

Exhibit 1

0115_24_hg

Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP

February 9, 2024

Transcript by TransPerfect

MR. CHAIRMAN: Members, if you could please find your seats. Good morning, everyone. Today is January 15, 2024. Welcome to the Committee on House and Governmental Affairs. Welcome members, welcome public. This is the, from what I can understand, the first gable of the new legislative leaders here at the capital. So, welcome everyone. A couple of things. If you have a cell phone, please silence it. If you forgot to turn off your gumbo or you need to remind somebody to stir your gumbo back home, we ask you to step out and take all calls outside. We have some cards up here for witnesses, although we won't be here in bills today. And just reminding everybody, this is a preparatory committee meeting. The special session doesn't start until this afternoon. So we're going to be doing here is educating members, educating the public, refreshing everyone on redistricting and redistricting principles, and then also hearing from our attorney general. So we won't be debating bills. If everyone could keep questions and comment strictly to the subject matter that we're going to be here from an education standpoint. And if you have questions as it relates to certain bills, we ask you to hold those until we have those bills. But Ms. Baker, if you wouldn't mind, please call roll.

MS. BAKER: Thank you Mr. Chair. Chairman Beaulieu?

CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Here.

MS. BAKER: Present. Vice Chair Lyons?

VICE CHAIR LYONS: Present.

MS. BAKER: Present. Representative Billings? Present. Representative Boyd? Representative Carlson?

REPRESENTATIVE CARLSON: Present.

MS. BAKER: Present. Representative Carter?

REPRESENTATIVE CARTER: Present.

MS. BAKER: Present. Representative Carver?

REPRESENTATIVE CARVER: Here.

MS. BAKER: Present. Representative Farnum?

REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: Here.

MS. BAKER: Present. Representative Gadberry?

REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: Here.

MS. BAKER: Present. Representative Johnson?

0115_24_hg
Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP
February 9, 2024
Transcript by TransPerfect

REPRESENTATIVE JOHNSON: Here.

MS. BAKER: Present. Representative Larvadain?

REPRESENTATIVE LARVADAIN: Here.

MS. BAKER: Present. Representative Marcelle? Representative Newell? Representative Schamerhorn?

REPRESENTATIVE SCHAMERHORN: Here.

MS. BAKER: Present. Representative Thomas?

REPRESENTATIVE THOMAS: Here.

MS. BAKER: Present. Representative Wright? Representative Wyble?

REPRESENTATIVE WYBLE: Here.

MS. BAKER: Present. We have 13 in the courtroom.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Members, a couple of things. One, in your folders, you're going to have a copy of the rules for the House and Governmental Affairs Committee. These are the rules that have been adopted by this committee. If you would review them at your leisure, we're not going to be discussing them today, but if you have questions regarding these rules or you would like to amend these rules or make some changes, we're going to address that in the regular session. I just wanted to point that out that we have those in the folder for all of you. Also, members and the viewing public, we don't want to forget all the work that this committee has done over the last several years as it relates to redistricting. On our website, if you go to the legislator's main page and you click on House page, there's a button that says Additional Sites. Under that Additional Sites button is the Louisiana Redistricting site where we have all the work that this committee has done over the last couple of years. We don't want to forget that hard work and if anybody needs a resource, there's a lot of resources there. But with that said, so we're going to start off this morning with Ms. Lowry from here, in House and Governmental staff. She's going to update us on some principles with redistricting and kind of get everybody up to speed. So Ms. Lowry.

MS. PATRICIA LOWREY-DUFOUR: Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman. Hi members. My name is Patricia Lowrey-dufour. I am the Senior Legislative Analyst for House and Governmental Affairs. I have staffed this committee in some capacity since 1988. And the Chairman has asked me to give you all a brief redistricting 101 this morning. And it's going to be abbreviated. And, again, as the Chairman said, there are plethora of resources available on the redistricting website of the legislature, including links to the videos of the hearings, the roadshow

0115_24_hg
Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP
February 9, 2024
Transcript by TransPerfect

hearings, all public comments and documents that we received there. So, again, you are encouraged to go look there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Anyone watching online? We're working on the technology.

MS. PATRICIA LOWREY-DUFOUR: Okay. Briefly, we'll be giving an overview of redistricting terms, concepts and law. Redistricting criteria, the 2020 census population and population trends, malapportionment statistics and illustrative maps on congress and the supreme court, since those are items included in the call for this special session and the act for congress that was adopted in the 2022 for extraordinary session as well as the timeline related to the adoption of that act. Okay. Briefly, Louisiana's resident population is 4,657,757.

[00:05:01]

This is the number that we use to determine the ideal district. Now, why is this important to you? One of the main criteria for redistricting is to achieve population equality among the district. So the ideal district population is very important. Just so you know, for congressional apportionment, there is a different number that is used. It's called the Apportionment Population. And Louisiana had an additional 3,711 overseas and uniform citizens allocated to Louisiana for the apportionment population, which is how congress uses the method of equal proportions to allocate the number of congressmen to the State. Okay. Briefly, in Louisiana, our 2020 census data showed that we grew by 2.74% while the growth rate of the nation was 7.35, and the southern region growth rate was 10.22. This is key because even though we are showing a population growth, we are lagging behind both the nation and the State. And just keep in mind that the nation grew at its lowest rate since 1940. This is a map that shows the historical population trends in the State of Louisiana. And while you can see that there were some decade differences, so, clearly we had significant population growth from 1990 to 2000. There were trends such as what you see in the 2000s to 2010, which were the effects of Hurricane Katrina and Rita on our coastal and Orleans metro areas. But what I also want to tell you is, this is important because, again, even though the State grew in each of these decades. When I first started working for this committee in the late '80s, we had eight congressmen allocated to the State. So in the 1980 to 90, we had eight. Following the 1990 census, we were dropped to seven, and then we maintained seven from 2000 to 2010, and again from 20 -- then we dropped another congressman. So what you see is a pattern is emerging that every other decade, even though the State is growing, because we are lagging behind the nation. We are losing our number allocated to us for congress. So specifically with the 2020 census, you will see there is growth in this State among really the I-10/12 Corridor. There is loss in North Louisiana generally, although there are a few spots of growth and there are areas of our coast that are clearly suffering population losses. So why is this important? Obviously, when the districts were drawn in 2010, the population was substantially equal or equal to the extent practicable in all the districts. Over the decade, you can see because of the shifts in population, it necessitated the change in the district boundaries. Now our census population demographic change. In 2010, you can see there we had 62.56% of people who identified a single race white, 32.8% of people who identified as black, and we had 1.8% of people who identified as Asian, 1.3% that identified as American-Indian, and 1.83 as other. And one thing I want to point out about this chart is Hispanic is an ethnicity. So when you look at

0115_24_hg

Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP

February 9, 2024

Transcript by TransPerfect

these numbers across the board, they will not total to a 100 because you can be any of these races and also Hispanic. Okay. So Hispanic is separately reported as a number and we had 4.25% Hispanic in 2010. That number has increased to 6.92 in 2020. The white population is 57.06, the black population 33.13, Asian 2.30, American-Indian 1.87. And again, the other you'll see the most significant growth in the other category. The sum of the race is interesting because it's not - these are people who chose to respond to the census as being not white, not black, not Asian, not American-Indian. Okay? So it's just an interesting jump to see this increase.

[00:10:03]

CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Ms. Lowry, also just to kind of point out, if members look at the decrease in the white population and look at the increase in the other population, they're pretty close to the same from a number standpoint just if -- I don't know if it's more people. We talked about this in committee over the last couple of years if it's more people identifying as other with mixed races but just to kind of point that out for you all.

MS. PATRICIA LOWREY-DUFOUR: Right, and I do want to point out that we -- so, this will tell you how the census reports, the population to the State. So, every person in the State can respond in a single race or any combination of six races. And so, there you can respond that you are white, black, and African. You could be all six. Okay? And you can respond to the census that way, but in order for you all to be able to analyze reports and we've included some reports from Act VI, which was the Congressional Act that you all adopted and if you flip to this page called Total Population, it's numbered Page 9 in your packet, and I just want to talk about it just a little bit so that you all will become familiar because, tomorrow, as we are hearing bills, you'll need to be familiar with these reports. So, each report will have a total population figure, will have white. So, your predecessors on this committee and the Joint Senate Committee adopted a population allocation document that is available on the redistricting website. And so, the white population number that you see on this report indicates white alone. So, this is not going to be any person that reported that they were white in any other race. The black category reflects all people who reported black alone plus any other race and black. Okay? Asian is Asian alone and any other race other than black. Okay? And total American-Indian, the same, American-Indian alone and any other race other than Asian or black, and the other is that category that we talked about, the people who reported that they were any other and it also includes the Pacific Islanders that the population in Louisiana was not significant, so, that is included in the other category. And the category that's labeled VAP total. That means voting age population and that's going to be key as you will hear, I'm sure, from our attorney general. Okay. Moving on. Any questions about that? All right. Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Hold on. Let me -- is it Carter? Alright, Representative Carter you're on.

REPRESENTATIVE CARTER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If you report it white and any other, only white is recounted all?

MS. PATRICIA LOWREY-DUFOUR: The white population category on your reports is

0115_24_hg
Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP
February 9, 2024
Transcript by TransPerfect

people who responded to the census as being white alone.

REPRESENTATIVE CARTER: White alone.

MS. PATRICIA LOWREY-DUFOUR: Not combination with any other race.

REPRESENTATIVE CARTER: Okay.

MS. PATRICIA LOWREY-DUFOUR: Okay?

REPRESENTATIVE CARTER: So basically, the same way with the black population?

MS. PATRICIA LOWREY-DUFOUR: No, Sir.

REPRESENTATIVE CARTER: Okay.

MS. PATRICIA LOWREY-DUFOUR: So, on the report -- and, again, this population allocation document is on the website, and it was adopted by the committee when we started the process. So, the black population category is people who reported to the census that they were black and any other race.

REPRESENTATIVE CARTER: Okay.

MS. PATRICIA LOWREY-DUFOUR: Okay? So, they can be a combination of up to the six.

REPRESENTATIVE CARTER: Got you.

MS. PATRICIA LOWREY-DUFOUR: Okay?

CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: Thank you, Representative Carter. And members also just to let you all know, I know some of this technology is new to some of you all. The buttons on your desk, the one to the left is dead. There's nothing on it. So, if you want to be recognized, please hit the button towards your right, and you'll see your microphone light up when it's your turn. Representative Gadberry for a question. Give me a second. It's giving me a little trouble here. All right. You're on.

REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: Pleasure, Mr. Chair.

[00:15:00]

So, when we proportion a district, we go by Voting Age Population and not Total Population?

MS. PATRICIA LOWREY-DUFOUR: No, sir. So, the population of the district that is keyed into the ideal district population is the total population of the district.

0115_24_hg
Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP
February 9, 2024
Transcript by TransPerfect

REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: Okay. So, what's the significance of Voting Age Population then if we --

MS. PATRICIA LOWREY-DUFOUR: That is the population that is 18 or over, and it is significant when you're analyzing voting rights issues because, obviously, the people who are 18 or over are of voting age.

REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: Right. So, I guess, the question is that I've always come up with is -- and I'm just taking say District 1 here serves 69% is white on Total Population and 71% on Voting Age Population. So, when we proportion or when we come up with a district, do we go by the percentage based on Total Population or Voting Age Population?

MS. PATRICIA LOWREY-DUFOUR: To achieve the population equality required on the districts, you go by population. To achieve other goals, you look at the totality of the circumstances including Voting Age Population. Okay?

REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: Thank you.

MS. PATRICIA LOWREY-DUFOUR: You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN BEAULLIEU: You did that well, Ms. Lowry.

MS. PATRICIA LOWREY-DUFOUR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. What is redistricting? I will tell you the terms Apportionment and Districting are sometimes used interchangeably. In fact, in our State Constitution, the term Reapportionment is used. However, they are different concepts. Apportionment is the process of allocating seats in the Legislature, while Districting is the process of drawing lines to create geographical territories from which officials are elected. So, again, we talked about the apportionment of members of Congress to each state. That is allocating seats to the State in Congress, whereas what the charge before you under the call for this special session is to draw lines for the geographic territories from which those officials will be elected. Why do you redistrict? Well, there are many, many, many legal requirements involving redistricting as we briefly touched on with a Representative Gadberry just a moment ago. One includes Article III, Section 6 of our Constitution, that includes deadlines and duties regarding legislative redistricting. There are also very statutes for your local governing bodies and school boards to conduct redistricting and as well as deadlines and then, there are some general legal requirements including the Equal Protection Clause and the Voting Rights Act of 1965. So given that, who are you responsible for redistricting? Congress, the courts, the House in the Senate, the Public Service Commission and the State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education. All those have been enacted by the State Legislature as laws. So, it takes a bill. The issues dealing with federal law. All right, so equal population. You hear often the term One Man, One Vote. So, how do you measure it? Again, you measure it by looking at the ideal population. And again, how do we come up with that ideal population? We take the total resident population of the State or the geographic area where the districts are to be confected and you divide that total population by the number of districts and you come up with an ideal district population. So, I'm going to refer you now to the planned statistic document that's in your folder. It's numbered

0115_24_hg
Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP
February 9, 2024
Transcript by TransPerfect

eight. And gain, this is all relevant to Act V of the 2022 first extraordinary session. So, this report -- and again, I encourage you to become familiar with the structure of it and what it is telling you. So, this will tell you there are six districts in a congressional plan. They are single-member districts, the actual population within the district, the ideal population that you are basing the calculation to determine your deviation off of. And so, you can see there that the absolute deviation --

[00:20:00]

-- ranges from negative 24 to positive 41 for an overall deviation of 65 people between all six districts and a relative mean deviation of 0.00 and overall range of 0.01.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ms. Lowry, if you don't mind just for a question, if we drew, since one of the maps we're going to be talking about is congress, and the deviation was 1.5%, which on Legislature maps, that's well within deviation range, what would 1.5% or 2% do for congress. Is that allowable? What's the wiggle room there?

MS. PATRICIA LOWREY-DUFOUR: So the courts have clearly established that strict population equality among congressional districts has to be the overriding objective. Now, that said, however, there have also been some deviations that have been okay in certain states, provided the State has an overriding reason for it that is rational and nondiscriminatory.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So we want to be as close to zero as we can.

MS. PATRICIA LOWREY-DUFOUR: Yes, sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS. PATRICIA LOWREY-DUFOUR: Okay, everybody clear on population, equality and deviations? Okay. And as the Chairman alluded to, the standards are different between congress and other representative districts that we draw, they are based on different legal provisions. Congress, the nearly as equal in population as practicable is based on jurisprudence, *Westbury v. Sanders* is the seminal case there based on Article 1, Section 2 in the 14th Amendment. Representatives shall be apportioned among the states according to their respective numbers and you must make a good faith effort to avoid deviation and to be able to provide a legally acceptable, nondiscriminatory justification for any deviation. Whereas for other representative districts that you will draw, you are allowed to have a slightly larger deviation field. It is substantial equality of population among various districts that derives from the case of *Reynolds v. Sims*. Again, the 1960s created a lot of cases dealing with population equality as well as requirements for single-member districts. Again, based on the [INDISCERNIBLE 00:22:46] clause of the 14th Amendment, there's a generally accepted 10% standard that a legislative plan with an overall range of less than 10% would not be enough to make a prima facie case of invidious discrimination under the 14th Amendment. However, so asterisk, it is not necessarily a Safe Harbor, I'm sorry. In *Larios v. Cox*, any substantial deviation must have a legitimate State interest behind it. In Louisiana, in order to accomplish this overall 10% range, we have adopted a

0115_24_hg

Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP

February 9, 2024

Transcript by TransPerfect

criteria of plus or minus five from the ideal to stay as close to that ideal population among the districts as you can get. Okay, again, and I know this seems like it's very repetitive, but it's important. Equality of population must be the overriding objective of districting, and deviations from the principle are permissible only if incident to the effectuation of a rational state policy, which would include allowing representation to political subdivisions, compactness, preserving cores of prior districts, and avoiding contests between incumbents. And again, that is based on Reynolds v. Sims. Okay. Judicial districts which, again, will be the subject of the special session. In a Louisiana case, Wells v. Edwards, that was decided in the middle District of Louisiana, the court decided that the One Person, One Vote standard does not apply to judicial districts as judges serve the people. They do not represent the people. Okay. Now we're going to talk about other issues of federal law, Discrimination Against Minorities. The Voting Rights Act of 1965, and again, principles of this are contained within the 14th and 15th Amendment. But basically, Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act prohibits the State or any political subdivision from imposing a voting qualification, standard, practice, or procedure that results in the denial or abridgement of any citizen's right to vote on account of race, color, status as a member of a language minority group.

[00:25:11]

So there have been a lot of litigation on this issue. Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act was amended in 1982 to clarify that a violation of Section 2 is established if, based on the totality of circumstances, it is shown that election processes are not equally open to participation by members of a protected class and that its members have less opportunity than other members of the electorate to participate in the political process and elect representatives of their choice. So there was a case, Thornburg v. Gingles 1986, that established certain preconditions that courts will look to, to make determinations on violations of the Voting Rights Act. They are size and geographical compactness of the group. It requires that the population be sufficiently large and geographically compact, constitutional majority in a single-member district, that the minority population is politically cohesive and that in the absence of special circumstances block voting by the majority defeats the minority's preferred candidates. Once courts have established those preconditions, there are other objective factors that it looks to determine the totality of the circumstances, and I'm not going to go into those at this moment, but if you would like to talk later, we'll be happy to do that. Now, the other side of that is racial gerrymandering. So again, the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment found there have been a series of cases, Reno v. Shaw in Louisiana, Hayes, the Hayes Lines of cases, where the courts have found that if race was found to be the predominant overriding factor, that strict scrutiny on the State's plan would apply. And in order to survive that strict scrutiny, the plan must have been narrowly tailored to serve a compelling State interest. So what would be a compelling State interest? Remedying past discrimination, avoiding retrogression, avoiding violations of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act. And key here is those interests must be strongly supported in the evidence when the policymakers are making their decisions on the plan. And this would apply not only to plans that distinguish citizens because of race, but also to plans that may be race-neutral, but on their face are inexplicable except on grounds other than race.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ms. Lowry, we have a question. Representative Marcelle.

0115_24_hg

Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP

February 9, 2024

Transcript by TransPerfect

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Thank you. Can you go back over what you just said about the strict scrutiny and how that's overridden? Why would that be overridden? So I know you talked about the idea of populations, and I'm dissatisfied, so it has to be satisfied.

MS. PATRICIA LOWREY-DUFOUR: If you can prove that the plan was narrowly tailored to further your compelling governmental interest.

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: And what would be an example of that?

MS. PATRICIA LOWREY-DUFOUR: Remedying past discrimination, avoiding retrogression, avoiding violations of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act. And again, all those things must be firmly established on the record as you are making your decisions on a plan.

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: So, in essence, I'm new on the committee, so you got to bring me up to speed. So, in essence, if a bill is proposed and these criteria aren't met, what you're saying is during the argument of the bill, they have to be laid out or they should be laid out. Is that what the law says?

MS. PATRICIA LOWREY-DUFOUR: Okay. This is based on jurisprudence necessarily the letter of the law. But, two, I think because you all were elected to represent your districts in the State of Louisiana, and you all are the policymakers of the State of Louisiana. And so as you're making the policy, I think it's important that as you're presenting, because individually, you alone have the right to present your bill. Right?

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Right.

MS. PATRICIA LOWREY-DUFOUR: And I think it's important for your colleagues to understand the reasons why, because you're asking them to vote for your bill. And I think that would be on any bill that you present. What is the policy behind your legislation? Why is it important?

[00:30:00]

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Well, I understand that each of us have to, when we present a bill, talk about how it's important to us at our districts, but we also have to take into account of the laws that are set and the criteria that we need to meet. So when we don't do that, then we find ourselves in court like we are now.

MS. PATRICIA LOWREY-DUFOUR: Yes, ma'am.

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Thank you.

MS. PATRICIA LOWREY-DUFOUR: Thank you.

0115_24_hg

Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP

February 9, 2024

Transcript by TransPerfect

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you Representative Marcelle.

MS. PATRICIA LOWREY-DUFOUR: And one other thing I want to say is the courts are very aware that redistricting plans are not drawn in a vacuum. They understand that this is environment, a political environment that y'all have awareness of many factors. So just want to put that on. All right. Redistricting criteria. The legislature adopted in the 21-regular session. Joint Rule 21. So this is the criteria and copies of this rule members are in your packets. And this is important because this is a standard that the legislature has adopted for consideration of redistricting plans. So what are we talking about? Compliance with the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment, the 15th Amendment, Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, all other applicable federal and state law. That all reducing plans must be composed of contiguous geography. Does anybody have a question about that? Contain whole VTDs. So that is the term, the census term for election precincts, to the extent practicable, and a limitation on the number of divisions that can be used in a precinct if they have to be split. All redistricting plans have to respect established boundaries of parishes, municipalities, but that is subordinate and not used to undermine maintenance of communities of interest within the same district. To the extent practicable, we must use the most recent census data that is the redistricting data file, the PL 94, 171 data released by the census as it is validated through our data verification program. If a member of the public wishes to submit a plan, they must submit it electronically in a comma delimited block equivalency file. The purpose for this, members, is so we can import it into our system and be able to produce the reports that you're going to be used to seeing. Each redistricting plan for the House and the Senate, PSC, BSC, Congress and the Supreme Court must be a whole plan which assigns all the geography of the state. Now, why is this? Well, I can tell you what. After many decades of drawing districts, I can tell you, I can draw a single perfect district every day, all day. But drawing 105 or 39 or even six is much more difficult. And you have to, again, continue and consider the totality of the circumstances there. So we require -- you can't just submit the perfect district; you must submit a whole plan. Each redistricting plan for the House, Senate, PSC, and BSC must contain single member districts, contain districts substantially equal in population. And that, again, is that plus or minus 5% from the ideal. Must give due consideration to traditional district alignments to the extent practicable for Congress. Again, single member districts and contained districts with as nearly equal to the ideal district population as practicable. Okay, let's talk about what we've got. So when the 2020 census came in and was reported to the state, and again, this was a unique year for the census. They were seriously behind in reporting the data to the states and they also employed a new privacy metric, the differential privacy, which has been a challenge. But anyway, the census data is considered the gold standard for data to use for redistricting. So in 2010, the ideal population for congressional districts was 755,562. That increased by over 20,000 to 776,292 following the 2020 census. Why is this important? Well, here is the map of the prior congressional districts before the redistricting cycle following the 2020 census. This is the malapportionment. So what does that mean? That is the number by which the districts, both each individual district and the overall plan deviate from the ideal. And as you can see, there is substantial deviation. There is a difference of 88,120 between Congressional District No. 4 and Congressional District No. 6.

[00:35:00]

0115_24_hg

Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP

February 9, 2024

Transcript by TransPerfect

As a reminder, Congressional Districts have to be as close to equal in population as possible. Therefore, the legislature had to act to redraw the districts. I call this the heat map. So the dark orange reddish color are deviations that are furthest below the ideal. The lighter orange is still below the ideal. The light-yellow colors are population that is above. But obviously, District 6 was the most above the ideal district. So to remedy the population inequality among the districts, the legislature passed a bill. That bill was introduced on February 1. It was reported favorably by your predecessor committee. On February 4, 2022, it passed the House 70 votes to 33 nays. On the 10th, it was received in the Senate. On the 14th, the Senate Government Affairs Committee reported it. On the 15th, Senate passed it 27 to 10. On the 18th, the House concurred in amendments 62 yeas to 27 nays. On the 18th, then it was sent to the governor. On March 10, the governor vetoed the bill. On May the 30th, the House overrode the veto 72 yeas to 31 nays. On March 30th, the Senate also overrode the veto 27 yeas to 11 nays and on March 31st, the bill became Act No. 5 of the 2022 1st extraordinary session. This bill, Act 5 is this map represents the districts that were drawn pursuant to Act 5. This is the map that, again, is in litigation currently. This is the population, again, statistics, the deviations. You've looked at the report. I don't need to repeat that to you, but you can see that they are as nearly equal in population and certainly much more equal in population than where we started. Malapportioned of the Supreme Court, and we're talking about this again because it is in the special session call. These are the current districts for these seven Supreme Court Districts. These districts, while not subject to equal population requirements due to that case that we mentioned earlier, when these districts were last drawn in 1997 using the 1990 census. Okay, so they were drawn in 1997 using 1990 census figures. The legislature did draw them with substantially equal populations. And in fact, the mean deviation was less than 2% among the districts. The ideal district population at that time was 602,853. This, members, shows you the current state of the deviations among each of the Supreme Court Districts. District 1, I'm just going to say the population of the districts vary considerably from a low of 476,554 in District No. 7 which is an Orleans and Jefferson based district to a high of 838,610 in District 5 which is the Baton Rouge Metropolitan based district. A difference among the districts of more than 362,000 people.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ms. Lowry, just the original districts, they were built in the 20s, is that correct? And only changed once if my memory --

MS. PATRICIA LOWREY-DUFOUR: Changed once, I believe 21. They were Supreme Court Districts were established.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah, let me [PH 00:38:50] rest. Since we're in the 20s again, we're talking the 1920s.

MS. PATRICIA LOWREY-DUFOUR: Yes. I'm sorry. Yes. Back before, I believe anyone in this room had yet made an appearance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yep. Representative Thompson may have been in the legislature, but that's it.

0115_24_hg

Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP

February 9, 2024

Transcript by TransPerfect

MS. PATRICIA LOWREY-DUFOUR: He certainly has more seniority than anyone in the legislature. Whether or not he was actually here in the 20s, we'd have to ask. But yes, so again, and here's that heat map showing the population deviations, dark red, dark orange, furthest below the ideal, and then dark green representing population the furthest above the ideal.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ms. Lowry, we have a question. Representative Wyble?

REPRESENTATIVE WYBLE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Ms. Lowry, thank you for all of this information. It's very helpful. I'm still trying to wrap my head around how the census is counting population we talked about earlier. So, if a respondent checked white and Asian, that respondent would be counted as?

[00:40:00]

MS. PATRICIA LOWREY-DUFOUR: Okay, the census reported all of those population figures to the state.

REPRESENTATIVE WYBLE: All right.

MS. PATRICIA LOWREY-DUFOUR: So if you really want to know who reported themselves not who but numbers. Who reported themselves as white and Asian we can certainly provide that to you. However, you know I just want to say there's a limited space on reports. In order for you to be able to analyze voting rights issues, and we have a document on our website, and it was a kind of guidance from the justice department, The United States Justice Department about analyzing Section 2 guidance for that. Where you really look at one, the population alone so who reported single race. And then you would allocate to protected class, minority groups, the white plus the minority group as well as any other reporting. So you would look at it like that. So for simplicity and to basically allow y'all to look at categories of population, this is how the reports are confected. But the census reports 100 of categories of racial populations and they'll tell you, I mean, it's like white alone, white plus black, white plus Asian, white plus black plus Asian plus other. I mean, all those things will be reported by the census. But for simplicity, I mean, there's no way for y'all to look at your report.

REPRESENTATIVE WYBLE: Sure.

MS. PATRICIA LOWREY-DUFOUR: Because it would be 100s of columns of data.

REPRESENTATIVE WYBLE: But that criteria is regarded equally regardless of what they check off, I guess is what I'm trying to find out. If they were white, white only they're counted as white. But if they're white and another, then they're counted as other. But if they check off black and others, then we count them a part of our black population, is that correct?

MS. PATRICIA LOWREY-DUFOUR: Right and that's based on that guidance.

REPRESENTATIVE WYBLE: From the federal government?

0115_24_hg
Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP
February 9, 2024
Transcript by TransPerfect

MS. PATRICIA LOWREY-DUFOUR: Yes, sir.

REPRESENTATIVE WYBLE: Is that guidance been, I don't know if this is a fair question or not, was that similar guidance in 2020 compared to 2010?

MS. PATRICIA LOWREY-DUFOUR: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE WYBLE: Has it always been that way?

MS. PATRICIA LOWREY-DUFOUR: Similar guidance.

REPRESENTATIVE WYBLE: All right. Thank you.

MS. PATRICIA LOWREY-DUFOUR: No. You're very welcome. Okay, well that concludes my presentation, unless there's any other questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you Ms. Lowry. Well, Representing Gadberry does have a question. Representative Gadberry.

REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: Thank you Mr. Chair. Just to make this clear, what was the ruling from the judge against the maps that were submitted [INDISCERNIBLE 00:42:53]

MS. PATRICIA LOWREY-DUFOUR: Representative Gadberry, we do have the attorney general here today.

REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: Okay.

MS. PATRICIA LOWREY-DUFOUR: To address those issues regarding the litigation. And I think it would be much more appropriate coming from the chief legal officer of the state.

REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: I figured that would be your answer. We submitted Act 5, though, right? This one?

MS. PATRICIA LOWREY-DUFOUR: Act 5? It was adopted by the legislature?

REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: That's what we submitted to the judge.

MS. PATRICIA LOWREY-DUFOUR: Well, the judge was looking at it as part of the litigation.

REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: All right. And that's the one that she looked at, though
--

MS. PATRICIA LOWREY-DUFOUR: Well, I mean and also there have been other plans.

0115_24_hg
Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP
February 9, 2024
Transcript by TransPerfect

REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: Okay.

MS. PATRICIA LOWREY-DUFOUR: That have been submitted by plaintiffs to the court.

REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: And would you say that Act 5 did not meet the redistricting criteria?

MS. PATRICIA LOWREY-DUFOUR: Representative Gadberry, that is a legal matter that is currently the subject of litigation in the middle district and again much more appropriately addressed by our chief legal officer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah, we're going to let our attorney general handle that one.

REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: Okay. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Ms. Lowry. Members, as you all would just got a teaser from Representative Gadberry. We have our attorney general here with us Ms. Liz Murrill. She's going to join us and give us an update on the litigation and I see Ms. Murrill has a familiar face with so I'd like to welcome back to the House of Representatives, former colleague, Representative Larry Freeman. Welcome, Mr. Freeman.

LARRY FREEMAN: Thank you Chairman, thank you members as I'm glad to be back and sitting on this side of the table as familiar place myself as well. So thank y'all for having.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If you wouldn't mind everyone introduce yourself for the committee and then it's all yours.

[00:45:00]

MS. LIZ MURRILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. It's great to be with you today as your new attorney general. I'm Liz Murrill, also have with me Tom Jones, who is the new director of the Civil Division and has been involved in the litigation. And now chief deputy, almost chief deputy assuming you confirm him is Larry Freeman so that'll be before you soon to. I want to tell you that redistricting is hard. I'm not going to tell you this is easy. I think that you did the best job you could before, we've been in litigation. The last time redistricting in the 1990s when the second majority minority map was drawn we ended up in litigation for a decade. So there is no guarantee that when you do this again, we won't still be in litigation, but we are in litigation now. The district court judge has conducted a fact finding mission that's what always happens, and made fact findings regarding the map. She issued an injunction. That injunction is not currently in effect for reasons that I can explain to you, but I think the bottom line is it is not currently in effect because the deadlines for the election that it enjoinder are over. The courts nevertheless have told us to draw a new map. They have indicated that we have a deadline to do that or Judge Dick will draw the map for us. So you have an opportunity now to go back and draw the map again and I think that it is not an easy task because

0115_24_hg

Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP

February 9, 2024

Transcript by TransPerfect

the United States Supreme Court has not made it an easy task. They've given you some directives that seem to be, to not give you a lot of clear lines for doing your job. I apologize on their behalf but we tried. I mean, I am defending that map. And so you won't hear me say that I believe that that map violated the redistricting criteria. I'm defending that map, but I will defend your new map if you draw a new map. So, it's an act of the legislature. My job is to defend the work of the legislature, and I will do that to the very best of my ability. I think that the difficulty is that in the *Merrill v. Milligan* case, which was the Alabama litigation that preceded ours, the Supreme Court issued an opinion and it says that in a Section 2 disparate impact claim, which is different really from the work that you did. You did your work. You did it in good faith, but the plaintiffs will go to court and they will make a disparate impact claim, and that's what gets litigated. That has nothing to do with whether your intent was nefarious or not. Everyone can have had the right intent and followed the rules as they believe they were given to them and go to court and the court can still say, under Section 2, there's a disparate impact, and because there's a disparate impact, you have to go back and do it again, or I will do it for you. And that is short version of what Judge Dick has held and what has not been overturned by any court that we have brought it before since then. There's no definitive ruling on that case. It is still in litigation. If you pass a new act of the legislature, that will become the new law. So I'm happy to take some more questions. I think that what *Merrill v. Milligan* did which is I think one question is that it said you can't do this job once there's been some litigation over disparate impact. You can't really do the job without taking race into account. And so that's not illegal or improper to think about race when you're doing this. You can't really do it otherwise. I mean, that's the whole -- the litigation is because someone has made a claim about the disparate impact. And so there's no way to not give some thought to what you're doing in that context, especially when it's preceded by some litigation and some fact finding. But what the United States Supreme Court has said is that race can't predominate in the way that you draw your lines. So there have to be other reasons that would justify the map and those are some -- I thought Ms. Lowry did an excellent job of giving you what the broad parameters are. They're not going to be real, it's not going to be easy because the Supreme Court hasn't made it real clear in terms of how you can meet strict scrutiny, Representative Marcelle. I mean, it is a difficult task and I think that some of the other directives that the court has given, like trying to keep geographical compact and it's doing the best you can in terms of meeting all the other requirements. I mean, those are things, those are justifications that still apply. Maintaining communities of interest still apply. Balancing, geographical, I mean population still applies.

[00:50:05]

So all of those things are -- and then the totality of the circumstances is ultimately what the test is going to be, that the courts apply. And so I think that if that makes things even more confusing to you, I blame the courts. I mean, we have tried to get them to explain and give you more clear directions. It is ultimately your job. The constitution makes this. The job of the legislature to draw the maps. And then when we end up in litigation, it perverts that process because the way that the precedent is built. There's fact finding that occurs from a judge that can override the very fact finding that you've made and your legislative record. And that's just a product of precedent and how these cases have been litigated. It's not something I can change.

0115_24_hg
Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP
February 9, 2024
Transcript by TransPerfect

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let me just to kind of -- I sat on this committee last four years and we spent a long time working on the map that we ultimately ended up drawing. With over two thirds vote of the legislature, we upheld it. Over veto, override, and whatnot went through, thought it was the most, two thirds of us, thought it was the most representative of the State of Louisiana. And even all the work we did, everything we've put into it, all the testimony we've heard, the deviation being what it is, close to zero. None of that matters with the federal judge in control. She has the ability to draw it without our input and can do what she wants. If we don't draw a map this week. Is that correct?

MS. LIZ MURRILL: Well, yeah. She made fact findings of her own based on the evidence that was presented to her in court. And those fact findings are very difficult to overturn in the federal judicial system. I can talk to you about precedent. I can talk to you about terms of art in terms of appellate review but at the end of the day, her fact finding becomes very difficult to overturn.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, we have a couple of questions. Representative Thomas?

REPRESENTATIVE THOMAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Good morning. I think I heard you say that race is the predominant.

[BACKGROUND CONVERSATION]

REPRESENTATIVE THOMAS: No, race cannot be the predominant factor in what you would draw. That would violate the equal protection clause. So what you have to do is think about how to best draw the maps given the criteria that the Supreme Court has established without allowing race to be the predominant factor that drives the drawing of your lines. That's where the actual equal protection clause violation will come in. So you need to stay south of that. And then I think that you're going to have a lot of other things that you have to think about when you draw these maps. Communities of interest is one of the most important ones. I think that's always been a driving feature of the maps or of the map drawing exercise. Core retention is what was discussed very heavily in *Merrill v. Milligan*, and I think core retention has now become -- and I'm just going to tell you my personal opinion in trying to decipher *Merrill v. Milligan*, it was not easy. There are a lot of -- It's a very fractured opinion. But I think that core retention is the part that the court has given the least amount of attention to in this process now. That once you are trying to redraw the map, I think that core retention becomes a less important factor under *Merrill v. Milligan*. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Representative Thomas, Representative Marcelle.

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Thank you. Let me start by congratulating you. I don't know if I should say congratulations or condolence. I'm not really sure. Congratulations.

MS. LIZ MURRILL: Well, I asked for the job so thank you.

0115_24_hg
Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP
February 9, 2024
Transcript by TransPerfect

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Okay, let me just go over a couple of things that you said so I can be clear in what you're telling us today. Number one, you said you're going to defend the map, act five, that they presented because that is your job to do so, correct?

MS. LIZ MURRILL: Yes, I am defending it now.

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Correct. Because that's what we hired you to do, defend us, right?

MS. LIZ MURRILL: Right.

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: And if we pass another map, you'll defend that map as well?

MS. LIZ MURRILL: That's correct.

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: The other thing that I heard you say was the judge has fact finding matters. Can you kind of elaborate on what that means? That's based upon the testimony that was presented by the plaintiffs. Is that accurate? And the defense, obviously, she took both matters into consideration when she was doing her fact finding.

[00:55:00]

MS. LIZ MURRILL: She did. That doesn't mean I agree with them.

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Okay.

MS. LIZ MURRILL: I think that it's also a product of -- this is part of what's frustrating, I think, for the legislature when it goes into litigation, because people can, like experts, for example, that are hired by the plaintiff's no matter who they are. This could happen on the new map, right? Those experts can come and testify in court and the judge can control that testimony. In our case, it happened in a very, very, short, short turnaround in a preliminary injunction hearing which is different from a trial on the merits. We've never had a trial on the merits, so the court, the judge, whoever that judge may be has enormous amount of control over how much testimony is allowed and by whom and how much time we will have to do that. That was all very compressed when we litigated this right after the maps was passed. We have not had any other fact finding because we haven't had a trial on the merits. I have raised an objection to that because I think that you are entitled to have a trial on the merits. But the courts have not accepted those arguments at this point. They have told us to go back and draw the map and they have given us a deadline. So I am making the same arguments that I would make on the new map. But at the same, the courts haven't given us a lot of safe harbor to go litigate the rest of this case. They've said, go do this.

0115_24_hg
Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP
February 9, 2024
Transcript by TransPerfect

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: So it is a fact that we do have six congressional districts in Louisiana. That is a fact, right? Is it also a fact that a third of that the population is African-American?

MS. LIZ MURRILL: Approximately. Based on the data, I would also point out that 50% are women. I mean, there are other population and gender indifferences like that's why Section 2 has never been -- I mean, it is expressly stated in section two of the Voting Rights Act that this is not an act of proportionate dividing. That is not permitted under Section 2. And so we can't just take that number and say, that's how we do this because it's not that simple and that's actually not permitted under the law.

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: So it's not permitted to say that we have six congressional districts, and of those six congressional districts, we talk about community interests, I think was one of them. So do you believe that all five of the other districts has all the community interests impacted in those, and African-American districts only should have one?

MS. LIZ MURRILL: Representative Marcelle, the job of drawing the districts is yours.

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: I get it.

MS. LIZ MURRILL: It's not mine and I am defending what I believe to have been a defensible map and if you draw a new map, I will defend that map. Judge Dick has put us in a position and the Fifth Circuit, the panel that reviewed that decision, and the whole court when I asked them to go en banc by declining to go en banc have put us in a position of where we are today, where we need to draw a map. I'm not here to tell you don't draw a map. I mean, I think we do have to draw a map and I will defend that map.

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: And my final question. I heard my Representative Blue talk about two thirds of the legislature proving this map and voting for it. Bolo. I'm sorry, Beaulieu. I just call you Bo. I'm trying to get your real name.

REPRESENTATIVE BEAULLIEU: We'll work on your Representative Marcel.

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: So Beaulieu. I always call him Bo, but Beaulieu, I heard him say that two thirds of the legislature voted for this map and he's absolutely accurate because the majority of the legislature would support this map because it benefits them. We talk about our districts and our interests. What I did not hear him say is because I sat at that table on the other side and presented a map and none of the maps that we presented got out of this committee. So it's unfair to say, okay, we passed it with the majority of the people because the majority of the people would support us not having an additional African-American representation in another district. I get that but it's not fair to say that those arguments weren't made to support that. I was one of those that made the argument to support an additional congressional map. I think what we're hearing from Judge Kelly Dick.

MS. LIZ MURRILL: Shelly Dick.

0115_24_hg
Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP
February 9, 2024
Transcript by TransPerfect

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Shelly Dick is that the map is not fair for the State of Louisiana. And what I agree with her on is that if we cannot and we had an opportunity to draw this map ourselves, and we did not do it as it supports Section 2 in my opinion.

[01:00:08]

So then, we will allow her to draw that map if we can't do that. We can draw a map right now, right? Is that accurate?

MS. LIZ MURRILL: So what will happen, if you do not draw a map is that she has set a trial date. It's very, very quick, and we will still be operating under the old map, so we will move forward then with the trial under the old map. There will be a trial on the merits, it's the same record I think that was presented and Tom can affirm or correct me if I'm wrong, but set the record from the preliminary injunction hearing, we'll all go into the court record and we will look at whether we want to have additional testimony and that trial will move forward. I don't expect Judge Dick to change her position. I think she will draw a map. And so, you are getting the first opportunity to do that. I mean, in theory we could have had a trial on the merits and she could have said, "Again, I don't like the old map, and I don't like the map that you drew and I'm going to re-draw your map, but as a matter of law, you get the first shot at doing that."

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: No, we did the second shot at doing it. Thank you very much though.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Representative Marcelle. Representative Farnum?

REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So, a couple of things. So, the parallel that the argument has been based on is the case in Alabama. Was that the one?

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Yeah, the Alabama case was litigated just a few months ahead of ours and so it went up to the Supreme Court before ours did and so we've basically been held -- our case was held in abeyance pending the outcome of that case.

REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: That was a seven-member district, right?

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: I believe so.

REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: So they were trying to reach a second district in a seven-member State? So, would you say, in your opinion is it harder to draw two of six than it is two of seven just based on the compactness of the population of that State? Because when you say that every State has a different compactness, there's no two states that are identical. Maybe it's easier in one State that maybe the compactness is much more centrally located to reach that conclusion? Would you agree with that?

0115_24_hg

Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP

February 9, 2024

Transcript by TransPerfect

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: I would agree to you that every State is different, and that our population -- how our population is spread out is different from every other State. So our population I think is relatively close to theirs. They probably have a little more population because they still have seven districts. This isn't going to be easy. I didn't -- that's why I started out by saying, "I'm not here to tell you this is an easy job." You have a hard job. Our State is different. Every State is different from each other and you have to do this based on the facts in our State. We have argued in our case that our State is different from Alabama with regard to -- so the fact findings can't be the same. We're not the same, our history isn't the same, our history of re-districting and re-districting litigation is not the same. And we brought those issues up and here we are still.

REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: I know. I spent a better part of three years going over this. I was on the committee last time, and sat through numerous, numerous meetings on this, so across a period of the three years. Help me understand how the Voting Age Population factors in when the black voting age population is lower than the total population in the State? How does that factor in?

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: You want to take down?

TOM JONES: Yeah, the judge --

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: Introduce yourself, just quickly under here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You're on.

TOM JONES: The judge here in the middle district has based her rulings on black --

MR. CHAIRMAN: If you don't mind, can you just kind of speak into the mic a little bit or you could pull the mic to you, I believe, as well.

TOM JONES: I'm sorry, my name is Tom Jones. I'm the Director of the Civil Division in the Attorney General's Office. The judge has principally based her ruling on black voting age population. That's what she -- that's the primary criteria. Then the experts take that black voting age population and they're very clever people and they do very clever things with those numbers that can persuade you on one side --

[01:04:59]

-- that the black voting age population should be -- and last this way, and the other experts can convince you of just the opposite the next day. The black voting age population has been the primary criteria for this judge's rulings. You did say something earlier that race cannot be a determining factor of why you draw maps.

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: It can't be the predominant factor.

0115_24_hg
Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP
February 9, 2024
Transcript by TransPerfect

TOM JONES: Isn't that the only reason we're here right now?

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: We're here because of --

TOM JONES: But isn't that predominant reason?

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: The court is telling us we have to be here. I think that's part of it. I mean I'm defending the map. I'm going to defend the new map. I want you to know, I mean, if you draw any map, I'm defending that map.

TOM JONES: I agree.

REPRESENTATIVE MARCELLE: So, I'm not going to say that -- I have complaints about how this case was managed. I mean, not by our litigators, not -- I just think that we need -- we should have a trial on the merits. I've always -- I have argued that in court, I have signed off on these pleadings. I still believe that that's true. The courts have told us to do this by a certain date or it's going to be done for us.

REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: I think the circular fashion of the 14th and 15th Amendment and Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act is a circle. So its engine is a race to chase your tail to try and accomplish what you're trying to accomplish and each one contradicts the other one in a circle, so you end up in this never-ending loop of how do you accomplish what we're tasked to do here. We did look at a lot of maps, and I personally think that the one we passed was a very legal, legitimate map, and we'll do the best we can with what we have, so I appreciate your time today. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Representative Farnum. Representative Carter?

REPRESENTATIVE CARTER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Because this committee meeting is being viewed by people throughout the State, I think it's important that we be honest and put the whole picture why we're here, how we got here. It seemed to be an impression that the old Judge Dick trying to make us do some even though we've done the right thing. Is it not true that the judge's job or task is look at the law? First, the law, that jurisprudence of reapportionment and look at the statutes that's been passed with apportionment, and other criteria that congress has given us to see if we went about this the right way. She just didn't come over and decide to say, "I'm going to make them have another black history." That is not her job. And if she did anything contrary to that, she certainly would be reversed quite quickly. But what she did -- she looked at the law and there was a request made by motion to ask whether or not the plaintiff will succeed on this problem with disparity and what have you, if they went to trial. And she pretty much said at the extent of the law, extent of the facts and what action took place in this Legislature, she decided he would probably succeed. So, she asked the Legislature to go back and try to do this over again the right way. And the Legislature had that opportunity but couldn't get nothing done. Okay? So now, the judge -- it [INDISCERNIBLE 01:08:41] she expressed that she wanted another map, a better map, she thought that's more legal. And so, she asked the Legislature to -- there was a statement made by the Attorney General's office and that was

0115_24_hg

Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP

February 9, 2024

Transcript by TransPerfect

granted by the Fifth Circuit, and because of the Alabama case -- the Alabama is different from -- Furthermore, Alabama has 26% population of African-Americans, Louisiana 33%. Alabama has a larger overall population that we found as well. That's why they have seven congressmen. But you can't compare Alabama to Louisiana, but the law is pretty much the same. So, based on that law, that just say, "You all are either going to do a map, or I'm going to do a map." So he gave us another, a third time, do the map. Now, if you look at the analysis of what we've done the last time, there was about eight maps that were made, presented to this house. It could have been a fast committee. But there's only one map, the speaker map, [INDISCERNIBLE 01:09:39] that was even considered, seriously considered. I mean, there were some people who came to the table and talked about these other maps, but it was asked by the speaker then -- the then speaker who was carrying a House Bill 1, did you look at Section 2 by the Voters' Right Act and did you try to comply this map with Section 2?

[01:10:00]

And the speaker said, no, or did you look at the disparities that this map represents? Is this common sense? If you got a-third of the population that is African-American and over 33%, did you look at those figures? You don't have to be the primary criteria, but you got to first look at whether or not it appears to be a fair map and compliant with the 14th Amendment section to another Supreme Court jurisprudence? He said, no. He said that this is his map that he's presenting, and he didn't let the lawyers worry about all this other stuff. This is his map. So, the record of the -- and I try to tell him this because I was asking questions on House Bill 1, like everybody else, why this map have a problem? So the Legislature knew the map had a problem, but it wouldn't listen to anybody else. So, I agree that your representation, that race is not the sole factor. The factor is you got to have six divided equally. Okay? But Section 2 says if you've got a group that is compact and that certain voting patterns, that you should try to create a map that allow that group to represent a person of their choice. That's all it says. So, I asked the speaker, did you look at Section 2 and try to come over the map that does that? He said, no, I didn't. So, it's the speaker's and the Legislator's testimony in the record that caused them the problem they had when it went to the judge. Had they said, we look at Section 2, we tried to comply with Section 2, but we couldn't because the black population is so dispersed in the State, we could not get another district that was compact. They didn't say. They didn't even try. So that's why the State is in a position it's in, not because somebody's out there, some federal just out there trying to make Louisiana have another minority district.

Now, however, I do agree that we need to have this opportunity, and it's wonderful to have this opportunity to try to create a map that will comply. And I think, I applaud the governor because I think the governor wants to do the right thing. The new governor wants to do the right thing. He wants to have a map so we can do our own map and not a federal judge and I support that. But I don't want to give the impression a federal judge is just a bad, bad monster is trying to make us do something we shouldn't do. She has to comply with the law. Now, the Supreme Court has reviewed what the attorney general was presented there on connection with the State, and they denied that. It's the United States Supreme Court saying, you got to go back and do this map, not just judge Dix. Okay? So we need to accept the fact that the map we had, based on the record, based on the testimony presented here in the Legislature, based on the debate in the Legislature,

0115_24_hg
Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP
February 9, 2024
Transcript by TransPerfect

based on the law, it was not in compliance. Now, you can differ -- people can differ because they don't like what the law says maybe, or they want to twist the law but the fact of the matter is, it's not a sustainable map. This map is not sustainable that we have now. And so, we have a chance to do that and not offend too many political notions at the same time. And so, I just want to make that, put that in the record, that this is an effort on the part of people, different political interests, to try to resolve an issue that has been defined by Supreme Court decision and by federal statute and try to come up with a district that is successful. That's what we're trying to do. And it doesn't mean that you're a bad person or you got a problem because you supported that last map. It's just that the record did not support. We didn't get enough input from other people that had concerns about it. We didn't allow people to put their input in. Have we put in three or four maps on the floor and explain why we put them on the floor that might have been different. Have we tried to do what the Supreme Courts over the years have told us to do? I happen to be on the Legislature in 84 to 92, where we wrote a lot of the real portion maps, okay? So this problem been around a long time. Oftentimes, federal judges have to put us on the right tracks, okay. You all doing good. You all working in the right direction, but you all got to go back and do this over again. That's what she did.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Judge Carter, Vice Chairman Lyons.

VICE CHAIRMAN LYONS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Is it Ms. Murrill?

MS. LIZ MURRILL: Murrill.

VICE CHAIRMAN LYONS: Murrill, I'm sorry. I have a question for you. But before I get into my question, I just wanted to note that as we talk about the Voting Rights Act and the premise of a lot of things that we've done, today is actually the holiday of Martin Luther King Day today, which is, actual birthday is tomorrow. This is the observance of is today. So a lot of us questioned as a federal holiday where everything was empty, what have you, is why are we here today. So I just want to just remind everyone that one of the things that Martin Luther King did say was, "There's never a wrong time to do the right thing." So we're here today and we would not have any other, I guess, issue he would, that we're doing something that we'll be doing to correct where we at and so forth.

[01:15:08]

But my question to you, ma'am, is you alluded to earlier that you want to have a preference to have a trial on the merits that you're requesting asking for. So as a body here, as we're going to be going through this process, can you outline to us in any form necessary to get it across what were some of those merits? Because I'm assuming when you say, "The trial on the merits", I mean at the merits of the decision that you may have had difference with, you had other merits that you wanted to talk about or maybe defend in the fact-finding portion that was not revealed.

MS. LIZ MURRILL: So, Representative Lyons, when we went into this litigation, right after the Legislature completed the map drawing process, we went into a very, very compressed hearing on a motion for a preliminary injunction. That is a different standard. It was very

0115_24_hg

Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP

February 9, 2024

Transcript by TransPerfect

compressed. We did not have the length of time that we would ordinarily have for a full trial. You can blame it on the litigator in me, which is fine, but I believe that the State and I believe this under the new map that you pass, that we should be entitled to have a trial on the merits before we are forced to go in and change an act of the Legislature. That is just a fundamental premise that I have about acts of the Legislature and us being required by the courts to redo them. As a practical matter, we did not have a lot of time, but we lost on that issue. I mean, we did, not just me, but the entire litigation team, including the lawyers who represented the Legislature or the speaker and the President and the Senate at the time and the Secretary of State. We asked to have a trial on the merits set before you were required to go into session, and we offered to do it quickly. So just to be clear, we were not trying to delay. We offered to do it in November. There was another trial set. I mean, we tried to do this quickly so that we could have a complete record upon which, whatever the decision was, and we did not believe that Judge Dick would change her decision, but we still believe that the case should be before the courts on a complete record. It is not because we never had a trial on merits. The courts have told you to go back and draw a map, and they said, "We can have a trial on the merits, but we could do that after you draw a map." Just fundamentally, as a lawyer who represents you and defends the laws that you pass, your laws, if you have a law that you pass that you feel very strongly about, and the entire Legislature has voted for it, even though some people may disagree with it, then I will defend your law. And I think that you are entitled, and the Legislature is entitled to that defense. So that's the point that I was making. I don't think any of these cases should be tried and decided at the preliminary injunction stage. I think we are entitled to a trial on the merits. But at this point, the courts have told you, the federal courts have told me and they have told you that we don't get that right now. You get to have this session right now, or judge Dick is going to draw the map for you. So I'm not here to say, "Don't draw the map", I'm here to tell you, "Draw the map."

VICE CHAIRMAN LYONS: Okay. Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Representative Lyons. Representative Gadberry.

REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: Pleasure, Mr. Chair. Ms. Murrill, if we draw a new map and Judge Dick decides she don't like that one, do we start all over again or will she immediately draw a map? I don't think she's capable of drawing a map, number one. I just don't think she can do it.

MS. LIZ MURRILL: No federal judge does this without a demographer helping. She will ask for experts. She will ask for the maps to be submitted to her with expert testimony, and then she will decide. Typically, she's probably going to decide which map to take, but she can tweak those lines. She can decide how to draw the map, how she wants to draw this map, based on the input of the experts from both sides. She could appoint her own expert and have that expert assist her in the map drawing exercise. And remember, you've been through this before. A large part of this exercise is done through computer-generated maps. So you put the numbers in, you start changing, you change the inputs --

[01:20:00]

0115_24_hg

Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP

February 9, 2024

Transcript by TransPerfect

MS. LIZ MURRILL: -- it spits out a new map. She's going to have to go through that same process that you did and then we continue. So, I mean, I can't tell you that the plaintiffs will accept the map that you draw. She has established a timeline for the plaintiffs to amend their petition and challenge that map and then we will go through the process again to determine whether or not that map is acceptable.

REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: And for four years on this committee previously, I spent hours upon hours looking at this map, all the maps, and I look at the plaintiff's map so to speak that they presented before this group and I didn't feel like any of those met the criteria. The overriding factor I guess was they had gerrymandered lines, which is against the Voting Rights Act. So, I'm hearing that you said that the current map that's been rejected I guess by the judge, has it been to the U.S. Supreme Court? Because that's the next step.

MS. LIZ MURRILL: It has not -- the U.S. Supreme Court can decide whether to take a case or not take a case. They have not taken our case. They took our -- they stayed our case last summer while the Alabama case went forward and was litigated. They said, "You just wait." They thought we had made a good case for a stay and so they paused our case while they decided that one, but they did something and -- this is kind of a "term of art" but, I mean, they granted cert in advance of judgment. That means they actually took our case and then after they decided the Merrill case, the Alabama case, they just vacated their own grant and sent it back to us. So, in a way, they took our case and then they vacated their own decision to take our case, and they sent it back down to the Fifth Circuit and to Judge Dick, and so it's back in the hands of the district court judge who is supervised by the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals. And so, there has been some litigation between August and really through the summer since the Merrill case came out all the way through the time that the opinion was issued in November, I think, from the Fifth Circuit where a panel of the Fifth Circuit said, "You need to go draw a map by February 15th." So, it actually suggested we should have done this before we legally really or I think it was practically possible to even get it done but, "Here you are." I think the governor heeded that call, that demand. I mean, we've had it reviewed by a number of Judges. They have had nothing to say about our arguments. It's been radio silence. And so, the only decision that remains in front of us right now is Judge Dick's. And so, Judge Dick has set a timeline for us to have a trial. They did say we get to have a trial, but we don't get to have that trial until after you go through this exercise and she will do it for you.

REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: And once we have that trial, we have the opportunity, if she still rejects the map, to appeal that.

MS. LIZ MURRILL: If she rejects the new map?

REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: Or the existing one, again.

MS. LIZ MURRILL: Well, I mean if you don't draw a map, then we will be back in front of her for the trial on the merits in very short order, and that case will continue. If you do draw a map then the plaintiffs will have to decide whether they wish to challenge that map, whether they accept that map, and if they accept that map, then the whole case should be over. If they do not

0115_24_hg
Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP
February 9, 2024
Transcript by TransPerfect

accept that map for whatever reason, then if they don't like it -- I mean, it may be a perfectly acceptable map for some people, it may be a second majority/minority map that some people like or that some people don't, so there's no guarantee that someone won't -- that the plaintiffs will like the map, but if they can -- so they could continue to challenge it, and now they will have to go and amend their pleadings and we basically will start over because it is a new act of the Legislature.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's going to replace the existing map. Representative Gadberry, hold on.

REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: It will replace the existing map.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Gadberry.

REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: Well, I mean, along what Representative Farnum was saying earlier, "You chase your tail on this thing."

[01:25:00]

MS. LIZ MURRILL: Well, that's why I said, it's not easy.

REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: You comply with one part and you check another part, and it doesn't meet the criteria so you go back and rework your population or your districts, and that doesn't meet, so you're constantly going in a circle.

MS. LIZ MURRILL: Look, I believe that the United States Supreme Court should give you better instructions. I do. I think that that is the argument that we made last summer and if you pass a map and somebody else challenges that map, I will make that argument again. I mean, I think that the courts have made this a difficult task for you, and so you are doing the best that you can now within the constraints of the rulings of the Federal Court. So, it's not an easy task that you have and I believe that the jurisprudence has made it confusing and that the Supreme Court would be, well, I mean, in my opinion, that the Supreme Court ought to make its own jurisprudence clearer to those of you who have the job of drawing the maps. I think that's fair. The Constitution makes it clear that it is your job to draw the maps. I believe that it is not correct in terms of the balance of power between the state and federal government between the Constitution, view of how this should be happening for the courts to create precedent that makes it impossible for you to follow. So, I think they should give you better guidance and you are here to do the best job that you can to try and draw the map and I will defend the map, and then we will see what happens.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah, members, look, we're not going to be able to litigate the litigation here in committee.

REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: My problem is, we had a year to draw this map, at least a year. Now we've got eight days.

0115_24_hg
Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP
February 9, 2024
Transcript by TransPerfect

MS. LIZ MURRILL: That's right. That's because the judge gave you deadlines.

REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: That's probably not going to work then. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you representative Gadberry. Representative Newell.

REPRESENTATIVE NEWELL: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I don't have very many questions because I just don't have that many questions. To add what Judge Carter said as far as ensuring that people are educated about this process, most of us who are attorneys that have some information or some kind of experience with the court's system and process, we know that sometimes you do need a preliminary injunction when things need to happen quickly, particularly when there is going to be irreparable harm to the applicants, and in this case the applicants were the minorities of this State who would have not been given the opportunity to vote for a candidate of choice in the elections that were quickly coming upon us at the end of the session, the first redistricting session. So, those citizens once again did not have the opportunity to have a candidate of choice because this Legislature could not come to an agreement. The process is not difficult. The rules, the guidelines are not difficult if you want to understand the rules and guidelines that have been put before you. What makes it difficult is when we are choosing not to do what is right, not to do what is fair for all of the citizens that we represent. I have a lot of folks in my district that did not vote for me, but you know what I do? I still represent them in this body. Some of us do not take upon that task. This is the first redistricting session that we have had where 21 was the first redistricting session that the United States had after the expiration of Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act, which required all of our maps and every law that we made, and I'm saying "We", States that have had a history of discrimination. Laws that we put in place before had to be reviewed by the United States Attorney General's Office or by United States district courts if they were challenged in court. This is why this has been such a foreign task, I guess, this second part because we are taking on all of the owners, creating the maps and then going back and reviewing and redrawing, and rewriting the maps, because this is the first time we've had to.

[01:30:05]

Before, we would just throw something together and the United States would take over it. We don't have that luxury anymore. We don't have that opportunity of having someone else to say, all right, you messed this up. We about to do it. Thank God for Judge Dick. Just as it was stated that she doesn't have the knowledge or the know how to write a map. Judge, I didn't see it. It clearly, we don't have it either. And we've been given every opportunity to learn, every opportunity to educate ourselves, but some of us take that information and, sir, what's your name again? I apologize.

TOM JONES: Tom Jones.

REPRESENTATIVE NEWELL: Just as Mr. Jones said in his opening statement, you got one side. That is their job to confuse you and make you think this. The other job is the other side. It's

0115_24_hg

Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP

February 9, 2024

Transcript by TransPerfect

their job to confuse you and make you think that. We are not here to confuse anybody. We should not try to confuse ourselves with trying not to do right. If we as a body task ourselves with representing the interests of all the citizens that we represent, whether they voted for us or not, whether we want them in our district or not. If we set ourselves to representing all, this is not going to be a difficult task. The more we argue amongst ourselves and the more we try to go and appease a national agenda that does not care for the State of Louisiana, the longer we're going to continue to have these fights and the more divided this state will be. I've never seen this state as divided as it is now. We used to have the divisions on just basic moral value things, but we always, as Louisiana, looked at family, looked at community, and tried to do what was right by our neighbors, I don't see that anymore and that is what's making this process difficult. Judge Marcelle said that we had maps, and he pointed out the fact that we as large and I think it was Rep. Marcelle that said it. We did not have an opportunity to vote on all maps, because all maps were not allowed to come out of this committee. There were options, upon options to draw a second minority/majority congressional district, and they went all across this state to give minorities an opportunity to vote for their candidate of choice. They were not allowed to come out of this committee. We sat for a month, six hours at least a day, listening to the arguments and the makeup of each map and discussing voting age, population versus population. So I understand why we're still having those questions because we talked about it ad nauseam. But when you choose not to do right that is when the process becomes difficult and it seems as though we can't make a headway. But I want to put it on the record that I didn't vote for none of the maps that came out. I didn't vote for any of the maps that Judge Dick had in front of her because they were not maps that were fair and they were not maps that would take in consideration of all of the citizens of this great state that I call home. No matter how unfair or how unjust it is to me, we still need to look and make sure that Louisiana is a state that it used to be considering all of her citizens and thank you for your time, Mr. Chair. I don't have a question for anybody.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let's try and keep this to questions for the attorney general. We're going to have a time to talk about maps and all that but if like to try and stick to any kind of questions out of respect for the attorney general's time. Representative Schamerhorn?

[01:35:00]

REPRESENTATIVE SCHAMERHORN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning.

MS. LIZ MURRILL: Good morning.

REPRESENTATIVE SCHAMERHORN: Welcome aboard.

MS. LIZ MURRILL: Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE SCHAMERHORN: My question is, if we do not present a different map, Judge Dick has threatened to draw her map. Is it not --

MS. LIZ MURRILL: Promised, not threatened?

0115_24_hg
Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP
February 9, 2024
Transcript by TransPerfect

REPRESENTATIVE SCHAMERHORN: Well, okay. Is it not our responsibility as legislators and protected by the Constitution that our map should be the one that is approved? Now, if she draws her own map, when she does, do we still have to approve? Would we have to approve her map, or would it automatically go in force above what the constitution says is our duties as representatives?

MS. LIZ MURRILL: So let me untangle that a little bit. If you draw a map now, that map will become an act of the legislature, and it will supersede the prior act of the legislature. The old map goes away.

REPRESENTATIVE SCHAMERHORN: Okay.

MS. LIZ MURRILL: If you do not draw a map, then the map that you drew before will be the map. And the plaintiffs will continue to litigate that. We will have a trial. On the merits, the record from the preliminary injunction will be probably supplemented with some additional testimony. She will issue a new ruling, and she will issue a permanent injunction against the map, and then that will be litigated, which is my duty, and so I will continue to carry forth my duty to defend against the injunction. That's the process. If she draws the map herself, then someone could intervene and challenge that map. There are a number of different potential outcomes if she draws the map. If she draws the map, we could accept that map. You don't get it back. You don't get another opportunity to approve her work. The only question is, can her work survive the scrutiny of the Fifth Circuit, who grades her papers? And potentially the United States Supreme Court, who grades their papers? I think what makes your job a little more complicated is that not the exact prior map, but the map before that had been precleared. There had been litigation in the past over a majority/minority map that was declared unconstitutional. So that's why I have never taken the position that our history, or at least our recent history, is the same in redistricting as Alabama. I believe that the courts need to make it more clear what your job is so that you can do it properly the first time and we can all avoid the litigation side of this and continue to move forward with an act that, as I believe all your acts are presumed to be constitutional. That's how I'll approach the next act that you issue. So I'm not picking and choosing. I mean, I think unless it's very clearly unconstitutional based on existing precedent, then my job is to defend the map. I mean, not just that map, any act of the legislature.

REPRESENTATIVE SCHAMERHORN: Thank you, ma'am.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Representative Schamerhorn. Attorney general, that clears the board. Thank you for your time this morning. Mr. Freeman, Mr. Jones, thank you all for being here with us today. Look forward to working with you all in the future. And again, congratulations on your election.

MS. LIZ MURRILL: Thank you very much. Thank you for having me and good luck.

TOM JONES: Thank you, chairman. Thank you, members.

0115_24_hg
Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP
February 9, 2024
Transcript by TransPerfect

MR. CHAIRMAN: Members, we have a couple of witnesses' card that would like to speak. Again I want to remind the witnesses as well. We're not debating any bills today. We want to hear your voices. So we have an information, call for information only card, but would like to speak. Mr. Edward Scott Galmon, if you want to, please come on up. You mind introducing yourself?

EDWARD SCOTT GALMON: Yes, I'm Edward Scott Galmon from St. Helena Parish, Greensburg, Louisiana and Jess was here. I'm a plaintiff on the map. My name is Galmon. If you look at the original lawsuit, it bears my name. You guys have a tremendous job ahead of you and I just want to thank y'all in advance. Number one, because I think that this time you guys are going to produce a map that both plaintiff and the courts can agree with.

[01:40:00]

I think the last map that we produced, it went away from some of the challenges that said before, because number one, this would be a lot easier if we pulled all the congressmen off the map, and just looked at geography, the people, it would be very easy to do a map. The challenge comes in is that the geography and the people that already elected if you leave them on a map, you have another caveat that you have to overcome. So once again, you guys have a challenge. I just thought I'd come this morning, just look at your face and thank y'all. I thank y'all in advance, because I think this time, we're going to achieve what we're trying to go. And for me 33% is 1/3, 6 divided by 3 is 2, it's simple for me. Not so simple for you guys. But once again, I want thank y'all advance and I know that at the end of this process, we're going to have something that we all can live with. Thank y'all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir. We have two witness cards. They're red cards. I'm not sure what we are with but this is just an educational meeting this morning. But you're welcome to come to the table, [PH 01:41:48] Ms. Labrie. Or if you wanted to save it for the bills that are presented. I mean, you're welcome to come to the table, come on up. You're welcome.

SUSIE LABRIE: Can he come up [INDISCERNIBLE 01:42:00]?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sure. Is this Mr. Harmon?

JC HARMON: Yes sir.

SUSIE LABRIE: I want to [INDISCERNIBLE 01:42:03].

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, go ahead. Y'all have a seat and introduce yourselves.

SUSIE LABRIE: You want to do you and I will do me.

JC HARMON: You want me go first?

SUSIE LABRIE: Yes. You need to.

0115_24_hg

Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP

February 9, 2024

Transcript by TransPerfect

JC HARMON: All right. [PH 01:42:15] JC Harmon. I'm speaking for myself, but I'm on the benefit of working with a bunch of groups that are interested in the process. What I did is I actually submitted to the committee of PowerPoint --

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah, we received the committee. We're going to hear -- we're not in the special session yet. So the committee is going to receive it, and it's going to be part of tomorrow's testimony.

JC HARMON: Okay, so you want me to hold it till then or --

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah, that might be if it's having to do with maps, I would suggest that.

JC HARMON: I can do a brief overview right now, if --

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're not debating maps at all today.

JC HARMON: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So if there was like an educational thing that you had for the committee real quick, we'll be happy to take it. But if it's on a map, we would like to hold that.

JC HARMON: Just, just let me give a brief overview. I won't go over the report. Basically, what I did is I took a map of Louisiana, and I color coded it based on the breakdown of black, white Republican, Democrat, and looked at the state from an overview standpoint. I had some people asked me to do that. And what I did is, when I did that, you could see that the northern part of the state only had -- I based it on senatorial districts. So if you look at the northern part of the state, you have three senatorial districts that would fit the criteria that you were looking for. The issue areas, if you take the 39 senatorial district divided by six, which is the number of representatives you get, you get 6 1/2. So you need 6 1/2 district, senatorial districts to make a US representative. So if you have suffered a breakdown standpoint, it gives you a good breakdown to start or preference to start with what you're looking to do. But when you do that, you immediately see that you take the northern part of the state off, because it doesn't work. So then you could sit now you're down at the southern part of the state. So what I was trying to do is make it, I know you have a big job, and it's not easy to do what you're trying to do. But if you can break down the state into geographical sections, and take certain sections off, that makes you focus on the other part of the state to where you need to do what you're looking to do and I'll hold the rest of it till later. But hopefully, if you take a look at what I did, I think you'll see and I did it to try and help the process. Because I agree that what you want to do is you want to look at what you can do to unite this state because I would agree with, I think it was Representative Newell that said, you know, we're divided now and I think, if anything, because we're not working to unite the state, that we -- I did a breakdown. If you look at the parishes and you break it down, we actually came up why the parishes actually split out. It's a perfect six representatives and I didn't know what the number was as far as the plus minus number. I was just looking at population, so it gives you a good starting point. So Representative Beaulieu, I'll leave it there.

0115_24_hg
Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP
February 9, 2024
Transcript by TransPerfect

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Harmon. Ms. Labrie, you have something you'd like to add?

SUSIE LABRIE: Yes, uh huh. I'm [PH 01:45:30] Susie Labrie and I'm representing myself. I'm an appropriate individualist, not as a part of a collective class of color of skin, height, genealogy, gender, physical descriptions. As for districting, I tried to find a way to create an additional minority district after studying up myself and with JC Harmon here, I still cannot come up with an additional majority district without gerrymandering which I consider is illegal if I wanted to or not, but I did try because gerrymandering as you know is illegal. Let's also see it myself as reverse discrimination. Those are seeing my pain is other ethnicities such as the Vietnamese, Spanish et cetera. Farmers, rural communities and into small business sole proprietors, Main Street USA, where I have seen that liberals poorly represent by unfair over-taxation in the working people and agricultural farmers and businesses. Three, it would pose more central power lessening individual power, individual constituents would fall between the cracks and get less attention by congressman or be heard a heated to last in a one size fit all class approach which is I have seen happened to me. When you represent a collective class as a one size fit all, too many of us individuals fall between the cracks is especially special needs self-identity, talents, ethnicities, nativities, et cetera. Four, it would cause us one vote short for conservatives in the United States House of Representatives and removing and keep Louisiana in a less empowered position in the United States. Five, the only way I could see myself to add a minority district is to draw it as ZS Coil or snake which all had been rejected over the decades. If we have to do so, I'm suggesting we pop up a minority district as a set of archipelago island looking like different size polka dots as the archipelago islands was scattered between a water, a majority districts or districts. Majority districts edition or we can make a district as a coil like a slinky toy and draw that around the minorities and after studying up with myself in JC, I find it mathematically impossible. So I would say please and he'd adapt to his maps where he'll be presenting later. JC here is a genius in research numbers, statistics and science. Being an active myself and also a great devil's advocate, and also trying as a fair approach, I have tried justifying both sides and I'm just going to ask you please do not add another minority district. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Labrie. The board is clear. Members, this is going to conclude our educational meeting this morning. I appreciate y'all being here this morning and your attentiveness and your questions. We're going to have a busy week, actually all to stay close to your computers as bills are uploaded, read them, become familiar with them. If you have amendments, please get them to staff as soon as possible. If anybody any from outside is submitting information or submitting maps to include shape files as well so we can have the equivalency, block equivalency files so that we can, we can have that data and get it to staff as soon as possible. But members look forward to it. It'll be a fun week. Thank you.

MS. BAKER: Move to adjourn.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yup, Representative Thomas has moved to adjourn.

[01:49:36]



I, Anders Nelson, hereby certify that "0115_24_hg" is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, a true and accurate transcription in English.

Anders Nelson
Anders Nelson (Feb 26, 2024 13:30 EST)

Anders Nelson
Project Manager
TransPerfect Legal Solutions

February 26, 2024