[MUSIC/OVERLAY 00:00:00- 00:00:08]

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Committee on House and Governmental Affairs will come to order. Today is Friday, February the 11th. I would ask that if anyone has a cellphone, please silence it so that we don't disturb our presenters. Also, if you would like to give testimony, please fill out a card, green in support, red in opposition, and white for information only. We have three items on the post-it agenda for today and I will go ahead and ask Ms. Ammersbach to call the rule.

MS. AMMERSBACH: Chairman Stefanski?

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Present.

MS. AMMERSBACH: Present. Vice Chairman Duplessis?

VICE CHAIRMAN DUPLESSIS: Present.

MS. AMMERSBACH: Present. Representative Beaullieu? Representative Wilford Carter?

REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: Present

MS. AMMERSBACH: Present. Representative Deshotel?

REPRESENTATIVE DESHOTEL: Present.

MS. AMMERSBACH: Present. Representative Farnum?

REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: Here.

Hearing Exhibit
PR-65
3:22-cv-00211-SDD-RLB

MS. AMMERSBACH: Present. Representative Gadberry?

REPRSENTATIVE GADBERRY: Here.

MS. AMMERSBACH: Present. Representative Hodges?

REPRESENTATIVE HODGES: Here.

MS. AMMERSBACH: Present. Representative Horton?

REPRSENTATIVE HORTON: Here.

MS. AMMERSBACH: Present. Representative Ivey? Representative Jenkins?

REPRESENTATIVE JENKINS: Here.

MS. AMMERSBACH: Present. Representative Mike Johnson?

REPRESENTATIVE MIKE JOHNSON: Present.

MS. AMMERSBACH: Present, representative LaCombe?

REPRESENTATIVE LACOMBE: Present.

MS. AMMERSBACH: Present, representative Lyons?

REPRESENTATIVE LYONS: Present.

MS. AMMERSBACH: Present, representative Magee?

REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: Present.

MS. AMMERSBACH: Present, representative Newell?

REPRESENTATIVE NEWELL: Present.

MS. AMMERSBACH: Present, representative Thomas?

REPRESENTATIVE THOMAS: Here.

MS. AMMERSBACH: Present, representative White?

REPRESENTATIVE WHITE: Here.

MS. AMMERSBACH: Present, 16 members.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Sixteen members and quorum. Members on the agenda this morning, first up is House Bill 5 by Representative Newell. It's my understanding Representative Newell would like to voluntarily defer that Bill, is that correct, Representative?

REPRESENTATIVE NEWELL: Yes, that's correct.

MALE 1: Okay. Representative Newell's House Bill 5 will be voluntarily deferred. Next up is House Bill 12 by Representative Bryant and I believe he's going to give us a presentation on that. Representative Bryant, whenever you're ready, House Bill 12.

REPRESENTATIVE BRYANT: Good morning.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Good morning.

REPRESENTATIVE BRYANT: Yesterday, I listened to the hearings and tried to gain some education from what you guys were saying that you wanted to see in the district. So, I'm not going to introduce my map because I think my map is just more of the same that I have now but I will work over the weekend with staff and LDF and try to come up with something that is competitive. Something that works where the population -- the black population can be competitive in and here to all to all of the other standards and

all the things that they say that are different roadshows. I'm asking we got to be open minded on Monday or Tuesday when we present the Bill. It will have tried to answer some of the issues and concerns that you all brought up and all of your questions yesterday. And we tried to have a discussion on a Bill that does fit our current population, that does fit our current makeup. And my whole idea is that, two is better than one when you're dealing with a democrat president and had stated that it always needs emergency response for this hurricane, a hurricane sensitive deal and roads and bridges I stated that still lasts and so many other factors. We've never had a republican president for a long time and we've never had a democratic president for a long time. So, not wanting a state that is balanced that it doesn't matter what the president is, or who the president is, republican or democratic, you still have some idea of they're bringing home the bacon and bringing home resources to your state, and your state doesn't still fall behind with the change in administration. It's just good common sense. If you look at other states in the south that do that, like Georgia who has 5 out of 14 minority representation and a couple of -- in the district, a minority that's

representing a minority, majority district, where they transition with their president so that they can bring home the most resources they can to their state and their state doesn't dwindle with this party politics and their states don't do what they're doing nationally. We try to understand what's best for their state and the demographics of their state and making use of those demographics to be the most advantageous in D.C., not the most anti-advantageous. Not the most critical -- criticism and brings grief to a person that has the right to check and send resources to your state, but keeping that balance, it should be smart and the great thing about us is that we have a balanced population that allows us to have doer voices in D.C. We should look at it from a different perspective. We should look at our population make up and say, "We have a duo balance to have more than one voice when one president is in office, and more than one voice when another president, depending on their party. To and for - and for fighting for resources when there's a republican in office is a lot.

[00:05:00]

And that's a balance. Two, when there's a democrat in office, and two democrats in D.C.,

fighting to bring resources in this hurricane heavy state that we don't know in another month where a hurricane may come and wipe out the stop of this state, the middle of this state, and the bottom of this state, while we're fighting in D.C. is senseless because that's the same person who got the call and tried to have him have a timely response to hurricane, a timely response to road and bridges. So, we have to have -- our party politics have to have -- our common sense have to outweigh our party politics in creating districts in this state that can be competitive and bring home resources from Washington D.C., because that's why we send our congressman into D.C. to bring home the bacon, to bring home resources. So, that's what we're going to try to do. if you guys on Monday are open minded hopefully achieves that and if it's not, then I'm okay with you not passing the Bill to the floor. But I'm going to at least go listen to everything again that you said yesterday and try to put together some kind of map that fits our population and fits your concerns and issues that you have with all the other maps and try to take them together, put them together and create one map that fits your concerns. So, thank you and I

1 look forward to talking with you on Monday and amen,
2 thank you.
3 CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Representative Lacombe he is
4 going to defer to you once they want to make a
5 comment? Okay, Representative Lacombe.
6 REPRESENTATIVE LACOMBE: Thank you Representative
7 Bryant for that point, because to me, I know that I -
8 - I've sat through these hearings and listened to
9 every argument that we've had and meant tons of them
10 in regards to Section 2 in race and populations, at
11 the end of the day, a congressional delegation is
12 there to serve us and our needs in Washington D.C.
13 and it makes common sense to not have an entire
14 delegation made up of one party.
15 REPRESENTATIVE BRYANT: Right.
16 REPRESENTATIVE LACOMBE: Every time, every four
17 years, or eight years once retention power changes
18 and a new party may come in, we may find ourselves
19 where we're at and if you look right now in the City
20 of Lake Charles, when we allow partisan politics to
21 come in to play where the only thing that's available
22 on there is one particular person or one particular
23 party, look at what Lake Charles is dealing with
24 right now two years after a hurricane, we still have
25 people with blue top proofs everywhere because their

1 congressional delegation has constantly focused on
2 nothing but partisan politics. Partisan politics is
3 the absolute scourge of this state, and the scourge
4 of most places. And when it comes to Washington D.C.,
5 I agree that you want thousand percent, our
6 delegation needs to be split both ways. We need to
7 ensure that when a republican comes into the
8 presidency, we have two synergies and four active
9 congressmen doing what they need to do and when it
10 comes to democrat switching and being in power in the
11 White House. We need to have more than just one
12 person of their fighting for resources. For years,
13 and years, and years, it's been a split state where
14 we had multiple things, but it's not serving our
15 needs anymore, where we have just one congressman.
16 Look, we sat through the roll caucus meeting the
17 other day and they're going to spend $1 trillion in
18 stimulus money that was put forth to all the places
19 all over the country for infrastructure needs and
20 essentially, we've had one person --we have one of
21 our delegation members voted on that bill. We need
22 it. We need $2 billion for bridges and [INDISCERNIBLE
23 00:08:38]. I mean, $2 billion for bridges in Lake
24 Charles, $2 billion for bridges here, that's to me
25 the single most common sense thing is to have -- not

have all of our eggs in one basket, but to rather split our situation to where we have an ability to want to transition the power happens in the White House. We have people in congress that are on that party side and it just makes the most common sense to me. Thank you for bringing that point out.

REPRESENTATIVE BRYANT: Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE LACOMBE: It's the first time I've heard it in any of these debates here, but I think it's something that we should focus on.

REPRESENTATIVE BRYANT: And we should especially with our population make up and it's easy for us to achieve that I believe and we're going to see over the weekend and still make the other districts districts majority majority, right, and still have two democratic districts. So that when we do have a change in government like we have now and assuming that the next four to eight years, we've going to deal with a democrat in office in D.C., we need to have people bringing resources back to our state period, especially in a hurricane heavy state like we are. And we're still in the same place we are 10 years ago. All of our number is still the same. We're still the lowest, we're still the poorest state, we're still the lowest in education, we're still the

worst in roads and bridges, we're still the worst in sewage and water.

[00:10:01]

So, to keep doing the same thing over and over again, expecting a different outcome is -- there's a word for that, and that is not going to be what we're going to do in Louisiana. We go and try to do a little different and d a little better.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Representative Bryant, I do appreciate your work and I appreciate your -- I look forward to seeing what you can come up with on Monday and I'll encourage the entire committee to keep an open mind. President support, we're going to give information, Jarred Evans, Victoria Winger, Kris Kaiser and Devonte Lewis. We're going to voluntarily defer House Bill 12. I'm going to set it on the agenda for Monday. If we're ready for Monday, good, if we're not, we can bump it until Tuesday but I'm just going to go ahead and set it for Monday in case we're ready, okay?

REPRESENTATIVE BRYANT: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Yes. Thank you Representative Bryant. Next up, last item on our agenda, House Bill 21 by Representative Glover. Representative Glover, whenever you're ready.

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Thank you, Mr. Chair, members of the committee. It's my privilege to present to you all today House Bill 21. I want to start by expressing to you, Mr. Chairman and to each of you committee members and especially to the staff my appreciation for all the work you all have done to get us to this point, the roadshow that you all have engaged in and all the various places that you've gone, all the conversations that you had, all the people that you've spoken to and met with. This is hard work, and so know that it has not gone unrecognized and unappreciated by those of us who have watched and observed the process. I know in terms of my interaction with the Chair and staff regarding house reapportionment, the one thing that I think that I ask, and Mr. Chairman, you correct me if I'm wrong, was that I think that we ought to look to try and put forth an effort that gives us a chance to effectively unpack our legislative districts. This is my second time being a part of a legislative reapportionment process. I was here in 2000 and one of the things that I observed at that time that I thought was problematic was the inclination to have too many of our districts end up being made up population-wise of a very high percentage of one

1 particular race or the other. I don't think that that
2 effectively serves the interest of Louisiana or of
3 democracy in general. And so, as I listened to the
4 various hearings and committee transactions that have
5 gone up into this point and especially when I had a
6 chance to be able to specifically review House Bill
7 14 as offered by the speaker is when I decided that
8 despite all of the effort that have been forth, I
9 thought there was at least one other approach to this
10 that was at least worthy of being introduced into the
11 conversation. So, in looking to draft the bill, one
12 of the first questions that Trish and the staff will
13 ask you is you know, what's your starting point?
14 Obviously knowing that as an individual member, that
15 I'm not in a position to do that which you all have
16 done and in particular, the Chairman and the house
17 leadership has done, and that is to have a meeting
18 and a dialogue with each of the individual members of
19 the house. I decided to start with the speaker's bill
20 as the base from which I would work and have adopted
21 all of that. In fact, Mr. Chairman, if you would
22 allow me at this point since the original draft of
23 this bill starts using HB14 as its template, and I
24 know that you all have since made some committee
25 amendments to the bill as well. I'd like to offer an

amendment for purposes of continued discussion of this bill that would place it within the posture that you all have placed House Bill 14 based on your last committee action.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Not yet. No problem, Representative. We'll go ahead and do that at this time, and it appears -- yeah, it appears the Amendment Set 91, members, which is what we're going to discuss, it appears the Amendment Set 91 just mirrors the amendments that we made to HB14 in committee, is that -- is that correct?

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: That is correct, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Okay. So members, obviously we have discussed many of these amendments before and we've had the debate on those, so I don't know if there really is a need for a lot of questions.

[00:15:01]

We've already had that but are there any questions, members, on the amendment? No? Oh, [INDISCERNIBLE 00:15:09], okay. The vice-chair has moved that we adopt Amendment Set 91. Is there any objection? Seeing no objection, Amendment Set 91 is adopted on your bill, representative.

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, members of the committee. And again, that place is now HB21 in the same exact posture of the speaker's bill in New Orleans, in Baton Rouge, in Acadiana, in Monroe, much of Central Louisiana and the only difference and distinction that I felt that I had any standing or ability to be able to offer and suggest any changes would be based upon my own home area and in directing staff in terms of which course to take with regard to drafting HB 21, my only directive to them was to unpack the districts. In particular, house districts 1 through 6 of which all of them are at least 69.9% either black or white, and unpack them even if it means taking me out of my current district. And so, what you see here before you today is reflective of just that, and the basis for doing so is this. The current configuration of the three black districts 2, 3 and 4 right now in Northwest Louisiana are 60 -- let me make sure I'm making my correct reference to you, one is 89% under this current configuration. That would be house district 3. One is 71% and the other is 66%.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Representative, are you talking about total pop?

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Okay.

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Now, under House Bill 14, as it currently stands, house district 1, 69.99% white, house district 2 67.381% black, house district 3 73.865% black, house district 4 72.006% black, house district 5 --

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Are you looking at HB 14 -- are you looking at your bill? Which stats are you talking about, current today or what your bill would do?

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: House Bill 14.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Oh, House Bill 14, okay. I was confused.

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Okay, thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: We're proposing House Bill 14, would have House District 4, my current district at 72.006%, and that's voting age population, not total population, but voting age population. House District 5 would be 70.917% white. House District 6 would be 74.740% white. I don't understand given the options and the opportunity to be able to create more racially balanced districts why we would choose to do this in a Parish like Caddo all one area like [Indiscernible 00:18:38] and

Bossier in northwest Louisiana. Since 2010 the Caddo Parish population has grown in terms of black percentages from 51% in 2010 to 56.5% in 2020. The Bossier Parish population has changed and gone from 27.8% black in 2010 to almost 2% increase in its black population in a decade. It's now 37% black. Once the parish's minority population has gone from 35.28 to 38.5. DeSoto Parish's minority population has shifted from 42% to 43%. Red River Parish's minority population has shifted from 41% to 44.9%. Now, Bossier Parish specifically has been our region's engine of population growth, adding more than 11,000 people since 2010 growing by over 10%. But that growth even in Bossier Parish has been driven by black increases in population. Since 2010 Bossier Parish has lost 3.378% of its white people.

[00:20:06]

That population and white percentage has shifted from 72 percent white to 63 percent white. And yet, we have a plan that maintains the status quo in the State of Louisiana, which overall has seen a decrease in overall white population and an increase in its black population, that maintains the current number of minority districts at 29 and does so, by creating districts that are 70 plus percent, one race or the

other within my home region. Just on its face, I would offer that, that would mean that what is currently before, the house would not be compliant with Section 2 of the Voters Rights Act, which is one of the things as Judge Carter has reminded the committee and those of us who have followed the process again and again, there's a part of what this legislature adopted in terms of the guidelines that we would follow as we went through this process, and I believe that this plan in that it does not for those of you who are outside of the Shreveport-Bossier, Northwest Louisiana area, doesn't affect or impact you in any way whatsoever. It leads every other region of the state as he is and as has been supported by the majority of this committee. What it says is that, for those of us in the Shreveport-Bossier area, we should unpack our districts and in doing so, we end up with what I think are better districts gives us the opportunity to be better representatives of the people, but it also creates an opportunity where the total number of minority majority districts in the state actually ends up becoming more reflective of the overall population of the state because 29 of 105 is 27 percent. Thirty percent or third of 105 would be well over 30. So,

1 the gap between where we are and what we actually
2 should aspire to, in terms of Section 2 compliance,
3 would take us well past 30. This particular Bill
4 offers a more reasonable approach to that, allows us
5 to be able to -- I think make a set of districts that
6 are better representative of the actual people and
7 region of Northwest Louisiana and gives us a chance
8 to be able to have a Bill that is compliant with
9 Federal Law reflective other intentions that we as a
10 body and as a legislature have put into statute and I
11 can only speak for myself. It puts me in a position,
12 especially as author of the Bill, to at that point be
13 compelled to vote for a Bill that is essentially
14 reflective of what you all have passed out and
15 Speaker Stefanski -- I'm sorry, Speaker Schexnayder's
16 Bill.
17 CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Don't upgrade me, don't
18 upgrade me.
19 REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: I'm not upgrading, I'm
20 not trying to create a conflict. But it would put me
21 in a posture of voting for a Bill that would be 99
22 plus percent reflective or what it is that this
23 committee has already passed and I would in turn
24 appeal to the entirety of this body to do the same. I
25 think anything less than that, puts us in a posture

of saying that we're going to pass a Bill that says we're good with creating districts in a region that is clearly representative of a demographic that is highly mixed and increasingly so that we think that you all should be saddled with districts that only allow folks to get elected if they have the ability to be able to appeal to a district that 70 percent black or 70 percent white.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Thank you Representative Glover. So, I have to admit, as I was reviewing your Bill, I was noticing a lot of similarity. So, I appreciated your thought process behind how you started with this and reflect that it does take a tremendous amount of work to meet with all those members and do the road show to try to come up with something that works for the majority. And so, a couple times, you made a couple comments, you do believe this Bill complies with Federal Law?

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: I believe that if we increase at least to 30, it puts me in a posture of being willing to vote for the Bill.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Got you.

[00:25:00]

And again, part of why I did not become any more expansive than I'd be, it is because I'm not in a

1 posture as you are and the rest of this committee is
2 to have actually had all of these individual
3 conversations in Baton Rouge, in New Orleans, in
4 Acadiana, in Monroe, in Calcasieu and what have you.
5 So, I don't know if the dynamic within those areas is
6 as stark as it is within Northwest Louisiana. Since I
7 don't know that and I'm not willing to speak for
8 those particular areas, the possibility exists that
9 you might be able to do a similar unpacking within
10 those areas and you end up with what may be a shift
11 here and a shift there. I can't attest that. But
12 because an understanding how this process works and
13 knowing and listening to this committee and that
14 there is a great deal of comfort throughout,
15 apparently, at least the committee. If not, a
16 substantial portion of my conservative colleagues
17 with the current status of HB14, then I didn't try to
18 do that. And so, because I know this one gives us
19 more representative districts in my area and
20 increases the number, it's reflective of the actual
21 demographic changes that have taken place in
22 Louisiana, more reflective. It's actually reflective
23 is more reflective of the demographic changes that
24 have taken place in Louisiana as a whole and in
25 Northwest Louisiana, in particular, then I would be

willing to support it and say that my vote would be a testament to the fact that if we are not fully compliant with Section 2, we have at least made a good-faith effort to be so.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Okay. Again, I don't want to put words in your mouth. I know when you gave your opening, you talked about Section 2, you talked about Federal Law. And so, it really is a broad question. Do you think it's compliant -- do you think the map you've presented today is compliant?

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: I think that there are those and you may hear from them, who are outside of my region. I'm being as out of this may sound; I'm trying to say slim on this legislation. I want to be very aerodynamic. I'm trying to limit the level and amount of resistance that I may be faced with. Going into other areas of the regions and attempting to try and do there what I'm attempting to do in terms of Northwest Louisiana, would broaden me up, increase my drag, slow me down, increase the level of heat and friction, friction brings out breakdown and ultimately that leads to failure. That's what I'm trying to avoid.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: No, I understand you.

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: I don't want to speak to places and regions and people who have not had a chance to be able to represent for the last 30 years as I have in Northwest Louisiana.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: No, and that makes sense.

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: So, in this regard it would be compliant in terms of Northwest Louisiana.

CHAIMAN STEFANSKI: Okay. What encompasses Northwest Louisiana?

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Shreveport-Bossier, Webster, DeSoto, Red River, Clayborne, that particular--

CHAIMAN STEFANSKI: That region. Got you. And so, in your opinion—

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: [INDISCERNIBLE 00:28:18].

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Okay. For those name Parishes in your - because if we're limited to that area, which is -- I'm trying to stay with how you said you want to speak and that region of the state, you believe this map would be comply with Federal Law in Section 2.

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Okay. The other thing I wanted to talk with you about is really it seems in your map; you came to kind of the same conclusion.

And obviously, if you started with the speaker's map, it makes a lot of sense and so, I'm not trying to dig too deep into that, but it seems like your map comes to the same conclusion that District 23 was a good candidate to move down into New Orleans, where we saw a tremendous population growth. Do you agree with that?

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Well, let me say this, and pulling this together, and knowing that the first thing I wanted to do was to communicate to my Northwest Louisiana delegation and I guess District 1 through 11, and 23 and put them on notice before a Bill gets filed or they hear from anybody else or that I'm coming in to file a plan, that's going to impact our region. I sent out the summer that I got from Trish in the staff of what the Bill would look like. And I reached out directly to -- I love all of you, but there's nobody I love more in this body, than Colonel Kenny Cox. I've known him since 2005. He served with people I grew up with and I think he's an American hero, and I heard his plea and agree substantially.

[00:30:05]

And again, if I were being bolder in this attempt and had the time to do the work necessary to try and

1 build the case in an argument to support what it is
2 that he would like to see happen, then I would
3 certainly look to do so but I'm trying to -- I think
4 accomplish something that is -- I think actually
5 reasonable and more than possible. I said to him, "I
6 want you to hear directly from me, I'm going to be
7 submitting a plan that does to your district, the
8 same thing that the speaker's Bill does to your
9 district." And part of the reason why from my
10 judgment is that there's no doubt in my mind that if
11 he had the opportunity to seek that district
12 configuration again, then he would be successful on
13 the fourth attempt as he has done in the previous
14 three. And probably the same could be said for his
15 brother and some of the other folks that are
16 identified with him and the leadership that he's
17 provided, but that's not the basis on which we should
18 be drawing districts. These are not districts that we
19 own, House District 4 doesn't belong to me any more
20 than anybody else's district belongs to them. And so,
21 an understanding that if I want to end up managing to
22 be able to come up with an approach that actually is
23 more Section 2 compliant and that comes up with a
24 district that is more compliant of a provision that
25 used to be a part of the Voters Rights Act which is

1 Section 5, that the district that I think would make
2 a stronger case for pre-clearance would be an
3 additional district based on the Shreveport-Bossier
4 are, as opposed to the demographic configuration of
5 what 23 was being proposed under the various
6 scenarios that Colonel Cox was supporting and
7 standing up for.
8 CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Okay. I appreciate that
9 explanation. It gives me some clarity on your
10 thought. I'm going to go to a couple of questions. I
11 may follow up with something after I hear some
12 testimony, but speaker Pro Temp Magee for a question.
13
14 REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
15 This has been covered a little bit. I just want to go
16 back over it. Actually, you and I have similar
17 approaches to redistricting. I look at it as my
18 region because that's what I know. I mean, I don't
19 know Shreveport. I don't know Northeast. I don't know
20 Southwest. I know my area. So, that's what I focused
21 in on. And by looking at your map, it looks like
22 you've adopted exactly what the speaker's Bill was in
23
24
25

1 District 53 and Terrebonne-Lafourche Parish and I
2 think you confirmed that, right?
3 REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Correct.
4 REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: And also, I think the
5 testimony from what I've heard that from the ACLU,
6 from every group, is that what the speakers of map
7 did in that area was probably the best we could do
8 under the circumstances for minority representation.
9 I haven't heard anything other than that. So, I was
10 sure that if you put in your map and you agree with
11 that as well.
12 REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Well, those are issues
13 that I can attest to.
14 REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: Sure.
15 REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: All I knew is -- again, I
16 didn't want to create a conflict in your area and
17 have that be a basis of objection. So, I said, if
18 everybody's good with that, then I'm going to proceed
19 with that in my plan as well.
20
21
22
23
24
25

REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: And that was my idea is that if everybody focused on their regions being as fair as possible and we came to the table with those little regional maps that are fair, then we'd have a fair map of the state. That's what I've -- that was always my thought process which I think is what you're telling me as well.

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Well, yes. But now understand that the other limitation of my approaches is this it’s because there was not any direct collective dialogue amongst of the Shreveport-Bossier area. Districts 1 through 11 in terms of the specific individual political areas and precincts, and what have you, that's not reflective of this. And as I've said to the members of the delegation and my communication to them was, if there are changes and adjustments that you would want to make because of -- this is an area, your home area where you believe you're more favorable than what have you, then I'm open to that. But I just wanted to offer an approach

that unpacks the district and make them more reflective of the overall population of the region.

REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: And I heard everything you said, but at the end of the day, this is a map that you drafted because you want it to pass, correct?

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Absolutely.

REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: And it's drafted with the intention to become the statewide map, correct?

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Correct.

REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: And so, then it would seem to me that the natural conclusion from that is that you think this map is legal.

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: I believe that if this map is passed out of committee, comes to the floor and is passed out in a version that increases the number of minority-majority districts, at least somewhat, it is reflective of a desire on the part of this body to recognize what it is that we have put in the statute.

[00:35:13]

1 And also, with Federal Law compels us to do. And
2 that is to offer a configuration that at least
3 attempts to become reflective of the composition of
4 the state as a whole. And I think that the other
5 thing that I think also bears mentioning is that for
6 us to do this or at least make an honest attempt to
7 do it 50 years after. The first multiple number of
8 African-Americans came to this body as members
9 because prior to 1972, this body was a hundred
10 members. And the first person post reconstruction to
11 be a member here was Dutch Morial from New Orleans
12 and he was a very lonely guy until 1972 when he was
13 joined by Alphonso Jackson and Dick Turnley and I'll
14 look for others to give me the rest of the -- I think
15 three or four Judge Carter that joined him. And it
16 has been a steady progression from that point forward
17 since August 6, 1965, three days before my birth, for
18 us to become reflective of that more perfect union.
19 And so, for us to pass a plan as a body that says
20 between 2010 and 2020, despite the increase in the
21
22
23
24
25

1 percentage of black population within the state that
2 the number of house districts should still remain at
3 29 would not be something that would either honor the
4 history that we have all been the beneficiaries of
5 and would certainly not be reflected. I think getting
6 that number to 30 would mean that we have at least
7 made an effort to grow and go forward. With that, I
8 would be willing to vote for a Bill that is
9 reflective of that and I would encourage in the
10 entirety of this body to do the same.
11 REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: Yeah. And I'm just trying
12 to point out you wouldn't author and vote for a Bill
13 that you didn't think was legal.
14 REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Correct.
15 REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: All right. Thank you, Mr.
16 Chairman.
17 REPRESENTATIVE STEFANSKI: Thank you, Mr. Pro
18 Temp. I guess I just want to explore that a little
19 bit. So, for you in your intent, is it -- and I know
20 you focused on your region, I'm not trying to pin you
21
22
23
24
25

1 down on some other part of the state but I mean, for
2 you, that number 30 majority-minority districts, 50
3 plus one that is a huge relevant part of this Bill
4 and the conversation. And that's what I think I'm
5 hearing from you.
6 REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: I think that the belief
7 that in line with what the census data tells us, that
8 we say maintaining the status quo is acceptable means
9 that we are not being true to the statute that we
10 passed, as a body and more importantly, we're not
11 being true to the provisions of Section 2 of the
12 Voter's Rights Act or to the history of the state and
13 this body that has set for now a half a century, that
14 we are going to look to configure ourselves in a way
15 that is reflective of our state. And six districts in
16 Shreveport-Bossier, Districts 1 through 6, yes, those
17 that are all 69 percent, either black or white from
18 the beginning, when the Parish itself is 56 percent
19 black. And the black population of Bossier has grown
20 by 10 percent in a decade. And the City of Shreveport
21
22
23
24
25

is 56 percent black, but we've got legislative districts. You wouldn't do that on the city council to come up with districts that are two thirds to 70 plus percent, one race or the other. And I don't see why it is that we as a legislative body would look to do that either.

REPRESENTATIVE STEFANSKI: Understood. For question, Representative Carter.

REPRESENTATIVE CARTER, W.: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So, Rep. Glover, you are only talking about analyzing this change in 14 for your area because you're most familiar with your area.

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Yes, sir.

REPRESENTATIVE CARTER, W.: Are you aware that the Louisiana been pretty much close to 130 percent of black for the 100 years, almost?

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Well, it was one point in time when we were actually majority black.

REPRESENTATIVE CARTER, W.: That's right. So, actually the situation hadn't changed that

dramatically. Now, we were about 33.7 percent total, you count everything on 33.1, 33.7, whoever figures you go with. The white population, the state has gone down.

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Correct.

REPRESENTATIVE CARTER, W.: And yet from 1972, I think we had five representatives in minority representatives in '72. And we had another big influx of representative in the 1980 census in reapportionment.

[00:40:02]

I think we got a substantial increase in 1983. I ran in '83. I was the first minority -- coming from a minority-majority district in Southwest Louisiana, and that was in '83. He took office in '84. When I got here, there must have been at least 25 minority representatives. So, we went from 5 to 25 in about 10 years.

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Yes sir.

REPRESENTATIVE CARTER, W.: Then in '90 - I wasn't here. I was a judge back then. But anyway, in 2010, we got the 29. And to the credit of the

leadership then, that was apparently -- I don't know if it was challenged or not. So, apparently, it was not challenged. One reason I'm told, you can correct me if I'm wrong, that some areas like your area, it was compacted and some people wanted to compact it. And that created a problem because they voted for it because they want to compact the district and so they kind of made it difficult to pursue litigation.

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Correct.

REPRESENTATIVE CARTER, W.: Because the minority representative voted for it, because that's what they wanted.

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Correct.

REPRESENTATIVE CARTER, W.: We're in a little bit different posture today and as to House Bill 14, when you look at House Bill 14, you have to first look at our -- compare with our law we passed setting forth the criteria we're going to use. That Bill as to your area -- I'm not talking about any other area of the state, just your area, and we heard many times that population have been reduced in North Louisiana. So, as to Northwest Louisiana, you telling us that the population may have been reduced, but it's been white population for the most part.

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Correct.

REPRESENTATIVE CARTER, W.: Not black population. And you went through each of the Parishes and you mentioned how many -- what was the percentage of the increase and it's the first time I really appreciated that information. I mean, it's given to us in the sense of what you always got to really be working with this to understand the census. It's gotten to be so complicated. So, I thank you for that, clearing that up because I had - it came to my mind every time someone came to the desk, who left North Louisiana? It appears that in your area, Northwest Louisiana, whites left.

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Correct.

REPRESENATATIVE CARTER, W.: And still yet, we have the same makeup of the districts. So, when you look at 14 as to Northwest Louisiana, it is not in compliance with even the legislature requirements because the legislature requirements say we would look at -- we would take into consideration Section 2 and I noticed that that statute we pass, it doesn't say which takes priority. It doesn't say Section 2 is more important than keeping these things together than say -- it says we need to look at all of those things. But Section 2 requires, not that you create more black districts, or minority districts -- let's

1 cut to the chase, we got white district, we got black
2 district. We don't have Asian district; we don't have
3 Oriental districts. We have basically white district
4 and black districts because you got to have -- while
5 the other members are protected classes in Section 2,
6 black folks are protected classes in Section 2 and
7 there are other protected class, but they have to
8 have a sufficient amount of numbers in order to
9 create a district to start with and it's only black
10 district that has sufficient amount of numbers. I
11 think there's a district probably somewhere in New
12 Orleans where it might be non-black, but for the most
13 part, the districts in this state are either black or
14 white.
15 REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Correct.
16 REPRESENTATIVE CARTER, W.: So, if you got 57
17 percent in the population and if it's only 29
18 minority-majority districts from 105, okay, so that
19 leaves like 75 districts or 76 districts that are
20 white. My math might be a little off. I'm a lawyer,
21 not a mathematician, but I can figure that out a
22 little bit. Now, that hadn't changed in 20 years.
23 REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Correct.
24 REPRESENTATIVE CARTER, W.: Notwithstanding, the
25 white population has changed going down. So, that

1 makes on its face, if you don't make an effort to
2 adjust that, then you're in violation not only after
3 Section 2 of Voters Rights Act, but you in violation
4 of the Bill, our own statute that we pass.
5 [00:45:08]
6 REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Correct.
7 REPRESENTATIVE CARTER, W.: And you have to
8 explain to the judge why you did that more than
9 likely. So, you almost set up a prima facie case of
10 litigation, okay? But the way you broke it down, you
11 made adjustments to accommodate the change in
12 population, so at least in North Louisiana, we pass
13 your Bill, if 14 becomes like your Bill is then that
14 would be legal. But you cannot say that's the same
15 case in other parts of the state because there are
16 other packing going on in this state. I'm not that
17 familiar with the other areas, but there are people
18 representing folks in those areas that maybe they
19 need to take a look at how much packing they have.
20 And we may create and I saw a Bill come through here
21 from power coalition that had 32 districts, minority
22 districts. And I think they did that by doing some
23 unpacking in other areas. So, when you say there's an
24 effort to say 14 is legal, 14 on the surface is not
25 on the face, it's not legal as to your area. Okay?

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Mm-hmm.

REPRESENTATIVE CARTER, W.: And will be attacked and have to be explained. So, there has to be an effort to correct that change in population shift based on the census report and the effort is not saying we looked at this Bill, we looked at that Bill. You got to make an effort going into the precincts and going into the districts and see how you can change it to make it more consistent with the population shifts. And I don't see 14 doing that. I see your Bill doing that and that's something else other Bills, other Bills doing that. The best thing in the world to do like they did last time in 2010, they didn't have apparently a real serious challenge to it because the minorities in the House apparently voted. A lot of them voted for the Bill. Okay? For their own personal reason, because they wanted 89 percent black, 80 percent black, that kind of stuff. But we hopefully have moved away from that and we have done enough studies to show, experts have studies to show you don't need an 80 percent district to be successful.

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Correct.

REPRESENTATIVE CARTER, W.: Actually, you can be successful with 60 percent or less, okay? In most

1 places, when you asked to comment on the legality of
2 14 as to other areas, you can't comment on that. But
3 you your comment is that as it stands now, 14 is in
4 violation of Civil Rights Act if they don't adopt
5 your amendments or something similar.
6 REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: That is correct.
7 REPRESENTATIVE CARTER, W.: Now, what you did,
8 basically, you bust up 23 and you changed the
9 majority makeup of five from white to black.
10 REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Correct. That's the
11 effect.
12 REPRESENTATIVE CARTER, W.: That's basically the
13 effect of the whole thing. So, the people in 23 went
14 to same place as 14 basically?
15 REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Correct.
16 REPRESENTATIVE CARTER, W.: I mean, the
17 [INDISCERNIBLE 00:48:16] in 14, 23 was split up in
18 different places based the same way you're doing it.
19 But did the 23 result in any unpacking, the taking of
20 23 and 14 and the taking of 23 in your Bill, did it
21 result in any unpacking by itself?
22 REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: I would have to yield to
23 staff to be able to give me some insight on that. I'm
24 assuming it may have been a part of the ripple effect
25 to facilitate, especially maybe some of the northern

portion of it. It helped to facilitate the unpacking of the other districts as well, but I would have to -

REPRESENTATIVE CARTER, W.: Okay. We have to concede that 23 was already on the number.

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Correct.

REPRESENTATIVE CARTER, W.: To ideal district.

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Correct, we had 52 I think.

REPRESENTATIVE CARTER, W.: Yeah. Now, 5 was okay, but you pretty much changed 5.

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Well, 5 under HB 14 is 70.971 percent white. Under HB 21, House District 5 becomes 58 percent black.

REPRESENTATIVE CARTER, W.: And you got those people from where? From the other districts?

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Just from within the Shreveport-Bossier area.

REPRESENTATIVE CARTER, W.: Okay.

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: I think the directive was unpack the districts even if it takes me out of House District 4.

REPRESENTATIVE CARTER, W.: Okay. What was your district makeup before we started this session?

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: I'm either the three districts now are either 3 is 89, and I'm not sure if

my district or Representative Jenkins -- Chairman Jenkins district is 66 or 71, but the three districts currently are 89, which I know is 3 and either 2 or 4 are either 66 or 71.

[00:50:14]

REPRESENTATIVE CARTER, W.: Okay.

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: That's now, under the current --

REPRESENTATIVE CARTER, W.: Okay. And under your plan, no district is lower than 60 but not higher than 74?

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: House District 4 becomes 56 percent black, I think House District 2 becomes 57-58 percent black. House 5 becomes 58 percent black and the other districts end up with similar configuration.

REPRESENTATIVE CARTER, W.: Okay. So, one of the fears they had ten years ago, I wasn't here, but from talking to folks, was that when you increase the percentages you make it difficult for a minority to get elected because of turnout and because of resources and because of ability to raise money and the campaign. Do you have any studies that would support reducing those districts to under 60 percent

that would still make it viable for a black candidate to get elected?

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: I can only give you my life experience. And that is one, philosophically, I think we elect better representatives when we don't have 70 plus percent districts. The idea that you can end up having someone who at least whether they are black or white knows that people outside of what maybe their core group are a relevant part of the electoral process for them. I think that makes us better representatives. Number two, I want the [INDISCERNIBLE 00:51:41] when the black population was I think about 52-53 percent. I think any of us who are looking to come here and represent people and be fair minded, and be open-minded have the ability to be able to effectively get elected in districts that are at least 55-56 percent of one particular dominant race or the other.

REPRESENTATIVE CARTER, W.: And I noticed out of 29 districts and 14, I think there are 26 percent black representative out of 29. I might be wrong. I might be a little off, so some of these protected districts, protected groups have selected someone other than their race to represent them.

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: That is correct.

1 REPRESENTATIVE CARTER, W.: Which is nothing
2 wrong with that. So, the ideas --
3 REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Or the duration of the
4 creation since they were created.
5 REPRESENTATIVE CARTER, W.: I understand that.
6 And so, the idea in Section 2 is not to guarantee
7 black representative, but guarantee minority groups
8 have an opportunity like someone of their choice,
9 whether they be a black white, Mexican, whatever.
10 REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Correct.
11 REPRESENTATIVE CARTER, W.: And so, the effort to
12 comply is to try to create a district where that
13 group can elect a person of their choice.
14 REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Correct.
15 REPRESENTATIVE CARTER, W.: Because they have the
16 numbers to choose who they want. Whether that person
17 be black or white.
18 REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Correct.
19 REPRESENTATIVE CARTER, W.: And it seemed they
20 have worked very good because I noticed some of the
21 white representative of minority districts, they've
22 done a good job for those people for them. If that's
23 what I can tell for since I've been here. So, the
24 people must know what they want to do. You have to
25

1 rely upon the people ability to select somebody they
2 feel is going to best represent them.
3 REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Yeah.
4 REPRESENTATIVE CARTER, W.: And have confidence
5 that that just because you got all minority, you got
6 a minority district, that's overwhelmingly black it
7 doesn't necessarily mean you get a better
8 representative.
9 REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Correct.
10 REPRESENTATIVE CARTER, W.: But you have to have
11 an effort to create more minority-majority district
12 so you can elect the candidate. Do you agree?
13 REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Yes, I do.
14 REPRESENTATIVE CARTER, W.: Okay. So now as you
15 sit right -- as you have looked at these Bills 14, is
16 it my understanding you saying 14 is not legal
17 because it did not unpack districts?
18 REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: That is correct.
19 REPRESENTATIVE CARTER, W.: Okay. Thank you.
20 That's all I have. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
21 REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Could I add? I think in
22 line with what you just asked, what is HB 21 seeks to
23 accomplish in terms of Shreveport-Bossier is
24 something that would have been accomplished a decade
25 ago, were it not for the fact that there was a

1 commitment on the part and the determination on the
2 part of one of the members of the delegation to
3 ensure that their particular district stayed at a
4 configuration that is still to this date 89.9 percent
5 black. Had that not been done at that time, then what
6 it is that is reflected in HB 21 would have been a
7 part of what happened.
8 REPRESENTATIVE CARTER, W.: So, you think what
9 you're doing now probably wouldn't happen back in
10 2010?
11 REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Exactly. This is simply
12 trying to facilitate what should have in fact
13 happened a decade ago. And where our baseline for
14 what we were engaged in right now would be whether or
15 not 30 is the number that we should maintain or that
16 we should be looking to increase. But that is
17 something absent that extreme packing. I mean, to
18 have a district that's only 11 percent of another
19 race in a city that has the demographic makeup of
20 Shreveport and a region that has the demographic
21 makeup of Shreveport-bossier in Northwest Louisiana.
22 [00:55:14]
23 It's just something that is hard to comprehend.
24 But it happened. And as you laid out, it happened
25 with the support of the members involved. And so,

from a challenge standpoint, it made it very difficult to be able to address. But absent that dynamic, then what we're here discussing now would have actually been, in fact, since that decade ago plan was adopted.

REPRESENTATIVE CARTER, W.: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Thank you, Representative Carter. Representative Glover, did you get a -- I know we've talked a lot about the speaker's Bill. Did you get a chance to view the numbers in your region because we talked about a lot of you've used some terms and you've talked about some very high race numbers in some of these districts? Did you get a chance to view those numbers in HB 14?

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Yes. That was the basis of me making the decision when the Bill went live and I was able to look at it and starting with that configuration is what prompted me to -- how is it that we managed to keep it at 29 is by keeping the first six districts in Shreveport 70 percent either black or white.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: And I think and I'm not going to put words in your mouth, because you never referenced what district you were alluding to and what former member and all that stuff. So, I'm not

1 going to throw any names or anything, but I'm
2 assuming --
3 REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: You're not going to get
4 me in trouble back in --
5 CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: I'm going to do my best
6 representative, to protect you back home. Okay?
7 REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: But now, Mr. Chairman, if
8 it gets this Bill out of committee, I'll do it.
9 CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: I'm not going to throw any
10 colleague under the bus or former colleagues. So, I'm
11 assuming you might have referenced District 3. Did
12 you see the difference in the numbers from where
13 district three currently is to where it was in the
14 speaker's proposed maps?
15 REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: I think it takes it from
16 89 to -- from 89 to 73.
17 CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Would you agree with me that
18 that is a pretty significant drop? Maybe not enough
19 for you, but it is a drop.
20 REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Well, you know, every now
21 and then, I'm a biscuit or two away in the grand
22 scheme of things though Mr. Speaker, it's kind of
23 like spitting the notion.
24 CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: But I mean, you're a very
25 smart gentleman, which I'll say that, I highly

1 respect you. I think you're a great rep. You would
2 agree with me that the numbers -- the numbers do go
3 down?
4 REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Yes. That is a factual
5 statement but for an electoral purposes and for the
6 purpose of crafting and developing districts, there
7 is no political difference and no practical
8 difference between 89 and 73. Because what you're
9 still doing is you still got another 13 or so points
10 before you even get to 60. You've got 18 points
11 before you get to 55. And any person that can manage
12 to get elected from a 55 percent district in that
13 particular district is probably something that we
14 should not be looking to accommodate.
15 CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: And I will --
16 REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: That 18 points means that
17 that's population that should be being used to ensure
18 that House District 5 is not 70 percent. Or that
19 House District 6 is not 74.74 percent.
20 CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Do you know the demographics
21 of House District 5 as it sits right now under the
22 malapportionment stats?
23 REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: No.
24 CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: If I told you that it was in
25 the 50s, would that shock you?

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: In terms of?

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Of white population.

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: No.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: So, second thing I want to touch on is you talked a little bit about that you spoke to the representatives in your region.

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: To make sure I'm clear with you --

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Sure, sure, sure.

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Are you saying that the demographic configuration of five under its malapportioned number is in the 50 and yet we drew it in House District 14 to be 70.917?

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Well, my question to you was, the understanding of where those levels are currently. You've told me how you think the numbers are too high one way or the other and when in actuality, the numbers of House District 5 are not that high one way or the other.

[01:00:07]

I was just asking if you knew that. You made a separate point which I'll let you elaborate on, but I would just -- my question to you to clarify was just, did you know that that's how the current numbers are?

1 REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Well, I'll say this. I
2 did not know the specifics of it, but I think what
3 you just said reiterates and potentially makes even
4 better the point that I was making at the conclusion
5 of Judge Carter's questions and that is what happened
6 or that status of House District 5 is reflective of
7 that 50 percent configuration of what was put off a
8 decade ago, for whatever set of political
9 considerations there were. So, if you fast forward a
10 decade and 5 is now, and I'm assuming when you say 50
11 percent that's 50 percent black?
12 CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: No, white. I was referring
13 to the white pop.
14 REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Okay. Which is, mean
15 still high 40s black, then that means that it was
16 only by creating one district at almost 90 percent
17 black that you were able to prevent the actual
18 configuration of 5 as a minority-majority district a
19 decade ago.
20 CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: And I wasn't here, were you?
21 REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: No.
22 CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Okay. I thought maybe you
23 had overlapped on the last one too.
24 REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: This is my fourth
25 reapportionment process. The first was on the

Shreveport City Council. The second was here for 2000. The third was as mayor in 2010 and here I am now.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: We're happy to have you. So, let me ask you another question about --

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: 66 finds me at the 5th.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Let me ask you another question about the representatives that you had an opportunity to reach out to. You said you reached out to everyone in the northwest delegation?

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: I sent an email out.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: You an email out. Okay.

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Yes, to everyone, giving them the summary of what it is that was being proposed, acknowledging that I had had a chance to speak with anyone and indicating that this was in no way reflective of people looking out for their particular areas of strength politically and what have you, but just was a directive to staff to unpack the districts. Take us from being these extremes to what is more reasonable and I'm open to any suggestions or requests that will give me this precinct or take these out and shift these around because it was not that kind of a political process.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Yeah, I understand. Did you get any responses for many of the members in your delegation?

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Not to my knowledge.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Okay. Nobody walked up to you said, "Hey, look, I'm good with it." Nothing like that?

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: I had conversation with Representative Jenkins. I had a conversation with Represented Phelps.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Okay. And they were in agreement with this?

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Well, Representative Phelps was certainly in agreement with the intent.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Well, I think everybody has good intentions. I don't think anybody who undertakes this task has bad intentions.

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Well, she understood that the need to unpack the districts was something that we ought to be seeking to do, especially in that she is representing the district that was packed to the hilt a decade ago.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Yeah. Okay. So, then my next question would be, let's see - so, the population that the former District 23 encompassed in that

1 geography, do you believe under this makeup as you
2 presented in 21, those people are fairly represented?
3 REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Well, I don't think that
4 is fairly representatives, they would be under a
5 district that would be in line with what their
6 current representative -- Representative Cox would
7 want to see them represented by. I have no doubt that
8 there's a community of people of color because I
9 think that's probably a more accurate reflection of
10 that region. Some are black, some are Creole and what
11 have you. But there is certainly a community of folks
12 who are people of color in that region that I think
13 deserve to be a substantial, if not deciding factor,
14 in selecting a member of this body. Given the time
15 and the opportunity to be able to try and figure out
16 how to make that happen, I would certainly be
17 inclined to do so. I know that Representative Jenkins
18 attempted to do that with his legislation. Part of
19 the problem for me with that was that it resulted in
20 the net loss of representation from the Shreveport-
21 Bossier area, which I do not agree with. We don't
22 always agree that myself and the rest of the
23 delegation.
24 CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: I don't always agree with my
25 delegation.

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: But when it comes to big picture items, I'd much rather have seven people speaking on behalf of Ochsner Health than have six. So that was part of what caused concern for me there and again was a part that prompted me to look to try and offer something.

[01:05:04]

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: And I certainly heard your explanation and I don't want to make you think that I didn't hear you. I just heard what you said and you said they may be could be fairer given the time, but for the purposes of today in our consideration of this vote of this Bill today, do you think that the former geography that encompassed District 23 is fairly represented?

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Well again, I'm not in a position to be able -- I fully understand the sentiment expressed by Colonel Cox and support him in that 100 percent. I also know that when it comes to these types of processes, I can't let the perfect be the enemy of the reasonable and very good. So, in that regard, which is why the one person that I did directly reach out to and communicate with, and have had several conversations with was Colonel Cox.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: What were his thoughts on this?

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Well, obviously, I think if he could have kneecapped me, he would. But I'm his friend. He loves me. I love him and so he restrained himself. But I wanted him to understand that this was not an effort to undermine him or the people he represents, and that I fully understood and embraced the points that he's making, but that if I've got to at this point have a choice between voting against a plan that has 29 minority.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Majority-minority districts. Yeah.

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: And has packed districts in Northwest Louisiana or vote for a plan that unpacks Northwest Louisiana and increases the number of minority-majority districts to 30. Then based upon the fact that I understand that at some point the decision that has to be made progress has to be weighed and measured and if it's there acknowledge, then I would be willing to support either my version of 21 or amended version of 14 that is reflective of what's contained within 21.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Yeah and that's -- I think you're very clear on your thought process and

1 methodology getting there. So, let me back away from
2 just that specific question. But I mean you think if
3 this committee would choose to adopt this Bill today
4 you think this is a fair representation of the state?
5 REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: I think it is fair than
6 14.
7 CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: But you don't think it's
8 fair?
9 REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Well again, because I
10 wished that I was in a position to speak as
11 authoritatively as you and the rest of this committee
12 because you have in fact -- I remember my day and my
13 time sitting there with you and Trish and the rest of
14 the team talking about reinforcement in general and
15 my district in particular. I've not done that. I've
16 had conversations with various members, but I know
17 that those conversations are not in any way
18 reflective of what it is that you all have done. I
19 also acknowledge in here that there are groups out
20 there who say that we can in fact do more. I'm not in
21 a position to be able to be the member that stands up
22 and offers those Bills to do that because I can't
23 look into the rest of you all, whether it's in the
24 home of Thibodaux area, Acadiana region of Monroe,
25 Central Louisiana, New Orleans and Baton Rouge in the

eye and say that as you have that I've heard, attended all the road shows. I've met with all the members. I know what their objectives and their concerns and the trepidations are and so I feel confident sitting here offering you this Bill. I can't do that. I can hear what those folks say and I acknowledge that they have a good point and be willing to hear the debate and discussion that goes along with that. But I can't sit here and say to you, that I can take the speaker's Bill that apparently at least a good number of the committee was supportive of to get it out of here and probably even a good part of the delegation and say that while I may have disagreements from folks on my own area, here's what the facts are. The facts are that the speaker's Bill creates 70-plus percent black-white districts. That's something that we should not do, at least within that area. Now that may be perfectly fine, justifiable and locate someplace else, but it's not reflective of the reality of Shreveport-Bossier, Webster, Red River, Claiborne, DeSoto. It's certainly not the reality since Districts 1 through 6 are primarily all in Caddo Parish that's 56 percent black, has six districts that every district is at least 70 percent black or white. I mean, I'm not trying to

characterize motivation, but in order for that to happen, that's what you seem to me as if you have to be planning to do that in order for it to happen.

[01:10:01]

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: I guess I'll take that long answer and I'm not trying to be disrespectful. I guess I think that long answer is just maybe --

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Well, again, I cannot -

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: You're saying that you're not in a position to be able to give an answer.

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: I'm in a position to say to you that if this committee acts favorably on this Bill, as it is presented, and is reflective of the change that I think at least needs to happen there, I'm willing to vote for it on the floor and support, and say that I did at least seen an effort to acknowledge these other circumstances that's problematic, that is it. At least in this instant, not compliant either with the statute that we pass as a legislature or Section 2 of the Voters Rights Act, and it made an effort to correct itself and become better. And based upon that, I'm willing to vote for it. But does that vote mean that I'm acknowledging that it is fully compliant with concerns that are being expressed out of Baton Rouge and Lafayette,

Calcasieu, New Orleans, or what have you? No, I cannot attest to that.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: But at the end of the day, do you think that -- and with all those qualifiers that you just talked about, at the end of the day, you think that this is the ultimate instrument that becomes law and becomes the new districts for our state is fair.

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: I'm willing to say that it made an effort to become better and that my vote for it is a testament to that, and that I was not willing to allow the desire to achieve the ideal, keep me from being willing to support that which ultimately represents growth, advancement and progress.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Do you think fair should be in consideration in this process?

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: I heard somebody who make this statement the other day. May have been Colonel Cox. There's a lawyer from Shreveport who says, the fair only comes once a year. Any other time, make sure you get a lawyer.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: And you are a lawyer, aren't you representative?

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: No, I'm not.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: You're not? I thought you had a law degree. I really did.

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: I just play one on television every time.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: I don't want to disparage anybody else, but you would have been in another life. I think you would have had a strong career.

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: I was hoping to be the [PH 01:12:21] nose for the Cowboys, but that didn't work out either.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Representative, I do appreciate you answering my questions, and I think you've stated your intentions pretty clearly, so I respect that. Speaker Pro Temp Magee for a question.

REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I've been thinking about your map and looking at it, and the one thing that concerns me or one of my concern, one thing I'm thinking about is, I think the chairman has been very, very clear on his map, on HB 14, that he went with a member-based approach, met with regional delegations, met with you, and that the map was the result of all those conversations. And I think you adopted that for 99 percent of the map. We're just nibbling in this northwest corner right here. My concern is, and what gives me pause I should

say is I was at least part of some of those conversations with the chairman and those delegations. I've never heard from the delegation themselves, each individual member on how they feel about the changes you're making. I guess that's what I'm trying to say. I haven't had a chance to talk to Representative Phelps about this. I haven't had a chance to talk to -- and that's probably my mistake too as I'm realizing, as I'm talking out loud. It's not anything you've done, that's just as well. And in fact, I think district -- I think when looking at the numbers, it looks to me like District 5 is the most impacted district from your changes, is that fair to say or is that right saying --

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Well, again, HB 14 has Districts 1 through 6, all of which are predominately in Caddo Parish where the lowest racial configuration is House District 2 at 67.38 percent black, and as high as 74.74 percent white. And so, you know --

REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: Right. And look, I'm not trying -- this is not a question about the details of the map. I'm just looking at it and saying, I feel like I need to have some conversations with some members in those districts to find out what's -- and I trust you what you're saying about your district.

And look, I applauded anybody who draws themselves out in their own district. I think that's extremely admirable. And I hear what you're saying about yours and I believe in that. But I haven't had the opportunity to talk to you like District 5 and see how it impacts that district and what he thinks about those impacts. And look, if the member from District 5 says, "Yeah, this is cool. I mean, this is the right thing to do. This is why." I mean that colors how I feel about it. And if he says it's not, then I wonder why he says it's not and I just don't want -- I'm not looking for his approval. I'm looking for his input like we did from day one.

[01:15:00]

And so, I think to me, what I would consider doing from my perspective is, since it's such a small part, you're not really changing the whole state. I think this sets up for a potential amendment to HB 14, and before I would weigh in on whether I support that amendment, I would like to talk to the members who are really impacted by it and just get their feedback before I move on. And we did that with Representative Cox, when we removed his district, we had feedback from it, even though we ultimately stuck with the plan. I just think it's, [INDISCERNIBLE

01:15:31] but it's also in our interest to find out from them. That's what I'm trying to tell you. I can't say I support this right now, but I can say I will look at it in amendment and see how it impacts that region. Sit down with everybody again, and re-look at it, and based off of their feedback, go from there. That seemed like a fair approach to you?

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Here's what I know is unfair. What is patently unfair is to draw Districts 1 through 6 at 67 percent black or white, and as high as 74.74 percent black or white. However else you managed to get to where you unpack those, again, as I shared with the delegation, I'm open to that. I want this to start as the template that shows that it's possible.

REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: Sure, I understand.

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: If there are changes and adjustments that that should be made, then fine. But the one thing that needs to be unequivocally clear is that the only way that you end up drawing districts like this, if that's what you intend to do. And intending to do that, what that means is that you are purposely avoiding the opportunity to come up with a configuration that is reflective of actually a Parish that's 56 percent black, and that is not in line with

what it is that we as a body said we were intending to do or in line with what Section 2 of the Voters Rights Act said that we should do.

REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: No. I understand your perspective. I'm not --

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: I don't know how we got to that point in HB 14 because I know - Chairman Stefanski, you correct me if I'm wrong. My conversation with you was we need districts, not just from mine, but throughout the state that are not packed that end up being configuring a way to where there is at least a significant percentage of those districts being made up of a race that is opposite of the member who holds the seat, so that we end up sending people to this body who come here, not believing that I don't have to listen to any of those folks on the other side of my district because they can't affect me politically. We are well-served when we come here with the mindset that says, "We want to try and do what's best, not only for entirety of our district, but the entirety of the state." And if that district ends up being reflective with the composition of state, then we end up, I think, doing what's best for the state as a whole. How you got to this in the current configuration of 14, I don't know

unless it was intended to avoid that which should've happened a decade ago. And so, if you're saying that we need to have that conversation, I mean, I get that needs to happen. But what I'm guessing I'm hoping that that end up becoming is the excuse to not attend to try and make either this Bill, come out of the committee or to make HB 14 much, much better than it is right now in regards to at least Northwest Louisiana.

REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: No, I understand completely what you're saying. In fact, I think the speaker's Bill did move, especially I think to District 3 which I think is Representative Phelps' district currently, I think he did reduce the numbers because that one was crazy high from this previous one.

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: It's still 73 percent.

REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: Sure. I understand. But, look, people get ownership of certain parts of and it's harder to move things around and it seems, I mean, I'll just be completely frank honestly, everybody says it in theory and then you start trying to do it, in practicality, the same people who say -- I'm not saying Representative Phelps has said. I'm saying that as a general statement of my conversation

with people, "Yeah, we should do this," and you start doing it and you go, "I didn't really want to talk about my district, I was talking about everybody else's district." And so, that's what kind of happens when we had this -- I'm not saying, for the record, be very clear, Representative Phelps did not say that. I'm just saying that's the conversations I've had by the bulk load, that we all think we have like a lot of good ideas, but how it should be done as long as it's not your district, you know?

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Well, and in this case, my directive to staff was unpack, even if it means taking me out of House District 4.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Right, and I appreciate that. I do. And I'm just saying I would like to have a conversation with the members impacted though. Since I had conversations with them based off, originally, with HB 14 to go back to them and see what their thoughts are in the stuff. That's all I'm trying to tell you.

[01:20:08]

Then based off of that, I'll make up my decision on amendment because I think since you keep everything whole, this is an easy amendment to consider. So, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1 CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Thank you, Mr. Pro Temp, and
2 I will -- it's been referenced earlier. So, in this
3 Bill, you're not actually located in your district?
4 REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: I don't know. I gave that
5 directive to Trish and didn't even -- I haven't even
6 bothered to see.
7 CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Okay. So, you are still in
8 it, but I commend the fact that -- got it. I do
9 commend the fact I think the public maybe doesn't
10 understand that and again, I don't want to throw
11 anyone under the bus, but I think you've been around
12 the legislative process for a long time and there are
13 a lot of things that sound great. And then when you
14 start working with the members, there are realities
15 that start presenting themselves. And one of those is
16 look, the members want to be located in their
17 district so that they have an opportunity to serve
18 their community. And that there's anything wrong with
19 that. If you feel like you do a great job for your
20 community, it makes sense that you would like to be
21 able to continue to do that, and that's part of this
22 process. But from the outside looking in, I think it
23 is very easy sometimes to just say, "Hey, do all of
24 this and make it happen" and it's, I believe in my
25 opinion, is rare that somebody would be actually

1 saying that. I was hoping you, not because I don't
2 like you, Representative, but I actually was hoping
3 you weren't going to be in that district so I could
4 have given you even more credit for that. But with
5 that said, it does what we do have Vice Chair
6 Duplessis for question.
7 VICE CHAIRMAN DUPLESSIS: Thank you, Mr.
8 Chairman. I'm not sure where we are with the
9 discussion and I'm not sure what's next procedurally
10 in terms of how we move forward. I certainly know
11 where I stand, and I say that in contrast to much of
12 the debate that we had previously and committee with
13 respect to House District 23. And the population loss
14 from the north that there had to be tough decisions
15 being made in terms of any loss of a district so we
16 knew that a district would have to be lost from the
17 north. And having the discussion, Representative
18 Glover, I don't know if you watch the conversation
19 that was had and the Chairman Speaker Schexnayder and
20 some of the criteria in the formulas that were put in
21 place to make the decision on which district would
22 essentially be moved a major factor, the major
23 criteria as I understand it was that members decided
24 that we would prioritize districts that were termed
25

or that were held by members that were term-limited. And I want to state -- were you aware of that?

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Yes.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUPLESSIS: Okay. I just want to state that for the record, as we evaluate your Bill and to which Pro Temp Magee mentioned about trying to get input and have this conversation, I just want to make it clear that your proposal in your area does in fact encompass a district where one of the members is term limited. Is that correct?

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: That is correct.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUPLESSIS: Okay. I just want to make sure that part is clear from our understanding, as well as for the committee's understanding, that one of the driving factors in terms of House District 23, that decision was made. I'm not saying it was the only decision -- the only reason, but a large part of the reason was the fact that that was a term limited district. So, as we think about, when we talk about "impact," we are also talking about a district for someone that essentially will not be here. So, I just want to make that -- I want to reiterate that point. Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: And Mr. Chairman, if I may.

1 CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Of course, yeah.
2 REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: A big part of the
3 pushback that I heard you all get in that regard, as
4 I listened to the testimony, was from people, the
5 public, especially some of the young people who
6 accused us of engaging in this process in a way to
7 try and protect their own situation and
8 circumstances, which is part of the motivation as to
9 why, in listening to that as well as what you just
10 pointed out in terms of considerations and making
11 decisions, was term limited numbers. My directive to
12 Trish was draw me out of District 4 if that
13 facilitates what it is that I've asked in terms of
14 unpacking. And to let you know exactly what that
15 means, I'm a Hail Mary pass away from Rep.
16 McCormick's district. My precinct is adjacent to one
17 that is represented by him. So, as in line with
18 Speaker Pro Temp Magee's suggestion of wanted to have
19 these conversations with report and other members of
20 the delegation about unpacking the district, but
21 doing so in a way that addresses their concerns. That
22 offer is still on the table. If you can accommodate
23 what makes the other numbers from that region, more
24 satisfied with what I've offered in HB 21 by drawing
25 me out and putting me into House District 1 or what

1 have you then I'm more than fine with that because
2 part of what people say is that these types of
3 considerations of why we shouldn't be making these
4 decisions the first place.
5 [01:25:23]
6 Now, we can talk about what we might want to have
7 happen but that's not how it works at this point.
8 This is a process that is vested within the
9 legislature and so we're the ones who have to make
10 this decision. And I want this decision to be made
11 based upon what accommodates District 1, District 2,
12 District 3, District 5, District 6, District 7,
13 District 8, District 9, 10, and 11 as opposed to
14 keeping me in House District 4.
15 VICE CHAIRMAN DUPLESSIS: I want to just commend
16 you for your thoughtfulness, your methodology. I
17 think you have put forward something that is more
18 than reasonable and I think it factors in all of the
19 criteria that we have not only adopted legislatively,
20 but that also I believe adheres more to Federal
21 Voting Rights Law. And again, it is more than
22 reasonable even if there is an argument that could be
23 made that more could be done. I think that the step
24 you have shown I think is the epitome of leadership,
25 selflessness, and I just can't commend you enough for

you taking this approach. I think you put something very pragmatic before this body, and I think we all should be compelled to support this quite frankly. I don't have an issue with what Pro Temp Magee has suggested in terms of trying to get that feedback. I don't have an issue with that. But I think you have put a real solid and firm solution and proposal in front of this body and I think it's one that we should clearly, clearly support. I don't see any justification or reason as to why we shouldn't, but from a pure process standpoint, I have no issue with his proposal. I guess I'm just asking how do we proceed next, because personally, I am ready to make a motion.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: I'll make some comments on that, and some suggestions, Mr. Pro Temp. You can engage in that discussion in a second if you would like. One thing I do want to highlight, Representative Glover, you've been talking a lot about equalizing these numbers for your region. I am looking at your plan and I'm looking at the VAP White in a number of these districts, and I'm seeing 71 percent, 72 percent, 70 percent, 68 percent, 65 percent in the district's reference. And so, I do have some concern with that because I think you've

1 probably done a yeoman's job of this -- these words
2 are so tricky, you got to make sure you choose the
3 right one, of accomplishing your goals with the
4 African-American community. Do you have any comments
5 on the white population in those areas?
6 REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Which districts are you
7 referring to?
8 CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: So, District 1, I'm seeing
9 has a VAP of 71.7 white, District 6 has a VAP of 72.3
10 white, District 8 has a VAP of 70.6 white, District 9
11 has VAP of 68.4 white.
12 REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: I need to pull up a copy
13 of the Bill.
14 CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: I can have staff bring you
15 the statistics if you would like.
16 REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Could you give me a copy
17 with numbers?
18 CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Would someone please bring
19 him a copy of the district with the split statistics?
20 REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Let me pull up the --
21 [BACKGROUND CONVERSATION]
22 Thank you. Thank you. All right. Let's see
23 here. Okay. Let me read from -- and I will yield to
24 the numbers. Let me pull up what I got from staff.
25 [BACKGROUND NOISE]

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Representative Duplessis would like to make a comment while you do.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUPLESSIS: While you're pulling that up, Mayor Glover, I want to say you're not a Hail Mary pass away from District 1. You're actually more of an underhanded pitch. I have a cousin who thought he lived in Cedric - Representative Glover's district. And I said, no, let's take a look at this map. He lives literally directly across the street, and I just thought that was so interesting. So, it's not a Hail Mary pass.

[01:30:07]

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Thank you Mr. Vice Chair.

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: What I am seeing here from what was sent to me by staff is that it takes District 1, total goes down. Let's see. Let me go VAP. I think the operative thing is, is that VAP for 2 goes to 66, 3 goes to 57, 4 goes to 57, 5 goes to 61.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: And you're referencing the VAP Black in those districts, right?

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Okay, yeah. And I was specifically asking the question about the VAP White in --

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Yeah, I think those are still -- I think there's more unpacking, yes. This is not perfect by any stretch of the imagination. I think that all of them should be lower if possible. I recognize that in starting this process, which was first I reached out to you over the weekend; I think Sunday maybe. I think it was prompted by the Committee hearing that you all had last Friday and that was what prompted me to say, let me see if I can look to do something especially after having looked at what the configuration was. So yes, I think that the numbers --

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: If you would agree with me that there are stills under your plans in your region some still very high numbers.

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Absolutely. And that probably should come even lower.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Okay, I just --

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: If you ask me to come up with an ideal configuration, I'd make 1-6, 1-7 60/40 depending upon whether it was a majority-majority district or a majority-minority district.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: And obviously these are by no means insinuating that's an easy task. I think when you balance geography and population shifts, the

1 communities of interest and municipalities and
2 parishes and all of these things that we weigh and
3 consider as well as federal law as well as what the
4 public wants and what the public has told us about
5 the neighborhoods that are important and the
6 communities that are important and when you weigh all
7 of these things it may seem like, well, on paper
8 let's just do X, but in reality it is just very
9 difficult to get there, in my opinion. So
10 Representative Glover, I will let you make some more
11 comment.
12 REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: It's all very difficult,
13 but again, if you acknowledge that Districts 1-6 are
14 all primarily centered out of Caddo Parish or Caddo
15 Bossier, the recognition that Caddo Parish in and of
16 itself is 56% Black, for you to end up with six
17 districts where the lowest VAP is 69 and the highest
18 is 74 of all of the districts means that you're
19 dealing with a set of circumstances that is just
20 unfortunately intended to keep us polarized and at
21 the extreme when there is obviously, as shown by what
22 was pulled together over the course of the weekend,
23 an opportunity to be able to make those districts
24 more representative of the region and in fact create
25 an additional majority-minority district.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Understood. So that concludes all the questions. I do have a couple cards that I am going to get to, although -- and Representative Phelps is present here for information only and would like to speak, if there is information Representative Phelps would like to give the committee. I do see a card. She might be in the anteroom. We do have a red card in opposition, Chris Kaiser with the ACLU of Louisiana and a green card in support from one of my favorite Representatives, Denise Marcelle, present, will provide information if requested. Is anyone requesting Representative Marcelle -- it's okay. It's okay. We're scheduled to go on the floor. So Representative Phelps, if you'd like to give some comments. Remember, you filled out a white card and I know you know how those work.

REPRESENTATIVE TAMMY PHELPS: Good morning Committee. Thank you Representative Glover for your bill and your additional information. I did want to clear up and bring some information of contradictory because I do want us to be transparent for the record, when Representative Magee mentioned that he had not spoken with me about this bill, he really had not spoken with me about the house speaker's bill either. The conversations that I've had with the

chairman was the one time when we all met for the very first time. Second time was when we all met for the very second time upon coming to this session.

[01:35:00]

So I don't know how much conversation. Obviously more members have had a lot of conversation with the Chairman, maybe Rep. Magee about their districts, but I wanted to be clear that I have not had that much conversation and why now would it be needed when there was not that much conversation for the speaker's bill?

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Well, so you were invited for the original 101. You remember that where we met, right?

REPRESENTATIVE TAMMY PHELPS: As I said the first time.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Okay. And then you remember when I invited you to a delegation meeting with your Northwest delegation?

REPRESENTATIVE TAMMY PHELPS: That was representation, yes.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Yes. Okay.

REPRESENTATIVE TAMMY PHELPS: And the second time.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: And then have you ever received any emails from me saying that I will be in the office and ready and willing to meet with anyone who would like to come?

REPRESENTATIVE TAMMY PHELPS: I am talking about when I met with you, not what I received.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: I am just -- but I mean, there's been opportunity, right?

REPRESENTATIVE TAMMY PHELPS: Yes, there's been opportunities for everyone, but I am saying to now, want to speak with this delegation about this map. Yes, we have had the opportunity before when there was packing of the other -- for the Black districts, the packing that we're talking about now, unpacking. That wasn't a concern because that's still on that speaker's map. My point is, when he wanted to meet with his delegation about this one, if it was that much of a concern, there still is that much of a concern on the speaker's bill that should have been addressed just like this one. That's what I wanted to make clear. And we wouldn't be having this conversation now. Unfortunately, when this was done 10 years ago, some things that should not have been done, this particular district should not have been packed with 89% African-American. Where was staff

1 saying, oh, maybe this is not a good idea. Let's look
2 at this. I don't know.
3 CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Staff's responsibility is
4 not to tell us what to do; staff's responsibility is
5 to do what the members instruct them to do.
6 REPRESENTATIVE TAMMY PHELPS: It's in the
7 guidelines. You know exactly what I am talking about
8 because we've had this conversation as we look at
9 what could be, should be and how to look at things
10 differently. This is a result of things that are done
11 in the past that I hope we would have this much
12 conversation the next 10 years so this does not
13 continue to happen. There is always a consequence of
14 not getting better but staying the same. So I did
15 want to just make that clear about meeting. I am glad
16 he wants to meet with us again but it would have been
17 a little bit better, because no, I didn't go into
18 this process thinking that a sitting member's
19 minority district would be dismantled. So we all were
20 waiting to see what was going to be presented to us,
21 not that there is a problem, and perfectly honest
22 with me, I just wanted to see what was going to be
23 done. If it was something that I thought I had to
24 fight for and talk to you 50 times about, of course I
25 would have called you, but we know the process was

1 going to go just like it has gone, but I just wanted
2 to be clear about, if he wanted to meet with us now,
3 this delegation that it was so important, we should
4 have done this for the entire, for the speaker's map
5 as well. Thank you.
6 CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Noted. And I will just make
7 the comment again though for me, who has spent a lot
8 of time and been very available, any member who has
9 wanted to meet, you know, I've made myself available
10 to and I don't think I've turned down a single
11 meeting since we started this. Representative Glover,
12 that does clear the cards and clear the board. I am
13 going to say this and I am going to let you close and
14 I am not going to cut you off. I believe what you're
15 trying to do. I appreciate it. And I am not -- I am
16 keeping an open mind and I am not shutting the door
17 on it. I do think it could be accomplished in an
18 amendment. Actually reviewing the minutes that have
19 been proposed today for House Bill 14, one of those
20 looks pretty familiar as well. So I think there is a
21 posture to do that on the floor and I again am
22 keeping an open mind about that, and in things like
23 this board effects an entire delegation, I think
24 where the delegation feels about their communities
25 and what the people they represent would say about

this type of change is important to me as well. And I echo the Speaker Pro Tem's comments about wanting to get with those members again and saying what do you think. But if you would indulge me, I think it would be beneficial to defer this, to keep it open; I am not saying vote it down, vote it forward, my suggestion would be we defer this, if there is a need for your instrument because the amendment process does not suffice, then I would be open to allowing and come back and have this committee vote in full on it. But I think with the ability to have the HB 14 accomplish your goals through an amendment which you have filed, which is pending on the floor, to me I think this this would be a good way to say, let's keep this legislative instrument open in committee and let's have the option for a full debate on the floor with what you're trying to accomplish. And really was one of the reasons I wanted to have your bill this morning because I wanted to have this discussion before we went on the floor because I thought it was very important. And so it's your prerogative. Obviously you can make the motion. Anybody here can make a motion. I am sure my Vice Chair is ready and willing to make that motion. It's

just my suggestion on what I think would be a good idea. Vice Chair.

[01:40:05]

VICE CHAIRMAN DUPLESSIS: Yeah. Thank you Mr. Chairman and thank you for keeping an open mind. I guess my question is what would be the harm in supporting this? My concern is that this House Bill 14 is up on the floor for debate today, and I don't know -- look, we have two -- at least one I know, but I know at least two members of the delegation who serve on this committee, and I am not trying to put anybody on the spot to publicly share where they stand on this. But my concern is that we have an instrument that is moving, it's on the floor today that could be debated. So I am just very concerned that if we hold off on this saying that well, we can possibly amend House Bill 14 and certain conversations aren't had between now when we were supposed to be on the floor at 11, where does that leave House Bill 21? So I don't see the harm in allowing [INDISCERNIBLE 01:41:00] committee.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Yeah. And to answer that specifically, I mean I've said that, if the process does not work out in a posture that's favorable to a member of this committee or Representative Glover, I

1 don't mind if we set it for Monday. I fully expect
2 that we could set this bill for Monday pending the
3 outcome of that. Look --
4 VICE CHAIRMAN DUPLESSIS: But I think if we know
5 if the amendment doesn't make it on -- if we can't
6 achieve it through an amendment and House Bill 14 is
7 advanced to the senate, then we know the fate of --
8 there is no point in having a hearing on Monday
9 because we already know the fate of House Bill 21.
10 CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Okay. So my counter to you
11 and I don't want to engage in --
12 VICE CHAIRMAN DUPLESSIS: No, but these are
13 decisions that we have to make.
14 CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: They are, they are, then how
15 is moving this bill out today going to affect the
16 posture of 14 on the floor today? Under your example
17 it doesn't make a difference either way.
18 VICE CHAIRMAN DUPLESSIS: It might not, Mr.
19 Chairman, but what it wouldn't do, it wouldn't hold
20 up the bill in committee and he would at least have
21 that opportunity to have his own fair hearing on the
22 floor. If House Bill 14 were to advance and there
23 will not be an amendment made, then we already know
24 the fate of House Bill 21 on Monday if it were to be
25 rescheduled then. So I think that -- look, I have not

1 heard much concern being shared. The only concern
2 that I've heard is a concern that we haven't heard.
3 So it's like we want to go see if there is concern
4 out there. And quite frankly, I don't think that's
5 good enough. I think we need to move this bill out of
6 committee Mr. Chairman. And I think we then have the
7 negotiations and talk about whether or not it works
8 for the delegation, and if it is concluded at that
9 point before we take the vote, we will know that. But
10 I don't think this bill should be hamstrung when we
11 have not heard any real concern or opposition raised
12 in the committee.
13 CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Mr. Vice Chair, you made
14 that very clear. I left that option open. I said that
15 I am sure my Vice Chair would be ready and willing to
16 make the motion. Look, I was very transparent with
17 that statement. I said I think my Vice Chairman is
18 probably going to want to make the motion. I was
19 making a suggestion. That's why we have this process.
20 That's why we go through all of this. It's the
21 legislative process. So Representative Glover, it's
22 clear that my Vice Chair is going to make a motion so
23 I'll give you an opportunity to close.
24 REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Well, Mr. Chairman, thank
25 you. Mr. Vice Chairman, members of the committee, I

want to thank you all for taking the time to hear this bill today. And what I want to suggest is this, and that is that as has been stated, we know that HB 14 is on the floor today. I think that we ought to have another option available for us to be able to continue to debate and deliberate this issue. And I want to say this based upon the concerns and the reservations that have been expressed, if you all allow this bill to move forward, I promise you not to bring it to the floor for debate or a vote until we have had the opportunity to have the conversations amongst our area delegation that both the Chairman and Speaker Pro Tem Magee have expressed need to happen in detail, because as I have acknowledged to you all, that has in fact not happened because we only got to this point, and someone tell me, when was it that the speaker's bill became available?

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: I believe it was live pre-convening the first day, so that would mean live probably like Sunday night I believe.

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Yeah, today is the 11th.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Yes, it was live on the 31st.

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: And so that was the first time that I had the opportunity to be able to look at

the data that detailed what it is that I have observed with regard to the configuration of Districts 1-6, listen to the initial deliberations that came before this committee and then come to the conclusion that I wanted to attempt to try and at least do something that would be different and better for my home region.

[01:45:09]

And so with that understanding, I was not in a position to be able to have the discussions that we're talking about having to have because I didn't have the information upon which to be able to base it on. In fact, if I am remembering correctly, the Thursday that I was driving home and you all were continuing to meet from last week is when the young man from staff called and said, we want you to come and take a look at the bill before it goes live just in the event that you have any concerns. And I said, well, I am already out of the city. I am at Andre's getting Cracklins.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Yeah. And I apologize. It's tough to schedule those things. And I want to just be clear. That was funny, but I want to be clear that I am not faulting any of your work ethic. I think you've done the best you can with the tools that you

1 have and the time and limitations that you have. So
2 from my perspective, there is no fault on my part
3 from your ability to be able to meet with those
4 members. I was just commenting for myself.
5 REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: I am just giving you the
6 context in terms of the basis for why I am about to
7 ask for what I am about to ask for and that is
8 because at that point I am not in a position to be
9 able to have those discussions because it would have
10 been the first time to be able to see it before it
11 went live. And so once that became apparent, the need
12 to move forward and try and do something became
13 apparent. That's when I reached out to staff and gave
14 them the directives that I did. They came up with
15 what they came up with, and again, before I filed it,
16 I shared it with the delegation to make them aware of
17 what the intentions were. I spoke directly to
18 Representative Cox and then here we are now. So I
19 guess what I am asking for is this, is that, if you
20 would advance the bill forward out of committee, I
21 commit to you that I am not going to look to bring it
22 to the floor without having those conversations with
23 everyone from Rep. McCormick all the way down to Rep.
24 Jefferson, that's 1-11, and to the extent that
25 Representative Cox in 23 is a relevant part of that

1 discussion still as well and attempt to try and see
2 if what is right now within the bill can be shifted
3 and configured in ways that are satisfactory to the
4 delegation. If it's not, then I'll understand that
5 opposition probably means that we won't be able to
6 end up with a majority vote on the floor, but at
7 least it means that we are attempting to be compliant
8 to what it is that we've already put in statute in
9 terms of how we're going to approach this process,
10 gives us a chance to be able to say that we've made a
11 good faith effort to at least make some movement and
12 progress towards being compliant with Section 2 and
13 to be reflective of what we are as a state. And so
14 that's what I would ask that you would allow us to
15 do, because at this point -- and in fact, if you do
16 that, I am even willing to have a conversation about
17 what to do with my amendment on HB 14 that's on the
18 calendar today. I know that today with this bill
19 still stuck in committee and what I would assume
20 would be a rejection of the amendments that I would
21 look to offer HB 14, then I am not in a posture to be
22 able to vote for anything in a positive way. But what
23 I am trying to hold out the hope for Mr. Chairman is
24 that we have a chance as a body to be able to pass a
25 bill that ends up with something other than just

1 token support coming from those of us who have Bs
2 behind our name and do something that represents an
3 effort at consensus. And while far from perfect at
4 least represents a commitment to that process which
5 got us from one minority member in 1968 to five in
6 1972 to the 29 of us who are here today attempting to
7 be a part of the representative voices of the estate.
8 Adding one more person to that number is not beyond
9 the realm of reasonability Mr. Chairman. In fact, as
10 many would say, it's probably a whole lot less than
11 what we should be seeking. But it's possible. It's
12 the right thing to do and it's our chance to be able
13 to do it. And so with that, I would ask your
14 favorable consideration.
15 CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: And again, I'll just be
16 clear. I think we all have different opinions about
17 how we do legislative instruments and all that. My
18 opinion is that I am not shutting the door open on
19 this. I would prefer to see how we progress on the
20 floor today, see where we're at and if we need this
21 option, you have my commitment, I'll put it on and
22 we'll vote on it.
23 [01:50:11]
24 But if that's not what the committee -- anybody
25 in this committee can make a motion and it's their

decision to do that. Just from my perspective, from the Chair's perspective, I would like to see -- first of all, we're in a unique situation. Your bill mirrors mine probably 88% of the way and so it really is an amendment tweak that you could make to, and when I say mine, I mean HB 14, the speaker's bill, it really is an amendment tweak you could make to put it in the posture that you're asking us to adopt today. Only because it's such a unique situation where you're not redrawing all these other areas in the state in my perspective we could see how 14 progresses, see how your amendment progresses, and if we need this, and I hope this committee has at least trusted me to know that if I am telling you I will schedule it and we can have a full vote on it on Monday, I'll tell staff to put it on the agenda right now for Monday. But if that's not the will of the committee, then it's not the will of the committee and I am going to respect the legislative process. That's the Chair's prerogative. I can't speak for all my members on this committee.

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Can I ask a question?

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Of course.

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: You referenced amendments for HB 14 on the floor today. I have an amendment set

that puts HB 14 in the exact same posture. It retains that 88% and adds this 12 of 21. That's on the schedule to come up today. I am not assuming that the rest of the body -- if this committee isn't in a position to be able to make a decision on moving HB 21 forward, then I can't expect that the rest of the House would be in a posture to be willing to be open to putting my amendment onto HB 14.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Well, that's your assumption. I will tell you this, that I have watched members and opinion shift dramatically since we started this process on what people are willing to support and what they believe is right for the state. And my own opinions have shifted dramatically. So I am not saying you're wrong, but what I am telling you is -- the Vice Chair and I were working on stuff last night and I don't know if that's an absolute truth, I can't speculate, there is members I need to go talk to to see what they could and couldn't support. Again, I think we've talked about it a lot. Look, this committee can entertain a motion and we'll progress from there. The Chair's intent, like I said, would be to defer the bill, to have an opportunity to see where 14 goes on the floor. And if we need this instrument have my commitment that this commit --

this will get a scheduling on as early as possible date and we'll have a vote of this committee to see if we need this instrument. Anything other than that, like I said, I am not going to speak for the other members of the committee. I am going to speak for myself and I am going to respect the legislative process.

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Thank you Mr. Chairman, your time and the time of the committee, I know we're 15 past. I am just struggling to try to understand how the floor is better informed about voting on my committee, then the people on the floor are better positioned to vote on my amendment to HB 14 than the people of this committee are postured to be able to vote on HB 21. Now, what you're telling me is that I can depend on your positive vote on my amendment to HB 14 that's up on the floor, then I am ready to withdraw HB 21 from the files of the House, shake your hand, give you a hug, and sing Kumbaya in my deepest base.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Okay. And what I am saying Representative is just that I am keeping an open mind. I am telling you there is a lot that goes into this. It's talking with a tremendous amount of members, and members aren't the only deciding factor

in this, they're not. We have the public to consider. We have all these other criteria that Representative Carter references all the time that we have to consider that we adopted. But the members represent their areas and they understand their areas, the same way you do in your region and it's important for me to check with those members and talk to them about these changes. And yeah, I could have done that last night, but I was in the midst of reading about 30 amendments to HB 14, yours included, preparing for committee today and getting off the floor yesterday with stuff. So we're all busy and we're all stressed. But again, like I say, if this committee wants to vote, let's vote. I have no problem doing that. I like to be clear on where I am at and what we're going to do. So with that said, members, I think we've done this enough. Is there any motion for this committee or is there no motion that this committee is going to make? Seeing no motion. Representative Duplessis has informed me he is going to withdraw.

[01:54:57]

So Representative Carter has made a motion that we move favorable. I am going to make a substitute motion that we voluntarily defer. There is an

1 objection I am sure from Representative Carter. So
2 Ms. Ammersbach will vote on the voluntary deferring.
3 MS. AMMERSBACH: Chairman Stefanski?
4 CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Yes. Let me clarify, a vote
5 yes in favor voluntarily defers the bill. A vote no
6 does not voluntarily defer the bill. We will then go
7 to the first motion. The first motion was made was a
8 motion to move favorable as amended. So this is the
9 motion to voluntarily defer, okay? Again, a yes vote
10 is to voluntarily defer the bill. A no vote, that
11 means that action would fail and then we would then
12 return to the first motion. Ms. Ammersbach, please
13 start the role again.
14 MS. AMMERSBACH: Chairman Stefanski.
15 CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Yes.
16 MS. AMMERSBACH: Yes. Vice Chairman Duplessis.
17 VICE CHAIRMAN DUPLESSIS: No.
18 MS. AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Bouie.
19 REPRESENTATIVE BOUIE: Yes.
20 MS. AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Wilford
21 Carter.
22 REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER: No.
23 MS. AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Deshotel.
24 REPRESENTATIVE DESHOTEL: Yes.
25 MS. AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Farnum.

1 REPRESENTATIVE FARNUM: Yes.
2 MS. AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Gadberry.
3 REPRESENTATIVE GADBERRY: Yes.
4 MS. AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Hodges.
5 REPRESENTATIVE HODGES: Yes.
6 MS. AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Horton.
7 REPRESENTATIVE HORTON: Yes.
8 MS. AMMERSBACH: Representative Ivey.
9 REPRESENTATIVE IVEY: Yes.
10 MS. AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Jenkins.
11 REPRESENTATIVE JENKINS: No.
12 MS. AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Mike Johnson.
13 REPRESENTATIVE MIKE JOHNSON: Yes.
14 MS. AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative LaCombe?
15 REPRESENTATIVE LACOMBE: No.
16 MS. AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Lyons?
17 REPRESENTATIVE LYONS: No.
18 MS. AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Magee.
19 Representative Newell.
20 REPRESENTATIVE NEWELL: No.
21 MS. AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Thomas.
22 REPRESENTATIVE THOMAS: Yes.
23 MS. AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative White.
24 REPRESENTATIVE WHITE: No.
25 MS. AMMERSBACH: No. Ten yeas, seven nays.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Ten yeas, seven nays. The motion to voluntarily defer passes. Thank you for your time here. Representative Glover, look forward to hearing the debate on the floor with your amendment as well.

REPRESENTATIVE GLOVER: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Thank you members.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Thank you. Members, with that said, that concludes our agenda for today. Representative Farnum makes a motion that we adjourn without objection.

[01:57:34]

TRANSPERFECT

I, Anders Nelson, hereby certify that the document "F889608-louisiana-redistricting_0211_22_hg-2" 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