CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: I'm going to call the Committee on House and Governmental Affairs to order. Today is Tuesday, February 8. I would ask anyone who wishes to give testimony, please fill out a card. Green in support, white for information only, red in opposition. We have two bills on the agenda today. We are going to go ahead and allow the birthday girl, Ms. Rosie Ammersbach to call the roll, please.

ROSIE AMMERSBACH: Chairman Stefanski.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Present.

ROSIE AMMERSBACH: Present. Vice Chairman Duplessis.

VICE CHAIRMAN DUPLESSIS ROYCE: Present.

ROSIE AMMERSBACH: Representative Beaullieu.

REPRESENTATIVE GERALD BEAULLIEU: Present.

ROSIE AMMERSBACH: Present. Representative Wilford Carter. Representative Deshotel.

REPRESENTATIVE DARYL ANDREW DESHOTEL: Present.

ROSIE AMMERSBACH: Present. Representative Farnum. Representative Gadberry.

REPRESENTATIVE FOY BRYAN GADBERRY: Here

ROSIE AMMERSBACH: Present. Representative Hodges.

REPRESENTATIVE VALARIE HODGES: Here.

Hearing Exhibit
PR-60
3:22-cv-00211-SDD-RLB

ROSIE AMMERSBACH: Present. Representative Horton.

REPRESENTATIVE HORTON: Here.

ROSIE AMMERSBACH: Present. Representative Ivey. Representative Jenkins.

REPRESENTATIVE JENKINS: Present.

ROSIE AMMERSBACH: Present. Representative Mike Johnson.

REPRESENTATIVE MIKE JOHNSON: Present.

ROSIE AMMERSBACH: Present. Representative LaCombe.

REPRESENTATIVE JEREMY LACOMBE: Present.

ROSIE AMMERSBACH: Present. Representative Lyons.

EDWARD WISHAM: Present.

ROSIE AMMERSBACH: Present. Representative Magee. Representative Newell.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: I'm present, by the way.

MALE 1: Magee is here.

ROSIE AMMERSBACH: Representative Magee is present. Representative Newell.

REPRESENTATIVE CANDACE NEWELL: Present. Happy birthday.

ROSIE AMMERSBACH: Present. Thank you. Representative Thomas.

REPRESENTATIVE POLLY THOMAS: Here.

ROSIE AMMERSBACH: Present. Representative White.

REPRESENTATIVE MALINDA WHITE: Present.

ROSIE AMMERSBACH: Present. Fifteen members in the quorum.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Fifteen members in the quorum. Members today, first bill we're going to take up today is House Bill 14 by the speaker. And so I'll put the pro tem in the chair.

[BACKGROUND NOISE]

You need to turn the witness.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Got it. All right. Mr. Chairman, you're here on House Bill 14, Representative - Speaker Schexnayder's bill. And I think we --

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: It's the amendments.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Yes, amendments you want to bring up. To recap what happened yesterday, we adopted some amendments. We allowed them to lie over for a day to get the public to look at it and then we were going to have additional discussion on those amendments. We had discussion on the general bill yesterday, and I think if I understand you right, Chairman, you want to add some more amendments.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Correct, and it's amendment set, is it 75? Amendment Set 75, members.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Could you give us a brief overview. And members, we're not going to vote on the bill today. I think he's going to adopt the amendments, but we do want you to take a look at it as it goes over what it is.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: So, members, Amendment No. 1. and 2 deal with Districts 1 and 7. Amendments 3 and 5 deal with House Districts 39, 44, 45, 47, 48, 49 and 96. It's a lot, but they're all in agreement to my knowledge and with meeting with those members last night. Amendment Set No. 7 deals with District 82 and 80. And Amendment No. 8 deals with House District 96. With that, I'm happy to answer any questions about those amendments. But just for your personal knowledge, I've spoken, I've worked with the members about these various changes about their communities and that's why we're bringing them.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: All right, there's no questions on the amendment. I think the Chairman moves to adopt - Whoop, sorry. Yep. Sorry, one popped up. Representative Duplessis.

VICE CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Thank you, Mr. Pro Tem. I just wanted to just be clear. I know we're

not voting on it today, but every member of these proposed amendments is in agreement with them

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Yeah, they are.

VICE CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Okay. Anybody who's affected by these?

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: They may not be 100%. They may not -- Let me say this. Yes, everyone understands what's going on and they've all signed off. That's the best way I'm going to put it.

VICE CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: They've indicated to you they are okay with the --

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: They indicated they're okay with that, absolutely.

VICE CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: But we'll still have today to review them and --

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Absolutely.

VICE CHAIRMAN ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: All righty. The chairman moves to adopt the amendments. Is there any objection to adopting amendments? Seeing no objection, the amendments are adopted.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: All right. Mr. Pro Tem, I'd move that we volunteer looking for this bill until tomorrow. We'll take it up. It'll be on the agenda first bill tomorrow morning.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: All right. Any objections? Seeing no objection, it is deferred to tomorrow. That brings us to House Bill 15 by Representative Jenkins.

[BACKGROUND NOISE]

[00:05:00]

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Representative Jen--

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Good morning, Mr. Pro Tem and members of the committee. I appreciate the opportunity to bring House Bill 15. It deals with, I want to do the 5 House Districts ideal population of 44,359. This bill population range is 42,157 to 46,515. Absolute range of a -2,202 to 2,156. The deviation is between a -4.96 to a 4.86. All of the districts are within the deviation. Now, the heart of this particular House Bill is really to try to deal with what we all knew was a population loss in the northern part of the state and population gains in the southern part of the state. What this plan proposes to do is to move House District 5 in the northern part of the state, which is a district right now being represented by a member that's term-limited, move that out of Caddo Parish and move it down to the New Orleans area to accommodate the

population gains in the southern part of the state. By moving House District 5, we were really able to help a number of districts in the northern part of the state. We were able to help probably 10 districts because we had a number of districts in that area, both Republican and Democratic that lost population. By moving House District 5, we were able to make sure that all of those districts complied with the deviation. No [PH00:07:12] incumbents were drawn out of their district and no incumbents as a result of this plan will find themselves running against one another. The population in House District 5 currently White 56%, Black 35%. That population by moving House District 5 will send those citizens into District 3 Democrat, District 4 Democrat, District 6 Republican, District 7 Republican. So that's some balance there. Two Democratic districts and two Republican districts. We want to point out that this plan on the House Bill 15, it does not go in and divide any existing district, minority or otherwise. It doesn't go in and divide any district in order to create any kind of a new district. The result of the plan was still basically come to 29 minority seats, but the overall makeup of the body under this plan will still be at what we're currently looking at, 68 Republican,

34 Democrats, and 3 Independent. The only other area that we had to go into in order to make this plan work involved Districts 46, 48 and 96. Under this plan, drawing District 96 to go down into the generate required us to move House District 48 to the east of House District 96 and House District 46 to the west of House District 96. But all three of those districts are also within the deviation. So, what we're trying to do is address population losses in the north, gains in the south. We are trying to do it in a manner that is least disruptive to existing districts. We are not going in and we are not trying to dismantle existing districts to try to deal with the population loss. So, with that, I'll be happy to answer any questions.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Thank you, Representative Jenkins. Start out similar lines I've asked Representative Stefanski yesterday. Who did you work with on compiling this map?

[00:10:00]

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Well, I'm trying to table for informational purposes with Mr. Ed Wisham. He does work with the state democratic party. And I certainly want to commend him. I think he took an approach in preparing this map in a manner where he

tried to protect Republican and Democratic districts as much as possible and not try to disrupt any of those particular lines. We also received information from a lot of the delegation meeting. So, a lot of the information where delegations around the state as you well know met and some of them somewhat drew their own areas. So, we used a lot of that information in order to try to prepare.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: I'm a little confused. When you say delegation meetings, which delegation are you referring to?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: From my understanding of the Shreveport delegation, New Orleans delegation, various delegations had met and had some idea of what they would like that area to look like. And so, some of the information that we have here is information that was shared to us from people who participated in those delegation meetings.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Were those Republicans or Democrats that shared that with you?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: My understanding is when these delegations met now that there's both Republican and Democrat. I know in mind when we met early on with the Chairman, staff and speakers, that was both Democrat and Republican in those

discussions. We were able to determine that there was a significant population decline in North Louisiana. And the general feeling is that we were going to lose a district in that area. We never came to a complete, you know, conclusion as to which district it was, but just as testimony, previous testimony he has said, we want to start with the idea that if we had somebody that was term-limited, just like at those districts and not affect someone who could run again and possibly come back.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: But let me ask a very specific question. Did the person who gave you the information from these delegation meetings, was that person ever a Republican?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: To the best of my knowledge, no. I think most of the information may have come from Democrats who were part of those discussions with both sides that were involved.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: And did you -- who did you meet with from the Bayou delegation, which I called Bayou which is my delegation. Who did you all meet with for our maps?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: What is the Bayou delegation?

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Terrebonne -- well, that's a nebulous term. I don't give you that but it's St. Mary, Terrebonne, Lafourche. Going further east a little bit sometimes, but I mean, that's kind of what we call it.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I can't remember a specific person that we may have met with in that particular delegation. But you know, what we try to do is look at the existing district lines and as best we could, we tried not to disturb, you know, those existing district lines. And I don't think that -- I don't believe that we did.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Let me ask you a question. Did you all ever meet with a Republican at all about this map? A single one.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I had some discussions with some Republicans about the map, you know, individually talking about this particular map --

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Where they gave you input. Like they saw their district and they said, "Let's do this."

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Not specifically, no. But I will say this. I did talk with some Republicans about this particular map, okay? And I

can say to you now, the offer to have input or to amend it or whatever the case may be, there was some discussion about that as recently as this weekend. Because this map has been posted since Friday and over the weekend and I could have heard it yesterday. I put it off until today so that anybody on the committee or anyone that had a chance to review it has some concerns could bring it to me. I can tell you that no one directly came to me and said they had some kind of overriding concerns about what we have.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: I'm specifically asking about prior to the posting of it. Did you consult with or show -- did you have any private meetings? Did you send out any invitations, "Hey, I'm working on a map," to Republicans?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: As recently as this weekend, I did talk with Republicans about this particular map and there were some discussions about maybe some kind of amendment. So, whatever the case may be, there were somewhat private discussions. But the point I'm making to you is that no one has come back to me since we published it and raised any specific concern.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: I know I'm asking a hundred different ways, but I'd be specific. You

never reached out to me and said, "Hey Tanner, I want to talk to you about the bio region and what my conception is for the districts that are in Southeast Louisiana."

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: No. The answer to that question, no. I never specifically reached out to you.

[00:15:00]

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: And you didn't do that to anybody else in Southeast Louisiana to talk about their maps that are Republicans.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Did we have anybody?

EDWARD WISHAM: No.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: No.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: So, it's fair to say that in the entire Southeast, what I consider Southeast, we had no input from the east Republican side of it into your map.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: There was no discussion, but I must say again, our general approach to this, Mr. Pro Tem, was not to go in and move lines that were already established in those particular districts. So, I can see if that was a burning concern if we move something around there that really affected someone, but our approach when

we went in to try to shape this particular map was really one, is try to deal with the population loss in the north and the gains in the south and secondly, let's try to do it in a manner that did not disturb existing house districts.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: And I appreciate that. Thank you for that. I mean, I do appreciate that. When we talk about -- And look, I'll be -- It's easier for me to talk about it this way because I know my own district. It seems to me that in the current map -- actually, in comparing my map -- not my map. It's Representative Stefanski's map – or actually technically it's Representative Schexnayder's map, but the one that Stefanski worked on really hard. My district under that plan has above 20% minority black voting in it. Your plan has 17% if I look at the numbers right. So, I guess my question is at least for my region, it seems like you're diluting my district's minority representation and I'm trying to figure out what was the thought process and why --

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: What is the district number again?

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: 53. I'm sorry.

[BACKGROUND NOISE]

EDWARD WISHAM: I started out at 20%. It's 20%, you said? For your -- Your current -- I mean before --

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Current is 20. You all diluted it to 17. And then I think under Chairman Stefanski's, we have it above 20. We kept it what it was. It was actually something me and Chairman Stefanski talked a lot about that I want to make sure that I would either keep what I had as far as minority representation -- or actually increase it because I really appreciate my community and I think we have a good dialogue. So, that was really important to me and my district.

REPRESENTATIVE JENKINS: One second, we're trying to get --

REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: Sure, yeah, take your time. That's why we're here.

[BACKGROUND CONVERSATION]

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Okay, we are not aware of moving like any precincts or anything like that that would have caused some lowering of the minority population in your district, okay? But I will say this now, the overall principle and approach of this plan, it is a plan just like, as I've said, it is a plan, it is an approach.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Absolutely.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: The overriding principle here was to see if that was a way to deal with the population loss in the north and the population gains in the south. And we were trying to go a route that would be the less disruptive to existing districts is what we were trying to do. So, I mean, I don't know why your number would have lowered because we're not sure where we shifted anything out of your district, or did it appear to you that we had shift up precinct or some out of your district to make those numbers go lower?

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: I couldn't tell how, I was just looking at the percentage numbers --

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I will say this, you know, my confidence, Mr. Pro Tem, in the overall sense of scout in these areas is still very, very shaky. I mean, especially when it comes to the minority population. I feel like even in my district --

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: We actually agree on this, I do --

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: There was some undercounting. So, I don't know what factors went into that, but I want the committee to really

1 understand, okay? Our approach was to try not to,
2 whether it was Democrat or Republican, our approach
3 was to try not to disturb some of the existing
4 districts. What we wanted to do was to address the
5 population loss in the north and the population gains
6 in the south and try to maintain existing districts.
7 So, that's pretty much what we were approaching to do
8 and that's what this plan is trying to do.
9 REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: And I commend you
10 on that. I believe that to be true. So, when you're
11 drawing the map or however you want to do it, were
12 you doing that with house staff or were you doing it
13 off campus?
14 [00:20:04]
15 REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Who was in the
16 room? I guess. Mr. Stefanski talked about this, him
17 and house staff, they were really drawing it. Where
18 we all and who was in the room is my question.
19 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I just want to make
20 sure we've consulted staff on numerous occasions to
21 assist us with shaping the map, and of course I had --
22 I'm joined at the table, I'm sorry. I don't know if
23 I introduced Mr. Ed Wisham. But I was joined by Mr.
24 Wisham, he also assisted us. He has a lot of
25

1 knowledge and information about the software that was
2 needed to do this. So, it was a combination of both.
3 REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: And was there
4 anybody besides Mr. Wisham participating in this? I
5 just want to make sure we're being -- we're getting
6 everybody and yourself and house staff or that's
7 really --
8 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: No, it was myself.
9 It was house staff and it was Mr. Wisham. To us, it
10 was not really a difficult process, to be honest with
11 you Mr. Pro Tem. I think all of us, you know, based
12 upon the census data, saw what happened in North
13 Louisiana. [INDISCERNIBLE 00:20:54] lost 17,000
14 people, and you had significant gains down in the
15 south. So, the question was is there a way to deal
16 with that issue and not go into like a District 23,
17 divide that district up, existing district, and send
18 people into different populations, okay? At the same
19 time, were we going to be able to make sure that we
20 were maintaining minority districts? And at the same
21 time, were we putting together a map that would still
22 be representative of this body as I said, it is.
23 REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Sure.
24 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: 68, so, you know,
25 and different numbers that were there.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: And so, and let me go there with you. Representative Stefanski, Schexnayder's plan has 29 minority seats and you have 29 too, correct?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: That is correct.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: So, the plans are the same on minority-majority representation.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: But how we get there is totally different. We're going to be taking a different path as to how we get there.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Sure. And the opportunity zones -- opportunity districts, whatever we phrase them yesterday. I think we decided or we heard testimony, I should say, not decided, that Chairman Stefanski has four in his plan. How does your plan stack up as far as the total numbers on that?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Now, give me some -- What is your definition of an opportunity?

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: I'm asking you. This is not -- I want to know how your plan is. What you consider opportunity? That'd be a great way to start. And then you tell me what you think your plan does. I'm just trying to find out from you what the plan does.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Are you saying opportunity for minorities to elect a candidate of their choice?

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Yeah. Number one, by keeping House District 23 in place where it's at. I think that that helped us to have a minority representation in that area. That's a very large area there. Once you take District 23 out, you got multiple parishes there where you don't have any kind of minority representation. Then by dividing District 23 in a manner that we're doing on the House Bill 14, I think you diluted minority voting strength because you're actually sending them into adjoining districts that are primary Republican districts. And when I say that, I'm not trying to say that if someone elected, that's not going to try to represent everybody, but we all know what we're trying to accomplish here with voting strength so that they have a strong enough voice to influence the decisions that are made in their particular district. So, we think that if we can sometime get away from causing a problem and at the same time address what the overall problem was, then we're okay. So, let me just be clear. We think the overall problem here was that you just had

population changes in the north and the south. So, we're not trying to necessarily disrupt an existing black district in order to make another black district and we're not trying to go in and lower voting numbers like I saw it in House Bill 14, where you are dividing up a community such as East Feliciana, West Feliciana, you're dividing it up and then you're going into an existing black district to pull more minority population out of that in order to try to make a black district. So, we think what we are presenting here is a much easier, much cleaner, much better route that maintains black representation in the State of Louisiana without disrupting whether it's already in place.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Sure, and let me ask for clarity's sake. I think there's a lot of discussion yesterday about the Orleans delegation district. How does your map in the Orleans delegation area compared to Chairman Stefanski/Schexnayder's plan?

EDWARD WISHAM: That map is pretty almost the same because of the Intel -- I want to go back at --

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Can you identify yourself for the record?

1 EDWARD WISHAM: I'm sorry, it's Edward Wisham.
2 Yes, sir.
3 [00:25:03]
4 REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: And who are you
5 with?
6 EDWARD WISHAM: The Democratic Party.
7 REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Okay.
8 EDWARD WISHAM: Louisiana Democratic Party. To
9 answer your question, to go back when you asked about
10 our districts of opportunity?
11 REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Yes.
12 EDWARD WISHAM: In our plan, the district
13 opportunities are plans where there's a minority
14 percentage that's 30% or above, and because this is a
15 Democratic plan, we're looking at opportunities for
16 Democrats to be elected in some of those places. I
17 think it's House District 39 I believe is 50. Even in
18 House District 1, there is a higher minority
19 percentage in those places. So, some of those places
20 are places that we looked for as to build up. Now, to
21 answer your question about speaking with Republicans,
22 I wasn't aware of how that was supposed to be set up.
23 So, what we did was we took into as Representative
24 Jenkins said from the Democratic reps that were
25 supposed to talk to their counterparts. And I

encouraged each one of them when we're doing the maps to actually talk to their counterparts so we could get a balanced map. I didn't talk to anybody from the Republican Party myself because that's not what I was there for, I just received it.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: I guess my question was who is the Democrat representative I was supposed to speak to, to talk about my --

EDWARD WISHAM: This is the problem in your areas. I mean technically in your region, there were not any Democratic reps. So, what I did was --

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: So, then I guess my question is, we've now highlighted an issue according to this, and then I hear you telling me you're also diluting minority representation without gaining a minority seat in my area. It seems like this is going against now what we're talking about.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: If I can, let me chime in.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM MAGEE: Go ahead.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I'm going to say again, I think we talked about this already. Now, I don't know what factors, Mr. Pro Tem, may have resorted in similar numbers in your area. I mean, I really don't know. But this map was not designed to

be a Democratic map, it wasn't designed to be a Republican map, okay?

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: [INDISCERNIBLE 00:27:06] we can talk about clarity reasons, and I'm not interrupting you so we can know we're talking about the same thing. You'll added the district, Precinct 11 too in Lafourche to my district, and that's what changed my voting numbers.

EDWARD WISHAM: In Lafourche, is that -- I'm trying to think of what that is. I'm not, look, I apologize.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: No, it's okay. These precincts get very small.

EDWARD WISHAM: Yeah, oh yeah.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: I'm not asking --

EDWARD WISHAM: Okay, yeah.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: You all did do something to my district that did change it and --

EDWARD WISHAM: It is probably because of some information. I mean, as all of us know when you change one district, it's like a domino effect.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Absolutely.

EDWARD WISHAM: So, what normally I do is I try to actualize representative to say I keep things because I didn't have entail from that side. I try to

1 keep things as a status quo. And so, sometimes based
2 on what the precincts are in those areas, we have to
3 use one of those.
4 REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Yeah. We call that
5 area Bayou Blue, actually. I was looking at
6 Representative Zeringue's district. For the purposes
7 of discussion, we have three representatives in
8 Terrebonne, Lafourche but most of all -- well, the
9 three I'm talking about Terrebonne reps, pieces of
10 Lafourche.
11 EDWARD WISHAM: Okay.
12 REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Representative
13 Zeringue gained population, Representative Amedee and
14 I lost representation. Representative Amedee and I
15 had higher minority populations than Representative
16 Zeringue. And so, what you did is you moved one of
17 his. He gained population. You took one of his and he
18 moved into me for me to pick up is what happened to
19 that map plan.
20 EDWARD WISHAM: That's exactly right.
21 REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: And then moving,
22 you know, I guess that districts which have lesser
23 was about 400 people, oh, 4,000 people.
24 EDWARD WISHAM: Yeah. And truth be told when
25 you're doing -- when you have that, I didn't have any

1 kind of conversation with you so I'm not going to go
2 and disrupt your district and totally mess it up and
3 then there's an issue.
4 REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Got you. Getting
5 back to -- so, is there any differences between New
6 Orleans map and the map Representative Stefanski put
7 forth yesterday?
8 EDWARD WISHAM: It appears. I mean when I look at
9 it, most of it is the same.
10 REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: So, it's fair to
11 say that's a fair representation of New Orleans at
12 this point?
13 EDWARD WISHAM: Yes. And I mean that was -- New
14 Orleans probably is one of the easiest areas because
15 the population we got in and pretty much everyone was
16 on the same --
17 REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Might be the first
18 time New Orleans is one of easiest areas ever --
19 EDWARD WISHAM: Yes, exactly. And I was very
20 shocked to have that happen so quickly.
21 REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: All right, thank
22 you. Now, we'll be asking questions. Representative
23 Stefanski?
24 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Thank you, Mr. Pro Tem.
25 Representative Jenkins, thank you for bringing the

maps so we can have this discussion. What was your name again, sir?

EDWARD WISHAM: Edward Wisham.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Edward Wisher.

EDWARD WISHAM: Wisham, W-I-S-H-A-M.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Okay. And you're employed by again who?

EDWARD WISHAM: Louisiana Democratic Party.

[00:30:00]

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Okay. And you're the one that drew this map?

EDWARD WISHAM: Correct.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Okay. Representative Jenkins, do you think that poses a conflict when you have someone who is partisan drawing a map for the whole state? Do you see that as an issue?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: No. I mean this is a plan that's going to be numerous plans, but I don't think there was anything partisan about it. Like I said, this wasn't designed to be a Democratic map or Republican map.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: But it was drawn by someone who is employed by the Democratic Party?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Yeah, but look at the outcome. The outcome is not much different from

1 what you drew in HB14. I mean the overall makeup of
2 the body is pretty much the same. The number of
3 minority districts are the same. Now, I could see if
4 we had a map here and we were presenting you with,
5 you know, four or five extra Democratic seats or
6 something like that, someone can say that there may
7 be some biasness involved. But that's not what
8 happened here at all. I want to say again, the
9 approach here, and I don't want this to get lost
10 because I really think this is important, okay. What
11 we were looking at was a loss of population in the
12 area where I live and a gang of population at a
13 southern part of the state. That was the premise we
14 started here. How can we address that, okay? We felt
15 like a district in the north would have to be
16 relocated to the south. We felt like it needed to be
17 a district where someone was turned down. We wanted
18 to do it in a way where we would not be dismantling
19 the district, like District 23 in HB14, and I'm not
20 saying anything sinister about all that. That was a
21 plan. That was a thought that we shift that down and
22 move people out and do these different things. I'm
23 simply saying that this is a plan where we felt like
24 if we move 5 down to New Orleans, we could basically
25 leave everything else pretty much a status quo as it

is. I'm not saying that's the best or most superior outcome but understand what approach was all about.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Yeah. And I understand you, look, this is your -- again, we went the other day, we talked a lot about attempt. This is your attempt and I respect that. I was just going to ask you some questions about your attempt.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Sure.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Secondly, you talked about an analysis of what this map would produce for Democrats and Republicans. What is that based on? You said this map will produce these many Democrats and these many Republicans. What are you basing that analysis on and what -- can you give me your voting analysis? What metric you use to your voting analysis to produce those results?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: The outcome here and I can't say what's going to happen in an election in the future.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: I thought I understood you. When you were presenting this map, you said this map will do this many Democrats, this many Republicans under this map, did I misunderstand you?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Yeah, I said it, but it was on the 68 Republicans, 34 Democrats, and 3 Independents.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: How did you come to that conclusion?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Based upon who are occupying those seats currently.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Did you do any analysis to determine that?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: No, just based upon --

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: This is based on your viewing of it?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Based upon the approach that we took and a part of that approach was how can we do this in a least disruptive manner to what exist now. And we have 68, 34, 3, okay, and we believe that our map maintains that.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: How would you know that? I mean, are you just guessing or you're looking at past election results? Like to me, that's probably a complicated metric to understand what a map will produce. And so, I'm just curious --

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I'm saying historically, that's what we have. That's what has

been established. What you presently have and historically that's what you have. When I came into the House last term, we had more Democrats than what we have right now. But what we have found out is that most of those Democrats, when they were turned down and moved on to other career opportunities, those districts that were Democrat elected Republicans. So, we add these numbers, 68, 34, 3. This map doesn't change that makeup of the body, that's what I was saying.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: But that's just according to you. I just want to be clear. Is that based on information you've gotten from voting analysis or is that just you looking at the map and thinking things will stay the same?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: That's me looking at what we currently have.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Okay. So, that's just you?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Me looking at what we currently have and what historically has happened here over the past what now, six to eight years. Like I said, when I first came in. Mr. Chairman, we had more Democrats. But every time a Democrat has left this body, that district elected a Republican. For

me, it's just one that difficult to see. I think what we try to do in this bill was to try to see if this would have the same makeup of the body.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Okay. Yeah, again, the question wasn't to trip you up. I was just looking to see what metric you use to determine that if there was something.

[00:35:04]

So, I would like to get that information if you did that because, you know, my approach, that's not the approach I took. I took a very member-based approach with staff to draw these maps. So, I'm just curious. So, secondly, so look, this is your map you've presented, correct?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Correct.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Do you think this map is fair?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Okay. Do you think the makeup of your map is an equal representation of Louisiana?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: It could be better, but I could say this, when we try to go in and look at creating -- let's say we want to try to create more minority districts. It is a challenge. It really

is a challenge. Because to do so, you're going to be gone into existing districts and you're going to be pulling black population out of those existing districts in order to try to make that happen. Could this be better? Could someone have a plan that gives you 30 or 31 or 32, or whatever case maybe? I'd like to see up to 34. But with this particular plan, I say again, our approach was to try not to be disrupted to our existing districts whether they were Democrat or Republican.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: I understand. But yeah, again, you believe this is a fair map?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Okay.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Fair in this sense, Mr. Chairman, if I can say that.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Sure. I'll let you explain it. I'm not trying to trip you out. I'm giving you fully way to explain yourself. I'm just asking questions.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Let me be clear. I don't feel intimidated by any question anyone has to ask.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: You know, you can't be intimidated by me.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Right. Anything I know I don't mind to say. And I've done what just to get last year, okay? We felt like coming into redistricting, one of the big issues was the population issue, and that was the driver of what we were trying to do. Now, some other things came out of this, that would have been great. What we didn't want to do was [INDISCERNIBLE 00:37:00] in a situation where we were gone into some of these existing districts and overly affecting those existing districts. That was the approach that we were trying to take, and I think we waived to accomplish that. This has been said before, this is just an approach to it. Now, you may have some people that filed, some that say you can get 34 minority districts, you may have some people that say, you can get 42 Democratic districts if you did it a certain way. You know, our approach was not necessarily that approach.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: I understand. But just for the purposes of today talking about your bill. So, this is your bill that you filed that your name is on it and you're the lead author.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Right.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: So, do you think this is a fair bill in the map that you've presented?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: You do. Do you think this is an equal representation of the State of Louisiana?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I think it could be better.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: But do you think it is? This is your bill.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I'm trying to answer as best I can.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Okay.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Mr. Chairman, I think it could be better. We wanted it to be better, okay. As far as representation of the state, okay. All I can say with this particular plan and the approach that we were taking, if we could not get to some of the places that we thought we could get to, to make it better. That's not to say to someone else can. I mean you could, other groups could, somebody else could come with a map. They could do it better, I will consider it. But our approach here was driven by the population and trying to make sure that we did not disrupt some of the existing districts that we have.

1 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: And I understand that,
2 and you've been pretty clear that look, this is my
3 approach. There could be other approaches.
4 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Absolutely.
5 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: But to answer the
6 question about do you think -- I mean I'll just tell
7 you from my perspective. If I was filing a map and
8 somebody asked me that question, do you think this is
9 an equal representation, you know, my name is on it.
10 This is my baby. Yeah, I think this is equal and
11 fair. But you don't believe that?
12 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I can answer that. I
13 think when you talk about the representation of the
14 state, I want to be very clear, I think it could be
15 better. I think HB14 could be better. I think HB15
16 could be better, and maybe there will be a plan that
17 will be better because your question is a question
18 about the equal representation or fair representation
19 of the state.
20 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Sure.
21 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Does HB15, my bill,
22 gets to where I wanted it to go? No. I wish we could
23 have done better. But I will say this, it does
24 accomplish something that we were trying to
25 accomplish and that was not to go in and try to

create another minority district by tearing up a minority district or create a minority district by going in minority population in an adjourning district and trying to keep existing districts in the lines for those existing districts and the people who are being represented by their representatives. We did the best we could to try to keep some of those things in line, but I just thought this was a better approach.

[00:40:00]

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: I understand. And so, I guess what I'm hearing from you is that you do not think your map is an equal representation of the state.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I think it could be better.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: But yes or no, do you believe it is?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I say, I think it could be better. I mean that's the best answer I can give and I'm not trying to be evasive. I think it could be better.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: But you filed it and you agreed with this bill though, right?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Yeah, I agree with the approach that we took with this bill is what I'm saying.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: And everything that it encompasses, because it's your bill, you know?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Yeah. I'm going to say again, I agree with the approach that we took with this bill, but I am saying, okay, if your question is about the population of this state and the representation of this state.

CHAIRMAN JOHN REPRESENTATIVE STEFANSKI: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: If that's what the question is, I'd say --

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Yeah, do you think your bill is an equal representation - because, you know, the only reason I'm asking this, Representative Jenkins, is because it gets asked to me. I will ask the same question. So, I'm just curious what your thought. And I heard you elaborate on it, but I guess you're not, and is your answer, you're not going to give a yes or no answer on that?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I think I've given the best answer I could, I think I can do that.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Understood. We'll move on. We'll move on. I'm not going to hammer it though.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Okay.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Let's talk about House District 91.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Who's district is that?

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: It is actually Representative Landry's district.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Yes, okay.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Okay. Why was the decision made to turn a majority-minority district into a non-majority-minority district?

EDWARD WISHAM: The information that we received from that actually came from the representative there, and that's the entail that I drew. Based on the communication there we have with the New Orleans delegation.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Yeah, I believe, Mr. Chairman, what happened there like I said, a lot of what we encompassed in this map was information that came from delegations that had met and agreed upon how they wanted the area to look.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Did you give extra scrutiny to something that would eliminate a majority-minority district?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Do you want to answer?

EDWARD WISHAM: Yes, I do. A lot of those areas I did because I noticed the population -- I mean it was a huge difference in that district from when it was created in 2010. And so, when I went back and looked at the district, the reason why I didn't go ahead as a strong way is because something you said in the previous testimony you were doing about the white population. The Democratic vote there that will -- Democratic carry over in '91.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Could you explain that chronic, what does that mean?

EDWARD WISHAM: I didn't say chronic, I said Democratic.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Democratic carry over?

EDWARD WISHAM: Yes.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Okay.

EDWARD WISHAM: Because that pop in that area was a large growth in white population.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Okay.

EDWARD WISHAM: Yeah. And so, that's why when I looked at the numbers from previous elections and just looked at how that turn out.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: What elections did you look at?

EDWARD WISHAM: I looked at the 2020 election and the 2019 election, which was gubernatorial and the 2020 election, and looked at --

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Wait. So, the 2020 gubernatorial?

EDWARD WISHAM: No, no, I'm sorry. The 2019 gubernatorial.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: 2019 gubernatorial.

EDWARD WISHAM: Yes. And the 2020 presidential.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Presidential. And did you do a report based on those?

EDWARD WISHAM: I didn't bring that with me.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Do you have that information that you could provide to the committee?

EDWARD WISHAM: Yes, I can.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Okay, thank you.

EDWARD WISHAM: Normally, in Louisiana, when I'm looking at those turnout figures from most of those elections, in Louisiana, we have two major elections where everybody can participate unless there's someone miserable or whatever. And so, I kind of look at those races first and then I bring in, because in New Orleans, they have their municipal race in the

1 past and an off year. So, I would go in and add those
2 races and kind of look at how they turnout amongst
3 white, black, and Democrat and Republican in all of
4 those areas.
5 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: So, Representative
6 Jenkins, my question to you is, to me, based on the
7 conversation we have been having throughout this re-
8 districting process, changing a majority-minority
9 district into a non-majority-minority is a thing
10 that's area of concern for you, correct?
11 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Yes. Well, let me
12 explain this in a way I understood it. First, I
13 understand that that delegation had come together and
14 looked at their area. So, although District 91, the
15 population change there still a what I would call a
16 safe Democratic district, okay?
17 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: But I'm not talking
18 about Democrat. I'm talking about majority-minority.
19 The federal law doesn't talk about Democrats.
20 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I understand. You
21 asked about my thought process.
22 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Yes, I am. I'm very
23 interested in that.
24 CHAIRMAN JOHN JENKINS: I'm just trying you all
25 to bits and pieces of it for whatever it's worth,

okay. I felt like that area had been represented by Democrat, it was still being represented by Democrat. Now, what gave me some conflict was knowing that you'd have a new minority district in that area so it was somewhat of a wash. And that goes back to what I was saying at first, Mr. Chairman, yeah, I mean you asked a question about fair representation and I say, you know, things could be better.

[00:45:07]

But you know, we all have these goals that we're trying to reach. So, what they knew minority district coming into the area, they gave me some sense of conflict that District 91, the makeup of District 91 was changing, but the representation of District 91 had not changed. Here's what they say, you know, we did not go into this to try to take Republican out of this district or anything. Like that's not what we were trying to do, okay. So, to say the whole truth with the Republican district, like I said, the makeup for the body when we looked at it, pretty much the same.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: But in your map, you made the decision that you were comfortable changing majority-minority district into a non-majority-minority district, correct?

1 EDWARD WISHAM: Can I answer something on that?
2 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Sure.
3 EDWARD WISHAM: Okay. That district because of
4 the population shift in that district and then
5 bringing district -- whatever district we brought
6 from North Louisiana there, we have to look at the
7 placement of whether district where best fit. And in
8 that area was the best place for it to fit. The
9 population shift initially dropped in that district,
10 and so that was the best place. If you look at the
11 way New Orleans is set up and the different districts
12 and all of those things, that was the best fit for it
13 and sometimes in order to achieve a certain goal
14 especially when you're doing a redistricting, it
15 depends on when someone leaves. I mean you have a lot
16 of factors to play in part of what takes place when
17 you do that. That was the best place. Once I looked
18 at it and they provided it to me, I was
19 [INDISCERNIBLE 00:46:38] because when I looked at the
20 district, I was kind of, I was like, well something
21 is not right here. And then when I went back and I
22 looked at all of the setup and how it could actually
23 fit whatever district we brought to New Orleans, that
24 was the best area as far as the growth and to
25 actually incorporate that district.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: But I guess my question is the decision was made to change a majority-minority district into a non-majority-minority district, correct?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Yes. And based upon the qualifiers that we just explained to you, it went like we just reached on a hat and pull something out, you know.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: I understand that. I think we all take deliberate approaches when do these maps and there are always explanations, but just wanted to highlight that point. Secondly, were there any attempts to make sure that District 91 remain the majority-minority district?

EDWARD WISHAM: Yes, it was. I actually went in before we brought the district to see how we could move it around, what could we do to actually maintain it and bring that district there. And with the population shift and what we were trying to do there and get that district into that range, it was not easy to do so.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: It's not easy but did you attempt to do it?

EDWARD WISHAM: I did.

1 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Was it possible to draw
2 that if you ignored where members live?
3 EDWARD WISHAM: Yes.
4 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: It was possible to keep
5 District 91 as a majority-minority district?
6 EDWARD WISHAM: Yes, it was possible.
7 CHAIRMAN JOHN JENKINS: And you made the decision
8 not to do that?
9 EDWARD WISHAM: Yes.
10 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Thank you. Next
11 question, District 23. Let's talk about District 23
12 and its current construct. As it's currently
13 constructed, Representative Jenkins, what confidence
14 do you have that the minority community will be able
15 to elect a candidate of choice?
16 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Well, I'll put it
17 this way, from what I can see, the last three terms,
18 they were able to do it. Secondly, I think some of
19 the major cities in that area such as Natchitoches
20 and some of the other major cities in that area, they
21 have black mayors, they have a tendency to vote
22 minority leadership. So, I have no reason to believe
23 that collectively if they stay the way that they are,
24 that they would not continue to elect a candidate of
25 their choice in District 23. Even to that extent, I

think those numbers will suggest that it is a good competitive district, you know, candidate to get in there and work hard. They can certainly win the district. So, I don't think it's a farfetched idea to think that they will continue to try to elect candidate of their choice and the candidate of color if that's what they chose to do.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Was any analysis done to determine that based on the levels? And when I say levels, based on the VAP and voter registration of the current construct under your bill at that district. Was any analysis done to determine whether or not the minority community would have an opportunity to elect the candidate of their choice?

EDWARD WISHAM: Yes, and I can provide that to you also just --

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: I would like that information.

EDWARD WISHAM: Yes.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: See, what concerns me is that if you look at how the district currently is constructed, so if we take the district right now, I took a snapshot of it with what we like to call the malapportionment stats.

[00:50:02]

1 That district is currently built at a VAP of
2 53.466. While I'm looking at your district, it is
3 built at a VAP of 50.054, by far the lowest BVAP in
4 your entire plan for a majority-minority district.
5 And so, I'm very interested to see your voting
6 analysis and the reasoning how that when you're
7 drawing a district of an even lower BVAP than it
8 currently exists. I'm very curious in does that raise
9 any concern for you with BVAP that low?
10 EDWARD WISHAM: Yes, it does. And actually, our
11 district was larger than that, but because of the
12 precincts, I think I work with -- I forgot. I think
13 you call it - her name is Trish -- Patricia?
14 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: She is our excellent.
15 EDWARD WISHAM: Yes, exactly. Right. It was an
16 honor to work--
17 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Staff person, Patricia
18 Lowrey do for it.
19 EDWARD WISHAM: Look, so I had an opportunity to
20 work with her, which was a privilege, and I want to
21 thank her for helping me. But we had several places
22 that one of these precincts were actually messed up.
23 And so, I had to take on some other precincts that I
24 desire not to, but because of the construction of the
25

precincts from the last time, I had to do that. So, when I--

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: But you do have some concern that a BVAP that low could produce a candidate of choice.

EDWARD WISHAM: Well, no. I believe they can produce the candidate of choice.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: What level of certainty?

EDWARD WISHAM: And that's what I'm going to provide to you.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: I would love that information because to me, a plan with that low level is just very concerning to me. And so, I appreciate that you share my concern and I would love to see the information about that.

EDWARD WISHAM: And can I, elaborate at just on one part but--

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Of course, you can.

EDWARD WISHAM: Yeah, what I've noticed is in this district, even though it was at 50% voting age population, the registration was almost at 53% in that district voter registration. And when we're talking about electing candidates or whatever, that's

most important because those are people who actually going to vote for that candidate.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Yeah, so, my question to you is what's the more important factor in your analysis?

EDWARD WISHAM: The more impact -- they have representation is the most important.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: I understand that. I'm asking you about your analyzation of a district to be an effective district for an ability for the minority community to elect a candidate of his choice. Based on those parameters, what to you is the most important factor?

EDWARD WISHAM: Is that the population -- When I'm sorry, say that again because I want to make sure I answer you correctly.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Based on a voter analysis when you're looking at a district that would potentially allow the minority community to elect a candidate of its choice, what is the most important factor, percentage, number to you when you're looking at that?

EDWARD WISHAM: A voting age population.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: VAP. So, BVAP.

EDWARD WISHAM: Yes.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: So, that's more important than what you just said on registration.

EDWARD WISHAM: That is correct. I agree.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Thank you. I appreciate that.

EDWARD WISHAM: No, that's, thank you.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: I understand. All right, let's see. And again, just to reiterate, Mr. Representative Jenkins, your plan has 29 majority-minority districts.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Correct, but we get to that 29 a little bit differently than House Bill 14.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: I understand that. We have two differences of opinion on how to get there. Let me elaborate on that. What was involved in your decision to move House District 5 from North Louisiana?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Well, we have several things. Like I said, it was really population driven. We had a number of districts in Northwest Louisiana, both Democrat and Republican, that was below the deviation, all right? So, we needed population and by moving House District 5, which is there in the Parish, we were able to help several

Democratic and Republican House Districts to pick up that population and move it to the southern part down to New Orleans that address the increasing population that was in that area. The other factor was, as I said and stated before, we tried to take an approach that would be the least disrupted to existing district, being a Republican or Democrat. If you looked at House District 23, I mean, in order to shift that out, you are actually going to send a lot of people into adjoining districts and we felt like, especially if under minority voting strength, that would dilute that minority voting strength by putting them into a lot of adjoining districts.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: So, why the decision to move a district versus just shift the district southwardly?

[00:55:00]

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Well, I thought this is what I was just explaining. I felt like we helped a lot of areas in the northwest part of the state where the greatest population loss had to a place. Democrat and Republican districts had lost population in that area. So, by moving District 5 and being able to use that population and equally balancing the opportunities in Democrat and Republican districts

was a motivating factor for us to try to move District 5.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: What led to the selection of House District 5?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Well, I mean, that area where, we are from there. All of districts are pretty compact. And number one, like I said, we felt like if we're going to do this, move where someone is termed out--

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Why the decision to take a term-limited member?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Well, we didn't warn up members districts who could run again and possibly want to come back. We did not want to do that to them. And I think that was a part of the overall thinking when HB 14 was done too, was trying that to harm those members who had an opportunity to run and try to come back if they so choose to do so. But House District 5 was term-limited. It's very compact and contiguous with a number of districts up there, Mr. Chairman, including my own, to be honest with you. District 2, District 1, District 3, District 4, District 6, District 7. I mean, you had any number of Republican and Democratic districts that had lost population and needed to get back into the deviation.

And by moving House District 5, that population was able to go in and get everybody back into a proper deviation.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Did you give any consideration to the adjacent districts now being drawn into where that old district was, District 5? Because, you know, when you remove a district like that, it acts like a magnet. It sucks everything around it in there.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Correct.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: So, did you have conversations with those adjacent representatives who represent their communities? Did you have conversations with the communities of those other parishes that now are going to have to be drawn to the Caddo? Talk to me about the members districts and the communities' districts that are now affected by being drawn into where House District 5 used to be.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Well, I mean the overall concern was that, I mean, we had to try to get into the proper deviation. All about numbers were low and we need to get into the property so we know there's going to be some shifting that would take place, but we don't think we displaced anybody too greatly with this particular plan. They are still

kind of contiguous in the same area when they came in and began to pick up some of that population. Once again, now, I have not heard from a single member, be it Republican or Democrat in that area who has come to me and this map has been posted and said that I have some kind of significant problem with your map on what you have there. But the overriding factor, Mr. Chairman was that we were all out of deviation and it was obvious we were going to have to probably lose a district. I hate to say that. I'm from North Louisiana, but it was pretty obvious that that's something we were going to do. That was a motivating factor behind this particular plan was to population shift.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: To follow up on a question that Mr. Pro Tem asked you earlier about who you talk to, did you talk to any Republican member before you filed this map about this proposed plan? Or was it only after the map was posted that you had those conversations?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: No, we actually came down, I want to say last year, a delegation and Republican and Democrat. I think we met with you and some others, and we looked at what the circumstances were, and we looked at and talked about what may need

to happen there. I think all of us left there with the notion that we would probably lose a district in that area. We could not make up our mind at that time what district that would be, okay? But given the idea of that it would have to be someone that was term-limited in that area, that we would have to try to move around. I don't think it was a hard decision to make that we would move District 5.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: No, I understand, and this really isn't a confusing question. It's more of just a direct, like. So, I heard you talk to representative, speaker Pro Tem Magee earlier about I've had some Republican members come to me after and talked to me about what the district looks like. So, before you filed this map, did you give an opportunity for any Republican member to come and look and go, that's what my district would look like, here's my comments, Representative Jenkins, or why that works or doesn't work for me. Or did those conversations happen after you filed the map?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I say again, there was a discussion with the delegation.

[01:00:02]

I think you are present. At that discussion, we were down here in Baton Rouge. We looked an area,

okay, and we were told what the circumstances were and something would have to be done to pick up all of the population. So, that conversation where we had no --

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Form the bases for what you're doing.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Actually, formed a base where, because the first thing I did was go in and try to shape North Louisiana where the biggest population that took place. And from there, we went down into the other areas with an approach as best we could not to be disruptive to existing district being Republican or Democrat.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: I noticed that District 7 currently represented by Representative Larry Bagley is dramatically changed under your map. He becomes a primary Caddo, Bossier District. Did you have any conversations individually with Representative Bagley about the damage this could potentially do to his district before you filed your map?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: No, I did not have conversation with Representative Bagley, but I would say this, I don't agree with the characterization now that it wasn't damaged. None of that.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: From what metric?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: This is why I'm saying that, I think all of our districts including Representative Bagley district needed numbers. That was only so far you can go. He brought us up against the Texas line, okay. So, there's only so far we could go, and in order to, I think our motivation was to try to make sure that all of our districts in that area be it a Republican or Democrat, got into the deviation and in order to shift it, once we shift out District 5, which just north of here, he had to begin to go up northerly to get him to the numbers that he needed.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Did you have of that conversation? You didn't have that conversation with him about what that would do?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I didn't have any direct conversation with him.

REPRESENTATIVE STEFANSKI: But you can see how maybe his community of interest was disrupted by going from more DeSoto, more Sabine to now more Caddo. Don't you see how that could be a disruption to someone? Do you think parishes and switching over into parishes have a factor in redistricting?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: To some extent, but in that particular case now, I mean, we consider Representative Bagley to be a very instrumental part, and he is a very instrumental part about Northwest delegation. He's a part of all those.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Well, he's still going to be in the Northwest.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: What I'm saying is you're using his terms like disruptive and all of these different things like that. I don't think that's what in my opinion and my plan, I'm not saying that he agreed with it. He may not. I'm just simply saying, I don't think we took an approach to hurt Representative Bagley.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Oh, I wasn't saying that. I just meant when you make changes that greatly affect the population of a district, especially into an adjacent Parish, that that current representative doesn't currently live in, it can have it. To you, it may not be a dramatic change, but to that representative, this may be something that's altering. It may be the ability to be able to represent his home parish now that more of the population is located into another. So, to you, I'm not saying you did it maliciously. I'm just saying

that would have been -- he looks like he's the one the most dramatically affected from the mapping you're changing your decision to do, HD 5 in particular, to remove that one. So, my question to you is, did you have a conversation with Representative Bagley about this big change in his district?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: No, I did not have a direct conversation with Representative Bagley. But, you know, if Representative Bagley or any members, since this map has been posted, has some concern just as they did with you, okay? Just like many of us continued to do with the map with HB 14, have some overriding concerns about it. I mean I'm open to that.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: I know you are. You're a great colleague to work with and I know you'll listen to as you will. Yeah.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: This is not -- You know, it is an entail. It is a plan.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: I got you.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Such as HB 14, we have a plan. And if someone comes to me and say, Sam, look, can you change this or change that or whatever case may be, we could sure get with staff, we could

1 try to see what that looks like. But I will say now
2 once again, the idea here is that Republican and
3 Democratic House Districts in that area suffered a
4 tremendous loss, and there's so many different ways
5 you could possibly go to try to make up for it.
6 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Oh, I get it. I'm in
7 the same shoes. I've been there for the past year.
8 One last, this is the last thing I think and I hope I
9 want to say. I'm noticing there was a lot of
10 testimony given particular yesterday about the need
11 to address districts that have a very, very high
12 minority population in them, very high BVAP. Did you
13 give consideration in trying to reduce the heavy
14 minority population in some districts in order to
15 disperse that?
16 EDWARD WISHAM: Yes, and if you looked at most of
17 the maps, a lot of the minority districts was the
18 districts without, with loss in population. I mean
19 huge loss in population.
20 [01:05:04]
21 So that forced us to go to other areas to dilute
22 it. I mean, a lot of these areas I didn't want to go
23 in or city to bring in more people. I tried to branch
24 them out as long as it was in their committee, I mean
25 in their community. Places like Baton Rouge and New

Orleans is a little easier to do and then some of these are the areas, Shreveport. I mean, when you were all gathered together in one place, it's a little easier to do that. Sometimes you have to go a little further, depends on what you're trying to accomplish.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Representative Jenkins, are you of the opinion that we should be looking to not have such high minority concentrations in districts? Do you share that opinion that that's something we should do?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I think all of these districts, be a minority districts or majority districts. We need to try to get a little bit more balance in it certainly.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Was that your intent with this map?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Absolutely. Like I said, to a large extent, Mr. Chairman, we were trying not to disrupt some of the existing district as best we can. But just like Mr. Wisham just said, some of those numbers did get lowered because of what we were trying.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: It's not always that easy, right?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: No, it's not. That's true.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: And the thought that just let's break up these super high minority districts to disperse that population is not always as easy as it may look. Would you agree with that?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I would agree with that.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Because I'm looking at your map and I'm counting. Well, let me ask you, you drew this map, how many districts are above 70% BVAP?

EDWARD WISHAM: Right off the bat, I don't know. I'm being honest with you, but it's several.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: It's several?

EDWARD WISHAM: Yes.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: So, one, two, three. I'm not going to gauge in that exercise. I'm not. But you would agree that there are several districts above 70% BVAP?

EDWARD WISHAM: Yes, and those, I agree with you 100% on that. Yes.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: It's not always as easy as someone may purport it to be.

EDWARD WISHAM: No, it's not, because you're dealing with places and communities and you know you

can't just go in and tear them. I mean, you shouldn't do that.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: One final question, you drew this map, right?

EDWARD WISHAM: Right.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Did you personally talk to any Republicans? You?

EDWARD WISHAM: No, I did not.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Did you only talk to Democrats?

EDWARD WISHAM: Yes.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Thank you. Representative Magee, that's all my questions.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Thank you, Chairman Stefanski. Before I turned over to other members, I do want to sum up some [INDISCERNIBLE 01:07:22], I think we've gone a lot of directions. I want to just consolidate some of it. There's a lot we agreed on these maps and I want to make that clear. We both have 29 minority-majority districts. When I say, we used to think, [INDISCERNIBLE 01:07:36] defense in your plan. We both reduce District 91 from being minority-majority to same level of representation.

EDWARD WISHAM: Correct.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: The main difference is and I think the approach you're talking about was you all maintained District 23 while Representative Stefanski creates District 62, and the comparison between those two districts is under your plan, 23 remain, is barely a minority district. But under 62, under this plan, the newly created 62, it has a much higher BVAP. Does that summarize the differences between the plans?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Yes, to some extent now.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Broad picture. I mean, I know like every precinct is different, but I mean big picture stuff, correct?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Right. What we were trying to do I think, you know, if we're talking about like minority districts, yeah, we both have 29 minority districts. But what I'm saying Mr. Pro Tem, I think the difference between House Bill 14 and 15 is how we maintain that number, okay?

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Correct.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: We got a different route why are we trying to get there. So, this is an attempt to show that we can still maintain the 29 districts. Yes, I wish it was better, without

1 necessarily disrupting nor destroying an existing
2 minority district to do as such as District 23.
3 REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: But you do had a
4 barely BVAP over 50 as opposed to the newly created
5 62, which would have a much higher BVAP and really if
6 we're talking and layman's terms, it would be a safer
7 minority-majority seat. Under the speaker
8 Schexnayder's plan, the 29 will call it minority-
9 majority district is actually a safer one than under
10 your plan. Isn't that fair to say?
11 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: It's hard to say
12 it's fair because of the way we are getting there.
13 I'm going to say it again, okay? If we are going to
14 an existing district such as District 63 and we are
15 reducing the minority population in there, to put it
16 in the 62, I think that still, you know--
17 [01:10:00]
18 REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: I'll rephrase it
19 another way and see if it you agree on this. You have
20 29, but that 29 is barely, Representative Stefanski
21 has 29 and that 29 is strong.
22 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I don't know if I
23 could phrase it that way, because in order to get to
24 the 29 under Representative Stefanski, that's
25 concerned about what we did to 23 and that's

concerned on what we're doing to the 63 to get there. I'm not saying that was anything sinister about it, but you are diluting black voting strength in those, in 23, because you're sitting everybody into some adjoining districts and you're doing the same thing in 63 because you have to pull that minority population out of there to make 62 work. What we've simply done is to say, look --

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: 62, sorry.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Well, we sent it down and say, look, let's look at what the problem really is, population lost in the north.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: But you have to agree with me that's reducing in 63, it's still way above--

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: For sure, numbers, I wouldn't argue with you about it, okay? But the mythology and the principles of getting there, I mean, they're subject to the bank which is why I think this committee I will let this bill out of here. I think that that ought to be more than one instrument on the floor because right now this committee, we're making the [INDISCERNIBLE 01:11:19] and 90% of our colleagues are not really that much involved in it.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Right, and I'm glad you brought that up. That's what my next question was. So, we've narrowed down the differences between the plans and so then there was a decision that Representative Stefanski made, there was a decision that you made, and when is those decisions, as I'm understanding, correct me If I said something wrong. Representative Stefanski met with 105 members of both parties, met with various regional delegations, met with everybody in this chamber multiple times, scheduled meetings with them, gave him every opportunity to discuss it and the approach to make that decision. To make the decision you made, you consulted with the Democratic party who relied on specific Democratic representatives to meet with Republican colleagues and then relay that information back to you about how that approach work. Did I summarize that correctly or did I leave something out?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: On our map, most of the information did come to us from Democratic members delegations who had met in some respect with their colleagues in that area, be it Democrats or Republicans. So, we did use that as a basis. Now, look, Representative Stefanski has worked very hard.

I have to give it to him. I mean, I don't doubt that at all. He's worked very hard. He's met with everybody, he has a full staff to do all of this stuff that he's doing, okay? And I think all of that is great. The only issue that I see here at the end of the day, regardless of how we got to where we are. The only issue I see here is we are destroying District 23 in a fashion to create another black district. This does not -- House Bill have 15 does not take that approach. And I'm not saying that that was anything sinister about that or anything like that. I'm just simply saying we think that this is an alternative method to redistricting that we would like divided to deliberate on.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Right. So, my summary of the process wasn't wrong is all I'm trying to say.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Not totally. No.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Okay. And look, I appreciate it. I want to say this. Anybody, I appreciate the work of anybody who draws the map because it's really difficult. I know it's not fun to have it picked apart and go and raked over the coals. It's important, right?

EDWARD WISHAM: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: And so, I think it's important part of the process, but I respect the work that you gentlemen did. I respect everything that went into it and I'm not being over critical. I just want to make sure we understand the differences of the results because it is the most difficult thing that you can do in this process, is actually to draw a map and deal with it. And I do believe you've proposed a real map as opposed to phrase you heard yesterday of the illustrative map, and I do thank you for that. I'm going to let Representative Beaullieu has some couple questions now though.

REPRESENTATIVE GERALD BEAULLIEU: Thank you, Mr. Speaker Pro Tem. Thank you, Mr. Jenkins, Mr. Wilsham. I enjoy working with you, Representative Jenkins.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Same here.

REPRESENTATIVE GERALD BEAULLIEU: Thank you. You look on the definition of a fine gentleman; your pictures are going to be sitting there. So, I really enjoyed and I've learned a lot from you. You've mentioned throughout your testimony trying to be least disruptive throughout the state. Can you give me a definition of what you consider disruptive?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Well, I think the perfect example for this conversation would be

1 District 23. If we are going to go in and actually
2 take a district away and disperse people, into
3 adjoining districts in a manner that dilute their
4 voices, dilute their voting strength, I mean, that
5 would be an example that I will use for the
6 conversation we have in here.
7 REPRESENTATIVE GERALD BEAULLIEU: So, let me ask
8 you when you start talking about diluting voices in
9 St. Martin Parish with District 48, excuse me, 46,
10 which represents Huval's District.
11 [01:15:07]
12 They're currently somewhere in the 70% St. Martin
13 Parish and your proposal St. Martin Parish is going
14 to be about 7% of that District. So, from 70 to 7,
15 would you consider that disruptive?
16 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Let's explain how we
17 get [INDISCERNIBLE 00:00:23] things.
18 EDWARD WISHAM: I knew this would not come up.
19 REPRESENTATIVE GERARD BEAULLIEU: That's not the
20 only one.
21 EDWARD WISHAM: No, but this is something that I
22 was not in agreement with initially on, because of
23 the way your district was currently configured.
24
25

REPRESENTATIVE GERARD BEAULLIEU: So, this is to Representative Huval's District. My district is going to be next on the agenda.

EDWARD WISHAM: And I mentioned that to Representative Jenkins. Based on the intelligence that I received from that representative, I was told that he met with his Republican counterparts and this is what they provided to him, and I received something that split that district while I didn't have a payoff way to continue – I'm sorry, go ahead.

REPRESENTATIVE GERARD BEAULLIEU: No, you good. Go and finish.

EDWARD WISHAM: All right. And Representative Huval is termed. So, when I create a map, the first thing that I do is to find out where the representatives reside, where they are registered. And so, I noticed you were on that side of District 96 and I noticed Huval was a little north of you. Okay? Okay, and I noticed your District curved around and came right behind. I think it's Migis, District 49.

REPRESENTATIVE GERARD BEAULLIEU: And Bryant, so Representative Bryant and I [INDISCERNIBLE 01:16:31] each other.

EDWARD WISHAM: Bryant, you're right. You're right. Representative Bryan in 96, correct. And so once we had that payoff way blocked, then I could not bring you back around anymore. It caused me to have to draw you over there. And so that's --

REPRESENTATIVE GERARD BEAULLIEU: Back to my question, do you think that is disruptive to District 46 to bring from 70% to 7% of population? Maybe not compared to 23. Okay, I'll give you that. But do you think that's disruptive?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Yes, but you took --

REPRESENTATIVE GERARD BEAULLIEU: We both agree with that.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: You took away what I was going to say, but not as this disruptive as removing the whole district now. I did have, Representative Beaullieu, has concerns about that, okay. It looked like based on the information that he had come back with District 46, with Representative Huval, District 48, which is yours, and District 96 that there obviously was some discussion of bringing District 96 down round the generate area, okay. And as you see, your current District did something like a horseshoe around the bottom of -

REPRESENTATIVE GERARD BEAULLIEU: Correct.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: But when it came down, it kind of blocked you over to a certain side. So, the question became how do we do this in a way where Representative Beaullieu and Representative Bryant, who needs to come back, how do we get them compact in an area. And the thought was okay, since Representative Huval was termlimited, why don't we move him over to the other side and make sure you stay where you lived on the east side. I will say to you, I would love to talk with you about that if we can move forward and see if there's another fix for it, to be honest with you. It was not the most ideal situation, but given the geography that we had, where everybody lived and things like that, that's pretty much I came together.

REPRESENTATIVE GERARD BEAULLIEU: So, did the representative that you discussed with, did they explain to you how much time that I committed to working with District 96 and making sure that they continue to represent the minority population in Iberia Parish and how we, even as of an amendment that we adopted this morning, that we've continued to work with them to make sure we protect that minority interest in Acadiana?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: You know, I did see the amendment unfortunately for the first time and see there's some things that have been done to address that. And as I say it now, this is a fluent estimate. If there's something we need to do to address an area, we can certainly do it.

REPRESENTATIVE GERARD BEAULLIEU: I feel like this is kind of a slap in the face for all the effort that we have done in Acadiana and working together. We have had multiple Acadiana delegation visits on the maps, and nowhere did anyone mention that we were doing this to Representative Huval's district or to my district in this manner. Everything has been an effort to help Representative Bryant and M's district. So, I just want to let you know that, you know, in good faith we've been working with them and this is not pleasant to see. One other question. You also talked about the house districts in the north. This is the best for the house district in the north. You mentioned that a couple of times and you also mentioned, which is evident to all of us that we, the north has lost most population. Do you think those house districts should benefit to the expense of those house districts in the south because they've lost population?

[01:20:04]

Does that make them a higher level of precedent or as far as importance than the ones in the south? Because it seems like that's what's happened in the Acadiana area. We are all shifted around for the benefit of those districts that lost the most population when we have good things going on in Acadiana and we're the ones who had taken it on the chin. I mean, that's where the disruption's happening right now.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I'll say again. You know, we're not trying to say any one area is superior to another area. That was never the intent of what we were trying to do, okay. What we were looking at was that when we looked at all of the census numbers, it was pretty glaring that there was population loss specially up in cattle at 17,000 people. That's a lot of people, okay. And then we had a number of districts, both Republican and Democrat, that needed to get back into deviation. So, that was the reason why we kind of started in that area to try to see what could be done that would bring in a number of districts into deviation. But at the same time, you know, when we did to complete geography, we were trying our best not to be disruptive to other

existing districts. Going back to your previous question in hindsight, I really wish we could have looked at that approach a little bit better before this matter was published, to be honest with you. We kind of relied upon some information there that, you know, I wish we parked and did some better due diligence on. But like I said, it's a fluent document and we certainly are open to seeing what can be fixed. I did see the amendment and just like HB 14 continued to get worked up to the bill, we could continue to do this. We had amened sent here this morning on HB 14. So, this is not some sort of [INDISCERNIBLE 01:21:54] where we can't, you know, this is some of those issues that there may be some concerns.

REPRESENTATIVE GERARD BEAULLIEU: Thank you, Representative Jenkins.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: All righty. Representative Duplessis. [INDISCERNIBLE 00:07:05].

REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Thank you, Mr. Pro Tem. Mr. Jenkins, Representative Jenkins, your last answer to Representative Beaullieu's question was really going to be, I think, an answer to my

first question, which was whether or not this was in your mind a final product.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: No, I say we had amendments sent here this morning on HB 14. So it's just part of the process.

REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Right. But also part of the process is the fact that this is very personal to members, right? So, we can understand and appreciate how if a member sees their district on a map that's been filed in a certain manner, that doesn't necessarily jive how that can cause a reaction. But that's certainly not your intent.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Absolutely. If members come to me and say, you know, we need to fix this, and they probably know better than me to be honest with you. We need to fix this or fix that. We're certainly open to that.

REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Absolutely. I want to go back to a few points that were discussed earlier, particularly around -- I want to start with black voting-age population, and that number.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Okay.

REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: There was a lot of discussion on that as it relates to House District 23, as it relates to House District 91, and a little

1 bit around House District 63. Is it your
2 understanding or belief that black voting-age
3 population percentage has to be a certain number in
4 order to guarantee that people will be able to select
5 their candidate of choice?
6 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Not guarantee, no.
7 REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Just give the
8 opportunity, correct?
9 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Yeah, the
10 opportunity.
11 REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Okay. I want to
12 make that clear because it appears as though when I
13 raised the issue yesterday in questioning regarding
14 House Bill 14 about the black voting-age population
15 being reduced in House District 91, which was a
16 result, not of anybody's intent, but just a result of
17 the shift in population and the increase in white
18 residents who have moved to that area. The fact that
19 that number has now decreased, it was cited that
20 voting analysis showed that in that particular area,
21 white people vote across racial lines. So, it's not
22 as easy just to simply say because a black voting-age
23 population is somewhere between 50% or 52% that you
24 cannot elect a black candidate, because every area is
25 different. Would you agree?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I agree with that, sure.

REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: And as it relates to House District 23, we have evidence, given the member who currently holds that district, we have proof that a minority, a black candidate can be elected in that area.

[01:25:00]

But that's not - The requirement is not that it be high enough to guarantee they will elect somebody, but just that they have the opportunity, correct?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I would agree.

REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Okay. And I guess the flip side of that is going to the question of some may call it packing, putting so many residents, voters of color in a particular district to the point where you make them up to 78% or whatever the case might be, that was some discussion that you had earlier with the chairman. You all kind of went back and forth on that. So, it's like if you're not going in the direction to try to maybe bring it down a little bit, then that means you're going in the opposite direction, right?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Right.

REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: So, that speaks to some of the challenges. Now, what I took away, the main thing I took away from your presentation this morning is not that this is a final instrument. That's not your intent. But what it does is it shows another way. All right. It's your attempt to show that there is a way that we can, if not achieved the same outcome in terms of preserving the number of majority-minority districts, but you do it in a way that is respectful and does not break up and dilute House District 23 to keep those voters in that area, DeSoto, Natchitoches, Red River. It's just an opportunity, but we can still have the same outcome through your path and we don't have to break up that district. That's one of the key distinctions in your map. Correct?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Correct.

REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Another observation that I have gained over these past two days, after having heard your map and seeing the map put forward by the chairman, is that if we kept House District 23 where it is and kept it intact, the way it was designed 10 years ago after the last census to give those residents in that area an opportunity to have a candidate of choice. And we incorporated the

1 changes in House Bill 14 with House District 62 and
2 House District 63, which may not be popular to
3 everyone, but it is an opportunity for us to not just
4 have the same number, but to actually have an
5 increase to 30.
6 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: That would be
7 correct.
8 REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: That would be
9 correct, right? So, we could actually achieve and
10 they're so far apart in the way that House District
11 62 and House District 63 are set up and drawn. There
12 could be a way to keep House District 23 where it is
13 and also have House District 62 and 63 change the way
14 the House Bill 14 is presented, so that way we can
15 actually achieve more by getting to 30. I just want
16 to make that clear for the committee and for us all
17 that neither of these are final instruments, and what
18 we are trying to do is figure out the best way to
19 make the state more reflective of its citizenry.
20 Because all of us can agree that trying to get there
21 is a very difficult task. But I think your bill
22 personally presents a better alternative to getting
23 there in terms of preserving communities of interest
24 and in terms of keeping in line with the goals and
25 the requirements under the Voting Rights Act. I will

also point out one of the challenges that I think is being caused by this requirement. I don't even know that it's a requirement, but it's a rule that we try not to split precincts. I just want to point out that I think that is one of the biggest factors that has stood in the way of our ability to draw maps and draw districts in a way that more adequately represent this state. I really think that is a huge impediment and I recognize history, but all history isn't good history and I think that we need to seriously evaluate that going forward. Because this unwillingness as a body to split precincts is causing a lot of the challenges that we're having right now. So, just want to mention that. I appreciate the effort you put into this Chairman Jenkins, Representative Jenkins, and I appreciate that this is not an easy task.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Not by any stretch of the imagination.

REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: I appreciate your willingness to compromise and not put forward something that's just purely illustrative, but put forward something that is workable in my opinion, and I thank you for your time.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Vice Chair and I appreciate those comments that you made. I'm simply saying that, our body needs to be able to look at some of these options and not just be tied to one bill, one option. I hope this committee will keep that in mind. I think we on the committee gets an opportunity partly discussed this morning, many of our colleagues that are in this body.

[01:30:02]

And I think giving them some different options to look at and to review, who knows that, maybe some things that can be exchanged between HB 14 and 15. And I just mentioned those two right now because those are only two bills I know that have opportunity to move forward anyway, and then maybe some information that could be exchanged between the two. But if we just have one instrument and just one attempt, and don't have an option to look at and discuss and maybe I think it leads to better compromise if you have more than one path that you're trying to follow. But I appreciate your comments, Mr. Vice Chairman.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Thank you, Representative Duplessis. Representative Ivey has questions and comments.

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: Thank you, Mr. Pro Tem. Representative Jenkins, I appreciate your efforts as someone who's tried to work on difficult legislation, especially when there's only so many people you've been authoring bills. It's easy to throw stones when you've not put in the time. So, I appreciate your efforts in trying to produce some options for us to consider. You provide a perspective and I think that's what each of these maps do with the authors and kind of what they're doing is they provide a perspective on how to possibly go about solving the problem we have to solve and redistricting. So, I appreciate your perspective. Would you say that your efforts to revise each district were comprehensive?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Yes. I'll put it this way, Representative Ivey. We have to go back to the approach to HB 15. What we were trying to do was address population issues, but at the same time, we were doing the best we could not to be disruptive to existing district lines and communities of interest that are all in the place. So, we tried not to go into the --

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: Sure. And I can appreciate that approach.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: [INDISCERNIBLE 00:17:08], we were not trying to fix it.

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: And I appreciate that approach. If you had to guess, because I asked Mr. Stefanski this, or Chairman Stefanski the other day, about how much time do you think you put into the creation of this map?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I believe we actually started -- It's been several months.

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: Couple hundred hours, you think, or more?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I can't remember when we initially had the meeting that here with Chairman Stefanski and others. But that's what really got us -- I can't remember exactly.

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: Okay, all right.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: It goes back that far, I could tell you that up until last night, we were still looking at this process.

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: All right.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: But I know that was sometime last year that we had that meeting with Chairman Stefanski.

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: Sure. So, many districts appear to be roughly the same. How many

1 districts, if you had to guess, had little to no
2 change, you know, plus or minus of couple precincts?
3 Would you say that's a majority or --
4 EDWARD WISHAM: Yeah, partly. Yeah, I would say
5 close to --
6 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I would say the
7 majority of them had no change.
8 REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: Plus or minus, one or
9 two, no real change. Okay. In EBR, East Baton Rouge
10 Parish, it seems like there was very little change in
11 the Parish. Does this approach assume that the
12 districts in their current configuration are somewhat
13 ideal in how they represent their communities?
14 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I can answer the
15 question this way, and it kind of goes back to what
16 we said. What we tried to base that upon was what was
17 being reported to us that delegations had met and
18 worked either coming together on what they wanted
19 their area to appear to be. So, we tried to adopt
20 that as much as we could.
21 REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: Yeah, I mean, again,
22 I don't recall any conversations from East Baton
23 Rouge Parish's perspective. I think there's a lot of
24 missed opportunities here, and I think this is a key
25 difference between the approach that our chairman

took with meeting with individual members and really trying to understand the districts at a very fundamental level. Because in some cases, and I'm going to use the City of Central as my district as an example. Representative Hodges, she represents part of the northern most part of the City of Central, and it's four precincts. Mildly populated. And the City of Central is small enough that it can fit entirely into its own district with additional population that kind of represent part of South East Baton Rouge as well.

[01:35:05]

And so, with a few minor changes, I was able just to get those three additional precincts and to make the community of interest, which is the City of Central, a whole community represented. And again, I'm termed out, but whoever comes next, they have that one representative and not have to deal with someone who's across the river in Livingston Parish, again, when it's not necessary. Sometimes it's not the case and we have to do what we have to do and I'm all for that. But I think there's some potential missed opportunities like that. Very low-hanging fruit, not very disruptive. And unless you speak to each member, I think those few small changes of

1 precinct here or there can actually complete a
2 community of interest and just make it a lot better.
3 And so, I think there's a lot of low-hanging fruit
4 left on a tree here respectfully.
5 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: As I say it now, we
6 saw members coming in as late as this morning on HB
7 14. So, I'm going to say again --
8 REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: It's a work in
9 progress, absolutely. And I appreciate and I know
10 that you're willing to work with anybody and try to
11 address it. and I acknowledge that and I appreciate
12 that. Okay. All right. Section 2 of the Voting Rights
13 Act. Your bill has a 29 majority-minority district,
14 number of districts. Do you believe that your bill
15 violates Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act?
16 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: No. I know we are
17 both at 29, but like I said, I think the route that
18 we're taking --
19 REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: And I'm not trying to
20 compare that to the other bill. Generally, just on
21 your bill, do you believe that it doesn't and why
22 not?
23 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Because I don't
24 think we -- in this bill, I don't think we've done
25 anything to dilute any kind of minority of voting

1 strength or to destroy any kind of minority district
2 or anything of that nature. So, I mean, this bill
3 doesn't do that in my opinion.
4 REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: Okay. Well, you've
5 sat on the road shows with me and in this committee,
6 and heard a whole lot of testimony and much has been
7 said specifically over the last several months about
8 the state's black minority population consisting of
9 one third of the state's total population. And that
10 by not adding more majority-minority seats and
11 multiple maps but in this case, the State House map
12 that it would violate Section 2 of the Voting Rights
13 Act and would likely end up in court. You know, again
14 testimony yesterday pretty much every day in
15 opposition to some of these other bills. The standard
16 is if you can draw it based on how it was explained
17 to us by some representatives of the NAACP LDF and
18 others is that if you can draw it, then you have to.
19 And again, you recognized early on that it's a real
20 tremendous challenge when you get down into the
21 weeds, particularly at the house level. Every map
22 levels can be different houses, very, very small. And
23 so, if there's -- The most possible opportunity to
24 adding minority representation you would imagine
25 would have to be at the house level, and that hasn't

happened. You explained that you showed great deference to preserving existing districts and things like that. And so, what's the difference between your map not violating Section 2? And based on testimony we heard against HB 14 and it violating Section 2 simply because it didn't add majority-minority representation when we had estimates up to needing additional nine seats.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Once again, I say this, you have gerrymandering, you have voter suppression, you have diluted black voting strength. You have a number of different violations or challenges that can come forward, okay. When I speak about my particular bill and I'll speak about my particular bill, okay. I feel like we did not go in and destroy an existing black district being District 23. We did not disperse that population in a manner that is and put them into districts that reduce their voting strength. That's one of the main things I think we were trying to avoid. As well as going down into Districts 62 and 63 trying to make 62 a majority-black seat.

[01:40:00]

But in order to do that, you had to go in and reduce minority population in another existing

minority district. So we're affecting all of these minority districts trying to get to 29. I will bill 15 does not do that. So I think the route that you--

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: Do you feel there's fewer ripples with your method to preserving the 29?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Right, yeah. The method that we are using I think is a safer method now. That does not in my mind take away from those who advocate and I think I asked this earlier that if we could get additional districts that we should be trying to get those additional districts, and I would applaud anyone that [INDISCERNIBLE 01:40:48] that could come to the table and show that and do that, okay? In fact,--

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: Viable maps, right? Because some of them are not practical and we may be possible in certain communities but it really just segments and just really fractures the actual representation.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Right. So, I don't want to take away from any argument or legal argument that someone may have, this is -- there are other minority districts that could have been drawn and if they help, viable map as you said that could show that, I think they have a right to challenge.

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: Sure. But they could challenge your map then.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I think any of these maps we've done could be challenged.

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: Sure.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I mean, no--

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: And that's the difficulty in trying to understand fundamentally what the real standard is and why -- if this goes to court what the judiciary is going to really hone in on in the review process. You know, I appreciate even though that you are affiliated directly with the Democrat Party. I trust the efforts have not been partisan in nature and any magnitude that's perceptible. And so, I appreciate that. But, you know, I'm wondering if we're going to have any opposition -- hear from red – If there's any red cards Mr. Chairman or Pro Tem on this. Do we have any red cards?

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: We do have some red cards, but they're not wishing to speak.

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: Okay. So anyway, that is a concern is how you all's this map doesn't violate Section 2 based on the standards identified

by some of the advocates for additional minority representation.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I think those are -- I can say once again, those may be different challenges that they raised. When I spoke on mine, I'm speaking on the fact that we -- I don't think we deluded voting strength, or tried to create a minority district by disrupting or destroying two other minority districts. So, that's why I'm at on that now. If there are persons who have viable maps, I'd love to see them--

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: Well, that's the issue, right? When you have 80%, 90% minority population, right? That means -- Again, you were on the road show and we weren't able to really respond to public comment but, you know, there's a bit of a fence that I personally took to some of the harsh criticism. Now while the current maps are none of our doing, right? The packing and cracking conversation and so it's curious, you know – It's not curious, we work together. I understand your practical approach. But what some of the public doesn't understand some of the people who've come and thankfully testified at the various redistricting meetings and even in this committee. The packing and cracking issue in some of

these communities where you have higher population of minorities and there's no real effort to maybe unpack some of that. And so, the criticism, let's say your map or even you know, whoever's map ends up passing if it's kind of the same 29, it's probably going to have about the same in the sense of minority percentages and ratios, it'll be fairly similar. And so, how do we deal with the harsh criticism there when even you all in your own opportunity didn't possibly take that opportunity to try to unpack some of those minority condensed districts.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Well, I'll say again, going back to the approach that we had with House Bill 15. I know it sounds like a broken record, okay. We did look at that. We did look to see if there were some additional minority districts that we could draw as it relates to House Bill 15. I'm not saying someone else could not come up with something beyond the 29 districts.

[01:45:00]

But our approach was to try not to disrupt some of the existing districts that was there. That was a part of our approach to where we were trying to go with all of this.

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: And I can appreciate that. And one of the common things that I specifically recall throughout all of the meetings and what went was not a partisan, was not a racial theme was we want maps that reflect us, not you, you know? Like, and so, to the extent that focusing on preserving things, especially on a house level scale, I think doesn't really achieve an objective of really trying to create districts that more accurately and adequately reflect the people that whomever is elected there will serve. And so, by focusing on that, you know, specifically the house level where there's the most opportunity for adjustment, I think this falls fairly short of that objective. Next, so, I want to point out that the approach that the speaker took on HB 1 with the congressional map was the same approach. He took the same approach as you, it made sense. This approach is again, while I'm making some critique here, I also recognize with the speakers that it's not a bad approach or a wrong approach to start with what you've got, see where the population shifted, and from there, try to make adjustments as necessary to make a map that works and you've done that. Functionally, it works and I think again, some of the issues and concerns with the

northwest corner of the state, you provide an alternative option that I think certainly merit serious consideration. But by the point is, they're the same approach and the speaker received harsh criticism from opponents on that same approach of why didn't you do this? Why didn't you do that? And so again it goes back -- on this map, why didn't you achieve that what everyone else was expecting anybody else who's drawing a map that doesn't add minority-majority districts achieve?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: This would be my point of view. The congressional map to me this is my point of view. I mean, it's somewhat of a different geography and I think if we're just isolating on the congressional map and not talking about these house district maps, it certainly has been shown that an additional minority seat can be drawn. So I think --

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: Well, it was a [INDISCERNIBLE 01:48:04], right?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: There actually were some - I'm understanding that there were bills actually filed over in the senate side. I mean, that clearly show that you could draw an additional compact effective minority seat and so, I think that

was admitted to said, you could get an influence district, okay?

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: Sure.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: So to come out of that congressional process, a status quo to me is -- I don't think we talking to apples and apples--

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: That's a much -- In my opinion, again, the smaller the district or you know the population, the -- you have more puzzle pieces to work with. With the congressional maps, the districts are so large and communities of interest, you know, I mean example, like, East Baton Rouge Parish, there's multiple ways that get cut up three ways in one map, it gets cut up in two and a couple others, and again, not trying to get on that map, but the point is, it really becomes more of a challenge to more accurately or adequately draw a map that represents the people in that effort to get a majority-minority district, which I'm not saying isn't warranted that effort, but the lower-hanging fruit is this house map and that effort doesn't seem was made.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I guess what I'm trying to say Representative I have a --

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: I know your approach. I understand your approach, but --

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I think the -- if you're bringing the congressional map into this conversation I'm saying, I don't think we're talking about the same thing. I think the geography about that is different and I do believe that it has been shown. The bill has been filed and embedded in that committee over there that can be achieved. So, I don't think we're talking about the same things here.

[01:50:00]

It's just my opinion and I can respect what you're trying to say.

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: Well, I mean, drawing lines, right? At the house level, they're much smaller bound districts, fewer precincts. So I mean, you can grab the right exact amount of number of precincts and skip stuff a lot easier than when you're just got a color big by Parish basically, you know? So anyway, I don't want to belabor the point anymore. But you know, I think there's been a lot of criticism in this process and until those who've actually come and tried it like yourself, it's hard to realize how difficult it is, and I just want the public to be aware that yourself having made

1 considerable effort with additional resources to help
2 you try and work on this map over months, the best
3 you could do was maintaining the current number of
4 majority-minority seats, you know?
5 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I'll say again. It
6 could be better, and if someone has --
7 REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: But it could be.
8 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: No, no. Understand
9 what I'm saying. No, no. Understand what I'm saying.
10 I'm not saying that this bill is better than someone
11 who may come with a bill that adds a district or add
12 two districts, okay? What I'm saying about this
13 particular bill that we did, we tried to make certain
14 that we did not -- we tried to say, look, we don't
15 have to go in and destroy the existing districts to
16 get to where we are trying to go. And I think that's
17 the big difference.
18 REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: And I appreciate
19 that. I do. I'm not saying it's wrong. I'm trying to
20 bring into context the criticism that we have
21 received that we will continue to receive and then
22 potentially, at the judicial level, have to try to
23 survive.
24
25

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I don't think you just going to spin the fact that is 29 and 29. That's what I'm saying. I still think --

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: I don't disagree. There's a few other elements involved potentially but -- So with regard to the standard of having to add additional majority-minority seats in order to comply with Section 2, which is been clearly stated against with some of the advocacy groups here. Yours doesn't do that. None of the other ones do on the house map that we've seen. And so, whose responsibility is it to actually achieve that standard of additional majority-minority seats in the house map? Whose responsibility is it?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I think it's our body.

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: The body.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: The legislation needs to come together. You have House Bill 14, you have this bill and maybe some others. I don't know. And I think we need to look at the various options and see what is the best thing for our state. I just want to be clear, okay? I know House Bill 15, if you just look at the [PH 01:53:01] wrong number saying 29 and 29 may not look distinguished from House Bill 14,

1 but I think I talked quite a bit about what I think
2 [INDISCERNIBLE 01:53:13] and that is how you get to
3 that 29.
4 REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: Sure. So, do you
5 personally believe that Section 2 of the Voting
6 Rights Act based on the current population of black
7 minority population State of Louisiana that if we do
8 not increase the number of majority-minority
9 districts from 29 to anything some range of
10 acceptability, do you believe that that map on that
11 sole fact would violate Section 2 of Voting Rights
12 Act?
13 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: It could. I mean,
14 you know, my belief is that if you can -- if it can
15 be shown that you can --
16 REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: I promise you, I can
17 draw maps. I can draw a map to add majority. I mean,
18 again, with no deference to all of the other things
19 to communities of interest and all that. I mean, if
20 we just ignore every other factor, I can draw a map.
21 I'm sure many of us. You could a draw map if we just
22 ignored everything else. And so, what's the standard
23 there? I mean, does Section 2 require us to ignore
24 everything else if, you know, I mean again, it's just
25 color by number at precinct level. We can draw all

kinds of stuff and we can get additional majority-minority seats in several areas.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Like I said, I don't want to make someone else's argument on it but my understanding of I think what has been [INDISCERNIBLE 01:54:44] there is, if it can be shown that it can be done and should be done. And for some reason, it's not being done then that maybe some challenge that exists there. With this particular map, and I tried to spend some time at the beginning talking about why we approached it the way we did.

[01:55:00]

That doesn't necessarily mean that someone cannot present a map that adds a district or adds two districts. I mean, I think the vice chairman even talked about that a few minutes ago, even with what could be done with House Bill 14. You could move District 5 to New Orleans, flipping it to a minority district, leave District 23 as is, and you could go in and make that exchange between District 62 and 63. That would add one, that would be 30. So I'm just saying, I think different bills are being presented with different options and different plans, but that doesn't close the door on someone else coming forward and said, "I have a viable map that says, you can

draw an additional or two additional minority seats," that's a different legal argument.

REPRESENTATIVE BARRY IVEY: Sure. Well, and again, this is my final comment. I appreciate your indulgence Mr. Pro Tem. Is the inconsistency in the criticism in the efforts that have been made that you know were difficult, you know, in HB 14 and 15 and anybody else who's tried to draw a map, it's hard. And so, for some interest here, and I don't know if they're here, I'm very curious if they'll have a green card or red card in on your bill. We heard from them yesterday on HB 14 and the criticisms of the failure to add additional majority-minority seats in the house and so, we'll see what their position is today with yours. Thank you for your efforts and looking forward to continue working with you on this.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I hope that be there proponents or opponents that they will understand that, you know, we're trying to take a different approach on this and that needs to be a part of the understanding of what we're doing with HB 15.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Thank you Mr. Ivey. And just to clarify because I know there's a lot of discussion about this. Representative Jenkins, do you think that HB 15 is legal, correct?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I think what my answer was, I think the question was since it was 29, 29, you know--

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: No, I'm just asking. Do you think it's legal? Period. End of the day, it's legal?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: I mean, you wouldn't publish a map or try to push a map that's unfair, correct?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: No.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Okay. Now, Representative Des -- no, it's -- Light up for the committee members, there was a problem with the pushing of the buttons desk tells technically in the cube but I think we acknowledge it was actually Representative Carter who pushed different buttons. I'm going to go to Representative Carter and then Daryl I'm going to come back to you after, okay?

REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER, SR.: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Pro Tem. Let's get some straight from the [INDISCERNIBLE 01:57:44]. You asked several times did you talk to every member of the house or did you talk to [INDISCERNIBLE 01:57:53] to the democrats who all you talk to in generating this map? You have somebody

from staff from the Democratic Party apparently with you, helping you do this map. Is this a conflict? I don't see the conflict in the way it's done because -- but my concern is, there's no way you could have gotten 105 members to give you input on your map because you're not the speaker and you're not the chairman of the committee, okay? To start with. If the speaker calls me and he says, I need to talk to you about your map. I'm running down there and everybody else is too, okay? So, you can send emails to every Republican, every Democrat in this body and more in the like you don't get a very little response. They're just [INDISCERNIBLE 01:58:42] because you're not the speaker. You're not the chairman of the committee. You don't have the resources, nor do you have the call on the resources necessary to compete with the speaker, or the chairman of committees. Would you agree with that?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Yes, but if I can elaborate [INDISCERNIBLE 01:58:58] I still want everyone to understand what -- With this approach, what we did was received information what delegations to admit and had some idea what they wanted that area to be. So, we kind of [INDISCERNIBLE 01:59:12].

REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER, SR.: I understand, but I just want to throw it out because it's not -- you're not comparing apples with apples [INDISCERNIBLE 01:59:18] just two different thing you know, resources. Now, we passed legislation to determine the criteria we would use to draw these maps to do this re-apportion, okay? And included in that law that we passed, it's a state law. One of the things in it is Section 2 of Voting Rights Act. Now, there's been an effort to make you put on the record that you had a good maps so it served the argument that 14 is a good map.

[02:00:00]

And because you are [INDISCERNIBLE 02:00:01] 19 minority group. 29. But, when you look at the population, Section 2 of Voting Rights Act, I think there are some [PH 02:00:14] failure to have clarity on what Section 2 really speaks about. If you want to satisfy Section 2 and comply with the statue we passed, say we will draw this map. It is not -- we have over 33.67 population minorities non-African-Americans in the state, non-whites in the state. And 57% identifies as white all, that sort of thing. So in order to comply with Voting Rights Act, you have to first give those people an opportunity to let a

1 candidate of their choice that 33.7%, which is about
2 35 districts. If you did that, it'd be about 35
3 districts. That's not to state that its' possible to
4 do and it's fairly difficult to do as you - I see you
5 all - What you did is difficult and what speaker did
6 and the chairman did, it's very difficult. Let's go
7 [INDISCERNIBLE 02:01:09]. It's got to be difficult.
8 It supposed to be difficult. It's understandable it's
9 difficult. But the law requires an effort that an
10 effort be made to achieve the minorities'
11 representation and the state reflected in the same
12 representation and its body, okay? It's the effort.
13 If you can show that you made an effort and that
14 because you couldn't -- because these other problems
15 you had, you couldn't reach that 35 representatives
16 out of 105 or 34 that you would comply with the
17 Voting Rights Act. In my opinion, based on what I
18 heard you say and what I've heard the speaker say and
19 the chairman say, neither one of you complied to
20 Voting Rights Act. Neither one. Both these maps are
21 subject to be challenged [INDISCERNIBLE 02:02:06]
22 because I never heard you say just like I didn't hear
23 the speaker say or the chairman say that there was an
24 effort made to get more minorities in the districts
25 in the legislature. I didn't get the impressed in

your approach to this thing. My mission in this Bill 15 is get more minorities in the legislature. I got the impression from what I heard was that you were trying to keep -- deal with the change in population shift from the northern part of state to the southern part of state and you chose to take District 5 and move it rather than District 23. It seemed your challenge was focused on not doing [PH 02:02:55] away with District 23, but if you had to choose one, do it with District 5.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Right.

REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER, SR.: I never heard you say I started this mission with this bill and [INDISCERNIBLE 02:03:06] in an effort to create more minority districts, okay? We just assume -- some people assume because you are minority and that you're leader of the Democratic Party here that that was your mission. But that's really was not what you testified to, that's not your mission.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: That was not -

REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER, SR.: In this bill. In this bill. I mean, I noted that is your concern but that is not your mission in this bill. In this bill, your mission was limited. Your mission was to try to hold together a District 23 that would

1 enhance a minority opportunity to be elected from
2 that population, for the geographic area and in order
3 to do that, you took 5, which is a primary Republican
4 district from what I understand. While 14, the
5 chairman and the speaker took 23. They protected 5.
6 They did not take 5. That's a choice they made. Why
7 they made that choice? They said they could talk to
8 everybody. Why you made your choice, because you said
9 you're trying to hold 23 black population,
10 represented by black, represented or not, both --
11 Neither one can run again I understand that both 5
12 and 23 are term-limited. So, you both have good
13 reason and logical reasons to take that approach. You
14 took another one. You went with -- to help the
15 democratic candidate and a minority population, to
16 keep it hold, keep a district there and they moved
17 that district to New Orleans. Basically, both players
18 kind of move things in New Orleans, shifted to New
19 Orleans. But you did it in a way in order to try to
20 protect 23. Now, all I'm saying is, let's cut the
21 bull, okay? You try to hit the democratic candidate,
22 the democratic district, the black district.
23 [02:05:01]
24 The black district here trying to help the
25 Republican District predominant, a Republican

1 District, okay? So it is a matter of philosophy. They
2 got the [INDISCERNIBLE 02:05:07] they will have their
3 way, okay? That's just the way it is in life. Now,
4 the more important question is whether either one of
5 you are doing what you supposed to be doing. What you
6 supposed to be doing is creating more minority
7 district if possible, if possible. That's the
8 mission. The mission should not be to say District 23
9 because of a democratic discourse or a large black
10 populated district or a lack of be liked represented
11 by Bernarde. It's not to protect the Republic
12 District 5, is likely to be represented by a
13 Republican. That is not what this is supposed to be
14 about. It's supposed to be about writing a district
15 that reflect the population of this state to be
16 represented in this house and that Section 2 of
17 Voting Rights Act to be complied with. If you take
18 the approach that I'm going to try to create some
19 more minority district. This is my mission to create
20 more minority districts. And you take into
21 consideration factors that we've always said that's
22 important to us, keep communities of interest
23 together when we can, keep precincts full, that sort
24 of thing. And you still can't create 35 black
25 districts. Do you have [INDISCERNIBLE 02:06:16]

1 comply with Section 2 of the Civil Rights Act? But if
2 you do not even put in the record what else that you
3 [INDISCERNIBLE 02:06:23] to try to create those 35
4 minority district that you have not complied? So,
5 neither one of you complied. So whether or not you
6 survive the test of the court would determine whether
7 or not someone else will come up with a district or
8 someone can come up with some party, some plaintiff
9 can come up with a district that have more minority
10 rep districts more than 29, be it 30, 31, 32,
11 whatever the case may be, and then explain why they
12 couldn't get more. That's the plan that's going to
13 survive the courts. Now, another point given to the
14 present posture of the Supreme Court. They just threw
15 out a case in Alabama -- a later case stand in
16 Alabama, didn't grant, denied an injunction in a case
17 in Alabama, was clearly leaving more conservative
18 courts said that Alabama Congressional District was
19 illegal but as [INDISCERNIBLE 02:07:22] stands, we
20 may be wasting our time here given what the Supreme
21 Court going to do in Alabama case later on but my
22 point is, I don't want nobody to think because your
23 district only have 29 minority district in it, that
24 makes both your district and 14 district illegal,
25 okay? And actually 14 served my interest in my

1 district better than your district, your bill but 14
2 served my area better. I had an opportunity to sit
3 down and talk with the speaker and the chairman and
4 I'm sure if I sat down and talk to you about my same
5 concern, you probably have the same type of district,
6 my district be dealt with the same way as they did
7 was, okay? So all I'm saying is, I don't think, I
8 don't read into your map, your bill, a bill that
9 meets the muster of Section 2 nor do I read and 14
10 meets the muster of Section 2 because I haven't had
11 any testimony that whatever's were made in order to
12 create these additional four, three, four, five black
13 minority districts, is all I'm saying.
14 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Yeah, and I can
15 appreciate what you're saying there, Representative
16 Carter. I really can, okay? And I'm going to say
17 again, okay, I still don't think that this come down
18 to a 29/29 argument as far as certain challenges that
19 can be made, okay? I do believe that the pros that we
20 try to take and the route that we're trying to take,
21 even though we have the same number of districts, is
22 one way we're not deluding black voting [PH 02:09:06]
23 strength especially when we're just walking about
24 District 23 and unfortunate, that's the district that
25 happened. It could've been any other one and I'd say

the same thing. And disbursing it to a joining district where that population cannot really elect a candidate. And I did not want to see a scenario either where we're trying to create an additional black district such as what's being done in 14, by reducing the black population in an existing industry, okay? So that's kind of what we -- I still think that that is a significant difference in what we're doing. So I'm not ascribe into that idea because I have 29 and HB 14 has 29 that there cannot be some kind of challenges to what has happened with HB 14.

[02:09:59]

I'm not ascribe in any at all. And I mean, you brought that Alabama case, we do need people to realize that the court has not ruled on the merits of that case. They took into consideration, it was getting close to their election time. The merits of that case, there still needs to be authored but once again, this is an attempt for [INDISCERNIBLE 02:10:21] an attempt. I think a question in my mind for this committee is, are we going to let options be available for this body to deliberate over? And I think that that's important that there be some differences.

REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER, SR.: And I just wanted to sum up my whole inquiry with you is that if I had to judge the two, 14 and 15, your 15 does more of an effort to try to preserve the minority district because you try to preserve 23 but 14 creates another minority districts. So your [INDISCERNIBLE 02:11:02] and somehow it creates a little minority district and you protect 23, the 23rd district.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: But it's a [INDISCERNIBLE 02:11:12] minority district to try to create it. So we don't want anything that was an additional district. Now, what they did show was if they wanted to [INDISCERNIBLE 02:11:21] that they could have.

REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER, SR.: Yeah, and that's the point I want to make.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: That's why I think both of these need to be out there because they could've sent 5 to New Orleans. They could have used 62 and 63 to do it but then --

REPRESENTATIVE WILFORD CARTER, SR.: And that's what I agree with you on. I agree with you on that. You did more effort to try to protect a minority district and now create up a minority district. While both created a minority, one gave up a minority

1 district. So I think it's much -- we got a long ways
2 to go to resolve this issue with a bill that is going
3 to be unchallengeable or a bill that's going to be
4 survived the challenge and I think it wouldn't hurt
5 to have both bills on the floor where we can work
6 with.
7 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Thank you.
8 REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Thank you. And
9 before [INDISCERNIBLE 02:12:11] more questions, we're
10 going to pause for a second and recognize
11 Representative Mike Johnson for personal privilege.
12 REPRESENTATIVE MIKE JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr.
13 Acting Chairman. I have the honor of introducing some
14 young people who are here today that wanted to see
15 what goes on in the legislature and we have with us
16 today the members of Scout Troops 626 and Cub Scout
17 Pack 626 from District 27. I thought this would -- I
18 did not give them each one of them red and green
19 card. So I just wanted you to know that but you know,
20 I thought this would be good for them but I also
21 thought it would be good for us. Look into the faces
22 of these young people. Every single one of them will
23 be voting in the next 10 years, within the next 10
24 years. So the plans that we come up with this week
25 and next week and that we pass along, these are the

young people who will -- we may be gone, Sam. You and I maybe, you know but they will be here. You know what I mean? You're not going to still be at that table. But I just wanted to give them an opportunity to meet some of my good friends, distinguished colleagues, but also I wanted us to take a look at them because this is the future in District 27 and what we do these next few weeks will affect them. So thank you for indulging me for a couple of minutes. Thank y'all for being so well-behaved. Y'all don't have to stay very long if you don't want to. Tanner's got eyes. No, I don't need to tell him that.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Thank you all for coming to Capitol. I just want to put on the record that Representative Johnson is pulling out all the stops to save his district including [PH 02:14:01] bringing in. Including bringing in the scouts as a form of intimidation or pulling on hard strings. He's really going the extra mile. All right, Representative Deshotel with a question.

REPRESENTATIVE DARYL ANDREW DESHOTEL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker pro tem. Rep Jenkins, I'm looking at your plan and specifically in my area. Obviously, when we look at these plans, the first thing we go do is look at our area. My district currently encompasses one

parish and only one parish. It's the only house district that that does that. Obviously, we lost some populations. I'm going to have to go outside my geographic parish boundaries but I'm a little concerned about your plan. One of the things that I think about is preserving communities of interest. I'm really big on that, preserving communities of interest.

[02:15:00]

And I've always considered the Cajun Crossroads. I don't know if you knew that. When you get above Avoyelles, things change and they change pretty dramatic. In your plan, I would be in five different parishes instead of one, 28. So 91% of my constituents would be from the Avoyelles Parish and the other 9% would be split between four of the parishes. So I'm a new rep and I'm used to only representing one parish. In your opinion or with these people that take up the other 9%, would they be represented equally as the other 91%? I mean, I would try but I think it'd be pretty hard.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Give us one second.

REPRESENTATIVE DARYL ANDREW DESHOTEL: Yes, sir.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Pull up my information on it.

EDWARD WISHAM: Okay, I see what you're saying.

REPRESENTATIVE DARYL ANDREW DESHOTEL: So, but would it be --

EDWARD WISHAM: Yes, I agree with you.

REPRESENTATIVE DARYL ANDREW DESHOTEL: So I don't think it would be fair to those people. We have 106 in LaSalle, 212 in Catahoula, 741 in Rapides and 3,000 in Evangeline. I just think it would be pretty hard to try to represent those people equally when we talking about roads or capital outlay and -- I mean, that's just me looking at this as a new legislator. I mean, would you agree with that, that's kind of --

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: We're certainly would be perfectly willing to take a look at their concern and see what we can do to address it.

REPRESENTATIVE DARYL ANDREW DESHOTEL: And I think that's brings up the bigger question, is this a reoccurring theme or is this just one time in my area? In other words, do we have these communities of interest divided in your plan, that maybe, that aren't in this committee haven't told you about yet? And I'm a little concerned that we've done that or this plan may do that.

EDWARD WISHAM: Well, not only in places that were in the central part of the state where there are

more, a lot of times, more land than people, then you have some of those issues and that's from not being able to talk to someone. So, no, it's not in a lot of different places, only in certain places where I had to go grab population.

REPRESENTATIVE DARYL ANDREW DESHOTEL: Well, unfortunately, I serve that area so I'm really concerned about my area.

EDWARD WISHAM: No, that's no problem and that's why we're having some action now so we can now make a decision.

REPRESENTATIVE DARYL ANDREW DESHOTEL: So I would just, just like I said, I'm a little bit concerned that we may have multiple -- this is reoccurring theme here and I don't know for sure, but I would like to hear from my colleagues if there's some other places that this is happening. But again, I appreciate. I know it's a tough to task and I know it's hard especially if you haven't talked to the members in the areas. You know, we were at the roadshow, Rep Jenkins and I don't know if you remember the gentleman from Rapides, his comment to me but Representative Johnson remembers it. It wasn't directed towards me but it was, he was trying to acknowledge the fact that Avoyelles was the Cajun

Crossroads and he really didn't want representation from Avoyelles. So that would actually go along with Catahoula and LaSalle and Rapides and you know, I love all those people but I think we need to really be mindful of our communities of interest and I just want to point that out to you.

EDWARD WISHAM: Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: And I appreciate that and as I said, we can certainly take a look at that particular concern. I know I did go through the bill to try to see about the various parish lands and I did not have a lot of them to jump at me to the extent of what you just described but it's certainly a concern that we need to look at. I would agree with you.

REPRESENTATIVE DARYL ANDREW DESHOTEL: Thank you, Rep. Appreciate you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker pro tem.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Thank you, Mr. Deshotel. Representative Thomas for question.

REPRESENTATIVE POLLY THOMAS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker pro tem. Good afternoon.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Good afternoon, Representative.

REPRESENTATIVE POLLY THOMAS: I'm curious about some conversation that we had a little bit earlier today.

[02:20:00]

And that was regarding how many Republicans are represented, how many Democrats are represented and how many people with no party are represented? And I believe that I heard you say that there are 68 Republicans currently and in your plan, 34 Democrats currently and in your plan, 3 no party currently and in your plan. Did I hear that correctly?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Yes, that's what I said.

REPRESENTATIVE POLLY THOMAS: Okay, then I need you to explain how moving House District 5 which had almost stable population and actually a little bit of increase, represented by a Republican and moving that to New Orleans area which according to the numbers that I see presented in this bill, would more than likely be represented by a Democrat? How does that keep the numbers the same?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Give me just a minute. I'm trying to get that back in my mind. I made it, so we stand corrected on that. You're right. I think that you would have, like, 5 will become

Democrat. I think my thought was that we had a District, is it 91, that was --

REPRESENTATIVE POLLY THOMAS: District 91 is represented by a Democrat and according to the numbers, will continue to be represented by Democrat.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Right, and I think I may have been mixing it up with my number of minority seat. So I may stand corrected on that, Representative Thomas.

REPRESENTATIVE POLLY THOMAS: So it would be moving from 68 Republicans to 67 Republicans and moving from 34 Democrats to 35 Democrats under your plan?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I believe you are correct.

REPRESENTATIVE POLLY THOMAS: Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: And I stand corrected on that. That was not deliberate. I think I may have been mixing it up how we were shifting the numbers as it related to the minority seats. I think it was a wash-on, some of the minority seats [INDISCERNIBLE 02:23:03] mixing it up.

REPRESENTATIVE POLLY THOMAS: Well, there's a possibility, I would believe that because the northern part of the state lost 50,000 residents, is

that roughly the correct number? And moving to Orleans Parish which gained 40-something thousand, that a better swap would be losing a Democrat seat from the north and moving it to Orleans, which is more than likely going to remain Democrat. Do you agree with that?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: No, I do not agree with that. I think what we had when we looked in the northern area and the approach that we took was to hopefully not affect someone who wanted to run again. And in the area where everybody had, I think District 5 I believe was the only seat that someone had turned out on.

REPRESENTATIVE POLLY THOMAS: There's actually four in the northern part of the state, two Democrats, two Republicans.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I've seen it there in that in that area of cattle where you had the significant loss. The District 5 would have been the only one that --

REPRESENTATIVE POLLY THOMAS: It didn't lose. It gained population. It's still within the deviation but it didn't gain. I mean, it didn't lose, it gained.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I agree but like I said, with the approach being that the surrounding districts had members who could, if they wanted to, run for office again and have another term that was the term limited district, was District 5 is what I'm saying. And I agree with what you're saying now about the District 5 had some increase. But what we were able to do, Representative Thomas, is help a number of Republican and Democratic districts in that area getting to come back into deviation because we were all, all of us had lost.

[02:25:07]

REPRESENTATIVE POLLY THOMAS: I understand that but earlier conversation was that the numbers of Republicans, Democrats and no party would remain the same and indeed and in fact, you agree that that is not the case.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Yeah, I misspoke on that.

REPRESENTATIVE POLLY THOMAS: Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker pro tem.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I don't have a problem admitting it at all. I misspoke on that and I'm sorry.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Thank you. Representative Malinda White with a question.

REPRESENTATIVE MALINDA WHITE: Good evening, Representative Jenkins. I think it's evening.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: It feels like it.

REPRESENTATIVE MALINDA WHITE: It is afternoon, non-minutes. I felt the need to speak on this. We spoke about it earlier before about the North Shore area and particularly, I just feel the need to say this on Washington Parish is a community of interest in particularly that we have this moment to become a whole that we could actually contain a district in one parish. And I will say in my experience and time here the legislature that the small section that was represented by someone else in my area and probably a lot of rural areas, everybody knows your [INDISCERNIBLE 02:26:24]. Okay? So I get the calls for needs of services connection to whatever across that river in Washington Parish. So I would just ask and the North Shore delegation and I'm speaking for that since there's no one here on this very narrow opportunity of members to speak on that North Shore delegation. We actually all met and met until we got a configuration that we all agreed to. Now, we have the largest growth in St. Tammany through the state,

right? So we've had to do a lot of looking and soul-searching and doing what we thought was the best idea for the North Shore region and the Florida parishes. Now, when you get more into the Florida parishes, I'm not as familiar, but I do know where I'll rule and we have similarities. So my question to you with was just, did you know that the speaker's bill would be able to contain a parish, a community of interest as a whole?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Yes, I believe when I looked at the bill that it did have that entire parish. Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE MALINDA WHITE: Right, and so from that point of view, and looking at my district because from my experience hereto that sometimes you're the only one fighting for your district, right? Okay. So that is my point on this is that for Washington Parish historically to become one parish contained, just makes sense for the community of interest. It cannot become a minority/majority any way we slice or dice it, the way I have looked at these maps. I've looked at all of them and as far as my particular district and the North Shore. So for the next thing that I look at then is community of interest and so I would just ask that we work

1 together on amending this particular area if we can
2 according to what the delegation has spoken and said
3 that mimics the speakers' feel and actuality. We all
4 met with John individually and I do understand what
5 the judge is saying here that you didn't have that
6 same opportunity to meet with every individual or you
7 felt you couldn't from what he said or we would have
8 gotten the response but we did and we would just ask
9 that that be taken into consideration based on the
10 community of interest and really trying to work
11 together in the North Shore delegation to grow our
12 economic as we've done in actuality but the next push
13 will be right before you get into Mississippi and
14 believe it or not, I don't [PH 02:29:24] see lines.
15 And I will tell you as a representative that I work
16 with Mississippi colleagues as well as Louisiana.
17 When I work with Congress on issues that we share a
18 river, we share. The rivers, Mother Nature knows no
19 boundaries. And so Malinda knows no boundaries and I
20 don't think a lot of people should have boundaries.
21 To be honest with you, I have reached out to not only
22 my congresswoman and man prior to that but I reached
23 out to where they are sitting at Congress and I know
24 this isn't the Congress map but I'm just going to --
25 [02:30:00]

--I'm wanting to make a point that whenever I need something done, I reach out to Congressman Scalise, Letlow because she's [INDISCERNIBLE 02:30:10]. Garret Graves because of where he sits in the issues that I'm dealing with on river and canals and things like that. Because I want to get something done for my people that I represent. I really don't care what party you are, what color you are. I like to get things done for my district. As a member and it represents that delegation as a whole, I just felt it necessary to really stress that point of opportunities for communities of interests to stay whole and also the difference between the urban and rural district that I represent. I just really wanted to make that point today and ask that you work with me on that in consideration. And I know that everything we do has a ripple effect. So, I'm not sure how the conclusion came to what would put me into some of [INDISCERNIBLE 02:31:06].

EDWARD WISHAM: Yeah.

REPRESENTATIVE MALINDA WHITE: I'm not sure how we arrived at that but this is your opportunity to work with all legislators. We're all here now and to make amendments and things that would - honestly, you're just going to have two instruments that look

very much alike that come down to the same results that are being approached in a different way. We all have that opportunity when it goes to the house floor to make changes.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Absolutely.

REPRESENTATIVE MALINDA WHITE: On either instrument.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Absolutely. Absolutely and we share that concern about communities of interests and like I say even this morning we had amendments in here trying to tweak things in HB14 so we certainly look forward to those opportunities hopefully to do that in HB15.

REPRESENTATIVE MALINDA WHITE: Representative Jenkins, I have said how much I've appreciated the staff and our Chairman and Vice Chairman here and their efforts and whatever but I want to tell you that I have utmost respect for you in your efforts, in what you've done with the loss of your life is tremendous. I pray for you every day. I can't imagine how that feels but I know what loss feels like. And for you to pick up something that is as difficult as this, to bring a bill to us to try to work together to achieve the goals that Federal Laws have regulated and put to us to mandate it and to try to balance all

of that, I just want to let you know how much respect I have for you as you balance your personal life and the lives of all of us in this effort and I want to say thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Thank you so much for those condolences and for your comments.

REPRESENTATIVE MALINDA WHITE: Thank you. That's all. I yield.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Thank you Representative White. And I got good news for your Representative Jenkins, your time at the table is almost done. You have one more set of questions from Representative Lyons.

REPRESENTATIVE RODNEY LYONS: Thank you Mr. Pro Tem. Representative Jenkins, I do commend you on the work here and you're almost time to clock out on the table now but it's been a while and certain things that I want to ask questions about that were covered as we went along this process here. I'm just going to go since I'm the last one apparently. This part here that's important. Have you ever driven to Grand Isle before and I'm going somewhere with that sir and I'm going to say because if you drive to Grand Isle, anyone who's ever driven to Grand Isle, you can't get there unless you drive on Highway 1.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Okay, all right.

REPRESENTATIVE RODNEY LYONS: And I want this process to be a trip to Grand Isle.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I understand.

REPRESENTATIVE RODNEY LYONS: So, what I'm saying is, as we talked about the parts of this thing and as now currently we have three bills and a file but you're presenting the second one and I remember the speakers are eloquently saying here at that table in the same chair you're in that this is my bill, my attempt, my opinion. There's going to be many bills or many people have opinions and things are going to happen that we work on to get to that point. And there's many factors as we know that were or may not have been included or considered in either bill based upon what the presenter talked about including yours today. So, you remember those conversations, right?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Absolutely.

REPRESENTATIVE RODNEY LYONS: Okay. So, as we look at those processes, one of the first things that we're talking about today and you can attest to that is everyone's [INDISCERNIBLE 02:35:02] back section to the [INDISCERNIBLE 02:35:02].

[02:35:02]

Is that correct? Whether or not the bill could be legal or the bill could sustain a challenge based upon it.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Correct.

REPRESENTATIVE RODNEY LYONS: And you were asked about yours. We were asked about House Bill 15. The speaker's bill is.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: 14

REPRESENTATIVE RODNEY LYONS: 14. Speaker's bill is same questions, correct?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Right.

REPRESENTATIVE RODNEY LYONS: So, as we look at that piece, we learn that through this process, the difference in the two bills as some characterization was that any - and everyone had an opportunity for input on their particular district and some of it by district, some by delegation, some by regions of the state and happen. And you weren't privy to conversating with everybody about all their conditions not based on the fact that you had no intention to do it. It's just based on the fact that some of this process similar is being similar to the ride to Grand Isle. Meaning that this is the only way to get there and this is the way on the table for us to get there. So, this is where you got to - the

route you got to come. So, you didn't - there's wasn't a sign saying another route to Grand Isle is by Highway Jenkins. That wasn't there. Am I correct in my characterization there sir? I do not usually speak without the parables and analogy like that to get everybody on board when you're dealing with a general project all the time. So, that hasn't happen. So, your inability to speak to everyone wasn't intentional in your part.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: No.

REPRESENTATIVE RODNEY LYONS: And it wasn't characterized as that. One of the other questions that was asked to you all and when you presented your map was there, you had a perspective of a democrat excite of it because you were a democrat and they may had been partisan in some degree. I lieu to the fact that even though the Chairman is the Chairman of Committee, presented a bill that he is republican and the majority of the members [INDISCERNIBLE 02:36:56] is republican and so you intend to think that it wouldn't be intentionally but the individuals will confer as to what they thought are - had any objections to what was presented by the speaker, would you agree or not?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Yes. I don't look at this bill as a democrat bill. I've not looked at the speaker's bill, chairman's bill as a republican bill. This is two different approaches to redistricting.

REPRESENTATIVE RODNEY LYONS: That's correct that's why we're here. If I remember right, the speaker the first that he presented his bill, he said that I'm going to let this bill lay here as he did. To record to this date, we have several amendments added, presented for that bill they got on, right? So, am I correct or not?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: That's correct.

REPRESENTATIVE RODNEY LYONS: So, that would not hinder any member from offer an amendment to your bill as we go forward. Would you be open that?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: That's correct.

REPRESENTATIVE RODNEY LYONS: Okay. And I'm assuming, the reason why we have those amendments added to that bill was because some members had either an issue or some corrections or changes to whatever happened in their districts or regions. Is that also a fair assessment to that?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I would agree.

REPRESENTATIVE RODNEY LYONS: And that would mean your bill were ought to have the same process to that

as we go forward so this will not be as I characterized it, a ride to Grand Isle. And with several options being on the table and several opportunities for input to that, I would think that the fair process that will not be a democratic or republican process or white or black process, just a democratic process of how we function here as body will be to have two instruments or your instrument travel the same pathway that where we get into where a member who may have a - because I'm sure now that there may be a member and based upon the testimony I'm hearing today regarding some of the colleagues, there are several members who may or may not be completely happy with how that map in that bill particularly is filed or laid out right now at this point. And to give them an opportunity to say okay well, let's work on something. So, maybe the bill that represent Jenkins has the region in it may be fine but it - something I can get done with my district or my region to offer an amendment. So, to give them an opportunity to do that, would that be fair?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE RODNEY LYONS: Okay. Now, I will be a part of the body's decision at that point. So,

what I'm saying is everything that I've relayed in my question to you oversight this, I would like this process to not be a trip to Grand Isle where you have to take Highway 1 in regards to how you drive by buggy, bike or truck. I want it to be a process to Louisiana where there's many road maps, many highways getting into this state to come to a conclusion so that your bill can come out of this committee and be fair.

[02:40:00]

Because there's members who don't sell in this committee who can't ask the questions that I'm asking and maybe some that who have issues with that - that's not here to do that but it can sit and lie over if it's possible and even goes to the floors with the other bill so that members want to add or change in trajectory based upon what's being provided in testimony or analysis they have opportunity to do so, would that be fair sir?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Yeah. I mean I'm perfectly willing to allow this bill to lie over. We had several concerns that came from members on this committee that I would like the opportunity to talk to them and see what need to do. Maybe gabble a bit more time to talk with other members now that the

debate has taken place and see if there are things that we can tweak. And if so, take a vote at that time on the bill. I don't have a problem with that. I'm not in no big rush to try to get it to the floor but I would like for that be at least some options for everybody to consider and not just as you say just one document that we all tie it to. I think this will give us some options that we could take a look at.

REPRESENTATIVE RODNEY LYONS: Yes. And I want to say on the record I used the analogy but I love Grand Isle. Grand Isle is one of my favorite communities in Jefferson Parish. So, it's fun getting there and it's a very scenic and nice ride to get there. However, if I'm driving there's only one way to get there and I want this process I served here on this body to be a process like Louisiana, several roll ways in, several roll ways out but we're all working together moving to make a product work that we all can work through. Thank you Mr. Pro Tem.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Thank you Representative.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Thank you Representative Lyons. I would be remised as a member of the Bio-Delegation if I wouldn't point out to the

1 record that Grand Isle should be a part of Lafourche
2 Parish but any way, we will move on from that
3 discussion. I guess based off from what I'm hearing
4 from Representative Lyons and from Representative
5 Jenkins, I think you're expressing an interest to
6 work with members of the committee and not vote
7 today. Am I misinterpreting?
8 REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: No, no. You are
9 correct. I think that would be a good process. We've
10 had some things that come up today and then maybe
11 some that didn't express some but I would like that
12 opportunity.
13 REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Sure absolutely.
14 And look what I'm going to do is, I want to read in
15 the cards. Two people want to speak but I'm asking
16 they still want to speak in light of that. But I'm
17 going to go read in the cards and we'll handle that
18 when we get to it. Present in support wishing to
19 speak is - that wish [INDISCERNIBLE 02:42:37]
20 information requested Larry Page from [INDISCERNIBLE
21 02:42:42]. We also have Edgar Cage who does not wish
22 to speak but is present in support with the [PH
23 02:42:48] Together Louisiana. And then in opposition
24 we have Chris Kaiser with the ACLU. He does not wish
25 to speak. We have Mike Bayham, here for himself, does

not wish to speak. And we have [PH 02:43:03] Ms. Suzy Labree who is present but does not wish to speak in opposition. That leaves us two cards remaining that are present and would like to speak in support and one of them is Katie Bernhardt with the Louisiana Democratic Party. Katie, you're still wishing to speak today or do you want to hold off?

KATIE BERNHARDT: I can wait.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Okay. And then we also have Representative Kenny Cox. Is Kenny still here? Kenny, you're going to –

REPRESENTATIVE KENNY COX: Defer.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Defer?

REPRESENTATIVE KENNY COX: Yeah, I got to leave.

REPRESENTATIVE MAGEE: Okay. So, they were present and they are in support, I do want to put that in the record but in light of what you're saying, I think Representative Jenkins has made a motion to defer his House Bill 15 to tomorrow, is there any oppositions to said motion, seeing no opposition that motion is adopted. The last thing we have on the agenda is to adjourn. There was [INDISCERNIBLE 02:43:50] moves to adjourn, is there any opposition to adjourning? Representative Newell, you object to adjourning? Oh, okay. I'm sorry. You're

1 motioning over there. Seeing no objection, we are
2 adjourned.
3 [02:44:02]
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

TRANSPERFECT

I, Anders Nelson, hereby certify that the document "F885610-la-house-on-demand-video" 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