REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: I was asked to start the meeting at 10:00 a.m. Just want to make it clear, I was here at 9:30. Just sort of pro tem and all of them are very clear. Madam Secretary, can we call a roll?

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Chairman Stefanski. Vice Chairman Duplessis.

REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Present.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Present. Representative Beaullieu. Representative Wilford Carter.

REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: Here.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Present. Representative Deshotel.

REPRESENTATIVE DARYL ANDREW DESHOTEL: Here.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Present. Representative Farnum.

REPRESENTATIVE LES FARNUM: Here.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Present. Representative Gadberry.

REPRESENTATIVE FOY BRYAN GADBERRY: Here.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Present. Representative Hodges.

REPRESENTATIVE VALARIE HODGES: Here.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Present. Representative Horton.

Hearing Exhibit
PR-64
3:22-cv-00211-SDD-RLB

REPRESENTATIVE DODIE HORTON: Here.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Present. Representative Ivey. Representative Jenkins.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Present.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Present. Representative Mike Johnson.

REPRESENTATIVE MIKE JOHNSON: Present.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Present. Representative LaCombe. Representative Lyons.

REPRESENTATIVE RODNEY LYONS: Present.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Present. Representative Magee.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Present.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Present. Representative Newell. Representative Thomas.

REPRESENTATIVE POLLY THOMAS: Here.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Present. Representative White.

REPRESENTATIVE MALINDA WHITE: Present.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Present. 11 members. Representative Ivey is present and Chairman Stefanski is present. 13 members in the quorum.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: All right. Thank you Mr. Vice Chair for getting it started, I've run a few minutes late. We're going to go ahead and start with

HB15. I believe it is Representative Jenkins so we can kind of pick up where we left off.

[OVERLAY]

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Representative Jenkins, we're ready.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: All right. Good morning Mr. Chairman and members. I have an amendments that I'd like to offer and put this bill in its proper posture and I will offer those amendments throughout and then I can go through and highlight what the amendments are.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Yeah, no problem. So members, we have amendments 85 in your packet. It looks like one, two, three, all the way to seventeen. Seventeen different amendments. Representative Jenkins wanted you to just hit on those amendments if you can, one by one, kind of telling us what you're trying to do so we can better understand. Members, as part of that amendment packet, you do have the maps that you can view as well that show you some of the proposed changes.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: All right. Thank you Mr. Chairman. Members, when we met and reviewed the bill on Tuesday, a number of you reached out to me and asked me to take a look at some concerns that you

had and we did do that so I do have these amendments said. Let me summarize basically what the amendments do so that we won't have to go back through the entire bill. One of the amendments is an amendment to House District 62. What we've done with House District 62 is effectively make that a majority-minority district voting age population, white 45, black 51. That was a concern I know came from Representative Carter and we want to make sure that we address every concern that came along. It would involve East Feliciana Parish, East Baton Rouge Parish. I did meet with the representatives for those house districts and to their credit, they indicated that if we could move forward with adding an additional majority-minority seat and this is something that we should do.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Similar to what I did, right?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Very much similar to what you did.

[00:05:00]

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Was that decision made based off of what I did?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: It's very close. Maybe just a couple of precints different, but --

1 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: But was the decision to
2 create a new majority-minority district there based
3 off of what I created?
4 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: In your map?
5 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Yeah.
6 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: In the map that you
7 have?
8 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: In my proposal, yes.
9 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Yes, very much so.
10 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: So you made that
11 decision to create a new majority-minority district
12 based on HB14 and the contents of that map?
13 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I want to make sure
14 I understand your question. If the question is that
15 we follow the pattern of the district, yes, but there
16 were concerns that came from this panel about the
17 fact that if another majority-minority district could
18 be created then go back and look at your map and do
19 it -- I think Representative Carter brought it up, so
20 we want to go back and address all of the concerns
21 that came from this panel when we talked this up on
22 Tuesday, but now, the --
23 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: But in your original
24 bill, as HB15 is currently constructed without this
25

amendment that new majority-minority district does not exist, correct?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: That is correct.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Okay.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: That is very much correct.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: So I just kind of asking you about why you know -- so your thought process on why you would create that? Was it based on the fact that I did had in the speaker's map and so you thought that was a good idea? I'm just throwing it up.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: No, no, not exactly.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Okay.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Let me try to explain as best I can.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Okay.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: All right. When I brought my original bill, go back and remember, my approach was to try to put together on an HB15 a bill with an approach to be as less disruptive as we possibly could to existing districts. When we went through this process on Tuesday with the original bill, there are number of concerns that came from this committee and Judge Carter brought up the

concern that it was only 29 minority district, can you create another minority district? And I hope everybody [INDISCERNIBLE 00:06:58] I said, yes. I saw where another minority district was created. I've seen where that can be done. So what I did was went back to address that concern and create that district in this House Bill 15. So that's how that really came about.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Okay. If we continue on that thought process -- so okay, let me ask you this, if we were to create a new majority-minority district in this state, it seems you agree with me where it should be located. One of the areas, list one of the areas.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Yeah. I want to be careful with that because you have good question and I have to be careful with your questions. I freak out with your questions. With all due respect, I'm just simply saying now, okay. Mr. Chairman and members, if we could create five more majority-minority districts, I think we should do it. I think if you could create some additional districts, you should do it.

1 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: But is that what you're
2 doing in this case? Are you creating five new ones as
3 part of this amendment?
4 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: No sir. I'm creating
5 one. I'm creating that one district which would be
6 House District 62.
7 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Which would seem to be
8 you agreeing with me. It would seem, I mean, if I was
9 just an outsider and I look and I go, well, he's
10 offered basically exactly what the chairman did, he
11 would agree that that's the right place to put a new
12 majority-minority district.
13 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Among the districts
14 that could be created. That solely could be one that
15 should be considered. For my bill, that sort of what
16 we are considered.
17 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: That's what you
18 considered, okay.
19 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Right. Let's not
20 just say that this is too some exclusion of other
21 areas where some minority-majority districts can be
22 created. I'm not trying to say it's not just be
23 limited.
24 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: No, no, but in this
25 specific case, with the amendment you're proposing,

you've made the decision that you believe this is the right place to put it.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Right. Once again, that was based upon the fact that I spoke with the representatives in that area and to their credit, they felt like if we could create one there then we should create one there. That's possibly the rationale here.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: It sounds like there is generally consensus that that's where a new majority-minority district should be.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Among those that could be created, yes, I guess this could be one of them.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: You're offering it, I did not offer your amendment.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I'm trying to be as clear as I can.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Okay.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: As it relates to House Bill 15. This is why we went back and created this district but I'm trying to be equally clear that I'm not saying that this majority-minority districts or additional loss could not be created in other areas of the state. I have actually seen some

1 illustrative maps that try to achieve that but for
2 purpose of House District 15, this is what we offer.
3 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Yeah. This is what
4 you're proposing today, correct? Okay. I'm going to
5 let you continue on, since you started with this, I
6 just want to keep the line of questioning on this
7 district so that it's probably easier for everybody
8 to keep up.
9 [00:10:01]
10 I'm looking, if your amendment was adopted, it
11 would create House District 62 with the BVAP of
12 51.026.
13 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Great.
14 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Do you believe the
15 district joined in this geographic region would allow
16 the minority community to elect a candidate of its
17 choice?
18 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Yes.
19 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: You do. Okay. What do
20 you base that on?
21 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Well, I mean, if you
22 look to the east, there is a majority black seat and
23 they've actually elected a white democrat to
24 represent them. I think there are some similarities
25 from St. Helena coming over to West Feliciana, East

1 Feliciana and down to this area of East Baton Rouge.
2 I think with what we have done and picked up that
3 population in East Baton Rouge, which is mostly
4 majority black, the outcome could definitely a
5 situation where people can elect a candidate of their
6 choice.
7 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Okay. I'm just a little
8 concern because the comparison you used as an
9 adjacent district that has produced a non-minority in
10 that position.
11 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: That is correct.
12 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Okay, and you expect
13 similar results in this one.
14 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I'm not saying
15 similar results. I'm saying there obviously a desire
16 either way, be it majority black or otherwise to try
17 to elect a candidate of their choice. So I'm simply
18 saying by forming this particular district and if the
19 question is, do I feel like that 51% is enough for
20 them to be able to elect a candidate of their choice,
21 I'm saying, yes.
22 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Okay.
23 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I pattern it on what
24 I visually see what's going on in this area today.
25

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Okay, that's good. Have you conducted any voting analysis to determine whether or not that would be effective?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: No. I have not conducted any kind of voting analysis or anything in that nature but we do feel like these numbers can produce a candidate of their choices.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Is that based on just your opinion? You elaborate a little bit so I don't want put words in your mouth. To me, you're telling me, you based that on the fact that there is an adjacent majority-minority district next to it and that's what you kind of model this.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: And they elected a candidate of their choice when they certainly could have elected -- they could have done otherwise if they wanted to. So the point that I'm simply making here is that I think if you look at this area and make up that particular district, I don't see any reason why the voters in that area cannot elect a candidate of their choice.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: One more follow-up. I'm sorry, I'm flipping through. All your numbers are obviously new now should this amendment get adopted and so I'm just sifting through some of those. So

since you are basing this off of District 72, which would be the adjacent majority-minority district, are you aware that the new District 62 numbers are actually lower than the BVAP of that adjacent district.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Does that give you any calls for concern since you're basing it on that adjacent district, but you haven't put those two numbers above or equal to and I'm talking about BVAP.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: It does not give me Mr. Chairman any overrating concern and if we went forward with District 62 with the vote age population that we have, the voters in that area can elect a candidate of their choice.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: But that's based on your opinion, not any voting analysis, correct?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Partially yes. Like I said, you have --

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Well, your opinion is a good one. I'm not saying it's a bad thing, I'm just asking the question.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I'm saying partially yes. I just feel like the numbers can work. I don't see any reasons why they should not work and as I say

it, from my point of view, that if you have a majority black seat and voters in that area does not too far away, the majority black seat is willing to elect a candidate of their choice and that person could be white, okay. I don't see why this should be problematic for someone to exempt that voters in this particular area can elect a candidate of their choice.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: But that's based on your opinion, correct?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Partially.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: What else is it based on?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Based on these numbers --

[00:15:00]

-- and based on what I see happening in the area already. You have a black candidate representing House District 63 already and we've taken some of that population and added into House District 62, so I'm not seeing why that would be some overrating concern as to why those person would not able to come out and vote.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: No, I understand that. I'm not disregard -- honestly, isn't a tricky

1 question. I'm just asking you. So if you haven't done
2 any voting analysis to determine that you're basing,
3 like this is you looking at the numbers and your
4 opinion of what you think is going to happen, right?
5 If it's not, what else is it based on besides you
6 viewing the numbers and the region in making that
7 decision. I'm just trying to --
8 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Mr. Chairman, we are
9 not done in this, we have deep pockets and resources
10 that some of you may have to do some of this but we
11 are looking at what we feel to be numbers and based
12 on historical archives that we've seen, okay. That
13 people have given the opportunity, they will come out
14 and vote and try to elect a candidate of their
15 choice. I just gave you a comparison that I felt
16 should be helpful to that analysis. If you got a
17 majority black district just on a couple of parishes
18 east of here, that could elect someone black and they
19 elected someone white and I don't have any problem
20 with that, okay, none at all. I'm just simply saying,
21 why are we so overly concerned that black folk in
22 this district can't come out and elect somebody to
23 represent them.
24 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: I'm just asking
25 questions.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: No, I'm just putting out as best I can. Why we would be so concern that black folk would not have an opportunity in this particular district to come out and elect a candidate of their choice. I believe that they can.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Let me ask you another question about the geography. I noticed that you included two precincts you removed or rather removed -- let me correct myself. I noticed that in your submittal, East Feliciana is not whole. Would you consider East Feliciana a community of interest?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Yes. I think we -- look at that. What those two precints?

EDWARD WISHAM: Actually, those two precints that you referring to -- when I was working with staff last night, we actually all were supposed to be in -- I just noticed that this morning when I look at it, but originally those two precints were supposed to be all in East Feliciana. Those previously were in 72 because he asked that they be in 72.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Who asked?

EDWARD WISHAM: The representative.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Okay.

EDWARD WISHAM: While we were doing our original map, that was part of what -- when we talked to him. He wanted that.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: And when you say the representative, you mean the representative of District 72?

EDWARD WISHAM: District 72, correct.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Okay.

EDWARD WISHAM: And so that's what the changes. Now, in reference to two, you are asking about the different communities that this district. If you look at the demographics of 72, most of that is rural until I get it to Hammond, it's a different type of communities there but this new proposed district comes through Baker, certain part is Zachary that are more urban and they have already elected a minority candidate. 63, it also takes part of 29, which is a majority-minority district already. I know we don't have the analysis because I really don't have time doing it.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: I understand.

EDWARD WISHAM: But I've been dealing with those areas forever. And as for as myself, I know what the turn out has been and how they've been driven based on the past election.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Yeah. I think you have certain level of expertise in being a demographer and understanding so I can appreciate that.

EDWARD WISHAM: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Representative Jenkins, I'm sorry, I diverted you greatly off of where you're going to your amendments, but I will allow you to continue or to collect your thoughts for you start again on explaining the rest of the amendments.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: It's not a problem. Any questions you're going to have for me on these amendments, I think it's important that we work it through. Another area that we had to look at and another concern that came up was with House District 75. I think the desire there from the representative was to make sure that that district composed of only Washington Parish so we make that adjustment. We make some adjustments to House District 65 also. There were some precints in House District 65 that representative in that area want it included -- we make those adjustments. House District 53 is a pretty significant area there that we needed to look at but we [INDISCERNIBLE 00:19:44] to accomplish making that adjustment by way of this amendment to add in those precincts in that area. House District 28, there was

concerned that I think when we did the original bill, we had the representative in about five different parishes, --

[00:20:00]

-- but we went back and adjusted that primarily now, so Avoyelles Parish and I think a portion of Evangelo.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Evangeline.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Evangeline Parish, okay. And then House District 34, we have an amendment in there at Precint 364. And then I reached out to the representative for House District 48 and I explained, it was going to take quite a bit more time to address what their concern was. I don't know what's going to happen today, but I have explained to him that you know if this bill move forward, we will certainly continue to work on --

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Representative Beaullieu's area.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Yeah. You would agree with me, that's a tough area, isn't it?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Yeah.

EDWARD WISHAM: Oh, definitely. That's the toughest area.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: We just run out of time you know the staff is working

very hard, but I got to understand it's just not me that they're trying to get things done for. We were able to get it started but in time for this meeting this morning, we would not able to just get it completed, but we are trying to make sure that that adjustment is made in any final bill that may go before the body. In essence, that's what the amendments do, Mr. Chairman. I welcome any questions from anyone on this room. I hope I'm not given the appearance that I want to talk about it but if it's something that you want to ask me in particular, let me know, but we believe that those were the concerns that came to us from the panel as well as from some other members of the body.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Understand. So it appears to be you're affecting District 18, 20, 25, 28, 29, 32, 34, 35, 38, 47, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 60, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66 67, 68, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 77, 86, 89, 95, and 104.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Yeah, you know when you move something to make an adjustment, it does

1 affect a lot of other areas, but I don't think we
2 demonstrably changed a lot of those areas. It may
3 have been some small changes in some of those areas.
4 So I don't want to spend a lot of time on it, but I
5 don't think we did anything to take anyone out of
6 deviational takeaway, anything from any of those
7 areas that someone really want to keep. But yes, once
8 you make a change, once you make a tweak, it affects
9 a lot of different areas.
10 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: And I was just
11 highlighting the fact that it was more -- and I know
12 you pick the high points, I was just pointing out
13 that it's a lot of district, just a pretty voluminous
14 amendment that's going to have some dramatic changes
15 throughout the state. Would you agree with that?
16 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Yes. I think
17 anything we have done here today is going to have
18 some pretty dramatic changes.
19 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Okay. One comment I do
20 have is that it does appear in several of these areas
21 that you really have mirrored a lot of the districts
22 in House Bill 14 by the speaker. Do you have any
23 comments or are you in agreement with that?
24 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: That could be true
25 and I go back to what I see in the original bill. We

have an approach on this Mr. Chairman where we're coming in and we would just trying to show a different approach basically to the redistricting. What we wanted to try to do was [INDISCERNIBLE 00:23:24] the population in North Louisiana by sending District 5, the loss of population in North Louisiana by sending District 5 down to New Orleans where it has some gains in population. We were trying to keep House District 23, which has been the subject of much discussion. Trying to keep that area whole as best as we can and was trying to be as least disruptive as we possibly could have been to existing lines. So the product were you know some similarities, but those were some distinctions that we had because in House Bill 14, we actually dismantled House District 23. In our opinion, we sent people into some majority districts that would dilute their voting strength and we just want to make sure that we had another approach that we could look at. Now, all of this is very fluid situation as you know and it's my heart's desire that at the end of this process as we call it that maybe we can all get on one bill, one page and then try to get it done, but it's difficult getting there if we only have one instrument and that's one of the reasons why we want

to bring forth at least a different approach with House Bill 15, but I do think these amendments making a better bill and if someone has something else they want to add to make it better, we certainly would entertain it.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Okay, but would you deny that if these amendments are adopted, many of these house districts will look very very similar to House Bill 14. I'm not saying all and I think you were very clear that there are some differences, I'm not saying that.

[00:25:01]

But many of the amendments that you have made mirror exactly what the speaker and I've done In-House Bill 14. Would you agree with that?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Yeah. Many of them do, Mr. Chairman. Like I said, but they, you know, I just touched about what I think is the differences.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: The differences. And I understand that. You've been very clear that there are differences. If this amendment is adopted, do you believe this proposal in House Bill 15 will be legal?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: And you know you asked me that question Tuesday, okay? You know, and

I'm not trying to get about legal opinion on House Bill 14.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: I'm not asking for opinion just the yes or no to "is it legal?"

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Well, it could be better but I certainly do think that by adding this amendment it helps to the legal arguments so that it guarantee us that they could come up with the Bill. Any Bill could be challenged legally.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Oh of course. No. No, I'm not. I'm not saying I certainly did not purport to say that do you believe if this amendment is adopted your Bill could never be challenged. That wasn't my question at all. You just look at, you, I am not going to put words in your mouth but I mean, you wouldn't submit a Bill and ask this body to prove something that you didn't believe was legal, would you?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Well no. I wouldn't and so my point--

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: So you believe this map? If these amendments are adopted, the map is legal?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Certainly. I think it makes it a better Bill. I think it helps with any

1 kind of legal challenge that may come up, I think it
2 would help.
3 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Okay, good. And do you
4 believe that this amendment is adopted especially
5 with the changes that you have made to these areas?
6 Do you think that with these, let's just talk about
7 your amendments. The amendments that you're
8 proposing, do you believe in those districts? Just
9 those districts that are affected, that's a fair
10 representation of Louisiana?
11 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Okay. Do you mind
12 repeating that question?
13 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Sure. In just the
14 districts that I listed, the amendments you're
15 changing and the amendments to the districts and the
16 changes you're making, do you believe what you've
17 done there is a fair representation of Louisiana? I'm
18 not talking about the whole map, just these
19 amendments that you're offering today.
20 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: It could be better
21 but what we did try to do was address the concerns
22 that came from this panel. I mean, that's primarily
23 of what we're trying to do with these amendments.
24 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Sure.
25

1 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: But it could be
2 better. I'm not, you know, I'm just trying to be
3 clear. I don't think that House Bill 15 is perfect in
4 any way. I think, you know, what we could be doing is
5 looking at moving all the districts, looking at, you
6 know, better ways to keep communities of interest
7 together. I mean, it's going to be a lot of different
8 concepts that could come into play but I'm simply
9 just saying at this particular point and stage, I
10 believe these amendments make the Bill better.
11 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Yeah.
12 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: And I think it will
13 certainly help with the process as we go forward, you
14 know to have some options between 14, 15 and any
15 other Bill that come forward to see if we can all
16 come together. Maybe at some point on a single
17 instrument that we all could agree upon. I know that
18 may be wishful thinking but nothing is impossible.
19 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: No, I agree. And I
20 commend you for the work you've done on this. I know
21 firsthand how incredibly difficult these things are
22 and you're exactly right. Every change makes a change
23 in everywhere else. I'll just comment one last time
24 on many of the similarities I'm saying, you know, in
25 what you're proposing in House Bill 14. So, it would

appear in the changes that you're making you agree that that's the right approach for those districts. Would you agree with that?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: With the exception now, you know and I think we cannot ignore what I believe to be a critical difference. You know, what, and it's been the subject of much discussion. I think we really need to look at why are we approaching House District 23, we're doing that differently. I think we need to look at how we're approaching House District 5, you know, there's some differences that we need to look at and I do think you know that carries a lot of weight when you start talking about the comparison has to take place between House Bill 14 and 15. You know, I commend you are on House Bill 14. We've had many conversations about it. From my conversation with many members on both sides of the house, they like what they see in House Bill 14. I have no problems with my District in House Bill 14, if you really want to know the truth, okay? But I do think when you look at the entire geography and the impact that may come out of our redistricting process, we have to look at what we're doing with 23, we have to look at what we're doing with our House District 5 and I believe we do have to look at what

we're doing as far as adding minority districts, a majority-minority districts as we move forward in this process.

[00:29:58]

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: And I guess I'll just one last time where you have districts whose precincts are exactly the same as House Bill 14, would you agree that that's the right approach for those districts? Just those districts I'm not talking about everything else is going on the state. Where you have amended, if this amendment is adopted, where the districts are exactly the same as House Bill 14, would you agree that's the right approach?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: It could. I mean, the best answer I could give you on that Mr. Chairman and I know you may not like it, I think any of this could be better. I really do.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Sure, but why would you offer an amendment Representative Jenkins, if you don't agree with that that's the right approach?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: No, I didn't say it was not the right approach.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Well, that's what I asked you.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I'm simply saying it's a part of a process.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Yeah, I know and I understand it's a long process.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Option of part of a process. If I had my way, I mean yeah that could be other ways to do this and maybe other people have a better way to do it. But I'm simply saying with House Bill 15, this is just one part, another part, another approach that we can look at to redistricting in the state of Louisiana.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: I understand.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Any of it could be better. House Bill 14 could be better.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: I got it so what I would interpret that statement is saying though is that you don't necessarily agree with all of these amendments. This is just a--

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Whatever amendment that I have here, with the ones that we just went over?

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: You're in full agreement?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Yeah, I don't have any problem with.

1 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: And you think that's
2 the right approach?
3 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: To the
4 redistricting?
5 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: No, no, just to the
6 amendments. Yes sir, just the Districts that were
7 talking about in these amendments.
8 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Alright. I agree.
9 It's the right approach of what we've done with House
10 District 62. I agree it's the right approach of what
11 we've done with House District 75, 65, 53, 28 and 34.
12 Once again I wish I could agree this morning about 48
13 but it's still a work in progress.
14 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Okay. What about House
15 District 18?
16 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: If we had to make
17 some changes there to accommodate these particular
18 concerns, you know, I would agree that in order for
19 us to have the entire geography, correct? Yes, 18
20 came out as best as we could get it.
21 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: And so--
22 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: On this particular
23 amendment.
24 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: I understand, I know
25 you, but I noticed you just picked a couple of the

1 districts where you said it was the right approach.
2 So, there are number --
3 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: But I thought you're
4 talking about the amendment but this --
5 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Yes, sir. No, no, in
6 the amendments there's a list of, there's about 20
7 districts that are affected and I know you picked a
8 couple and you said I agree with these. Do you not
9 agree with all the changes to all the districts?
10 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: The best as I could,
11 I mean any of this could be better, okay?
12 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Oh, I understand.
13 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Any of this could be
14 better but like I say, I have no problem with the
15 amendment that we're offering here.
16 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: And you support this
17 amendment and you think this is the right moves for
18 these districts?
19 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Absolutely, based
20 upon the comments that we received.
21 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Okay.
22 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Okay? I believe it
23 is now. I'll be the first to say with some of the
24 districts that we had to make some tweaks to in order
25 to accommodate this amendment I have not had direct

conversation with those representatives and I would like to keep the door open --

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: I understand.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: -- for this conversation that they came to me to say hey look, you did this in order to do that. Can you go back and look at this or that, I want to keep it open to be able to do it.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: But until that happens you believe this is the right approach?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: At this stage, yes.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Okay, thank you very much Representative Jenkins. I wasn't trying to be bad during, I really, look I -

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I don't feel that way.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: I really try to get into your head on the thought process because to me, I'll just make a general comment. I'll look at these and I'll go, wow he's just doing everything I did.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Okay.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: And I'm just being honest and I go, I must have done something right if he's if he's drawn all the districts for all these members exactly like I did.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: But Mr. Chairman, I say again. The only differences I saw I think I brought up.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: You have and you've highlighted that. You've made it very clear that there is a major difference between our two maps but for the rest of this state and all these other areas you tend to go boy John did a pretty good job. That's what it looks like to me.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Oh yeah.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: All right. All right, that's what I --

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I wouldn't disagree with you.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Mr. Pro Tem for a question.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Thank you. Mr. Chairman. Representative Jenkins. I assume this is obvious I'm just going to cover it though. You are the head of the democratic caucus, is that correct?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: And so just like you all said yesterday, this isn't just a map when you're referring to the speaker's Bill. Because of

your position, this Bill has a greater importance than just a regular one. Isn't that fair to say?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I believe the major concern here would be HB 14, that's the speaker's Bill. I believe that people on both sides of the aisle want to respect that simply because it is the speaker's Bill. I respect it because it's the speaker's bill.

[00:35:00]

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Right but you are in a position of leadership too though.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Yes, but you know, we'recomparing HB 14 and 15 an impact, from an impact standpoint. I believe, you know, people are going to look very, very critically at the speaker's Bill.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Sure. That's not my question.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Okay.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: My question is that I think on HB 1, I think it was one. The speaker said it was just a Bill and then he got a lot of pushback from this committee saying no, no, no, you're a leader. This has more significance and I think if we use that same logic to all leadership, if I filed a Bill, it has greater significance. The chairman files

a Bill, chairman files a Bill that that maybe has more significance. Not to say that every member is not the same and equal or anything like that but that was what was told back to -- this committee told back to the speaker the other day. So, I'm just actually reflecting what was said by most of the people on this committee. And is that a fair statement?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Now you're saying HB 1?

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: When a speaker came here and testify, he said this is just a Bills beginning our processes, he actually echoing a lot of things that you were also testifying to today. And at that time, the people in this committee pushed back and said, no, no, no, it's not just a bill, that's not correct. You're the speaker. This is a special Bill and that's fair and I understand that concept, but I'm also saying that you are head of the Louisiana Democratic caucus. You have been given a demographer on loan for the democrat party. Is it fair to say that this is more than just some regular old Bill coming from a regular old member?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I don't see anybody up here as a regular old member but I think I get your point, okay?

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: These are not the points I made, these are the points you all made. I'm just wondering if it applies to you as well or is it just the speaker's Bill? I'm just trying to draw to understand and I will grant you the speaker is maybe hired on that food chain but I'm trying to get a conception of are we looking at just, are we bringing approach to this? Or are we going to call it just a Bill and it's a process. Are we going to bring it? Which is what we start out saying or are we going to have greater significance being attached to the people of leadership because you are one. Is that fair?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Well, in so many words I think people, you know, people can look at it that way. They can certainly say that, you know, you know, this Bill is being bombed by the chairman of the house democratic caucus but I think if you look at the Bill, you know, it's authored by Representative Jenkins and you know, what we simply try to do with this Bill was just give another approach. I mean, that's really what we were trying to do.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Sure, I appreciate that and look I appreciate the work. I had an

1 opportunities to meet Mr. Wisham. I'm sorry if I
2 pronounce your name wrong.
3 EDWARD WISHAM: Oh, it is fine.
4 REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: The other day,
5 extremely nice and engaging and I appreciate all the
6 effort. So moving on from that. I did ask for you to
7 make some amendments to home and Terrebonne is that,
8 that's reflected in here, is that correct? The
9 District 53 is my district.
10 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: That's correct.
11 REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Look, I mean, on
12 District 53, I met with Representative Stefanski on
13 his Bill, on the speaker's Bill and you know, I took
14 a lot of pride in that. I didn't take, I didn't meet
15 with any consultants. I didn't meet with any
16 demographers. I didn't meet with anybody. I literally
17 went in there, me and Trish and John sat down and
18 said, I want to make this as fair of a district as
19 possible and just looking at the numbers and I will
20 share with you and I met with John and Ms. Lowry
21 privately like we all did and they said, what's your
22 goals in this? I said, I want to keep my district the
23 same and then they started laughing because everybody
24 says that but not the way you all think. I want to
25 keep the demographics of the same. I like that I have

a competitive District. I like that I have to work with different groups of people. I think it colors the way in the perspective I bring to this body. I want to keep that. I don't need the lines to be the same but I want to keep that. And so when we were going through this process, we actually made significant changes to my district. It now brings in communities of interest that had never been communities -- who have always been communities of interests but had never been brought together before at least in recent memory. It does not - it is no way drawing a line to protect me as an incumbent. In fact, it probably doesn't and then we released it and then I looked at, we came after, which is the fair districts map and the fair district maps almost echoes this completely. So, I said, I then must done a pretty good job and then you filed, and then your map came out and you had less black people in my district than my map did and I brought it up last time and said, I would like you to bring these numbers up and I think you got close. I think I'm still under Representative Stefanski's work in 14.

[00:40:00]

I think I'm might get 20% BVAP and I think maybe a little bit higher and I think 19 on your map. Is that fair to say?

EDWARD WISHAM: Correct.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Okay. That's correct.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Because I think all that being said, I think it's, I think which is close I'm very appreciative of what you all did. I'm not saying I'm not. I don't want to come off wrong. But I do still feel like minority representation is better under Chairman Stefanski HB 14 than it does still that it is under you're bringing it closer. Is that fair to say?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Yes, I mean I can understand your concern there for your district and we certainly tried to accommodate, you know, the points that you made to us, you know, as a concern so but once again, I will say and I don't know what may happen here today, you know, the Bill is still open for discussion. It's still open for input.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Sure. No, I know that and of all the maps that've been proposed I don't think I saw one and correct me if I'm wrong that had more minority representation in my District

then the one that than HB 14. I've not seen a map proposes done better than that.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Okay, it's 1% apart, is that what we're talking about?

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: No, no, look really what I'm trying to get here is that, out of all the maps that have been presented that nobody has been able with demographers, ACOU, NWCP, they have resources. Like I'm not -- this whole like pour me thing does not quite go all the way to me but they have resources. They poured into it and nobody has been able to do a map that increases minority representation and District 53 than what me and Representative Stefanski did and I think that's fair to say.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Right, I mean I don't have any criticism of that point that you're making.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: So, we can then all agree that as it pertains to District 53, this is probably the best we can do to increase minority representation District 53. Is that fair to say?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Well, if the map that Chairman Stefanski did and the map that I've done is like 1% each point apart, you know.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: It's close enough for me. I'm not picking that part.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I just don't know if that's a--

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: I think I'm commenting more on the efforts that we made in District, on HB 14 to get District 53 to this point that I am commenting on your map. I think you're close enough. I'm not going to -- all over percentage point. I might be able to work with you a little bit to get the lines. I think maybe better because I know the district but I think by just trying to say that and really what I'm trying to establish is that the map in HB 14 as it pertains to District 53 is probably the best we can do for a minority representation standpoint. Is that fair to say?

EDWARD WISHAM: Yes. I agree with you based on demographics of that area.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Thank you.

EDWARD WISHAM: Yeah, that's what I wanted to say. And I want to say this too also after we had the meeting yesterday. I have no problem with anybody criticizing what I do. I like things to be better and so everybody that spoke yesterday. I immediately after we left out, one thing, I want to speak and

1 introduce myself to you individually and also go back
2 and provide you with some of the product that you
3 asked for. And so that's why I know that I go and
4 fish in that area a lot over where you are. I'm glad
5 to know who the Rep is over there now so but that's
6 the kind of thing that I think that's been beneficial
7 about us sharing and doing.
8 REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Yeah. Absolutely.
9 EDWARD WISHAM: Yeah.
10 REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Now these are my
11 more general questions. The BVAP we talked about, do
12 we have to worry about be BVAP if the district has
13 shown a historically devote for minority candidate?
14 Is that something you have to worry about?
15 EDWARD WISHAM: That's my, in those areas like
16 that that we haven't did an analysis on I -- because
17 I do a lot of that. I mean, my job at the democratic
18 party is we're running the voter file one of them
19 that I contract with them and I see data all the time
20 and I'm involved in elections. I've actually been
21 doing this is 1991. So, I've gone through a lot of
22 elections and actually look at the trends from a
23 voting standpoint in a lot of these precincts. So, I
24 know that the voting age population says certain
25 things and I respect those numbers but also look on

the other side and look at how they actually perform when certain things or going on the ballot and when certain candidates on the ballot and how the turnout is.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Thank you for that. And look I think we're dancing around a lot or use Chairman's Stefanski but -- and I think you said it but just to be very clear. The amendments that you have proposed today make the Bill better, right?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I would agree.

EDWARD WISHAM: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: And it probably is a member-based approach to try and right size from these districts in ways that make sense, is that fair to say?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I would agree with that.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Thank you. I don't think I have any more questions. I think that is good for me.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Thank you, Mr. Pro Tem, for questions. Vice Chairman Duplessis.

VICE CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I don't know if I should call you Representative Jenkins or would I call you Mr.

Chairman. Are we doing -- is your Bill focused on the entire state or just house District 53?

[00:45:08]

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: No, we're trying to look at the entire state.

VICE CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Okay, because some questions were raised about increasing minority population in houses 253 which were valid questions but I've just want to step back a little bit. We are not just doing a map for house District 53. Are we?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: No.

VICE CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Okay, right because to increase minority population in house District 53, if that's the goal would that, would the inverse of that not be to decrease minority representation in an adjoining District nearby?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: You're correct. You'd have to go get those people from somewhere.

VICE CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Right. I just want to make that clear from the record. So, we're not just focused on one district. We're focused on an entire state. How many votes does it take to pass a Bill in this body?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: 53. Adjournal Bills. 53.

VICE CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: 53. So it was alluded to and the reason I said, I don't know if I should call you Chairman, those alluded to you being whether or not you're just a regular member of this body or what level of weight or influence any legislative instrument that you brought might have on this body. You said it takes 53 votes to pass a Bill. How many members are in your caucus?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: We have 34.

VICE CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: 34. Okay. How many members are in the caucus of leadership that -- who oath the House Bill 14?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: 67.

VICE CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Okay. All right.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Well, let me change it. I'm sorry. It's 68.

VICE CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Okay.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I'm looking at this amendment. It's 68, isn't that right? 68.

VICE CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Okay. Do you have the ability to hire or fire house legislative staff?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: No.

VICE CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Okay.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: They're looking at me as though they are glad. But no, to answer your question? No.

VICE CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Okay, do you have the ability to remove committee leadership and appoint committee leadership and develop ad hoc committees whenever you like?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: No.

VICE CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Okay. All right. Do you have the ability to enter into contracts with outside law firms to give you advice on redistricting?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: No.

VICE CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Okay. Were you aware that an outside law firm has been hired to give advice on redistricting?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I became aware of it really through the media but before that was done at, I wasn't aware, I wasn't consulted, I wasn't involved in that decision.

VICE CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Okay, so it's fair to say that your legislative instrument probably does not carry the same amount of weight that the House Bill 14 would.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Right. And I repeat again. That's the speaker's Bill. I think it's going to receive far more weight than HB 15.

VICE CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Okay going back to the speaker's Bill not just House Bill 14, but when the speaker presented on HB1 the congressional map, it was repeatedly saying that it was just one attempt. It was just his attempt to try to get us to a place. There's been a lot of discussion this morning about comparing maps. Who's maps goes further in an attempt to try to create minority districts, how close they are, how different they are. But if we put other instruments out there, we can look and see opportunities where there, none of us are demographers but we can see opportunities upon how we can improve all maps. Is that not correct?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Yeah, I would agree with that. Mr. Vice Chairman, you know. I alluded to this earlier in my comments that I think we need to be certain that we are letting all of our colleagues have an opportunity to see different routes to get to where we're trying to go. In hopes that maybe we can come together on one instrument.

VICE CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Prior to your Bill be at presented, your Bill has been cited by the

1 fact that it was simply filed as an instrument that
2 was out there. It was referenced oftentimes. Did you
3 know that another Bill has been filed by another
4 member of this body, another representative,
5 Representative Cedric Glover?
6 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Yes.
7 VICE CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Okay. And you saw
8 what his map did it created an additional minority-
9 majority seat in Caddo Parish?
10 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Yes
11 VICE CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Right. So, if we
12 took your amendments and combine them with House Bill
13 14 and we took what's Representative Glover is
14 proposing in his, that would in effect create how
15 many majority-minority districts? Have you done that
16 count?
17 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I want to say it
18 would end up being three.
19 VICE CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Right.
20 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: It should end up
21 being three.
22 VICE CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Okay. So, we see
23 a path and we see an opportunity in a way to get
24 their based upon all of the hard work by various
25 members of this body, right? It doesn't have to come

from just one instrument. We can amend these instruments to try to get us there, right? We see a pathway into doing this, is that correct?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: That's correct. You said it far more eloquently than I could Mr. Vice Chairman.

VICE CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Okay. Thank you for answering my questions.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: And I'm going to leave you on Representative Duplessis for a second because I just want to clarify and I know you weren't. So, I know you weren't insinuating that our staff is biased in any way, would you?

[00:50:01]

REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Staff?

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN M. STEFANSKI: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: In what way would I haven't seen you -- absolutely not but in what way --

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN M. STEFANSKI: Just to make it, but you said that you have the power to hire and fire staff.

REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: It was a yes or no question, but it made no reference to staff. My answer is unequivocally no, I do not believe that --

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN M. STEFANSKI: I understand and I knew that was true and I just wanted to make sure.

REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Okay. Thank you for making sure that everyone is clear about that, we have the best staff anywhere.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN M. STEFANSKI: And again, I wanted to be clear because I'm publicly saying I know that's not what you meant, I just want to make sure --

REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Yeah, I was making another point.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN M. STEFANSKI: I understand. Representative Carter for the question.

REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER SR.: Okay, we spent an hour trying to justify House Bill 14. We really didn't spend much time on House Bill 15. All the questions directed to -- like somebody trying to get a record in using court to say House Bill 14 is all this great thing. The thing, that's the best we can do. My concern is to --

[OVERLAY]

REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER SR.: You give me the staff and we have a very good staff, it's not to

say that our staff is bias, that's something you jump on when you got to, you seeks up a weakness.

This Bill 14 is I think was poorly done given the resources, okay? Poorly done. And the reason why it was poorly done, you got to start from the census. Why we here? Why are we here? Because we had a census in 2020 and the law requires that we apportion based on that census, okay? Now I was not here in 2010, but there was a reapportionment took place then. And so starting off you have a population -- a white population in state of 62% point something and 10,010 census and 10,020 census, if it's 57%, roughly 57%. The black population is 32% and 2020 is 33 point something percent, 33.1%. So the purpose of the census is to make sure we do as best job as we can to proportionate the seats in the House of Representative or any district to consistent with the population reflected in the state, okay? We got 4.6 million people in the state little over and so we're trying to proportion it, the house district to be as equal as possible to the population. That's just basic reason why we do this every 10 years. Now there was been population shifts, there was population shift from the North Louisiana and decrease in population, increase in south part of Louisiana. So

when you said, you gave the minority's another district, like Mr. Chairman like to say, I gave y'all district. He give us nothing. You created a district that they weren't to because of population, it's based on population, it's not based on being nice, it's how many people you have. So they had enough people in the southern part of the state, in the New Orleans area or whatever they -- I think it was. So they created another minority district. But at the same time, they took a minority district, District 23. Now, they had a choice, they could have took District 5 and the only reason why I say those two districts because both districts, I think have representatives that are term-limited, okay? So if you're going to take a district, it's pretty much common sense to try to deal with a district that's term-limited, okay? Not necessarily required, you know, but we tend to do that, but they chose to identify with their group, their group, White Republicans. So they say District 5.

[00:55:03]

Now they don't -- nobody will outright admit this but this is the result. So it's not always what you intend to do but what is the result of what you do? So in Section 2 Votes Right Act doesn't necessarily

say that you got 35%-33% of population, only have 35 representative, just off of the top of your head that don't mean that can happen, okay? Because there are other problems that created in trying to do that. The effort is to try to create it. Now, one way you do that is that you create these districts and you do studies to see what would be the likely outcome if you created this district, it maybe 53%, it maybe 52%, it maybe 60% but they are studies. They are formulas. Their experts have gotten a different type of program where they can study and see what the likely outcome is. [PH 00:55:59] Mayzel, you told us about this the other day and the NAACP lawyers, they got these studies and accepted by courts, okay? I didn't hear one of those studies that the speaker or the chairman said they conducted in order to study these districts. One of these basic studies that expert use in court been accepted in court, okay? So we started out with 75 -- well I don't know they got an Asian district, Latino districts out, I don't know. I don't think we have no district like that. We got basically black districts and white districts, okay? So out of 105 districts, House Bill 14 created 29, okay? They had 29 before and I think out of that 29, three all represented by whites, okay? Which I'm

1 going to wreck it. I don't have a problem who the
2 people who represent. As long as they have an
3 opportunity, like a person of their choice. If they
4 choice I would be a white candidate, I'm good with
5 that, okay? I don't have problem with that. But when
6 you start out with 29, you're trying to get to 35, in
7 10 years you hadn't made any progress. I think if I
8 had to access of the staff and the staff computer for
9 a couple of months, not a whole 10 years or one year,
10 or six months, a couple of months. I think I get more
11 than 32. Now, there is a bill that power coalition
12 presented that has 32 black districts. Your bill has
13 31? 30?
14 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: 30.
15 REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER SR.: 30. Well
16 what's important about your bill, what I like more --
17 I'm not crazy about your bill because your bill
18 affects my district in a more negative way than the
19 speaker's bill, okay? But how my district is affected
20 is not the issue here, okay? How the speaker pro tem
21 how many blacks got in this district, that's not the
22 issue, okay? The issue is how do you try to achieve
23 or equal representation of protected class. Whites
24 are not a protected class under Section 2, on the
25 Civil Rights Act, blacks are protected class, okay?

There are other protected classes, but you have enough numbers in order to get a district and you got enough blacks that have asked protected class, if you can show they got enough numbers to get a district, then you should get them that district, unless there's a good reason not to. So it's not the end result, it is the effort. How can you show the court that I taking this effort to try to get more minorities consistent with their numbers in the state that has not been shown to me in House Bill 14. You done a better job than they did, okay? But I think you can even more -- as you already indicated, get more than you have. So now you had yourself, you got access to staff when the leadership don't have, okay? You have this gentleman sitting next to you who's the [INDISCERNIBLE 00:59:15] by the Democratic Party. And so we have had assistance of the ACLU power coalition and NAACP Legal Defense Funds has helped us. I don't see nothing wrong with getting outside information to help you. If you got the money to do it, I don't have a problem but the leadership got outside assistance and they had a very good staff with a very good computer software. So I thought they could have done a better job or at least show me why they couldn't do better. Now, they've been spending a whole hour

trying to get you to say that that's the best thing can happen. 29. That ain't the case and you said that it's not necessarily the case. You got 30. If they have not taken 23 and destroyed 23 in favor of -- to try to deal with the reduction in population in the north, okay?

[01:00:11]

They went pretty much by and I'm not saying it's hard to understand why they did that. I understand what it did it. I'm not saying I wouldn't have done it if I was on the other side, but not what we think doesn't matter and what could be held up in court. I think it's challenged but by 14 is highly challengeable because of what they did, okay? They could have create least one black district just from what they did and they didn't give any detail information on how to try to create others, okay? I'm sure they're going to come with some, they're going to use your bill to try to tell a course, look, that's the best he can do. At least you did one better, okay? And there are some bills that do even more better. So compliance of Section 2 has not been made, okay? It been an epiphany in your part, I don't know if you made the who effort for Statewide, but I don't think it's sufficient to satisfy the

1 requirement of Section 2. Now, we pass, they had
2 these have you seen the statute we past when we say
3 it be going to set up the criteria is how we going to
4 do these are reapportionments. We passed a law, it's
5 a state law and in that law that says compliance
6 Section 2 in the Votes Right Act and I see no effort
7 to comply. We got the same thing we had last year
8 except we in population increased in the south, and
9 they gave us another district but they took one from
10 the north, okay? Do we know exactly who left the
11 north? How many people left? With 45, whatever number
12 of people left was reduced from the north and came
13 south or somewhere else. Can we really identify the
14 race of these people? Nobody have really done gone
15 that far with. We know districts have lost people but
16 we don't know what race they were where they lost.
17 District 23 lost people, okay? District 5 did not
18 lose people not to -- they were in the deviation. But
19 District 23 lost people. But you could have easily
20 salvage District 23 if you're not taking it away and
21 use another district to get your population from and
22 that's the difference so far in these two plus you
23 created more district and you tried to create more
24 districts. The leadership didn't try to create more
25 district. They created another district but they took

one away. So that's going to be a problem. And what they're trying to do right now is trying to make a record for court. And I'm trying to make a record for court in my way, the other way, okay? So I'm looking at -- did you get a chance to see the power coalition second submission?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: No I had not seen that one yet.

REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER SR.: Well I was looking at it this morning and I pull it up and they create 32 black districts, but there are some concerns, they affect 46 parishes, you know, split up 46 parishes, and they split up some communities, more communities. But if you start there and you really trying to do the right thing, comply with Section 2, then you try to work out some of these problems they have. Nobody have indicated they done that because I don't see no difference, except the population in the south and that was not given that happened because people move down there, okay? So we still have right now with 14, and you have -- we have 75 white districts and 29 black districts. I mean, 29 from 35, you know, they got seven, 76 really. Now, these districts can be closed and what I notice from what the ACLU was talking about, you get a 73% district

and when I first look at the 73 district I said, oh my God, I don't think I'm going to get elected in that 73 that district but if you look at all the past elections and you studied and there's some formulas you use, you can pretty much guess what degree of success a minority would have in that district, that's ways to do it. So all I'm saying is, I think we still got a problem with 14. I think we got some improvement with 15. I don't think 15 is going anywhere, but you know, I'm going to vote for it because it offers another opportunity to try to work toward trying to achieve a goal of making the state more equal, okay? If 57% of the people control 75% of the district or 76% of district, that's a start. It's a problem, okay? And so, we need to work on that a little bit just to make it fair, I'm not trying to take nothing from no group.

[01:05:05]

The statute does not even talk about. The Section 2 talks about groups. If there is a group, that has enough compactness, have enough population, and they have enough voting pattern that they vote the same that they can have a district and they like a person that charge do we ought to do that? I haven't seen

that effort was done more in your bill, none in 14, okay? And that's my concern is all I'm saying.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN M. STEFANSKI: Thank you Representative Carter. I just want to clarify, you know, from a staff perspective, we've sent out numerous emails, it's actually the first one was sent out when the malapportionment data came out offering to set appointments with staff and access to staff. So, you know, I reject the notion that me or anyone else has more access to staff than another member. There may not have been an effort made to access the staff and access that but it is not because of opportunity. The second thing is I have no more access to any software than any other member. I, in fact, do not have the ability to be able to use any type of software that we have used without staff and that's flat-out the truth. And so I reject the notion that that I have had some advantage from a pure staff perspective.

REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER SR.: Thank you Mr. Chairman to let me know I have an equal amount of consult of staff and use of staff as you --

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN M. STEFANSKI: You're not recognized, Representative Carter you're not recognized, you're not recognized, you're not

1 recognized. And then secondly, I will say that if you
2 don't schedule the time, and you don't ask staff for
3 the meeting, I don't understand how there could be a
4 complaint there. Representative Farnum for a
5 question.
6 REPRESENTATIVE LES FARNUM: Thank you Mr.
7 Chairman. You and I have not had a discussion about
8 the amendments of this and I was curious how many of
9 the members in this body were contacted to discuss
10 their particular districts and how your plan would
11 affect their districts with communities of interest?
12 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Okay. I think I
13 talked about that when we went over the bill Tuesday.
14 The approach that we was using with House Bill 15
15 representative, we made contact with members of
16 various litigations that have been meeting around the
17 state and we try to incorporate that information into
18 House Bill 15. So, whatever is not direct contact
19 with a hundredfold other members, which I wish I
20 would have had time to do, we did try to incorporate
21 to House Bill 15, the information that the
22 delegations had got together and said that this is
23 how they wanted their map to look.
24 REPRESENTATIVE LES FARNUM: I'm pretty sure our
25 delegation, if maybe Representative Carter was

contacted. No other member of our delegation was contacted in Southwest Louisiana because I don't know if you're aware that you separated two very distinct communities of interest from my district that are integral parts of my district and had no regard for that whatsoever.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Can you maybe be a bit more specific because I'm --

REPRESENTATIVE LES FARNUM: The lower half of my district was given the Cameron Parish and they have no interest with Cameron Parish at all. They do to the north of very, very integral part of the north side of that District.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Well, I'll say again, you know, we are open to look at anything that members have some concerns about. I said that Tuesday when we were going to do these amendments. Now, I did not hear from you now, but what I'm saying is if I wish you would have reached out to me and would have told me if you saw that and you said that was in the original billing amendment, which one is --

REPRESENTATIVE LES FARNUM: The original had it in there and it was deferred, all I had my focus on other things as you well know, we have a lot of stuff

coming for. So we have to pay very close attention to this coming up that day.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Right. And I'm equally preoccupied myself trying --

REPRESENTATIVE LES FARNUM: I understand.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: And the thousand other things but I'll say this if there is something here we need to look at concerning your districts, I don't know where the bill goes from here, but we certainly open to that --

REPRESENTATIVE LES FARNUM: I'll get with you after this and show you exactly what I'm talking about.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Absolutely.

REPRESENTATIVE LES FARNUM: I want you to help me understand what a candidate of choice means? To somebody, I mean it probably means a variety of things to everybody. Is it based on race? Is it based on party affiliation? Is it philosophical beliefs? What is your understanding of what a candidate of choice is?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: It could be a combination and you know, actually my understanding now, it can be a combination of all those things but

I think it's very important that we have minorities represented in the legislature.

[01:10:06]

REPRESENTATIVE LES FARNUM: Because that's very interesting because you made a statement earlier that you would be just perfectly fine if a white person was elected in one of those districts.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: If that was their choice.

REPRESENTATIVE LES FARNUM: Now would it be a white Democrat? Would it be a white Republican? Where does that line go?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I think the concept here is to make sure that we don't have districts where you don't have but one choice where it's just, you know, a scenario where your vote is doesn't carry any weight. So what we're trying to do is make sure we have districts where the vote could carry some weight, a minority vote could carry some weight. Now, I was given an example that you're talking about to say that, you know, that doesn't all the time means that you know, because you got a majority black district it may be a black representative to come out of it. If their choice is to elect a white representative then so be it. I'm just saying me

1 personally I don't have a problem with that because I
2 know they were given a choice. They was given the
3 numbers that it take to make that decision and now
4 I'm saying so long till you know, they did not have
5 any impact at all on that outcome --
6 REPRESENTATIVE LES FARNUM: Because when you look
7 at this version of a house bill with the party
8 sitting at the table. It appears to me, just my
9 observation is that the objective here is to gain
10 more democratic seats in the state and at face value
11 that's what it looks like to me.
12 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Well, I could not
13 disagree with you more --
14 REPRESENTATIVE LES FARNUM: Because, you know, he
15 made a statement the other day that with your, with
16 the current makeup and your bill, they would be the
17 same and they weren't. It was gaining a democratic
18 seat and this appears that it would gain another
19 democratic seat.
20 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: But this is the
21 point that I'm making -- this bill did not come out
22 to gain you know, a democratic seat. Now, the major
23 bill that's out here now is a bill that came
24 basically from the majority. And I'm not viewing that
25 as a bill -- a republican bill to try to gain

1 republican seats. I'm saying that that bill is there
2 with an approach to what we faced with redistricting.
3 What districts will stay, what districts will go? How
4 do we deal with the population? How do we deal with
5 the census numbers? I don't understand why someone
6 would not take that same point of view with this bill
7 to say okay, this is another option or another -- or
8 a route that we could go to deal with those same
9 problems and not necessarily make it a partisan
10 situation. And let's just be, you know, if we just
11 deal with reality, reality is the speaker's bill.
12 It's a bill that's coming from basically coming from
13 the leadership majority party. I think that the
14 voices of others who have a different opinion should
15 be able to be a part of the process and looked at
16 also. I think if you look at different options just
17 as the vice chairman so adequately explained, it
18 could very well represented lead us to a point where
19 we can come together on the same page. When you
20 prefer us all come together on one bill out of here
21 that we all felt was representative of this state. Is
22 that something that you would prefer?
23 REPRESENTATIVE LES FARNUM: I think at the end of
24 the day, that's our only option is that we come
25 together on one bill. That's the process that we go

through. Is that when we finish this session, there will be only one bill that --

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: But would you rather see unanimous across the unanimous vote on it?

REPRESENTATIVE LES FARNUM: Oh absolutely.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: That's my point.

REPRESENTATIVE LES FARNUM: That would be a great option.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I think in order to get there, we need to have an open mind and be willing to look at everybody's point of view on how we get there, if we don't then it makes it very difficult for everybody to come together because they feel like they only had one shot and it's being shutdown at through.

REPRESENTATIVE LES FARNUM: And I'll bring one last thing up, somebody else made the reference to Representative Glover's Bill as another option. But I don't know if you're aware that in Representative Glover's Bill they take away District 23 as well. They take away District 23 and 5.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I do know that actually.

REPRESENTATIVE LES FARNUM: So there seems to be a lot of talk about keeping District 23 intact as it

is and maybe add a little territory to it to get the population rise.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Yeah, and there goes the point I'm making, I think all of those points of view need to be taken into consideration and hopefully if we got different points of view maybe we can come together on what that end product needs to be. So I did look at Representative Glover's Bill and your correct in your assessment of what that bill does to District 23 and I think you would agree with me, it is definitely, District 23 is definitely a subject of much conversation. But now at the end of the day so is adding minority districts.

[01:15:00]

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I think that's a subject of much conversation also.

REPRESENTATIVE LES FARNUM: Okay. Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Thank you Representative.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Thank you Representative Farnum. For questioning Representative Beaullieu.

REPRESENTATIVE GERALD BEAULLIEU: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Just a quick question following up on Judge Carter's conversation and the Chairman. I just want

to be clear just from our standpoint. Did staff ever turned down any offer for you to visit with them?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Oh, oh no. I didn't take that from Judge Carter's comments. Staff worked with me very diligently.

REPRESENTATIVE GERALD BEAULLIEU: Okay. So you had but you, so you had all the resources of staff and all that that the rest of us did? Correct?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: To the extent that they could be involved in this, I have.

REPRESENTATIVE GERALD BEAULLIEU: And you had the resources of the Democrat Party as well, correct?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: You know to the extent that they could be involved in this I have no complaint.

REPRESENTATIVE GERALD BEAULLIEU: Did the ACLU or Power Coalition ever turned down a meeting with you to where you didn't have their resources as well?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I did not utilize resources from the ACLU or Power Coalition with House Bill 15.

REPRESENTATIVE GERALD BEAULLIEU: If you wanted to though you could have, correct?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: No, not necessarily because I do think Representative that Power

1 Coalition had a rapid, they wish to go with this
2 process which I deeply respect. And I think the ACLU
3 had a route that they wished to go and those goals
4 may not necessarily at all been the same.
5 REPRESENTATIVE GERALD BEAULLIEU: So it was your
6 choice to use the resources that you had with the
7 Democrat Party and staff to a certain degree,
8 correct?
9 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Yes.
10 REPRESENTATIVE GERALD BEAULLIEU: Okay. I just
11 want to clear that up. Under what, you talked about
12 diluting the vote I guess in the Cane River Area and
13 that was kind of a concern my getting -- under what
14 circumstances is it okay to dilute the vote of a
15 community of interest?
16 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: From my point of
17 view, I mean, I don't know of any acceptable
18 circumstances to intentionally to do something like
19 that. Now, can something like that happen? Maybe so.
20 But I never think that that ought to be an intent to
21 dilute minority voting.
22 REPRESENTATIVE GERALD BEAULLIEU: So, you know,
23 you'll tried some attempts in District 48, but when
24 you're taking Iberia Parish and splitting it into
25 five different districts and carving it up as opposed

1 to right now it's represented by three different
2 representatives and to where they would not have the
3 ability to potentially elect any of that candidates
4 of choice potentially District 96 maybe. But, do you
5 think that you would be diluting the vote of that
6 community of interest in the whole entire Iberia
7 Parish?
8 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Let -- let me ask
9 you this way. And we talked about this when we looked
10 at, you know, the original Bill and of course we want
11 to try to amend that Bill. What we thought we had in
12 the original Bill was information where that
13 delegation had talked about how they wanted the area
14 to look. And to be honest with you, we -- we had some
15 questions about it. And we say okay. All right, but
16 that's what we tried to incorporate into what we were
17 doing. Now, you certainly brought to our attention,
18 you know, that maybe that wasn't correct information
19 that we had received. And so we wanted to try to go
20 and address that based upon the comments that you
21 gave us. Once again, you know.
22 REPRESENTATIVE GERALD BEAULLIEU: But
23 mathematically, you couldn't make that work in a
24 couple of days' time.
25 EDWARD WISHAM: Correct. Time..

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Yes. The clock was just - was really ticking and we had to be here today and like I said, staff has done a great job. They have not denied me anytime I don't want anybody to leave that here, but I do know I'm not the only person they have to work for and have to get things in, you know, all times.

REPRESENTATIVE GERALD BEAULLIEU: Okay. So, following up on the question Speaker Pro Tem asked, just with regards to VAP and historical elections, if you had a minority district that historic like just maybe from your standpoint when you're using Mr. Wisham kind of a gut call, I guess looking at historical elections, if you had a couple of historical elections back-to-back where you had a white candidate and you had a black candidate in the race, and the black candidate seemed to get elected each time, would that be a situation where you would agree is probably one of those opportunities where you wouldn't have to worry about VAP as much?

EDWARD WISHAM: No, I still, somewhat, but that's not always the case. It really depends --

REPRESENTATIVE GERALD BEAULLIEU: And so, but earlier you said, I mean earlier you said it --

EDWARD WISHAM: Can you repeat it again? I want to make sure I'm --

REPRESENTATIVE GERALD BEAULLIEU: Yeah so, the historic elections where you had black candidates and white candidates and the black candidate, you know, was always the victorious. Would this be one of those circumstances where you wouldn't be as concerned about VAP?

EDWARD WISHAM: And you use the word historic?

REPRESENTATIVE GERALD BEAULLIEU: Right. Over the last couple election cycles.

EDWARD WISHAM: Okay.

REPRESENTATIVE GERALD BEAULLIEU: Or since the beginning of the district.

EDWARD WISHAM: When you use the word historic that absolutely threw me off, okay. Because I mean something like Obama running, that's a history. I consider that historic.

REPRESENTATIVE GERALD BEAULLIEU: I'm talking about on House District 96 to be specific.

EDWARD WISHAM: Okay. Good. Yeah. Yeah, exactly. I would take that for.

REPRESENTATIVE GERALD BEAULLIEU: Because we're working out an issue in that area.

[01:20:00]

EDWARD WISHAM: Correct.

REPRESENTATIVE GERALD BEAULLIEU: And I'm just curious if, if I can, if it would be okay to lower VAP of District 96 which is represented by Bryan to protect communities of interest and because we can use this historic election with him and Representative Terry Landry before him both had white opponents, can we not be worried about VAP in those areas?

EDWARD WISHAM: If the candidate, I mean if the -- we're doing maps and your -- and the representative is fine with it doing, yes. I mean, we've done that in several other places. So I'm not definitely not looking strictly at the voting age population.

REPRESENTATIVE GERALD BEAULLIEU: Okay. Perfect. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Thank you Representative Beaullieu. For questioning Representative Ivey. You know, I'm just going to make a comment. No, I'm not going to make this comment because it always seems to happen on him.

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: I knew it. I appreciate you using some wisdom there. Thank you Mr. Chairman. I was going to say it's difficult to have to wait so long to speak the list of things that I

1 want to cover. It just keeps getting longer. I've got
2 so many notes. But I want to first recognize my
3 friend and brother in Christ, Dr. Rodney Wood is
4 here. He's returned to the capital from a bout of
5 COVID and fully recovered. Thank God. And I know,
6 even while he's been absent, he has been in continual
7 prayer for us and asking God to give us wisdom and
8 strength to do, you know, serve the people. And I
9 know he's been praying during this whole meeting for
10 us. So his prayers are so welcome and needed
11 throughout this process. Next, I'd like to thank you
12 Representative Jenkins for always being a model of
13 respect and civility even while under tremendous
14 pressure. Your examples actually inspired me over the
15 years to work toward extending the length of my own
16 fuse. I know my reputation, I can get a little hot-
17 headed sometimes, and you know, because of -- we care
18 so much. But you've been a tremendous model in this
19 committee last term and this one, on some, you know,
20 extremely controversial issues and I have a
21 tremendous amount of respect for you in how you do
22 what you do. First thing I want to tackle dealing
23 with the fact that the speaker's name is on the Bill,
24 right? Leadership. And I'm going to read my statement
25 just to be brief. So I have to trust that while at

1 times members will appear to vote in block support of
2 senior leadership. And at times with some
3 consistency. In the end, members will vote their
4 conscience. I trust members will vote their
5 conscience in their district. If that's not the case,
6 then I might need to take offense to the consistent
7 voting block or block voting against most of my
8 legislation over the last eight years and, you know,
9 that would be a problem. But I do believe the joke is
10 that people block vote against my bills all the time.
11 And so was it their conscience or were they're
12 following leadership we don't know, right? But I
13 don't worry about it, I trust that each member is to
14 the best of their ability trying to figure out what
15 the right thing to do is and these kinds of cases
16 like on these issues that we're dealing with today,
17 it's extremely difficulty and leadership certainly
18 plays a role, but I do trust that, you know, to the
19 extent practical and possible and that's why it's our
20 job when we get bills onto the floor that we provide
21 the context that they may not have been privileged
22 to, with all the lengthy community debates and
23 redistricting roadshow processes and that we do our
24 job on the floor to try and convince members on what
25 the right thing to do, and why this is the right

thing to do or not. And so, it is a process and as we heard with some of the other bills, it's hard for any member who's not served on this committee during this process, who's not been to many redistricting roadshows to even ask any questions. Like, where do you even begin? It's very complicated. And so, with respect to staff and the resources that were brought up not by yourself, but I just want to make the general statement and I believe in every case Chairman had shown deference as to the access and utilization of staff's time and other necessary resources. I believe this is necessary because of the responsibilities that comes with that role. That said, I am also confident that no member has been denied any access or provided to them. I'm sorry. I'm confident that no member has been denied any access provided that the member put forth the requisite level of effort and engagement to work with staff. I have authored many bills on complicated subjects and ways and means example and staff was busy. They've got hundreds of bill request and they're just overwhelmed and consumed and look, you know, our poor staff. Just you got to be praying for them.

[01:25:00]

Because they've been overworked with just every single map is so complicated. And that said, I know they made time. They've been here till late, probably after midnight many times trying to get it done. And so I just want to say that I don't believe anybody has been denied anything that they felt that they needed. And also there are other options and avenues I've personally met with and spoke with multiple advocacy groups, who have resources and are willing and begging to engage with any member and try to help them in their efforts and what they want to accomplish on a map. Even some that may appear to have some partisan lien or absolutely willing to work with someone like myself to try to develop a map, okay. And so again, there's so many resources available, anybody who wanted to try and make an impact on these maps has had nothing but air and opportunity. Let's see. And I am getting toward the end with my.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Question?

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: Yeah, exactly. The comments. I'm trying -- I do have a question and I'm just trying to find it now. So you know, there's a lot of approaches and you know, you mentioned this is an approach and you're absolutely right. The only

1 wrong approach is the approach that intends to
2 violate Section 2 or you know the Voting Rights out
3 our Constitution and the U.S. Constitution, State
4 Constitution and the Laws of Louisiana. That's the
5 only wrong approach. Every other approach is fair
6 game. Some may fall far short with based on the
7 object or the intent that goals of different members,
8 but it's not a wrong approach. I don't think your
9 approach is the wrong approach and it is a process.
10 And so I think we'll just continue to work on it.
11 Okay, here's a question. You kept mentioning various
12 and I'm trying not to beat you up, okay because I did
13 that the other day and then I thought I'd beat you up
14 and then Judge Carter, he just really beat you up.
15 So, but you mentioned delegations met with you know,
16 regional delegates, delegations. Was that
17 specifically Black Caucus delegations, Democrat
18 Regional delegations, or was an invitation actually
19 extended more broadly to all the members of the
20 region and then just you know, maybe they didn't
21 participate?
22 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Well, to answer that
23 question, it was not as broad as what probably should
24 have occurred. Now, I do know when I came down and I
25

1 met with my delegation it was Republicans and
2 Democrats. We met with the Chair.
3 REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: And I want to make
4 this distinction. Okay, because I think they're --
5 the house or the staff hosted multiple delegation,
6 regional delegation meetings at the Capitol. And I
7 don't know if they went on the road specific, but I
8 know that when they brought us in, you know, it was
9 bipartisan, you know, just like the East Baton Rouge
10 Parish Greater Area and so, is that the meetings
11 you're specifically referring to or were there
12 additional meetings?
13 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: That's the meeting I
14 am referring to.
15 REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: Okay, so every member
16 did was extended an invitation in one of those
17 regional meetings at the Capitol you would assume?
18 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: To my knowledge,
19 yes.
20 REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: Right.
21 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I thought that's
22 what they were doing.
23 REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: Okay and just to your
24 experience are the ones that you participated in
25 maybe there wasn't as broad engagement as from a --

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: No, I think we've mixed it up.

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: Okay. I'm trying to get straight on the way which meetings you're referring to.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I thought what asked and I'm sorry was our effort to meet with every delegation in putting together the House Bill 15 is that what you're asking me?

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: Whatever when into House Bill 15.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Okay.

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: You know I don't know how many of those meetings you participated in outside of your own region or did you have what -- are you referring to a separate group of meetings that were held regionally?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: No, no, I started off talking about the meeting that I used as far as the delegation meeting for the part about House Bill 15. And from that, we did contact numbers of delegations.

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: Right. Can you please specify, I mean we've got tons of delegations and that regionals, some of them are Republican,

Democrat, some of them are North, you know, I mean, if you could specify the delegation.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I can't. I'm sorry, I can't go back and just name out every delegation. But my understanding is that we did reach out to different delegations like the Orleans delegations, [INDISCERNIBLE 01:29:32], the groups that we're meeting and we're shaping what they wanted their area to look like. We reached out to them and we use that information as a framework for what we're doing here in HB15. That's what I'm explaining.

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: Okay. Right. It was brought up like, you know, what you know candidate of choice. I would like to think that, you know, and we've seen this in certain, you know, elections, they're more, they're more than of an outlier than the norm, where people cross party lines to elect the candidate.

[01:30:10]

You know, where it's not about, you know, white or black or [INDISCERNIBLE 01:30:14] and it may have been more to the character and the qualities of the actual candidate. And so, is that what you're getting at when it doesn't like, you know, like when someone mention like black people electing a white candidate,

it is, do you think that's absolutely possible and why it's not just a pure racial thing because people may actually look to the, you know, the quality and nature and character of the individual candidate and not just be a DR black-white thing.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I mean, I would hope that people make that choice, you know, based on a combination of all those factors that you just discussed.

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: Okay. All right. Well, I'm going to wrap it out Mr. Chairman. See, look, you're not even ready for me to wrap it up.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Well, there were two pauses and I kept looking at you, but I know how your mind works. I was waiting.

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: I appreciate that.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: They looked and sits.

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: You didn't pull a Stewie on me. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Since thank you Representative Ivey. Since Representative Ivey is finished, I'll just want to know committee, you know, we're still, we're still on the amendment. We have a bunch of other Congressional Bills scheduled for debate today. I would go on the floor to, I'm just,

just throwing that out there but Representative Thomas for question.

REPRESENTATIVE POLLY THOMAS: Thank you Mr. Chair. I understand that I got that message because you didn't want to give it to Barry. Good morning gentlemen.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Good morning Representative.

REPRESENTATIVE POLLY THOMAS: The other day, Representative Jenkins, you spoke about one of the goals that you had in your original bill was to keep the party representation as it was and that would be 68 Republicans, 34 Democrats and three no party. And when I asked you about moving House District 5, you acknowledged that indeed that the goal was not met that it became 67 Republicans, 35 Democrat seats and three no party. In your -- with your amendments that you're proposing, it seems to me that that is now that number has now changed to 66 Republicans, 36 Democrats and still three no parties. My question is, which Republican district have you dismantled?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Well, I mean, our Billt is not attempt to dismantle, you know, a Republican district. Now, let's make sure we straight on the numbers because you're better at this than I

1 am. I think with this amendment what we would have is
2 67 Republican districts, 36 Democratic districts and
3 two independent district because the majority-
4 minority district that we are creating involved one
5 of the three independents. So I believe we got 67, 36
6 and two, I believe that's what the numbers are and
7 then that would be a total of 30 black seats. So to
8 answer your question now --
9 REPRESENTATIVE POLLY THOMAS: Would it be 60 --
10 House District 62 that would change from no party to
11 Democrat?
12 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: It would change to
13 a, yes. And the formula that we're using, it would be
14 a majority black seat. Now. I'm not saying that an
15 independent cannot win that seat, I'm not saying
16 that, but I am just trying to base the numbers based
17 upon what we are assuming the situation would be, 67
18 Republicans, 36 Democrats and two independents that
19 could very well be 67 Republicans, 35 Democrats and
20 three independents if the new majority black seat.
21 REPRESENTATIVE POLLY THOMAS: But it is reducing
22 the number of Republican seats and increasing the
23 number of Democrat seats, is that correct?
24 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Yes, by one and let
25 me explain. I believe what we were trying to do not

dismantle anything Representative. What we were trying to do was to address the population shift in the northwest part of the state and District 5 was very contiguous with a number of Republican and Democratic districts that were below deviation and it made more sense to move District 5 and use that population to bring both Republican and Democratic house districts in Northwest Louisiana back into deviation. It helped everybody up there.

[01:35:00]

REPRESENTATIVE POLLY THOMAS: But House District 5 did not lose population, in fact, they gained population.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Population is --

REPRESENTATIVE POLLY THOMAS: They're still within the deviation, but they gained population.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: That's correct.

REPRESENTATIVE POLLY THOMAS: Okay. Thank you Mr. Chair. That concludes my questions.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Thank you Representative Thomas. For question Representative Magee.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to clarify and look. I think we get a little too in the numbers and everybody, I

1 mean that's we're here for, but I don't think there's
2 a party ownership of seats. We have swing districts
3 in the state.
4 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Right. Yeah.
5 EDWARD WISHAM: Exactly.
6 REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: I mean, we had and
7 I don't want the public to think that -- I know it
8 gets easy to fall into that trap, but I don't want
9 the public to think that's really what our brain is
10 at. Because I think we have enough swing districts in
11 the state where people can win from both parties. I
12 think we have enough where the quality of the
13 candidate is always, I think Louisiana has shown
14 itself that the quality of the candidate is really
15 important to a lot of voters in Louisiana. I think
16 that goes across even statewide elections. I think
17 probably Representative White is a good example of
18 that of a quality of candidate that has continually
19 performed the other parties in our district. So I
20 just want it to be cautioned to everybody in the
21 community when we talked about this stuff that. I
22 know where the numbers and everything like that, but
23 there is -- there is no ownership of party seats.
24 That's all I think I want to. But other than that
25 also I want to address this is that first of all I

1 feel a little remiss because I feel like how staff
2 works harder than they even get. We were giving them
3 credit, but I'm -- when I leave the building, they're
4 still here and I've left the building like 9:00 p.m.,
5 10:00 p.m. and they're still here. So, I think
6 they're willing to meet as long as we're willing to
7 meet with them. I think only us to our own exhaustion
8 is what stops them from meeting with anybody. So I
9 want their -- I want everybody to understand the
10 amount of hours that they put in and then I couldn't
11 even imagine spending like two weeks of my life
12 working on amendment and never gets filed. But that's
13 got to be one of the most frustrating things on life
14 so and they do that. And then you walk up with
15 another amendment and I've never in this body ever
16 had a staff member tell me no. They never said, I
17 can't meet with you, I can't do that. And I just want
18 the public to know that they are tireless workers.
19 And I also feel like now I feel like my experience is
20 when they have the highest ethical obligations. I
21 accidentally asked Ms. Lowry a question yesterday
22 that I should not have asked and I got the most
23 serious look on my face and she said, I can't tell
24 you that and that was absolutely the right response,
25 I was like, oh yeah, I never should have asked that.

I was not thinking when I asked that because she knew that she as a staff member confidentiality was really important and she could not tell me what other members have told her and I immediately realized my mistake. So I just want everybody to know how much the staff is important. And then moving on with the actual questions, Representative Jenkins, you would admit with -- you would agree with me that Chairman Stefanski could have not met with the single member because he's drawn a map that he like. That's his prerogative as the chairman. He did not have to meet with us. Is there a rule requiring it?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I'm not aware of any rule that requires it, no.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: He could have met with just Republicans if he wanted to.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I'm sure he could have, yes.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: He could have not met with any single member and just drawn a map and that would have been - and he could have filed it as a chairman of this committee. But we've -- I think we've all acknowledged he met with 105 members, is that correct?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: To my knowledge, yes.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Of both parties, correct?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: To my knowledge, yes.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: He took in their concerns and considerations as best as he possibly could, is that fair to say?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: To my knowledge, yes.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: I don't think we had a member coming to me. I don't think I have had a single member come up to me and I think you would agree with me and say, I met with Chairman Stefanski and he told me, he didn't listen to me. I don't think he did that.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I'm not aware of that. I would say, you know, I don't know, you know, when it comes to House District 23. I mean, I'm hearing different things about how discussion may or may not have taken place, but I want to go on record and say, I think that Chairman Stefanski reached out to everybody and talked to him about it, explained time and again what it was he was trying to do. I

1 talked to a number of members our caucus who felt
2 very good about you know, what he was doing with that
3 district. I feel good about what he was doing, but I
4 don't give my airport away. I felt very good about
5 what he was doing in my district for that matter, so
6 I mean, I never came into this trying to make a
7 competition so to speak.
8 REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: I agree with you.
9 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: It feels you know, I
10 would have -- that's not -- that's what I was, you
11 know, we went around the state, we talked to a lot of
12 people. Okay and I just feel like everybody's voice
13 need to be heard in the process so be it the House
14 Bill 14, be it the House Bill 15, be it
15 Representative Glover's Bill, be it Power Coalition
16 Bill, ACLU's Bill, or whatever they want to do. Let's
17 don't exclude the opportunity to hear what they have
18 to say.
19 [01:40:07]
20 Now, you may not be able to take 100% of it, but
21 maybe that one 5% of it can make a big difference in
22 how we all end up in the end.
23 REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Right, and then
24 looking in -- I would freely say this, I feel like
25 one of the things that's kind of dismaying me a

little bit is your Bill Representative Jenkins, it feels like we're worlds apart, but when I look at it on paper, I'm like, this doesn't seem that far apart. I mean, I know they're not the same, I know they got issues and I think we all kind of -- we've hammered home what the issues are between two bills. But if you like take a step back and like big picture it.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: All right.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: I don't think we're worlds apart. I mean, I think this is the process as we've said a million times and we have a disagreement on like 1% of something, it's 100% issue. And I think that's a fair across the board. We agree on like 99% of the stuff at this point and we're at 1% breakdown, which is fine. That's part of the process. I would also tip everybody that I don't think we need to be as -- I think there's a feeling hanging over that we're like, this is really contentious, when I'm not sure, it's just not normal of a democratic process to where we are. Is that fair to say?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I would agree with that. Yeah. You know, we just need to respect one another's right to come with some approaches and not have in place a system that would exclude a valid consideration of another approach to redistricting.

If we go through a process where we predetermine that we're only going to let one bill out of this committee, and we're not going to listen to or give our colleagues an opportunity to talk about several of these bills to me, it just makes it more difficult to get on the same page. I'm not saying we may not get there, but I think it makes it more difficult to get there.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: I understand. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Thank you Mr. Pro Tem. For question, Representative Carter.

REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER, SR.: I just want to clear up. I've never indicated and staff was biased or was not available. I came here one day on one bill and sat six hours, almost seven hours with staff. And couldn't have gotten the bill done without staff assistance. So, it's not about, I'm not trying to -- I don't know why we got some of us trying to make an issue of we're blaming staff. Staff does an outstanding job, okay? They put in a lot of time when we're not here. I would [INDISCERNIBLE 01:42:36] availability. I would expect the speaker and the chairman to spend a lot more time working on something like this, and I do because number one, I

1 don't have a House Bill, okay? The bill I had was the
2 Supreme Court Bill and they spent a lot of time with
3 me. But if I was chairman, I would expect the
4 chairman to be here one day on that one bill, he
5 probably here 100 days or more. But I expect that and
6 they need to have that opportunity. They got the
7 present a bill. So don't try to make out what I'm
8 saying to be a criticism of staff or the process. The
9 process is the process. And I agree that chairman did
10 a lot of work on this bill and I'm not saying he
11 didn't have good intentions. I'm talking about the
12 results. I don't have to go along with the results
13 just because thousands of hours were spent on it. If
14 I can see a reason why I have a different opinion,
15 that's all I wanted to say is that is no criticism of
16 staff. There's not even a criticism of the leadership
17 having more time with staff because they need a lot
18 more time than I do. And I don't have to present a
19 bill, they got to present a bill.
20 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Thank you for the
21 clarification Representative Carter. Representative
22 Gadberry for question.
23 REPRESENTATIVE FOY BRYAN GADBERRY: Thank you,
24 Mr. Chairman. There's been a lot of talk about using
25 staff in various timeframes, et cetera. I guess my

1 question to you is, it was alluded to -- before I get
2 to my question – alluded to that -- and I guess
3 related to – you know, I'm a soldier, there's squad
4 leaders, there's platoon leaders, the speaker would
5 be a battalion leader, okay. But me, as a soldier, I
6 was able to meet with staff prior to the session
7 several times, one-on-one, manipulated maps, getting
8 background information, getting constructive
9 criticism et cetera. So I guess my question to you
10 Mr. Jenkins is, did you ever meet with staff prior to
11 this special session on your map?
12 [01:45:00]
13 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Yes.
14 REPRESENTATIVE FOY BRYAN GADBERRY: Okay.
15 Approximately how many hours?
16 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Well, I'll tell you,
17 I can't say hours but I can say to the extent that I
18 needed the assistance of staff, they were available
19 to me. And I did come down to Baton Rouge to meet
20 with them and then some of this was done by telephone
21 and different things like that. So I wasn't really
22 just kind of keeping track of time, but I would like
23 to say to the extent that I needed staff to assist
24 me, they were available to me.
25

REPRESENTATIVE FOY BRYAN GADBERRY: Okay, so you met with them prior to the session to talk about your map.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Yes. Oh yes.

REPRESENTATIVE FOY BRYAN GADBERRY: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Thank you, Representative Gadberry for the question. And last one on the board, just so -- Maybe there's none others that pop up. Vice Chair Duplessis.

VICE CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just can't miss the opportunity since we've talked so much about our wonderful staff and the amount of time that they put in. How much I think we should we should fight for a raise for them. I think. I think we got some co-authors. That may not be the issue that we're discussing right now but I just want to reiterate how wonderful they are. We got a few co-authors you all.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Absolutely. All right members that clears the board. So we're still on the amendment. I always like to go back to procedure. We're still on the amendment. House Bill 85 is what we're discussing.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: 15.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: 15.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: I'm sorry. Amendment set 85 is what we're discussing. Representative Jenkins do you have any more comments about this amendment or do you possibly have a motion?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I like to move for the amendments to be adopted.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Representative Jenkins is making a motion that we adopt Amendment set 85. Is there any objection? Seeing no objection, Amendment set 85 is adopted. Representative Jenkins, on your bill.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: First of all, let me thank you Mr. Chairman, Mr. Vice Chairman, Pro Tem, all members of this committee. Thank you for the time that we put into reviewing House Bill 15 as I stated. It is a process. It is an approach that we should consider. You know, we went around the state on the road shows and we heard a lot of information from a lot of people. I just hope that we took it to heart and we had a lot of people that come down and talk about this process also. And I said that to say this, you know, when I look at House Bill 15, even House Bill 14 for that matter, I know we got our names on it and we are authors of bills and things of that

1 nature, but at the end of the day, we are making
2 decisions that will affect people at least for the
3 next 10 years. And so we just need to make sure that
4 we are considering all options and in order to do
5 that, I do believe that our entire body, a lot of our
6 colleagues who are not on this committee who also
7 represent people from different locations, different
8 voices, need to be a part of the process, need to see
9 what these different options are and have an
10 opportunity to weigh in. And that's why I would like
11 for House Bill 15 to be advanced from this committee.
12 It is open to further amendments. It is open to
13 further suggestions. If there's anything that we need
14 to adjust, just as with House Bill 14, we can do
15 that. For many of the people we serve just keep in
16 mind, perception is their reality. Perception is
17 their reality. And I just hope this committee don't
18 send a signal to them that there are concerns, some
19 of which is embodied here in House Bill 15 is not
20 worthy of going to the floor and being compared with
21 other bills that hopefully could make it to the floor
22 and trying to come up with a plan. I will say again,
23 I came into this redistricting process and it was my
24 heart desire, and remains to be my desire, that
25 maybe, just maybe we all can come together on one

page, come out here but one instrument. Do you know what that would do? Do you know the impression that would give the state? Do you know what that would say about Louisiana? That we all unanimously or just nearly unanimously came out with one House Bill that we felt satisfied everybody. Just think about that. But if we have a process or procedure in place that says, hey look, we're going to use a process if we just going to let one bill come out and that's just going to be it. Do you know what that says to a lot of people who spent their time coming out to the road shows, we encourage them to do it, coming down here to talk to us and we encourage them to do it. Do you know what kind of signal that sends to them?

[01:50:00]

Members, I don't know if you've already made up your mind what you're going to do, but I just ask you to just think about that. This really needs to be about looking at different routes and see that we can come together as a body on one plan. It's very difficult to get there if we don't have various options that we can consider. Mr. Chairman I move House Bill 15 - Oh I'm sorry

MALE 1: [INDISCERNIBLE 01:50:29]

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Okay. Okay, when duty calls.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: [INDISCERNIBLE 01:50:32] they may waive and we may get right back there. But let me -- All right.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Okay. We have a public testimony?

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: We do, yeah, and I apologize. We got so wrapped up in that Amendment talk, but I bet your motion is noted, all right? Your motion is noted, but if you concede the table. So members, there are a lot of cards that were submitted yesterday that we carried over to today. And so, I'm going to read off all the present in support but would not like to speak, okay? So today we have Lauren Primo. We have - I'm sorry Rosie. We have Avery Mann. We have Lady Carlson. We have Catherine Bernhardt. Those are present in support would not like to speak. From yesterday, present in support would not like to speak. Rochelle Bell. Augusta Turner. Reverend Wilson. Wilfred Johnson. Judith Polk. Patricia Hill. Chris Williams. Kingston Willis. Frederick McDaniel. Ryan Wilkinson. Caitlin Peoples. Mikaela Turner. Rica Peoples. Kennedy Dennis. Renee Harris. Kristen Thompson. Yolanda Crump. Sabrina

Hyun. Katrina Roberson. Reno Rice. Jeremiah [INDISCERNIBLE 01:51:50]. All those present in support would not like to speak. Present in support would like to speak. Representative Cox.

REPRESENTATIVE KENNY R. COX: I won't be long. And I won't speak about sleep all of the day. Let me say this in as very short. I want to thank the Chairman Jenkins for his due diligence to put something together that is trying to do what section 2 of the Civil Rights Voting Right Act does is trying to develop an extra district and in the process it allows my people the right to vote for somebody that they want. And I think that's what this whole thing is about. If we can cater this as well as possible. So that that a generation of people who did endure slavery and then Jim Crow and then the racism of the 60s and the Voting Civil Rights Act, and it's been hacked on quite a bit. But it allows us to keep that intact. Now we don't know what the future brings on this, but the bottom line is, this is to me, it allows voters to not be suppressed. It allows voters the opportunity to not be cornered off into little small groups and divided. And that's not what I fought for anyway. I fought for this country to have -- if you have the right to vote and you have the

right to be able to have an - If you have the people to be able to vote and to have somebody that you would vote for whether they're black, white, Hispanic and then they got all kind of glazing and all kind of different -- I'm sorry, I'm serious, my kids tell me about that if you're black and you're Asian, they got a name for that. I'm telling you, I told them, don't tell me no more of that's because I'll end up saying some of that stuff like I did today. But listen, we represent all the people not just -- And I know some of you say, well he's being biased towards - Yeah, absolutely. We must fight for what is ours. And we must fight for what is others'. And this bill is much more fair and there's a lawyer at Shreveport that had a -- said the fair comes once a year. You got to get a lawyer. I hope we don't get that less.

[01:55:00]

He's out of Shreveport, I don't know what his name is but he wears a patch over there. But the whole thing is, it gives us the opportunity to take this to the floor and give us opportunity to have it looked at by the whole body and let them make that decision. I thank you all for the time.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Thank you Representative Cox. Oh you do have a question. Would you want to take question?

REPRESENTATIVE KENNY R. COX: I'll take a question.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Representative Johnson has question for you.

REPRESENTATIVE MIKE JOHNSON: Representative Carter, you know - I mean, Cox, you know I respect you, you're my friend. You're my friend. But when you say, I want to represent my people. And then say, we need to represent all the people. What if I said I want to just represent my people. What does that mean when you say that? I don't -- Because I like that we represent all the people.

REPRESENTATIVE KENNY R. COX: We do. Let me say --

REPRESENTATIVE MIKE JOHNSON: But I don't understand how one hand I'm being called, you know, I've been sitting here, we've been called all kind of things.

REPRESENTATIVE KENNY R. COX: Let me break it down to you.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Again, members, let's let one talk, then the other and let's just -- I'm

just asking that you'll give each other an opportunity -

REPRESENTATIVE MIKE JOHNSON: So let me be clear on my question. When you say, my people, who do you mean?

REPRESENTATIVE KENNY R. COX: What I mean is my district.

REPRESENTATIVE MIKE JOHNSON: You didn't say my district. You said my people and you talked about slavery and all of these other things. What --

REPRESENTATIVE KENNY R. COX: I'm not going to get into an argument with you.

REPRESENTATIVE MIKE JOHNSON: I'm not arguing, I'm asking.

REPRESENTATIVE KENNY R. COX: Well, I'm telling you. I'm telling you it's my district. And you say I didn't say that and I know I did. But the point is, is I grew up with those people. I grew up in the Cottonfields. I grew up seeing slavery, man, and I've been oppressed.

REPRESENTATIVE MIKE JOHNSON: Yes, sir.

REPRESENTATIVE KENNY R. COX: That's what I'm saying.

REPRESENTATIVE MIKE JOHNSON: I understand. I just don't understand -

REPRESENTATIVE KENNY R. COX: All right I just wanted say that I mean --

REPRESENTATIVE MIKE JOHNSON: But I mean if I were to sit there and say "my people" it would be front page. I just --

REPRESENTATIVE KENNY R. COX: It might be front page on mine, but all I will say is --

REPRESENTATIVE MIKE JOHNSON: Well I hope not -- because I see you represent all -

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Let's just -- Again, members, let's just - It's not either one of you, just let each other talk so that we're not arguing.

REPRESENTATIVE MIKE JOHNSON: I just want to make sure I understood because your actions show that you represent all of the people, but when you say my people, I just wanted to know what you meant.

REPRESENTATIVE KENNY R. COX: And as I said again, that group of people in that area, I personally saw the difficulties and disrespect and - We were poor. [INDISCERNIBLE 01:57:33] poor.

REPRESENTATIVE MIKE JOHNSON: Yes sir.

REPRESENTATIVE KENNY R. COX: And we had to deal with what we had to deal with. And we went through a lot of different phases and I struggled with them and I could not do anything. But I then decide that I

would fight for everybody and doing that, it would create an environment that once I got back, it would be right. So all I'm asking folks is to just make it as right as you can. That's all I'm saying. And if I offended anybody by saying my people, well I'm sorry.

REPRESENTATIVE MIKE JOHNSON: You didn't. I just want to understand.

REPRESENTATIVE KENNY R. COX: I'll apologize but I'm not really because they are. And as I said before, you know they're your people when they call you and ask you about the sewage back --

REPRESENTATIVE MIKE JOHNSON: But Representative Cox, I don't ask somebody if they're black or white when they call me. I help all people and I assume you do too. So I just want -- When I hear "my people" that's foreign to the way I think because it doesn't matter to me, I'm going to treat everybody the same.

REPRESENTATIVE KENNY R. COX: I would not treat - And my people include -- When I say my people, it's the people in that district.

REPRESENTATIVE MIKE JOHNSON: Okay.

REPRESENTATIVE KENNY R. COX: White, black, Hispanic -

REPRESENTATIVE MIKE JOHNSON: Then we're clear.

REPRESENTATIVE KENNY R. COX: And as I said before, you know, as much like when the man tells us to get up and we go to the battlefield, we never ask anybody about any color about anything. We just make sure that your gun is ready to fire and we move to the target.

REPRESENTATIVE MIKE JOHNSON: I honor you for your service.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Thank you. I think you all discussed it, we clarified, we're good. All right.

MALE 2: I hope I [INDISCERNIBLE 01:59:21].

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Also, yesterday there were two cards in support and would like to speak. So I'm going to see if they're here, I'm not sure if they are or not. Khadijah Rashad, is she here? No. Is Emerson Slain here? Okay, just checking. All right. Also, present in opposition, would not like to speak Mary Labree. In opposition and would like to speak from yesterday, again, I'm just going to see if they're here or not so that we have all on the record.

[02:00:00]

Shannon Bernard. No. Tammy [PH 02:00:05] Savoie. No. Kim Holmes. No. In opposition, would not like to

speak. This might have changed with the amendment, I'm just reading what we had yesterday. Judith Polk. Chris Kaiser. Lory Acanola. And Khadijah Rashad as well. Okay, good. Clears all the cards up. We will invite Representative Jenkins back. And Representative Jenkins I know you can - I'll give you another opportunity to close. I know you kind of did. I'll bring one concern of mine up so that you can address it because it was going to come after anyway. Do you think with the amount of amendments that you have adopted, there's a need to lie over to allow the public to digest that or you would have postured to where you feel comfortable moving forward today? I know you already made the motion. I'm not trying to withdraw that, I'm just bringing that that up.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: As I said before, I'm perfectly willing to leave the bill open and allow the public to look at the amendments and then see if anybody else on this panel, I heard a few more things here, have some suggestions that we need to try to take up. I'm not in a horse race with it. I just want to try to get it right.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: No, I understand that. And that's your option as the author of the bill, I just was going to bring that up. We've been trying to

1 give the public opportunity to digest some of this
2 and I just know these are a lot of amendments for us
3 not only as a committee but as the public watching
4 and interested to be able to really understand what
5 happens to this bill after that. I'm not trying to
6 push you in that direction though, I want to be
7 clear. I was going to bring it up and so I want to
8 bring it up on the front end rather than the back
9 end.
10 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Right. Well, I think
11 those amendments for the most part they hit this
12 morning. I tell you Mr. Chairman, I move this bill to
13 be reported as amended.
14 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Report as amended.
15 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Let's go ahead and
16 take the vote.
17 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Okay, and I'm going to
18 make a substitute motion that we voluntarily defer.
19 Is there any objection to the substitute motion?
20 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Yes.
21 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Yes, there is an
22 objection. So we will call the roll. So any members
23 in the anteroom, we will call the roll on the
24 substitute motion to voluntarily defer. Ms.
25

Ammersbach, if you would please read the roll. Yes, point of order? Ms. Newell.

REPRESENTATIVE CANDACE N. NEWELL: Point of order. Could you please ask Ms. Trish or Ms. Lowry to tell this what our vote is - what it needs to be.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Well, I could tell you that though.

REPRESENTATIVE CANDACE N. NEWELL: Okay.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: A vote Yes means that the bill would be voluntarily deferred. A vote No means that that substitute motion fails, we would then move on to the first motion.

REPRESENTATIVE CANDACE N. NEWELL: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Yes, ma'am. Ms. Ammersbach, if you would please call the roll.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Chairman Stefanski.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Vice Chairman Duplessis.

VICE CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Beaullieu.

REPRESENTATIVE GERALD BEAU BEAULLIEU, IV: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Wilford Carter.

REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Deshotel.

REPRESENTATIVE DARYL ANDREW DESHOTEL: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Farnum.

REPRESENTATIVE LES FARNUM: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Gadberry.

REPRESENTATIVE FOY BRYAN GADBERRY: Yes

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Hodges

REPRESENTATIVE VALARIE HODGES: Yes

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Horton.

REPRESENTATIVE DODIE HORTON: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Ivey.

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Jenkins.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: No. Representative Mike Johnson.

REPRESENTATIVE MIKE JOHNSON: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative LaCombe.

REPRESENTATIVE JEREMY LACOMBE: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Lyons.

REPRESENTATIVE RODNEY LYONS: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Magee.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Yes

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Newell.

REPRESENTATIVE CANDACE N. NEWELL: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Thomas.

REPRESENTATIVE POLLY THOMAS: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative White.

REPRESENTATIVE MALINDA WHITE: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. 10 yays. 8 nays.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: And the motion passes. House Bill 15 is voluntarily deferred. Next up on the agenda members, we have House Bill 4 by Representative Marcelle. Representative Marcelle on your bill.

REPRESENTATIVE C. DENISE MARCELLE: Thank you. I was about to say good morning but good afternoon. Thank you, Chairman Stefanski and members of this committee, for allowing me to present House Bill 4. But before I start, I need to ask Chairman if he's providing lunch since I've been here since 9. Sorry?

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Representative, the honorable speaker Pro Tem Magee has taken that--

[02:05:00]

-- under account, and it will be bringing something in. And in fact, he mentioned to me, it was only because -- possibly that you're here.

REPRESENTATIVE DENISE MARCELLE: Thank you very much.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN M. STEFANSKI: All right.

REPRESENTATIVE DENISE MARCELLE: Thank you, Representative Magee. Members, I present to you House Bill 4 which is the reapportionment of the congressional districts in Louisiana. Let me start by saying that, I've heard a lot of discussion early on the maps of the house and I respect those differences. But for me, I'm presenting this bill based upon the senses that we received of 2020, the population of Louisiana and the ability to follow Section 2 when we can in order to give minorities an opportunity to have a second congressional district. And in my opinion, my bill does that. My map is very similar to the speaker's map with respect to Districts 1, 3 and 4. In the speaker's map, District 1 contains St. Bernard, Plaquemines, Jefferson and Lafourche Parishes. Those parishes are also in District 1 in this map. In the speaker's map, District 3 contains Lake Charles, Lafayette and the Acadiana region District 3 in my map also includes Lake Charles and the most of Lafayette and the Acadiana region. In the speaker's map, District 4 includes all of Caddo and Bossier and the Northwest parishes in my map, Caddo, Bossier and all of the Northwest parishes are also in District 4. Where my

1 map differs from the speaker's map is instead of
2 packing black voters in New Orleans and Baton Rouge
3 into one District. District 2 goes west and includes
4 communities in the River Parishes and the Bayou
5 region areas that have many industries in common such
6 as fishing and also share some of the same concerns
7 and challenges such as hurricanes and flooding. The
8 communities in District 2 are also united by a large
9 petrochemical industry. And you know, that's Exxon in
10 Baton Rouge being one of. Baton Rouge is the capital
11 city in the State of Louisiana. I went to -- attended
12 the roadshow in Baton Rouge and heard much of the
13 conversation as it relates to the congressional
14 districts and other districts as well, BESE and
15 courts and overwhelmingly, the people in Baton Rouge
16 has expressed an interest in having their own
17 congressional district separate from New Orleans.
18 Having said that, I realized that not only could you
19 just make the request, you simply had to look at the
20 numbers to make sure that that could work. In looking
21 at that, the map that we have before us does that. It
22 creates the congressional district for New Orleans
23 and Baton Rouge and it achieves a lot of goals that
24 or presented before us and we had on a committee that
25 we voted on that we said we would attempt to do as a

state. Initially, when we started this process of redistricting, I respect the speaker and I certainly respect the chairman and everybody said that they were going to be fair and equitable as it relates to the numbers and the people. And the reason that we have the roadshow was to listen to the people of our state. And when we could do so attempt to make sure that they had representation or at least the opportunity to select someone to represent them. I believe that this map that we have before us in House Bill 4 does that. And so, that's why I've presented it and I will be open for questions. And I think that there are -- I'm sure there are many maps out there, and I'm sure that they would do different things. But anything short of two districts that does not give Baton Rouge its own congressional district, I think it's not a fair attempt in order to represent the people that I serve. Not only the people that I serve in Baton Rouge, but the people in New Orleans as well. And so, I present to you House Bill 4.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN M. STEFANSKI: Representative Newell for question.

[02:09:58]

REPRESENTATIVE CANDACE N. NEWELL: Thank you very much. Representative Marcelle, you have two people at the table with you, do you mind introducing them?

REPRESENTATIVE DENISE MARCELLE: Absolutely.

ATTORNEY VICTORIA WENGER: Good afternoon. I believe we're in afternoon. My name is Victoria Wenger and I'm an attorney with the NAACP Legal Defense Fund.

REPRESENTATIVE CANDACE N. NEWELL: Thank you.

ATTORNEY JARED EVANS: I'm Jared Evans. I'm also an attorney with the NAACP Legal Defense Fund.

REPRESENTATIVE CANDACE N. NEWELL: Thank you. Mr. Evans. Of all the places that y'all could have come to spend your time, expanded your resources. Why did you choose this state?

ATTORNEY JARED EVANS: That's a very good question Representative Newell. We primarily do our Voting Rights work in every state from Texas --

REPRESENTATIVE CANDACE N. NEWELL: Could you speak up in the mic, please?

ATTORNEY JARED EVANS: Albeit primarily does work in the south and our Voting Rights work is done in every state from Texas through South Carolina, where the vestiges of slavery and the confederacy and Jim Crow are strongest. But we only chose three states to

do our redistricting work with our limited amount of resources. And so, when we looked at the states that we work in, we looked at the greatest opportunity, but we also looked at where black voters were most disadvantaged. And when you look at black voters in every other state -- every state in this country, black voters in Louisiana have less opportunity to elect candidates of their choice and participate in the political process than black voters anywhere else in the country. That's kind of why we chose to work in Louisiana, and also, because the relationships. Relationships, I'm a native of Louisiana.

REPRESENTATIVE CANDACE N. NEWELL: Okay. Nice. Good to know and I appreciate you all coming in to our statement and system with this map because it has been a very time-consuming and stressful process. And I know I can speak for myself being the first time, this is my first time ever being this involved in redistricting and even if I get all three terms, I don't think I have a chance to touch it again. And so saying that to say that most of us are new to this process outside of our staff members because we do have our term limits here in the state. So I just appreciate you offering the expertise and the help in this state. Because we have been played by Jim Crow

for a long time even when he was supposed to have been retired, he still comes back to work sometimes and we're fighting it now. And again, thank you for your help.

ATTORNEY JARED EVANS: Thank you Representative Newell.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN M. STEFANSKI: Thank you very much Representative Newell. For question, Representative Deshotel.

REPRESENTATIVE DARYL ANDREW DESHOTEL: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Representative, I'm looking at the map and I'm obviously interested in my area and I'm looking at Avoyelles Parish. And I noticed that you have the northern portion of Avoyelles in District 3. And I'm assuming that you separated Avoyelles via the river. Is that the case?

REPRESENTATIVE DENISE MARCELLE: Absolutely.

REPRESENTATIVE DARYL ANDREW DESHOTEL: So, I just would like to know your thought process of giving North Avoyelles, which is a community of interest with more North Louisiana. Why did you give North Avoyelles to a district in -- that would be South Louisiana?

REPRESENTATIVE DENISE MARCELLE: Let me just take that -- I'm not a demographer. What I did was took

the map that the Legal Defense Fund drew to achieve a goal that I thought was possible. And so, they drew it based upon the demographics of the state and the numbers. So I'll allow Jared to answer that for you.

ATTORNEY JARED EVANS: So when we originally submitted our map, Avoyelles Parish was in District 5. When we submitted our maps, we split precincts. You're not supposed to do that.

REPRESENTATIVE DARYL ANDREW DESHOTEL: Okay.

ATTORNEY JARED EVANS: And so when the maps are processed into bill format, precincts were made whole and so that's how -- and making those precincts whole, that's how Avoyelles Parish got split up. But if this is a map of the committee we would like to move forward. We can work with you between now on the floor, to fix that issue and get Avoyelles Parish back whole, I mean, there is a way to get achieve both goals to keep Avoyelles whole if that's what your goal is, and also to maintain to minorities.

SPEAKER 1: So I think my goal -- and I had the same question for Rep. Jenkins with his map. I am -- my whole thought process and maybe it's not right, but I like keeping communities of interest together, okay? I think that that's extremely important and

that's not what's happening here and that's what concerns me.

[02:15:02]

So I want to make sure that we keep our communities of interest together and we understand, you know, it's not just drawing lines. Maybe we really have to think about those communities of interest and this doesn't do that. So, I would definitely have to work on that.

ATTORNEY VICTORIA WENGER: And just a quick point of clarification. So, the original map that we submitted that this bill, mirrors in many ways did have split precincts, which is allowed under both Federal and State Law. The current map that's being presented here does not split precincts but as you just mentioned, splits a parish. So those are different criteria or principles that this body can take into account and can do the balancing and weighing between those are just two options where you could kind of rank those priorities whichever way you think best represents Louisianans. Either of those priorities, however, cannot be valued above compliance with the Voting Rights Act of 1965. So what we're trying to show is that you can create two majority black districts, but you can also account

for those exact types of principles that you also want to take into account for the people that you represent.

REPRESENTATIVE DARYL ANDREW DESHOTEL: I'm not sure if I follow that 100%. I'm still thinking about communities of interest. So, you're saying that creating the two black districts is more important that communities of interest. I'm just trying to follow what you said.

ATTORNEY VICTORIA WENGER: Certainly. So when creating maps, you have to comply with Federal Laws, so the constitution and the Voting Rights Act of 1965. You're also allow to take in a plethora of other criteria including respecting communities of interest, which is what you're talking about as well as maintaining full parish boundaries, which is something we're talking about or keeping precincts whole, which is another criteria. So there's this laundry list of different factors that you need to take into account and can rank in different ways. However, Federal Law has to be first.

REPRESENTATIVE DARYL ANDREW DESHOTEL: Okay. Well, thank you. I appreciate it. But again, I think we'd have to work on this map to accomplish what we all think we need accomplish.

ATTORNEY VICTORIA WENGER: And we'd happy too.

REPRESENTATIVE DENISE MARCELLE: Representative Deshotel, you know that --

REPRESENTATIVE DARYL ANDREW DESHOTEL: It's Deshotel and -- like Newell.

REPRESENTATIVE DENISE MARCELLE: I just want to say Queen Denise will be happy to work with you.

REPRESENTATIVE DARYL ANDREW DESHOTEL: Thank you. I appreciate you.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN M. STEFANSKI: Thank you Representative Deshotel. For a question, Representative Ivey.

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: All right. I'm going to be gentle, Queen Denise. All right. So in your opinion, does the Voting Rights Act or does it require or would it require Louisiana to create a second majority-minority congressional district?

REPRESENTATIVE DENISE MARCELLE: Yes. In my opinion, it does. Based upon the numbers from 2020 census. As I stated when I did my opening comments, I believe that it requires us to attempt to create the second district where people will have the opportunity, it's not a guarantee, but the opportunity to elect someone for a second congressional seat of likeminds.

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: Okay. And what about your legal counsel? Do y'all concur with that answer? Or do you have any other?

REPRESENTATIVE DENISE MARCELLE: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: Okay.

ATTORNEY VICTORIA WENGER: Yes. The Voting Rights Act would require Louisiana to create two districts that allow black voters to elect their candidate of choice.

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: Okay. Where specifically is the requirement to add one -- again, if there are no other parameters other than total population if that -- is there, you know, if that is the only parameter total pop divided by the number of minorities, go get you two districts. If that's not the case, then there are other factors that I'm assuming the judiciary could consider in any kind of legal case that would -- that might present an argument where a map that doesn't provide for two majority-minority districts would still be compliant with Section 2. Is that not a possibility?

ATTORNEY JARED EVANS: Well Representative Ivey, the Supreme Court Thornburg vs. Gingles laid out the factors that you look at to determine whether a map is compliant with Section 2. And the first factor

that the minority community must be geographically compact and sufficiently large to cast to the majority and a single-member district.

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: Right. And that's -- then, and so, geographically compact is -- it is subjective. I'm not saying you didn't achieve it here, okay? But that is subjective.

ATTORNEY VICTORIA WENGER: Compactness can also be mathematically measured as well as in courts look to objective measures of compactness not just --

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: Correct. I know y'all reference that before I read some of the acronyms for those standards.

[02:20:03]

I just not been able to delve into them yet and have y'all done those tests on -- specifically on this map?

ATTORNEY JARED EVANS: Yes.

ATTORNEY VICTORIA WENGER: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE DENISE MARCELLE: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: Have y'all provided those results to this committee?

ATTORNEY VICTORIA WENGER: Yes. We've written to the committee multiple times throughout the --

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: But I mean with the published map. This specific filed map. Have y'all provided?

ATTORNEY VICTORIA WENGER: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: Okay.

ATTORNEY VICTORIA WENGER: What we've indicated with all seven of the maps that LDF submitted during the roadshow and that has been also the inspiration for multiple bills submitted throughout this session is that at least on two of three of those objective measures on compactness. The maps we have presented outperformed the current map and more so they also outperformed the bill that just moved through the Senate, as well as the speaker's bill on at least two of three measures. And what I can say about this bill is that it outperforms among all three.

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: Okay.

ATTORNEY JARED EVANS: And Representative Ivey, we laid all of that out in our October 18th letter. That was given to y'all right before the Monroe Roadshow.

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: Right. But how close is this bill to one of the other bills that you've -- one of the other maps that you all presented before.

Very close with other accepting of the precinct split issue?

ATTORNEY JARED EVANS: It's the same bill with the exception of precincts.

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: Okay. All right, great. That's it.

ATTORNEY VICTORIA WENGER: Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN M. STEFANSKI: Thank you Representative Ivey. Representative Farnum.

REPRESENTATIVE LES FARNUM: Thank you Mr. Vice Chair. What is your definition of gerrymandering?

REPRESENTATIVE DENISE MARCELLE: My definition?

REPRESENTATIVE LES FARNUM: Or anybody at the table.

ATTORNEY VICTORIA WENGER: Gerrymandering can happen many different ways. If you're talking about racial gerrymandering specifically, it would be the dilution of racial groups voting strength by either packing them into one district above a threshold that they need to be able to elect their candidate of choice or cracking them across multiple districts, so that they are essentially impeded from having an influence on the outcome of those elections.

1 REPRESENTATIVE LES FARNUM: So geography ought to
2 play a huge part in the formation of a district, is
3 that correct?
4 ATTORNEY JARED EVANS: It's correct.
5 REPRESENTATIVE LES FARNUM: Plain and simple. I'm
6 going to read Webster's definition of gerrymandering,
7 the practice of diving or arranging a territorial
8 unit into election districts in a way, that gives one
9 political party or race an unfair advantage in an
10 election.
11 Would you agree with that?
12 ATTORNEY VICTORIA WENGER: Yes.
13 REPRESENTATIVE LES FARNUM: So in your mind, I'm
14 looking at this map and a couple of places that goes
15 down to a pencil point and circles around one area
16 and another to gather the voting strength that you
17 need to create the second minority district. Is that
18 correct?
19 REPRESENTATIVE DENISE MARCELLE: That's correct.
20 REPRESENTATIVE LES FARNUM: So, would
21 gerrymandering be permissive to create another
22 minority district legally?
23 ATTORNEY VICTORIA WENGER: The state's interest
24 in complying with the Voting Rights Act can survive
25 strict scrutiny if there's a compelling interest to

1 create opportunity for black voters. What I can see
2 on these maps though is that again, we are looking at
3 other objective measures of this process including
4 compactness, which it performs better on than the
5 current map and the other bills that have moved far
6 this in this process. It also maintains parish lines.
7 It also -- in this version has complete precinct
8 boundaries maintained. So there's multiple other
9 objectives here and when you're getting into racial
10 gerrymandering, you're really looking at whether or
11 not race was the predominant factor, putting aside
12 all else. What we've put on the record multiple times
13 and can attest you now, is that all of these maps
14 that we've presented take into account multiple
15 different criteria and they also comply with the
16 constitution. They have relative balance between the
17 populations. So here is not a case where race is
18 predominating across all other metrics.
19 REPRESENTATIVE LES FARNUM: So, to me, the top
20 three measures and the no-nos and redistricting, you
21 can't base it on race, you can't base it on political
22 party and you absolutely cannot gerrymander to
23 accomplish any of the above. Is that correct?
24 ATTORNEY VICTORIA WENGER: Correct.
25

REPRESENTATIVE LES FARNUM: So, looking at this map at the base of Concordia Parish, it comes down to I don't know -- at this granularity it looks like a road. Is what the district survives. At the base of Concordia before you get to or maybe that's not the base. It comes down to a point where the river touches another side of parish. So, and there're several of them that are split in half and it looks like that was the -- the only way you could get there was to gerrymander.

ATTORNEY JARED EVANS: Well, Representative Farnum, in our original submissions to the committee are maps didn't look this bad. The issue that I mentioned earlier about precincts splits is kind of what makes the maps look like this. And our original submission Concordia Parish was whole.

REPRESENTATIVE LES FARNUM: You get into splitting of precincts and things of that nature that to me is a very disenfranchising method of splitting absolutely an area of interest.

[02:25:02]

When you take an individual precinct and cut it in half, much less a parish or any other thing. So, I guess the method of how you got here is disturbing.

REPRESENTATIVE DENISE MARCELLE: Well, thank you Representative Farnum for your comments. As they said earlier, the initial map split precincts that was concerns about splitting the precincts either we split the precincts or we make the map as we've done in and make them whole. In order to make them whole, we have to do either or and the question becomes, can we work going forward on what that looks like of that concern of that member is. And the answer is, yes, we can. So what we attempted to do was to split the least amount of precincts as possible in this map. If those concerns are still there about those precincts that we've made whole then we can talk and work on it between here and the floor. What I believe is important is that we have another instrument on the floor that we can discuss other than one instrument. Y'all know we pass bills, multiple bills all year through and there are multiple instruments. If we don't have another instrument in which to work well then we only have an instrument that has us with one congressional district. There is nothing to work on. We are stuck with one version of what some of us may believe a lot of is good and some of us may believe a lot of it is not. So, we need to have the voices of the entire state to be presented on the house floor.

1 And this is one of the voices. We're not saying that
2 this is the absolute perfect map. But what we are
3 saying is this is an option other than what we have
4 on the table.
5 REPRESENTATIVE LES FARNUM: Yeah. I just know
6 that the Voting Right Act does not guarantee that a
7 third of six is two. I know that to be true. And in
8 order to get to -- I'm all for creating another
9 district if it makes sense on a map and --
10 REPRESENTATIVE DENISE MARCELLE: Would you help
11 me with this one, Representative Farnum?
12 REPRESENTATIVE LES FARNUM: I don't know how to
13 get there. I just really don't know how to get there
14 because we've --
15 REPRESENTATIVE DENISE MARCELLE: We can pass it
16 out with this committee. You and I can work on our
17 own the floor.
18 REPRESENTATIVE LES FARNUM: We've been blending
19 our communities for decades now and the population is
20 dispersed a lot better than it was in the '60s and
21 all of those things that came out of the '60s have
22 worked quite well to make us all blend our
23 communities a lot better than we did back then. So,
24 getting there is a very difficult process in the
25 world that we live in today.

REPRESENTATIVE DENISE MARCELLE: We didn't say it was easy. We just think it's necessary.

REPRESENTATIVE LES FARNUM: Okay, thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN M. STEFANSKI: Thank you Representative Farnum. For question, Vice Chair Duplessis.

REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Representative Marcelle, thank you for bringing this legislation. You're from Baton Rouge, right?

REPRESENTATIVE DENISE MARCELLE: Absolutely.

REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: All right. So, I've been in and out of the room. So I don't know that I got to hear all your testimony, but I did attend the roadshow, and we went to Baton Rouge, we went to Northern Louisiana, we went to Central Louisiana, we went to Southeast Louisiana, Southwest Louisiana. And do you know what the overwhelming message was that we heard when we went on the roadshow?

REPRESENTATIVE DENISE MARCELLE: I know that in Baton Rouge the overwhelming comments that we had as it relates to the congressional districts, was that we needed two.

REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: To what?

REPRESENTATIVE DENISE MARCELLE: Two congressional districts.

REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Okay. We have two.

REPRESENTATIVE DENISE MARCELLE: To minority-majority.

REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Okay. All right. I just -- I want to be clear.

REPRESENTATIVE DENISE MARCELLE: I'm sorry. Two minority-majority congressional districts, sir.

REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: So, were you are -- which current congressional district are you in?

REPRESENTATIVE DENISE MARCELLE: I'm currently in Troy Carter's District 2.

REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Congressional District 2? Okay.

REPRESENTATIVE DENISE MARCELLE: Correct.

REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Because I'm actually a Congressional District 2 as well. And --

REPRESENTATIVE DENISE MARCELLE: We are miles and miles away.

REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: One of the things that a former colleague and friend, Representative Ted James said during this process was that he believed that his high school and my high

school shouldn't be in the same district, and I countered I say, yeah. You don't want that because we would beat you all every time. But he was really referring to the communities of interest that his high school in McKinley and my high school at St. Aug that those two communities should see two different -- have two opportunities. Their own opportunity to like a candidate of choice. So, I thank you for bringing this legislation and I look forward to making a motion at the appropriate time to move it favorably.

REPRESENTATIVE DENISE MARCELLE: Thank you Representative Duplessis.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN M. STEFANSKI: Thank you Mr. Vice Chair. That clears the Board for questions. I'm going to go to the cards next. Well, actually before we do that, I have a question.

[02:30:01]

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN STEFANSKI: I have a question, was there any detailed voting analysis done to support the map?

ATTORNEY JARED EVANS: Yes, as we outlined in our October 18 letter to the committee.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN STEFANSKI: Okay. And can you provide any of that additional information to the

1 committee other than just what was contained in the
2 packet because obviously I read everything and I read
3 the packet and that's all the cases that were cited
4 down there but I didn't see anything presented in
5 like a format where the committee would have an
6 opportunity to really digest why these districts will
7 perform in a way or what past elections those were
8 based on. So, is that something that you all can
9 provide to the committee?
10 ATTORNEY VICTORIA WENGER: Sir, we can speak to
11 some of that right now.
12 REPRESENTATIVE JOHN STEFANSKI: Yeah, sure.
13 ATTORNEY VICTORIA WENGER: Certainly. So, when
14 we're looking at - well two things, racially
15 polarized voting in general. We're seeing whether or
16 not in this state black voters tend to vote for one
17 candidate and then if white voters who here are the
18 majority tend to vote for another candidate and in
19 any district where white people make up the majority
20 and black population or another population are in the
21 minority. If there are diverging trends in how those
22 two groups are voting, the minority group is never
23 going to have an opportunity to elect their candidate
24 of choice. So, as we mention in that letter, a lot of
25 case law has cited this, has analyzed this and those

1 records are all public. What we went the step beyond
2 to do is look at recent elections as well, so things
3 like Secretary of States race where as many courts
4 have acknowledged, experts have acknowledged if you
5 have candidates of different races, the data is going
6 to be more compelling. However, we also looked at
7 races where you had candidates of the same race to
8 see again if voters who are the ones protected by the
9 Voting Rights Act are voting in different patterns.
10 What we found in a robust level of elections in
11 recent years including just those to name a few,
12 there were patterns of racially polarized voting. But
13 then also, when you look into the performance of the
14 two majority-minority districts that we created both
15 District 2 the current majority-minority district and
16 only one under the current map and then District 5,
17 the new one we've created. We found that by very
18 compelling margins, sometimes up to close to 30%
19 especially for District 2 the current majority
20 district. The candidate preferred by black voters, by
21 voters of color was successful. That gives us the
22 confidence, that's the same confidence that courts
23 are looking for to say that these districts would
24 perform and achieve compliance with the Voting Rights
25 Act under that metric.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN STEFANSKI: Okay. We talked about some of those elections, so you mentioned the Secretary of State's race when was that from?

ATTORNEY JARED EVANS: 2018.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN STEFANSKI: 2018, okay. What other elections did you look at?

ATTORNEY VICTORIA WENGER: Gubernatorial race from 2019.

ATTORNEY JARED EVANS: 2014 U.S. Senate race.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN STEFANSKI: 2014 U.S. Senate. Anything else?

ATTORNEY VICTORIA WENGER: I don't have them all in front of me, I think also if you even just look at media publications from recent congressional cycles as well, you can see some of these patterns manifest as well. So, not even needing to go into the expert research that we have summarized and provided multiple times.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN STEFANSKI: Yeah, I just --

ATTORNEY JARED EVANS: The Special Secretary States race.

ATTORNEY VICTORIA WENGER: Correct.

ATTORNEY JARED EVANS: You already said that but that one's in there as well.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN STEFANSKI: Okay. And so, those three in particular are the ones that you all looked at? I know you said it so --

ATTORNEY VICTORIA WENGER: Yeah.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN STEFANSKI: Is there any way you could provide those detailed analysis to the committee other than just -- I read the report, I did, and I read it but it wasn't like laid out to where you can see, hey, this election in this section, this is how it performed. So, I'm curious if there would be another type of format you could provide the information that you have provided before. I don't discount that you've included that in something but could you provide that in a way that's easily readable and accessible in a one-pager for instance to this committee to consider?

ATTORNEY VICTORIA WENGER: We'd have to consult our team and also look at our resources again, we're a non-profit organization trying to engage in the process but even more so we would compel you as we have many times to please also consult your own experts as well if you're able to obtain them. We have understanding that at least you have legal counsel and I think they've retained them but that would also give you the confidence that through, you

know, people who are working for you as well, these numbers are met and there is both racially polarized voting and the districts that we have provided through multiple different permutations of a map would perform for voters of color certainly more than the districts right now, the five out of six districts, that do not provide people of color the opportunity to elect their candidate of choice.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN STEFANSKI: No. And I understand that and I will take those recommendations into consideration. Certainly, I'm not a czar who has all of those under my control, you know, it's a legislative process and different kind of structure. But again, you know, so we're here to talk about this bill, House Bill 4, right? And this is a bill that the representative said was -- it's your bill in essence. It's your map that she took and put into a bill form. I believe that was the testimony right, Representative?

REPRESENTATIVE DENISE MARCELLE: That's correct.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN STEFANSKI: Okay. And so, I get it, you're saying you need to do all your own stuff but this on bill, it would be --

[02:35:03]

I think, you know, and I'm being honest with this, I think it would be helpful for the committee if we had an opportunity to analyze exactly the same types of data that you use to analyze to help make our decision as well.

ATTORNEY VICTORIA WENGER: Well, and just quickly to clarify the type of data that's going into this analysis is stuff that's publicly available. It's the returns on elections, it's the outcome of elections, it's the racial breakdown of precincts. And Louisiana is a state that actually, you know, collects data on the race of voters which is not the case in all states so that makes that data even more robust to plug into these formulas, these calculations that again are not secret, they're widely accepted by courts. So, all of that is certainly available. I think we've provided how our expert has analyzed it. We'd welcome anyone that you're working with to analyze it as well. I will state again that this map differs slightly. What we did was the analysis for the map that we presented but this one differs slightly, because there was a cost-benefit between precinct splits and keeping parishes whole. So, I am doubtful that that would change the data too much. But again, in terms of providing the most robust

analysis of the bills that you all are considering within this legislative body in terms of resources and your confidence as well working with an expert of your own is certainly our highest recommendation and one that's been adopted in other states.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN STEFANSKI: Yeah. Again, I've heard the recommendation, I get it but again, if you were able to provide us exactly how you analyzed this map not in the summary form but in a breakdown to where we can really dig down and we can see what you saw to come to this conclusion. I do think that's beneficial to the committee and so I've asked for it before, I have asked other people who've come up here and hey, look, please send that stuff to me so I can take a look at it and I haven't had any submittals in a really detailed form and more in a summary form. And I just think, look, we have some committee members I think are becoming junior demographers on here and junior voting -- what's the right, redistricting legal scholars. So, I do think I'm just -- I'm being honest. I think it's helpful when we have all of the same data and can access it the same way that you have because I'll say it again for this committee, when individuals like you come up here, I mean, from committee members who were certainly not

1 even the ones that are not lawyers and it just can be
2 very intimidating from a perspective of you all know
3 exactly what you're talking about. And you have
4 formulated these over years of expertise and had been
5 privy to information in order to come to that
6 conclusion. And so, when we have that same type of
7 stuff beforehand so that we can sit and we can have a
8 discussion of okay, you're saying this precinct is
9 going to perform this way because of this election.
10 Let's look at that. Let's talk about the results in
11 this box and this election and go through that with
12 you. I do think that it would go a long way and it
13 would be helpful. And so, if there's a way that this
14 committee and you could submit that type of detailed
15 analysis not in the summary form, but then we look at
16 this election, and this election, and this precinct,
17 we look at this election and this election, and this
18 precinct, and all of those things, I do think this
19 committee is educated enough and when I say educated,
20 I mean, has been -- we've been a year of our lives
21 we've been doing this stuff. I think we're to the
22 point now to where we're starting -- most people on
23 this committee are starting to understand some of
24 those terms and some of the important aspects of the
25 legalities that are involved in the Voting Rights Act

and involved in a lot of this Federal litigation. And so, that you have made a suggestion to me, I have made a suggestion to you too about some information that could be beneficial. And that was my point. For your question Represented Carter.

REPRESENTATIVE DENISE MARCELLE: Representative Stefanski, if I may?

REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER SR.: You go first

REPRESENTATIVE DENISE MARCELLE: Thank you. I think what you have heard is that, it's not that they're not willing into it. I don't think that they have the resources to necessarily dig into the information that you're requesting to give to you other than what they've already presented and which is where those numbers are coming from, how they got to the analysis, how did they do it. And I think that's what I'm hearing that they don't have the resources to go back in and do something different than --

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN STEFANSKI: That's not what I heard. I heard that they provided to us already but just in one type of format. I was just asking for the different type of format.

REPRESENTATIVE DENISE MARCELLE: Correct.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN STEFANSKI: Yeah. And I'm not saying you're wrong but I heard was that well, we've given you that already and I said yeah, but not necessarily in the format that allows an easy, accessible way for us to analyze that so we can make our own determination of whether or not these districts will do what they're being purported to do. That's what I'm getting at. And so Representative Marcelle, I'm not saying you're wrong, I'm just saying that's what I heard. Got it?

REPRESENTATIVE DENISE MARCELLE: I'm glad you're saying I'm right, thank you very much.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN STEFANSKI: Look, very rarely does John Stefanski tries to go to an argument with Denise Marcelle and you know that. Representative Carter for your question.

[2:40:00]

REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER SR.: Actually, I'm looking at these various maps we've seen thus far, congressional maps and House Bill 1 was the one that we had opportunity to look at and this is another one. And I've got more information in this bill and actually, I had about 15 -- it looks like 15 different organization signed off on this communication to the House Government Affairs

1 Committee back in October 18, that's when I got it.
2 And as a lawyer that has handled some Civil Rights
3 cases in my 10 years in Florida, 7 years as a lawyer
4 I've got more information out of this than I've ever
5 seen. So, you all done an outstanding job of breaking
6 down why we should have two districts minority-
7 majority districts and how do this would perform. No,
8 you don't have every precinct you look at to see how
9 they were performed. But the inquiry here is whether
10 or not we can come up with a district that will
11 comply with Section 2 i.e., they'll allow people of a
12 group to select a candidate of their choice if they
13 are significant numbers in the total number. So, we
14 have 33% of the population. We have 57% white, 33%
15 black, that's the 2020 census basic is what we're
16 dealing with. We want to have one affected particular
17 class blacks that has enough population to get a
18 congressional district, okay. So, what you did, you
19 had just about 30 pages of material that I read
20 through, it's a lot of material and it breaks down
21 the law, it breaks down a lot of statutory arguments
22 being made in other cases and how you dealt with that
23 and the numbers. And so, I think you've done a
24 tremendous job and I actually no proposal yet that's
25 done as much work that you've done. So, to make you

1 require you to go get every precinct you study and
2 looked at, I think that's not fair, okay, because
3 nobody has had to do that. And nobody has explained
4 why they have the -- two congressional districts why
5 it's so important and why we'd be violating the law
6 we didn't do it. Based on what you're doing you
7 really gave more than one option to this legislature.
8 This is one option. You gave several there, I think
9 about five different options, seven, so, seven
10 options, okay. And actually, your map, that's much
11 different from the map we got now.
12 ATTORNEY JARED EVANS: That's exactly what we're
13 -
14 REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER SR.: You know
15 that's another important point I want to make. I
16 looked at both maps I said, they're not that much
17 different. All you did is cut off that part of
18 District 2 that come in in East Baton Rouge Parish
19 and create another district by reducing District 2
20 numbers. And if Troy Carter don't have any problem
21 with it, I ain't got a problem with it, okay. So,
22 apparently, you must have satisfied him that the
23 studies you've done would be that he would -- that
24 district produced favorable to him. And I assume you
25 did the same study for District 5. And so, number

one, it's not that outrageous of a map. Number two, it's backed by a lot of study and research that more so than anybody gave us, okay? And I would really hope that we take a serious look at this map and it will solve a lot of problems. It will bring a lot of people together to do the right thing. And you look at the numbers, it had come closer to the numbers by the representation and black representation of any state. And so, that's why I commend you Representative Marcelle, you got a good team here and they've done their homework and I would certainly also support consideration of this map. Here's one map, I know they got all these, this is the impression you got, there's one and I'm sure they got the other map that this group has accessor, there's about 15 different organization that success that came up with, this is one of them. But all of them are pretty good, I like this from here.

REPRESENTATIVE DENISE MARCELLE: Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN STEFANSKI: Thank you, Representative Carter for your question. Vice-Chair Duplessis?

REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I think this is more of a point than a question because when the issue was raised around

voting performance analysis and whether or not a certain number would dictate or indicate the black community's ability to select the candidate of choice. There's been some back-and-forth there about what is the right number and is that based on any sort of voting analysis because we only have one seat here in Louisiana, we don't have too many examples.

[02:45:06]

But I did look nationally at some of the districts that are considered majority-minority and they're all by percentage -- but by percentages alone that being 50 plus 1 percentage. There are 22 congressional seats nationally that are above 50 plus 1%, but there are as I understand at least 53 voting members of U.S. Congress who identify as African-American. So that means there is actual evidence that we can look to nationally that you don't need 50 plus 1% to be elected -- to be an African-American representing a community in Congress. There's also evidence to the contrary that you -- if given the opportunity, you all will not believe what I'm about to share. What we might consider to be the blackest district in the country, this is in Tennessee, 65.7% minority district is represented by a non-black person that is in Tennessee. So, to me that says that

the people there, that is who they wanted to represent them. When we talk about candidates of choice, right? That's in the minority. That's one example. But the point is that I can go to Illinois, Congressman, he's about to retire, Bobby Rush, former Black Panther. He represents a district that is just made up of 51.3% African-American. I just think it's important that we share as we talk about voting trends and in populations. I'm still looking for examples where you have something other than the one in Tennessee that I shared where you have something in the 51%, 52% range where black candidates are struggling to get elected because I think there are examples out there where we can see. So, I think that's important for us to point out because, yeah.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN STEFANSKI: Yeah, I'm just curious is that total pop? I'm just curious what --

REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: So, I think that is total pop, not vote days pop.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN STEFANSKI: Yes, sir.

REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: And I didn't know if you all had anything in addition to add or if anything I said was not true but I do think as we're talking about it, it's important for us to just know that.

ATTORNEY JARED EVANS: Thank you so much for making that point Representative Duplessis. Your obligation under the law, the obligation of a committee in a legislature is to drive districts that provide minorities and opportunity. Opportunity does not mean guarantee, that does not mean that that person is guaranteed to win, that just means that the voters of color in that district have an opportunity to look at their other choice and that person has a chance of actually being successful in that election.

REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN STEFANSKI: Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chair. All right, that clears the board for questions. I'll go to the cards if you all don't mind. Janea Jamison? You're going to -- present and would like to speak in support?

JANEA JAMISON: Hello.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN STEFANSKI: Whenever you're ready. Yes, ma'am.

JANEA JAMISON: Good morning, Chairman, members of the committee. I'll probably reinstate some of the things that were previously said, but I still would like to provide my perspective. My name is Janea Jamison, I'm Director of Programs with Power Coalition for Equity and Justice. I know our

1 organization has been brought up quite a few times so
2 to bring clarity, our organization, it's a civic
3 engagement table that works to shift power back to
4 the people and we fight against policies that hurt
5 Louisiana families. We focus on increasing voter
6 participation and turnout and just building support
7 structures for community activism and voice. And our
8 goal is to ensure that community voices are heard. As
9 elected leaders, you should honor the needs of the
10 people and when I say the people, I mean all
11 Louisianians. From October 20, 2021 to January 20,
12 2022, 10 regional road shows were held throughout the
13 state and every single road show, the public made it
14 clear that there was an urgent need for an equitable
15 redistricting process and demanded fair changes to
16 the congressional districts. I have an evident love
17 for this state as we all do. We all play a role as
18 advocates, as activists, as elected officials, but a
19 specific demographic of citizens can't be ignored
20 throughout this process such as voters of color and
21 to be clear, black voters. Ten roadshows, 10 days of
22 this current session, and there has been an outcry of
23 the need for change for additional representation
24 each day.
25 [2:50:06]

I respect each of you as a leader but as a voice on the ground, I cannot ignore the voices of minorities who have continuously shown up and showed out, and made it clear that they're sick and tired of being underrepresented. I know each of you has put in a strenuous amount of work, research, and time to draw a map that you feel is the best. However, I challenge you to look beyond party lines. I challenge you to respect that what has been stated repeatedly, additional representation for one-third of the state's population. the people have charged you to create an additional majority-minority district that complies with Section 2 of the VRA. The people have challenged you to create a map that moves us closer to reflect the current percentage of minority voters contained within the state of Louisiana. I cannot support a map that does not even attempt to create a minimum, a minority opportunity district that will provide minority voters with at least a chance or opportunity to elect a candidate of choice. A district that packs 60% of the total black population does not provide black voters with an equitable say in how they are governed. A map that doesn't offer at least at minimum a minority opportunity district to elect their candidate of choice would mean that the

public testimony, civic engagement, the organizing and educational components involving the community were simply in vain. I trust and believe in your leadership to reevaluate and center all voices and ensure that everyone is heard. The process is long, the burden is heavy, and many guidelines and criteria must be in place. But I ask you to work together and to create a map that is a fair representation of the state of Louisiana that we all love. The issue should not just be black or white, Democrat or Republican, but simply ensuring that all Louisianian's voices are fairly heard. I cannot support -- again, I cannot support any plan that is remotely similar to the current plan. The current plan lines have not been drawn in decades. The Voting Rights Act again does not guarantee an outcome, but guarantees at least an opportunity. HB4 is just one of the multiple bills presented today that would do just that. And in closing, you cannot provide equity for all Louisianians while ignoring a growing demographic.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN STEFANSKI: Thank you. There are no questions. Thank you for your testimony. Next, present in support would like to speak to Davante Lewis.

DAVANTE LOUIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. I'm going to do something a little bit different than I normally do. I don't think it's lost on me that in this room typically is joint budget. It's normally the appropriations committee where we're debating resources. A lot of people come with a bunch of requests and this committee in this room typically is debating resources. And requests are denied simply because we don't have enough resources. The debate on these congressional maps whether or not we should have two minority-majority districts is not centered on resources. You had a letter that my organization signed on, seven different maps. Today, you'll hear five. The question presented in front of you is not about whether or not you can do it. It's about will you do it. Will you honor people? I know we've all been here a long time, I've been here everyday with you all. I'm tired and I know you are tired. But I want to talk about another tired. I want to talk about the tired of my family. This debate reminds me of someone who I've learned a lot about, my great, great, great grandmother Liza, born in Sheraton, Louisiana, 1873. Moved there after her mother and father were released from the plantation in New

1 Orleans. Eight years, she was born after slavery
2 ended. My great, great grandmother known as Alberta,
3 better known as Ma was born in 1901. She was born
4 five years after Plessy V. Ferguson. My great
5 grandmother who raised me lived with me until 2012,
6 was born in 1920, just a year after women got the
7 right to vote. My grandmother who's watching probably
8 right now born in 1948, six years old --
9 [02:55:01]
10 that's how old she was when Brown v. Board of
11 Education came from the Supreme Court. It was five
12 months before her 18th birthday when the Voting
13 Rights Act which we're talking about today was
14 passed. My mother was five years old before Louisiana
15 finally desegregated every school in 1976. That's 149
16 years from the date my great-great-grandmother was
17 born to this very moment. She had a letter that is
18 passed down in our family that she asked her mother
19 and it was, "Did they see you? Did they hear you? Did
20 they value you?" 149 years, I'm asking that same
21 question. Do you see me? Do you hear me? Do you value
22 me? This is not about resources. The Voting Rights
23 Act came because you didn't value people that look
24 like me. You didn't see me. So the semantics that we
25 argue about whether or not it complies with VRA or

not is irrelevant because the reason it came is because people who said in your shoes chose not to do the right thing. This is a choice that we have. This is not about partisanship politics. It's not about whether or not I can win another election. It's not about whether or not I'm going against the speaker or I'm standing with the governor. It's about do you value people who live in this state? Do you value that at 149-year legacy that I'm carrying right now? I think of the Book of Joshua. When Joshua was on the way to the Battle of Jericho and he saw men in front of him with a sword and he asked him the question "Are you with me or are you with my enemy?" And that man said, I'm with neither. I'm a soldier in the army of the Lord. And we need to see each other. And Joshua fell to his knees and said, "Thank you." It's not about a fight. The sword in front of us today is not about Democrat versus Republican or black or white, it's about do you respect and honor all God's children? That's the battle. Whose side are you on? I think about the song my grandmother and my great-grandmother sung in Lake Charles when they were at First Ward Colored School, I think Representative Carter went there, where they would sing that old hymn, which side are you on? Are you fighting the

fight or are you with the con? Which side are you on? I support HB 4, I support all the other maps because I'm choosing a side. And I ask you before you click that green or red button upstairs, because I understand the political process. I know exactly where this is going. I want you to ask yourself that, which side did you stand on? And don't allow another 149 years of pain and trauma go on. Which side will this committee be on? Which side will this legislature be on? Which side will this governor be on? Be on the side of the people. Choose a side. Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN STEFANSKI: Thank you, Mr. Lewis. Jared Evans had filled out a card. I know you -- you're good, right? Yep. Okay. And Ms. Victoria had filled out a card. Michael Pernick is present in support, willing to provide information if anyone needs any. Chris Kaiser's present in support, not wishing to speak. Hilda Tiburcio present, in support not wishing to speak. Lady Carlson present in support, not wishing to speak. Frankie Robertson present in support, not wishing to speak. And Mary Labrie present in opposition not wishing to speak. That concludes all the cards. I invite Representative Marcelle up again. Oh, we have another card? Just

1 give me a second, Representative Marcelle. It's a
2 wishing to speak. Mr. Cage would, I'm sorry. You came
3 in late. Present in support wishing to speak, Edgar
4 Cage.
5 EDGAR CAGE: Good afternoon, Mr. Chair, Vice
6 Chair and committee. My name is Edgar Cage and I'm
7 with Together Louisiana.
8 [03:10:01]
9 And, you know, I've been down to this capitol
10 every day for the last nine years with the exception
11 of time a year before last, I got COVID from being
12 down here, but I'm here. This is a very important
13 issue and the process is very important also. But
14 what I've witnessed from this process today is
15 something that I don't understand. I'm scratching my
16 head about it. How can and why do we pass certain
17 bills without requesting analysis and additional
18 information about how a precinct or how a district
19 will perform? We passed a bill out of this committee,
20 while if we create a second majority-minority
21 district, it might dilute the vote of the district
22 that you have now without any analysis, without any
23 scrutiny. Let's be fair, at least in the process. If
24 you -- and don't make people jump through hoops when
25 you know how you're going to vote anyway. At least do

what you said was right. Well, I can't say what's right or what's fair because the outcome would be totally different. The people of Louisiana in your roadshows that you, this committee conducted sent you a clear message from all over the state. You had people, young people come here the first day you're in session and subsequent days to express to you their desire. They want to live in Louisiana. They want to raise their families here. They want to be citizens of this state and produce for this state, but the decisions we're making today would give them no choice. No choice but to go somewhere else. They're very simple. I mean, and I hear about the math and Representative Duplessis, I know you went to St. Aug, a lot of friends went to St. Aug but no matter what school you went to, one-third of six, one-third of six is two. The Voting Rights Act don't have to tell me that. My math teacher in third grade taught me that. That's all we're asking for is the consideration, the opportunity for fair representation, and a consideration for opportunity to move the bills that may be different from what you feel but don't require certain analysis and additional information before you move when you

didn't before. Let's just be real and be straight. Thank you very much.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN STEFANSKI: We do have a question, Vice Chair Duplessis. No? Oh, you just want to make a statement? Okay, appreciate it Mr. Cage. Thank you, sir.

REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: I think Mr. Cage made a very poignant and excellent observation. There were bills that were passed out of committee. No discussion. No question. No analysis had been provided but here we are with Representative Marcelle's bill and we're like, we're getting down into the weeds. You know, we're talking about all of these questions around now analysis and I want to thank you for raising that point because I think you hit the nail on the head, sir. Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN STEFANSKI: Thank you, Mr. Vice Chair. That completes all the questions. Everything, I'll allow you an opportunity to close, Representative Marcelle.

REPRESENTATIVE DENISE MARCELLE: Thank you, Chairman Stefanski and members of this committee. I first want to thank the Legal Defense Fund for all of the hard work that they have done, for staying engaged, getting the numbers right, doing all these

maps. I know it's been a task and I want to thank you guys from the bottom of my heart for at least giving us an opportunity to look at maps that create two minority-majority seats. Having said that, I think it's just logical that New Orleans and Baton Rouge should not be packed into one congressional seat. I didn't need -- I'm not a demographer, but I didn't need anybody to come and tell me that because that's what I believe. I also believe that the one-third should come out to two regardless of where you are and how we draw it. We can agree to disagree on how we get there on whether those precincts are split or whether we have to do something with the parishes. We can continue to work on this legislation, but I think it's important that the people that we represent all over this state, we shouldn't make people feel like they came to roadshows

[03:05:01]

from the top of the state down to the boot of the state. And they came out in mass numbers to tell us what they prefer or what they thought should happen with their districts and the places that they lived. And I think it would be unconscionable of us to vote in a different manner to not even allow these types of bills to be heard where there's another choice. We

have to do what's right by the citizens of the state and pass this bill out of committee to have it heard on the floor to continue to work on it. No bill is perfect, none, but we can work on this. We can make this right for the state of Louisiana, for all of the citizens, particularly the two minority-majority districts that we're asking to be created. It is fair. It is what is right to have like-minded people be able to vote for a person of their choice, to have them the opportunity. It doesn't guarantee anything but let's give them the opportunity. If we do not vote to pass this bill out here, what we're saying to people are is that we don't even want you to have the opportunity to have another congressional seat. And I don't think that any of us came here to do that to any part of the state. I want you to do what's right. I really want to pick up an offering for Davante in that sermon that he preached because I'm going to let him do my closing remarks next time but he said it better than I could ever say it. Let's do what's right by people, no matter the color, no matter the party. Let's do what's right by the census. It makes no difference, makes no sense to have a census. We could just skip it. It's a lot of money we spent. We can just skip the census if we're going to go with

the status quo. A member told me, I said, you know, what are you guys going to do? I just say, you know what we're going to do, we're going to do what we want to do and I hope that's the right thing. I hope that's the right thing. Thank you for allowing me to present House Bill 4 and I ask for your favorable passage.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN STEFANSKI: Thank you, Representative Marcelle. Thank you for all the testimony we got today. Members, Vice Chair Duplessis has made a motion that we move favorable on House Bill 4. Is there any objection? There is an objection. Ms. Ammersbach will call the roll. Members, a vote yes means to move the bill favorable. A vote no means the bill will remain in committee. Ms. Ammersbach will call the roll.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Vice Chairman Duplessis.

REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Beaullieu.

REPRESENTATIVE GERALD BEAULLIEU: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Wilford Carter.

REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Deshotel.

REPRESENTATIVE DARYL DESHOTEL: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Farnum.

REPRESENTATIVE LES FARNUM: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Gadberry.

REPRESENTATIVE FOY GADBERRY: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Hodges.

REPRESENTATIVE VALARIE HODGES: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Horton.

REPRESENTATIVE DODIE HORTON: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Ivey. Representative Jenkins.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Mike Johnson.

REPRESENTATIVE MIKE JOHNSON: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative LaCombe.

REPRESENTATIVE JEREMY LACOMBE: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Lyons.

REPRESENTATIVE RODNEY LYONS: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Magee.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Newell.

REPRESENTATIVE CANDACE NEWELL: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Thomas.

REPRESENTATIVE POLLY THOMAS: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative White.

REPRESENTATIVE MALINDA WHITE: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Seven yays, nine nays.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN STEFANSKI: Seven yays, nine nays and that motion fails. Thank you, Ms. Marcelle. Next up, we have House Bill 7 by Representative Moore. I believe she has authorized Representative Jefferson to handle this bill. Representative Jefferson, whenever you're ready.

REPRESENTATIVE PATRICK JEFFERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Notwithstanding, despite and irrespective, I don't know why, I just want to utter Joshua fought the Battle of Jericho and the walls came tumbling down. Thank you so much for giving me this opportunity on behalf of Representative Moore and Representative Fisher. It's not my style but I'm going to acquiesce and be obedient. Representative Moore asked me to read something into the record and I'm going to comply because she is experiencing her hour of challenge at this moment. Otherwise, she would be here. And basically, she says good afternoon. I would say top of the afternoon, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Vice Chairman and esteemed members

of H and G. Unfortunately, I'm not able to come before you and present HB 7 but I am grateful that my colleague has agreed to present it in my stead.

[03:10:01]

Thank you for allowing him to speak. When you all traveled to Monroe with the Redistricting Roadshow in October, the people were grateful for the opportunity to voice their opinions. Many expressed their concerns and asked for not less than a majority-minority seats including the congressional and [INDISCERNIBLE 03:10:22] seats. Because one in three Louisianians are black and only one of the six congressional districts has a majority black population, the people have asked to create an additional congressional seat preferably in Northeast Louisiana. They also were aware of the Northern Louisiana population change and that the voting age population showed that the white population decreased by 7.8% and the black population increased by 0.1%. She goes on to say that she did not speak that night. However, she did talk to the many individuals who came forward. They understood that drawing the lines had to comply with the Voting Rights Act Section 2. I told them that I believe that my colleagues again that proverbial phrase, do the right thing. We would

consider the population change and shift. It is an honor to represent the people of Ouachita Parish and I pray that we as a body will pass legislation that will reflect the African-American's growth. Therefore, she's asking as we will do that this piece of legislation moves forward favorably. I want to also, as in the side real briefly in the economy of time, I'd like to start with those things in which we can agree upon. First and foremost, all of us will contend that this task that we have been vested to undertake is monumental. Now, there are many of us who are now pseudo-experts. Some a little more so than others, but this is a monumental task notwithstanding, this is ours to do and those who follow us. Number two, nobody will contend that we have a top-flight staff. Every one of them from the lowest to the highest, they are exemplary in every respect and they have assisted when queried, they've assisted even when we have not questioned and for that, we are grateful. Number three, and this is what I'm most proud of, the public has been phenomenal. Whether it was on the roadshow or here in committee are coming, watching us on the floor, our public, our people, Brother Johnson, they have been outstanding, all Louisiana, whether they have sent in cards in

support or against. They have participated in this process. So that's something that we can agree upon and then lastly, as my seatmate, Chairman of the Democratic Caucus alluded and so many others that this is yet but another attempt as we go through this laborious but yet essential process. We have an opportunity to comply because all of us have heard. All of us have participated and all of us have seen as it relates to what the demands are. As it relates to HB 7, this map, of course, out of respect in deference to my colleague before and those who will follow, I believe, as we say in North Louisiana, this is the bestest map that we will present. However, I do understand that maybe you may not agree with me but I believe when you look behind me and you perhaps see chairs that are not seated by individuals who look like me and you. But there are many individuals behind me who are impressing upon us, who are impressing upon us to do the right thing. They are impressing upon us to assist those walls to come tumbling down. Now, you may say, as you look at the map, its configuration. Well, as you've heard ad nauseam the testimony as it relates to what the requirements are. This is our effort spearheaded by Representative Moore. This is our attempt to comply

and to do something that the people have demanded that we do. Now, you've heard a lot of individuals as it relates to compactness and what have you. One of the similarities, if you look at the map, either they are bordering one state or they are bordering another state. So there is a link. There is continuity --

[03:15:01]

and there is a link where as these parishes, we've tried to make them as whole as possible. There is commonality and common interests as you've also heard. So again, the data is going to be duplicative. It's going to be duplicitous. It's going to perhaps recite the same things and I like my other colleague. I want to say to Legal Defense Fund and other groups who have also expended a lot of time and energy on behalf of the entirety of the State of Louisiana. Thank you. Thank you for the energy, the effort that you have put into this process. And again, this is my attempt following Representative Moore and Representative Fisher to comply with what our constituents have asked that we do and that is to create this second district that is representative. And the last thing I'll say because Dr. Kaufman is going to come by and she's really going to wow you. What I'd like to say is, we've heard a lot about the

celebration of cultures in this great state. This piece of legislation allows us to celebrate the vast diversity, the vast cultures that we have by allowing us to have this second district. Now again, I could but in the immediate economy of time go and dissect the differences between HB 1 and this piece of legislation, but I get it or as we say in North Louisiana, and I wasn't English major, I gets it, but I want to make sure that you understand and can appreciate as I did the other day, Dr. Thomas, that we are speaking on behalf of the citizenry of the great State of Louisiana as it relates reflecting upon our diversity, reflecting upon the population and reflecting upon at the end of the day, that all of us have been tasked and charged to do what the constitution mandates. And in this instance, this is not violative of the Voting Rights Act but it also embraces us. It gives us an opportunity to say no, we comply it because we had an opportunity to create this district. We had an opportunity to choreograph this district and that's what we did. So, with that Mr. Chairman again, thank you for allowing me to stand in for Representative Moore and thank you for allowing me to articulate because for the most part, these two fine individuals will assist us if there

are any questions that we might have and thank you for your consideration.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN STEFANSKI: Thank you, Representative and I have to comment just because we don't want to have too many bills that you and I are in front of your mastery of the English language has always impresses me. I love that. I love the way you approach it. Let me just clarify something that you talked about. I think you were speaking about in your proposed map of, rather Representative Moore's proposed map, the Congressional District 5. You spoke about a commonality of border parishes. I've never heard that before. Could you elaborate on that? You're the first person I've ever heard talk about a commonality being a border parish.

REPRESENTATIVE PATRICK JEFFERSON: And again, I adopted that listening to the learned individuals in this committee as they talked about common interests. When you look at most five, they are either bordering Arkansas or Arkansas or Mississippi, it's a Z. So that's bordering another state. Many of our residents live in Louisiana but perhaps work elsewhere so that's the commonality that I was referring to.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN STEFANSKI: And now you're a, you -- I believe you could probably speak to this

because you're a citizen of Claiborne, if I'm correct. Am I correct?

REPRESENTATIVE PATRICK JEFFERSON: That's correct. That is correct.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN STEFANSKI: All right. I'm learning where everyone lives. It's an amazing thing.

REPRESENTATIVE PATRICK JEFFERSON: Yes, sir. All of us are.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN STEFANSKI: Yeah. And so talk to me about what it means to be a border parish and how that -- talk to me about what that new -- for your parish for Claiborne bordering another state, what does that mean to you? What is that -- you know, talk to me about that commonality. I'm generally curious.

REPRESENTATIVE PATRICK JEFFERSON: This is an upside but since we are going to have a surplus, we'll be able to deal with it. Once you leave Claiborne Parish and many of the northern parishes, any parish in the State of Louisiana and you go to Arkansas or Texas or Mississippi, you could immediately tell you're in another state because of the roads, first and foremost. Number two, when unfortunately, we've had catastrophic events as it relates to hurricanes and other disasters, many

1 individuals come north to prepare themselves as it
2 relates to going back.
3 [03:20:01]
4 So in those two instances, that gives us a
5 commonality and then we have a lot of logging, a lot
6 of forestry, things of that nature. That also helps
7 us as it relates to being in common interest.
8 REPRESENTATIVE JOHN STEFANSKI: Interesting.
9 Okay. Members, do we have any questions for the
10 committee? I see none on here. I'm going to go ahead
11 and go to the cards if not. We do of course have Mr.
12 Jared Evans with the NAACP Legal Defense Fund ready
13 and present to give testimony and if you would like
14 to sir, after [INDISCERNIBLE 03:20:32], you're
15 welcome to do that. We also have Ms. Victoria Wenger
16 with the NAACP Legal Defense Fund in support,
17 present, and ready to give a testimony should we need
18 it as well. Also filling out a card in support
19 willing to provide information, if necessary, Michael
20 Pernick. In support not wishing to speak, Chris
21 Kaiser, Janea Jamison, Davante Lewis, Frankie
22 Robertson. Filling out a card in support and wishing
23 to speak is your colleague, Ms. Tammy Phelps if she's
24 here. Oh, Ms. Phelps.
25

1 REPRESENTATIVE TAMMY PHELPS: Good afternoon,
2 committee. Thank you, Chairman Stefanski. Just, I
3 want to thank my colleagues for the bringing the
4 additional maps and just on behalf of the people of
5 the State of Louisiana. When you first mentioned
6 again, how the people came out, Rep. Jefferson across
7 the state. Again, we are not listening or there are
8 words that are going on deaf ears. I have had the
9 question again, why do we ask them come out, why did
10 we waste taxpayer's dollars going around the state if
11 we're not listening to them? And I'm looking at
12 everybody and I already know my words are going on
13 deaf ears right now but I think I have the obligation
14 to still speak for them. Once again, Louisiana's at
15 the bottom of the totem pole. I don't know if it's --
16 what appears to be such a black-white issue. I don't
17 know why we cannot serve all the citizens of
18 Louisiana, not based on their color of their skin
19 because no one asked to come here and no one chose
20 the color of their skin. And it really bothers me as
21 we travel -- I travel outside of our state and it
22 looked like there are all kinds of efforts being made
23 to represent everyone. Inclusion, because obviously
24 that's what America's made of but African-Americans
25 always fall short. Anyone can come over here from any

other country and feel just as welcome. They can come to the melting pot, come to Louisiana, come to New Orleans and things are still so different. So I guess what I'm asking again which we already probably know, I hope I'll be very sharp that we are allowed the opportunity to get this map or any of them out other than what the speaker has presented. As I was a school board member, we would ask the committee, constituents from each committee of 12 to get together and this may have used the example of giving their choice about choosing a superintendent. And we would ask them to give their time and their energy for free and at the end of the day, it made no difference what their input was. That is bothering me since the 2000s, early 2000s. And I cannot believe in 2001, here we are at this state again, never expecting that we were not here and respect and listen to, to the people around the state for what they're asking. So again, I'm going to try to do it for them again. Please, committee members, we sat again, we're on the floor 105. I don't know when it has ever mattered, I've only been here. This is the third year. And disappointedly so, I see sometimes it doesn't matter what is being said. I don't know if party lines are so thick. I can never think of an

opportunity where it was really about us and the people. I thank Representative Fontenot said it the other day. We're one way in the chambers, we're another way outside of the chambers. That hurts. I know this building is not about emotions but some of us have conscience. We have a heart for people that put us here to serve. If you will be so kind, please know that one map, and one opportunity may not be it because people are asking and we're only asking you to allow more than one map to leave this committee so that other members will have an opportunity to vote for the people that they represent.

[03:25:01]

Lastly, if I can ask the question, why is it that we ask for these roadshows and ask people to come out but only one opportunity is given to them per one map laid in this room? What is my answer to the community that I serve for that question? Maybe whomever would like to answer. Maybe we could think about it. If no answer, thank you Representative Stefanski.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN STEFANSKI: There are no questions, Representative Phelps. Thank you. Filling out a card in opposition, Mary Labrie. Representative, if you'd like to come back up and close. It looks like the board is still clear.

REPRESENTATIVE PATRICK JEFFERSON: Again, real briefly, Mr. Chairman and members of this esteemed committee, in my prayer the other day, I focused on two words, thank you. I want to thank each and every one of you for number one, availing yourself for the process. Number two, I want to thank you for in my heart of hearts believing that at least you are considering all this being presented before you. And number three, I want to thank you that what we do during this session, this is the interesting thing because all of us are public servants but in many instances we will plant trees that we will never sit underneath. So what we do during this time, the next group of legislators who come behind us will see what we've done and hopefully if there were errors, they'll correct. And if there were good things which I'm sure there have been many good things, they'll build upon. So again, I ask you, this is another attempt as it relates to complying to the people's demands as well as what the census has presented and I ask that you consider it and that we all do what we feel is right as it relates to all of Louisiana.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN STEFANSKI: Thank you, Representative. Members [INDISCERNIBLE 03:27:12] pleasure of the committee. There's a bunch of them --

I believe I heard Sam first. Representative Jenkins has made a motion that we move House Bill 7 favorable. Is there any objection? There is an objection. Ms. Ammersbach will call the roll.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Vice Chairman Duplessis?

REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Beaullieu?

REPRESENTATIVE GERALD BEAULLIEU IV: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Wilford Carter?

REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER, SR.: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Deshotel?

REPRESENTATIVE DARYL ANDRO DESHOTEL: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Farnum?

REPRESENTATIVE LES FARNUM: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Gadberry?

REPRESENTATIVE FOY BRYAN GADBERRY: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Hodges?

REPRESENTATIVE VALARIE HODGES: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Horton?

REPRESENTATIVE DODIE HORTON: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Ivey? Representative Jenkins?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Mike Johnson?

REPRESENTATIVE MIKE JOHNSON: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative LaCombe?

REPRESENTATIVE JEREMY LACOMBE: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Lyons?

REPRESENTATIVE RODNEY LYONS: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Magee? Representative Newell?

REPRESENTATIVE CANDACE NEWELL: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Thomas?

REPRESENTATIVE POLLY THOMAS: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative White?

REPRESENTATIVE MALINDA WHITE: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Seven yays, eight nays.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN STEFANSKI: Seven yays, eight nays and the motion fails. Thank you, Representative Jenkins. Next up, Jefferson. I'm sorry. I'm sorry. It's a long day, you're right. Representative Gaines for House Bill 8 next.

REPRESENTATIVE RANDAL GAINES: I came to the table Mr. Chairman. I would assume before you called my name that you weren't going to skip over me so.

REPRESNETATIVE JOHN STEFANSKI: Just trying to go in order. The only one we jumped is Representative Jenkins because I wanted to continue on where we were from the day before.

REPRESENTATIVE RANDAL GAINES: Thank you, members of the committee. I appreciate the opportunity to have a chance to speak to you this morning on the proposed map that we feel will achieve all of the objectives of the Voting Rights Act as well as all equitable and fair consideration when it comes to providing minorities in the State of Louisiana and the opportunity to elect someone with shared value, shared interest and to be aboard for them to advance the things that will change their lives. This particular map is more compact than any of the maps that's been presented. Louisiana has one-third black population. That's evident. The current map that we operate on now with the one out of six districts being a minority district. That current map and the other five districts that value black's voting strength. The maps that we're presenting today and this particular map solved that problem.

[03:30:00]

It aligns the community of interest. It's compact. It's regularly shaped, void of any

1 irregularities in terms of the shape and design and
2 it meets all of the constitutionally mandated
3 requirements for reapportionment and redistricting.
4 This particular map does that all at the same time of
5 creating a second minority district to allow blacks
6 to get fair representation. Now, it took 120 years
7 for a black to be elected to congress not considering
8 reconstruction and there was a particular specified
9 area but it took 120 years and that was Bill
10 Jefferson in 1991 when he was elected as the first
11 black since reconstruction of congress. In 1965, the
12 Voting Rights Act was passed which outlawed in trans-
13 racism and I'm sure you've read the books, seen the
14 stories, watched the documentaries in which black
15 people were not allowed to vote. In most areas of the
16 south, only 10% of blacks prior to 1965 were able to
17 vote, 10%. One percent in summary was Alabama. The
18 Voting Rights Act changed that and it changed the
19 political landscape but even after the Voting Rights
20 Act was passed in 1965, it took another 26 years for
21 Louisiana to elect a black congressman, 26 years.
22 Now, Louisiana was still one-third black. We're one-
23 third black in 1970, was one-third black in 1980, it
24 was one-third black in 1990, we still did not have a
25 representative to represent the interests of blacks

1 in the state which is totally unfair. All we're
2 asking for now is another opportunity to elect a
3 proportionate representative that's proportionate to
4 the current configuration, two out of six. So we
5 won't continue the pattern of disenfranchising as
6 that have been -- that has persisted even not only
7 before the Voting Rights Act but even after. We can
8 change that pattern and we can change that consistent
9 pattern of disenfranchising black communities. So we
10 can't complain and we do often see that the
11 mainstream America complain about the ills, the
12 social ills of some of our disenfranchised
13 communities, the inner cities. We complain about
14 crime. We complain about drugs but we don't allow
15 them to elect a representative that's going to lead
16 the charge to transform those communities into
17 productive communities. But we can't complain about
18 the problem without creating solutions to do and this
19 is a solution, to allow a representative or an
20 additional representative that's going to represent
21 black interest in Louisiana that's going to help them
22 change the trajectory of their communities, change
23 their lives. And Rep. Farnum, you made a good point.
24 I mean, maybe there are some other -- I'm sure there
25 are other representatives like you, white or black,

that represent everybody but that's not everybody. You can see that in congress. In congress, we have a congressional body now in the senate that's blocking the very Voting Rights Act they gave blacks the right to vote in the first place in 1965. So everybody doesn't think like that so no, it's important for blacks to be able to elect someone that's going to represent their interest and be a voice for them because we have experiences that you may not have. We have goals that you may not share and we've suffered things that you never experienced so it's going to take someone who can relate to that to be able to advocate that. Not that you can't because you're doing a good job and I felt many of you can do. You do a good job but everybody doesn't think like you. We change -- America is a great country not because bad things have happened because there are more people who want the good, and want the right thing than they do that oppose it that's why it makes a difference. So this map creates an opportunity to elect another minority to congress to represent those -- the interest of those that have been disenfranchised and the same black -- bringing one-third of the state, have served in the military, served their community, pay their taxes, they deserve

an opportunity to elect someone who have shared values and opportunity to elect someone who have shared interest and who are willing to take a stand for the things that are important to them because they have experienced those things and that's what we're asking for. And we invite any question. A lot of questions have been answered but if we can shed any more light on this particular bill, we believe that this is a good map. It's more compact than any of the maps that's been presented and more compact than the HB 1 and SB 5.

[03:35:00]

So we invite any questions you may have.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN STEFANSKI: Thank you, Representative. Present in support would like to speak, Jared Evans who's currently sitting at the table and also present in support willing to speak if needed, Victoria Wenger who's also sitting at the table as well. Either one of you want to make any comments? Nope? Present in support willing to provide information if necessary, Michael Pernick. Present in support not wishing to speak, Chris Kaiser. Present in support Janea Jamison. Present in support Davante Lewis. Present in support Frankie Robertson. Present -- sorry. Present in support not wishing to speak,

Peter Robins-Brown. Filling out a card in opposition not wishing to speak, Mary Susie Labrie. Present in support not wishing to speak, Edgar Cage. Present in support not wishing to speak, Hilda Tiburcio [PH 03:35:59] sorry if I messed it up. There's a question, Representative Lyons.

REPRESENTATIVE RODNEY LYONS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This question is for Mr. Pernick. Did I pronounce your name correctly?

MICHAEL PERNICK: You did, Representative Lyons. Michael Pernick, Redistricting Counsel, NAACP Legal Defense Fund. Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE RODNEY LYONS: Mr. Pernick, and I know you've been observing the presentation of these last three bills and regarding the maps here and I know you sat for the last two hours and we spent a lot of stuff on other things unrelated to this. But I know there's been a lot of conversation about Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act and I know you are pretty vested in that, that's your profession to do that. And we talked about all of the variables that go into these decisions and I think we spent most of the morning here, the testimony has been about what are we doing right or what we may be doing wrong as a body here in doing these things. And a lot of times,

1 you know, old thoughts tell you that if you got to
2 defend something before you're doing something, you
3 probably are doing something you know, and that's
4 kind of like how that is in most cases. But, in the
5 Voting Rights Act itself and I know there's been some
6 litigation that you may have seen in past cases
7 because we referred the past case law as we go
8 through these things. What does specifically the Act
9 contains information on intent?
10 MICHAEL PERNICK: That's a very important
11 question, Representative Lyons and I appreciate you
12 raising that. There are a number of different types
13 of claims that can be brought under the Voting Rights
14 Act and that could be brought under the United State
15 Constitution. The most common claim that we see in
16 redistricting is what's called a results claim where
17 the courts are not looking at the intent of the
18 legislature. They're not looking to understand
19 whether somebody intended to harm voters of color.
20 What they're looking is what is the outcome and they
21 assess that through the three Gingles preconditions
22 that we've spoken about many, many times and looking
23 at whether an alternate configuration is possible
24 where black voters would have an opportunity to elect
25 candidates of their choice given the presence of

1 racial depolarized voting, white-black voting that
2 would otherwise deny that opportunity. So we've
3 spoken about the results claim quite a bit and that's
4 the most common claim that we're seeing in the
5 redistricting context. However, when there is
6 intentional discrimination in redistricting, that is
7 also a violation of the Voting Rights Act and a
8 violation of the United States Constitution and
9 evidence of intent is certainly relevant and could
10 come in in these cases. For example, when a
11 legislative body is on notice of a potential
12 violation and decides to proceed anyway, that could
13 be viewed as circumstantial evidence of intent. When
14 there are less discriminatory alternatives that are
15 presented to a legislative body and the legislature
16 proceeds -- doesn't explore those alternatives, that
17 could be evidence of intent. If there's -- of course
18 statements that are made could be circumstantial
19 evidence of intent but ultimately, what our focus has
20 been and the focus of the letters that we've
21 submitted has been on the results claim, has been on
22 the possibility that the maps that are enacted might
23 violate Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act under the
24 results theory where it's not suggesting that anybody
25 here had a racist intent or intent to harm people.

[03:40:00]

That claim and that legal theory is really looking at the effect on the opportunity of voters of color. So I hope that answers your question, Representative Lyons.

REPRESENTATIVE RODNEY LYONS: That answered my question in some part. Now, I'll go back to Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act and the portion -- in verbatim, I can't remember the words that's your profession but the phrase that says that you may provide or you may draw map of districts wherever possible, how's that possibly phrased?

MICHAEL PERNICK: Yeah, so the language is you see whether the minority community is sufficiently large and geographically compact to constitute a majority in an alternate district. And what courts look at is whether there's an alternate plan other than the plan that's ultimately been adopted where there are additional majority of black districts and we've presented not one but seven in our letter to this committee. So that's where that comes in. The language is, is there an alternate plan, is there an illustrative or demonstrative plan in which the minority community is sufficiently large and geographically compact to constitute a majority.

REPRESENTATIVE RODNEY LYONS: And in the plans that you referred to, are those plans, as you know it, legal and compliant with the Voting Rights Act Section 2?

MICHAEL PERNICK: The seven maps that we introduced, we in a coalition of 16 organizations introduced to this committee during the roadshow, yes Representative.

REPRESENTATIVE RODNEY LYONS: And I asked you that question because going back to your reference in there and I talked about the intent where we are and we're halfway during the process here now and it seems as though -- we haven't decided on this map yet which is another one of those opportunities there that this small body as we see it is consistent with the fact that nothing that we've presented that in your professional testimony is sufficient enough to provide exactly what Section 2 calls for in the Voting Rights Act an opportunity to do so. But as -- and I'm only asking you that particular point because I'm kind of confused and my sphere of thought here was that if there's testimony and we've had -- we have some proficient legal minds on this panel here and they all attest to the fact that there's certain marks that have to be met when we do that. But we

have a plan -- our plan here actually missed the mark. But yet, we may -- like we did the rest of them, go and consider them to be on the table for discussion. So at some point in time my understanding tells me that if it can work and it can work, and it can't work, but it can't and can work doesn't mean -- that's not even part of the equation because not even allowed to be a part of the process. That says to me a lot about the intent and I don't understand that's why I brought you up to ask you that question. Clearly it doesn't define one of the measures of intent that you talked about and you did say that you know, for your purposes is only one measure that you write about, okay? So in that part, I want to thank you for clearing that up for me because I'm kind of confused in that part that's there. But as I said before, and I'm repeating it, according the markers in the Voting Rights Act, that would trigger any type of non-compliance. These plans that you had submitted does not meet that, in your opinion.

MICHAEL PERNICK: Representative Lyons, the seven plans that we have submitted would comply the -- as we said in the letter to this committee and the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee, HB 1 and SB 5

would not comply with Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act.

REPRESENTATIVE RODNEY LYONS: And I remember sir the very first day, I think HB 1 that we came through here and you came testifying that day and I spoke and I think you came in after the speaker spoke and we said that we knew that there's going to be several other objectives -- or several other revisions of opinions to come before us to do so and you asked at that time that you think that that particular wasn't compliant with Section 2 and you said -- I don't remember what you said.

MICHAEL PERNICK: I said it was not.

REPRESENTATIVE RODNEY LYONS: Okay. Thank you, sir. And you say that this one is, correct?

MICHAEL PERNICK: That is correct.

REPRESENTATIVE RODNEY LYONS: And the plans that you have are -- but as of right now, we have no other plan on the table except the one that you said was not?

MICHAEL PERNICK: That's my understanding, Representative.

REPRESENTATIVE RODNEY LYONS: Okay. Alright. Thank you, sir. Thank you for clearing everything up

and my sphere of thought is more clear now than ever. Thank you very much.

MICHAEL PERNICK: Thank you, Representative.

VICE CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Thank you for your questions Representative Lyons. The board is clear. We have three cards. All present but do not wish to speak in support, Lady Carlson, Together Louisiana.

[03:45:01]

Lauren Primo, Westside Sponsoring Committee and Khalid Hudson with Together Baton Rouge, all present in support but do not wish to speak. Those are all the cards that we have for Rep. Gaines' bill. Rep. Gaines, would you like to close on your bill?

REPRESENTATIVE RANDAL GAINES: Yeah, just briefly given the time well spent. So you want to come in the committee and the Chair and all the amount of work they put into this and it's a balancing test, but there's little to speak that the congressional configuration that we have is out of balance when it comes to making sure that minorities in Louisiana have representation. Given the fact that Louisiana is one-third black, about 1.5 million people is also little dispute that given the maps that's been drawn, little dispute there. Second majority-minority

1 district a little dispute there that it cannot be
2 created. We believe that it can. It's been proven,
3 it's been established and we look forward to this
4 body moving in that direction. I ask that it be moved
5 favorably.
6 VICE CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Thank you. We
7 have a motion to move favorable from Representative
8 Jenkins and there's objections. Representative
9 Beaullieu, Madame Secretary. We will vote.
10 ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Vice Chairman Duplessis.
11 VICE CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Yes.
12 ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative
13 Beaullieu.
14 REPRESENTATIVE GERALD BEAULLIEU: No.
15 ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Wilford
16 Carter.
17 REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: Yes.
18 ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative
19 Deshotel.
20 REPRESENTATIVE DARYL ANDREW DESHOTEL: No.
21 ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Farnum.
22 REPRESENTATIVE LES FARNUM: No.
23 ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Gadberry.
24 REPRESENTATIVE FOY BRYAN GADBERRY: No.
25 ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Hodges.

REPRESENTATIVE VALARIE HODGES: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Horton.

REPRESENTATIVE DODIE HORTON: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Ivey. Representative Jenkins.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Mike Johnson.

REPRESENTATIVE MIKE JOHNSON: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative LaCombe.

REPRESENTATIVE JEREMY LACOMBE: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Lyons.

REPRESENTATIVE RODNEY LYONS: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Magee.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Newell.

REPRESENTATIVE CANDACE NEWELL: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Thomas. Representative White.

REPRESENTATIVE MALINDA WHITE: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes.

FEMALE 1: Sorry here.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Seven yays, eight nays.

VICE CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Thank you. And the motion fails to --

REPRESENATATIVE RANDAL GAINES: Thank you members, appreciate it.

VICE CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Thank you, Representative Gaines. Our last bill for the day will be brought to us by Dr. Carpenter. Would you like to come forward? Save the best for last. We have House Bill 9, the Chairwoman Carpenter.

REPRESENTATIVE BARBARA CARPENTER: Thank you Mr. Acting Chair and members of the committee. I guess you are tired, I'm tired, I'm hungry and cold, all of that wrapped up in one. But as I said here, Mr. Acting Chair and members of the committee, I've written several different versions of notes for this House Bill 9, but on a personal note, if you will, allow me just the opportunity. I need to share with you as I listened to Davante Lewis and his impassionate plea to you, I could not help but think of the fact that everyone, just about all of us, came to this country either by desire or by force and so after listening at his story of what he said about his great-great grandmothers and all they went through and where he is now, I can tell you the same story and just about every one of us could tell you the same story. So this to me is personal because it brings back so many memories to me because I am one

of you maybe in this legislature who is a product of the '60s. And so I know what it's like not to be able to go and vote period until the Voting Right Act was signed. And it is something that you will never forget. I had a different track. I lived in Baton Rouge so I could register and vote. My late husband lived in Natchitoches Cane River. He had to take a test.

[03:50:01]

VICE CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Dr. Carpenter, if you can just come into mic just a little bit. Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE BARBARA CARPENTER: He had to take a test to get to vote and I don't know there are many of you in here who had to take a test to be allowed your rights to vote. And so, it's a hard thing for me to sit and listen that here we are, all of these years and the struggle still continues. And you wonder when is it ever going to end that everyone will be treated equally with the right that all citizens in this United States should be given. So this bill is just another one, another version of this necessity to give people equal access. That's all it's asking for. So I happen to live in a district that is affected by this because I am in

1 District 2 and it's interesting when we were working
2 on this, I shared with him. I said, you know, with
3 the last congressional election, a lot of people
4 really didn't realize who our real congressman was
5 because the district is just so large. So they really
6 had no idea. I want to say that House Bill 9 merely
7 requests the establishment of another congressional
8 district that will give Louisianians greater access
9 and the opportunity to elect a minority member to
10 Congress. That's simply what it does. You know the
11 math. I don't need to repeat it. I don't need to
12 repeat any of the statistics to you any other day.
13 You've heard it over and over again. It's just like
14 class, when you hear it enough, you get it. So
15 surely, you got it by now that the math says, one-
16 third is how many? Two. That's the way I was taught
17 back in the day. Now, unless it's changed, you all
18 tell to me. But there needs to be two. That's all
19 we're asking for. So give them that one-third of
20 Louisiana residents according to the 2020 census of
21 this population should have the opportunity to elect
22 a preferred congressional representative. That's all
23 it's asking for. And this to me is critical because
24 as Congress people are responsible for making
25 decisions about everyday lives of the people that we

1 serve every aspect of American life. It's the
2 education, economic opportunity, housing, healthcare,
3 criminal justice. It's just amazing. I go back
4 personal again. My parents both were educators. I'm a
5 fourth-generation educator. I'm not a demographer,
6 I'm not a mathematician. I'm just a regular educator
7 and I used to have a sign on my door that says, if
8 you can read this, thank a teacher. But I will tell
9 you this, being that fourth-generation educator, it
10 taught me something. Both my parents earned master's
11 degrees at universities way away from Louisiana. You
12 want to know why? Because this state would pay
13 teachers, black teachers to go out of the State of
14 Louisiana to get a degree rather than allow them to
15 attend the schools here in Louisiana. So therefore,
16 my parents went to Iowa. So they got their masters
17 degrees at the University of Iowa. When is it ever
18 going to end that everyone is not given the same
19 opportunities?
20 [03:55:02]
21 So all this bill is doing is asking for equal
22 access and giving people all who live here in this
23 great United States of America, in Louisiana, the
24 same opportunities. So, an additional congressional
25 seat would give at least to provide the block of the

1 minority voters, the representation to address
2 ongoing records of inequity, of opportunity in all
3 aspects of life.
4 So you've heard the statistics here. I don't need
5 to go over all of that and repeat it to you, but I'm
6 grateful to have these two young people here who
7 probably have not experienced all I have or some of
8 you, but they know the data and these data tell the
9 story. So, what I'm saying to you is that the
10 roadshows went out, the population spoke, they are
11 asking for another congressional district and I too
12 am before you asking that you honor what they have
13 requested of you. And so I will take your questions
14 if they're limited enough and won't be too long
15 because I'm hungry.
16 VICE CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Well, Dr.
17 Carpenter, I think the committee's going to respect
18 that because I don't see any questions. We want to
19 thank you, I want to thank you for your testimony.
20 There are no questions from the board. With that, I
21 will read in the cards. Jared Evans in favor, present
22 at the table. Victoria Weng -- that's what the NAACP
23 Legal Defense Fund, Victoria Wenger, also NAACP Legal
24 Defense Fund present, will provide information.
25 Michael Pernick, NAACP Legal Defense Fund, in favor,

present, would like to provide information. Also in favor Chris Kaiser, ACLU Louisiana, does not wish to speak. In favor, does not wish to speak, Janea Jamison, Power Coalition. Present in support in favor, does not wish to speak Davante Lewis, Louisiana Budget Project. In favor, present, does not wish to speak, Frankie Robertson with MetroMorphosis. Now, I have another card from Frankie Robertson in favor, present, would like to speak, NOLA Maternal Child Health Coalition. Okay, you'll pass? All right. You're going to speak? All right.

FRANKIE ROBERTSON: Good afternoon. My name is Frankie Robertson and I'm here today representing the New Orleans Maternal Child Health Coalition and I want to thank all of the legislators that came before us today, presenting maps to increase majority-minority representation. I particularly like to offer testimony after the presentation on Dr. Carpenter's legislation, but also want to thank all of the legislators who presented before and appreciate their time effort in trying to ensure fairness and equity in our state. I would like to start off my brief testimony just with quoting a famous poet by the name of Langston Hughes who I'm sure we've all heard of or have had the opportunity to read his magnificent

1 works. "What happens to a dream deferred? Does it dry
2 up like a raisin in the sun? Or fester like a sore -
3 and then run? Does it stink like rotten meat? Or
4 crust and sugar over - like a syrupy sweet. Maybe it
5 just sags like a heavy load, or does it just
6 explode?" We've heard a lot of conversation today
7 about civil rights, about historical structure and
8 systemic racism in our country. We've had our
9 esteemed respectfully our elders talk about
10 historical issues that have happened. We've had
11 individuals acknowledge the present-day systemic
12 racism that we have endured and we've also had people
13 speak about things as if it was in the past tense
14 when it's very much so very alive in various forms in
15 the present tense. I've sat in this committee room on
16 behalf of New Orleans Child Coalition and other
17 agencies on this week
18 [04:00:05]
19 And I've already shared the statistics about
20 black maternal health and infant health in our state.
21 I think at this point we all know that Louisiana has
22 the highest death rate or maternal mortality rate for
23 black women. We know that we have the second highest
24 rates in infant mortality just next to our neighbors
25 in Mississippi. We know that there is a maternal

1 health crisis and we know that that is shaped by the
2 life course or the lived experiences of black women
3 in our families. So I don't have to go over those
4 statistics anymore because I think that you've heard
5 out there in here or in a regular session and there's
6 been a lot of attention and concern when those
7 statistics are brought up. I've already shared about
8 the social determinants of health and how that
9 impacts our overall health, but I want to frame a
10 different phrase that perhaps some of you have heard
11 of and some of you haven't, that has been highlighted
12 and the Journal of Women's Health, an article that
13 was written in February of last year, authored by Dr.
14 Joia Crear-Perry, Maeve Wallace here in our state,
15 Dr. Monica McLemore and I don't want to leave anyone
16 else. So I'm going to kind of list the names Rosaly,
17 I believe I'm pronouncing people's names correctly so
18 I do apologize and I take that very seriously, Rosaly
19 Correa-de-Araujo, Tamara Lewis Johnson and Elizabeth
20 Neilson. They talked about the structural
21 determinants of health and just calling greater
22 attention to the fact that we know that there are
23 disparities based upon race for black women and black
24 communities, but often times even as I sit in these
25 committees, whether it's intentional or not that

there is still perceived as a lens, lens of personal responsibility. I think some of us have gotten better in being able to understand the social determinants of health, but then looking at the indicators that impact the social determinants of health and that's what's referred to as the structural determinants of health things that are influenced by political power which redistricting is one of those. So, as I shared earlier in the week, just to frame why I'm here on behalf of Maternal Child Health Community, it's because of this. No, it's not. How's health and welfare, it's not sending health and welfare, but the maldistribution of resources as dictated by the political power that you hole is really a matter of life and death for people particularly black and brown people and as a result black and brown birthing people. I do want to share quickly some excerpts of public testimony that was shared about two years ago now from famous, well-known respected researcher and scholar. Her name is Dr. Fleda Mask Jackson and she studies gendered racism and she studies black maternal stress and how that impacts the overall health of black and brown birthing people. So I want to take a moment just to share some of those things that talk about the day-to-day struggles and then

I'll pose a question, which I know you can't answer. I shouldn't pose it but I'm just going to frame it. And I'll just share a few quick excerpts. I promise I won't make this long, but I'm quoting her. "My name is Dr. Fleda Mask Jackson and I reside in Atlanta, Georgia and probably live and work" -- she talked about working in Congressman John Lewis' District. "But I'm a researcher and scholar and the President of Majaica, LLC whose work over the last decade is focused on the connections between racial and gendered stress and the disproportionately higher rates of maternal and infant deaths experienced by African-American women. Specifically, my studies have focused on the effects of the stress of gendered racism on pregnant African-American women from all walks of life. It has been my pleasure to assist Congress Robin Kelly staff." And she goes on to talk about how she's been supporting some of the federal work. "As we are all aware, African-American women are three to four times likely to die from pregnancy-associated causes and despite overall improvements and U.S. infant deaths, African-American babies remain twice as likely to die before reaching their first birthday. While the explanations are complex, it is wildly agreed that healthcare alone with

1 concerns about access and quality is not the sole
2 reason for the birth inequities we are witnessing.
3 Undoubtedly, inequities and the prenatal and
4 postpartum care received by African-American women is
5 a significant contributor to adverse birth outcomes
6 and maternal outcomes, but equally impactful are the
7 experiences that African-American women confront in
8 the places where they are born and give birth, live,
9 work and age, i.e., the social determinants of
10 health. Alongside studies on reproductive
11 disparities, there are studies and reports
12 documenting racial and gender inequities and
13 employment, income, housing, education and
14 environmental quality. Increasingly, investigations
15 are revealing how the experiences of cumulative
16 inequities across the social determinants literally
17 get under the skin so that person's response to them
18 in the form of physical and mental stress.
19 [04:05:14]
20 In my research web, listen to the Voices of
21 African-American Women from all walks of life, from
22 across generations, I've heard them describe the
23 stressors confronted in the places where they give
24 birth, live, work and age that are shaped by their
25 identities as women and their identities as African-

1 Americans. African-American women have shared with me
2 the stress they feel from having to travel outside of
3 their neighborhoods to attend to the basic needs for
4 themselves and their families, their fears of the
5 safety and well-being of their children of community
6 violence and police brutality and the strain from job
7 discrimination and unequal low wages in the face of
8 burdens of financial responsibilities for family and
9 kin. From my research and that of investigators
10 throughout the country, I can say with confidence
11 that the combination of racial and gender
12 discrimination in healthcare and inequities within
13 the social determinants of health are taking a toll
14 on childbearing African-American women." And, as I've
15 said in the testimony today, and as I was a proud
16 member of the audience yesterday alongside of
17 constituents across the state representing black
18 voters matter and other social justice organizations
19 being here during normal session, special session and
20 so on, I see the interactions between members of the
21 legislature and the community and I will just say
22 that yesterday, there were some elements of that
23 testimony that were disturbing whether they were one-
24 off, whether they were intentional, whether they were
25 by accident long day, but they're not quite equal,

1 right? Yesterday was different, with or without an
2 apology, yesterday was different. Today, hearing some
3 of the comments that may have gone unnoticed by many
4 people sitting here today, but not unnoticed by
5 people who experienced them every day they will refer
6 to as micro aggressions. Having a legislator both
7 black men, even though it's accident it still matters
8 called by the wrong name and these are colleagues.
9 Having someone I can't even remember earlier someone
10 being referred to as well-spoken. I've had that
11 happen to me a lot and it's offensive. So what I'm
12 asking is that if these are experiences that have
13 gone over respectfully, many of the legislators that
14 sit in the minority, majority here but they didn't go
15 over the head of those who are in the minority, these
16 are things that we experience as black people every
17 day and they do take their toll. If legislators here
18 whether knowingly, unknowingly, innocently, all of
19 that I'm not saying it's intentional, don't get it.
20 Isn't important for people who do to sit amongst you
21 to represent us to state the issues that are taking a
22 toll on us mentally and physically that are in turn
23 impacting our overall health? Isn't that
24 representation important, so that we can have people
25 speak for us? There was also respectfully a comment,

1 the legislator that said, they were representing my
2 people and immediately, there was, whether it was
3 intentional or not, backlash. If we can't acknowledge
4 black or representing our people and that seen as a
5 negative because the assumption is that being
6 colorblind is the status quo, I will tell you that
7 being colorblind is not the status quo. We all have
8 lived experiences that are different and from a basic
9 level, we have to start with being able to understand
10 that by seeing color, seeing color is a good thing,
11 seeing color is what we have to do because we can
12 utilize our experiences as people of color,
13 navigating this world differently. So, I just wanted
14 to support Dr. Carpenter's legislation and those that
15 came before her, even though they did not pass this
16 committee and just ask ourselves if you are not
17 seeing the necessary or the importance of ensuring
18 that there is adequate representation to be able to
19 relate to these lived experiences, what are you going
20 to do to make sure that those voices are heard? When
21 community advocates come forth with legislation that
22 speaks to the unique needs of black Americans, are
23 you going to vote in favor of that or do we need
24 people here to be able to address that? And I'm
25 asking those questions here, and I know this bill is

about congress, but it's the same thing and we're talking about the state house and the house and senate locally. So, those are my questions, but thank you so much.

VICE CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Thank you so much. We appreciate your testimony and also for making the connection to the daily experiences especially amongst women's maternal health disparities. So thank you so much.

[04:10:04]

FRANKIE ROBERTSON: Absolutely.

VICE CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: We really appreciate it. I still have some more cards. I don't think any of these cards are here to speak but present, in favor, not wishing to speak Peter Robins-Brown, Louisiana Progress Action. In support, present but does not wish to speak Edgar Cage, Together Louisiana. Present in support, does not wish to speak Hilda Tiburcio. I hope I pronounced that right. Westside Sponsoring Committee. Present in opposition but does not wish to speak Mary Labrie. In opposition? Okay and we have a card here in support and would like to speak, Khalid Hudson, Together Baton Rouge.

KHALID HUDSON: All right, good afternoon. My name is Khalid Hudson. I'm an organizer with Together Baton Rouge and one of the organizers for Together Louisiana and I live here in East Baton Rouge Parish. I wasn't planning to speak but it was really compelled by Ms. Carpenter's presentation and her story and it got me thinking about the history and the role that you all play in history and so I just dropped down a couple comments. We have supported calls for the second congressional majority- minority district because our state deserves it. This is an opportunity for this elected body to be on the right side of history. I would like to state that right after reconstruction, African-Americans, some African-Americans were allowed to vote that allowed for P.B.S. Pinchback to become the lieutenant governor here in the state of Louisiana in the late 1800s. Hiram Revels becomes a U.S. senator in Mississippi around the same period of time and then there was another state senator or U.S. senator that becomes elected towards late 1800s in South Carolina. But that right to vote was immediately aggressively repress and Jim Crow laws were ushered in which required African-Americans to fight for their right to reinstitute their right to vote. We have to fight.

It wasn't the first time we got to vote. We have to fight to regain the right to vote in the '60s. And so I know many of you all or none of you all were all alive on that time period but to deny proper representation for a large portion of people here in the state is a continuation of that legacy. And so what we ask is that you, you know that you're conscious prevails to be on the right side of history and allow for the proper representation of a third of the state and support a second majority-minority district. Thank you.

VICE CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Thank you so much for your comments. We don't have any more cards as far as I can see. Dr. Carpenter you have an opportunity to close on your bill if you would like to do so.

REPRESENTATIVE BARBARA CARPENTER: Thank you, Mr. Acting Chair. All I can say to you is that I hope you find this bill favorable and put yourselves in the shoes of some of the people who have requested it. So thank you very much.

VICE CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Thank you, Dr. Carpenter. House Bill 9, is there a motion we like to move favorable Representative Jenkins? Any objection? We have an objection? Madame Secretary.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Vice Chairman Duplessis?

VICE CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Beaullieu?

REPRESENTATIVE GERALD BEAULLIEU: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Wilford Carter?

REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Deshotel?

REPRESENTATIVE DARYL ANDREW DESHOTEL: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Farnum?

REPRESENTATIVE LES FARNUM: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Gadberry?

REPRESENTATIVE FOY BRYAN GADBERRY: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Hodges? No. Representative Horton?

REPRESENTATIVE DODIE HORTON: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Ivey?

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Jenkins?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Mike Johnson? No. Representative LaCombe?

REPRESENTATIVE JEREMY LACOMBE: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Lyons?

REPRESENTATIVE RODNEY LYONS: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Magee? Representative Newell?

REPRESENTATIVE CANDACE NEWELL: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Thomas?

REPRESENTATIVE POLLY THOMAS: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative White?

REPRESENTATIVE MALINDA WHITE: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Eight yays, eight nays.

[04:15:00]

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: The speaker, I mean the Chairman will vote.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: The Chairman will vote.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Chairman Stefanski votes no.

VICE CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: All right. The motion fails. Eight yays, nine nays. The last bill of today's agenda was House Bill 12 by Representative Bryan. It's my understanding he'd like to defer that bill so with that, I'm going to move that we defer House Bill 12. Any objections? Seeing none, House Bill is deferred.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Members, my plan is we will hear Representative Bryan's bill tomorrow

morning. I'm going to request the speaker grant us a meeting before we come on the floor tomorrow. That will be the plan and yet with any other bills that we choose to schedule. So, with that being said that concludes our agenda for today. Representative Farnum has made a motion that we adjourn without objection.

[04:16:25]

TRANSPERFECT

I, Anders Nelson, hereby certify that the document "F886456-louisiana-redistricting" is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, a true and accurate transcription from English to English.

Anders Nelson
Project Manager

April 27, 2022

216 EAST 45TH STREET, 9TH FLOOR, NEW YORK, NY 10017 T +1 212.400.8845 F +1.212.867.3106 LEGAL.TRANSPERFECT.COM