CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: We're going live, members. I'm going to call the Committee on Housing Governmental Affairs to order. Today is Tuesday, February 15th. We have one, two, three, four, five items on the agenda for this morning. I'd ask you to please silence your cellphones if you have one. I would ask that if you wish to give a testimony, please fill out a card, green in support, red in opposition, and white for information only. Ms. Ammersbach, please call the roll.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Chairman Stefanski?

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Present.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Present. Vice Chairman Duplessis?

REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Here.

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

REPRESENTATIVE DARYL DESHOTEL: Here.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Present. Representative Farnum?

REPRESENTATIVE LES FARNUM: Here.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Present. Representative Gadberry?

REPRESENTATIVE FOY GADBERRY: Here.

Hearing Exhibit
PR-68
3:22-cv-00211-SDD-RLB

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Present. Representative Hodges? Representative Horton?

REPRESENTATIVE DODIE HORTON: Here.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Present. Representative Ivey? Representative Jenkins?

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Present. Representative Mike Johnson?

REPRESENTATIVE MIKE JOHNSON: Present.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Present. Representative LaCombe? Representative Lyons? Representative Magee?

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Present.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Present. Representative Newell? Representative Thomas?

REPRESENTATIVE POLLY THOMAS: Here.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Present. Representative White?

REPRESENTATIVE MALINDA WHITE: Here.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Present. Eleven members.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Eleven members and a quorum. Members, we're going to go a little out of order this morning. We're going to start with Senate Bill 19 by Senator Reese and he's given Senator Cathey permission to go ahead and present that. So, Senator Cathey, whenever you're ready.

SENATOR STEWART CATHEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Senate Bill 19 provides for the redistricting of the public service commission. Based on the 2020 census, the size of an ideal district just changed to 931,551 citizens. In creating this map in Senate Bill 19, Senator Reese and I adhere to traditional redistricting principles as well as a criteria adopted by the legislature's Joint Rule 21 redistricting criteria. We all know that, I'm not going to go through each individual point on that. Basically, what we did was we started with the current configuration as the map is today, preserve the integrity of the majority-minority district in the New Orleans area which is District 3 and then cleaned up lines and other areas tweaking it to make it fit the population. I'm happy to answer any questions.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: So, yeah, and so I appreciate it, Senator Cathey, and look, Senator Reese and I have PSC bill as well. Senator Reese and I have been working on that and actually we met yesterday and met this morning on it and so, I think we're going to try to come up with a version that both the House and the Senate can agree on. I think

it got no no-votes on the Senate side, is that correct?

SENATOR STEWART CATHEY: Right.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: My House version didn't get any no-votes on my side. The bills are extremely similar, minimal precinct differences between the two. And so, the hope is that we're going to move -- mine was moved forward this morning. I'm going to ask this committee to move this one favorable and then we're going to just try to come up with one version that both the sides agree on which I think is the plan. Any questions on these, members? Seeing no questions, I'm going to move that we report Senate Bill 19 favorable. Any objection? Seeing no objection, Senate Bill 19 is reported favorable. Thank you, Senator Cathey.

SENATOR STEWART CATHEY: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Next up, Senator FOIL. He's going to be handling the precedent Senate Bill 14.

SENATOR FRANKLIN FOIL: Thank you, Mr. President -- I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Don't upgrade me yet, please. I don't want that responsibility.

SENATOR FRANKLIN FOIL: It's okay. You've got a lot on your plate, I understand. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members. Senate Bill 14 is the best redistricting bill. And what the president tried to do is to look at the existing districts and see if we could keep continuity of those districts. Looking at the population, we have the one person, one vote principle and based on that principle, we can have a 5% deviation of the Supreme Court as set for local and state officials. And looking at the districts, District 3 and District 8 were under, so we had to put some more population on those districts to keep them within the deviation. District 6 and District 7 were over, so we had to move some population from those districts. But overall, members, I believe that this map represents common communities of interest, it's compact, it maintains two majority-minority districts, District 2 and 8, and that's what it does. I've been working with Representative Thomas who has a similar bill. There are some changes and I believe she's going to offer some amendments to put this bill in the posture that her bill was when it passed the House.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Let's go ahead and entertain that amendment before we move on to any

questions about the bill itself. So, members, in your packet, you will see Amendment Set -- hold on, 121, correct? I believe we have 121. So, members, in your packet Amendment Set 121. Representative Thomas, on your amendment.

[00:04:57]

REPRESENTATIVE POLLY THOMAS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning again, Senator Foil. As you said, we have been working together. This puts the bill back in the posture that passed the House and we have some differences to work out, they are not major, and we have agreed that we will work this out. So, this set of amendments puts it back into its original posture, House Bill 3.

SENATOR FRANKLIN FOIL: Thank you. And, Mr. Chairman, that's what Representative Thomas and I had agreed to, if that's the will of the committee.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Good deal. So, members, any questions on this amendment? Representative Jenkins does have a question on the amendment. I'm going to turn on both of Ms. Thomas and Representative Jenkins at the same time since she's the one offering the amendment.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Okay. I'm trying to get some clarity on exactly what does this amendment

do? Does it make this bill the same as Representative Thomas' bill, is that --?

REPRESENTATIVE POLLY THOMAS: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: So, the same bill that Representative Thomas passed out of the committee, with this amendment, the Senate Bill -- they would be the same bill?

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: That's correct. Representative Jenkins. What this amendment would do, it would put the precincts in the same configuration as Representative Thomas' bill that left this committee and left the House floor.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Okay. Now, is this the proper time to raise questions about any effort to create a third majority-minority district, or do you want to wait for the bill?

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: You could or you can ask that question now on the amendment or you can wait and see if this committee adopts the amendment and then question the bill author at that time. It's your prerogative.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Well, let's get it to the bill there to ask my question.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Okay. Thank you, Representative Jenkins. Okay, members, there's

Amendment Set 121 has been offered up for adoption. Is there any objection to the -- is there any more discussion first of all on this or is there any objection to Amendment Set 121? Seeing no objection, Amendment Set 121 is adopted. Representative Jenkins for question on the bill.

REPRESENATIVE SAM JENKINS: Can you explain to me rather this particular bill creates an additional majority-minority seat whether there are any efforts were made to create such a seat and if it was not done, what were the obstacles that may have prevented adding a third majority-minority seat?

SENATOR FRANKLIN FOIL: Sure. Representative Jenkins, I worked on -- this is the president's bill, but I worked on this bill with the president and the way we started the process is to look at the existing districts that were in place that had been approved by the legislature in 2010 and also approved by the Justice Department through pre-clearance. And so, we took that plan and we adjusted the districts for the one person, one vote rule and came up with this plan that we have here now which keeps two majority-minority districts. I believe the plan meets the requirements of the Voting Rights Act as it's drawn as well as the regulations that we've set forth. I

did see two Senate proposed plans for BESE districts by Senator Fields that were proposed. They did not get through committee, but those plans also only had two majority-minority districts.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Are you aware that there are some plans? I believe the NAACP Legal Defense Fund I believe had a plan that added a third majority-minority seat. And of course, I know you're handling this bill for someone else but if you don't know the answer to this question, it's fine. I'm just wondering, did the author look at that particular plan and gave it a consideration to try to maybe create a third seat?

SENATOR FRANKLIN FOIL: I can't speak for that particular plan whether or not the author actually looked at that plan. I would concede that if you wanted to, it may not be compact and you may have problems with the numbers as far as the deviation. I'm sure it will be possible to draw one. But as far as a plan that meets all the requirements redistricting as a whole, I believe this plan meets those requirements and it's a good proposal.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Do you believe that if a third majority-minority seat can be created for the BESE board that it should be created?

SENATOR FRANKLIN FOIL: I believe we should follow the rules of redistricting in creating a plan and I think this plan meets that and this plan, once again, it keeps continuity in place and this is the plan that was approved by the Justice Department 2010.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Okay. Thank you for answering my questions. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SENATOR FRANKLIN FOIL: Thank you, Representative Jenkins.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Thank you, Representative Jenkins. Members, that clears the board. Do we have any cards?

[00:10:00]

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: No cards? Any further discussion on this, members? Seeing no further discussion, I believe Representative Thomas is going to make a motion that we move as amended. Members, do we have any objection? We do have an objection from Representative Jenkins. Members, we are going to vote on the motion. Right now I'll give you a chance to close and I apologize, and I was moving ahead of myself.

SENATOR FRANKLIN FOIL: I'll waive, Mr. Chairman. I know you have already heard this bill before and given it a lot of deliberation.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Good deal. There has been a motion by Representative Thomas to move as amended. There has been an objection. A vote for is to move this bill as amended out of committee. A vote against is to keep the bill in committee, members. Ms. Ammersbach is going to go ahead and call the roll.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Vice Chairman Duplessis?

REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Beaullieu.

REPRESENTATIVE GERALD BEAULLIEU: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Wilfred Carter. Representative Deshotel.

REPRESENTATIVE DARYL DESHOTEL: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Farnum.

REPRESENTATIVE LES FARNUM: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Gadberry.

REPRESENTATIVE FOY GADBERRY: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Hodges. Representative Horton. Representative Ivey. Representative Jenkins.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Mike Johnson.

REPRESENTATIVE MIKE JOHNSON: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative LaCombe.

REPRESENTATIVE JEREMY LACOMBE: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Lyons.

REPRESENTATIVE RODNEY LYONS: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Magee.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Newell.

REPRESENTATIVE CANDACE NEWELL: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Thomas.

REPRESENTATIVE POLLY THOMAS: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative White.

REPRESENTATIVE MALINDA WHITE: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Eight yays, four nays.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Eight yays, four nays, and the bill is reported as amended. Thank you, Senator.

SENATOR FRANKLIN FOIL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Yes sir. And welcome back to the House side. I always like to say to former colleagues, absolutely. We'll go ahead and do House Bill 6 now. Representative Jefferson. Again, this is another BESE reapportionment bill, members.

REPRESENTATIVE PATRICK JEFFERSON: Top of the morning to you, Mr. Chairman and members of this committee. We know that you have expended great hours into your considerations and deliberations but still, we certainly appreciate on behalf of the citizenry of Louisiana, the opportunity to present this bill. Although it's a bit of a paradox and that we've already, as a body, passed the bill, but nevertheless your commitment was that anything that was filed, you would give them, the authors, the opportunity to be heard. And today, I sit before you on behalf of the great citizens of this state with another option. Today, I'm going to do as has been intimated, we'll start with a little levity. I'll be like Elizabeth Taylor with that last husband. I won't keep you too long because we've heard so much. That's the levity. And then we'll try also to be a bit serious. I'm presenting before you a different form of PPP, not as

what we've heard in the past, but today we're going to look at the process. We're going to look at the product and we're going to also look at the people. I want to start with the people. You see before me, not many people in the audience, when I came in -- it's a challenge when you hear the media being a bit jovial about controversial bills, but nevertheless we still sit before you and you may not be able to see them, but I can hear them hauntingly as those young people came before you a week ago and their testimony and their commitment. You've heard them as you crisscross this great state with the various road shows and you've heard what they've asked. You've heard what they've employed you as it relates to being fair in this state. Now, all of us can count. All of us understand what we are dealing with but at the end of the day, we owe it to the citizens to present various ideas, various options, and that's what you have before you and HB6. The people have spoken and yes, in many instances you've heard, "Let's try to keep traditional lines in place." Perhaps you've heard, "Let's try to -- it's not broken per se," but in 10 years, none of us can disagree that the African-American population, the minority population, has increased.

[00:15:03]

In 10 years, none of us will disagree that the state has made some changes. Today, with HB6, we are attempting to add a third district of individuals who are people of color who are able to exercise their particular right. Now, why are we doing this? Number one, we are driven by the data. We are driven by Dr. Thomas, by every child in the State of Louisiana. And what we've done as you did, we presented something on behalf of a group because we feel is in the best interest of our children. In addition, the process -- as I said to you, I'm like my roommate and colleague, Colonel Cox. I'm not afraid of any particular policy or a challenge. And a friend of mine told me yesterday when we went to the way out, he said, "I just knew you were going to go off. Well, you don't need to go off when you have the data in front of you." There's no need for us to be disagreeable although unequivocally, we disagree with this process. Unequivocally, we disagree with the products, but we respect them nevertheless. And again, going back to those people, I'm encouraged as I make my exit out of this great body. I'm encouraged because those individuals have determined and relayed to us that they're going to be a part of this

1 process. They're going to be vibrant. They're going
2 to make sure that they are heard. They're going to
3 make sure that representation is fair all across
4 various levels. For that, I am encouraged. And I'm
5 also encouraged as the question was posed a few
6 minutes ago to my good friend, Senator Foil, if there
7 was a thought that we needed. And I've heard many
8 members say, "Yes, I can agree with it." But
9 publicly, they may not be able to regarding that
10 third district. But today, again, you know the
11 census, you know the student population, you know
12 overwhelmingly individuals have come forth and have
13 asked us to do this. So, this is my attempt. Although
14 it's a Hail Mary, although the House has already
15 spoken, you're still going to be able to. At the end
16 of the day, after this process concludes, you'll be
17 able to leave here and say, "Well, I did what was
18 fair, I did what was equitable." And as all of us, we
19 could agree with on this as well. Every author whose
20 piece of legislation has advanced, every person has
21 said, "It is not perfect." Every person has said that
22 it is their best attempt. So, I'm giving you my best
23 attempt as it relates to creating that third district
24 so that we can have equity and representation and so
25 that we can relay to the people that we've heard them

and so that we can say that we made an honest attempt to balance this great state. Because as I've said to you on many instances, "Contrary, there are more things that unite us than divide us." It's just this process that we have and it's a process that you didn't create. It's a process that was handed to each of us. And I know that you've done the best that you could, but I'm asking you as it concludes, let us not just discard and say, "Well, we've spoken. This is what it's going to be." Let us always be open-minded as it comes to representation, as it comes to BESE, as it comes to all of those bills that will come forward. But today, I come before you with House Bill 6. I believe -- and, again, that's the other thing too those of us who are barristers or solicitors. You get various lawyers in the room, everybody's going to believe one thing or the other. And just as you've been steadfast in your belief of its legality, I stand here today also with an instrument understanding and respecting the process and this is part of it and I know you all know that the process will not end with what we're doing. But this is our effort, this is our attempt to make fairness the call of the day. When we finish with redistricting, when

whoever looks at our effort and, again, we can all agree of the time that you've put into it --

[00:20:02]

-- the energy that you put into it, the staff, the citizens, the people who are tuning in, the people who came hundreds of miles just to participate in this process. We all understand that and we all appreciate it, but this is our effort. And I, at this moment, will entertain any questions as it relates to HB 6. Mr. Chairman, again, thank you for the opportunity as you promised it was filed and that you would give me an opportunity to be heard, so thank you, sir.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Yes, of course. One thing -- and, Representative, thank you. I appreciate again, we've said another similar thing times and times again about these not being perfect documents, but as well as the amount of effort it takes to come and just be part of this and to present a bill, so I commend you for doing that and taking on this effort. One thing that strikes me about the map is specifically the fourth district in here and just the geography. Does the geography of the fourth district give you any concern?

REPRESENTATIVE PATRICK JEFFERSON: The only heartburn I have is that we were not able at this point to create that third district. The geography, no, sir, to answer your question.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Okay.

REPRESENTATIVE PATRICK JEFFERSON: And the reason being because of words that all of us will sleep and recite in our sleep the common interest, the population that it serves, and the opportunity for these individuals to elect the candidate of their choice.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: And do you believe that the black minority community in District 4 would have an opportunity to elect a candidate of their choice under this?

REPRESENTATIVE PATRICK JEFFERSON: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Do you believe that the VAP census below that 50 plus 1, does that give you any concern on the BVAP?

REPRESENTATIVE PATRICK JEFFERSON: No, again, when you look at the factors, it's an opportunity.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Okay.

REPRESENTATIVE PATRICK JEFFERSON: And I believe that when you look at the various metrics -- and again, we can recite all that we've heard and all of

us are pseudo experts at this point, some more so than others, but no, sir.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Okay. For questioning, Representative Thomas.

REPRESENTATIVE POLLY THOMAS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning, Representative.

REPRESENTATIVE PATRICK JEFFERSON: Good morning, Representative.

REPRESENTATIVE POLLY THOMAS: I have a question about this map. Is this similar or identical to the amendment that you proposed on the floor a couple of days ago, last week?

REPRESENTATIVE PATRICK JEFFERSON: Very good question. Regarding that, it's a little similar, but not much. If you remember, the amendment that I proposed, it wasn't as contiguous as this, ma'am, so it's a little different.

REPRESENTATIVE POLLY THOMAS: Okay. So, it's a little different.

REPRESENTATIVE PATRICK JEFFERSON: Yes, ma'am.

REPRESENTATIVE POLLY THOMAS: Okay. In looking at the numbers, I'd like to extend what Chairman Stefanski has said. The numbers do not appear to me to meet the threshold of the 50% plus 1 in terms of a third minority district.

REPRESENTATIVE PATRICK JEFFERSON: Okay.

REPRESENTATIVE POLLY THOMAS: What is your comment on that?

REPRESENTATIVE PATRICK JEFFERSON: And again, when I looked at the VAP numbers, and again, there are others who are better positioned than I, I think it does meet that threshold. Again, my contention is it gives us the opportunity to have this particular district. The maps that we've already affirmed, if you will, do not give that opportunity nor did the authors indicate that they even attempted. This at least gives us an opportunity and it also gives us an attempt to have that third district.

REPRESENTATIVE POLLY THOMAS: Yeah. My other concern is the communities of interest. In looking at the geography, you have along the Mississippi River, so bordering the State of Mississippi and going almost to Texas and across the state, and I'm wondering what communities of interest you considered.

REPRESENTATIVE PATRICK JEFFERSON: Thank you for that beach ball, Ms. Thomas. Ms. Thomas, one of the things that I've considered is if you look at the school performance, if you look at that particular area, and I'm from that area, so there's much

1 community of interest as it relates to socioeconomic
2 status of that particular area. So, I think that
3 threshold is definitely met in your question in that
4 regard.
5 REPRESENTATIVE POLLY THOMAS: Is this farming
6 communities? Are these farming communities --
7 REPRESENTATIVE PATRICK JEFFERSON: Some of them
8 are.
9 REPRESENTATIVE POLLY THOMAS: -- or timber or --
10 REPRESENTATIVE PATRICK JEFFERSON: Yes, ma'am,
11 all of them.
12 REPRESENTATIVE POLLY THOMAS: Any manufacturing?
13 REPRESENTATIVE PATRICK JEFFERSON: If you go
14 back, yes, ma'am, all of those. Again, if you look at
15 Louisiana, it's such a vibrant pot, it's such a
16 melting pot, it's not just farming, it's not just
17 agriculture, it's not just timber, but all of those
18 extend throughout that particular district.
19 REPRESENTATIVE POLLY THOMAS: Okay. Thank you.
20 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
21 REPRESENTATIVE PATRICK JEFFERSON: Thank you,
22 Representative Thomas.
23 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Thank you,
24 Representative Thomas. For questioning,
25 Representative LaCombe.

REPRESENTATIVE JEREMY LACOMBE: Thank you, Representative Jefferson, for bringing this plan.

[00:25:02]

Councilmen, gentlemen and professionals, I appreciate your efforts here. I'm looking at particularly my parish, one of the main parishes that I represent, Pointe Coupee. In this plan, Pointe Coupee is split again. I see that this map looks very, very, very similar to most of the other maps that are floating around, and I just want to ask you the question, would you be -- if this map is going to move forward, out of committee, moving forward, would we be able to possibly work with you to get this amendment amended so that Pointe Coupee could be all in one district? Our superintendent back home, our school board, felt like they would -- from their perspective, they would rather be all in one district than split. We only have one public school system there, and I just wanted to bring that to light. in the event that we can work with you, I'd like to work with you possibly to amend that.

REPRESENTATIVE PATRICK JEFFERSON: Yes, sir, without question.

REPRESENTATIVE JEREMY LACOMBE: If the numbers work.

REPRESENTATIVE PATRICK JEFFERSON: Yes, sir, if the numbers work. And one thing I will say, Representative LaCombe, you have been consistent on that point, so yes, sir, if we could make the numbers work, without question.

REPRESENTATIVE JEREMY LACOMBE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Thank you, Representative Lacombe. For questioning, Representative Jenkins.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do want to express my appreciation to you, Representative Jefferson, for bringing this map, bringing this plan. It would appear that the two plans that made it out of committee only contain two of the eight elected BESE districts as majority-minority districts, is that right?

REPRESENTATIVE PATRICK JEFFERSON: That is correct, Representative Jenkins.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: In other words, it's maintaining the status quo.

REPRESENTATIVE PATRICK JEFFERSON: That's correct. Yes, sir.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: And there has been some increase in the African-American population in the State of Louisiana, which you so adequately had

in your opening summary about this bill that you're bringing, is that correct?

REPRESENTATIVE PATRICK JEFFERSON: Yes, sir. I think again, that's another fact that all of us agree.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Correct. And so, I noticed in other two maps, they are keeping District 2, I believe, and District 8 of the elected positions as minority-majority. Your map will add a District 4 as a majority-minority district, is that correct?

REPRESENTATIVE PATRICK JEFFERSON: That is correct.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: And what it would do, it will give some representation to minorities in the northern part of the state with your map, is that right?

REPRESENTATIVE PATRICK JEFFERSON: That is correct, sir.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: It further appears to me that this particular map that you're presenting and I believe the NAACP had presented a map clearly shows that a third majority-minority district can be created if Louisiana wanted to do that, is that right?

REPRESENTATIVE PATRICK JEFFERSON: That is correct, sir.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: And do you agree that if we could create that third district, we should create that third district?

REPRESENTATIVE PATRICK JEFFERSON: I think we owe it to the citizens, that is correct. Yes, sir.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: I thank you for your effort and I thank you for the map that you're presenting. I think it clearly shows that there are options that will allow not only some more minority representation amongst those elected to BESE, but it also gives some representation in the northern part of the state. Thank you so much.

REPRESENTATIVE PATRICK JEFFERSON: Thank you, sir.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Thank you, Representative Jenkins. Members, that clears the board. Filling out a card in support not wishing to speak Edgar Cage with Together Louisiana. Filling out a card in support not wishing to speak Davante Lewis with Louisiana Budget Project. Members, do we have any more discussion on this bill? There is a motion

to move favorable. I'm going to give Representative Jefferson an opportunity to close.

REPRESENTATIVE PATRICK JEFFERSON: Again, thank you, Chairman Stefanski. Thank you, members of this committee, for indulging me, indulging the citizens, this morning and I just want to leave you with this last nugget. You've heard me quote King many a time and I'm going to quote him as I depart from you. Dr. King so eloquently and vehemently stated that our generation will be judged not just by the acts of bad people but by the silence of good people. I'm looking before me a room full of good people and I am imploring each and every one of you to not be silent as it relates to our population gain as it relates to fairness, as it relates to equity, as it relates to this process because in the end, we will all be judged by what we do or didn't do in this special session. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Thank you, Representative. Members, there is a motion by Representative Jenkins to move favorable. Is there any objection? I do see an objection from our Representative Thomas.

[00:30:01]

Members, a vote yay is to move this bill to the floor. A vote nay is to the bill will remain in committee. I will have Ms. Ammersbach call the roll.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Vice Chairman Duplessis.

REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Beaullieu.

REPRESENTATIVE GERALD BEAULLIEU: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Wilford Carter. Representative Deshotel.

REPRESENTATIVE DARYL DESHOTEL: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Farnum.

REPRESENTATIVE LES FARNUM: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Gadberry.

REPRESENTATIVE FOY GADBERRY: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Hodges. Representative Horton. No. Representative Ivey. Representative Jenkins.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Mike Johnson.

REPRESENTATIVE MIKE JOHNSON: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative LaCombe.

REPRESENTATIVE JEREMY LACOMBE: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Lyons.

REPRESENTATIVE RODNEY LYONS: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Magee. Representative Newell.

REPRESENTATIVE CANDACE NEWELL: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Thomas.

REPRESENTATIVE POLLY THOMAS: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative White.

REPRESENTATIVE MALINDA WHITE: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Six yays, seven nays.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Six yays, seven nays, and the bill fails. Thank you, Representative, I appreciate it.

REPRESENTATIVE PATRICK JEFFERSON: Thank you, Chairman. I'm still looking at some good people. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Members, next on the agenda is House Bill 20 by Representative Carter. He has informed me that he does not wish to proceed with that bill and so, I'm going to voluntarily defer that bill without objection. Members, I want to take a brief recess unless -- but we have a Senate Bill 5 by Senator Hewitt. So, we're going to take about a five-minute pause on this.

[BACKGROUND CONVERSATION]

[00:59:45]

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Last bill on the agenda, Senate Bill 5 by Senator Hewitt. It is a Congressional Reapportionment Bill and, Senator Hewitt, whenever you're ready, you can begin.

[01:00:00]

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, members, for your time today and for giving me the opportunity to present this bill and also, thank you for the recess as we juggle schedules between the Senate Governmental and House and Governmental Affairs Committees. And thank you too -- we've traveled together a lot, all of us. On the road show, it's been months that we have worked together and I want you to know how much I appreciate your commitment to the process. I believe that what we have done together has been a very public and transparent process. We've gotten a lot of good input, and I'm very proud of what we have done up until this point. So, thank you for that and thanks to staff as well for your commitment. You guys have carried a very heavy load, both in this committee and the Senate committee. So, this is Senate Bill 5, which will look at redistricting congress. I believe that this bill does comply with the Voting Rights Act and it does the best job of the maps presented to

1 this committee in keeping communities of interest,
2 parishes and precincts together and providing for
3 continuity of representation by preserving the cores
4 of our current districts. It provides a majority-
5 minority districts, Congressional District 2 in the
6 New Orleans and Baton Rouge areas that has
7 consistently provided the minority voters in that
8 district the opportunity to elect candidates of their
9 choice. So, I'll tell you the kind of redistricting
10 principles that I considered in drawing this map. Of
11 course, the first is to comply with the Voting Rights
12 Act and all other federal and state laws. I also
13 looked at configuring the districts so that they are
14 as nearly equal to the ideal district population as
15 practicable. And so, as you all know, the ideal
16 population for the congressional districts is
17 776,292. In this bill, the deviations range then from
18 minus 92 in Congressional District 4 to 36 in
19 Congressional District 2. I respected the established
20 boundaries of the political subdivisions and natural
21 geography of the state and contained whole precincts
22 to the extent practicable. And so, in this map, 49 of
23 the 64 parishes were kept whole, which is more than
24 the current map and we have zero split precincts. The
25 other principle, of course, is preserving the core of

1 prior districts to ensure continuity of
2 representation. I think that's very important. And
3 particularly, in the congressional maps, they're
4 elected every two years. I think people in those
5 districts know those representatives as elected
6 officials better than anyone and they can choose to
7 elect them or choose not to elect them depending on
8 their performance. And finally and certainly, very
9 important, we preserve the communities of interest
10 and some of those that I will touch on, we ensure
11 that Louisiana's agricultural heritage continues to
12 be respected by maintaining a primarily rural
13 agriculturally-based district. We preserve the
14 connectivity of Louisiana's Acadiana region,
15 Louisiana's major cities and their surrounding
16 communities are preserved and connected to the extent
17 possible. We ensure that Louisiana's major military
18 installations remain strong and in connection with
19 their surrounding communities of support, which is
20 very important when you're considering BRAC actions.
21 They look at communities of support in the
22 surrounding area and are they connected in a strong
23 way to the military installations. It maintains the
24 connection within the communities of interest of
25 Baton Rouge and its surrounding communities.

Similarly, it maintains the connection within the communities of interest of the New Orleans region and its surrounding communities. It maintains the connection within the communities of interest in Shreveport, as well as Alexandria and Monroe. And so, with that kind of highlight overview, Mr. Chairman, I will open it up to any questions that you might have on any specifics.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Thank you, Senator Hewitt. For questioning, Vice Chair Duplessis.

REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning, Madam Chair.

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: Good morning.

REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: All right. We spent a lot of time together on the road show.

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: Sure did.

REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: And thank you for the time that you've put into this. My first question is, in your remarks just now, you said that you believe that this complied with the Voting Rights Act, could you please expound on that and explain why you believe this is compliant with the Voting Rights Act?

1 SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: Well, I believe it is
2 because, of course, we have drawn one majority-
3 minority district.
4 [01:05:03]
5 So, I believe that -- as you know, the Voting
6 Rights Act, you have to be able to have a minority
7 district that's sufficient in population and
8 geographically compact that would allow minorities to
9 elect a candidate of their choice. And so, we have
10 done that in this map.
11 REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: So, you did that
12 in one, Congressional District 2, which essentially
13 preserves what is in the current map?
14 SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: Yes.
15 REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Was there not an
16 opportunity anywhere else to do the same thing?
17 SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: Yeah, I don't believe
18 there is. Of course, there have been maps proposed
19 that looked at that, but I do believe that this map
20 does the best job of preserving the minority
21 population and giving them an opportunity to elect a
22 candidate of their choice.
23 REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: So, can we talk
24 about the other maps for a second that you said you
25 believe that the other maps looked at that or the

other maps attempted to do that? What was the issue with those other maps? If other proposals were made that could have potentially created or in all likelihood did create a second minority-majority district? Why were those maps not put forward, or why would those plans not adopted in your plan, or was there any attempt to incorporate those plans into your plan to create a second majority-minority district?

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: Well, we had lots of input at the road shows. Certainly, there were maps that were proposed by the NAACP and their partner groups. I looked at all those and considered those and again believe that this map, the way I have drawn it, does the very best job of doing that.

REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Can you tell me how you think it's better? How yours does a better job than those that were submitted by the NAACP or any group for that matter, not just NAACP, because I don't think they were the only group that submitted a map with a second minority-majority. I just want to know what criteria you used to determine why your map is better than those that did.

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: Well, the law requires you to have an equal opportunity to be able to elect

a candidate of your choice. And I think that maps that draw with a lower BVAP put that at risk where you may not be able to elect a candidate of your choice.

REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Has there ever been anything in law that says that a certain BVAP has to be met in order for communities of color to select their candidate of choice?

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: I'm not aware of any of that. This is just my personal opinion --

REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Okay.

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: -- in terms of how to do that.

REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Okay. Because we do have evidence that we do have examples of other districts in this state and outside of this state that have shown that you don't always need to be in the high 50s in terms of BVAP for communities of interest to have the opportunity to select a candidate of choice. It's not a guarantee, is it?

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: I think that issue that you're speaking of, of course, we've talked about quite a bit. I think that will be litigated and considered in a court of law as to exactly how you define equal opportunity and is there any particular

number and what those opportunities are, is there evidence, is there not evidence. I think those are all legal issues that will, of course, be discussed in the future. What I'm here to talk about is the map and the geography and the communities of interest and the redistricting principles that I used and I'll leave that to the legal scholars that are going to be working on that issue.

REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Right. But I guess before we get to that point, did we not do all that we could to at least attempt or to try to achieve that before simply saying, "Well --" Because I haven't heard a specific number, Madam Chair, that says that this is where we have to be in order for communities of interest whether it'd be black --the community of the African-American population that makes up more than a third of this state that they would have an opportunity to select a candidate of choice. Do we not have an obligation under the Voting Rights Act to make every attempt possible to try to do that, and there have been other maps submitted? Why didn't you select one of those maps and say, "Well, just let the lawyers decide." If that's the approach that you seem to be taking, if we're going to just say "let the lawyers decide," why didn't we

1 go after trying to create a second black minority-
2 majority district and then just let the lawyers
3 decide as to whether or not communities of interest,
4 black community in particular, are going to be
5 actually able to select a candidate of choice if the
6 numbers are, let's say, 50.1 BVAP? Why couldn't we
7 just attempt to do that and then let the courts
8 decide whether or not they have a choice or they have
9 an opportunity?
10 SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: I believe this committee
11 has had that opportunity.
12 [01:09:59]
13 They have seen multiple maps with multiple
14 proposals and it's up to this legislative body to
15 decide what our policy is going to be and how we want
16 to move forward. What I'm offering you is my opinion
17 on how to best do that and the map that I've proposed
18 and it's up to this committee to decide if you want
19 to move that idea forward or if you choose to adopt
20 something that's completely different.
21 REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Understood. So,
22 do you believe that we've done all that we've could -
23 - not this committee just yet, but through your bill,
24 do you believe that you've done everything possible
25 to try to draw a second majority-minority district?

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: I believe that I have and I believe that this map does comply.

REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: I want to talk a little bit about some of the other criteria that has been mentioned and that you highlighted based upon equal proportionality. In the congressional maps, we don't have the same flexibility as we do with the State House and Senate maps. We have to draw them as equal as practicable based on federal jurisprudence which is interpreted through the U.S. Constitution, so we don't have the same level of flexibility. In looking at your map, I see an absolute range that you provided of roughly -- not roughly, but 128, is that correct? Up and down?

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: Yes, I think so. Minus 92 to 36, I believe.

REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Okay. And do you believe that the map that you put forward scores high in terms of compactness?

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Okay. And how many split parishes does your map have?

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: Fifteen.

REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Okay.

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: Doing the math, 15.

REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Okay. All right. Thank you. So, if I may, Mr. Chairman, based on everything that I've heard, I've talked to Madam Chair prior to committee and I told her that I had a friendly amendment, a way that I think I could improve your map quite frankly. Based on the same criteria, I have an amendment that I'd like to offer up to the committee when the time is right.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: No problem. We will -- Representative Farnum, you want to hold your question after this amendment? You're fine with that? All right. So, what are we going ahead and do, members, is we're going to take up Amendment Set 116 in your packet. Amendment 116. Representative Duplessis, on your amendment.

REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As I mentioned, I do believe that this amendment that I'm offering right now takes in all of the criteria that has already been discussed starting with the Voting Rights Act, which I believe we are compelled to under the Voting Rights Act, when possible, draw districts that give communities of color an opportunity to select their candidate of choice. This map does that by creating a second

1 majority-minority district. Not only does it do that,
2 it has fewer split parishes. Senator Hewitt's bill,
3 SB5, has 15. The amendment that I'm proposing will
4 have split parishes of just 14 as well as when you
5 talk about population equality, SB5 has a deviation
6 of 128 people. The amendment that I'm proposing would
7 have just an absolute range of 44 people. This
8 amendment does not have any split precincts and it
9 overall scores higher in terms of compactness based
10 on all the standard measures that are used to decide
11 on compactness. So, from all indications, I believe
12 that what I am proposing in this amendment is a
13 better alternative and I realized that we all have
14 different ways in which we come to this, but in terms
15 of just the pure numbers, I think we have a good
16 option here and under the Voting Rights Act, I
17 believe we're obligated to do all that we can. I
18 believe this amendment, 116, gives us that
19 opportunity to do that. So, that's what the amendment
20 does and I'm happy to try to answer any questions.
21 CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: For questioning on the
22 amendment, Representative Magee. Speaker Pro Temp.
23 Magee and Vice Chair, sorry, I messed up.
24
25

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is kind of weird, like a Senate debate. We can like turn and look at each other.

REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Rather than use your mic?

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Yeah, we can do the whole. It is very weird. My concern when I'm looking at the map -- I'm borrowing my colleague's map. If I'm seeing it correctly, you're drawing one all the way to Iberia Parish, is that correct?

REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: That's correct. [01:14:58]

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: My concern with the map is -- and look, I'm just going to be --

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Mr. Vice Chair, your mic is on too, they're both on, so just --

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: My concern with the map is -- and I appreciate your perspective, I really do and I understand it completely, but you got to hear my perspective.

REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: I'm listening.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: I ran on one issue when I ran, which was fighting coastal erosion, CPRA, protecting the coast. I didn't run on taxes. I didn't run on any of those issues. That was the single issue

that I did. I literally said, "I'm going to do everything I can to fight coastal erosion." An issue that I believe affects Republicans, Democrats, all races equally. I am losing under this proposal to congressmen who worked diligently to solve that problem who made humongous drives. If you follow the press recently, we are on the cusp of actually making the first -- I don't want to say real because all the efforts have been great, the first monumental effort. And by accepting this map, I'm losing that. Well, I have to respectfully push back on this notion that you're losing a congressmen or congressman. You've made it about a person or persons when that's not what it should be about. Any one of the six congress people who are elected to serve from whatever region they might be, I think they all have a vested interest in our coast. I think that applies to every member that currently serves in the Louisiana Congressional Delegation. So, the idea that you would be losing any advocacy, I simply just disagree with that and it should not be about any one particular congressman. It should be about the people in that area and knowing that you're going to have representation. So, whether it's District 3, whether it's District 1, whether it's District 2, we all have

1 a vested interest in ensuring that our coast is
2 respect --
3 REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Under the
4 current configuration we have, I have one, three and
5 six. Under this configuration, I just have one and
6 three. I like -- not like, I think the people I
7 represent would be deeply upset to find out that they
8 would be losing three voices.
9 REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: How do you say
10 they're going to lose three voices? Because
11 potentially one, but they just wouldn't necessarily
12 represent the coast.
13 REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: What I mean is
14 their voices are -- a better way of phrasing it,
15 their voices are being reduced from three to two on
16 what to me is a defining issue of Louisiana going
17 forward for the next thousand years because if we
18 don't do something, I don't -- let me put it this
19 way: If we don't solve that problem, we don't have a
20 District 1 to worry about. Again, I don't agree
21 because the idea that someone in -- let me see, that
22 someone in Vermilion Parish has two congress people,
23 which is not the case, and someone in Lafourche or
24 Plaquemines Parish would have two congress people,
25

that doesn't change. They still have one congressperson.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Who people representing the coast of Louisiana right now? We have three representing the coast of Louisiana.

REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: But who chooses to promote coastal restoration and in protecting our Coast? Your district does not have to extend to the coast. Now, we will disagree on this.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: I very much disagree on the [INDISCERNIBLE 01:18:21].

REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: I understand what you're saying.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: I Don't think history will show that somebody -- and know with all due respect, everybody from North Louisiana that Districts 4 and 5, they go to D.C. with the mindset, "I'm going to save Terrebonne Parish." It's no disrespect to these members, it just hasn't shown out that way, and I just don't believe that this map is the most effective map for representing my main concern which is making sure that the Republicans and Democrats of Terrebonne, and Lafourche, and St. Mary Parish have homes in a hundred years.

REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: I disagree, but I accept what you're saying. I respect what you're saying. I disagree. I think the map is more compact. I think the map again ranks higher in terms of all the other criteria that I laid out, but I do hear what you're saying.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Thank you, both. And, Madam Chairwoman, I'll let you comment on -- obviously, you can't vote on this amendment, but I'll let you comment on your thoughts about it if you so choose.

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: Yeah. Thank you, I appreciate that, Mr. Chairman. I do think the Speaker Pro Temp. made some very good points. I do think this current amendment does not honor the communities of interest and the continuity of representation as well as my map does. And so, for that reason, I would not be supportive of this amendment.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Members, any further discussion on the amendment, which is 116? Vice Chair Duplessis has made a motion that we adopt Amendment 116. Is there any objection? I do see an objection. Members, a vote yes is to adopt the amendment, a vote no is to not adopt the amendment.

And I will have Ms. Ammersbach call the roll.

[01:20:07]

[BACKGROUND CONVERSATION]

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Chairman Stefanski.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Vice Chairman Duplessis.

REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Beaullieu. Representative Wilford Carter. Representative Deshotel.

REPRESENTATIVE DARYL DESHOTEL: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Farnum.

REPRESENTATIVE LES FARNUM: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Gadberry.

REPRESENTATIVE FOY GADBERRY: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Hodges.

REPRESENTATIVE VALERIE HODGES: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Horton.

REPRESENTATIVE DODIE HORTON: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Ivey. Representative Jenkins.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Mike Johnson.

REPRESENTATIVE MIKE JOHNSON: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative LaCombe. Representative Lyons.

REPRESENTATIVE RODNEY LYONS: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Magee.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Newell.

REPRESENTATIVE CANDACE NEWELL: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Thomas.

REPRESENTATIVE POLLY THOMAS: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative White.

REPRESENTATIVE MALINDA WHITE: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Five yays, nine nays.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Five yays, nine nays, and the amendment fails to be adopted. Members, I apologize I was a little confused with the cards. You all filled them up for the amendment. I was thinking it was the bill. I'm going to read them. That is again my fault. That should have been read out before filling out a card in support of Representative Duplessis' amendment. Jared Evans with the NAACP Legal Defense Fund. Frankie Robertson with Metamorphosis. Frankie Robertson also with NOLA Maternal and Child Health Coalition. And also Janea Jamison with the Power Coalition. All right, members, we will go next to -- any questions, members? If not,

we will move on to the additional amendments. Members, you had two additional amendments, Amendment Set 127, but I believe it's the intent of the author to defer that Amendment Set 127, so we are going to do that. And then, secondly, I had an amendment, members, Amendment Set 128. And I'll put this on the record. Madam Chairwoman, you and I have talked that I have deep concerns about some of my communities being kept whole in the third congressional district, Calcasieu being kept all in one and also, Jeff Davis Parish being kept whole under your map. There's a few precincts that are snipped into one of the other congressional districts and not in Congressional District 3. And so, you and I have talked about that. I believe it's -- we're going to try to find a way to make those parishes whole, if we can. I certainly understand it's a balancing act, but I would like to see those parishes whole. So, anything that you can do and in order to be able to do that, I would greatly appreciate it and I know that the members of Congressional District 3 would as well.

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: Yeah, I agree with you. That would be my strong desire as well. There wasn't really any strategic reason why we initially carved those out other than trying to make all the numbers

work. And so, let's look for a better place to do that and I'd be happy to work with you to get those two parishes put back together.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Thank you, Madam Chairwoman. Members, that is all the amendments. Is there any further discussion on this bill for the committee? Seeing no further discussion, do we have any cards on this bill? Well, I'm going to go and read the cards first. Filling out a card in opposition, not wishing to speak, Davante Lewis with Louisiana Budget Project. Filling out a card in opposition, not wishing to speak, Jared Evans with NAACP Legal Defense Fund. Filling out a card in opposition, not wishing to speak, Edgar Cage with Together Louisiana. Filling out a card in opposition, not wishing to speak, Peter Robins-Brown with Louisiana Progress Action. Filling out a card in opposition, not wishing to speak, Frankie Robertson with Metamorphosis. Filling out a card, not wishing to speak, Frankie Robertson with NOLA Maternal and Child Health Coalition. Filling out a card, not wishing to speak, Janea Jamison with the Power Coalition. Filling out a card, not wishing to speak, Dr. Tammy Savoie with the Democrat State Central Committee CD 1. Members, the chair is going to move

that we report Senate Bill 5 favorable. Is there any objection? I do see an objection from the vice chair. Members, a vote yes is to move the bill forward to the floor. A vote no is to keep the bill in committee. Yes, move forward. No, keep it in. Ms. Ammersbach, if you would read the roll.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Chairman Stefanski.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Vice Chairman Duplessis.

REPRESENTATIVE ROYCE DUPLESSIS: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Beaullieu.

REPRESENTATIVE GERALD BEAULLIEU: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Wilford Carter. Representative Deshotel.

REPRESENTATIVE DARYL DESHOTEL: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Farnum.

REPRESENTATIVE LES FARNUM: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Gadberry.

REPRESENTATIVE FOY GADBERRY: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Hodges.

REPRESENTATIVE VALERIE HODGES: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Horton.

REPRESENTATIVE DODIE HORTON: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Ivey. Representative Jenkins.

REPRESENTATIVE SAM JENKINS: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Mike Johnson.

REPRESENTATIVE MIKE JOHNSON: Yes.

[01:25:01]

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative LaCombe. Representative Lyons.

REPRESENTATIVE RODNEY LYONS: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Magee.

REPRESENTATIVE TANNER MAGEE: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative Newell.

REPRESENTATIVE CANDACE NEWELL: No.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: No. Representative Thomas.

REPRESENTATIVE POLLY THOMAS: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Representative White.

REPRESENTATIVE MALINDA WHITE: Yes.

ROSALIE AMMERSBACH: Yes. Ten yays, four nays.

CHAIRMAN JOHN STEFANSKI: Ten yays, four nays, and Senate Bill 5 is moved favorable. Thank you, Madam Chairwoman. Members, that concludes the agenda for today. I will entertain some motion.

Representative Deshotel moves that we adjourn without objection.

SENATOR SHARON HEWITT: Thank you.

[BACKGROUND CONVERSATION]

[01:26:30]

TRANSPERFECT

I, Anders Nelson, hereby certify that the document "F893255-louisiana-redistricting_0215_22_hg-4" 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