

Maura Baker

From: Lynne Baronoff <la.baronoff@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 8:47 AM
To: Senate Redistricting; Lynne Baronoff
Subject: Public Comments on the Draft SC Senate Plan – RE: Senate District 33

November 15, 2021

TO: SC Senate Redistricting Subcommittee

As a resident of the rapidly growing southern end of Myrtle Beach, I object that portions of our Market Common area city residents and taxpayers are not joined with the vast majority of the City of Myrtle Beach in the proposed Senate District 33. Preserving city boundaries is one of the foremost principles of the Redistricting process.

I urge you to re-evaluate the voting precinct boundaries proposed as Jet Port 2, 3 and 4, and the new Belle Harbor developments that are inside city limits, but that have been wrongly aligned in Surfside 4, which is primarily in unincorporated Horry County. Now is the time to make these changes to avoid inevitable voter stress and confusion later.

I and my neighbors recommend the following:

1. Realign the current and future city residents that reside in Surfside 4 to the new Jet Port 3 or 4 precinct thereby including them in Senate District 33 instead of 34.
2. Redraw the new Jet Port 3 and 4 boundaries to avoid splitting neighborhoods. Both Emmens Preserve and Balmoral communities have residents on both sides of Coventry Blvd. For example, the three sections of Emmens Preserve share in common property and financial resources (pool, clubhouse, park, ponds, etc.) and extensive weekly, monthly, and annual social activities. We identify as one neighborhood, and we should identify as voters in the same precinct. This eliminates one layer of confusion in communicating to voters when and where to vote.

My area's public services, our environment and our quality of life is totally dependent on the City of Myrtle Beach. The mighty economic engine of Myrtle Beach and its contributions to the State deserve State House representation which consistently represents all city resident voices. Therefore, do not split the City of Myrtle Beach between multiple districts and precincts. We need one voice focused directly on the issues of rapid growth in the City of Myrtle Beach.

Lynne A. Baronoff 3560 Willow Street, Myrtle Beach, SC 29577 843.828.0664 JetPort 2

Maura Baker

From: Carol Beard <crabeard@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 10:21 AM
To: Senate Redistricting
Subject: Back to the Drawing Board on House Redistricting Ad Hoc Committee map

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Let's try this again!

The proposed redistricting map presented by this committee is an extreme partisan gerrymander mess!

A redrawn map should include the following:

- fewer precinct splits
- fewer county & municipal splits
- no priority to incumbency or partisan protection - always put voters' interests first
- protect communities of interest

I respectfully request that this committee try again before forwarding a map to the House Judiciary Committee.

Carol Beard

Winter Brook Lane, Simpsonville, SC
member of the League of Women Voters, Greenville County

Maura Baker

From: John Moore <johnnotless@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 12:53 PM
To: Senate Redistricting
Cc: Senate Judiciary Committee; Thomas "Case" Brittain;
dearcitycouncil@cityofmyrtlebeach.com
Subject: Public Comments on the Draft SC Senate Plan - Senate District 33

TO: SC Senate Redistricting Subcommittee [redistricting@scsenate.gov]

SUBJECT: Public Comments on the Draft SC Senate Plan – RE: Senate District 33

As a resident of the rapidly growing southern end of Myrtle Beach, I object that portions of our Market Common area city residents and taxpayers are not joined with the vast majority of the City of Myrtle Beach in the proposed Senate District 33. Preserving city boundaries is one of the foremost principles of the Redistricting process. I urge you to re-evaluate the voting precinct boundaries proposed as Jet Port 2, 3 and 4, and the new Belle Harbor developments that are inside city limits, but that have been wrongly aligned in Surfside 4, which is primarily in unincorporated Horry County. Now is the time to make these changes to avoid inevitable voter stress and confusion later. I and my neighbors recommend the following: 1. Realign the current and future city residents that reside in Surfside 4 to the new Jet Port 3 or 4 precinct thereby including them in Senate District 33 instead of 34. 2. Redraw the new Jet Port 3 and 4 boundaries to avoid splitting neighborhoods. Both Emmens Preserve and Belle Harbor communities have residents on both sides of Coventry Blvd. For example, the three sections of Emmens Preserve share in common property and financial resources (pool, clubhouse, park, ponds, etc.) and extensive weekly, monthly, and annual social activities. We identify as one neighborhood, and we should identify as voters in the same precinct. This eliminates one layer of confusion in communicating to voters when and where to vote. My area's public services, our environment and our quality of life is totally dependent on the City of

Myrtle Beach. The mighty economic engine of Myrtle Beach and its contributions to the State deserve State House representation which consistently represents all city resident voices. Therefore, do not split the City of Myrtle Beach between multiple districts and precincts. We need one voice focused directly on the issues of rapid growth in the City of Myrtle Beach.

Respectfully,

John Moore
1701 Paddington St
Myrtle Beach, SC 29577
914-805-9309
johnnotless@gmail.com

cc: SC Senator Luke Rankin SJudComm@scsenate.gov
SC Rep Case Brittain casebrittain@schouse.gov
Myrtle Beach City
Council dearcitycouncil@cityofmyrtlebeach.com

Maura Baker

From: Sara Moore <saranotless@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 1:03 PM
To: Senate Redistricting
Cc: Senate Judiciary Committee; Thomas "Case" Brittain;
dearcitycouncil@cityofmyrtlebeach.com
Subject: Re: Public Comments on the Draft SC Senate Plan - Senate District 33

TO: SC Senate Redistricting Subcommittee [redistricting@scsenate.gov]

SUBJECT: Public Comments on the Draft SC Senate Plan – RE: Senate District 33

As a resident of the rapidly growing southern end of Myrtle Beach, I object that portions of our Market Common area city residents and taxpayers are not joined with the vast majority of the City of Myrtle Beach in the proposed Senate District 33. Preserving city boundaries is one of the foremost principles of the Redistricting process. I urge you to re-evaluate the voting precinct boundaries proposed as Jet Port 2, 3 and 4, and the new Belle Harbor developments that are inside city limits, but that have been wrongly aligned in Surfside 4, which is primarily in unincorporated Horry County. Now is the time to make these changes to avoid inevitable voter stress and confusion later. I and my neighbors recommend the following: 1. Realign the current and future city residents that reside in Surfside 4 to the new Jet Port 3 or 4 precinct thereby including them in Senate District 33 instead of 34. 2. Redraw the new Jet Port 3 and 4 boundaries to avoid splitting neighborhoods. Both Emmens Preserve and Belle Harbor communities have residents on both sides of Coventry Blvd. For example, the three sections of Emmens Preserve share in common property and financial resources (pool, clubhouse, park, ponds, etc.) and extensive weekly, monthly, and annual social activities. We identify as one neighborhood, and we should identify as voters in the same precinct. This eliminates one layer of confusion in communicating to voters when and where to vote. My area's public services, our

environment and our quality of life is totally dependent on the City of Myrtle Beach. The mighty economic engine of Myrtle Beach and its contributions to the State deserve State House representation which consistently represents all city resident voices. Therefore, do not split the City of Myrtle Beach between multiple districts and precincts. We need one voice focused directly on the issues of rapid growth in the City of Myrtle Beach.

Respectfully,

Sara Moore
1701 Paddington St
Myrtle Beach, SC 29577
914-924-9875
saranotless@gmail.com

cc: SC Senator Luke Rankin SJudComm@scsenate.gov
SC Rep Case Brittain casebrittain@schouse.gov
Myrtle Beach City
Council dearcitycouncil@cityofmyrtlebeach.com

Maura Baker

From: B M Shumpert <bonnie5374@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 8:46 AM
To: Senate Redistricting

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

I live in the Fairview community and I want to keep Ryan McCabe as my representative. I do not want to be included with a representative from Aiken County that I know nothing about. My taxes r paid in Lexington County and I want to continue the way it is now. Thanks for your help. BonitaShumpert

Maura Baker

From: jspwarren@aol.com
Sent: Friday, November 19, 2021 7:32 PM
To: Senate Redistricting
Subject: Redrawing districts

My name is Sally Warren. I live in Mount Pleasant and have voted In every election since I turned 18 (a very, very long time ago). I almost always vote Republican. I am very disappointed to hear how the districts have been redrawn. It makes no sense. This is not rocket science. This is not a game. We need to keep communities together in districts. Please reconsider your divisions.

Sincerely,
Sally Langston Warren
649 Ferry Street
Mount Pleasant 29464

Sent from the all new AOL app for iOS

Maura Baker

From: Jenna Zablocki <jaznycla@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, November 26, 2021 1:43 PM
To: Senate Redistricting
Subject: Florence County precincts

The blatant attempt to power grab for Republicans by gerrymandering districts away from Democrats, is appalling. Politicians need to be reminded that their positions were meant to be held "for public service", not for political greed. Ask yourself if what you are doing is truly for "the people", because it's quite obvious that the motives here, are anything but. Shame on the hypocrite "public servants" that are more in touch with the lining of their pockets, than the constituents of this state.

Sincerely,

Jenna Sass
Florence resident

Maura Baker

From: Michelle McGee
Sent: Friday, November 26, 2021 4:08 PM
To: Senate Redistricting
Subject: FW: Redistricting

See below an email from Mr. Tim Higgins.

Michelle McGee
Senate Judiciary Committee
Full Committee Meeting Coordinator
Executive Assistant to the Redistricting Subcommittee
Gressette Building 102
803-212-6634
MichelleMcGee@scsenate.gov

From: Timothy Higgins <higginstimothy82@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 24, 2021 6:38 PM
To: Michelle McGee <MichelleMcGee@scsenate.gov>
Subject: Redistricting

Good evening, I want to voice my opinion on this matter. I think issue should be left alone, because this will change the vote in areas to allow candidates seeking office to change the vote between Black and White voters.

Sincerely

Tim Higgins

Maura Baker

From: Bob Murray <erm5drm@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 26, 2021 6:25 PM
To: Senate Redistricting
Subject: changing residents of district 1 to district 6

Where did the input for this ridiculous change come from? Was a blindfold and dart board involved? I have read a in good deal about gerrymandering , but this is my first time at seeing it up close and personal. I'm sure that this map that I am looking at showing this oddball projection protruding into district 1 must be a misdirected key punch. It is beyond belief that state bean counters have decided that the interest of the West Ashley residents of Charleston co. and the people of the rural counties of Clarendon, Orangeburg and Darlington are anywhere close to similar. This political anomaly needs to be corrected before it is set in stone.

Emmett Robert Murray Jr

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

Maura Baker

From: Carmen Cunningham <hhicarmen@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, November 27, 2021 9:45 AM
To: Senate Redistricting
Subject: Redistributing

The people should select in a democracy. Members of one party should not select due to gerrymandering. Shame!

Maura Baker

From: Rita Conrad <ritaaconrad@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, November 27, 2021 11:07 AM
To: Senate Redistricting
Subject: Changes to District 1

To the Senate Redistricting Subcommittee:

As a resident of District 1, I am dismayed that proposed changes would nearly guarantee a Republican victory in the only District other than 6 that has ever stood a chance of electing a Democratic representative in South Carolina. It is only fair to provide a greater than 14% chance of representation of less conservative constituents. Just how much of a Republican edge must you have? Please readjust District 1 to better reflect the demographics of the population that resides here.

Thank you.

--
Rita Conrad
ritaaconrad@gmail.com
C: 734-604-5830

Maura Baker

From: avrandall@aol.com
Sent: Saturday, November 27, 2021 3:41 PM
To: Senate Redistricting
Subject: District 1

Strongly oppose the proposed redistricting of District 1 in South Carolina. Republican efforts to end all Democratic wins is an attempt to stamp-out democracy and it won't work.

No redistricting of District 1.

Thanks.

Ann V. Randall
Adams Run, SC

Maura Baker

From: kayandrolf@roadrunner.com
Sent: Saturday, November 27, 2021 6:18 PM
To: Senate Redistricting
Subject: redistricting plan

I am a long time voting constituent of District One and I strongly oppose the present plan to redistrict it. This plan is pure partisan gerrymandering. It also combines voters from districts that are geographically separated by large areas rather than neighboring ones. Thank you. Catherine Sartorius, 70 Shipyard Drive, Apt. 195, Hilton Head, SC, 29928.

Maura Baker

From: kathleen Quirk <quirk.kathy@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 28, 2021 11:48 AM
To: Senate Redistricting
Subject: SC 1st Congressional District

I would like to add my name to the list of SC voters in the 1st Congressional District who are objecting to the current move by the legislature to make this district less competitive. A district where the election is actually competitive makes officeholders accountable to voters and protects democracy.

Kathleen Quirk
Hilton Head, SC 29926

Maura Baker

From: John MacLaurin <sjmaclaurin@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 29, 2021 9:11 AM
To: Senate Redistricting
Subject: SC01

Stop gerrymandering SC01!
John MacLaurin
18 Spotted Sandpiper
Hilton Head SC 29928-5704

Sent from my iPad

Maura Baker

From: Siobhan Mendetzki <siobhanto@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, November 29, 2021 11:20 AM
To: Senate Redistricting
Subject: We do not support partisan GERRYMANDERING!!

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

This is so wrong and you know it!

Sent from my iPhone

Maura Baker

From: Lynn Teague <teaguelynn@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 29, 2021 1:33 PM
To: Senate Redistricting
Subject: LWVSC written testimony on Staff Congressional Plan
Attachments: Senate Congressional Map Testimony LWVSC.pdf

This is our written testimony on the Congressional plan that was discussed this morning:

As always, thanks for your assistance —

Lynn

Lynn Shuler Teague
VP for Issues and Action, LWVSC
teaguelynn@gmail.com
803 556-9802



PO Box 8453, Columbia, SC, 29202, (803) 636-0431, www.lwvsc.org

TESTIMONY ON SENATE STAFF CONGRESSIONAL MAP PROPOSAL BEFORE THE REDISTRICTING
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SC SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

November 29, 2021

We are disappointed by the Senate's proposed Congressional map. Everyone who is engaged on this issue has realized that the most significant adjustments in the SC Congressional map would involve CD 1 and CD 6. Currently, Congressional District (CD) 1 has far too many people within its boundaries and CD 6 is under-populated by a comparable amount. The largest adjustments must come in these adjacent districts. The decision that has been made in the Senate Staff proposal is to gerrymander extensively to render CD 1 strongly non-competitive in favor of the Republican Party.

The League's proposal was drawn without reference to voting history and demonstrates that when reasonable boundaries are drawn around genuine communities of interest and political subdivisions in the Lowcountry, CD 1 retains a Republican lean but is competitive for the major parties. The League plan accurately reflects the diverse population is what is increasingly a network of closely tied satellite communities around a center in urban Charleston. The League proposal shows that much of this important community of interest could easily be kept together in CD 1.

The Senate's map, on the other hand, produces what in our measure is a 14-percentage point partisan gap by slicing and dicing this clear community of interest in unreasonable ways. Charleston itself is split. Adjacent North Charleston would continue to be put into a district with Columbia, more than a hundred miles away, although it is very much a part of the social and economic networks associated with Charleston. James Island and Johns Island would be split.

What would the people of South Carolina sacrifice so that the General Assembly can achieve this gerrymander? The answer is a lot. First, the people of CD 1 would lose their ability to influence how they are governed in November elections for the next decade. Only under extreme circumstances would their vote matter in general elections. Throughout South Carolina, citizens would realize that the General Assembly is willing to take meaningful votes away from them. This is not government by and for the people. It is government by and for legislators and for the very small percentage of qualified electors that vote for the favored party in partisan primaries.

Instead of providing a natural context for campaigns focused on policies that are appealing to a diverse community of South Carolinians, CD 1 in this map is designed to respond primarily to very partisan appeals in primary elections and therefore to amplify extremism in our state and national politics. This is not what most South Carolinians want.

The League has other concerns as well:

- There are places where, to blindly follow municipal or county lines, Black communities are split at the border of CD 6. The blocks and precincts surrounding the northern part of City of Sumter are as or nearly as Black as the City precincts across the district line. In many municipalities racially discriminatory annexation often leaves minority populations just outside the municipality. Using the municipal line to crack that community is an extension of that discrimination.

- CD 2 should not have a finger projecting through Columbia. In Richland County, the effort to get CD 2 to Fort Jackson drives CD 2 through the Black communities of northwest Richland, separating them from neighboring communities to allow the incumbent to “keep” Fort Jackson within “his” district. Why must a legislator have a specific base within his district to protect it in deliberations of the House Armed Services Committee? Also, how does an incumbent’s interest constitute a community of interest—especially where it requires violating a clear and very real community of interest of minority voters?
- The Staff Plan does better on splitting Voter Tabulation Districts (VTDs or precincts) than the LWVSC Plan, with only 20 splits to the League’s 23. However, the Senate map clearly views keeping counties together as a much lower value than the League does, splitting 13 to the League’s 6. Everybody finds splitting counties abhorrent—unless it fits another agenda. You don’t have to split that number of counties to achieve effectively equivalent minority population in CD 6. So, we know that these splits are done for other reasons.

If the current Senate plan is enacted, for the next 10 years many South Carolinians will vote in districts for which boundaries have been made absurd to further partisan and incumbent interests. Furthermore, without even one competitive district where candidates must speak to a diverse electorate to win, the potential for real dialogue about issues both on the coast and throughout South Carolina is greatly diminished. A district that is a fair representation of the diverse community in the increasingly urbanized Lowcountry would not solve all of our political problems, but not doing so will surely amplify those problems.

We would very much like to see our own plan enacted. We ask you to consider that and other options that are less damaging to voter rights and to reasonable political dialogue.

Contact: Lynn Shuler Teague, Vice President for Issues and Action, LWVSC
803 556-9802 TEAGUELYNN@GMAIL.COM

APPENDIX

Our estimates of partisanship are based on general elections in South Carolina from 2016-2020, as calculated for Dave’s Redistricting App (DRA). We regard this as a more reliable measure than the simple Biden-Trump proportions sometimes used.

DISTRICT PARTISAN LEAN

Congress Districts	Current			LWVSC			Senate Staff		
	Rep	Dem	Partisan Gap	Rep	Dem	Partisan Gap	Rep	Dem	Partisan Gap
1	54.46	43.19	11	49.26	48.31	1	55.92	41.82	14
2	56.50	41.29	15	60.29	37.67	23	56.36	41.43	15
3	67.98	30.19	38	68.19	29.96	38	67.92	30.25	38
4	60.81	36.96	24	59.97	37.79	22	59.92	37.84	22
5	57.51	40.58	17	58.85	39.3	20	58.30	39.79	19

6	31.45	67.08	36	35.43	62.95	28	32.60	66.74	34
7	58.54	40.08	18	59.76	39.74	20	58.56	40.06	19

DRA RATINGS

	Competitiveness	Proportionality	Splitting	Compactness	Minority
Current Map	9	0	30	38	50
LWVSC	20	25	78	42	50
Senate Staff	6	0	30	38	50

DRA ASSESSMENT OF PARTISAN LEAN

	Rep Lean	Dem Lean	Number in $\pm 5\%$ Competitive Range
Current Map	6	1	0
LWVSC	5	1	1
Senate Staff	6	1	0



Joint Testimony of Brenda Murphy, President, South Carolina State
Conference of the NAACP; Leah C. Aden, Deputy Director of
Litigation, the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc.;
Somil Trivedi, Senior Staff Attorney, American Civil Liberties Union;
and Allen Chaney, Director of Legal Advocacy, ACLU of South
Carolina

Before the South Carolina Senate
Judiciary Committee's Redistricting Subcommittee

Written Testimony on Senate Redistricting Subcommittee's
Proposed Congressional Redistricting Plan

November 29, 2021

Dear Chair Rankin and Subcommittee Members:

On behalf of the South Carolina State Conference of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (“South Carolina NAACP”),¹ the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc. (“LDF”),² American Civil Liberties Union (“ACLU”), and ACLU of South Carolina, we write to provide our preliminary view about the Senate’s proposed map for South Carolina’s seven Congressional seats. As you know, this body released its map on Tuesday, November 23, less than 48 hours before the official Thanksgiving holiday. It also scheduled a public hearing on this proposed map for Monday, November 29 at 10:30 a.m., just after the holiday weekend. Because of this timeline, we will continue to assess and may send you additional written comments to supplement this testimony.

I. South Carolina’s Congressional Map Must Comply with the U.S. Constitution and Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act.

During this Subcommittee’s November 12 hearing, we shared information about our coalition’s two proposed Congressional redistricting plans, which we submitted on October 8.³ Our coalition’s two proposed plans (a) correct for the malapportionment that exists among all seven of South

¹ The South Carolina NAACP is state conference of 77 branches and over 13,000 NAACP members throughout South Carolina.

² LDF has been fully separate from the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (“NAACP”) since 1957, though LDF was originally founded by the NAACP and shares its commitment to equal rights.

³ See *Testimony on Proposed Congressional Redistricting Plans*, (Nov. 12, 2021) (Testimony of Brenda Murphy), <https://www.naacpldf.org/wp-content/uploads/Testimony-of-President-Brenda-Murphy-for-11-12-21-Senate-Hearing.pdf>; *Testimony on the Public’s Proposed Congressional Redistricting Plans*, (Nov. 12, 2021) (Testimony of Leah C. Aden), <https://www.naacpldf.org/wp-content/uploads/Testimony-of-Leah-Aden-for-11-12-21-Senate-Hearing-Proposed-Congressional-Plans.pdf>; Letter from LDF, et al., to the S.C. Senate Judiciary Redistricting Subcomm. (Oct. 8, 2021), <https://www.naacpldf.org/wp-content/uploads/Letter-to-Sen-Jud-Redistricting-Subcomm-Submitting-Congressional-and-Senate-Maps-10-8-21.pdf>.

In addition to this testimony and supplemental comments, we have repeatedly reminded the Senate Judiciary Committee’s Redistricting Subcommittee of its obligations under the U.S. Constitution and Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act. See e.g., Letter from LDF, et al., to the S.C. Senate Judiciary Redistricting Subcomm. (Sept. 27, 2021), https://www.naacpldf.org/wp-content/uploads/Follow-Up-Letter-to-SC-Senate-Redistricting-Subcommittee.9.27.2021_final.pdf; Letter from LDF, et al., to the S.C. Senate Judiciary Redistricting Subcomm. (Aug. 2, 2021), <https://www.naacpldf.org/wp-content/uploads/Letter-to-South-Carolina-Senate-Judiciary-Redistricting-Subcommittee-8-2-21.pdf>.

Carolina's Congressional districts, particularly the severe population disparities between CD 1 and CD 6 following the 2020 Census, and they also (b) ensure that Black South Carolinian voters have a voice in Congress and can meaningfully elect their preferred representatives and influence elections in more than just one of the seven Congressional seats. Specifically, in our two proposed maps, CD 6 is comprised of a majority (more than 50%) of Black voters (thus, it is a "majority-Black district"). This district—the only Congressional district in which Black South Carolinians have consistently enjoyed an equal opportunity to elect candidates of choice—was hard won. It also reflects a consideration of racially polarized voting patterns that, as we shared with the Senate in written and oral testimony, continue to exist at the state and county level across South Carolina as found by federal courts and our coalition's more recent analyses.

In addition, one of our proposed maps also aims to ensure that Black voters can have an impact and influence the outcome of elections outside of CD 6. In that proposed map, two other districts—CD 1 and CD 5—would have any-part Black voting-age populations ("BVAP") of approximately 35% and 24%, respectively. The Black citizen voting-age populations ("BCVAP") in CD 1 and CD 5 under this proposed plan would be 37% and 26%, respectively. And accounting for the 3% and 2% Latino CVAP in CD 1 and CD 5, respectively, the minority citizen voting-age population would be 40% in CD 1 and 28% in CD 5. This proposal would ensure that representatives and candidates in those districts cannot ignore Black voters and constituents.

In our other proposed map, in addition to preserving CD 6 as a majority-Black district, we also aimed to ensure that CD 1 could be politically competitive for *all* voters, including Black voters. This was a goal shared by other proposed maps submitted to this body, including that by the League of Women Voters of South Carolina.

Yet this Subcommittee's proposed Congressional map reduces the BVAP to below a majority in CD 6, whether using the U.S. Census's narrower non-Hispanic DOJ BVAP category (at 47%) or the more inclusive any-part Black classification (48%). Indeed, although Black voters make up 29% of South Carolina's VAP, adopting this proposed plan would ensure that none of the State's seven Congressional districts would consist of a majority of Black voters.

Except for CD 6, the Senate's proposed map also fails to ensure that Black voters are more than about 25% of the voting-age population in any other Congressional district. The BVAP is only in the mid-to-high teens in three of

these seven proposed Congressional districts. And the Senate's proposed map also fails to make CD 1 politically competitive for *any* voters.

Speaking preliminarily because of the rushed timeline, we also share serious concerns about other aspects of the Senate's proposed Congressional map. The map appears to unnecessarily split Black communities at the border of CD 6, including, for example, near the northern part of the City of Sumter. And the map also appears to appease an incumbent's preference to have CD 2 include Fort Jackson, even though accommodating this preference drives CD 2 through Black communities in northwest Richland County, thereby separating them from neighboring communities of Black voters. But any incumbent's preferences must not be elevated above state traditional redistricting principles such as maintaining communities of interest. Protecting communities of interest—in this case interest of Black voters in northwest Richland—is a far more significant redistricting consideration than an incumbent's personal preference.

Having preliminarily considered this body's proposed plan, we ask the following questions:

1. Has this Subcommittee performed any analysis of racially polarized voting patterns in developing this map? If so, will this Subcommittee be publicizing the results of that analysis? And how is that analysis reflected in the Subcommittee's proposed map?
2. Has this Subcommittee considered whether each of these districts, particularly CD 1 and CD 6, will perform and function as effective districts for Black voters in particular? If so, will this Subcommittee be publicizing the results of that analysis? And how is that analysis reflected in the Subcommittee's proposed map?
3. How does the Subcommittee's proposed map reflect consideration of communities of interest ("COIs") particularly in the areas noted above where COIs appear to have been split?
4. Has this Subcommittee considered South Carolina's history of discrimination against Black voters? If so, how does the map reflect an awareness of that history?

II. This Subcommittee Must Ensure Transparency During the Redistricting Process.

This Subcommittee's choice to impose an unreasonably rushed timeline on its constituents to review its proposed Congressional map over a major holiday weekend, when most South Carolinians are prioritizing time with family, raises serious accountability and transparency concerns.

In redrawing the lines for South Carolina's seven-member Congressional delegation, this Subcommittee is engaging in an undertaking that impacts all South Carolinians. How districts are drawn affects every issue of concern on the federal level for Black South Carolinians, like the need for COVID-19 protections, COVID-19 funding relief, moratoriums on evictions, access to low-income housing, equitable healthcare, infrastructure funding, police accountability, hate-crime protections, and jobs that pay living wages, among other issues. The district lines you draw will determine whether Black South Carolinians have a voice on these issues, and indeed whether Black voters' "precious, almost sacred"⁴ right to vote is either undermined or protected.

Based on the timing of this Subcommittee's Congressional map release and having scheduled only one public hearing for this map, this Subcommittee has failed to meet these objectives. It publicly released the Senate's proposed map on Tuesday, November 23 and scheduled a hearing for 10:30 a.m. on Monday, November 29. Under normal circumstances, this short timeline would be insufficient to provide the public with adequate opportunities to review a proposed map. But this unreasonable timeline is even more deficient when you factor in that the map was released less than 48 hours before the Thanksgiving holiday when many South Carolinians have travel, family, and other obligations during the end of work week and through the long weekend.

* * *

In closing, we thank you again for the opportunity to provide this written testimony, which we may continue to supplement. We look forward to hearing your answers to our questions.

⁴ *Rep. John Lewis: 'Your Vote is Precious, Almost Sacred'*, PBS NewsHour (Sept. 6, 2021). <https://www.pbs.org/newshour/show/rep-john-lewis-your-vote-is-precious-almost-sacred>.

Maura Baker

From: rhsetser@aol.com
Sent: Tuesday, November 30, 2021 5:04 PM
To: Senate Redistricting

I think the Founding Fathers would be disgusted with the gerrymandering you are doing to maintain complete control by one party in this State. Our legislature does not reflect the diversity of political views held by the citizens of South Carolina. Gerrymandering is a perversion of democracy and you should be ashamed of yourselves.
Marie Eloise Setser
Capt. Raymond H. Setser, Jr., USN(ret)

Maura Baker

From: Ava Kleinman <ava.kleinman@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 1, 2021 10:56 AM
To: Senate Redistricting
Subject: Extreme Gerrymandering Must Not Be Approved

To the Senate Redistricting Committee:

I live on Seabrook Island (District 1) and am appalled by the proposals of the House and Senate to gerrymander our District to such an extent that historically Democratic pockets will be cut out of the district, in a blatant attempt to make this a "safe" district for Republicans. The proposals cut through the center of Charleston, destroy communities of interest, include parts of the current district into far-flung, non-community-minded areas of the state, and remove any competitive aspects from the district. In effect, these proposals would disenfranchise many, many voters, both those moved to the one "safe" Democratic district (where their votes are not critical) as well as those remaining the District 1, where the overwhelming Republican nature of the newly-defined district would make those votes irrelevant.

South Carolina is unfortunately the "Number 1" (or close to it) state in the nation in areas such as domestic violence, condition of roads, sufficiency of education, and health care. Now the legislature is racing to the bottom again in its plan to eliminate the voting power of even more citizens of this state.

Please consider your duty to all of your citizens, and not your personal interest in securing seats for one party in all districts of the state.

Respectfully submitted,

Ava Kleinman
1400 Nancy Island Drive
Johns Island, SC 29455

Maura Baker

From: Pam Madaio <pamadaio@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 1, 2021 11:38 AM
To: Senate Redistricting
Subject: Proposed map disenfranchises District 1 voters

To the Senate Redistricting Committee:

I live on Seabrook Island (District 1) and am appalled by the proposals of the House and Senate to gerrymander our District to such an extent that historically Democratic pockets will be cut out of the district, in a blatant attempt to make this a "safe" district for Republicans. The proposals cut through the center of Charleston, destroy communities of interest, move parts of the current district into far-flung, non-like-minded areas of the state, to eliminate the natural competitive nature of the district. In effect, these proposals would disenfranchise many, many voters, both those to be moved to the one "safe" Democratic district (where their votes are not critical) as well as those remaining the District 1, where the overwhelming Republican nature of the newly-defined district would make their votes irrelevant.

Please consider your duty to all of your citizens, and not your personal interest in securing seats for one party in all districts of the state. All voters deserve to have an opportunity to elect representatives who are aligned with their interests and those of their neighbors.

Respectfully submitted,

Pamela and Michael Madaio
Seabrook Island

Maura Baker

From: Inger Fyfe <ingerfyfe@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 1, 2021 11:53 AM
To: Senate Redistricting
Subject: Attn: Sandy Senn, Chip Campsen

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: Subcommittee Comment

It is essential that our state senate fairly represents the voters in their district and area..
The proposed redistricting map unfairly draws arbitrary lines cutting across communities and counties especially in District 1 where I live. With the increasing distrust of the electorate in the voting process, it is important to be fair and avoid obvious gerrymandering. Please vote to keep the boundaries fair.

Sincerely ,
INGER Fyfe
1014 Embassy Row Way, Johns Island

Maura Baker

From: b4ki@bellsouth.net
Sent: Wednesday, December 1, 2021 11:58 AM
To: Senate Redistricting
Subject: URGENT request regarding redistricting plan.

Attn. Senator Sandy Senn and Senator Chip Campson.

As your constituent I am asking you to reconsider the proposed map to more fairly represent the voters of SC, and to make our districts more competitive, not less. ***Communities and counties should be united as much as possible to support the common goals and interests of specific communities and areas of the state. The voters of District 1 stand to lose the most in the entire state with this proposal.***

The SC State Legislature is meeting on Dec 1st to discuss the new redistricting plan, which will govern legislative districts (state and federal) for the next ten years. The proposal significantly changes SC District 1. While we are currently a "toss up," competitive district, the changes will plow through our district and divide communities, meander through the very heart of Charleston, and move most minority voters out of District 1. Click [here](#) to read comments from Shayna Howell CoChair of Redistricting SC for League of Women Voters Commentary, published in the November 30th Post and Courier.

Lynn Teague with the League of Women Voters noted that even under her group's maps, drawn with the goal of keeping communities together and seats competitive, five seats would remain Republican and one would be reliably Democratic. The 1st Congressional District is the lone, naturally competitive seat, which the Senate proposal makes a GOP stronghold, she said.

As your constituent, I ask that you please let me know of your action in this URGENT request.

Sincerely,
Marilyn Blizard
Kiawah Island, SC

Maura Baker

From: joanne gallivan <gallivanjoanne@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 1, 2021 1:31 PM
To: House Redistricting; Senate Redistricting
Subject: Redistributing

Attn: Spencer Wetmore, Sandy Senn, Chip Campson

Please reconsider the proposed map to be more fairly represent the voters of SC. Make our districts more competitive, not less. Communities and counties need to be united to support the common goals and interests of specific communities and areas of the state. The voters of District 1 stand to lose the MOST in the ENTIRE state.

Thank you

Joanne Gallivan
2759 Old Oak Walk
Seabrook Island SC 39455

Sent from my iPhone

Maura Baker

From: Margaret Wildermann <mlwildermann@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 1, 2021 4:59 PM
To: Senate Redistricting
Subject: Redistricting Map and District 1

I am asking your committee to reconsider the proposed map to more fairly represent the voters of SC, and to make our districts more competitive, not less. Communities and counties should be united as much as possible to support the common goals and interests of specific communities and areas of the state. The voters of District 1 stand to lose the most in the entire state with this proposal. District 1 should include like minded communities, the city and surrounds which have common interests. Instead this proposal is a political effort to disenfranchise the voters of Charleston and its metropolitan area.

Please look to the League of Women Voters suggested proposals for a more equitable redistricting map.

Margaret Wildermann
3138 Privateer Creek Rd
Johns Island, SC 29455

Maura Baker

From: phmarino@aol.com
Sent: Wednesday, December 1, 2021 5:18 PM
To: Senate Redistricting
Subject: redistricting proposal

Make our election districts more competitive , not less. Leave district one as it is. Practice democracy!

Pat Marino
Johns Island

Maura Baker

From: William Reehl <bill@koncept-llc.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 2, 2021 8:44 AM
To: Senate Redistricting
Subject: Unfair redistricting

My Senator, Larry Grooms suggested that I contact you and be specific on how I would like lines drawn differently from what is being proposed, rather than address my request to vote against the proposed redistricting maps.

Today's Post & Courier has an editorial that states, "Still, the League of Women Voters of South Carolina has presented statistical analyses that show it would be difficult to draw maps that were skewed more for partisan advantage than the ones the House Judiciary Committee approved for the 124 S.C. House districts."

So in response to Senator Grooms, I would suggest that you start with the League's recommendations.

William Reehl
Mount Pleasant, SC 29464

Maura Baker

From: Rachael McNamara <rmnaas@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 2, 2021 9:05 AM
To: House Redistricting; Senate Redistricting; Kevin McNamara
Subject: Redistricting map in Charleston County

Hello,

I am a resident of Mt. Pleasant, SC in Charleston County. I have recently been made aware that the current proposed map for our county is drawn in a way that will produce a strongly majority party district thereby making a large number of people's votes less likely to be heard.

The political subdivisions below need to be redrawn to on less partisan lines so that Black voters, college students and so on are more fairly represented. This map makes no sense. See below:

CD 1, generally regarded as the coastal Charleston district, is drawn with a BVAP of 16.7%, the lowest percentage of Black voters in the state. The College of Charleston is crammed into CD 6 with the University of South Carolina in Columbia. The upper Charleston peninsula shares CD 6 with northern Richland County. Meanwhile, affluent predominantly White areas such as Charleston South of Broad are linked in CD 1 with other predominantly White residential areas at Kiawah and Seabrook.

Sincerely,
Rachael McNamara

Maura Baker

From: Lauri Mitchell <lauri.mitchell@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 5, 2021 7:09 AM
To: Senate Redistricting
Subject: No gerrymandering

I am writing to voice my concerns about the proposed changes to South Carolina's congressional changes. The changes to district 1 appear to be an attempt at gerrymandering that will convert it to a "safe" republican district and diminish minority representation.

I urge you to reconsider and not make these changes. Thank you.

Lauri Mitchell
Hilton Head Island