	44.36%	1,556	2.99%	641	1.23%
116	10,605	19.68%	41,135	76.32%	1,724	3.20%	432	0.80%
117	29,774	56.70%	20,525	39.08%	1,615	3.08%	601	1.14%
118	28,901	58.63%	18,157	36.83%	1,444	2.93%	791	1.60%
119	25,818	53.30%	20,259	41.82%	1,638	3.38%	728	1.50%
120	33,709	69.91%	12,581	26.09%	1,162	2.41%	766	1.59%
Total:	2,661,369	48.67%	2,567,510	46.95%	171,398	3.13%	68,459	1.25%

Candidates: Tillis (Rep), Cunningham (Dem), Bray (Lib), Hayes (Cst)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-SEN-20G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Governor

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep	Lib	% Lib	Cnst	% Cnst
1	18,800	38.76%	29,000	59.79%	489	1.01%	218	0.45%
2	29,387	57.77%	20,885	41.05%	435	0.86%	166	0.33%
3	19,813	42.34%	26,283	56.17%	491	1.05%	206	0.44%
4	15,680	43.08%	20,372	55.97%	214	0.59%	129	0.35%
5	21,550	51.04%	20,093	47.59%	395	0.94%	187	0.44%
6	16,036	42.61%	20,816	55.31%	592	1.57%	189	0.50%
7	21,432	47.45%	23,127	51.21%	432	0.96%	172	0.38%
8	25,493	66.18%	12,406	32.21%	458	1.19%	163	0.42%
9	23,109	47.86%	24,576	50.90%	437	0.91%	165	0.34%
10	18,969	45.80%	21,905	52.89%	352	0.85%	187	0.45%
11	35,152	68.26%	15,403	29.91%	720	1.40%	219	0.43%
12	20,533	48.14%	21,713	50.91%	255	0.60%	152	0.36%
13	15,916	32.72%	32,020	65.83%	481	0.99%	227	0.47%
14	9,042	38.78%	13,553	58.13%	531	2.28%	190	0.81%
15	13,533	37.00%	22,041	60.27%	719	1.97%	280	0.77%
16	15,677	34.37%	29,098	63.78%	602	1.32%	242	0.53%
17	24,173	42.19%	32,281	56.35%	566	0.99%	271	0.47%
18	29,543	63.98%	15,621	33.83%	793	1.72%	221	0.48%
19	25,996	42.17%	34,774	56.41%	615	1.00%	265	0.43%
20	26,536	47.59%	28,265	50.69%	721	1.29%	235	0.42%
21	30,061	65.77%	14,950	32.71%	558	1.22%	140	0.31%
22	19,668	43.14%	25,492	55.91%	279	0.61%	152	0.33%
23	29,071	61.00%	18,255	38.30%	201	0.42%	132	0.28%
24	22,965	53.08%	19,879	45.95%	281	0.65%	136	0.31%
25	26,741	53.85%	22,488	45.28%	287	0.58%	145	0.29%
26	22,007	45.28%	25,859	53.21%	533	1.10%	202	0.42%
27	27,191	61.93%	16,317	37.16%	240	0.55%	158	0.36%
28	14,352	35.94%	25,075	62.80%	357	0.89%	144	0.36%
29	47,229	85.04%	7,597	13.68%	543	0.98%	170	0.31%
30	41,339	86.34%	5,874	12.27%	519	1.08%	149	0.31%
31	38,141	81.50%	7,882	16.84%	597	1.28%	176	0.38%
32	24,906	55.67%	19,293	43.13%	364	0.81%	173	0.39%
33	33,110	73.89%	10,912	24.35%	590	1.32%	200	0.45%
34	30,823	73.11%	10,560	25.05%	637	1.51%	139	0.33%
35	26,183	49.79%	25,703	48.88%	520	0.99%	180	0.34%
36	29,717	57.51%	21,099	40.83%	672	1.30%	183	0.35%
37	26,236	49.35%	26,006	48.91%	715	1.34%	211	0.40%
38	33,969	83.86%	5,878	14.51%	510	1.26%	150	0.37%
39	29,162	64.31%	15,480	34.14%	530	1.17%	177	0.39%
40	36,405	65.48%	18,332	32.97%	686	1.23%	173	0.31%
41	31,577	70.42%	12,620	28.14%	506	1.13%	141	0.31%
42	20,985	76.46%	5,695	20.75%	555	2.02%	210	0.77%
43	20,268	46.36%	22,777	52.10%	460	1.05%	215	0.49%
44	23,992	63.87%	12,725	33.88%	603	1.61%	241	0.64%
45	23,033	60.91%	14,000	37.03%	550	1.45%	229	0.61%
46	15,456	39.04%	23,780	60.07%	208	0.53%	142	0.36%
47	17,133	51.49%	15,819	47.54%	211	0.63%	110	0.33%
48	20,268	56.02%	15,296	42.28%	437	1.21%	179	0.49%

Candidates: Cooper (Dem), Forest (Rep), DiFiore (Lib), Pisano (Cst)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-GOV-20G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Governor

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep	Lib	% Lib	Cnst	% Cnst
49	35,472	67.51%	16,217	30.86%	668	1.27%	189	0.36%
50	30,574	59.72%	20,042	39.15%	442	0.86%	140	0.27%
51	16,881	43.03%	21,773	55.50%	409	1.04%	166	0.42%
52	19,810	45.72%	22,819	52.66%	485	1.12%	215	0.50%
53	16,757	38.98%	25,609	59.56%	426	0.99%	202	0.47%
54	29,317	56.07%	22,432	42.90%	380	0.73%	159	0.30%
55	16,770	42.45%	22,227	56.26%	344	0.87%	168	0.43%
56	39,753	87.02%	5,402	11.83%	413	0.90%	113	0.25%
57	34,462	69.89%	14,083	28.56%	551	1.12%	213	0.43%
58	32,825	78.52%	8,232	19.69%	545	1.30%	205	0.49%
59	25,574	47.33%	27,698	51.27%	561	1.04%	196	0.36%
60	26,984	66.55%	12,785	31.53%	516	1.27%	265	0.65%
61	33,904	78.37%	8,606	19.89%	569	1.32%	184	0.43%
62	26,410	49.11%	26,567	49.40%	563	1.05%	242	0.45%
63	21,479	49.99%	21,003	48.88%	335	0.78%	149	0.35%
64	20,500	47.69%	21,918	50.99%	421	0.98%	150	0.35%
65	18,197	38.19%	28,891	60.63%	415	0.87%	149	0.31%
66	32,519	65.93%	16,023	32.48%	616	1.25%	167	0.34%
67	14,482	31.03%	31,644	67.81%	360	0.77%	178	0.38%
68	21,379	41.01%	30,012	57.57%	547	1.05%	190	0.36%
69	19,273	38.48%	30,043	59.98%	556	1.11%	217	0.43%
70	12,108	27.61%	31,204	71.17%	364	0.83%	171	0.39%
71	30,918	71.15%	11,740	27.02%	592	1.36%	205	0.47%
72	31,659	77.00%	8,799	21.40%	474	1.15%	185	0.45%
73	21,540	47.91%	22,578	50.22%	626	1.39%	217	0.48%
74	24,791	48.39%	25,716	50.20%	526	1.03%	194	0.38%
75	20,809	45.98%	23,692	52.35%	541	1.20%	214	0.47%
76	17,964	40.84%	25,335	57.60%	457	1.04%	226	0.51%
77	14,347	28.00%	36,301	70.84%	405	0.79%	194	0.38%
78	15,058	29.85%	34,876	69.13%	358	0.71%	158	0.31%
79	20,698	40.51%	29,763	58.25%	401	0.78%	233	0.46%
80	12,393	28.37%	30,730	70.36%	392	0.90%	161	0.37%
81	14,193	31.71%	30,018	67.07%	405	0.90%	140	0.31%
82	22,783	46.36%	25,626	52.15%	539	1.10%	194	0.39%
83	16,182	35.58%	28,533	62.74%	566	1.24%	199	0.44%
84	15,796	35.48%	28,005	62.90%	523	1.17%	198	0.44%
85	14,838	29.69%	34,504	69.04%	420	0.84%	217	0.43%
86	15,028	33.74%	28,898	64.88%	364	0.82%	253	0.57%
87	13,467	29.49%	31,629	69.25%	405	0.89%	171	0.37%
88	27,527	71.38%	10,265	26.62%	618	1.60%	153	0.40%
89	13,109	27.62%	33,693	70.99%	462	0.97%	195	0.41%
90	11,793	28.46%	29,236	70.55%	300	0.72%	114	0.28%
91	17,051	37.89%	27,369	60.81%	412	0.92%	175	0.39%
92	29,726	70.96%	11,266	26.89%	668	1.59%	234	0.56%
93	22,993	45.14%	27,092	53.19%	618	1.21%	234	0.46%
94	12,580	27.12%	33,310	71.81%	343	0.74%	156	0.34%
95	18,144	37.31%	29,648	60.97%	615	1.26%	223	0.46%
96	17,593	39.36%	26,418	59.10%	455	1.02%	234	0.52%

Candidates: Cooper (Dem), Forest (Rep), DiFiore (Lib), Pisano (Cst)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-GOV-20G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Governor

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep	Lib	% Lib	Cnst	% Cnst
97	14,730	29.39%	34,711	69.25%	449	0.90%	237	0.47%
98	25,642	51.00%	23,874	47.48%	596	1.19%	166	0.33%
99	26,730	84.49%	4,255	13.45%	506	1.60%	146	0.46%
100	26,541	66.07%	12,763	31.77%	610	1.52%	260	0.65%
101	29,271	69.77%	11,810	28.15%	655	1.56%	220	0.52%
102	33,278	74.89%	10,203	22.96%	782	1.76%	172	0.39%
103	27,252	58.85%	18,294	39.51%	589	1.27%	171	0.37%
104	30,667	60.34%	19,393	38.15%	573	1.13%	194	0.38%
105	26,837	49.77%	26,292	48.76%	581	1.08%	211	0.39%
106	33,883	75.60%	10,093	22.52%	635	1.42%	206	0.46%
107	35,874	83.61%	6,095	14.21%	706	1.65%	229	0.53%
108	15,784	35.56%	27,939	62.95%	452	1.02%	210	0.47%
109	20,566	42.92%	26,590	55.49%	559	1.17%	203	0.42%
110	16,308	37.36%	26,821	61.45%	373	0.85%	148	0.34%
111	12,845	29.85%	29,725	69.08%	315	0.73%	144	0.33%
112	29,452	79.94%	6,513	17.68%	627	1.70%	251	0.68%
113	19,095	36.80%	32,192	62.04%	413	0.80%	190	0.37%
114	31,147	57.33%	22,184	40.83%	755	1.39%	243	0.45%
115	25,186	48.20%	26,145	50.04%	684	1.31%	233	0.45%
116	43,063	79.81%	9,822	18.20%	833	1.54%	237	0.44%
117	23,142	43.88%	28,730	54.48%	636	1.21%	230	0.44%
118	20,269	40.91%	28,538	57.59%	528	1.07%	216	0.44%
119	22,675	46.52%	25,166	51.63%	657	1.35%	241	0.49%
120	13,696	28.19%	34,169	70.32%	476	0.98%	252	0.52%
Total:	2,830,701	51.50%	2,582,462	46.98%	60,408	1.10%	22,956	0.42%

Candidates: Cooper (Dem), Forest (Rep), DiFiore (Lib), Pisano (Cst)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-GOV-20G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Lieutenant Governor

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
1	30,287	63.45%	17,443	36.55%
2	22,645	45.26%	27,387	54.74%
3	27,852	60.55%	18,147	39.45%
4	21,205	59.14%	14,651	40.86%
5	20,907	50.26%	20,690	49.74%
6	22,263	59.89%	14,911	40.11%
7	24,961	56.03%	19,586	43.97%
8	13,485	35.50%	24,501	64.50%
9	26,474	55.47%	21,253	44.53%
10	23,097	56.46%	17,811	43.54%
11	18,119	35.75%	32,562	64.25%
12	22,795	54.11%	19,333	45.89%
13	33,499	70.31%	14,148	29.69%
14	14,285	62.69%	8,502	37.31%
15	23,163	64.76%	12,602	35.24%
16	30,402	67.97%	14,327	32.03%
17	34,575	61.84%	21,336	38.16%
18	17,370	38.39%	27,875	61.61%
19	37,555	62.08%	22,940	37.92%
20	30,825	56.52%	23,709	43.48%
21	17,667	39.34%	27,237	60.66%
22	26,810	59.65%	18,137	40.35%
23	19,406	41.22%	27,668	58.78%
24	21,290	49.71%	21,537	50.29%
25	24,368	49.52%	24,845	50.48%
26	27,769	58.30%	19,863	41.70%
27	17,331	39.86%	26,148	60.14%
28	26,519	67.66%	12,676	32.34%
29	9,430	17.21%	45,378	82.79%
30	7,198	15.21%	40,115	84.79%
31	9,276	20.05%	36,992	79.95%
32	20,926	47.37%	23,245	52.63%
33	12,391	27.95%	31,936	72.05%
34	12,549	30.26%	28,924	69.74%
35	28,450	54.83%	23,436	45.17%
36	24,198	47.64%	26,592	52.36%
37	28,797	54.93%	23,627	45.07%
38	7,036	17.54%	33,072	82.46%
39	16,992	37.88%	27,863	62.12%
40	21,408	39.16%	33,257	60.84%
41	15,210	34.47%	28,919	65.53%
42	6,476	23.86%	20,664	76.14%
43	24,248	56.07%	18,999	43.93%
44	14,154	38.21%	22,890	61.79%
45	15,421	41.28%	21,932	58.72%
46	24,871	63.75%	14,144	36.25%
47	17,325	53.76%	14,904	46.24%
48	16,538	46.51%	19,018	53.49%

Candidates: Robinson (Rep), Holley (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-LG-20G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Lieutenant Governor

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
49	19,092	36.91%	32,639	63.09%
50	22,057	43.65%	28,475	56.35%
51	23,532	60.96%	15,068	39.04%
52	24,597	58.04%	17,784	41.96%
53	27,115	64.13%	15,165	35.87%
54	24,516	47.64%	26,946	52.36%
55	23,097	59.49%	15,727	40.51%
56	6,790	15.08%	38,247	84.92%
57	16,559	33.90%	32,281	66.10%
58	9,566	23.00%	32,021	77.00%
59	30,456	56.90%	23,066	43.10%
60	14,746	36.78%	25,348	63.22%
61	10,285	23.94%	32,668	76.06%
62	29,742	55.98%	23,386	44.02%
63	23,162	54.32%	19,477	45.68%
64	23,729	55.61%	18,944	44.39%
65	31,170	66.26%	15,871	33.74%
66	18,214	37.37%	30,522	62.63%
67	33,459	73.10%	12,312	26.90%
68	31,977	62.73%	18,999	37.27%
69	31,607	64.38%	17,484	35.62%
70	33,380	76.85%	10,058	23.15%
71	13,585	31.75%	29,196	68.25%
72	10,603	26.22%	29,828	73.78%
73	24,403	54.88%	20,065	45.12%
74	28,830	57.21%	21,564	42.79%
75	25,934	58.02%	18,764	41.98%
76	26,960	62.20%	16,382	37.80%
77	38,953	76.83%	11,746	23.17%
78	37,247	75.01%	12,411	24.99%
79	31,211	62.23%	18,940	37.77%
80	32,876	75.71%	10,547	24.29%
81	32,301	72.69%	12,138	27.31%
82	27,633	56.92%	20,912	43.08%
83	30,141	67.04%	14,820	32.96%
84	29,417	67.17%	14,375	32.83%
85	36,252	73.71%	12,932	26.29%
86	30,728	69.97%	13,191	30.03%
87	33,354	74.23%	11,581	25.77%
88	11,866	31.24%	26,116	68.76%
89	35,271	75.08%	11,705	24.92%
90	31,337	76.65%	9,546	23.35%
91	29,235	65.80%	15,192	34.20%
92	12,616	30.46%	28,808	69.54%
93	28,935	58.12%	20,850	41.88%
94	35,415	77.55%	10,250	22.45%
95	31,254	65.67%	16,335	34.33%
96	28,310	63.91%	15,987	36.09%

Candidates: Robinson (Rep), Holley (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-LG-20G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Lieutenant Governor

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
97	36,359	73.84%	12,883	26.16%
98	26,162	53.03%	23,168	46.97%
99	4,927	15.69%	26,473	84.31%
100	14,378	36.26%	25,278	63.74%
101	13,043	31.43%	28,462	68.57%
102	11,942	27.28%	31,829	72.72%
103	20,425	44.73%	25,242	55.27%
104	22,396	44.90%	27,482	55.10%
105	29,017	54.63%	24,097	45.37%
106	11,360	25.63%	32,958	74.37%
107	6,920	16.27%	35,624	83.73%
108	28,947	66.74%	14,426	33.26%
109	28,236	60.27%	18,616	39.73%
110	27,837	65.16%	14,882	34.84%
111	30,913	72.95%	11,462	27.05%
112	7,479	20.51%	28,992	79.49%
113	34,177	66.66%	17,093	33.34%
114	24,376	45.56%	29,124	54.44%
115	28,206	54.66%	23,392	45.34%
116	11,261	21.12%	42,051	78.88%
117	31,291	59.93%	20,922	40.07%
118	30,851	63.04%	18,084	36.96%
119	27,651	57.52%	20,418	42.48%
120	35,489	74.16%	12,367	25.84%
Total:	2,796,976	51.64%	2,619,726	48.36%

Candidates: Robinson (Rep), Holley (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-LG-20G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Attorney General

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
1	17,912	37.71%	29,582	62.29%
2	28,452	57.12%	21,355	42.88%
3	18,769	41.15%	26,840	58.85%
4	15,272	42.86%	20,359	57.14%
5	20,957	50.77%	20,319	49.23%
6	15,512	41.86%	21,542	58.14%
7	20,779	46.71%	23,708	53.29%
8	25,103	66.21%	12,809	33.79%
9	22,372	47.06%	25,164	52.94%
10	18,478	45.24%	22,364	54.76%
11	33,529	66.13%	17,174	33.87%
12	20,228	48.20%	21,742	51.80%
13	14,939	31.37%	32,683	68.63%
14	8,672	37.99%	14,154	62.01%
15	13,005	36.40%	22,723	63.60%
16	15,004	33.61%	29,644	66.39%
17	22,063	39.50%	33,796	60.50%
18	28,724	63.55%	16,473	36.45%
19	24,136	40.02%	36,181	59.98%
20	24,977	45.83%	29,525	54.17%
21	27,945	62.33%	16,887	37.67%
22	19,037	42.60%	25,647	57.40%
23	28,819	61.43%	18,094	38.57%
24	22,623	52.95%	20,106	47.05%
25	26,342	53.59%	22,810	46.41%
26	20,854	43.99%	26,549	56.01%
27	26,887	62.09%	16,416	37.91%
28	13,770	35.36%	25,168	64.64%
29	45,830	83.60%	8,992	16.40%
30	40,397	85.47%	6,866	14.53%
31	37,235	80.62%	8,948	19.38%
32	24,332	55.12%	19,815	44.88%
33	32,537	73.46%	11,756	26.54%
34	29,933	72.07%	11,598	27.93%
35	24,372	47.07%	27,408	52.93%
36	27,538	54.26%	23,216	45.74%
37	24,686	47.18%	27,639	52.82%
38	33,403	83.36%	6,666	16.64%
39	28,535	63.80%	16,189	36.20%
40	34,335	62.74%	20,391	37.26%
41	29,557	67.00%	14,556	33.00%
42	20,729	76.54%	6,353	23.46%
43	19,861	46.01%	23,306	53.99%
44	23,416	63.40%	13,518	36.60%
45	22,295	59.81%	14,980	40.19%
46	15,043	38.76%	23,767	61.24%
47	15,639	48.93%	16,326	51.07%
48	19,351	54.66%	16,050	45.34%

Candidates: Stein (Dem), O'Neill (Rep)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-AG-20G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Attorney General

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
49	34,069	65.75%	17,747	34.25%
50	29,694	58.79%	20,813	41.21%
51	16,035	41.66%	22,451	58.34%
52	18,531	43.86%	23,719	56.14%
53	16,000	37.99%	26,120	62.01%
54	27,902	54.25%	23,527	45.75%
55	16,580	42.72%	22,231	57.28%
56	38,703	85.93%	6,336	14.07%
57	33,037	67.80%	15,688	32.20%
58	32,368	78.05%	9,102	21.95%
59	24,205	45.42%	29,085	54.58%
60	25,985	64.91%	14,048	35.09%
61	33,112	77.33%	9,705	22.67%
62	24,290	45.85%	28,687	54.15%
63	20,375	47.96%	22,105	52.04%
64	19,750	46.47%	22,754	53.53%
65	16,993	36.19%	29,959	63.81%
66	31,171	64.10%	17,454	35.90%
67	13,617	29.89%	31,936	70.11%
68	19,705	38.59%	31,353	61.41%
69	18,221	37.07%	30,935	62.93%
70	10,984	25.40%	32,268	74.60%
71	29,311	68.21%	13,662	31.79%
72	29,718	73.06%	10,957	26.94%
73	21,042	47.40%	23,350	52.60%
74	21,957	43.48%	28,547	56.52%
75	19,403	43.35%	25,357	56.65%
76	17,449	40.33%	25,813	59.67%
77	12,878	25.44%	37,740	74.56%
78	13,348	26.97%	36,150	73.03%
79	19,781	39.57%	30,210	60.43%
80	11,481	26.47%	31,886	73.53%
81	13,049	29.39%	31,357	70.61%
82	21,800	45.07%	26,568	54.93%
83	15,808	35.21%	29,093	64.79%
84	15,195	34.81%	28,455	65.19%
85	13,929	28.40%	35,119	71.60%
86	14,313	32.58%	29,620	67.42%
87	12,840	28.63%	32,014	71.37%
88	26,393	69.57%	11,543	30.43%
89	12,742	27.15%	34,187	72.85%
90	10,445	25.59%	30,366	74.41%
91	15,986	35.99%	28,431	64.01%
92	28,949	70.03%	12,391	29.97%
93	21,849	43.95%	27,865	56.05%
94	11,629	25.53%	33,916	74.47%
95	16,933	35.68%	30,523	64.32%
96	16,976	38.34%	27,301	61.66%

Candidates: Stein (Dem), O'Neill (Rep)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-AG-20G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Attorney General

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
97	14,212	28.95%	34,874	71.05%
98	23,779	48.19%	25,565	51.81%
99	26,524	84.67%	4,802	15.33%
100	25,770	64.99%	13,882	35.01%
101	28,661	69.18%	12,769	30.82%
102	32,146	73.58%	11,544	26.42%
103	25,697	56.41%	19,860	43.59%
104	28,389	56.95%	21,456	43.05%
105	25,006	47.13%	28,055	52.87%
106	33,134	74.90%	11,101	25.10%
107	35,558	83.87%	6,841	16.13%
108	15,266	34.90%	28,478	65.10%
109	19,743	41.88%	27,403	58.12%
110	15,816	36.89%	27,060	63.11%
111	12,156	28.79%	30,071	71.21%
112	29,156	79.98%	7,297	20.02%
113	17,662	34.51%	33,519	65.49%
114	29,741	55.76%	23,600	44.24%
115	24,139	46.96%	27,261	53.04%
116	42,555	79.91%	10,701	20.09%
117	21,463	41.23%	30,594	58.77%
118	19,157	39.23%	29,674	60.77%
119	21,335	44.52%	26,589	55.48%
120	12,995	27.24%	34,703	72.76%
Total:	2,710,775	50.13%	2,696,297	49.87%

Candidates: Stein (Dem), O'Neill (Rep)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-AG-20G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Auditor

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
1	18,651	39.50%	28,562	60.50%
2	28,868	58.41%	20,555	41.59%
3	20,353	44.67%	25,211	55.33%
4	15,681	44.18%	19,811	55.82%
5	21,582	52.37%	19,632	47.63%
6	15,855	42.94%	21,070	57.06%
7	21,335	48.25%	22,887	51.75%
8	25,743	68.16%	12,028	31.84%
9	23,856	50.33%	23,543	49.67%
10	18,842	46.44%	21,730	53.56%
11	33,776	67.42%	16,323	32.58%
12	21,088	50.44%	20,721	49.56%
13	15,650	33.27%	31,391	66.73%
14	8,908	39.58%	13,598	60.42%
15	13,350	37.87%	21,900	62.13%
16	15,151	34.27%	29,059	65.73%
17	21,741	39.59%	33,179	60.41%
18	28,324	63.55%	16,248	36.45%
19	23,968	40.31%	35,494	59.69%
20	24,527	45.78%	29,045	54.22%
21	28,023	63.23%	16,298	36.77%
22	19,354	43.39%	25,249	56.61%
23	29,950	64.00%	16,849	36.00%
24	23,364	54.93%	19,168	45.07%
25	29,558	60.38%	19,399	39.62%
26	21,439	45.47%	25,710	54.53%
27	27,455	63.37%	15,871	36.63%
28	14,523	37.39%	24,319	62.61%
29	45,807	84.26%	8,557	15.74%
30	40,425	86.01%	6,577	13.99%
31	37,239	81.02%	8,723	18.98%
32	24,631	56.14%	19,244	43.86%
33	32,801	74.57%	11,183	25.43%
34	29,734	72.57%	11,240	27.43%
35	24,894	48.59%	26,337	51.41%
36	27,857	55.61%	22,234	44.39%
37	25,194	48.61%	26,635	51.39%
38	33,299	83.74%	6,464	16.26%
39	28,793	64.87%	15,592	35.13%
40	34,656	64.16%	19,363	35.84%
41	29,681	68.09%	13,908	31.91%
42	20,710	76.87%	6,232	23.13%
43	19,747	46.08%	23,105	53.92%
44	23,376	63.71%	13,313	36.29%
45	22,259	60.12%	14,765	39.88%
46	15,151	39.23%	23,466	60.77%
47	16,308	51.21%	15,536	48.79%
48	19,799	56.18%	15,444	43.82%

Candidates: Wood (Dem), Street (Rep)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-AUD-20G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Auditor

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
49	34,239	66.89%	16,951	33.11%
50	29,520	58.97%	20,541	41.03%
51	16,327	42.72%	21,892	57.28%
52	18,859	45.04%	23,013	54.96%
53	16,546	39.50%	25,346	60.50%
54	28,174	55.32%	22,751	44.68%
55	16,288	42.24%	22,273	57.76%
56	38,417	86.08%	6,212	13.92%
57	33,102	68.72%	15,066	31.28%
58	32,211	78.13%	9,018	21.87%
59	24,222	45.94%	28,503	54.06%
60	26,000	65.51%	13,689	34.49%
61	33,146	78.17%	9,259	21.83%
62	24,634	47.12%	27,650	52.88%
63	20,151	47.82%	21,991	52.18%
64	19,645	46.57%	22,543	53.43%
65	16,900	36.32%	29,631	63.68%
66	31,278	64.92%	16,900	35.08%
67	13,384	29.49%	32,001	70.51%
68	19,442	38.66%	30,844	61.34%
69	17,903	36.84%	30,696	63.16%
70	10,872	25.31%	32,075	74.69%
71	29,713	70.03%	12,713	29.97%
72	30,341	75.68%	9,749	24.32%
73	20,795	47.31%	23,161	52.69%
74	22,509	45.21%	27,282	54.79%
75	19,598	44.27%	24,667	55.73%
76	17,171	39.96%	25,798	60.04%
77	13,031	25.96%	37,160	74.04%
78	13,314	27.17%	35,695	72.83%
79	20,671	41.63%	28,983	58.37%
80	11,491	26.63%	31,661	73.37%
81	13,390	30.32%	30,767	69.68%
82	21,638	45.25%	26,176	54.75%
83	15,556	34.91%	29,007	65.09%
84	15,315	35.22%	28,166	64.78%
85	13,837	28.63%	34,495	71.37%
86	14,098	32.33%	29,506	67.67%
87	12,479	28.05%	32,013	71.95%
88	26,286	70.12%	11,202	29.88%
89	12,461	26.71%	34,191	73.29%
90	10,542	26.07%	29,890	73.93%
91	16,101	36.61%	27,883	63.39%
92	28,830	70.26%	12,206	29.74%
93	21,640	44.20%	27,324	55.80%
94	11,357	25.21%	33,690	74.79%
95	16,975	36.10%	30,043	63.90%
96	16,768	38.10%	27,239	61.90%

Candidates: Wood (Dem), Street (Rep)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-AUD-20G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Auditor

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
97	13,988	28.70%	34,749	71.30%
98	23,579	48.55%	24,985	51.45%
99	26,421	84.69%	4,778	15.31%
100	25,526	65.01%	13,736	34.99%
101	28,583	69.52%	12,534	30.48%
102	31,801	73.63%	11,390	26.37%
103	25,632	56.88%	19,429	43.12%
104	28,196	57.42%	20,913	42.58%
105	24,870	47.45%	27,543	52.55%
106	33,040	75.22%	10,883	24.78%
107	35,455	83.93%	6,789	16.07%
108	14,950	34.79%	28,018	65.21%
109	19,269	41.62%	27,025	58.38%
110	15,522	36.64%	26,847	63.36%
111	12,024	28.61%	30,002	71.39%
112	29,014	80.01%	7,249	19.99%
113	17,632	34.75%	33,111	65.25%
114	29,664	56.14%	23,171	43.86%
115	24,121	47.29%	26,886	52.71%
116	42,309	80.09%	10,516	19.91%
117	21,476	41.59%	30,165	58.41%
118	19,183	39.57%	29,292	60.43%
119	21,452	45.16%	26,054	54.84%
120	13,223	27.91%	34,149	72.09%
Total:	2,727,373	50.89%	2,632,494	49.11%

Candidates: Wood (Dem), Street (Rep)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-AUD-20G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Commissioner of Agriculture

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
1	30,278	64.04%	17,002	35.96%
2	24,230	48.67%	25,552	51.33%
3	28,046	61.42%	17,615	38.58%
4	21,590	60.45%	14,127	39.55%
5	21,057	51.02%	20,215	48.98%
6	22,913	61.82%	14,152	38.18%
7	26,338	59.34%	18,044	40.66%
8	13,799	36.59%	23,917	63.41%
9	26,975	57.03%	20,327	42.97%
10	23,858	58.52%	16,911	41.48%
11	21,328	42.37%	29,015	57.63%
12	23,094	54.99%	18,905	45.01%
13	34,165	71.98%	13,300	28.02%
14	14,137	62.77%	8,385	37.23%
15	22,952	64.98%	12,367	35.02%
16	30,319	68.51%	13,936	31.49%
17	34,656	63.08%	20,286	36.92%
18	17,446	39.00%	27,290	61.00%
19	37,761	63.35%	21,847	36.65%
20	31,180	57.91%	22,663	42.09%
21	19,451	43.73%	25,029	56.27%
22	27,427	61.22%	17,377	38.78%
23	19,929	42.44%	27,025	57.56%
24	22,153	51.85%	20,570	48.15%
25	25,404	51.67%	23,764	48.33%
26	29,497	62.02%	18,067	37.98%
27	17,911	41.26%	25,494	58.74%
28	27,837	70.91%	11,419	29.09%
29	11,331	20.88%	42,938	79.12%
30	8,563	18.26%	38,321	81.74%
31	10,393	22.66%	35,467	77.34%
32	22,128	50.28%	21,880	49.72%
33	14,432	32.72%	29,681	67.28%
34	15,667	38.03%	25,527	61.97%
35	30,736	59.67%	20,772	40.33%
36	26,580	52.76%	23,795	47.24%
37	31,247	59.97%	20,857	40.03%
38	8,750	21.94%	31,133	78.06%
39	18,996	42.55%	25,646	57.45%
40	25,478	46.89%	28,862	53.11%
41	16,793	38.42%	26,911	61.58%
42	6,641	24.62%	20,334	75.38%
43	24,855	57.67%	18,244	42.33%
44	14,566	39.56%	22,255	60.44%
45	15,664	42.18%	21,475	57.82%
46	24,775	63.90%	13,996	36.10%
47	17,106	53.77%	14,709	46.23%
48	16,761	47.54%	18,498	52.46%

Candidates: Troxler (Rep), Wadsworth (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-COA-20G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Commissioner of Agriculture

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
49	23,026	44.74%	28,440	55.26%
50	23,957	47.59%	26,387	52.41%
51	24,815	64.41%	13,711	35.59%
52	25,163	59.88%	16,857	40.12%
53	28,709	67.98%	13,520	32.02%
54	26,368	51.45%	24,878	48.55%
55	23,324	60.32%	15,343	39.68%
56	8,123	18.25%	36,387	81.75%
57	18,741	38.58%	29,836	61.42%
58	10,547	25.49%	30,828	74.51%
59	32,573	60.96%	20,860	39.04%
60	15,469	38.79%	24,405	61.21%
61	12,012	28.17%	30,636	71.83%
62	31,465	59.60%	21,326	40.40%
63	24,417	57.52%	18,033	42.48%
64	24,793	58.33%	17,710	41.67%
65	32,616	69.49%	14,323	30.51%
66	20,053	41.49%	28,279	58.51%
67	34,043	74.51%	11,647	25.49%
68	31,828	63.22%	18,517	36.78%
69	31,777	65.35%	16,852	34.65%
70	33,966	78.53%	9,288	21.47%
71	14,541	34.18%	28,004	65.82%
72	11,514	28.71%	28,586	71.29%
73	24,924	56.53%	19,168	43.47%
74	30,252	60.45%	19,790	39.55%
75	26,772	60.15%	17,739	39.85%
76	27,716	64.36%	15,345	35.64%
77	40,057	79.28%	10,467	20.72%
78	38,320	77.55%	11,095	22.45%
79	31,615	63.54%	18,143	36.46%
80	33,699	77.72%	9,663	22.28%
81	33,346	75.21%	10,991	24.79%
82	27,914	58.23%	20,020	41.77%
83	30,578	68.47%	14,081	31.53%
84	29,903	68.45%	13,786	31.55%
85	36,517	74.76%	12,328	25.24%
86	30,950	70.83%	12,744	29.17%
87	33,620	75.46%	10,933	24.54%
88	12,490	33.20%	25,134	66.80%
89	35,615	76.12%	11,175	23.88%
90	32,076	78.70%	8,682	21.30%
91	29,845	67.57%	14,323	32.43%
92	12,750	31.04%	28,324	68.96%
93	29,898	60.50%	19,521	39.50%
94	35,825	78.93%	9,566	21.07%
95	31,190	66.30%	15,854	33.70%
96	28,731	65.13%	15,383	34.87%

Candidates: Troxler (Rep), Wadsworth (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-COA-20G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Commissioner of Agriculture

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
97	36,248	74.16%	12,633	25.84%
98	26,282	54.00%	22,392	46.00%
99	5,029	16.09%	26,221	83.91%
100	14,657	37.28%	24,661	62.72%
101	13,246	32.14%	27,962	67.86%
102	12,695	29.31%	30,621	70.69%
103	20,634	45.80%	24,419	54.20%
104	23,590	47.91%	25,646	52.09%
105	29,613	56.37%	22,917	43.63%
106	11,698	26.59%	32,292	73.41%
107	6,944	16.43%	35,328	83.57%
108	28,973	66.82%	14,388	33.18%
109	28,350	60.79%	18,288	39.21%
110	28,196	65.95%	14,557	34.05%
111	31,114	73.73%	11,085	26.27%
112	7,659	21.10%	28,646	78.90%
113	34,472	67.73%	16,424	32.27%
114	25,168	47.41%	27,914	52.59%
115	28,776	56.10%	22,515	43.90%
116	11,835	22.34%	41,136	77.66%
117	32,081	61.89%	19,758	38.11%
118	31,917	65.36%	16,915	34.64%
119	27,955	58.56%	19,779	41.44%
120	35,232	74.22%	12,236	25.78%
Total:	2,898,000	53.85%	2,483,543	46.15%

Candidates: Troxler (Rep), Wadsworth (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-COA-20G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Commissioner of Insurance

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
1	29,017	61.52%	18,153	38.48%
2	22,106	44.77%	27,276	55.23%
3	27,402	60.34%	18,008	39.66%
4	20,762	58.46%	14,752	41.54%
5	20,132	48.92%	21,018	51.08%
6	21,928	59.56%	14,890	40.44%
7	24,303	54.97%	19,911	45.03%
8	13,234	35.15%	24,414	64.85%
9	25,906	54.83%	21,345	45.17%
10	22,799	56.24%	17,743	43.76%
11	18,427	36.93%	31,475	63.07%
12	22,264	53.29%	19,518	46.71%
13	32,992	70.03%	14,117	29.97%
14	14,165	62.97%	8,329	37.03%
15	22,808	64.68%	12,455	35.32%
16	30,219	68.38%	13,974	31.62%
17	34,626	63.10%	20,245	36.90%
18	17,357	39.07%	27,074	60.93%
19	37,484	63.12%	21,901	36.88%
20	30,931	57.74%	22,642	42.26%
21	17,792	40.36%	26,287	59.64%
22	26,245	58.77%	18,412	41.23%
23	18,639	39.77%	28,228	60.23%
24	20,941	49.30%	21,536	50.70%
25	23,976	49.07%	24,887	50.93%
26	27,454	58.33%	19,612	41.67%
27	16,861	38.96%	26,412	61.04%
28	26,037	66.98%	12,835	33.02%
29	9,929	18.31%	44,285	81.69%
30	7,586	16.20%	39,227	83.80%
31	9,448	20.58%	36,450	79.42%
32	20,566	46.84%	23,343	53.16%
33	12,349	28.15%	31,514	71.85%
34	12,954	31.76%	27,838	68.24%
35	28,489	55.79%	22,579	44.21%
36	24,381	48.84%	25,537	51.16%
37	28,629	55.37%	23,073	44.63%
38	7,230	18.22%	32,442	81.78%
39	16,955	38.25%	27,369	61.75%
40	21,878	40.66%	31,934	59.34%
41	15,424	35.52%	28,004	64.48%
42	6,371	23.70%	20,513	76.30%
43	23,866	55.70%	18,980	44.30%
44	13,871	37.88%	22,746	62.12%
45	15,154	40.99%	21,820	59.01%
46	24,183	62.54%	14,483	37.46%
47	16,283	50.98%	15,654	49.02%
48	15,896	45.09%	19,361	54.91%

Candidates: Causey (Rep), Goodwin (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-COI-20G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Commissioner of Insurance

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
49	19,486	38.20%	31,526	61.80%
50	21,823	43.59%	28,245	56.41%
51	23,065	60.49%	15,068	39.51%
52	22,281	52.91%	19,829	47.09%
53	26,811	64.05%	15,049	35.95%
54	24,428	48.10%	26,355	51.90%
55	22,612	58.58%	15,985	41.42%
56	7,199	16.17%	37,320	83.83%
57	16,679	34.57%	31,563	65.43%
58	9,520	23.08%	31,721	76.92%
59	30,247	57.13%	22,696	42.87%
60	14,623	36.87%	25,043	63.13%
61	10,481	24.71%	31,930	75.29%
62	29,525	56.36%	22,858	43.64%
63	22,905	54.30%	19,278	45.70%
64	23,483	55.60%	18,754	44.40%
65	30,495	65.38%	16,149	34.62%
66	18,279	38.04%	29,770	61.96%
67	32,446	71.44%	12,972	28.56%
68	32,056	63.86%	18,138	36.14%
69	31,551	65.03%	16,969	34.97%
70	33,184	77.15%	9,828	22.85%
71	13,490	31.82%	28,907	68.18%
72	10,622	26.58%	29,341	73.42%
73	24,102	54.95%	19,760	45.05%
74	28,864	57.98%	20,916	42.02%
75	25,674	57.94%	18,637	42.06%
76	26,939	62.61%	16,089	37.39%
77	38,552	76.78%	11,660	23.22%
78	36,851	75.25%	12,119	24.75%
79	30,491	61.53%	19,060	38.47%
80	32,716	75.86%	10,412	24.14%
81	32,012	72.56%	12,103	27.44%
82	27,178	57.00%	20,503	43.00%
83	29,946	67.16%	14,642	32.84%
84	28,994	66.74%	14,447	33.26%
85	35,368	72.95%	13,114	27.05%
86	30,299	69.71%	13,166	30.29%
87	32,866	73.88%	11,617	26.12%
88	12,573	33.59%	24,863	66.41%
89	35,010	75.17%	11,564	24.83%
90	30,819	76.20%	9,626	23.80%
91	28,692	65.16%	15,342	34.84%
92	12,811	31.27%	28,158	68.73%
93	28,429	58.06%	20,532	41.94%
94	34,576	76.67%	10,523	23.33%
95	31,056	66.43%	15,691	33.57%
96	28,312	64.42%	15,636	35.58%

Candidates: Causey (Rep), Goodwin (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-COI-20G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Commissioner of Insurance

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
97	35,833	73.72%	12,772	26.28%
98	26,408	54.55%	22,007	45.45%
99	5,006	16.06%	26,163	83.94%
100	14,611	37.22%	24,644	62.78%
101	13,217	32.15%	27,890	67.85%
102	12,936	30.04%	30,133	69.96%
103	20,741	46.19%	24,166	53.81%
104	23,629	48.25%	25,348	51.75%
105	29,585	56.53%	22,749	43.47%
106	11,579	26.39%	32,293	73.61%
107	7,220	17.12%	34,958	82.88%
108	28,897	66.93%	14,277	33.07%
109	28,038	60.36%	18,410	39.64%
110	27,594	64.86%	14,950	35.14%
111	30,505	72.63%	11,495	27.37%
112	7,562	20.87%	28,664	79.13%
113	33,741	66.65%	16,880	33.35%
114	24,154	45.80%	28,583	54.20%
115	27,683	54.35%	23,252	45.65%
116	11,205	21.26%	41,493	78.74%
117	31,108	60.41%	20,388	39.59%
118	30,217	62.41%	18,200	37.59%
119	26,971	56.90%	20,430	43.10%
120	34,818	73.62%	12,479	26.38%
Total:	2,771,928	51.77%	2,582,699	48.23%

Candidates: Causey (Rep), Goodwin (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-COI-20G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Commissioner of Labor

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
1	29,276	62.15%	17,832	37.85%
2	21,744	44.04%	27,634	55.96%
3	26,789	58.85%	18,730	41.15%
4	20,507	57.62%	15,081	42.38%
5	20,059	48.75%	21,087	51.25%
6	21,739	58.87%	15,188	41.13%
7	24,194	54.79%	19,963	45.21%
8	12,806	33.96%	24,905	66.04%
9	25,283	53.42%	22,044	46.58%
10	22,618	55.70%	17,987	44.30%
11	17,659	35.40%	32,230	64.60%
12	21,914	52.31%	19,981	47.69%
13	32,443	69.00%	14,579	31.00%
14	13,642	60.81%	8,791	39.19%
15	22,023	62.61%	13,152	37.39%
16	29,164	66.09%	14,964	33.91%
17	33,541	60.90%	21,533	39.10%
18	16,538	36.99%	28,166	63.01%
19	36,422	61.15%	23,143	38.85%
20	29,715	55.34%	23,980	44.66%
21	17,037	38.65%	27,039	61.35%
22	26,008	58.29%	18,610	41.71%
23	18,672	39.84%	28,196	60.16%
24	20,799	48.89%	21,745	51.11%
25	23,871	48.79%	25,056	51.21%
26	27,072	57.45%	20,053	42.55%
27	16,884	39.00%	26,411	61.00%
28	25,860	66.60%	12,970	33.40%
29	9,167	16.88%	45,127	83.12%
30	7,105	15.14%	39,823	84.86%
31	8,975	19.52%	37,004	80.48%
32	20,427	46.56%	23,442	53.44%
33	11,975	27.33%	31,848	72.67%
34	12,255	30.06%	28,507	69.94%
35	27,888	54.64%	23,148	45.36%
36	23,555	47.17%	26,379	52.83%
37	28,104	54.45%	23,507	45.55%
38	6,851	17.25%	32,858	82.75%
39	16,488	37.22%	27,809	62.78%
40	21,097	39.28%	32,613	60.72%
41	14,612	33.67%	28,780	66.33%
42	6,234	23.08%	20,781	76.92%
43	23,719	55.19%	19,257	44.81%
44	13,747	37.37%	23,035	62.63%
45	14,959	40.27%	22,186	59.73%
46	23,803	61.65%	14,808	38.35%
47	16,036	50.37%	15,802	49.63%
48	15,833	44.90%	19,428	55.10%

Candidates: Dobson (Rep), Holmes (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-COL-20G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Commissioner of Labor

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
49	18,761	36.88%	32,114	63.12%
50	21,492	42.91%	28,596	57.09%
51	22,894	60.07%	15,221	39.93%
52	23,813	56.95%	18,002	43.05%
53	26,566	63.40%	15,338	36.60%
54	24,003	47.05%	27,009	52.95%
55	22,718	58.83%	15,897	41.17%
56	6,635	14.89%	37,932	85.11%
57	15,990	33.20%	32,169	66.80%
58	9,094	22.06%	32,139	77.94%
59	29,504	55.91%	23,269	44.09%
60	14,171	35.71%	25,513	64.29%
61	9,934	23.47%	32,391	76.53%
62	28,766	55.07%	23,466	44.93%
63	22,604	53.57%	19,595	46.43%
64	23,095	54.68%	19,143	45.32%
65	30,328	65.17%	16,206	34.83%
66	17,789	37.05%	30,229	62.95%
67	32,803	72.24%	12,606	27.76%
68	31,366	62.41%	18,891	37.59%
69	31,005	63.88%	17,531	36.12%
70	32,525	75.87%	10,343	24.13%
71	13,095	30.92%	29,258	69.08%
72	10,334	25.87%	29,606	74.13%
73	23,727	54.14%	20,097	45.86%
74	28,212	56.78%	21,474	43.22%
75	25,274	57.12%	18,972	42.88%
76	26,439	61.54%	16,524	38.46%
77	38,257	76.14%	11,991	23.86%
78	36,487	74.53%	12,468	25.47%
79	29,984	60.41%	19,652	39.59%
80	32,367	74.96%	10,814	25.04%
81	31,749	71.95%	12,377	28.05%
82	26,754	56.13%	20,912	43.87%
83	29,579	66.38%	14,980	33.62%
84	28,846	66.22%	14,712	33.78%
85	36,205	73.95%	12,756	26.05%
86	30,191	69.09%	13,504	30.91%
87	32,625	73.27%	11,900	26.73%
88	11,707	31.23%	25,785	68.77%
89	34,796	74.56%	11,873	25.44%
90	30,644	75.65%	9,862	24.35%
91	28,416	64.58%	15,585	35.42%
92	12,324	29.99%	28,768	70.01%
93	28,279	57.62%	20,798	42.38%
94	34,466	76.40%	10,646	23.60%
95	30,553	65.10%	16,380	34.90%
96	27,868	63.29%	16,163	36.71%

Candidates: Dobson (Rep), Holmes (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-COL-20G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Commissioner of Labor

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
97	35,586	73.04%	13,133	26.96%
98	25,507	52.59%	22,994	47.41%
99	4,728	15.14%	26,493	84.86%
100	13,956	35.55%	25,302	64.45%
101	12,684	30.84%	28,451	69.16%
102	11,841	27.43%	31,334	72.57%
103	19,850	44.13%	25,130	55.87%
104	22,059	45.03%	26,924	54.97%
105	28,387	54.24%	23,952	45.76%
106	11,016	25.07%	32,925	74.93%
107	6,742	15.96%	35,509	84.04%
108	28,425	65.82%	14,760	34.18%
109	27,590	59.41%	18,851	40.59%
110	27,418	64.43%	15,134	35.57%
111	30,405	72.28%	11,660	27.72%
112	7,235	19.94%	29,049	80.06%
113	33,691	66.33%	17,105	33.67%
114	23,745	44.95%	29,076	55.05%
115	27,449	53.86%	23,515	46.14%
116	10,896	20.63%	41,921	79.37%
117	30,668	59.39%	20,972	40.61%
118	29,870	61.68%	18,554	38.32%
119	26,681	56.14%	20,844	43.86%
120	34,534	72.95%	12,808	27.05%
Total:	2,723,106	50.82%	2,635,045	49.18%

Candidates: Dobson (Rep), Holmes (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-COL-20G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Secretary of State

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
1	18,668	39.48%	28,619	60.52%
2	29,010	58.48%	20,595	41.52%
3	19,493	42.76%	26,095	57.24%
4	15,959	44.78%	19,678	55.22%
5	21,675	52.47%	19,631	47.53%
6	16,438	44.36%	20,614	55.64%
7	21,540	48.56%	22,814	51.44%
8	25,458	67.42%	12,302	32.58%
9	23,188	48.90%	24,236	51.10%
10	19,184	47.10%	21,544	52.90%
11	33,781	67.12%	16,550	32.88%
12	21,082	50.27%	20,859	49.73%
13	15,609	33.09%	31,566	66.91%
14	8,896	39.38%	13,693	60.62%
15	13,560	38.27%	21,877	61.73%
16	15,338	34.57%	29,028	65.43%
17	22,122	39.96%	33,243	60.04%
18	28,889	64.30%	16,036	35.70%
19	24,342	40.59%	35,630	59.41%
20	25,228	46.69%	28,809	53.31%
21	28,005	63.01%	16,442	36.99%
22	20,046	44.77%	24,733	55.23%
23	29,408	62.65%	17,532	37.35%
24	23,231	54.42%	19,458	45.58%
25	26,740	54.49%	22,331	45.51%
26	21,504	45.49%	25,766	54.51%
27	27,367	63.02%	16,059	36.98%
28	15,154	38.82%	23,887	61.18%
29	45,982	84.31%	8,559	15.69%
30	40,505	86.04%	6,573	13.96%
31	37,442	81.27%	8,628	18.73%
32	24,979	56.69%	19,080	43.31%
33	32,921	74.66%	11,172	25.34%
34	30,025	72.94%	11,141	27.06%
35	24,841	48.24%	26,658	51.76%
36	27,749	55.18%	22,539	44.82%
37	25,190	48.47%	26,777	51.53%
38	33,555	84.06%	6,361	15.94%
39	29,001	65.07%	15,568	34.93%
40	34,736	63.98%	19,554	36.02%
41	29,758	68.01%	13,995	31.99%
42	20,991	77.61%	6,055	22.39%
43	20,121	46.72%	22,948	53.28%
44	23,865	64.64%	13,057	35.36%
45	22,622	60.78%	14,596	39.22%
46	15,714	40.59%	22,996	59.41%
47	16,796	52.65%	15,106	47.35%
48	19,968	56.51%	15,366	43.49%

Candidates: Marshall (Dem), Sykes (Rep)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-SOS-20G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Secretary of State

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
49	34,535	67.13%	16,909	32.87%
50	29,789	59.22%	20,516	40.78%
51	16,904	44.02%	21,495	55.98%
52	19,192	45.66%	22,840	54.34%
53	17,284	41.09%	24,775	58.91%
54	28,237	55.20%	22,914	44.80%
55	16,585	42.79%	22,170	57.21%
56	38,571	86.17%	6,188	13.83%
57	33,313	68.86%	15,068	31.14%
58	32,529	78.75%	8,778	21.25%
59	24,570	46.40%	28,378	53.60%
60	26,214	65.89%	13,570	34.11%
61	33,335	78.33%	9,222	21.67%
62	24,758	47.15%	27,755	52.85%
63	20,722	48.93%	21,631	51.07%
64	20,018	47.23%	22,369	52.77%
65	17,342	37.14%	29,355	62.86%
66	31,453	64.99%	16,942	35.01%
67	13,906	30.59%	31,546	69.41%
68	19,641	38.76%	31,029	61.24%
69	18,193	37.18%	30,740	62.82%
70	11,133	25.85%	31,936	74.15%
71	29,837	70.28%	12,617	29.72%
72	30,446	75.99%	9,618	24.01%
73	21,096	47.84%	23,001	52.16%
74	22,734	45.54%	27,186	54.46%
75	19,761	44.53%	24,617	55.47%
76	17,658	40.96%	25,456	59.04%
77	13,265	26.34%	37,097	73.66%
78	13,516	27.46%	35,705	72.54%
79	20,751	41.61%	29,117	58.39%
80	11,636	26.90%	31,619	73.10%
81	13,416	30.31%	30,849	69.69%
82	21,755	45.37%	26,192	54.63%
83	15,747	35.25%	28,923	64.75%
84	15,485	35.54%	28,091	64.46%
85	14,219	29.18%	34,504	70.82%
86	14,649	33.49%	29,090	66.51%
87	12,889	28.89%	31,732	71.11%
88	26,473	70.19%	11,244	29.81%
89	12,708	27.19%	34,038	72.81%
90	10,856	26.72%	29,766	73.28%
91	16,397	37.17%	27,719	62.83%
92	29,162	70.77%	12,047	29.23%
93	22,259	45.16%	27,025	54.84%
94	11,796	26.08%	33,430	73.92%
95	17,050	36.22%	30,018	63.78%
96	17,092	38.72%	27,045	61.28%

Candidates: Marshall (Dem), Sykes (Rep)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-SOS-20G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Secretary of State

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
97	14,388	29.45%	34,460	70.55%
98	23,867	48.83%	25,006	51.17%
99	26,603	85.08%	4,665	14.92%
100	25,843	65.49%	13,620	34.51%
101	28,894	69.98%	12,394	30.02%
102	32,162	74.13%	11,222	25.87%
103	25,769	56.99%	19,449	43.01%
104	28,631	57.88%	20,831	42.12%
105	25,090	47.66%	27,557	52.34%
106	33,341	75.63%	10,742	24.37%
107	35,701	84.35%	6,626	15.65%
108	15,266	35.34%	27,928	64.66%
109	19,772	42.47%	26,779	57.53%
110	15,937	37.43%	26,641	62.57%
111	12,380	29.40%	29,735	70.60%
112	29,328	80.64%	7,041	19.36%
113	17,962	35.31%	32,911	64.69%
114	29,812	56.25%	23,190	43.75%
115	24,273	47.50%	26,825	52.50%
116	42,475	80.21%	10,481	19.79%
117	21,813	42.07%	30,037	57.93%
118	19,607	40.36%	28,977	59.64%
119	21,805	45.67%	25,935	54.33%
120	13,491	28.39%	34,035	71.61%
Total:	2,752,763	51.17%	2,627,315	48.83%

Candidates: Marshall (Dem), Sykes (Rep)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-SOS-20G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Superintendent of Public Instruction

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
1	29,463	62.62%	17,591	37.38%
2	22,031	44.71%	27,241	55.29%
3	27,058	59.57%	18,364	40.43%
4	20,698	58.40%	14,746	41.60%
5	20,383	49.59%	20,718	50.41%
6	22,000	59.71%	14,844	40.29%
7	24,485	55.52%	19,617	44.48%
8	13,064	34.67%	24,616	65.33%
9	25,591	54.12%	21,699	45.88%
10	22,876	56.44%	17,652	43.56%
11	17,974	36.11%	31,798	63.89%
12	22,323	53.39%	19,490	46.61%
13	32,737	69.73%	14,209	30.27%
14	14,063	62.61%	8,400	37.39%
15	22,688	64.40%	12,541	35.60%
16	29,789	67.44%	14,384	32.56%
17	34,223	62.51%	20,528	37.49%
18	16,976	38.10%	27,578	61.90%
19	36,885	62.13%	22,487	37.87%
20	30,149	56.28%	23,424	43.72%
21	17,354	39.39%	26,701	60.61%
22	26,216	58.94%	18,260	41.06%
23	18,785	40.21%	27,934	59.79%
24	20,745	48.81%	21,755	51.19%
25	23,730	48.57%	25,132	51.43%
26	27,440	58.33%	19,599	41.67%
27	16,992	39.32%	26,228	60.68%
28	26,047	67.25%	12,687	32.75%
29	9,524	17.52%	44,833	82.48%
30	7,352	15.68%	39,549	84.32%
31	9,306	20.27%	36,608	79.73%
32	20,715	47.26%	23,120	52.74%
33	12,283	28.14%	31,362	71.86%
34	12,264	30.12%	28,448	69.88%
35	28,017	55.06%	22,869	44.94%
36	23,708	47.51%	26,189	52.49%
37	28,151	54.65%	23,359	45.35%
38	7,048	17.86%	32,425	82.14%
39	16,821	38.14%	27,280	61.86%
40	21,163	39.40%	32,557	60.60%
41	14,921	34.45%	28,385	65.55%
42	6,624	24.60%	20,305	75.40%
43	24,112	56.25%	18,757	43.75%
44	14,149	38.55%	22,555	61.45%
45	15,429	41.64%	21,628	58.36%
46	24,175	62.67%	14,400	37.33%
47	16,459	51.79%	15,324	48.21%
48	16,153	46.02%	18,946	53.98%

Candidates: Truitt (Rep), Mangrum (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-SPI-20G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Superintendent of Public Instruction

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
49	18,659	36.77%	32,088	63.23%
50	21,568	43.08%	28,500	56.92%
51	22,934	60.15%	15,196	39.85%
52	24,048	57.62%	17,686	42.38%
53	26,804	64.07%	15,031	35.93%
54	24,113	47.39%	26,767	52.61%
55	22,796	59.17%	15,732	40.83%
56	6,801	15.24%	37,827	84.76%
57	16,039	33.27%	32,165	66.73%
58	9,404	22.83%	31,789	77.17%
59	29,548	55.97%	23,249	44.03%
60	14,452	36.42%	25,227	63.58%
61	9,864	23.26%	32,535	76.74%
62	28,797	55.00%	23,560	45.00%
63	22,651	53.69%	19,540	46.31%
64	23,308	55.19%	18,925	44.81%
65	30,022	64.36%	16,623	35.64%
66	17,933	37.41%	30,008	62.59%
67	32,647	72.14%	12,605	27.86%
68	31,616	62.71%	18,802	37.29%
69	31,310	64.39%	17,315	35.61%
70	32,668	76.19%	10,210	23.81%
71	13,388	31.61%	28,961	68.39%
72	10,430	26.10%	29,532	73.90%
73	23,947	54.55%	19,949	45.45%
74	28,258	56.71%	21,572	43.29%
75	25,447	57.46%	18,840	42.54%
76	26,684	62.26%	16,174	37.74%
77	38,187	76.03%	12,036	23.97%
78	36,545	74.78%	12,322	25.22%
79	30,445	61.45%	19,099	38.55%
80	32,645	75.61%	10,531	24.39%
81	31,961	72.36%	12,209	27.64%
82	27,084	56.63%	20,740	43.37%
83	29,816	66.91%	14,746	33.09%
84	29,014	66.83%	14,403	33.17%
85	35,336	72.93%	13,116	27.07%
86	30,350	69.56%	13,279	30.44%
87	32,770	73.72%	11,684	26.28%
88	12,044	32.15%	25,422	67.85%
89	34,992	75.05%	11,632	24.95%
90	30,729	76.01%	9,701	23.99%
91	28,572	64.96%	15,413	35.04%
92	12,704	30.98%	28,308	69.02%
93	28,128	57.43%	20,853	42.57%
94	34,519	76.67%	10,503	23.33%
95	30,797	65.65%	16,113	34.35%
96	28,140	63.88%	15,910	36.12%

Candidates: Truitt (Rep), Mangrum (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-SPI-20G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Superintendent of Public Instruction

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
97	35,743	73.58%	12,834	26.42%
98	25,834	53.16%	22,761	46.84%
99	5,010	16.07%	26,157	83.93%
100	14,321	36.49%	24,922	63.51%
101	13,087	31.83%	28,023	68.17%
102	11,983	27.77%	31,169	72.23%
103	20,380	45.26%	24,645	54.74%
104	22,439	45.66%	26,704	54.34%
105	28,887	55.06%	23,576	44.94%
106	11,442	26.05%	32,479	73.95%
107	7,078	16.78%	35,110	83.22%
108	28,713	66.72%	14,322	33.28%
109	27,776	59.91%	18,586	40.09%
110	27,492	64.80%	14,936	35.20%
111	30,501	72.58%	11,524	27.42%
112	7,606	20.99%	28,630	79.01%
113	33,721	66.49%	16,992	33.51%
114	24,012	45.50%	28,763	54.50%
115	27,644	54.33%	23,237	45.67%
116	11,073	20.99%	41,671	79.01%
117	30,970	59.99%	20,654	40.01%
118	30,067	62.13%	18,323	37.87%
119	26,967	56.75%	20,556	43.25%
120	34,845	73.61%	12,493	26.39%
Total:	2,749,644	51.37%	2,602,617	48.63%

Candidates: Truitt (Rep), Mangrum (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-SPI-20G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Treasurer

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
1	29,827	63.56%	17,104	36.44%
2	22,491	45.79%	26,630	54.21%
3	27,242	60.27%	17,960	39.73%
4	20,800	58.89%	14,520	41.11%
5	20,833	50.85%	20,136	49.15%
6	22,238	60.48%	14,530	39.52%
7	24,824	56.39%	19,195	43.61%
8	13,766	36.67%	23,772	63.33%
9	25,805	54.76%	21,320	45.24%
10	23,034	57.05%	17,343	42.95%
11	19,170	38.37%	30,787	61.63%
12	22,520	53.96%	19,211	46.04%
13	32,714	69.84%	14,126	30.16%
14	14,030	62.59%	8,386	37.41%
15	22,600	64.43%	12,479	35.57%
16	29,792	67.67%	14,235	32.33%
17	34,070	62.36%	20,561	37.64%
18	17,996	40.55%	26,381	59.45%
19	37,065	62.64%	22,105	37.36%
20	30,821	57.75%	22,550	42.25%
21	18,154	41.09%	26,032	58.91%
22	26,117	58.88%	18,241	41.12%
23	19,309	41.40%	27,336	58.60%
24	21,389	50.47%	20,992	49.53%
25	24,536	50.34%	24,204	49.66%
26	27,612	59.02%	19,174	40.98%
27	17,456	40.48%	25,668	59.52%
28	25,952	67.32%	12,600	32.68%
29	10,721	19.78%	43,489	80.22%
30	8,217	17.56%	38,587	82.44%
31	10,461	22.86%	35,310	77.14%
32	21,243	48.57%	22,493	51.43%
33	13,320	30.38%	30,527	69.62%
34	13,718	33.58%	27,134	66.42%
35	28,963	56.69%	22,131	43.31%
36	24,880	49.79%	25,093	50.21%
37	29,222	56.54%	22,460	43.46%
38	8,024	20.20%	31,691	79.80%
39	17,760	40.09%	26,544	59.91%
40	22,748	42.17%	31,196	57.83%
41	15,724	36.13%	27,794	63.87%
42	7,228	26.88%	19,660	73.12%
43	24,283	56.76%	18,498	43.24%
44	14,676	40.09%	21,932	59.91%
45	15,976	43.23%	20,981	56.77%
46	23,968	62.36%	14,469	37.64%
47	16,541	52.36%	15,052	47.64%
48	16,560	47.21%	18,519	52.79%

Candidates: Folwell (Rep), Chatterji (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-TRS-20G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Treasurer

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
49	20,223	39.63%	30,806	60.37%
50	22,123	44.31%	27,801	55.69%
51	23,415	61.62%	14,586	38.38%
52	24,572	59.03%	17,051	40.97%
53	26,863	64.48%	14,798	35.52%
54	24,624	48.51%	26,138	51.49%
55	23,093	60.06%	15,360	39.94%
56	7,872	17.69%	36,621	82.31%
57	16,723	34.71%	31,462	65.29%
58	10,105	24.52%	31,102	75.48%
59	29,596	56.07%	23,188	43.93%
60	14,784	37.26%	24,895	62.74%
61	10,947	25.84%	31,422	74.16%
62	29,041	55.49%	23,292	44.51%
63	22,761	53.92%	19,449	46.08%
64	23,401	55.40%	18,837	44.60%
65	30,302	65.18%	16,191	34.82%
66	19,079	39.71%	28,963	60.29%
67	32,736	72.48%	12,427	27.52%
68	31,980	63.81%	18,140	36.19%
69	31,672	65.43%	16,736	34.57%
70	32,229	75.08%	10,699	24.92%
71	14,631	34.49%	27,788	65.51%
72	11,975	29.86%	28,123	70.14%
73	24,791	56.73%	18,912	43.27%
74	29,241	58.53%	20,714	41.47%
75	25,790	58.20%	18,519	41.80%
76	26,817	62.78%	15,902	37.22%
77	38,103	75.86%	12,128	24.14%
78	36,311	74.23%	12,606	25.77%
79	30,772	62.24%	18,671	37.76%
80	31,946	73.97%	11,241	26.03%
81	31,513	71.30%	12,687	28.70%
82	27,659	58.12%	19,930	41.88%
83	29,939	67.49%	14,423	32.51%
84	29,224	67.46%	14,095	32.54%
85	35,110	72.75%	13,150	27.25%
86	30,299	69.77%	13,127	30.23%
87	32,945	74.33%	11,376	25.67%
88	13,214	35.29%	24,231	64.71%
89	35,124	75.44%	11,432	24.56%
90	30,525	75.43%	9,944	24.57%
91	28,635	65.02%	15,403	34.98%
92	13,563	33.15%	27,355	66.85%
93	28,743	58.89%	20,066	41.11%
94	34,157	75.90%	10,845	24.10%
95	31,222	66.91%	15,439	33.09%
96	28,589	65.06%	15,356	34.94%

Candidates: Folwell (Rep), Chatterji (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-TRS-20G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Treasurer

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
97	35,799	73.96%	12,602	26.04%
98	26,811	55.42%	21,563	44.58%
99	5,888	18.92%	25,232	81.08%
100	15,355	39.20%	23,812	60.80%
101	14,061	34.27%	26,966	65.73%
102	13,483	31.29%	29,612	68.71%
103	21,167	47.13%	23,745	52.87%
104	23,782	48.62%	25,137	51.38%
105	29,904	57.21%	22,370	42.79%
106	12,472	28.46%	31,345	71.54%
107	8,217	19.48%	33,972	80.52%
108	28,771	66.95%	14,206	33.05%
109	28,170	60.93%	18,066	39.07%
110	27,548	65.09%	14,778	34.91%
111	30,425	72.60%	11,483	27.40%
112	8,534	23.61%	27,618	76.39%
113	33,864	66.99%	16,689	33.01%
114	24,867	47.27%	27,741	52.73%
115	28,246	55.62%	22,536	44.38%
116	12,311	23.41%	40,267	76.59%
117	31,568	61.26%	19,967	38.74%
118	30,445	63.07%	17,828	36.93%
119	27,499	57.99%	19,918	42.01%
120	34,641	73.39%	12,563	26.61%
Total:	2,809,203	52.57%	2,534,581	47.43%

Candidates: Folwell (Rep), Chatterji (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-TRS-20G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Supreme Court Chief Justice

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
1	29,202	61.68%	18,144	38.32%
2	21,563	43.50%	28,004	56.50%
3	26,687	58.48%	18,945	41.52%
4	20,307	57.11%	15,250	42.89%
5	20,224	49.05%	21,007	50.95%
6	21,504	58.18%	15,460	41.82%
7	23,880	53.89%	20,434	46.11%
8	12,867	34.01%	24,971	65.99%
9	25,198	53.16%	22,206	46.84%
10	22,407	55.06%	18,289	44.94%
11	17,766	35.32%	32,535	64.68%
12	21,994	52.38%	19,996	47.62%
13	32,478	68.60%	14,869	31.40%
14	13,740	60.78%	8,865	39.22%
15	22,125	62.46%	13,295	37.54%
16	29,080	65.37%	15,408	34.63%
17	33,094	59.72%	22,323	40.28%
18	16,349	36.32%	28,667	63.68%
19	35,725	59.54%	24,279	40.46%
20	29,218	53.97%	24,924	46.03%
21	17,223	38.75%	27,228	61.25%
22	25,380	56.78%	19,319	43.22%
23	18,568	39.59%	28,328	60.41%
24	20,633	48.41%	21,987	51.59%
25	23,488	47.89%	25,558	52.11%
26	26,617	56.38%	20,594	43.62%
27	16,749	38.64%	26,602	61.36%
28	25,239	64.98%	13,603	35.02%
29	9,204	16.84%	45,437	83.16%
30	7,101	15.06%	40,038	84.94%
31	9,042	19.59%	37,110	80.41%
32	20,190	45.86%	23,837	54.14%
33	12,047	27.31%	32,070	72.69%
34	12,293	29.85%	28,891	70.15%
35	27,844	54.09%	23,632	45.91%
36	23,547	46.77%	26,800	53.23%
37	27,895	53.65%	24,101	46.35%
38	6,801	17.04%	33,118	82.96%
39	16,434	36.91%	28,096	63.09%
40	21,249	39.12%	33,068	60.88%
41	14,852	33.94%	28,913	66.06%
42	6,190	22.85%	20,905	77.15%
43	23,056	53.47%	20,063	46.53%
44	13,286	35.90%	23,719	64.10%
45	14,724	39.55%	22,507	60.45%
46	23,264	60.11%	15,438	39.89%
47	15,047	47.00%	16,970	53.00%
48	15,578	44.14%	19,717	55.86%

Candidates: Newby (Rep), Beasley (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-SCCJ-20G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Supreme Court Chief Justice

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
49	18,675	36.30%	32,765	63.70%
50	21,168	42.04%	29,183	57.96%
51	22,532	58.87%	15,742	41.13%
52	23,381	55.64%	18,644	44.36%
53	26,146	62.37%	15,773	37.63%
54	23,704	46.31%	27,486	53.69%
55	22,325	57.77%	16,322	42.23%
56	6,564	14.63%	38,298	85.37%
57	15,763	32.47%	32,777	67.53%
58	9,134	22.05%	32,281	77.95%
59	28,986	54.62%	24,085	45.38%
60	14,091	35.29%	25,833	64.71%
61	9,823	23.01%	32,871	76.99%
62	28,440	53.97%	24,258	46.03%
63	22,058	52.05%	20,323	47.95%
64	22,777	53.70%	19,639	46.30%
65	29,778	63.66%	16,996	36.34%
66	17,766	36.73%	30,606	63.27%
67	32,094	70.57%	13,385	29.43%
68	31,170	61.54%	19,481	38.46%
69	30,911	63.28%	17,939	36.72%
70	32,141	74.36%	11,085	25.64%
71	12,953	30.34%	29,735	69.66%
72	10,226	25.34%	30,136	74.66%
73	23,568	53.40%	20,565	46.60%
74	27,876	55.61%	22,250	44.39%
75	24,889	55.88%	19,648	44.12%
76	25,928	60.16%	17,172	39.84%
77	37,616	74.50%	12,874	25.50%
78	36,100	73.27%	13,168	26.73%
79	29,997	60.13%	19,894	39.87%
80	31,809	73.53%	11,453	26.47%
81	31,061	70.10%	13,248	29.90%
82	26,731	55.61%	21,339	44.39%
83	29,201	65.35%	15,482	34.65%
84	28,437	65.25%	15,142	34.75%
85	34,886	71.60%	13,836	28.40%
86	29,449	67.29%	14,318	32.71%
87	32,015	71.60%	12,700	28.40%
88	11,396	30.14%	26,417	69.86%
89	34,126	72.88%	12,700	27.12%
90	30,039	73.75%	10,690	26.25%
91	27,986	63.28%	16,238	36.72%
92	12,177	29.51%	29,086	70.49%
93	27,615	55.97%	21,722	44.03%
94	33,768	74.49%	11,563	25.51%
95	30,256	64.24%	16,840	35.76%
96	27,204	61.56%	16,988	38.44%

Candidates: Newby (Rep), Beasley (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-SCCJ-20G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Supreme Court Chief Justice

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
97	34,852	71.42%	13,950	28.58%
98	25,328	51.68%	23,686	48.32%
99	4,781	15.26%	26,556	84.74%
100	13,954	35.31%	25,559	64.69%
101	12,606	30.49%	28,735	69.51%
102	11,401	26.19%	32,135	73.81%
103	19,765	43.60%	25,572	56.40%
104	21,573	43.53%	27,982	56.47%
105	28,251	53.57%	24,486	46.43%
106	11,036	25.02%	33,081	74.98%
107	6,596	15.57%	35,776	84.43%
108	28,155	64.98%	15,171	35.02%
109	27,223	58.30%	19,472	41.70%
110	26,962	63.26%	15,656	36.74%
111	30,050	71.27%	12,113	28.73%
112	7,266	19.95%	29,149	80.05%
113	33,348	65.42%	17,630	34.58%
114	23,878	44.91%	29,295	55.09%
115	27,499	53.61%	23,795	46.39%
116	11,016	20.74%	42,086	79.26%
117	30,540	58.87%	21,341	41.13%
118	29,730	61.13%	18,908	38.87%
119	26,543	55.51%	21,271	44.49%
120	34,436	72.44%	13,103	27.56%
Total:	2,692,474	50.00%	2,693,004	50.00%

Candidates: Newby (Rep), Beasley (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-SCCJ-20G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Supreme Court Associate Justice Seat 02

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
1	29,267	62.18%	17,804	37.82%
2	21,901	44.35%	27,483	55.65%
3	26,865	59.10%	18,591	40.90%
4	20,643	58.20%	14,825	41.80%
5	20,217	49.18%	20,894	50.82%
6	21,763	58.95%	15,157	41.05%
7	24,353	54.99%	19,930	45.01%
8	12,861	34.24%	24,701	65.76%
9	25,431	53.88%	21,765	46.12%
10	22,740	56.01%	17,858	43.99%
11	17,455	34.80%	32,708	65.20%
12	22,038	52.82%	19,688	47.18%
13	32,585	69.02%	14,629	30.98%
14	13,934	61.68%	8,656	38.32%
15	22,398	63.37%	12,945	36.63%
16	29,610	66.64%	14,821	33.36%
17	33,853	61.26%	21,407	38.74%
18	16,561	36.96%	28,244	63.04%
19	36,505	61.07%	23,267	38.93%
20	29,761	55.18%	24,169	44.82%
21	16,945	38.24%	27,365	61.76%
22	26,009	58.59%	18,381	41.41%
23	18,800	40.28%	27,876	59.72%
24	20,832	48.98%	21,696	51.02%
25	23,846	48.73%	25,089	51.27%
26	26,976	57.29%	20,110	42.71%
27	16,958	39.18%	26,323	60.82%
28	25,793	66.51%	12,985	33.49%
29	9,091	16.70%	45,348	83.30%
30	7,012	14.94%	39,931	85.06%
31	9,028	19.68%	36,844	80.32%
32	20,628	47.00%	23,258	53.00%
33	12,006	27.30%	31,971	72.70%
34	11,891	28.96%	29,171	71.04%
35	27,599	53.82%	23,679	46.18%
36	23,280	46.41%	26,880	53.59%
37	27,813	53.67%	24,014	46.33%
38	6,687	16.80%	33,120	83.20%
39	16,532	37.24%	27,866	62.76%
40	20,645	38.16%	33,461	61.84%
41	14,587	33.43%	29,045	66.57%
42	6,304	23.39%	20,649	76.61%
43	23,817	55.47%	19,118	44.53%
44	13,717	37.30%	23,057	62.70%
45	15,039	40.56%	22,039	59.44%
46	23,917	62.08%	14,606	37.92%
47	16,297	51.62%	15,276	48.38%
48	15,967	45.35%	19,241	54.65%

Candidates: Berger (Rep), Inman (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-SCS2-20G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Supreme Court Associate Justice Seat 02

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
49	18,174	35.43%	33,119	64.57%
50	21,470	42.73%	28,773	57.27%
51	22,854	59.84%	15,335	40.16%
52	23,778	56.81%	18,075	43.19%
53	26,505	63.29%	15,375	36.71%
54	23,991	46.89%	27,178	53.11%
55	22,652	58.77%	15,891	41.23%
56	6,442	14.40%	38,282	85.60%
57	15,745	32.47%	32,744	67.53%
58	9,222	22.32%	32,092	77.68%
59	29,386	55.43%	23,632	44.57%
60	14,139	35.48%	25,716	64.52%
61	9,750	22.84%	32,930	77.16%
62	28,678	54.48%	23,960	45.52%
63	22,520	53.25%	19,775	46.75%
64	23,227	54.89%	19,092	45.11%
65	30,079	64.11%	16,840	35.89%
66	17,591	36.47%	30,641	63.53%
67	32,663	72.03%	12,681	27.97%
68	31,177	61.70%	19,354	38.30%
69	31,091	63.81%	17,636	36.19%
70	32,582	75.53%	10,556	24.47%
71	13,108	30.78%	29,484	69.22%
72	10,112	25.13%	30,128	74.87%
73	23,734	54.04%	20,187	45.96%
74	28,063	56.09%	21,972	43.91%
75	25,211	56.67%	19,279	43.33%
76	26,515	61.70%	16,462	38.30%
77	38,144	75.66%	12,270	24.34%
78	36,399	74.07%	12,744	25.93%
79	30,210	61.01%	19,303	38.99%
80	32,317	74.71%	10,937	25.29%
81	31,817	71.85%	12,467	28.15%
82	26,729	55.84%	21,140	44.16%
83	29,609	66.43%	14,963	33.57%
84	28,788	66.22%	14,685	33.78%
85	35,233	72.54%	13,339	27.46%
86	30,103	69.00%	13,524	31.00%
87	32,674	73.40%	11,842	26.60%
88	11,383	30.22%	26,282	69.78%
89	34,793	74.45%	11,938	25.55%
90	30,641	75.31%	10,044	24.69%
91	28,543	64.51%	15,703	35.49%
92	12,228	29.73%	28,902	70.27%
93	28,130	57.30%	20,964	42.70%
94	34,359	76.12%	10,778	23.88%
95	30,338	64.55%	16,664	35.45%
96	27,841	63.17%	16,229	36.83%

Candidates: Berger (Rep), Inman (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-SCS2-20G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Supreme Court Associate Justice Seat 02

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
97	35,380	72.64%	13,324	27.36%
98	25,388	51.99%	23,444	48.01%
99	4,779	15.30%	26,462	84.70%
100	14,007	35.56%	25,382	64.44%
101	12,769	30.98%	28,453	69.02%
102	11,326	26.10%	32,074	73.90%
103	19,821	43.82%	25,407	56.18%
104	21,597	43.72%	27,806	56.28%
105	28,367	53.93%	24,232	46.07%
106	11,123	25.26%	32,912	74.74%
107	6,759	15.99%	35,509	84.01%
108	28,580	65.95%	14,755	34.05%
109	27,669	59.24%	19,034	40.76%
110	27,485	64.49%	15,134	35.51%
111	30,419	72.27%	11,671	27.73%
112	7,383	20.32%	28,945	79.68%
113	33,535	65.94%	17,319	34.06%
114	23,788	44.85%	29,253	55.15%
115	27,440	53.70%	23,656	46.30%
116	10,814	20.42%	42,132	79.58%
117	30,731	59.40%	21,008	40.60%
118	30,001	61.92%	18,453	38.08%
119	26,788	56.27%	20,819	43.73%
120	34,664	73.14%	12,733	26.86%
Total:	2,720,108	50.65%	2,649,765	49.35%

Candidates: Berger (Rep), Inman (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-SCS2-20G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Supreme Court Associate Justice Seat 04

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
1	29,096	62.02%	17,820	37.98%
2	21,759	44.18%	27,494	55.82%
3	26,944	59.35%	18,455	40.65%
4	20,223	57.11%	15,188	42.89%
5	20,117	49.01%	20,931	50.99%
6	22,012	59.69%	14,866	40.31%
7	24,009	54.52%	20,025	45.48%
8	12,810	34.21%	24,638	65.79%
9	24,994	53.11%	22,069	46.89%
10	22,642	55.88%	17,875	44.12%
11	18,448	36.85%	31,615	63.15%
12	21,493	51.63%	20,134	48.37%
13	32,555	69.38%	14,370	30.62%
14	14,124	62.84%	8,351	37.16%
15	22,541	64.08%	12,633	35.92%
16	29,951	67.61%	14,349	32.39%
17	34,115	62.03%	20,887	37.97%
18	17,064	38.30%	27,486	61.70%
19	36,803	61.83%	22,724	38.17%
20	30,262	56.34%	23,453	43.66%
21	17,950	40.58%	26,289	59.42%
22	25,597	57.79%	18,698	42.21%
23	18,276	39.26%	28,270	60.74%
24	20,448	48.22%	21,955	51.78%
25	23,429	48.01%	25,369	51.99%
26	27,335	58.17%	19,660	41.83%
27	16,557	38.32%	26,651	61.68%
28	25,543	66.05%	13,127	33.95%
29	9,997	18.41%	44,303	81.59%
30	7,597	16.23%	39,223	83.77%
31	9,761	21.32%	36,028	78.68%
32	20,212	46.25%	23,488	53.75%
33	12,616	28.73%	31,291	71.27%
34	12,568	30.74%	28,318	69.26%
35	28,215	55.17%	22,930	44.83%
36	24,383	48.65%	25,733	51.35%
37	28,731	55.51%	23,030	44.49%
38	7,355	18.51%	32,385	81.49%
39	16,999	38.37%	27,299	61.63%
40	21,647	40.11%	32,326	59.89%
41	15,454	35.48%	28,107	64.52%
42	6,767	25.11%	20,187	74.89%
43	23,898	55.70%	19,008	44.30%
44	14,047	38.27%	22,662	61.73%
45	15,457	41.70%	21,610	58.30%
46	23,342	60.81%	15,045	39.19%
47	15,401	49.11%	15,958	50.89%
48	16,073	45.78%	19,034	54.22%

Candidates: Barringer (Rep), Davis (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-SCS4-20G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Supreme Court Associate Justice Seat 04

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
49	18,822	36.88%	32,212	63.12%
50	21,458	42.88%	28,580	57.12%
51	22,881	60.06%	15,218	39.94%
52	23,897	57.32%	17,797	42.68%
53	26,740	63.88%	15,123	36.12%
54	24,158	47.38%	26,834	52.62%
55	22,622	58.80%	15,851	41.20%
56	7,107	15.95%	37,459	84.05%
57	15,808	32.76%	32,453	67.24%
58	9,463	22.95%	31,763	77.05%
59	29,081	55.07%	23,728	44.93%
60	14,244	35.83%	25,509	64.17%
61	9,957	23.43%	32,538	76.57%
62	28,536	54.45%	23,871	45.55%
63	22,226	52.71%	19,939	47.29%
64	23,004	54.47%	19,228	45.53%
65	29,590	63.66%	16,892	36.34%
66	18,315	38.05%	29,814	61.95%
67	32,711	72.16%	12,621	27.84%
68	31,954	63.29%	18,535	36.71%
69	31,623	64.91%	17,094	35.09%
70	32,388	75.36%	10,591	24.64%
71	13,309	31.38%	29,107	68.62%
72	10,390	25.89%	29,737	74.11%
73	24,269	55.29%	19,622	44.71%
74	28,141	56.47%	21,693	43.53%
75	25,252	56.99%	19,061	43.01%
76	26,568	61.94%	16,326	38.06%
77	37,808	75.27%	12,423	24.73%
78	36,319	74.09%	12,704	25.91%
79	30,007	60.78%	19,365	39.22%
80	32,096	74.33%	11,087	25.67%
81	31,275	70.75%	12,933	29.25%
82	27,367	57.31%	20,388	42.69%
83	29,786	66.95%	14,703	33.05%
84	29,114	66.94%	14,381	33.06%
85	34,907	72.06%	13,532	27.94%
86	30,094	69.00%	13,522	31.00%
87	32,688	73.67%	11,682	26.33%
88	12,292	32.72%	25,280	67.28%
89	34,937	74.85%	11,739	25.15%
90	30,257	74.65%	10,276	25.35%
91	28,155	63.93%	15,883	36.07%
92	13,048	31.75%	28,054	68.25%
93	28,300	57.86%	20,607	42.14%
94	33,737	74.83%	11,346	25.17%
95	31,299	66.56%	15,724	33.44%
96	28,174	63.97%	15,868	36.03%

Candidates: Barringer (Rep), Davis (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-SCS4-20G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Supreme Court Associate Justice Seat 04

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
97	35,863	73.61%	12,860	26.39%
98	26,167	53.74%	22,521	46.26%
99	5,255	16.82%	25,982	83.18%
100	14,546	36.99%	24,780	63.01%
101	13,457	32.69%	27,713	67.31%
102	12,301	28.42%	30,980	71.58%
103	20,585	45.58%	24,575	54.42%
104	22,417	45.54%	26,811	54.46%
105	28,979	55.23%	23,487	44.77%
106	11,836	26.93%	32,119	73.07%
107	7,406	17.52%	34,856	82.48%
108	28,873	66.93%	14,266	33.07%
109	27,898	60.07%	18,543	39.93%
110	27,486	64.72%	14,980	35.28%
111	30,569	72.64%	11,516	27.36%
112	7,917	21.82%	28,374	78.18%
113	33,529	66.01%	17,266	33.99%
114	24,149	45.59%	28,822	54.41%
115	27,469	53.79%	23,599	46.21%
116	11,226	21.21%	41,713	78.79%
117	30,784	59.52%	20,939	40.48%
118	29,411	60.74%	19,012	39.26%
119	26,577	55.82%	21,036	44.18%
120	34,285	72.47%	13,025	27.53%
Total:	2,742,776	51.20%	2,613,815	48.80%

Candidates: Barringer (Rep), Davis (Dem)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-SCS4-20G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2016 Election Contest Report - US President

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib	W-I	% W-I
1	25,334	60.23%	15,236	36.22%	1,134	2.70%	360	0.86%
2	19,997	43.67%	24,090	52.61%	1,133	2.47%	572	1.25%
3	24,704	59.17%	15,611	37.39%	1,054	2.52%	384	0.92%
4	19,202	56.40%	14,223	41.78%	458	1.35%	163	0.48%
5	17,620	46.59%	19,115	50.54%	826	2.18%	258	0.68%
6	16,900	58.56%	10,808	37.45%	860	2.98%	289	1.00%
7	19,911	53.23%	16,221	43.37%	875	2.34%	397	1.06%
8	12,502	33.15%	23,767	63.02%	1,051	2.79%	395	1.05%
9	23,145	54.24%	17,961	42.09%	1,109	2.60%	455	1.07%
10	20,558	54.82%	15,831	42.21%	765	2.04%	349	0.93%
11	16,212	35.47%	26,639	58.29%	1,936	4.24%	915	2.00%
12	20,836	52.78%	17,864	45.26%	543	1.38%	231	0.59%
13	29,581	68.79%	11,954	27.80%	1,064	2.47%	405	0.94%
14	11,653	61.68%	6,411	33.93%	626	3.31%	204	1.08%
15	19,506	64.40%	9,478	31.29%	1,017	3.36%	287	0.95%
16	23,605	65.86%	10,978	30.63%	966	2.70%	290	0.81%
17	26,277	61.43%	15,089	35.28%	1,031	2.41%	378	0.88%
18	15,162	36.79%	23,938	58.09%	1,425	3.46%	685	1.66%
19	30,171	61.39%	16,954	34.49%	1,463	2.98%	562	1.14%
20	26,436	56.15%	18,254	38.77%	1,747	3.71%	640	1.36%
21	12,486	39.08%	17,407	54.49%	1,422	4.45%	631	1.98%
22	23,395	55.93%	17,602	42.08%	605	1.45%	227	0.54%
23	17,584	38.18%	27,744	60.23%	517	1.12%	215	0.47%
24	19,102	47.15%	20,410	50.38%	711	1.76%	286	0.71%
25	21,751	48.02%	22,488	49.65%	706	1.56%	349	0.77%
26	21,323	59.59%	12,933	36.14%	1,122	3.14%	405	1.13%
27	15,717	35.38%	27,991	63.01%	520	1.17%	192	0.43%
28	22,101	66.15%	10,390	31.10%	683	2.04%	238	0.71%
29	7,395	15.09%	39,315	80.23%	1,405	2.87%	885	1.81%
30	5,787	13.25%	36,172	82.81%	966	2.21%	757	1.73%
31	6,275	17.16%	28,906	79.03%	902	2.47%	494	1.35%
32	17,380	43.13%	21,791	54.08%	792	1.97%	331	0.82%
33	10,407	27.17%	26,327	68.73%	1,090	2.85%	483	1.26%
34	11,095	28.13%	25,799	65.41%	1,769	4.48%	780	1.98%
35	21,972	53.47%	16,775	40.83%	1,459	3.55%	883	2.15%
36	19,242	46.13%	20,003	47.95%	1,739	4.17%	733	1.76%
37	22,787	54.86%	16,466	39.64%	1,600	3.85%	686	1.65%
38	5,484	14.88%	29,977	81.33%	878	2.38%	519	1.41%
39	13,884	38.55%	20,516	56.97%	1,098	3.05%	517	1.44%
40	18,736	37.74%	27,886	56.18%	1,996	4.02%	1,023	2.06%
41	12,602	33.55%	22,972	61.16%	1,365	3.63%	623	1.66%
42	5,237	21.69%	18,028	74.66%	618	2.56%	263	1.09%
43	20,122	54.55%	15,494	42.01%	922	2.50%	347	0.94%
44	12,747	36.71%	20,643	59.45%	973	2.80%	359	1.03%
45	13,158	41.44%	17,439	54.92%	860	2.71%	294	0.93%
46	21,144	60.39%	13,221	37.76%	505	1.44%	140	0.40%
47	13,774	47.09%	14,661	50.12%	596	2.04%	221	0.76%
48	14,006	43.57%	17,044	53.02%	831	2.59%	266	0.83%

Candidates: Trump (Rep), Clinton (Dem), Johnson (Lib)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-PRS-16G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2016 Election Contest Report - US President

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib	W-I	% W-I
49	16,192	34.18%	28,535	60.23%	1,758	3.71%	891	1.88%
50	18,328	41.09%	24,535	55.01%	1,204	2.70%	534	1.20%
51	19,456	57.96%	12,925	38.51%	904	2.69%	282	0.84%
52	21,073	54.95%	15,958	41.61%	971	2.53%	345	0.90%
53	21,661	63.85%	10,973	32.34%	934	2.75%	358	1.06%
54	19,421	45.00%	21,973	50.91%	1,190	2.76%	573	1.33%
55	19,537	55.21%	14,859	41.99%	736	2.08%	253	0.71%
56	6,253	12.81%	40,175	82.32%	1,414	2.90%	960	1.97%
57	14,331	32.28%	28,203	63.53%	1,181	2.66%	677	1.53%
58	8,568	21.80%	29,466	74.98%	804	2.05%	463	1.18%
59	26,441	58.66%	17,030	37.78%	1,141	2.53%	464	1.03%
60	13,202	35.93%	22,173	60.34%	967	2.63%	405	1.10%
61	9,641	21.55%	33,206	74.22%	1,195	2.67%	697	1.56%
62	25,633	55.27%	18,680	40.28%	1,443	3.11%	621	1.34%
63	19,241	53.15%	15,644	43.22%	940	2.60%	373	1.03%
64	19,563	55.98%	14,185	40.59%	855	2.45%	341	0.98%
65	26,834	63.46%	14,231	33.65%	871	2.06%	349	0.83%
66	14,979	37.06%	23,431	57.97%	1,350	3.34%	662	1.64%
67	29,091	70.18%	11,244	27.12%	867	2.09%	252	0.61%
68	24,825	62.74%	12,680	32.05%	1,446	3.65%	618	1.56%
69	26,818	64.99%	12,652	30.66%	1,274	3.09%	519	1.26%
70	29,047	75.02%	8,443	21.80%	875	2.26%	356	0.92%
71	11,928	29.97%	25,979	65.27%	1,252	3.15%	642	1.61%
72	8,906	22.76%	28,591	73.06%	1,059	2.71%	580	1.48%
73	20,597	56.95%	14,031	38.80%	1,095	3.03%	444	1.23%
74	24,776	56.81%	16,649	38.17%	1,490	3.42%	699	1.60%
75	22,327	57.77%	14,736	38.13%	1,162	3.01%	420	1.09%
76	23,657	60.02%	14,395	36.52%	939	2.38%	425	1.08%
77	33,328	74.63%	9,728	21.78%	1,126	2.52%	473	1.06%
78	32,128	73.45%	10,258	23.45%	965	2.21%	389	0.89%
79	26,974	59.99%	16,552	36.81%	1,027	2.28%	408	0.91%
80	27,983	74.19%	8,557	22.69%	895	2.37%	285	0.76%
81	26,318	70.89%	9,557	25.74%	964	2.60%	286	0.77%
82	22,885	59.08%	14,116	36.44%	1,226	3.17%	509	1.31%
83	25,631	67.37%	11,073	29.11%	946	2.49%	393	1.03%
84	24,878	65.40%	12,004	31.56%	811	2.13%	347	0.91%
85	31,665	72.24%	10,730	24.48%	922	2.10%	518	1.18%
86	26,224	67.41%	11,248	28.91%	988	2.54%	443	1.14%
87	28,001	71.92%	9,517	24.44%	932	2.39%	484	1.24%
88	8,579	26.76%	21,622	67.43%	1,349	4.21%	515	1.61%
89	29,515	72.81%	9,661	23.83%	988	2.44%	371	0.92%
90	30,193	75.15%	8,750	21.78%	869	2.16%	365	0.91%
91	25,186	63.44%	13,167	33.17%	982	2.47%	364	0.92%
92	9,290	29.71%	20,569	65.79%	1,020	3.26%	385	1.23%
93	25,529	55.38%	17,851	38.73%	1,713	3.72%	1,001	2.17%
94	30,990	74.81%	9,121	22.02%	948	2.29%	366	0.88%
95	24,366	65.87%	10,955	29.62%	1,199	3.24%	470	1.27%
96	24,419	61.86%	13,347	33.81%	1,161	2.94%	545	1.38%

Candidates: Trump (Rep), Clinton (Dem), Johnson (Lib)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-PRS-16G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2016 Election Contest Report - US President

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib	W-I	% W-I
97	28,706	71.96%	9,865	24.73%	970	2.43%	348	0.87%
98	21,123	52.14%	17,220	42.51%	1,558	3.85%	611	1.51%
99	4,649	16.65%	22,131	79.27%	723	2.59%	416	1.49%
100	12,029	34.45%	21,222	60.79%	1,066	3.05%	596	1.71%
101	11,399	33.26%	21,430	62.52%	996	2.91%	451	1.32%
102	8,091	22.80%	25,231	71.09%	1,525	4.30%	643	1.81%
103	16,819	44.77%	18,861	50.20%	1,312	3.49%	579	1.54%
104	18,076	41.59%	22,704	52.24%	1,747	4.02%	936	2.15%
105	24,140	53.45%	18,631	41.25%	1,606	3.56%	784	1.74%
106	9,548	26.69%	24,647	68.90%	1,030	2.88%	547	1.53%
107	4,279	12.04%	30,107	84.68%	749	2.11%	418	1.18%
108	24,843	68.06%	10,426	28.56%	891	2.44%	341	0.93%
109	24,016	59.54%	14,612	36.23%	1,203	2.98%	505	1.25%
110	23,827	62.28%	13,399	35.02%	717	1.87%	314	0.82%
111	26,886	71.75%	9,574	25.55%	677	1.81%	334	0.89%
112	5,893	19.21%	23,726	77.35%	691	2.25%	365	1.19%
113	29,889	65.99%	13,780	30.42%	1,046	2.31%	578	1.28%
114	21,152	45.69%	22,478	48.56%	1,600	3.46%	1,060	2.29%
115	24,589	55.07%	17,761	39.78%	1,308	2.93%	990	2.22%
116	9,977	20.78%	35,208	73.34%	1,379	2.87%	1,445	3.01%
117	27,115	60.28%	15,836	35.20%	1,321	2.94%	712	1.58%
118	25,726	61.23%	14,406	34.29%	1,241	2.95%	644	1.53%
119	23,870	56.13%	16,402	38.57%	1,462	3.44%	793	1.86%
120	30,694	72.91%	9,872	23.45%	1,030	2.45%	501	1.19%
Total:	2,359,749	49.90%	2,180,316	46.10%	129,929	2.75%	59,397	1.26%

Candidates: Trump (Rep), Clinton (Dem), Johnson (Lib)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-PRS-16G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2016 Election Contest Report - US Senate

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib
1	25,044	60.77%	15,060	36.54%	1,110	2.69%
2	20,517	45.13%	23,655	52.04%	1,287	2.83%
3	24,764	59.97%	14,973	36.26%	1,558	3.77%
4	18,899	56.27%	13,842	41.21%	846	2.52%
5	17,343	46.83%	18,823	50.82%	870	2.35%
6	16,623	58.04%	10,874	37.97%	1,143	3.99%
7	19,755	53.15%	16,241	43.70%	1,169	3.15%
8	13,271	35.65%	22,773	61.17%	1,183	3.18%
9	23,835	56.37%	17,196	40.67%	1,249	2.95%
10	20,637	55.66%	15,458	41.69%	984	2.65%
11	18,209	40.10%	25,561	56.29%	1,641	3.61%
12	20,582	52.81%	17,402	44.65%	992	2.55%
13	29,147	68.51%	11,648	27.38%	1,748	4.11%
14	11,348	61.08%	6,230	33.53%	1,001	5.39%
15	19,065	64.06%	9,181	30.85%	1,515	5.09%
16	22,954	65.19%	10,705	30.40%	1,552	4.41%
17	25,755	61.26%	14,537	34.58%	1,748	4.16%
18	15,532	38.40%	23,019	56.91%	1,899	4.69%
19	29,926	61.69%	16,325	33.65%	2,261	4.66%
20	27,037	58.17%	17,460	37.57%	1,981	4.26%
21	14,407	45.51%	16,204	51.18%	1,048	3.31%
22	23,065	55.91%	17,265	41.85%	923	2.24%
23	17,595	38.66%	27,019	59.36%	904	1.99%
24	19,200	47.73%	20,178	50.16%	850	2.11%
25	21,894	48.52%	22,350	49.53%	877	1.94%
26	21,398	60.23%	12,791	36.00%	1,337	3.76%
27	15,648	35.52%	27,666	62.80%	738	1.68%
28	21,690	65.47%	10,411	31.43%	1,028	3.10%
29	9,714	19.91%	37,995	77.86%	1,092	2.24%
30	7,382	17.04%	35,006	80.83%	921	2.13%
31	7,036	19.35%	28,436	78.21%	885	2.43%
32	17,466	43.71%	21,453	53.69%	1,038	2.60%
33	10,908	28.63%	26,074	68.44%	1,118	2.93%
34	13,389	34.15%	24,483	62.45%	1,335	3.41%
35	23,855	58.34%	15,874	38.82%	1,160	2.84%
36	21,295	51.30%	18,789	45.26%	1,425	3.43%
37	23,681	57.34%	16,120	39.03%	1,497	3.62%
38	6,324	17.27%	29,377	80.23%	914	2.50%
39	14,475	40.42%	20,184	56.37%	1,150	3.21%
40	21,469	43.40%	26,465	53.50%	1,532	3.10%
41	14,683	39.44%	21,427	57.56%	1,117	3.00%
42	5,502	23.05%	17,574	73.64%	789	3.31%
43	20,009	54.89%	15,276	41.91%	1,168	3.20%
44	13,104	38.25%	19,959	58.26%	1,196	3.49%
45	13,286	42.42%	16,923	54.03%	1,113	3.55%
46	20,145	58.89%	13,041	38.12%	1,020	2.98%
47	13,176	46.45%	14,665	51.69%	528	1.86%
48	13,773	43.72%	16,721	53.08%	1,010	3.21%

Candidates: Burr (Rep), Ross (Dem), Haugh (Lib)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-SEN-16G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2016 Election Contest Report - US Senate

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib
49	18,786	39.75%	27,144	57.44%	1,328	2.81%
50	19,118	43.16%	23,889	53.93%	1,291	2.91%
51	19,146	57.69%	12,877	38.80%	1,164	3.51%
52	20,643	54.73%	15,687	41.59%	1,388	3.68%
53	21,571	63.97%	11,029	32.71%	1,119	3.32%
54	20,287	47.20%	21,423	49.85%	1,268	2.95%
55	19,114	54.85%	14,491	41.58%	1,243	3.57%
56	8,750	18.06%	38,652	79.79%	1,039	2.14%
57	15,779	35.84%	27,050	61.45%	1,193	2.71%
58	8,915	22.94%	28,852	74.25%	1,092	2.81%
59	26,635	59.55%	16,634	37.19%	1,455	3.25%
60	13,751	37.98%	21,199	58.55%	1,256	3.47%
61	11,071	25.01%	32,033	72.36%	1,162	2.63%
62	26,944	58.44%	17,681	38.35%	1,477	3.20%
63	19,786	55.05%	14,967	41.64%	1,190	3.31%
64	19,586	56.50%	13,904	40.11%	1,178	3.40%
65	26,162	62.44%	14,198	33.89%	1,538	3.67%
66	16,305	40.61%	22,580	56.23%	1,269	3.16%
67	27,666	67.34%	11,461	27.90%	1,956	4.76%
68	26,073	66.57%	11,542	29.47%	1,553	3.96%
69	27,056	66.37%	11,873	29.12%	1,838	4.51%
70	28,306	73.72%	8,412	21.91%	1,679	4.37%
71	13,360	33.82%	24,823	62.84%	1,321	3.34%
72	11,180	28.76%	26,874	69.14%	817	2.10%
73	20,492	57.25%	13,530	37.80%	1,775	4.96%
74	26,766	61.57%	15,327	35.26%	1,376	3.17%
75	22,613	58.96%	14,280	37.24%	1,458	3.80%
76	22,929	58.80%	14,170	36.34%	1,893	4.85%
77	32,938	74.23%	9,598	21.63%	1,837	4.14%
78	31,709	73.05%	10,218	23.54%	1,479	3.41%
79	26,549	60.00%	16,161	36.52%	1,537	3.47%
80	27,597	73.83%	8,393	22.45%	1,387	3.71%
81	25,925	70.51%	9,366	25.47%	1,476	4.01%
82	23,042	60.07%	13,628	35.53%	1,689	4.40%
83	24,811	65.89%	10,839	28.78%	2,008	5.33%
84	23,911	63.62%	11,809	31.42%	1,864	4.96%
85	29,859	69.21%	11,446	26.53%	1,838	4.26%
86	25,153	65.52%	11,468	29.87%	1,770	4.61%
87	26,993	70.07%	9,584	24.88%	1,946	5.05%
88	10,385	32.81%	20,049	63.34%	1,217	3.85%
89	28,416	71.00%	9,621	24.04%	1,985	4.96%
90	29,410	74.08%	8,826	22.23%	1,467	3.69%
91	24,813	62.83%	13,131	33.25%	1,547	3.92%
92	9,965	32.37%	19,517	63.40%	1,304	4.24%
93	25,762	56.58%	17,705	38.88%	2,066	4.54%
94	29,741	72.59%	9,302	22.70%	1,931	4.71%
95	23,913	65.46%	10,629	29.10%	1,990	5.45%
96	24,211	62.12%	12,890	33.07%	1,876	4.81%

Candidates: Burr (Rep), Ross (Dem), Haugh (Lib)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-SEN-16G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2016 Election Contest Report - US Senate

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib
97	27,770	70.40%	9,767	24.76%	1,909	4.84%
98	22,572	56.42%	15,856	39.63%	1,581	3.95%
99	5,120	18.58%	21,490	77.99%	944	3.43%
100	12,941	37.48%	20,217	58.56%	1,368	3.96%
101	11,808	34.83%	20,710	61.09%	1,382	4.08%
102	10,289	29.34%	23,368	66.64%	1,408	4.02%
103	18,584	50.01%	17,080	45.96%	1,499	4.03%
104	21,942	50.68%	20,015	46.23%	1,341	3.10%
105	26,281	58.65%	16,875	37.66%	1,652	3.69%
106	10,402	29.37%	23,832	67.28%	1,188	3.35%
107	5,030	14.35%	28,942	82.58%	1,076	3.07%
108	23,899	66.34%	10,361	28.76%	1,765	4.90%
109	24,075	60.32%	14,078	35.27%	1,761	4.41%
110	22,921	60.68%	13,340	35.31%	1,514	4.01%
111	25,493	69.08%	10,041	27.21%	1,372	3.72%
112	6,261	20.69%	22,969	75.90%	1,032	3.41%
113	28,572	64.06%	14,400	32.28%	1,632	3.66%
114	21,766	47.48%	22,258	48.56%	1,815	3.96%
115	24,000	54.28%	18,351	41.51%	1,862	4.21%
116	10,326	21.76%	35,280	74.33%	1,857	3.91%
117	26,815	60.34%	15,824	35.61%	1,800	4.05%
118	24,173	58.42%	15,232	36.81%	1,976	4.78%
119	23,100	55.00%	17,027	40.54%	1,876	4.47%
120	28,594	69.53%	10,932	26.58%	1,600	3.89%
Total:	2,392,439	51.13%	2,119,696	45.30%	167,190	3.57%

Candidates: Burr (Rep), Ross (Dem), Haugh (Lib)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-SEN-16G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2016 Election Contest Report - NC Governor

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep	Lib	% Lib
1	15,644	37.80%	24,955	60.30%	785	1.90%
2	25,096	54.99%	19,774	43.33%	771	1.69%
3	15,764	38.03%	24,927	60.14%	757	1.83%
4	14,116	41.81%	19,296	57.15%	351	1.04%
5	19,085	51.27%	17,526	47.08%	615	1.65%
6	11,387	39.70%	16,560	57.74%	733	2.56%
7	17,312	46.38%	19,355	51.85%	663	1.78%
8	23,512	62.92%	13,171	35.25%	686	1.84%
9	18,313	43.15%	23,487	55.35%	636	1.50%
10	15,924	42.72%	20,797	55.79%	553	1.48%
11	27,930	61.26%	16,452	36.08%	1,212	2.66%
12	17,685	45.09%	21,128	53.87%	405	1.03%
13	12,731	29.79%	29,078	68.04%	928	2.17%
14	6,445	34.64%	11,572	62.19%	591	3.18%
15	9,769	32.69%	19,269	64.48%	848	2.84%
16	11,964	33.86%	22,469	63.59%	903	2.56%
17	16,369	38.77%	24,869	58.90%	985	2.33%
18	25,440	62.54%	13,965	34.33%	1,272	3.13%
19	19,059	39.12%	28,370	58.23%	1,293	2.65%
20	20,762	44.52%	24,614	52.78%	1,256	2.69%
21	18,002	56.58%	12,976	40.79%	837	2.63%
22	17,827	42.92%	23,251	55.98%	454	1.09%
23	27,358	59.75%	18,064	39.45%	362	0.79%
24	21,287	52.70%	18,675	46.24%	429	1.06%
25	23,830	52.64%	20,974	46.33%	468	1.03%
26	14,127	39.60%	20,828	58.38%	722	2.02%
27	28,256	63.97%	15,554	35.21%	359	0.81%
28	11,284	33.86%	21,535	64.62%	508	1.52%
29	39,771	81.39%	8,276	16.94%	819	1.68%
30	36,083	83.27%	6,562	15.14%	687	1.59%
31	29,010	79.61%	6,797	18.65%	635	1.74%
32	22,332	55.63%	17,235	42.93%	578	1.44%
33	26,877	70.34%	10,580	27.69%	755	1.98%
34	27,045	68.70%	11,319	28.75%	1,004	2.55%
35	17,901	43.62%	22,356	54.47%	785	1.91%
36	21,175	50.84%	19,482	46.77%	994	2.39%
37	18,156	43.76%	22,392	53.97%	941	2.27%
38	30,165	82.13%	5,887	16.03%	677	1.84%
39	21,276	59.17%	14,013	38.97%	670	1.86%
40	29,442	59.27%	19,135	38.52%	1,099	2.21%
41	23,454	62.75%	13,062	34.95%	861	2.30%
42	17,483	73.36%	5,755	24.15%	594	2.49%
43	15,660	42.82%	20,175	55.17%	737	2.02%
44	20,245	59.00%	13,261	38.65%	806	2.35%
45	17,060	54.33%	13,570	43.21%	772	2.46%
46	13,558	39.32%	20,482	59.40%	439	1.27%
47	14,108	48.98%	14,442	50.14%	251	0.87%
48	17,038	53.92%	13,881	43.93%	679	2.15%

Candidates: Cooper (Dem), McCrory (Rep), Cecil (Lib)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-GOV-16G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2016 Election Contest Report - NC Governor

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep	Lib	% Lib
49	29,932	63.20%	16,486	34.81%	944	1.99%
50	25,557	57.54%	18,059	40.66%	801	1.80%
51	14,141	42.41%	18,488	55.44%	716	2.15%
52	16,920	44.52%	20,334	53.50%	755	1.99%
53	12,054	35.64%	21,120	62.45%	645	1.91%
54	23,158	53.66%	19,216	44.52%	785	1.82%
55	14,959	42.66%	19,540	55.72%	569	1.62%
56	40,813	84.13%	6,852	14.12%	847	1.75%
57	29,331	66.48%	13,926	31.56%	866	1.96%
58	29,776	76.42%	8,413	21.59%	774	1.99%
59	18,830	41.94%	25,141	56.00%	924	2.06%
60	22,693	62.50%	12,709	35.01%	904	2.49%
61	33,924	76.51%	9,530	21.49%	888	2.00%
62	20,632	44.67%	24,533	53.12%	1,020	2.21%
63	16,706	46.38%	18,690	51.89%	625	1.74%
64	15,324	44.05%	18,803	54.05%	658	1.89%
65	16,335	38.87%	24,835	59.10%	850	2.02%
66	24,197	60.05%	15,213	37.75%	885	2.20%
67	12,821	31.04%	27,707	67.08%	776	1.88%
68	13,346	33.88%	25,098	63.72%	944	2.40%
69	13,462	32.81%	26,584	64.79%	987	2.41%
70	10,370	26.93%	27,223	70.70%	914	2.37%
71	26,765	67.73%	11,797	29.85%	958	2.42%
72	28,714	73.95%	9,394	24.19%	720	1.85%
73	14,987	41.63%	20,044	55.67%	973	2.70%
74	18,705	42.98%	23,907	54.93%	913	2.10%
75	16,431	42.77%	20,982	54.62%	1,003	2.61%
76	15,687	40.01%	22,507	57.41%	1,009	2.57%
77	11,985	26.93%	31,530	70.84%	992	2.23%
78	11,990	27.52%	30,716	70.51%	855	1.96%
79	17,297	38.81%	26,492	59.45%	774	1.74%
80	10,298	27.43%	26,457	70.46%	792	2.11%
81	11,650	31.55%	24,390	66.05%	884	2.39%
82	15,159	39.30%	22,452	58.20%	965	2.50%
83	12,189	32.17%	24,710	65.21%	996	2.63%
84	13,065	34.57%	23,826	63.04%	902	2.39%
85	13,382	30.74%	29,007	66.64%	1,141	2.62%
86	13,369	34.55%	24,454	63.19%	876	2.26%
87	11,215	28.93%	26,556	68.51%	989	2.55%
88	21,831	68.54%	9,147	28.72%	872	2.74%
89	11,240	27.92%	28,029	69.62%	990	2.46%
90	11,277	28.27%	27,848	69.82%	759	1.90%
91	15,244	38.56%	23,334	59.02%	960	2.43%
92	20,392	65.92%	9,671	31.26%	870	2.81%
93	20,436	44.54%	24,097	52.52%	1,351	2.94%
94	11,234	27.17%	29,251	70.75%	857	2.07%
95	13,436	36.66%	21,895	59.75%	1,315	3.59%
96	14,632	37.33%	23,538	60.05%	1,028	2.62%

Candidates: Cooper (Dem), McCrory (Rep), Cecil (Lib)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-GOV-16G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2016 Election Contest Report - NC Governor

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep	Lib	% Lib
97	11,297	28.44%	27,461	69.14%	958	2.41%
98	19,353	48.22%	19,429	48.41%	1,349	3.36%
99	21,937	79.34%	4,997	18.07%	715	2.59%
100	21,315	61.41%	12,547	36.15%	848	2.44%
101	21,700	63.76%	11,396	33.49%	937	2.75%
102	25,764	73.03%	8,470	24.01%	1,045	2.96%
103	19,176	51.37%	17,182	46.03%	968	2.59%
104	22,926	52.72%	19,620	45.12%	941	2.16%
105	19,092	42.38%	24,931	55.35%	1,022	2.27%
106	24,701	69.47%	10,013	28.16%	841	2.37%
107	29,480	83.85%	4,914	13.98%	762	2.17%
108	11,529	31.79%	23,902	65.91%	833	2.30%
109	15,515	38.63%	23,728	59.08%	917	2.28%
110	14,320	37.70%	22,954	60.43%	709	1.87%
111	11,184	30.10%	25,277	68.03%	695	1.87%
112	23,260	76.56%	6,475	21.31%	647	2.13%
113	16,123	36.00%	27,612	61.65%	1,053	2.35%
114	24,543	53.32%	20,060	43.58%	1,428	3.10%
115	20,502	46.21%	22,524	50.76%	1,345	3.03%
116	36,822	77.30%	9,292	19.51%	1,522	3.20%
117	17,967	40.32%	25,296	56.76%	1,302	2.92%
118	17,669	42.43%	22,690	54.49%	1,279	3.07%
119	19,371	46.00%	21,361	50.73%	1,378	3.27%
120	12,827	31.06%	27,224	65.92%	1,249	3.02%
Total:	2,300,381	48.95%	2,296,039	48.86%	102,729	2.19%

Candidates: Cooper (Dem), McCrory (Rep), Cecil (Lib)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-GOV-16G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2016 Election Contest Report - NC Lieutenant Governor

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib
1	24,352	59.82%	15,273	37.52%	1,082	2.66%
2	20,507	45.80%	23,273	51.98%	992	2.22%
3	24,430	60.05%	15,222	37.42%	1,028	2.53%
4	18,726	56.60%	13,800	41.71%	560	1.69%
5	16,951	46.24%	18,868	51.47%	839	2.29%
6	16,738	59.00%	10,762	37.93%	870	3.07%
7	19,781	53.89%	16,146	43.99%	777	2.12%
8	12,812	35.03%	22,757	62.23%	1,002	2.74%
9	23,568	56.49%	17,169	41.15%	987	2.37%
10	20,560	56.30%	15,231	41.71%	729	2.00%
11	18,112	40.61%	24,744	55.48%	1,747	3.92%
12	20,258	52.55%	17,663	45.82%	629	1.63%
13	28,844	68.82%	11,879	28.34%	1,191	2.84%
14	11,129	61.30%	6,230	34.32%	796	4.38%
15	18,461	63.54%	9,394	32.33%	1,200	4.13%
16	23,214	66.94%	10,429	30.07%	1,034	2.98%
17	25,793	62.35%	14,487	35.02%	1,085	2.62%
18	15,476	39.13%	22,315	56.42%	1,764	4.46%
19	30,119	63.18%	16,025	33.62%	1,528	3.21%
20	26,788	58.99%	16,964	37.35%	1,662	3.66%
21	14,194	45.81%	15,724	50.75%	1,067	3.44%
22	22,328	55.10%	17,532	43.27%	661	1.63%
23	16,999	37.88%	27,264	60.75%	617	1.37%
24	19,168	48.08%	20,048	50.29%	649	1.63%
25	21,870	48.89%	22,222	49.67%	645	1.44%
26	21,679	61.87%	12,353	35.25%	1,010	2.88%
27	15,277	35.05%	27,754	63.67%	560	1.28%
28	22,053	67.36%	9,970	30.45%	717	2.19%
29	9,547	19.83%	37,359	77.60%	1,239	2.57%
30	7,234	17.01%	34,241	80.49%	1,065	2.50%
31	6,886	19.11%	28,133	78.09%	1,008	2.80%
32	17,394	44.04%	21,258	53.83%	840	2.13%
33	10,966	29.08%	25,684	68.10%	1,063	2.82%
34	13,218	34.41%	23,622	61.50%	1,568	4.08%
35	24,246	59.98%	15,166	37.52%	1,012	2.50%
36	21,174	51.97%	18,245	44.78%	1,327	3.26%
37	23,760	58.34%	15,741	38.65%	1,227	3.01%
38	6,266	17.31%	28,895	79.83%	1,035	2.86%
39	14,453	40.77%	20,081	56.65%	915	2.58%
40	21,613	44.35%	25,511	52.35%	1,610	3.30%
41	14,408	39.47%	20,844	57.11%	1,248	3.42%
42	5,281	22.44%	17,434	74.09%	815	3.46%
43	19,726	54.97%	15,083	42.03%	1,074	2.99%
44	12,833	38.07%	19,796	58.73%	1,076	3.19%
45	12,892	41.78%	16,810	54.48%	1,155	3.74%
46	19,378	57.76%	13,558	40.41%	612	1.82%
47	11,656	42.18%	15,377	55.64%	603	2.18%
48	12,997	42.19%	16,854	54.70%	958	3.11%

Candidates: Forest (Rep), Coleman (Dem), Cole (Lib)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-LG-16G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2016 Election Contest Report - NC Lieutenant Governor

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib
49	18,721	40.23%	26,379	56.68%	1,439	3.09%
50	19,102	43.71%	23,547	53.89%	1,048	2.40%
51	19,218	58.70%	12,676	38.72%	846	2.58%
52	20,297	54.96%	15,597	42.23%	1,037	2.81%
53	21,773	65.22%	10,795	32.34%	814	2.44%
54	20,283	47.78%	21,180	49.89%	988	2.33%
55	19,508	56.69%	14,199	41.26%	704	2.05%
56	8,408	17.75%	37,484	79.14%	1,473	3.11%
57	15,409	35.52%	26,815	61.81%	1,160	2.67%
58	8,720	22.69%	28,591	74.41%	1,114	2.90%
59	26,519	60.12%	16,434	37.26%	1,156	2.62%
60	13,455	37.82%	21,003	59.04%	1,118	3.14%
61	10,637	24.47%	31,436	72.31%	1,403	3.23%
62	26,719	59.03%	17,245	38.10%	1,298	2.87%
63	19,871	56.06%	14,549	41.05%	1,023	2.89%
64	19,521	56.99%	13,696	39.98%	1,038	3.03%
65	25,691	62.43%	14,470	35.16%	992	2.41%
66	16,641	41.89%	21,912	55.16%	1,171	2.95%
67	28,404	70.19%	11,091	27.41%	971	2.40%
68	26,454	68.66%	10,903	28.30%	1,172	3.04%
69	27,692	68.97%	11,270	28.07%	1,186	2.95%
70	28,456	75.24%	8,383	22.17%	980	2.59%
71	12,731	32.87%	24,735	63.86%	1,269	3.28%
72	10,474	27.50%	26,664	70.00%	953	2.50%
73	20,963	59.41%	13,136	37.23%	1,188	3.37%
74	26,407	61.78%	15,204	35.57%	1,130	2.64%
75	22,478	59.54%	14,163	37.52%	1,109	2.94%
76	23,329	60.76%	13,938	36.30%	1,131	2.95%
77	33,021	75.76%	9,480	21.75%	1,085	2.49%
78	31,935	74.56%	9,962	23.26%	935	2.18%
79	25,937	59.49%	16,584	38.04%	1,078	2.47%
80	27,375	74.45%	8,497	23.11%	898	2.44%
81	25,814	71.27%	9,417	26.00%	988	2.73%
82	23,440	62.14%	13,141	34.84%	1,138	3.02%
83	25,443	68.36%	10,640	28.59%	1,138	3.06%
84	24,572	66.29%	11,505	31.04%	989	2.67%
85	29,886	70.54%	11,278	26.62%	1,204	2.84%
86	25,656	67.66%	11,334	29.89%	930	2.45%
87	27,948	73.42%	9,193	24.15%	925	2.43%
88	10,506	33.84%	19,272	62.07%	1,272	4.10%
89	29,224	74.14%	9,096	23.08%	1,098	2.79%
90	28,865	74.20%	9,163	23.56%	872	2.24%
91	24,343	62.79%	13,302	34.31%	1,123	2.90%
92	10,068	33.21%	19,064	62.88%	1,186	3.91%
93	25,170	56.80%	17,315	39.08%	1,827	4.12%
94	30,168	74.78%	9,216	22.85%	957	2.37%
95	24,575	68.65%	9,961	27.83%	1,260	3.52%
96	24,809	64.52%	12,425	32.31%	1,217	3.17%

Candidates: Forest (Rep), Coleman (Dem), Cole (Lib)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-LG-16G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2016 Election Contest Report - NC Lieutenant Governor

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib
97	28,590	73.46%	9,253	23.77%	1,077	2.77%
98	23,055	58.69%	14,933	38.01%	1,297	3.30%
99	5,134	18.89%	21,048	77.46%	990	3.64%
100	13,374	39.24%	19,549	57.36%	1,157	3.39%
101	12,087	36.15%	20,198	60.41%	1,151	3.44%
102	10,029	29.20%	22,747	66.23%	1,571	4.57%
103	18,930	51.82%	16,348	44.75%	1,252	3.43%
104	22,097	51.98%	19,084	44.89%	1,330	3.13%
105	26,958	61.08%	15,945	36.12%	1,236	2.80%
106	10,660	30.46%	23,192	66.27%	1,146	3.27%
107	4,890	14.15%	28,680	82.98%	992	2.87%
108	24,866	69.64%	9,865	27.63%	977	2.74%
109	25,006	63.40%	13,360	33.87%	1,075	2.73%
110	23,592	63.14%	13,014	34.83%	761	2.04%
111	26,036	71.24%	9,671	26.46%	840	2.30%
112	6,318	21.11%	22,675	75.75%	940	3.14%
113	29,032	65.91%	13,770	31.26%	1,243	2.82%
114	21,182	46.99%	22,095	49.01%	1,805	4.00%
115	23,483	54.03%	18,277	42.05%	1,702	3.92%
116	9,891	21.19%	34,621	74.17%	2,169	4.65%
117	27,394	62.39%	15,198	34.61%	1,318	3.00%
118	24,010	58.91%	15,207	37.31%	1,540	3.78%
119	22,955	55.48%	16,811	40.63%	1,611	3.89%
120	28,299	69.92%	10,904	26.94%	1,271	3.14%
Total:	2,390,619	51.88%	2,084,975	45.25%	132,360	2.87%

Candidates: Forest (Rep), Coleman (Dem), Cole (Lib)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-LG-16G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2016 Election Contest Report - NC Attorney General

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
1	16,170	40.41%	23,848	59.59%
2	25,429	57.39%	18,880	42.61%
3	16,346	40.58%	23,938	59.42%
4	14,997	45.82%	17,732	54.18%
5	19,582	54.28%	16,492	45.72%
6	12,010	42.70%	16,115	57.30%
7	17,783	48.89%	18,592	51.11%
8	23,753	65.40%	12,566	34.60%
9	18,582	44.92%	22,783	55.08%
10	16,485	45.52%	19,729	54.48%
11	27,369	61.90%	16,843	38.10%
12	18,650	48.93%	19,467	51.07%
13	12,742	30.62%	28,872	69.38%
14	6,834	38.02%	11,140	61.98%
15	10,211	35.60%	18,473	64.40%
16	12,182	35.51%	22,126	64.49%
17	16,896	41.23%	24,080	58.77%
18	24,824	63.23%	14,434	36.77%
19	19,125	40.47%	28,138	59.53%
20	19,762	43.89%	25,263	56.11%
21	17,247	56.18%	13,450	43.82%
22	18,863	46.96%	21,305	53.04%
23	28,311	63.50%	16,274	36.50%
24	21,016	52.73%	18,841	47.27%
25	23,362	52.23%	21,371	47.77%
26	14,076	40.48%	20,698	59.52%
27	28,790	66.45%	14,536	33.55%
28	11,723	36.16%	20,694	63.84%
29	39,215	81.89%	8,675	18.11%
30	35,634	84.18%	6,695	15.82%
31	29,171	81.37%	6,681	18.63%
32	22,944	58.61%	16,206	41.39%
33	27,041	72.33%	10,346	27.67%
34	26,225	68.76%	11,917	31.24%
35	17,204	43.11%	22,705	56.89%
36	20,156	49.90%	20,235	50.10%
37	17,664	43.79%	22,672	56.21%
38	30,099	83.89%	5,781	16.11%
39	21,321	60.73%	13,786	39.27%
40	28,460	58.97%	19,803	41.03%
41	22,666	62.53%	13,581	37.47%
42	18,011	76.99%	5,382	23.01%
43	16,493	46.25%	19,165	53.75%
44	20,982	62.65%	12,507	37.35%
45	17,886	58.17%	12,862	41.83%
46	15,390	46.40%	17,780	53.60%
47	16,390	59.97%	10,941	40.03%
48	17,473	57.22%	13,061	42.78%

Candidates: Stein (Dem), Newton (Rep)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-AG-16G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2016 Election Contest Report - NC Attorney General

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
49	29,370	63.59%	16,816	36.41%
50	25,401	58.56%	17,977	41.44%
51	14,280	44.12%	18,085	55.88%
52	17,304	47.34%	19,251	52.66%
53	12,202	36.91%	20,857	63.09%
54	22,996	54.53%	19,179	45.47%
55	16,047	47.06%	18,051	52.94%
56	39,290	83.36%	7,841	16.64%
57	28,543	66.19%	14,582	33.81%
58	29,715	77.76%	8,501	22.24%
59	18,399	41.96%	25,455	58.04%
60	22,324	63.09%	13,061	36.91%
61	33,131	76.56%	10,146	23.44%
62	19,319	42.91%	25,705	57.09%
63	16,427	46.69%	18,758	53.31%
64	15,262	44.84%	18,777	55.16%
65	16,155	39.50%	24,747	60.50%
66	23,789	60.64%	15,438	39.36%
67	13,508	33.63%	26,662	66.37%
68	12,771	33.45%	25,408	66.55%
69	13,547	34.06%	26,228	65.94%
70	9,929	26.42%	27,648	73.58%
71	26,487	68.61%	12,119	31.39%
72	28,340	74.66%	9,618	25.34%
73	15,209	43.49%	19,764	56.51%
74	17,730	41.75%	24,741	58.25%
75	16,066	42.82%	21,451	57.18%
76	16,379	42.94%	21,762	57.06%
77	11,752	27.14%	31,551	72.86%
78	11,680	27.49%	30,805	72.51%
79	17,615	40.84%	25,516	59.16%
80	9,886	26.96%	26,789	73.04%
81	11,311	31.38%	24,738	68.62%
82	14,990	40.11%	22,385	59.89%
83	12,882	34.88%	24,052	65.12%
84	13,648	37.15%	23,089	62.85%
85	13,200	31.60%	28,575	68.40%
86	13,839	36.76%	23,812	63.24%
87	12,185	32.34%	25,490	67.66%
88	21,148	68.50%	9,724	31.50%
89	11,749	29.97%	27,451	70.03%
90	11,068	28.59%	27,649	71.41%
91	15,029	38.93%	23,577	61.07%
92	20,493	68.01%	9,639	31.99%
93	20,065	45.79%	23,752	54.21%
94	11,861	29.69%	28,093	70.31%
95	12,127	34.19%	23,342	65.81%
96	14,934	39.08%	23,283	60.92%

Candidates: Stein (Dem), Newton (Rep)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-AG-16G] - Generated 10/23/2023

2016 Election Contest Report - NC Attorney General

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
97	11,868	30.77%	26,699	69.23%
98	17,245	44.35%	21,642	55.65%
99	21,976	81.33%	5,046	18.67%
100	21,438	63.45%	12,348	36.55%
101	21,869	65.84%	11,347	34.16%
102	24,528	71.91%	9,582	28.09%
103	18,452	50.97%	17,753	49.03%
104	21,990	52.16%	20,165	47.84%
105	18,577	42.48%	25,153	57.52%
106	24,681	71.01%	10,077	28.99%
107	29,484	85.68%	4,926	14.32%
108	11,889	33.71%	23,383	66.29%
109	15,751	40.32%	23,311	59.68%
110	15,155	40.99%	21,817	59.01%
111	11,475	31.71%	24,714	68.29%
112	23,689	79.69%	6,038	20.31%
113	15,056	34.48%	28,607	65.52%
114	23,814	53.29%	20,877	46.71%
115	20,112	46.60%	23,043	53.40%
116	36,493	78.79%	9,826	21.21%
117	16,833	38.68%	26,685	61.32%
118	17,217	42.61%	23,193	57.39%
119	18,544	45.21%	22,474	54.79%
120	11,792	29.51%	28,169	70.49%
Total:	2,294,855	50.20%	2,276,276	49.80%

Candidates: Stein (Dem), Newton (Rep)

Data Source: North Carolina State Board of Elections, 'statewide_precinct_sort' file, administrative precincts excluded.

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

[EL20-AG-16G] - Generated 10/23/2023

County - District Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

County	District	Total County Population	Total District Population	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Alamance	63	171,415	83,847	83,847	48.91 %	100.00 %
	64	171,415	87,568	87,568	51.09 %	100.00 %
Alexander	94	36,444	85,564	36,444	100.00 %	42.59 %
Alleghany	93	10,888	87,194	10,888	100.00 %	12.49 %
Anson	55	22,055	82,927	22,055	100.00 %	26.60 %
Ashe	93	26,577	87,194	26,577	100.00 %	30.48 %
Avery	85	17,806	90,770	17,806	100.00 %	19.62 %
Beaufort	79	44,652	84,681	44,652	100.00 %	52.73 %
Bertie	23	17,934	88,865	17,934	100.00 %	20.18 %
Bladen	22	29,606	88,642	29,606	100.00 %	33.40 %
Brunswick	17	136,693	90,514	90,514	66.22 %	100.00 %
	19	136,693	91,288	46,179	33.78 %	50.59 %
Buncombe	114	269,452	90,248	90,248	33.49 %	100.00 %
	115	269,452	89,747	89,747	33.31 %	100.00 %
	116	269,452	89,457	89,457	33.20 %	100.00 %
Burke	86	87,570	87,570	87,570	100.00 %	100.00 %
Cabarrus	73	225,804	90,036	90,036	39.87 %	100.00 %
	82	225,804	91,227	91,227	40.40 %	100.00 %
	83	225,804	90,899	44,541	19.73 %	49.00 %
Caldwell	87	80,652	85,009	80,652	100.00 %	94.87 %
Camden	5	10,355	82,953	10,355	100.00 %	12.48 %
Carteret	13	67,686	83,500	67,686	100.00 %	81.06 %
Caswell	50	22,736	86,290	22,736	100.00 %	26.35 %
Catawba	89	160,610	85,577	71,023	44.22 %	82.99 %
	96	160,610	89,587	89,587	55.78 %	100.00 %
Chatham	54	76,285	83,475	76,285	100.00 %	91.39 %
Cherokee	120	28,774	84,907	28,774	100.00 %	33.89 %
Chowan	1	13,708	82,812	13,708	100.00 %	16.55 %
Clay	120	11,089	84,907	11,089	100.00 %	13.06 %
Cleveland	110	99,519	89,459	39,865	40.06 %	44.56 %
	111	99,519	84,508	59,654	59.94 %	70.59 %
Columbus	46	50,623	83,701	50,623	100.00 %	60.48 %
Craven	3	100,720	84,906	84,906	84.30 %	100.00 %
	13	100,720	83,500	15,814	15.70 %	18.94 %
Cumberland	42	334,728	82,965	82,965	24.79 %	100.00 %
	43	334,728	85,335	85,335	25.49 %	100.00 %
	44	334,728	82,683	82,683	24.70 %	100.00 %
	45	334,728	83,745	83,745	25.02 %	100.00 %
Currituck	1	28,100	82,812	28,100	100.00 %	33.93 %
Dare	1	36,915	82,812	13,751	37.25 %	16.61 %
	79	36,915	84,681	23,164	62.75 %	27.35 %

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

Data Source: 2020 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File - North Carolina

[G20-CntyDist] - Generated 10/23/2023

County - District Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

County	District	Total County Population	Total District Population	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Davidson	80	168,930	83,289	83,289	49.30 %	100.00 %
	81	168,930	85,641	85,641	50.70 %	100.00 %
Davie	77	42,712	90,628	42,712	100.00 %	47.13 %
Duplin	4	48,715	83,034	48,715	100.00 %	58.67 %
Durham	2	324,833	90,751	51,654	15.90 %	56.92 %
	29	324,833	90,900	90,900	27.98 %	100.00 %
	30	324,833	91,038	91,038	28.03 %	100.00 %
	31	324,833	91,241	91,241	28.09 %	100.00 %
Edgecombe	23	48,900	88,865	48,900	100.00 %	55.03 %
Forsyth	71	382,590	88,823	88,823	23.22 %	100.00 %
	72	382,590	84,444	84,444	22.07 %	100.00 %
	74	382,590	83,545	83,545	21.84 %	100.00 %
	75	382,590	87,378	87,378	22.84 %	100.00 %
	91	382,590	82,920	38,400	10.04 %	46.31 %
Franklin	7	68,573	83,541	68,573	100.00 %	82.08 %
Gaston	108	227,943	89,468	89,468	39.25 %	100.00 %
	109	227,943	88,881	88,881	38.99 %	100.00 %
	110	227,943	89,459	49,594	21.76 %	55.44 %
Gates	5	10,478	82,953	10,478	100.00 %	12.63 %
Graham	120	8,030	84,907	8,030	100.00 %	9.46 %
Granville	32	60,992	88,602	60,992	100.00 %	68.84 %
Greene	12	20,451	84,745	20,451	100.00 %	24.13 %
Guilford	57	541,299	90,259	90,259	16.67 %	100.00 %
	58	541,299	90,051	90,051	16.64 %	100.00 %
	59	541,299	90,829	90,829	16.78 %	100.00 %
	60	541,299	90,340	90,340	16.69 %	100.00 %
	61	541,299	90,183	90,183	16.66 %	100.00 %
	62	541,299	89,637	89,637	16.56 %	100.00 %
Halifax	27	48,622	84,735	48,622	100.00 %	57.38 %
Harnett	6	133,568	90,919	90,919	68.07 %	100.00 %
	53	133,568	83,312	42,649	31.93 %	51.19 %
Haywood	118	62,089	83,282	62,089	100.00 %	74.55 %
Henderson	113	116,281	89,151	25,246	21.71 %	28.32 %
	117	116,281	91,035	91,035	78.29 %	100.00 %
Hertford	5	21,552	82,953	21,552	100.00 %	25.98 %
Hoke	48	52,082	86,256	52,082	100.00 %	60.38 %
Hyde	79	4,589	84,681	4,589	100.00 %	5.42 %
Iredell	84	186,693	86,773	86,773	46.48 %	100.00 %
	89	186,693	85,577	14,554	7.80 %	17.01 %
	95	186,693	85,366	85,366	45.73 %	100.00 %
Jackson	119	43,109	90,212	43,109	100.00 %	47.79 %

County - District Report**District Plan: H898, Ed 2**

County	District	Total County Population	Total District Population	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Johnston	26	215,999	89,947	89,947	41.64 %	100.00 %
	28	215,999	85,389	85,389	39.53 %	100.00 %
	53	215,999	83,312	40,663	18.83 %	48.81 %
Jones	12	9,172	84,745	9,172	100.00 %	10.82 %
Lee	51	63,285	83,073	63,285	100.00 %	76.18 %
Lenoir	12	55,122	84,745	55,122	100.00 %	65.04 %
Lincoln	97	86,810	86,810	86,810	100.00 %	100.00 %
Macon	120	37,014	84,907	37,014	100.00 %	43.59 %
Madison	118	21,193	83,282	21,193	100.00 %	25.45 %
Martin	23	22,031	88,865	22,031	100.00 %	24.79 %
McDowell	85	44,578	90,770	39,591	88.81 %	43.62 %
	113	44,578	89,151	4,987	11.19 %	5.59 %
Mecklenburg	88	1,115,482	84,505	84,505	7.58 %	100.00 %
	92	1,115,482	87,079	87,079	7.81 %	100.00 %
	98	1,115,482	82,789	82,789	7.42 %	100.00 %
	99	1,115,482	84,406	84,406	7.57 %	100.00 %
	100	1,115,482	86,763	86,763	7.78 %	100.00 %
	101	1,115,482	84,368	84,368	7.56 %	100.00 %
	102	1,115,482	84,206	84,206	7.55 %	100.00 %
	103	1,115,482	89,354	89,354	8.01 %	100.00 %
	104	1,115,482	83,554	83,554	7.49 %	100.00 %
	105	1,115,482	85,671	85,671	7.68 %	100.00 %
	106	1,115,482	86,716	86,716	7.77 %	100.00 %
	107	1,115,482	88,854	88,854	7.97 %	100.00 %
	112	1,115,482	87,217	87,217	7.82 %	100.00 %
Mitchell	85	14,903	90,770	14,903	100.00 %	16.42 %
Montgomery	67	25,751	88,255	25,751	100.00 %	29.18 %
Moore	51	99,727	83,073	19,788	19.84 %	23.82 %
	52	99,727	84,383	41,437	41.55 %	49.11 %
	78	99,727	86,365	38,502	38.61 %	44.58 %
Nash	24	94,970	83,322	4,538	4.78 %	5.45 %
	25	94,970	90,432	90,432	95.22 %	100.00 %
New Hanover	18	225,702	89,413	89,413	39.62 %	100.00 %
	19	225,702	91,288	45,109	19.99 %	49.41 %
	20	225,702	91,180	91,180	40.40 %	100.00 %
Northampton	27	17,471	84,735	17,471	100.00 %	20.62 %
Onslow	14	204,576	88,470	88,470	43.25 %	100.00 %
	15	204,576	91,212	91,212	44.59 %	100.00 %
	16	204,576	85,097	24,894	12.17 %	29.25 %
Orange	50	148,696	86,290	63,554	42.74 %	73.65 %
	56	148,696	85,142	85,142	57.26 %	100.00 %
Pamlico	79	12,276	84,681	12,276	100.00 %	14.50 %

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

Data Source: 2020 Census Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File - North Carolina

[G20-CntyDist] - Generated 10/23/2023

County - District Report**District Plan: H898, Ed 2**

County	District	Total County Population	Total District Population	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Pasquotank	5	40,568	82,953	40,568	100.00 %	48.90 %
Pender	16	60,203	85,097	60,203	100.00 %	70.75 %
Perquimans	1	13,005	82,812	13,005	100.00 %	15.70 %
Person	2	39,097	90,751	39,097	100.00 %	43.08 %
Pitt	8	170,243	83,559	83,559	49.08 %	100.00 %
	9	170,243	86,684	86,684	50.92 %	100.00 %
Polk	113	19,328	89,151	19,328	100.00 %	21.68 %
Randolph	54	144,171	83,475	7,190	4.99 %	8.61 %
	70	144,171	89,118	89,118	61.81 %	100.00 %
	78	144,171	86,365	47,863	33.20 %	55.42 %
Richmond	52	42,946	84,383	42,946	100.00 %	50.89 %
Robeson	46	116,530	83,701	33,078	28.39 %	39.52 %
	47	116,530	83,452	83,452	71.61 %	100.00 %
Rockingham	65	91,096	91,096	91,096	100.00 %	100.00 %
Rowan	76	146,875	89,815	89,815	61.15 %	100.00 %
	77	146,875	90,628	10,702	7.29 %	11.81 %
	83	146,875	90,899	46,358	31.56 %	51.00 %
Rutherford	111	64,444	84,508	24,854	38.57 %	29.41 %
	113	64,444	89,151	39,590	61.43 %	44.41 %
Sampson	22	59,036	88,642	59,036	100.00 %	66.60 %
Scotland	48	34,174	86,256	34,174	100.00 %	39.62 %
Stanly	67	62,504	88,255	62,504	100.00 %	70.82 %
Stokes	91	44,520	82,920	44,520	100.00 %	53.69 %
Surry	90	71,359	88,208	71,359	100.00 %	80.90 %
Swain	119	14,117	90,212	14,117	100.00 %	15.65 %
Transylvania	119	32,986	90,212	32,986	100.00 %	36.56 %
Tyrrell	1	3,245	82,812	3,245	100.00 %	3.92 %
Union	55	238,267	82,927	60,872	25.55 %	73.40 %
	68	238,267	88,209	88,209	37.02 %	100.00 %
	69	238,267	89,186	89,186	37.43 %	100.00 %
Vance	7	42,578	83,541	14,968	35.15 %	17.92 %
	32	42,578	88,602	27,610	64.85 %	31.16 %

County - District Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

County	District	Total County Population	Total District Population	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Wake	11	1,129,410	86,381	86,381	7.65 %	100.00 %
	21	1,129,410	87,764	87,764	7.77 %	100.00 %
	33	1,129,410	85,001	85,001	7.53 %	100.00 %
	34	1,129,410	84,251	84,251	7.46 %	100.00 %
	35	1,129,410	83,094	83,094	7.36 %	100.00 %
	36	1,129,410	86,038	86,038	7.62 %	100.00 %
	37	1,129,410	90,307	90,307	8.00 %	100.00 %
	38	1,129,410	86,444	86,444	7.65 %	100.00 %
	39	1,129,410	85,371	85,371	7.56 %	100.00 %
	40	1,129,410	86,359	86,359	7.65 %	100.00 %
	41	1,129,410	89,876	89,876	7.96 %	100.00 %
	49	1,129,410	89,807	89,807	7.95 %	100.00 %
	66	1,129,410	88,717	88,717	7.86 %	100.00 %
Warren	27	18,642	84,735	18,642	100.00 %	22.00 %
Washington	1	11,003	82,812	11,003	100.00 %	13.29 %
Watauga	87	54,086	85,009	4,357	8.06 %	5.13 %
	93	54,086	87,194	49,729	91.94 %	57.03 %
Wayne	4	117,333	83,034	34,319	29.25 %	41.33 %
	10	117,333	83,014	83,014	70.75 %	100.00 %
Wilkes	90	65,969	88,208	16,849	25.54 %	19.10 %
	94	65,969	85,564	49,120	74.46 %	57.41 %
Wilson	24	78,784	83,322	78,784	100.00 %	94.55 %
Yadkin	77	37,214	90,628	37,214	100.00 %	41.06 %
Yancey	85	18,470	90,770	18,470	100.00 %	20.35 %
Assigned Geography Total:				10,439,388		

Report display: all assigned counties

Total Counties Statewide: 100

Fully Assigned Counties: 100

Partially Assigned Counties: 0

Fully Unassigned Counties: 0

Total Districts Assigned: 120

Split Counties: 36

District - County Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	County	Total District Population	Total County Population	District Pop in County	Percent of District Pop in County	Percent of County Pop in District
1	Chowan	82,812	13,708	13,708	16.55 %	100.00 %
	Currituck	82,812	28,100	28,100	33.93 %	100.00 %
	Dare	82,812	36,915	13,751	16.61 %	37.25 %
	Perquimans	82,812	13,005	13,005	15.70 %	100.00 %
	Tyrrell	82,812	3,245	3,245	3.92 %	100.00 %
	Washington	82,812	11,003	11,003	13.29 %	100.00 %
2	Durham	90,751	324,833	51,654	56.92 %	15.90 %
	Person	90,751	39,097	39,097	43.08 %	100.00 %
3	Craven	84,906	100,720	84,906	100.00 %	84.30 %
4	Duplin	83,034	48,715	48,715	58.67 %	100.00 %
	Wayne	83,034	117,333	34,319	41.33 %	29.25 %
5	Camden	82,953	10,355	10,355	12.48 %	100.00 %
	Gates	82,953	10,478	10,478	12.63 %	100.00 %
	Hertford	82,953	21,552	21,552	25.98 %	100.00 %
	Pasquotank	82,953	40,568	40,568	48.90 %	100.00 %
6	Harnett	90,919	133,568	90,919	100.00 %	68.07 %
7	Franklin	83,541	68,573	68,573	82.08 %	100.00 %
	Vance	83,541	42,578	14,968	17.92 %	35.15 %
8	Pitt	83,559	170,243	83,559	100.00 %	49.08 %
9	Pitt	86,684	170,243	86,684	100.00 %	50.92 %
10	Wayne	83,014	117,333	83,014	100.00 %	70.75 %
11	Wake	86,381	1,129,410	86,381	100.00 %	7.65 %
12	Greene	84,745	20,451	20,451	24.13 %	100.00 %
	Jones	84,745	9,172	9,172	10.82 %	100.00 %
	Lenoir	84,745	55,122	55,122	65.04 %	100.00 %
13	Carteret	83,500	67,686	67,686	81.06 %	100.00 %
	Craven	83,500	100,720	15,814	18.94 %	15.70 %
14	Onslow	88,470	204,576	88,470	100.00 %	43.25 %
15	Onslow	91,212	204,576	91,212	100.00 %	44.59 %
16	Onslow	85,097	204,576	24,894	29.25 %	12.17 %
	Pender	85,097	60,203	60,203	70.75 %	100.00 %
17	Brunswick	90,514	136,693	90,514	100.00 %	66.22 %
18	New Hanover	89,413	225,702	89,413	100.00 %	39.62 %
	Brunswick	91,288	136,693	46,179	50.59 %	33.78 %
19	New Hanover	91,288	225,702	45,109	49.41 %	19.99 %
	New Hanover	91,180	225,702	91,180	100.00 %	40.40 %
20	New Hanover	91,180	225,702	91,180	100.00 %	40.40 %
21	Wake	87,764	1,129,410	87,764	100.00 %	7.77 %
22	Bladen	88,642	29,606	29,606	33.40 %	100.00 %
	Sampson	88,642	59,036	59,036	66.60 %	100.00 %
23	Bertie	88,865	17,934	17,934	20.18 %	100.00 %
	Edgecombe	88,865	48,900	48,900	55.03 %	100.00 %
	Martin	88,865	22,031	22,031	24.79 %	100.00 %

District - County Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	County	Total District Population	Total County Population	District Pop in County	Percent of District Pop in County	Percent of County Pop in District
24	Nash	83,322	94,970	4,538	5.45 %	4.78 %
	Wilson	83,322	78,784	78,784	94.55 %	100.00 %
25	Nash	90,432	94,970	90,432	100.00 %	95.22 %
26	Johnston	89,947	215,999	89,947	100.00 %	41.64 %
27	Halifax	84,735	48,622	48,622	57.38 %	100.00 %
	Northampton	84,735	17,471	17,471	20.62 %	100.00 %
	Warren	84,735	18,642	18,642	22.00 %	100.00 %
28	Johnston	85,389	215,999	85,389	100.00 %	39.53 %
29	Durham	90,900	324,833	90,900	100.00 %	27.98 %
30	Durham	91,038	324,833	91,038	100.00 %	28.03 %
31	Durham	91,241	324,833	91,241	100.00 %	28.09 %
32	Granville	88,602	60,992	60,992	68.84 %	100.00 %
	Vance	88,602	42,578	27,610	31.16 %	64.85 %
33	Wake	85,001	1,129,410	85,001	100.00 %	7.53 %
34	Wake	84,251	1,129,410	84,251	100.00 %	7.46 %
35	Wake	83,094	1,129,410	83,094	100.00 %	7.36 %
36	Wake	86,038	1,129,410	86,038	100.00 %	7.62 %
37	Wake	90,307	1,129,410	90,307	100.00 %	8.00 %
38	Wake	86,444	1,129,410	86,444	100.00 %	7.65 %
39	Wake	85,371	1,129,410	85,371	100.00 %	7.56 %
40	Wake	86,359	1,129,410	86,359	100.00 %	7.65 %
41	Wake	89,876	1,129,410	89,876	100.00 %	7.96 %
42	Cumberland	82,965	334,728	82,965	100.00 %	24.79 %
43	Cumberland	85,335	334,728	85,335	100.00 %	25.49 %
44	Cumberland	82,683	334,728	82,683	100.00 %	24.70 %
45	Cumberland	83,745	334,728	83,745	100.00 %	25.02 %
46	Columbus	83,701	50,623	50,623	60.48 %	100.00 %
	Robeson	83,701	116,530	33,078	39.52 %	28.39 %
47	Robeson	83,452	116,530	83,452	100.00 %	71.61 %
48	Hoke	86,256	52,082	52,082	60.38 %	100.00 %
	Scotland	86,256	34,174	34,174	39.62 %	100.00 %
49	Wake	89,807	1,129,410	89,807	100.00 %	7.95 %
50	Caswell	86,290	22,736	22,736	26.35 %	100.00 %
	Orange	86,290	148,696	63,554	73.65 %	42.74 %
51	Lee	83,073	63,285	63,285	76.18 %	100.00 %
	Moore	83,073	99,727	19,788	23.82 %	19.84 %
52	Moore	84,383	99,727	41,437	49.11 %	41.55 %
	Richmond	84,383	42,946	42,946	50.89 %	100.00 %
53	Harnett	83,312	133,568	42,649	51.19 %	31.93 %
	Johnston	83,312	215,999	40,663	48.81 %	18.83 %
54	Chatham	83,475	76,285	76,285	91.39 %	100.00 %
	Randolph	83,475	144,171	7,190	8.61 %	4.99 %

District - County Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	County	Total District Population	Total County Population	District Pop in County	Percent of District Pop in County	Percent of County Pop in District
55	Anson	82,927	22,055	22,055	26.60 %	100.00 %
	Union	82,927	238,267	60,872	73.40 %	25.55 %
56	Orange	85,142	148,696	85,142	100.00 %	57.26 %
57	Guilford	90,259	541,299	90,259	100.00 %	16.67 %
58	Guilford	90,051	541,299	90,051	100.00 %	16.64 %
59	Guilford	90,829	541,299	90,829	100.00 %	16.78 %
60	Guilford	90,340	541,299	90,340	100.00 %	16.69 %
61	Guilford	90,183	541,299	90,183	100.00 %	16.66 %
62	Guilford	89,637	541,299	89,637	100.00 %	16.56 %
63	Alamance	83,847	171,415	83,847	100.00 %	48.91 %
64	Alamance	87,568	171,415	87,568	100.00 %	51.09 %
65	Rockingham	91,096	91,096	91,096	100.00 %	100.00 %
66	Wake	88,717	1,129,410	88,717	100.00 %	7.86 %
67	Montgomery	88,255	25,751	25,751	29.18 %	100.00 %
	Stanly	88,255	62,504	62,504	70.82 %	100.00 %
68	Union	88,209	238,267	88,209	100.00 %	37.02 %
69	Union	89,186	238,267	89,186	100.00 %	37.43 %
70	Randolph	89,118	144,171	89,118	100.00 %	61.81 %
71	Forsyth	88,823	382,590	88,823	100.00 %	23.22 %
72	Forsyth	84,444	382,590	84,444	100.00 %	22.07 %
73	Cabarrus	90,036	225,804	90,036	100.00 %	39.87 %
74	Forsyth	83,545	382,590	83,545	100.00 %	21.84 %
75	Forsyth	87,378	382,590	87,378	100.00 %	22.84 %
76	Rowan	89,815	146,875	89,815	100.00 %	61.15 %
77	Davie	90,628	42,712	42,712	47.13 %	100.00 %
	Rowan	90,628	146,875	10,702	11.81 %	7.29 %
	Yadkin	90,628	37,214	37,214	41.06 %	100.00 %
78	Moore	86,365	99,727	38,502	44.58 %	38.61 %
	Randolph	86,365	144,171	47,863	55.42 %	33.20 %
79	Beaufort	84,681	44,652	44,652	52.73 %	100.00 %
	Dare	84,681	36,915	23,164	27.35 %	62.75 %
	Hyde	84,681	4,589	4,589	5.42 %	100.00 %
	Pamlico	84,681	12,276	12,276	14.50 %	100.00 %
80	Davidson	83,289	168,930	83,289	100.00 %	49.30 %
81	Davidson	85,641	168,930	85,641	100.00 %	50.70 %
82	Cabarrus	91,227	225,804	91,227	100.00 %	40.40 %
83	Cabarrus	90,899	225,804	44,541	49.00 %	19.73 %
	Rowan	90,899	146,875	46,358	51.00 %	31.56 %
84	Iredell	86,773	186,693	86,773	100.00 %	46.48 %

District - County Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	County	Total District Population	Total County Population	District Pop in County	Percent of District Pop in County	Percent of County Pop in District
85	Avery	90,770	17,806	17,806	19.62 %	100.00 %
	McDowell	90,770	44,578	39,591	43.62 %	88.81 %
	Mitchell	90,770	14,903	14,903	16.42 %	100.00 %
	Yancey	90,770	18,470	18,470	20.35 %	100.00 %
86	Burke	87,570	87,570	87,570	100.00 %	100.00 %
87	Caldwell	85,009	80,652	80,652	94.87 %	100.00 %
	Watauga	85,009	54,086	4,357	5.13 %	8.06 %
88	Mecklenburg	84,505	1,115,482	84,505	100.00 %	7.58 %
89	Catawba	85,577	160,610	71,023	82.99 %	44.22 %
	Iredell	85,577	186,693	14,554	17.01 %	7.80 %
90	Surry	88,208	71,359	71,359	80.90 %	100.00 %
	Wilkes	88,208	65,969	16,849	19.10 %	25.54 %
91	Forsyth	82,920	382,590	38,400	46.31 %	10.04 %
	Stokes	82,920	44,520	44,520	53.69 %	100.00 %
92	Mecklenburg	87,079	1,115,482	87,079	100.00 %	7.81 %
93	Alleghany	87,194	10,888	10,888	12.49 %	100.00 %
	Ashe	87,194	26,577	26,577	30.48 %	100.00 %
	Watauga	87,194	54,086	49,729	57.03 %	91.94 %
94	Alexander	85,564	36,444	36,444	42.59 %	100.00 %
	Wilkes	85,564	65,969	49,120	57.41 %	74.46 %
95	Iredell	85,366	186,693	85,366	100.00 %	45.73 %
96	Catawba	89,587	160,610	89,587	100.00 %	55.78 %
97	Lincoln	86,810	86,810	86,810	100.00 %	100.00 %
98	Mecklenburg	82,789	1,115,482	82,789	100.00 %	7.42 %
99	Mecklenburg	84,406	1,115,482	84,406	100.00 %	7.57 %
100	Mecklenburg	86,763	1,115,482	86,763	100.00 %	7.78 %
101	Mecklenburg	84,368	1,115,482	84,368	100.00 %	7.56 %
102	Mecklenburg	84,206	1,115,482	84,206	100.00 %	7.55 %
103	Mecklenburg	89,354	1,115,482	89,354	100.00 %	8.01 %
104	Mecklenburg	83,554	1,115,482	83,554	100.00 %	7.49 %
105	Mecklenburg	85,671	1,115,482	85,671	100.00 %	7.68 %
106	Mecklenburg	86,716	1,115,482	86,716	100.00 %	7.77 %
107	Mecklenburg	88,854	1,115,482	88,854	100.00 %	7.97 %
108	Gaston	89,468	227,943	89,468	100.00 %	39.25 %
109	Gaston	88,881	227,943	88,881	100.00 %	38.99 %
110	Cleveland	89,459	99,519	39,865	44.56 %	40.06 %
	Gaston	89,459	227,943	49,594	55.44 %	21.76 %
111	Cleveland	84,508	99,519	59,654	70.59 %	59.94 %
	Rutherford	84,508	64,444	24,854	29.41 %	38.57 %
112	Mecklenburg	87,217	1,115,482	87,217	100.00 %	7.82 %

District - County Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	County	Total District Population	Total County Population	District Pop in County	Percent of District Pop in County	Percent of County Pop in District
113	Henderson	89,151	116,281	25,246	28.32 %	21.71 %
	McDowell	89,151	44,578	4,987	5.59 %	11.19 %
	Polk	89,151	19,328	19,328	21.68 %	100.00 %
	Rutherford	89,151	64,444	39,590	44.41 %	61.43 %
114	Buncombe	90,248	269,452	90,248	100.00 %	33.49 %
115	Buncombe	89,747	269,452	89,747	100.00 %	33.31 %
116	Buncombe	89,457	269,452	89,457	100.00 %	33.20 %
117	Henderson	91,035	116,281	91,035	100.00 %	78.29 %
118	Haywood	83,282	62,089	62,089	74.55 %	100.00 %
	Madison	83,282	21,193	21,193	25.45 %	100.00 %
119	Jackson	90,212	43,109	43,109	47.79 %	100.00 %
	Swain	90,212	14,117	14,117	15.65 %	100.00 %
	Transylvania	90,212	32,986	32,986	36.56 %	100.00 %
120	Cherokee	84,907	28,774	28,774	33.89 %	100.00 %
	Clay	84,907	11,089	11,089	13.06 %	100.00 %
	Graham	84,907	8,030	8,030	9.46 %	100.00 %
	Macon	84,907	37,014	37,014	43.59 %	100.00 %
Total:				10,439,388		

Total Districts Assigned: 120
 Total Counties Statewide: 100
 Fully Assigned Counties: 100
 Partially Assigned Counties: 0
 Fully Unassigned Counties: 0
 Split Counties: 36

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Aberdeen	52	8,516	84,383	8,516	100.00 %	10.09 %
	78	8,516	86,365	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Ahoskie	5	4,891	82,953	4,891	100.00 %	5.90 %
Alamance	63	988	83,847	988	100.00 %	1.18 %
Albemarle	67	16,432	88,255	16,432	100.00 %	18.62 %
Alliance	79	733	84,681	733	100.00 %	0.87 %
Andrews	120	1,667	84,907	1,667	100.00 %	1.96 %
Angier	37	5,265	90,307	556	10.56 %	0.62 %
	53	5,265	83,312	4,709	89.44 %	5.65 %
Ansonville	55	440	82,927	440	100.00 %	0.53 %
Apex	11	58,780	86,381	6,287	10.70 %	7.28 %
	21	58,780	87,764	42,698	72.64 %	48.65 %
	36	58,780	86,038	9,795	16.66 %	11.38 %
Arapahoe	79	416	84,681	416	100.00 %	0.49 %
Archdale	59	11,907	90,829	250	2.10 %	0.28 %
	60	11,907	90,340	130	1.09 %	0.14 %
	70	11,907	89,118	11,527	96.81 %	12.93 %
Archer Lodge	26	4,797	89,947	4,797	100.00 %	5.33 %
Asheboro	70	27,156	89,118	25,890	95.34 %	29.05 %
	78	27,156	86,365	1,266	4.66 %	1.47 %
Asheville	114	94,589	90,248	20,413	21.58 %	22.62 %
	115	94,589	89,747	785	0.83 %	0.87 %
	116	94,589	89,457	73,391	77.59 %	82.04 %
Askewville	23	184	88,865	184	100.00 %	0.21 %
Atkinson	16	296	85,097	296	100.00 %	0.35 %
Atlantic Beach	13	1,364	83,500	1,364	100.00 %	1.63 %
Aulander	23	763	88,865	763	100.00 %	0.86 %
Aurora	79	455	84,681	455	100.00 %	0.54 %
Autoryville	22	167	88,642	167	100.00 %	0.19 %
Ayden	9	4,977	86,684	4,977	100.00 %	5.74 %
Badin	67	2,024	88,255	2,024	100.00 %	2.29 %
Bailey	25	568	90,432	568	100.00 %	0.63 %
Bakersville	85	450	90,770	450	100.00 %	0.50 %
Bald Head Island	19	268	91,288	268	100.00 %	0.29 %
Banner Elk	85	1,049	90,770	1,049	100.00 %	1.16 %
Bath	79	245	84,681	245	100.00 %	0.29 %
Bayboro	79	1,161	84,681	1,161	100.00 %	1.37 %
Bear Grass	23	89	88,865	89	100.00 %	0.10 %
Beaufort	13	4,464	83,500	4,464	100.00 %	5.35 %
Beech Mountain	85	675	90,770	62	9.19 %	0.07 %
	93	675	87,194	613	90.81 %	0.70 %
Belhaven	79	1,410	84,681	1,410	100.00 %	1.67 %

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 10/23/2023

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Belmont	108	15,010	89,468	1,868	12.45 %	2.09 %
	109	15,010	88,881	13,142	87.55 %	14.79 %
Belville	17	2,406	90,514	2,406	100.00 %	2.66 %
Belwood	110	857	89,459	857	100.00 %	0.96 %
Benson	28	3,967	85,389	3,967	100.00 %	4.65 %
	53	3,967	83,312	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Bermuda Run	77	3,120	90,628	3,120	100.00 %	3.44 %
Bessemer City	110	5,428	89,459	5,428	100.00 %	6.07 %
Bethania	74	344	83,545	344	100.00 %	0.41 %
Bethel	8	1,373	83,559	1,373	100.00 %	1.64 %
Beulaville	4	1,116	83,034	1,116	100.00 %	1.34 %
Biltmore Forest	114	1,409	90,248	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	116	1,409	89,457	1,409	100.00 %	1.58 %
Biscoe	67	1,848	88,255	1,848	100.00 %	2.09 %
Black Creek	24	692	83,322	692	100.00 %	0.83 %
Black Mountain	114	8,426	90,248	8,426	100.00 %	9.34 %
Bladenboro	22	1,648	88,642	1,648	100.00 %	1.86 %
Blowing Rock	87	1,376	85,009	96	6.98 %	0.11 %
	93	1,376	87,194	1,280	93.02 %	1.47 %
Boardman	46	166	83,701	166	100.00 %	0.20 %
Bogue	13	695	83,500	695	100.00 %	0.83 %
Boiling Spring Lakes	19	5,943	91,288	5,943	100.00 %	6.51 %
Boiling Springs	111	4,615	84,508	4,615	100.00 %	5.46 %
Bolivia	19	149	91,288	149	100.00 %	0.16 %
Bolton	46	519	83,701	519	100.00 %	0.62 %
Boone	87	19,092	85,009	595	3.12 %	0.70 %
	93	19,092	87,194	18,497	96.88 %	21.21 %
Boonville	77	1,185	90,628	1,185	100.00 %	1.31 %
Bostic	111	355	84,508	355	100.00 %	0.42 %
Brevard	119	7,744	90,212	7,744	100.00 %	8.58 %
Bridgeton	3	349	84,906	349	100.00 %	0.41 %
Broadway	6	1,267	90,919	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	51	1,267	83,073	1,267	100.00 %	1.53 %
Brookford	96	442	89,587	442	100.00 %	0.49 %
Brunswick	46	973	83,701	973	100.00 %	1.16 %
Bryson City	119	1,558	90,212	1,558	100.00 %	1.73 %
Bunn	7	327	83,541	327	100.00 %	0.39 %
Burgaw	16	3,088	85,097	3,088	100.00 %	3.63 %
Burlington	59	57,303	90,829	1,822	3.18 %	2.01 %
	63	57,303	83,847	41,298	72.07 %	49.25 %
	64	57,303	87,568	14,183	24.75 %	16.20 %
Burnsville	85	1,614	90,770	1,614	100.00 %	1.78 %

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Butner	32	8,397	88,602	8,397	100.00 %	9.48 %
Cajah's Mountain	87	2,722	85,009	2,722	100.00 %	3.20 %
Calabash	17	2,011	90,514	2,011	100.00 %	2.22 %
Calypso	4	327	83,034	327	100.00 %	0.39 %
Cameron	51	244	83,073	244	100.00 %	0.29 %
Candor	67	813	88,255	813	100.00 %	0.92 %
	78	813	86,365	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Canton	118	4,422	83,282	4,422	100.00 %	5.31 %
Cape Carteret	13	2,224	83,500	2,224	100.00 %	2.66 %
Carolina Beach	19	6,564	91,288	6,564	100.00 %	7.19 %
Carolina Shores	17	4,588	90,514	4,588	100.00 %	5.07 %
Carrboro	56	21,295	85,142	21,295	100.00 %	25.01 %
Carthage	51	2,775	83,073	2,747	98.99 %	3.31 %
	52	2,775	84,383	28	1.01 %	0.03 %
Cary	11	174,721	86,381	64,839	37.11 %	75.06 %
	21	174,721	87,764	35,876	20.53 %	40.88 %
	33	174,721	85,001	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	34	174,721	84,251	6,581	3.77 %	7.81 %
	36	174,721	86,038	15,876	9.09 %	18.45 %
	41	174,721	89,876	47,840	27.38 %	53.23 %
	54	174,721	83,475	3,709	2.12 %	4.44 %
Casar	110	305	89,459	305	100.00 %	0.34 %
Castalia	25	264	90,432	264	100.00 %	0.29 %
Caswell Beach	19	395	91,288	395	100.00 %	0.43 %
Catawba	89	702	85,577	702	100.00 %	0.82 %
Cedar Point	13	1,764	83,500	1,764	100.00 %	2.11 %
Cedar Rock	87	301	85,009	301	100.00 %	0.35 %
Cerro Gordo	46	131	83,701	131	100.00 %	0.16 %
Chadbourn	46	1,574	83,701	1,574	100.00 %	1.88 %
Chapel Hill	29	61,960	90,900	2,906	4.69 %	3.20 %
	50	61,960	86,290	4,636	7.48 %	5.37 %
	56	61,960	85,142	54,418	87.83 %	63.91 %

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Charlotte	88	874,579	84,505	84,505	9.66 %	100.00 %
	92	874,579	87,079	65,691	7.51 %	75.44 %
	99	874,579	84,406	80,216	9.17 %	95.04 %
	100	874,579	86,763	69,531	7.95 %	80.14 %
	101	874,579	84,368	56,322	6.44 %	66.76 %
	102	874,579	84,206	84,206	9.63 %	100.00 %
	103	874,579	89,354	73,571	8.41 %	82.34 %
	104	874,579	83,554	83,554	9.55 %	100.00 %
	105	874,579	85,671	40,470	4.63 %	47.24 %
	106	874,579	86,716	73,248	8.38 %	84.47 %
	107	874,579	88,854	83,491	9.55 %	93.96 %
	112	874,579	87,217	79,774	9.12 %	91.47 %
Cherryville	110	6,078	89,459	6,078	100.00 %	6.79 %
Chimney Rock Village	113	140	89,151	140	100.00 %	0.16 %
China Grove	83	4,434	90,899	4,434	100.00 %	4.88 %
Chocowinity	79	722	84,681	722	100.00 %	0.85 %
Claremont	89	1,692	85,577	1,692	100.00 %	1.98 %
Clarkton	22	614	88,642	614	100.00 %	0.69 %
Clayton	26	26,307	89,947	26,307	100.00 %	29.25 %
	33	26,307	85,001	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	39	26,307	85,371	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Clemmons	74	21,163	83,545	21,163	100.00 %	25.33 %
Cleveland	77	846	90,628	846	100.00 %	0.93 %
Clinton	22	8,383	88,642	8,383	100.00 %	9.46 %
Clyde	118	1,368	83,282	1,368	100.00 %	1.64 %
Coats	53	2,155	83,312	2,155	100.00 %	2.59 %
Cofield	5	267	82,953	267	100.00 %	0.32 %
Colerain	23	217	88,865	217	100.00 %	0.24 %
Columbia	1	610	82,812	610	100.00 %	0.74 %
Columbus	113	1,060	89,151	1,060	100.00 %	1.19 %
Como	5	67	82,953	67	100.00 %	0.08 %
Concord	73	105,240	90,036	65,770	62.50 %	73.05 %
	82	105,240	91,227	39,470	37.50 %	43.27 %
	83	105,240	90,899	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Conetoe	23	198	88,865	198	100.00 %	0.22 %
Connelly Springs	86	1,529	87,570	1,529	100.00 %	1.75 %
Conover	89	8,421	85,577	424	5.04 %	0.50 %
	96	8,421	89,587	7,997	94.96 %	8.93 %
Conway	27	752	84,735	752	100.00 %	0.89 %
Cooleemee	77	940	90,628	940	100.00 %	1.04 %
Cornelius	98	31,412	82,789	31,412	100.00 %	37.94 %
Cove City	3	378	84,906	378	100.00 %	0.45 %

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 10/23/2023

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Cramerton	108	5,296	89,468	96	1.81 %	0.11 %
	109	5,296	88,881	5,200	98.19 %	5.85 %
Creedmoor	32	4,866	88,602	4,866	100.00 %	5.49 %
Creswell	1	207	82,812	207	100.00 %	0.25 %
Crossnore	85	143	90,770	143	100.00 %	0.16 %
Dallas	108	5,927	89,468	5,927	100.00 %	6.62 %
Danbury	91	189	82,920	189	100.00 %	0.23 %
Davidson	95	15,106	85,366	378	2.50 %	0.44 %
	98	15,106	82,789	14,728	97.50 %	17.79 %
Dellview	110	6	89,459	6	100.00 %	0.01 %
Denton	80	1,494	83,289	1,494	100.00 %	1.79 %
Dillsboro	119	213	90,212	213	100.00 %	0.24 %
Dobbins Heights	52	687	84,383	687	100.00 %	0.81 %
Dobson	90	1,462	88,208	1,462	100.00 %	1.66 %
Dortches	25	1,082	90,432	1,082	100.00 %	1.20 %
Dover	3	349	84,906	349	100.00 %	0.41 %
Drexel	86	1,760	87,570	1,760	100.00 %	2.01 %
Dublin	22	267	88,642	267	100.00 %	0.30 %
Duck	1	742	82,812	742	100.00 %	0.90 %
Dunn	6	8,446	90,919	1	0.01 %	0.00 %
	53	8,446	83,312	8,445	99.99 %	10.14 %
Durham	2	283,506	90,751	28,462	10.04 %	31.36 %
	29	283,506	90,900	85,000	29.98 %	93.51 %
	30	283,506	91,038	89,784	31.67 %	98.62 %
	31	283,506	91,241	79,847	28.16 %	87.51 %
	40	283,506	86,359	269	0.09 %	0.31 %
	41	283,506	89,876	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	50	283,506	86,290	144	0.05 %	0.17 %
Earl	111	198	84,508	198	100.00 %	0.23 %
East Arcadia	22	418	88,642	418	100.00 %	0.47 %
East Bend	77	634	90,628	634	100.00 %	0.70 %
East Laurinburg	48	234	86,256	234	100.00 %	0.27 %
Eastover	43	3,656	85,335	3,656	100.00 %	4.28 %
East Spencer	76	1,567	89,815	1,567	100.00 %	1.74 %
Eden	65	15,421	91,096	15,421	100.00 %	16.93 %
Edenton	1	4,460	82,812	4,460	100.00 %	5.39 %
Elizabeth City	5	18,631	82,953	18,631	100.00 %	22.46 %
Elizabethtown	22	3,296	88,642	3,296	100.00 %	3.72 %
Elkin	90	4,122	88,208	4,122	100.00 %	4.67 %
Elk Park	85	542	90,770	542	100.00 %	0.60 %
Ellenboro	111	723	84,508	723	100.00 %	0.86 %
Ellerbe	52	864	84,383	864	100.00 %	1.02 %

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 10/23/2023

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Elm City	24	1,218	83,322	1,218	100.00 %	1.46 %
Elon	63	11,336	83,847	11,336	100.00 %	13.52 %
Emerald Isle	13	3,847	83,500	3,847	100.00 %	4.61 %
Enfield	27	1,865	84,735	1,865	100.00 %	2.20 %
Erwin	6	4,542	90,919	4,542	100.00 %	5.00 %
	53	4,542	83,312	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Eureka	10	214	83,014	214	100.00 %	0.26 %
Everetts	23	150	88,865	150	100.00 %	0.17 %
Fair Bluff	46	709	83,701	709	100.00 %	0.85 %
Fairmont	47	2,191	83,452	2,191	100.00 %	2.63 %
Fairview	69	3,456	89,186	3,456	100.00 %	3.88 %
Faison	4	784	83,034	784	100.00 %	0.94 %
	22	784	88,642	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Faith	76	819	89,815	819	100.00 %	0.91 %
Falcon	22	324	88,642	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	43	324	85,335	324	100.00 %	0.38 %
Falkland	8	47	83,559	47	100.00 %	0.06 %
Fallston	110	627	89,459	627	100.00 %	0.70 %
Farmville	8	4,461	83,559	4,461	100.00 %	5.34 %
Fayetteville	42	208,501	82,965	68,284	32.75 %	82.30 %
	43	208,501	85,335	23,719	11.38 %	27.80 %
	44	208,501	82,683	80,996	38.85 %	97.96 %
	45	208,501	83,745	35,502	17.03 %	42.39 %
Flat Rock	113	3,486	89,151	3,486	100.00 %	3.91 %
Fletcher	117	7,987	91,035	7,987	100.00 %	8.77 %
Fontana Dam	120	13	84,907	13	100.00 %	0.02 %
Forest City	111	7,377	84,508	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	113	7,377	89,151	7,377	100.00 %	8.27 %
Forest Hills	119	303	90,212	303	100.00 %	0.34 %
Fountain	8	385	83,559	385	100.00 %	0.46 %
Four Oaks	28	2,158	85,389	2,158	100.00 %	2.53 %
Foxfire	52	1,288	84,383	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	78	1,288	86,365	1,288	100.00 %	1.49 %
Franklin	120	4,175	84,907	4,175	100.00 %	4.92 %
Franklinton	7	2,456	83,541	2,456	100.00 %	2.94 %
Franklinville	78	1,197	86,365	1,197	100.00 %	1.39 %
Fremont	10	1,196	83,014	1,196	100.00 %	1.44 %
Fuquay-Varina	6	34,152	90,919	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	36	34,152	86,038	3,076	9.01 %	3.58 %
	37	34,152	90,307	31,076	90.99 %	34.41 %
Gamewell	87	3,702	85,009	3,702	100.00 %	4.35 %
Garland	22	595	88,642	595	100.00 %	0.67 %

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Garner	33	31,159	85,001	27,457	88.12 %	32.30 %
	36	31,159	86,038	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	37	31,159	90,307	3,702	11.88 %	4.10 %
Garysburg	27	904	84,735	904	100.00 %	1.07 %
Gaston	27	1,008	84,735	1,008	100.00 %	1.19 %
Gastonia	108	80,411	89,468	15,548	19.34 %	17.38 %
	109	80,411	88,881	49,589	61.67 %	55.79 %
	110	80,411	89,459	15,274	18.99 %	17.07 %
Gatesville	5	267	82,953	267	100.00 %	0.32 %
Gibson	48	449	86,256	449	100.00 %	0.52 %
Gibsonville	59	8,920	90,829	4,642	52.04 %	5.11 %
	63	8,920	83,847	4,278	47.96 %	5.10 %
Glen Alpine	86	1,529	87,570	1,529	100.00 %	1.75 %
Godwin	43	128	85,335	128	100.00 %	0.15 %
Goldsboro	4	33,657	83,034	2,546	7.56 %	3.07 %
	10	33,657	83,014	31,111	92.44 %	37.48 %
Goldston	54	234	83,475	234	100.00 %	0.28 %
Graham	64	17,157	87,568	17,157	100.00 %	19.59 %
Grandfather Village	85	95	90,770	95	100.00 %	0.10 %
Granite Falls	87	4,965	85,009	4,965	100.00 %	5.84 %
Granite Quarry	76	2,984	89,815	2,984	100.00 %	3.32 %
Grantsboro	79	692	84,681	692	100.00 %	0.82 %
Greenevers	4	567	83,034	567	100.00 %	0.68 %
Green Level	63	3,152	83,847	396	12.56 %	0.47 %
	64	3,152	87,568	2,756	87.44 %	3.15 %
Greensboro	57	299,035	90,259	85,668	28.65 %	94.91 %
	58	299,035	90,051	77,753	26.00 %	86.34 %
	59	299,035	90,829	9,852	3.29 %	10.85 %
	60	299,035	90,340	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	61	299,035	90,183	90,183	30.16 %	100.00 %
	62	299,035	89,637	35,579	11.90 %	39.69 %
Greenville	8	87,521	83,559	57,659	65.88 %	69.00 %
	9	87,521	86,684	29,862	34.12 %	34.45 %
Grifton	9	2,448	86,684	2,301	94.00 %	2.65 %
	12	2,448	84,745	147	6.00 %	0.17 %
Grimesland	9	386	86,684	386	100.00 %	0.45 %
Grover	111	802	84,508	802	100.00 %	0.95 %
Halifax	27	170	84,735	170	100.00 %	0.20 %
Hamilton	23	306	88,865	306	100.00 %	0.34 %
Hamlet	52	6,025	84,383	6,025	100.00 %	7.14 %
Harmony	84	543	86,773	543	100.00 %	0.63 %

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Harrells	4	160	83,034	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	22	160	88,642	160	100.00 %	0.18 %
Harrellsville	5	85	82,953	85	100.00 %	0.10 %
Harrisburg	73	18,967	90,036	1,414	7.46 %	1.57 %
	82	18,967	91,227	17,553	92.54 %	19.24 %
Hassell	23	49	88,865	49	100.00 %	0.06 %
Havelock	3	16,621	84,906	4,939	29.72 %	5.82 %
	13	16,621	83,500	11,682	70.28 %	13.99 %
Haw River	63	2,252	83,847	46	2.04 %	0.05 %
	64	2,252	87,568	2,206	97.96 %	2.52 %
Hayesville	120	461	84,907	461	100.00 %	0.54 %
Hemby Bridge	69	1,614	89,186	1,614	100.00 %	1.81 %
Henderson	7	15,060	83,541	330	2.19 %	0.40 %
	32	15,060	88,602	14,730	97.81 %	16.62 %
Hendersonville	113	15,137	89,151	623	4.12 %	0.70 %
	117	15,137	91,035	14,514	95.88 %	15.94 %
Hertford	1	1,934	82,812	1,934	100.00 %	2.34 %
Hickory	86	43,490	87,570	79	0.18 %	0.09 %
	87	43,490	85,009	32	0.07 %	0.04 %
	89	43,490	85,577	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	96	43,490	89,587	43,379	99.74 %	48.42 %
Highlands	119	1,072	90,212	12	1.12 %	0.01 %
	120	1,072	84,907	1,060	98.88 %	1.25 %
High Point	59	114,059	90,829	4,012	3.52 %	4.42 %
	60	114,059	90,340	88,578	77.66 %	98.05 %
	62	114,059	89,637	14,731	12.92 %	16.43 %
	70	114,059	89,118	8	0.01 %	0.01 %
	75	114,059	87,378	84	0.07 %	0.10 %
	80	114,059	83,289	6,646	5.83 %	7.98 %
High Shoals	108	595	89,468	595	100.00 %	0.67 %
	110	595	89,459	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Hildebran	86	1,679	87,570	1,679	100.00 %	1.92 %
Hillsborough	50	9,660	86,290	9,660	100.00 %	11.19 %
Hobgood	27	268	84,735	268	100.00 %	0.32 %
Hoffman	52	418	84,383	418	100.00 %	0.50 %
Holden Beach	17	921	90,514	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	19	921	91,288	921	100.00 %	1.01 %
Holly Ridge	16	4,171	85,097	4,171	100.00 %	4.90 %
Holly Springs	21	41,239	87,764	6	0.01 %	0.01 %
	36	41,239	86,038	35,450	85.96 %	41.20 %
	37	41,239	90,307	5,783	14.02 %	6.40 %
Hookerton	12	413	84,745	413	100.00 %	0.49 %

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Hope Mills	43	17,808	85,335	402	2.26 %	0.47 %
	45	17,808	83,745	17,406	97.74 %	20.78 %
Hot Springs	118	520	83,282	520	100.00 %	0.62 %
Hudson	87	3,780	85,009	3,780	100.00 %	4.45 %
Huntersville	98	61,376	82,789	34,639	56.44 %	41.84 %
	101	61,376	84,368	16,997	27.69 %	20.15 %
	106	61,376	86,716	9,740	15.87 %	11.23 %
Indian Beach	13	223	83,500	223	100.00 %	0.27 %
Indian Trail	68	39,997	88,209	2,376	5.94 %	2.69 %
	69	39,997	89,186	37,621	94.06 %	42.18 %
Jackson	27	430	84,735	430	100.00 %	0.51 %
Jacksonville	14	72,723	88,470	47,353	65.11 %	53.52 %
	15	72,723	91,212	25,370	34.89 %	27.81 %
Jamestown	59	3,668	90,829	3,661	99.81 %	4.03 %
	60	3,668	90,340	7	0.19 %	0.01 %
Jamesville	23	424	88,865	424	100.00 %	0.48 %
Jefferson	93	1,622	87,194	1,622	100.00 %	1.86 %
Jonesville	77	2,308	90,628	2,308	100.00 %	2.55 %
Kannapolis	73	53,114	90,036	3,277	6.17 %	3.64 %
	82	53,114	91,227	1,006	1.89 %	1.10 %
	83	53,114	90,899	48,831	91.94 %	53.72 %
Kelford	23	203	88,865	203	100.00 %	0.23 %
Kenansville	4	770	83,034	770	100.00 %	0.93 %
Kenly	24	1,491	83,322	198	13.28 %	0.24 %
	28	1,491	85,389	1,293	86.72 %	1.51 %
Kernersville	62	26,449	89,637	502	1.90 %	0.56 %
	75	26,449	87,378	25,947	98.10 %	29.70 %
	91	26,449	82,920	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Kill Devil Hills	79	7,656	84,681	7,656	100.00 %	9.04 %
King	74	7,197	83,545	591	8.21 %	0.71 %
	91	7,197	82,920	6,606	91.79 %	7.97 %
Kings Mountain	110	11,142	89,459	1,110	9.96 %	1.24 %
	111	11,142	84,508	10,032	90.04 %	11.87 %
Kingstown	110	656	89,459	656	100.00 %	0.73 %
Kinston	12	19,900	84,745	19,900	100.00 %	23.48 %
Kittrell	7	132	83,541	132	100.00 %	0.16 %
Kitty Hawk	1	3,689	82,812	3,689	100.00 %	4.45 %
Knightdale	35	19,435	83,094	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	38	19,435	86,444	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	39	19,435	85,371	19,435	100.00 %	22.77 %
Kure Beach	19	2,191	91,288	2,191	100.00 %	2.40 %
La Grange	12	2,595	84,745	2,595	100.00 %	3.06 %

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 10/23/2023

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Lake Lure	113	1,365	89,151	1,365	100.00 %	1.53 %
Lake Park	69	3,269	89,186	3,269	100.00 %	3.67 %
Lake Santeetlah	120	38	84,907	38	100.00 %	0.04 %
Lake Waccamaw	46	1,296	83,701	1,296	100.00 %	1.55 %
Landis	83	3,690	90,899	3,690	100.00 %	4.06 %
Lansing	93	126	87,194	126	100.00 %	0.14 %
Lasker	27	64	84,735	64	100.00 %	0.08 %
Lattimore	111	406	84,508	406	100.00 %	0.48 %
Laurel Park	113	2,250	89,151	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	117	2,250	91,035	2,250	100.00 %	2.47 %
Laurinburg	48	14,978	86,256	14,978	100.00 %	17.36 %
Lawndale	110	570	89,459	570	100.00 %	0.64 %
Leggett	23	37	88,865	37	100.00 %	0.04 %
Leland	17	22,908	90,514	22,908	100.00 %	25.31 %
Lenoir	87	18,352	85,009	18,352	100.00 %	21.59 %
Lewiston Woodville	23	426	88,865	426	100.00 %	0.48 %
Lewisville	74	13,381	83,545	13,381	100.00 %	16.02 %
Lexington	80	19,632	83,289	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	81	19,632	85,641	19,632	100.00 %	22.92 %
Liberty	54	2,655	83,475	2,655	100.00 %	3.18 %
Lilesville	55	395	82,927	395	100.00 %	0.48 %
Lillington	6	4,735	90,919	3,991	84.29 %	4.39 %
	53	4,735	83,312	744	15.71 %	0.89 %
Lincolnton	97	11,091	86,810	11,091	100.00 %	12.78 %
Linden	43	136	85,335	136	100.00 %	0.16 %
Littleton	27	559	84,735	559	100.00 %	0.66 %
Locust	67	4,537	88,255	3,996	88.08 %	4.53 %
	82	4,537	91,227	541	11.92 %	0.59 %
Long View	86	5,088	87,570	735	14.45 %	0.84 %
	96	5,088	89,587	4,353	85.55 %	4.86 %
Louisburg	7	3,064	83,541	3,064	100.00 %	3.67 %
Love Valley	84	154	86,773	154	100.00 %	0.18 %
Lowell	108	3,654	89,468	3,654	100.00 %	4.08 %
	109	3,654	88,881	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Lucama	24	1,036	83,322	1,036	100.00 %	1.24 %
Lumber Bridge	46	82	83,701	82	100.00 %	0.10 %
Lumberton	46	19,025	83,701	191	1.00 %	0.23 %
	47	19,025	83,452	18,834	99.00 %	22.57 %
McAdenville	108	890	89,468	890	100.00 %	0.99 %
Macclesfield	23	413	88,865	413	100.00 %	0.46 %
McDonald	47	94	83,452	94	100.00 %	0.11 %
McFarlan	55	94	82,927	94	100.00 %	0.11 %

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Macon	27	110	84,735	110	100.00 %	0.13 %
Madison	65	2,129	91,096	2,129	100.00 %	2.34 %
Maggie Valley	118	1,687	83,282	1,687	100.00 %	2.03 %
Magnolia	4	831	83,034	831	100.00 %	1.00 %
Maiden	89	3,736	85,577	3,736	100.00 %	4.37 %
	97	3,736	86,810	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Manteo	79	1,600	84,681	1,600	100.00 %	1.89 %
Marietta	47	111	83,452	111	100.00 %	0.13 %
Marion	85	7,717	90,770	7,717	100.00 %	8.50 %
	113	7,717	89,151	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Marshall	118	777	83,282	777	100.00 %	0.93 %
Mars Hill	118	2,007	83,282	2,007	100.00 %	2.41 %
Marshville	55	2,522	82,927	2,522	100.00 %	3.04 %
Marvin	68	6,358	88,209	6,358	100.00 %	7.21 %
Matthews	100	29,435	86,763	11,369	38.62 %	13.10 %
	103	29,435	89,354	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	105	29,435	85,671	18,066	61.38 %	21.09 %
Maxton	47	2,110	83,452	1,902	90.14 %	2.28 %
	48	2,110	86,256	208	9.86 %	0.24 %
Mayodan	65	2,418	91,096	2,418	100.00 %	2.65 %
Maysville	12	818	84,745	818	100.00 %	0.97 %
Mebane	50	17,797	86,290	3,171	17.82 %	3.67 %
	64	17,797	87,568	14,626	82.18 %	16.70 %
Mesic	79	144	84,681	144	100.00 %	0.17 %
Micro	28	458	85,389	458	100.00 %	0.54 %
Middleburg	32	101	88,602	101	100.00 %	0.11 %
Middlesex	25	912	90,432	912	100.00 %	1.01 %
Midland	82	4,684	91,227	4,684	100.00 %	5.13 %
	105	4,684	85,671	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Midway	80	4,742	83,289	3,469	73.15 %	4.17 %
	81	4,742	85,641	1,273	26.85 %	1.49 %
Mills River	117	7,078	91,035	7,078	100.00 %	7.78 %
Milton	50	155	86,290	155	100.00 %	0.18 %
Mineral Springs	55	3,159	82,927	47	1.49 %	0.06 %
	68	3,159	88,209	3,112	98.51 %	3.53 %
Minnesott Beach	79	530	84,681	530	100.00 %	0.63 %
Mint Hill	69	26,450	89,186	6	0.02 %	0.01 %
	100	26,450	86,763	3,903	14.76 %	4.50 %
	105	26,450	85,671	22,541	85.22 %	26.31 %
Misenheimer	67	650	88,255	650	100.00 %	0.74 %
Mocksville	77	5,900	90,628	5,900	100.00 %	6.51 %
Momeyer	25	277	90,432	277	100.00 %	0.31 %

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 10/23/2023

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Monroe	55	34,562	82,927	21,381	61.86 %	25.78 %
	68	34,562	88,209	1,511	4.37 %	1.71 %
	69	34,562	89,186	11,670	33.77 %	13.09 %
Montreat	114	901	90,248	901	100.00 %	1.00 %
Mooresboro	111	293	84,508	293	100.00 %	0.35 %
Mooresville	84	50,193	86,773	205	0.41 %	0.24 %
	95	50,193	85,366	49,988	99.59 %	58.56 %
Morehead City	13	9,556	83,500	9,556	100.00 %	11.44 %
Morganton	86	17,474	87,570	17,474	100.00 %	19.95 %
Morrisville	31	29,630	91,241	207	0.70 %	0.23 %
	41	29,630	89,876	29,423	99.30 %	32.74 %
Morven	55	329	82,927	329	100.00 %	0.40 %
Mount Airy	90	10,676	88,208	10,676	100.00 %	12.10 %
Mount Gilead	67	1,171	88,255	1,171	100.00 %	1.33 %
Mount Holly	108	17,703	89,468	17,703	100.00 %	19.79 %
Mount Olive	4	4,198	83,034	4,198	100.00 %	5.06 %
Mount Pleasant	82	1,671	91,227	1,671	100.00 %	1.83 %
Murfreesboro	5	2,619	82,953	2,619	100.00 %	3.16 %
Murphy	120	1,608	84,907	1,608	100.00 %	1.89 %
Nags Head	79	3,168	84,681	3,168	100.00 %	3.74 %
Nashville	25	5,632	90,432	5,632	100.00 %	6.23 %
Navassa	17	1,367	90,514	1,367	100.00 %	1.51 %
New Bern	3	31,291	84,906	31,291	100.00 %	36.85 %
Newland	85	715	90,770	715	100.00 %	0.79 %
New London	67	607	88,255	607	100.00 %	0.69 %
Newport	13	4,364	83,500	4,364	100.00 %	5.23 %
Newton	89	13,148	85,577	13,148	100.00 %	15.36 %
	96	13,148	89,587	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Newton Grove	22	585	88,642	585	100.00 %	0.66 %
Norlina	27	920	84,735	920	100.00 %	1.09 %
Norman	52	100	84,383	100	100.00 %	0.12 %
North Topsail Beach	16	1,005	85,097	1,005	100.00 %	1.18 %
Northwest	17	703	90,514	703	100.00 %	0.78 %
North Wilkesboro	90	4,382	88,208	11	0.25 %	0.01 %
	94	4,382	85,564	4,371	99.75 %	5.11 %
Norwood	67	2,367	88,255	2,367	100.00 %	2.68 %
Oakboro	67	2,128	88,255	2,128	100.00 %	2.41 %
Oak City	23	266	88,865	266	100.00 %	0.30 %
Oak Island	19	8,396	91,288	8,396	100.00 %	9.20 %
Oak Ridge	62	7,474	89,637	7,474	100.00 %	8.34 %
Ocean Isle Beach	17	867	90,514	867	100.00 %	0.96 %
Old Fort	85	811	90,770	811	100.00 %	0.89 %

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 10/23/2023

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Oriental	79	880	84,681	880	100.00 %	1.04 %
Orrum	46	59	83,701	59	100.00 %	0.07 %
Ossipee	63	536	83,847	536	100.00 %	0.64 %
Oxford	32	8,628	88,602	8,628	100.00 %	9.74 %
Pantego	79	164	84,681	164	100.00 %	0.19 %
Parkton	46	504	83,701	504	100.00 %	0.60 %
Parmele	23	243	88,865	243	100.00 %	0.27 %
Patterson Springs	111	571	84,508	571	100.00 %	0.68 %
Peachland	55	390	82,927	390	100.00 %	0.47 %
Peletier	13	769	83,500	769	100.00 %	0.92 %
Pembroke	47	2,823	83,452	2,823	100.00 %	3.38 %
Pikeville	10	712	83,014	712	100.00 %	0.86 %
Pilot Mountain	90	1,440	88,208	1,440	100.00 %	1.63 %
Pinebluff	52	1,473	84,383	1,473	100.00 %	1.75 %
Pinehurst	52	17,581	84,383	8	0.05 %	0.01 %
	78	17,581	86,365	17,573	99.95 %	20.35 %
Pine Knoll Shores	13	1,388	83,500	1,388	100.00 %	1.66 %
Pine Level	28	2,046	85,389	2,046	100.00 %	2.40 %
Pinetops	23	1,200	88,865	1,200	100.00 %	1.35 %
Pineville	103	10,602	89,354	10,602	100.00 %	11.87 %
	104	10,602	83,554	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Pink Hill	12	451	84,745	451	100.00 %	0.53 %
Pittsboro	54	4,537	83,475	4,537	100.00 %	5.44 %
Pleasant Garden	59	5,000	90,829	5,000	100.00 %	5.50 %
Plymouth	1	3,320	82,812	3,320	100.00 %	4.01 %
Polkton	55	2,250	82,927	2,250	100.00 %	2.71 %
Polkville	110	516	89,459	516	100.00 %	0.58 %
Pollocksville	12	268	84,745	268	100.00 %	0.32 %
Powellsville	23	189	88,865	189	100.00 %	0.21 %
Princeton	28	1,315	85,389	1,315	100.00 %	1.54 %
Princeville	23	1,254	88,865	1,254	100.00 %	1.41 %
Proctorville	46	121	83,701	121	100.00 %	0.14 %
Raeford	48	4,559	86,256	4,559	100.00 %	5.29 %

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Raleigh	11	467,665	86,381	14,217	3.04 %	16.46 %
	31	467,665	91,241	1,559	0.33 %	1.71 %
	33	467,665	85,001	38,296	8.19 %	45.05 %
	34	467,665	84,251	75,591	16.16 %	89.72 %
	35	467,665	83,094	1,532	0.33 %	1.84 %
	38	467,665	86,444	83,928	17.95 %	97.09 %
	39	467,665	85,371	13,702	2.93 %	16.05 %
	40	467,665	86,359	69,728	14.91 %	80.74 %
	41	467,665	89,876	12,014	2.57 %	13.37 %
	49	467,665	89,807	89,594	19.16 %	99.76 %
	66	467,665	88,717	67,504	14.43 %	76.09 %
Ramseur	78	1,774	86,365	1,774	100.00 %	2.05 %
Randleman	70	4,595	89,118	4,595	100.00 %	5.16 %
Ranlo	108	4,511	89,468	4,511	100.00 %	5.04 %
Raynham	47	60	83,452	60	100.00 %	0.07 %
Red Cross	67	762	88,255	762	100.00 %	0.86 %
Red Oak	25	3,342	90,432	3,342	100.00 %	3.70 %
Red Springs	47	3,087	83,452	3,087	100.00 %	3.70 %
	48	3,087	86,256	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Reidsville	65	14,583	91,096	14,583	100.00 %	16.01 %
Rennert	46	275	83,701	275	100.00 %	0.33 %
Rhodhiss	86	997	87,570	639	64.09 %	0.73 %
	87	997	85,009	358	35.91 %	0.42 %
Richfield	67	582	88,255	582	100.00 %	0.66 %
Richlands	15	2,287	91,212	2,287	100.00 %	2.51 %
Rich Square	27	894	84,735	894	100.00 %	1.06 %
River Bend	3	2,902	84,906	2,902	100.00 %	3.42 %
Roanoke Rapids	27	15,229	84,735	15,229	100.00 %	17.97 %
Robbins	78	1,168	86,365	1,168	100.00 %	1.35 %
Robbinsville	120	597	84,907	597	100.00 %	0.70 %
Robersonville	23	1,269	88,865	1,269	100.00 %	1.43 %
Rockingham	52	9,243	84,383	9,243	100.00 %	10.95 %
Rockwell	76	2,302	89,815	2,302	100.00 %	2.56 %
Rocky Mount	23	54,341	88,865	15,414	28.37 %	17.35 %
	24	54,341	83,322	241	0.44 %	0.29 %
	25	54,341	90,432	38,686	71.19 %	42.78 %
Rolesville	35	9,475	83,094	8,162	86.14 %	9.82 %
	39	9,475	85,371	8	0.08 %	0.01 %
	66	9,475	88,717	1,305	13.77 %	1.47 %
Ronda	90	438	88,208	438	100.00 %	0.50 %
Roper	1	485	82,812	485	100.00 %	0.59 %
Roseboro	22	1,163	88,642	1,163	100.00 %	1.31 %

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Rose Hill	4	1,371	83,034	1,371	100.00 %	1.65 %
Rosman	119	701	90,212	701	100.00 %	0.78 %
Rowland	47	885	83,452	885	100.00 %	1.06 %
Roxboro	2	8,134	90,751	8,134	100.00 %	8.96 %
Roxobel	23	187	88,865	187	100.00 %	0.21 %
Rural Hall	91	3,351	82,920	3,351	100.00 %	4.04 %
Ruth	113	347	89,151	347	100.00 %	0.39 %
Rutherford College	86	1,226	87,570	1,226	100.00 %	1.40 %
	87	1,226	85,009	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Rutherfordton	113	3,640	89,151	3,640	100.00 %	4.08 %
St. Helena	16	417	85,097	417	100.00 %	0.49 %
St. James	19	6,529	91,288	6,529	100.00 %	7.15 %
St. Pauls	46	2,045	83,701	2,045	100.00 %	2.44 %
Salemburg	22	457	88,642	457	100.00 %	0.52 %
Salisbury	76	35,540	89,815	35,540	100.00 %	39.57 %
Saluda	113	631	89,151	631	100.00 %	0.71 %
Sandy Creek	17	248	90,514	248	100.00 %	0.27 %
Sandyfield	46	430	83,701	430	100.00 %	0.51 %
Sanford	51	30,261	83,073	30,261	100.00 %	36.43 %
Saratoga	24	353	83,322	353	100.00 %	0.42 %
Sawmills	87	5,020	85,009	5,020	100.00 %	5.91 %
Scotland Neck	27	1,640	84,735	1,640	100.00 %	1.94 %
Seaboard	27	542	84,735	542	100.00 %	0.64 %
Seagrove	78	235	86,365	235	100.00 %	0.27 %
Sedalia	59	676	90,829	676	100.00 %	0.74 %
Selma	28	6,317	85,389	6,317	100.00 %	7.40 %
Seven Devils	85	313	90,770	38	12.14 %	0.04 %
	93	313	87,194	275	87.86 %	0.32 %
Seven Springs	4	55	83,034	55	100.00 %	0.07 %
Severn	27	191	84,735	191	100.00 %	0.23 %
Shallotte	17	4,185	90,514	4,185	100.00 %	4.62 %
Sharpsburg	23	1,697	88,865	215	12.67 %	0.24 %
	24	1,697	83,322	1,482	87.33 %	1.78 %
Shelby	110	21,918	89,459	14,967	68.29 %	16.73 %
	111	21,918	84,508	6,951	31.71 %	8.23 %
Siler City	54	7,702	83,475	7,702	100.00 %	9.23 %
Simpson	9	390	86,684	390	100.00 %	0.45 %
Sims	24	275	83,322	275	100.00 %	0.33 %
Smithfield	28	11,292	85,389	11,292	100.00 %	13.22 %
Snow Hill	12	1,481	84,745	1,481	100.00 %	1.75 %
Southern Pines	52	15,545	84,383	15,545	100.00 %	18.42 %
	78	15,545	86,365	0	0.00 %	0.00 %

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 10/23/2023

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Southern Shores	1	3,090	82,812	3,090	100.00 %	3.73 %
Southport	19	3,971	91,288	3,971	100.00 %	4.35 %
Sparta	93	1,834	87,194	1,834	100.00 %	2.10 %
Speed	23	63	88,865	63	100.00 %	0.07 %
Spencer	76	3,308	89,815	3,308	100.00 %	3.68 %
Spencer Mountain	108	0	89,468	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Spindale	113	4,225	89,151	4,225	100.00 %	4.74 %
Spring Hope	25	1,309	90,432	1,309	100.00 %	1.45 %
Spring Lake	42	11,660	82,965	11,660	100.00 %	14.05 %
Spruce Pine	85	2,194	90,770	2,194	100.00 %	2.42 %
Staley	54	397	83,475	397	100.00 %	0.48 %
Stallings	68	16,112	88,209	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	69	16,112	89,186	15,728	97.62 %	17.64 %
	105	16,112	85,671	384	2.38 %	0.45 %
Stanfield	67	1,585	88,255	1,585	100.00 %	1.80 %
Stanley	108	3,963	89,468	3,963	100.00 %	4.43 %
Stantonsburg	24	762	83,322	762	100.00 %	0.91 %
Star	67	806	88,255	806	100.00 %	0.91 %
Statesville	84	28,419	86,773	28,415	99.99 %	32.75 %
	89	28,419	85,577	4	0.01 %	0.00 %
Stedman	43	1,277	85,335	1,277	100.00 %	1.50 %
Stem	32	960	88,602	960	100.00 %	1.08 %
Stokesdale	62	5,924	89,637	5,924	100.00 %	6.61 %
Stoneville	65	1,308	91,096	1,308	100.00 %	1.44 %
Stonewall	79	214	84,681	214	100.00 %	0.25 %
Stovall	32	324	88,602	324	100.00 %	0.37 %
Sugar Mountain	85	371	90,770	371	100.00 %	0.41 %
Summerfield	62	10,951	89,637	10,951	100.00 %	12.22 %
Sunset Beach	17	4,175	90,514	4,175	100.00 %	4.61 %
Surf City	16	3,867	85,097	3,867	100.00 %	4.54 %
Swansboro	14	3,744	88,470	3,744	100.00 %	4.23 %
Sweepsonville	64	2,445	87,568	2,445	100.00 %	2.79 %
Sylva	119	2,578	90,212	2,578	100.00 %	2.86 %
Tabor City	46	3,781	83,701	3,781	100.00 %	4.52 %
Tarboro	23	10,721	88,865	10,721	100.00 %	12.06 %
Tar Heel	22	90	88,642	90	100.00 %	0.10 %
Taylorsville	94	2,320	85,564	2,320	100.00 %	2.71 %
Taylortown	52	634	84,383	4	0.63 %	0.00 %
	78	634	86,365	630	99.37 %	0.73 %
Teachey	4	448	83,034	448	100.00 %	0.54 %
Thomasville	70	27,183	89,118	521	1.92 %	0.58 %
	80	27,183	83,289	26,662	98.08 %	32.01 %

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

[G20-MuniDist] - Generated 10/23/2023

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Tobaccoville	74	2,578	83,545	2,578	100.00 %	3.09 %
	91	2,578	82,920	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Topsail Beach	16	461	85,097	461	100.00 %	0.54 %
Trenton	12	238	84,745	238	100.00 %	0.28 %
Trent Woods	3	4,074	84,906	4,074	100.00 %	4.80 %
Trinity	70	7,006	89,118	7,006	100.00 %	7.86 %
Troutman	84	3,698	86,773	885	23.93 %	1.02 %
	89	3,698	85,577	2,813	76.07 %	3.29 %
Troy	67	2,850	88,255	2,850	100.00 %	3.23 %
Tryon	113	1,562	89,151	1,562	100.00 %	1.75 %
Turkey	22	213	88,642	213	100.00 %	0.24 %
Unionville	55	6,643	82,927	691	10.40 %	0.83 %
	69	6,643	89,186	5,952	89.60 %	6.67 %
Valdese	86	4,689	87,570	4,689	100.00 %	5.35 %
Vanceboro	3	869	84,906	869	100.00 %	1.02 %
Vandemere	79	246	84,681	246	100.00 %	0.29 %
Varnamtown	19	525	91,288	525	100.00 %	0.58 %
Vass	51	952	83,073	952	100.00 %	1.15 %
Waco	110	310	89,459	310	100.00 %	0.35 %
Wade	43	638	85,335	638	100.00 %	0.75 %
Wadesboro	55	5,008	82,927	5,008	100.00 %	6.04 %
Wagram	48	615	86,256	615	100.00 %	0.71 %
Wake Forest	7	47,601	83,541	1,504	3.16 %	1.80 %
	35	47,601	83,094	30,884	64.88 %	37.17 %
	66	47,601	88,717	15,213	31.96 %	17.15 %
Walkertown	75	5,692	87,378	1,081	18.99 %	1.24 %
	91	5,692	82,920	4,611	81.01 %	5.56 %
Wallace	4	3,413	83,034	3,413	100.00 %	4.11 %
	16	3,413	85,097	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Wallburg	80	3,051	83,289	3,051	100.00 %	3.66 %
Walnut Cove	91	1,586	82,920	1,586	100.00 %	1.91 %
Walnut Creek	10	1,084	83,014	1,084	100.00 %	1.31 %
Walstonburg	12	193	84,745	193	100.00 %	0.23 %
Warrenton	27	851	84,735	851	100.00 %	1.00 %
Warsaw	4	2,733	83,034	2,733	100.00 %	3.29 %
Washington	79	9,875	84,681	9,875	100.00 %	11.66 %
Washington Park	79	392	84,681	392	100.00 %	0.46 %
Watha	16	181	85,097	181	100.00 %	0.21 %
Waxhaw	55	20,534	82,927	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	68	20,534	88,209	20,534	100.00 %	23.28 %
Waynesville	118	10,140	83,282	10,140	100.00 %	12.18 %
Weaverville	115	4,567	89,747	4,567	100.00 %	5.09 %

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Webster	119	372	90,212	372	100.00 %	0.41 %
Weddington	68	13,181	88,209	11,637	88.29 %	13.19 %
	69	13,181	89,186	1,539	11.68 %	1.73 %
	103	13,181	89,354	5	0.04 %	0.01 %
Weldon	27	1,444	84,735	1,444	100.00 %	1.70 %
Wendell	35	9,793	83,094	9	0.09 %	0.01 %
	39	9,793	85,371	9,784	99.91 %	11.46 %
Wentworth	65	2,662	91,096	2,662	100.00 %	2.92 %
Wesley Chapel	68	8,681	88,209	8,265	95.21 %	9.37 %
	69	8,681	89,186	416	4.79 %	0.47 %
West Jefferson	93	1,279	87,194	1,279	100.00 %	1.47 %
Whispering Pines	52	4,987	84,383	4,987	100.00 %	5.91 %
Whitakers	23	627	88,865	290	46.25 %	0.33 %
	25	627	90,432	337	53.75 %	0.37 %
White Lake	22	843	88,642	843	100.00 %	0.95 %
Whiteville	46	4,766	83,701	4,766	100.00 %	5.69 %
Whitsett	59	584	90,829	584	100.00 %	0.64 %
Wilkesboro	94	3,687	85,564	3,687	100.00 %	4.31 %
Williamston	23	5,248	88,865	5,248	100.00 %	5.91 %
Wilmington	18	115,451	89,413	82,820	71.74 %	92.63 %
	19	115,451	91,288	5,187	4.49 %	5.68 %
	20	115,451	91,180	27,444	23.77 %	30.10 %
Wilson	24	47,851	83,322	47,851	100.00 %	57.43 %
Wilson's Mills	26	2,534	89,947	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	28	2,534	85,389	2,534	100.00 %	2.97 %
Windsor	23	3,582	88,865	3,582	100.00 %	4.03 %
Winfall	1	555	82,812	555	100.00 %	0.67 %
Wingate	55	4,055	82,927	4,055	100.00 %	4.89 %
Winston-Salem	71	249,545	88,823	86,109	34.51 %	96.94 %
	72	249,545	84,444	84,444	33.84 %	100.00 %
	74	249,545	83,545	27,464	11.01 %	32.87 %
	75	249,545	87,378	33,872	13.57 %	38.76 %
	91	249,545	82,920	17,656	7.08 %	21.29 %
Winterville	8	10,462	83,559	44	0.42 %	0.05 %
	9	10,462	86,684	10,418	99.58 %	12.02 %
Winton	5	629	82,953	629	100.00 %	0.76 %
Woodfin	115	7,936	89,747	3,031	38.19 %	3.38 %
	116	7,936	89,457	4,905	61.81 %	5.48 %
Woodland	27	557	84,735	557	100.00 %	0.66 %
Wrightsville Beach	20	2,473	91,180	2,473	100.00 %	2.71 %
Yadkinville	77	2,995	90,628	2,995	100.00 %	3.30 %
Yanceyville	50	1,937	86,290	1,937	100.00 %	2.24 %

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Youngsville	7	2,016	83,541	2,016	100.00 %	2.41 %
Zebulon	26	6,903	89,947	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	39	6,903	85,371	6,903	100.00 %	8.09 %
Assigned Geography Total:				6,017,605		

Report display: all municipalities
 Total Municipalities Statewide: 553
 Fully Assigned Municipalities: 553
 Partially Assigned Municipalities: 0
 Fully Unassigned Municipalities: 0
 Total Districts Assigned: 120
 Split Municipalities: 118
 Splits Involving Population: 87

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Aberdeen	52	8,516	84,383	8,516	100.00 %	10.09 %
	78	8,516	86,365	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Ahoskie	5	4,891	82,953	4,891	100.00 %	5.90 %
Alamance	63	988	83,847	988	100.00 %	1.18 %
Albemarle	67	16,432	88,255	16,432	100.00 %	18.62 %
Alliance	79	733	84,681	733	100.00 %	0.87 %
Andrews	120	1,667	84,907	1,667	100.00 %	1.96 %
Angier (Harnett)	53	4,709	83,312	4,709	100.00 %	5.65 %
Angier (Wake)	37	556	90,307	556	100.00 %	0.62 %
Ansonville	55	440	82,927	440	100.00 %	0.53 %
Apex	11	58,780	86,381	6,287	10.70 %	7.28 %
	21	58,780	87,764	42,698	72.64 %	48.65 %
	36	58,780	86,038	9,795	16.66 %	11.38 %
Arapahoe	79	416	84,681	416	100.00 %	0.49 %
Archdale (Guilford)	59	380	90,829	250	65.79 %	0.28 %
	60	380	90,340	130	34.21 %	0.14 %
Archdale (Randolph)	70	11,527	89,118	11,527	100.00 %	12.93 %
Archer Lodge	26	4,797	89,947	4,797	100.00 %	5.33 %
Asheboro	70	27,156	89,118	25,890	95.34 %	29.05 %
	78	27,156	86,365	1,266	4.66 %	1.47 %
Asheville	114	94,589	90,248	20,413	21.58 %	22.62 %
	115	94,589	89,747	785	0.83 %	0.87 %
	116	94,589	89,457	73,391	77.59 %	82.04 %
Askewville	23	184	88,865	184	100.00 %	0.21 %
Atkinson	16	296	85,097	296	100.00 %	0.35 %
Atlantic Beach	13	1,364	83,500	1,364	100.00 %	1.63 %
Aulander	23	763	88,865	763	100.00 %	0.86 %
Aurora	79	455	84,681	455	100.00 %	0.54 %
Autoryville	22	167	88,642	167	100.00 %	0.19 %
Ayden	9	4,977	86,684	4,977	100.00 %	5.74 %
Badin	67	2,024	88,255	2,024	100.00 %	2.29 %
Bailey	25	568	90,432	568	100.00 %	0.63 %
Bakersville	85	450	90,770	450	100.00 %	0.50 %
Bald Head Island	19	268	91,288	268	100.00 %	0.29 %
Banner Elk	85	1,049	90,770	1,049	100.00 %	1.16 %
Bath	79	245	84,681	245	100.00 %	0.29 %
Bayboro	79	1,161	84,681	1,161	100.00 %	1.37 %
Bear Grass	23	89	88,865	89	100.00 %	0.10 %
Beaufort	13	4,464	83,500	4,464	100.00 %	5.35 %
Beech Mountain (Avery)	85	62	90,770	62	100.00 %	0.07 %
Beech Mountain (Watauga)	93	613	87,194	613	100.00 %	0.70 %

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 10/23/2023

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Belhaven	79	1,410	84,681	1,410	100.00 %	1.67 %
Belmont	108	15,010	89,468	1,868	12.45 %	2.09 %
	109	15,010	88,881	13,142	87.55 %	14.79 %
Belville	17	2,406	90,514	2,406	100.00 %	2.66 %
Belwood	110	857	89,459	857	100.00 %	0.96 %
Benson (Harnett)	53	0	83,312	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Benson (Johnston)	28	3,967	85,389	3,967	100.00 %	4.65 %
Bermuda Run	77	3,120	90,628	3,120	100.00 %	3.44 %
Bessemer City	110	5,428	89,459	5,428	100.00 %	6.07 %
Bethania	74	344	83,545	344	100.00 %	0.41 %
Bethel	8	1,373	83,559	1,373	100.00 %	1.64 %
Beulaville	4	1,116	83,034	1,116	100.00 %	1.34 %
Biltmore Forest	114	1,409	90,248	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	116	1,409	89,457	1,409	100.00 %	1.58 %
Biscoe	67	1,848	88,255	1,848	100.00 %	2.09 %
Black Creek	24	692	83,322	692	100.00 %	0.83 %
Black Mountain	114	8,426	90,248	8,426	100.00 %	9.34 %
Bladenboro	22	1,648	88,642	1,648	100.00 %	1.86 %
Blowing Rock (Caldwell)	87	91	85,009	91	100.00 %	0.11 %
Blowing Rock (Watauga)	87	1,285	85,009	5	0.39 %	0.01 %
	93	1,285	87,194	1,280	99.61 %	1.47 %
Boardman	46	166	83,701	166	100.00 %	0.20 %
Bogue	13	695	83,500	695	100.00 %	0.83 %
Boiling Spring Lakes	19	5,943	91,288	5,943	100.00 %	6.51 %
Boiling Springs	111	4,615	84,508	4,615	100.00 %	5.46 %
Bolivia	19	149	91,288	149	100.00 %	0.16 %
Bolton	46	519	83,701	519	100.00 %	0.62 %
Boone	87	19,092	85,009	595	3.12 %	0.70 %
	93	19,092	87,194	18,497	96.88 %	21.21 %
Boonville	77	1,185	90,628	1,185	100.00 %	1.31 %
Bostic	111	355	84,508	355	100.00 %	0.42 %
Brevard	119	7,744	90,212	7,744	100.00 %	8.58 %
Bridgeton	3	349	84,906	349	100.00 %	0.41 %
Broadway (Harnett)	6	0	90,919	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Broadway (Lee)	51	1,267	83,073	1,267	100.00 %	1.53 %
Brookford	96	442	89,587	442	100.00 %	0.49 %
Brunswick	46	973	83,701	973	100.00 %	1.16 %
Bryson City	119	1,558	90,212	1,558	100.00 %	1.73 %
Bunn	7	327	83,541	327	100.00 %	0.39 %
Burgaw	16	3,088	85,097	3,088	100.00 %	3.63 %

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 10/23/2023

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Burlington (Alamance)	63	55,481	83,847	41,298	74.44 %	49.25 %
	64	55,481	87,568	14,183	25.56 %	16.20 %
Burlington (Guilford)	59	1,822	90,829	1,822	100.00 %	2.01 %
Burnsville	85	1,614	90,770	1,614	100.00 %	1.78 %
Butner	32	8,397	88,602	8,397	100.00 %	9.48 %
Cajah's Mountain	87	2,722	85,009	2,722	100.00 %	3.20 %
Calabash	17	2,011	90,514	2,011	100.00 %	2.22 %
Calypso	4	327	83,034	327	100.00 %	0.39 %
Cameron	51	244	83,073	244	100.00 %	0.29 %
Candor (Montgomery)	67	813	88,255	813	100.00 %	0.92 %
Candor (Moore)	78	0	86,365	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Canton	118	4,422	83,282	4,422	100.00 %	5.31 %
Cape Carteret	13	2,224	83,500	2,224	100.00 %	2.66 %
Carolina Beach	19	6,564	91,288	6,564	100.00 %	7.19 %
Carolina Shores	17	4,588	90,514	4,588	100.00 %	5.07 %
Carrboro	56	21,295	85,142	21,295	100.00 %	25.01 %
Carthage	51	2,775	83,073	2,747	98.99 %	3.31 %
	52	2,775	84,383	28	1.01 %	0.03 %
Cary (Chatham)	54	3,709	83,475	3,709	100.00 %	4.44 %
Cary (Wake)	11	171,012	86,381	64,839	37.91 %	75.06 %
	21	171,012	87,764	35,876	20.98 %	40.88 %
	33	171,012	85,001	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	34	171,012	84,251	6,581	3.85 %	7.81 %
	36	171,012	86,038	15,876	9.28 %	18.45 %
	41	171,012	89,876	47,840	27.97 %	53.23 %
Casar	110	305	89,459	305	100.00 %	0.34 %
Castalia	25	264	90,432	264	100.00 %	0.29 %
Caswell Beach	19	395	91,288	395	100.00 %	0.43 %
Catawba	89	702	85,577	702	100.00 %	0.82 %
Cedar Point	13	1,764	83,500	1,764	100.00 %	2.11 %
Cedar Rock	87	301	85,009	301	100.00 %	0.35 %
Cerro Gordo	46	131	83,701	131	100.00 %	0.16 %
Chadbourn	46	1,574	83,701	1,574	100.00 %	1.88 %
Chapel Hill (Durham)	29	2,906	90,900	2,906	100.00 %	3.20 %
Chapel Hill (Orange)	50	59,054	86,290	4,636	7.85 %	5.37 %
	56	59,054	85,142	54,418	92.15 %	63.91 %

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 10/23/2023

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Charlotte	88	874,579	84,505	84,505	9.66 %	100.00 %
	92	874,579	87,079	65,691	7.51 %	75.44 %
	99	874,579	84,406	80,216	9.17 %	95.04 %
	100	874,579	86,763	69,531	7.95 %	80.14 %
	101	874,579	84,368	56,322	6.44 %	66.76 %
	102	874,579	84,206	84,206	9.63 %	100.00 %
	103	874,579	89,354	73,571	8.41 %	82.34 %
	104	874,579	83,554	83,554	9.55 %	100.00 %
	105	874,579	85,671	40,470	4.63 %	47.24 %
	106	874,579	86,716	73,248	8.38 %	84.47 %
	107	874,579	88,854	83,491	9.55 %	93.96 %
	112	874,579	87,217	79,774	9.12 %	91.47 %
Cherryville	110	6,078	89,459	6,078	100.00 %	6.79 %
Chimney Rock Village	113	140	89,151	140	100.00 %	0.16 %
China Grove	83	4,434	90,899	4,434	100.00 %	4.88 %
Chocowinity	79	722	84,681	722	100.00 %	0.85 %
Claremont	89	1,692	85,577	1,692	100.00 %	1.98 %
Clarkton	22	614	88,642	614	100.00 %	0.69 %
Clayton (Johnston)	26	26,307	89,947	26,307	100.00 %	29.25 %
Clayton (Wake)	33	0	85,001	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	39	0	85,371	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Clemmons	74	21,163	83,545	21,163	100.00 %	25.33 %
Cleveland	77	846	90,628	846	100.00 %	0.93 %
Clinton	22	8,383	88,642	8,383	100.00 %	9.46 %
Clyde	118	1,368	83,282	1,368	100.00 %	1.64 %
Coats	53	2,155	83,312	2,155	100.00 %	2.59 %
Cofield	5	267	82,953	267	100.00 %	0.32 %
Colerain	23	217	88,865	217	100.00 %	0.24 %
Columbia	1	610	82,812	610	100.00 %	0.74 %
Columbus	113	1,060	89,151	1,060	100.00 %	1.19 %
Como	5	67	82,953	67	100.00 %	0.08 %
Concord	73	105,240	90,036	65,770	62.50 %	73.05 %
	82	105,240	91,227	39,470	37.50 %	43.27 %
	83	105,240	90,899	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Conetoe	23	198	88,865	198	100.00 %	0.22 %
Connelly Springs	86	1,529	87,570	1,529	100.00 %	1.75 %
Conover	89	8,421	85,577	424	5.04 %	0.50 %
	96	8,421	89,587	7,997	94.96 %	8.93 %
Conway	27	752	84,735	752	100.00 %	0.89 %
Cooleemee	77	940	90,628	940	100.00 %	1.04 %
Cornelius	98	31,412	82,789	31,412	100.00 %	37.94 %

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Cove City	3	378	84,906	378	100.00 %	0.45 %
Cramerton	108	5,296	89,468	96	1.81 %	0.11 %
	109	5,296	88,881	5,200	98.19 %	5.85 %
Creedmoor	32	4,866	88,602	4,866	100.00 %	5.49 %
Creswell	1	207	82,812	207	100.00 %	0.25 %
Crossnore	85	143	90,770	143	100.00 %	0.16 %
Dallas	108	5,927	89,468	5,927	100.00 %	6.62 %
Danbury	91	189	82,920	189	100.00 %	0.23 %
Davidson (Iredell)	95	378	85,366	378	100.00 %	0.44 %
Davidson (Mecklenburg)	98	14,728	82,789	14,728	100.00 %	17.79 %
Dellview	110	6	89,459	6	100.00 %	0.01 %
Denton	80	1,494	83,289	1,494	100.00 %	1.79 %
Dillsboro	119	213	90,212	213	100.00 %	0.24 %
Dobbins Heights	52	687	84,383	687	100.00 %	0.81 %
Dobson	90	1,462	88,208	1,462	100.00 %	1.66 %
Dortches	25	1,082	90,432	1,082	100.00 %	1.20 %
Dover	3	349	84,906	349	100.00 %	0.41 %
Drexel	86	1,760	87,570	1,760	100.00 %	2.01 %
Dublin	22	267	88,642	267	100.00 %	0.30 %
Duck	1	742	82,812	742	100.00 %	0.90 %
Dunn	6	8,446	90,919	1	0.01 %	0.00 %
	53	8,446	83,312	8,445	99.99 %	10.14 %
Durham (Durham)	2	283,093	90,751	28,462	10.05 %	31.36 %
	29	283,093	90,900	85,000	30.03 %	93.51 %
	30	283,093	91,038	89,784	31.72 %	98.62 %
	31	283,093	91,241	79,847	28.21 %	87.51 %
Durham (Orange)	50	144	86,290	144	100.00 %	0.17 %
Durham (Wake)	40	269	86,359	269	100.00 %	0.31 %
	41	269	89,876	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Earl	111	198	84,508	198	100.00 %	0.23 %
East Arcadia	22	418	88,642	418	100.00 %	0.47 %
East Bend	77	634	90,628	634	100.00 %	0.70 %
East Laurinburg	48	234	86,256	234	100.00 %	0.27 %
East Spencer	76	1,567	89,815	1,567	100.00 %	1.74 %
Eastover	43	3,656	85,335	3,656	100.00 %	4.28 %
Eden	65	15,421	91,096	15,421	100.00 %	16.93 %
Edenton	1	4,460	82,812	4,460	100.00 %	5.39 %
Elizabeth City (Camden)	5	38	82,953	38	100.00 %	0.05 %
Elizabeth City (Pasquotank)	5	18,593	82,953	18,593	100.00 %	22.41 %
Elizabethtown	22	3,296	88,642	3,296	100.00 %	3.72 %
Elk Park	85	542	90,770	542	100.00 %	0.60 %

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Elkin (Surry)	90	4,049	88,208	4,049	100.00 %	4.59 %
Elkin (Wilkes)	90	73	88,208	73	100.00 %	0.08 %
Ellenboro	111	723	84,508	723	100.00 %	0.86 %
Ellerbe	52	864	84,383	864	100.00 %	1.02 %
Elm City (Nash)	24	0	83,322	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Elm City (Wilson)	24	1,218	83,322	1,218	100.00 %	1.46 %
Elon	63	11,336	83,847	11,336	100.00 %	13.52 %
Emerald Isle	13	3,847	83,500	3,847	100.00 %	4.61 %
Enfield	27	1,865	84,735	1,865	100.00 %	2.20 %
Erwin	6	4,542	90,919	4,542	100.00 %	5.00 %
	53	4,542	83,312	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Eureka	10	214	83,014	214	100.00 %	0.26 %
Everetts	23	150	88,865	150	100.00 %	0.17 %
Fair Bluff	46	709	83,701	709	100.00 %	0.85 %
Fairmont	47	2,191	83,452	2,191	100.00 %	2.63 %
Fairview	69	3,456	89,186	3,456	100.00 %	3.88 %
Faison (Duplin)	4	784	83,034	784	100.00 %	0.94 %
Faison (Sampson)	22	0	88,642	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Faith	76	819	89,815	819	100.00 %	0.91 %
Falcon (Cumberland)	43	324	85,335	324	100.00 %	0.38 %
Falcon (Sampson)	22	0	88,642	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Falkland	8	47	83,559	47	100.00 %	0.06 %
Fallston	110	627	89,459	627	100.00 %	0.70 %
Farmville	8	4,461	83,559	4,461	100.00 %	5.34 %
Fayetteville	42	208,501	82,965	68,284	32.75 %	82.30 %
	43	208,501	85,335	23,719	11.38 %	27.80 %
	44	208,501	82,683	80,996	38.85 %	97.96 %
	45	208,501	83,745	35,502	17.03 %	42.39 %
Flat Rock	113	3,486	89,151	3,486	100.00 %	3.91 %
Fletcher	117	7,987	91,035	7,987	100.00 %	8.77 %
Fontana Dam	120	13	84,907	13	100.00 %	0.02 %
Forest City	111	7,377	84,508	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	113	7,377	89,151	7,377	100.00 %	8.27 %
Forest Hills	119	303	90,212	303	100.00 %	0.34 %
Fountain	8	385	83,559	385	100.00 %	0.46 %
Four Oaks	28	2,158	85,389	2,158	100.00 %	2.53 %
Foxfire	52	1,288	84,383	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	78	1,288	86,365	1,288	100.00 %	1.49 %
Franklin	120	4,175	84,907	4,175	100.00 %	4.92 %
Franklinton	7	2,456	83,541	2,456	100.00 %	2.94 %
Franklinville	78	1,197	86,365	1,197	100.00 %	1.39 %

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 10/23/2023

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Fremont	10	1,196	83,014	1,196	100.00 %	1.44 %
Fuquay-Varina (Harnett)	6	0	90,919	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Fuquay-Varina (Wake)	36	34,152	86,038	3,076	9.01 %	3.58 %
	37	34,152	90,307	31,076	90.99 %	34.41 %
Gamewell	87	3,702	85,009	3,702	100.00 %	4.35 %
Garland	22	595	88,642	595	100.00 %	0.67 %
Garner	33	31,159	85,001	27,457	88.12 %	32.30 %
	36	31,159	86,038	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	37	31,159	90,307	3,702	11.88 %	4.10 %
Garysburg	27	904	84,735	904	100.00 %	1.07 %
Gaston	27	1,008	84,735	1,008	100.00 %	1.19 %
Gastonia	108	80,411	89,468	15,548	19.34 %	17.38 %
	109	80,411	88,881	49,589	61.67 %	55.79 %
	110	80,411	89,459	15,274	18.99 %	17.07 %
Gatesville	5	267	82,953	267	100.00 %	0.32 %
Gibson	48	449	86,256	449	100.00 %	0.52 %
Gibsonville (Alamance)	63	4,278	83,847	4,278	100.00 %	5.10 %
Gibsonville (Guilford)	59	4,642	90,829	4,642	100.00 %	5.11 %
Glen Alpine	86	1,529	87,570	1,529	100.00 %	1.75 %
Godwin	43	128	85,335	128	100.00 %	0.15 %
Goldsboro	4	33,657	83,034	2,546	7.56 %	3.07 %
	10	33,657	83,014	31,111	92.44 %	37.48 %
Goldston	54	234	83,475	234	100.00 %	0.28 %
Graham	64	17,157	87,568	17,157	100.00 %	19.59 %
Grandfather Village	85	95	90,770	95	100.00 %	0.10 %
Granite Falls	87	4,965	85,009	4,965	100.00 %	5.84 %
Granite Quarry	76	2,984	89,815	2,984	100.00 %	3.32 %
Grantsboro	79	692	84,681	692	100.00 %	0.82 %
Green Level	63	3,152	83,847	396	12.56 %	0.47 %
	64	3,152	87,568	2,756	87.44 %	3.15 %
Greenevers	4	567	83,034	567	100.00 %	0.68 %
Greensboro	57	299,035	90,259	85,668	28.65 %	94.91 %
	58	299,035	90,051	77,753	26.00 %	86.34 %
	59	299,035	90,829	9,852	3.29 %	10.85 %
	60	299,035	90,340	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	61	299,035	90,183	90,183	30.16 %	100.00 %
	62	299,035	89,637	35,579	11.90 %	39.69 %
Greenville	8	87,521	83,559	57,659	65.88 %	69.00 %
	9	87,521	86,684	29,862	34.12 %	34.45 %
Grifton (Lenoir)	12	147	84,745	147	100.00 %	0.17 %
Grifton (Pitt)	9	2,301	86,684	2,301	100.00 %	2.65 %

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Grimesland	9	386	86,684	386	100.00 %	0.45 %
Grover	111	802	84,508	802	100.00 %	0.95 %
Halifax	27	170	84,735	170	100.00 %	0.20 %
Hamilton	23	306	88,865	306	100.00 %	0.34 %
Hamlet	52	6,025	84,383	6,025	100.00 %	7.14 %
Harmony	84	543	86,773	543	100.00 %	0.63 %
Harrells (Duplin)	4	0	83,034	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Harrells (Sampson)	22	160	88,642	160	100.00 %	0.18 %
Harrellsville	5	85	82,953	85	100.00 %	0.10 %
Harrisburg	73	18,967	90,036	1,414	7.46 %	1.57 %
	82	18,967	91,227	17,553	92.54 %	19.24 %
Hassell	23	49	88,865	49	100.00 %	0.06 %
Havelock	3	16,621	84,906	4,939	29.72 %	5.82 %
	13	16,621	83,500	11,682	70.28 %	13.99 %
Haw River	63	2,252	83,847	46	2.04 %	0.05 %
	64	2,252	87,568	2,206	97.96 %	2.52 %
Hayesville	120	461	84,907	461	100.00 %	0.54 %
Hemby Bridge	69	1,614	89,186	1,614	100.00 %	1.81 %
Henderson	7	15,060	83,541	330	2.19 %	0.40 %
	32	15,060	88,602	14,730	97.81 %	16.62 %
Hendersonville	113	15,137	89,151	623	4.12 %	0.70 %
	117	15,137	91,035	14,514	95.88 %	15.94 %
Hertford	1	1,934	82,812	1,934	100.00 %	2.34 %
Hickory (Burke)	86	79	87,570	79	100.00 %	0.09 %
Hickory (Caldwell)	87	32	85,009	32	100.00 %	0.04 %
Hickory (Catawba)	89	43,379	85,577	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	96	43,379	89,587	43,379	100.00 %	48.42 %
High Point (Davidson)	80	6,646	83,289	6,646	100.00 %	7.98 %
High Point (Forsyth)	75	84	87,378	84	100.00 %	0.10 %
High Point (Guilford)	59	107,321	90,829	4,012	3.74 %	4.42 %
	60	107,321	90,340	88,578	82.54 %	98.05 %
	62	107,321	89,637	14,731	13.73 %	16.43 %
High Point (Randolph)	70	8	89,118	8	100.00 %	0.01 %
High Shoals	108	595	89,468	595	100.00 %	0.67 %
	110	595	89,459	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Highlands (Jackson)	119	12	90,212	12	100.00 %	0.01 %
Highlands (Macon)	120	1,060	84,907	1,060	100.00 %	1.25 %
Hildebran	86	1,679	87,570	1,679	100.00 %	1.92 %
Hillsborough	50	9,660	86,290	9,660	100.00 %	11.19 %
Hobgood	27	268	84,735	268	100.00 %	0.32 %
Hoffman	52	418	84,383	418	100.00 %	0.50 %

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 10/23/2023

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Holden Beach	17	921	90,514	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	19	921	91,288	921	100.00 %	1.01 %
Holly Ridge	16	4,171	85,097	4,171	100.00 %	4.90 %
Holly Springs	21	41,239	87,764	6	0.01 %	0.01 %
	36	41,239	86,038	35,450	85.96 %	41.20 %
	37	41,239	90,307	5,783	14.02 %	6.40 %
Hookerton	12	413	84,745	413	100.00 %	0.49 %
Hope Mills	43	17,808	85,335	402	2.26 %	0.47 %
	45	17,808	83,745	17,406	97.74 %	20.78 %
Hot Springs	118	520	83,282	520	100.00 %	0.62 %
Hudson	87	3,780	85,009	3,780	100.00 %	4.45 %
Huntersville	98	61,376	82,789	34,639	56.44 %	41.84 %
	101	61,376	84,368	16,997	27.69 %	20.15 %
	106	61,376	86,716	9,740	15.87 %	11.23 %
Indian Beach	13	223	83,500	223	100.00 %	0.27 %
Indian Trail	68	39,997	88,209	2,376	5.94 %	2.69 %
	69	39,997	89,186	37,621	94.06 %	42.18 %
Jackson	27	430	84,735	430	100.00 %	0.51 %
Jacksonville	14	72,723	88,470	47,353	65.11 %	53.52 %
	15	72,723	91,212	25,370	34.89 %	27.81 %
Jamestown	59	3,668	90,829	3,661	99.81 %	4.03 %
	60	3,668	90,340	7	0.19 %	0.01 %
Jamesville	23	424	88,865	424	100.00 %	0.48 %
Jefferson	93	1,622	87,194	1,622	100.00 %	1.86 %
Jonesville	77	2,308	90,628	2,308	100.00 %	2.55 %
Kannapolis (Cabarrus)	73	42,846	90,036	3,277	7.65 %	3.64 %
	82	42,846	91,227	1,006	2.35 %	1.10 %
	83	42,846	90,899	38,563	90.00 %	42.42 %
Kannapolis (Rowan)	83	10,268	90,899	10,268	100.00 %	11.30 %
Kelford	23	203	88,865	203	100.00 %	0.23 %
Kenansville	4	770	83,034	770	100.00 %	0.93 %
Kenly (Johnston)	28	1,293	85,389	1,293	100.00 %	1.51 %
Kenly (Wilson)	24	198	83,322	198	100.00 %	0.24 %
Kernersville (Forsyth)	75	25,947	87,378	25,947	100.00 %	29.70 %
	91	25,947	82,920	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Kernersville (Guilford)	62	502	89,637	502	100.00 %	0.56 %
Kill Devil Hills	79	7,656	84,681	7,656	100.00 %	9.04 %
King (Forsyth)	74	591	83,545	591	100.00 %	0.71 %
King (Stokes)	91	6,606	82,920	6,606	100.00 %	7.97 %
Kings Mountain (Cleveland)	110	10,032	89,459	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	111	10,032	84,508	10,032	100.00 %	11.87 %

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 10/23/2023

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Kings Mountain (Gaston)	110	1,110	89,459	1,110	100.00 %	1.24 %
Kingstown	110	656	89,459	656	100.00 %	0.73 %
Kinston	12	19,900	84,745	19,900	100.00 %	23.48 %
Kittrell	7	132	83,541	132	100.00 %	0.16 %
Kitty Hawk	1	3,689	82,812	3,689	100.00 %	4.45 %
Knightdale	35	19,435	83,094	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	38	19,435	86,444	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	39	19,435	85,371	19,435	100.00 %	22.77 %
Kure Beach	19	2,191	91,288	2,191	100.00 %	2.40 %
La Grange	12	2,595	84,745	2,595	100.00 %	3.06 %
Lake Lure	113	1,365	89,151	1,365	100.00 %	1.53 %
Lake Park	69	3,269	89,186	3,269	100.00 %	3.67 %
Lake Santeetlah	120	38	84,907	38	100.00 %	0.04 %
Lake Waccamaw	46	1,296	83,701	1,296	100.00 %	1.55 %
Landis	83	3,690	90,899	3,690	100.00 %	4.06 %
Lansing	93	126	87,194	126	100.00 %	0.14 %
Lasker	27	64	84,735	64	100.00 %	0.08 %
Lattimore	111	406	84,508	406	100.00 %	0.48 %
Laurel Park	113	2,250	89,151	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	117	2,250	91,035	2,250	100.00 %	2.47 %
Laurinburg	48	14,978	86,256	14,978	100.00 %	17.36 %
Lawndale	110	570	89,459	570	100.00 %	0.64 %
Leggett	23	37	88,865	37	100.00 %	0.04 %
Leland	17	22,908	90,514	22,908	100.00 %	25.31 %
Lenoir	87	18,352	85,009	18,352	100.00 %	21.59 %
Lewiston Woodville	23	426	88,865	426	100.00 %	0.48 %
Lewisville	74	13,381	83,545	13,381	100.00 %	16.02 %
Lexington	80	19,632	83,289	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	81	19,632	85,641	19,632	100.00 %	22.92 %
Liberty	54	2,655	83,475	2,655	100.00 %	3.18 %
Lilesville	55	395	82,927	395	100.00 %	0.48 %
Lillington	6	4,735	90,919	3,991	84.29 %	4.39 %
	53	4,735	83,312	744	15.71 %	0.89 %
Lincolnton	97	11,091	86,810	11,091	100.00 %	12.78 %
Linden	43	136	85,335	136	100.00 %	0.16 %
Littleton	27	559	84,735	559	100.00 %	0.66 %
Locust (Cabarrus)	82	541	91,227	541	100.00 %	0.59 %
Locust (Stanly)	67	3,996	88,255	3,996	100.00 %	4.53 %
Long View (Burke)	86	735	87,570	735	100.00 %	0.84 %
Long View (Catawba)	96	4,353	89,587	4,353	100.00 %	4.86 %
Louisburg	7	3,064	83,541	3,064	100.00 %	3.67 %

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Love Valley	84	154	86,773	154	100.00 %	0.18 %
Lowell	108	3,654	89,468	3,654	100.00 %	4.08 %
	109	3,654	88,881	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Lucama	24	1,036	83,322	1,036	100.00 %	1.24 %
Lumber Bridge	46	82	83,701	82	100.00 %	0.10 %
Lumberton	46	19,025	83,701	191	1.00 %	0.23 %
	47	19,025	83,452	18,834	99.00 %	22.57 %
Macclesfield	23	413	88,865	413	100.00 %	0.46 %
Macon	27	110	84,735	110	100.00 %	0.13 %
Madison	65	2,129	91,096	2,129	100.00 %	2.34 %
Maggie Valley	118	1,687	83,282	1,687	100.00 %	2.03 %
Magnolia	4	831	83,034	831	100.00 %	1.00 %
Maiden (Catawba)	89	3,736	85,577	3,736	100.00 %	4.37 %
Maiden (Lincoln)	97	0	86,810	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Manteo	79	1,600	84,681	1,600	100.00 %	1.89 %
Marietta	47	111	83,452	111	100.00 %	0.13 %
Marion	85	7,717	90,770	7,717	100.00 %	8.50 %
	113	7,717	89,151	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Mars Hill	118	2,007	83,282	2,007	100.00 %	2.41 %
Marshall	118	777	83,282	777	100.00 %	0.93 %
Marshville	55	2,522	82,927	2,522	100.00 %	3.04 %
Marvin	68	6,358	88,209	6,358	100.00 %	7.21 %
Matthews	100	29,435	86,763	11,369	38.62 %	13.10 %
	103	29,435	89,354	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	105	29,435	85,671	18,066	61.38 %	21.09 %
Maxton (Robeson)	47	1,902	83,452	1,902	100.00 %	2.28 %
Maxton (Scotland)	48	208	86,256	208	100.00 %	0.24 %
Mayodan	65	2,418	91,096	2,418	100.00 %	2.65 %
Maysville	12	818	84,745	818	100.00 %	0.97 %
McAdenville	108	890	89,468	890	100.00 %	0.99 %
McDonald	47	94	83,452	94	100.00 %	0.11 %
McFarlan	55	94	82,927	94	100.00 %	0.11 %
Mebane (Alamance)	64	14,626	87,568	14,626	100.00 %	16.70 %
Mebane (Orange)	50	3,171	86,290	3,171	100.00 %	3.67 %
Mesic	79	144	84,681	144	100.00 %	0.17 %
Micro	28	458	85,389	458	100.00 %	0.54 %
Middleburg	32	101	88,602	101	100.00 %	0.11 %
Middlesex	25	912	90,432	912	100.00 %	1.01 %
Midland (Cabarrus)	82	4,684	91,227	4,684	100.00 %	5.13 %
Midland (Mecklenburg)	105	0	85,671	0	0.00 %	0.00 %

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 10/23/2023

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Midway	80	4,742	83,289	3,469	73.15 %	4.17 %
	81	4,742	85,641	1,273	26.85 %	1.49 %
Mills River	117	7,078	91,035	7,078	100.00 %	7.78 %
Milton	50	155	86,290	155	100.00 %	0.18 %
Mineral Springs	55	3,159	82,927	47	1.49 %	0.06 %
	68	3,159	88,209	3,112	98.51 %	3.53 %
Minnesott Beach	79	530	84,681	530	100.00 %	0.63 %
Mint Hill (Mecklenburg)	100	26,444	86,763	3,903	14.76 %	4.50 %
	105	26,444	85,671	22,541	85.24 %	26.31 %
Mint Hill (Union)	69	6	89,186	6	100.00 %	0.01 %
Misenheimer	67	650	88,255	650	100.00 %	0.74 %
Mocksville	77	5,900	90,628	5,900	100.00 %	6.51 %
Momeyer	25	277	90,432	277	100.00 %	0.31 %
Monroe	55	34,562	82,927	21,381	61.86 %	25.78 %
	68	34,562	88,209	1,511	4.37 %	1.71 %
	69	34,562	89,186	11,670	33.77 %	13.09 %
Montreat	114	901	90,248	901	100.00 %	1.00 %
Mooresboro	111	293	84,508	293	100.00 %	0.35 %
Mooresville	84	50,193	86,773	205	0.41 %	0.24 %
	95	50,193	85,366	49,988	99.59 %	58.56 %
Morehead City	13	9,556	83,500	9,556	100.00 %	11.44 %
Morganton	86	17,474	87,570	17,474	100.00 %	19.95 %
Morrisville (Durham)	31	207	91,241	207	100.00 %	0.23 %
Morrisville (Wake)	41	29,423	89,876	29,423	100.00 %	32.74 %
Morven	55	329	82,927	329	100.00 %	0.40 %
Mount Airy	90	10,676	88,208	10,676	100.00 %	12.10 %
Mount Gilead	67	1,171	88,255	1,171	100.00 %	1.33 %
Mount Holly	108	17,703	89,468	17,703	100.00 %	19.79 %
Mount Olive (Duplin)	4	5	83,034	5	100.00 %	0.01 %
Mount Olive (Wayne)	4	4,193	83,034	4,193	100.00 %	5.05 %
Mount Pleasant	82	1,671	91,227	1,671	100.00 %	1.83 %
Murfreesboro	5	2,619	82,953	2,619	100.00 %	3.16 %
Murphy	120	1,608	84,907	1,608	100.00 %	1.89 %
Nags Head	79	3,168	84,681	3,168	100.00 %	3.74 %
Nashville	25	5,632	90,432	5,632	100.00 %	6.23 %
Navassa	17	1,367	90,514	1,367	100.00 %	1.51 %
New Bern	3	31,291	84,906	31,291	100.00 %	36.85 %
New London	67	607	88,255	607	100.00 %	0.69 %
Newland	85	715	90,770	715	100.00 %	0.79 %
Newport	13	4,364	83,500	4,364	100.00 %	5.23 %

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 10/23/2023

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Newton	89	13,148	85,577	13,148	100.00 %	15.36 %
	96	13,148	89,587	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Newton Grove	22	585	88,642	585	100.00 %	0.66 %
Norlina	27	920	84,735	920	100.00 %	1.09 %
Norman	52	100	84,383	100	100.00 %	0.12 %
North Topsail Beach	16	1,005	85,097	1,005	100.00 %	1.18 %
North Wilkesboro	90	4,382	88,208	11	0.25 %	0.01 %
	94	4,382	85,564	4,371	99.75 %	5.11 %
Northwest	17	703	90,514	703	100.00 %	0.78 %
Norwood	67	2,367	88,255	2,367	100.00 %	2.68 %
Oak City	23	266	88,865	266	100.00 %	0.30 %
Oak Island	19	8,396	91,288	8,396	100.00 %	9.20 %
Oak Ridge	62	7,474	89,637	7,474	100.00 %	8.34 %
Oakboro	67	2,128	88,255	2,128	100.00 %	2.41 %
Ocean Isle Beach	17	867	90,514	867	100.00 %	0.96 %
Old Fort	85	811	90,770	811	100.00 %	0.89 %
Oriental	79	880	84,681	880	100.00 %	1.04 %
Orrum	46	59	83,701	59	100.00 %	0.07 %
Ossipee	63	536	83,847	536	100.00 %	0.64 %
Oxford	32	8,628	88,602	8,628	100.00 %	9.74 %
Pantego	79	164	84,681	164	100.00 %	0.19 %
Parkton	46	504	83,701	504	100.00 %	0.60 %
Parmele	23	243	88,865	243	100.00 %	0.27 %
Patterson Springs	111	571	84,508	571	100.00 %	0.68 %
Peachland	55	390	82,927	390	100.00 %	0.47 %
Peletier	13	769	83,500	769	100.00 %	0.92 %
Pembroke	47	2,823	83,452	2,823	100.00 %	3.38 %
Pikeville	10	712	83,014	712	100.00 %	0.86 %
Pilot Mountain	90	1,440	88,208	1,440	100.00 %	1.63 %
Pine Knoll Shores	13	1,388	83,500	1,388	100.00 %	1.66 %
Pine Level	28	2,046	85,389	2,046	100.00 %	2.40 %
Pinebluff	52	1,473	84,383	1,473	100.00 %	1.75 %
Pinehurst	52	17,581	84,383	8	0.05 %	0.01 %
	78	17,581	86,365	17,573	99.95 %	20.35 %
Pinetops	23	1,200	88,865	1,200	100.00 %	1.35 %
Pineville	103	10,602	89,354	10,602	100.00 %	11.87 %
	104	10,602	83,554	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Pink Hill	12	451	84,745	451	100.00 %	0.53 %
Pittsboro	54	4,537	83,475	4,537	100.00 %	5.44 %
Pleasant Garden	59	5,000	90,829	5,000	100.00 %	5.50 %
Plymouth	1	3,320	82,812	3,320	100.00 %	4.01 %

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Polkton	55	2,250	82,927	2,250	100.00 %	2.71 %
Polkville	110	516	89,459	516	100.00 %	0.58 %
Pollocksville	12	268	84,745	268	100.00 %	0.32 %
Powellsville	23	189	88,865	189	100.00 %	0.21 %
Princeton	28	1,315	85,389	1,315	100.00 %	1.54 %
Princeville	23	1,254	88,865	1,254	100.00 %	1.41 %
Proctorville	46	121	83,701	121	100.00 %	0.14 %
Raeford	48	4,559	86,256	4,559	100.00 %	5.29 %
Raleigh (Durham)	31	1,559	91,241	1,559	100.00 %	1.71 %
Raleigh (Wake)	11	466,106	86,381	14,217	3.05 %	16.46 %
	33	466,106	85,001	38,296	8.22 %	45.05 %
	34	466,106	84,251	75,591	16.22 %	89.72 %
	35	466,106	83,094	1,532	0.33 %	1.84 %
	38	466,106	86,444	83,928	18.01 %	97.09 %
	39	466,106	85,371	13,702	2.94 %	16.05 %
	40	466,106	86,359	69,728	14.96 %	80.74 %
	41	466,106	89,876	12,014	2.58 %	13.37 %
	49	466,106	89,807	89,594	19.22 %	99.76 %
66	466,106	88,717	67,504	14.48 %	76.09 %	
Ramseur	78	1,774	86,365	1,774	100.00 %	2.05 %
Randleman	70	4,595	89,118	4,595	100.00 %	5.16 %
Ranlo	108	4,511	89,468	4,511	100.00 %	5.04 %
Raynham	47	60	83,452	60	100.00 %	0.07 %
Red Cross	67	762	88,255	762	100.00 %	0.86 %
Red Oak	25	3,342	90,432	3,342	100.00 %	3.70 %
Red Springs (Hoke)	48	0	86,256	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Red Springs (Robeson)	47	3,087	83,452	3,087	100.00 %	3.70 %
Reidsville	65	14,583	91,096	14,583	100.00 %	16.01 %
Rennert	46	275	83,701	275	100.00 %	0.33 %
Rhodhiss (Burke)	86	639	87,570	639	100.00 %	0.73 %
Rhodhiss (Caldwell)	87	358	85,009	358	100.00 %	0.42 %
Rich Square	27	894	84,735	894	100.00 %	1.06 %
Richfield	67	582	88,255	582	100.00 %	0.66 %
Richlands	15	2,287	91,212	2,287	100.00 %	2.51 %
River Bend	3	2,902	84,906	2,902	100.00 %	3.42 %
Roanoke Rapids	27	15,229	84,735	15,229	100.00 %	17.97 %
Robbins	78	1,168	86,365	1,168	100.00 %	1.35 %
Robbinsville	120	597	84,907	597	100.00 %	0.70 %
Robersonville	23	1,269	88,865	1,269	100.00 %	1.43 %
Rockingham	52	9,243	84,383	9,243	100.00 %	10.95 %
Rockwell	76	2,302	89,815	2,302	100.00 %	2.56 %

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Rocky Mount (Edgecombe)	23	15,414	88,865	15,414	100.00 %	17.35 %
Rocky Mount (Nash)	24	38,927	83,322	241	0.62 %	0.29 %
	25	38,927	90,432	38,686	99.38 %	42.78 %
Rolesville	35	9,475	83,094	8,162	86.14 %	9.82 %
	39	9,475	85,371	8	0.08 %	0.01 %
	66	9,475	88,717	1,305	13.77 %	1.47 %
Ronda	90	438	88,208	438	100.00 %	0.50 %
Roper	1	485	82,812	485	100.00 %	0.59 %
Rose Hill	4	1,371	83,034	1,371	100.00 %	1.65 %
Roseboro	22	1,163	88,642	1,163	100.00 %	1.31 %
Rosman	119	701	90,212	701	100.00 %	0.78 %
Rowland	47	885	83,452	885	100.00 %	1.06 %
Roxboro	2	8,134	90,751	8,134	100.00 %	8.96 %
Roxobel	23	187	88,865	187	100.00 %	0.21 %
Rural Hall	91	3,351	82,920	3,351	100.00 %	4.04 %
Ruth	113	347	89,151	347	100.00 %	0.39 %
Rutherford College (Burke)	86	1,226	87,570	1,226	100.00 %	1.40 %
Rutherford College (Caldwell)	87	0	85,009	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Rutherfordton	113	3,640	89,151	3,640	100.00 %	4.08 %
Salemburg	22	457	88,642	457	100.00 %	0.52 %
Salisbury	76	35,540	89,815	35,540	100.00 %	39.57 %
Saluda (Henderson)	113	11	89,151	11	100.00 %	0.01 %
Saluda (Polk)	113	620	89,151	620	100.00 %	0.70 %
Sandy Creek	17	248	90,514	248	100.00 %	0.27 %
Sandyfield	46	430	83,701	430	100.00 %	0.51 %
Sanford	51	30,261	83,073	30,261	100.00 %	36.43 %
Saratoga	24	353	83,322	353	100.00 %	0.42 %
Sawmills	87	5,020	85,009	5,020	100.00 %	5.91 %
Scotland Neck	27	1,640	84,735	1,640	100.00 %	1.94 %
Seaboard	27	542	84,735	542	100.00 %	0.64 %
Seagrove	78	235	86,365	235	100.00 %	0.27 %
Sedalia	59	676	90,829	676	100.00 %	0.74 %
Selma	28	6,317	85,389	6,317	100.00 %	7.40 %
Seven Devils (Avery)	85	38	90,770	38	100.00 %	0.04 %
Seven Devils (Watauga)	93	275	87,194	275	100.00 %	0.32 %
Seven Springs	4	55	83,034	55	100.00 %	0.07 %
Severn	27	191	84,735	191	100.00 %	0.23 %
Shallotte	17	4,185	90,514	4,185	100.00 %	4.62 %
Sharpsburg (Edgecombe)	23	215	88,865	215	100.00 %	0.24 %
Sharpsburg (Nash)	24	1,061	83,322	1,061	100.00 %	1.27 %
Sharpsburg (Wilson)	24	421	83,322	421	100.00 %	0.51 %

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Shelby	110	21,918	89,459	14,967	68.29 %	16.73 %
	111	21,918	84,508	6,951	31.71 %	8.23 %
Siler City	54	7,702	83,475	7,702	100.00 %	9.23 %
Simpson	9	390	86,684	390	100.00 %	0.45 %
Sims	24	275	83,322	275	100.00 %	0.33 %
Smithfield	28	11,292	85,389	11,292	100.00 %	13.22 %
Snow Hill	12	1,481	84,745	1,481	100.00 %	1.75 %
Southern Pines	52	15,545	84,383	15,545	100.00 %	18.42 %
	78	15,545	86,365	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Southern Shores	1	3,090	82,812	3,090	100.00 %	3.73 %
Southport	19	3,971	91,288	3,971	100.00 %	4.35 %
Sparta	93	1,834	87,194	1,834	100.00 %	2.10 %
Speed	23	63	88,865	63	100.00 %	0.07 %
Spencer	76	3,308	89,815	3,308	100.00 %	3.68 %
Spencer Mountain	108	0	89,468	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Spindale	113	4,225	89,151	4,225	100.00 %	4.74 %
Spring Hope	25	1,309	90,432	1,309	100.00 %	1.45 %
Spring Lake	42	11,660	82,965	11,660	100.00 %	14.05 %
Spruce Pine	85	2,194	90,770	2,194	100.00 %	2.42 %
St. Helena	16	417	85,097	417	100.00 %	0.49 %
St. James	19	6,529	91,288	6,529	100.00 %	7.15 %
St. Pauls	46	2,045	83,701	2,045	100.00 %	2.44 %
Staley	54	397	83,475	397	100.00 %	0.48 %
Stallings (Mecklenburg)	105	384	85,671	384	100.00 %	0.45 %
Stallings (Union)	68	15,728	88,209	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	69	15,728	89,186	15,728	100.00 %	17.64 %
Stanfield	67	1,585	88,255	1,585	100.00 %	1.80 %
Stanley	108	3,963	89,468	3,963	100.00 %	4.43 %
Stantonsburg	24	762	83,322	762	100.00 %	0.91 %
Star	67	806	88,255	806	100.00 %	0.91 %
Statesville	84	28,419	86,773	28,415	99.99 %	32.75 %
	89	28,419	85,577	4	0.01 %	0.00 %
Stedman	43	1,277	85,335	1,277	100.00 %	1.50 %
Stem	32	960	88,602	960	100.00 %	1.08 %
Stokesdale	62	5,924	89,637	5,924	100.00 %	6.61 %
Stoneville	65	1,308	91,096	1,308	100.00 %	1.44 %
Stonewall	79	214	84,681	214	100.00 %	0.25 %
Stovall	32	324	88,602	324	100.00 %	0.37 %
Sugar Mountain	85	371	90,770	371	100.00 %	0.41 %
Summerfield	62	10,951	89,637	10,951	100.00 %	12.22 %
Sunset Beach	17	4,175	90,514	4,175	100.00 %	4.61 %

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

[G20-MbCD] - Generated 10/23/2023

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Surf City (Onslow)	16	334	85,097	334	100.00 %	0.39 %
Surf City (Pender)	16	3,533	85,097	3,533	100.00 %	4.15 %
Swansboro	14	3,744	88,470	3,744	100.00 %	4.23 %
Sweptonville	64	2,445	87,568	2,445	100.00 %	2.79 %
Sylva	119	2,578	90,212	2,578	100.00 %	2.86 %
Tabor City	46	3,781	83,701	3,781	100.00 %	4.52 %
Tar Heel	22	90	88,642	90	100.00 %	0.10 %
Tarboro	23	10,721	88,865	10,721	100.00 %	12.06 %
Taylorsville	94	2,320	85,564	2,320	100.00 %	2.71 %
Taylortown	52	634	84,383	4	0.63 %	0.00 %
	78	634	86,365	630	99.37 %	0.73 %
Teachey	4	448	83,034	448	100.00 %	0.54 %
Thomasville (Davidson)	80	26,662	83,289	26,662	100.00 %	32.01 %
Thomasville (Randolph)	70	521	89,118	521	100.00 %	0.58 %
Tobaccoville (Forsyth)	74	2,578	83,545	2,578	100.00 %	3.09 %
Tobaccoville (Stokes)	91	0	82,920	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Topsail Beach	16	461	85,097	461	100.00 %	0.54 %
Trent Woods	3	4,074	84,906	4,074	100.00 %	4.80 %
Trenton	12	238	84,745	238	100.00 %	0.28 %
Trinity	70	7,006	89,118	7,006	100.00 %	7.86 %
Troutman	84	3,698	86,773	885	23.93 %	1.02 %
	89	3,698	85,577	2,813	76.07 %	3.29 %
Troy	67	2,850	88,255	2,850	100.00 %	3.23 %
Tryon	113	1,562	89,151	1,562	100.00 %	1.75 %
Turkey	22	213	88,642	213	100.00 %	0.24 %
Unionville	55	6,643	82,927	691	10.40 %	0.83 %
	69	6,643	89,186	5,952	89.60 %	6.67 %
Valdese	86	4,689	87,570	4,689	100.00 %	5.35 %
Vanceboro	3	869	84,906	869	100.00 %	1.02 %
Vandemere	79	246	84,681	246	100.00 %	0.29 %
Varnantown	19	525	91,288	525	100.00 %	0.58 %
Vass	51	952	83,073	952	100.00 %	1.15 %
Waco	110	310	89,459	310	100.00 %	0.35 %
Wade	43	638	85,335	638	100.00 %	0.75 %
Wadesboro	55	5,008	82,927	5,008	100.00 %	6.04 %
Wagram	48	615	86,256	615	100.00 %	0.71 %
Wake Forest (Franklin)	7	1,504	83,541	1,504	100.00 %	1.80 %
Wake Forest (Wake)	35	46,097	83,094	30,884	67.00 %	37.17 %
	66	46,097	88,717	15,213	33.00 %	17.15 %
Walkertown	75	5,692	87,378	1,081	18.99 %	1.24 %
	91	5,692	82,920	4,611	81.01 %	5.56 %

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Wallace (Duplin)	4	3,413	83,034	3,413	100.00 %	4.11 %
Wallace (Pender)	16	0	85,097	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Wallburg	80	3,051	83,289	3,051	100.00 %	3.66 %
Walnut Cove	91	1,586	82,920	1,586	100.00 %	1.91 %
Walnut Creek	10	1,084	83,014	1,084	100.00 %	1.31 %
Walstonburg	12	193	84,745	193	100.00 %	0.23 %
Warrenton	27	851	84,735	851	100.00 %	1.00 %
Warsaw	4	2,733	83,034	2,733	100.00 %	3.29 %
Washington	79	9,875	84,681	9,875	100.00 %	11.66 %
Washington Park	79	392	84,681	392	100.00 %	0.46 %
Watha	16	181	85,097	181	100.00 %	0.21 %
Waxhaw	55	20,534	82,927	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	68	20,534	88,209	20,534	100.00 %	23.28 %
Waynesville	118	10,140	83,282	10,140	100.00 %	12.18 %
Weaverville	115	4,567	89,747	4,567	100.00 %	5.09 %
Webster	119	372	90,212	372	100.00 %	0.41 %
Weddington (Mecklenburg)	103	5	89,354	5	100.00 %	0.01 %
Weddington (Union)	68	13,176	88,209	11,637	88.32 %	13.19 %
	69	13,176	89,186	1,539	11.68 %	1.73 %
Weldon	27	1,444	84,735	1,444	100.00 %	1.70 %
Wendell	35	9,793	83,094	9	0.09 %	0.01 %
	39	9,793	85,371	9,784	99.91 %	11.46 %
Wentworth	65	2,662	91,096	2,662	100.00 %	2.92 %
Wesley Chapel	68	8,681	88,209	8,265	95.21 %	9.37 %
	69	8,681	89,186	416	4.79 %	0.47 %
West Jefferson	93	1,279	87,194	1,279	100.00 %	1.47 %
Whispering Pines	52	4,987	84,383	4,987	100.00 %	5.91 %
Whitakers (Edgecombe)	23	290	88,865	290	100.00 %	0.33 %
Whitakers (Nash)	25	337	90,432	337	100.00 %	0.37 %
White Lake	22	843	88,642	843	100.00 %	0.95 %
Whiteville	46	4,766	83,701	4,766	100.00 %	5.69 %
Whitsett	59	584	90,829	584	100.00 %	0.64 %
Wilkesboro	94	3,687	85,564	3,687	100.00 %	4.31 %
Williamston	23	5,248	88,865	5,248	100.00 %	5.91 %
Wilmington	18	115,451	89,413	82,820	71.74 %	92.63 %
	19	115,451	91,288	5,187	4.49 %	5.68 %
	20	115,451	91,180	27,444	23.77 %	30.10 %
Wilson	24	47,851	83,322	47,851	100.00 %	57.43 %
Wilson's Mills	26	2,534	89,947	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	28	2,534	85,389	2,534	100.00 %	2.97 %
Windsor	23	3,582	88,865	3,582	100.00 %	4.03 %

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

Municipalities derive from the 2020 Census Redistricting Data (P.L. 94-171) Shapefiles. Population figures are based on the associated Summary File.

Note that for the purposes of this report, portions of municipalities in different counties are treated separately.

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Winfall	1	555	82,812	555	100.00 %	0.67 %
Wingate	55	4,055	82,927	4,055	100.00 %	4.89 %
Winston-Salem	71	249,545	88,823	86,109	34.51 %	96.94 %
	72	249,545	84,444	84,444	33.84 %	100.00 %
	74	249,545	83,545	27,464	11.01 %	32.87 %
	75	249,545	87,378	33,872	13.57 %	38.76 %
	91	249,545	82,920	17,656	7.08 %	21.29 %
Winterville	8	10,462	83,559	44	0.42 %	0.05 %
	9	10,462	86,684	10,418	99.58 %	12.02 %
Winton	5	629	82,953	629	100.00 %	0.76 %
Woodfin	115	7,936	89,747	3,031	38.19 %	3.38 %
	116	7,936	89,457	4,905	61.81 %	5.48 %
Woodland	27	557	84,735	557	100.00 %	0.66 %
Wrightsville Beach	20	2,473	91,180	2,473	100.00 %	2.71 %
Yadkinville	77	2,995	90,628	2,995	100.00 %	3.30 %
Yanceyville	50	1,937	86,290	1,937	100.00 %	2.24 %
Youngsville	7	2,016	83,541	2,016	100.00 %	2.41 %
Zebulon (Johnston)	26	0	89,947	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Zebulon (Wake)	39	6,903	85,371	6,903	100.00 %	8.09 %
Assigned Geography Total:				6,017,605		

Report display: all municipalities

Total Municipalities (by County) Statewide: 614

Fully Assigned Municipalities: 614

Partially Assigned Municipalities: 0

Fully Unassigned Municipalities: 0

Total Districts Assigned: 120

Split Municipalities: 88

Splits Involving Population: 65

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
1	Columbia	82,812	610	610	0.74 %	100.00 %
	Creswell	82,812	207	207	0.25 %	100.00 %
	Duck	82,812	742	742	0.90 %	100.00 %
	Edenton	82,812	4,460	4,460	5.39 %	100.00 %
	Hertford	82,812	1,934	1,934	2.34 %	100.00 %
	Kitty Hawk	82,812	3,689	3,689	4.45 %	100.00 %
	Plymouth	82,812	3,320	3,320	4.01 %	100.00 %
	Roper	82,812	485	485	0.59 %	100.00 %
	Southern Shores	82,812	3,090	3,090	3.73 %	100.00 %
	Winfall	82,812	555	555	0.67 %	100.00 %
2	Durham (Durham)	90,751	283,093	28,462	31.36 %	10.05 %
	Roxboro	90,751	8,134	8,134	8.96 %	100.00 %
3	Bridgeton	84,906	349	349	0.41 %	100.00 %
	Cove City	84,906	378	378	0.45 %	100.00 %
	Dover	84,906	349	349	0.41 %	100.00 %
	Havelock	84,906	16,621	4,939	5.82 %	29.72 %
	New Bern	84,906	31,291	31,291	36.85 %	100.00 %
	River Bend	84,906	2,902	2,902	3.42 %	100.00 %
	Trent Woods	84,906	4,074	4,074	4.80 %	100.00 %
	Vanceboro	84,906	869	869	1.02 %	100.00 %
4	Beulaville	83,034	1,116	1,116	1.34 %	100.00 %
	Calypso	83,034	327	327	0.39 %	100.00 %
	Faison (Duplin)	83,034	784	784	0.94 %	100.00 %
	Goldsboro	83,034	33,657	2,546	3.07 %	7.56 %
	Greenevers	83,034	567	567	0.68 %	100.00 %
	Harrells (Duplin)	83,034	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Kenansville	83,034	770	770	0.93 %	100.00 %
	Magnolia	83,034	831	831	1.00 %	100.00 %
	Mount Olive (Duplin)	83,034	5	5	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Mount Olive (Wayne)	83,034	4,193	4,193	5.05 %	100.00 %
	Rose Hill	83,034	1,371	1,371	1.65 %	100.00 %
	Seven Springs	83,034	55	55	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Teachey	83,034	448	448	0.54 %	100.00 %
	Wallace (Duplin)	83,034	3,413	3,413	4.11 %	100.00 %
	Warsaw	83,034	2,733	2,733	3.29 %	100.00 %
5	Ahoskie	82,953	4,891	4,891	5.90 %	100.00 %
	Cofield	82,953	267	267	0.32 %	100.00 %
	Como	82,953	67	67	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Elizabeth City (Camden)	82,953	38	38	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Elizabeth City (Pasquotank)	82,953	18,593	18,593	22.41 %	100.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
5	Gatesville	82,953	267	267	0.32 %	100.00 %
	Harrellsville	82,953	85	85	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Murfreesboro	82,953	2,619	2,619	3.16 %	100.00 %
	Winton	82,953	629	629	0.76 %	100.00 %
6	Broadway (Harnett)	90,919	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Dunn	90,919	8,446	1	0.00 %	0.01 %
	Erwin	90,919	4,542	4,542	5.00 %	100.00 %
	Fuquay-Varina (Harnett)	90,919	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Lillington	90,919	4,735	3,991	4.39 %	84.29 %
7	Bunn	83,541	327	327	0.39 %	100.00 %
	Franklinton	83,541	2,456	2,456	2.94 %	100.00 %
	Henderson	83,541	15,060	330	0.40 %	2.19 %
	Kittrell	83,541	132	132	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Louisburg	83,541	3,064	3,064	3.67 %	100.00 %
	Wake Forest (Franklin)	83,541	1,504	1,504	1.80 %	100.00 %
	Youngsville	83,541	2,016	2,016	2.41 %	100.00 %
8	Bethel	83,559	1,373	1,373	1.64 %	100.00 %
	Falkland	83,559	47	47	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Farmville	83,559	4,461	4,461	5.34 %	100.00 %
	Fountain	83,559	385	385	0.46 %	100.00 %
	Greenville	83,559	87,521	57,659	69.00 %	65.88 %
	Winterville	83,559	10,462	44	0.05 %	0.42 %
9	Ayden	86,684	4,977	4,977	5.74 %	100.00 %
	Greenville	86,684	87,521	29,862	34.45 %	34.12 %
	Grifton (Pitt)	86,684	2,301	2,301	2.65 %	100.00 %
	Grimesland	86,684	386	386	0.45 %	100.00 %
	Simpson	86,684	390	390	0.45 %	100.00 %
	Winterville	86,684	10,462	10,418	12.02 %	99.58 %
10	Eureka	83,014	214	214	0.26 %	100.00 %
	Fremont	83,014	1,196	1,196	1.44 %	100.00 %
	Goldsboro	83,014	33,657	31,111	37.48 %	92.44 %
	Pikeville	83,014	712	712	0.86 %	100.00 %
	Walnut Creek	83,014	1,084	1,084	1.31 %	100.00 %
11	Apex	86,381	58,780	6,287	7.28 %	10.70 %
	Cary (Wake)	86,381	171,012	64,839	75.06 %	37.91 %
	Raleigh (Wake)	86,381	466,106	14,217	16.46 %	3.05 %
12	Grifton (Lenoir)	84,745	147	147	0.17 %	100.00 %
	Hookerton	84,745	413	413	0.49 %	100.00 %
	Kinston	84,745	19,900	19,900	23.48 %	100.00 %
	La Grange	84,745	2,595	2,595	3.06 %	100.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
12	Maysville	84,745	818	818	0.97 %	100.00 %
	Pink Hill	84,745	451	451	0.53 %	100.00 %
	Pollocksville	84,745	268	268	0.32 %	100.00 %
	Snow Hill	84,745	1,481	1,481	1.75 %	100.00 %
	Trenton	84,745	238	238	0.28 %	100.00 %
	Walstonburg	84,745	193	193	0.23 %	100.00 %
13	Atlantic Beach	83,500	1,364	1,364	1.63 %	100.00 %
	Beaufort	83,500	4,464	4,464	5.35 %	100.00 %
	Bogue	83,500	695	695	0.83 %	100.00 %
	Cape Carteret	83,500	2,224	2,224	2.66 %	100.00 %
	Cedar Point	83,500	1,764	1,764	2.11 %	100.00 %
	Emerald Isle	83,500	3,847	3,847	4.61 %	100.00 %
	Havelock	83,500	16,621	11,682	13.99 %	70.28 %
	Indian Beach	83,500	223	223	0.27 %	100.00 %
	Morehead City	83,500	9,556	9,556	11.44 %	100.00 %
	Newport	83,500	4,364	4,364	5.23 %	100.00 %
	Peletier	83,500	769	769	0.92 %	100.00 %
	Pine Knoll Shores	83,500	1,388	1,388	1.66 %	100.00 %
14	Jacksonville	88,470	72,723	47,353	53.52 %	65.11 %
	Swansboro	88,470	3,744	3,744	4.23 %	100.00 %
15	Jacksonville	91,212	72,723	25,370	27.81 %	34.89 %
	Richlands	91,212	2,287	2,287	2.51 %	100.00 %
16	Atkinson	85,097	296	296	0.35 %	100.00 %
	Burgaw	85,097	3,088	3,088	3.63 %	100.00 %
	Holly Ridge	85,097	4,171	4,171	4.90 %	100.00 %
	North Topsail Beach	85,097	1,005	1,005	1.18 %	100.00 %
	St. Helena	85,097	417	417	0.49 %	100.00 %
	Surf City (Onslow)	85,097	334	334	0.39 %	100.00 %
	Surf City (Pender)	85,097	3,533	3,533	4.15 %	100.00 %
	Topsail Beach	85,097	461	461	0.54 %	100.00 %
	Wallace (Pender)	85,097	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Watha	85,097	181	181	0.21 %	100.00 %
17	Belville	90,514	2,406	2,406	2.66 %	100.00 %
	Calabash	90,514	2,011	2,011	2.22 %	100.00 %
	Carolina Shores	90,514	4,588	4,588	5.07 %	100.00 %
	Holden Beach	90,514	921	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Leland	90,514	22,908	22,908	25.31 %	100.00 %
	Navassa	90,514	1,367	1,367	1.51 %	100.00 %
	Northwest	90,514	703	703	0.78 %	100.00 %
	Ocean Isle Beach	90,514	867	867	0.96 %	100.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
17	Sandy Creek	90,514	248	248	0.27 %	100.00 %
	Shalotte	90,514	4,185	4,185	4.62 %	100.00 %
	Sunset Beach	90,514	4,175	4,175	4.61 %	100.00 %
18	Wilmington	89,413	115,451	82,820	92.63 %	71.74 %
19	Bald Head Island	91,288	268	268	0.29 %	100.00 %
	Boiling Spring Lakes	91,288	5,943	5,943	6.51 %	100.00 %
	Bolivia	91,288	149	149	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Carolina Beach	91,288	6,564	6,564	7.19 %	100.00 %
	Caswell Beach	91,288	395	395	0.43 %	100.00 %
	Holden Beach	91,288	921	921	1.01 %	100.00 %
	Kure Beach	91,288	2,191	2,191	2.40 %	100.00 %
	Oak Island	91,288	8,396	8,396	9.20 %	100.00 %
	Southport	91,288	3,971	3,971	4.35 %	100.00 %
	St. James	91,288	6,529	6,529	7.15 %	100.00 %
	Varnamtown	91,288	525	525	0.58 %	100.00 %
	Wilmington	91,288	115,451	5,187	5.68 %	4.49 %
20	Wilmington	91,180	115,451	27,444	30.10 %	23.77 %
	Wrightsville Beach	91,180	2,473	2,473	2.71 %	100.00 %
21	Apex	87,764	58,780	42,698	48.65 %	72.64 %
	Cary (Wake)	87,764	171,012	35,876	40.88 %	20.98 %
	Holly Springs	87,764	41,239	6	0.01 %	0.01 %
22	Autryville	88,642	167	167	0.19 %	100.00 %
	Bladenboro	88,642	1,648	1,648	1.86 %	100.00 %
	Clarkton	88,642	614	614	0.69 %	100.00 %
	Clinton	88,642	8,383	8,383	9.46 %	100.00 %
	Dublin	88,642	267	267	0.30 %	100.00 %
	East Arcadia	88,642	418	418	0.47 %	100.00 %
	Elizabethtown	88,642	3,296	3,296	3.72 %	100.00 %
	Faison (Sampson)	88,642	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Falcon (Sampson)	88,642	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Garland	88,642	595	595	0.67 %	100.00 %
	Harrells (Sampson)	88,642	160	160	0.18 %	100.00 %
	Newton Grove	88,642	585	585	0.66 %	100.00 %
	Roseboro	88,642	1,163	1,163	1.31 %	100.00 %
	Salemburg	88,642	457	457	0.52 %	100.00 %
	Tar Heel	88,642	90	90	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Turkey	88,642	213	213	0.24 %	100.00 %
White Lake	88,642	843	843	0.95 %	100.00 %	
23	Askewville	88,865	184	184	0.21 %	100.00 %
	Aulander	88,865	763	763	0.86 %	100.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
23	Bear Grass	88,865	89	89	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Colerain	88,865	217	217	0.24 %	100.00 %
	Conetoe	88,865	198	198	0.22 %	100.00 %
	Everetts	88,865	150	150	0.17 %	100.00 %
	Hamilton	88,865	306	306	0.34 %	100.00 %
	Hassell	88,865	49	49	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Jamesville	88,865	424	424	0.48 %	100.00 %
	Kelford	88,865	203	203	0.23 %	100.00 %
	Leggett	88,865	37	37	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Lewiston Woodville	88,865	426	426	0.48 %	100.00 %
	Macclesfield	88,865	413	413	0.46 %	100.00 %
	Oak City	88,865	266	266	0.30 %	100.00 %
	Parmele	88,865	243	243	0.27 %	100.00 %
	Pinetops	88,865	1,200	1,200	1.35 %	100.00 %
	Powellsville	88,865	189	189	0.21 %	100.00 %
	Princeville	88,865	1,254	1,254	1.41 %	100.00 %
	Robersonville	88,865	1,269	1,269	1.43 %	100.00 %
	Rocky Mount (Edgecombe)	88,865	15,414	15,414	17.35 %	100.00 %
	Roxobel	88,865	187	187	0.21 %	100.00 %
	Sharpsburg (Edgecombe)	88,865	215	215	0.24 %	100.00 %
	Speed	88,865	63	63	0.07 %	100.00 %
Tarboro	88,865	10,721	10,721	12.06 %	100.00 %	
Whitakers (Edgecombe)	88,865	290	290	0.33 %	100.00 %	
Williamston	88,865	5,248	5,248	5.91 %	100.00 %	
Windsor	88,865	3,582	3,582	4.03 %	100.00 %	
24	Black Creek	83,322	692	692	0.83 %	100.00 %
	Elm City (Nash)	83,322	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Elm City (Wilson)	83,322	1,218	1,218	1.46 %	100.00 %
	Kenly (Wilson)	83,322	198	198	0.24 %	100.00 %
	Lucama	83,322	1,036	1,036	1.24 %	100.00 %
	Rocky Mount (Nash)	83,322	38,927	241	0.29 %	0.62 %
	Saratoga	83,322	353	353	0.42 %	100.00 %
	Sharpsburg (Nash)	83,322	1,061	1,061	1.27 %	100.00 %
	Sharpsburg (Wilson)	83,322	421	421	0.51 %	100.00 %
	Sims	83,322	275	275	0.33 %	100.00 %
	Stantonsburg	83,322	762	762	0.91 %	100.00 %
	Wilson	83,322	47,851	47,851	57.43 %	100.00 %
25	Bailey	90,432	568	568	0.63 %	100.00 %
	Castalia	90,432	264	264	0.29 %	100.00 %
	Dortches	90,432	1,082	1,082	1.20 %	100.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
25	Middlesex	90,432	912	912	1.01 %	100.00 %
	Momeyer	90,432	277	277	0.31 %	100.00 %
	Nashville	90,432	5,632	5,632	6.23 %	100.00 %
	Red Oak	90,432	3,342	3,342	3.70 %	100.00 %
	Rocky Mount (Nash)	90,432	38,927	38,686	42.78 %	99.38 %
	Spring Hope	90,432	1,309	1,309	1.45 %	100.00 %
	Whitakers (Nash)	90,432	337	337	0.37 %	100.00 %
26	Archer Lodge	89,947	4,797	4,797	5.33 %	100.00 %
	Clayton (Johnston)	89,947	26,307	26,307	29.25 %	100.00 %
	Wilson's Mills	89,947	2,534	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Zebulon (Johnston)	89,947	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
27	Conway	84,735	752	752	0.89 %	100.00 %
	Enfield	84,735	1,865	1,865	2.20 %	100.00 %
	Garysburg	84,735	904	904	1.07 %	100.00 %
	Gaston	84,735	1,008	1,008	1.19 %	100.00 %
	Halifax	84,735	170	170	0.20 %	100.00 %
	Hobgood	84,735	268	268	0.32 %	100.00 %
	Jackson	84,735	430	430	0.51 %	100.00 %
	Lasker	84,735	64	64	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Littleton	84,735	559	559	0.66 %	100.00 %
	Macon	84,735	110	110	0.13 %	100.00 %
	Norlina	84,735	920	920	1.09 %	100.00 %
	Rich Square	84,735	894	894	1.06 %	100.00 %
	Roanoke Rapids	84,735	15,229	15,229	17.97 %	100.00 %
	Scotland Neck	84,735	1,640	1,640	1.94 %	100.00 %
	Seaboard	84,735	542	542	0.64 %	100.00 %
	Severn	84,735	191	191	0.23 %	100.00 %
	Warrenton	84,735	851	851	1.00 %	100.00 %
	Weldon	84,735	1,444	1,444	1.70 %	100.00 %
Woodland	84,735	557	557	0.66 %	100.00 %	
28	Benson (Johnston)	85,389	3,967	3,967	4.65 %	100.00 %
	Four Oaks	85,389	2,158	2,158	2.53 %	100.00 %
	Kenly (Johnston)	85,389	1,293	1,293	1.51 %	100.00 %
	Micro	85,389	458	458	0.54 %	100.00 %
	Pine Level	85,389	2,046	2,046	2.40 %	100.00 %
	Princeton	85,389	1,315	1,315	1.54 %	100.00 %
	Selma	85,389	6,317	6,317	7.40 %	100.00 %
	Smithfield	85,389	11,292	11,292	13.22 %	100.00 %
Wilson's Mills	85,389	2,534	2,534	2.97 %	100.00 %	
29	Chapel Hill (Durham)	90,900	2,906	2,906	3.20 %	100.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
29	Durham (Durham)	90,900	283,093	85,000	93.51 %	30.03 %
30	Durham (Durham)	91,038	283,093	89,784	98.62 %	31.72 %
31	Durham (Durham)	91,241	283,093	79,847	87.51 %	28.21 %
	Morrisville (Durham)	91,241	207	207	0.23 %	100.00 %
	Raleigh (Durham)	91,241	1,559	1,559	1.71 %	100.00 %
32	Butner	88,602	8,397	8,397	9.48 %	100.00 %
	Creedmoor	88,602	4,866	4,866	5.49 %	100.00 %
	Henderson	88,602	15,060	14,730	16.62 %	97.81 %
	Middleburg	88,602	101	101	0.11 %	100.00 %
	Oxford	88,602	8,628	8,628	9.74 %	100.00 %
	Stem	88,602	960	960	1.08 %	100.00 %
	Stovall	88,602	324	324	0.37 %	100.00 %
33	Cary (Wake)	85,001	171,012	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Clayton (Wake)	85,001	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Garner	85,001	31,159	27,457	32.30 %	88.12 %
	Raleigh (Wake)	85,001	466,106	38,296	45.05 %	8.22 %
34	Cary (Wake)	84,251	171,012	6,581	7.81 %	3.85 %
	Raleigh (Wake)	84,251	466,106	75,591	89.72 %	16.22 %
35	Knightdale	83,094	19,435	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Raleigh (Wake)	83,094	466,106	1,532	1.84 %	0.33 %
	Rolesville	83,094	9,475	8,162	9.82 %	86.14 %
	Wake Forest (Wake)	83,094	46,097	30,884	37.17 %	67.00 %
	Wendell	83,094	9,793	9	0.01 %	0.09 %
36	Apex	86,038	58,780	9,795	11.38 %	16.66 %
	Cary (Wake)	86,038	171,012	15,876	18.45 %	9.28 %
	Fuquay-Varina (Wake)	86,038	34,152	3,076	3.58 %	9.01 %
	Garner	86,038	31,159	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Holly Springs	86,038	41,239	35,450	41.20 %	85.96 %
37	Angier (Wake)	90,307	556	556	0.62 %	100.00 %
	Fuquay-Varina (Wake)	90,307	34,152	31,076	34.41 %	90.99 %
	Garner	90,307	31,159	3,702	4.10 %	11.88 %
	Holly Springs	90,307	41,239	5,783	6.40 %	14.02 %
38	Knightdale	86,444	19,435	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Raleigh (Wake)	86,444	466,106	83,928	97.09 %	18.01 %
39	Clayton (Wake)	85,371	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Knightdale	85,371	19,435	19,435	22.77 %	100.00 %
	Raleigh (Wake)	85,371	466,106	13,702	16.05 %	2.94 %
	Rolesville	85,371	9,475	8	0.01 %	0.08 %
	Wendell	85,371	9,793	9,784	11.46 %	99.91 %
	Zebulon (Wake)	85,371	6,903	6,903	8.09 %	100.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
40	Durham (Wake)	86,359	269	269	0.31 %	100.00 %
	Raleigh (Wake)	86,359	466,106	69,728	80.74 %	14.96 %
41	Cary (Wake)	89,876	171,012	47,840	53.23 %	27.97 %
	Durham (Wake)	89,876	269	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Morrisville (Wake)	89,876	29,423	29,423	32.74 %	100.00 %
	Raleigh (Wake)	89,876	466,106	12,014	13.37 %	2.58 %
42	Fayetteville	82,965	208,501	68,284	82.30 %	32.75 %
	Spring Lake	82,965	11,660	11,660	14.05 %	100.00 %
43	Eastover	85,335	3,656	3,656	4.28 %	100.00 %
	Falcon (Cumberland)	85,335	324	324	0.38 %	100.00 %
	Fayetteville	85,335	208,501	23,719	27.80 %	11.38 %
	Godwin	85,335	128	128	0.15 %	100.00 %
	Hope Mills	85,335	17,808	402	0.47 %	2.26 %
	Linden	85,335	136	136	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Stedman	85,335	1,277	1,277	1.50 %	100.00 %
44	Wade	85,335	638	638	0.75 %	100.00 %
	Fayetteville	82,683	208,501	80,996	97.96 %	38.85 %
45	Fayetteville	83,745	208,501	35,502	42.39 %	17.03 %
	Hope Mills	83,745	17,808	17,406	20.78 %	97.74 %
46	Boardman	83,701	166	166	0.20 %	100.00 %
	Bolton	83,701	519	519	0.62 %	100.00 %
	Brunswick	83,701	973	973	1.16 %	100.00 %
	Cerro Gordo	83,701	131	131	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Chadbourn	83,701	1,574	1,574	1.88 %	100.00 %
	Fair Bluff	83,701	709	709	0.85 %	100.00 %
	Lake Waccamaw	83,701	1,296	1,296	1.55 %	100.00 %
	Lumber Bridge	83,701	82	82	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Lumberton	83,701	19,025	191	0.23 %	1.00 %
	Orrum	83,701	59	59	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Parkton	83,701	504	504	0.60 %	100.00 %
	Proctorville	83,701	121	121	0.14 %	100.00 %
	Rennert	83,701	275	275	0.33 %	100.00 %
	Sandyfield	83,701	430	430	0.51 %	100.00 %
	St. Pauls	83,701	2,045	2,045	2.44 %	100.00 %
	Tabor City	83,701	3,781	3,781	4.52 %	100.00 %
47	Whiteville	83,701	4,766	4,766	5.69 %	100.00 %
	Fairmont	83,452	2,191	2,191	2.63 %	100.00 %
	Lumberton	83,452	19,025	18,834	22.57 %	99.00 %
	Marietta	83,452	111	111	0.13 %	100.00 %
	Maxton (Robeson)	83,452	1,902	1,902	2.28 %	100.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
47	McDonald	83,452	94	94	0.11 %	100.00 %
	Pembroke	83,452	2,823	2,823	3.38 %	100.00 %
	Raynham	83,452	60	60	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Red Springs (Robeson)	83,452	3,087	3,087	3.70 %	100.00 %
	Rowland	83,452	885	885	1.06 %	100.00 %
48	East Laurinburg	86,256	234	234	0.27 %	100.00 %
	Gibson	86,256	449	449	0.52 %	100.00 %
	Laurinburg	86,256	14,978	14,978	17.36 %	100.00 %
	Maxton (Scotland)	86,256	208	208	0.24 %	100.00 %
	Raeford	86,256	4,559	4,559	5.29 %	100.00 %
	Red Springs (Hoke)	86,256	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Wagram	86,256	615	615	0.71 %	100.00 %
49	Raleigh (Wake)	89,807	466,106	89,594	99.76 %	19.22 %
50	Chapel Hill (Orange)	86,290	59,054	4,636	5.37 %	7.85 %
	Durham (Orange)	86,290	144	144	0.17 %	100.00 %
	Hillsborough	86,290	9,660	9,660	11.19 %	100.00 %
	Mebane (Orange)	86,290	3,171	3,171	3.67 %	100.00 %
	Milton	86,290	155	155	0.18 %	100.00 %
	Yanceyville	86,290	1,937	1,937	2.24 %	100.00 %
51	Broadway (Lee)	83,073	1,267	1,267	1.53 %	100.00 %
	Cameron	83,073	244	244	0.29 %	100.00 %
	Carthage	83,073	2,775	2,747	3.31 %	98.99 %
	Sanford	83,073	30,261	30,261	36.43 %	100.00 %
	Vass	83,073	952	952	1.15 %	100.00 %
52	Aberdeen	84,383	8,516	8,516	10.09 %	100.00 %
	Carthage	84,383	2,775	28	0.03 %	1.01 %
	Dobbins Heights	84,383	687	687	0.81 %	100.00 %
	Ellerbe	84,383	864	864	1.02 %	100.00 %
	Foxfire	84,383	1,288	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Hamlet	84,383	6,025	6,025	7.14 %	100.00 %
	Hoffman	84,383	418	418	0.50 %	100.00 %
	Norman	84,383	100	100	0.12 %	100.00 %
	Pinebluff	84,383	1,473	1,473	1.75 %	100.00 %
	Pinehurst	84,383	17,581	8	0.01 %	0.05 %
	Rockingham	84,383	9,243	9,243	10.95 %	100.00 %
	Southern Pines	84,383	15,545	15,545	18.42 %	100.00 %
	Taylortown	84,383	634	4	0.00 %	0.63 %
Whispering Pines	84,383	4,987	4,987	5.91 %	100.00 %	
53	Angier (Harnett)	83,312	4,709	4,709	5.65 %	100.00 %
	Benson (Harnett)	83,312	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
53	Coats	83,312	2,155	2,155	2.59 %	100.00 %
	Dunn	83,312	8,446	8,445	10.14 %	99.99 %
	Erwin	83,312	4,542	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Lillington	83,312	4,735	744	0.89 %	15.71 %
54	Cary (Chatham)	83,475	3,709	3,709	4.44 %	100.00 %
	Goldston	83,475	234	234	0.28 %	100.00 %
	Liberty	83,475	2,655	2,655	3.18 %	100.00 %
	Pittsboro	83,475	4,537	4,537	5.44 %	100.00 %
	Siler City	83,475	7,702	7,702	9.23 %	100.00 %
	Staley	83,475	397	397	0.48 %	100.00 %
55	Ansonville	82,927	440	440	0.53 %	100.00 %
	Lilesville	82,927	395	395	0.48 %	100.00 %
	Marshville	82,927	2,522	2,522	3.04 %	100.00 %
	McFarlan	82,927	94	94	0.11 %	100.00 %
	Mineral Springs	82,927	3,159	47	0.06 %	1.49 %
	Monroe	82,927	34,562	21,381	25.78 %	61.86 %
	Morven	82,927	329	329	0.40 %	100.00 %
	Peachland	82,927	390	390	0.47 %	100.00 %
	Polkton	82,927	2,250	2,250	2.71 %	100.00 %
	Unionville	82,927	6,643	691	0.83 %	10.40 %
	Wadesboro	82,927	5,008	5,008	6.04 %	100.00 %
	Waxhaw	82,927	20,534	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Wingate	82,927	4,055	4,055	4.89 %	100.00 %
56	Carrboro	85,142	21,295	21,295	25.01 %	100.00 %
	Chapel Hill (Orange)	85,142	59,054	54,418	63.91 %	92.15 %
57	Greensboro	90,259	299,035	85,668	94.91 %	28.65 %
58	Greensboro	90,051	299,035	77,753	86.34 %	26.00 %
59	Archdale (Guilford)	90,829	380	250	0.28 %	65.79 %
	Burlington (Guilford)	90,829	1,822	1,822	2.01 %	100.00 %
	Gibsonville (Guilford)	90,829	4,642	4,642	5.11 %	100.00 %
	Greensboro	90,829	299,035	9,852	10.85 %	3.29 %
	High Point (Guilford)	90,829	107,321	4,012	4.42 %	3.74 %
	Jamestown	90,829	3,668	3,661	4.03 %	99.81 %
	Pleasant Garden	90,829	5,000	5,000	5.50 %	100.00 %
	Sedalia	90,829	676	676	0.74 %	100.00 %
	Whitsett	90,829	584	584	0.64 %	100.00 %
60	Archdale (Guilford)	90,340	380	130	0.14 %	34.21 %
	Greensboro	90,340	299,035	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	High Point (Guilford)	90,340	107,321	88,578	98.05 %	82.54 %
	Jamestown	90,340	3,668	7	0.01 %	0.19 %

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
61	Greensboro	90,183	299,035	90,183	100.00 %	30.16 %
62	Greensboro	89,637	299,035	35,579	39.69 %	11.90 %
	High Point (Guilford)	89,637	107,321	14,731	16.43 %	13.73 %
	Kernersville (Guilford)	89,637	502	502	0.56 %	100.00 %
	Oak Ridge	89,637	7,474	7,474	8.34 %	100.00 %
	Stokesdale	89,637	5,924	5,924	6.61 %	100.00 %
	Summerfield	89,637	10,951	10,951	12.22 %	100.00 %
63	Alamance	83,847	988	988	1.18 %	100.00 %
	Burlington (Alamance)	83,847	55,481	41,298	49.25 %	74.44 %
	Elon	83,847	11,336	11,336	13.52 %	100.00 %
	Gibsonville (Alamance)	83,847	4,278	4,278	5.10 %	100.00 %
	Green Level	83,847	3,152	396	0.47 %	12.56 %
	Haw River	83,847	2,252	46	0.05 %	2.04 %
	Ossipee	83,847	536	536	0.64 %	100.00 %
64	Burlington (Alamance)	87,568	55,481	14,183	16.20 %	25.56 %
	Graham	87,568	17,157	17,157	19.59 %	100.00 %
	Green Level	87,568	3,152	2,756	3.15 %	87.44 %
	Haw River	87,568	2,252	2,206	2.52 %	97.96 %
	Mebane (Alamance)	87,568	14,626	14,626	16.70 %	100.00 %
	Swepsonville	87,568	2,445	2,445	2.79 %	100.00 %
65	Eden	91,096	15,421	15,421	16.93 %	100.00 %
	Madison	91,096	2,129	2,129	2.34 %	100.00 %
	Mayodan	91,096	2,418	2,418	2.65 %	100.00 %
	Reidsville	91,096	14,583	14,583	16.01 %	100.00 %
	Stoneville	91,096	1,308	1,308	1.44 %	100.00 %
	Wentworth	91,096	2,662	2,662	2.92 %	100.00 %
66	Raleigh (Wake)	88,717	466,106	67,504	76.09 %	14.48 %
	Rolesville	88,717	9,475	1,305	1.47 %	13.77 %
	Wake Forest (Wake)	88,717	46,097	15,213	17.15 %	33.00 %
67	Albemarle	88,255	16,432	16,432	18.62 %	100.00 %
	Badin	88,255	2,024	2,024	2.29 %	100.00 %
	Biscoe	88,255	1,848	1,848	2.09 %	100.00 %
	Candor (Montgomery)	88,255	813	813	0.92 %	100.00 %
	Locust (Stanly)	88,255	3,996	3,996	4.53 %	100.00 %
	Misenheimer	88,255	650	650	0.74 %	100.00 %
	Mount Gilead	88,255	1,171	1,171	1.33 %	100.00 %
	New London	88,255	607	607	0.69 %	100.00 %
	Norwood	88,255	2,367	2,367	2.68 %	100.00 %
	Oakboro	88,255	2,128	2,128	2.41 %	100.00 %
	Red Cross	88,255	762	762	0.86 %	100.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
67	Richfield	88,255	582	582	0.66 %	100.00 %
	Stanfield	88,255	1,585	1,585	1.80 %	100.00 %
	Star	88,255	806	806	0.91 %	100.00 %
	Troy	88,255	2,850	2,850	3.23 %	100.00 %
68	Indian Trail	88,209	39,997	2,376	2.69 %	5.94 %
	Marvin	88,209	6,358	6,358	7.21 %	100.00 %
	Mineral Springs	88,209	3,159	3,112	3.53 %	98.51 %
	Monroe	88,209	34,562	1,511	1.71 %	4.37 %
	Stallings (Union)	88,209	15,728	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Waxhaw	88,209	20,534	20,534	23.28 %	100.00 %
	Weddington (Union)	88,209	13,176	11,637	13.19 %	88.32 %
	Wesley Chapel	88,209	8,681	8,265	9.37 %	95.21 %
69	Fairview	89,186	3,456	3,456	3.88 %	100.00 %
	Hemby Bridge	89,186	1,614	1,614	1.81 %	100.00 %
	Indian Trail	89,186	39,997	37,621	42.18 %	94.06 %
	Lake Park	89,186	3,269	3,269	3.67 %	100.00 %
	Mint Hill (Union)	89,186	6	6	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Monroe	89,186	34,562	11,670	13.09 %	33.77 %
	Stallings (Union)	89,186	15,728	15,728	17.64 %	100.00 %
	Unionville	89,186	6,643	5,952	6.67 %	89.60 %
	Weddington (Union)	89,186	13,176	1,539	1.73 %	11.68 %
	Wesley Chapel	89,186	8,681	416	0.47 %	4.79 %
70	Archdale (Randolph)	89,118	11,527	11,527	12.93 %	100.00 %
	Asheboro	89,118	27,156	25,890	29.05 %	95.34 %
	High Point (Randolph)	89,118	8	8	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Randleman	89,118	4,595	4,595	5.16 %	100.00 %
	Thomasville (Randolph)	89,118	521	521	0.58 %	100.00 %
	Trinity	89,118	7,006	7,006	7.86 %	100.00 %
71	Winston-Salem	88,823	249,545	86,109	96.94 %	34.51 %
72	Winston-Salem	84,444	249,545	84,444	100.00 %	33.84 %
73	Concord	90,036	105,240	65,770	73.05 %	62.50 %
	Harrisburg	90,036	18,967	1,414	1.57 %	7.46 %
	Kannapolis (Cabarrus)	90,036	42,846	3,277	3.64 %	7.65 %
74	Bethania	83,545	344	344	0.41 %	100.00 %
	Clemmons	83,545	21,163	21,163	25.33 %	100.00 %
	King (Forsyth)	83,545	591	591	0.71 %	100.00 %
	Lewisville	83,545	13,381	13,381	16.02 %	100.00 %
	Tobaccoville (Forsyth)	83,545	2,578	2,578	3.09 %	100.00 %
	Winston-Salem	83,545	249,545	27,464	32.87 %	11.01 %
75	High Point (Forsyth)	87,378	84	84	0.10 %	100.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
75	Kernersville (Forsyth)	87,378	25,947	25,947	29.70 %	100.00 %
	Walkertown	87,378	5,692	1,081	1.24 %	18.99 %
	Winston-Salem	87,378	249,545	33,872	38.76 %	13.57 %
76	East Spencer	89,815	1,567	1,567	1.74 %	100.00 %
	Faith	89,815	819	819	0.91 %	100.00 %
	Granite Quarry	89,815	2,984	2,984	3.32 %	100.00 %
	Rockwell	89,815	2,302	2,302	2.56 %	100.00 %
	Salisbury	89,815	35,540	35,540	39.57 %	100.00 %
	Spencer	89,815	3,308	3,308	3.68 %	100.00 %
77	Bermuda Run	90,628	3,120	3,120	3.44 %	100.00 %
	Boonville	90,628	1,185	1,185	1.31 %	100.00 %
	Cleveland	90,628	846	846	0.93 %	100.00 %
	Cooleemee	90,628	940	940	1.04 %	100.00 %
	East Bend	90,628	634	634	0.70 %	100.00 %
	Jonesville	90,628	2,308	2,308	2.55 %	100.00 %
	Mocksville	90,628	5,900	5,900	6.51 %	100.00 %
	Yadkinville	90,628	2,995	2,995	3.30 %	100.00 %
78	Aberdeen	86,365	8,516	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Asheboro	86,365	27,156	1,266	1.47 %	4.66 %
	Candor (Moore)	86,365	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Foxfire	86,365	1,288	1,288	1.49 %	100.00 %
	Franklinville	86,365	1,197	1,197	1.39 %	100.00 %
	Pinehurst	86,365	17,581	17,573	20.35 %	99.95 %
	Ramseur	86,365	1,774	1,774	2.05 %	100.00 %
	Robbins	86,365	1,168	1,168	1.35 %	100.00 %
	Seagrove	86,365	235	235	0.27 %	100.00 %
	Southern Pines	86,365	15,545	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Taylortown	86,365	634	630	0.73 %	99.37 %
79	Alliance	84,681	733	733	0.87 %	100.00 %
	Arapahoe	84,681	416	416	0.49 %	100.00 %
	Aurora	84,681	455	455	0.54 %	100.00 %
	Bath	84,681	245	245	0.29 %	100.00 %
	Bayboro	84,681	1,161	1,161	1.37 %	100.00 %
	Belhaven	84,681	1,410	1,410	1.67 %	100.00 %
	Chocowinity	84,681	722	722	0.85 %	100.00 %
	Grantsboro	84,681	692	692	0.82 %	100.00 %
	Kill Devil Hills	84,681	7,656	7,656	9.04 %	100.00 %
	Manteo	84,681	1,600	1,600	1.89 %	100.00 %
	Mesic	84,681	144	144	0.17 %	100.00 %
	Minnesott Beach	84,681	530	530	0.63 %	100.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
79	Nags Head	84,681	3,168	3,168	3.74 %	100.00 %
	Oriental	84,681	880	880	1.04 %	100.00 %
	Pantego	84,681	164	164	0.19 %	100.00 %
	Stonewall	84,681	214	214	0.25 %	100.00 %
	Vandemere	84,681	246	246	0.29 %	100.00 %
	Washington	84,681	9,875	9,875	11.66 %	100.00 %
	Washington Park	84,681	392	392	0.46 %	100.00 %
80	Denton	83,289	1,494	1,494	1.79 %	100.00 %
	High Point (Davidson)	83,289	6,646	6,646	7.98 %	100.00 %
	Lexington	83,289	19,632	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Midway	83,289	4,742	3,469	4.17 %	73.15 %
	Thomasville (Davidson)	83,289	26,662	26,662	32.01 %	100.00 %
	Wallburg	83,289	3,051	3,051	3.66 %	100.00 %
81	Lexington	85,641	19,632	19,632	22.92 %	100.00 %
	Midway	85,641	4,742	1,273	1.49 %	26.85 %
82	Concord	91,227	105,240	39,470	43.27 %	37.50 %
	Harrisburg	91,227	18,967	17,553	19.24 %	92.54 %
	Kannapolis (Cabarrus)	91,227	42,846	1,006	1.10 %	2.35 %
	Locust (Cabarrus)	91,227	541	541	0.59 %	100.00 %
	Midland (Cabarrus)	91,227	4,684	4,684	5.13 %	100.00 %
	Mount Pleasant	91,227	1,671	1,671	1.83 %	100.00 %
83	China Grove	90,899	4,434	4,434	4.88 %	100.00 %
	Concord	90,899	105,240	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Kannapolis (Cabarrus)	90,899	42,846	38,563	42.42 %	90.00 %
	Kannapolis (Rowan)	90,899	10,268	10,268	11.30 %	100.00 %
	Landis	90,899	3,690	3,690	4.06 %	100.00 %
84	Harmony	86,773	543	543	0.63 %	100.00 %
	Love Valley	86,773	154	154	0.18 %	100.00 %
	Mooresville	86,773	50,193	205	0.24 %	0.41 %
	Statesville	86,773	28,419	28,415	32.75 %	99.99 %
	Troutman	86,773	3,698	885	1.02 %	23.93 %
85	Bakersville	90,770	450	450	0.50 %	100.00 %
	Banner Elk	90,770	1,049	1,049	1.16 %	100.00 %
	Beech Mountain (Avery)	90,770	62	62	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Burnsville	90,770	1,614	1,614	1.78 %	100.00 %
	Crossnore	90,770	143	143	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Elk Park	90,770	542	542	0.60 %	100.00 %
	Grandfather Village	90,770	95	95	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Marion	90,770	7,717	7,717	8.50 %	100.00 %
Newland	90,770	715	715	0.79 %	100.00 %	

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
85	Old Fort	90,770	811	811	0.89 %	100.00 %
	Seven Devils (Avery)	90,770	38	38	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Spruce Pine	90,770	2,194	2,194	2.42 %	100.00 %
	Sugar Mountain	90,770	371	371	0.41 %	100.00 %
86	Connelly Springs	87,570	1,529	1,529	1.75 %	100.00 %
	Drexel	87,570	1,760	1,760	2.01 %	100.00 %
	Glen Alpine	87,570	1,529	1,529	1.75 %	100.00 %
	Hickory (Burke)	87,570	79	79	0.09 %	100.00 %
	Hildebran	87,570	1,679	1,679	1.92 %	100.00 %
	Long View (Burke)	87,570	735	735	0.84 %	100.00 %
	Morganton	87,570	17,474	17,474	19.95 %	100.00 %
	Rhodhiss (Burke)	87,570	639	639	0.73 %	100.00 %
	Rutherford College (Burke)	87,570	1,226	1,226	1.40 %	100.00 %
	Valdese	87,570	4,689	4,689	5.35 %	100.00 %
87	Blowing Rock (Caldwell)	85,009	91	91	0.11 %	100.00 %
	Blowing Rock (Watauga)	85,009	1,285	5	0.01 %	0.39 %
	Boone	85,009	19,092	595	0.70 %	3.12 %
	Cajah's Mountain	85,009	2,722	2,722	3.20 %	100.00 %
	Cedar Rock	85,009	301	301	0.35 %	100.00 %
	Gamewell	85,009	3,702	3,702	4.35 %	100.00 %
	Granite Falls	85,009	4,965	4,965	5.84 %	100.00 %
	Hickory (Caldwell)	85,009	32	32	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Hudson	85,009	3,780	3,780	4.45 %	100.00 %
	Lenoir	85,009	18,352	18,352	21.59 %	100.00 %
	Rhodhiss (Caldwell)	85,009	358	358	0.42 %	100.00 %
	Rutherford College (Caldwell)	85,009	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Sawmills	85,009	5,020	5,020	5.91 %	100.00 %
88	Charlotte	84,505	874,579	84,505	100.00 %	9.66 %
89	Catawba	85,577	702	702	0.82 %	100.00 %
	Claremont	85,577	1,692	1,692	1.98 %	100.00 %
	Conover	85,577	8,421	424	0.50 %	5.04 %
	Hickory (Catawba)	85,577	43,379	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Maiden (Catawba)	85,577	3,736	3,736	4.37 %	100.00 %
	Newton	85,577	13,148	13,148	15.36 %	100.00 %
	Statesville	85,577	28,419	4	0.00 %	0.01 %
	Troutman	85,577	3,698	2,813	3.29 %	76.07 %
90	Dobson	88,208	1,462	1,462	1.66 %	100.00 %
	Elkin (Surry)	88,208	4,049	4,049	4.59 %	100.00 %
	Elkin (Wilkes)	88,208	73	73	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Mount Airy	88,208	10,676	10,676	12.10 %	100.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
90	North Wilkesboro	88,208	4,382	11	0.01 %	0.25 %
	Pilot Mountain	88,208	1,440	1,440	1.63 %	100.00 %
	Ronda	88,208	438	438	0.50 %	100.00 %
91	Danbury	82,920	189	189	0.23 %	100.00 %
	Kernersville (Forsyth)	82,920	25,947	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	King (Stokes)	82,920	6,606	6,606	7.97 %	100.00 %
	Rural Hall	82,920	3,351	3,351	4.04 %	100.00 %
	Tobaccoville (Stokes)	82,920	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Walkertown	82,920	5,692	4,611	5.56 %	81.01 %
	Walnut Cove	82,920	1,586	1,586	1.91 %	100.00 %
	Winston-Salem	82,920	249,545	17,656	21.29 %	7.08 %
	92	Charlotte	87,079	874,579	65,691	75.44 %
93	Beech Mountain (Watauga)	87,194	613	613	0.70 %	100.00 %
	Blowing Rock (Watauga)	87,194	1,285	1,280	1.47 %	99.61 %
	Boone	87,194	19,092	18,497	21.21 %	96.88 %
	Jefferson	87,194	1,622	1,622	1.86 %	100.00 %
	Lansing	87,194	126	126	0.14 %	100.00 %
	Seven Devils (Watauga)	87,194	275	275	0.32 %	100.00 %
	Sparta	87,194	1,834	1,834	2.10 %	100.00 %
	West Jefferson	87,194	1,279	1,279	1.47 %	100.00 %
94	North Wilkesboro	85,564	4,382	4,371	5.11 %	99.75 %
	Taylorsville	85,564	2,320	2,320	2.71 %	100.00 %
	Wilkesboro	85,564	3,687	3,687	4.31 %	100.00 %
95	Davidson (Iredell)	85,366	378	378	0.44 %	100.00 %
	Mooresville	85,366	50,193	49,988	58.56 %	99.59 %
96	Brookford	89,587	442	442	0.49 %	100.00 %
	Conover	89,587	8,421	7,997	8.93 %	94.96 %
	Hickory (Catawba)	89,587	43,379	43,379	48.42 %	100.00 %
	Long View (Catawba)	89,587	4,353	4,353	4.86 %	100.00 %
	Newton	89,587	13,148	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
97	Lincolnton	86,810	11,091	11,091	12.78 %	100.00 %
	Maiden (Lincoln)	86,810	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
98	Cornelius	82,789	31,412	31,412	37.94 %	100.00 %
	Davidson (Mecklenburg)	82,789	14,728	14,728	17.79 %	100.00 %
	Huntersville	82,789	61,376	34,639	41.84 %	56.44 %
99	Charlotte	84,406	874,579	80,216	95.04 %	9.17 %
100	Charlotte	86,763	874,579	69,531	80.14 %	7.95 %
	Matthews	86,763	29,435	11,369	13.10 %	38.62 %
	Mint Hill (Mecklenburg)	86,763	26,444	3,903	4.50 %	14.76 %
101	Charlotte	84,368	874,579	56,322	66.76 %	6.44 %

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
101	Huntersville	84,368	61,376	16,997	20.15 %	27.69 %
102	Charlotte	84,206	874,579	84,206	100.00 %	9.63 %
103	Charlotte	89,354	874,579	73,571	82.34 %	8.41 %
	Matthews	89,354	29,435	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Pineville	89,354	10,602	10,602	11.87 %	100.00 %
	Weddington (Mecklenburg)	89,354	5	5	0.01 %	100.00 %
104	Charlotte	83,554	874,579	83,554	100.00 %	9.55 %
	Pineville	83,554	10,602	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
105	Charlotte	85,671	874,579	40,470	47.24 %	4.63 %
	Matthews	85,671	29,435	18,066	21.09 %	61.38 %
	Midland (Mecklenburg)	85,671	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Mint Hill (Mecklenburg)	85,671	26,444	22,541	26.31 %	85.24 %
	Stallings (Mecklenburg)	85,671	384	384	0.45 %	100.00 %
106	Charlotte	86,716	874,579	73,248	84.47 %	8.38 %
	Huntersville	86,716	61,376	9,740	11.23 %	15.87 %
107	Charlotte	88,854	874,579	83,491	93.96 %	9.55 %
108	Belmont	89,468	15,010	1,868	2.09 %	12.45 %
	Cramerton	89,468	5,296	96	0.11 %	1.81 %
	Dallas	89,468	5,927	5,927	6.62 %	100.00 %
	Gastonia	89,468	80,411	15,548	17.38 %	19.34 %
	High Shoals	89,468	595	595	0.67 %	100.00 %
	Lowell	89,468	3,654	3,654	4.08 %	100.00 %
	McAdenville	89,468	890	890	0.99 %	100.00 %
	Mount Holly	89,468	17,703	17,703	19.79 %	100.00 %
	Ranlo	89,468	4,511	4,511	5.04 %	100.00 %
	Spencer Mountain	89,468	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Stanley	89,468	3,963	3,963	4.43 %	100.00 %
109	Belmont	88,881	15,010	13,142	14.79 %	87.55 %
	Cramerton	88,881	5,296	5,200	5.85 %	98.19 %
	Gastonia	88,881	80,411	49,589	55.79 %	61.67 %
	Lowell	88,881	3,654	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
110	Belwood	89,459	857	857	0.96 %	100.00 %
	Bessemer City	89,459	5,428	5,428	6.07 %	100.00 %
	Casar	89,459	305	305	0.34 %	100.00 %
	Cherryville	89,459	6,078	6,078	6.79 %	100.00 %
	Dellview	89,459	6	6	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Fallston	89,459	627	627	0.70 %	100.00 %
	Gastonia	89,459	80,411	15,274	17.07 %	18.99 %
	High Shoals	89,459	595	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Kings Mountain (Cleveland)	89,459	10,032	0	0.00 %	0.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
110	Kings Mountain (Gaston)	89,459	1,110	1,110	1.24 %	100.00 %
	Kingstown	89,459	656	656	0.73 %	100.00 %
	Lawndale	89,459	570	570	0.64 %	100.00 %
	Polkville	89,459	516	516	0.58 %	100.00 %
	Shelby	89,459	21,918	14,967	16.73 %	68.29 %
	Waco	89,459	310	310	0.35 %	100.00 %
111	Boiling Springs	84,508	4,615	4,615	5.46 %	100.00 %
	Bostic	84,508	355	355	0.42 %	100.00 %
	Earl	84,508	198	198	0.23 %	100.00 %
	Ellenboro	84,508	723	723	0.86 %	100.00 %
	Forest City	84,508	7,377	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Grover	84,508	802	802	0.95 %	100.00 %
	Kings Mountain (Cleveland)	84,508	10,032	10,032	11.87 %	100.00 %
	Lattimore	84,508	406	406	0.48 %	100.00 %
	Mooresboro	84,508	293	293	0.35 %	100.00 %
	Patterson Springs	84,508	571	571	0.68 %	100.00 %
	Shelby	84,508	21,918	6,951	8.23 %	31.71 %
112	Charlotte	87,217	874,579	79,774	91.47 %	9.12 %
113	Chimney Rock Village	89,151	140	140	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Columbus	89,151	1,060	1,060	1.19 %	100.00 %
	Flat Rock	89,151	3,486	3,486	3.91 %	100.00 %
	Forest City	89,151	7,377	7,377	8.27 %	100.00 %
	Hendersonville	89,151	15,137	623	0.70 %	4.12 %
	Lake Lure	89,151	1,365	1,365	1.53 %	100.00 %
	Laurel Park	89,151	2,250	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Marion	89,151	7,717	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Ruth	89,151	347	347	0.39 %	100.00 %
	Rutherfordton	89,151	3,640	3,640	4.08 %	100.00 %
	Saluda (Henderson)	89,151	11	11	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Saluda (Polk)	89,151	620	620	0.70 %	100.00 %
	Spindale	89,151	4,225	4,225	4.74 %	100.00 %
	Tryon	89,151	1,562	1,562	1.75 %	100.00 %
114	Asheville	90,248	94,589	20,413	22.62 %	21.58 %
	Biltmore Forest	90,248	1,409	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Black Mountain	90,248	8,426	8,426	9.34 %	100.00 %
	Montreat	90,248	901	901	1.00 %	100.00 %
115	Asheville	89,747	94,589	785	0.87 %	0.83 %
	Weaverville	89,747	4,567	4,567	5.09 %	100.00 %
	Woodfin	89,747	7,936	3,031	3.38 %	38.19 %
116	Asheville	89,457	94,589	73,391	82.04 %	77.59 %

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
116	Biltmore Forest	89,457	1,409	1,409	1.58 %	100.00 %
	Woodfin	89,457	7,936	4,905	5.48 %	61.81 %
117	Fletcher	91,035	7,987	7,987	8.77 %	100.00 %
	Hendersonville	91,035	15,137	14,514	15.94 %	95.88 %
	Laurel Park	91,035	2,250	2,250	2.47 %	100.00 %
	Mills River	91,035	7,078	7,078	7.78 %	100.00 %
118	Canton	83,282	4,422	4,422	5.31 %	100.00 %
	Clyde	83,282	1,368	1,368	1.64 %	100.00 %
	Hot Springs	83,282	520	520	0.62 %	100.00 %
	Maggie Valley	83,282	1,687	1,687	2.03 %	100.00 %
	Mars Hill	83,282	2,007	2,007	2.41 %	100.00 %
	Marshall	83,282	777	777	0.93 %	100.00 %
	Waynesville	83,282	10,140	10,140	12.18 %	100.00 %
119	Brevard	90,212	7,744	7,744	8.58 %	100.00 %
	Bryson City	90,212	1,558	1,558	1.73 %	100.00 %
	Dillsboro	90,212	213	213	0.24 %	100.00 %
	Forest Hills	90,212	303	303	0.34 %	100.00 %
	Highlands (Jackson)	90,212	12	12	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Rosman	90,212	701	701	0.78 %	100.00 %
	Sylva	90,212	2,578	2,578	2.86 %	100.00 %
	Webster	90,212	372	372	0.41 %	100.00 %
120	Andrews	84,907	1,667	1,667	1.96 %	100.00 %
	Fontana Dam	84,907	13	13	0.02 %	100.00 %
	Franklin	84,907	4,175	4,175	4.92 %	100.00 %
	Hayesville	84,907	461	461	0.54 %	100.00 %
	Highlands (Macon)	84,907	1,060	1,060	1.25 %	100.00 %
	Lake Santeetlah	84,907	38	38	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Murphy	84,907	1,608	1,608	1.89 %	100.00 %
	Robbinsville	84,907	597	597	0.70 %	100.00 %
Total:				6,017,605		

Total Districts Assigned: 120

Total Municipalities (by County) Statewide: 614

Fully Assigned Municipalities: 614

Partially Assigned Municipalities: 0

Fully Unassigned Municipalities: 0

Split Municipalities: 88

Splits Involving Population: 65

Whole-Split VTD Counts by District Report**District Plan: H898, Ed 2**

District	County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
1	Chowan	6	0
	Currituck	11	0
	Dare	7	0
	Perquimans	7	0
	Tyrrell	6	0
	Washington	6	0
2	Durham	8	0
	Person	11	0
3	Craven	19	1
4	Duplin	19	0
	Wayne	7	1
5	Camden	3	0
	Gates	6	0
	Hertford	13	0
	Pasquotank	9	0
6	Harnett	8	0
7	Franklin	18	0
	Vance	3	0
8	Pitt	20	0
9	Pitt	20	0
10	Wayne	20	1
11	Wake	21	0
12	Greene	10	0
	Jones	7	0
	Lenoir	22	0
13	Carteret	28	0
	Craven	1	1
14	Onslow	9	0
15	Onslow	11	0
16	Onslow	4	0
	Pender	20	0
17	Brunswick	14	1
18	New Hanover	18	0
19	Brunswick	10	1
	New Hanover	8	0
20	New Hanover	17	0
21	Wake	10	0
22	Bladen	17	0
	Sampson	23	0
23	Bertie	12	0
	Edgecombe	21	0
	Martin	13	0

Whole-Split VTD Counts by District Report**District Plan: H898, Ed 2**

District	County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
24	Nash	1	0
	Wilson	24	0
25	Nash	23	0
26	Johnston	12	0
27	Halifax	23	0
	Northampton	13	0
	Warren	14	0
28	Johnston	18	0
29	Durham	16	0
30	Durham	18	0
31	Durham	15	0
32	Granville	15	0
	Vance	9	0
33	Wake	15	0
34	Wake	16	0
35	Wake	14	1
36	Wake	12	0
37	Wake	13	0
38	Wake	17	0
39	Wake	12	0
40	Wake	21	0
41	Wake	12	0
42	Cumberland	12	0
43	Cumberland	20	0
44	Cumberland	27	0
45	Cumberland	17	0
46	Columbus	26	0
	Robeson	11	0
47	Robeson	28	0
48	Hoke	15	0
	Scotland	7	0
49	Wake	26	0
50	Caswell	9	0
	Orange	19	0
51	Lee	10	0
	Moore	4	0
52	Moore	10	0
	Richmond	16	0
53	Harnett	5	0
	Johnston	6	0
54	Chatham	18	0
	Randolph	2	0

Whole-Split VTD Counts by District Report**District Plan: H898, Ed 2**

District	County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
55	Anson	9	0
	Union	18	0
56	Orange	22	0
57	Guilford	29	0
58	Guilford	24	0
59	Guilford	26	0
60	Guilford	30	0
61	Guilford	32	0
62	Guilford	24	0
63	Alamance	19	0
64	Alamance	18	0
65	Rockingham	15	0
66	Wake	14	1
67	Montgomery	14	0
	Stanly	22	0
68	Union	15	0
69	Union	19	0
70	Randolph	12	0
71	Forsyth	24	0
72	Forsyth	29	0
73	Cabarrus	20	1
74	Forsyth	20	0
75	Forsyth	19	0
76	Rowan	25	0
77	Davie	14	0
	Rowan	5	0
	Yadkin	12	0
78	Moore	12	0
	Randolph	8	0
79	Beaufort	21	0
	Dare	9	0
	Hyde	7	0
	Pamlico	10	0
80	Davidson	21	0
81	Davidson	22	0
82	Cabarrus	12	1
83	Cabarrus	7	0
	Rowan	11	0
84	Iredell	19	0
85	Avery	19	0
	McDowell	15	0
	Mitchell	9	0
	Yancey	11	0

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

Based on TIGER 2020 VTDs

[G20-VTD-Sbd] - Generated 10/23/2023

Whole-Split VTD Counts by District Report**District Plan: H898, Ed 2**

District	County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
86	Burke	33	0
87	Caldwell	20	0
	Watauga	1	0
88	Mecklenburg	19	0
89	Catawba	17	0
	Iredell	2	0
90	Surry	24	0
	Wilkes	8	0
91	Forsyth	9	0
	Stokes	18	0
92	Mecklenburg	9	0
93	Alleghany	4	0
	Ashe	17	0
	Watauga	19	0
94	Alexander	10	0
	Wilkes	19	0
95	Iredell	8	0
96	Catawba	23	0
97	Lincoln	23	0
98	Mecklenburg	10	1
99	Mecklenburg	9	0
100	Mecklenburg	19	0
101	Mecklenburg	10	0
102	Mecklenburg	19	0
103	Mecklenburg	12	0
104	Mecklenburg	27	0
105	Mecklenburg	18	0
106	Mecklenburg	10	1
107	Mecklenburg	16	0
108	Gaston	18	0
109	Gaston	17	0
110	Cleveland	10	0
	Gaston	11	0
111	Cleveland	11	0
	Rutherford	6	0
112	Mecklenburg	16	0
113	Henderson	8	0
	McDowell	2	0
	Polk	7	0
	Rutherford	11	0
114	Buncombe	27	0
115	Buncombe	20	0
116	Buncombe	32	0

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

Based on TIGER 2020 VTDs

[G20-VTD-Sbd] - Generated 10/23/2023

Whole-Split VTD Counts by District Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

District	County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
117	Henderson	26	0
118	Haywood	29	0
	Madison	12	0
119	Jackson	13	0
	Swain	5	0
	Transylvania	15	0
120	Cherokee	16	0
	Clay	9	0
	Graham	4	0
	Macon	15	0
Total:		2,660	

Total Districts Assigned: 120
 Total VTDs Statewide: 2666
 Fully Assigned VTDs: 2666
 Partially Assigned VTDs: 0
 Fully Unassigned VTDs: 0
 Split VTDs: 6
 Splits Involving Population: 6

Whole-Split VTD Counts by County Report**District Plan: H898, Ed 2**

County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
Alamance	37	0
Alexander	10	0
Alleghany	4	0
Anson	9	0
Ashe	17	0
Avery	19	0
Beaufort	21	0
Bertie	12	0
Bladen	17	0
Brunswick	24	1
Buncombe	79	0
Burke	33	0
Cabarrus	39	1
Caldwell	20	0
Camden	3	0
Carteret	28	0
Caswell	9	0
Catawba	40	0
Chatham	18	0
Cherokee	16	0
Chowan	6	0
Clay	9	0
Cleveland	21	0
Columbus	26	0
Craven	20	1
Cumberland	76	0
Currituck	11	0
Dare	16	0
Davidson	43	0
Davie	14	0
Duplin	19	0
Durham	57	0
Edgecombe	21	0
Forsyth	101	0
Franklin	18	0
Gaston	46	0
Gates	6	0
Graham	4	0
Granville	15	0
Greene	10	0
Guilford	165	0
Halifax	23	0
Harnett	13	0

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

Based on TIGER 2020 VTDs

[G20-VTD-Sbc] - Generated 10/23/2023

Whole-Split VTD Counts by County Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
Haywood	29	0
Henderson	34	0
Hertford	13	0
Hoke	15	0
Hyde	7	0
Iredell	29	0
Jackson	13	0
Johnston	36	0
Jones	7	0
Lee	10	0
Lenoir	22	0
Lincoln	23	0
Macon	15	0
Madison	12	0
Martin	13	0
McDowell	17	0
Mecklenburg	194	1
Mitchell	9	0
Montgomery	14	0
Moore	26	0
Nash	24	0
New Hanover	43	0
Northampton	13	0
Onslow	24	0
Orange	41	0
Pamlico	10	0
Pasquotank	9	0
Pender	20	0
Perquimans	7	0
Person	11	0
Pitt	40	0
Polk	7	0
Randolph	22	0
Richmond	16	0
Robeson	39	0
Rockingham	15	0
Rowan	41	0
Rutherford	17	0
Sampson	23	0
Scotland	7	0
Stanly	22	0
Stokes	18	0
Surry	24	0

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

Based on TIGER 2020 VTDs

[G20-VTD-Sbc] - Generated 10/23/2023

Whole-Split VTD Counts by County Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
Swain	5	0
Transylvania	15	0
Tyrrell	6	0
Union	52	0
Vance	12	0
Wake	203	1
Warren	14	0
Washington	6	0
Watauga	20	0
Wayne	27	1
Wilkes	27	0
Wilson	24	0
Yadkin	12	0
Yancey	11	0
Totals:	2,660	6

Total VTDs Statewide: 2666

Fully Assigned VTDs: 2666

Partially Assigned VTDs: 0

Fully Unassigned VTDs: 0

Total Districts Assigned: 120

Split VTDs: 6

Splits Involving Population: 6

Split VTD Detail Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

County	VTD	District	Total VTD Population	VTD Pop in District	Percent of VTD Pop in District
Brunswick	012	17	3,837	751	19.57 %
		19	3,837	3,086	80.43 %
Cabarrus	08-00	73	5,318	725	13.63 %
		82	5,318	4,593	86.37 %
Craven	002	3	18,203	6,290	34.55 %
		13	18,203	11,913	65.45 %
Mecklenburg	241	98	11,404	499	4.38 %
		106	11,404	10,905	95.62 %
Wake	19-12	35	11,520	9,286	80.61 %
		66	11,520	2,234	19.39 %
Wayne	015	4	5,882	4,731	80.43 %
		10	5,882	1,151	19.57 %
Assigned Geography Total:				56,164	

Total VTDs Statewide: 2666
 Fully Assigned VTDs: 2666
 Partially Assigned VTDs: 0
 Fully Unassigned VTDs: 0
 Total Districts Assigned: 120
 Split VTDs: 6
 Splits Involving Population: 6

Incumbent-District Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

Residence Set: NC House - 9/26/2023

Last Name	First Name	Party	Current District	District in this Plan
Adams	James	Republican	96	96
Ager	John	Democrat	114	114
Alexander	Kelly	Democrat	107	107
Alston	Vernetta	Democrat	29	29
Arp	Larry	Republican	69	69
Autry	Johnnie	Democrat	100	100
Baker	Amber	Democrat	72	72
Baker	Kristin	Republican	82	73
Balkcom	Jennifer	Republican	117	117
Ball	Cynthia	Democrat	49	34
Belk	Mary	Democrat	88	88
Bell	John	Republican	10	10
Biggs	Brian	Republican	70	70
Blackwell	Hugh	Republican	86	86
Bradford	John	Republican	98	98
Brisson	William	Republican	22	22
Brockman	Cecil	Democrat	60	60
Brody	Mark	Republican	55	55
Brown	Gloristine	Democrat	8	8
Brown	Kanika	Democrat	71	71
Brown	Terry	Democrat	92	92
Buansi	Allen	Democrat	56	56
Budd	Laura	Democrat	103	103
Butler	Deborah	Democrat	18	18
Cairns	Celeste	Republican	13	13
Carney	Rebecca	Democrat	102	102
Cervania	Maria Louisa	Democrat	41	41
Chesser	Gregory	Republican	25	25
Clampitt	James	Republican	119	119
Clemmons	Ashton	Democrat	57	57
Cleveland	George	Republican	14	14
Cotham	Patricia	Republican	112	105
Crawford	Sarah	Democrat	66	66
Crutchfield	Kevin	Republican	83	82
Cunningham	Carla	Democrat	106	106
Dahle	Allison	Democrat	11	11
Davis	Robert	Republican	20	20
Dixon	James	Republican	4	4
Elmore	Jeffrey	Republican	94	94
Everitt	Terence	Democrat	35	35
Faircloth	Joseph	Republican	62	62
Fontenot	Kenneth	Republican	24	24

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

Row shading indicates that the district in this plan is shared by more than one incumbent.

[G20-IncDist] - Generated 10/23/2023

Incumbent-District Report**District Plan: H898, Ed 2****Residence Set: NC House - 9/26/2023**

Last Name	First Name	Party	Current District	District in this Plan
Gill	Rosa	Democrat	33	33
Gillespie	Karl	Republican	120	120
Goodwin	Edward	Republican	1	1
Greene	Edwin	Republican	85	85
Hall	Destin	Republican	87	87
Hall	Kyle	Republican	91	91
Hardister	Jonathan	Republican	59	59
Harris	Wesley	Democrat	105	103
Harrison	Mary	Democrat	61	61
Hastings	Kelly	Republican	110	110
Hawkins	Zack	Democrat	31	31
Howard	Julia	Republican	77	77
Humphrey	Thomas	Republican	12	12
Iler	Francis	Republican	17	17
Jackson	Frances	Democrat	45	45
Jackson	Maze	Republican	78	78
Jeffers	Brannon	Democrat	2	2
John	Joseph	Democrat	40	40
Johnson	Jake	Republican	113	113
Jones	Abraham	Democrat	38	38
Jones	Brenden	Republican	46	46
Kidwell	Keith	Republican	79	79
Lambeth	Donny	Republican	75	75
Liu	Ya	Democrat	21	21
Loftis	Donnie	Republican	109	109
Lofton	Brandon	Democrat	104	104
Logan	Carolyn	Democrat	101	101
Longest	Timothy	Democrat	34	49
Lowery	Jarrold	Republican	47	47
Lucas	Marvin	Democrat	42	42
Majeed	Nasif	Democrat	99	99
McNeely	Jeffrey	Republican	84	84
Miller	Charles	Republican	19	19
Mills	Paul	Republican	95	95
Moore	Timothy	Republican	111	111
Morey	Marcia	Democrat	30	30
Moss	Ben	Republican	52	52
Paré	Erin	Republican	37	37
Penny	Howard	Republican	53	53
Pickett	Phillip	Republican	93	93
Pierce	Garland	Democrat	48	48
Pike	Joseph	Republican	6	6

District plan definition file: 'H898, Ed 2.csv', modified 10/23/2023 7:51 PM

Row shading indicates that the district in this plan is shared by more than one incumbent.

[G20-IncDist] - Generated 10/23/2023

Incumbent-District Report**District Plan: H898, Ed 2****Residence Set: NC House - 9/26/2023**

Last Name	First Name	Party	Current District	District in this Plan
Pless	Steven	Republican	118	118
Potts	Larry	Republican	81	81
Prather	Lindsey	Democrat	115	115
Price	Renée	Democrat	50	50
Pyrtle	Armor	Republican	65	65
Quick	Amos	Democrat	58	58
Reeder	Timothy	Republican	9	9
Reives	Robert	Democrat	54	54
Riddell	Dennis	Republican	64	64
Roberson	James	Democrat	39	39
Ross	Stephen	Republican	63	63
Rudow	Caleb	Democrat	116	116
Saine	Jason	Republican	97	97
Sasser	Clayton	Republican	67	67
Sauls	John	Republican	51	51
Setzer	Mitchell	Republican	89	89
Shepard	Phillip	Republican	15	15
Smith	Carson	Republican	16	16
Smith	Charles	Democrat	44	44
Sossamon	John	Republican	32	32
Staton-Williams	Diamond	Democrat	73	73
Stevens	Sarah	Republican	90	90
Strickland	Larry	Republican	28	28
Torbett	John	Republican	108	108
Tyson	John	Republican	3	3
von Haefen	Julie	Democrat	36	36
Ward	William	Republican	5	5
Warren	Harry	Republican	76	76
Watford	Samuel	Republican	80	80
Wheatley	Diane	Republican	43	43
White	Donna	Republican	26	26
Willingham	Shelly	Democrat	23	23
Willis	David	Republican	68	68
Winslow	Matthew	Republican	7	7
Wray	Michael	Democrat	27	27
Zenger	Jeffrey	Republican	74	74

District-Incumbent Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

Residence Set: NC House - 9/26/2023

District in this Plan	Last Name	First Name	Party	Current District
1	Goodwin	Edward	Republican	1
2	Jeffers	Brannon	Democrat	2
3	Tyson	John	Republican	3
4	Dixon	James	Republican	4
5	Ward	William	Republican	5
6	Pike	Joseph	Republican	6
7	Winslow	Matthew	Republican	7
8	Brown	Gloristine	Democrat	8
9	Reeder	Timothy	Republican	9
10	Bell	John	Republican	10
11	Dahle	Allison	Democrat	11
12	Humphrey	Thomas	Republican	12
13	Cairns	Celeste	Republican	13
14	Cleveland	George	Republican	14
15	Shepard	Phillip	Republican	15
16	Smith	Carson	Republican	16
17	Iler	Francis	Republican	17
18	Butler	Deborah	Democrat	18
19	Miller	Charles	Republican	19
20	Davis	Robert	Republican	20
21	Liu	Ya	Democrat	21
22	Brisson	William	Republican	22
23	Willingham	Shelly	Democrat	23
24	Fontenot	Kenneth	Republican	24
25	Chesser	Gregory	Republican	25
26	White	Donna	Republican	26
27	Wray	Michael	Democrat	27
28	Strickland	Larry	Republican	28
29	Alston	Vernetta	Democrat	29
30	Morey	Marcia	Democrat	30
31	Hawkins	Zack	Democrat	31
32	Sossamon	John	Republican	32
33	Gill	Rosa	Democrat	33
34	Ball	Cynthia	Democrat	49
35	Everitt	Terence	Democrat	35
36	von Haefen	Julie	Democrat	36
37	Paré	Erin	Republican	37
38	Jones	Abraham	Democrat	38
39	Roberson	James	Democrat	39
40	John	Joseph	Democrat	40
41	Cervania	Maria Louisa	Democrat	41
42	Lucas	Marvin	Democrat	42

District-Incumbent Report**District Plan: H898, Ed 2****Residence Set: NC House - 9/26/2023**

District in this Plan	Last Name	First Name	Party	Current District
43	Wheatley	Diane	Republican	43
44	Smith	Charles	Democrat	44
45	Jackson	Frances	Democrat	45
46	Jones	Brenden	Republican	46
47	Lowery	Jarrod	Republican	47
48	Pierce	Garland	Democrat	48
49	Longest	Timothy	Democrat	34
50	Price	Renée	Democrat	50
51	Sauls	John	Republican	51
52	Moss	Ben	Republican	52
53	Penny	Howard	Republican	53
54	Reives	Robert	Democrat	54
55	Brody	Mark	Republican	55
56	Buansi	Allen	Democrat	56
57	Clemmons	Ashton	Democrat	57
58	Quick	Amos	Democrat	58
59	Hardister	Jonathan	Republican	59
60	Brockman	Cecil	Democrat	60
61	Harrison	Mary	Democrat	61
62	Faircloth	Joseph	Republican	62
63	Ross	Stephen	Republican	63
64	Riddell	Dennis	Republican	64
65	Pyrtle	Armor	Republican	65
66	Crawford	Sarah	Democrat	66
67	Sasser	Clayton	Republican	67
68	Willis	David	Republican	68
69	Arp	Larry	Republican	69
70	Biggs	Brian	Republican	70
71	Brown	Kanika	Democrat	71
72	Baker	Amber	Democrat	72
73	Baker	Kristin	Republican	82
	Staton-Williams	Diamond	Democrat	73
74	Zenger	Jeffrey	Republican	74
75	Lambeth	Donny	Republican	75
76	Warren	Harry	Republican	76
77	Howard	Julia	Republican	77
78	Jackson	Maze	Republican	78
79	Kidwell	Keith	Republican	79
80	Watford	Samuel	Republican	80
81	Potts	Larry	Republican	81
82	Crutchfield	Kevin	Republican	83
83				

District-Incumbent Report

District Plan: H898, Ed 2

Residence Set: NC House - 9/26/2023

District in this Plan	Last Name	First Name	Party	Current District
84	McNeely	Jeffrey	Republican	84
85	Greene	Edwin	Republican	85
86	Blackwell	Hugh	Republican	86
87	Hall	Destin	Republican	87
88	Belk	Mary	Democrat	88
89	Setzer	Mitchell	Republican	89
90	Stevens	Sarah	Republican	90
91	Hall	Kyle	Republican	91
92	Brown	Terry	Democrat	92
93	Pickett	Phillip	Republican	93
94	Elmore	Jeffrey	Republican	94
95	Mills	Paul	Republican	95
96	Adams	James	Republican	96
97	Saine	Jason	Republican	97
98	Bradford	John	Republican	98
99	Majeed	Nasif	Democrat	99
100	Autry	Johnnie	Democrat	100
101	Logan	Carolyn	Democrat	101
102	Carney	Rebecca	Democrat	102
103	Budd	Laura	Democrat	103
	Harris	Wesley	Democrat	105
104	Lofton	Brandon	Democrat	104
105	Cotham	Patricia	Republican	112
106	Cunningham	Carla	Democrat	106
107	Alexander	Kelly	Democrat	107
108	Torbett	John	Republican	108
109	Loftis	Donnie	Republican	109
110	Hastings	Kelly	Republican	110
111	Moore	Timothy	Republican	111
112				
113	Johnson	Jake	Republican	113
114	Ager	John	Democrat	114
115	Prather	Lindsey	Democrat	115
116	Rudow	Caleb	Democrat	116
117	Balkcom	Jennifer	Republican	117
118	Pless	Steven	Republican	118
119	Clampitt	James	Republican	119
120	Gillespie	Karl	Republican	120