CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: I want to call the Committee on House and Governmental Affairs to order. Today is Monday, February the 14th. We have a posted agenda over the weekend, three Bills for consideration today. I would ask that if you would like to testify on any of those Bills, please fill out a green card, if you're in support, a white card if your here for information only and a red card, if you are in opposition. Also, please indicate whether or not you would like to give testimony or not today. With that said, I'd also ask that you please silence your cellphone so we don't disturb any of our presenters or any of the legislative action that's going on today. With that said, I will ask Ms. Ammersbach to go ahead and read the roll.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Chairman Stefanski?

JOHN STEFANSKI: Present.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Present. Vice-chairman Duplessis?

ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Here.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Present. Representative Beaulieu.

REP. Beaulieu: Here.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Present. Representative Wilford Carter? Representative Deshotel?

Hearing Exhibit
PR-66
3:22-cv-00211-SDD-RLB

REP. DESHOTEL: Here.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Present. Representative Farnum?

REP. FARNUM: Here.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Present. Representative Gadberry?

REP. GADBERRY: Here.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Present. Representative Hodges?

REP.HODGES: Here.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Present. Representative Horton?

REP. HORTON: Here.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Present. Representative Ivey? Representative Jenkins?

REP. JENKINS: Present, sorry.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Present. Representative Ivey is present. Representative Mike Johnson. Present. Representative LaCombe?

REP. LACOMBE: Present.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Present. Representative Lyons?

REP. LYONS: Present.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Present. Representative Magee? Representative Newell?

REP. NEWELL: Here.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Present. Representative Thomas?

REP. THOMAS: Here.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Present. Representative White?

REP. WHITE: Present.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Present. Representative Wilford Carter is present, 17 members.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Seventeen members in a quorum. With that said, members will do a little housekeeping. I know some of you may be here for Senate Bill 5. I have talked with the chairwoman and we in an effort to continue working on the instrument. She's asked that I defer the Bill until tomorrow morning. So, we are going to take up Senate Bill 5 tomorrow morning and I apologize if that's why you all are here, but it was something that we just discussed late last night in this morning. So, that one will be on the agenda, Senate Bill 5 tomorrow for discussion where I expect we will take a vote on that tomorrow. So, with that said, the Chair is going to make a motion that we defer. SB 5, is there any objection? See no objections Senate Bill 5 is voluntarily deferred. Next up on the agenda is House

Bill 12 by Representative Bryant. I know he's here. And the next one, like I said, we'll take up is House Bill 12 by Representative Bryant. You're up, buddy. Members and I'll call to your attention. Representative Bryant has a rather lengthy set of amendments. Amendments Set 112, if you all want to start looking at that as well. Representative Bryant, whenever you're ready on House Bill 12.

REP. BRYANT: To put it in his right posture, I have to offer the amendment.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Why don't you just give us a quick opening and then we'll entertain a motion to adopt that amendment.

REP. BRYANT: Okay, good morning members. I listened to the other maps brought in last week. And I think I talked about this on Friday and I went and tried to make a map that was compact but also that showed some competitiveness or gave some voice to our increased population of African-Americans in our state. Now, this district does not divide. It does not take away Mike Johnson's district. It does not take away Economist [INDISCERNIBLE 00:03:53] district. It allows both of them to win in their district. We did nothing to the bottom of the map that was already on Clay's map. We looked at four and

five, and we made four just a little bit more African-Americans in it, just to lend them a voice to their congressmen and the top of the state. So, if you look at it, you would have a congressman in the top of the state that would have to listen to the minority population. And then you would have a congressman in the bottom of the state that has to listen to the minority population leaving for the congress to listen to whoever they feel, right? If we need to go through the numbers on the makeups of the –

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: And that's pretty – Representative Bryant, you want to go ahead -- you gave us a good overview, you want to go ahead and see if there's a motion to adopt your amendment set?

REP. BRYANT: Okay.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Okay. It appears members on Amendment Set 112 Representative LaCombe is going to make a motion that we adopt it to put it in the proper posture. Are there any questions about that amendment before we entertain that motion?

[00:05:04]

Seeing no questions on the amendment. There's a motion by Representative LaCombe to adopt the Amendment Set 112, is there any objection? Seeing no

1 objection, Amendment Set 112 is adopted.
2 Representative Bryant, on your Bill.
3 REP. BRYANT: Okay. Any questions on the Bill?
4 Because the Bill is 51 percent white, VAP 41 percent,
5 51 percent voter population white and 42 percent
6 black. It's a diverse district, but it does not take
7 away the current congress vulnerability to win in his
8 district. The rest of the districts are intact again
9 from Clay's Bill. We did nothing to Clay's map, but
10 adjust the top two districts four and five.
11 CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: So, that's my understanding
12 Representative Bryant. What your amendment does is it
13 leaves you -- you take HB 1 apparently -- you take HB
14 1, you leave the same Congressional Districts 1, 2
15 and 3 as an HB 1, but you change four and five.
16 REP. BRYANT: I changed four and five, making
17 four lending to the increased population that we have
18 had in the state, that is obvious. And giving it a
19 voice in a district to listen to the congress and at
20 least have to answer there calls and give some kind
21 of opportunity to make changes, bring projects to the
22 area.
23 CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: For question, Representative
24 Johnson.
25

REP. JOHNSON, M.: First of all, thank you for your hard work on this. I like the fact that it takes in more Rapides Parish as one Parish, but I see you come in. I'm wondering how many votes and I'm sorry, I didn't put the go through and check. Do you know how many votes in Rapides Parish District 4 takes?

REP. BRYANT: Currently, it will be -- Rapides Parish, you have 73,000 total population, 57 percent white, 9 percent black.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: It appears Representative Johnson, 56,000 people would be in Rapides in Congressional District 4.

REP. JOHNSON, M.: Four? Okay. That's what I was asking. Thank you.

REP. BRYANT: Okay, 56,000.

REP. JOHNSON, M.: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Okay. For question, Representative Carter.

REP. CARTER, W.: I guess you call it an opportunity district.

REP. BRYANT: I am.

REP. CARTER, W.: I don't call it an opportunity district, but you call an opportunity. And you don't think the district would be have a problem with compactness?

REP. BRYANT: No sir. Not the way it's currently is once they agree to amendment.

REP. CARTER, W.: Well, that's all I have.

REP. BRYANT: And this district does -it doesn't make anybody happy. It doesn't make my party happy. It doesn't make the Republican party happy, which to me makes it fair in addressing the concerns.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: For question, Representative Deshotel.

REP. DESHOTEL: Thank you Mr. Chair. Rep., I read a quote you had in the paper this morning about -- I won't read the whole quote, but it's basically saying that we need another democratic district. So, was the primary driver to create a party district or a competitive district?

REP. BRYANT: Competitive. That was only 44 percent African-American, but it's still -- Mike Johnson should be able still win in that district and just to hear the voice of the other party.

REP. DESHOTEL: Okay. I was just curious about your quote and the one Mr. LaCombe agreed with.

REP. BRYANT: When we went in to make it on Friday, it was let's make a competitive district. A district that lends voice to the African-American population without them not being having any voice

even though the population is one-third African-American in this state.

REP. DESHOTEL: Okay. I appreciate your answer.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Thank you, Representative Deshotel. Members that clears the Board, I'm going to read some cards in present in support not wishing to speak Peter Robbins Brown, Louisiana Progress Action, present and support not wishing to speak Edgar Cage with Together Louisiana.

[00:10:05]

Present in opposition not wishing to speak, Elizabeth Kogler. Present in opposition not wishing to speak Mary Susie Labry. Present in opposition not wishing to speak, Jay Broussard. Present not wishing to speak, Georgette Anderson. I believe Anderson. Members, is there any more discussion? I'll tell you; I like to try to stay consistent Representative Bryant. You have a tremendously lengthy set of amendments on this. Obviously, you're not a member of the committee, you can't make a motion, but one of my suggestions maybe would be to let this lie over. Let the amendments lie over for a day. Let this committee digest it and let the public digest what you're trying to do too once we've adopted it and let's see from a public perspective or from a committee

1 perspective if there's any further discussion to be
2 made and you would have my commitment if you would be
3 agreeable with that then I'll set it on another
4 agenda to allow you to present it and have a vote if
5 that's what your decision is. I've been consistent on
6 that with everybody. I've done that with the
7 speaker's Bills. I've done that with my Bills.
8 Everything has come into the committee. So, I'll make
9 that suggestion but obviously, it's the will of this
10 committee on what they want to do. Would you have any
11 comments on that suggestion?
12 REP. BRYANT: I know that we're running out of
13 time.
14 CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Yep.
15 REP. BRYANT: I don't know how this plays into
16 that having very limited time. Actually, I've been on
17 last week's session so bring it to a vote. Wherever
18 it lands, it lands but at least why don't I just go
19 and make some fair map.
20 CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Okay. Representative Newell
21 for a question.
22 REP. NEWELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That was
23 going to be my comment of concern. Procedurally,
24 where would that put us leaving this, letting this
25 lie over because we have to get it out off the floor

and then bring it over to the Senate. So procedurally, how would making it lie over affect its ability to be heard on both floors considering we are wanting to have an open mind. We need to have multiple Bills on multiple areas to choose from.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: There's no question Representative Newell that -- obviously, we have a special session that's scheduled to end on the 20th and you're exactly right. It is. That is certainly a concern that this committee should have about taking action on procedures. I just want to stay consistent with all the Bills and I've made that suggestion on everybody that we lie over and let the public digest. But certainly, the will of this committee, we'll go forward with.

REP. NEWELL: If I may, considering the time limits that we have, I would propose that we move this Bill favorably. I appreciate you being consistent but we only have six days.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: I understand.

REP. NEWELL: Six days left but I do appreciate you offering and being consistent with all members so it doesn't appear to be any favoritism to anyone. But considering again that time limits, I would like to vote to move this Bill favorably.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: No problem. All right, Representative Bryant, I'll let you close. We have a motion to move favorable. I'll go ahead and let you close if you want to give any last comments on this.

REP. BRYANT: And that is a district that is consistent with our population. It's a district that gives a voice to the top of the state and does not touch the rest of the districts that we already agreed on in Clay's Bill. If you want diversity and you want inclusion, this Bill does give you an opportunity, if not, we just deal with the Bills that we have in front of us. But at least, I want to create something that from listening to your voices and your questions and go and try to meet those requirements.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: No, and I do. I commend you on a different approach because I think you have brought a different approach to this committee as well. So, members, there is a motion by Representative Newell that we report with amendments. There is an objection so we will go ahead and call the roll. Members, just to be clear, a vote yes is to report the Bill out of committee with amendments or a vote no means that the Bill stays here in committee

with no action. All right, Ms. Ammersbach will go ahead and call the roll.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Vice Chairman Duplessis.

VICE-CHAIRMAN DUPLESSIS: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Beaulieu.

REP. BEAULIEU: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Wilford Carter.

REP. CARTER, W.: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Deshotel.

REP. DESHOTEL: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Farnun.

REP. FARNUM: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Gadberry.

REP. GADBERRY: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Hodges.

REP. HODGES: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Horton.

REP. HORTON: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Ivey.

REP. IVEY: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Jenkins. Representative Mike Johnson.

REP. MIKE JOHNSON: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative LaCombe.

REP. LACOMBE: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Lyons.

REP. LYONS: Yes.

[00:15:00]

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Magee. Representative Newell.

REP. NEWELL: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Thomas.

REP. THOMAS: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative White.

REP. WHITE: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Seven yays, eight nays.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Seven yays, eight nays and the Bill is not passed. So, thank you Representative Bryant. We will move on next to our agenda. We have House Bill 22 by Representative Ivey. Whenever you're ready, Representative Ivey.

REP. IVEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Members, happy Valentine's Day. I just ask that you all show me a little love. I mean, it is the season. Members, HB 22 redraws the seven-district supreme court map. Before I begin, Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring your attention and members to the amendment for the

Bill which is substantive and was released on a legislative website Friday afternoon so you should have had time between Super Bowl.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: And members, that's Amendment Set 106 in your packet, 1-0-6. Would you like to touch on those amendments real quick before we entertain a motion, Representative?

REP. IVEY: It's substantive in that I had a member asked me pointing out a few concerns with the map as it was originally drawn. And in my effort to try to see what I could do to accommodate his concern; I was able to actually substantively change the map into a much better map where it provides more compact more regionally. It makes a lot more sense particularly in the central and north part of the state. I was able to really do a lot of -- just improve the scores and things like that.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Okay. Members, any questions on the amendment? Any questions on the amendment? Seeing no questions, Representative Ivey, I assume you would move that we adopt Amendment Set 106?

REP. IVEY: I do.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Representative Ivey has made a motion that we adopt Amendment Set 106. Is there

1 any objection? Seeing no objection, Amendment Set 106
2 is adopted. Representative Ivey on your Bill.
3 REP. IVEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Members,
4 before I really begin to get into the Bill, I'd like
5 to bring to your attention some history of the
6 Supreme Court map. I didn't really know this until I
7 began to get into trying to redrawn something that
8 has not been redrawn in a very long time since '97.
9 In 1974, the constitution that was adopted by the
10 people required that we go and redraw the map. And
11 so, in 1975, Act 51 of the 1975 regular session
12 created six judicial districts. District 1 was
13 comprised of Orleans, St. Bernard, Plaquemines and
14 Jefferson Parishes and was a multi-member district of
15 two. The five other districts were single-member
16 districts. In the early 1990s, there was some
17 lawsuits and I believe it was Chishom v. Edwards is
18 when it started may have ended up as Chishom v.
19 Roemer. But the point is that, out of that suit came
20 a decree called the Chisholm decree which require
21 Louisiana to draw a majority-minority district in the
22 Orleans Parish area basically. And so, currently, we
23 have one majority-minority district on the seven-
24 district court. In 1997, HB 581 was passed and that
25

was the act that was done to comply with the Chishom decree and it went to effect January of 1999.

[00:20:00]

Since then, our map has not changed and the history of the map is that the federal government forced us to add a majority-minority district. Right now, there's pending litigation and to my understanding, it's been the defendants which I believe the Secretary of State and someone else with the state have tried to get the case dismissed and both the federal court and the appellate court have both denied that request. So, this case that was currently pending to my understanding will be going to court. And if you read some of the explanations by the court in their denial for dismissal, what you find is that that they've identified that the State of Louisiana has done absolutely nothing to address the fundamental underlying issues that were born out of the Chisholm decree. And so, this is an opportunity for Louisiana to demonstrate that we can do this ourselves and not have to have the federal courts potentially redraw our districts. Again, we know what legislation is pending, I believe in the Senate, Senator Hewitt has a Bill. I have a Bill. I know Representative Carter has a few Bills that he's

been working on to redraw the maps and members, you all heard me on this committee. I've been pretty critical of districts when things just have to make sense. And it's kind of update for each of us to use the criteria and the process and assimilate it all and to get a sense of what makes sense and what doesn't. And with respect to this map, obviously as amended, District 2 is the district that's been pointed out of potential areas of concerns. What I'd like to point out though is and this is coming from the NCSL Redistricting Law 2020 revised edition. The Supreme Court map is a very different map than all of the other maps in this one regard with our congressional map, our House map, Senate map, PSC, and BESE, we create districts to elect someone to represent the people in the district. The role of whoever is being elected is that of representation. With the courts, it is not the case. They do not serve in a representative capacity and that's clearly stated in Wells v. Edwards, it says the Supreme Court without opinion affirmed the ruling of a three-judge district court in Louisiana, that the 14th amendments one person, one vote requirement does not apply to redistricting of judicial districts. The lower court reason, the primary purpose of one man, one vote

1 apportionment is to make sure that each official
2 member of an elected body speaks for approximately
3 the same number of constituents. But as stated in
4 Buchanan v. Rhodes supra judges do not represent
5 people. They serve people. Thus, the rationale behind
6 the one-man one-vote principle which evolved out of
7 our efforts to preserve a truly representative form
8 of government is simply not relevant to the makeup of
9 the judiciary. There's more that you can read there
10 but ultimately, they serve as administrators of the
11 law not as representatives of any constituency. And
12 so, the most significant fact that is different
13 between the judiciary and all the other elected
14 representatives is that we don't have to -- like
15 malapportioned is lawful to the extent that we don't
16 have to do this because we haven't redrawn the map in
17 quite a while. And so, I believe there's a lot more
18 flexibility in how we approach and then that's the
19 approach that I used in trying to draw this map. If
20 you think about the role of electing a supreme court
21 justice, it's to reflect the values, the ideals and
22 things like that and how they would go about making
23 decisions. And so, I believe it's not about making
24 sure that you know our area and that you're going to
25 be able to bring back federal dollars to Louisiana or

that you understand the flooding you can work on something. It's just a very different proposition. And so, that's why I really felt that it was long past time that we should try to tackle this problem. And if you look members, you all should have all gotten some of this.

[00:24:58]

Page 1, top right corner. It says that the current justices on Louisiana Supreme Court. I would like to point out that while it's never a primary objective to protect incumbency when practicable, I believe it's certainly worth noting, incumbents and times of re-election, and things like that. And so, the Supreme Court is people are elected for tenure terms and they are staggered terms which also adds a level of complexity and the failing to act now only delays the potential for someone to be elected. And so, example, in the current District 2 and the people that red color are the ones who are actually aged out and will not be able to run for re-election. They're aged out and so any map would not affect these individuals, but I'd like to point out that Judge Scott Crichton is in the District 2 that I've drawn

as a second majority-minority district and that his term ends in 24, at the end of 24. And so, the earliest possible practical opportunity ignoring the fact that Judge Weimer is going to have to run for re-election in this fall, that aside, the next earliest opportunity happens to be coincidentally the District 2 where if this map does pass, it would allow for a second majority-minority opportunity for the people in that district. Again, I've taken care to ensure that no one else is impacted in any negative way whatsoever. The Bill would not go into effect until January 1, 2023. A member pointed out that Judge Weimer is up for re-election this fall and it would -- the district is pretty significantly shifted around a little bit and knowing this process and all, it'd be better to just make that effective January 1, 2023, which I thought was reasonable saying he's the only judge would have to do this. If it was everybody, it'd be a little bit different. But anyway, that was the first thing I wanted to point out. Page 2, this is from analysis from daysredistricting.org. I know everyone has different metrics on how they score things so I felt that was necessary to have a couple just to demonstrate the strength of the actual map. This compares Senator

1 Hewitt's SB 15 and its engrossed version. And then it
2 also compares the bottom left corner, the amendment,
3 the map as amended and it also compares what the
4 current map looks like. And clearly, the map that is
5 before you now is the most compact, it scores the
6 strongest except for the split Parishes. That's the
7 only thing it doesn't score compared to the current
8 map. But the current map isn't as compact and it's
9 not as proportional. It doesn't address the majority-
10 minority concerns some people had and this one's
11 actually a little bit more competitive as well. So,
12 with that said, that's one analysis for you. Fair
13 districts Louisiana also did some analysis. I don't
14 know how they scored everything, but this is across
15 the Board of all the maps that they had in their
16 database. My map scored the highest at 287. The
17 current map scores at 236 and SB 15 in gross scores
18 at 179. Compactness, I had the highest compactness
19 score of 52. The next highest was the current map at
20 51. So, even though that District 2 may appears to be
21 a little bit odd shape, there is a strong case to be
22 made on why that's absolutely acceptable as a
23 community of interest. And Page 4 allows you to see
24 what the current map is, if you want to know what
25 that looks like, current districts. Page 5, I want to

bring your attention to and at the heart of trying to find strong communities of interest and what makes sense.

[00:30:09]

The urban versus rural Louisiana. We understand the population shift over time. And rural Louisiana has lost a lot of population particularly North Louisiana. And the needs of rural Louisiana are very different than the needs of urban Louisiana. I live in the city of Central inside of East Baton Rouge Parish. I have a good mixed flavor, but the needs of more dense population is just much different. How many of the rural Parishes have provide public sewer or public water? There's not that many that provide that, certainly not to the scale of Shreveport or Monroe or East Baton Rouge. And so, there are many things that I believe can bring these communities together. And this is just a population density map for you -- just get a big picture view of that. So, on the map -- let me pull mine up, pardon me. So, if you look at the map, you'll see that there is a Southwest Louisiana District or it's actually Southwest Acadiana District. There's an Acadiana Bayou Region District. There's the Washington Parish, St. Tammany, Jefferson and Plaquemines and St.

Bernard. And then the Florida Parish district right there with EBR. Anyway, you can see and then there's the big Central Louisiana/North Louisiana District. And the District 2 is really urban and Mississippi River Parishes. Our rivers, you can look at the map. We have many rivers and bodies all through Louisiana, but the Mississippi River, Red River where these major cities were born from, from the agriculture production, and that's where the economy started. And so, trying to connect that in form of not only the economic but also the urban communities of interest, that just makes sense. And so, by doing this with District 2, it allowed for more compactness for all of the other districts. And if you look at each district individually, you can see that each district just makes sense. And that's the approach that I took when trying to come up with a solution for redistricting this map. And I'm happy to answer any questions.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: Thank you, Representative Ivey, thank you for your work on this. First question is Representative Carter.

REP. CARTER, W.: Thank you, Mr. Chair. You did a lot of good work in here. You try to do the right thing. And you were talking about the difference

between a congressional map and a Supreme Court map. You're talking about Hughes. Hughes case. And I say Supreme Court Hughes, where one man, one vote was the thing that doesn't apply as a result of the [INDISCERNIBLE 00:34:09] case.

REP. IVEY: Correct.

REP. CARTER, W.: And that's the United States Supreme Court case.

REP. IVEY: Correct.

REP. CARTER, W.: So, you don't have the problem with compactness in a court district you would have been a congressional district. All even numbers. So, I'm just curious, what's the number total, what's the deviation between the districts?

REP. IVEY: Okay. Per the Bill, while it was not necessary for me to try to stick within our plus or minus account. That was my objective. I tried to stick within the standard range of deviations. So, with District 1, it's minus 3.695 percent.

[00:35:00]

District 2 is plus 4.675. District 3 is plus .788 percent. District 4 is plus 3.096 percent. District 5 is minus 1.523 percent. District 6 is minus is 1.975, and District 7 is minus 1.365. So, it really is very

1 proportional. And again, it was not necessary, but I
2 did want --
3 REP. CARTER, W.: For those that look at that,
4 that was a good job of coming up with a map within
5 the 5 percent range.
6 REP. IVEY: Thank you.
7 REP. CARTER, W.: I noticed that District 2, most
8 of the districts surrounded by rivers within river
9 boundaries. When you talk about community of
10 interest, that sort of play into the community
11 interest thing.
12 REP. IVEY: It does. I mean, while those river
13 Parishes from East Baton Rouge North, with the
14 exception of East Baton Rouge, are fairly rural. They
15 are very similar in culture and many other things.
16 And there's no district where every region in its
17 most perfect ideal form can fit with regard to per
18 equal apportionment. And so just like with South
19 Louisiana, you've got Acadiana and you've got the
20 Lake Charles area, and then you've also got the Bayou
21 Region as well. And so, a mixture of two stronger
22 regional communities of interest is what I did on
23 some of those, again, splitting up Acadiana between
24 Southwest and the Bayou Region. And so, it's that
25 type of logic where combining different a couple when

1 practicable. And I do believe that by doing that, it
2 allows for District 4, which is the big middle, to be
3 a much more practical district itself. I've thought a
4 lot about how do I present perspective before this
5 body and how do I maybe help us think a little bit
6 differently on a map that is actually much different.
7 And if you look at what we currently have and ask
8 yourself, is this better than what we currently have?
9 A malapportioned map, a map that again, it stretches
10 from North Louisiana on the west side to part of
11 Acadiana. Does that make as much sense as this? I
12 don't believe it does. Doing nothing here is a vote
13 for the status quo. It's a vote to keep what we have.
14 This map will require two thirds vote. And so,
15 Senator Hewitt again has one. I don't know if hers
16 has been voted on the floor or not, but it is by no
17 means a low hurdle. And it's a politically
18 controversial subject and map. And my commitment is
19 through this process to work with each of you for any
20 practical concerns or issues and any ideas. Look,
21 I've redrawn this map a few more times. I can come up
22 with quite a few completely different looking maps.
23 And so, there's no perfect way. This was my approach
24 and you can see the difference between my first
25 effort compared to my second effort. I believed it

was dramatically improved just between one more iteration. But if we wanted to, we could draw a map around a single Parish like East Baton Rouge Parish and make that its own district. There's nothing wrong with that, I mean, passing it may be impossible, but if you want compactness, we can go compact. If we want, we can take some of our major Metropolitan areas, two or three of them, and then we can just spread everything else around the other Parishes. But I'm trying to find the balance and I think this is my best effort for that. Someone's got a better map. Look, I'm happy to support it and work with anybody, but this was my best effort for this.

REP. CARTER, W.: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STEFANSKI: All right, next, Representative Beaullieu.

REP. Beaullieu: Thank you, Mr. Acting Chairman. A couple of questions. You mentioned the odd shape and different things when you were going through all your various attempts, was the primary driver for creating the map after you talked about the Chisholm Decree and all that stuff was the primary driver based on race?

REP. IVEY: No, the primary driver for redistricting is for me, was malapportionment, that was number one, right?

[00:40:04]

We've got a population shift from the North to the South and so I wanted to map that kind of reflected that if you could see on like the first version on that West Side, the district, I shift it down. It just kind of shifts down a little bit and grabs. And so, again, it really is driven by population. So, and so there's many factors that we all use in redistricting. I have been highly inquisitive from other people who have brought maps, like, with some of the congressional maps that we had. And one of my biggest concerns and I've been asked by the press on this, well, how come you bring this but oppose some of the other congressional maps? And for me is trying to weigh all these different factors in the balance. What is important is that we don't disrupt something that's been working together for a while and do something that's so massively disruptive, I don't think in a representative map, that that would actually do the people any good. If we just wholesale changed everything and members had to start from scratch and you trying to figure out what their

1 districts are and all these things. This map does not
2 have that effect because it is not a map that
3 provides for representation of the elected.
4 SENATOR BEAULLIEU: So, with all that said, then
5 how do you explain this if it's not just based on
6 race. How do you explain District 2? You said it
7 commonality of the bayous?
8 REP. IVEY: Primarily based on race, okay?
9 REP. BEAULLIEU: Correct.
10 REP. IVEY: So, the fact is this. You can go into
11 a process to create a map and where practicable try
12 to solve another problem. For instance, the fact
13 that, you know, the ratio of majority-minority
14 districts compared to the population all that. So,
15 that can be a goal, but it wasn't the primary goal at
16 all. But it doesn't mean that I wasn't trying to also
17 solve that question of whether or not it was
18 possible. And so, I don't believe we should force
19 anything and whatever we do needs to make sense. And
20 the fact is this map cleans up a lot of the issues
21 with the current map and that it really makes a more
22 clean and compact and you know, districts for
23 everybody else as well. And so, for me personally,
24 when I looked at some of the congressional maps, and
25 of course, there was doing a lot of things with East

1 Baton Parish. I felt like, I looked at like, how does
2 that affect, you know, the area, I serve? And I
3 would argue that, you know, this doesn't affect any
4 other district negatively. It only affects them in a
5 more positive way. And because it's not a
6 representative capacity, the people being elected,
7 they don't serve as representatives. Then, I believe
8 it allows for a little more flexibility or a lot more
9 in that regard.
10 REP. BEAULLIEU: You mentioned some
11 malapportionment was your primary drivers is what you
12 said. So, in District 2, malapportionment was a
13 primary driver for creating District 2 and that what
14 you quote as an odd-shaped district?
15 REP. IVEY: You got to start shifting
16 populations. Right. And so, population shifted to the
17 South. And I also again, I also looked at incumbents
18 and where they lived and try to, you know, take that
19 into consideration to the extent it wasn't a self-
20 defeating, you know, proposition to try to make any
21 accommodations and every one of us, you know, to a
22 degree, I mean, how come -- I mean it's been okay
23 that we try to make those accommodations is you know
24 for incumbency when practicable, that's all, that's
25 what I did with this as well. And so that the

1 majority minority element of this was probably
2 fourth, third or fourth and third at the top. But it
3 possible. But is more fourth. But again, you have to
4 look at drawing a map. Have you attempted -- I mean,
5 I can't ask questions. But if you haven't attempted
6 you really need to try one. It's really, its color by
7 number so even a legislator can do it like me. And
8 so, I can send you the link in five minutes. I can
9 have you up and running. But it's really, it's a lot
10 of clicking and you got to see what the population
11 is, you know, if you go with the whole parish and or
12 precinct wise and so that sort.
13 REP. BEAULLIEU: Colors and by numbers I did that
14 in kindergarten. I never could draw inside the lines
15 and all. But I get what you take. So, you also talked
16 about in your testimony that you talked about the
17 culture and the values. How'd you come up with the
18 culture and the values? I must still pick on
19 District 2 but when you take Oil City and then you
20 take the, in the Florida parishes culture and values
21 between. How'd you come up with the determination of
22 they have someone similar culture and values?
23 [00:45:17]
24 REP. IVEY: Sure. So, by combining two kinds of
25 communities of interest at least at the geographical,

1 you know, point of urban communities. And then also
2 where population density and all of these factors
3 really do provide for a very different type of
4 perspective. I went to Los Angeles one time and you
5 know Los Angeles some of their laws and stuff, I know
6 we joked about here, you know, they're, you know, the
7 really low amount of water they can use for their
8 flushing their toilets. You can't have plastic
9 straws. You got a paper plastic bags. These are
10 things that for folks like us we just think it
11 sounded a little crazy. But then I got to thinking
12 one day, what if everybody flushed their toilet three
13 times a day in Los Angeles County. Well, there's you
14 know, 10 plus million people in a very compact area.
15 The perspective that they have on what's necessary to
16 govern is very different than a state like Louisiana.
17 And then to take, you know, just with in Louisiana
18 communities who are more densely packed, they have
19 very different needs. The crime issues are more
20 prevalent in Urban Louisiana than they are in Rural
21 Louisiana. Again, population density plays a critical
22 role. So that's one. The second one is the
23 Mississippi River Parishes down to Baton Rouge.
24 There's a tremendous amount of cultural similarity
25

there. And, you know, so again, just trying to connect some of this --

REP. BEAULLIEU: And just for clarification, in District 2, you count the number of toilet flushes per area?

REP. IVEY: I don't believe I made that statement, but the point is, it's a perspective. Thank you, Representative Beaullieu.

REP. BEAULLIEU: It just want for clarification purposes.

REP. IVEY: It's a perspective. The needs are very different. And crime isn't a perfect example, you know, our major urban communities throughout Louisiana have very different crime issues than do our Rural Louisiana. And so, just like, we are all rep elected to come here, our perspectives are different. Someone who doesn't have a high crime area or very low crime area, may not feel the need to increase funding for law enforcement. They just might feel that what we have is adequate. That's their perspective. And so, it's not necessarily about bigger government all the time. It's just maybe very different needs and we just don't understand them. And so, I try to take a more personable approach about who lives in these communities and what some of

1 their common interest maybe. Also, in you know, all
2 of these major cities have major universities. And
3 our kids who are living Rural Louisiana are moving to
4 these major cities, you know, including East Baton
5 Rouge Parish. So anyway --
6 REP. BEAULLIEU: Thank you Representative Ivey.
7 VICE-CHAIRMAN DUPLESSIS: Thank you
8 Representative Beaullieu. For question Representative
9 Deshotel.
10 REP. DESHOTEL: Thank Mr. Vice-Chair. I'm going
11 to follow up on some of those questions because I got
12 a little confused in your explanation. So, bear with
13 me. So, basically, what you said was your community
14 of interest was the river. The Mississippi.
15 REP. IVEY: The urban communities within that
16 district and the River Parishes. And obviously
17 there's some connecting along the way, but --
18 REP. DESHOTEL: I think you have 14 total
19 parishes in District 2 and 6 of them on the river.
20 That's less than half. I'm just trying to understand
21 the river community of interest.
22 REP. IVEY: So, I don't know how to explain it
23 better. I mean, people who live along the Mississippi
24 River for --
25

REP. DESHOTEL: But it's only, it's less than half of your total district.

REP. IVEY: By Parish County. Okay.

REP. DESHOTEL: And a whole lot less --

REP. IVEY: If we should go by parishes

REP. DESHOTEL: It's a whole lot less population.

REP. IVEY: If you go by parishes in North Louisiana, I mean, look how many parishes are in that the big Central Louisiana District. Because the population is not compact and so --

REP. DESHOTEL: What do you saying, District 2 is not compact?

REP. IVEY: No, I said the population density. People are spread out. So, you've got a lot more parishes in that Central Louisiana.

REP. DESHOTEL: Yeah, I understand that. I'm just trying to, so, I'm just trying to understand the communities of interest. Do you live here in East Baton Rouge?

REP. IVEY: So, look, I understand what we're trying to do. Okay, and I've dish it, I can take it. Okay, I just but I'll be real with everybody.

[00:50:03]

I said what I said. I meant what I said. With regard to the community adventures, we can all have

1 different perspectives on that. If we look at other
2 maps and you know, I was okay with trying to like
3 with the congressional map, trying to just make some
4 accommodations but some of those don't make any sense
5 whatsoever. They're more politically driven then they
6 are practically driven and so, I'm just, you know,
7 our standard how uniform are our standards. Are they
8 more out of politically expediency or are they out
9 really, you know, do we really care about the people
10 who live there so--
11 REP. DESHOTEL: And that's where I'm going.
12 That's exactly the reason I'm asking you the
13 questions, you know. You made the comment that this
14 map make sense, and I think I have a different
15 opinion. I don't think it make sense when you have
16 people in Cado in the same district with people in
17 East Baton Rouge, that's just my opinion and I'll
18 just ask him how you came up with did it make sense.
19 That was it, that was the only thing I was trying to
20 figure out.
21 REP. IVEY: And I appreciate it. It's not an easy
22 task, right? Trying to do all these factors and so, I
23 try to think, okay, who has more in common with each
24 other in this process? And so I believe that District
25 2 has more commonality than what the current make up

as of the two North Louisiana districts. I mean, I think District 2, so if anybody is going to complain about the district, it would be the people in District 2. I mean, I don't know why somebody in that Southwest District would complain about District 2.

REP. DESHOTEL: Right.

REP. IVEY: Because their district looks pretty good to them. It should, it's pretty compact. That Central Louisiana District is pretty, it's as compact as it can be. These are all great districts for whoever will want to run in them. And so that's one of the other things is, trying to elect someone from these districts. If you have a district stretched all across the parish, it certainly has all of us know, it makes it more difficult to run in but because I chose to have the major population centers in District 2, I believe it could maybe even be an easier district to run in because of the more dense population centers, so someone can hit those and then, you know, hit some of the other communities up the river. So, I try to take all these factors into consideration but again, I believe the only people who are really entitled to maybe complain about District 2 would be the people who live there if they felt like this doesn't make any sense then, so be it.

1 That's not, you know, I'm happy to listen and see if
2 there's something else that makes more sense.
3
4 REP. DESHOTEL: That's fair enough and I do
5 believe though that the people in Tensile or Clayburn
6 may disagree with you and that's just my opinion just
7 like you stated yours.
8 REP. IVEY: It might be but again we try to do
9 our best and we can choose to do nothing. We can
10 choose to do nothing and there's a probability out
11 there that based on the response from the courts on
12 the dismissal that the courts can redraw our maps.
13 And so, we can for a second time make let the courts
14 do it instead of letting us do it ourselves and so
15 the fact is at least historically, the courts have
16 said, our actions or inactions have produced a court
17 that wasn't fair. And so, there may be a hundred ways
18 to draw a map and maybe a second majority-minority
19 district is warranted. Maybe it's not. Okay, maybe a
20 shape of a district on a judicial map matters more. I
21 probably think it doesn't matter as much and so I've
22 tried to strike the balance. Not sacrificing the good
23 principles of redistricting for every other district
24 that provides for compactness, that provides for
25 proportionality. Everything else works and I believe

1 District 2 makes sense as well. And so, it could be
2 the remedy that if this bill passes, it could just go
3 ahead and take care of that suit but it'd be
4 embarrassing for us to have had this opportunity to
5 address an issue, a legitimate issue about the
6 population of Louisiana and specifically at the
7 Supreme Court where they're seven districts. The
8 Congressional map is not easy, right? I've been here
9 with you all. It's not an easy thing and I can't
10 support something that just completely puts
11 representation into some kind of upheaval right now.
12 I did like what the effort that Representative Ryan
13 put forth on that map. I felt it made a lot of sense.
14 [00:55:11]
15 It didn't look too dissimilar to the current map it's
16 just the shade here shade there and I felt that was
17 reasonable. I don't believe this is an unreasonable
18 map. And so, I do believe it's today is the
19 opportunity, tomorrow you never know and so why put
20 off tomorrow, and what we should be doing today and
21 I'm just one person, if anybody else has a map, has
22 an idea, look bring it forth, you know. Put some
23 effort. I'm happy to work with anybody here and along
24 the way. I don't have to have my name on a bill but
25

nobody else filed one so I just did what I could do and so.

REP. DESHOTEL: Thank you Representative, thank you Mr. Vice-Chair.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUPLESSIS: Thank you Representative Deshotel for questioning representative Farnum. Thank

REP. FARNUM: Thank you Mr. Vice Chair. Your Honor, along those same lines when you opened your statement you said that since spring court wasn't held to the same standards of one-person one-vote that communities of interest really had no bearing in the whole process.

REP. IVEY: I don't believe I said they had no bearing in the whole process.

REP. FARNUM: Well, maybe in summarizing those words. That's what I got out of that.

REP. IVEY: That was for more flexibility.

REP. FARNUM: That was my interpretation of it. But help me with consent decree. What is the purpose? To form another minority district right?

REP. IVEY: The decree, I don't believe it was consent decree. It was just a federal decree where

the court required that Louisiana go back and add a majority-minority district.

REP. FARNUM: So, the fact that we're not held to the -- I think the whole problem that makes this map looks so much like some of the other maps that I haven't been able to support is because everything else we deal with is held to that same standard of population deviation and this one is not and there's a reason for it. I believe. You know the current minority district in New Orleans is so much smaller in geography than every other district did exist for a reason. That was the only way you could draw it but I agree with some of the other reps that East Feliciana really doesn't have anything in common with Cattle Parish in the whole Supreme Court is supposed to look at the law. By your word, they were the administrators of law period. They don't look at religion, race, culture, philosophical beliefs. None of those things matter in the court system or they shouldn't because all they look at is the law. Period.

REP. IVEY: I believe that many of those things you just mentioned inform our perspectives as individuals.

REP. FARNUM: But the law is the law. The law is the law and if something sways your judgment of what the law is, something's fundamentally wrong with that. I would think. Two people sit in front of a judge and they come up with two different decisions based on who you are. There's something wrong with that.

REP, IVEY: No, no. no. That's not what I meant. What I mean is the judge that their culture that they were raised in you know, those things, maybe race. Those things inform their perspective when judging, right? So, while the law is the law, it's the various perspectives. Otherwise, we'd all think exactly the same way. We'd all look at the law and think that it applied the same way but the courts exist and their clogged with cases of people suing because there's a dispute over the interpretation of the law and so it's because of the variety of perspectives and of course as legislator for nine years. I've seen us break law; I've seen us be short-sighted. I've seen us, you know, not taking account other factors that you know, perpetuating lawsuits and we had to come back and fix things so, you know it I believe perspective is an important thing. And so, if I was selecting voting for a Supreme Court Justice just as

an individual, you know their background where they were raised, you know their community things like that would be important to me.

REP. FARNUM: I can tell you for the record I've not been aware of this body breaking the law. So, just for the record.

REP. IVEY: We've authored many bills that have violated the constitution.

REP. FARNUM: I haven't been part of that. For the record anyway. So I guess, you know, if the whole objective here, why are you hung up on the population equalization across the state?

[01:00:00]

REP. IVEY: Look, okay. As someone who's authored more bills that have died than anybody here. Okay. I can tell you I can go for what is ideal, the perfect and the principal and it'll absolutely fail 90% of the time or more actually, because my ratio is lower than that. And so, I've tried to grow as an individual and respect the perspectives that are brought throughout our 105-member body, and try to find a balanced approach to addressing a solution. Because I could just as easily draw a map that you can't argue with compactness. I can ignore every existing incumbent and who's running for re-election,

but will that bill pass? Hell, no, it won't pass. And everybody here lying if you say it would and because it's a 2/3 vote and we -- so we can't say on some legislation that "Oh, well politics and stuff don't matter when it does." It just does, I hate that it does. But, and I've tried throughout my tenure to not let that be modus operandi that I go by. But the fact is, I have to operate within a political environment. And so, I've tried to take the most balanced, fair, reasonable, practical approach to redrawing this map, but I can just as easily put a check in every single box. Ignore incumbency, and draw a map, and then we'll find another excuse for that one. Well, it's malapportioned. So, even though again, we're saying clearly that it's not required. But that will be the pitfall that will prevent anything like that from moving forward.

REP. FARNUM: Don't get me wrong. I appreciate all the hard work that you do for this body on every single--

REP. IVEY: They both know after though. They say that.

REP. FARNUM: You really do. You bring a lot of different ideas to the table that I think a lot of

the members feed off of. They might not agree with that particular part of it, but--

REP, IVEY: Yeah absolutely. Any ideas that other members like therefore they get it.

REP. FARNUM: So, anyway, for the same reason, I have not supported some of the other congressional maps. This is just a gerrymandered version of how you get from Caddo Parish [INDISCERNIBLE 01:02:23] and I have a hard time supporting that. I think if the objective is to create another minority district, we do just what we say we're going to do and just create one and however big it needs to be, that's how big it needs to be.

REP. IVEY: Well, I will tell you that first of all, I'm not looking for your support today. I'm just looking for your approval to get it to the floor. And so it's a 2/3 vote. We know where we are in this process. I would ask that we move this bill as amended and let me go back to work. I will present another three or four amendments for the floor to allow people to look at and see if there's anyone, again, we have to vote on it. So I mean, if you can't pass the amendment, you ain't going to pass the bills. And so, you know, all I ask the opportunity to

1 continue to work on it and I can answer any more
2 questions. I appreciate it. Thank you.
3 REP. FARNUM: Thank you Mr. Vice Chair.
4 VICE CHAIR DUPLESSIS: Thank you, representative
5 Farnum for a question Representative Newell.
6 REP. NEWELL: Thank you very much Mr. Vice Chair.
7 Representative Ivey, thank you so much. You put in a
8 lot of work with all the bills that you bring. And I
9 appreciate the historical perspective that you've
10 offered with this bill so that we can see what I'm
11 asked look like now and what they could possibly look
12 like next. And, no, the Supreme Court Justices do not
13 represent. Like you said, they serve the members of
14 all communities and looking at your map, I see
15 commonalities in this District 2. The parishes may
16 not have the commonalities amongst one another that
17 you would want them to have for someone that's
18 representing them. But as far as serving them, like a
19 justice would do, I see this. You have border
20 parishes in this district that a bordering Texas,
21 Arkansas and Mississippi. And with this, you have a
22 lot of interstate commerce. And as Rep. Farnum just
23 pointed out, the Supreme Court looks at the law. And
24 they look at all aspects and areas of the law.
25 Interstate commerce is one of them.

[01:05:03]
We have a lot of trucking that goes in and out of Arkansas and Texas. We have lots of ships that come in from all across the world into the Mississippi River, which goes to part of these parishes. So, I appreciate the fact that you took some of these parishes that were just on this side of the state and put them across the top of the state. Because one would believe that if you have a justice that comes out of one of these bordering parishes, they would be well-versed on interstate commerce, which is important to our state as a whole. So, that was my comments. I didn't really have a question, but I'm sure you're going to expound and I would like you to on any other parts of this matter because like I said, the interests of the people doesn't need to be the same. But the interest of the area and the laws that impact are important for the justices that we put on the Supreme Court, and that is what I have noticed from this border district.

REP. IVEY: That was one of the things that I had noted in some of my notes. I just didn't mention it. I've kind of get overwhelmed with information and I'm trying to know what to cll. It's kind of difficult.

REP. NEWELL: Understand, we help each other when we can.

REP. IVEY: We do, we do. But these are all border parishes except for East Baton Rouge Parish. And like you said, the interstate commerce factor is a significant one. They have issues at the border that other parishes simply do not have.

REP. NEWELL: They don't have to deal with.

REP. IVEY: And those are absolute legal in nature. So, thank you for pointing that out.

REP. NEWELL: No problem.

VICE CHAIR DUPLESSIS: Thank you, Representative Newell for a question. Representative LaCombe.

REP. LACOMBE: Thank you Representative Ivey for your work on this matter. Just a few questions. You're not a lawyer, right?

REP. IVEY: I'm not an attorney.

REP. LACOMBE: Okay.

REP. IVEY: Which yeah, no reprisal or repercussions maybe.

REP. LACOMBE: I bring it up because you sort of there's a lot of lawyers here, but you're not. So you just kind of outsider to this approach.

REP. IVEY: Don't care.

REP. LACOMBE: When you were creating this map, did you speak to any particular special interest groups or anything?

REP. IVEY: The only person I spoke to, I reached out to just for some assistance on the map, like not drawing the map but like getting the map out there, to -- I wanted to make sure that a lot of the stakeholder groups were informed of the amendment. And so, I spoke with a couple of individuals who have been here a lot and I asked them to send it out and share it, but nobody's informed me on any specific -- there's been no drawing of this map that's been from any specific suggestion from anyone. I had one comment from a colleague, who just pointed something out and asked. So, I just went to the drawing board and did that. They didn't offer any specific suggestions. So this is my creation.

REP. LACOMBE: It's your account.

REP. IVEY: Yes.

REP. LACOMBE: Okay. That's all the questions.

VICE CHAIR DUPLESSIS: Thank you, Rep LaCombe. Speaker pro tem Magee.

REP. MAGEE: Thank you, Mr. Vice Chairman and thank you Rep. Ivey. I'm going to support your map for a couple of reasons. First of all, it's really

1 difficult to draw any map. But I've said to every
2 single person who has come up here and the process is
3 just unbelievably difficult and I'm sure we can make
4 some changes that people want. But the only way we
5 can keep having that conversation is to get your map
6 out today and move it to the floor. And the reason
7 why I think it's important is because I think it's
8 incumbent upon us. It's our constitutional duty as
9 Chairman Stefanski said to redraw the maps and we
10 haven't done in the Supreme Court in a really long
11 time. And I know that everybody could pick a flaw if
12 they wanted to but we're not going to get perfection
13 in this business. I think you've done a great job,
14 especially, just doing it on yourself and everything
15 else. I think you're close to something that I think
16 is workable and I like to keep having that
17 conversation as it move to the house floor and make
18 some tweaks and changes that I've known that you will
19 work on diligently as you hear feedback, and go
20 forward. And then the second thing is I think we have
21 some litigation and I think it's also incumbent upon
22 us to try and resolve the constitutionality of all
23 those things. And I've always said that we may not
24 like the answers but it's our obligation to respond
25

to questions and litigation as we came – as we come forward.

REP. IVEY: And I pointed out one of the comments in the denial for dismissal was that we've made no efforts to try to make things any fair or anything like that, abbreviating there.

REP. MAGEE: Right.

[01:10:02]

And look, I know that we have the one-man, one-vote principle for the Supreme Court, but at the end of the day, I think it's unfair that one judge comes from like 400,000 people and another judge comes like 800,000 people. It's unfair if the judge has a campaign. It's unfair for the people who live in those two respective regions. So, I think why you don't need one-man, one-vote, you do need some level of overall fairness and I think this is an attempt to do it, so that's all I got.

REP. IVEY: I appreciate it.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUPLESSIS: Thank you, Mr. Pro Tem. Representative Thomas.

REP. THOMAS: Thank you, Mr. Vice Chair. Good morning. I applaud your efforts to draw a map because I agree with the comment that Representative Magee just made about it's not fair for some people to

1 represent, or to have to campaign and be responsive
2 to 400,000 versus 800,000. I totally get that the
3 malapportionment. But I have a question, two
4 questions for you, actually. The first question is in
5 terms of campaigning which is according to your map
6 would need to happen, do you know how many miles it
7 is between Caddo Parish and East Feliciana?
8 REP. IVEY: I haven't pulled the map. But if you
9 pull up on the like deanery districting site and you
10 select municipalities, which is where you have more
11 population, what you'll find -- and this is why I
12 believe when you have three major population centers,
13 even if they are, you know, form this kind of
14 triangle, I think what you'll find is that from a
15 campaign stand point, you've got three main stops
16 that you've got to make, whatever frequency as
17 compared to the Florida Parishes where you've got
18 small to medium-sized communities dotted everywhere.
19 And so, it may be a longer drive, but I think there's
20 less stops along the way. And so, I think the net
21 effect may actually be more advantageous combining
22 these three major urban areas together.
23 REP. THOMAS: Okay. So, your answer is you really
24 don't know how many miles it is? Okay.
25

REP. IVEY: I didn't know that was going to be asked. I'm sorry.

REP. THOMAS: Well, it was just a curiosity because the idea of campaigning came up. My second question is, I believe you mentioned shareholder groups that you consulted, could you tell us what those groups are?

REP. IVEY: I didn't consult anyone.

REP. THOMAS: Who did you had conversations with?

REP. IVEY: Yes. I informed them that I had an amendment to the map and I asked them to disseminate that, let everybody know because it hit Friday afternoon and so I wanted the stakeholders to know who've been looking at these maps.

REP. THOMAS: And who are those stakeholders?

REP. IVEY: I spoke with Mr. Peter Robbins Brown and also -- that's basically who I mainly spoke with.

REP. THOMAS: Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Vice Chair.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUPLESSIS: Thank you. For a question, Representative Johnson.

REP. JOHNSON: Yeah. Rep Ivey, thank you. I want to echo what everyone else has said, you clearly put the Ivey touch on trying to cover all the bases, and I appreciate the time you put into this -

REP. IVEY: And Ivey of lethal injection, doses.

REP. JOHNSON: Not necessarily. But it's very thoughtful and you have good answers for most of this. I, of course, am concerned about that District 2. And I just wonder if you've looked at Senate Bill 15.

REP. IVEY: I did.

REP> JOHNSON: And what does your bill -- in your mind, what is your bill accomplish that Senate Bill does not accomplish or that you think you improve upon?

REP. IVEY: Right. So, in the packet that I handed out.

REP. JOHNSON: Yes, sir.

REP. IVEY: Page 2 and page 3, you can provide some insight into, again, however these are scored, I wanted to demonstrate from at least two sources, and maybe there's others out there that can do an analysis on the different maps. But just the deanery redistricting, you hit the analyze button and you pick a few maps. The compactness of SB15 and its engrossed version, scores at 43. The compactness of the HB22 as amended is 54, and so, my map is more compact. With respect to competitiveness, her map scores at one. I believe mine scores at -- it looks

like here at 19. With regard to proportionality, her scores at 13, mine scores at 38. With regard to splitting, her scores at 47, mine scores at 74.

[01:15:03]

I mean I'd say by the numbers, it's better. And then if you look at the fair districts, Louisiana Supreme Court on page 3 that I handed out, it compares all of the maps and the total score -- my map happens to score at 287, which is higher than any of the other maps. Senator Hewitt's maps, total score is 179, and proportionality heard, they score hers at 13, mine scores at 81. Competitiveness, mine is at 2, hers is at 1. And minority representation, mine scores 100%, her score is 75%. And then compactness, mine scores 52 and her scores 43, and splitting, mine scores 52, her scores 47. So, again, by whatever mathematical formulas they've got going on, consistently, across both of these, my map scores better. And it also scores better than the current map. And so, it's actually the best offer on the table that's been presented.

REP. JOHNSON: For purpose of full disclosure, we did not prepare this little inner chain so that you could lob it underhand.

REP. IVEY: No, sir.

REP. JOHNSON: Okay. Thank you.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUPLESSIS: Thank you, Representative Johnson. Those are all the questions that we have in the queue. We do have some cards. Okay. I'm going to read the cards in. We have Peter Robbins Brown, Louisiana Progress, in support, present would like to speak, but apparently, he's going to waive. We have Jared Evans, NAACP Legal Defense Fund, present, in support, does not wish to speak. Chris Kaiser ACLU Louisiana, in support, present, does not wish to speak. Edgar Cage, Together Louisiana, present, in support, does not wish to speak. Frankie Roberts, Robertson New Orleans MCH Coalition, in support, present, does not wish to speak. Frankie Robinson, Metamorphosis, in support, present, does not wish to speak. Those are all the cards we have. We have none in opposition. No other members have their buttons pressed for a question. I do believe Representative Ivey made a motion earlier during his presentation that he would like to move favorable.

REP. IVEY: Move as amended.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUPLESSIS: I'm sorry. I'm sorry would like to make a motion to move up as -- report as amended.

REP. BEAULLIEU: Chairman in his defense he is not in the room so I am going to ask you the same thing that we asked Representative Bryant and we've asked every other person here. Since we just have these amendments, are you going to allow these amendments, are you going to allow these to lay over for a day or is this something that the committee wants to just disband of? We didn't do it for Representative Bryant, just kind of so we can all know what the game plan is and how we're going to treat everything.

REP. IVEY: I appreciate consistency. I'd like to point out that this amendment has been available since Friday afternoon. And therefore, it's had enough time for the public, it's been disseminated, links have been sent out online. And so, I think there's been adequate time by the standards we've been using on any subset of amendment, and so, that's why I believe it would be appropriate to move it forward in the process. I know I don't believe Representative Bryant's amendment was published until like yesterday evening. And so, I do think that's a kind of key distinguishing factor there. And again, it is late in the game and I've been here awhile, I understand what happens when you get behind the

curve, and I just like the opportunity to just kind of move it forward. There's no threat that this bill is going to sell out the house without more scrutiny and more engagement from each of you in the process. And again, looking -- I'm absolutely willing to work with you all and try to fix anything. Any idea is a good idea if it improves it, so, I'm happy to work with you all.

REP. STEFANSKI: And just for the record, Representative Ivey, this does require two-thirds vote, if anything would happen in the floor -

REP. IVEY: On the floor, it does. And then of course, there's the senate you've got to get through to yourself. My records even worse over there.

REP. STEFANSKI: Okay. So, to Representative Beaullieu's question regarding point of order, I will say we're going to defer to the bill author on this matter, who has requested that we move forward. The amendments have been available publicly since last week. With that, we have a motion to report as amended. Yes. And we have a motion by Representative Ivey to report as amended. We have an objection. Madam Secretary, please call the vote.

[01:20:00]

SECRETARY: Chairman Stefanski. Vice Chairman Duplessis.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUPLESSIS: Yes.

SECRETARY: Yes. Representative Beaullieu.

REP. BEAULLIEU: No.

SECRETARY: No. Representative Wilford Carter.

REP. CARTER: Yes.

SECRETARY: Yes. Representative Deshotel.

REP. DESHOTEL: No.

SECRETARY: No. Representative Farnum.

REP. FARNUM: No.

SECRETARY: No. Representative Gadberry.

REP. GADBERRY: No.

SECRETARY: No. Representative Hodges.

REP. HODGES: No.

SECRETARY: No. Representative Horton.

REP. HORTON: No.

SECRETARY: No. Representative Ivey.

REP. IVEY: Yes.

SECRETARY: Yes. Representative Jenkins.

REP. JENKINS: Yes.

SECRETARY: Yes. Representative Mike Johnson.

REP. MIKE JOHNSON: Yes.

SECRETARY: Yes. Representative LaCombe.

REP. LACOMBE: Yes.

SECRETARY: Yes. Representative Lyons.

REP. LYONS: Yes.

SECRETARY: Yes. Representative Magee.

REP. MAGEE: Yes.

SECRETARY: Yes. Representative Newell.

REP. NEWELL: Yes.

SECRETARY: Yes. Representative Thomas.

REP. THOMAS: No.

SECRETARY: No. Representative White.

REP. WHITE: Yes.

SECRETARY: Yes. 10 yays, 7 nays.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUPLESSIS: All right. And the bill is reported favorable as amended. All right, thank you Representative Ivey. And can we get a motion to adjourn by Representative Newell, motion to adjourn. Thank you.

[OVERLAY]

[01:21:22]

TRANSPERFECT
LEGAL SOLUTIONS

I, Anders Nelson, hereby certify that the document "2022.02.14 HGA Committee Transcript (F893242)" is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, a true and accurate transcription from English to English.

Anders Nelson

Digitally signed by Anders Nelson
Date: 2022.05.01 18:49:41 -04'00'

Anders Nelson
Project Manager

May 1, 2022