May 2, 2022

***Robinson, et al. v. Ardoin*, No. 3:22-cv-00211-SDD-SDJ**
***Galmon, et al. v. Ardoin*, No. 3:22-cv-00214-SDD-SDJ**

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA

EXPERT REBUTTAL REPORT OF

Allan J. Lichtman, Ph.D.
Distinguished Professor of History
American University
Washington, DC

Allan J. Lichtman

EXHIBIT
GX-31

I. Statement of Purpose and Opinion

In this rebuttal report, I respond to material presented by experts retained by Defendant Ardoin and Defendant-Intervenors (collectively "Defendants") relevant to the nine Senate Factors that I analyzed in my initial report. It should be noted that the Defendants do not present any material responding to my analysis of Senate Factors 6 ("Whether political campaigns have been characterized by overt or subtle racial appeals") and 7 ("The extent to which members of the minority group have been elected to public office in the jurisdiction"). Except for Senate Factors 2 ("The extent to which voting in the elections of the state or political subdivision is racially polarized") and 9 ("Whether the policy underlying the state or political subdivision's use of such voting qualification, prerequisite to voting, or standard, practice, or procedure is tenuous"), their response to the remaining factors is at best cursory. This rebuttal report will concentrate on Senate Factors 2 and 9 and respond to material presented on the other Senate Factors.[1]

II. Senate Factor 1: "The extent of any history of official discrimination in the state or political subdivision that touched the right of members of the minority group to register, vote, or otherwise to participate in the democratic process."

Defendants do not challenge any of the findings on this factor from my original report; they question only whether the findings are recent. As indicated in my opening report, most of my findings are from the twenty-first century, including direct discrimination in voting and discrimination in law enforcement, education, and housing that touch upon opportunities for Black citizens in Louisiana "to register, vote, or otherwise to participate in the democratic process."

[1] I will also make two corrections to my opening expert report. First, although I referenced Appendix 1—a list of cases since 2015 for which I have provided written or oral testimony—that appendix was inadvertently omitted from my report. It is now appended to the end of this rebuttal. In addition, I mistakenly referenced an expert report by Dr. Charles Vincent; Dr. Vincent did not prepare an expert report in these consolidated matters.

III. Senate Factor 2: "The extent to which voting in the elections of the state or political subdivision is racially polarized."

It should be noted first that analysis of Senate Factor 2 is distinct from analysis of the third *Gingles* precondition. According to *Gingles* Precondition Three, "the minority must be able to demonstrate that the white majority votes sufficiently as a bloc to enable it—in the absence of special circumstances, such as the minority candidate running unopposed—usually to defeat the minority's preferred candidate."[2] Senate Factor 2 does not probe this question but considers only the *extent* of racial polarization in the state of Louisiana. In turn, for example, the analysis presented in the report of Dr. Tumulesh K.S. Solanky purports to show that in East Baton Rouge Parish whites did not vote sufficiently as a bloc to defeat the minority-preferred candidate in the presidential election of 2020, *see Solanky* Report at 12–13. but which is not relevant to the consideration of Senate Factor 2.

The report of Dr. John R. Alford does address Senate Factor 2, although it does so indirectly without naming the factor specifically or referencing my initial report. Dr. Alford does not dispute or even address any of my initial report's statistical findings. Instead, his report rests on the sole claim that perhaps voting in Louisiana is polarized along party lines, independent of the candidate's race. The fundamental flaw in Dr. Alford's report is that it assumes that party affiliation motivates Black and white voting polarization independent of race. However, Alford presents no analysis or evidence to demonstrate this independence.

Dr. Alford also ignores the analysis in my report showing that based on the history and current status of the Democratic and Republican Parties in Louisiana, race is inextricably tied to party identification. My analysis demonstrated that Blacks vote for Democrats and whites vote for Republicans largely *because* of, not in spite of, race. The linkage between race and party has for

[2] *Thornburg v. Gingles*, 478 U.S. 30, 50-51 (1986).

some time split Blacks and whites along partisan lines, and that division continues through the present. The partisan divide on race in Louisiana is also evident in the many racial appeals launched by Republican candidates in Louisiana, as documented in my analysis of Senate Factor 6 in my initial report. *See* Lichtman Opening Report, at 39-46, App. 20-23.

In addition to the polling data from the Cooperative Congressional Election Study in my initial report, a recent Louisiana survey by the Reilly Center for Media & Public Affairs provides additional insight into fundamental partisan differences on race. As shown in **Table R1**, two percent of Republicans responded that Blacks were treated less fairly than whites in voting in elections, compared to 58% of Democrats. More Republicans, seven percent, believed that whites were being treated less fairly.[3] By contrast, not a single Democrat responded that wwhites were being treated less fairly.

Table R1 further shows that 16% of Republicans responded that Blacks were treated less fairly than whites in hiring, pay, and promotion at work, compared to 77% of Democrats. Nearly as many Republicans, 13%, believed that whites were being treated less fairly. Only two percent of Democrats responded that whites were being treated less fairly. In addition, the Table shows that 12% of Republicans responded that Blacks were treated less fairly than whites in applying for a loan or mortgage, compared to 71% of Democrats. Among Republicans, five percent, believed that whites were being treated less fairly, compared to one percent of Democrats. Finally, Table 1 shows that five percent of Republicans responded that Blacks were treated less fairly than whites in seeking medical treatment as compared to 62% of Democrats. Nearly as many Republicans, four percent, believed that whites were being treated less fairly, while only two percent of Democrats responded that whites were being treated less fairly.[4]

---

[3] TABLE R1.

[4] *See Rebuttal App.* at R. App. 1.

Scholar and political science Professor Jacob Grumbach, Ph.D. of the University of Washington has analyzed how a national Republican political strategy based on race plays out in the states. Dr. Grumbach developed a "State Democracy Index." He based the index on 61 indicators that illuminate the totality of circumstances in a state regarding equal access to participation in the democratic process. Grumbach said that "electoral democracy" as gauged by his index is important "especially for minority populations who have been historically subjugated." Grumbach found that one variable dominates all others in determining the level of democracy in the states: Republican control of state government. "Difference-in-differences results suggest a minimal role for all factors except Republican control of state government, which dramatically reduces states' democratic performance during this period [2000 to 2018]," he wrote. He found that Republican states are not adopting anti-democratic policies independently but are following this national strategy.[5]

Differences between Republicans and Democrats in providing democratic access, Grumbach found, is closely tied to race. He notes that "their preferences with respect to race and partisan identity provide the Republican electoral base with reason to oppose democracy in a diversifying country." Thus, "[t]he politics of race are therefore still central to this theory of party coalitions." Grumbach adds, "Despite Barack Obama's avoidance of racial discussion and consistent promotion of Black respectability politics (Gillion 2016; Stephens-Dougan 2016), his

[5] Jacob Grumbach, "Laboratories of Democratic Backsliding," 5 April 2021, at 1, 17, https://uc91f311d0abcde6063d09f388fd.dl.dropboxusercontent.com/cd/0/inline2/Bd8DparMuYL4TMvMUN9oc8tXiZTI0ht22HgWXvdHisOfbKwcnZX_qQBt6Hf6ira32vpRjSYoBQ3Z8l8sj_V7yRiD5CE7uE9m0DocoGEp5scZnpm8XPtP1rkeyMJ6n2ibg-fX-B-UBo-9ecW27qGvO3clXlDkfLqq0vF00FNzWBE120qzLl6G7DediVJCh7ipTDQkDxb0Fn7R7OsMjHJfzNl5AP5Suv5Zuk95WePbXetPudtOik-f1BtPLBC8YqJ4sEVZ7ybE1cAmh-HLRxvYA4cXLEn6DTMq1kA0A5vbDpqaemIjimK0OWIlTbxS3jedMc5h8BtpMzEmAbskzdg6aJvaTp2kma-EeOk7UMgFCG7haIblyBsl82plE8r7dXA9aDM/file#.

presidency, rather than signaling the emergence of a post-racial America, was met with a Republican Party that made gains by radicalizing on issues of race and immigration (Parker and Barreto 2014). In the contemporary period, elite racial appeals and frames are facilitated by a sophisticated conservative media ecosystem that consolidates the mass elements of the Republican Party."[6]

Dr. Alford also ignores the evidence presented in my report that examines racial polarization for Democratic voters, which includes the vast majority of Blacks in Louisiana, in the two 2008 elections in which Black candidate Barack Obama competed against white candidates. In the 2008 primary, Black and White Democrats sharply polarized in the choice of Obama versus white candidate Hillary Clinton. In the 2008 general election, Black Democrats voted for Obama rather than white candidate John McCain in much greater proportion than White Democrats.

Although Republicans are the dominant political party in Louisiana, Republicans have not elected any Black Republicans statewide, to Congress, or to the Legislature. All statewide officials and both U.S. Senators are white Republicans. The only Black member of the congressional delegation is a Democrat and was elected from a majority-Black district. All Black legislators in the Legislature are Democrats elected from majority-Black population districts, as shown in **Table R2** and **Table R3**. As shown in Table R2, the Black Democrats in the Senate are elected from districts that range from 53% to 75% in their Black populations.[7] As shown in Table R3, the Black Democrats in the House are elected from districts ranging from 52% to 88% in their Black populations.[8]

---

[6] *Id*. at 1, 16-17, 53.
[7] *See Rebuttal App.* at R. App. 2.
[8] *Id.* at R. App. 3.

A similar pattern holds for mayoral elections in Louisiana. **Table R4** reports the results of mayoral elections in Louisiana municipalities with a population of at least 10,000. The results reported in Table R4 show that there is not a single Black Republican mayor in the 28 municipalities included. The results reported in Table R4 additionally demonstrate that all Black mayors are elected in majority-Black cities.[9] For these jurisdictions, 70% of the mayors are Black, all Democrats.[10]

IV. Senate Factor 3: "The extent to which the state or political subdivision has used unusually large election districts, majority vote requirements, anti-single shot provisions, or other voting practices or procedures that may enhance the opportunity for discrimination against the minority group."

Defendants do not challenge my finding that the majority vote requirement in Louisiana impedes the opportunities for Black voters to elect candidates of their choice. They raise two other claims, neither of which withstands scrutiny. First, they claim that Louisiana adopted the majority-vote requirement only in response to the 1997 decision in *Foster v. Love*, 522 U.S. 67 (1997). This is incorrect. Louisiana adopted the majority-vote requirement in 1975, 22 years prior to *Foster*, in order to protect white incumbents from significant electoral challenges.[11] Louisiana's most famous runoff election occurred in 1991, six years before *Foster*. In that election, former KKK leader David Duke ran against the eventual winner, Edwin Edwards.[12] In his losing runoff, Duke still garnered 39% of the vote, including a majority of the white vote.[13]

---

[9] *Id.* at R. App. 4.
[10] It is also worth noting that none of the 26 Republican candidates analyzed in the Alford report is Black.
[11] Chris Mooney, "Why Does Louisiana Have Such an Odd Election System," *Slate*, 13 November 2002, https://slate.com/news-and-politics/2002/11/why-does-louisiana-have-such-an-odd-election-system.html.
[12] Lichtman Initial Report, 15 April 2022, p. 39.
[13] "David Duke v. Edwin Edwards: A 1991 Election Reflection," *NOLA*, 13 November 2017, https://www.nola.com/300/article_e0a91c9b-122a-5150-8b78-81ffd66487bc.html.

Defendants also question whether the majority-vote runoff requirement in Louisiana was adopted with the intent to discriminate against Black voters. However, this challenge arises from their erroneous claim that Louisiana first adopted the runoff system in response to the 1997 *Foster* decision. In addition, the factor as worded does not consider whether a practice at issue was adopted with discriminatory intent. It only considers whether such a system exists in the jurisdiction under challenge and impedes opportunities for minority voters to participate in the political process and elect candidates of their choice. Defendants have presented no evidence to the contrary.

V. Senator Factor 4: "If there is a candidate slating process, whether the members of the minority group have been denied access to that process."

Defendants do not deny that, as a result of packing Black voters into one congressional district and submerging the rest into the remaining districts, slating becomes irrelevant for Black voters in congressional elections in Louisiana. The election of a Black candidate of choice is only possible in packed Congressional District 2 and otherwise precluded in the remaining five districts where White Republicans dominate.

VI. Senate Factor 5: "The extent to which members of the minority group in the state or political subdivision bear the effects of discrimination in such areas as education, employment and health, which hinder their ability to participate effectively in the political process."

Defendants do not deny that Blacks in Louisiana bear the effects of discrimination in these areas. They claim only that the socioeconomic disparities that resulted from such discrimination did not lead to lower Black than White turnout in Louisiana. I presented proof of such turnout disparities on page 37 of my opening report and in Table 13 in the report's Appendix.

Data presented in the Solanky report confirms the lower turnout of Blacks relative to whites in Louisiana. Solanky's Tables 2 and 4 on turnout by race in Louisiana are reproduced below. The data reported in Solanky's Table 2 for the 2020 presidential election in Louisiana shows that the

white turnout of 74.47% of registered voters exceeded the Black turnout of 63.1%, a difference of 11.4 percentage points. The data reported in Solanky's Table 4 for 2020 turnout by congressional district shows that white turnout exceeded Black turnout in every district. The differential ranged from 14.5 percentage points in CD 5 to 7.3 percentage points in CD 2 and CD 6, respectively.[14]

In addition, as I explained in my initial report, the effects of the documented socioeconomic disparities are not limited to turnout. Rather, the lack of resources for Blacks relative to whites in Louisiana affects other aspects of the ability of Black voters to have an impact on the political process. For example, such effects are manifest in racial differentials in the lobbying of public officials or the making of campaign contributions. As shown in **Table R5**, according to the 2020 Cooperative Congressional Election Study, a standard source for political analysis, 22.1% of White respondents in Louisiana reported contributing to a candidate, campaign or political organization, compared to 11.4% of Black respondents.[15] **Table R4** further shows that 22.9% of White respondents reported contacting a public official, compared to 8.3% of Black respondents.[16] Both sets of racial differences are statistically significant beyond stringent levels in social science.

VII. Senate Factor 8: "Whether there is a significant lack of responsiveness on the part of elected officials to the particularized needs of the members of the minority group."

Again, the defendants do not dispute the findings under this factor but suggest that the analysis is subjective and limited. However, I examine five policy areas under this factor that are standard in social science: education, health care, economic opportunity, criminal justice, and environmental opportunity. For each element, I explain the lack of responsiveness on the part of the state and the harm to Black residents of Louisiana. None of the Defendants' expert reports

[14] *See Rebuttal App.* at R. App. 5
[15] *Id.* at R. App. 6.
[16] *Id.* at R. App. 4.

point to any additional areas of analysis or ways in which the state has been responsive to the particularized needs of its Black residents.

VIII. Senate Factor 9: "Whether the policy underlying the state or political subdivision's use of such voting qualification, prerequisite to voting, or standard, practice, or procedure is tenuous."

The state claims that the rationale for its congressional redistricting plan is not tenuous because it conforms to constitutional requirements. However, none of the state's experts provide any analysis to demonstrate that it is constitutionally required to pack Blacks into one congressional district and submerge them into other white-dominated districts, where they cannot elect candidates of their choice. And although it does not address the issue of tenuousness, the report of Michael Hefner at least implies that the state plan has the following rationale: it "preserves communities of interest while using the other traditional redistricting criteria." But there are serious problems with Hefner's analysis.

First, Hefner does not define communities of interest with sufficient specificity for his analysis. He states, "Because of that self-identification, there is no set standard for a community of interest. Criteria that bind people together into a cohesive unit vary from one group to another as are set by the group. The specificity of the issues shared by a community of interest also can vary by level of geography." *See* Hefner Report at 4. He does list some general categories of assessing communities of interest: "Communities of interest are formed by people, often within a geographic or a defined area, that self-identify themselves with others who share similar traits based on political issues, culture, economic, occupation, religion, or local traditions." *Id.*

Rather than pursuing a detailed analysis of these factors for Blacks and whites in the congressional districts of Louisiana, Hefner relies on overly broad criteria for assessing communities of interest: the five distinct regions that have been identified by the Louisiana Regional Folklore Program ("LRFP"). These regions are far too broad to be of use for analyzing

communities of interest within Louisiana's congressional districts. As Hefner's Map 4 on page 11 of his report shows, Louisiana's enacted congressional districts cut across these five wide regions. In addition, Hefner's map validates the analysis in my initial report that to pack Black voters in Congressional District 2, the state created a highly non-compact district, violating one of the traditional redistricting principles. Moreover, with respect to redistricting principles, one of the standards in every state is conformance with federal law, including the Voting Rights Act.

Hefner's regions are not only far too expansive for an accurate assessment of communities of interest in congressional districts, but he fails to consider differences between groups within these districts, especially for Blacks and whites. An example is Region 5. This region is anchored by New Orleans and includes the parishes of Jefferson, Orleans, Plaquemines, St. Bernard, and St. Tammany. Analysis shows that Blacks and whites in Louisiana have little in common and do not constitute a community of interest despite whether in the same region. My initial report already established that, across Louisiana, Blacks and whites differ sharply in their politics, their experience of discrimination, and the failure of the state to meet the particularized needs of Black people. Data specific to New Orleans show a gulf between Blacks and whites on other criteria that purportedly define a community of interest.

Table R6 demonstrates that although Blacks and whites live in New Orleans, they do not live in the same neighborhoods. Table R6 presents dissimilarity indexes for whites and Blacks in metropolitan areas of Louisiana as compiled by *Governing*, a standard source for state-level political and social analysis. The Black/White dissimilarity index measures the percentage of Blacks that would have to move to create integration within the metropolitan area. Table R6 demonstrates that New Orleans has a high degree of racial segregation with the dissimilarity index for New Orleans resting at 63.5%. That index is substantially higher than the national median of

52.6% and ranks New Orleans 35th of 233 metropolitan areas that *Governing* studied. The New Orleans index means that the 63.5% of Blacks in the city would have to move to create integration.[17]

Table R6 further demonstrates that racial segregation is not confined to New Orleans but characterizes other metropolitan regions in Louisiana, which would be included in the congressional districts across Louisiana. In six of the nine metropolitan areas studied, comprising 69% of the population of the areas, the dissimilarity index exceeds the national median. 54.3% to 63.5% of the Black population would have to move to create integration in all these areas. More than 42% of the population would have to move to create integration in two of the remaining three areas.

Segregation between Blacks and whites also applies to schools (K-12) in Louisiana. Hefner cites as an example of a community of interest: "parents of students attending a particular high school can constitute a community of interest centered around school issues and may be very specific." However, he does not study school segregation, and as shown in **Table R7** in New Orleans and elsewhere in Louisiana, Blacks and whites do not attend the same schools.[18]

The Black/White dissimilarity school index for New Orleans is 62.9%. That index is substantially higher than the national median of 54.5% and ranks New Orleans 64th of 242 metropolitan areas that *Governing* studied. The New Orleans index means that the 62.9% of Black students in the city would have to change schools to create school integration. High levels of school segregation are present in other metropolitan areas in Louisiana as well, particularly in Monroe (68.6%, 32nd of 242) and Baton Rouge (66.4%, 45th of 242). Overall, five of nine metropolitan

[17] *Id.* at R. App. 7.
[18] *Id.* at R. App. 8.

areas in Louisiana have school dissimilarity indexes above the national median. In six of nine areas, comprising 69% of the population, more than 50% of Black students would have to change schools to create integration.

Hefner did not study any congressional districts under the enacted plan to assess whether the Blacks submerged within majority-white districts share a community of interests with the whites in the districts. The data presented above indicate that they do not. Beyond differences in politics, historical and ongoing discrimination, and current experience with state policies, Blacks and whites across Louisiana do not live in the same neighborhoods or attend the same schools.

Table R8 further establishes significant differences across Louisiana for whites and Blacks. Blacks have different family structures than whites and work at different jobs. Relative to whites, Blacks have lower incomes, fewer assets, and lower educational attainment than whites. Blacks and whites, live in different kinds of housing, with Black home ownership rates lower than White rates.[19]

IX. Conclusion

It is my conclusion that, after an examination of materials presented by the Defendants, my findings and opinions as expressed in my opening report are unchanged regarding the presence of the Senate Factors when evaluating the totality of circumstances confronting Black voters in Louisiana.

Respectfully submitted,

Allan J. Lichtman

Allan J. Lichtman

[19] *Id.* at R. App. 9.

REBUTTAL APPENDIX

SENATE FACTOR 2

TABLE R1
RESPONSES BY PARTY TO LOUISIANA SURVEY QUESTION: "In general in our country these days, would you say that Black people are treated less fairly than White people, White people are treated less fairly than Black people, or both are treated about equally."

When voting in elections.				
Group	**Blacks Treated Less Fairly**	**Whites Treated Less Fairly**	**Both Equally Treated**	**Don't Know**
Republicans	**2%**	**7%**	**84%**	**6%**
Democrats	**58%**	**0%**	**35%**	**6%**
In hiring, pay and promotion at work.				
Group	**Blacks Treated Less Fairly**	**Whites Treated Less Fairly**	**Both Equally Treated**	**Don't Know**
Republicans	**16%**	**13%**	**62%**	**10%**
Democrats	**77%**	**2%**	**16%**	**4%**
When applying for a loan or mortgage.				
Group	**Blacks Treated Less Fairly**	**Whites Treated Less Fairly**	**Both Equally Treated**	**Don't Know**
Republicans	**12%**	**5%**	**66%**	**17%**
Democrats	**71%**	**1%**	**20%**	**8%**
When seeking medical treatment				
Republicans	**5%**	**4%**	**80%**	**11%**
Democrats	**62%**	**2%**	**31%**	**5%**
Source: 2021 Louisiana Survey, Reilly Center for Media & Public Affairs, https://pprllsu.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/Louisiana-Survey-2021-Report-4-Crosstabs.pdf.				

TABLE R2
BLACK MEMBERS, LOUISIANA STATE SENATE, PARTY, BLACK POPULATION PERCENT

STATE SENATE DISTRICT	PARTY	BLACK POPULATION PERCENT
2	DEMOCRAT	53%
4	DEMOCRAT	54%
14	DEMOCRAT	55%
24	DEMOCRAT	55%
3	DEMOCRAT	58%
7	DEMOCRAT	59%
34	DEMOCRAT	66%
39	DEMOCRAT	66%
15	DEMOCRAT	75%
MEAN BLACK POPULATION		60%
MEDIAN BLACK POPULATION		58%

Sources: Louisiana Secretary of State, Elected Officials, State Senate, https://voterportal.sos.la.gov/ELECTEDOFFICIALS; Ballotpedia for the black percentage for each district.

TABLE R3
BLACK MEMBERS, LOUISIANA STATE HOUSE, PARTY, BLACK POPULATION PERCENT

STATE HOUSE DISTRICT	PARTY	BLACK POPULATION PERCENT
93	DEMOCRAT	52%
67	DEMOCRAT	52%
23	DEMOCRAT	55%
83	DEMOCRAT	55%
96	DEMOCRAT	56%
21	DEMOCRAT	56%
11	DEMOCRAT	57%
40	DEMOCRAT	58%
87	DEMOCRAT	60%
57	DEMOCRAT	61%
97	DEMOCRAT	62%
44	DEMOCRAT	63%
58	DEMOCRAT	63%
102	DEMOCRAT	66%
16	DEMOCRAT	66%
2	DEMOCRAT	67%
26	DEMOCRAT	68%
17	DEMOCRAT	68%
34	DEMOCRAT	69%
101	DEMOCRAT	71%
4	DEMOCRAT	72%
99	DEMOCRAT	75%
61	DEMOCRAT	75%
63	DEMOCRAT	78%
29	DEMOCRAT	78%
100	DEMOCRAT	87%
3	DEMOCRAT	88%
MEAN BLACK POPULATION		66%
MEDIAN BLACK POPULATION		66%

Sources: Louisiana Secretary of State, Elected Officials, State Senate, https://voterportal.sos.la.gov/ELECTEDOFFICIALS; Ballotpedia for the black percentage for each district.

SENATE FACTOR 5

TABLE R4
RACE OF MAYORS, LOUISIANA MUNICIPALITIES WITH 10,000+ POPULATION

50%+ - BLACK	RACE MAYOR	PARTY	50%+ WHITE	RACE MAYOR	PARTY	COUNT
Baker	BLACK	DEMOCRAT	Mandeville	WHITE	REPUBLICAN	1
Opelousas	BLACK	DEMOCRAT	Sulphur	WHITE	DEMOCRAT	2
Monroe	WHITE	INDEPEND.	Central	WHITE	REPUBLICAN	3
New Orleans	BLACK	DEMOCRAT	Youngsville	WHITE	REPUBLICAN	4
Alexandria	BLACK	DEMOCRAT	Slidell	WHITE	REPUBLICAN	5
Shreveport	BLACK	DEMOCRAT	Morgan City	WHITE	REPUBLICAN	6
Natchitoches	BLACK	DEMOCRAT	Covington	WHITE	REPUBLICAN	7
Baton Rouge	BLACK		Broussard	WHITE	REPUBLICAN	8
Minden	WHITE	REPUBLICAN	Kenner	WHITE	REPUBLICAN	9
Gonzales	WHITE	DEMOCRAT	Lafayette	WHITE	REPUBLICAN	10
			Crowley	WHITE	REPUBLICAN	11
			Bossier City	WHITE	REPUBLICAN	12
			Gretna	WHITE	DEMOCRAT	13
			Pineville	WHITE	DEMOCRAT	14
			Thibodaux	WHITE	NO PARTY	15
			West Monroe	WHITE	REPUBLICAN	16
			New Iberia	WHITE	REPUBLICAN	17
			Zachery	WHITE	NO PARTY	18
SUM	10/7B 3W, 70% BLACK 30% WHITE			18/0B, 18W 0% BLACK 100% WHITE		
Sources: U.S. Census Quick Facts; Individual web sites: Louisiana Secretary of State, "Elected Officials: Mayors," https://voterportal.sos.la.gov/ELECTEDOFFICIALS.						

Table 2: Race Summary for November 2020 General Elections

Race	Voted in Elections		
	NO	YES	Total
BLACK	356231 36.90%	609134 63.10%	965365
OTHER	68799 39.30%	106256 60.70%	175055
WHITE	498560 25.53%	1454024 74.47%	1952584
Total	923590	2169414	3093004

**Reproduced from Dr. Tumulesh K.S. Solanky's Report*

Table 4: Voting Summary and Race by Congressional District for November 2020 General Elections

CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT	Race	Voted in Elections =YES		Total Registered Voters
		Count	Percent of Total Registered Voters	
1	**BLACK**	42993	63.44	67765
	OTHER	30566	65.14	46924
	WHITE	322564	75.64	426439
2	**BLACK**	206416	63.97	322664
	OTHER	24436	58.79	41564
	WHITE	117609	71.24	165100
3	**BLACK**	75774	60.62	124996
	OTHER	12433	56.18	22131
	WHITE	271338	72.98	371806
4	**BLACK**	99509	61.39	162092
	OTHER	12588	58.03	21692
	WHITE	219946	73.48	299323
5	**BLACK**	97595	59.75	163340
	OTHER	8101	56.06	14451
	WHITE	231678	74.21	312190
6	**BLACK**	86847	69.75	124508
	OTHER	18132	64.09	28293
	WHITE	290889	77.01	377726
All		2169414	70.14	3093004

**Reproduced from Dr. Tumulesh K.S. Solanky's Report*

TABLE R5
CONTACTING PUBLIC OFFICIALS, MAKING CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS, BY RACE LOUISIANA

Group	% Donating money to a candidate, campaign or political organization.	% Contacting a Public Official
Whites	**22.1%**	**22.9%**
Blacks	**11.4%**	**8.3%**
Source: Cooperative Congressional Election Study (CCES), 2020, https://cces.gov.harvard.edu/.		

SENATE FACTOR 9

TABLE R6
RESIDENTIAL SEGREGATION IN LOUISIANA METROPOLITAN AREAS

Metropolitan Area	Population	Dissimilarity Index	National Median	Difference With National Median	Count
New Orleans	1,271,845	63.5%	52.6%	+10.9%	1
Lake Charles	210,409	62.5%	52.6%	+9.9%	2
Monroe	202,138	62.3%	52.6%	+9.7%	3
Alexandria	153,922	57.0%	52.6%	+4.4%	4
Shreveport-Bossier City	393,406	56.4%	52.6%	+.3.8%	5
Baton Rouge	870,569	54.3%	52.6%	+1.7%	6
Lafayette	478,384	47.0%	52.6%	-5.6%	7
Houma-Thibodaux	209,277	42.3%	52.6%	-10.3%	8
Hammond	136,765	36.1%	52.6%	-16.5%	9

Source: *Governing*, "Residential Segregation for U.S. Metropolitan Areas," 10 January 2019, https://www.governing.com/archive/residential-racial-segregation-metro-areas.html.

TABLE R7
SCHOOL SEGREGATION IN LOUISIANA METROPOLITAN AREAS

Metropolitan Area	Population	Dissimilarity Index	National Median	Difference With National Median	Count
Monroe	202,138	68.6%	54.5%	+14.1%	1
Baton Rouge	870,569	66.4%	54.5%	+11.9%	2
New Orleans	1,271,845	62.9%	54.5%	+8.4%	3
Lake Charles	210,409	60.4%	54.5%	+5.9%	4
Shreveport-Bossier City	393,406	57.2%	54.5%	+2.7%	5
Alexandria	153,922	53.2%	54.5%	-1.3%	6
Houma-Thibodaux	209,277	46.0%	54.5%	-8.5%	7
Lafayette	478,384	43.0%	54.5%	-11.5%	9
Hammond	136,765	39.6%	54.5%	-14.9%	9

Source: *Governing*, "School Segregation for U.S. Metropolitan Areas," 10 January 2019, https://www.governing.com/archive/school-segregation-dissimilarity-index-for-metro-areas.html.

TABLE R8
BLACK AND WHITE DIFFERENCES, SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC FACTORS, LOUISIANA

MEASURE	BLACK	WHITE
FAMILY HOUSEHOLDS*	59.4%	65.7%
FEMALE HEADED HOUSEHOLDS*	28.5%	10.4%
MARRIED PERSONS 15+ YEARS*	26.3%	50.8%
COLLEGE GRADUATES*	17.2%	28.9%
EMPLOYED, MANAGEMENT, BUSINESS, SCIENCE*	26.5%	40.4%
EMPLOYED SERVICE*	29.5%	14.4%
MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME*	$32,782	$61,697
PER CAPITA INCOME*	$19,351	$34,690
FOOD STAMP RECIPIENT*	27.0%	8.6%
POVERTY RATE, PERSONS*	29.4%	12.7%
HOUSEHOLD ASSET POVERTY RATE**	34.9%	18.6%
NET WORTH OF HOUSEHOLDS**	$17,000	$96,510
HOUSEHOLDS, NO BANK ACCOUNT**	28.3%	6.3%
PERCENT OWNER OCCUPIED	49.0%	76.6%
NO VEHICLES AVAILABLE	16.4%	4.7%
Sources: * U.S. Census American Community Survey, 2019; ** Prosperity Now Scorecard, 12 September 2021, https://scorecard.prosperitynow.org/.[1]		

[1] Prosperity Now is a nonpartisan, independent research organization founded in 1979. It launched its first scorecard on the states using standard sources in social science, including for example, the American Community Survey, and the U.S. Census Survey of Income and Program Participation, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the Mortgage Bankers Association, the Kaiser Family Foundation.

APPENDIX 1 (Table of Cases as Litigation Expert)

CASES 2015-2022

In The Matter Of 2022 Legislative Districting Of The State Of Maryland (Maryland Court of Appeals), 2022

Szeliga v. Lamone (Maryland Circuit Court, Anne Arundel County), 2022

LULAC v. Pate (Iowa District Court, Johnson County), 2021

McConchie v. Illinois State Board of Elections (U.S. District Court, Illinois), 2021

City of South Miami v. DeSantis (U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Florida), 2020

Bruni v. Hughs (U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Texas), 2020

NAACP v. Cooper (U.S. District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina), 2019

Jason Gonzales v. Michael J. Madigan (U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois), 2019

Anne Harding v. County of Dallas, (U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Texas), 2018

Pico Neighborhood Association v. Santa Monica (State Superior Court, California), 2018

Benisek v. Lamone, (U.S. District Court, Maryland), 2017

Arizona Democratic Party v. Reagan (U.S. District Court, Arizona), 2017

Perez v. Abbott (U.S. District Court for the Western District of Texas), 2017

Terrebonne Parish NAACP v. Jindal (U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Louisiana), 2017

Feldman v. Arizona Secretary of State (U.S. District Court for the District of Arizona), 2016, 2017

Covington v. North Carolina (U. S. District Court Middle District of North Carolina) 2016

One Wisconsin Institute v. Nichols (United States District Court for the Western District of Wisconsin) 2016

Lee v. Virginia State Board of Elections (United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia) 2016

League of Women Voters v. Detzner, (Circuit Court for the Second Judicial Circuit, Leon County, Florida) 2015

North Carolina State Conference of the NAACP v. McCrory (U. S. District Court Middle District of North Carolina) 2015