## Mattingly Rebuttal Report Table 3

Plaintiffs Exhibit 496

		House		Senate	
Counties; Election (Year)	Black CVAP	No. above	% of Ensemble	No. above	% of Ensemble
	Needed (%)	BCVAP in	with the same or	BCVAP in	with the same or
	from Lewis	Enacted	more above than	Enacted	more above than
		from Lewis	Enacted	from Lewis	Enacted
Alamance-Guilford-Randolph; Attorney General (2016)	22	-	-	2	100.0
Bladen-Greene-Harnett-Johnston-Lee-Sampson-Wayne; Att	tor- 21	5	99.92	-	-
ney General (2016)					
Columbus-Pender-Robeson; Attorney General (2016)	4	3	100.0	-	-
Cumberland; Attorney General (2016)	13	4	100.0	-	-
Cumberland; Commissioner of Labor (2016)	65	0	100.0	-	-
Davie-Forsyth; Attorney General (2016)	42	-	-	1	0.05
Forsyth; Attorney General (2016)	44	1	59.01	0	100.0
Forsyth; Commissioner of Labor (2016)	5	4	100.0	1	100.0
Forsyth-Yadkin; Attorney General (2016)	42	1	71.21	-	-
Franklin-Nash; Lieutenant Governor (2016)	12	2	100.0	-	-
Guilford; Attorney General (2016)	26	4	100.0	1	100.0
Guilford; Commissioner of Labor (2016)	5	6	100.0	2	100.0
Guilford; Sheriff (2014)	23	5	99.93	1	100.0
Guilford; Sheriff (2018)	30	4	100.0	1	100.0
Lenoir-Pitt; Attorney General (2016)	18	3	100.0	-	-
Nash; Sheriff (2014)	30	1	100.0	-	-
Person-Granville-Vance-Warren; Attorney General (2016)	34	1	100.0	-	-
Robeson; Sheriff (2018)	36	0	100.0	-	-

TABLE 3. We contextualize Table 2 of Dr. Lewis's report with our primary ensembles in both the North Carolina House and Senate. We examine how many districts in the enacted plan both lie within the specified counties and have a greater black CVAP than reported by Dr. Lewis for a particular election (and year). We then examine the fraction of plans in the ensemble that have the same number, or more, districts that are also above the black CVAP requirement within the specified counties.