



©2021 CALIPER

Description:

Population Deviation Report

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Seats	Ideal Pop	Actual Pop	Deviation	Deviation %
1	1	86,995	84,230	-2,765	-3.18%
2	1	86,995	90,751	3,756	4.32%
3	1	86,995	85,099	-1,896	-2.18%
4	1	86,995	83,269	-3,726	-4.28%
5	1	86,995	84,060	-2,935	-3.37%
6	1	86,995	84,016	-2,979	-3.42%
7	1	86,995	83,510	-3,485	-4.01%
8	1	86,995	85,089	-1,906	-2.19%
9	1	86,995	85,154	-1,841	-2.12%
10	1	86,995	83,352	-3,643	-4.19%
11	1	86,995	85,987	-1,008	-1.16%
12	1	86,995	84,172	-2,823	-3.25%
13	1	86,995	83,307	-3,688	-4.24%
14	1	86,995	90,506	3,511	4.04%
15	1	86,995	89,176	2,181	2.51%
16	1	86,995	85,097	-1,898	-2.18%
17	1	86,995	89,763	2,768	3.18%
18	1	86,995	90,862	3,867	4.45%
19	1	86,995	91,041	4,046	4.65%
20	1	86,995	90,729	3,734	4.29%
21	1	86,995	88,313	1,318	1.52%
22	1	86,995	88,642	1,647	1.89%
23	1	86,995	85,179	-1,816	-2.09%
24	1	86,995	89,964	2,969	3.41%
25	1	86,995	83,790	-3,205	-3.68%
26	1	86,995	90,540	3,545	4.07%
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	88,633	1,638	1.88%
33	1	86,995	86,863	-132	-0.15%
34	1	86,995	83,302	-3,693	-4.25%
35	1	86,995	86,765	-230	-0.26%
36	1	86,995	89,336	2,341	2.69%
37	1	86,995	88,334	1,339	1.54%
38	1	86,995	90,560	3,565	4.10%
39	1	86,995	86,971	-24	-0.03%
40	1	86,995	90,047	3,052	3.51%
41	1	86,995	84,646	-2,349	-2.70%
42	1	86,995	84,462	-2,533	-2.91%
43	1	86,995	83,198	-3,797	-4.36%

Population Deviation Report

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Seats	Ideal Pop	Actual Pop	Deviation	Deviation %
44	1	86,995	83,751	-3,244	-3.73%
45	1	86,995	83,317	-3,678	-4.23%
46	1	86,995	84,307	-2,688	-3.09%
47	1	86,995	82,846	-4,149	-4.77%
48	1	86,995	86,256	-739	-0.85%
49	1	86,995	84,041	-2,954	-3.40%
50	1	86,995	85,345	-1,650	-1.90%
51	1	86,995	83,073	-3,922	-4.51%
52	1	86,995	84,383	-2,612	-3.00%
53	1	86,995	89,622	2,627	3.02%
54	1	86,995	83,475	-3,520	-4.05%
55	1	86,995	84,549	-2,446	-2.81%
56	1	86,995	86,087	-908	-1.04%
57	1	86,995	91,158	4,163	4.79%
58	1	86,995	89,713	2,718	3.12%
59	1	86,995	87,559	564	0.65%
60	1	86,995	90,919	3,924	4.51%
61	1	86,995	90,814	3,819	4.39%
62	1	86,995	91,136	4,141	4.76%
63	1	86,995	83,540	-3,455	-3.97%
64	1	86,995	87,875	880	1.01%
65	1	86,995	91,096	4,101	4.71%
66	1	86,995	84,245	-2,750	-3.16%
67	1	86,995	88,255	1,260	1.45%
68	1	86,995	86,978	-17	-0.02%
69	1	86,995	88,795	1,800	2.07%
70	1	86,995	89,118	2,123	2.44%
71	1	86,995	83,748	-3,247	-3.73%
72	1	86,995	83,262	-3,733	-4.29%
73	1	86,995	90,390	3,395	3.90%
74	1	86,995	89,692	2,697	3.10%
75	1	86,995	84,659	-2,336	-2.69%
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	85,842	-1,153	-1.33%
80	1	86,995	84,864	-2,131	-2.45%
81	1	86,995	84,066	-2,929	-3.37%
82	1	86,995	90,805	3,810	4.38%
83	1	86,995	90,967	3,972	4.57%
84	1	86,995	85,875	-1,120	-1.29%
85	1	86,995	89,525	2,530	2.91%
86	1	86,995	87,570	575	0.66%

Population Deviation Report

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Seats	Ideal Pop	Actual Pop	Deviation	Deviation %
87	1	86,995	85,009	-1,986	-2.28%
88	1	86,995	86,239	-756	-0.87%
89	1	86,995	85,577	-1,418	-1.63%
90	1	86,995	82,937	-4,058	-4.66%
91	1	86,995	85,749	-1,246	-1.43%
92	1	86,995	89,640	2,645	3.04%
93	1	86,995	87,194	199	0.23%
94	1	86,995	90,835	3,840	4.41%
95	1	86,995	86,264	-731	-0.84%
96	1	86,995	89,587	2,592	2.98%
97	1	86,995	86,810	-185	-0.21%
98	1	86,995	82,669	-4,326	-4.97%
99	1	86,995	82,746	-4,249	-4.88%
100	1	86,995	82,932	-4,063	-4.67%
101	1	86,995	84,391	-2,604	-2.99%
102	1	86,995	87,483	488	0.56%
103	1	86,995	88,259	1,264	1.45%
104	1	86,995	84,647	-2,348	-2.70%
105	1	86,995	89,460	2,465	2.83%
106	1	86,995	86,758	-237	-0.27%
107	1	86,995	86,497	-498	-0.57%
108	1	86,995	84,457	-2,538	-2.92%
109	1	86,995	87,462	467	0.54%
110	1	86,995	89,588	2,593	2.98%
111	1	86,995	90,809	3,814	4.38%
112	1	86,995	83,761	-3,234	-3.72%
113	1	86,995	91,102	4,107	4.72%
114	1	86,995	89,628	2,633	3.03%
115	1	86,995	88,843	1,848	2.12%
116	1	86,995	90,981	3,986	4.58%
117	1	86,995	90,329	3,334	3.83%
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: -4.97% to 4.88%

2022 Election Contest Report - US Senate

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib	Grn	% Grn	W-I	% W-I
1	24,853	67.32%	11,139	30.17%	585	1.58%	296	0.80%	46	0.12%
2	15,734	43.26%	19,860	54.60%	514	1.41%	248	0.68%	18	0.05%
3	19,414	59.49%	12,439	38.11%	512	1.57%	243	0.74%	28	0.09%
4	19,069	67.51%	8,598	30.44%	391	1.38%	176	0.62%	14	0.05%
5	12,771	45.19%	14,843	52.52%	392	1.39%	218	0.77%	35	0.12%
6	11,167	57.85%	7,599	39.37%	354	1.83%	174	0.90%	8	0.04%
7	19,225	56.28%	14,133	41.37%	503	1.47%	270	0.79%	28	0.08%
8	10,976	44.42%	13,172	53.30%	332	1.34%	220	0.89%	12	0.05%
9	15,109	50.07%	14,470	47.96%	349	1.16%	226	0.75%	20	0.07%
10	17,891	65.69%	8,861	32.54%	309	1.13%	158	0.58%	15	0.06%
11	9,221	31.32%	19,427	65.98%	420	1.43%	363	1.23%	13	0.04%
12	9,967	42.00%	13,315	56.11%	266	1.12%	171	0.72%	13	0.05%
13	25,276	69.03%	10,512	28.71%	534	1.46%	272	0.74%	22	0.06%
14	9,181	63.93%	4,707	32.78%	291	2.03%	166	1.16%	16	0.11%
15	13,930	64.76%	6,923	32.19%	395	1.84%	231	1.07%	31	0.14%
16	21,461	67.69%	9,488	29.93%	505	1.59%	237	0.75%	13	0.04%
17	27,470	60.63%	16,922	37.35%	556	1.23%	328	0.72%	32	0.07%
18	16,125	44.43%	19,329	53.26%	500	1.38%	314	0.87%	22	0.06%
19	28,359	59.17%	18,510	38.62%	652	1.36%	377	0.79%	29	0.06%
20	17,967	47.80%	18,711	49.78%	538	1.43%	353	0.94%	22	0.06%
21	8,440	30.03%	19,038	67.75%	369	1.31%	248	0.88%	6	0.02%
22	18,319	61.73%	10,850	36.56%	303	1.02%	174	0.59%	29	0.10%
23	13,525	45.71%	15,532	52.49%	334	1.13%	179	0.60%	19	0.06%
24	12,112	41.33%	16,685	56.93%	292	1.00%	205	0.70%	12	0.04%
25	19,994	61.11%	12,236	37.40%	337	1.03%	142	0.43%	10	0.03%
26	18,782	55.14%	14,501	42.57%	506	1.49%	255	0.75%	19	0.06%
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	13,457	46.88%	14,625	50.94%	425	1.48%	189	0.66%	12	0.04%
33	12,295	37.15%	19,984	60.37%	487	1.47%	320	0.97%	14	0.04%
34	14,052	34.26%	25,973	63.33%	620	1.51%	341	0.83%	29	0.07%
35	17,104	45.70%	19,482	52.05%	504	1.35%	318	0.85%	22	0.06%
36	15,396	39.01%	23,120	58.58%	613	1.55%	321	0.81%	20	0.05%
37	19,834	48.96%	19,621	48.44%	679	1.68%	339	0.84%	35	0.09%
38	3,738	13.00%	24,334	84.64%	378	1.31%	288	1.00%	13	0.05%
39	11,720	37.58%	18,750	60.12%	441	1.41%	263	0.84%	15	0.05%
40	19,105	42.15%	25,232	55.67%	644	1.42%	312	0.69%	35	0.08%
41	12,538	32.83%	24,656	64.56%	583	1.53%	386	1.01%	25	0.07%
42	4,103	27.26%	10,597	70.41%	199	1.32%	147	0.98%	5	0.03%
43	13,744	52.03%	12,102	45.82%	373	1.41%	183	0.69%	12	0.05%
44	8,998	40.63%	12,629	57.03%	295	1.33%	209	0.94%	13	0.06%
45	8,829	43.13%	11,160	54.52%	293	1.43%	171	0.84%	17	0.08%
46	17,248	63.29%	9,406	34.52%	350	1.28%	216	0.79%	31	0.11%
47	10,237	53.98%	8,301	43.77%	225	1.19%	182	0.96%	20	0.11%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

2022 Election Contest Report - US Senate

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib	Grn	% Grn	W-I	% W-I
49	9,830	29.10%	23,100	68.37%	500	1.48%	337	1.00%	18	0.05%
50	15,185	39.34%	22,663	58.72%	458	1.19%	265	0.69%	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	21,285	64.20%	11,112	33.52%	505	1.52%	233	0.70%	17	0.05%
54	18,086	43.07%	23,164	55.16%	459	1.09%	264	0.63%	23	0.05%
55	16,919	63.61%	9,121	34.29%	353	1.33%	191	0.72%	13	0.05%
56	3,894	10.78%	31,599	87.49%	275	0.76%	341	0.94%	10	0.03%
57	15,677	42.13%	20,699	55.62%	503	1.35%	298	0.80%	36	0.10%
58	7,312	29.02%	17,353	68.87%	284	1.13%	235	0.93%	11	0.04%
59	17,506	49.88%	16,859	48.04%	427	1.22%	253	0.72%	49	0.14%
60	10,084	39.79%	14,716	58.07%	317	1.25%	211	0.83%	14	0.06%
61	4,948	19.83%	19,391	77.71%	320	1.28%	279	1.12%	15	0.06%
62	19,015	48.05%	19,709	49.81%	491	1.24%	324	0.82%	33	0.08%
63	13,280	48.45%	13,524	49.34%	384	1.40%	206	0.75%	16	0.06%
64	19,586	60.02%	12,364	37.89%	453	1.39%	214	0.66%	16	0.05%
65	21,617	66.37%	10,114	31.05%	577	1.77%	223	0.68%	40	0.12%
66	7,545	28.06%	18,658	69.39%	396	1.47%	267	0.99%	21	0.08%
67	23,761	73.50%	7,847	24.27%	440	1.36%	265	0.82%	17	0.05%
68	21,819	59.41%	14,169	38.58%	461	1.26%	244	0.66%	35	0.10%
69	21,855	64.32%	11,411	33.58%	419	1.23%	248	0.73%	46	0.14%
70	21,688	76.73%	5,973	21.13%	405	1.43%	181	0.64%	20	0.07%
71	6,727	27.67%	16,984	69.86%	338	1.39%	252	1.04%	12	0.05%
72	6,456	24.83%	19,035	73.22%	291	1.12%	193	0.74%	21	0.08%
73	12,996	46.67%	14,143	50.79%	440	1.58%	248	0.89%	18	0.06%
74	19,509	49.91%	18,706	47.86%	552	1.41%	294	0.75%	24	0.06%
75	16,452	54.79%	12,915	43.01%	436	1.45%	212	0.71%	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	23,739	62.42%	13,378	35.18%	579	1.52%	258	0.68%	78	0.21%
80	22,338	75.36%	6,753	22.78%	362	1.22%	168	0.57%	19	0.06%
81	21,055	70.99%	7,926	26.72%	433	1.46%	229	0.77%	16	0.05%
82	15,760	53.21%	13,125	44.32%	443	1.50%	267	0.90%	21	0.07%
83	24,449	73.21%	8,205	24.57%	472	1.41%	249	0.75%	19	0.06%
84	20,094	68.50%	8,586	29.27%	415	1.41%	214	0.73%	25	0.09%
85	25,732	71.46%	9,384	26.06%	543	1.51%	323	0.90%	27	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	7,659	27.69%	19,336	69.91%	403	1.46%	247	0.89%	13	0.05%
89	24,459	74.54%	7,641	23.29%	484	1.48%	207	0.63%	21	0.06%
90	22,107	75.44%	6,547	22.34%	426	1.45%	194	0.66%	29	0.10%
91	23,107	68.62%	9,720	28.86%	570	1.69%	240	0.71%	37	0.11%
92	7,518	29.10%	17,744	68.68%	307	1.19%	252	0.98%	15	0.06%
93	21,284	56.98%	15,063	40.32%	616	1.65%	365	0.98%	28	0.07%
94	27,321	77.54%	7,101	20.15%	516	1.46%	266	0.75%	31	0.09%
95	21,669	64.22%	11,285	33.45%	540	1.60%	228	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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

2022 Election Contest Report - US Senate

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

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	16,828	47.32%	18,015	50.66%	450	1.27%	255	0.72%	16	0.04%
99	2,382	14.61%	13,519	82.94%	178	1.09%	208	1.28%	13	0.08%
100	4,424	23.98%	13,496	73.16%	278	1.51%	241	1.31%	9	0.05%
101	5,143	23.91%	15,893	73.89%	234	1.09%	231	1.07%	7	0.03%
102	4,808	17.06%	22,698	80.53%	350	1.24%	311	1.10%	18	0.06%
103	17,382	44.95%	20,489	52.99%	473	1.22%	293	0.76%	30	0.08%
104	16,077	41.83%	21,622	56.26%	422	1.10%	282	0.73%	29	0.08%
105	12,913	41.56%	17,458	56.19%	404	1.30%	280	0.90%	14	0.05%
106	8,372	28.38%	20,532	69.60%	294	1.00%	280	0.95%	22	0.07%
107	3,981	17.19%	18,708	80.78%	224	0.97%	228	0.98%	17	0.07%
108	17,415	65.11%	8,755	32.73%	367	1.37%	194	0.73%	17	0.06%
109	18,170	58.06%	12,489	39.91%	420	1.34%	199	0.64%	16	0.05%
110	18,684	68.16%	8,189	29.87%	344	1.25%	175	0.64%	21	0.08%
111	20,791	70.08%	8,248	27.80%	428	1.44%	187	0.63%	14	0.05%
112	10,255	39.28%	15,304	58.62%	311	1.19%	220	0.84%	18	0.07%
113	24,034	65.67%	11,666	31.88%	555	1.52%	326	0.89%	15	0.04%
114	13,276	31.20%	28,145	66.14%	594	1.40%	518	1.22%	19	0.04%
115	15,064	40.93%	20,769	56.43%	547	1.49%	401	1.09%	21	0.06%
116	14,881	36.44%	24,919	61.03%	510	1.25%	504	1.23%	19	0.05%
117	23,492	57.06%	16,731	40.64%	583	1.42%	354	0.86%	13	0.03%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

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

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
1	25,221	68.91%	11,378	31.09%
2	15,984	44.33%	20,069	55.67%
3	20,397	62.80%	12,082	37.20%
4	19,566	69.64%	8,530	30.36%
5	13,037	46.57%	14,955	53.43%
6	11,405	59.31%	7,823	40.69%
7	19,370	57.05%	14,582	42.95%
8	11,577	47.10%	13,005	52.90%
9	15,794	52.69%	14,179	47.31%
10	18,102	66.88%	8,964	33.12%
11	9,685	33.13%	19,549	66.87%
12	10,298	43.66%	13,290	56.34%
13	26,078	71.49%	10,398	28.51%
14	9,540	67.00%	4,699	33.00%
15	14,392	67.62%	6,893	32.38%
16	22,039	69.83%	9,522	30.17%
17	28,500	63.11%	16,662	36.89%
18	16,854	46.82%	19,143	53.18%
19	29,439	61.70%	18,277	38.30%
20	18,737	50.23%	18,565	49.77%
21	8,803	31.50%	19,144	68.50%
22	18,536	62.92%	10,922	37.08%
23	13,975	47.50%	15,444	52.50%
24	12,304	42.19%	16,859	57.81%
25	20,032	61.52%	12,530	38.48%
26	19,066	56.33%	14,782	43.67%
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	13,552	47.51%	14,973	52.49%
33	12,530	38.08%	20,374	61.92%
34	14,544	35.67%	26,232	64.33%
35	17,571	47.18%	19,669	52.82%
36	16,124	41.13%	23,083	58.87%
37	20,464	50.90%	19,740	49.10%
38	4,064	14.24%	24,483	85.76%
39	12,085	38.95%	18,943	61.05%
40	19,848	44.06%	25,199	55.94%
41	13,222	34.90%	24,668	65.10%
42	4,327	28.88%	10,655	71.12%
43	13,983	53.29%	12,258	46.71%
44	9,163	41.75%	12,786	58.25%
45	9,057	44.43%	11,328	55.57%
46	17,495	64.67%	9,558	35.33%
47	10,194	55.12%	8,300	44.88%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

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

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
49	10,332	30.80%	23,211	69.20%
50	15,567	40.52%	22,847	59.48%
51	16,159	61.81%	9,985	38.19%
52	16,908	59.48%	11,516	40.52%
53	21,520	65.17%	11,503	34.83%
54	18,446	44.21%	23,277	55.79%
55	17,338	65.54%	9,117	34.46%
56	4,252	11.83%	31,691	88.17%
57	16,472	44.50%	20,543	55.50%
58	7,719	30.82%	17,328	69.18%
59	18,091	51.76%	16,863	48.24%
60	10,576	41.98%	14,616	58.02%
61	5,422	21.88%	19,361	78.12%
62	19,761	50.23%	19,582	49.77%
63	13,739	50.29%	13,579	49.71%
64	20,133	61.93%	12,377	38.07%
65	22,301	68.89%	10,070	31.11%
66	7,933	29.64%	18,831	70.36%
67	24,231	75.33%	7,936	24.67%
68	22,499	61.62%	14,012	38.38%
69	22,396	66.24%	11,412	33.76%
70	22,108	78.51%	6,051	21.49%
71	7,256	30.08%	16,865	69.92%
72	7,086	27.49%	18,692	72.51%
73	13,590	49.20%	14,034	50.80%
74	20,404	52.47%	18,484	47.53%
75	17,070	57.10%	12,825	42.90%
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	24,442	64.78%	13,288	35.22%
80	22,830	77.12%	6,774	22.88%
81	21,630	73.01%	7,997	26.99%
82	16,374	55.67%	13,037	44.33%
83	24,990	75.24%	8,222	24.76%
84	20,611	70.60%	8,581	29.40%
85	26,301	73.60%	9,434	26.40%
86	20,937	70.13%	8,918	29.87%
87	22,572	75.19%	7,447	24.81%
88	8,332	30.30%	19,169	69.70%
89	25,150	76.84%	7,580	23.16%
90	22,587	77.29%	6,638	22.71%
91	23,703	70.72%	9,815	29.28%
92	8,057	31.29%	17,689	68.71%
93	21,817	58.95%	15,191	41.05%
94	27,834	79.56%	7,151	20.44%
95	22,310	66.50%	11,240	33.50%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

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

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
97	26,815	74.12%	9,365	25.88%
98	17,645	49.84%	17,761	50.16%
99	2,643	16.26%	13,612	83.74%
100	4,805	26.15%	13,570	73.85%
101	5,491	25.57%	15,986	74.43%
102	5,327	18.99%	22,724	81.01%
103	18,394	47.80%	20,091	52.20%
104	17,284	45.17%	20,983	54.83%
105	13,732	44.40%	17,198	55.60%
106	8,941	30.43%	20,446	69.57%
107	4,313	18.66%	18,795	81.34%
108	17,910	67.22%	8,734	32.78%
109	18,816	60.46%	12,304	39.54%
110	19,089	70.05%	8,160	29.95%
111	21,211	71.89%	8,293	28.11%
112	10,782	41.43%	15,245	58.57%
113	24,633	67.62%	11,793	32.38%
114	13,998	33.09%	28,311	66.91%
115	15,847	43.26%	20,782	56.74%
116	15,566	38.32%	25,052	61.68%
117	24,426	59.51%	16,619	40.49%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

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

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
1	25,121	68.56%	11,521	31.44%
2	16,141	44.79%	19,895	55.21%
3	20,201	62.19%	12,280	37.81%
4	19,355	68.85%	8,757	31.15%
5	12,953	46.23%	15,066	53.77%
6	11,447	59.56%	7,771	40.44%
7	19,673	57.98%	14,255	42.02%
8	11,392	46.39%	13,166	53.61%
9	15,530	51.84%	14,426	48.16%
10	18,145	66.96%	8,953	33.04%
11	9,632	33.02%	19,536	66.98%
12	10,314	43.81%	13,227	56.19%
13	25,912	70.99%	10,589	29.01%
14	9,499	66.52%	4,781	33.48%
15	14,374	67.27%	6,995	32.73%
16	22,098	70.02%	9,460	29.98%
17	28,529	63.33%	16,518	36.67%
18	16,769	46.63%	19,189	53.37%
19	29,412	61.77%	18,207	38.23%
20	18,649	50.03%	18,627	49.97%
21	8,856	31.77%	19,018	68.23%
22	18,646	63.43%	10,749	36.57%
23	13,787	46.81%	15,668	53.19%
24	12,291	42.20%	16,836	57.80%
25	20,148	61.88%	12,410	38.12%
26	19,272	57.00%	14,538	43.00%
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	13,727	48.19%	14,758	51.81%
33	12,711	38.72%	20,118	61.28%
34	14,520	35.70%	26,155	64.30%
35	17,712	47.65%	19,460	52.35%
36	16,169	41.36%	22,922	58.64%
37	20,638	51.48%	19,448	48.52%
38	4,182	14.68%	24,303	85.32%
39	12,173	39.30%	18,801	60.70%
40	19,779	43.99%	25,179	56.01%
41	13,216	34.95%	24,598	65.05%
42	4,387	29.33%	10,570	70.67%
43	14,064	53.61%	12,171	46.39%
44	9,178	41.88%	12,736	58.12%
45	9,129	44.87%	11,216	55.13%
46	17,651	65.21%	9,415	34.79%
47	10,420	56.30%	8,089	43.70%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

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

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
49	10,250	30.65%	23,194	69.35%
50	15,624	40.68%	22,779	59.32%
51	16,191	61.95%	9,943	38.05%
52	16,977	59.76%	11,434	40.24%
53	21,683	65.70%	11,318	34.30%
54	18,473	44.19%	23,332	55.81%
55	17,283	65.35%	9,163	34.65%
56	4,216	11.74%	31,693	88.26%
57	16,347	44.25%	20,592	55.75%
58	7,771	31.08%	17,233	68.92%
59	18,104	51.84%	16,818	48.16%
60	10,493	41.74%	14,647	58.26%
61	5,369	21.70%	19,376	78.30%
62	19,744	50.27%	19,533	49.73%
63	13,780	50.41%	13,555	49.59%
64	20,141	61.85%	12,424	38.15%
65	22,318	68.94%	10,055	31.06%
66	7,985	29.89%	18,726	70.11%
67	24,272	75.41%	7,913	24.59%
68	22,478	61.64%	13,988	38.36%
69	22,421	66.33%	11,380	33.67%
70	22,191	78.79%	5,975	21.21%
71	7,153	29.70%	16,932	70.30%
72	6,864	26.69%	18,858	73.31%
73	13,534	49.05%	14,057	50.95%
74	20,228	52.07%	18,618	47.93%
75	16,981	56.88%	12,873	43.12%
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	24,227	64.20%	13,507	35.80%
80	22,796	76.98%	6,816	23.02%
81	21,662	73.12%	7,963	26.88%
82	16,297	55.47%	13,083	44.53%
83	24,918	74.94%	8,332	25.06%
84	20,419	70.00%	8,750	30.00%
85	25,779	71.97%	10,039	28.03%
86	19,794	66.05%	10,172	33.95%
87	22,091	73.52%	7,956	26.48%
88	8,277	30.10%	19,217	69.90%
89	24,813	75.74%	7,949	24.26%
90	22,506	77.04%	6,708	22.96%
91	23,698	70.70%	9,823	29.30%
92	8,046	31.24%	17,711	68.76%
93	21,592	58.35%	15,413	41.65%
94	27,510	78.61%	7,485	21.39%
95	22,199	66.33%	11,269	33.67%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

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

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
97	26,559	73.46%	9,594	26.54%
98	17,491	49.41%	17,908	50.59%
99	2,690	16.56%	13,555	83.44%
100	4,814	26.23%	13,539	73.77%
101	5,529	25.77%	15,928	74.23%
102	5,311	18.94%	22,735	81.06%
103	18,238	47.40%	20,239	52.60%
104	16,728	43.78%	21,485	56.22%
105	13,607	44.03%	17,295	55.97%
106	8,940	30.42%	20,446	69.58%
107	4,338	18.77%	18,777	81.23%
108	17,784	66.90%	8,799	33.10%
109	18,533	59.64%	12,543	40.36%
110	18,935	69.50%	8,308	30.50%
111	21,081	71.42%	8,434	28.58%
112	10,755	41.32%	15,272	58.68%
113	24,311	66.72%	12,129	33.28%
114	13,792	32.59%	28,525	67.41%
115	15,504	42.32%	21,132	57.68%
116	15,266	37.58%	25,357	62.42%
117	24,003	58.46%	17,055	41.54%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

2020 Election Contest Report - US President

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib	Grn	% Grn	Cnst	% Cnst	W-I	% W-I
1	32,964	65.47%	16,605	32.98%	482	0.96%	79	0.16%	113	0.22%	105	0.21%
2	22,478	44.08%	27,859	54.63%	387	0.76%	106	0.21%	82	0.16%	85	0.17%
3	27,012	58.58%	18,363	39.83%	497	1.08%	79	0.17%	76	0.16%	81	0.18%
4	26,427	64.05%	14,523	35.20%	177	0.43%	48	0.12%	56	0.14%	32	0.08%
5	17,751	42.03%	24,049	56.94%	236	0.56%	72	0.17%	61	0.14%	63	0.15%
6	18,289	56.17%	13,585	41.72%	485	1.49%	85	0.26%	47	0.14%	69	0.21%
7	26,510	57.14%	19,161	41.30%	413	0.89%	90	0.19%	110	0.24%	107	0.23%
8	17,264	41.43%	23,752	57.00%	383	0.92%	96	0.23%	87	0.21%	90	0.22%
9	21,479	47.39%	23,129	51.03%	405	0.89%	113	0.25%	82	0.18%	117	0.26%
10	25,892	63.69%	14,310	35.20%	272	0.67%	60	0.15%	76	0.19%	44	0.11%
11	13,229	31.27%	28,089	66.40%	600	1.42%	159	0.38%	63	0.15%	165	0.39%
12	14,849	38.15%	23,682	60.84%	199	0.51%	59	0.15%	76	0.20%	59	0.15%
13	34,048	68.49%	14,878	29.93%	502	1.01%	77	0.15%	112	0.23%	93	0.19%
14	14,797	61.24%	8,663	35.85%	568	2.35%	47	0.19%	35	0.14%	52	0.22%
15	22,763	62.56%	12,715	34.94%	723	1.99%	69	0.19%	48	0.13%	68	0.19%
16	30,474	66.42%	14,611	31.85%	544	1.19%	83	0.18%	86	0.19%	81	0.18%
17	34,687	60.64%	21,863	38.22%	422	0.74%	78	0.14%	57	0.10%	98	0.17%
18	22,754	43.81%	28,225	54.34%	619	1.19%	153	0.29%	68	0.13%	119	0.23%
19	36,065	60.29%	22,976	38.41%	499	0.83%	96	0.16%	68	0.11%	114	0.19%
20	25,598	48.42%	26,265	49.68%	622	1.18%	154	0.29%	88	0.17%	139	0.26%
21	12,640	31.17%	27,288	67.29%	367	0.90%	94	0.23%	40	0.10%	124	0.31%
22	27,078	59.16%	18,286	39.95%	211	0.46%	41	0.09%	92	0.20%	63	0.14%
23	19,448	42.40%	26,081	56.85%	181	0.39%	50	0.11%	75	0.16%	38	0.08%
24	17,871	38.48%	28,073	60.44%	265	0.57%	84	0.18%	77	0.17%	76	0.16%
25	27,537	59.09%	18,628	39.98%	267	0.57%	47	0.10%	59	0.13%	61	0.13%
26	27,593	56.44%	20,446	41.82%	564	1.15%	115	0.24%	72	0.15%	100	0.20%
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	19,429	44.54%	23,710	54.36%	258	0.59%	64	0.15%	92	0.21%	64	0.15%
33	17,340	36.50%	29,221	61.51%	575	1.21%	130	0.27%	84	0.18%	156	0.33%
34	19,107	35.27%	33,984	62.72%	634	1.17%	136	0.25%	93	0.17%	226	0.42%
35	23,896	46.49%	26,428	51.42%	627	1.22%	110	0.21%	93	0.18%	245	0.48%
36	20,828	40.49%	29,527	57.41%	702	1.36%	113	0.22%	63	0.12%	201	0.39%
37	26,022	50.32%	24,570	47.51%	732	1.42%	122	0.24%	95	0.18%	173	0.33%
38	6,324	14.34%	37,061	84.03%	392	0.89%	139	0.32%	63	0.14%	128	0.29%
39	17,540	37.92%	27,960	60.44%	447	0.97%	100	0.22%	81	0.18%	132	0.29%
40	25,149	42.12%	33,414	55.97%	681	1.14%	111	0.19%	103	0.17%	244	0.41%
41	17,485	34.11%	32,750	63.88%	643	1.25%	128	0.25%	84	0.16%	175	0.34%
42	8,151	28.58%	19,748	69.24%	393	1.38%	98	0.34%	69	0.24%	61	0.21%
43	21,658	50.80%	20,326	47.67%	390	0.91%	97	0.23%	76	0.18%	89	0.21%
44	14,442	37.31%	23,496	60.70%	440	1.14%	117	0.30%	102	0.26%	111	0.29%
45	15,781	42.26%	20,899	55.97%	422	1.13%	111	0.30%	52	0.14%	76	0.20%
46	25,832	64.23%	14,072	34.99%	146	0.36%	42	0.10%	85	0.21%	41	0.10%
47	18,804	56.20%	14,394	43.02%	103	0.31%	54	0.16%	52	0.16%	50	0.15%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

2020 Election Contest Report - US President

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib	Grn	% Grn	Cnst	% Cnst	W-I	% W-I
49	14,670	29.68%	33,704	68.20%	668	1.35%	141	0.29%	59	0.12%	177	0.36%
50	21,540	42.24%	28,793	56.46%	381	0.75%	96	0.19%	84	0.16%	106	0.21%
51	23,774	60.28%	15,116	38.33%	338	0.86%	81	0.21%	70	0.18%	59	0.15%
52	24,769	56.84%	18,241	41.86%	350	0.80%	69	0.16%	66	0.15%	83	0.19%
53	31,020	64.33%	16,473	34.16%	490	1.02%	80	0.17%	69	0.14%	91	0.19%
54	23,857	45.55%	27,826	53.13%	387	0.74%	95	0.18%	95	0.18%	115	0.22%
55	24,161	59.09%	16,226	39.68%	274	0.67%	62	0.15%	94	0.23%	74	0.18%
56	5,725	12.41%	39,659	86.00%	336	0.73%	140	0.30%	75	0.16%	181	0.39%
57	21,454	40.46%	30,714	57.92%	484	0.91%	86	0.16%	119	0.22%	172	0.32%
58	11,753	27.30%	30,715	71.35%	273	0.63%	131	0.30%	66	0.15%	110	0.26%
59	24,566	48.81%	25,087	49.84%	362	0.72%	113	0.22%	98	0.19%	107	0.21%
60	15,545	37.20%	25,597	61.26%	324	0.78%	118	0.28%	105	0.25%	95	0.23%
61	7,732	18.66%	33,049	79.77%	315	0.76%	136	0.33%	80	0.19%	117	0.28%
62	26,245	47.70%	27,925	50.75%	474	0.86%	120	0.22%	111	0.20%	145	0.26%
63	19,003	47.53%	20,385	50.98%	325	0.81%	106	0.27%	84	0.21%	80	0.20%
64	27,053	58.65%	18,440	39.98%	361	0.78%	117	0.25%	86	0.19%	70	0.15%
65	31,301	65.47%	15,992	33.45%	312	0.65%	75	0.16%	55	0.12%	74	0.15%
66	11,967	28.44%	29,340	69.72%	446	1.06%	129	0.31%	60	0.14%	141	0.34%
67	33,869	72.35%	12,456	26.61%	303	0.65%	45	0.10%	83	0.18%	56	0.12%
68	29,961	58.22%	20,681	40.19%	467	0.91%	100	0.19%	84	0.16%	171	0.33%
69	31,582	63.28%	17,607	35.28%	436	0.87%	90	0.18%	68	0.14%	124	0.25%
70	33,424	75.84%	10,146	23.02%	310	0.70%	78	0.18%	60	0.14%	55	0.12%
71	10,972	27.80%	27,837	70.53%	326	0.83%	129	0.33%	77	0.20%	125	0.32%
72	9,066	22.61%	30,346	75.69%	323	0.81%	111	0.28%	104	0.26%	141	0.35%
73	20,899	46.90%	22,913	51.42%	450	1.01%	110	0.25%	58	0.13%	134	0.30%
74	26,847	49.88%	26,059	48.42%	537	1.00%	109	0.20%	87	0.16%	180	0.33%
75	24,701	54.49%	19,943	43.99%	427	0.94%	97	0.21%	60	0.13%	105	0.23%
76	26,943	61.11%	16,534	37.50%	337	0.76%	103	0.23%	84	0.19%	89	0.20%
77	38,630	75.25%	11,973	23.32%	386	0.75%	94	0.18%	133	0.26%	118	0.23%
78	37,320	73.71%	12,751	25.18%	341	0.67%	75	0.15%	55	0.11%	89	0.18%
79	31,700	61.10%	19,539	37.66%	337	0.65%	80	0.15%	137	0.26%	86	0.17%
80	33,169	74.44%	10,747	24.12%	358	0.80%	93	0.21%	121	0.27%	71	0.16%
81	31,459	71.55%	11,880	27.02%	345	0.78%	94	0.21%	122	0.28%	69	0.16%
82	24,058	51.63%	21,777	46.74%	444	0.95%	99	0.21%	68	0.15%	150	0.32%
83	36,166	73.22%	12,551	25.41%	400	0.81%	82	0.17%	75	0.15%	119	0.24%
84	29,288	66.18%	14,382	32.50%	340	0.77%	74	0.17%	82	0.19%	89	0.20%
85	36,117	72.75%	12,899	25.98%	344	0.69%	93	0.19%	110	0.22%	85	0.17%
86	31,019	69.43%	13,118	29.36%	270	0.60%	83	0.19%	117	0.26%	69	0.15%
87	33,590	73.26%	11,707	25.53%	309	0.67%	67	0.15%	84	0.18%	93	0.20%
88	11,925	27.62%	30,352	70.30%	520	1.20%	122	0.28%	72	0.17%	184	0.43%
89	35,214	74.02%	11,749	24.70%	344	0.72%	86	0.18%	83	0.17%	96	0.20%
90	29,453	75.69%	9,046	23.25%	251	0.65%	46	0.12%	54	0.14%	63	0.16%
91	33,612	69.52%	14,132	29.23%	352	0.73%	83	0.17%	94	0.19%	74	0.15%
92	12,594	29.46%	29,403	68.79%	454	1.06%	130	0.30%	60	0.14%	105	0.25%
93	28,949	56.60%	21,307	41.66%	511	1.00%	134	0.26%	111	0.22%	133	0.26%
94	38,020	77.41%	10,573	21.53%	301	0.61%	51	0.10%	93	0.19%	76	0.15%
95	31,205	63.35%	17,249	35.02%	500	1.02%	95	0.19%	86	0.17%	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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

2020 Election Contest Report - US President

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

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	24,050	47.92%	25,335	50.48%	477	0.95%	99	0.20%	68	0.14%	156	0.31%
99	4,762	15.28%	25,866	83.02%	263	0.84%	123	0.39%	43	0.14%	101	0.32%
100	7,767	23.50%	24,689	74.71%	293	0.89%	121	0.37%	75	0.23%	101	0.31%
101	9,007	23.03%	29,441	75.27%	331	0.85%	154	0.39%	68	0.17%	114	0.29%
102	8,792	19.44%	35,560	78.63%	483	1.07%	136	0.30%	87	0.19%	169	0.37%
103	23,897	44.99%	28,281	53.24%	533	1.00%	105	0.20%	96	0.18%	204	0.38%
104	20,962	40.40%	29,955	57.74%	530	1.02%	106	0.20%	96	0.19%	231	0.45%
105	19,293	40.66%	27,361	57.67%	464	0.98%	130	0.27%	53	0.11%	143	0.30%
106	13,209	28.86%	31,849	69.58%	399	0.87%	114	0.25%	54	0.12%	147	0.32%
107	6,951	16.62%	34,174	81.73%	319	0.76%	142	0.34%	75	0.18%	150	0.36%
108	28,128	66.05%	13,892	32.62%	354	0.83%	83	0.19%	50	0.12%	81	0.19%
109	27,346	58.11%	19,001	40.38%	412	0.88%	108	0.23%	79	0.17%	111	0.24%
110	29,856	67.80%	13,740	31.20%	236	0.54%	61	0.14%	77	0.17%	66	0.15%
111	32,016	69.39%	13,586	29.45%	311	0.67%	72	0.16%	84	0.18%	67	0.15%
112	16,006	37.66%	25,791	60.68%	360	0.85%	128	0.30%	90	0.21%	130	0.31%
113	33,221	65.42%	16,890	33.26%	372	0.73%	107	0.21%	94	0.19%	99	0.19%
114	18,671	33.40%	36,265	64.87%	484	0.87%	191	0.34%	136	0.24%	155	0.28%
115	21,969	42.97%	28,257	55.27%	524	1.02%	160	0.31%	91	0.18%	127	0.25%
116	21,772	39.85%	31,988	58.55%	452	0.83%	191	0.35%	102	0.19%	133	0.24%
117	31,405	57.42%	22,332	40.83%	553	1.01%	136	0.25%	135	0.25%	130	0.24%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

2020 Election Contest Report - US Senate

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib	Cnst	% Cnst
1	32,252	64.93%	15,537	31.28%	1,364	2.75%	516	1.04%
2	21,455	42.48%	27,034	53.53%	1,447	2.87%	568	1.12%
3	25,798	56.52%	17,708	38.80%	1,472	3.23%	663	1.45%
4	24,857	60.92%	14,435	35.38%	917	2.25%	591	1.45%
5	16,962	40.81%	23,248	55.93%	891	2.14%	465	1.12%
6	17,294	53.50%	13,154	40.69%	1,335	4.13%	545	1.69%
7	25,019	54.28%	18,813	40.82%	1,553	3.37%	704	1.53%
8	16,593	40.20%	22,973	55.66%	1,254	3.04%	454	1.10%
9	21,116	46.86%	22,296	49.48%	1,242	2.76%	409	0.91%
10	24,548	60.97%	14,112	35.05%	1,038	2.58%	567	1.41%
11	13,789	32.84%	26,337	62.73%	1,581	3.77%	278	0.66%
12	14,185	36.85%	22,868	59.40%	900	2.34%	543	1.41%
13	32,236	65.59%	14,562	29.63%	1,612	3.28%	736	1.50%
14	13,704	57.55%	8,307	34.89%	1,308	5.49%	493	2.07%
15	21,117	58.93%	12,289	34.29%	1,744	4.87%	684	1.91%
16	28,707	63.33%	14,034	30.96%	1,849	4.08%	739	1.63%
17	32,825	58.07%	21,137	37.39%	1,823	3.22%	745	1.32%
18	22,033	42.86%	26,496	51.55%	2,141	4.17%	733	1.43%
19	34,351	58.05%	21,861	36.94%	2,172	3.67%	795	1.34%
20	25,107	48.07%	24,281	46.49%	2,258	4.32%	581	1.11%
21	13,344	33.21%	25,385	63.17%	1,224	3.05%	230	0.57%
22	25,476	56.27%	18,119	40.02%	1,034	2.28%	642	1.42%
23	18,040	39.64%	25,969	57.07%	927	2.04%	571	1.25%
24	17,118	37.15%	27,481	59.65%	989	2.15%	485	1.05%
25	26,243	56.72%	18,453	39.88%	1,013	2.19%	557	1.20%
26	26,238	54.25%	19,497	40.31%	1,921	3.97%	709	1.47%
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	18,197	42.07%	23,479	54.28%	1,055	2.44%	521	1.20%
33	16,837	35.66%	28,028	59.36%	1,824	3.86%	527	1.12%
34	20,594	38.27%	31,215	58.00%	1,702	3.16%	306	0.57%
35	24,046	47.17%	24,767	48.58%	1,731	3.40%	434	0.85%
36	21,912	42.95%	26,869	52.67%	1,839	3.60%	396	0.78%
37	25,917	50.46%	22,831	44.45%	2,140	4.17%	474	0.92%
38	6,556	14.98%	35,429	80.94%	1,447	3.31%	341	0.78%
39	16,941	36.89%	26,798	58.35%	1,664	3.62%	520	1.13%
40	26,572	44.76%	30,518	51.41%	1,938	3.26%	332	0.56%
41	18,221	35.81%	30,433	59.81%	1,843	3.62%	386	0.76%
42	7,743	27.44%	18,771	66.52%	1,253	4.44%	450	1.59%
43	20,597	48.76%	19,669	46.57%	1,344	3.18%	629	1.49%
44	13,822	36.09%	22,491	58.73%	1,421	3.71%	562	1.47%
45	14,959	40.44%	20,083	54.29%	1,361	3.68%	591	1.60%
46	23,940	60.40%	14,290	36.06%	783	1.98%	620	1.56%
47	16,832	51.87%	14,471	44.59%	688	2.12%	462	1.42%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

2020 Election Contest Report - US Senate

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib	Cnst	% Cnst
49	15,778	32.15%	31,311	63.80%	1,699	3.46%	292	0.59%
50	20,930	41.28%	28,050	55.32%	1,274	2.51%	452	0.89%
51	22,354	57.24%	14,780	37.85%	1,306	3.34%	612	1.57%
52	23,582	54.85%	17,321	40.29%	1,401	3.26%	687	1.60%
53	29,543	61.78%	15,961	33.38%	1,612	3.37%	703	1.47%
54	23,545	45.22%	26,752	51.38%	1,286	2.47%	489	0.94%
55	23,123	57.07%	15,764	38.91%	1,041	2.57%	586	1.45%
56	6,575	14.35%	38,104	83.14%	965	2.11%	189	0.41%
57	21,674	41.18%	28,959	55.02%	1,563	2.97%	437	0.83%
58	11,089	25.99%	29,779	69.80%	1,316	3.08%	482	1.13%
59	23,351	46.75%	24,510	49.07%	1,484	2.97%	601	1.20%
60	14,890	36.02%	24,548	59.39%	1,360	3.29%	537	1.30%
61	7,873	19.16%	31,561	76.80%	1,282	3.12%	380	0.92%
62	26,030	47.63%	26,527	48.54%	1,585	2.90%	503	0.92%
63	18,082	45.52%	20,083	50.56%	1,100	2.77%	458	1.15%
64	26,164	57.12%	17,960	39.21%	1,202	2.62%	477	1.04%
65	28,971	61.23%	16,189	34.22%	1,473	3.11%	680	1.44%
66	11,881	28.48%	27,833	66.71%	1,598	3.83%	409	0.98%
67	31,632	68.33%	12,445	26.88%	1,285	2.78%	930	2.01%
68	30,567	59.92%	18,594	36.45%	1,450	2.84%	399	0.78%
69	30,936	62.53%	16,537	33.42%	1,478	2.99%	526	1.06%
70	31,396	71.95%	10,281	23.56%	1,295	2.97%	662	1.52%
71	10,706	27.42%	26,471	67.79%	1,343	3.44%	529	1.35%
72	9,696	24.46%	28,404	71.65%	1,135	2.86%	408	1.03%
73	20,331	46.08%	21,450	48.62%	1,722	3.90%	617	1.40%
74	26,515	49.64%	24,577	46.01%	1,725	3.23%	597	1.12%
75	23,638	52.52%	19,192	42.64%	1,562	3.47%	616	1.37%
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	30,025	58.57%	19,039	37.14%	1,454	2.84%	745	1.45%
80	31,373	70.67%	11,130	25.07%	1,241	2.80%	652	1.47%
81	29,286	66.86%	12,554	28.66%	1,255	2.87%	704	1.61%
82	23,400	50.72%	20,314	44.03%	1,713	3.71%	705	1.53%
83	34,362	70.13%	12,192	24.88%	1,547	3.16%	898	1.83%
84	27,570	62.93%	13,955	31.85%	1,376	3.14%	908	2.07%
85	34,135	69.48%	13,099	26.66%	1,183	2.41%	709	1.44%
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	13,446	31.37%	27,447	64.03%	1,589	3.71%	386	0.90%
89	33,443	70.78%	11,445	24.22%	1,444	3.06%	917	1.94%
90	27,255	70.67%	9,670	25.08%	1,067	2.77%	572	1.48%
91	31,265	65.24%	14,267	29.77%	1,580	3.30%	810	1.69%
92	12,527	29.53%	27,840	65.62%	1,631	3.84%	430	1.01%
93	27,433	54.26%	20,707	40.95%	1,694	3.35%	728	1.44%
94	35,139	72.34%	11,158	22.97%	1,332	2.74%	944	1.94%
95	30,517	62.58%	15,825	32.45%	1,817	3.73%	602	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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

2020 Election Contest Report - US Senate

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

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	24,948	50.15%	22,843	45.91%	1,553	3.12%	407	0.82%
99	4,602	14.89%	24,727	80.03%	1,163	3.76%	405	1.31%
100	7,862	23.97%	23,153	70.60%	1,376	4.20%	402	1.23%
101	8,692	22.40%	28,048	72.27%	1,483	3.82%	588	1.52%
102	9,622	21.46%	33,049	73.71%	1,739	3.88%	427	0.95%
103	25,243	47.83%	25,596	48.50%	1,565	2.97%	369	0.70%
104	23,784	46.15%	26,053	50.55%	1,428	2.77%	273	0.53%
105	20,012	42.60%	24,927	53.06%	1,638	3.49%	405	0.86%
106	13,437	29.58%	29,949	65.94%	1,635	3.60%	398	0.88%
107	6,878	16.56%	32,718	78.77%	1,420	3.42%	519	1.25%
108	26,568	63.15%	13,390	31.83%	1,444	3.43%	667	1.59%
109	26,414	56.68%	18,205	39.06%	1,461	3.13%	523	1.12%
110	27,988	64.33%	13,677	31.44%	1,050	2.41%	792	1.82%
111	30,364	66.49%	13,502	29.57%	1,116	2.44%	685	1.50%
112	15,632	37.07%	24,473	58.04%	1,544	3.66%	515	1.22%
113	31,829	63.28%	16,599	33.00%	1,186	2.36%	683	1.36%
114	18,170	32.81%	34,918	63.05%	1,735	3.13%	556	1.00%
115	21,569	42.61%	26,801	52.95%	1,671	3.30%	579	1.14%
116	20,949	38.70%	31,004	57.28%	1,648	3.04%	528	0.98%
117	30,985	57.07%	21,096	38.85%	1,615	2.97%	601	1.11%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Governor

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep	Lib	% Lib	Cnst	% Cnst
1	17,354	34.68%	31,887	63.72%	566	1.13%	236	0.47%
2	29,387	57.77%	20,885	41.05%	435	0.86%	166	0.33%
3	19,479	42.40%	25,796	56.15%	472	1.03%	198	0.43%
4	15,369	37.36%	25,408	61.76%	225	0.55%	141	0.34%
5	24,588	58.55%	16,932	40.32%	321	0.76%	155	0.37%
6	14,572	44.97%	17,130	52.87%	531	1.64%	170	0.52%
7	21,032	45.36%	24,678	53.22%	471	1.02%	187	0.40%
8	24,415	58.80%	16,476	39.68%	449	1.08%	180	0.43%
9	24,187	53.41%	20,506	45.28%	446	0.98%	148	0.33%
10	15,344	37.88%	24,695	60.96%	289	0.71%	184	0.45%
11	28,914	68.67%	12,364	29.36%	674	1.60%	155	0.37%
12	24,469	63.05%	13,887	35.79%	307	0.79%	143	0.37%
13	16,250	32.83%	32,507	65.68%	500	1.01%	235	0.47%
14	9,150	38.29%	13,986	58.53%	560	2.34%	201	0.84%
15	13,425	37.30%	21,608	60.04%	690	1.92%	269	0.75%
16	15,677	34.37%	29,098	63.78%	602	1.32%	242	0.53%
17	24,044	42.26%	32,022	56.28%	563	0.99%	269	0.47%
18	29,401	56.86%	21,318	41.22%	775	1.50%	218	0.42%
19	25,058	42.04%	33,653	56.46%	633	1.06%	263	0.44%
20	27,745	52.69%	23,948	45.48%	724	1.37%	242	0.46%
21	28,734	71.22%	11,063	27.42%	436	1.08%	115	0.29%
22	19,668	43.14%	25,492	55.91%	279	0.61%	152	0.33%
23	27,330	59.69%	18,130	39.60%	189	0.41%	139	0.30%
24	29,412	63.41%	16,511	35.59%	320	0.69%	143	0.31%
25	20,294	43.61%	25,856	55.56%	248	0.53%	138	0.30%
26	22,115	45.40%	25,853	53.07%	544	1.12%	200	0.41%
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	25,306	58.13%	17,742	40.76%	325	0.75%	158	0.36%
33	30,596	64.57%	15,985	33.74%	585	1.23%	218	0.46%
34	35,519	65.72%	17,700	32.75%	647	1.20%	179	0.33%
35	27,993	54.69%	22,438	43.84%	579	1.13%	175	0.34%
36	31,103	60.67%	19,348	37.74%	652	1.27%	161	0.31%
37	26,357	51.12%	24,288	47.11%	711	1.38%	204	0.40%
38	37,593	85.51%	5,655	12.86%	557	1.27%	158	0.36%
39	29,158	63.20%	16,281	35.29%	522	1.13%	178	0.39%
40	35,040	58.87%	23,654	39.74%	653	1.10%	177	0.30%
41	34,277	67.10%	15,921	31.17%	676	1.32%	211	0.41%
42	20,244	71.46%	7,312	25.81%	559	1.97%	213	0.75%
43	21,532	50.67%	20,286	47.74%	470	1.11%	209	0.49%
44	24,531	63.67%	13,136	34.09%	612	1.59%	251	0.65%
45	21,971	59.09%	14,463	38.90%	527	1.42%	222	0.60%
46	15,561	39.00%	23,987	60.12%	210	0.53%	142	0.36%
47	17,028	51.66%	15,612	47.37%	209	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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Governor

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep	Lib	% Lib	Cnst	% Cnst
49	34,765	70.57%	13,690	27.79%	659	1.34%	148	0.30%
50	30,249	59.38%	20,113	39.48%	439	0.86%	140	0.27%
51	16,881	43.03%	21,773	55.50%	409	1.04%	166	0.42%
52	19,810	45.72%	22,819	52.66%	485	1.12%	215	0.50%
53	18,113	37.65%	29,301	60.90%	476	0.99%	223	0.46%
54	29,317	56.07%	22,432	42.90%	380	0.73%	159	0.30%
55	17,191	42.15%	23,037	56.48%	379	0.93%	183	0.45%
56	40,078	87.24%	5,331	11.60%	416	0.91%	113	0.25%
57	32,054	60.80%	19,849	37.65%	596	1.13%	222	0.42%
58	31,595	73.96%	10,353	24.24%	556	1.30%	213	0.50%
59	26,699	53.33%	22,664	45.27%	505	1.01%	195	0.39%
60	26,751	64.59%	13,906	33.57%	518	1.25%	244	0.59%
61	33,370	81.20%	6,960	16.94%	569	1.38%	195	0.47%
62	29,690	54.25%	24,239	44.29%	561	1.03%	236	0.43%
63	21,797	54.59%	17,624	44.14%	375	0.94%	136	0.34%
64	20,182	43.85%	25,297	54.97%	381	0.83%	163	0.35%
65	18,197	38.19%	28,891	60.63%	415	0.87%	149	0.31%
66	30,337	72.40%	10,796	25.77%	577	1.38%	190	0.45%
67	14,482	31.03%	31,644	67.81%	360	0.77%	178	0.38%
68	21,515	42.02%	28,984	56.60%	530	1.04%	176	0.34%
69	18,716	37.63%	30,261	60.85%	538	1.08%	216	0.43%
70	12,108	27.61%	31,204	71.17%	364	0.83%	171	0.39%
71	28,558	72.78%	9,934	25.32%	556	1.42%	193	0.49%
72	30,825	77.47%	8,344	20.97%	449	1.13%	174	0.44%
73	23,830	53.86%	19,631	44.37%	588	1.33%	194	0.44%
74	28,184	52.54%	24,705	46.05%	554	1.03%	200	0.37%
75	21,435	47.48%	22,971	50.88%	539	1.19%	205	0.45%
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	20,847	40.36%	30,162	58.39%	410	0.79%	240	0.46%
80	12,665	28.45%	31,283	70.28%	400	0.90%	163	0.37%
81	13,921	31.70%	29,465	67.09%	397	0.90%	138	0.31%
82	22,678	49.10%	22,659	49.06%	637	1.38%	213	0.46%
83	13,997	28.48%	34,447	70.08%	506	1.03%	203	0.41%
84	15,684	35.54%	27,726	62.83%	520	1.18%	198	0.45%
85	14,684	29.67%	34,187	69.07%	413	0.83%	209	0.42%
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	30,287	70.50%	11,833	27.55%	663	1.54%	175	0.41%
89	13,109	27.62%	33,693	70.99%	462	0.97%	195	0.41%
90	11,267	28.98%	27,222	70.02%	283	0.73%	107	0.28%
91	16,226	33.64%	31,362	65.02%	447	0.93%	201	0.42%
92	29,983	70.51%	11,651	27.40%	674	1.59%	215	0.51%
93	22,993	45.14%	27,092	53.19%	618	1.21%	234	0.46%
94	13,106	26.77%	35,324	72.16%	360	0.74%	163	0.33%
95	18,256	37.24%	29,927	61.05%	618	1.26%	223	0.45%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Governor

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

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	25,821	51.75%	23,280	46.66%	615	1.23%	177	0.35%
99	26,103	84.25%	4,238	13.68%	490	1.58%	153	0.49%
100	24,975	75.96%	7,070	21.50%	595	1.81%	239	0.73%
101	29,798	76.52%	8,271	21.24%	642	1.65%	230	0.59%
102	35,325	78.56%	8,591	19.11%	861	1.91%	189	0.42%
103	29,027	54.81%	23,192	43.79%	549	1.04%	192	0.36%
104	30,035	58.13%	20,900	40.45%	554	1.07%	181	0.35%
105	28,000	59.35%	18,395	38.99%	615	1.30%	167	0.35%
106	32,397	71.05%	12,401	27.20%	614	1.35%	183	0.40%
107	34,406	82.58%	6,422	15.41%	627	1.50%	207	0.50%
108	14,953	35.31%	26,742	63.15%	455	1.07%	198	0.47%
109	20,309	43.31%	25,848	55.12%	543	1.16%	193	0.41%
110	15,111	34.50%	28,170	64.31%	353	0.81%	170	0.39%
111	15,130	32.94%	30,315	65.99%	348	0.76%	144	0.31%
112	26,523	62.63%	14,872	35.12%	647	1.53%	305	0.72%
113	18,573	36.73%	31,371	62.03%	431	0.85%	197	0.39%
114	37,124	66.89%	17,365	31.29%	767	1.38%	247	0.45%
115	29,218	57.56%	20,550	40.49%	740	1.46%	251	0.49%
116	33,054	60.91%	20,236	37.29%	765	1.41%	215	0.40%
117	23,818	43.67%	29,868	54.76%	625	1.15%	231	0.42%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Lieutenant Governor

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
1	33,197	67.42%	16,039	32.58%
2	22,645	45.26%	27,387	54.74%
3	27,341	60.52%	17,833	39.48%
4	26,337	64.93%	14,225	35.07%
5	17,640	42.66%	23,714	57.34%
6	18,406	57.53%	13,585	42.47%
7	26,626	58.21%	19,117	41.79%
8	17,671	43.17%	23,262	56.83%
9	22,288	49.77%	22,492	50.23%
10	25,823	64.54%	14,189	35.46%
11	14,284	34.46%	27,171	65.54%
12	14,937	38.98%	23,381	61.02%
13	34,010	70.16%	14,462	29.84%
14	14,748	63.14%	8,608	36.86%
15	22,700	64.50%	12,496	35.50%
16	30,402	67.97%	14,327	32.03%
17	34,298	61.77%	21,227	38.23%
18	23,349	45.99%	27,417	54.01%
19	36,304	62.10%	22,157	37.90%
20	26,374	51.28%	25,059	48.72%
21	13,455	33.90%	26,236	66.10%
22	26,810	59.65%	18,137	40.35%
23	19,345	42.73%	25,924	57.27%
24	18,016	39.21%	27,929	60.79%
25	27,642	59.97%	18,453	40.03%
26	27,765	58.17%	19,969	41.83%
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	19,261	44.82%	23,714	55.18%
33	17,713	37.80%	29,146	62.20%
34	20,856	39.26%	32,267	60.74%
35	24,943	49.39%	25,562	50.61%
36	22,551	44.80%	27,791	55.20%
37	27,152	53.43%	23,669	46.57%
38	6,871	15.78%	36,672	84.22%
39	17,801	39.01%	27,834	60.99%
40	27,106	46.22%	31,544	53.78%
41	18,820	37.46%	31,423	62.54%
42	8,269	29.52%	19,739	70.48%
43	21,646	51.50%	20,385	48.50%
44	14,598	38.41%	23,405	61.59%
45	15,786	42.96%	20,956	57.04%
46	25,079	63.82%	14,216	36.18%
47	17,117	53.58%	14,832	46.42%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Lieutenant Governor

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
49	16,095	33.23%	32,335	66.77%
50	22,107	43.96%	28,179	56.04%
51	23,532	60.96%	15,068	39.04%
52	24,597	58.04%	17,784	41.96%
53	30,976	65.40%	16,385	34.60%
54	24,516	47.64%	26,946	52.36%
55	23,977	59.83%	16,100	40.17%
56	6,740	14.88%	38,543	85.12%
57	22,793	43.72%	29,346	56.28%
58	11,895	28.02%	30,554	71.98%
59	24,908	50.17%	24,743	49.83%
60	15,894	38.77%	25,098	61.23%
61	8,402	20.57%	32,441	79.43%
62	27,462	50.81%	26,588	49.19%
63	19,289	48.65%	20,363	51.35%
64	27,602	60.45%	18,058	39.55%
65	31,170	66.26%	15,871	33.74%
66	12,476	30.13%	28,936	69.87%
67	33,459	73.10%	12,312	26.90%
68	30,950	61.82%	19,118	38.18%
69	31,754	65.14%	16,992	34.86%
70	33,380	76.85%	10,058	23.15%
71	11,474	29.69%	27,169	70.31%
72	10,088	25.78%	29,045	74.22%
73	21,391	48.91%	22,346	51.09%
74	27,952	52.98%	24,810	47.02%
75	25,143	56.39%	19,445	43.61%
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	31,629	62.39%	19,064	37.61%
80	33,480	75.66%	10,772	24.34%
81	31,697	72.68%	11,913	27.32%
82	24,579	53.87%	21,046	46.13%
83	36,207	74.48%	12,405	25.52%
84	29,129	67.11%	14,276	32.89%
85	35,918	73.75%	12,784	26.25%
86	30,728	69.97%	13,191	30.03%
87	33,354	74.23%	11,581	25.77%
88	13,663	32.32%	28,614	67.68%
89	35,271	75.08%	11,705	24.92%
90	29,195	76.10%	9,169	23.90%
91	33,530	70.43%	14,075	29.57%
92	13,009	30.94%	29,031	69.06%
93	28,935	58.12%	20,850	41.88%
94	37,557	77.94%	10,627	22.06%
95	31,542	65.75%	16,434	34.25%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Lieutenant Governor

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
97	36,359	73.84%	12,883	26.16%
98	25,518	52.16%	23,409	47.84%
99	4,900	15.93%	25,851	84.07%
100	8,234	25.34%	24,262	74.66%
101	9,120	23.61%	29,508	76.39%
102	10,020	22.59%	34,330	77.41%
103	25,885	49.58%	26,323	50.42%
104	24,029	47.43%	26,636	52.57%
105	20,657	44.45%	25,815	55.55%
106	13,943	30.94%	31,126	69.06%
107	7,219	17.47%	34,106	82.53%
108	27,711	66.97%	13,669	33.03%
109	27,481	59.91%	18,389	40.09%
110	29,137	68.00%	13,710	32.00%
111	31,604	69.89%	13,618	30.11%
112	16,334	39.03%	25,518	60.97%
113	33,347	66.72%	16,635	33.28%
114	19,163	34.97%	35,641	65.03%
115	22,629	45.25%	27,378	54.75%
116	22,051	41.14%	31,548	58.86%
117	32,455	60.12%	21,528	39.88%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Attorney General

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
1	16,405	33.51%	32,548	66.49%
2	28,452	57.12%	21,355	42.88%
3	18,450	41.19%	26,338	58.81%
4	15,059	37.40%	25,206	62.60%
5	23,969	58.38%	17,086	41.62%
6	14,085	44.16%	17,810	55.84%
7	20,291	44.42%	25,390	55.58%
8	23,955	58.64%	16,894	41.36%
9	23,520	52.74%	21,079	47.26%
10	15,017	37.60%	24,920	62.40%
11	27,810	67.11%	13,627	32.89%
12	23,902	62.50%	14,339	37.50%
13	15,258	31.50%	33,185	68.50%
14	8,790	37.58%	14,597	62.42%
15	12,887	36.65%	22,280	63.35%
16	15,004	33.61%	29,644	66.39%
17	21,950	39.57%	33,521	60.43%
18	28,334	55.89%	22,359	44.11%
19	23,224	39.83%	35,088	60.17%
20	26,392	51.35%	25,007	48.65%
21	26,811	67.55%	12,880	32.45%
22	19,037	42.60%	25,647	57.40%
23	27,175	60.20%	17,968	39.80%
24	29,005	63.22%	16,872	36.78%
25	19,960	43.39%	26,044	56.61%
26	20,941	44.09%	26,557	55.91%
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	24,820	57.78%	18,133	42.22%
33	29,949	63.97%	16,870	36.03%
34	33,786	63.43%	19,480	36.57%
35	26,440	52.48%	23,941	47.52%
36	28,748	57.15%	21,553	42.85%
37	24,612	48.54%	26,097	51.46%
38	37,015	85.12%	6,469	14.88%
39	28,526	62.70%	16,972	37.30%
40	32,588	55.57%	26,055	44.43%
41	32,403	64.50%	17,831	35.50%
42	19,901	71.24%	8,036	28.76%
43	21,186	50.50%	20,769	49.50%
44	23,961	63.20%	13,950	36.80%
45	21,253	57.98%	15,402	42.02%
46	15,122	38.69%	23,962	61.31%
47	15,560	49.10%	16,131	50.90%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Attorney General

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
49	33,395	68.87%	15,094	31.13%
50	29,379	58.47%	20,863	41.53%
51	16,035	41.66%	22,451	58.34%
52	18,531	43.86%	23,719	56.14%
53	17,340	36.75%	29,844	63.25%
54	27,902	54.25%	23,527	45.75%
55	16,955	42.32%	23,108	57.68%
56	39,018	86.12%	6,286	13.88%
57	30,235	58.15%	21,762	41.85%
58	30,956	73.16%	11,356	26.84%
59	25,690	51.94%	23,770	48.06%
60	25,763	62.99%	15,135	37.01%
61	32,770	80.49%	7,945	19.51%
62	27,583	51.15%	26,347	48.85%
63	21,097	53.41%	18,406	46.59%
64	19,028	41.84%	26,453	58.16%
65	16,993	36.19%	29,959	63.81%
66	29,527	71.43%	11,812	28.57%
67	13,617	29.89%	31,936	70.11%
68	19,809	39.50%	30,342	60.50%
69	17,742	36.35%	31,069	63.65%
70	10,984	25.40%	32,268	74.60%
71	27,235	70.16%	11,584	29.84%
72	28,922	73.49%	10,433	26.51%
73	23,015	52.77%	20,595	47.23%
74	25,199	47.62%	27,715	52.38%
75	20,059	44.92%	24,599	55.08%
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	19,920	39.43%	30,603	60.57%
80	11,715	26.51%	32,480	73.49%
81	12,815	29.41%	30,763	70.59%
82	21,964	48.24%	23,569	51.76%
83	13,671	28.18%	34,847	71.82%
84	15,091	34.88%	28,173	65.12%
85	13,778	28.37%	34,791	71.63%
86	14,313	32.58%	29,620	67.42%
87	12,840	28.63%	32,014	71.37%
88	28,858	68.39%	13,338	31.61%
89	12,742	27.15%	34,187	72.85%
90	10,024	26.17%	28,277	73.83%
91	14,960	31.44%	32,623	68.56%
92	29,179	69.53%	12,786	30.47%
93	21,849	43.95%	27,865	56.05%
94	12,050	25.08%	36,005	74.92%
95	17,037	35.61%	30,805	64.39%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Attorney General

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
97	14,212	28.95%	34,874	71.05%
98	23,976	48.98%	24,978	51.02%
99	25,930	84.39%	4,797	15.61%
100	24,441	75.35%	7,995	24.65%
101	29,559	76.76%	8,947	23.24%
102	34,570	78.07%	9,712	21.93%
103	27,174	52.14%	24,947	47.86%
104	27,662	54.57%	23,029	45.43%
105	26,349	56.81%	20,030	43.19%
106	31,429	69.89%	13,538	30.11%
107	34,066	82.64%	7,157	17.36%
108	14,459	34.66%	27,257	65.34%
109	19,502	42.24%	26,666	57.76%
110	14,664	34.08%	28,366	65.92%
111	14,356	31.85%	30,723	68.15%
112	25,969	62.10%	15,852	37.90%
113	17,196	34.48%	32,675	65.52%
114	36,148	66.11%	18,531	33.89%
115	28,080	56.28%	21,816	43.72%
116	32,207	60.29%	21,215	39.71%
117	22,080	41.01%	31,766	58.99%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Auditor

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
1	17,239	35.43%	31,418	64.57%
2	28,868	58.41%	20,555	41.59%
3	20,024	44.75%	24,720	55.25%
4	15,711	39.16%	24,412	60.84%
5	24,513	59.74%	16,523	40.26%
6	14,324	45.07%	17,457	54.93%
7	20,910	46.04%	24,503	53.96%
8	24,814	60.95%	15,898	39.05%
9	24,785	55.75%	19,673	44.25%
10	15,604	39.33%	24,072	60.67%
11	27,906	68.10%	13,072	31.90%
12	24,296	63.81%	13,778	36.19%
13	15,979	33.39%	31,882	66.61%
14	9,022	39.11%	14,046	60.89%
15	13,236	38.16%	21,452	61.84%
16	15,151	34.27%	29,059	65.73%
17	21,624	39.65%	32,913	60.35%
18	27,968	55.95%	22,018	44.05%
19	23,079	40.14%	34,423	59.86%
20	25,889	51.26%	24,612	48.74%
21	26,778	68.27%	12,445	31.73%
22	19,354	43.39%	25,249	56.61%
23	28,286	62.85%	16,717	37.15%
24	30,200	66.11%	15,479	33.89%
25	22,722	49.60%	23,088	50.40%
26	21,564	45.65%	25,675	54.35%
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	25,056	58.70%	17,628	41.30%
33	30,302	65.15%	16,207	34.85%
34	34,024	64.73%	18,541	35.27%
35	26,775	53.70%	23,084	46.30%
36	28,886	58.21%	20,735	41.79%
37	25,110	50.04%	25,071	49.96%
38	36,870	85.45%	6,279	14.55%
39	28,829	63.84%	16,327	36.16%
40	33,029	57.02%	24,894	42.98%
41	32,708	65.91%	16,918	34.09%
42	19,867	71.52%	7,911	28.48%
43	21,063	50.58%	20,583	49.42%
44	23,917	63.51%	13,743	36.49%
45	21,245	58.33%	15,178	41.67%
46	15,247	39.21%	23,639	60.79%
47	16,212	51.34%	15,363	48.66%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Auditor

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
49	33,414	69.81%	14,447	30.19%
50	29,231	58.68%	20,587	41.32%
51	16,327	42.72%	21,892	57.28%
52	18,859	45.04%	23,013	54.96%
53	17,952	38.24%	28,994	61.76%
54	28,174	55.32%	22,751	44.68%
55	16,676	41.88%	23,139	58.12%
56	38,706	86.26%	6,166	13.74%
57	30,431	59.29%	20,891	40.71%
58	30,860	73.44%	11,161	26.56%
59	25,636	52.33%	23,357	47.67%
60	25,795	63.56%	14,789	36.44%
61	32,777	81.16%	7,609	18.84%
62	27,816	52.29%	25,378	47.71%
63	20,977	53.47%	18,253	46.53%
64	18,819	41.73%	26,281	58.27%
65	16,900	36.32%	29,631	63.68%
66	29,594	72.18%	11,408	27.82%
67	13,384	29.49%	32,001	70.51%
68	19,549	39.58%	29,837	60.42%
69	17,408	36.08%	30,837	63.92%
70	10,872	25.31%	32,075	74.69%
71	27,608	71.97%	10,754	28.03%
72	29,537	76.13%	9,261	23.87%
73	22,887	53.02%	20,279	46.98%
74	25,733	49.36%	26,397	50.64%
75	20,251	45.86%	23,905	54.14%
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	20,816	41.48%	29,368	58.52%
80	11,752	26.72%	32,226	73.28%
81	13,129	30.30%	30,202	69.70%
82	21,778	48.34%	23,278	51.66%
83	13,324	27.69%	34,787	72.31%
84	15,211	35.29%	27,887	64.71%
85	13,685	28.59%	34,176	71.41%
86	14,098	32.33%	29,506	67.67%
87	12,479	28.05%	32,013	71.95%
88	28,744	68.92%	12,961	31.08%
89	12,461	26.71%	34,191	73.29%
90	10,135	26.71%	27,815	73.29%
91	15,133	32.12%	31,977	67.88%
92	29,064	69.78%	12,589	30.22%
93	21,640	44.20%	27,324	55.80%
94	11,764	24.75%	35,765	75.25%
95	17,079	36.03%	30,322	63.97%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Auditor

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
97	13,988	28.70%	34,749	71.30%
98	23,809	49.43%	24,362	50.57%
99	25,857	84.52%	4,734	15.48%
100	24,372	75.67%	7,838	24.33%
101	29,427	76.76%	8,907	23.24%
102	34,198	77.99%	9,651	22.01%
103	26,927	52.32%	24,539	47.68%
104	27,453	55.03%	22,435	44.97%
105	26,260	57.29%	19,579	42.71%
106	31,309	70.18%	13,305	29.82%
107	34,011	82.86%	7,035	17.14%
108	14,151	34.54%	26,823	65.46%
109	19,032	41.98%	26,301	58.02%
110	14,328	33.72%	28,162	66.28%
111	14,254	31.77%	30,606	68.23%
112	25,802	62.17%	15,702	37.83%
113	17,164	34.71%	32,287	65.29%
114	36,025	66.44%	18,195	33.56%
115	27,948	56.54%	21,483	43.46%
116	32,121	60.59%	20,895	39.41%
117	22,096	41.38%	31,308	58.62%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Commissioner of Agriculture

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
1	33,073	67.87%	15,657	32.13%
2	24,230	48.67%	25,552	51.33%
3	27,533	61.40%	17,307	38.60%
4	26,563	65.75%	13,839	34.25%
5	17,862	43.44%	23,258	56.56%
6	18,967	59.48%	12,921	40.52%
7	28,060	61.65%	17,457	38.35%
8	18,019	44.31%	22,647	55.69%
9	22,755	51.31%	21,597	48.69%
10	26,569	66.61%	13,316	33.39%
11	16,775	40.77%	24,375	59.23%
12	15,410	40.34%	22,788	59.66%
13	34,678	71.82%	13,608	28.18%
14	14,626	63.37%	8,455	36.63%
15	22,463	64.62%	12,297	35.38%
16	30,319	68.51%	13,936	31.49%
17	34,376	63.01%	20,183	36.99%
18	23,507	46.85%	26,665	53.15%
19	36,410	63.18%	21,220	36.82%
20	26,750	52.69%	24,018	47.31%
21	14,677	37.31%	24,656	62.69%
22	27,427	61.22%	17,377	38.78%
23	19,910	44.12%	25,212	55.88%
24	18,887	41.19%	26,971	58.81%
25	28,670	62.28%	17,363	37.72%
26	29,448	61.77%	18,222	38.23%
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	20,406	47.60%	22,467	52.40%
33	19,943	42.74%	26,723	57.26%
34	25,439	48.12%	27,422	51.88%
35	26,828	53.59%	23,237	46.41%
36	24,711	49.57%	25,137	50.43%
37	29,433	58.33%	21,029	41.67%
38	8,675	20.06%	34,579	79.94%
39	19,867	43.73%	25,565	56.27%
40	30,582	52.49%	27,682	47.51%
41	21,815	43.73%	28,065	56.27%
42	8,440	30.32%	19,399	69.68%
43	22,170	52.94%	19,708	47.06%
44	15,038	39.81%	22,734	60.19%
45	16,078	44.00%	20,467	56.00%
46	24,976	63.96%	14,074	36.04%
47	16,905	53.61%	14,631	46.39%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Commissioner of Agriculture

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
49	19,472	40.48%	28,630	59.52%
50	23,983	47.87%	26,119	52.13%
51	24,815	64.41%	13,711	35.59%
52	25,163	59.88%	16,857	40.12%
53	32,704	69.14%	14,596	30.86%
54	26,368	51.45%	24,878	48.55%
55	24,182	60.60%	15,725	39.40%
56	8,097	18.09%	36,655	81.91%
57	25,224	48.67%	26,604	51.33%
58	12,888	30.53%	29,328	69.47%
59	26,967	54.34%	22,661	45.66%
60	16,695	40.94%	24,085	59.06%
61	9,802	24.16%	30,771	75.84%
62	29,231	54.46%	24,442	45.54%
63	20,185	51.12%	19,303	48.88%
64	29,025	63.84%	16,440	36.16%
65	32,616	69.49%	14,323	30.51%
66	14,320	34.79%	26,847	65.21%
67	34,043	74.51%	11,647	25.49%
68	30,801	62.30%	18,641	37.70%
69	31,946	66.15%	16,346	33.85%
70	33,966	78.53%	9,288	21.47%
71	12,287	31.96%	26,162	68.04%
72	10,946	28.21%	27,857	71.79%
73	21,663	50.09%	21,589	49.91%
74	29,448	56.23%	22,920	43.77%
75	25,946	58.46%	18,437	41.54%
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	32,034	63.70%	18,258	36.30%
80	34,335	77.70%	9,857	22.30%
81	32,710	75.18%	10,797	24.82%
82	24,973	55.28%	20,200	44.72%
83	36,780	76.21%	11,480	23.79%
84	29,614	68.39%	13,690	31.61%
85	36,185	74.82%	12,180	25.18%
86	30,950	70.83%	12,744	29.17%
87	33,620	75.46%	10,933	24.54%
88	14,333	34.27%	27,494	65.73%
89	35,615	76.12%	11,175	23.88%
90	29,920	78.21%	8,336	21.79%
91	34,297	72.41%	13,066	27.59%
92	13,132	31.50%	28,558	68.50%
93	29,898	60.50%	19,521	39.50%
94	37,981	79.30%	9,912	20.70%
95	31,479	66.37%	15,950	33.63%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Commissioner of Agriculture

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
97	36,248	74.16%	12,633	25.84%
98	25,646	53.11%	22,640	46.89%
99	5,004	16.34%	25,623	83.66%
100	8,528	26.44%	23,726	73.56%
101	9,288	24.18%	29,117	75.82%
102	10,559	24.01%	33,418	75.99%
103	26,453	51.33%	25,084	48.67%
104	25,217	50.41%	24,806	49.59%
105	21,014	45.81%	24,855	54.19%
106	14,205	31.82%	30,441	68.18%
107	7,393	17.98%	33,732	82.02%
108	27,748	67.11%	13,598	32.89%
109	27,597	60.42%	18,076	39.58%
110	29,459	68.63%	13,466	31.37%
111	31,829	70.72%	13,178	29.28%
112	16,515	39.71%	25,069	60.29%
113	33,584	67.71%	16,013	32.29%
114	19,889	36.52%	34,574	63.48%
115	23,277	46.89%	26,370	53.11%
116	22,613	42.48%	30,621	57.52%
117	33,301	62.11%	20,317	37.89%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Commissioner of Insurance

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
1	31,882	65.63%	16,697	34.37%
2	22,106	44.77%	27,276	55.23%
3	26,892	60.31%	17,701	39.69%
4	25,814	64.32%	14,318	35.68%
5	16,984	41.41%	24,026	58.59%
6	18,133	57.25%	13,542	42.75%
7	26,046	57.39%	19,336	42.61%
8	17,346	42.77%	23,211	57.23%
9	21,794	49.15%	22,548	50.85%
10	25,287	63.73%	14,390	36.27%
11	14,504	35.56%	26,279	64.44%
12	14,724	38.72%	23,305	61.28%
13	33,502	69.90%	14,424	30.10%
14	14,628	63.48%	8,417	36.52%
15	22,345	64.37%	12,367	35.63%
16	30,219	68.38%	13,974	31.62%
17	34,349	63.04%	20,138	36.96%
18	23,370	46.81%	26,554	53.19%
19	36,222	63.11%	21,176	36.89%
20	26,457	52.44%	23,994	47.56%
21	13,623	34.87%	25,441	65.13%
22	26,245	58.77%	18,412	41.23%
23	18,533	41.12%	26,542	58.88%
24	17,751	38.93%	27,852	61.07%
25	27,166	59.40%	18,571	40.60%
26	27,416	58.14%	19,738	41.86%
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	18,823	44.04%	23,918	55.96%
33	17,687	38.13%	28,697	61.87%
34	21,432	40.94%	30,916	59.06%
35	24,799	49.92%	24,875	50.08%
36	22,723	45.96%	26,723	54.04%
37	26,991	53.96%	23,027	46.04%
38	7,102	16.50%	35,934	83.50%
39	17,737	39.34%	27,354	60.66%
40	27,569	47.76%	30,153	52.24%
41	19,075	38.61%	30,329	61.39%
42	8,165	29.43%	19,576	70.57%
43	21,272	51.07%	20,379	48.93%
44	14,281	38.03%	23,269	61.97%
45	15,544	42.73%	20,835	57.27%
46	24,371	62.58%	14,573	37.42%
47	16,095	50.84%	15,564	49.16%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Commissioner of Insurance

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
49	16,537	34.67%	31,160	65.33%
50	21,868	43.88%	27,965	56.12%
51	23,065	60.49%	15,068	39.51%
52	22,281	52.91%	19,829	47.09%
53	30,644	65.32%	16,271	34.68%
54	24,428	48.10%	26,355	51.90%
55	23,499	59.01%	16,325	40.99%
56	7,154	15.99%	37,600	84.01%
57	22,844	44.44%	28,561	55.56%
58	11,827	28.12%	30,229	71.88%
59	24,749	50.33%	24,426	49.67%
60	15,793	38.92%	24,783	61.08%
61	8,542	21.16%	31,835	78.84%
62	27,320	51.26%	25,977	48.74%
63	19,015	48.42%	20,258	51.58%
64	27,373	60.63%	17,774	39.37%
65	30,495	65.38%	16,149	34.62%
66	12,494	30.51%	28,460	69.49%
67	32,446	71.44%	12,972	28.56%
68	31,068	63.03%	18,219	36.97%
69	31,652	65.67%	16,548	34.33%
70	33,184	77.15%	9,828	22.85%
71	11,354	29.62%	26,973	70.38%
72	10,110	26.14%	28,571	73.86%
73	21,145	49.14%	21,886	50.86%
74	27,995	53.73%	24,111	46.27%
75	24,876	56.28%	19,324	43.72%
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	30,880	61.67%	19,194	38.33%
80	33,320	75.81%	10,631	24.19%
81	31,408	72.55%	11,884	27.45%
82	24,238	53.89%	20,735	46.11%
83	35,843	74.48%	12,284	25.52%
84	28,712	66.68%	14,347	33.32%
85	35,019	72.96%	12,976	27.04%
86	30,299	69.71%	13,166	30.29%
87	32,866	73.88%	11,617	26.12%
88	14,629	35.14%	26,998	64.86%
89	35,010	75.17%	11,564	24.83%
90	28,705	75.63%	9,252	24.37%
91	33,007	69.97%	14,164	30.03%
92	13,185	31.71%	28,393	68.29%
93	28,429	58.06%	20,532	41.94%
94	36,690	77.10%	10,897	22.90%
95	31,338	66.49%	15,791	33.51%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Commissioner of Insurance

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
97	35,833	73.72%	12,772	26.28%
98	25,748	53.60%	22,286	46.40%
99	4,958	16.23%	25,589	83.77%
100	8,455	26.29%	23,711	73.71%
101	9,311	24.29%	29,027	75.71%
102	10,757	24.59%	32,992	75.41%
103	26,527	51.62%	24,863	48.38%
104	25,348	50.95%	24,401	49.05%
105	21,029	46.00%	24,687	54.00%
106	14,155	31.80%	30,363	68.20%
107	7,381	17.99%	33,656	82.01%
108	27,665	67.20%	13,501	32.80%
109	27,295	60.01%	18,192	39.99%
110	28,885	67.66%	13,805	32.34%
111	31,189	69.58%	13,634	30.42%
112	16,395	39.54%	25,070	60.46%
113	32,908	66.68%	16,444	33.32%
114	18,954	35.00%	35,193	65.00%
115	22,427	45.48%	26,889	54.52%
116	21,661	40.94%	31,246	59.06%
117	32,290	60.64%	20,962	39.36%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Commissioner of Labor

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
1	32,118	66.17%	16,424	33.83%
2	21,744	44.04%	27,634	55.96%
3	26,292	58.83%	18,402	41.17%
4	25,384	63.09%	14,850	36.91%
5	16,903	41.20%	24,119	58.80%
6	17,932	56.44%	13,841	43.56%
7	25,882	57.09%	19,454	42.91%
8	16,873	41.53%	23,755	58.47%
9	21,216	47.77%	23,194	52.23%
10	25,178	63.45%	14,504	36.55%
11	13,980	34.26%	26,824	65.74%
12	14,477	37.93%	23,695	62.07%
13	32,940	68.84%	14,907	31.16%
14	14,089	61.27%	8,905	38.73%
15	21,576	62.33%	13,038	37.67%
16	29,164	66.09%	14,964	33.91%
17	33,266	60.83%	21,422	39.17%
18	22,420	44.72%	27,718	55.28%
19	35,189	61.12%	22,389	38.88%
20	25,341	50.05%	25,293	49.95%
21	12,933	33.12%	26,112	66.88%
22	26,008	58.29%	18,610	41.71%
23	18,594	41.29%	26,437	58.71%
24	17,529	38.35%	28,177	61.65%
25	27,141	59.31%	18,624	40.69%
26	27,008	57.21%	20,203	42.79%
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	18,739	43.90%	23,951	56.10%
33	17,196	37.14%	29,109	62.86%
34	20,640	39.56%	31,529	60.44%
35	24,309	48.93%	25,373	51.07%
36	21,804	44.10%	27,640	55.90%
37	26,523	53.06%	23,465	46.94%
38	6,634	15.40%	36,449	84.60%
39	17,299	38.40%	27,751	61.60%
40	26,698	46.27%	30,999	53.73%
41	18,258	36.98%	31,109	63.02%
42	7,988	28.68%	19,863	71.32%
43	21,103	50.51%	20,675	49.49%
44	14,165	37.53%	23,582	62.47%
45	15,403	42.15%	21,139	57.85%
46	23,988	61.68%	14,905	38.32%
47	15,851	50.23%	15,705	49.77%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Commissioner of Labor

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
49	15,682	32.93%	31,942	67.07%
50	21,537	43.21%	28,310	56.79%
51	22,894	60.07%	15,221	39.93%
52	23,813	56.95%	18,002	43.05%
53	30,437	64.80%	16,535	35.20%
54	24,003	47.05%	27,009	52.95%
55	23,566	59.14%	16,280	40.86%
56	6,590	14.71%	38,218	85.29%
57	22,070	43.03%	29,214	56.97%
58	11,394	27.10%	30,646	72.90%
59	24,085	49.10%	24,964	50.90%
60	15,290	37.69%	25,279	62.31%
61	8,051	19.96%	32,279	80.04%
62	26,569	50.00%	26,565	50.00%
63	18,718	47.65%	20,561	52.35%
64	26,981	59.75%	18,177	40.25%
65	30,328	65.17%	16,206	34.83%
66	12,115	29.64%	28,759	70.36%
67	32,803	72.24%	12,606	27.76%
68	30,359	61.51%	18,995	38.49%
69	31,164	64.64%	17,044	35.36%
70	32,525	75.87%	10,343	24.13%
71	11,069	28.91%	27,223	71.09%
72	9,822	25.40%	28,843	74.60%
73	20,683	48.07%	22,348	51.93%
74	27,293	52.47%	24,719	47.53%
75	24,498	55.50%	19,645	44.50%
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	30,376	60.55%	19,787	39.45%
80	32,969	74.92%	11,035	25.08%
81	31,147	71.93%	12,156	28.07%
82	23,860	53.08%	21,088	46.92%
83	35,517	73.89%	12,553	26.11%
84	28,564	66.16%	14,610	33.84%
85	35,844	73.95%	12,628	26.05%
86	30,191	69.09%	13,504	30.91%
87	32,625	73.27%	11,900	26.73%
88	13,574	32.55%	28,127	67.45%
89	34,796	74.56%	11,873	25.44%
90	28,543	75.11%	9,461	24.89%
91	32,649	69.30%	14,465	30.70%
92	12,697	30.46%	28,989	69.54%
93	28,279	57.62%	20,798	42.38%
94	36,567	76.80%	11,047	23.20%
95	30,835	65.17%	16,482	34.83%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Commissioner of Labor

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
97	35,586	73.04%	13,133	26.96%
98	24,871	51.69%	23,241	48.31%
99	4,731	15.45%	25,884	84.55%
100	7,970	24.72%	24,269	75.28%
101	8,904	23.21%	29,467	76.79%
102	9,870	22.51%	33,986	77.49%
103	25,307	49.25%	26,075	50.75%
104	23,692	47.61%	26,073	52.39%
105	20,041	43.81%	25,706	56.19%
106	13,510	30.30%	31,077	69.70%
107	6,973	16.97%	34,108	83.03%
108	27,205	66.08%	13,965	33.92%
109	26,850	59.03%	18,635	40.97%
110	28,722	67.26%	13,978	32.74%
111	31,061	69.20%	13,827	30.80%
112	15,896	38.29%	25,614	61.71%
113	32,856	66.36%	16,659	33.64%
114	18,650	34.40%	35,570	65.60%
115	22,020	44.58%	27,375	55.42%
116	21,420	40.43%	31,567	59.57%
117	31,864	59.66%	21,546	40.34%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Secretary of State

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
1	17,208	35.30%	31,541	64.70%
2	29,010	58.48%	20,595	41.52%
3	19,168	42.82%	25,598	57.18%
4	15,851	39.37%	24,410	60.63%
5	24,663	59.97%	16,461	40.03%
6	14,840	46.54%	17,045	53.46%
7	20,964	46.02%	24,587	53.98%
8	24,457	60.09%	16,245	39.91%
9	24,189	54.38%	20,293	45.62%
10	15,811	39.73%	23,985	60.27%
11	27,967	68.02%	13,148	31.98%
12	24,563	64.22%	13,686	35.78%
13	15,934	33.20%	32,063	66.80%
14	9,004	38.90%	14,144	61.10%
15	13,452	38.57%	21,426	61.43%
16	15,338	34.57%	29,028	65.43%
17	22,005	40.03%	32,972	59.97%
18	28,496	56.57%	21,877	43.43%
19	23,487	40.50%	34,506	59.50%
20	26,593	52.19%	24,363	47.81%
21	26,948	68.43%	12,432	31.57%
22	20,046	44.77%	24,733	55.23%
23	27,730	61.44%	17,402	38.56%
24	29,525	64.39%	16,329	35.61%
25	20,446	44.54%	25,460	55.46%
26	21,647	45.70%	25,722	54.30%
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	25,555	59.62%	17,307	40.38%
33	30,348	65.12%	16,254	34.88%
34	34,375	64.99%	18,518	35.01%
35	26,782	53.47%	23,310	46.53%
36	28,840	57.91%	20,964	42.09%
37	25,067	49.82%	25,250	50.18%
38	37,182	85.87%	6,120	14.13%
39	29,042	64.05%	16,303	35.95%
40	33,046	56.77%	25,160	43.23%
41	32,619	65.44%	17,224	34.56%
42	20,107	72.10%	7,779	27.90%
43	21,477	51.29%	20,394	48.71%
44	24,431	64.48%	13,456	35.52%
45	21,584	58.95%	15,027	41.05%
46	15,819	40.56%	23,183	59.44%
47	16,691	52.80%	14,919	47.20%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Secretary of State

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
49	33,603	69.88%	14,487	30.12%
50	29,478	58.88%	20,583	41.12%
51	16,904	44.02%	21,495	55.98%
52	19,192	45.66%	22,840	54.34%
53	18,739	39.76%	28,388	60.24%
54	28,237	55.20%	22,914	44.80%
55	16,938	42.35%	23,056	57.65%
56	38,882	86.40%	6,121	13.60%
57	30,567	59.28%	20,999	40.72%
58	31,136	73.89%	11,003	26.11%
59	26,011	52.89%	23,172	47.11%
60	26,028	64.00%	14,640	36.00%
61	32,994	81.44%	7,519	18.56%
62	27,983	52.38%	25,438	47.62%
63	21,347	54.16%	18,065	45.84%
64	19,393	42.78%	25,935	57.22%
65	17,342	37.14%	29,355	62.86%
66	29,731	72.22%	11,438	27.78%
67	13,906	30.59%	31,546	69.41%
68	19,792	39.76%	29,991	60.24%
69	17,689	36.41%	30,892	63.59%
70	11,133	25.85%	31,936	74.15%
71	27,723	72.24%	10,655	27.76%
72	29,636	76.43%	9,137	23.57%
73	23,069	53.32%	20,200	46.68%
74	25,943	49.66%	26,296	50.34%
75	20,434	46.15%	23,840	53.85%
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	20,901	41.47%	29,495	58.53%
80	11,891	26.97%	32,191	73.03%
81	13,161	30.30%	30,277	69.70%
82	21,946	48.58%	23,231	51.42%
83	13,583	28.14%	34,685	71.86%
84	15,380	35.61%	27,812	64.39%
85	14,056	29.14%	34,174	70.86%
86	14,649	33.49%	29,090	66.51%
87	12,889	28.89%	31,732	71.11%
88	28,916	68.97%	13,011	31.03%
89	12,708	27.19%	34,038	72.81%
90	10,419	27.32%	27,714	72.68%
91	15,439	32.66%	31,829	67.34%
92	29,398	70.30%	12,419	29.70%
93	22,259	45.16%	27,025	54.84%
94	12,233	25.64%	35,482	74.36%
95	17,155	36.15%	30,297	63.85%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Secretary of State

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
97	14,388	29.45%	34,460	70.55%
98	24,133	49.77%	24,356	50.23%
99	26,041	84.95%	4,615	15.05%
100	24,620	76.11%	7,728	23.89%
101	29,757	77.34%	8,718	22.66%
102	34,568	78.49%	9,474	21.51%
103	27,144	52.49%	24,567	47.51%
104	27,892	55.48%	22,379	44.52%
105	26,434	57.43%	19,592	42.57%
106	31,541	70.48%	13,212	29.52%
107	34,318	83.36%	6,849	16.64%
108	14,446	35.08%	26,740	64.92%
109	19,543	42.87%	26,047	57.13%
110	14,726	34.48%	27,977	65.52%
111	14,640	32.56%	30,319	67.44%
112	26,102	62.71%	15,524	37.29%
113	17,556	35.39%	32,058	64.61%
114	36,205	66.56%	18,192	33.44%
115	28,066	56.64%	21,484	43.36%
116	32,289	60.80%	20,820	39.20%
117	22,382	41.76%	31,220	58.24%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Superintendent of Public Instruction

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
1	32,273	66.54%	16,229	33.46%
2	22,031	44.71%	27,241	55.29%
3	26,549	59.53%	18,050	40.47%
4	25,652	64.00%	14,432	36.00%
5	17,215	42.08%	23,697	57.92%
6	18,165	57.28%	13,547	42.72%
7	26,166	57.76%	19,136	42.24%
8	17,196	42.36%	23,402	57.64%
9	21,459	48.36%	22,913	51.64%
10	25,444	64.21%	14,181	35.79%
11	14,095	34.59%	26,652	65.41%
12	14,801	38.87%	23,275	61.13%
13	33,246	69.60%	14,523	30.40%
14	14,524	63.10%	8,492	36.90%
15	22,227	64.10%	12,449	35.90%
16	29,789	67.44%	14,384	32.56%
17	33,945	62.43%	20,424	37.57%
18	22,891	45.77%	27,121	54.23%
19	35,747	62.28%	21,652	37.72%
20	25,650	50.82%	24,820	49.18%
21	13,277	34.03%	25,736	65.97%
22	26,216	58.94%	18,260	41.06%
23	18,753	41.74%	26,177	58.26%
24	17,580	38.50%	28,081	61.50%
25	26,895	58.85%	18,806	41.15%
26	27,424	58.19%	19,702	41.81%
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	19,034	44.64%	23,601	55.36%
33	17,543	38.02%	28,604	61.98%
34	20,463	39.26%	31,660	60.74%
35	24,404	49.23%	25,169	50.77%
36	22,006	44.57%	27,369	55.43%
37	26,509	53.11%	23,405	46.89%
38	6,866	16.03%	35,967	83.97%
39	17,603	39.26%	27,235	60.74%
40	26,809	46.49%	30,857	53.51%
41	18,584	37.70%	30,709	62.30%
42	8,341	30.02%	19,447	69.98%
43	21,558	51.74%	20,108	48.26%
44	14,582	38.72%	23,077	61.28%
45	15,833	43.44%	20,613	56.56%
46	24,381	62.75%	14,471	37.25%
47	16,253	51.59%	15,253	48.41%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Superintendent of Public Instruction

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
49	15,782	33.20%	31,751	66.80%
50	21,640	43.43%	28,189	56.57%
51	22,934	60.15%	15,196	39.85%
52	24,048	57.62%	17,686	42.38%
53	30,655	65.39%	16,225	34.61%
54	24,113	47.39%	26,767	52.61%
55	23,689	59.57%	16,077	40.43%
56	6,729	15.00%	38,138	85.00%
57	22,041	42.89%	29,344	57.11%
58	11,675	27.78%	30,345	72.22%
59	24,210	49.38%	24,814	50.62%
60	15,517	38.25%	25,048	61.75%
61	8,073	20.00%	32,283	80.00%
62	26,588	49.90%	26,691	50.10%
63	18,904	48.13%	20,371	51.87%
64	27,055	59.92%	18,094	40.08%
65	30,022	64.36%	16,623	35.64%
66	12,355	30.35%	28,355	69.65%
67	32,647	72.14%	12,605	27.86%
68	30,580	61.75%	18,943	38.25%
69	31,453	65.14%	16,829	34.86%
70	32,668	76.19%	10,210	23.81%
71	11,328	29.60%	26,948	70.40%
72	9,909	25.63%	28,760	74.37%
73	20,993	48.64%	22,166	51.36%
74	27,403	52.53%	24,766	47.47%
75	24,665	55.81%	19,533	44.19%
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	30,835	61.58%	19,239	38.42%
80	33,247	75.56%	10,751	24.44%
81	31,359	72.34%	11,989	27.66%
82	24,170	53.67%	20,865	46.33%
83	35,684	74.21%	12,404	25.79%
84	28,730	66.76%	14,303	33.24%
85	34,976	72.92%	12,990	27.08%
86	30,350	69.56%	13,279	30.44%
87	32,770	73.72%	11,684	26.28%
88	13,840	33.23%	27,814	66.77%
89	34,992	75.05%	11,632	24.95%
90	28,602	75.38%	9,342	24.62%
91	32,790	69.62%	14,311	30.38%
92	13,099	31.47%	28,527	68.53%
93	28,128	57.43%	20,853	42.57%
94	36,646	77.14%	10,862	22.86%
95	31,081	65.72%	16,213	34.28%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Superintendent of Public Instruction

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
97	35,743	73.58%	12,834	26.42%
98	25,202	52.29%	22,998	47.71%
99	5,007	16.39%	25,547	83.61%
100	8,215	25.54%	23,951	74.46%
101	9,279	24.22%	29,040	75.78%
102	10,103	23.05%	33,719	76.95%
103	25,727	49.97%	25,762	50.03%
104	24,136	48.35%	25,787	51.65%
105	20,611	44.98%	25,214	55.02%
106	13,928	31.24%	30,657	68.76%
107	7,369	17.96%	33,671	82.04%
108	27,482	67.00%	13,536	33.00%
109	27,031	59.52%	18,383	40.48%
110	28,821	67.73%	13,733	32.27%
111	31,148	69.43%	13,716	30.57%
112	16,299	39.26%	25,219	60.74%
113	32,911	66.61%	16,501	33.39%
114	18,845	34.80%	35,305	65.20%
115	22,264	45.10%	27,104	54.90%
116	21,620	40.88%	31,262	59.12%
117	32,140	60.17%	21,271	39.83%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Treasurer

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
1	32,629	67.45%	15,745	32.55%
2	22,491	45.79%	26,630	54.21%
3	26,733	60.23%	17,652	39.77%
4	25,678	64.16%	14,346	35.84%
5	17,707	43.44%	23,059	56.56%
6	18,451	58.32%	13,187	41.68%
7	26,495	58.61%	18,708	41.39%
8	17,641	43.61%	22,808	56.39%
9	21,930	49.60%	22,284	50.40%
10	25,336	64.19%	14,133	35.81%
11	15,181	37.18%	25,655	62.82%
12	15,340	40.44%	22,595	59.56%
13	33,223	69.71%	14,434	30.29%
14	14,480	63.04%	8,490	36.96%
15	22,150	64.16%	12,375	35.84%
16	29,792	67.67%	14,235	32.33%
17	33,795	62.30%	20,453	37.70%
18	23,774	47.72%	26,043	52.28%
19	35,921	62.78%	21,296	37.22%
20	26,462	52.64%	23,805	47.36%
21	13,821	35.30%	25,336	64.70%
22	26,117	58.88%	18,241	41.12%
23	19,236	42.86%	25,641	57.14%
24	18,583	40.81%	26,950	59.19%
25	27,342	59.98%	18,246	40.02%
26	27,536	58.77%	19,316	41.23%
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	19,572	46.00%	22,980	54.00%
33	18,557	40.03%	27,799	59.97%
34	22,170	42.28%	30,267	57.72%
35	25,466	51.21%	24,258	48.79%
36	23,169	46.81%	26,325	53.19%
37	27,595	55.17%	22,423	44.83%
38	7,953	18.46%	35,124	81.54%
39	18,561	41.18%	26,512	58.82%
40	28,171	48.73%	29,636	51.27%
41	19,694	39.79%	29,797	60.21%
42	8,966	32.34%	18,757	67.66%
43	21,699	52.17%	19,895	47.83%
44	15,148	40.34%	22,404	59.66%
45	16,350	44.96%	20,015	55.04%
46	24,168	62.42%	14,553	37.58%
47	16,341	52.19%	14,968	47.81%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Treasurer

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
49	17,392	36.40%	30,392	63.60%
50	22,180	44.64%	27,505	55.36%
51	23,415	61.62%	14,586	38.38%
52	24,572	59.03%	17,051	40.97%
53	30,726	65.76%	15,999	34.24%
54	24,624	48.51%	26,138	51.49%
55	23,959	60.39%	15,713	39.61%
56	7,815	17.47%	36,917	82.53%
57	22,630	44.09%	28,701	55.91%
58	12,247	29.15%	29,773	70.85%
59	24,350	49.67%	24,670	50.33%
60	15,870	39.12%	24,701	60.88%
61	9,067	22.47%	31,277	77.53%
62	27,032	50.74%	26,239	49.26%
63	19,029	48.45%	20,245	51.55%
64	27,133	60.06%	18,041	39.94%
65	30,302	65.18%	16,191	34.82%
66	13,255	32.42%	27,634	67.58%
67	32,736	72.48%	12,427	27.52%
68	31,004	62.98%	18,222	37.02%
69	31,782	66.10%	16,301	33.90%
70	32,229	75.08%	10,699	24.92%
71	12,480	32.55%	25,859	67.45%
72	11,401	29.38%	27,409	70.62%
73	21,808	50.74%	21,173	49.26%
74	28,498	54.53%	23,762	45.47%
75	25,016	56.58%	19,194	43.42%
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	31,169	62.37%	18,802	37.63%
80	32,546	73.95%	11,465	26.05%
81	30,913	71.27%	12,463	28.73%
82	24,945	55.69%	19,847	44.31%
83	35,636	74.43%	12,245	25.57%
84	28,940	67.40%	13,998	32.60%
85	34,778	72.78%	13,005	27.22%
86	30,299	69.77%	13,127	30.23%
87	32,945	74.33%	11,376	25.67%
88	15,195	36.48%	26,453	63.52%
89	35,124	75.44%	11,432	24.56%
90	28,491	74.99%	9,501	25.01%
91	32,877	69.65%	14,323	30.35%
92	14,017	33.74%	27,530	66.26%
93	28,743	58.89%	20,066	41.11%
94	36,191	76.23%	11,288	23.77%
95	31,506	66.97%	15,536	33.03%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Treasurer

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
97	35,799	73.96%	12,602	26.04%
98	26,182	54.56%	21,805	45.44%
99	5,874	19.25%	24,633	80.75%
100	9,198	28.61%	22,949	71.39%
101	10,167	26.56%	28,119	73.44%
102	11,552	26.40%	32,209	73.60%
103	26,978	52.58%	24,331	47.42%
104	25,373	51.02%	24,356	48.98%
105	21,467	47.01%	24,201	52.99%
106	14,912	33.53%	29,557	66.47%
107	8,429	20.57%	32,539	79.43%
108	27,528	67.21%	13,429	32.79%
109	27,442	60.58%	17,854	39.42%
110	28,763	67.73%	13,705	32.27%
111	31,181	69.72%	13,545	30.28%
112	17,107	41.34%	24,276	58.66%
113	32,990	66.97%	16,271	33.03%
114	19,860	36.78%	34,139	63.22%
115	23,093	46.92%	26,127	53.08%
116	22,471	42.60%	30,278	57.40%
117	32,774	61.49%	20,530	38.51%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Supreme Court Chief Justice

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
1	32,010	65.66%	16,740	34.34%
2	21,563	43.50%	28,004	56.50%
3	26,188	58.44%	18,623	41.56%
4	25,332	62.92%	14,926	37.08%
5	17,118	41.69%	23,941	58.31%
6	17,739	55.74%	14,085	44.26%
7	25,562	56.17%	19,943	43.83%
8	16,909	41.50%	23,838	58.50%
9	21,156	47.55%	23,339	52.45%
10	24,867	62.53%	14,901	37.47%
11	13,992	33.98%	27,187	66.02%
12	14,509	37.96%	23,708	62.04%
13	32,977	68.46%	15,191	31.54%
14	14,197	61.27%	8,973	38.73%
15	21,668	62.17%	13,187	37.83%
16	29,080	65.37%	15,408	34.63%
17	32,827	59.65%	22,206	40.35%
18	22,145	43.90%	28,303	56.10%
19	34,561	59.58%	23,451	40.42%
20	24,853	48.65%	26,233	51.35%
21	13,125	33.33%	26,258	66.67%
22	25,380	56.78%	19,319	43.22%
23	18,471	40.93%	26,657	59.07%
24	17,521	38.25%	28,282	61.75%
25	26,600	58.00%	19,263	42.00%
26	26,535	56.13%	20,740	43.87%
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	18,508	43.21%	24,328	56.79%
33	17,227	36.93%	29,418	63.07%
34	20,556	38.90%	32,287	61.10%
35	24,257	48.45%	25,814	51.55%
36	21,824	43.82%	27,979	56.18%
37	26,315	52.27%	24,034	47.73%
38	6,600	15.24%	36,715	84.76%
39	17,233	38.05%	28,060	61.95%
40	26,789	45.99%	31,458	54.01%
41	18,452	37.04%	31,365	62.96%
42	7,900	28.27%	20,047	71.73%
43	20,529	48.95%	21,407	51.05%
44	13,690	36.07%	24,260	63.93%
45	15,137	41.34%	21,480	58.66%
46	23,404	60.03%	15,584	39.97%
47	14,907	46.98%	16,824	53.02%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Supreme Court Chief Justice

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
49	15,844	32.94%	32,262	67.06%
50	21,215	42.34%	28,893	57.66%
51	22,532	58.87%	15,742	41.13%
52	23,381	55.64%	18,644	44.36%
53	29,993	63.82%	17,002	36.18%
54	23,704	46.31%	27,486	53.69%
55	23,203	58.14%	16,707	41.86%
56	6,517	14.45%	38,588	85.55%
57	21,725	42.02%	29,981	57.98%
58	11,392	26.97%	30,852	73.03%
59	23,622	47.93%	25,658	52.07%
60	15,207	37.26%	25,602	62.74%
61	8,022	19.74%	32,610	80.26%
62	26,269	48.94%	27,402	51.06%
63	18,490	46.88%	20,953	53.12%
64	26,345	58.09%	19,009	41.91%
65	29,778	63.66%	16,996	36.34%
66	12,178	29.58%	28,986	70.42%
67	32,094	70.57%	13,385	29.43%
68	30,163	60.64%	19,579	39.36%
69	31,040	64.01%	17,456	35.99%
70	32,141	74.36%	11,085	25.64%
71	10,984	28.46%	27,617	71.54%
72	9,715	24.87%	29,341	75.13%
73	20,649	47.61%	22,726	52.39%
74	26,943	51.35%	25,525	48.65%
75	24,101	54.24%	20,337	45.76%
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	30,392	60.27%	20,035	39.73%
80	32,393	73.47%	11,697	26.53%
81	30,477	70.09%	13,004	29.91%
82	23,815	52.61%	21,449	47.39%
83	35,036	72.62%	13,211	27.38%
84	28,158	65.19%	15,038	34.81%
85	34,543	71.61%	13,695	28.39%
86	29,449	67.29%	14,318	32.71%
87	32,015	71.60%	12,700	28.40%
88	13,155	31.30%	28,875	68.70%
89	34,126	72.88%	12,700	27.12%
90	27,998	73.23%	10,233	26.77%
91	32,187	67.94%	15,187	32.06%
92	12,550	29.96%	29,337	70.04%
93	27,615	55.97%	21,722	44.03%
94	35,809	74.87%	12,020	25.13%
95	30,535	64.31%	16,944	35.69%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

2020 Election Contest Report - NC Supreme Court Chief Justice

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
97	34,852	71.42%	13,950	28.58%
98	24,680	50.75%	23,952	49.25%
99	4,778	15.55%	25,949	84.45%
100	7,911	24.40%	24,510	75.60%
101	8,859	23.02%	29,622	76.98%
102	9,529	21.58%	34,620	78.42%
103	25,147	48.55%	26,648	51.45%
104	23,148	45.99%	27,189	54.01%
105	19,954	43.24%	26,193	56.76%
106	13,480	30.07%	31,343	69.93%
107	7,001	16.99%	34,195	83.01%
108	26,959	65.28%	14,340	34.72%
109	26,478	57.90%	19,254	42.10%
110	28,259	66.08%	14,505	33.92%
111	30,694	68.20%	14,313	31.80%
112	15,938	38.20%	25,787	61.80%
113	32,507	65.41%	17,189	34.59%
114	18,791	34.45%	35,748	65.55%
115	22,135	44.52%	27,589	55.48%
116	21,467	40.27%	31,839	59.73%
117	31,724	59.13%	21,923	40.87%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

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

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
1	32,079	66.08%	16,466	33.92%
2	21,901	44.35%	27,483	55.65%
3	26,368	59.07%	18,270	40.93%
4	25,522	63.71%	14,538	36.29%
5	17,099	41.78%	23,826	58.22%
6	17,985	56.59%	13,794	43.41%
7	26,029	57.24%	19,447	42.76%
8	16,967	41.91%	23,515	58.09%
9	21,325	48.16%	22,951	51.84%
10	25,313	63.81%	14,354	36.19%
11	13,774	33.56%	27,266	66.44%
12	14,586	38.32%	23,479	61.68%
13	33,082	68.87%	14,950	31.13%
14	14,388	62.15%	8,763	37.85%
15	21,944	63.09%	12,838	36.91%
16	29,610	66.64%	14,821	33.36%
17	33,578	61.19%	21,295	38.81%
18	22,463	44.70%	27,789	55.30%
19	35,301	61.09%	22,483	38.91%
20	25,338	49.82%	25,520	50.18%
21	12,916	32.89%	26,351	67.11%
22	26,009	58.59%	18,381	41.41%
23	18,711	41.71%	26,153	58.29%
24	17,624	38.57%	28,072	61.43%
25	27,054	59.11%	18,713	40.89%
26	26,957	57.15%	20,209	42.85%
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	18,952	44.39%	23,741	55.61%
33	17,253	37.10%	29,253	62.90%
34	19,924	37.83%	32,748	62.17%
35	24,090	48.30%	25,788	51.70%
36	21,507	43.32%	28,138	56.68%
37	26,161	52.14%	24,011	47.86%
38	6,448	14.93%	36,733	85.07%
39	17,319	38.35%	27,844	61.65%
40	26,211	45.17%	31,813	54.83%
41	18,166	36.57%	31,507	63.43%
42	8,061	28.97%	19,764	71.03%
43	21,220	50.84%	20,515	49.16%
44	14,154	37.52%	23,566	62.48%
45	15,442	42.35%	21,018	57.65%
46	24,115	62.14%	14,692	37.86%
47	16,099	51.45%	15,190	48.55%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

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

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
49	15,380	32.07%	32,578	67.93%
50	21,518	43.03%	28,487	56.97%
51	22,854	59.84%	15,335	40.16%
52	23,778	56.81%	18,075	43.19%
53	30,302	64.55%	16,639	35.45%
54	23,991	46.89%	27,178	53.11%
55	23,515	59.08%	16,284	40.92%
56	6,394	14.22%	38,568	85.78%
57	21,746	42.07%	29,947	57.93%
58	11,472	27.21%	30,686	72.79%
59	24,060	48.89%	25,153	51.11%
60	15,260	37.47%	25,471	62.53%
61	7,962	19.62%	32,628	80.38%
62	26,420	49.28%	27,189	50.72%
63	18,858	47.92%	20,495	52.08%
64	26,889	59.41%	18,372	40.59%
65	30,079	64.11%	16,840	35.89%
66	12,056	29.36%	29,010	70.64%
67	32,663	72.03%	12,681	27.97%
68	30,159	60.78%	19,460	39.22%
69	31,246	64.58%	17,137	35.42%
70	32,582	75.53%	10,556	24.47%
71	11,077	28.77%	27,430	71.23%
72	9,610	24.68%	29,326	75.32%
73	20,710	47.93%	22,496	52.07%
74	27,134	51.80%	25,251	48.20%
75	24,470	55.13%	19,914	44.87%
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	30,605	61.16%	19,432	38.84%
80	32,915	74.67%	11,167	25.33%
81	31,219	71.84%	12,237	28.16%
82	23,881	52.97%	21,200	47.03%
83	35,481	73.80%	12,594	26.20%
84	28,506	66.15%	14,584	33.85%
85	34,903	72.58%	13,183	27.42%
86	30,103	69.00%	13,524	31.00%
87	32,674	73.40%	11,842	26.60%
88	13,098	31.26%	28,807	68.74%
89	34,793	74.45%	11,938	25.55%
90	28,545	74.75%	9,644	25.25%
91	32,746	69.10%	14,645	30.90%
92	12,617	30.22%	29,140	69.78%
93	28,130	57.30%	20,964	42.70%
94	36,455	76.53%	11,178	23.47%
95	30,620	64.62%	16,765	35.38%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

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

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
97	35,380	72.64%	13,324	27.36%
98	24,778	51.13%	23,683	48.87%
99	4,771	15.58%	25,843	84.42%
100	7,989	24.73%	24,318	75.27%
101	9,012	23.48%	29,369	76.52%
102	9,512	21.61%	34,498	78.39%
103	25,216	48.80%	26,461	51.20%
104	23,169	46.17%	27,018	53.83%
105	20,063	43.60%	25,954	56.40%
106	13,573	30.36%	31,127	69.64%
107	7,095	17.25%	34,024	82.75%
108	27,324	66.13%	13,994	33.87%
109	26,937	58.90%	18,798	41.10%
110	28,777	67.30%	13,981	32.70%
111	31,115	69.24%	13,821	30.76%
112	16,037	38.55%	25,568	61.45%
113	32,678	65.93%	16,889	34.07%
114	18,642	34.28%	35,735	65.72%
115	22,027	44.42%	27,558	55.58%
116	21,373	40.23%	31,748	59.77%
117	31,918	59.65%	21,594	40.35%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

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

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
1	32,056	66.20%	16,364	33.80%
2	21,759	44.18%	27,494	55.82%
3	26,431	59.29%	18,147	40.71%
4	24,912	62.27%	15,097	37.73%
5	16,954	41.46%	23,941	58.54%
6	18,224	57.44%	13,505	42.56%
7	25,805	57.04%	19,432	42.96%
8	16,778	41.59%	23,567	58.41%
9	21,026	47.61%	23,140	52.39%
10	24,961	63.13%	14,578	36.87%
11	14,589	35.64%	26,345	64.36%
12	14,485	38.11%	23,522	61.89%
13	33,068	69.26%	14,678	30.74%
14	14,585	63.29%	8,460	36.71%
15	22,080	63.81%	12,524	36.19%
16	29,951	67.61%	14,349	32.39%
17	33,838	61.96%	20,779	38.04%
18	23,021	45.98%	27,045	54.02%
19	35,650	61.93%	21,918	38.07%
20	25,735	50.92%	24,808	49.08%
21	13,703	34.97%	25,485	65.03%
22	25,597	57.79%	18,698	42.21%
23	18,087	40.49%	26,582	59.51%
24	17,292	37.94%	28,285	62.06%
25	26,585	58.27%	19,039	41.73%
26	27,322	58.03%	19,763	41.97%
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	18,416	43.33%	24,081	56.67%
33	17,825	38.39%	28,609	61.61%
34	20,742	39.60%	31,638	60.40%
35	24,771	49.77%	24,996	50.23%
36	22,732	45.82%	26,881	54.18%
37	27,179	54.23%	22,942	45.77%
38	7,204	16.71%	35,901	83.29%
39	17,789	39.48%	27,267	60.52%
40	27,121	46.84%	30,783	53.16%
41	19,103	38.55%	30,455	61.45%
42	8,513	30.61%	19,297	69.39%
43	21,354	51.22%	20,335	48.78%
44	14,480	38.44%	23,187	61.56%
45	15,822	43.38%	20,648	56.62%
46	23,502	60.79%	15,160	39.21%
47	15,241	49.03%	15,843	50.97%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

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

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
49	16,195	33.88%	31,612	66.12%
50	21,520	43.21%	28,285	56.79%
51	22,881	60.06%	15,218	39.94%
52	23,897	57.32%	17,797	42.68%
53	30,541	65.09%	16,381	34.91%
54	24,158	47.38%	26,834	52.62%
55	23,540	59.24%	16,195	40.76%
56	7,045	15.73%	37,754	84.27%
57	21,778	42.35%	29,645	57.65%
58	11,666	27.74%	30,382	72.26%
59	23,886	48.70%	25,166	51.30%
60	15,298	37.65%	25,330	62.35%
61	8,157	20.16%	32,312	79.84%
62	26,304	49.32%	27,027	50.68%
63	18,677	47.54%	20,609	52.46%
64	26,553	58.86%	18,558	41.14%
65	29,590	63.66%	16,892	36.34%
66	12,550	30.62%	28,435	69.38%
67	32,711	72.16%	12,621	27.84%
68	30,912	62.36%	18,659	37.64%
69	31,747	65.63%	16,626	34.37%
70	32,388	75.36%	10,591	24.64%
71	11,287	29.43%	27,071	70.57%
72	9,878	25.44%	28,957	74.56%
73	21,398	49.61%	21,738	50.39%
74	27,331	52.40%	24,831	47.60%
75	24,451	55.30%	19,768	44.70%
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	30,399	60.92%	19,499	39.08%
80	32,681	74.26%	11,329	25.74%
81	30,690	70.75%	12,691	29.25%
82	24,458	54.31%	20,580	45.69%
83	35,566	74.16%	12,395	25.84%
84	28,825	66.87%	14,284	33.13%
85	34,575	72.10%	13,378	27.90%
86	30,094	69.00%	13,522	31.00%
87	32,688	73.67%	11,682	26.33%
88	14,140	33.83%	27,659	66.17%
89	34,937	74.85%	11,739	25.15%
90	28,208	74.12%	9,847	25.88%
91	32,300	68.50%	14,854	31.50%
92	13,469	32.30%	28,232	67.70%
93	28,300	57.86%	20,607	42.14%
94	35,786	75.24%	11,775	24.76%
95	31,588	66.63%	15,821	33.37%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

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

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem
97	35,863	73.61%	12,860	26.39%
98	25,577	52.95%	22,730	47.05%
99	5,255	17.17%	25,353	82.83%
100	8,498	26.33%	23,781	73.67%
101	9,584	24.98%	28,783	75.02%
102	10,399	23.68%	33,514	76.32%
103	25,939	50.31%	25,621	49.69%
104	23,977	47.98%	25,996	52.02%
105	20,842	45.36%	25,109	54.64%
106	14,271	31.97%	30,367	68.03%
107	7,717	18.78%	33,380	81.22%
108	27,654	67.25%	13,467	32.75%
109	27,153	59.69%	18,337	40.31%
110	28,728	67.44%	13,873	32.56%
111	31,291	69.66%	13,628	30.34%
112	16,538	39.81%	25,007	60.19%
113	32,644	65.96%	16,850	34.04%
114	18,971	34.90%	35,393	65.10%
115	22,347	45.10%	27,203	54.90%
116	21,526	40.57%	31,538	59.43%
117	32,001	59.80%	21,509	40.20%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

2016 Election Contest Report - US President

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib	W-I	% W-I
1	27,176	64.65%	13,233	31.48%	1,253	2.98%	375	0.89%
2	19,997	43.67%	24,090	52.61%	1,133	2.47%	572	1.25%
3	24,225	59.12%	15,352	37.46%	1,025	2.50%	375	0.92%
4	23,878	62.63%	13,532	35.49%	511	1.34%	203	0.53%
5	15,262	39.49%	22,481	58.17%	668	1.73%	239	0.62%
6	13,884	55.88%	9,911	39.89%	782	3.15%	267	1.07%
7	20,622	55.28%	15,236	40.84%	992	2.66%	456	1.22%
8	16,023	40.27%	22,265	55.96%	1,102	2.77%	396	1.00%
9	19,624	48.34%	19,463	47.94%	1,058	2.61%	454	1.12%
10	23,201	63.15%	12,599	34.29%	692	1.88%	250	0.68%
11	13,260	33.09%	24,243	60.50%	1,767	4.41%	802	2.00%
12	13,517	37.38%	21,787	60.26%	563	1.56%	290	0.80%
13	30,060	68.66%	12,213	27.90%	1,093	2.50%	414	0.95%
14	12,067	62.30%	6,420	33.15%	664	3.43%	218	1.13%
15	19,092	64.04%	9,469	31.76%	979	3.28%	273	0.92%
16	23,605	65.86%	10,978	30.63%	966	2.70%	290	0.81%
17	26,027	61.35%	14,993	35.34%	1,025	2.42%	376	0.89%
18	19,439	44.28%	22,351	50.92%	1,489	3.39%	618	1.41%
19	28,577	61.31%	16,130	34.61%	1,349	2.89%	553	1.19%
20	24,003	50.76%	20,761	43.91%	1,803	3.81%	718	1.52%
21	10,400	33.42%	19,136	61.49%	1,066	3.43%	518	1.66%
22	23,395	55.93%	17,602	42.08%	605	1.45%	227	0.54%
23	17,679	39.55%	26,268	58.76%	542	1.21%	215	0.48%
24	16,531	37.48%	26,511	60.11%	719	1.63%	345	0.78%
25	24,322	58.33%	16,387	39.30%	698	1.67%	290	0.70%
26	21,236	59.58%	12,885	36.15%	1,118	3.14%	406	1.14%
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	16,669	41.27%	22,776	56.39%	675	1.67%	272	0.67%
33	14,972	37.32%	23,377	58.28%	1,247	3.11%	517	1.29%
34	17,689	36.59%	27,837	57.58%	1,858	3.84%	958	1.98%
35	19,218	49.16%	17,640	45.12%	1,365	3.49%	873	2.23%
36	16,118	43.96%	18,125	49.44%	1,734	4.73%	685	1.87%
37	21,167	52.90%	16,588	41.45%	1,584	3.96%	678	1.69%
38	5,162	13.11%	32,780	83.25%	904	2.30%	530	1.35%
39	14,451	39.44%	20,568	56.14%	1,103	3.01%	514	1.40%
40	23,032	44.41%	25,784	49.71%	2,066	3.98%	986	1.90%
41	16,770	37.01%	25,741	56.81%	1,917	4.23%	881	1.94%
42	6,801	28.06%	16,475	67.97%	688	2.84%	276	1.14%
43	18,144	48.98%	17,677	47.72%	878	2.37%	343	0.93%
44	13,255	37.35%	20,906	58.91%	970	2.73%	357	1.01%
45	13,064	42.51%	16,546	53.84%	837	2.72%	287	0.93%
46	21,277	60.38%	13,305	37.75%	509	1.44%	150	0.43%
47	13,641	47.00%	14,577	50.23%	592	2.04%	211	0.73%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

2016 Election Contest Report - US President

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib	W-I	% W-I
49	13,422	31.48%	26,664	62.53%	1,723	4.04%	830	1.95%
50	18,367	41.44%	24,248	54.71%	1,189	2.68%	519	1.17%
51	19,456	57.96%	12,925	38.51%	904	2.69%	282	0.84%
52	21,073	54.95%	15,958	41.61%	971	2.53%	345	0.90%
53	24,764	65.04%	11,918	31.30%	1,016	2.67%	379	1.00%
54	19,421	45.00%	21,973	50.91%	1,190	2.76%	573	1.33%
55	20,308	55.54%	15,092	41.28%	827	2.26%	335	0.92%
56	6,214	12.66%	40,462	82.44%	1,429	2.91%	975	1.99%
57	19,637	42.04%	24,938	53.38%	1,393	2.98%	747	1.60%
58	10,579	26.46%	28,017	70.07%	899	2.25%	490	1.23%
59	21,469	51.71%	18,704	45.05%	944	2.27%	405	0.98%
60	14,190	37.93%	21,923	58.60%	916	2.45%	381	1.02%
61	7,658	18.02%	33,174	78.06%	1,045	2.46%	623	1.47%
62	24,283	50.07%	22,002	45.36%	1,534	3.16%	681	1.40%
63	15,881	48.28%	15,896	48.33%	814	2.47%	300	0.91%
64	22,923	59.93%	13,933	36.43%	981	2.56%	414	1.08%
65	26,834	63.46%	14,231	33.65%	871	2.06%	349	0.83%
66	10,417	28.64%	24,250	66.68%	1,126	3.10%	574	1.58%
67	29,091	70.18%	11,244	27.12%	867	2.09%	252	0.61%
68	24,117	62.12%	12,779	32.92%	1,366	3.52%	562	1.45%
69	26,755	65.53%	12,320	30.17%	1,263	3.09%	493	1.21%
70	29,047	75.02%	8,443	21.80%	875	2.26%	356	0.92%
71	10,021	27.64%	24,547	67.71%	1,138	3.14%	548	1.51%
72	8,538	22.51%	27,821	73.34%	1,015	2.68%	562	1.48%
73	17,637	50.92%	15,396	44.45%	1,132	3.27%	469	1.35%
74	23,964	52.46%	19,380	42.42%	1,568	3.43%	771	1.69%
75	21,607	55.85%	15,555	40.20%	1,140	2.95%	388	1.00%
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	27,395	60.19%	16,665	36.62%	1,041	2.29%	412	0.91%
80	28,541	74.15%	8,737	22.70%	920	2.39%	291	0.76%
81	25,760	70.85%	9,377	25.79%	939	2.58%	280	0.77%
82	20,907	55.56%	15,123	40.19%	1,120	2.98%	478	1.27%
83	30,569	75.14%	8,701	21.39%	1,015	2.49%	399	0.98%
84	24,634	65.32%	11,930	31.63%	807	2.14%	344	0.91%
85	31,444	72.25%	10,658	24.49%	910	2.09%	510	1.17%
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	9,085	26.51%	23,142	67.52%	1,493	4.36%	556	1.62%
89	29,515	72.81%	9,661	23.83%	988	2.44%	371	0.92%
90	28,262	74.71%	8,363	22.11%	850	2.25%	352	0.93%
91	28,993	68.49%	11,819	27.92%	1,084	2.56%	436	1.03%
92	9,576	30.35%	20,514	65.02%	1,067	3.38%	391	1.24%
93	25,529	55.38%	17,851	38.73%	1,713	3.72%	1,001	2.17%
94	32,921	75.21%	9,508	21.72%	967	2.21%	379	0.87%
95	24,610	65.95%	11,029	29.56%	1,203	3.22%	473	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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

2016 Election Contest Report - US President

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

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	20,518	51.08%	17,463	43.47%	1,568	3.90%	621	1.55%
99	4,600	16.08%	22,937	80.20%	669	2.34%	395	1.38%
100	6,224	22.03%	20,728	73.38%	864	3.06%	430	1.52%
101	7,570	23.09%	24,095	73.50%	733	2.24%	385	1.17%
102	6,479	18.28%	27,045	76.32%	1,367	3.86%	544	1.54%
103	21,333	48.57%	20,156	45.89%	1,604	3.65%	830	1.89%
104	19,309	43.42%	22,440	50.46%	1,704	3.83%	1,018	2.29%
105	17,740	44.07%	20,416	50.72%	1,451	3.60%	647	1.61%
106	11,535	32.49%	22,278	62.76%	1,150	3.24%	536	1.51%
107	6,460	18.46%	27,360	78.16%	739	2.11%	444	1.27%
108	23,526	68.69%	9,491	27.71%	893	2.61%	339	0.99%
109	23,563	59.20%	14,589	36.65%	1,158	2.91%	494	1.24%
110	24,995	65.27%	12,329	32.19%	695	1.81%	278	0.73%
111	27,488	68.35%	11,602	28.85%	742	1.85%	383	0.95%
112	13,486	39.18%	19,527	56.72%	963	2.80%	449	1.30%
113	29,028	66.04%	13,341	30.35%	1,023	2.33%	560	1.27%
114	16,845	34.11%	29,692	60.13%	1,498	3.03%	1,346	2.73%
115	19,627	45.75%	20,895	48.71%	1,419	3.31%	957	2.23%
116	19,246	41.24%	24,860	53.27%	1,370	2.94%	1,192	2.55%
117	28,197	60.46%	16,347	35.05%	1,356	2.91%	738	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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

2016 Election Contest Report - US Senate

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib
1	26,817	65.23%	13,166	32.03%	1,128	2.74%
2	20,517	45.13%	23,655	52.04%	1,287	2.83%
3	24,295	59.94%	14,717	36.31%	1,518	3.75%
4	23,392	62.21%	13,169	35.02%	1,041	2.77%
5	15,152	39.96%	22,015	58.05%	755	1.99%
6	13,714	55.63%	9,942	40.33%	994	4.03%
7	20,537	55.36%	15,226	41.05%	1,331	3.59%
8	16,674	42.44%	21,362	54.37%	1,257	3.20%
9	20,432	50.81%	18,607	46.27%	1,175	2.92%
10	22,951	63.16%	12,393	34.11%	991	2.73%
11	15,093	37.94%	23,263	58.47%	1,430	3.59%
12	13,775	38.58%	21,140	59.21%	790	2.21%
13	29,616	68.38%	11,904	27.49%	1,788	4.13%
14	11,751	61.69%	6,252	32.82%	1,047	5.50%
15	18,662	63.71%	9,159	31.27%	1,469	5.02%
16	22,954	65.19%	10,705	30.40%	1,552	4.41%
17	25,520	61.22%	14,443	34.64%	1,726	4.14%
18	19,723	45.68%	21,585	49.99%	1,872	4.34%
19	28,195	61.31%	15,588	33.90%	2,201	4.79%
20	24,812	53.21%	19,725	42.30%	2,090	4.48%
21	12,150	39.40%	17,790	57.68%	901	2.92%
22	23,065	55.91%	17,265	41.85%	923	2.24%
23	17,637	39.90%	25,582	57.87%	986	2.23%
24	16,894	38.52%	26,098	59.51%	861	1.96%
25	24,200	58.32%	16,430	39.59%	866	2.09%
26	21,282	60.11%	12,782	36.10%	1,340	3.78%
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	16,684	41.68%	22,468	56.13%	876	2.19%
33	15,378	38.53%	23,254	58.27%	1,276	3.20%
34	20,747	42.97%	26,216	54.29%	1,324	2.74%
35	20,631	53.14%	16,935	43.62%	1,258	3.24%
36	18,205	50.02%	16,964	46.61%	1,223	3.36%
37	22,366	56.22%	15,930	40.04%	1,485	3.73%
38	6,024	15.40%	32,178	82.25%	920	2.35%
39	15,023	41.24%	20,245	55.58%	1,157	3.18%
40	25,921	50.15%	24,231	46.88%	1,530	2.96%
41	18,955	42.10%	24,475	54.36%	1,590	3.53%
42	7,104	29.69%	15,990	66.82%	836	3.49%
43	18,069	49.38%	17,394	47.54%	1,127	3.08%
44	13,575	38.75%	20,242	57.79%	1,211	3.46%
45	13,153	43.34%	16,106	53.07%	1,092	3.60%
46	20,285	58.91%	13,119	38.10%	1,029	2.99%
47	13,036	46.32%	14,587	51.83%	519	1.84%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

2016 Election Contest Report - US Senate

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib
49	15,860	37.42%	25,169	59.39%	1,351	3.19%
50	19,154	43.50%	23,597	53.59%	1,280	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	24,596	65.02%	11,970	31.64%	1,265	3.34%
54	20,287	47.20%	21,423	49.85%	1,268	2.95%
55	20,009	55.54%	14,686	40.77%	1,331	3.69%
56	8,714	17.89%	38,944	79.95%	1,050	2.16%
57	21,287	45.87%	23,714	51.10%	1,406	3.03%
58	11,034	27.90%	27,366	69.20%	1,148	2.90%
59	21,615	52.44%	18,351	44.52%	1,256	3.05%
60	14,632	39.66%	21,036	57.01%	1,229	3.33%
61	8,795	20.96%	32,045	76.38%	1,114	2.66%
62	25,732	53.44%	20,937	43.48%	1,482	3.08%
63	16,010	49.10%	15,505	47.55%	1,094	3.35%
64	23,362	61.48%	13,366	35.17%	1,274	3.35%
65	26,162	62.44%	14,198	33.89%	1,538	3.67%
66	11,433	31.62%	23,632	65.36%	1,089	3.01%
67	27,666	67.34%	11,461	27.90%	1,956	4.76%
68	25,415	66.15%	11,552	30.07%	1,455	3.79%
69	26,819	66.49%	11,668	28.93%	1,848	4.58%
70	28,306	73.72%	8,412	21.91%	1,679	4.37%
71	11,282	31.37%	23,513	65.38%	1,169	3.25%
72	10,718	28.43%	26,192	69.48%	786	2.09%
73	17,809	52.02%	14,794	43.21%	1,633	4.77%
74	26,191	57.57%	17,871	39.28%	1,435	3.15%
75	21,924	57.08%	15,075	39.25%	1,413	3.68%
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	26,925	60.13%	16,300	36.40%	1,552	3.47%
80	28,146	73.79%	8,579	22.49%	1,419	3.72%
81	25,376	70.49%	9,180	25.50%	1,444	4.01%
82	20,955	56.25%	14,511	38.95%	1,789	4.80%
83	29,581	73.36%	8,692	21.56%	2,050	5.08%
84	23,682	63.57%	11,731	31.49%	1,843	4.95%
85	29,695	69.34%	11,345	26.49%	1,787	4.17%
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	11,354	33.62%	21,174	62.70%	1,244	3.68%
89	28,416	71.00%	9,621	24.04%	1,985	4.96%
90	27,584	73.77%	8,434	22.55%	1,376	3.68%
91	28,617	67.95%	11,784	27.98%	1,716	4.07%
92	10,310	33.15%	19,436	62.49%	1,357	4.36%
93	25,762	56.58%	17,705	38.88%	2,066	4.54%
94	31,567	72.93%	9,694	22.40%	2,022	4.67%
95	24,142	65.50%	10,707	29.05%	2,011	5.46%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

2016 Election Contest Report - US Senate

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib
97	27,770	70.40%	9,767	24.76%	1,909	4.84%
98	21,950	55.36%	16,081	40.56%	1,615	4.07%
99	5,008	17.76%	22,253	78.89%	945	3.35%
100	6,937	24.93%	19,753	70.99%	1,134	4.08%
101	7,830	24.19%	23,357	72.16%	1,181	3.65%
102	8,032	22.99%	25,507	73.00%	1,400	4.01%
103	23,692	54.39%	18,293	42.00%	1,574	3.61%
104	23,566	53.09%	19,522	43.98%	1,302	2.93%
105	19,690	49.43%	18,588	46.66%	1,559	3.91%
106	12,489	35.48%	21,490	61.06%	1,218	3.46%
107	6,935	20.04%	26,565	76.78%	1,101	3.18%
108	22,674	67.06%	9,461	27.98%	1,674	4.95%
109	23,622	59.97%	14,031	35.62%	1,738	4.41%
110	23,914	63.27%	12,344	32.66%	1,541	4.08%
111	26,178	66.07%	11,984	30.25%	1,459	3.68%
112	13,787	40.49%	18,901	55.51%	1,362	4.00%
113	27,525	63.65%	14,037	32.46%	1,679	3.88%
114	17,121	35.03%	29,808	60.98%	1,950	3.99%
115	19,983	47.07%	20,720	48.81%	1,750	4.12%
116	18,988	41.11%	25,361	54.91%	1,834	3.97%
117	28,026	60.77%	16,288	35.32%	1,804	3.91%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

2016 Election Contest Report - NC Governor

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep	Lib	% Lib
1	13,903	33.66%	26,517	64.21%	880	2.13%
2	25,096	54.99%	19,774	43.33%	771	1.69%
3	15,492	38.08%	24,457	60.12%	731	1.80%
4	13,472	35.59%	23,972	63.33%	411	1.09%
5	22,040	57.81%	15,603	40.93%	481	1.26%
6	10,381	42.07%	13,614	55.18%	679	2.75%
7	16,457	44.14%	20,072	53.84%	753	2.02%
8	22,131	56.14%	16,584	42.07%	708	1.80%
9	19,694	48.77%	20,074	49.71%	614	1.52%
10	12,913	35.30%	23,191	63.40%	473	1.29%
11	25,490	63.80%	13,358	33.43%	1,105	2.77%
12	21,340	59.57%	14,058	39.24%	425	1.19%
13	13,003	29.89%	29,548	67.92%	954	2.19%
14	6,503	34.09%	11,951	62.65%	622	3.26%
15	9,711	33.01%	18,890	64.21%	817	2.78%
16	11,964	33.86%	22,469	63.59%	903	2.56%
17	16,259	38.83%	24,639	58.85%	973	2.32%
18	24,050	55.49%	18,094	41.75%	1,200	2.77%
19	18,006	38.99%	26,900	58.26%	1,270	2.75%
20	23,315	49.75%	22,185	47.34%	1,363	2.91%
21	19,433	62.79%	10,807	34.92%	707	2.28%
22	17,827	42.92%	23,251	55.98%	454	1.09%
23	26,005	58.53%	18,041	40.61%	384	0.86%
24	27,228	61.87%	16,330	37.11%	451	1.02%
25	17,889	42.95%	23,319	55.98%	446	1.07%
26	14,087	39.62%	20,745	58.35%	723	2.03%
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	23,187	57.69%	16,518	41.10%	488	1.21%
33	24,309	60.71%	14,942	37.32%	790	1.97%
34	29,383	60.69%	18,096	37.38%	933	1.93%
35	18,735	48.05%	19,438	49.85%	818	2.10%
36	19,161	52.41%	16,463	45.03%	938	2.57%
37	18,069	45.23%	20,918	52.36%	965	2.42%
38	32,955	83.97%	5,595	14.26%	694	1.77%
39	21,336	58.33%	14,550	39.78%	689	1.88%
40	27,387	52.79%	23,381	45.07%	1,108	2.14%
41	26,850	59.42%	17,170	38.00%	1,166	2.58%
42	15,999	66.95%	7,287	30.49%	612	2.56%
43	17,592	47.95%	18,385	50.11%	709	1.93%
44	20,565	58.58%	13,721	39.09%	817	2.33%
45	16,292	53.54%	13,368	43.93%	771	2.53%
46	13,589	39.15%	20,683	59.58%	441	1.27%
47	14,077	49.28%	14,241	49.85%	249	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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

2016 Election Contest Report - NC Governor

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep	Lib	% Lib
49	27,705	65.05%	13,895	32.62%	991	2.33%
50	25,268	57.24%	18,083	40.97%	791	1.79%
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	13,100	34.52%	24,149	63.64%	698	1.84%
54	23,158	53.66%	19,216	44.52%	785	1.82%
55	15,171	41.83%	20,466	56.43%	629	1.73%
56	41,102	84.25%	6,828	14.00%	857	1.76%
57	26,590	57.17%	18,917	40.67%	1,005	2.16%
58	28,462	71.77%	10,385	26.19%	813	2.05%
59	20,095	48.59%	20,436	49.42%	823	1.99%
60	22,490	60.80%	13,653	36.91%	850	2.30%
61	33,588	79.89%	7,629	18.15%	827	1.97%
62	23,961	49.66%	23,232	48.15%	1,058	2.19%
63	16,787	51.33%	15,324	46.86%	592	1.81%
64	15,243	40.00%	22,169	58.18%	691	1.81%
65	16,335	38.87%	24,835	59.10%	850	2.02%
66	24,739	68.27%	10,740	29.64%	760	2.10%
67	12,821	31.04%	27,707	67.08%	776	1.88%
68	13,432	34.77%	24,296	62.90%	899	2.33%
69	13,164	32.43%	26,460	65.18%	972	2.39%
70	10,370	26.93%	27,223	70.70%	914	2.37%
71	25,149	69.90%	9,947	27.65%	883	2.45%
72	27,942	74.22%	9,014	23.94%	693	1.84%
73	16,067	46.65%	17,433	50.62%	940	2.73%
74	21,352	46.86%	23,248	51.02%	962	2.11%
75	17,183	44.66%	20,333	52.85%	955	2.48%
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	17,436	38.66%	26,876	59.59%	791	1.75%
80	10,519	27.45%	26,980	70.41%	817	2.13%
81	11,429	31.61%	23,867	66.01%	859	2.38%
82	16,018	42.76%	20,418	54.51%	1,023	2.73%
83	10,250	25.26%	29,355	72.35%	971	2.39%
84	12,969	34.61%	23,605	63.00%	894	2.39%
85	13,267	30.70%	28,845	66.74%	1,108	2.56%
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	23,386	68.87%	9,694	28.55%	878	2.59%
89	11,240	27.92%	28,029	69.62%	990	2.46%
90	10,796	28.73%	26,064	69.37%	713	1.90%
91	14,233	33.75%	26,872	63.73%	1,061	2.52%
92	20,342	65.10%	10,005	32.02%	898	2.87%
93	20,436	44.54%	24,097	52.52%	1,351	2.94%
94	11,715	26.84%	31,035	71.09%	903	2.07%
95	13,532	36.60%	22,116	59.82%	1,323	3.58%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

2016 Election Contest Report - NC Governor

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep	Lib	% Lib
97	11,297	28.44%	27,461	69.14%	958	2.41%
98	19,546	49.14%	18,871	47.44%	1,360	3.42%
99	22,613	79.95%	4,989	17.64%	681	2.41%
100	20,499	73.26%	6,721	24.02%	762	2.72%
101	23,708	72.98%	8,037	24.74%	740	2.28%
102	27,394	77.93%	6,711	19.09%	1,046	2.98%
103	20,532	46.88%	22,239	50.78%	1,027	2.34%
104	22,770	51.12%	20,868	46.85%	903	2.03%
105	20,817	52.01%	18,177	45.41%	1,032	2.58%
106	22,662	64.15%	11,770	33.32%	894	2.53%
107	27,040	77.87%	6,869	19.78%	817	2.35%
108	10,598	31.13%	22,642	66.51%	803	2.36%
109	15,446	38.98%	23,290	58.77%	894	2.26%
110	13,274	34.91%	24,042	63.23%	709	1.86%
111	13,230	33.19%	25,887	64.94%	748	1.88%
112	19,618	57.30%	13,841	40.43%	779	2.28%
113	15,723	36.21%	26,610	61.29%	1,084	2.50%
114	31,689	64.61%	15,814	32.24%	1,547	3.15%
115	22,814	53.53%	18,459	43.31%	1,350	3.17%
116	27,364	59.02%	17,603	37.97%	1,398	3.02%
117	18,482	39.96%	26,460	57.22%	1,304	2.82%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

2016 Election Contest Report - NC Lieutenant Governor

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib
1	26,221	64.51%	13,271	32.65%	1,157	2.85%
2	20,507	45.80%	23,273	51.98%	992	2.22%
3	23,975	60.04%	14,961	37.47%	996	2.49%
4	23,119	62.41%	13,263	35.80%	662	1.79%
5	14,657	39.12%	22,124	59.06%	681	1.82%
6	13,737	56.25%	9,893	40.51%	793	3.25%
7	20,794	56.61%	15,058	40.99%	881	2.40%
8	16,230	42.07%	21,306	55.23%	1,041	2.70%
9	20,150	50.73%	18,620	46.88%	948	2.39%
10	22,906	63.92%	12,299	34.32%	631	1.76%
11	15,043	38.64%	22,291	57.26%	1,593	4.09%
12	13,519	38.32%	21,132	59.90%	625	1.77%
13	29,299	68.68%	12,140	28.46%	1,223	2.87%
14	11,525	61.93%	6,253	33.60%	832	4.47%
15	18,065	63.16%	9,371	32.77%	1,164	4.07%
16	23,214	66.94%	10,429	30.07%	1,034	2.98%
17	25,555	62.30%	14,392	35.09%	1,073	2.62%
18	19,633	46.38%	21,128	49.91%	1,571	3.71%
19	28,460	62.93%	15,288	33.80%	1,479	3.27%
20	24,528	53.99%	18,983	41.79%	1,916	4.22%
21	11,856	39.19%	17,413	57.56%	983	3.25%
22	22,328	55.10%	17,532	43.27%	661	1.63%
23	17,074	39.14%	25,866	59.30%	679	1.56%
24	16,761	38.53%	26,033	59.84%	709	1.63%
25	24,277	59.07%	16,237	39.51%	585	1.42%
26	21,576	61.79%	12,341	35.34%	1,003	2.87%
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	16,381	41.51%	22,346	56.63%	736	1.87%
33	15,509	39.25%	22,892	57.93%	1,115	2.82%
34	20,714	43.52%	25,466	53.50%	1,419	2.98%
35	21,146	55.07%	16,200	42.19%	1,055	2.75%
36	18,027	50.56%	16,401	46.00%	1,224	3.43%
37	22,375	57.09%	15,562	39.71%	1,253	3.20%
38	5,969	15.43%	31,633	81.79%	1,075	2.78%
39	15,019	41.65%	20,116	55.78%	928	2.57%
40	26,097	51.26%	23,254	45.68%	1,560	3.06%
41	18,827	42.65%	23,693	53.67%	1,628	3.69%
42	6,845	29.04%	15,849	67.25%	873	3.70%
43	17,848	49.54%	17,162	47.64%	1,015	2.82%
44	13,274	38.48%	20,117	58.32%	1,104	3.20%
45	12,765	42.71%	15,995	53.52%	1,128	3.77%
46	19,454	57.61%	13,696	40.56%	620	1.84%
47	11,580	42.24%	15,239	55.59%	595	2.17%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

2016 Election Contest Report - NC Lieutenant Governor

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib
49	15,671	37.59%	24,488	58.74%	1,529	3.67%
50	19,129	44.04%	23,265	53.57%	1,038	2.39%
51	19,218	58.70%	12,676	38.72%	846	2.58%
52	20,297	54.96%	15,597	42.23%	1,037	2.81%
53	24,877	66.43%	11,676	31.18%	898	2.40%
54	20,283	47.78%	21,180	49.89%	988	2.33%
55	20,466	57.51%	14,366	40.37%	754	2.12%
56	8,381	17.60%	37,766	79.29%	1,483	3.11%
57	20,992	45.99%	23,368	51.19%	1,287	2.82%
58	10,855	27.77%	27,100	69.33%	1,131	2.89%
59	21,456	52.69%	18,253	44.83%	1,011	2.48%
60	14,378	39.64%	20,805	57.35%	1,093	3.01%
61	8,376	20.30%	31,537	76.43%	1,348	3.27%
62	25,402	53.77%	20,461	43.31%	1,379	2.92%
63	15,939	49.51%	15,326	47.60%	930	2.89%
64	23,453	62.54%	12,919	34.45%	1,131	3.02%
65	25,691	62.43%	14,470	35.16%	992	2.41%
66	11,519	32.24%	23,139	64.77%	1,067	2.99%
67	28,404	70.19%	11,091	27.41%	971	2.40%
68	25,761	68.17%	10,901	28.85%	1,128	2.98%
69	27,427	69.06%	11,105	27.96%	1,180	2.97%
70	28,456	75.24%	8,383	22.17%	980	2.59%
71	10,682	30.27%	23,437	66.41%	1,172	3.32%
72	10,019	27.12%	26,008	70.40%	914	2.47%
73	18,195	54.04%	14,329	42.56%	1,143	3.40%
74	25,766	57.67%	17,714	39.64%	1,202	2.69%
75	21,759	57.55%	14,961	39.57%	1,092	2.89%
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	26,287	59.59%	16,728	37.92%	1,099	2.49%
80	27,918	74.40%	8,690	23.16%	914	2.44%
81	25,271	71.25%	9,224	26.01%	972	2.74%
82	21,422	58.33%	14,074	38.32%	1,228	3.34%
83	30,229	75.88%	8,514	21.37%	1,093	2.74%
84	24,335	66.21%	11,435	31.11%	982	2.67%
85	29,670	70.55%	11,206	26.65%	1,179	2.80%
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	11,252	34.04%	20,448	61.86%	1,356	4.10%
89	29,224	74.14%	9,096	23.08%	1,098	2.79%
90	27,047	73.74%	8,794	23.98%	838	2.28%
91	28,207	68.20%	11,948	28.89%	1,204	2.91%
92	10,416	34.04%	18,963	61.96%	1,224	4.00%
93	25,170	56.80%	17,315	39.08%	1,827	4.12%
94	31,986	75.15%	9,585	22.52%	991	2.33%
95	24,812	68.71%	10,031	27.78%	1,267	3.51%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

2016 Election Contest Report - NC Lieutenant Governor

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Rep	% Rep	Dem	% Dem	Lib	% Lib
97	28,590	73.46%	9,253	23.77%	1,077	2.77%
98	22,451	57.69%	15,145	38.92%	1,322	3.40%
99	5,040	18.11%	21,855	78.53%	936	3.36%
100	7,057	25.75%	19,247	70.22%	1,105	4.03%
101	7,970	24.93%	23,000	71.93%	1,004	3.14%
102	7,862	22.93%	24,889	72.61%	1,529	4.46%
103	24,320	56.67%	17,345	40.42%	1,248	2.91%
104	23,670	54.31%	18,712	42.94%	1,198	2.75%
105	20,109	51.34%	17,688	45.16%	1,369	3.50%
106	12,783	36.81%	20,794	59.88%	1,149	3.31%
107	6,991	20.43%	26,233	76.66%	997	2.91%
108	23,612	70.50%	8,928	26.66%	953	2.85%
109	24,523	62.99%	13,360	34.32%	1,049	2.69%
110	24,629	65.81%	12,045	32.18%	751	2.01%
111	26,736	68.18%	11,577	29.52%	900	2.30%
112	14,185	42.11%	18,416	54.67%	1,083	3.22%
113	28,049	65.69%	13,406	31.40%	1,243	2.91%
114	16,639	34.56%	29,399	61.06%	2,107	4.38%
115	19,403	46.51%	20,619	49.42%	1,697	4.07%
116	18,514	40.81%	24,975	55.06%	1,872	4.13%
117	28,593	62.75%	15,634	34.31%	1,343	2.95%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

2016 Election Contest Report - NC Attorney General

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
1	14,114	35.39%	25,772	64.61%
2	25,429	57.39%	18,880	42.61%
3	16,064	40.63%	23,473	59.37%
4	14,611	39.91%	21,997	60.09%
5	22,745	61.53%	14,218	38.47%
6	10,901	45.02%	13,315	54.98%
7	16,778	46.13%	19,592	53.87%
8	22,426	58.55%	15,875	41.45%
9	19,909	50.55%	19,474	49.45%
10	13,631	38.37%	21,895	61.63%
11	24,435	63.31%	14,160	36.69%
12	21,890	62.68%	13,036	37.32%
13	13,024	30.75%	29,337	69.25%
14	6,888	37.38%	11,541	62.62%
15	10,157	35.98%	18,072	64.02%
16	12,182	35.51%	22,126	64.49%
17	16,780	41.29%	23,856	58.71%
18	23,343	55.60%	18,643	44.40%
19	18,271	40.76%	26,552	59.24%
20	22,213	49.28%	22,864	50.72%
21	18,824	62.68%	11,207	37.32%
22	18,863	46.96%	21,305	53.04%
23	27,046	62.41%	16,288	37.59%
24	26,984	62.05%	16,504	37.95%
25	17,394	42.32%	23,708	57.68%
26	14,038	40.52%	20,605	59.48%
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	23,949	61.16%	15,206	38.84%
33	24,436	62.43%	14,704	37.57%
34	28,736	60.87%	18,475	39.13%
35	18,170	47.95%	19,727	52.05%
36	18,172	51.44%	17,155	48.56%
37	17,442	44.94%	21,374	55.06%
38	32,891	85.72%	5,478	14.28%
39	21,346	59.80%	14,351	40.20%
40	26,148	51.89%	24,246	48.11%
41	26,184	59.85%	17,567	40.15%
42	16,498	70.37%	6,946	29.63%
43	18,486	51.68%	17,287	48.32%
44	21,341	62.24%	12,949	37.76%
45	17,047	57.24%	12,734	42.76%
46	15,546	46.57%	17,836	53.43%
47	16,234	59.86%	10,885	40.14%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

2016 Election Contest Report - NC Attorney General

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
49	27,124	65.51%	14,281	34.49%
50	25,121	58.26%	17,997	41.74%
51	14,280	44.12%	18,085	55.88%
52	17,304	47.34%	19,251	52.66%
53	13,349	35.98%	23,750	64.02%
54	22,996	54.53%	19,179	45.47%
55	16,247	46.06%	19,024	53.94%
56	39,570	83.50%	7,821	16.50%
57	25,423	56.02%	19,955	43.98%
58	28,356	72.96%	10,509	27.04%
59	19,836	49.01%	20,635	50.99%
60	22,188	61.47%	13,909	38.53%
61	32,948	80.26%	8,104	19.74%
62	22,680	48.24%	24,338	51.76%
63	16,709	52.22%	15,288	47.78%
64	14,980	40.24%	22,247	59.76%
65	16,155	39.50%	24,747	60.50%
66	24,703	69.88%	10,648	30.12%
67	13,508	33.63%	26,662	66.37%
68	12,740	34.03%	24,697	65.97%
69	13,378	34.00%	25,966	66.00%
70	9,929	26.42%	27,648	73.58%
71	24,913	70.87%	10,239	29.13%
72	27,617	75.03%	9,193	24.97%
73	16,033	47.99%	17,374	52.01%
74	20,376	45.85%	24,066	54.15%
75	16,764	44.61%	20,814	55.39%
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	17,773	40.74%	25,852	59.26%
80	10,126	27.06%	27,297	72.94%
81	11,071	31.36%	24,230	68.64%
82	16,155	44.40%	20,228	55.60%
83	10,893	27.58%	28,599	72.42%
84	13,556	37.22%	22,867	62.78%
85	13,088	31.55%	28,389	68.45%
86	13,839	36.76%	23,812	63.24%
87	12,185	32.34%	25,490	67.66%
88	22,278	67.79%	10,587	32.21%
89	11,749	29.97%	27,451	70.03%
90	10,569	28.93%	25,961	71.07%
91	13,982	33.96%	27,194	66.04%
92	20,460	67.32%	9,933	32.68%
93	20,065	45.79%	23,752	54.21%
94	12,360	29.33%	29,781	70.67%
95	12,219	34.15%	23,564	65.85%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

2016 Election Contest Report - NC Attorney General

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Dem	% Dem	Rep	% Rep
97	11,868	30.77%	26,699	69.23%
98	17,479	45.38%	21,042	54.62%
99	22,732	82.18%	4,930	17.82%
100	20,635	75.81%	6,586	24.19%
101	24,239	76.16%	7,589	23.84%
102	26,428	77.57%	7,642	22.43%
103	19,986	47.00%	22,540	53.00%
104	21,587	49.94%	21,637	50.06%
105	20,054	51.67%	18,759	48.33%
106	22,360	64.86%	12,116	35.14%
107	27,363	80.42%	6,663	19.58%
108	10,932	33.05%	22,147	66.95%
109	15,664	40.63%	22,889	59.37%
110	14,143	38.18%	22,896	61.82%
111	13,531	34.85%	25,293	65.15%
112	19,969	59.81%	13,416	40.19%
113	14,707	34.76%	27,600	65.24%
114	31,285	65.57%	16,428	34.43%
115	22,167	53.54%	19,237	46.46%
116	26,967	59.86%	18,081	40.14%
117	17,294	38.28%	27,878	61.72%
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

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

County - District Report**District Plan: HCM-5 Amend**

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	83,540	83,540	48.74 %	100.00 %
	64	171,415	87,875	87,875	51.26 %	100.00 %
Alexander	94	36,444	90,835	36,444	100.00 %	40.12 %
Alleghany	93	10,888	87,194	10,888	100.00 %	12.49 %
Anson	55	22,055	84,549	22,055	100.00 %	26.09 %
Ashe	93	26,577	87,194	26,577	100.00 %	30.48 %
Avery	85	17,806	89,525	17,806	100.00 %	19.89 %
Beaufort	79	44,652	85,842	44,652	100.00 %	52.02 %
Bertie	5	17,934	84,060	17,934	100.00 %	21.33 %
Bladen	22	29,606	88,642	29,606	100.00 %	33.40 %
Brunswick	17	136,693	89,763	89,763	65.67 %	100.00 %
	19	136,693	91,041	46,930	34.33 %	51.55 %
Buncombe	114	269,452	89,628	89,628	33.26 %	100.00 %
	115	269,452	88,843	88,843	32.97 %	100.00 %
	116	269,452	90,981	90,981	33.77 %	100.00 %
Burke	86	87,570	87,570	87,570	100.00 %	100.00 %
Cabarrus	73	225,804	90,390	90,390	40.03 %	100.00 %
	82	225,804	90,805	90,805	40.21 %	100.00 %
	83	225,804	90,967	44,609	19.76 %	49.04 %
Caldwell	87	80,652	85,009	80,652	100.00 %	94.87 %
Camden	1	10,355	84,230	10,355	100.00 %	12.29 %
Carteret	13	67,686	83,307	67,686	100.00 %	81.25 %
Caswell	50	22,736	85,345	22,736	100.00 %	26.64 %
Catawba	89	160,610	85,577	71,023	44.22 %	82.99 %
	96	160,610	89,587	89,587	55.78 %	100.00 %
Chatham	54	76,285	83,475	76,285	100.00 %	91.39 %
Cherokee	120	28,774	84,907	28,774	100.00 %	33.89 %
Chowan	1	13,708	84,230	13,708	100.00 %	16.27 %
Clay	120	11,089	84,907	11,089	100.00 %	13.06 %
Cleveland	110	99,519	89,588	33,564	33.73 %	37.46 %
	111	99,519	90,809	65,955	66.27 %	72.63 %
Columbus	46	50,623	84,307	50,623	100.00 %	60.05 %
Craven	3	100,720	85,099	85,099	84.49 %	100.00 %
	13	100,720	83,307	15,621	15.51 %	18.75 %
Cumberland	42	334,728	84,462	84,462	25.23 %	100.00 %
	43	334,728	83,198	83,198	24.86 %	100.00 %
	44	334,728	83,751	83,751	25.02 %	100.00 %
	45	334,728	83,317	83,317	24.89 %	100.00 %
Currituck	1	28,100	84,230	28,100	100.00 %	33.36 %
Dare	1	36,915	84,230	12,590	34.11 %	14.95 %
	79	36,915	85,842	24,325	65.89 %	28.34 %

County - District Report

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

County	District	Total County Population	Total District Population	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Davidson	80	168,930	84,864	84,864	50.24 %	100.00 %
	81	168,930	84,066	84,066	49.76 %	100.00 %
Davie	77	42,712	90,628	42,712	100.00 %	47.13 %
Duplin	4	48,715	83,269	48,715	100.00 %	58.50 %
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	85,179	48,900	100.00 %	57.41 %
Forsyth	71	382,590	83,748	83,748	21.89 %	100.00 %
	72	382,590	83,262	83,262	21.76 %	100.00 %
	74	382,590	89,692	89,692	23.44 %	100.00 %
	75	382,590	84,659	84,659	22.13 %	100.00 %
	91	382,590	85,749	41,229	10.78 %	48.08 %
Franklin	7	68,573	83,510	68,573	100.00 %	82.11 %
Gaston	108	227,943	84,457	84,457	37.05 %	100.00 %
	109	227,943	87,462	87,462	38.37 %	100.00 %
	110	227,943	89,588	56,024	24.58 %	62.54 %
Gates	5	10,478	84,060	10,478	100.00 %	12.46 %
Graham	120	8,030	84,907	8,030	100.00 %	9.46 %
Granville	7	60,992	83,510	14,937	24.49 %	17.89 %
	32	60,992	88,633	46,055	75.51 %	51.96 %
Greene	10	20,451	83,352	20,451	100.00 %	24.54 %
Guilford	57	541,299	91,158	91,158	16.84 %	100.00 %
	58	541,299	89,713	89,713	16.57 %	100.00 %
	59	541,299	87,559	87,559	16.18 %	100.00 %
	60	541,299	90,919	90,919	16.80 %	100.00 %
	61	541,299	90,814	90,814	16.78 %	100.00 %
	62	541,299	91,136	91,136	16.84 %	100.00 %
Halifax	27	48,622	84,735	48,622	100.00 %	57.38 %
Harnett	6	133,568	84,016	84,016	62.90 %	100.00 %
	53	133,568	89,622	49,552	37.10 %	55.29 %
Haywood	118	62,089	83,282	62,089	100.00 %	74.55 %
Henderson	113	116,281	91,102	25,952	22.32 %	28.49 %
	117	116,281	90,329	90,329	77.68 %	100.00 %
Hertford	5	21,552	84,060	21,552	100.00 %	25.64 %
Hoke	48	52,082	86,256	52,082	100.00 %	60.38 %
Hyde	79	4,589	85,842	4,589	100.00 %	5.35 %
Iredell	84	186,693	85,875	85,875	46.00 %	100.00 %
	89	186,693	85,577	14,554	7.80 %	17.01 %
	95	186,693	86,264	86,264	46.21 %	100.00 %
Jackson	119	43,109	90,212	43,109	100.00 %	47.79 %

District plan definition file: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 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: HCM-5 Amend

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	90,540	90,540	41.92 %	100.00 %
	28	215,999	85,389	85,389	39.53 %	100.00 %
	53	215,999	89,622	40,070	18.55 %	44.71 %
Jones	4	9,172	83,269	9,172	100.00 %	11.01 %
Lee	51	63,285	83,073	63,285	100.00 %	76.18 %
Lenoir	4	55,122	83,269	25,382	46.05 %	30.48 %
	12	55,122	84,172	29,740	53.95 %	35.33 %
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	85,179	22,031	100.00 %	25.86 %
McDowell	85	44,578	89,525	38,346	86.02 %	42.83 %
	113	44,578	91,102	6,232	13.98 %	6.84 %
Mecklenburg	88	1,115,482	86,239	86,239	7.73 %	100.00 %
	92	1,115,482	89,640	89,640	8.04 %	100.00 %
	98	1,115,482	82,669	82,669	7.41 %	100.00 %
	99	1,115,482	82,746	82,746	7.42 %	100.00 %
	100	1,115,482	82,932	82,932	7.43 %	100.00 %
	101	1,115,482	84,391	84,391	7.57 %	100.00 %
	102	1,115,482	87,483	87,483	7.84 %	100.00 %
	103	1,115,482	88,259	88,259	7.91 %	100.00 %
	104	1,115,482	84,647	84,647	7.59 %	100.00 %
	105	1,115,482	89,460	89,460	8.02 %	100.00 %
	106	1,115,482	86,758	86,758	7.78 %	100.00 %
	107	1,115,482	86,497	86,497	7.75 %	100.00 %
	112	1,115,482	83,761	83,761	7.51 %	100.00 %
Mitchell	85	14,903	89,525	14,903	100.00 %	16.65 %
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	89,964	31,051	32.70 %	34.51 %
	25	94,970	83,790	63,919	67.30 %	76.28 %
New Hanover	18	225,702	90,862	90,862	40.26 %	100.00 %
	19	225,702	91,041	44,111	19.54 %	48.45 %
	20	225,702	90,729	90,729	40.20 %	100.00 %
Northampton	27	17,471	84,735	17,471	100.00 %	20.62 %
Onslow	14	204,576	90,506	90,506	44.24 %	100.00 %
	15	204,576	89,176	89,176	43.59 %	100.00 %
	16	204,576	85,097	24,894	12.17 %	29.25 %
Orange	50	148,696	85,345	62,609	42.11 %	73.36 %
	56	148,696	86,087	86,087	57.89 %	100.00 %

County - District Report**District Plan: HCM-5 Amend**

County	District	Total County Population	Total District Population	County Pop in District	Percent of County Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in County
Pamlico	79	12,276	85,842	12,276	100.00 %	14.30 %
Pasquotank	1	40,568	84,230	6,472	15.95 %	7.68 %
	5	40,568	84,060	34,096	84.05 %	40.56 %
Pender	16	60,203	85,097	60,203	100.00 %	70.75 %
Perquimans	1	13,005	84,230	13,005	100.00 %	15.44 %
Person	2	39,097	90,751	39,097	100.00 %	43.08 %
Pitt	8	170,243	85,089	85,089	49.98 %	100.00 %
	9	170,243	85,154	85,154	50.02 %	100.00 %
Polk	113	19,328	91,102	19,328	100.00 %	21.22 %
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	84,307	33,684	28.91 %	39.95 %
	47	116,530	82,846	82,846	71.09 %	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	90,967	46,358	31.56 %	50.96 %
Rutherford	111	64,444	90,809	24,854	38.57 %	27.37 %
	113	64,444	91,102	39,590	61.43 %	43.46 %
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	85,749	44,520	100.00 %	51.92 %
Surry	90	71,359	82,937	71,359	100.00 %	86.04 %
Swain	119	14,117	90,212	14,117	100.00 %	15.65 %
Transylvania	119	32,986	90,212	32,986	100.00 %	36.56 %
Tyrrell	23	3,245	85,179	3,245	100.00 %	3.81 %
Union	55	238,267	84,549	62,494	26.23 %	73.91 %
	68	238,267	86,978	86,978	36.50 %	100.00 %
	69	238,267	88,795	88,795	37.27 %	100.00 %
Vance	32	42,578	88,633	42,578	100.00 %	48.04 %

County - District Report

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

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	85,987	85,987	7.61 %	100.00 %
	21	1,129,410	88,313	88,313	7.82 %	100.00 %
	33	1,129,410	86,863	86,863	7.69 %	100.00 %
	34	1,129,410	83,302	83,302	7.38 %	100.00 %
	35	1,129,410	86,765	86,765	7.68 %	100.00 %
	36	1,129,410	89,336	89,336	7.91 %	100.00 %
	37	1,129,410	88,334	88,334	7.82 %	100.00 %
	38	1,129,410	90,560	90,560	8.02 %	100.00 %
	39	1,129,410	86,971	86,971	7.70 %	100.00 %
	40	1,129,410	90,047	90,047	7.97 %	100.00 %
	41	1,129,410	84,646	84,646	7.49 %	100.00 %
	49	1,129,410	84,041	84,041	7.44 %	100.00 %
	66	1,129,410	84,245	84,245	7.46 %	100.00 %
Warren	27	18,642	84,735	18,642	100.00 %	22.00 %
Washington	23	11,003	85,179	11,003	100.00 %	12.92 %
Watauga	87	54,086	85,009	4,357	8.06 %	5.13 %
	93	54,086	87,194	49,729	91.94 %	57.03 %
Wayne	10	117,333	83,352	62,901	53.61 %	75.46 %
	12	117,333	84,172	54,432	46.39 %	64.67 %
Wilkes	90	65,969	82,937	11,578	17.55 %	13.96 %
	94	65,969	90,835	54,391	82.45 %	59.88 %
Wilson	24	78,784	89,964	58,913	74.78 %	65.49 %
	25	78,784	83,790	19,871	25.22 %	23.72 %
Yadkin	77	37,214	90,628	37,214	100.00 %	41.06 %
Yancey	85	18,470	89,525	18,470	100.00 %	20.63 %
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: 39

District - County Report

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

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	Camden	84,230	10,355	10,355	12.29 %	100.00 %
	Chowan	84,230	13,708	13,708	16.27 %	100.00 %
	Currituck	84,230	28,100	28,100	33.36 %	100.00 %
	Dare	84,230	36,915	12,590	14.95 %	34.11 %
	Pasquotank	84,230	40,568	6,472	7.68 %	15.95 %
	Perquimans	84,230	13,005	13,005	15.44 %	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	85,099	100,720	85,099	100.00 %	84.49 %
4	Duplin	83,269	48,715	48,715	58.50 %	100.00 %
	Jones	83,269	9,172	9,172	11.01 %	100.00 %
	Lenoir	83,269	55,122	25,382	30.48 %	46.05 %
5	Bertie	84,060	17,934	17,934	21.33 %	100.00 %
	Gates	84,060	10,478	10,478	12.46 %	100.00 %
	Hertford	84,060	21,552	21,552	25.64 %	100.00 %
	Pasquotank	84,060	40,568	34,096	40.56 %	84.05 %
6	Harnett	84,016	133,568	84,016	100.00 %	62.90 %
7	Franklin	83,510	68,573	68,573	82.11 %	100.00 %
	Granville	83,510	60,992	14,937	17.89 %	24.49 %
8	Pitt	85,089	170,243	85,089	100.00 %	49.98 %
9	Pitt	85,154	170,243	85,154	100.00 %	50.02 %
10	Greene	83,352	20,451	20,451	24.54 %	100.00 %
	Wayne	83,352	117,333	62,901	75.46 %	53.61 %
11	Wake	85,987	1,129,410	85,987	100.00 %	7.61 %
12	Lenoir	84,172	55,122	29,740	35.33 %	53.95 %
	Wayne	84,172	117,333	54,432	64.67 %	46.39 %
13	Carteret	83,307	67,686	67,686	81.25 %	100.00 %
	Craven	83,307	100,720	15,621	18.75 %	15.51 %
14	Onslow	90,506	204,576	90,506	100.00 %	44.24 %
15	Onslow	89,176	204,576	89,176	100.00 %	43.59 %
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	89,763	136,693	89,763	100.00 %	65.67 %
18	New Hanover	90,862	225,702	90,862	100.00 %	40.26 %
19	Brunswick	91,041	136,693	46,930	51.55 %	34.33 %
	New Hanover	91,041	225,702	44,111	48.45 %	19.54 %
20	New Hanover	90,729	225,702	90,729	100.00 %	40.20 %
21	Wake	88,313	1,129,410	88,313	100.00 %	7.82 %
22	Bladen	88,642	29,606	29,606	33.40 %	100.00 %
	Sampson	88,642	59,036	59,036	66.60 %	100.00 %

District - County Report

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	County	Total District Population	Total County Population	District Pop in County	Percent of District Pop in County	Percent of County Pop in District
23	Edgecombe	85,179	48,900	48,900	57.41 %	100.00 %
	Martin	85,179	22,031	22,031	25.86 %	100.00 %
	Tyrrell	85,179	3,245	3,245	3.81 %	100.00 %
	Washington	85,179	11,003	11,003	12.92 %	100.00 %
24	Nash	89,964	94,970	31,051	34.51 %	32.70 %
	Wilson	89,964	78,784	58,913	65.49 %	74.78 %
25	Nash	83,790	94,970	63,919	76.28 %	67.30 %
	Wilson	83,790	78,784	19,871	23.72 %	25.22 %
26	Johnston	90,540	215,999	90,540	100.00 %	41.92 %
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	88,633	60,992	46,055	51.96 %	75.51 %
	Vance	88,633	42,578	42,578	48.04 %	100.00 %
33	Wake	86,863	1,129,410	86,863	100.00 %	7.69 %
34	Wake	83,302	1,129,410	83,302	100.00 %	7.38 %
35	Wake	86,765	1,129,410	86,765	100.00 %	7.68 %
36	Wake	89,336	1,129,410	89,336	100.00 %	7.91 %
37	Wake	88,334	1,129,410	88,334	100.00 %	7.82 %
38	Wake	90,560	1,129,410	90,560	100.00 %	8.02 %
39	Wake	86,971	1,129,410	86,971	100.00 %	7.70 %
40	Wake	90,047	1,129,410	90,047	100.00 %	7.97 %
41	Wake	84,646	1,129,410	84,646	100.00 %	7.49 %
42	Cumberland	84,462	334,728	84,462	100.00 %	25.23 %
43	Cumberland	83,198	334,728	83,198	100.00 %	24.86 %
44	Cumberland	83,751	334,728	83,751	100.00 %	25.02 %
45	Cumberland	83,317	334,728	83,317	100.00 %	24.89 %
46	Columbus	84,307	50,623	50,623	60.05 %	100.00 %
	Robeson	84,307	116,530	33,684	39.95 %	28.91 %
47	Robeson	82,846	116,530	82,846	100.00 %	71.09 %
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	84,041	1,129,410	84,041	100.00 %	7.44 %
50	Caswell	85,345	22,736	22,736	26.64 %	100.00 %
	Orange	85,345	148,696	62,609	73.36 %	42.11 %
51	Lee	83,073	63,285	63,285	76.18 %	100.00 %
	Moore	83,073	99,727	19,788	23.82 %	19.84 %

District - County Report

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	County	Total District Population	Total County Population	District Pop in County	Percent of District Pop in County	Percent of County Pop in District
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	89,622	133,568	49,552	55.29 %	37.10 %
	Johnston	89,622	215,999	40,070	44.71 %	18.55 %
54	Chatham	83,475	76,285	76,285	91.39 %	100.00 %
	Randolph	83,475	144,171	7,190	8.61 %	4.99 %
55	Anson	84,549	22,055	22,055	26.09 %	100.00 %
	Union	84,549	238,267	62,494	73.91 %	26.23 %
56	Orange	86,087	148,696	86,087	100.00 %	57.89 %
57	Guilford	91,158	541,299	91,158	100.00 %	16.84 %
58	Guilford	89,713	541,299	89,713	100.00 %	16.57 %
59	Guilford	87,559	541,299	87,559	100.00 %	16.18 %
60	Guilford	90,919	541,299	90,919	100.00 %	16.80 %
61	Guilford	90,814	541,299	90,814	100.00 %	16.78 %
62	Guilford	91,136	541,299	91,136	100.00 %	16.84 %
63	Alamance	83,540	171,415	83,540	100.00 %	48.74 %
64	Alamance	87,875	171,415	87,875	100.00 %	51.26 %
65	Rockingham	91,096	91,096	91,096	100.00 %	100.00 %
66	Wake	84,245	1,129,410	84,245	100.00 %	7.46 %
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	86,978	238,267	86,978	100.00 %	36.50 %
69	Union	88,795	238,267	88,795	100.00 %	37.27 %
70	Randolph	89,118	144,171	89,118	100.00 %	61.81 %
71	Forsyth	83,748	382,590	83,748	100.00 %	21.89 %
72	Forsyth	83,262	382,590	83,262	100.00 %	21.76 %
73	Cabarrus	90,390	225,804	90,390	100.00 %	40.03 %
74	Forsyth	89,692	382,590	89,692	100.00 %	23.44 %
75	Forsyth	84,659	382,590	84,659	100.00 %	22.13 %
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	85,842	44,652	44,652	52.02 %	100.00 %
	Dare	85,842	36,915	24,325	28.34 %	65.89 %
	Hyde	85,842	4,589	4,589	5.35 %	100.00 %
	Pamlico	85,842	12,276	12,276	14.30 %	100.00 %
80	Davidson	84,864	168,930	84,864	100.00 %	50.24 %
81	Davidson	84,066	168,930	84,066	100.00 %	49.76 %
82	Cabarrus	90,805	225,804	90,805	100.00 %	40.21 %

District - County Report

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	County	Total District Population	Total County Population	District Pop in County	Percent of District Pop in County	Percent of County Pop in District
83	Cabarrus	90,967	225,804	44,609	49.04 %	19.76 %
	Rowan	90,967	146,875	46,358	50.96 %	31.56 %
84	Iredell	85,875	186,693	85,875	100.00 %	46.00 %
85	Avery	89,525	17,806	17,806	19.89 %	100.00 %
	McDowell	89,525	44,578	38,346	42.83 %	86.02 %
	Mitchell	89,525	14,903	14,903	16.65 %	100.00 %
	Yancey	89,525	18,470	18,470	20.63 %	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	86,239	1,115,482	86,239	100.00 %	7.73 %
89	Catawba	85,577	160,610	71,023	82.99 %	44.22 %
	Iredell	85,577	186,693	14,554	17.01 %	7.80 %
90	Surry	82,937	71,359	71,359	86.04 %	100.00 %
	Wilkes	82,937	65,969	11,578	13.96 %	17.55 %
91	Forsyth	85,749	382,590	41,229	48.08 %	10.78 %
	Stokes	85,749	44,520	44,520	51.92 %	100.00 %
92	Mecklenburg	89,640	1,115,482	89,640	100.00 %	8.04 %
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	90,835	36,444	36,444	40.12 %	100.00 %
	Wilkes	90,835	65,969	54,391	59.88 %	82.45 %
95	Iredell	86,264	186,693	86,264	100.00 %	46.21 %
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	82,669	1,115,482	82,669	100.00 %	7.41 %
99	Mecklenburg	82,746	1,115,482	82,746	100.00 %	7.42 %
100	Mecklenburg	82,932	1,115,482	82,932	100.00 %	7.43 %
101	Mecklenburg	84,391	1,115,482	84,391	100.00 %	7.57 %
102	Mecklenburg	87,483	1,115,482	87,483	100.00 %	7.84 %
103	Mecklenburg	88,259	1,115,482	88,259	100.00 %	7.91 %
104	Mecklenburg	84,647	1,115,482	84,647	100.00 %	7.59 %
105	Mecklenburg	89,460	1,115,482	89,460	100.00 %	8.02 %
106	Mecklenburg	86,758	1,115,482	86,758	100.00 %	7.78 %
107	Mecklenburg	86,497	1,115,482	86,497	100.00 %	7.75 %
108	Gaston	84,457	227,943	84,457	100.00 %	37.05 %
109	Gaston	87,462	227,943	87,462	100.00 %	38.37 %
110	Cleveland	89,588	99,519	33,564	37.46 %	33.73 %
	Gaston	89,588	227,943	56,024	62.54 %	24.58 %
111	Cleveland	90,809	99,519	65,955	72.63 %	66.27 %
	Rutherford	90,809	64,444	24,854	27.37 %	38.57 %

District - County Report

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	County	Total District Population	Total County Population	District Pop in County	Percent of District Pop in County	Percent of County Pop in District
112	Mecklenburg	83,761	1,115,482	83,761	100.00 %	7.51 %
113	Henderson	91,102	116,281	25,952	28.49 %	22.32 %
	McDowell	91,102	44,578	6,232	6.84 %	13.98 %
	Polk	91,102	19,328	19,328	21.22 %	100.00 %
	Rutherford	91,102	64,444	39,590	43.46 %	61.43 %
114	Buncombe	89,628	269,452	89,628	100.00 %	33.26 %
115	Buncombe	88,843	269,452	88,843	100.00 %	32.97 %
116	Buncombe	90,981	269,452	90,981	100.00 %	33.77 %
117	Henderson	90,329	116,281	90,329	100.00 %	77.68 %
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: 39

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

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	84,060	4,891	100.00 %	5.82 %
Alamance	64	988	87,875	988	100.00 %	1.12 %
Albemarle	67	16,432	88,255	16,432	100.00 %	18.62 %
Alliance	79	733	85,842	733	100.00 %	0.85 %
Andrews	120	1,667	84,907	1,667	100.00 %	1.96 %
Angier	37	5,265	88,334	556	10.56 %	0.63 %
	53	5,265	89,622	4,709	89.44 %	5.25 %
Ansonville	55	440	84,549	440	100.00 %	0.52 %
Apex	21	58,780	88,313	6	0.01 %	0.01 %
	36	58,780	89,336	45,473	77.36 %	50.90 %
	41	58,780	84,646	13,301	22.63 %	15.71 %
Arapahoe	79	416	85,842	416	100.00 %	0.48 %
Archdale	60	11,907	90,919	380	3.19 %	0.42 %
	70	11,907	89,118	11,527	96.81 %	12.93 %
Archer Lodge	26	4,797	90,540	4,797	100.00 %	5.30 %
Asheboro	70	27,156	89,118	25,890	95.34 %	29.05 %
	78	27,156	86,365	1,266	4.66 %	1.47 %
Asheville	114	94,589	89,628	37,562	39.71 %	41.91 %
	115	94,589	88,843	30,907	32.68 %	34.79 %
	116	94,589	90,981	26,120	27.61 %	28.71 %
Askewville	5	184	84,060	184	100.00 %	0.22 %
Atkinson	16	296	85,097	296	100.00 %	0.35 %
Atlantic Beach	13	1,364	83,307	1,364	100.00 %	1.64 %
Aulander	5	763	84,060	763	100.00 %	0.91 %
Aurora	79	455	85,842	455	100.00 %	0.53 %
Autryville	22	167	88,642	167	100.00 %	0.19 %
Ayden	9	4,977	85,154	4,977	100.00 %	5.84 %
Badin	67	2,024	88,255	2,024	100.00 %	2.29 %
Bailey	25	568	83,790	568	100.00 %	0.68 %
Bakersville	85	450	89,525	450	100.00 %	0.50 %
Bald Head Island	19	268	91,041	268	100.00 %	0.29 %
Banner Elk	85	1,049	89,525	1,049	100.00 %	1.17 %
Bath	79	245	85,842	245	100.00 %	0.29 %
Bayboro	79	1,161	85,842	1,161	100.00 %	1.35 %
Bear Grass	23	89	85,179	89	100.00 %	0.10 %
Beaufort	13	4,464	83,307	4,464	100.00 %	5.36 %
Beech Mountain	85	675	89,525	62	9.19 %	0.07 %
	93	675	87,194	613	90.81 %	0.70 %
Belhaven	79	1,410	85,842	1,410	100.00 %	1.64 %

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

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	84,457	6,006	40.01 %	7.11 %
	109	15,010	87,462	9,004	59.99 %	10.29 %
Belville	17	2,406	89,763	2,406	100.00 %	2.68 %
Belwood	110	857	89,588	857	100.00 %	0.96 %
Benson	28	3,967	85,389	3,967	100.00 %	4.65 %
	53	3,967	89,622	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Bermuda Run	77	3,120	90,628	3,120	100.00 %	3.44 %
Bessemer City	110	5,428	89,588	5,428	100.00 %	6.06 %
Bethania	74	344	89,692	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	91	344	85,749	344	100.00 %	0.40 %
Bethel	8	1,373	85,089	1,373	100.00 %	1.61 %
Beulaville	4	1,116	83,269	1,116	100.00 %	1.34 %
Biltmore Forest	115	1,409	88,843	1,409	100.00 %	1.59 %
Biscoe	67	1,848	88,255	1,848	100.00 %	2.09 %
Black Creek	25	692	83,790	692	100.00 %	0.83 %
Black Mountain	114	8,426	89,628	8,426	100.00 %	9.40 %
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	84,307	166	100.00 %	0.20 %
Bogue	13	695	83,307	695	100.00 %	0.83 %
Boiling Spring Lakes	19	5,943	91,041	5,943	100.00 %	6.53 %
Boiling Springs	111	4,615	90,809	4,615	100.00 %	5.08 %
Bolivia	19	149	91,041	149	100.00 %	0.16 %
Bolton	46	519	84,307	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	90,809	355	100.00 %	0.39 %
Brevard	119	7,744	90,212	7,744	100.00 %	8.58 %
Bridgeton	3	349	85,099	349	100.00 %	0.41 %
Broadway	6	1,267	84,016	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	84,307	973	100.00 %	1.15 %
Bryson City	119	1,558	90,212	1,558	100.00 %	1.73 %
Bunn	7	327	83,510	327	100.00 %	0.39 %
Burgaw	16	3,088	85,097	3,088	100.00 %	3.63 %
Burlington	59	57,303	87,559	1,822	3.18 %	2.08 %
	63	57,303	83,540	20,671	36.07 %	24.74 %
	64	57,303	87,875	34,810	60.75 %	39.61 %
Burnsville	85	1,614	89,525	1,614	100.00 %	1.80 %

District plan definition file: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 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: HCM-5 Amend

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Butner	32	8,397	88,633	8,397	100.00 %	9.47 %
Cajah's Mountain	87	2,722	85,009	2,722	100.00 %	3.20 %
Calabash	17	2,011	89,763	2,011	100.00 %	2.24 %
Calypso	4	327	83,269	327	100.00 %	0.39 %
Cameron	51	244	83,073	244	100.00 %	0.29 %
Candor	67	813	88,255	813	100.00 %	0.92 %
	78	813	86,365	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Canton	118	4,422	83,282	4,422	100.00 %	5.31 %
Cape Carteret	13	2,224	83,307	2,224	100.00 %	2.67 %
Carolina Beach	19	6,564	91,041	6,564	100.00 %	7.21 %
Carolina Shores	17	4,588	89,763	4,588	100.00 %	5.11 %
Carrboro	50	21,295	85,345	174	0.82 %	0.20 %
	56	21,295	86,087	21,121	99.18 %	24.53 %
Carthage	51	2,775	83,073	2,747	98.99 %	3.31 %
	52	2,775	84,383	28	1.01 %	0.03 %
Cary	11	174,721	85,987	15,301	8.76 %	17.79 %
	21	174,721	88,313	57,857	33.11 %	65.51 %
	36	174,721	89,336	8,272	4.73 %	9.26 %
	37	174,721	88,334	2,012	1.15 %	2.28 %
	41	174,721	84,646	70,058	40.10 %	82.77 %
	49	174,721	84,041	17,512	10.02 %	20.84 %
	54	174,721	83,475	3,709	2.12 %	4.44 %
Casar	110	305	89,588	305	100.00 %	0.34 %
Castalia	25	264	83,790	264	100.00 %	0.32 %
Caswell Beach	19	395	91,041	395	100.00 %	0.43 %
Catawba	89	702	85,577	702	100.00 %	0.82 %
Cedar Point	13	1,764	83,307	1,764	100.00 %	2.12 %
Cedar Rock	87	301	85,009	301	100.00 %	0.35 %
Cerro Gordo	46	131	84,307	131	100.00 %	0.16 %
Chadbourn	46	1,574	84,307	1,574	100.00 %	1.87 %
Chapel Hill	29	61,960	90,900	2,906	4.69 %	3.20 %
	56	61,960	86,087	59,054	95.31 %	68.60 %

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

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	86,239	81,695	9.34 %	94.73 %
	92	874,579	89,640	69,175	7.91 %	77.17 %
	99	874,579	82,746	78,624	8.99 %	95.02 %
	100	874,579	82,932	82,932	9.48 %	100.00 %
	101	874,579	84,391	73,459	8.40 %	87.05 %
	102	874,579	87,483	87,483	10.00 %	100.00 %
	103	874,579	88,259	57,696	6.60 %	65.37 %
	104	874,579	84,647	84,647	9.68 %	100.00 %
	105	874,579	89,460	78,415	8.97 %	87.65 %
	106	874,579	86,758	59,599	6.81 %	68.70 %
	107	874,579	86,497	75,124	8.59 %	86.85 %
	112	874,579	83,761	45,730	5.23 %	54.60 %
Cherryville	110	6,078	89,588	6,078	100.00 %	6.78 %
Chimney Rock Village	113	140	91,102	140	100.00 %	0.15 %
China Grove	83	4,434	90,967	4,434	100.00 %	4.87 %
Chocowinity	79	722	85,842	722	100.00 %	0.84 %
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	90,540	26,307	100.00 %	29.06 %
	33	26,307	86,863	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	39	26,307	86,971	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Clemmons	74	21,163	89,692	21,163	100.00 %	23.60 %
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	89,622	2,155	100.00 %	2.40 %
Cofield	5	267	84,060	267	100.00 %	0.32 %
Colerain	5	217	84,060	217	100.00 %	0.26 %
Columbia	23	610	85,179	610	100.00 %	0.72 %
Columbus	113	1,060	91,102	1,060	100.00 %	1.16 %
Como	5	67	84,060	67	100.00 %	0.08 %
Concord	73	105,240	90,390	53,986	51.30 %	59.73 %
	82	105,240	90,805	43,784	41.60 %	48.22 %
	83	105,240	90,967	7,470	7.10 %	8.21 %
Conetoe	23	198	85,179	198	100.00 %	0.23 %
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	82,669	31,412	100.00 %	38.00 %
Cove City	3	378	85,099	378	100.00 %	0.44 %

District plan definition file: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 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: HCM-5 Amend

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	84,457	123	2.32 %	0.15 %
	109	5,296	87,462	5,173	97.68 %	5.91 %
Creedmoor	7	4,866	83,510	2,065	42.44 %	2.47 %
	32	4,866	88,633	2,801	57.56 %	3.16 %
Creswell	23	207	85,179	207	100.00 %	0.24 %
Crossnore	85	143	89,525	143	100.00 %	0.16 %
Dallas	108	5,927	84,457	5,927	100.00 %	7.02 %
Danbury	91	189	85,749	189	100.00 %	0.22 %
Davidson	95	15,106	86,264	378	2.50 %	0.44 %
	98	15,106	82,669	14,728	97.50 %	17.82 %
Dellview	110	6	89,588	6	100.00 %	0.01 %
Denton	80	1,494	84,864	1,494	100.00 %	1.76 %
Dillsboro	119	213	90,212	213	100.00 %	0.24 %
Dobbins Heights	52	687	84,383	687	100.00 %	0.81 %
Dobson	90	1,462	82,937	1,462	100.00 %	1.76 %
Dortches	24	1,082	89,964	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	25	1,082	83,790	1,082	100.00 %	1.29 %
Dover	3	349	85,099	349	100.00 %	0.41 %
Drexel	86	1,760	87,570	1,760	100.00 %	2.01 %
Dublin	22	267	88,642	267	100.00 %	0.30 %
Duck	1	742	84,230	742	100.00 %	0.88 %
Dunn	53	8,446	89,622	8,446	100.00 %	9.42 %
Durham	2	283,506	90,751	28,462	10.04 %	31.36 %
	21	283,506	88,313	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	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	90,047	269	0.09 %	0.30 %
	49	283,506	84,041	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	50	283,506	85,345	144	0.05 %	0.17 %
Earl	111	198	90,809	198	100.00 %	0.22 %
East Arcadia	22	418	88,642	418	100.00 %	0.47 %
East Bend	77	634	90,628	634	100.00 %	0.70 %
East Laurinburg	48	234	86,256	234	100.00 %	0.27 %
Eastover	43	3,656	83,198	3,656	100.00 %	4.39 %
East Spencer	76	1,567	89,815	1,567	100.00 %	1.74 %
Eden	65	15,421	91,096	15,421	100.00 %	16.93 %
Edenton	1	4,460	84,230	4,460	100.00 %	5.30 %
Elizabeth City	1	18,631	84,230	38	0.20 %	0.05 %
	5	18,631	84,060	18,593	99.80 %	22.12 %
Elizabethtown	22	3,296	88,642	3,296	100.00 %	3.72 %
Elkin	90	4,122	82,937	4,122	100.00 %	4.97 %

District plan definition file: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 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: HCM-5 Amend

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Elk Park	85	542	89,525	542	100.00 %	0.61 %
Ellenboro	111	723	90,809	723	100.00 %	0.80 %
Ellerbe	52	864	84,383	864	100.00 %	1.02 %
Elm City	24	1,218	89,964	1,218	100.00 %	1.35 %
Elon	64	11,336	87,875	11,336	100.00 %	12.90 %
Emerald Isle	13	3,847	83,307	3,847	100.00 %	4.62 %
Enfield	27	1,865	84,735	1,865	100.00 %	2.20 %
Erwin	6	4,542	84,016	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	53	4,542	89,622	4,542	100.00 %	5.07 %
Eureka	10	214	83,352	214	100.00 %	0.26 %
Everetts	23	150	85,179	150	100.00 %	0.18 %
Fair Bluff	46	709	84,307	709	100.00 %	0.84 %
Fairmont	47	2,191	82,846	2,191	100.00 %	2.64 %
Fairview	69	3,456	88,795	3,456	100.00 %	3.89 %
Faison	4	784	83,269	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	83,198	324	100.00 %	0.39 %
Falkland	8	47	85,089	47	100.00 %	0.06 %
Fallston	110	627	89,588	627	100.00 %	0.70 %
Farmville	8	4,461	85,089	4,461	100.00 %	5.24 %
Fayetteville	42	208,501	84,462	67,330	32.29 %	79.72 %
	43	208,501	83,198	35,621	17.08 %	42.81 %
	44	208,501	83,751	78,340	37.57 %	93.54 %
	45	208,501	83,317	27,210	13.05 %	32.66 %
Flat Rock	113	3,486	91,102	3,486	100.00 %	3.83 %
	117	3,486	90,329	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Fletcher	117	7,987	90,329	7,987	100.00 %	8.84 %
Fontana Dam	120	13	84,907	13	100.00 %	0.02 %
Forest City	111	7,377	90,809	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	113	7,377	91,102	7,377	100.00 %	8.10 %
Forest Hills	119	303	90,212	303	100.00 %	0.34 %
Fountain	8	385	85,089	385	100.00 %	0.45 %
Four Oaks	28	2,158	85,389	2,158	100.00 %	2.53 %
Foxfire	52	1,288	84,383	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	78	1,288	86,365	1,288	100.00 %	1.49 %
Franklin	120	4,175	84,907	4,175	100.00 %	4.92 %
Franklinton	7	2,456	83,510	2,456	100.00 %	2.94 %
Franklinville	78	1,197	86,365	1,197	100.00 %	1.39 %
Fremont	10	1,196	83,352	1,196	100.00 %	1.43 %

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Fuquay-Varina	33	34,152	86,863	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	37	34,152	88,334	34,152	100.00 %	38.66 %
	53	34,152	89,622	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Gamewell	87	3,702	85,009	3,702	100.00 %	4.35 %
Garland	22	595	88,642	595	100.00 %	0.67 %
Garner	11	31,159	85,987	490	1.57 %	0.57 %
	33	31,159	86,863	30,658	98.39 %	35.29 %
	37	31,159	88,334	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	38	31,159	90,560	11	0.04 %	0.01 %
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	84,457	9,831	12.23 %	11.64 %
	109	80,411	87,462	52,909	65.80 %	60.49 %
	110	80,411	89,588	17,671	21.98 %	19.72 %
Gatesville	5	267	84,060	267	100.00 %	0.32 %
Gibson	48	449	86,256	449	100.00 %	0.52 %
Gibsonville	59	8,920	87,559	4,642	52.04 %	5.30 %
	64	8,920	87,875	4,278	47.96 %	4.87 %
Glen Alpine	86	1,529	87,570	1,529	100.00 %	1.75 %
Godwin	43	128	83,198	128	100.00 %	0.15 %
Goldsboro	10	33,657	83,352	7,074	21.02 %	8.49 %
	12	33,657	84,172	26,583	78.98 %	31.58 %
Goldston	54	234	83,475	234	100.00 %	0.28 %
Graham	63	17,157	83,540	17,157	100.00 %	20.54 %
	64	17,157	87,875	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Grandfather Village	85	95	89,525	95	100.00 %	0.11 %
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	85,842	692	100.00 %	0.81 %
Greenevers	4	567	83,269	567	100.00 %	0.68 %
Green Level	63	3,152	83,540	3,152	100.00 %	3.77 %
Greensboro	57	299,035	91,158	72,113	24.12 %	79.11 %
	58	299,035	89,713	72,909	24.38 %	81.27 %
	59	299,035	87,559	18,796	6.29 %	21.47 %
	60	299,035	90,919	1,397	0.47 %	1.54 %
	61	299,035	90,814	90,814	30.37 %	100.00 %
	62	299,035	91,136	43,006	14.38 %	47.19 %
Greenville	8	87,521	85,089	42,222	48.24 %	49.62 %
	9	87,521	85,154	45,299	51.76 %	53.20 %
Grifton	4	2,448	83,269	147	6.00 %	0.18 %
	9	2,448	85,154	2,301	94.00 %	2.70 %
Grimesland	8	386	85,089	386	100.00 %	0.45 %

District plan definition file: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 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: HCM-5 Amend

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Grover	111	802	90,809	802	100.00 %	0.88 %
Halifax	27	170	84,735	170	100.00 %	0.20 %
Hamilton	23	306	85,179	306	100.00 %	0.36 %
Hamlet	52	6,025	84,383	6,025	100.00 %	7.14 %
Harmony	84	543	85,875	543	100.00 %	0.63 %
Harrells	4	160	83,269	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	22	160	88,642	160	100.00 %	0.18 %
Harrellsville	5	85	84,060	85	100.00 %	0.10 %
Harrisburg	73	18,967	90,390	18,602	98.08 %	20.58 %
	83	18,967	90,967	365	1.92 %	0.40 %
Hassell	23	49	85,179	49	100.00 %	0.06 %
Havelock	3	16,621	85,099	5,986	36.01 %	7.03 %
	13	16,621	83,307	10,635	63.99 %	12.77 %
Haw River	63	2,252	83,540	2,252	100.00 %	2.70 %
Hayesville	120	461	84,907	461	100.00 %	0.54 %
Hemby Bridge	69	1,614	88,795	1,614	100.00 %	1.82 %
Henderson	32	15,060	88,633	15,060	100.00 %	16.99 %
Hendersonville	113	15,137	91,102	731	4.83 %	0.80 %
	117	15,137	90,329	14,406	95.17 %	15.95 %
Hertford	1	1,934	84,230	1,934	100.00 %	2.30 %
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	58	114,059	89,713	2,538	2.23 %	2.83 %
	60	114,059	90,919	77,884	68.28 %	85.66 %
	62	114,059	91,136	26,899	23.58 %	29.52 %
	70	114,059	89,118	8	0.01 %	0.01 %
	75	114,059	84,659	84	0.07 %	0.10 %
	80	114,059	84,864	6,646	5.83 %	7.83 %
High Shoals	110	595	89,588	595	100.00 %	0.66 %
Hildebran	86	1,679	87,570	1,679	100.00 %	1.92 %
Hillsborough	50	9,660	85,345	9,660	100.00 %	11.32 %
Hobgood	27	268	84,735	268	100.00 %	0.32 %
Hoffman	52	418	84,383	418	100.00 %	0.50 %
Holden Beach	17	921	89,763	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	19	921	91,041	921	100.00 %	1.01 %
Holly Ridge	16	4,171	85,097	4,171	100.00 %	4.90 %

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Holly Springs	11	41,239	85,987	1,355	3.29 %	1.58 %
	36	41,239	89,336	25,760	62.47 %	28.83 %
	37	41,239	88,334	14,124	34.25 %	15.99 %
Hookerton	10	413	83,352	413	100.00 %	0.50 %
Hope Mills	45	17,808	83,317	17,808	100.00 %	21.37 %
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	82,669	34,762	56.64 %	42.05 %
	106	61,376	86,758	20,721	33.76 %	23.88 %
	107	61,376	86,497	5,893	9.60 %	6.81 %
Indian Beach	13	223	83,307	223	100.00 %	0.27 %
Indian Trail	68	39,997	86,978	5,590	13.98 %	6.43 %
	69	39,997	88,795	34,407	86.02 %	38.75 %
Jackson	27	430	84,735	430	100.00 %	0.51 %
Jacksonville	14	72,723	90,506	47,353	65.11 %	52.32 %
	15	72,723	89,176	25,370	34.89 %	28.45 %
Jamestown	58	3,668	89,713	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	60	3,668	90,919	3,668	100.00 %	4.03 %
Jamesville	23	424	85,179	424	100.00 %	0.50 %
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	82	53,114	90,805	37,735	71.05 %	41.56 %
	83	53,114	90,967	15,379	28.95 %	16.91 %
Kelford	5	203	84,060	203	100.00 %	0.24 %
Kenansville	4	770	83,269	770	100.00 %	0.92 %
Kenly	25	1,491	83,790	198	13.28 %	0.24 %
	28	1,491	85,389	1,293	86.72 %	1.51 %
Kernersville	62	26,449	91,136	502	1.90 %	0.55 %
	75	26,449	84,659	25,947	98.10 %	30.65 %
Kill Devil Hills	79	7,656	85,842	7,656	100.00 %	8.92 %
King	91	7,197	85,749	7,197	100.00 %	8.39 %
Kings Mountain	110	11,142	89,588	1,110	9.96 %	1.24 %
	111	11,142	90,809	10,032	90.04 %	11.05 %
Kingstown	110	656	89,588	656	100.00 %	0.73 %
Kinston	4	19,900	83,269	1,182	5.94 %	1.42 %
	12	19,900	84,172	18,718	94.06 %	22.24 %
Kittrell	32	132	88,633	132	100.00 %	0.15 %
Kitty Hawk	1	3,689	84,230	3,689	100.00 %	4.38 %
Knightdale	38	19,435	90,560	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	39	19,435	86,971	19,435	100.00 %	22.35 %
Kure Beach	19	2,191	91,041	2,191	100.00 %	2.41 %
La Grange	12	2,595	84,172	2,595	100.00 %	3.08 %

District plan definition file: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 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: HCM-5 Amend

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	91,102	1,365	100.00 %	1.50 %
Lake Park	69	3,269	88,795	3,269	100.00 %	3.68 %
Lake Santeetlah	120	38	84,907	38	100.00 %	0.04 %
Lake Waccamaw	46	1,296	84,307	1,296	100.00 %	1.54 %
Landis	83	3,690	90,967	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	110	406	89,588	406	100.00 %	0.45 %
Laurel Park	117	2,250	90,329	2,250	100.00 %	2.49 %
Laurinburg	48	14,978	86,256	14,978	100.00 %	17.36 %
Lawndale	110	570	89,588	570	100.00 %	0.64 %
Leggett	23	37	85,179	37	100.00 %	0.04 %
Leland	17	22,908	89,763	22,908	100.00 %	25.52 %
Lenoir	87	18,352	85,009	18,352	100.00 %	21.59 %
Lewiston Woodville	5	426	84,060	426	100.00 %	0.51 %
Lewisville	74	13,381	89,692	13,381	100.00 %	14.92 %
Lexington	80	19,632	84,864	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	81	19,632	84,066	19,632	100.00 %	23.35 %
Liberty	54	2,655	83,475	2,655	100.00 %	3.18 %
Lilesville	55	395	84,549	395	100.00 %	0.47 %
Lillington	6	4,735	84,016	4,735	100.00 %	5.64 %
	53	4,735	89,622	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Lincolnton	97	11,091	86,810	11,091	100.00 %	12.78 %
Linden	43	136	83,198	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 %
	83	4,537	90,967	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	83,510	3,064	100.00 %	3.67 %
Love Valley	84	154	85,875	154	100.00 %	0.18 %
Lowell	108	3,654	84,457	3,654	100.00 %	4.33 %
	109	3,654	87,462	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Lucama	25	1,036	83,790	1,036	100.00 %	1.24 %
Lumber Bridge	46	82	84,307	82	100.00 %	0.10 %
Lumberton	46	19,025	84,307	454	2.39 %	0.54 %
	47	19,025	82,846	18,571	97.61 %	22.42 %
McAdenville	108	890	84,457	890	100.00 %	1.05 %
Macclesfield	23	413	85,179	413	100.00 %	0.48 %
McDonald	47	94	82,846	94	100.00 %	0.11 %
McFarlan	55	94	84,549	94	100.00 %	0.11 %
Macon	27	110	84,735	110	100.00 %	0.13 %

District plan definition file: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 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: HCM-5 Amend

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
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	83,269	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	85,842	1,600	100.00 %	1.86 %
Marietta	47	111	82,846	111	100.00 %	0.13 %
Marion	85	7,717	89,525	7,717	100.00 %	8.62 %
	113	7,717	91,102	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	84,549	2,522	100.00 %	2.98 %
Marvin	68	6,358	86,978	6,358	100.00 %	7.31 %
Matthews	103	29,435	88,259	29,435	100.00 %	33.35 %
Maxton	47	2,110	82,846	1,902	90.14 %	2.30 %
	48	2,110	86,256	208	9.86 %	0.24 %
Mayodan	65	2,418	91,096	2,418	100.00 %	2.65 %
Maysville	4	818	83,269	818	100.00 %	0.98 %
Mebane	50	17,797	85,345	3,171	17.82 %	3.72 %
	63	17,797	83,540	14,626	82.18 %	17.51 %
Mesic	79	144	85,842	144	100.00 %	0.17 %
Micro	28	458	85,389	458	100.00 %	0.54 %
Middleburg	32	101	88,633	101	100.00 %	0.11 %
Middlesex	25	912	83,790	912	100.00 %	1.09 %
Midland	83	4,684	90,967	4,684	100.00 %	5.15 %
	112	4,684	83,761	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Midway	80	4,742	84,864	3,469	73.15 %	4.09 %
	81	4,742	84,066	1,273	26.85 %	1.51 %
Mills River	117	7,078	90,329	7,078	100.00 %	7.84 %
Milton	50	155	85,345	155	100.00 %	0.18 %
Mineral Springs	55	3,159	84,549	193	6.11 %	0.23 %
	68	3,159	86,978	2,966	93.89 %	3.41 %
Minnesott Beach	79	530	85,842	530	100.00 %	0.62 %
Mint Hill	69	26,450	88,795	6	0.02 %	0.01 %
	112	26,450	83,761	26,444	99.98 %	31.57 %
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	83,790	277	100.00 %	0.33 %
Monroe	55	34,562	84,549	20,688	59.86 %	24.47 %
	68	34,562	86,978	1,511	4.37 %	1.74 %
	69	34,562	88,795	12,363	35.77 %	13.92 %
Montreat	114	901	89,628	901	100.00 %	1.01 %

District plan definition file: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 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: HCM-5 Amend

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Moorestown	111	293	90,809	293	100.00 %	0.32 %
Mooresville	95	50,193	86,264	50,193	100.00 %	58.19 %
Morehead City	13	9,556	83,307	9,556	100.00 %	11.47 %
Morganton	86	17,474	87,570	17,474	100.00 %	19.95 %
Morrisville	21	29,630	88,313	29,423	99.30 %	33.32 %
	31	29,630	91,241	207	0.70 %	0.23 %
	41	29,630	84,646	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Morven	55	329	84,549	329	100.00 %	0.39 %
Mount Airy	90	10,676	82,937	10,676	100.00 %	12.87 %
Mount Gilead	67	1,171	88,255	1,171	100.00 %	1.33 %
Mount Holly	108	17,703	84,457	17,703	100.00 %	20.96 %
Mount Olive	4	4,198	83,269	5	0.12 %	0.01 %
	10	4,198	83,352	4,171	99.36 %	5.00 %
	12	4,198	84,172	22	0.52 %	0.03 %
Mount Pleasant	83	1,671	90,967	1,671	100.00 %	1.84 %
Murfreesboro	5	2,619	84,060	2,619	100.00 %	3.12 %
Murphy	120	1,608	84,907	1,608	100.00 %	1.89 %
Nags Head	79	3,168	85,842	3,168	100.00 %	3.69 %
Nashville	25	5,632	83,790	5,632	100.00 %	6.72 %
Navassa	17	1,367	89,763	1,367	100.00 %	1.52 %
New Bern	3	31,291	85,099	31,291	100.00 %	36.77 %
Newland	85	715	89,525	715	100.00 %	0.80 %
New London	67	607	88,255	607	100.00 %	0.69 %
Newport	13	4,364	83,307	4,364	100.00 %	5.24 %
Newton	89	13,148	85,577	13,148	100.00 %	15.36 %
	96	13,148	89,587	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Newton Grove	22	585	88,642	585	100.00 %	0.66 %
Norlina	27	920	84,735	920	100.00 %	1.09 %
Norman	52	100	84,383	100	100.00 %	0.12 %
North Topsail Beach	16	1,005	85,097	1,005	100.00 %	1.18 %
Northwest	17	703	89,763	703	100.00 %	0.78 %
North Wilkesboro	94	4,382	90,835	4,382	100.00 %	4.82 %
Norwood	67	2,367	88,255	2,367	100.00 %	2.68 %
Oakboro	67	2,128	88,255	2,128	100.00 %	2.41 %
Oak City	23	266	85,179	266	100.00 %	0.31 %
Oak Island	19	8,396	91,041	8,396	100.00 %	9.22 %
Oak Ridge	57	7,474	91,158	29	0.39 %	0.03 %
	62	7,474	91,136	7,445	99.61 %	8.17 %
Ocean Isle Beach	17	867	89,763	867	100.00 %	0.97 %
Old Fort	85	811	89,525	811	100.00 %	0.91 %
Oriental	79	880	85,842	880	100.00 %	1.03 %
Orrum	46	59	84,307	59	100.00 %	0.07 %

District plan definition file: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 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: HCM-5 Amend

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Ossipee	64	536	87,875	536	100.00 %	0.61 %
Oxford	32	8,628	88,633	8,628	100.00 %	9.73 %
Pantego	79	164	85,842	164	100.00 %	0.19 %
Parkton	46	504	84,307	504	100.00 %	0.60 %
Parmele	23	243	85,179	243	100.00 %	0.29 %
Patterson Springs	111	571	90,809	571	100.00 %	0.63 %
Peachland	55	390	84,549	390	100.00 %	0.46 %
Peletier	13	769	83,307	769	100.00 %	0.92 %
Pembroke	47	2,823	82,846	2,823	100.00 %	3.41 %
Pikeville	10	712	83,352	712	100.00 %	0.85 %
Pilot Mountain	90	1,440	82,937	1,440	100.00 %	1.74 %
Pinebluff	52	1,473	84,383	1,473	100.00 %	1.75 %
Pinehurst	52	17,581	84,383	8	0.05 %	0.01 %
	78	17,581	86,365	17,573	99.95 %	20.35 %
Pine Knoll Shores	13	1,388	83,307	1,388	100.00 %	1.67 %
Pine Level	28	2,046	85,389	2,046	100.00 %	2.40 %
Pinetops	23	1,200	85,179	1,200	100.00 %	1.41 %
Pineville	92	10,602	89,640	3,621	34.15 %	4.04 %
	105	10,602	89,460	6,981	65.85 %	7.80 %
Pink Hill	4	451	83,269	451	100.00 %	0.54 %
Pittsboro	54	4,537	83,475	4,537	100.00 %	5.44 %
Pleasant Garden	58	5,000	89,713	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	59	5,000	87,559	5,000	100.00 %	5.71 %
Plymouth	23	3,320	85,179	3,320	100.00 %	3.90 %
Polkton	55	2,250	84,549	2,250	100.00 %	2.66 %
Polkville	110	516	89,588	516	100.00 %	0.58 %
Pollocksville	4	268	83,269	268	100.00 %	0.32 %
Powellsville	5	189	84,060	189	100.00 %	0.22 %
Princeton	28	1,315	85,389	1,315	100.00 %	1.54 %
Princeville	23	1,254	85,179	1,254	100.00 %	1.47 %
Proctorville	46	121	84,307	121	100.00 %	0.14 %
Raeford	48	4,559	86,256	4,559	100.00 %	5.29 %

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

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	85,987	52,233	11.17 %	60.75 %
	31	467,665	91,241	1,559	0.33 %	1.71 %
	33	467,665	86,863	21,874	4.68 %	25.18 %
	34	467,665	83,302	81,107	17.34 %	97.37 %
	35	467,665	86,765	16,132	3.45 %	18.59 %
	38	467,665	90,560	87,892	18.79 %	97.05 %
	39	467,665	86,971	11,902	2.54 %	13.69 %
	40	467,665	90,047	48,709	10.42 %	54.09 %
	41	467,665	84,646	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	49	467,665	84,041	64,064	13.70 %	76.23 %
	66	467,665	84,245	82,193	17.58 %	97.56 %
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	84,457	4,511	100.00 %	5.34 %
Raynham	47	60	82,846	60	100.00 %	0.07 %
Red Cross	67	762	88,255	762	100.00 %	0.86 %
Red Oak	25	3,342	83,790	3,342	100.00 %	3.99 %
Red Springs	47	3,087	82,846	3,087	100.00 %	3.73 %
	48	3,087	86,256	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Reidsville	65	14,583	91,096	14,583	100.00 %	16.01 %
Rennert	47	275	82,846	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	89,176	2,287	100.00 %	2.56 %
Rich Square	27	894	84,735	894	100.00 %	1.06 %
River Bend	3	2,902	85,099	2,902	100.00 %	3.41 %
Roanoke Rapids	27	15,229	84,735	15,229	100.00 %	17.97 %
Robbins	78	1,168	86,365	1,168	100.00 %	1.35 %
Robbinsville	120	597	84,907	597	100.00 %	0.70 %
Robersonville	23	1,269	85,179	1,269	100.00 %	1.49 %
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	85,179	15,414	28.37 %	18.10 %
	24	54,341	89,964	26,754	49.23 %	29.74 %
	25	54,341	83,790	12,173	22.40 %	14.53 %
Rolesville	35	9,475	86,765	9,475	100.00 %	10.92 %
Ronda	90	438	82,937	438	100.00 %	0.53 %
Roper	23	485	85,179	485	100.00 %	0.57 %
Roseboro	22	1,163	88,642	1,163	100.00 %	1.31 %
Rose Hill	4	1,371	83,269	1,371	100.00 %	1.65 %
Rosman	119	701	90,212	701	100.00 %	0.78 %

District plan definition file: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 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: HCM-5 Amend

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Rowland	47	885	82,846	885	100.00 %	1.07 %
Roxboro	2	8,134	90,751	8,134	100.00 %	8.96 %
Roxobel	5	187	84,060	187	100.00 %	0.22 %
Rural Hall	91	3,351	85,749	3,351	100.00 %	3.91 %
Ruth	113	347	91,102	347	100.00 %	0.38 %
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	91,102	3,640	100.00 %	4.00 %
St. Helena	16	417	85,097	417	100.00 %	0.49 %
St. James	19	6,529	91,041	6,529	100.00 %	7.17 %
St. Pauls	46	2,045	84,307	2,045	100.00 %	2.43 %
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	91,102	631	100.00 %	0.69 %
Sandy Creek	17	248	89,763	248	100.00 %	0.28 %
Sandyfield	46	430	84,307	430	100.00 %	0.51 %
Sanford	51	30,261	83,073	30,261	100.00 %	36.43 %
Saratoga	25	353	83,790	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	87,559	676	100.00 %	0.77 %
Selma	28	6,317	85,389	6,317	100.00 %	7.40 %
Seven Devils	85	313	89,525	38	12.14 %	0.04 %
	93	313	87,194	275	87.86 %	0.32 %
Seven Springs	12	55	84,172	55	100.00 %	0.07 %
Severn	27	191	84,735	191	100.00 %	0.23 %
Shallotte	17	4,185	89,763	4,185	100.00 %	4.66 %
Sharpsburg	23	1,697	85,179	215	12.67 %	0.25 %
	24	1,697	89,964	1,482	87.33 %	1.65 %
Shelby	110	21,918	89,588	4,432	20.22 %	4.95 %
	111	21,918	90,809	17,486	79.78 %	19.26 %
Siler City	54	7,702	83,475	7,702	100.00 %	9.23 %
Simpson	8	390	85,089	390	100.00 %	0.46 %
Sims	25	275	83,790	275	100.00 %	0.33 %
Smithfield	28	11,292	85,389	11,292	100.00 %	13.22 %
Snow Hill	10	1,481	83,352	1,481	100.00 %	1.78 %
Southern Pines	52	15,545	84,383	15,545	100.00 %	18.42 %
	78	15,545	86,365	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Southern Shores	1	3,090	84,230	3,090	100.00 %	3.67 %
Southport	19	3,971	91,041	3,971	100.00 %	4.36 %

District plan definition file: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 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: HCM-5 Amend

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Sparta	93	1,834	87,194	1,834	100.00 %	2.10 %
Speed	23	63	85,179	63	100.00 %	0.07 %
Spencer	76	3,308	89,815	3,308	100.00 %	3.68 %
Spencer Mountain	108	0	84,457	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Spindale	113	4,225	91,102	4,225	100.00 %	4.64 %
Spring Hope	25	1,309	83,790	1,309	100.00 %	1.56 %
Spring Lake	42	11,660	84,462	11,660	100.00 %	13.81 %
Spruce Pine	85	2,194	89,525	2,194	100.00 %	2.45 %
Staley	54	397	83,475	397	100.00 %	0.48 %
Stallings	68	16,112	86,978	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	69	16,112	88,795	15,728	97.62 %	17.71 %
	103	16,112	88,259	11	0.07 %	0.01 %
	112	16,112	83,761	373	2.32 %	0.45 %
Stanfield	67	1,585	88,255	1,585	100.00 %	1.80 %
Stanley	108	3,963	84,457	3,963	100.00 %	4.69 %
Stantonsburg	25	762	83,790	762	100.00 %	0.91 %
Star	67	806	88,255	806	100.00 %	0.91 %
Statesville	84	28,419	85,875	28,415	99.99 %	33.09 %
	89	28,419	85,577	4	0.01 %	0.00 %
Stedman	43	1,277	83,198	1,277	100.00 %	1.53 %
Stem	32	960	88,633	960	100.00 %	1.08 %
Stokesdale	62	5,924	91,136	5,924	100.00 %	6.50 %
Stoneville	65	1,308	91,096	1,308	100.00 %	1.44 %
Stonewall	79	214	85,842	214	100.00 %	0.25 %
Stovall	32	324	88,633	324	100.00 %	0.37 %
Sugar Mountain	85	371	89,525	371	100.00 %	0.41 %
Summerfield	57	10,951	91,158	10,951	100.00 %	12.01 %
Sunset Beach	17	4,175	89,763	4,175	100.00 %	4.65 %
Surf City	16	3,867	85,097	3,867	100.00 %	4.54 %
Swansboro	14	3,744	90,506	3,744	100.00 %	4.14 %
Sweepsonville	63	2,445	83,540	2,445	100.00 %	2.93 %
Sylva	119	2,578	90,212	2,578	100.00 %	2.86 %
Tabor City	46	3,781	84,307	3,781	100.00 %	4.48 %
Tarboro	23	10,721	85,179	10,721	100.00 %	12.59 %
Tar Heel	22	90	88,642	90	100.00 %	0.10 %
Taylorsville	94	2,320	90,835	2,320	100.00 %	2.55 %
Taylortown	52	634	84,383	4	0.63 %	0.00 %
	78	634	86,365	630	99.37 %	0.73 %
Teachey	4	448	83,269	448	100.00 %	0.54 %
Thomasville	70	27,183	89,118	521	1.92 %	0.58 %
	80	27,183	84,864	26,662	98.08 %	31.42 %
Tobaccoville	91	2,578	85,749	2,578	100.00 %	3.01 %

District plan definition file: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 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: HCM-5 Amend

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Topsail Beach	16	461	85,097	461	100.00 %	0.54 %
Trenton	4	238	83,269	238	100.00 %	0.29 %
Trent Woods	3	4,074	85,099	4,074	100.00 %	4.79 %
Trinity	70	7,006	89,118	7,006	100.00 %	7.86 %
Troutman	84	3,698	85,875	885	23.93 %	1.03 %
	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	91,102	1,562	100.00 %	1.71 %
Turkey	22	213	88,642	213	100.00 %	0.24 %
Unionville	69	6,643	88,795	6,643	100.00 %	7.48 %
Valdese	86	4,689	87,570	4,689	100.00 %	5.35 %
Vanceboro	3	869	85,099	869	100.00 %	1.02 %
Vandemere	79	246	85,842	246	100.00 %	0.29 %
Varnamtown	19	525	91,041	525	100.00 %	0.58 %
Vass	51	952	83,073	952	100.00 %	1.15 %
Waco	110	310	89,588	310	100.00 %	0.35 %
Wade	43	638	83,198	638	100.00 %	0.77 %
Wadesboro	55	5,008	84,549	5,008	100.00 %	5.92 %
Wagram	48	615	86,256	615	100.00 %	0.71 %
Wake Forest	7	47,601	83,510	1,504	3.16 %	1.80 %
	35	47,601	86,765	46,097	96.84 %	53.13 %
Walkertown	75	5,692	84,659	4,257	74.79 %	5.03 %
	91	5,692	85,749	1,435	25.21 %	1.67 %
Wallace	4	3,413	83,269	3,413	100.00 %	4.10 %
	16	3,413	85,097	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Wallburg	80	3,051	84,864	3,051	100.00 %	3.60 %
Walnut Cove	91	1,586	85,749	1,586	100.00 %	1.85 %
Walnut Creek	12	1,084	84,172	1,084	100.00 %	1.29 %
Walstonburg	10	193	83,352	193	100.00 %	0.23 %
Warrenton	27	851	84,735	851	100.00 %	1.00 %
Warsaw	4	2,733	83,269	2,733	100.00 %	3.28 %
Washington	79	9,875	85,842	9,875	100.00 %	11.50 %
Washington Park	79	392	85,842	392	100.00 %	0.46 %
Watha	16	181	85,097	181	100.00 %	0.21 %
Waxhaw	55	20,534	84,549	1,631	7.94 %	1.93 %
	68	20,534	86,978	18,903	92.06 %	21.73 %
Waynesville	118	10,140	83,282	10,140	100.00 %	12.18 %
Weaverville	116	4,567	90,981	4,567	100.00 %	5.02 %
Webster	119	372	90,212	372	100.00 %	0.41 %
Weddington	68	13,181	86,978	13,172	99.93 %	15.14 %
	69	13,181	88,795	4	0.03 %	0.00 %
	103	13,181	88,259	5	0.04 %	0.01 %

District plan definition file: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 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: HCM-5 Amend

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Weldon	27	1,444	84,735	1,444	100.00 %	1.70 %
Wendell	39	9,793	86,971	9,793	100.00 %	11.26 %
Wentworth	65	2,662	91,096	2,662	100.00 %	2.92 %
Wesley Chapel	68	8,681	86,978	8,449	97.33 %	9.71 %
	69	8,681	88,795	232	2.67 %	0.26 %
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	85,179	290	46.25 %	0.34 %
	25	627	83,790	337	53.75 %	0.40 %
White Lake	22	843	88,642	843	100.00 %	0.95 %
Whiteville	46	4,766	84,307	4,766	100.00 %	5.65 %
Whitsett	59	584	87,559	584	100.00 %	0.67 %
Wilkesboro	94	3,687	90,835	3,687	100.00 %	4.06 %
Williamston	23	5,248	85,179	5,248	100.00 %	6.16 %
Wilmington	18	115,451	90,862	37,227	32.24 %	40.97 %
	19	115,451	91,041	8,207	7.11 %	9.01 %
	20	115,451	90,729	70,017	60.65 %	77.17 %
Wilson	24	47,851	89,964	47,340	98.93 %	52.62 %
	25	47,851	83,790	511	1.07 %	0.61 %
Wilson's Mills	26	2,534	90,540	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	28	2,534	85,389	2,534	100.00 %	2.97 %
Windsor	5	3,582	84,060	3,582	100.00 %	4.26 %
Winfall	1	555	84,230	555	100.00 %	0.66 %
Wingate	55	4,055	84,549	4,055	100.00 %	4.80 %
Winston-Salem	71	249,545	83,748	81,468	32.65 %	97.28 %
	72	249,545	83,262	83,262	33.37 %	100.00 %
	74	249,545	89,692	40,157	16.09 %	44.77 %
	75	249,545	84,659	31,045	12.44 %	36.67 %
	91	249,545	85,749	13,613	5.46 %	15.88 %
Winterville	9	10,462	85,154	10,462	100.00 %	12.29 %
Winton	5	629	84,060	629	100.00 %	0.75 %
Woodfin	116	7,936	90,981	7,936	100.00 %	8.72 %
Woodland	27	557	84,735	557	100.00 %	0.66 %
Wrightsville Beach	18	2,473	90,862	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	20	2,473	90,729	2,473	100.00 %	2.73 %
Yadkinville	77	2,995	90,628	2,995	100.00 %	3.30 %
Yanceyville	50	1,937	85,345	1,937	100.00 %	2.27 %
Youngsville	7	2,016	83,510	2,016	100.00 %	2.41 %
Zebulon	26	6,903	90,540	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	39	6,903	86,971	6,903	100.00 %	7.94 %
Assigned Geography Total:				6,017,605		

Municipality - District Report

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

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: 113

Splits Involving Population: 79

Municipality by County - District Report

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

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	84,060	4,891	100.00 %	5.82 %
Alamance	64	988	87,875	988	100.00 %	1.12 %
Albemarle	67	16,432	88,255	16,432	100.00 %	18.62 %
Alliance	79	733	85,842	733	100.00 %	0.85 %
Andrews	120	1,667	84,907	1,667	100.00 %	1.96 %
Angier (Harnett)	53	4,709	89,622	4,709	100.00 %	5.25 %
Angier (Wake)	37	556	88,334	556	100.00 %	0.63 %
Ansonville	55	440	84,549	440	100.00 %	0.52 %
Apex	21	58,780	88,313	6	0.01 %	0.01 %
	36	58,780	89,336	45,473	77.36 %	50.90 %
	41	58,780	84,646	13,301	22.63 %	15.71 %
Arapahoe	79	416	85,842	416	100.00 %	0.48 %
Archdale (Guilford)	60	380	90,919	380	100.00 %	0.42 %
Archdale (Randolph)	70	11,527	89,118	11,527	100.00 %	12.93 %
Archer Lodge	26	4,797	90,540	4,797	100.00 %	5.30 %
Asheboro	70	27,156	89,118	25,890	95.34 %	29.05 %
	78	27,156	86,365	1,266	4.66 %	1.47 %
Asheville	114	94,589	89,628	37,562	39.71 %	41.91 %
	115	94,589	88,843	30,907	32.68 %	34.79 %
	116	94,589	90,981	26,120	27.61 %	28.71 %
Askewville	5	184	84,060	184	100.00 %	0.22 %
Atkinson	16	296	85,097	296	100.00 %	0.35 %
Atlantic Beach	13	1,364	83,307	1,364	100.00 %	1.64 %
Aulander	5	763	84,060	763	100.00 %	0.91 %
Aurora	79	455	85,842	455	100.00 %	0.53 %
Autryville	22	167	88,642	167	100.00 %	0.19 %
Ayden	9	4,977	85,154	4,977	100.00 %	5.84 %
Badin	67	2,024	88,255	2,024	100.00 %	2.29 %
Bailey	25	568	83,790	568	100.00 %	0.68 %
Bakersville	85	450	89,525	450	100.00 %	0.50 %
Bald Head Island	19	268	91,041	268	100.00 %	0.29 %
Banner Elk	85	1,049	89,525	1,049	100.00 %	1.17 %
Bath	79	245	85,842	245	100.00 %	0.29 %
Bayboro	79	1,161	85,842	1,161	100.00 %	1.35 %
Bear Grass	23	89	85,179	89	100.00 %	0.10 %
Beaufort	13	4,464	83,307	4,464	100.00 %	5.36 %
Beech Mountain (Avery)	85	62	89,525	62	100.00 %	0.07 %
Beech Mountain (Watauga)	93	613	87,194	613	100.00 %	0.70 %
Belhaven	79	1,410	85,842	1,410	100.00 %	1.64 %

District plan definition file: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 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: HCM-5 Amend

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	84,457	6,006	40.01 %	7.11 %
	109	15,010	87,462	9,004	59.99 %	10.29 %
Belville	17	2,406	89,763	2,406	100.00 %	2.68 %
Belwood	110	857	89,588	857	100.00 %	0.96 %
Benson (Harnett)	53	0	89,622	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	89,588	5,428	100.00 %	6.06 %
Bethania	74	344	89,692	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	91	344	85,749	344	100.00 %	0.40 %
Bethel	8	1,373	85,089	1,373	100.00 %	1.61 %
Beulaville	4	1,116	83,269	1,116	100.00 %	1.34 %
Biltmore Forest	115	1,409	88,843	1,409	100.00 %	1.59 %
Biscoe	67	1,848	88,255	1,848	100.00 %	2.09 %
Black Creek	25	692	83,790	692	100.00 %	0.83 %
Black Mountain	114	8,426	89,628	8,426	100.00 %	9.40 %
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	84,307	166	100.00 %	0.20 %
Bogue	13	695	83,307	695	100.00 %	0.83 %
Boiling Spring Lakes	19	5,943	91,041	5,943	100.00 %	6.53 %
Boiling Springs	111	4,615	90,809	4,615	100.00 %	5.08 %
Bolivia	19	149	91,041	149	100.00 %	0.16 %
Bolton	46	519	84,307	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	90,809	355	100.00 %	0.39 %
Brevard	119	7,744	90,212	7,744	100.00 %	8.58 %
Bridgeton	3	349	85,099	349	100.00 %	0.41 %
Broadway (Harnett)	6	0	84,016	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	84,307	973	100.00 %	1.15 %
Bryson City	119	1,558	90,212	1,558	100.00 %	1.73 %
Bunn	7	327	83,510	327	100.00 %	0.39 %
Burgaw	16	3,088	85,097	3,088	100.00 %	3.63 %
Burlington (Alamance)	63	55,481	83,540	20,671	37.26 %	24.74 %
	64	55,481	87,875	34,810	62.74 %	39.61 %

District plan definition file: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 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: HCM-5 Amend

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 (Guilford)	59	1,822	87,559	1,822	100.00 %	2.08 %
Burnsville	85	1,614	89,525	1,614	100.00 %	1.80 %
Butner	32	8,397	88,633	8,397	100.00 %	9.47 %
Cajah's Mountain	87	2,722	85,009	2,722	100.00 %	3.20 %
Calabash	17	2,011	89,763	2,011	100.00 %	2.24 %
Calypso	4	327	83,269	327	100.00 %	0.39 %
Cameron	51	244	83,073	244	100.00 %	0.29 %
Candor (Montgomery)	67	813	88,255	813	100.00 %	0.92 %
Candor (Moore)	78	0	86,365	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Canton	118	4,422	83,282	4,422	100.00 %	5.31 %
Cape Carteret	13	2,224	83,307	2,224	100.00 %	2.67 %
Carolina Beach	19	6,564	91,041	6,564	100.00 %	7.21 %
Carolina Shores	17	4,588	89,763	4,588	100.00 %	5.11 %
Carrboro	50	21,295	85,345	174	0.82 %	0.20 %
	56	21,295	86,087	21,121	99.18 %	24.53 %
Carthage	51	2,775	83,073	2,747	98.99 %	3.31 %
	52	2,775	84,383	28	1.01 %	0.03 %
Cary (Chatham)	54	3,709	83,475	3,709	100.00 %	4.44 %
Cary (Wake)	11	171,012	85,987	15,301	8.95 %	17.79 %
	21	171,012	88,313	57,857	33.83 %	65.51 %
	36	171,012	89,336	8,272	4.84 %	9.26 %
	37	171,012	88,334	2,012	1.18 %	2.28 %
	41	171,012	84,646	70,058	40.97 %	82.77 %
	49	171,012	84,041	17,512	10.24 %	20.84 %
Casar	110	305	89,588	305	100.00 %	0.34 %
Castalia	25	264	83,790	264	100.00 %	0.32 %
Caswell Beach	19	395	91,041	395	100.00 %	0.43 %
Catawba	89	702	85,577	702	100.00 %	0.82 %
Cedar Point	13	1,764	83,307	1,764	100.00 %	2.12 %
Cedar Rock	87	301	85,009	301	100.00 %	0.35 %
Cerro Gordo	46	131	84,307	131	100.00 %	0.16 %
Chadbourn	46	1,574	84,307	1,574	100.00 %	1.87 %
Chapel Hill (Durham)	29	2,906	90,900	2,906	100.00 %	3.20 %
Chapel Hill (Orange)	56	59,054	86,087	59,054	100.00 %	68.60 %

District plan definition file: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 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: HCM-5 Amend

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	86,239	81,695	9.34 %	94.73 %
	92	874,579	89,640	69,175	7.91 %	77.17 %
	99	874,579	82,746	78,624	8.99 %	95.02 %
	100	874,579	82,932	82,932	9.48 %	100.00 %
	101	874,579	84,391	73,459	8.40 %	87.05 %
	102	874,579	87,483	87,483	10.00 %	100.00 %
	103	874,579	88,259	57,696	6.60 %	65.37 %
	104	874,579	84,647	84,647	9.68 %	100.00 %
	105	874,579	89,460	78,415	8.97 %	87.65 %
	106	874,579	86,758	59,599	6.81 %	68.70 %
	107	874,579	86,497	75,124	8.59 %	86.85 %
112	874,579	83,761	45,730	5.23 %	54.60 %	
Cherryville	110	6,078	89,588	6,078	100.00 %	6.78 %
Chimney Rock Village	113	140	91,102	140	100.00 %	0.15 %
China Grove	83	4,434	90,967	4,434	100.00 %	4.87 %
Chocowinity	79	722	85,842	722	100.00 %	0.84 %
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	90,540	26,307	100.00 %	29.06 %
Clayton (Wake)	33	0	86,863	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	39	0	86,971	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Clemmons	74	21,163	89,692	21,163	100.00 %	23.60 %
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	89,622	2,155	100.00 %	2.40 %
Cofield	5	267	84,060	267	100.00 %	0.32 %
Colerain	5	217	84,060	217	100.00 %	0.26 %
Columbia	23	610	85,179	610	100.00 %	0.72 %
Columbus	113	1,060	91,102	1,060	100.00 %	1.16 %
Como	5	67	84,060	67	100.00 %	0.08 %
Concord	73	105,240	90,390	53,986	51.30 %	59.73 %
	82	105,240	90,805	43,784	41.60 %	48.22 %
	83	105,240	90,967	7,470	7.10 %	8.21 %
Conetoe	23	198	85,179	198	100.00 %	0.23 %
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	82,669	31,412	100.00 %	38.00 %

District plan definition file: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 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: HCM-5 Amend

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Cove City	3	378	85,099	378	100.00 %	0.44 %
Cramerton	108	5,296	84,457	123	2.32 %	0.15 %
	109	5,296	87,462	5,173	97.68 %	5.91 %
Creedmoor	7	4,866	83,510	2,065	42.44 %	2.47 %
	32	4,866	88,633	2,801	57.56 %	3.16 %
Creswell	23	207	85,179	207	100.00 %	0.24 %
Crossnore	85	143	89,525	143	100.00 %	0.16 %
Dallas	108	5,927	84,457	5,927	100.00 %	7.02 %
Danbury	91	189	85,749	189	100.00 %	0.22 %
Davidson (Iredell)	95	378	86,264	378	100.00 %	0.44 %
Davidson (Mecklenburg)	98	14,728	82,669	14,728	100.00 %	17.82 %
Dellview	110	6	89,588	6	100.00 %	0.01 %
Denton	80	1,494	84,864	1,494	100.00 %	1.76 %
Dillsboro	119	213	90,212	213	100.00 %	0.24 %
Dobbins Heights	52	687	84,383	687	100.00 %	0.81 %
Dobson	90	1,462	82,937	1,462	100.00 %	1.76 %
Dortches	24	1,082	89,964	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	25	1,082	83,790	1,082	100.00 %	1.29 %
Dover	3	349	85,099	349	100.00 %	0.41 %
Drexel	86	1,760	87,570	1,760	100.00 %	2.01 %
Dublin	22	267	88,642	267	100.00 %	0.30 %
Duck	1	742	84,230	742	100.00 %	0.88 %
Dunn	53	8,446	89,622	8,446	100.00 %	9.42 %
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	85,345	144	100.00 %	0.17 %
Durham (Wake)	21	269	88,313	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	40	269	90,047	269	100.00 %	0.30 %
	49	269	84,041	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Earl	111	198	90,809	198	100.00 %	0.22 %
East Arcadia	22	418	88,642	418	100.00 %	0.47 %
East Bend	77	634	90,628	634	100.00 %	0.70 %
East Laurinburg	48	234	86,256	234	100.00 %	0.27 %
East Spencer	76	1,567	89,815	1,567	100.00 %	1.74 %
Eastover	43	3,656	83,198	3,656	100.00 %	4.39 %
Eden	65	15,421	91,096	15,421	100.00 %	16.93 %
Edenton	1	4,460	84,230	4,460	100.00 %	5.30 %
Elizabeth City (Camden)	1	38	84,230	38	100.00 %	0.05 %

District plan definition file: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 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: HCM-5 Amend

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Elizabeth City (Pasquotank)	1	18,593	84,230	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	5	18,593	84,060	18,593	100.00 %	22.12 %
Elizabethtown	22	3,296	88,642	3,296	100.00 %	3.72 %
Elk Park	85	542	89,525	542	100.00 %	0.61 %
Elkin (Surry)	90	4,049	82,937	4,049	100.00 %	4.88 %
Elkin (Wilkes)	90	73	82,937	73	100.00 %	0.09 %
Ellenboro	111	723	90,809	723	100.00 %	0.80 %
Ellerbe	52	864	84,383	864	100.00 %	1.02 %
Elm City (Nash)	24	0	89,964	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Elm City (Wilson)	24	1,218	89,964	1,218	100.00 %	1.35 %
Elon	64	11,336	87,875	11,336	100.00 %	12.90 %
Emerald Isle	13	3,847	83,307	3,847	100.00 %	4.62 %
Enfield	27	1,865	84,735	1,865	100.00 %	2.20 %
Erwin	6	4,542	84,016	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	53	4,542	89,622	4,542	100.00 %	5.07 %
Eureka	10	214	83,352	214	100.00 %	0.26 %
Everetts	23	150	85,179	150	100.00 %	0.18 %
Fair Bluff	46	709	84,307	709	100.00 %	0.84 %
Fairmont	47	2,191	82,846	2,191	100.00 %	2.64 %
Fairview	69	3,456	88,795	3,456	100.00 %	3.89 %
Faison (Duplin)	4	784	83,269	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	83,198	324	100.00 %	0.39 %
Falcon (Sampson)	22	0	88,642	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Falkland	8	47	85,089	47	100.00 %	0.06 %
Fallston	110	627	89,588	627	100.00 %	0.70 %
Farmville	8	4,461	85,089	4,461	100.00 %	5.24 %
Fayetteville	42	208,501	84,462	67,330	32.29 %	79.72 %
	43	208,501	83,198	35,621	17.08 %	42.81 %
	44	208,501	83,751	78,340	37.57 %	93.54 %
	45	208,501	83,317	27,210	13.05 %	32.66 %
Flat Rock	113	3,486	91,102	3,486	100.00 %	3.83 %
	117	3,486	90,329	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Fletcher	117	7,987	90,329	7,987	100.00 %	8.84 %
Fontana Dam	120	13	84,907	13	100.00 %	0.02 %
Forest City	111	7,377	90,809	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	113	7,377	91,102	7,377	100.00 %	8.10 %
Forest Hills	119	303	90,212	303	100.00 %	0.34 %
Fountain	8	385	85,089	385	100.00 %	0.45 %
Four Oaks	28	2,158	85,389	2,158	100.00 %	2.53 %

District plan definition file: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 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: HCM-5 Amend

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Foxfire	52	1,288	84,383	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	78	1,288	86,365	1,288	100.00 %	1.49 %
Franklin	120	4,175	84,907	4,175	100.00 %	4.92 %
Franklinton	7	2,456	83,510	2,456	100.00 %	2.94 %
Franklinville	78	1,197	86,365	1,197	100.00 %	1.39 %
Fremont	10	1,196	83,352	1,196	100.00 %	1.43 %
Fuquay-Varina (Harnett)	53	0	89,622	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Fuquay-Varina (Wake)	33	34,152	86,863	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	37	34,152	88,334	34,152	100.00 %	38.66 %
Gamewell	87	3,702	85,009	3,702	100.00 %	4.35 %
Garland	22	595	88,642	595	100.00 %	0.67 %
Garner	11	31,159	85,987	490	1.57 %	0.57 %
	33	31,159	86,863	30,658	98.39 %	35.29 %
	37	31,159	88,334	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	38	31,159	90,560	11	0.04 %	0.01 %
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	84,457	9,831	12.23 %	11.64 %
	109	80,411	87,462	52,909	65.80 %	60.49 %
	110	80,411	89,588	17,671	21.98 %	19.72 %
Gatesville	5	267	84,060	267	100.00 %	0.32 %
Gibson	48	449	86,256	449	100.00 %	0.52 %
Gibsonville (Alamance)	64	4,278	87,875	4,278	100.00 %	4.87 %
Gibsonville (Guilford)	59	4,642	87,559	4,642	100.00 %	5.30 %
Glen Alpine	86	1,529	87,570	1,529	100.00 %	1.75 %
Godwin	43	128	83,198	128	100.00 %	0.15 %
Goldsboro	10	33,657	83,352	7,074	21.02 %	8.49 %
	12	33,657	84,172	26,583	78.98 %	31.58 %
Goldston	54	234	83,475	234	100.00 %	0.28 %
Graham	63	17,157	83,540	17,157	100.00 %	20.54 %
	64	17,157	87,875	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Grandfather Village	85	95	89,525	95	100.00 %	0.11 %
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	85,842	692	100.00 %	0.81 %
Green Level	63	3,152	83,540	3,152	100.00 %	3.77 %
Greenevers	4	567	83,269	567	100.00 %	0.68 %

District plan definition file: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 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: HCM-5 Amend

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Greensboro	57	299,035	91,158	72,113	24.12 %	79.11 %
	58	299,035	89,713	72,909	24.38 %	81.27 %
	59	299,035	87,559	18,796	6.29 %	21.47 %
	60	299,035	90,919	1,397	0.47 %	1.54 %
	61	299,035	90,814	90,814	30.37 %	100.00 %
	62	299,035	91,136	43,006	14.38 %	47.19 %
Greenville	8	87,521	85,089	42,222	48.24 %	49.62 %
	9	87,521	85,154	45,299	51.76 %	53.20 %
Grifton (Lenoir)	4	147	83,269	147	100.00 %	0.18 %
Grifton (Pitt)	9	2,301	85,154	2,301	100.00 %	2.70 %
Grimesland	8	386	85,089	386	100.00 %	0.45 %
Grover	111	802	90,809	802	100.00 %	0.88 %
Halifax	27	170	84,735	170	100.00 %	0.20 %
Hamilton	23	306	85,179	306	100.00 %	0.36 %
Hamlet	52	6,025	84,383	6,025	100.00 %	7.14 %
Harmony	84	543	85,875	543	100.00 %	0.63 %
Harrells (Duplin)	4	0	83,269	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Harrells (Sampson)	22	160	88,642	160	100.00 %	0.18 %
Harrellsville	5	85	84,060	85	100.00 %	0.10 %
Harrisburg	73	18,967	90,390	18,602	98.08 %	20.58 %
	83	18,967	90,967	365	1.92 %	0.40 %
Hassell	23	49	85,179	49	100.00 %	0.06 %
Havelock	3	16,621	85,099	5,986	36.01 %	7.03 %
	13	16,621	83,307	10,635	63.99 %	12.77 %
Haw River	63	2,252	83,540	2,252	100.00 %	2.70 %
Hayesville	120	461	84,907	461	100.00 %	0.54 %
Hemby Bridge	69	1,614	88,795	1,614	100.00 %	1.82 %
Henderson	32	15,060	88,633	15,060	100.00 %	16.99 %
Hendersonville	113	15,137	91,102	731	4.83 %	0.80 %
	117	15,137	90,329	14,406	95.17 %	15.95 %
Hertford	1	1,934	84,230	1,934	100.00 %	2.30 %
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	84,864	6,646	100.00 %	7.83 %
High Point (Forsyth)	75	84	84,659	84	100.00 %	0.10 %
High Point (Guilford)	58	107,321	89,713	2,538	2.36 %	2.83 %
	60	107,321	90,919	77,884	72.57 %	85.66 %
	62	107,321	91,136	26,899	25.06 %	29.52 %
High Point (Randolph)	70	8	89,118	8	100.00 %	0.01 %

District plan definition file: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 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: HCM-5 Amend

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
High Shoals	110	595	89,588	595	100.00 %	0.66 %
Highlands (Jackson)	119	12	90,212	12	100.00 %	0.01 %
Highlands (Macon)	120	1,060	84,907	1,060	100.00 %	1.25 %
Hildebran	86	1,679	87,570	1,679	100.00 %	1.92 %
Hillsborough	50	9,660	85,345	9,660	100.00 %	11.32 %
Hobgood	27	268	84,735	268	100.00 %	0.32 %
Hoffman	52	418	84,383	418	100.00 %	0.50 %
Holden Beach	17	921	89,763	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	19	921	91,041	921	100.00 %	1.01 %
Holly Ridge	16	4,171	85,097	4,171	100.00 %	4.90 %
Holly Springs	11	41,239	85,987	1,355	3.29 %	1.58 %
	36	41,239	89,336	25,760	62.47 %	28.83 %
	37	41,239	88,334	14,124	34.25 %	15.99 %
Hookerton	10	413	83,352	413	100.00 %	0.50 %
Hope Mills	45	17,808	83,317	17,808	100.00 %	21.37 %
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	82,669	34,762	56.64 %	42.05 %
	106	61,376	86,758	20,721	33.76 %	23.88 %
	107	61,376	86,497	5,893	9.60 %	6.81 %
Indian Beach	13	223	83,307	223	100.00 %	0.27 %
Indian Trail	68	39,997	86,978	5,590	13.98 %	6.43 %
	69	39,997	88,795	34,407	86.02 %	38.75 %
Jackson	27	430	84,735	430	100.00 %	0.51 %
Jacksonville	14	72,723	90,506	47,353	65.11 %	52.32 %
	15	72,723	89,176	25,370	34.89 %	28.45 %
Jamestown	58	3,668	89,713	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	60	3,668	90,919	3,668	100.00 %	4.03 %
Jamesville	23	424	85,179	424	100.00 %	0.50 %
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)	82	42,846	90,805	37,735	88.07 %	41.56 %
	83	42,846	90,967	5,111	11.93 %	5.62 %
Kannapolis (Rowan)	83	10,268	90,967	10,268	100.00 %	11.29 %
Kelford	5	203	84,060	203	100.00 %	0.24 %
Kenansville	4	770	83,269	770	100.00 %	0.92 %
Kenly (Johnston)	28	1,293	85,389	1,293	100.00 %	1.51 %
Kenly (Wilson)	25	198	83,790	198	100.00 %	0.24 %
Kernersville (Forsyth)	75	25,947	84,659	25,947	100.00 %	30.65 %
Kernersville (Guilford)	62	502	91,136	502	100.00 %	0.55 %
Kill Devil Hills	79	7,656	85,842	7,656	100.00 %	8.92 %

District plan definition file: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 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: HCM-5 Amend

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
King (Forsyth)	91	591	85,749	591	100.00 %	0.69 %
King (Stokes)	91	6,606	85,749	6,606	100.00 %	7.70 %
Kings Mountain (Cleveland)	110	10,032	89,588	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	111	10,032	90,809	10,032	100.00 %	11.05 %
Kings Mountain (Gaston)	110	1,110	89,588	1,110	100.00 %	1.24 %
Kingstown	110	656	89,588	656	100.00 %	0.73 %
Kinston	4	19,900	83,269	1,182	5.94 %	1.42 %
	12	19,900	84,172	18,718	94.06 %	22.24 %
Kittrell	32	132	88,633	132	100.00 %	0.15 %
Kitty Hawk	1	3,689	84,230	3,689	100.00 %	4.38 %
Knightdale	38	19,435	90,560	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	39	19,435	86,971	19,435	100.00 %	22.35 %
Kure Beach	19	2,191	91,041	2,191	100.00 %	2.41 %
La Grange	12	2,595	84,172	2,595	100.00 %	3.08 %
Lake Lure	113	1,365	91,102	1,365	100.00 %	1.50 %
Lake Park	69	3,269	88,795	3,269	100.00 %	3.68 %
Lake Santeetlah	120	38	84,907	38	100.00 %	0.04 %
Lake Waccamaw	46	1,296	84,307	1,296	100.00 %	1.54 %
Landis	83	3,690	90,967	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	110	406	89,588	406	100.00 %	0.45 %
Laurel Park	117	2,250	90,329	2,250	100.00 %	2.49 %
Laurinburg	48	14,978	86,256	14,978	100.00 %	17.36 %
Lawndale	110	570	89,588	570	100.00 %	0.64 %
Leggett	23	37	85,179	37	100.00 %	0.04 %
Leland	17	22,908	89,763	22,908	100.00 %	25.52 %
Lenoir	87	18,352	85,009	18,352	100.00 %	21.59 %
Lewiston Woodville	5	426	84,060	426	100.00 %	0.51 %
Lewisville	74	13,381	89,692	13,381	100.00 %	14.92 %
Lexington	80	19,632	84,864	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	81	19,632	84,066	19,632	100.00 %	23.35 %
Liberty	54	2,655	83,475	2,655	100.00 %	3.18 %
Lilesville	55	395	84,549	395	100.00 %	0.47 %
Lillington	6	4,735	84,016	4,735	100.00 %	5.64 %
	53	4,735	89,622	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Lincolnton	97	11,091	86,810	11,091	100.00 %	12.78 %
Linden	43	136	83,198	136	100.00 %	0.16 %
Littleton	27	559	84,735	559	100.00 %	0.66 %
Locust (Cabarrus)	83	541	90,967	541	100.00 %	0.59 %
Locust (Stanly)	67	3,996	88,255	3,996	100.00 %	4.53 %

District plan definition file: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 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: HCM-5 Amend

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Long View (Burke)	86	735	87,570	735	100.00 %	0.84 %
Long View (Catawba)	96	4,353	89,587	4,353	100.00 %	4.86 %
Louisburg	7	3,064	83,510	3,064	100.00 %	3.67 %
Love Valley	84	154	85,875	154	100.00 %	0.18 %
Lowell	108	3,654	84,457	3,654	100.00 %	4.33 %
	109	3,654	87,462	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Lucama	25	1,036	83,790	1,036	100.00 %	1.24 %
Lumber Bridge	46	82	84,307	82	100.00 %	0.10 %
Lumberton	46	19,025	84,307	454	2.39 %	0.54 %
	47	19,025	82,846	18,571	97.61 %	22.42 %
Macclesfield	23	413	85,179	413	100.00 %	0.48 %
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	83,269	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	85,842	1,600	100.00 %	1.86 %
Marietta	47	111	82,846	111	100.00 %	0.13 %
Marion	85	7,717	89,525	7,717	100.00 %	8.62 %
	113	7,717	91,102	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	84,549	2,522	100.00 %	2.98 %
Marvin	68	6,358	86,978	6,358	100.00 %	7.31 %
Matthews	103	29,435	88,259	29,435	100.00 %	33.35 %
Maxton (Robeson)	47	1,902	82,846	1,902	100.00 %	2.30 %
Maxton (Scotland)	48	208	86,256	208	100.00 %	0.24 %
Mayodan	65	2,418	91,096	2,418	100.00 %	2.65 %
Maysville	4	818	83,269	818	100.00 %	0.98 %
McAdenville	108	890	84,457	890	100.00 %	1.05 %
McDonald	47	94	82,846	94	100.00 %	0.11 %
McFarlan	55	94	84,549	94	100.00 %	0.11 %
Mebane (Alamance)	63	14,626	83,540	14,626	100.00 %	17.51 %
Mebane (Orange)	50	3,171	85,345	3,171	100.00 %	3.72 %
Mesic	79	144	85,842	144	100.00 %	0.17 %
Micro	28	458	85,389	458	100.00 %	0.54 %
Middleburg	32	101	88,633	101	100.00 %	0.11 %
Middlesex	25	912	83,790	912	100.00 %	1.09 %
Midland (Cabarrus)	83	4,684	90,967	4,684	100.00 %	5.15 %
Midland (Mecklenburg)	112	0	83,761	0	0.00 %	0.00 %

District plan definition file: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 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: HCM-5 Amend

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	84,864	3,469	73.15 %	4.09 %
	81	4,742	84,066	1,273	26.85 %	1.51 %
Mills River	117	7,078	90,329	7,078	100.00 %	7.84 %
Milton	50	155	85,345	155	100.00 %	0.18 %
Mineral Springs	55	3,159	84,549	193	6.11 %	0.23 %
	68	3,159	86,978	2,966	93.89 %	3.41 %
Minnesott Beach	79	530	85,842	530	100.00 %	0.62 %
Mint Hill (Mecklenburg)	112	26,444	83,761	26,444	100.00 %	31.57 %
Mint Hill (Union)	69	6	88,795	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	83,790	277	100.00 %	0.33 %
Monroe	55	34,562	84,549	20,688	59.86 %	24.47 %
	68	34,562	86,978	1,511	4.37 %	1.74 %
	69	34,562	88,795	12,363	35.77 %	13.92 %
Montreat	114	901	89,628	901	100.00 %	1.01 %
Mooresboro	111	293	90,809	293	100.00 %	0.32 %
Mooresville	95	50,193	86,264	50,193	100.00 %	58.19 %
Morehead City	13	9,556	83,307	9,556	100.00 %	11.47 %
Morganton	86	17,474	87,570	17,474	100.00 %	19.95 %
Morrisville (Durham)	31	207	91,241	207	100.00 %	0.23 %
Morrisville (Wake)	21	29,423	88,313	29,423	100.00 %	33.32 %
	41	29,423	84,646	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Morven	55	329	84,549	329	100.00 %	0.39 %
Mount Airy	90	10,676	82,937	10,676	100.00 %	12.87 %
Mount Gilead	67	1,171	88,255	1,171	100.00 %	1.33 %
Mount Holly	108	17,703	84,457	17,703	100.00 %	20.96 %
Mount Olive (Duplin)	4	5	83,269	5	100.00 %	0.01 %
Mount Olive (Wayne)	10	4,193	83,352	4,171	99.48 %	5.00 %
	12	4,193	84,172	22	0.52 %	0.03 %
Mount Pleasant	83	1,671	90,967	1,671	100.00 %	1.84 %
Murfreesboro	5	2,619	84,060	2,619	100.00 %	3.12 %
Murphy	120	1,608	84,907	1,608	100.00 %	1.89 %
Nags Head	79	3,168	85,842	3,168	100.00 %	3.69 %
Nashville	25	5,632	83,790	5,632	100.00 %	6.72 %
Navassa	17	1,367	89,763	1,367	100.00 %	1.52 %
New Bern	3	31,291	85,099	31,291	100.00 %	36.77 %
New London	67	607	88,255	607	100.00 %	0.69 %
Newland	85	715	89,525	715	100.00 %	0.80 %
Newport	13	4,364	83,307	4,364	100.00 %	5.24 %

District plan definition file: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 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: HCM-5 Amend

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	94	4,382	90,835	4,382	100.00 %	4.82 %
Northwest	17	703	89,763	703	100.00 %	0.78 %
Norwood	67	2,367	88,255	2,367	100.00 %	2.68 %
Oak City	23	266	85,179	266	100.00 %	0.31 %
Oak Island	19	8,396	91,041	8,396	100.00 %	9.22 %
Oak Ridge	57	7,474	91,158	29	0.39 %	0.03 %
	62	7,474	91,136	7,445	99.61 %	8.17 %
Oakboro	67	2,128	88,255	2,128	100.00 %	2.41 %
Ocean Isle Beach	17	867	89,763	867	100.00 %	0.97 %
Old Fort	85	811	89,525	811	100.00 %	0.91 %
Oriental	79	880	85,842	880	100.00 %	1.03 %
Orrum	46	59	84,307	59	100.00 %	0.07 %
Ossipee	64	536	87,875	536	100.00 %	0.61 %
Oxford	32	8,628	88,633	8,628	100.00 %	9.73 %
Pantego	79	164	85,842	164	100.00 %	0.19 %
Parkton	46	504	84,307	504	100.00 %	0.60 %
Parmele	23	243	85,179	243	100.00 %	0.29 %
Patterson Springs	111	571	90,809	571	100.00 %	0.63 %
Peachland	55	390	84,549	390	100.00 %	0.46 %
Peletier	13	769	83,307	769	100.00 %	0.92 %
Pembroke	47	2,823	82,846	2,823	100.00 %	3.41 %
Pikeville	10	712	83,352	712	100.00 %	0.85 %
Pilot Mountain	90	1,440	82,937	1,440	100.00 %	1.74 %
Pine Knoll Shores	13	1,388	83,307	1,388	100.00 %	1.67 %
Pine Level	28	2,046	85,389	2,046	100.00 %	2.40 %
Pinebluff	52	1,473	84,383	1,473	100.00 %	1.75 %
Pinehurst	52	17,581	84,383	8	0.05 %	0.01 %
	78	17,581	86,365	17,573	99.95 %	20.35 %
Pinetops	23	1,200	85,179	1,200	100.00 %	1.41 %
Pineville	92	10,602	89,640	3,621	34.15 %	4.04 %
	105	10,602	89,460	6,981	65.85 %	7.80 %
Pink Hill	4	451	83,269	451	100.00 %	0.54 %
Pittsboro	54	4,537	83,475	4,537	100.00 %	5.44 %
Pleasant Garden	58	5,000	89,713	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	59	5,000	87,559	5,000	100.00 %	5.71 %

District plan definition file: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 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: HCM-5 Amend

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Plymouth	23	3,320	85,179	3,320	100.00 %	3.90 %
Polkton	55	2,250	84,549	2,250	100.00 %	2.66 %
Polkville	110	516	89,588	516	100.00 %	0.58 %
Pollocksville	4	268	83,269	268	100.00 %	0.32 %
Powellsville	5	189	84,060	189	100.00 %	0.22 %
Princeton	28	1,315	85,389	1,315	100.00 %	1.54 %
Princeville	23	1,254	85,179	1,254	100.00 %	1.47 %
Proctorville	46	121	84,307	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	85,987	52,233	11.21 %	60.75 %
	33	466,106	86,863	21,874	4.69 %	25.18 %
	34	466,106	83,302	81,107	17.40 %	97.37 %
	35	466,106	86,765	16,132	3.46 %	18.59 %
	38	466,106	90,560	87,892	18.86 %	97.05 %
	39	466,106	86,971	11,902	2.55 %	13.69 %
	40	466,106	90,047	48,709	10.45 %	54.09 %
	41	466,106	84,646	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	49	466,106	84,041	64,064	13.74 %	76.23 %
66	466,106	84,245	82,193	17.63 %	97.56 %	
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	84,457	4,511	100.00 %	5.34 %
Raynham	47	60	82,846	60	100.00 %	0.07 %
Red Cross	67	762	88,255	762	100.00 %	0.86 %
Red Oak	25	3,342	83,790	3,342	100.00 %	3.99 %
Red Springs (Hoke)	48	0	86,256	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Red Springs (Robeson)	47	3,087	82,846	3,087	100.00 %	3.73 %
Reidsville	65	14,583	91,096	14,583	100.00 %	16.01 %
Rennert	47	275	82,846	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	89,176	2,287	100.00 %	2.56 %
River Bend	3	2,902	85,099	2,902	100.00 %	3.41 %
Roanoke Rapids	27	15,229	84,735	15,229	100.00 %	17.97 %
Robbins	78	1,168	86,365	1,168	100.00 %	1.35 %
Robbinsville	120	597	84,907	597	100.00 %	0.70 %
Robersonville	23	1,269	85,179	1,269	100.00 %	1.49 %
Rockingham	52	9,243	84,383	9,243	100.00 %	10.95 %

District plan definition file: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 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: HCM-5 Amend

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Rockwell	76	2,302	89,815	2,302	100.00 %	2.56 %
Rocky Mount (Edgecombe)	23	15,414	85,179	15,414	100.00 %	18.10 %
Rocky Mount (Nash)	24	38,927	89,964	26,754	68.73 %	29.74 %
	25	38,927	83,790	12,173	31.27 %	14.53 %
Rolesville	35	9,475	86,765	9,475	100.00 %	10.92 %
Ronda	90	438	82,937	438	100.00 %	0.53 %
Roper	23	485	85,179	485	100.00 %	0.57 %
Rose Hill	4	1,371	83,269	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	82,846	885	100.00 %	1.07 %
Roxboro	2	8,134	90,751	8,134	100.00 %	8.96 %
Roxobel	5	187	84,060	187	100.00 %	0.22 %
Rural Hall	91	3,351	85,749	3,351	100.00 %	3.91 %
Ruth	113	347	91,102	347	100.00 %	0.38 %
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	91,102	3,640	100.00 %	4.00 %
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	91,102	11	100.00 %	0.01 %
Saluda (Polk)	113	620	91,102	620	100.00 %	0.68 %
Sandy Creek	17	248	89,763	248	100.00 %	0.28 %
Sandyfield	46	430	84,307	430	100.00 %	0.51 %
Sanford	51	30,261	83,073	30,261	100.00 %	36.43 %
Saratoga	25	353	83,790	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	87,559	676	100.00 %	0.77 %
Selma	28	6,317	85,389	6,317	100.00 %	7.40 %
Seven Devils (Avery)	85	38	89,525	38	100.00 %	0.04 %
Seven Devils (Watauga)	93	275	87,194	275	100.00 %	0.32 %
Seven Springs	12	55	84,172	55	100.00 %	0.07 %
Severn	27	191	84,735	191	100.00 %	0.23 %
Shallotte	17	4,185	89,763	4,185	100.00 %	4.66 %
Sharpsburg (Edgecombe)	23	215	85,179	215	100.00 %	0.25 %
Sharpsburg (Nash)	24	1,061	89,964	1,061	100.00 %	1.18 %
Sharpsburg (Wilson)	24	421	89,964	421	100.00 %	0.47 %

District plan definition file: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 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: HCM-5 Amend

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	89,588	4,432	20.22 %	4.95 %
	111	21,918	90,809	17,486	79.78 %	19.26 %
Siler City	54	7,702	83,475	7,702	100.00 %	9.23 %
Simpson	8	390	85,089	390	100.00 %	0.46 %
Sims	25	275	83,790	275	100.00 %	0.33 %
Smithfield	28	11,292	85,389	11,292	100.00 %	13.22 %
Snow Hill	10	1,481	83,352	1,481	100.00 %	1.78 %
Southern Pines	52	15,545	84,383	15,545	100.00 %	18.42 %
	78	15,545	86,365	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Southern Shores	1	3,090	84,230	3,090	100.00 %	3.67 %
Southport	19	3,971	91,041	3,971	100.00 %	4.36 %
Sparta	93	1,834	87,194	1,834	100.00 %	2.10 %
Speed	23	63	85,179	63	100.00 %	0.07 %
Spencer	76	3,308	89,815	3,308	100.00 %	3.68 %
Spencer Mountain	108	0	84,457	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Spindale	113	4,225	91,102	4,225	100.00 %	4.64 %
Spring Hope	25	1,309	83,790	1,309	100.00 %	1.56 %
Spring Lake	42	11,660	84,462	11,660	100.00 %	13.81 %
Spruce Pine	85	2,194	89,525	2,194	100.00 %	2.45 %
St. Helena	16	417	85,097	417	100.00 %	0.49 %
St. James	19	6,529	91,041	6,529	100.00 %	7.17 %
St. Pauls	46	2,045	84,307	2,045	100.00 %	2.43 %
Staley	54	397	83,475	397	100.00 %	0.48 %
Stallings (Mecklenburg)	103	384	88,259	11	2.86 %	0.01 %
	112	384	83,761	373	97.14 %	0.45 %
Stallings (Union)	68	15,728	86,978	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	69	15,728	88,795	15,728	100.00 %	17.71 %
Stanfield	67	1,585	88,255	1,585	100.00 %	1.80 %
Stanley	108	3,963	84,457	3,963	100.00 %	4.69 %
Stantonsburg	25	762	83,790	762	100.00 %	0.91 %
Star	67	806	88,255	806	100.00 %	0.91 %
Statesville	84	28,419	85,875	28,415	99.99 %	33.09 %
	89	28,419	85,577	4	0.01 %	0.00 %
Stedman	43	1,277	83,198	1,277	100.00 %	1.53 %
Stem	32	960	88,633	960	100.00 %	1.08 %
Stokesdale	62	5,924	91,136	5,924	100.00 %	6.50 %
Stoneville	65	1,308	91,096	1,308	100.00 %	1.44 %
Stonewall	79	214	85,842	214	100.00 %	0.25 %
Stovall	32	324	88,633	324	100.00 %	0.37 %
Sugar Mountain	85	371	89,525	371	100.00 %	0.41 %
Summerfield	57	10,951	91,158	10,951	100.00 %	12.01 %

District plan definition file: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 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: HCM-5 Amend

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Sunset Beach	17	4,175	89,763	4,175	100.00 %	4.65 %
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	90,506	3,744	100.00 %	4.14 %
Sweptonville	63	2,445	83,540	2,445	100.00 %	2.93 %
Sylva	119	2,578	90,212	2,578	100.00 %	2.86 %
Tabor City	46	3,781	84,307	3,781	100.00 %	4.48 %
Tar Heel	22	90	88,642	90	100.00 %	0.10 %
Tarboro	23	10,721	85,179	10,721	100.00 %	12.59 %
Taylorsville	94	2,320	90,835	2,320	100.00 %	2.55 %
Taylortown	52	634	84,383	4	0.63 %	0.00 %
	78	634	86,365	630	99.37 %	0.73 %
Teachey	4	448	83,269	448	100.00 %	0.54 %
Thomasville (Davidson)	80	26,662	84,864	26,662	100.00 %	31.42 %
Thomasville (Randolph)	70	521	89,118	521	100.00 %	0.58 %
Tobaccoville (Forsyth)	91	2,578	85,749	2,578	100.00 %	3.01 %
Tobaccoville (Stokes)	91	0	85,749	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Topsail Beach	16	461	85,097	461	100.00 %	0.54 %
Trent Woods	3	4,074	85,099	4,074	100.00 %	4.79 %
Trenton	4	238	83,269	238	100.00 %	0.29 %
Trinity	70	7,006	89,118	7,006	100.00 %	7.86 %
Troutman	84	3,698	85,875	885	23.93 %	1.03 %
	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	91,102	1,562	100.00 %	1.71 %
Turkey	22	213	88,642	213	100.00 %	0.24 %
Unionville	69	6,643	88,795	6,643	100.00 %	7.48 %
Valdese	86	4,689	87,570	4,689	100.00 %	5.35 %
Vanceboro	3	869	85,099	869	100.00 %	1.02 %
Vandemere	79	246	85,842	246	100.00 %	0.29 %
Varnantown	19	525	91,041	525	100.00 %	0.58 %
Vass	51	952	83,073	952	100.00 %	1.15 %
Waco	110	310	89,588	310	100.00 %	0.35 %
Wade	43	638	83,198	638	100.00 %	0.77 %
Wadesboro	55	5,008	84,549	5,008	100.00 %	5.92 %
Wagram	48	615	86,256	615	100.00 %	0.71 %
Wake Forest (Franklin)	7	1,504	83,510	1,504	100.00 %	1.80 %
Wake Forest (Wake)	35	46,097	86,765	46,097	100.00 %	53.13 %
Walkertown	75	5,692	84,659	4,257	74.79 %	5.03 %
	91	5,692	85,749	1,435	25.21 %	1.67 %
Wallace (Duplin)	4	3,413	83,269	3,413	100.00 %	4.10 %

District plan definition file: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 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: HCM-5 Amend

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 (Pender)	16	0	85,097	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Wallburg	80	3,051	84,864	3,051	100.00 %	3.60 %
Walnut Cove	91	1,586	85,749	1,586	100.00 %	1.85 %
Walnut Creek	12	1,084	84,172	1,084	100.00 %	1.29 %
Walstonburg	10	193	83,352	193	100.00 %	0.23 %
Warrenton	27	851	84,735	851	100.00 %	1.00 %
Warsaw	4	2,733	83,269	2,733	100.00 %	3.28 %
Washington	79	9,875	85,842	9,875	100.00 %	11.50 %
Washington Park	79	392	85,842	392	100.00 %	0.46 %
Watha	16	181	85,097	181	100.00 %	0.21 %
Waxhaw	55	20,534	84,549	1,631	7.94 %	1.93 %
	68	20,534	86,978	18,903	92.06 %	21.73 %
Waynesville	118	10,140	83,282	10,140	100.00 %	12.18 %
Weaverville	116	4,567	90,981	4,567	100.00 %	5.02 %
Webster	119	372	90,212	372	100.00 %	0.41 %
Weddington (Mecklenburg)	103	5	88,259	5	100.00 %	0.01 %
Weddington (Union)	68	13,176	86,978	13,172	99.97 %	15.14 %
	69	13,176	88,795	4	0.03 %	0.00 %
Weldon	27	1,444	84,735	1,444	100.00 %	1.70 %
Wendell	39	9,793	86,971	9,793	100.00 %	11.26 %
Wentworth	65	2,662	91,096	2,662	100.00 %	2.92 %
Wesley Chapel	68	8,681	86,978	8,449	97.33 %	9.71 %
	69	8,681	88,795	232	2.67 %	0.26 %
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	85,179	290	100.00 %	0.34 %
Whitakers (Nash)	25	337	83,790	337	100.00 %	0.40 %
White Lake	22	843	88,642	843	100.00 %	0.95 %
Whiteville	46	4,766	84,307	4,766	100.00 %	5.65 %
Whitsett	59	584	87,559	584	100.00 %	0.67 %
Wilkesboro	94	3,687	90,835	3,687	100.00 %	4.06 %
Williamston	23	5,248	85,179	5,248	100.00 %	6.16 %
Wilmington	18	115,451	90,862	37,227	32.24 %	40.97 %
	19	115,451	91,041	8,207	7.11 %	9.01 %
	20	115,451	90,729	70,017	60.65 %	77.17 %
Wilson	24	47,851	89,964	47,340	98.93 %	52.62 %
	25	47,851	83,790	511	1.07 %	0.61 %
Wilson's Mills	26	2,534	90,540	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	28	2,534	85,389	2,534	100.00 %	2.97 %
Windsor	5	3,582	84,060	3,582	100.00 %	4.26 %
Winfall	1	555	84,230	555	100.00 %	0.66 %

District plan definition file: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 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: HCM-5 Amend

Municipality	District	Total Muni Population	Total District Population	Muni Pop in District	Percent of Muni Pop in District	Percent of District Pop in Muni
Wingate	55	4,055	84,549	4,055	100.00 %	4.80 %
Winston-Salem	71	249,545	83,748	81,468	32.65 %	97.28 %
	72	249,545	83,262	83,262	33.37 %	100.00 %
	74	249,545	89,692	40,157	16.09 %	44.77 %
	75	249,545	84,659	31,045	12.44 %	36.67 %
	91	249,545	85,749	13,613	5.46 %	15.88 %
Winterville	9	10,462	85,154	10,462	100.00 %	12.29 %
Winton	5	629	84,060	629	100.00 %	0.75 %
Woodfin	116	7,936	90,981	7,936	100.00 %	8.72 %
Woodland	27	557	84,735	557	100.00 %	0.66 %
Wrightsville Beach	18	2,473	90,862	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	20	2,473	90,729	2,473	100.00 %	2.73 %
Yadkinville	77	2,995	90,628	2,995	100.00 %	3.30 %
Yanceyville	50	1,937	85,345	1,937	100.00 %	2.27 %
Youngsville	7	2,016	83,510	2,016	100.00 %	2.41 %
Zebulon (Johnston)	26	0	90,540	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
Zebulon (Wake)	39	6,903	86,971	6,903	100.00 %	7.94 %
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: 82

Splits Involving Population: 54

District plan definition file: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 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.

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

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	Duck	84,230	742	742	0.88 %	100.00 %
	Edenton	84,230	4,460	4,460	5.30 %	100.00 %
	Elizabeth City (Camden)	84,230	38	38	0.05 %	100.00 %
	Elizabeth City (Pasquotank)	84,230	18,593	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Hertford	84,230	1,934	1,934	2.30 %	100.00 %
	Kitty Hawk	84,230	3,689	3,689	4.38 %	100.00 %
	Southern Shores	84,230	3,090	3,090	3.67 %	100.00 %
	Winfall	84,230	555	555	0.66 %	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	85,099	349	349	0.41 %	100.00 %
	Cove City	85,099	378	378	0.44 %	100.00 %
	Dover	85,099	349	349	0.41 %	100.00 %
	Havelock	85,099	16,621	5,986	7.03 %	36.01 %
	New Bern	85,099	31,291	31,291	36.77 %	100.00 %
	River Bend	85,099	2,902	2,902	3.41 %	100.00 %
	Trent Woods	85,099	4,074	4,074	4.79 %	100.00 %
	Vanceboro	85,099	869	869	1.02 %	100.00 %
4	Beulaville	83,269	1,116	1,116	1.34 %	100.00 %
	Calypso	83,269	327	327	0.39 %	100.00 %
	Faison (Duplin)	83,269	784	784	0.94 %	100.00 %
	Greenevers	83,269	567	567	0.68 %	100.00 %
	Grifton (Lenoir)	83,269	147	147	0.18 %	100.00 %
	Harrells (Duplin)	83,269	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Kenansville	83,269	770	770	0.92 %	100.00 %
	Kinston	83,269	19,900	1,182	1.42 %	5.94 %
	Magnolia	83,269	831	831	1.00 %	100.00 %
	Maysville	83,269	818	818	0.98 %	100.00 %
	Mount Olive (Duplin)	83,269	5	5	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Pink Hill	83,269	451	451	0.54 %	100.00 %
	Pollocksville	83,269	268	268	0.32 %	100.00 %
	Rose Hill	83,269	1,371	1,371	1.65 %	100.00 %
	Teachey	83,269	448	448	0.54 %	100.00 %
	Trenton	83,269	238	238	0.29 %	100.00 %
Wallace (Duplin)	83,269	3,413	3,413	4.10 %	100.00 %	
Warsaw	83,269	2,733	2,733	3.28 %	100.00 %	
5	Ahoskie	84,060	4,891	4,891	5.82 %	100.00 %
	Askewville	84,060	184	184	0.22 %	100.00 %
	Aulander	84,060	763	763	0.91 %	100.00 %
	Cofield	84,060	267	267	0.32 %	100.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

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	Colerain	84,060	217	217	0.26 %	100.00 %
	Como	84,060	67	67	0.08 %	100.00 %
	Elizabeth City (Pasquotank)	84,060	18,593	18,593	22.12 %	100.00 %
	Gatesville	84,060	267	267	0.32 %	100.00 %
	Harrellsville	84,060	85	85	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Kelford	84,060	203	203	0.24 %	100.00 %
	Lewiston Woodville	84,060	426	426	0.51 %	100.00 %
	Murfreesboro	84,060	2,619	2,619	3.12 %	100.00 %
	Powellsville	84,060	189	189	0.22 %	100.00 %
	Roxobel	84,060	187	187	0.22 %	100.00 %
	Windsor	84,060	3,582	3,582	4.26 %	100.00 %
	Winton	84,060	629	629	0.75 %	100.00 %
6	Broadway (Harnett)	84,016	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Erwin	84,016	4,542	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Lillington	84,016	4,735	4,735	5.64 %	100.00 %
7	Bunn	83,510	327	327	0.39 %	100.00 %
	Creedmoor	83,510	4,866	2,065	2.47 %	42.44 %
	Franklinton	83,510	2,456	2,456	2.94 %	100.00 %
	Louisburg	83,510	3,064	3,064	3.67 %	100.00 %
	Wake Forest (Franklin)	83,510	1,504	1,504	1.80 %	100.00 %
	Youngsville	83,510	2,016	2,016	2.41 %	100.00 %
8	Bethel	85,089	1,373	1,373	1.61 %	100.00 %
	Falkland	85,089	47	47	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Farmville	85,089	4,461	4,461	5.24 %	100.00 %
	Fountain	85,089	385	385	0.45 %	100.00 %
	Greenville	85,089	87,521	42,222	49.62 %	48.24 %
	Grimesland	85,089	386	386	0.45 %	100.00 %
	Simpson	85,089	390	390	0.46 %	100.00 %
9	Ayden	85,154	4,977	4,977	5.84 %	100.00 %
	Greenville	85,154	87,521	45,299	53.20 %	51.76 %
	Grifton (Pitt)	85,154	2,301	2,301	2.70 %	100.00 %
	Winterville	85,154	10,462	10,462	12.29 %	100.00 %
10	Eureka	83,352	214	214	0.26 %	100.00 %
	Fremont	83,352	1,196	1,196	1.43 %	100.00 %
	Goldsboro	83,352	33,657	7,074	8.49 %	21.02 %
	Hookerton	83,352	413	413	0.50 %	100.00 %
	Mount Olive (Wayne)	83,352	4,193	4,171	5.00 %	99.48 %
	Pikeville	83,352	712	712	0.85 %	100.00 %
	Snow Hill	83,352	1,481	1,481	1.78 %	100.00 %
	Walstonburg	83,352	193	193	0.23 %	100.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
11	Cary (Wake)	85,987	171,012	15,301	17.79 %	8.95 %
	Garner	85,987	31,159	490	0.57 %	1.57 %
	Holly Springs	85,987	41,239	1,355	1.58 %	3.29 %
	Raleigh (Wake)	85,987	466,106	52,233	60.75 %	11.21 %
12	Goldsboro	84,172	33,657	26,583	31.58 %	78.98 %
	Kinston	84,172	19,900	18,718	22.24 %	94.06 %
	La Grange	84,172	2,595	2,595	3.08 %	100.00 %
	Mount Olive (Wayne)	84,172	4,193	22	0.03 %	0.52 %
	Seven Springs	84,172	55	55	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Walnut Creek	84,172	1,084	1,084	1.29 %	100.00 %
13	Atlantic Beach	83,307	1,364	1,364	1.64 %	100.00 %
	Beaufort	83,307	4,464	4,464	5.36 %	100.00 %
	Bogue	83,307	695	695	0.83 %	100.00 %
	Cape Carteret	83,307	2,224	2,224	2.67 %	100.00 %
	Cedar Point	83,307	1,764	1,764	2.12 %	100.00 %
	Emerald Isle	83,307	3,847	3,847	4.62 %	100.00 %
	Havelock	83,307	16,621	10,635	12.77 %	63.99 %
	Indian Beach	83,307	223	223	0.27 %	100.00 %
	Morehead City	83,307	9,556	9,556	11.47 %	100.00 %
	Newport	83,307	4,364	4,364	5.24 %	100.00 %
	Peletier	83,307	769	769	0.92 %	100.00 %
	Pine Knoll Shores	83,307	1,388	1,388	1.67 %	100.00 %
14	Jacksonville	90,506	72,723	47,353	52.32 %	65.11 %
	Swansboro	90,506	3,744	3,744	4.14 %	100.00 %
15	Jacksonville	89,176	72,723	25,370	28.45 %	34.89 %
	Richlands	89,176	2,287	2,287	2.56 %	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 %
17	Watha	85,097	181	181	0.21 %	100.00 %
	Belville	89,763	2,406	2,406	2.68 %	100.00 %
	Calabash	89,763	2,011	2,011	2.24 %	100.00 %
	Carolina Shores	89,763	4,588	4,588	5.11 %	100.00 %
	Holden Beach	89,763	921	0	0.00 %	0.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

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	Leland	89,763	22,908	22,908	25.52 %	100.00 %
	Navassa	89,763	1,367	1,367	1.52 %	100.00 %
	Northwest	89,763	703	703	0.78 %	100.00 %
	Ocean Isle Beach	89,763	867	867	0.97 %	100.00 %
	Sandy Creek	89,763	248	248	0.28 %	100.00 %
	Shalotte	89,763	4,185	4,185	4.66 %	100.00 %
	Sunset Beach	89,763	4,175	4,175	4.65 %	100.00 %
18	Wilmington	90,862	115,451	37,227	40.97 %	32.24 %
	Wrightsville Beach	90,862	2,473	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
19	Bald Head Island	91,041	268	268	0.29 %	100.00 %
	Boiling Spring Lakes	91,041	5,943	5,943	6.53 %	100.00 %
	Bolivia	91,041	149	149	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Carolina Beach	91,041	6,564	6,564	7.21 %	100.00 %
	Caswell Beach	91,041	395	395	0.43 %	100.00 %
	Holden Beach	91,041	921	921	1.01 %	100.00 %
	Kure Beach	91,041	2,191	2,191	2.41 %	100.00 %
	Oak Island	91,041	8,396	8,396	9.22 %	100.00 %
	Southport	91,041	3,971	3,971	4.36 %	100.00 %
	St. James	91,041	6,529	6,529	7.17 %	100.00 %
	Varnamtown	91,041	525	525	0.58 %	100.00 %
	Wilmington	91,041	115,451	8,207	9.01 %	7.11 %
20	Wilmington	90,729	115,451	70,017	77.17 %	60.65 %
	Wrightsville Beach	90,729	2,473	2,473	2.73 %	100.00 %
21	Apex	88,313	58,780	6	0.01 %	0.01 %
	Cary (Wake)	88,313	171,012	57,857	65.51 %	33.83 %
	Durham (Wake)	88,313	269	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Morrisville (Wake)	88,313	29,423	29,423	33.32 %	100.00 %
22	Autryville	88,642	167	167	0.19 %	100.00 %
	Bladenboro	88,642	1,648	1,648	1.86 %	100.00 %
	Clarkton	88,642	614	614	0.69 %	100.00 %
	Clinton	88,642	8,383	8,383	9.46 %	100.00 %
	Dublin	88,642	267	267	0.30 %	100.00 %
	East Arcadia	88,642	418	418	0.47 %	100.00 %
	Elizabethtown	88,642	3,296	3,296	3.72 %	100.00 %
	Faison (Sampson)	88,642	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Falcon (Sampson)	88,642	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Garland	88,642	595	595	0.67 %	100.00 %
	Harrells (Sampson)	88,642	160	160	0.18 %	100.00 %
	Newton Grove	88,642	585	585	0.66 %	100.00 %
	Roseboro	88,642	1,163	1,163	1.31 %	100.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
22	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	Bear Grass	85,179	89	89	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Columbia	85,179	610	610	0.72 %	100.00 %
	Conetoe	85,179	198	198	0.23 %	100.00 %
	Creswell	85,179	207	207	0.24 %	100.00 %
	Everetts	85,179	150	150	0.18 %	100.00 %
	Hamilton	85,179	306	306	0.36 %	100.00 %
	Hassell	85,179	49	49	0.06 %	100.00 %
	Jamesville	85,179	424	424	0.50 %	100.00 %
	Leggett	85,179	37	37	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Macclesfield	85,179	413	413	0.48 %	100.00 %
	Oak City	85,179	266	266	0.31 %	100.00 %
	Parmele	85,179	243	243	0.29 %	100.00 %
	Pinetops	85,179	1,200	1,200	1.41 %	100.00 %
	Plymouth	85,179	3,320	3,320	3.90 %	100.00 %
	Princetonville	85,179	1,254	1,254	1.47 %	100.00 %
	Robersonville	85,179	1,269	1,269	1.49 %	100.00 %
	Rocky Mount (Edgecombe)	85,179	15,414	15,414	18.10 %	100.00 %
	Roper	85,179	485	485	0.57 %	100.00 %
	Sharpsburg (Edgecombe)	85,179	215	215	0.25 %	100.00 %
	Speed	85,179	63	63	0.07 %	100.00 %
Tarboro	85,179	10,721	10,721	12.59 %	100.00 %	
Whitakers (Edgecombe)	85,179	290	290	0.34 %	100.00 %	
Williamston	85,179	5,248	5,248	6.16 %	100.00 %	
24	Dortches	89,964	1,082	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Elm City (Nash)	89,964	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Elm City (Wilson)	89,964	1,218	1,218	1.35 %	100.00 %
	Rocky Mount (Nash)	89,964	38,927	26,754	29.74 %	68.73 %
	Sharpsburg (Nash)	89,964	1,061	1,061	1.18 %	100.00 %
	Sharpsburg (Wilson)	89,964	421	421	0.47 %	100.00 %
	Wilson	89,964	47,851	47,340	52.62 %	98.93 %
25	Bailey	83,790	568	568	0.68 %	100.00 %
	Black Creek	83,790	692	692	0.83 %	100.00 %
	Castalia	83,790	264	264	0.32 %	100.00 %
	Dortches	83,790	1,082	1,082	1.29 %	100.00 %
	Kenly (Wilson)	83,790	198	198	0.24 %	100.00 %
	Lucama	83,790	1,036	1,036	1.24 %	100.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

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	83,790	912	912	1.09 %	100.00 %
	Momeyer	83,790	277	277	0.33 %	100.00 %
	Nashville	83,790	5,632	5,632	6.72 %	100.00 %
	Red Oak	83,790	3,342	3,342	3.99 %	100.00 %
	Rocky Mount (Nash)	83,790	38,927	12,173	14.53 %	31.27 %
	Saratoga	83,790	353	353	0.42 %	100.00 %
	Sims	83,790	275	275	0.33 %	100.00 %
	Spring Hope	83,790	1,309	1,309	1.56 %	100.00 %
	Stantonsburg	83,790	762	762	0.91 %	100.00 %
	Whitakers (Nash)	83,790	337	337	0.40 %	100.00 %
	Wilson	83,790	47,851	511	0.61 %	1.07 %
26	Archer Lodge	90,540	4,797	4,797	5.30 %	100.00 %
	Clayton (Johnston)	90,540	26,307	26,307	29.06 %	100.00 %
	Wilson's Mills	90,540	2,534	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Zebulon (Johnston)	90,540	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 %

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
28	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 %
	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	88,633	8,397	8,397	9.47 %	100.00 %
	Creedmoor	88,633	4,866	2,801	3.16 %	57.56 %
	Henderson	88,633	15,060	15,060	16.99 %	100.00 %
	Kittrell	88,633	132	132	0.15 %	100.00 %
	Middleburg	88,633	101	101	0.11 %	100.00 %
	Oxford	88,633	8,628	8,628	9.73 %	100.00 %
	Stem	88,633	960	960	1.08 %	100.00 %
	Stovall	88,633	324	324	0.37 %	100.00 %
33	Clayton (Wake)	86,863	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Fuquay-Varina (Wake)	86,863	34,152	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Garner	86,863	31,159	30,658	35.29 %	98.39 %
	Raleigh (Wake)	86,863	466,106	21,874	25.18 %	4.69 %
34	Raleigh (Wake)	83,302	466,106	81,107	97.37 %	17.40 %
35	Raleigh (Wake)	86,765	466,106	16,132	18.59 %	3.46 %
	Rolesville	86,765	9,475	9,475	10.92 %	100.00 %
	Wake Forest (Wake)	86,765	46,097	46,097	53.13 %	100.00 %
36	Apex	89,336	58,780	45,473	50.90 %	77.36 %
	Cary (Wake)	89,336	171,012	8,272	9.26 %	4.84 %
	Holly Springs	89,336	41,239	25,760	28.83 %	62.47 %
37	Angier (Wake)	88,334	556	556	0.63 %	100.00 %
	Cary (Wake)	88,334	171,012	2,012	2.28 %	1.18 %
	Fuquay-Varina (Wake)	88,334	34,152	34,152	38.66 %	100.00 %
	Garner	88,334	31,159	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Holly Springs	88,334	41,239	14,124	15.99 %	34.25 %
38	Garner	90,560	31,159	11	0.01 %	0.04 %
	Knightdale	90,560	19,435	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Raleigh (Wake)	90,560	466,106	87,892	97.05 %	18.86 %
39	Clayton (Wake)	86,971	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Knightdale	86,971	19,435	19,435	22.35 %	100.00 %
	Raleigh (Wake)	86,971	466,106	11,902	13.69 %	2.55 %
	Wendell	86,971	9,793	9,793	11.26 %	100.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
39	Zebulon (Wake)	86,971	6,903	6,903	7.94 %	100.00 %
40	Durham (Wake)	90,047	269	269	0.30 %	100.00 %
	Raleigh (Wake)	90,047	466,106	48,709	54.09 %	10.45 %
41	Apex	84,646	58,780	13,301	15.71 %	22.63 %
	Cary (Wake)	84,646	171,012	70,058	82.77 %	40.97 %
	Morrisville (Wake)	84,646	29,423	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Raleigh (Wake)	84,646	466,106	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
42	Fayetteville	84,462	208,501	67,330	79.72 %	32.29 %
	Spring Lake	84,462	11,660	11,660	13.81 %	100.00 %
43	Eastover	83,198	3,656	3,656	4.39 %	100.00 %
	Falcon (Cumberland)	83,198	324	324	0.39 %	100.00 %
	Fayetteville	83,198	208,501	35,621	42.81 %	17.08 %
	Godwin	83,198	128	128	0.15 %	100.00 %
	Linden	83,198	136	136	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Stedman	83,198	1,277	1,277	1.53 %	100.00 %
	Wade	83,198	638	638	0.77 %	100.00 %
44	Fayetteville	83,751	208,501	78,340	93.54 %	37.57 %
45	Fayetteville	83,317	208,501	27,210	32.66 %	13.05 %
	Hope Mills	83,317	17,808	17,808	21.37 %	100.00 %
46	Boardman	84,307	166	166	0.20 %	100.00 %
	Bolton	84,307	519	519	0.62 %	100.00 %
	Brunswick	84,307	973	973	1.15 %	100.00 %
	Cerro Gordo	84,307	131	131	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Chadbourn	84,307	1,574	1,574	1.87 %	100.00 %
	Fair Bluff	84,307	709	709	0.84 %	100.00 %
	Lake Waccamaw	84,307	1,296	1,296	1.54 %	100.00 %
	Lumber Bridge	84,307	82	82	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Lumberton	84,307	19,025	454	0.54 %	2.39 %
	Orrum	84,307	59	59	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Parkton	84,307	504	504	0.60 %	100.00 %
	Proctorville	84,307	121	121	0.14 %	100.00 %
	Sandyfield	84,307	430	430	0.51 %	100.00 %
	St. Pauls	84,307	2,045	2,045	2.43 %	100.00 %
	Tabor City	84,307	3,781	3,781	4.48 %	100.00 %
Whiteville	84,307	4,766	4,766	5.65 %	100.00 %	
47	Fairmont	82,846	2,191	2,191	2.64 %	100.00 %
	Lumberton	82,846	19,025	18,571	22.42 %	97.61 %
	Marietta	82,846	111	111	0.13 %	100.00 %
	Maxton (Robeson)	82,846	1,902	1,902	2.30 %	100.00 %
	McDonald	82,846	94	94	0.11 %	100.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

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	Pembroke	82,846	2,823	2,823	3.41 %	100.00 %
	Raynham	82,846	60	60	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Red Springs (Robeson)	82,846	3,087	3,087	3.73 %	100.00 %
	Rennert	82,846	275	275	0.33 %	100.00 %
	Rowland	82,846	885	885	1.07 %	100.00 %
48	East Laurinburg	86,256	234	234	0.27 %	100.00 %
	Gibson	86,256	449	449	0.52 %	100.00 %
	Laurinburg	86,256	14,978	14,978	17.36 %	100.00 %
	Maxton (Scotland)	86,256	208	208	0.24 %	100.00 %
	Raeford	86,256	4,559	4,559	5.29 %	100.00 %
	Red Springs (Hoke)	86,256	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Wagram	86,256	615	615	0.71 %	100.00 %
49	Cary (Wake)	84,041	171,012	17,512	20.84 %	10.24 %
	Durham (Wake)	84,041	269	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Raleigh (Wake)	84,041	466,106	64,064	76.23 %	13.74 %
50	Carrboro	85,345	21,295	174	0.20 %	0.82 %
	Durham (Orange)	85,345	144	144	0.17 %	100.00 %
	Hillsborough	85,345	9,660	9,660	11.32 %	100.00 %
	Mebane (Orange)	85,345	3,171	3,171	3.72 %	100.00 %
	Milton	85,345	155	155	0.18 %	100.00 %
	Yanceyville	85,345	1,937	1,937	2.27 %	100.00 %
51	Broadway (Lee)	83,073	1,267	1,267	1.53 %	100.00 %
	Cameron	83,073	244	244	0.29 %	100.00 %
	Carthage	83,073	2,775	2,747	3.31 %	98.99 %
	Sanford	83,073	30,261	30,261	36.43 %	100.00 %
	Vass	83,073	952	952	1.15 %	100.00 %
52	Aberdeen	84,383	8,516	8,516	10.09 %	100.00 %
	Carthage	84,383	2,775	28	0.03 %	1.01 %
	Dobbins Heights	84,383	687	687	0.81 %	100.00 %
	Ellerbe	84,383	864	864	1.02 %	100.00 %
	Foxfire	84,383	1,288	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Hamlet	84,383	6,025	6,025	7.14 %	100.00 %
	Hoffman	84,383	418	418	0.50 %	100.00 %
	Norman	84,383	100	100	0.12 %	100.00 %
	Pinebluff	84,383	1,473	1,473	1.75 %	100.00 %
	Pinehurst	84,383	17,581	8	0.01 %	0.05 %
	Rockingham	84,383	9,243	9,243	10.95 %	100.00 %
	Southern Pines	84,383	15,545	15,545	18.42 %	100.00 %
	Taylortown	84,383	634	4	0.00 %	0.63 %
Whispering Pines	84,383	4,987	4,987	5.91 %	100.00 %	

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

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	Angier (Harnett)	89,622	4,709	4,709	5.25 %	100.00 %
	Benson (Harnett)	89,622	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Coats	89,622	2,155	2,155	2.40 %	100.00 %
	Dunn	89,622	8,446	8,446	9.42 %	100.00 %
	Erwin	89,622	4,542	4,542	5.07 %	100.00 %
	Fuquay-Varina (Harnett)	89,622	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Lillington	89,622	4,735	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
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	84,549	440	440	0.52 %	100.00 %
	Lilesville	84,549	395	395	0.47 %	100.00 %
	Marshville	84,549	2,522	2,522	2.98 %	100.00 %
	McFarlan	84,549	94	94	0.11 %	100.00 %
	Mineral Springs	84,549	3,159	193	0.23 %	6.11 %
	Monroe	84,549	34,562	20,688	24.47 %	59.86 %
	Morven	84,549	329	329	0.39 %	100.00 %
	Peachland	84,549	390	390	0.46 %	100.00 %
	Polkton	84,549	2,250	2,250	2.66 %	100.00 %
	Wadesboro	84,549	5,008	5,008	5.92 %	100.00 %
	Waxhaw	84,549	20,534	1,631	1.93 %	7.94 %
Wingate	84,549	4,055	4,055	4.80 %	100.00 %	
56	Carrboro	86,087	21,295	21,121	24.53 %	99.18 %
	Chapel Hill (Orange)	86,087	59,054	59,054	68.60 %	100.00 %
57	Greensboro	91,158	299,035	72,113	79.11 %	24.12 %
	Oak Ridge	91,158	7,474	29	0.03 %	0.39 %
	Summerfield	91,158	10,951	10,951	12.01 %	100.00 %
58	Greensboro	89,713	299,035	72,909	81.27 %	24.38 %
	High Point (Guilford)	89,713	107,321	2,538	2.83 %	2.36 %
	Jamestown	89,713	3,668	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Pleasant Garden	89,713	5,000	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
59	Burlington (Guilford)	87,559	1,822	1,822	2.08 %	100.00 %
	Gibsonville (Guilford)	87,559	4,642	4,642	5.30 %	100.00 %
	Greensboro	87,559	299,035	18,796	21.47 %	6.29 %
	Pleasant Garden	87,559	5,000	5,000	5.71 %	100.00 %
	Sedalia	87,559	676	676	0.77 %	100.00 %
	Whitsett	87,559	584	584	0.67 %	100.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
60	Archdale (Guilford)	90,919	380	380	0.42 %	100.00 %
	Greensboro	90,919	299,035	1,397	1.54 %	0.47 %
	High Point (Guilford)	90,919	107,321	77,884	85.66 %	72.57 %
	Jamestown	90,919	3,668	3,668	4.03 %	100.00 %
61	Greensboro	90,814	299,035	90,814	100.00 %	30.37 %
62	Greensboro	91,136	299,035	43,006	47.19 %	14.38 %
	High Point (Guilford)	91,136	107,321	26,899	29.52 %	25.06 %
	Kernersville (Guilford)	91,136	502	502	0.55 %	100.00 %
	Oak Ridge	91,136	7,474	7,445	8.17 %	99.61 %
	Stokesdale	91,136	5,924	5,924	6.50 %	100.00 %
63	Burlington (Alamance)	83,540	55,481	20,671	24.74 %	37.26 %
	Graham	83,540	17,157	17,157	20.54 %	100.00 %
	Green Level	83,540	3,152	3,152	3.77 %	100.00 %
	Haw River	83,540	2,252	2,252	2.70 %	100.00 %
	Mebane (Alamance)	83,540	14,626	14,626	17.51 %	100.00 %
	Swepsonville	83,540	2,445	2,445	2.93 %	100.00 %
64	Alamance	87,875	988	988	1.12 %	100.00 %
	Burlington (Alamance)	87,875	55,481	34,810	39.61 %	62.74 %
	Elon	87,875	11,336	11,336	12.90 %	100.00 %
	Gibsonville (Alamance)	87,875	4,278	4,278	4.87 %	100.00 %
	Graham	87,875	17,157	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Ossipee	87,875	536	536	0.61 %	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)	84,245	466,106	82,193	97.56 %	17.63 %
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: HCM-5 Amend

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	86,978	39,997	5,590	6.43 %	13.98 %
	Marvin	86,978	6,358	6,358	7.31 %	100.00 %
	Mineral Springs	86,978	3,159	2,966	3.41 %	93.89 %
	Monroe	86,978	34,562	1,511	1.74 %	4.37 %
	Stallings (Union)	86,978	15,728	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Waxhaw	86,978	20,534	18,903	21.73 %	92.06 %
	Weddington (Union)	86,978	13,176	13,172	15.14 %	99.97 %
	Wesley Chapel	86,978	8,681	8,449	9.71 %	97.33 %
69	Fairview	88,795	3,456	3,456	3.89 %	100.00 %
	Hemby Bridge	88,795	1,614	1,614	1.82 %	100.00 %
	Indian Trail	88,795	39,997	34,407	38.75 %	86.02 %
	Lake Park	88,795	3,269	3,269	3.68 %	100.00 %
	Mint Hill (Union)	88,795	6	6	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Monroe	88,795	34,562	12,363	13.92 %	35.77 %
	Stallings (Union)	88,795	15,728	15,728	17.71 %	100.00 %
	Unionville	88,795	6,643	6,643	7.48 %	100.00 %
	Weddington (Union)	88,795	13,176	4	0.00 %	0.03 %
	Wesley Chapel	88,795	8,681	232	0.26 %	2.67 %
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	83,748	249,545	81,468	97.28 %	32.65 %
72	Winston-Salem	83,262	249,545	83,262	100.00 %	33.37 %
73	Concord	90,390	105,240	53,986	59.73 %	51.30 %
	Harrisburg	90,390	18,967	18,602	20.58 %	98.08 %
74	Bethania	89,692	344	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Clemmons	89,692	21,163	21,163	23.60 %	100.00 %
	Lewisville	89,692	13,381	13,381	14.92 %	100.00 %
	Winston-Salem	89,692	249,545	40,157	44.77 %	16.09 %
75	High Point (Forsyth)	84,659	84	84	0.10 %	100.00 %
	Kernersville (Forsyth)	84,659	25,947	25,947	30.65 %	100.00 %
	Walkertown	84,659	5,692	4,257	5.03 %	74.79 %
	Winston-Salem	84,659	249,545	31,045	36.67 %	12.44 %

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
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	85,842	733	733	0.85 %	100.00 %
	Arapahoe	85,842	416	416	0.48 %	100.00 %
	Aurora	85,842	455	455	0.53 %	100.00 %
	Bath	85,842	245	245	0.29 %	100.00 %
	Bayboro	85,842	1,161	1,161	1.35 %	100.00 %
	Belhaven	85,842	1,410	1,410	1.64 %	100.00 %
	Chocowinity	85,842	722	722	0.84 %	100.00 %
	Grantsboro	85,842	692	692	0.81 %	100.00 %
	Kill Devil Hills	85,842	7,656	7,656	8.92 %	100.00 %
	Manteo	85,842	1,600	1,600	1.86 %	100.00 %
	Mesic	85,842	144	144	0.17 %	100.00 %
	Minnesott Beach	85,842	530	530	0.62 %	100.00 %
	Nags Head	85,842	3,168	3,168	3.69 %	100.00 %
	Oriental	85,842	880	880	1.03 %	100.00 %
	Pantego	85,842	164	164	0.19 %	100.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

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	Stonewall	85,842	214	214	0.25 %	100.00 %
	Vandemere	85,842	246	246	0.29 %	100.00 %
	Washington	85,842	9,875	9,875	11.50 %	100.00 %
	Washington Park	85,842	392	392	0.46 %	100.00 %
80	Denton	84,864	1,494	1,494	1.76 %	100.00 %
	High Point (Davidson)	84,864	6,646	6,646	7.83 %	100.00 %
	Lexington	84,864	19,632	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Midway	84,864	4,742	3,469	4.09 %	73.15 %
	Thomasville (Davidson)	84,864	26,662	26,662	31.42 %	100.00 %
	Wallburg	84,864	3,051	3,051	3.60 %	100.00 %
81	Lexington	84,066	19,632	19,632	23.35 %	100.00 %
	Midway	84,066	4,742	1,273	1.51 %	26.85 %
82	Concord	90,805	105,240	43,784	48.22 %	41.60 %
	Kannapolis (Cabarrus)	90,805	42,846	37,735	41.56 %	88.07 %
83	China Grove	90,967	4,434	4,434	4.87 %	100.00 %
	Concord	90,967	105,240	7,470	8.21 %	7.10 %
	Harrisburg	90,967	18,967	365	0.40 %	1.92 %
	Kannapolis (Cabarrus)	90,967	42,846	5,111	5.62 %	11.93 %
	Kannapolis (Rowan)	90,967	10,268	10,268	11.29 %	100.00 %
	Landis	90,967	3,690	3,690	4.06 %	100.00 %
	Locust (Cabarrus)	90,967	541	541	0.59 %	100.00 %
	Midland (Cabarrus)	90,967	4,684	4,684	5.15 %	100.00 %
	Mount Pleasant	90,967	1,671	1,671	1.84 %	100.00 %
84	Harmony	85,875	543	543	0.63 %	100.00 %
	Love Valley	85,875	154	154	0.18 %	100.00 %
	Statesville	85,875	28,419	28,415	33.09 %	99.99 %
	Troutman	85,875	3,698	885	1.03 %	23.93 %
85	Bakersville	89,525	450	450	0.50 %	100.00 %
	Banner Elk	89,525	1,049	1,049	1.17 %	100.00 %
	Beech Mountain (Avery)	89,525	62	62	0.07 %	100.00 %
	Burnsville	89,525	1,614	1,614	1.80 %	100.00 %
	Crossnore	89,525	143	143	0.16 %	100.00 %
	Elk Park	89,525	542	542	0.61 %	100.00 %
	Grandfather Village	89,525	95	95	0.11 %	100.00 %
	Marion	89,525	7,717	7,717	8.62 %	100.00 %
	Newland	89,525	715	715	0.80 %	100.00 %
	Old Fort	89,525	811	811	0.91 %	100.00 %
	Seven Devils (Avery)	89,525	38	38	0.04 %	100.00 %
	Spruce Pine	89,525	2,194	2,194	2.45 %	100.00 %
Sugar Mountain	89,525	371	371	0.41 %	100.00 %	

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
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	86,239	874,579	81,695	94.73 %	9.34 %
89	Catawba	85,577	702	702	0.82 %	100.00 %
	Claremont	85,577	1,692	1,692	1.98 %	100.00 %
	Conover	85,577	8,421	424	0.50 %	5.04 %
	Hickory (Catawba)	85,577	43,379	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Maiden (Catawba)	85,577	3,736	3,736	4.37 %	100.00 %
	Newton	85,577	13,148	13,148	15.36 %	100.00 %
	Statesville	85,577	28,419	4	0.00 %	0.01 %
	Troutman	85,577	3,698	2,813	3.29 %	76.07 %
90	Dobson	82,937	1,462	1,462	1.76 %	100.00 %
	Elkin (Surry)	82,937	4,049	4,049	4.88 %	100.00 %
	Elkin (Wilkes)	82,937	73	73	0.09 %	100.00 %
	Mount Airy	82,937	10,676	10,676	12.87 %	100.00 %
	Pilot Mountain	82,937	1,440	1,440	1.74 %	100.00 %
	Ronda	82,937	438	438	0.53 %	100.00 %
91	Bethania	85,749	344	344	0.40 %	100.00 %
	Danbury	85,749	189	189	0.22 %	100.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
91	King (Forsyth)	85,749	591	591	0.69 %	100.00 %
	King (Stokes)	85,749	6,606	6,606	7.70 %	100.00 %
	Rural Hall	85,749	3,351	3,351	3.91 %	100.00 %
	Tobaccoville (Forsyth)	85,749	2,578	2,578	3.01 %	100.00 %
	Tobaccoville (Stokes)	85,749	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Walkertown	85,749	5,692	1,435	1.67 %	25.21 %
	Walnut Cove	85,749	1,586	1,586	1.85 %	100.00 %
	Winston-Salem	85,749	249,545	13,613	15.88 %	5.46 %
92	Charlotte	89,640	874,579	69,175	77.17 %	7.91 %
	Pineville	89,640	10,602	3,621	4.04 %	34.15 %
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	90,835	4,382	4,382	4.82 %	100.00 %
	Taylorsville	90,835	2,320	2,320	2.55 %	100.00 %
	Wilkesboro	90,835	3,687	3,687	4.06 %	100.00 %
95	Davidson (Iredell)	86,264	378	378	0.44 %	100.00 %
	Mooresville	86,264	50,193	50,193	58.19 %	100.00 %
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	82,669	31,412	31,412	38.00 %	100.00 %
	Davidson (Mecklenburg)	82,669	14,728	14,728	17.82 %	100.00 %
	Huntersville	82,669	61,376	34,762	42.05 %	56.64 %
99	Charlotte	82,746	874,579	78,624	95.02 %	8.99 %
100	Charlotte	82,932	874,579	82,932	100.00 %	9.48 %
101	Charlotte	84,391	874,579	73,459	87.05 %	8.40 %
102	Charlotte	87,483	874,579	87,483	100.00 %	10.00 %
103	Charlotte	88,259	874,579	57,696	65.37 %	6.60 %
	Matthews	88,259	29,435	29,435	33.35 %	100.00 %
	Stallings (Mecklenburg)	88,259	384	11	0.01 %	2.86 %

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
103	Weddington (Mecklenburg)	88,259	5	5	0.01 %	100.00 %
104	Charlotte	84,647	874,579	84,647	100.00 %	9.68 %
105	Charlotte	89,460	874,579	78,415	87.65 %	8.97 %
	Pineville	89,460	10,602	6,981	7.80 %	65.85 %
106	Charlotte	86,758	874,579	59,599	68.70 %	6.81 %
	Huntersville	86,758	61,376	20,721	23.88 %	33.76 %
107	Charlotte	86,497	874,579	75,124	86.85 %	8.59 %
	Huntersville	86,497	61,376	5,893	6.81 %	9.60 %
108	Belmont	84,457	15,010	6,006	7.11 %	40.01 %
	Cramerton	84,457	5,296	123	0.15 %	2.32 %
	Dallas	84,457	5,927	5,927	7.02 %	100.00 %
	Gastonia	84,457	80,411	9,831	11.64 %	12.23 %
	Lowell	84,457	3,654	3,654	4.33 %	100.00 %
	McAdenville	84,457	890	890	1.05 %	100.00 %
	Mount Holly	84,457	17,703	17,703	20.96 %	100.00 %
	Ranlo	84,457	4,511	4,511	5.34 %	100.00 %
	Spencer Mountain	84,457	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
109	Belmont	87,462	15,010	9,004	10.29 %	59.99 %
	Cramerton	87,462	5,296	5,173	5.91 %	97.68 %
	Gastonia	87,462	80,411	52,909	60.49 %	65.80 %
	Lowell	87,462	3,654	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
110	Belwood	89,588	857	857	0.96 %	100.00 %
	Bessemer City	89,588	5,428	5,428	6.06 %	100.00 %
	Casar	89,588	305	305	0.34 %	100.00 %
	Cherryville	89,588	6,078	6,078	6.78 %	100.00 %
	Dellview	89,588	6	6	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Fallston	89,588	627	627	0.70 %	100.00 %
	Gastonia	89,588	80,411	17,671	19.72 %	21.98 %
	High Shoals	89,588	595	595	0.66 %	100.00 %
	Kings Mountain (Cleveland)	89,588	10,032	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Kings Mountain (Gaston)	89,588	1,110	1,110	1.24 %	100.00 %
	Kingstown	89,588	656	656	0.73 %	100.00 %
	Lattimore	89,588	406	406	0.45 %	100.00 %
	Lawndale	89,588	570	570	0.64 %	100.00 %
	Polkville	89,588	516	516	0.58 %	100.00 %
	Shelby	89,588	21,918	4,432	4.95 %	20.22 %
Waco	89,588	310	310	0.35 %	100.00 %	
111	Boiling Springs	90,809	4,615	4,615	5.08 %	100.00 %
	Bostic	90,809	355	355	0.39 %	100.00 %

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
111	Earl	90,809	198	198	0.22 %	100.00 %
	Ellenboro	90,809	723	723	0.80 %	100.00 %
	Forest City	90,809	7,377	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Grover	90,809	802	802	0.88 %	100.00 %
	Kings Mountain (Cleveland)	90,809	10,032	10,032	11.05 %	100.00 %
	Mooresboro	90,809	293	293	0.32 %	100.00 %
	Patterson Springs	90,809	571	571	0.63 %	100.00 %
	Shelby	90,809	21,918	17,486	19.26 %	79.78 %
112	Charlotte	83,761	874,579	45,730	54.60 %	5.23 %
	Midland (Mecklenburg)	83,761	0	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Mint Hill (Mecklenburg)	83,761	26,444	26,444	31.57 %	100.00 %
	Stallings (Mecklenburg)	83,761	384	373	0.45 %	97.14 %
113	Chimney Rock Village	91,102	140	140	0.15 %	100.00 %
	Columbus	91,102	1,060	1,060	1.16 %	100.00 %
	Flat Rock	91,102	3,486	3,486	3.83 %	100.00 %
	Forest City	91,102	7,377	7,377	8.10 %	100.00 %
	Hendersonville	91,102	15,137	731	0.80 %	4.83 %
	Lake Lure	91,102	1,365	1,365	1.50 %	100.00 %
	Marion	91,102	7,717	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Ruth	91,102	347	347	0.38 %	100.00 %
	Rutherfordton	91,102	3,640	3,640	4.00 %	100.00 %
	Saluda (Henderson)	91,102	11	11	0.01 %	100.00 %
	Saluda (Polk)	91,102	620	620	0.68 %	100.00 %
	Spindale	91,102	4,225	4,225	4.64 %	100.00 %
	Tryon	91,102	1,562	1,562	1.71 %	100.00 %
114	Asheville	89,628	94,589	37,562	41.91 %	39.71 %
	Black Mountain	89,628	8,426	8,426	9.40 %	100.00 %
	Montreat	89,628	901	901	1.01 %	100.00 %
115	Asheville	88,843	94,589	30,907	34.79 %	32.68 %
	Biltmore Forest	88,843	1,409	1,409	1.59 %	100.00 %
116	Asheville	90,981	94,589	26,120	28.71 %	27.61 %
	Weaverville	90,981	4,567	4,567	5.02 %	100.00 %
	Woodfin	90,981	7,936	7,936	8.72 %	100.00 %
117	Flat Rock	90,329	3,486	0	0.00 %	0.00 %
	Fletcher	90,329	7,987	7,987	8.84 %	100.00 %
	Hendersonville	90,329	15,137	14,406	15.95 %	95.17 %
	Laurel Park	90,329	2,250	2,250	2.49 %	100.00 %
	Mills River	90,329	7,078	7,078	7.84 %	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 %

District - Municipality by County Report

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	Municipality	Total District Population	Total Muni Population	District Pop in Muni	Percent of District Pop in Muni	Percent of Muni Pop in District
118	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: 82

Splits Involving Population: 54

Whole-Split VTD Counts by District Report

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

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

Whole-Split VTD Counts by District Report**District Plan: HCM-5 Amend**

District	County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
23	Edgecombe	21	0
	Martin	13	0
	Tyrrell	6	0
	Washington	6	0
24	Nash	7	0
	Wilson	18	0
25	Nash	17	0
	Wilson	6	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	13	0
	Vance	12	0
33	Wake	15	0
34	Wake	27	0
35	Wake	14	0
36	Wake	12	0
37	Wake	12	0
38	Wake	18	0
39	Wake	13	0
40	Wake	19	0
41	Wake	20	0
42	Cumberland	12	0
43	Cumberland	21	0
44	Cumberland	28	0
45	Cumberland	15	0
46	Columbus	26	0
	Robeson	9	1
47	Robeson	29	1
48	Hoke	15	0
	Scotland	7	0
49	Wake	17	0
50	Caswell	9	0
	Orange	18	0
51	Lee	10	0
	Moore	4	0
52	Moore	10	0
	Richmond	16	0

District plan definition file: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

Based on TIGER 2020 VTDs

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

Whole-Split VTD Counts by District Report**District Plan: HCM-5 Amend**

District	County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
53	Harnett	6	0
	Johnston	6	0
54	Chatham	18	0
	Randolph	2	0
55	Anson	9	0
	Union	19	0
56	Orange	23	0
57	Guilford	27	0
58	Guilford	25	0
59	Guilford	23	0
60	Guilford	30	0
61	Guilford	31	0
62	Guilford	29	0
63	Alamance	16	0
64	Alamance	21	0
65	Rockingham	15	0
66	Wake	15	0
67	Montgomery	14	0
	Stanly	22	0
68	Union	14	0
69	Union	19	0
70	Randolph	12	0
71	Forsyth	24	0
72	Forsyth	28	0
73	Cabarrus	14	0
74	Forsyth	20	0
75	Forsyth	18	0
76	Rowan	25	0
77	Davie	14	0
	Rowan	5	0
	Yadkin	12	0
78	Moore	12	0
	Randolph	8	0
79	Beaufort	21	0
	Dare	12	0
	Hyde	7	0
	Pamlico	10	0
80	Davidson	22	0
81	Davidson	21	0
82	Cabarrus	15	0
83	Cabarrus	11	0
	Rowan	11	0
84	Iredell	18	1

District plan definition file: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

Based on TIGER 2020 VTDs

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

Whole-Split VTD Counts by District Report**District Plan: HCM-5 Amend**

District	County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
85	Avery	19	0
	McDowell	15	0
	Mitchell	9	0
	Yancey	11	0
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	6	0
91	Forsyth	11	0
	Stokes	18	0
92	Mecklenburg	9	0
93	Alleghany	4	0
	Ashe	17	0
	Watauga	19	0
94	Alexander	10	0
	Wilkes	21	0
95	Iredell	8	1
96	Catawba	23	0
97	Lincoln	23	0
98	Mecklenburg	9	1
99	Mecklenburg	12	0
100	Mecklenburg	20	0
101	Mecklenburg	13	0
102	Mecklenburg	19	0
103	Mecklenburg	17	0
104	Mecklenburg	26	0
105	Mecklenburg	15	0
106	Mecklenburg	9	1
107	Mecklenburg	11	0
108	Gaston	16	0
109	Gaston	17	0
110	Cleveland	10	0
	Gaston	13	0
111	Cleveland	11	0
	Rutherford	6	0
112	Mecklenburg	15	0

Whole-Split VTD Counts by District Report

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

District	County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
113	Henderson	7	0
	McDowell	2	0
	Polk	7	0
	Rutherford	11	0
114	Buncombe	34	0
115	Buncombe	20	0
116	Buncombe	25	0
117	Henderson	27	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:		2,661	

Total Districts Assigned: 120
 Total VTDs Statewide: 2666
 Fully Assigned VTDs: 2666
 Partially Assigned VTDs: 0
 Fully Unassigned VTDs: 0
 Split VTDs: 5
 Splits Involving Population: 5

Whole-Split VTD Counts by County Report

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
Alamance	37	0
Alexander	10	0
Alleghany	4	0
Anson	9	0
Ashe	17	0
Avery	19	0
Beaufort	21	0
Bertie	12	0
Bladen	17	0
Brunswick	25	0
Buncombe	79	0
Burke	33	0
Cabarrus	40	0
Caldwell	20	0
Camden	3	0
Carteret	28	0
Caswell	9	0
Catawba	40	0
Chatham	18	0
Cherokee	16	0
Chowan	6	0
Clay	9	0
Cleveland	21	0
Columbus	26	0
Craven	20	1
Cumberland	76	0
Currituck	11	0
Dare	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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

Based on TIGER 2020 VTDs

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

Whole-Split VTD Counts by County Report

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
Haywood	29	0
Henderson	34	0
Hertford	13	0
Hoke	15	0
Hyde	7	0
Iredell	28	1
Jackson	13	0
Johnston	36	0
Jones	7	0
Lee	10	0
Lenoir	21	1
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	38	1
Rockingham	15	0
Rowan	41	0
Rutherford	17	0
Sampson	23	0
Scotland	7	0
Stanly	22	0
Stokes	18	0
Surry	24	0

District plan definition file: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 PM

Based on TIGER 2020 VTDs

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

Whole-Split VTD Counts by County Report

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

County	Whole VTDs	Split VTDs
Swain	5	0
Transylvania	15	0
Tyrrell	6	0
Union	52	0
Vance	12	0
Wake	204	0
Warren	14	0
Washington	6	0
Watauga	20	0
Wayne	28	0
Wilkes	27	0
Wilson	24	0
Yadkin	12	0
Yancey	11	0
Totals:	2,661	5

Total VTDs Statewide: 2666

Fully Assigned VTDs: 2666

Partially Assigned VTDs: 0

Fully Unassigned VTDs: 0

Total Districts Assigned: 120

Split VTDs: 5

Splits Involving Population: 5

Split VTD Detail Report

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

County	VTD	District	Total VTD Population	VTD Pop in District	Percent of VTD Pop in District
Craven	002	3	18,203	6,483	35.62 %
		13	18,203	11,720	64.38 %
Iredell	BA	84	7,790	6,892	88.47 %
		95	7,790	898	11.53 %
Lenoir	MH	4	5,245	661	12.60 %
		12	5,245	4,584	87.40 %
Mecklenburg	133	98	7,343	5,129	69.85 %
		106	7,343	2,214	30.15 %
Robeson	030	46	4,728	4,453	94.18 %
		47	4,728	275	5.82 %
Assigned Geography Total:				43,309	

Total VTDs Statewide: 2666
 Fully Assigned VTDs: 2666
 Partially Assigned VTDs: 0
 Fully Unassigned VTDs: 0
 Total Districts Assigned: 120
 Split VTDs: 5
 Splits Involving Population: 5

Incumbent-District Report

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

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	82
Balkcom	Jennifer	Republican	117	117
Ball	Cynthia	Democrat	49	49
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	112
Crawford	Sarah	Democrat	66	66
Crutchfield	Kevin	Republican	83	83
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 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: HCM-5 Amend****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	105
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	34
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: 'HCM-5 Amend.csv', modified 10/23/2023 5:11 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: HCM-5 Amend****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: HCM-5 Amend

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	Longest	Timothy	Democrat	34
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: HCM-5 Amend****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	Ball	Cynthia	Democrat	49
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	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	Baker	Kristin	Republican	82
83	Crutchfield	Kevin	Republican	83
84	McNeely	Jeffrey	Republican	84

District-Incumbent Report

District Plan: HCM-5 Amend

Residence Set: NC House - 9/26/2023

District in this Plan	Last Name	First Name	Party	Current District
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
104	Lofton	Brandon	Democrat	104
105	Harris	Wesley	Democrat	105
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	Cotham	Patricia	Republican	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



NORTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY
AMENDMENT
House Bill 898

AMENDMENT NO. _____
(to be filled in by
Principal Clerk)

H898-ACL-42 [v.2]

Page 1 of 15

Amends Title [NO]
Second Edition

Date _____, 2023

Representative Harrison

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

moves to amend the bill on page 1, line 9, through page 13, line 26, by rewriting the lines to read:
"District 1: Camden County, Chowan County, Currituck County, Dare County: VTD COL, VTD
DUCK, VTD KTHK, VTD SOSH; Pasquotank County: VTD NIX, VTD SAL; Perquimans
County.

District 2: Durham County: VTD 023, VTD 025, VTD 026, VTD 028, VTD 029, VTD 044,
VTD 045, VTD 046; Person County.

District 3: Craven County: VTD 002: Block(s) 0499611012002, 0499611012019,
0499611012020, 0499611012021, 0499611012022, 0499611012023, 0499611012024,
0499611012025, 0499611012026, 0499611012027, 0499611012028, 0499611012029,
0499611012030, 0499611012031, 0499611012032, 0499611012033, 0499611012034,
0499611012035, 0499611012036, 0499611012037, 0499611021000, 0499611021002,
0499611021003, 0499611021006, 0499611021007, 0499611021008, 0499611021009,
0499611021015, 0499611021016, 0499611021017, 0499611021018, 0499611021019,
0499611021020, 0499611021021, 0499611021022, 0499611021023, 0499611021024,
0499611021026, 0499611022013, 0499611022014, 0499611022015, 0499611022016,
0499611022017, 0499611022018, 0499611022020, 0499611022044, 0499611022045,
0499611022074, 0499612011000, 0499612011001, 0499612011002, 0499612011003,
0499612011004, 0499612011005, 0499612011006, 0499612011007, 0499612011008,
0499612011009, 0499612011010, 0499612011011, 0499612011012, 0499612011013,
0499612011014, 0499612011015, 0499612011016, 0499612011017, 0499612011018,
0499612011019, 0499612011020, 0499612011021, 0499612011022, 0499612011023,
0499612011024, 0499612011025, 0499612011026, 0499612011027, 0499612011028,



* H 8 9 8 - A C L - 4 2 - V - 2 *

**NORTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY
AMENDMENT
House Bill 898**

AMENDMENT NO. _____
(to be filled in by
Principal Clerk)

H898-ACL-42 [v.2]

Page 2 of 15

1 0499612011029, 0499612011030, 0499612011031, 0499612011032, 0499612011033,
2 0499612011034, 0499612011035, 0499612011036, 0499612011037, 0499612011038,
3 0499612011039, 0499612011040, 0499612011041, 0499612011042, 0499612011043,
4 0499612011044, 0499612011045, 0499612012000, 0499612012001, 0499612012002,
5 0499612012003, 0499612012004, 0499612012005, 0499612012006, 0499612012007,
6 0499612012008, 0499612012009, 0499612012010, 0499612012011, 0499612012012,
7 0499612012013, 0499612012014, 0499612012015, 0499612012016, 0499612012017,
8 0499612012018, 0499612012019, 0499612012020, 0499612012021, 0499612012022,
9 0499612012023, 0499612012024, 0499612012037, 0499612013000, 0499612013001,
10 0499612013002, 0499612013003, 0499612013004, 0499612013005, 0499612013006,
11 0499612013007, 0499612013008, 0499612013009, 0499612013010, 0499612013011,
12 0499612013012, 0499612013013, 0499612013014, 0499612013015, 0499612013016,
13 0499612013017, 0499612013018, 0499612013019, 0499612013020, 0499612013021,
14 0499612021000, 0499612021001, 0499612021002, 0499612021003, 0499612021004,
15 0499612021005, 0499612021006, 0499612021007, 0499612021008, 0499612021009,
16 0499612021010, 0499612021011, 0499612021012, 0499612021013, 0499612021014,
17 0499612021015, 0499612021016, 0499612021017, 0499612021018, 0499612021019,
18 0499612021020, 0499612021021, 0499612021022, 0499612021023, 0499612021024,
19 0499612021025, 0499612021026, 0499612021027, 0499612021028, 0499612021029,
20 0499612021030, 0499612021031, 0499612021032, 0499612021033, 0499612021034,
21 0499612021035, 0499612021036, 0499612021037, 0499612021038, 0499612021039,
22 0499612021040, 0499612021041, 0499612021042, 0499612021043, 0499612021044,
23 0499612021045, 0499612021046, 0499612021047, 0499612021048, 0499612021049,
24 0499612021050, 0499612021051, 0499612021052, 0499612021053, 0499612021054,
25 0499612021055, 0499612021056, 0499612021057, 0499612021058, 0499612021059,
26 0499612021060, 0499612021061, 0499612021062, 0499612021063, 0499612021064,
27 0499612021065, 0499612021066, 0499612021067, 0499612021068, 0499612021069,
28 0499612021070, 0499612021071, 0499612021072, 0499612021073, 0499612021074,
29 0499612021075, 0499612021076, 0499612021077, 0499612021078, 0499612021080,
30 0499612021081, 0499612021082, 0499612021083, 0499612021084, 0499612021085,
31 0499612021086, 0499612021087, 0499612021088, 0499612021089, 0499612021090,
32 0499612021095, 0499612021099, 0499612021100, 0499612021101, 0499612021103,
33 0499612021104, 0499612021105, 0499613013000, 0499613032046; VTD 003, VTD 005,
34 VTD 007, VTD 011, VTD 016, VTD 017, VTD 020, VTD 021, VTD 023, VTD CFB8, VTD
35 CLR4, VTD DFB9, VTD N1, VTD N2, VTD N3N5, VTD N4, VTD N6, VTD TE13, VTD
36 VE14.
37 **District 4:** Duplin County, Jones County, Lenoir County: VTD C, VTD FC, VTD MH: Block(s)
38 1070110011045, 1070110011062, 1070110011063, 1070111002033, 1070111002034,
39 1070111002043, 1070111003000, 1070111003001, 1070111003034, 1070111003035,
40 1070111003046, 1070111003047, 1070111003049, 1070111003050, 1070111003051,
41 1070111003052, 1070111003053, 1070111003054, 1070111003055, 1070111003056,
42 1070111003057, 1070111003058, 1070111003059, 1070111003060, 1070111003061,
43 1070111004036, 1070111004037, 1070111004045, 1070111004046, 1070111004047,

**NORTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY
AMENDMENT
House Bill 898**

AMENDMENT NO. _____
(to be filled in by
Principal Clerk)

H898-ACL-42 [v.2]

Page 3 of 15

1 1070111004048, 1070111004049; VTD N, VTD PH1, VTD PH2, VTD SH, VTD SW, VTD
2 T1, VTD T2, VTD W.
3 **District 5:** Bertie County, Gates County, Hertford County, Pasquotank County: VTD EAST,
4 VTD MH, VTD NEW, VTD NORTH, VTD PRO, VTD SOUTH, VTD WEST.
5 **District 6:** Harnett County: VTD PR01, VTD PR07, VTD PR16, VTD PR20, VTD PR23, VTD
6 PR31, VTD PR32.
7 **District 7:** Franklin County, Granville County: VTD MTEN, VTD WILT.
8 **District 8:** Pitt County: VTD 101, VTD 1101, VTD 1102A, VTD 1102B, VTD 1201, VTD 1501,
9 VTD 1503, VTD 1504A, VTD 1504B, VTD 1506, VTD 1507, VTD 1507B, VTD 1508A,
10 VTD 1508B, VTD 1509, VTD 301, VTD 401, VTD 501, VTD 701, VTD 800A, VTD 800B,
11 VTD 901.
12 **District 9:** Pitt County: VTD 1001, VTD 1301, VTD 1403A1, VTD 1403A2, VTD 1403B, VTD
13 1505A, VTD 1505B, VTD 1510A, VTD 1510B, VTD 1511A, VTD 1511B, VTD 1512A,
14 VTD 1512B, VTD 1513A, VTD 1513B, VTD 200A, VTD 200B, VTD 601.
15 **District 10:** Greene County, Wayne County: VTD 001, VTD 002, VTD 003, VTD 004, VTD
16 005, VTD 006, VTD 007, VTD 008, VTD 009, VTD 012, VTD 016, VTD 024, VTD 2530.
17 **District 11:** Wake County: VTD 01-01, VTD 01-23, VTD 01-31, VTD 01-32, VTD 01-41, VTD
18 01-48, VTD 06-07, VTD 18-01, VTD 18-02, VTD 18-04, VTD 18-05, VTD 18-06, VTD 18-
19 08.
20 **District 12:** Lenoir County: VTD I, VTD K1, VTD K2, VTD K3, VTD K4, VTD K5, VTD K6,
21 VTD K7, VTD K8, VTD K9, VTD MH: Block(s) 1070111001000, 1070111001001,
22 1070111001002, 1070111001003, 1070111001004, 1070111001005, 1070111001006,
23 1070111001007, 1070111001008, 1070111001009, 1070111001010, 1070111001011,
24 1070111001012, 1070111001013, 1070111001014, 1070111001015, 1070111001016,
25 1070111001017, 1070111001018, 1070111001019, 1070111001020, 1070111001021,
26 1070111001022, 1070111001023, 1070111001024, 1070111001025, 1070111001026,
27 1070111001027, 1070111001028, 1070111001029, 1070111001030, 1070111001031,
28 1070111001032, 1070111001033, 1070111001034, 1070111001035, 1070111001036,
29 1070111001037, 1070111001038, 1070111001039, 1070111001040, 1070111001041,
30 1070111001042, 1070111001043, 1070111001044, 1070111001045, 1070111001046,
31 1070111001047, 1070111001048, 1070111001049, 1070111001050, 1070111001051,
32 1070111001052, 1070111001053, 1070111001054, 1070111001055, 1070111001056,
33 1070111001057, 1070111001058, 1070111001059, 1070111001060, 1070111001061,
34 1070111001062, 1070111002000, 1070111002001, 1070111002002, 1070111002003,
35 1070111002004, 1070111002005, 1070111002006, 1070111002010, 1070111002011,
36 1070111002012, 1070111002013, 1070111002014, 1070111002015, 1070111002016,
37 1070111002017, 1070111002018, 1070111002019, 1070111002020, 1070111002021,
38 1070111002022, 1070111002023, 1070111002024, 1070111002025, 1070111002026,
39 1070111002027, 1070111002028, 1070111002029, 1070111002030, 1070111002031,
40 1070111002032, 1070111002035, 1070111002036, 1070111002037, 1070111002038,
41 1070111002039, 1070111002040, 1070111002041, 1070111002042, 1070111003002,
42 1070111003003, 1070111003004, 1070111003005, 1070111003006, 1070111003007,
43 1070111003008, 1070111003009, 1070111003010, 1070111003011, 1070111003012,

**NORTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY
AMENDMENT
House Bill 898**

AMENDMENT NO. _____
(to be filled in by
Principal Clerk)

H898-ACL-42 [v.2]

Page 4 of 15

1	1070111003013,	1070111003014,	1070111003015,	1070111003016,	1070111003017,
2	1070111003018,	1070111003019,	1070111003020,	1070111003021,	1070111003022,
3	1070111003023,	1070111003024,	1070111003025,	1070111003026,	1070111003027,
4	1070111003028,	1070111003029,	1070111003030,	1070111003031,	1070111003032,
5	1070111003033,	1070111003036,	1070111003037,	1070111003038,	1070111003039,
6	1070111003040,	1070111003041,	1070111003042,	1070111003043,	1070111003044,
7	1070111003045,	1070111003048,	1070111004000,	1070111004001,	1070111004002,
8	1070111004003,	1070111004004,	1070111004005,	1070111004006,	1070111004007,
9	1070111004008,	1070111004009,	1070111004010,	1070111004011,	1070111004012,
10	1070111004013,	1070111004014,	1070111004015,	1070111004016,	1070111004017,
11	1070111004018,	1070111004019,	1070111004020,	1070111004021,	1070111004022,
12	1070111004023,	1070111004024,	1070111004025,	1070111004026,	1070111004027,
13	1070111004028,	1070111004029,	1070111004030,	1070111004031,	1070111004032,
14	1070111004033,	1070111004034,	1070111004035,	1070111004038,	1070111004039,
15	1070111004040,	1070111004041,	1070111004042,	1070111004043,	1070111004044,
16	1070111004050,	1070111004051,	1070111004052,	1070111004053,	1070111004054,
17	1070111004055,	1070111004056,	1070111004057,	1070111004058,	1070111004059,
18	1070111004060,	1070111004061,	1070111004062,	1070111004063,	1070111004064,
19	1070111004065,	1070111004066,	1070111004067,	1070111004068,	1070111004069,
20	1070111004070,	1070111004071,	1070111004072,	1070111004073,	1070111004074,
21	1070111004075,	1070111004076,	1070111004077,	1070111004078,	1070111004079; VTD
22	V; Wayne County: VTD 010, VTD 011, VTD 013, VTD 014, VTD 015, VTD 017, VTD 018,				
23	VTD 021, VTD 022, VTD 023, VTD 026, VTD 027, VTD 028, VTD 029, VTD 1920.				
24	District 13: Carteret County, Craven County: VTD 002: Block(s) 0499611021001,				
25	0499611021004,	0499611021005,	0499611021010,	0499611021011,	0499611021012,
26	0499611021013,	0499611021014,	0499611021025,	0499611021027,	0499611022023,
27	0499611022024,	0499611022025,	0499611022026,	0499611022027,	0499611022029,
28	0499611022030,	0499611022031,	0499611022032,	0499611022033,	0499611022035,
29	0499611022036,	0499611022037,	0499611022038,	0499611022041,	0499611022042,
30	0499611022043,	0499611022046,	0499611022047,	0499611022048,	0499611022049,
31	0499611022051,	0499611022052,	0499611022053,	0499611022054,	0499611022055,
32	0499611022056,	0499611022057,	0499611022058,	0499611022059,	0499611022060,
33	0499611022061,	0499611022062,	0499611022063,	0499611022064,	0499611022065,
34	0499611022066,	0499611022067,	0499611022068,	0499611022069,	0499611022070,
35	0499611022071,	0499611022072,	0499611022073,	0499611022075,	0499611022076,
36	0499611022077,	0499611022078,	0499611022079,	0499611022080,	0499611022081,
37	0499611022082,	0499611022083,	0499611022084,	0499611022085,	0499611022086,
38	0499611022087,	0499611022088,	0499611022089,	0499612012025,	0499612012026,
39	0499612012027,	0499612012028,	0499612012029,	0499612012030,	0499612012031,
40	0499612012032,	0499612012033,	0499612012034,	0499612012035,	0499612012036,
41	0499612012038,	0499612012039,	0499612012040,	0499612012041,	0499612012042,
42	0499612012043,	0499612021079,	0499612021091,	0499612021092,	0499612021093,
43	0499612021094,	0499612021102,	0499613011000,	0499613011001,	0499613011002,

**NORTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY
AMENDMENT
House Bill 898**

AMENDMENT NO. _____
(to be filled in by
Principal Clerk)

H898-ACL-42 [v.2]

Page 5 of 15

1 0499613011003, 0499613011004, 0499613011005, 0499613011006, 0499613011007,
2 0499613011008, 0499613011009, 0499613011010, 0499613011011, 0499613011012,
3 0499613011013, 0499613011014, 0499613011015, 0499613011016, 0499613011017,
4 0499613011018, 0499613011019, 0499613011020, 0499613011021, 0499613011022,
5 0499613011023, 0499613011024, 0499613011025, 0499613012000, 0499613012001,
6 0499613012002, 0499613012003, 0499613012004, 0499613012005, 0499613012006,
7 0499613012007, 0499613012008, 0499613012009, 0499613012010, 0499613012011,
8 0499613012012, 0499613012013, 0499613012014, 0499613012015, 0499613012016,
9 0499613012017, 0499613012018, 0499613012019, 0499613012020, 0499613012021,
10 0499613012022, 0499613012023, 0499613012024, 0499613012025, 0499613012026,
11 0499613012027, 0499613012028, 0499613012029, 0499613012030, 0499613012031,
12 0499613012032, 0499613012033, 0499613012034, 0499613012035, 0499613012036,
13 0499613012037, 0499613012038, 0499613012039, 0499613012040, 0499613012041,
14 0499613012042, 0499613012043, 0499613012044, 0499613012045, 0499613013001,
15 0499613013002, 0499613013003, 0499613013004, 0499613013005, 0499613013006,
16 0499613013007, 0499613013008, 0499613013009, 0499613013010, 0499613013011,
17 0499613013012, 0499613013013, 0499613013014, 0499613013015, 0499613013016,
18 0499613013017, 0499613013018, 0499613013019, 0499613013020, 0499613013021,
19 0499613013022, 0499613013023, 0499613013024, 0499613013025, 0499613013026,
20 0499613013027, 0499613013028, 0499613013029, 0499613013030, 0499613021004,
21 0499613021005, 0499613021006, 0499613021007, 0499613021008, 0499613021009,
22 0499613021010, 0499613021011, 0499613021012, 0499613021013, 0499613021014,
23 0499613021015, 0499613021016, 0499613021017, 0499613021019, 0499613021020,
24 0499613021021, 0499613021022, 0499613021023, 0499613022000, 0499613022001,
25 0499613022002, 0499613022003, 0499613022004, 0499613022005, 0499613022006,
26 0499613022007, 0499613022008, 0499613022009, 0499613022010, 0499613022011,
27 0499613022012, 0499613022013, 0499613022014, 0499613022015, 0499613022016,
28 0499613023000, 0499613023001, 0499613023002, 0499613023003, 0499613023004,
29 0499613023005, 0499613023006, 0499613023007, 0499613023008, 0499613023009,
30 0499613023010, 0499613023011, 0499613023012, 0499613023013, 0499613023014,
31 0499613023015, 0499613023016, 0499613023017, 0499613023018, 0499613023019,
32 0499613032044, 0499613032045; VTD 019.

33 **District 14:** Onslow County: VTD BC21, VTD BM08, VTD HU20, VTD JA01, VTD MT24,
34 VTD NE22A, VTD NR02, VTD SW19, VTD VR15.

35 **District 15:** Onslow County: VTD CL10, VTD CR07, VTD EN03, VTD GB12, VTD HM05,
36 VTD ML23, VTD NE22B, VTD NM13, VTD RL09, VTD TL06, VTD WN04.

37 **District 16:** Onslow County: VTD FS16, VTD HN14, VTD HR17, VTD SF18; Pender County.

38 **District 17:** Brunswick County: VTD 001, VTD 002, VTD 003, VTD 005, VTD 011, VTD 013,
39 VTD 014, VTD 015, VTD 016, VTD 017, VTD 018, VTD 019, VTD 04A, VTD 4B2.

40 **District 18:** New Hanover County: VTD CF01, VTD CF02, VTD CF05, VTD CF06, VTD H02,
41 VTD H08, VTD H10, VTD H11, VTD H12, VTD H13, VTD W03, VTD W08, VTD W15,
42 VTD W25, VTD W26, VTD W27, VTD W29.

**NORTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY
AMENDMENT
House Bill 898**

AMENDMENT NO. _____
(to be filled in by
Principal Clerk)

H898-ACL-42 [v.2]

Page 6 of 15

- 1 **District 19:** Brunswick County: VTD 006, VTD 007, VTD 008, VTD 009, VTD 012, VTD 020,
2 VTD 021, VTD 022, VTD 023, VTD 10A, VTD 10B; New Hanover County: VTD FP03,
3 VTD FP04, VTD FP06, VTD FP07, VTD FP08, VTD M03, VTD W30.
- 4 **District 20:** New Hanover County: VTD H01, VTD H03, VTD H04, VTD H05, VTD H06, VTD
5 M02, VTD M04, VTD M06, VTD M07, VTD W12, VTD W13, VTD W16, VTD W17, VTD
6 W18, VTD W21, VTD W24, VTD W28, VTD W31, VTD WB.
- 7 **District 21:** Wake County: VTD 05-01, VTD 05-03, VTD 05-06, VTD 05-07, VTD 05-08, VTD
8 20-14, VTD 20-15, VTD 20-16, VTD 20-17.
- 9 **District 22:** Bladen County, Sampson County.
- 10 **District 23:** Edgecombe County, Martin County, Tyrrell County, Washington County.
- 11 **District 24:** Nash County: VTD P17A, VTD P18A, VTD P20A, VTD P21A, VTD P22A, VTD
12 P23A, VTD P24A; Wilson County: VTD PRGA, VTD PRTA, VTD PRTO, VTD PRWA,
13 VTD PRWB, VTD PRWC, VTD PRWD, VTD PRWE, VTD PRWH, VTD PRWI, VTD
14 PRWJ, VTD PRWK, VTD PRWL, VTD PRWM, VTD PRWN, VTD PRWP, VTD PRWQ,
15 VTD PRWR.
- 16 **District 25:** Nash County: VTD P01A, VTD P02A, VTD P03A, VTD P04A, VTD P05A, VTD
17 P06A, VTD P07A, VTD P08A, VTD P09A, VTD P10A, VTD P11A, VTD P12A, VTD
18 P13A, VTD P14A, VTD P15A, VTD P16A, VTD P19A; Wilson County: VTD PRBL, VTD
19 PRCR, VTD PROL, VTD PRSA, VTD PRSP, VTD PRST.
- 20 **District 26:** Johnston County: VTD PR09, VTD PR10A, VTD PR10B, VTD PR11A, VTD
21 PR11B, VTD PR12A, VTD PR20, VTD PR21, VTD PR29A, VTD PR29B, VTD PR32, VTD
22 PR34.
- 23 **District 27:** Halifax County, Northampton County, Warren County.
- 24 **District 28:** Johnston County: VTD PR04, VTD PR07, VTD PR08, VTD PR13, VTD PR14,
25 VTD PR19, VTD PR22, VTD PR24, VTD PR25, VTD PR26, VTD PR27A, VTD PR27B,
26 VTD PR28, VTD PR30, VTD PR35, VTD PR36, VTD PR37, VTD PR38.
- 27 **District 29:** Durham County: VTD 009, VTD 016, VTD 027, VTD 036, VTD 038, VTD 039,
28 VTD 041, VTD 042, VTD 048, VTD 051, VTD 054, VTD 34-1, VTD 34-2, VTD 35.3, VTD
29 53-1, VTD 53-2.
- 30 **District 30:** Durham County: VTD 001, VTD 002, VTD 003, VTD 004, VTD 005, VTD 006,
31 VTD 007, VTD 008, VTD 017, VTD 019, VTD 020, VTD 021, VTD 022, VTD 024, VTD
32 037, VTD 040, VTD 043, VTD 050.
- 33 **District 31:** Durham County: VTD 010, VTD 012, VTD 013, VTD 014, VTD 015, VTD 018,
34 VTD 031, VTD 032, VTD 033, VTD 047, VTD 052, VTD 055-11, VTD 055-49, VTD 30-1,
35 VTD 30-2.
- 36 **District 32:** Granville County: VTD ANTI, VTD BERE, VTD BTNR, VTD CORI, VTD CRDL,
37 VTD CRDM, VTD EAOX, VTD OKHL, VTD SALM, VTD SASS, VTD SOOX, VTD
38 TYHO, VTD WOEL; Vance County.
- 39 **District 33:** Wake County: VTD 01-22, VTD 15-01, VTD 15-02, VTD 15-03, VTD 15-04, VTD
40 16-01, VTD 16-02, VTD 16-03, VTD 16-04, VTD 16-05, VTD 16-06, VTD 16-07, VTD 16-
41 09, VTD 16-10, VTD 16-11.
- 42 **District 34:** Wake County: VTD 01-04, VTD 01-05, VTD 01-06, VTD 01-09, VTD 01-10, VTD
43 01-11, VTD 01-12, VTD 01-15, VTD 01-17, VTD 01-18, VTD 01-30, VTD 01-36, VTD 01-

**NORTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY
AMENDMENT
House Bill 898**

AMENDMENT NO. _____
(to be filled in by
Principal Clerk)

H898-ACL-42 [v.2]

Page 7 of 15

- 1 37, VTD 01-39, VTD 01-43, VTD 01-45, VTD 01-51, VTD 02-06, VTD 07-02, VTD 07-03,
2 VTD 07-04, VTD 07-05, VTD 07-06, VTD 07-07, VTD 07-09, VTD 07-11, VTD 07-13.
3 **District 35:** Wake County: VTD 19-03, VTD 19-05, VTD 19-07, VTD 19-09, VTD 19-11, VTD
4 19-12, VTD 19-13, VTD 19-14, VTD 19-15, VTD 19-16, VTD 19-18, VTD 19-19, VTD 19-
5 20, VTD 19-21.
6 **District 36:** Wake County: VTD 03-00, VTD 04-07, VTD 06-06, VTD 06-08, VTD 06-09, VTD
7 20-01, VTD 20-05, VTD 20-06A, VTD 20-06B, VTD 20-09, VTD 20-11, VTD 20-12.
8 **District 37:** Wake County: VTD 06-04, VTD 06-05, VTD 06-10, VTD 12-01, VTD 12-02, VTD
9 12-04, VTD 12-05, VTD 12-06, VTD 12-07, VTD 12-08, VTD 12-09, VTD 18-07.
10 **District 38:** Wake County: VTD 01-07, VTD 01-13, VTD 01-14, VTD 01-19, VTD 01-20, VTD
11 01-21, VTD 01-25, VTD 01-26, VTD 01-27, VTD 01-28, VTD 01-34, VTD 01-35, VTD 01-
12 40, VTD 01-50, VTD 17-01, VTD 17-05, VTD 17-07, VTD 17-09.
13 **District 39:** Wake County: VTD 09-01, VTD 09-02, VTD 09-03, VTD 10-01, VTD 10-02, VTD
14 10-03, VTD 10-04, VTD 17-02, VTD 17-03, VTD 17-04, VTD 17-06, VTD 17-12, VTD 17-
15 13.
16 **District 40:** Wake County: VTD 02-01, VTD 02-02, VTD 02-03, VTD 02-04, VTD 02-05, VTD
17 08-02, VTD 08-03, VTD 08-04, VTD 08-05, VTD 08-06, VTD 08-07, VTD 08-08, VTD 08-
18 09, VTD 08-10, VTD 08-11, VTD 13-10, VTD 13-11, VTD 14-01, VTD 14-02.
19 **District 41:** Wake County: VTD 04-01, VTD 04-02, VTD 04-03, VTD 04-04, VTD 04-06, VTD
20 04-09, VTD 04-10, VTD 04-11, VTD 04-12, VTD 04-13, VTD 04-14, VTD 04-15, VTD 04-
21 16, VTD 04-19, VTD 04-20, VTD 18-03, VTD 20-03, VTD 20-04, VTD 20-08, VTD 20-10.
22 **District 42:** Cumberland County: VTD CC27, VTD CL57-1, VTD CL57-2, VTD G11B, VTD
23 G2D, VTD G5A-1, VTD G5A-2, VTD G5B-2, VTD LR63, VTD MB62, VTD MR02, VTD
24 SL78-3.
25 **District 43:** Cumberland County: VTD AL51, VTD CC01, VTD CC05, VTD CC19, VTD EO61-
26 1, VTD EO61-2, VTD G1A, VTD G1B, VTD G2A, VTD G2B, VTD G2C-1, VTD G2C-2,
27 VTD G2E-1, VTD G3C, VTD G6A, VTD G6B, VTD G6C, VTD G7A, VTD G7B, VTD
28 LI65, VTD SH77.
29 **District 44:** Cumberland County: VTD CC03, VTD CC04, VTD CC06, VTD CC07, VTD CC08,
30 VTD CC10, VTD CC12, VTD CC13, VTD CC14, VTD CC15, VTD CC16, VTD CC17,
31 VTD CC18, VTD CC21, VTD CC24, VTD CC25, VTD CC26, VTD CC29, VTD CC31,
32 VTD CC32, VTD CC33, VTD CC34, VTD CU02, VTD G2E-2, VTD G3B, VTD G4A, VTD
33 G4B, VTD G4C.
34 **District 45:** Cumberland County: VTD AH49, VTD G10A, VTD G10B, VTD G10C, VTD G3A-
35 1, VTD G3A-2, VTD G5B-1, VTD G5C, VTD G8A, VTD G8B, VTD G8C, VTD G8D, VTD
36 G9A, VTD G9B-1, VTD G9B-2.
37 **District 46:** Columbus County, Robeson County: VTD 003, VTD 008, VTD 009, VTD 010,
38 VTD 020, VTD 021, VTD 030: Block(s) 1559607011000, 1559607011001, 1559607011002,
39 1559607011003, 1559607011004, 1559607011005, 1559607011006, 1559607011007,
40 1559607011008, 1559607011009, 1559607011010, 1559607011011, 1559607011012,
41 1559607011013, 1559607011014, 1559607011015, 1559607011016, 1559607011017,
42 1559607011018, 1559607011019, 1559607011020, 1559607011021, 1559607011022,
43 1559607011023, 1559607011024, 1559607011025, 1559607011026, 1559607011027,

**NORTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY
AMENDMENT
House Bill 898**

AMENDMENT NO. _____
(to be filled in by
Principal Clerk)

H898-ACL-42 [v.2]

Page 8 of 15

1 1559607011028, 1559607012000, 1559607012001, 1559607012002, 1559607012003,
2 1559607012004, 1559607012005, 1559607012006, 1559607012007, 1559607012008,
3 1559607012009, 1559607012010, 1559607012011, 1559607012012, 1559607012013,
4 1559607012014, 1559607012015, 1559607012016, 1559607012017, 1559607012018,
5 1559607012019, 1559607013000, 1559607013001, 1559607013002, 1559607013003,
6 1559607013004, 1559607013005, 1559607013006, 1559607013007, 1559607013008,
7 1559607013009, 1559607013010, 1559607013011, 1559607013012, 1559607013013,
8 1559607013014, 1559607013015, 1559607013016, 1559607013017, 1559607013018,
9 1559607013019, 1559607013020, 1559607013021, 1559607013022, 1559607013023,
10 1559607013024, 1559607013025, 1559607013026, 1559607013029, 1559607013030,
11 1559607013031, 1559607013032, 1559607013033, 1559607013034, 1559607013038,
12 1559607013051, 1559607013061, 1559607013062, 1559607013063, 1559607013064,
13 1559607013065, 1559607013066, 1559607013067, 1559607013075, 1559607013076,
14 1559607013077, 1559613013000, 1559613013001, 1559613013002, 1559613013003,
15 1559613013004, 1559613013006, 1559613013007, 1559613013008, 1559613013009,
16 1559613013010, 1559613013011, 1559613013012, 1559613013013, 1559613013015,
17 1559613013016, 1559613013017, 1559613013019, 1559613013020, 1559613013021,
18 1559613013022, 1559614002036, 1559614002037, 1559614002038, 1559614002039,
19 1559614002040, 1559614002041, 1559614002042, 1559614002055, 1559614002056,
20 1559614002057; VTD 037, VTD 041, VTD 32A.
21 **District 47:** Robeson County: VTD 001, VTD 002, VTD 004, VTD 007, VTD 011, VTD 012,
22 VTD 013, VTD 014, VTD 015, VTD 016, VTD 017, VTD 019, VTD 022, VTD 023, VTD
23 024, VTD 025, VTD 028, VTD 029, VTD 030: Block(s) 1559607013068, 1559607013069,
24 1559607013070, 1559607013071, 1559607013072, 1559607013073, 1559607013074,
25 1559607013079, 1559607013080; VTD 033, VTD 034, VTD 035, VTD 036, VTD 038, VTD
26 039, VTD 040, VTD 05A, VTD 11A, VTD 18A, VTD 26A.
27 **District 48:** Hoke County, Scotland County.
28 **District 49:** Wake County: VTD 01-02, VTD 01-03, VTD 01-16, VTD 01-29, VTD 01-33, VTD
29 01-49, VTD 04-05, VTD 04-08, VTD 04-17, VTD 04-18, VTD 04-21, VTD 05-05, VTD 07-
30 01, VTD 07-10, VTD 07-12, VTD 11-01, VTD 11-02.
31 **District 50:** Caswell County, Orange County: VTD CA, VTD CG, VTD CP, VTD CS1, VTD
32 CW, VTD CX, VTD EF, VTD ENO, VTD GB, VTD H, VTD HE, VTD OG, VTD PA, VTD
33 SJ, VTD SM, VTD TO, VTD WC, VTD WH.
34 **District 51:** Lee County, Moore County: VTD CAM, VTD CAR, VTD LTR, VTD VSS.
35 **District 52:** Moore County: VTD EAB, VTD EKWD, VTD EUR-WP, VTD EWD, VTD NSP,
36 VTD PBF, VTD PDN, VTD SSP, VTD WAB, VTD WKWD; Richmond County.
37 **District 53:** Harnett County: VTD PR08, VTD PR24, VTD PR25, VTD PR26, VTD PR28, VTD
38 PR29; Johnston County: VTD PR12B, VTD PR23A, VTD PR23B, VTD PR31A, VTD
39 PR31B, VTD PR33.
40 **District 54:** Chatham County, Randolph County: VTD LB, VTD ST.
41 **District 55:** Anson County, Union County: VTD 001, VTD 002, VTD 003, VTD 004, VTD 007,
42 VTD 008, VTD 009, VTD 010, VTD 011, VTD 021, VTD 022, VTD 023, VTD 024, VTD
43 025, VTD 026, VTD 027, VTD 033, VTD 036, VTD 043.

**NORTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY
AMENDMENT
House Bill 898**

AMENDMENT NO. _____
(to be filled in by
Principal Clerk)

H898-ACL-42 [v.2]

Page 9 of 15

- 1 **District 56:** Orange County: VTD CB, VTD CF, VTD CH, VTD CO, VTD DA, VTD DM, VTD
2 EA1, VTD EH, VTD ES, VTD GL, VTD HF, VTD KM, VTD LC, VTD NC, VTD NS, VTD
3 OW, VTD RE, VTD RF, VTD TH, VTD UNC, VTD WD, VTD WDS, VTD WW.
- 4 **District 57:** Guilford County: VTD CG1, VTD CG2, VTD CG3A, VTD CG3B, VTD G07, VTD
5 G08, VTD G09, VTD G10, VTD G20, VTD G21, VTD G22, VTD G23, VTD G24, VTD
6 G25, VTD G26, VTD G27, VTD G28, VTD G29, VTD G30, VTD G31, VTD G40B, VTD
7 NCGR1, VTD NCGR2, VTD SF1, VTD SF2, VTD SF3, VTD SF4.
- 8 **District 58:** Guilford County: VTD FEN1, VTD FR1, VTD FR2, VTD G46, VTD G47, VTD
9 G52, VTD G53, VTD G54, VTD G55, VTD G56, VTD G57, VTD G58, VTD G59, VTD
10 G60, VTD G61, VTD G62, VTD G65, VTD G66, VTD G73, VTD G75, VTD JAM3, VTD
11 SUM1, VTD SUM2, VTD SUM3, VTD SUM4.
- 12 **District 59:** Guilford County: VTD FEN2, VTD G06, VTD GIB, VTD GR, VTD JEF1, VTD
13 JEF2, VTD JEF3, VTD JEF4, VTD MON1, VTD MON2A, VTD MON2B, VTD MON3,
14 VTD NCLAY1, VTD NCLAY2, VTD NMAD, VTD NWASH, VTD PG1, VTD PG2, VTD
15 RC1, VTD RC2, VTD SCLAY, VTD SMAD, VTD SWASH.
- 16 **District 60:** Guilford County: VTD H01, VTD H02, VTD H03, VTD H04, VTD H05, VTD H06,
17 VTD H07, VTD H08, VTD H09, VTD H10, VTD H11, VTD H12, VTD H13, VTD H14,
18 VTD H15, VTD H16, VTD H17, VTD H18, VTD H19A, VTD H19B, VTD H20A, VTD
19 H20B, VTD H22, VTD H26, VTD H28, VTD H29A, VTD JAM1, VTD JAM2, VTD JAM4,
20 VTD JAM5.
- 21 **District 61:** Guilford County: VTD G01, VTD G02, VTD G03, VTD G04, VTD G05, VTD G11,
22 VTD G12, VTD G13, VTD G14, VTD G15, VTD G16, VTD G17, VTD G18, VTD G19,
23 VTD G35, VTD G36, VTD G37, VTD G44, VTD G45, VTD G48, VTD G49, VTD G50,
24 VTD G51, VTD G63, VTD G67, VTD G68, VTD G69, VTD G70, VTD G71, VTD G72,
25 VTD G74.
- 26 **District 62:** Guilford County: VTD FR3, VTD FR4, VTD FR5A, VTD FR5B, VTD G32, VTD
27 G33, VTD G34, VTD G38, VTD G39, VTD G40A1, VTD G40A2, VTD G41A, VTD G41B,
28 VTD G42A, VTD G42B, VTD G43, VTD G64, VTD H21, VTD H23, VTD H24, VTD H25,
29 VTD H27-A, VTD H27-B, VTD H29B, VTD NDRI, VTD OR1, VTD OR2, VTD SDRI,
30 VTD STOK.
- 31 **District 63:** Alamance County: VTD 005, VTD 011, VTD 013, VTD 063, VTD 064, VTD 06E,
32 VTD 06N, VTD 06S, VTD 06W, VTD 09N, VTD 103, VTD 10N, VTD 10S, VTD 124, VTD
33 127, VTD 12N.
- 34 **District 64:** Alamance County: VTD 001, VTD 002, VTD 004, VTD 007, VTD 035, VTD 03C,
35 VTD 03N, VTD 03S, VTD 03W, VTD 08N, VTD 08S, VTD 09S, VTD 1210, VTD 125,
36 VTD 126, VTD 128, VTD 129, VTD 12E, VTD 12S, VTD 12W, VTD 3N2.
- 37 **District 65:** Rockingham County.
- 38 **District 66:** Wake County: VTD 01-38, VTD 01-42, VTD 01-44, VTD 01-46, VTD 01-47, VTD
39 13-01, VTD 13-02, VTD 13-05, VTD 13-06, VTD 13-07, VTD 13-08, VTD 13-09, VTD 17-
40 10, VTD 17-11, VTD 19-17.
- 41 **District 67:** Montgomery County, Stanly County.
- 42 **District 68:** Union County: VTD 018, VTD 019, VTD 031, VTD 040, VTD 041, VTD 042, VTD
43 17A, VTD 17B, VTD 20A, VTD 20B, VTD 28A, VTD 28B, VTD 28C, VTD 28D.

**NORTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY
AMENDMENT
House Bill 898**

AMENDMENT NO. _____
(to be filled in by
Principal Clerk)

H898-ACL-42 [v.2]

Page 10 of 15

- 1 **District 69:** Union County: VTD 005, VTD 006, VTD 012, VTD 013, VTD 014, VTD 015, VTD
2 016, VTD 030, VTD 032, VTD 034, VTD 035, VTD 039, VTD 29A, VTD 29B, VTD 29C,
3 VTD 37A, VTD 37B, VTD 38A, VTD 38B.
- 4 **District 70:** Randolph County: VTD AE, VTD AN, VTD AR, VTD AS, VTD AW, VTD BC,
5 VTD LC, VTD NM, VTD RN, VTD TB, VTD TR, VTD TT.
- 6 **District 71:** Forsyth County: VTD 122, VTD 404, VTD 405, VTD 501, VTD 502, VTD 503,
7 VTD 504, VTD 505, VTD 506, VTD 601, VTD 602, VTD 603, VTD 604, VTD 605, VTD
8 606, VTD 607, VTD 701, VTD 702, VTD 703, VTD 704, VTD 705, VTD 706, VTD 707,
9 VTD 806.
- 10 **District 72:** Forsyth County: VTD 201, VTD 203, VTD 204, VTD 205, VTD 206, VTD 207,
11 VTD 301, VTD 302, VTD 303, VTD 304, VTD 305, VTD 306, VTD 401, VTD 402, VTD
12 403, VTD 801, VTD 802, VTD 803, VTD 804, VTD 805, VTD 809, VTD 901, VTD 902,
13 VTD 903, VTD 904, VTD 905, VTD 906, VTD 907.
- 14 **District 73:** Cabarrus County: VTD 01-04, VTD 01-07, VTD 01-08, VTD 01-10, VTD 01-11,
15 VTD 02-03, VTD 02-09, VTD 11-01, VTD 12-04, VTD 12-06, VTD 12-08, VTD 12-09,
16 VTD 12-12, VTD 12-13.
- 17 **District 74:** Forsyth County: VTD 051, VTD 052, VTD 053, VTD 054, VTD 055, VTD 071,
18 VTD 072, VTD 073, VTD 074, VTD 075, VTD 123, VTD 131, VTD 132, VTD 133, VTD
19 708, VTD 709, VTD 807, VTD 808, VTD 908, VTD 909.
- 20 **District 75:** Forsyth County: VTD 011, VTD 012, VTD 013, VTD 014, VTD 015, VTD 042,
21 VTD 043, VTD 061, VTD 062, VTD 063, VTD 064, VTD 065, VTD 066, VTD 067, VTD
22 068, VTD 082, VTD 083, VTD 507.
- 23 **District 76:** Rowan County: VTD 001, VTD 008, VTD 010, VTD 011, VTD 012, VTD 015,
24 VTD 018, VTD 021, VTD 022, VTD 023, VTD 025, VTD 026, VTD 028, VTD 030, VTD
25 031, VTD 034, VTD 035, VTD 036, VTD 038, VTD 039, VTD 040, VTD 041, VTD 042,
26 VTD 045, VTD 14A.
- 27 **District 77:** Davie County, Rowan County: VTD 007, VTD 024, VTD 027, VTD 029, VTD 032;
28 Yadkin County.
- 29 **District 78:** Moore County: VTD BEN, VTD DHR, VTD PHA1, VTD PHA2, VTD PHB1, VTD
30 PHB2, VTD PHC, VTD RBN, VTD SLS, VTD TLT, VTD WEM, VTD WND; Randolph
31 County: VTD DR, VTD GR, VTD PR, VTD RM, VTD SE, VTD SO, VTD SW, VTD UG.
- 32 **District 79:** Beaufort County, Dare County: VTD AVON, VTD BUX, VTD CHCA, VTD EL,
33 VTD FRCO, VTD HAT, VTD KDH, VTD MATO, VTD MH, VTD NGHD, VTD STPT,
34 VTD WAN; Hyde County, Pamlico County.
- 35 **District 80:** Davidson County: VTD 008, VTD 012, VTD 014, VTD 016, VTD 018, VTD 020,
36 VTD 042, VTD 044, VTD 054, VTD 056, VTD 060, VTD 062, VTD 064, VTD 066, VTD
37 068, VTD 070, VTD 072, VTD 074, VTD 076, VTD 088, VTD 80A, VTD 86A.
- 38 **District 81:** Davidson County: VTD 004, VTD 006, VTD 010, VTD 022, VTD 024, VTD 026,
39 VTD 028, VTD 030, VTD 032, VTD 034, VTD 036, VTD 038, VTD 040, VTD 046, VTD
40 048, VTD 050, VTD 052, VTD 058, VTD 078, VTD 082, VTD 084.
- 41 **District 82:** Cabarrus County: VTD 02-01, VTD 02-02, VTD 02-05, VTD 02-06, VTD 02-07,
42 VTD 02-08, VTD 03-00, VTD 04-01, VTD 04-08, VTD 04-09, VTD 04-11, VTD 04-12,
43 VTD 04-13, VTD 12-03, VTD 12-11.

**NORTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY
AMENDMENT
House Bill 898**

AMENDMENT NO. _____
(to be filled in by
Principal Clerk)

H898-ACL-42 [v.2]

Page 11 of 15

- 1 **District 83:** Cabarrus County: VTD 01-02, VTD 04-03, VTD 05-00, VTD 06-00, VTD 07-00,
2 VTD 08-00, VTD 09-00, VTD 10-00, VTD 11-02, VTD 12-05, VTD 12-10; Rowan County:
3 VTD 002, VTD 003, VTD 004, VTD 009, VTD 013, VTD 016, VTD 017, VTD 033, VTD
4 044, VTD 05A, VTD 19A.
- 5 **District 84:** Iredell County: VTD BA: Block(s) 0970612013035, 0970612013036,
6 0970612013037, 0970612013040, 0970612013041, 0970612013048, 0970612013049,
7 0970612022000, 0970612022001, 0970612022002, 0970612022003, 0970612022004,
8 0970612022005, 0970612022006, 0970612022013, 0970612022022, 0970612022023,
9 0970612022024, 0970612022025, 0970612022026, 0970612022027, 0970612022028,
10 0970612022029, 0970612022030, 0970612022031, 0970612022032, 0970612022033,
11 0970612022034, 0970612022035, 0970612022036, 0970612022037, 0970612022038,
12 0970612022039, 0970612022040, 0970612022041, 0970612022042, 0970612022047,
13 0970612022048, 0970612022049, 0970612022053, 0970612022058, 0970612022059,
14 0970612023012, 0970612023013, 0970612023022, 0970612023023, 0970612023024,
15 0970612023025, 0970612023026, 0970612023027, 0970612023028, 0970612023029,
16 0970612023030, 0970612023031, 0970612023032, 0970612023033, 0970612023034,
17 0970612023046, 0970612031000, 0970612031001, 0970612031003, 0970612031004,
18 0970612031014, 0970613011001, 0970613011007, 0970613011020, 0970613011021,
19 0970613011022, 0970613011023, 0970613011024, 0970613011025, 0970613011028,
20 0970613011029, 0970613011030, 0970613011031, 0970613011032, 0970613011033,
21 0970613011034, 0970613011035, 0970613011036, 0970613011037, 0970613012010,
22 0970613012011, 0970613012012, 0970613012013, 0970613021000, 0970613021001,
23 0970613021002, 0970613021003, 0970613021004, 0970613021005, 0970613021006,
24 0970613021007, 0970613021008, 0970613021009, 0970613021010, 0970613021011,
25 0970613021012, 0970613021013, 0970613021014, 0970613021015, 0970613021016,
26 0970613021017, 0970613021018, 0970613021019, 0970613021020, 0970613021021,
27 0970613021022, 0970613021023, 0970613021024, 0970613021025, 0970613021026,
28 0970613021027, 0970613021028, 0970613021029, 0970613021030, 0970613021036,
29 0970613021037, 0970613021038, 0970613022002, 0970613022003, 0970613022004,
30 0970613022005, 0970613022006, 0970613022007, 0970613022008, 0970613022009,
31 0970613022010, 0970613022011, 0970613022012, 0970613022013, 0970613022014,
32 0970613022015, 0970613022016, 0970613022017, 0970613023009, 0970613023010,
33 0970613023011, 0970613023012, 0970613023013, 0970613023014, 0970613023015,
34 0970613023016, 0970613023017, 0970613023019, 0970613023020, 0970613023021,
35 0970613023022, 0970613023023, 0970613023024, 0970613023025, 0970613023026,
36 0970613023027, 0970613023028, 0970613023029, 0970613023030, 0970613023031,
37 0970613023032, 0970613023033, 0970613023034, 0970613023035, 0970613023036,
38 0970613023037, 0970613023038, 0970613023039, 0970613023045, 0970613031000,
39 0970613031001, 0970613031002, 0970613031003, 0970613031015, 0970613031016,
40 0970613042000, 0970613042002; VTD BE, VTD CD, VTD CH-A, VTD CH-B, VTD CS,
41 VTD EM, VTD NH, VTD OL, VTD SB, VTD SH-A, VTD ST1, VTD ST2, VTD ST3, VTD
42 ST4, VTD ST5, VTD ST6, VTD TB, VTD UG.

**NORTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY
AMENDMENT
House Bill 898**

AMENDMENT NO. _____
(to be filled in by
Principal Clerk)

H898-ACL-42 [v.2]

Page 12 of 15

- 1 **District 85:** Avery County, McDowell County: VTD CCREEK, VTD FORT-1, VTD FORT-2,
2 VTD HIGGIN, VTD M.COVE, VTD MAR-1, VTD MAR-2, VTD MAR-3, VTD MAR-4,
3 VTD MAR-5, VTD N.COVE, VTD NEBO, VTD PLEASA, VTD T.COVE, VTD WEST-M;
4 Mitchell County, Yancey County.
- 5 **District 86:** Burke County.
- 6 **District 87:** Caldwell County, Watauga County: VTD 004.
- 7 **District 88:** Mecklenburg County: VTD 008, VTD 009, VTD 010, VTD 020, VTD 021, VTD
8 022, VTD 023, VTD 031, VTD 037, VTD 038, VTD 039, VTD 049, VTD 050, VTD 051,
9 VTD 052, VTD 059, VTD 098, VTD 200, VTD 78.1.
- 10 **District 89:** Catawba County: VTD 001, VTD 002, VTD 003, VTD 005, VTD 006, VTD 009,
11 VTD 010, VTD 020, VTD 021, VTD 022, VTD 025, VTD 027, VTD 031, VTD 032, VTD
12 034, VTD 040, VTD 041; Iredell County: VTD FT, VTD SH-B.
- 13 **District 90:** Surry County, Wilkes County: VTD 105, VTD 106, VTD 107, VTD 117, VTD 123,
14 VTD 124.
- 15 **District 91:** Forsyth County: VTD 021, VTD 031, VTD 032, VTD 033, VTD 034, VTD 081,
16 VTD 091, VTD 092, VTD 101, VTD 111, VTD 112; Stokes County.
- 17 **District 92:** Mecklenburg County: VTD 077, VTD 122, VTD 138, VTD 147, VTD 225, VTD
18 228, VTD 229, VTD 230, VTD 243.
- 19 **District 93:** Alleghany County, Ashe County, Watauga County: VTD 001, VTD 002, VTD 003,
20 VTD 005, VTD 006, VTD 007, VTD 008, VTD 009, VTD 010, VTD 011, VTD 012, VTD
21 013, VTD 014, VTD 015, VTD 016, VTD 017, VTD 018, VTD 019, VTD 020.
- 22 **District 94:** Alexander County, Wilkes County: VTD 101, VTD 102, VTD 103, VTD 104, VTD
23 108, VTD 109, VTD 111, VTD 112, VTD 113A, VTD 114, VTD 115A, VTD 118, VTD 119,
24 VTD 120, VTD 121, VTD 122, VTD 125, VTD 126, VTD 127, VTD 128, VTD 129.
- 25 **District 95:** Iredell County: VTD BA: Block(s) 0970613023040, 0970613023041,
26 0970613023042, 0970613023043, 0970613023044, 0970613031018, 0970613031019,
27 0970613031020, 0970613031021, 0970613031022, 0970613031035, 0970613031036,
28 0970613031037, 0970613031038, 0970613031039, 0970613031040, 0970613031041,
29 0970613031043, 0970613031057, 0970613032000, 0970613032001, 0970613032002,
30 0970613032003, 0970613032004, 0970613032005, 0970613032006, 0970613032007,
31 0970613032008, 0970613032009, 0970613032010, 0970613032011, 0970613032012,
32 0970613032013, 0970613032014, 0970613032015, 0970613032016, 0970613032017,
33 0970613032018, 0970613032019, 0970613032020, 0970613032021, 0970613032022,
34 0970613032023, 0970613032024, 0970613032025, 0970613032027, 0970613032028,
35 0970613032048, 0970613032049, 0970613032066; VTD CC1, VTD CC2, VTD CC3, VTD
36 CC4, VTD DV1-A, VTD DV1-B, VTD DV2-A, VTD DV2-B.
- 37 **District 96:** Catawba County: VTD 004, VTD 007, VTD 008, VTD 011, VTD 012, VTD 013,
38 VTD 014, VTD 015, VTD 016, VTD 017, VTD 019, VTD 023, VTD 024, VTD 026, VTD
39 028, VTD 029, VTD 030, VTD 033, VTD 035, VTD 036, VTD 037, VTD 038, VTD 039.
- 40 **District 97:** Lincoln County.
- 41 **District 98:** Mecklenburg County: VTD 127, VTD 133: Block(s) 1190062093053,
42 1190062093054, 1190062093055, 1190062093056, 1190062093057, 1190062111000,
43 1190062111001, 1190062111014, 1190062121000, 1190062121003, 1190063081001,

**NORTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY
AMENDMENT
House Bill 898**

AMENDMENT NO. _____
(to be filled in by
Principal Clerk)

H898-ACL-42 [v.2]

Page 13 of 15

1 1190063081007, 1190063081009, 1190063081010, 1190063081011, 1190063081012,
2 1190063081013, 1190063081014, 1190063081015, 1190063081016, 1190063081017,
3 1190063081018, 1190063081029, 1190063081033, 1190063081076, 1190063081077,
4 1190063081078, 1190063081079, 1190063081081, 1190063081082, 1190063111005,
5 1190063111006, 1190063111007, 1190063111008, 1190063111009, 1190063111010,
6 1190063111011, 1190064071014, 1190064071023, 1190064071025, 1190064071026,
7 1190064071027, 1190064071028, 1190064071029, 1190064071030, 1190064071046,
8 1190064071047, 1190064071048, 1190064071049, 1190064071050, 1190064072000,
9 1190064072001, 1190064072002, 1190064072003, 1190064072006, 1190064072008,
10 1190064072009, 1190064072010, 1190064072011, 1190064072012, 1190064072013,
11 1190064072014, 1190064072015, 1190064072016, 1190064072017, 1190064072018,
12 1190064072019, 1190064072020, 1190064072021; VTD 134, VTD 142, VTD 143, VTD
13 202, VTD 206, VTD 208, VTD 240, VTD 242.
14 **District 99:** Mecklenburg County: VTD 003, VTD 042, VTD 060, VTD 082, VTD 104, VTD
15 105, VTD 132, VTD 141, VTD 149, VTD 204.1, VTD 205, VTD 237.
16 **District 100:** Mecklenburg County: VTD 006, VTD 007, VTD 017, VTD 033, VTD 034, VTD
17 035, VTD 045, VTD 062, VTD 063, VTD 064, VTD 066, VTD 084, VTD 099, VTD 102,
18 VTD 106, VTD 108, VTD 117, VTD 124, VTD 125, VTD 130.
19 **District 101:** Mecklenburg County: VTD 012, VTD 024, VTD 040, VTD 041, VTD 053, VTD
20 079, VTD 080, VTD 081, VTD 089, VTD 150, VTD 222, VTD 223.1, VTD 224.
21 **District 102:** Mecklenburg County: VTD 001, VTD 002, VTD 005, VTD 011, VTD 013, VTD
22 014, VTD 015, VTD 027, VTD 028, VTD 029, VTD 030, VTD 043, VTD 044, VTD 046,
23 VTD 054, VTD 055, VTD 056, VTD 061, VTD 109.
24 **District 103:** Mecklenburg County: VTD 085, VTD 090, VTD 091, VTD 096, VTD 103, VTD
25 112, VTD 113, VTD 118, VTD 121, VTD 136, VTD 137, VTD 215, VTD 216, VTD 217,
26 VTD 218, VTD 227, VTD 233.
27 **District 104:** Mecklenburg County: VTD 018, VTD 019, VTD 032, VTD 036, VTD 047, VTD
28 048, VTD 057, VTD 058, VTD 065, VTD 067, VTD 068, VTD 069, VTD 070, VTD 071,
29 VTD 072, VTD 073, VTD 074, VTD 075, VTD 076, VTD 086, VTD 100, VTD 110, VTD
30 111, VTD 119, VTD 120, VTD 131.
31 **District 105:** Mecklenburg County: VTD 087, VTD 088, VTD 092, VTD 093, VTD 097, VTD
32 101, VTD 114, VTD 129, VTD 139.1, VTD 140, VTD 144, VTD 148, VTD 226, VTD 231,
33 VTD 232.
34 **District 106:** Mecklenburg County: VTD 126, VTD 128, VTD 133: Block(s) 1190063081000,
35 1190063081002, 1190063081003, 1190063081004, 1190063081005, 1190063081006,
36 1190063081008, 1190063081019, 1190063081020, 1190063081021, 1190063081022,
37 1190063081023, 1190063081024, 1190063081025, 1190063081026, 1190063081027,
38 1190063081028, 1190063081030, 1190063081031, 1190063081032, 1190063081034,
39 1190063081035, 1190063081036, 1190063081037, 1190063081038, 1190063081039,
40 1190063081040, 1190063081041, 1190063081042, 1190063081043, 1190063081044,
41 1190063081045, 1190063081046, 1190063081047, 1190063081048, 1190063081049,
42 1190063081050, 1190063081051, 1190063081052, 1190063081053, 1190063081054,
43 1190063081055, 1190063081056, 1190063081057, 1190063081058, 1190063081059,

**NORTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY
AMENDMENT
House Bill 898**

AMENDMENT NO. _____
(to be filled in by
Principal Clerk)

H898-ACL-42 [v.2]

Page 14 of 15

- 1 1190063081060, 1190063081061, 1190063081062, 1190063081063, 1190063081064,
2 1190063081065, 1190063081066, 1190063081067, 1190063081068, 1190063081069,
3 1190063081070, 1190063081071, 1190063081072, 1190063081073, 1190063081074,
4 1190063081075, 1190063081080; VTD 145, VTD 151, VTD 207, VTD 212, VTD 214, VTD
5 239, VTD 241.
- 6 **District 107:** Mecklenburg County: VTD 016, VTD 025, VTD 026, VTD 107.1, VTD 135, VTD
7 146, VTD 209, VTD 210, VTD 211, VTD 213, VTD 238.1.
- 8 **District 108:** Gaston County: VTD 008, VTD 012, VTD 013, VTD 024, VTD 025, VTD 026,
9 VTD 030, VTD 032, VTD 039, VTD 040, VTD 041, VTD 042, VTD 043, VTD 044, VTD
10 045, VTD 046.
- 11 **District 109:** Gaston County: VTD 001, VTD 002, VTD 003, VTD 009, VTD 010, VTD 011,
12 VTD 014, VTD 015, VTD 016, VTD 017, VTD 018, VTD 019, VTD 023, VTD 027, VTD
13 028, VTD 029, VTD 031.
- 14 **District 110:** Cleveland County: VTD CASAR, VTD FALSTN, VTD KINGST, VTD LATT,
15 VTD LAWNDL, VTD MULLS, VTD POLKVL, VTD S 5, VTD S-4A, VTD WACO; Gaston
16 County: VTD 004, VTD 005, VTD 006, VTD 007, VTD 020, VTD 021, VTD 022, VTD 033,
17 VTD 034, VTD 035, VTD 036, VTD 037, VTD 038.
- 18 **District 111:** Cleveland County: VTD 0S-C, VTD 0S-S, VTD BETHWR, VTD BR, VTD
19 GROVER, VTD KM N, VTD KM S, VTD MRB-YO, VTD OAKGRV, VTD RIPPY, VTD
20 SHANGI; Rutherford County: VTD 011, VTD 019, VTD 03A, VTD 05A, VTD 09A, VTD
21 10A.
- 22 **District 112:** Mecklenburg County: VTD 004, VTD 083, VTD 094, VTD 095, VTD 115, VTD
23 116, VTD 123, VTD 201, VTD 203, VTD 219, VTD 220, VTD 221, VTD 234, VTD 235,
24 VTD 236.
- 25 **District 113:** Henderson County: VTD AR, VTD EF, VTD FR, VTD NB, VTD RR, VTD SB,
26 VTD SE; McDowell County: VTD DYSART, VTD GLENWD; Polk County, Rutherford
27 County: VTD 013, VTD 014, VTD 018, VTD 027, VTD 028, VTD 029, VTD 030, VTD 034,
28 VTD 04A, VTD 06A, VTD 16A.
- 29 **District 114:** Buncombe County: VTD 1.1, VTD 10.1, VTD 11.1, VTD 17.1, VTD 2.1, VTD
30 20.1, VTD 21.1, VTD 23.2, VTD 23.3, VTD 25.1, VTD 3.1, VTD 32.1, VTD 33.2, VTD 33.3,
31 VTD 34.1, VTD 35.1, VTD 36.1, VTD 37.1, VTD 38.2, VTD 38.3, VTD 39.2, VTD 39.3,
32 VTD 50.1, VTD 6.1, VTD 60.2, VTD 60.4, VTD 61.1, VTD 62.1, VTD 64.1, VTD 65.1, VTD
33 66.1, VTD 7.1, VTD 8.3, VTD 9.1.
- 34 **District 115:** Buncombe County: VTD 13.1, VTD 18.2, VTD 19.1, VTD 24.1, VTD 26.1, VTD
35 29.2, VTD 30.2, VTD 30.3, VTD 31.1, VTD 44.1, VTD 45.1, VTD 46.1, VTD 47.1, VTD
36 48.1, VTD 49.1, VTD 54.2, VTD 55.1, VTD 56.2, VTD 57.1, VTD 8.2.
- 37 **District 116:** Buncombe County: VTD 12.1, VTD 14.2, VTD 14.3, VTD 15.1, VTD 16.2, VTD
38 22.2, VTD 27.2, VTD 28.1, VTD 4.1, VTD 40.2, VTD 41.1, VTD 42.1, VTD 43.2, VTD 5.1,
39 VTD 51.2, VTD 52.1, VTD 53.1, VTD 58.1, VTD 59.1, VTD 63.1, VTD 67.1, VTD 68.1,
40 VTD 69.1, VTD 70.1, VTD 71.1.
- 41 **District 117:** Henderson County: VTD AT, VTD BC, VTD BK, VTD CB, VTD CC, VTD ED,
42 VTD ES, VTD EV, VTD FL, VTD GM, VTD GR, VTD HC, VTD HS, VTD HV-1, VTD

**NORTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY
AMENDMENT
House Bill 898**

AMENDMENT NO. _____
(to be filled in by
Principal Clerk)

H898-ACL-42 [v.2]

Page 15 of 15

- 1 HV-2, VTD HV-3, VTD LJ, VTD LP, VTD MG, VTD NE, VTD NM, VTD NW, VTD PR,
- 2 VTD PV, VTD RG, VTD SM, VTD SW.
- 3 **District 118:** Haywood County, Madison County.
- 4 **District 119:** Jackson County, Swain County, Transylvania County.
- 5 **District 120:** Cherokee County, Clay County, Graham County, Macon County."
- 6
- 7

SIGNED _____
Amendment Sponsor

SIGNED _____
Committee Chair if Senate Committee Amendment

ADOPTED _____ FAILED _____ TABLED _____